International Library of Sociology

SOCIOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE AND COLLECTIVE IDENTITY

S. N. EISENSTADT AND ISRAELI SOCIETY

Stavit Sinai

Stavit Sinai's powerful book addresses the postcolonial context of the emergence of the state of Israel and its influence on Shmuel Eisenstadt's sociology. Widely regarded as the foremost theorist of "multiple modernities", Eisenstadt is also the "father of Israeli sociology". This is a compelling and urgent inquiry into the ways in which national social imaginaries have been central for the development of universal concepts.

—Gurminder K. Bhambra, Professor of Postcolonial and Decolonial Studies at the University of Sussex, UK

Sociological Knowledge and Collective Identity

Sociology, emerging in the 19th century as the study of national societies, is the intellectual product of its time, power relations and social imaginaries. As a discursive practice that was enmeshed in the meta-narratives of modernity, the discipline of sociology bears the inherent capacity to shape socially shared concepts and construct collective identities. This book examines the relationships between sociology and projects of national identity construction and presents a critique of Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, the prominent Israeli sociologist known as the "father of Israeli sociology".

The book focuses on Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel as a case of knowledge construction within an ideological system and examines the relationships between his various sociological analyses of Israeli society and the Zionist imaginary, namely the deeply entrenched political myths and historiographical narratives that constitute Israel's hegemonic national identity. By emphasizing the interrelation between textuality, identity, and loaded language, the volume seeks to demythologize Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel. Three major concepts in Eisenstadt's scholarship are specifically thematized: integration, civilization, and modernities. In each of these foci, the author shows how Eisenstadt's sociological conjectures reproduce dominant Zionist historiographical representations of the past, rationalize prevalent social hierarchies, reify the boundaries of a national collective "Self", and render legitimacy to Israel's governing ethnocratic tendencies, underlying the premises of the Zionist settler-colonial project.

Sociological Knowledge and Collective Identity will appeal to those interested in the interconnectedness of sociology and political memory, as well as in a radical postcolonial reconstruction of sociology.

Stavit Sinai is a scholar working in the field of sociology of knowledge, memory studies, and postcolonial critique. She earned her doctoral degree in the Department of History and Sociology at Konstanz University. Her paper "Self and Otherness in Israeli Sociology" was awarded the Junior Scholar prize by the International Sociological Association (ISA, 2014). Other topics of scholarly interest include, inter alia, classical Greek philosophy. Sinai is also a human rights activist.

International Library of Sociology
Founded by Karl Mannheim
Editors: John Holmwood and Vineeta Sinha

China Constructing Capitalism
Economic Life and Urban Change
Scott Lash, Michael Keith, Jakob Arnoldi and Tyler Rooker

Theories of the Information Society, 4th Edition
Frank Webster

Mobilising Modernity
The Nuclear Moment
Ian Welsh

Illness as a Work of Thought
A Foucauldian Perspective on Psychosomatics
Monica Greco

Social Class Language and Education
Denis Lawton

Housing Needs and Planning Policy
Problems of Housing Need and 'Overspill' in England and Wales
J. Barry Cullingworth

European Cosmopolitanism
Colonial Histories and Postcolonial Societies
Edited by Gurminder K. Bhambra and John Narayan

Sociological Knowledge and Collective Identity
S. N. Eisenstadt and Israeli Society
Stavit Sinai

For more information about this series, please visit: www.routledge.com

Sociological Knowledge and Collective Identity

S. N. Eisenstadt and Israeli Society

Stavit Sinai

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2019
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Sinai, Stavit, 1985– author.
Title: Sociological knowledge and collective identity / Stavit Sinai.
Description: Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY : Routledge, 2019.
Identifiers: LCCN 2018056909 | ISBN 9781138351837 (hardback) | ISBN 9780429435010 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Eisenstadt, S. N. (Shmuel Noah), 1923–2010. | Sociology—Israel. | Group identity—Israel. | Collective memory—Israel. | Israel—Civilization.
Classification: LCC HM479.E34 S56 2019 | DDC 301.095694—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2018056909

ISBN: 978-1-138-35183-7 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-429-43501-0 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

To my father, Eliezer Sinai

Contents

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my appreciation, first and foremost, to Prof. Bernhard Giesen, who provided me the opportunity to undertake this research at the Department of History and Sociology at Konstanz University. Prof. Giesen's intellectual generosity and erudition were a source of inspiration, and I am genuinely thankful for the freedom he gave me. Prof. Aleida Assmann's critical observations and guidance have supported me immensely throughout the writing of this book. I could only aspire to follow the model that Prof. Aleida Assmann has established as a scholar.

Special thanks are reserved for Dr. Kay Junge, whose kindness and trust are deeply appreciated. I am grateful for the support and encouragement of my dear colleagues in the Chair of Macro-sociology at Konstanz University: Dr. Werner Binder, Vanessa Kristin Bittner, Diana Burchardt, Dr. Marco Gerster, Noura Hafez, Francis Le-Maitre, Dr. Nils Meise, Dr. Kim Meyer, Dr. Marcel Schwarz, Dr. Robert Seyfert, Prof. Ana Sobral, and Dr. Dmitri Zakharine. I am thankful for the efforts of Konstanz University's administrative staff and the manual workers whose kindness is not forgotten.

I thank the academic advisors of the International Sociological Association's PhD Laboratory (Singapore, July 2015) – Prof. John Holmwood, Prof. Ayse Saktanber, and Prof. Vineeta Sinha – for their invaluable contribution to this book. I also thank Prof. Per Wisselgren and ISA's Research Committee on History of Sociology for awarding the Junior Scholar prize to my paper, "Self and Otherness in Israeli Sociology" (ISA's World Congress of Sociology, Yokohama, July 2014).

I thank Eik Dödtmann, Lisa Ratz, Dr. Irit Dekel, Prof. Lena Inowlocki, Prof. Micha Brumlik, Prof. Ghil'ad Zuckermann, and Prof. Dan Diner.

My beloved friends, Dr. Yuval Laor and Asaad Zoabi, have been a family to me since I entered the halls of "Gilman", the Faculty of Humanities at Tel Aviv University (Sheikh Munis). This book could not have been written without them. I wish to thank all my comrades in Berlin, especially Majed Abusalama and Ronnie Barkan.

To my loving Ada (Adela), Leehee, Yam, and Raz, I owe more than words could ever express.

This study was supported by Ernst Ludwig Erlich Studienwerk (ELES). I would like to thank Dr. Eva Lezzi and Dr. Dmitrij Belkin for their great assistance. Additional funding was received from the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD).

Introduction

This book examines the relationships between sociology, a reflective discursive sphere that engages social power, and the construction of collective national identities. It does so by focusing on the role of political memory on the level of ideology formation. The study discusses problems concerning the incorporation of political myths and historical narratives into sociological analyses and investigates – through the analysis of Eisenstadt's studies of Israel – the potential of academic sociology to reify these myths and narratives in the service of national identity construction projects.

At the center of the thesis lies the question which Max Weber (1949 [1904], 1949 [1917]) has raised about the possibility and pre-conditions for a "value-free" sociology as a science that is able to think its object of study, i.e. "modern society", while being one of its profound products.

Sociology's attempt to reflect on "modernity" and "modern society" has historically engaged the construction of certain analytical categories with which societies and groups were discussed, conceptualized, and comprehended. Terms such as "society", "modernity", "culture", "civilization", "race", or "system", which were either formed or reshaped during sociology's formative period, are examples of the discipline assuming the existence of categories and analytical units on which it had to critically reflect in order to avoid circular reasoning (petitio principii).

Hence, the discourse-object relation, where the course of analysis results in the construction of its object of study, constitutes a fundamental problem in the development of sociological discourse to the extent that sociology cannot be understood separately from the modern imaginaries from which it emerged. It also cannot be dispatched from the collective identities that these imaginaries have given rise to, particularly national identities.

The book formulates in a theoretical environment that understands knowledge, sociological knowledge in particular, as the product of its time and power relations, and where political memory and ideological trajectories, perhaps inevitably, play a role in the process of its production. This view – which was developed across the 20th century under different intellectual auspices, from Mannheim (1954 [1929]) to Foucault (2005 [1966], 1972 [1969], 1980) and later Said (1978, 1993) – perceives knowledge as subject to social construction as well as a means to rationalize existing conventions and hegemonies.

To show how the interplay between sociology and national identities manifests itself, this book offers an analysis of the works of Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt (1923–2010), the acclaimed Israeli sociologist who rose to prominence in the second half of the 20th century. The book examines Eisenstadt's works in light of the tension between sociology and the construction of national identities, thereby contributing to the discourse regarding both Eisenstadt's sociology and fundamental questions concerning sociology as a context-laden discursive practice.

The book's objective is to present a critical, post-structural and postcolonial analysis of Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel. This analysis severs sociological knowledge from national mythologies and deconstructs Eisenstadt's sociological approaches, terminology, and use of politically loaded language. Eisenstadt's studies of Israel, ranging from the year 1947 to 2010, are the primary source which the book addresses as an example of knowledge construction in an ideological system. An ideological system, in this analysis, refers to a social environment that is often recruited to national political ends, aimed at self-legitimation, and dominated by ever-evolving collective and political forms of memory.

Chapter 1 positions Zionism as the political philosophy and ideological framework of the Zionist movement – a late 19th-century national movement that engaged settler-colonial practices and whose emergence profoundly connects to a series of crises: The most pivotal among these was the rise of anti-Jewish racism.

As it aimed to establish a Jewish nation-state, the Zionist movement created and supported, toward the end of the 19th century, settler nuclei in Palestine (later known as the "Yishuv"), which expanded significantly following World War I during the "British Mandate for Palestine". The years 1947–1948 were crucial in transforming the movement's institutions to a sovereign state named "the state of Israel", constituted as the "State of the Jews". The state of Israel was accepted into the United Nations in 1947, coinciding with the beginning of the Palestinian "Nakba" – which included the violent displacement of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians who became refugees – and culminating in the 1948 War, which created a new demographic reality where native Palestinians no longer constitutes a majority.

Similarly to other 19th-century national movements that were influenced by European Romanticism that upheld ethnos-based criteria of belonging, the Zionist movement advocated the "existence of a Jewish people independent of citizenship" (Arendt 1973 [1951]: 355). The doctrine which the Zionist movement developed views circularly people of Jewish origins as members of "the Jewish people", a group whose members are regarded not necessarily as members of a religious community but as a modern national collective defined by a presumed primordial common ancestry. Zionism and its political program have affinities with other 19th-century national movements and ideologies which have established national frameworks based on their members imagining themselves as part of the same national unit, thereby creating a new type of identity that transcends different local and cultural affiliations (Anderson 1983).

Being the product of the historiographical construction of the "Jewish past", a process that commenced with the intellectual project of the Wissenschaft des

Judentums in the 19th century, Zionism nourished three main governing myths. The first two are a myth of common ancestry – equating God's "chosen people" (*Am Yisrael*) with present-day Jews; and a territorial myth in which the "Land of Israel" (*Eretz Yisrael*, the "Promised Land") is regarded as a property that belongs to the "Jewish people". Combined these two myths form the myth of exile, return, and revival, which regards the broadly defined territory known as Palestine as the biblical land from which ancient Judeans were exiled in the first or second century CE and as the place to which present-day Jews ought to return.

These political myths were cultivated by late 19th-century and early 20th-century intellectuals whose secular reading of the sacred scriptures approached the Bible as a historical source rather than as a theosophical text. Anachronistically projecting their contemporary understanding of nationalism on the political structures that prevailed in the ancient past, this cohort of scholars has qualified ancient Judea as a modern sovereign nation and drew simultaneously a direct line from the ancient Hebrews to the Jewish communities of the present (Sand 2010).

Based on the three aforementioned governing myths, it was later that the 20th-century Zionist historiography that emphasized the unity and continuity of an ethnically defined "Jewish people". Elements such as these have thereafter dominated the historiographical construction of Zionist political memory on which Israeli nationalism is based (Ram 2011: 7; Zerubavel 1995: 26).

The notion of collective Jewish wholeness rests on a representation of an ancient Jewish past, a representation which was tied to the political needs of the settler-colonial and state-building project, aiming to create a homogeneous Jewish nation-state. Narratives of Jewish unity and continuity provided the reasoning for the territorial claim over Palestine, which was regarded as the "homeland" (*Moledet*, related to the meaning of "birth" in Modern Hebrew) or "fatherland" (*Eretz Avot*) – a physical, undefined space where "the Jewish people", seen as a national entity, maintain the exclusive right to fulfill their aspiration for national self-determination. These tendencies, as has been pointed out by contemporary critical Israeli scholars, are engraved in the definition of the state of Israel as a "Jewish state", which to date claims to represent one group: "the Jewish people". These definitions were formulated in two of the constituting documents of the Zionist movement: the "Baseler Programm", originally published in 1897 in German, and "The Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel" from 1948 (hereinafter "The Declaration").[1]

Drawing on Castoriadis's "social imaginary" (Castoriadis 1987 [1975]), a concept that accounts for the unquestionable societal constitutive perceptions, the book attends to the concept of the "Zionist imaginary" to denote the omnipresence of the mythologized elements underlying Zionism's political memory. The elements composing the Zionist imaginary have developed vis-à-vis the different phases of the settler colonization of Palestine and were formed in relation to the socioeconomic and political order that the Zionist movement sought to establish. This imaginary is conceptualized as an irrefutable ideological array of overarching and interconnected reasoning, motives, narratives, symbols, and myths, the ends of which are to self-legitimize and rationalize the very premises that lie at its core (see Chapter 1).

Prior to the outbreak of World War II and as the Zionist movement began to gain momentum, Eisenstadt arrived as a child to Palestine from Warsaw, his hometown. Known as "the father of Israeli sociology" (Weil 2010: 252), Eisenstadt is widely considered as one of the leading contemporary sociologists of the second half of the 20th century, most notably known for his monumental macro-comparative studies on social change, structural differentiation, agency, and other central sociological themes. Eisenstadt, whose biographical and intellectual background is unfolded in Chapter 1, has risen to world prominence mainly for reintroducing civilizational analysis and for contributing to the discourse on modernity.

To a large extent, Eisenstadt's studies and shifting sociological approaches mirror the development of the discipline of sociology as a whole. For this reason, examining Eisenstadt's studies is an act of reflection on the history of the sociological discipline, which bears significance to thinking the discourse's capacities and limitations. One of the ramifications of reassessing Eisenstadt's studies of Israel pertains to the impact that this reassessment might have on our understanding of Eisenstadt's general sociological contributions (see Chapter 5).

Although a plethora of scholarly accounts of Eisenstadt's works can be found in the literature, no comprehensive analysis of Eisenstadt's studies of Israel has heretofore been presented. Whereas the book follows the efforts of critical Israeli sociologists such as those of Ram and Kimmerling, who mainly evaluated Eisenstadt's early sociology, it claims that such accounts do not go far enough in addressing the deeply entrenched essentialist ideological trajectories and mythic elements underlying Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel.

The book sheds light on the connection between Eisenstadt's sociology, the Zionist imaginary, and the construction of Israeli collective identity. It brings to the fore two central perspectives that were not sufficiently addressed in the discourse and assessments of Eisenstadt's works: The first is the postcolonial perspective, where the state of Israel is understood as the historical product of late 19th-century settler colonialism. The second perspective, following the constructivist approach in the study of nationalism, regards the "Jewish people" – the subject of the Zionist project – as a politically, socially, and historically constructed entity that developed in the 19th century as part of the rise of national consciousness and identities in Europe. Congruently the book locates the origins of the Zionist movement's practices within the political culture in which its founders were operating, namely, Europe's fin de siècle imperial sphere – the German Empire, the Habsburg Empire, and the Russian Empire, in particular.

Eisenstadt's scholarship covers a wide array of topics and research areas. Due to this exceptional range of erudition, this book will examine three major thematic foci which were chosen in light of their centrality in Eisenstadt's sociological analysis: integration, civilization, and modernities.

The first topic, "integration", deals with Eisenstadt's early studies (1947–1956) which focus mainly on the making of social stability and national unity in a "system" that Eisenstadt considered as "modern". Chapter 2 offers a Saidian reading of Eisenstadt's analysis of Israel's early statehood and discusses two major and interrelated orientations that Eisenstadt's early studies of Israel reveal: utopianism and orientalism.

Under the auspices of the Zionist myth of exile and return, Eisenstadt's early utopian portrayal of Israeli society and its pre-state settlements render an image of a homogeneous Jewish nation where individuals and groups strive toward a realization of their political salvation in an attempt to redeem themselves from their previous "exilic" existence.

This utopian view, which was heavily influenced by Parsonian structural functionalism as well as late 1940s British social anthropology, reifies a hierarchy where European immigrants are assumed to be superior to non-European immigrants. This assumption marked an imagined boundary between European Jews and non-European Jews. Although the former were considered to have a constructive role in the Zionist nation-building project, the latter were found to be in a state of "anomie". The term "anomie" is one of the means by which Eisenstadt discursively counterposed the Arab Jews/Mizrahim to the national ideals of the time using sociological terminology. Eisenstadt's sociological "invention" of the non-European "other" played a major role in defining the ideal utopian society and in shaping a homogeneous collective "self". Both tendencies, utopianism and hierarchization of different groups, are bound together by the socio-political and cultural logic of Israel's etatist period, which necessitated the production of categories of self and otherness to articulate social boundaries.

The second topic, "civilization", concerns Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis, which was developed beginning in the 1970s. Apart from tracing the different sociographical roots of Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis, the chapter offers a critical reading of Eisenstadt's conceptualization of the Jewish civilization (Eisenstadt 1992). The chapter first develops a critique of Eisenstadt's view and use of sources concerning the Jewish past, and second, it engages a historical contextualization of the sociological-historical perceptions conveyed in *Jewish Civilization*.

Chapter 3 first centers on Eisenstadt's emphasis on a narrative of continuity, showing how his accounts of the "Jewish historical experience" have relied almost entirely on Zionist historiography and its contemporized perception of the Jewish past. A closer examination of Eisenstadt's depiction of the history of Jews reveals a teleological view in which the establishment of the state of Israel is seen as the institutional realization of ancient visions and as the point to which the path of the history of Jews has been leading since antiquity. Eisenstadt's reliance on Zionist historiography is examined as an example of a general and fundamental problem that arises as sociological analyses rely on national myths as the basis of their historical sociology.

Second, the chapter argues that Eisenstadt's understanding of the "Jewish historical experience" corresponds to and legitimizes the emerging concept of Judaism as a culture. Observing Judaism in terms of a distinct culture is a perspective which prevailed among circles of Israeli Zionist secular elites in the last third of the 20th century. Applying the category of civilization to Judaism provided a sociological justificatory account, a sociodicy, for a secular elite that was in need of redefining its relation to Judaism, especially after the 1977 political shift when Judaism became a significant criterion of group belonging and an essential factor in Israel's electoral politics and mobilization.

The final topic to be examined in this book, "modernities", concerns Eisenstadt's "multiple modernities" thesis (Eisenstadt 1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2001, 2010). The chapter traces the different historical and intellectual contexts in which the paradigm of multiple modernities was formulated, presents recent critiques of the paradigm, and discusses its application to the case of Israel.

"Multiple modernities" gained wide recognition in the academic sphere at the turn of the 21st century for positioning a theoretical model where modernity is understood as a phenomenon whose institutional manifestations do not necessarily take a Western form. The theory criticizes classical sociology for regarding the European cultural program as the sole model of modernity destined to spread to the non-European world. Instead, Eisenstadt – emphasizing the autonomy of culture from structural conditions and stressing the significance of human agency in the constitution of social lives – explains the different patterns of societal change by underscoring the endless interactions between culture (agency) and structure (institutional constellations). Eisenstadt's model provides a renewed understanding of modernity, theorized as a civilization by and of itself: a "second axial age" that emerged with the rise of new agencies, causing different formations of modernities to flourish simultaneously.

Chapter 4 then reviews the insights that the multiple modernities thesis offers when attempting to sociologically analyze Israeli society as one of these modern formations. It shows that Eisenstadt's view of Israel within his new theory did not significantly break with its depiction as a Western entity.

Eisenstadt's late portrayal of Israel as being constitutional and consociational positions Israel as an essentially democratic polity. Such sociological interpretation is, however, grounded within the hegemonic narrative of Israel being a "Jewish democracy", a polity which Eisenstadt understands as a unique institutional expression that is part of the modern cultural and institutional variability. Despite its inclusive approach to understanding modernity, this interpretation, the chapter argues, does not bring into account the pervasiveness of the exclusivist and essentialist dimensions embedded in the "Jewish and democratic" definition of Israel, elements which contradict the very definition of a democratic civil sphere, where all civilians are seen equally as part of the body of a nation.

Furthermore, it is argued that just as the multiple modernities thesis refrains from addressing the historical process of colonialism, its application to the case of Israel masks the broader context of settler colonialism in which the history of the Zionist movement interweaves. Eisenstadt's depiction of Israel as a Western polity and his reluctance to account for the phenomenon of colonialism in the making of modernity in Israel, in particular, leads to an examination of the validity of Eisenstadt's general sociological contributions.

Reflecting the paradoxes of Israeli collective identity, shifting between universalism and ethnic essentialism, Eisenstadt's analysis of Israel within the theoretical framework of multiple modernities has obfuscated the exclusivist political dimensions inherent to the Zionist imaginary while providing a theoretical base to reassure and mainly neutralizing Israel's existing ethnocratic political structure and discourse.

The book's concluding chapter accounts for the embeddedness of narratives, myths, and national historiography in Eisenstadt's sociological writings and their discursive power. It positions Eisenstadt's sociology as a mnemonic reflective space, where the image of the national "Self" and its collective boundaries are assured and reassured from different sociological perspectives. Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel engages the discursive construction of its object of investigation, namely, of Israeli society, to which it renders a sense of subjectivity by reproducing, rationalizing, and reifying its hegemonic representations. Challenging the cosmopolitan character that is often attributed to Eisenstadt's work, the chapter underscores the impossibility of severing Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel from the settler colonization episteme from which Zionism emerged.

Last, the book discusses the meta-theoretical prospect of untying sociology from the constituting narratives in which it is enmeshed. It offers to view the deconstruction and demythologization of the sociological corpus as a means to pursue a radical reconstruction of the discipline through a reflection on its function and telos.

Note

1 This definition was affirmed by the recent "Basic Law: Israel as the Nation-State of the Jewish People" (The Knesset, 2018). Following "The Declaration" (1948), the bill defines the exclusive entitlement of the Jewish people for self-determination as both a "natural and historic right".

References

Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso.

Arendt, H. (1973) [1951] *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Castoriadis, C. (1987) [1975] *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, trans. Blamey, K., Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1992) *Jewish Civilization: The Jewish Historical Experience in a Comparative Perspective*, New York: SUNY Press.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1999) "Multiple Modernities in an Age of Globalization", *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 24 (2): 283–295.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (2000a) "The Civilizational Dimension in Sociological Analysis", *Thesis Eleven* 62: 1–21.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (2000b) "Multiple Modernities", *Daedalus* 129 (1): 1–29.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (2001) "The Civilizational Dimension of Modernity: Modernity as a Distinct Civilization", *International Sociology* 16: 320–340.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (2010) *Multiple Modernities*, Tel Aviv: The Van Leer Jerusalem Institute and Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing House. [Hebrew]

Foucault, M. (1972) [1969] *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, trans. Sheridan, Smith A. M., New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, ed. Gordon, C., New York: Random House.

Foucault, M. (2005) [1966] *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, London and New York: Routledge.

The Knesset. (2018) "Basic Law: Israel as the Nation-State of the Jewish People", no. 2743, *Laws of the State of Israel*, Israel: Government Printer. [Hebrew]

Mannheim, K. (1954) [1929] *Ideology and Utopia*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

The Provisional Government of Israel. (1948) "The Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel", *Official Gazette*: Number 1, Tel Aviv, May 14, 1948.

Ram, U. (2011) *Israeli Nationalism: Social Conflicts and the Politics of Knowledge*, New York: Routledge.

Said, E.W. (1978) *Orientalism*, New York: Vintage Books.

Said, E.W. (1993) *Culture and Imperialism*, London: Vintage Books.

Sand, S. (2010) *The Invention of the Jewish People*, London and New York: Verso.

Weber, M. (1949) [1904] " 'Objectivity' in Social Science and Social Policy", in: Shils, A., and Finch, H.A. (eds.) *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, New York: Free Press, pp. 50–112.

Weber, M. (1949) [1917] "The Meaning of 'Ethical Neutrality' in Sociology and Economics", in: Shils, A., and Finch, H.A. (eds.) *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, New York: Free Press, pp. 1–47.

Weil, S. (2010) "On Multiple Modernities, Civilizations and Ancient Judaism, An interview with Prof. S.N. Eisenstadt", *European Societies* 12 (4): 451–465.

Zerubavel, Y. (1995) *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

1 Eisenstadt, modern imaginaries, and the political mythology of Zionism

> All knowledge of cultural reality [. . .] is always knowledge from particular points of view.
>
> —Weber (1949 [1904]: 81)

Sociology and modern imaginaries

The discourse of Western sociology emerged in the late 18th and 19th centuries as a reflection on the momentous societal transformations that were later conceptualized in the term "modernity". Here one encounters the primary and fundamental complex that characterizes the discipline, namely, the fact that sociology itself was both a product of the analytical categories that it defined and aimed to account for at the same time. The constitution of the social order and the conditions that propel or hinder social change were among the central problems that the discipline of sociology contended with. This was the result of the great dislocation and the epistemic rupture caused primarily by the "dual revolutions" – the French and the Industrial (Hobsbawm 1962) – as well as by the social, political, and national revolutions of the 19th century (Heilbron et al. 1998; Wokler 2002: 63; Harrison 2004: 138; Adams et al. 2005).

As inferred from the term "social science", which Abbé Sieyès coined in prerevolutionary France (Jones 1998: xv), the core of the sociological discourse draws on the assumption that humans and societies can be the objects of rational scientific analysis (Foucault (2005) [1966]) and that social phenomena can be observed, pointed out, and explained (Weber 1949 [1904]). This assumption makes the sociological discourse not only inseparable from modern imagination and ideologies but also a distinct product of both. As a reflective practice that centers on the idea of modernity and modern societies (Giddens 1991: 2), the sociological discourse engages the production and reproduction of different representations of society (Bourdieu 1994). Such representations could, in turn, have crucial bearings on societies' self-understanding, "collective representations" (Durkheim 1954 [1912]), and their "social imaginary" (Castoriadis 1987 [1975]). It is therefore assumed that if social reality is indeed socially constructed, as Berger and Luckmann argue (1966), then sociology as discourse can potentially operate as a tool in shaping socially shared concepts (Bourdieu 1991 [1977]: 170).

Whereas the endeavor to reflect on society's structures in Western tradition of thought harks back to classic philosophy, most notably to Plato's *Republic*, it was the "sociological imagination" (Wright Mills 2000 [1959]) which emerged in the early 19th century with thinkers such as Auguste Comte – who coined the term "sociology" (Hobsbawm 1962: 284) – Alexis de Tocqueville, and their 18th-century predecessors that has marked a new phase in Western sociography.

Such formative "imagination" has shaped sociology's early classics, first by positioning society as an object of scientific inquiry based on empirical and objective criteria of truth, and second, by adhering to the discourse of the Enlightenment movement, its new perception of the human subject, and its underlying idea of "progress".[1]

The reflection on society has chiefly reinterpreted terms such as "culture", "civilization", "order", and "history". Concurrently, the very concept of "society" is to be seen as an artifact of the social sciences presupposing "a meaningful conceptualization of something called a society" (Wittrock 2003: 103). These constructed terms and their shifting meanings are to be understood in relation to the European rise to dominance. In this context, the "civilized" was defined in contrast to the "uncivilized" (Rousseau [1755] 1994); "developed" societies were understood in relation to underdeveloped ones (Rodney 1981 [1972]); the "modern", or the "purposeful-rational" – to use Weber's terminology[2] – was conceived in a similar vein, namely, as the opposition of the "non-modern", or the "traditional" (Bhambra 2014: 25). These kinds of dichotomies were embedded in Western thought and constituted one of its major errors (Derrida 1978 [1967]). The use of dichotomous distinctions, conserving "the subject of the West, or the West as Subject" (Spivak 1988: 271), has consequently perpetuated the symbolic marking of social boundaries (Lamont and Molnár 2002) and hierarchies (Dumont 1969).

Postcolonial critique of sociology regards the primary categories that lie at the core of the sociological discourse as framed within a Western-centric understanding of the modern self, a Self that necessitates the construction of the epistemological "Other" (Said 1978; Bhambra 2007a). In light of this critique, the period of sociology's disciplinary formation is understood in relation to the simultaneous emergence of a European subject, constituted by the meta-narratives of "progress", "democracy", and "universality". These meta-narratives, being in sharp contrast to practices of enslavement and imperial oppression that Europe employed and spread throughout its colonial enterprises, have nevertheless shaped the sociological prisms, terminology, and its fundamental questions.

The formative period of sociology should also be understood in relation to the emergence of another, equally central, modern narrative: nationalism and the rise of the nation-state. Among other historical causes, the nation-state emerged due to shifts in the form of political legitimacy. Following the weakening of monarchic regimes that were based on the "Mandate of Heaven", nationalism has reintroduced the concept of the collective, "the people", as the sovereign. It did so as it positioned the collective's general will, conceptualized by Rousseau in *The Social Contract* (1762) as the source of political legitimacy. Nationalism began as a general universal movement (Hobsbawm 1962: 132), calling mass populations to rule

themselves, for and by themselves. However, this process of democratization has quickly taken particularistic local forms which necessitated the maintenance of social-cultural boundaries in a sphere of great heterogeneity. The nation-building process, which dominated 19th-century Europe, is thus understood as a political project of social and cultural construction in which heterogeneous groups "imagine" themselves as being a part of a broader and yet distinguished homogeneous unit (Anderson 1983). The ideological premise that guided the cultural and social construction of these localized national projects has generally propagated a notion of a "uniform and integral society" (Turner 2006: 225), which was used as one of the major mobilizing tools to establish this novel form of collective identity – a social phenomenon which did not exist in pre-modern times.

The rise of nationalism and the nation-state in 19th-century Europe has necessitated the use of symbolic means such as myths, rituals, and a national language through which individual members of the collective could imagine themselves as part of the national collective. The nation, as Giesen argues, has therefore "became a political project to be described, advised upon, and programmatically realized with the help of sociology, pedagogy, and political science" (Giesen 1998: 3).

Sociology, as in the case of the discipline of history, has not only engaged the "discursive writing" (Frye (2015) [1957], cited in White (2002) [1974]: 193) of the modern Subject, but also emerged as "the science of national societies" (Delanty 2015), the ends of which was to address "the problems and challenges associated with the newly formed nation states" (Bhambra 2014: 15). Nationalism, though, remained an undertheorized concept in classic sociology (Smith 1983: 20), for the idea of the nation was either embedded within the concept of modern society or was simply perceived as illusive and irrelevant, as was in the case of Marxist theory.

The social sciences have historically developed under the aegis of modern academic institutions, which were developed vis-à-vis the rise of the nation-state (Hobsbawm 1962). The emergence of the nation-state was also followed by the rising status of intellectuals who played a significant role in mediating the interest and logic of the nation-state (Kedourie 1993 [1960]).

Nisbet underscores the paradox of sociology as being rooted in "mainstream modernism" on the one hand, and in "philosophical conservatism" on the other. Nisbet points to Comte's ambition of the "total reordering of western societies", to Le Play's conservatism, to Marx's radicalism, and to Spencer's liberalism (Nisbet 1993: 17). The relationships between sociology and national ideologies connect to its potential to produce representations and to employ symbolic means, that is, to its *discursive power*.

One of the most evident examples of the interplay between sociological theories and national identity building is Marxism's late adaptation as a state ideology, as seen, inter alia, in the case of Soviet Russia and the People's Republic of China. Marxism conceives the concept of ideology as an overarching framework that legitimizes relations of production and class domination. It operated as a "camera obscura" that reflected an inverted view of reality (Marx and Engels (1975) [1846]). Marxism, as Wieviorka (2003: 82–84) notes, regards itself as science,

which positioned a critique of ideological systems. At the same time, Marxism's revolutionary vision, assuming that modernization would give rise to a working class that would eventually abolish the capitalist market economy, grew into an ideology that had a far-reaching influence in shaping 20th-century societies, regimes, and scientific paradigms.

The case of Brazil exemplifies how sociological discourse shapes national ideologies: The construction of Brazilian identity involved the adoption of Comte's positivism as official state ideology (Freyre and Horton 1986). Interpretations given to Comte's concepts of "order" and "progress"[3] – the motto displayed on the Brazilian flag – have had a long-term effect on the shaping of Brazilian social policies and self-understanding.

Similarly, as Pavlich (2014) and Sooryamoorthy (2016: 8) show, the bulk of the sociological research conducted by Afrikaner settlers during the apartheid period in South Africa has supported segregation policies which have aimed to establish a social order governed by racial superiority.

An additional example can be seen in the case of Parsonian structural functionalism which became the dominant paradigm in sociology in the two decades succeeding World War II (Ram 1995: 27). During this period, the United States reached a hegemonic position as a powerful geopolitical actor. This position was also nourished by the dynamic of the Cold War that divided the world into two blocs of "East" and "West", "capitalists" and "communists". Being located within these historical settings, Parsonian structural functionalism regarded society "as an integrated whole whose various parts fits together. Its normal condition is one of equilibrium" (Harrison 2004: 141).

Parsons's social system was conceived as a "closed and self-maintaining social unit" (Ram 1995: 27). The system's social institutions were investigated "in terms of their functions, that is the manner in which they contribute to the maintenance of societal equilibrium" (Harrison 2004: 141). The teleological assumption of functionality that Parsons's theory embeds is a corollary of the sociological discourse of modernity, where the functionality of social arrangements is regarded as a liberating power (Wagner 1994: 9).

Parsons's theory, hypothesizing a "state of (perfect) system integration" (Schmid 1992: 109), considers the nation-state to be its basic analytical unit, according to Spohn (2001: 502), and tended to subsume the nation in the categories of society, as Smith argues (1983: 24).

Another example concerns the relation between the social sciences and colonialism. Asad frames British social anthropology in the context of British colonial domination and regards it as a project that was carried out "by Europeans, for a European audience – of non-European societies dominated by European power" (Asad 1995 [1973]: 15). He maintains that the field of anthropology developed out of an unequal power encounter where Western researchers were given "access to cultural and historical information about the societies it [the West] has progressively dominated". Such encounter re-enforced the "inequalities between the European and non-European worlds" (ibid., 16). Asad draws attention to how anthropological understanding of the non-European was shaped by the mode of

life, language, and reason which the West represents. Asad underscores the discipline's "readiness to adapt to colonial ideology", its compliance with the colonial system, and the fact that it did not pose a challenge to this system's inherent inequality (ibid., 17–18).

Following Asad – who depicts the connection of the Colonial Social Science Research Council (CSSRS) to the studies of British anthropologists such as Alfred Radcliffe-Brown, Raymond Firth and Audrey Richards (the latter being Eisenstadt's instructors at the London School of Economics [LSE]) – Steinmetz's recent work points out the connection between the establishment of British sociology in the years 1945 and 1965, and the British Empire's "new phase of developmental colonialism backed by the social and other sciences" (Steinmetz 2013: 353). Steinmetz argues that "many parts of the emerging sociological discipline became entangled with colonialism". He further underscores "the involvement of sociologists from the London School of Economics in training colonial officials" (ibid.).

Critical studies such as these bring to the surface the involvement of leading institutions for sociological research in colonial enterprises. The understanding that sociology is engraved in modern Western-centric thought and colonial imagination further stresses the need for a critical postcolonial deconstruction and reconstruction of the basic analytical categories which lie at the core of the sociological discourse (Bhambra 2014).

Being a product of modern imaginaries, sociology – as a reflective discursive practice – is not immune to the omnipresence of the ideological mechanisms that are shaped and informed by world-views, épistémès, and social imaginaries. Nor is it immune to the pervasiveness of national culture and political memory, the notion of group belonging and collectivity. As any cultural construct, sociology too is shaped by its temporal horizons, power relations, hegemonic views, and collective memory. It cannot be severed from the conditions from which it emerges.

Sociology of knowledge

Inquiring how social and cultural predicates dominate modes of knowing is the subject matter of the field of sociology of knowledge. Max Weber (1949 [1904], 1949 [1917]) discusses the possible existence of a "value-free" sociology. Weber argues that scientific knowledge, the analysis of facts, is a cultural product (Weber 1949 [1904]: 55) and that knowledge of "cultural reality" is derived from "particular points of view" (ibid., 81). Weber maintains that

> there is no absolutely "objective" scientific analysis of culture [. . .] of "social phenomena" independent of special and "one-sided" viewpoints according to which – expressly or tacitly, consciously or unconsciously – they are selected, analyzed and organized for expository purposes. The reasons for this lie in the character of the cognitive goal of all research in social science which seeks to transcend the purely formal treatment of the legal or conventional norms regulating social life.
>
> (ibid., 72)

Weber points out an intricacy that would continue to resonate in the sociological discourse, namely, the presuppositions of "cultural values with which we approach reality" (ibid., 78), the cultural significance which is attributed to a certain phenomenon and on which scientific interests rest (ibid., 81), and the possibility of withholding value judgment in the process of scientific investigation (Weber 1949 [1917]). Universal concepts, according to this approach, cannot but be culturally relativized.

Bourdieu has gone further to argue for what can be understood as the underlying totalitarian grasp of the state over the social scientist's perception: "To endeavor to think the state", he writes,

> is to take the risk of taking over (or being taken over by) a thought of the state, i.e. of applying to the state categories of thought produced and guaranteed by the state and hence to misrecognize its most profound truth.
>
> (Bourdieu 1994: 1)

What is "the most profound truth" that Bourdieu refers to?

In an effort to underscore major shifts in Western thought, Mannheim's epistemological sociology attempted "to investigate the conditions under which problems and disciplines come into being and pass away" (Mannheim 1954 [1929]: 97). Mannheim frames the discourse of sociology as a discipline that emerged from the philosophic turn to the subject and regards it as a "theoretical weapon" that was implemented in the battles of modern politics (ibid., 35). He points out the collective motivations that guide different "directions of thought" and discusses the role of the "intelligentsia", that is, of social groups "whose special task is to provide an interpretation of the worlds for that society" (ibid., 9). Mannheim focuses on two crucial elements which dominated modern thought: ideology and utopia, both of which were chosen as the title for his known monograph that was published towards the end phase of Weimar Republic.

Attempting to present a neutral concept of ideology, analyzed outside the tradition of Marxism (Thompson 1990: 7), Mannheim regards ideology as a force that tends to obscure thought. His conceptualization of ideology pertains to the practices of "ruling groups" whose "thinking become so intensively interest-bound to a situation that they are simply no longer able to see certain facts which would undermine their sense of domination" (Mannheim 1954 [1929]: 36).

Ideology, according to Mannheim, is a force that masks "the real condition of society both to itself and to others and thereby stabilizes it" (ibid., 36). Whereas Mannheim's concept of ideology includes an element of stabilization, one that seeks to maintain existing social order as it is, his understating of utopia relates to the realm of change, of future hopes and aspirations, associated with non-ruling groups.

Utopian thought, according to Mannheim, tends to eclipse the understanding of the existing conditions of society. "In the utopian mentality", he writes, "the collective unconscious, guided by wishful representation and the will to action, hides certain aspects of reality" (ibid., 36). The utopists "are not concerned with what

really exists; rather in their thinking they already seek to change the situation that exists" (ibid., 36). Utopian thinking is oriented towards "transcending reality", one that ought to break "bonds of the existing order" (ibid., 173).

Mannheim argues that social reality is "concealed" by ideological and utopian "distortions". Despite their embedded obscureness, "both concepts", he argues, "contain the imperative that every idea must be tested by its congruence with reality" (ibid., 87). Mannheim, therefore, suggests seeing these concepts as the basis of "sound skepticism" to be used for investigating social reality (ibid., 87). From being tools that operate within and on the political sphere, ideology and utopia become analytical concepts that can be instrumentalized for critical investigation. The difference between the concepts of ideology and utopia is merely analytical because both are dependent on "the stage and degree of reality to which one applies this standard" (ibid., 176). The meaning and effects these concepts have cannot be grasped outside a specific point of view or context, which are the result of particular social settings.

Knowledge, Mannheim argues, does not reside outside of its social surroundings, a *Weltanschauung*, which lie at its core; for knowledge is "bound up with a mode of existence and social position" (ibid., 166). Sociology, which ought to provide "an adequate picture of the structure of the whole of society" (ibid., 228), is therefore subjected to ideological utopian tendencies. Congruently, sociology becomes means to exogenous social ends rather than being an end in itself.

As academic sociology descended from the meta-discipline of philosophy (Lévi-Strauss 2001 [1978]: 3), its end harks back to the Platonic notion of "know thyself". Sociology is not only a study of human "societies" but also a humanizing practice, for it reflects on the essence and modes of societal existence. Sociology, in so far as it an independent inquiry of human societies, has no external goal rather than engaging in a reflective thought process of its study objects. The aim of the sociology of knowledge, according to Mannheim, is to envisage the "social processes influencing the process of knowledge" (Mannheim 1954 [1929]: 240) and to "research into ideology, that interrelations of social position, motives, and points of view" (ibid., 169).

Mannheim's sociology of knowledge speaks of the " 'perspective' of a thinker", which refers to the "the subject's whole mode of conceiving things as determined by his historical and social settings" (ibid., 239). Whereas sociology of knowledge engages "the varying ways in which objects present themselves to the subject according to the differences in social settings" (ibid., 238), the term "perspective" points out how "one views an object, what one perceives in it, and how one construes it in his thinking" (ibid., 244). Mannheim's epistemological sociology then embeds the understanding that

> content of social-intellectual phenomena is primarily meaningful and because meaning is perceived in acts of understanding and interpretation, we may say that the problem of perspectivism in the sociology of knowledge refers, first of all, to what is understandable in social phenomena.
>
> (ibid., 272–273)

Sociology of knowledge developed into a field of different emphases.[4] One of the intellectually influential streams of thought in the field of sociology of knowledge was developed by post-structuralist thinkers who theorized the relationships between power and knowledge. Similar to Mannheim, these thinkers stress that modes of thought cannot be severed from the context of collective action (Mannheim 1954 [1929]: 3) and that individual thought is connected to a discourse shaped by a social-historical situation (ibid.).

Post-structuralism emerged as a critique of both structuralism's and existentialism's idea of individual choice. Declaring "the death of the author" (Barthes (2001) [1977]), post-structuralist thinkers, who rose to prominence during the 1970s, sought to challenge the concept of the subject, namely, the tangibility of having a distinctive, individual point of view, free from any structural constraints. In this framework, texts and authors are perceived as cultural artifacts rather than of an expression of a unique individual perspective. Bodies of knowledge and modes of thought are regarded as unseparated from the socio-historical conditions out of which these emerged. This approach, articulated in the works of Foucault (2005 [1966], 1972 [1969], 1980), Derrida (1978 [1967]), Barthes (2001 [1977]), and others, criticizes the analytical and binary categories which dominated the Western tradition of thought, emphasizing the interconnectedness of language, power, and discourse.

Foucault understands knowledge as being discursively constructed by social powers to reflect and preserve social power. Foucault, equating discourse with ideology, maintains that what is being conceived as "truth" cannot be disassociated from social ordering. In *The Order of Things*, he argues that human sciences have resided within certain "épistémès", that is, a sphere that enables the possibility of certain configurations of knowledge to emerge (Foucault 2005 [1966]: xxiv–xxiii): the intermingling of social order and its confirmed framework of interpretation of the world.[5]

In *The Archeology of Knowledge*, Foucault argues that an analysis of a certain object entails its discursive formation. Based on the argument that objects are formed through their analysis (Foucault 1972 [1969]: 45), Foucault identifies discourse as a practice (ibid., 46): Discourse is not just a sphere of confrontation between "reality" and "language", "the intrication of a lexicon and an experience", "nor the canonical use of a vocabulary", but a practice that involves "the ordering of objects" (ibid., 48–49). Discourse is thus "governed by analysable rules" (ibid., 211). Furthermore, it defines the domain of its "validity", "normativity" and "actuality", that is, it establishes the criteria according to which truth and falsehood are deliberated, for certain statements to be excluded, and of defining present problems, situating and utilizing concepts (ibid., 61).

Foucault's "archaeology" differs from the history of ideas or conceptual history in its attempt to establish a "systematic description of a discourse-object" (ibid.) and in its endeavor to reveal "relations between discursive formations and non-discursive domains (institutions, political events, economic practices, and processes)" (ibid., 162). It does not resolve contradictions within a certain discourse, nor does it seek to attain the coherency of thought (ibid., 155). "Archaeology" is

much more willing than the history of ideas to underscore "discontinuities, ruptures, gaps, entirely new forms of positivity, and of sudden redistributions" (ibid., 169). Foucault's archeological description lays out a set of fundamental questions: "Who is its author? Who is speaking? In what circumstances and in what context? With what intentions, what project in mind?" (ibid., 171–172). These questions pertain to the status of speakers, to that which qualifies speakers to render the assurance that their claims are true (ibid., 50–51). Foucault further questions the possible positions that the subject may hold in relation to the object and asks from which "institutional sites" do speakers lay out their claims? (ibid., 51).

The relationships between discourse and power are discussed in Barthes's article, "The Discourse of History", where he argues that "historical discourse is in its essence a form of ideological elaboration [. . .] an *imaginary* elaboration" (Barthes 1981 [1967]: 16). "The historian", he argues, "is not so much a collector of facts as a collector and relater of signifiers; that is to say, he organizes them with the purpose of establishing positive meaning and filling the vacuum of pure, meaningless series" (ibid.). Barthes understands discourse – historical discourse in particular – as having performative dimensions in which "what appears as a statement (and description) is in fact no more than the signifier of the speech act as an act of authority" (ibid., 17).

Barthes then challenges the very possibility of discourse to have a grasp of "the real" or to be able to do "more than signify the real" (ibid.). "History's refusal to assume the real as signified", Barthes concludes,

> led it [. . .] at the privileged point when it attempted to form itself into a genre in the nineteenth century, to see in the 'pure and simple' relation of the facts [. . .] and to institute narration as the privileged signifier of the real.
>
> (ibid., 18)

Barthes's radical critique of the discourse of history – a critique that can be extended to the social sciences – points out the intangibility of the past. The discourse of history, according to Barthes, is but a mere form of narration. Barthes's critique aligns the discourse of history with the realms of memory, a sphere which is in and of itself discursively constructed in a way that reflects as it engages dimensions of power.

The question of the very intelligibility of the past is discussed in Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics, which he develops in his seminal work *Truth and Method* (1975 [1960]). Gadamer, being one of the later thinkers of the 20th century who wrote in the late tradition of German idealism, regards the relation of individuals to the world as discursive in character (Rosen 1997: 207). Drawing on Heidegger's philosophy, Gadamer views language as the medium through which such relation is mediated. Language is not merely a tool for interpreting the world, for it "bears its own truth within it" (Gadamer 1975 [1960]: 385). This means that language itself frames the scope of hermeneutics and forms it.[6] As Rosen suggests, Gadamer's inquiry into the hermeneutic process by which sense and significance are formed results in the equation of understanding with interpretation

(Rosen 1997: 207). "Language is the universal medium in which understanding occurs", Gadamer maintains, and "understanding occurs in interpreting" (Gadamer 1975 [1960]: 390).

Within this frame, Gadamer's concept of "fusion of horizons" (*Horizontverschmelzung*) denotes how the historical hermeneutic response to the perspectives of the present and the way the present is shaped by the "horizon" of the past (ibid., 304–306). "Every encounter with tradition that takes place within historical consciousness involves the experience of a tension between the text and the present", Gadamer argues (ibid.). Gadamer claims that individuals have their own contemporal self-understanding, one that preempts them from addressing sources from a temporal perspective different from their own, namely, without projecting their own "historical horizon" (ibid.). Given that individuals exist only within their own epoch, their subjective understanding/interpretation of sources is one in which past and present mediate one another. The same principle applies to how individuals understand their own times: "The horizon of the present", Gadamer writes, "cannot be formed without the past" (ibid.). Prefigured interpretations of the "historical past" therefore "include our own comprehension of them" (ibid., 367).

Castoriadis's concept of the "social imaginary" (*l'imaginaire social*) constitutes another seminal contribution to understanding discursive power (Castoriadis 1987 [1975]). Castoriadis, a thinker keen on post-structuralism, employs the term "social imaginary" to denote the deeply entrenched "significations", which are the given, irrefutable, and unquestionable constitutive perceptions and institutional patterns that are created in every social form of existence and stand outside the realm of rational critique.

The imaginary to which Castoriadis refers is not defined as a reflection: "it is not an image *of*", but rather as "the unceasing and essentially *undetermined* (social-historical and psychical) creation of figures/forms/images, on the basis of which alone there can ever be a question of 'something'. What we call 'reality' and 'rationality' are its works" (ibid., 3).

Such critiques have far-reaching implications not only for understanding the social sciences as practices that engage forms of discursive power, but also for positioning intellectuals as agents who act within these fields of power and in relation to them. Sociologists in particular, Bourdieu maintains, have the symbolic capital to cultivate and produce intellectual trajectories that can affect the social sphere (Bourdieu 1991 [1977]).

As a product of the social reality from which they emerged, and being located within particular institutional sites, scholarly discourses are nourished from their social-historical contexts, their politics of identity, as well as their "social imaginaries". The relationships among scholarly discourses, ideological systems, and the collective identities within which they reside and operate can therefore be defined as mutually constituting relations (Wodak et al. 1999: 8).

Postcolonial critique engages another crucial aspect surrounding the intricacy typifying the process of knowledge production: It understands knowledge and concepts produced in the "West" as the products of ingrained colonial relations of

power (Said 1978; Spivak 1988; Asad 1992, 1995 [1975]; Bhabha 1997 [1991]; Gandhi 1998; Bhambra 2007a, 2014). Postcolonial scholars discuss how European identity, meta-narratives, and modern imaginaries were constituted in relation to the colonial processes of expansion, and how the course of Western scholarship iterated an image of the non-European "other" as inferior and as counterposed to the cultural logic and ideals bequeathed by the West. This critique does not only seek to challenge and deconstruct knowledge constructed and based on Western épistémès, but it also strives to think and write history from the point of view of the colonized. Postcolonial critique emerged as part of the turn toward memory, a renewed theoretical field that accounts for the role of remembrance as an identity building mechanisms.

Collective memory, political myths, and the construction of national identity

The first main contributions to contemporary discourse of collective memory were, by and large, a corollary of the historical rise of the nation-state and its ensuing collective traumas.[7] Renan, reacting to the Franco-Prussian War, has argued that forgetfulness, no less than the accumulation of shared memories, is crucial in the creation of a nation (Renan 2011 [1882]: 80). The next significant contribution to the discourse on memory would emerge after World War I, when the role of state pedagogical institutions in constructing national identity became more evident. Preceded by A. Warburg's iconological theory, which observes cultural objects as carriers of memory, it was Halbwachs (1925) who underscored the social and communicative dimensions of memory (J. Assmann 2011: 16). Halbwachs distinguishes autobiographical memory from historical memory, and theorizes memory as being subjected to social formations. This distinction has laid out a foundation for a sociological account of memory (Olick et al. 2011: 16–19). Drawing on Bergson's notion of memory and Durkheim's "collective representations", Halbwachs contends that "the succession of our remembrances, of even our most personal ones, is always explained by changes occurring in our relationships to various collective milieus – in short, by the transformations these milieus undergo separately and as a whole" (Halbwachs 2011 [1925]: 142).

Halbwachs's work was developed along with the rise of the first generation of Annalistes. The historiographical lines of the Annales School – emphasizing long-term processes in historical analysis and bringing to the fore histories other than those of the elite ("history from below") – was deeply informed by Halbwachs's work (Olick et al. 2011: 22–23). Halbwachs's notion of memory as being rooted within social frameworks has opened new research paths, situating memory as an object of sociological analysis to be examined under various sociological foci – the sociology of knowledge in particular (Olick and Robbins 1998).

The idea of "collective memory" was not absent from the sociological writing between the late 1940s to the 1980s, and yet it was the "memory boom", emerging along with the "cultural turn" in the late 1970s, that reiterated the discourse on collective memory, offering a new prism to view the great traumas of the 20th

century. Marked by a rediscovery of Halbwachs's work, the memory boom has led to renewed sociological interest in collective memory, mediated mainly by figures such as M. Douglas, E. Shils, and B. Schwarz (Olick et al. 2011: 4, 23–24, 26). A. Assmann discusses the possible factors which have led to the new interest in memory, including the "breakdown of the so-called 'grand narratives' at the end of the cold war"; a postcolonial recovery of the narratives and memories of those who were deprived of their own voice under colonial rules; and a post-traumatic situation following the Holocaust and the two World Wars which became evident after a period of silence (A. Assmann 2006: 210–211).

Nora, a prominent figure of the revived discourse on collective memory and a member of the third generation of Annalistes, argues that the past is fundamentally inaccessible to historians. Nora depicts historical writing as a never to be completed reconstruction "of what is no longer" (Nora 1989: 8), and regards it as writing that does not engage the past but rather draws on its residual representations. Collective memory, by definition, has to be mediated and maintained. A. Assmann refers to the means by which collective memory is mediated as "memorial signs", which include "symbols, texts, images, rites, ceremonies, places, and monuments" (A. Assmann 2008: 56). During the 1980s a new and central contribution to the discourse of memory appeared: the concept of cultural memory. Developed by A. Assmann and J. Assmann, the concept ties the poles of memory (understood as contemporized past), culture, and society to each another (A. Assmann and J. Assmann 1988; J. Assmann 1995: 129). Drawing on Warburg's work (Olick et al. 2011: 19, 28), the concept of cultural memory attends to the relation between a remembering collective and forms of objectivized culture, denoting the institutional realms in which cultural traditions, with reference to the ancient past, are transmitted through different media, including those of material culture (J. Assmann 1995, 2011).

Unlike "communicative memory" and "social memory", concepts which refer to uninstitutionalized recollections of the recent past that individuals share directly with their contemporaries (J. Assmann 1995: 127, 2011: 19; A. Assmann 2006: 213–215), "cultural memory" – mediated through texts, icons, rites, and objects with traces in the spatial sphere – has a fixed temporal horizon that "does not change with the passing of time" (J. Assmann 1995: 129, 2011: 22).

"Cultural memory" embeds the "collective knowledge" about the past. This knowledge, which "varies from culture to culture as well as from epoch to epoch" (J. Assmann 1995: 132–133), has the potential of directing "behavior and experience in the interactive framework of a society". It thus constitutes the foundation upon which "each group bases its awareness of unity and particularity" (ibid., 126, 132).

One of the essential elements of cultural memory is rooted in its self-reflectivity. It is self-reflective, J. Assmann argues, "insofar as it reflects the self-image of the group through a preoccupation with its own social system" (ibid., 132). "Through its cultural heritage", J. Assmann contends, "a society becomes visible to itself and to others. Which past becomes evident in that heritage and which values emerge in its identificatory appropriation tells us much about the constitution and tenderness of a society" (ibid., 133).

"In the contexts of cultural memory", J. Assmann argues, "the distinction between myth and history vanishes. What counts is not the past as it is investigated

and reconstructed by archeologists and historians but only the past as it is remembered" (J. Assmann 2011: 19). "Memory", J. Assmann concludes, "is what allows us to construe an image or narrative of the past and, by the same process, to develop an image and narrative of ourselves" (ibid., 15). In light of these insights, J. Assmann offers to engage the notion and method of "mnemohistory", which is "concerned not with the past as such, but only with the past as it is remembered" (ibid., 9). "Mnemohistory", J. Assmann writes, "analyzes the importance which a present ascribes to the past" (ibid., 10), and stresses that historical "truth" "lies not so much in its 'factuality' as in its 'actuality'" (ibid.).

A. Assmann's conceptualization of "political memory" captures how "an embodied, implicit, heterogeneous, and fuzzy bottom-up memory is transformed into an explicit, homogeneous, and institutionalized top-down memory" (A. Assmann 2006: 215). Collective identities and collective memory are conceptualized as ever-changing and mutually constituting spheres in which a group's symbolic boundaries are formed, and cultural distinctions reaffirmed (J. Assmann 1998: 2, 2011: 23). Collective remembrance is "a process" (Bloch 2011 [1925]) in which the past is "modeled, invented, reinvented and reconstructed by the present" (J. Assmann 1998: 9). Subsequently, collective memory does not lend itself to historical accuracy, and the narratives it generates do not flow chronologically from past to present.

Political memory, which "is necessarily a mediated memory", refers to the process by which "history turns into memory" in order to create "collective identification and participation" in the context of national identity construction projects (ibid., 216).

Political memory is highly central in the constitution of national cultures and is used as a tool of political mobilization that instills and maintains a hegemonic identity geared toward political action (ibid., 215–220). National identities are a relatively new and prevalent form of collective identities which evolved with the rise of 19th-century nationalism. Like other forms of collective identity, national identities are understood as "mental constructs" (Wodak et al. 1999: 22) built "through social processes" (Giesen 1998: 12). Giesen points out the elements that form collective and national identities. First, he argues that the borders of collective identity are a "contingent social construction", and "because they could be drawn differently, they require social reinforcement and symbolic manifestation" (ibid., 13). Second, Giesen depicts the inherent latency that characterizes collective identities by arguing that the codes and rules upon which these identities are based tend to "remain hidden from everyday activity" (ibid., 18). Third, Giesen claims that although collective identities are based on the situational construction of difference (ibid., 1), they nonetheless require to "overlook the fact of diversity and difference" (ibid., 40).

National identities, similar to other forms of collective identities, must be constructed and instilled. Viewing a nation as a symbolic community – an "imaginary complex of ideas containing at least the defining elements of collective unity and equality, of boundaries and autonomy" (Wodak et al. 1999: 22) – Wodak stresses that this kind of collective imaginary is constructed through a discursive process that corresponds with the "audience, setting, topic and substantive content"

(ibid., 4). Drawing mainly on the work of Hall (1996), she claims that national culture constitutes a discourse, a way of constructing meaning, ordering actions, and of carving a path of self-identification (Wodak et al. 1999: 23).

Somers discusses contemporary scholarship (for example, the works of P. Ricoeur [1979, 1981]) that attends to narratives and narration as the "*ontological condition of social life*" (Somers 1994: 614). She underscores not only how narratives transform events into "episodes" and render meaning to the past, but also how these narratives have the potential to "guide action" and form "social identities" (ibid., 617). Somers argues that "social life is itself *storied* [*sic*]" (ibid., 614), it is a sphere where

> people construct identities (however multiple and changing) by locating themselves or being located within a repertoire of emplotted stories; that "experience" is constituted through narratives; that people make sense of what has happened and is happening to them by attempting to assemble or in some way to integrate these happenings within one or more narratives; and that people are guided to act in certain ways and not others, on the basis of the projections, expectations, and memories derived from a multiplicity but ultimate limited repertoire of available social, public and cultural narratives.
>
> (Somers 1994: 614)

National myths are understood as a discursive strategy by which national collectives narrate themselves. Along with other discursive means, such as the notion of an "original people" and invented national traditions (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983), national myths revolve around "the three temporal axes of the past, the present and the future" (Wodak et al. 1999: 26).

Advocators of the constructivist approach to the study of nationalism regard the emergence of national myths within the frame of the historical construction of national consciousness (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983; Hobsbawm 1990). They argued that the production and spread of standardized historical narratives in Europe during the 19th century were based on the "invention" of common popular traditions. These "invented" traditions, along with the generic education, the capitalism of print, a new linear temporal conception, and the spread of new means of media such as newspapers and novels, have enabled different heterogeneous groups to "imagine" themselves as being a part of the same nation (Gellner 2006 [1983]; Anderson 1983).

The constructivist approach has introduced a new perspective in understanding nations as the product of political construction and challenged the very givenness of existing historical conventions. However, this approach was criticized for its Marxist line of argumentation that regards ideology as a form of false consciousness and fictitious framework on which nations are built, a view that preempts any further investigation into the process of memory work and its social ramifications (A. Assmann 2008: 67).

Contemporary historians, sociologists and political theorists who debated the mythical dimensions in the constitution of collective identities and memory tend to regard political myths as having a crucial role in shaping the group's image of

the self, constructing the group's boundaries, and most significantly, providing the symbolic foundation for its existence as a group. As the following discussion concerning the function of myths shows, political/national myths are considered to be a tool of political mobilization, of maintaining the political order in its existing form; these can potentially act as a tool of cultural reproduction of the hegemonic group, as well as a means of social exclusion and hierarchization.

National myths narrate and represent a group's past in the present, rendering significance to the constructed image of the past, which simultaneously fulfill contemporary hegemonic needs. This view can be traced back to Sorel's *Reflections on Violence*, where he depicts myths as a means to act collectively in the present (Sorel 2004 [1908]: 116).

Bottici defines political myths as "narratives that coagulate and reproduce significance. They consist of the work on a common narrative by which the members of a social group or society represent or posit their experiences and deeds". Political myths, she argues, "are an important part of what following Castoriadis, can be called the social imaginary" (Bottici 2007: 201). Both political myths and ideology, Bottici maintains, constitute a "set of ideas by which human beings posit and represent the ends and means of social action" (ibid., 196). Because they address the political conditions in which a given group acts, political myths can be seen as "mapping devices that orient in the social and political world" (ibid.; Bottici and Challand 2010: 15).

Additional accounts of political myths are found in the works of Schöpflin (1997), Bouchard (2013), and Zerubavel (2013), all of whom emphasize how identities and belongings are informed by myths. Myths, according to Schöpflin, are essential tools for establishing coherence, "in the making of thought-worlds that appear clear and logical" (Schöpflin 1997: 20). He regards the political myth as a "kind of simplified representation", a means of "establishing an illusion of community", an "ordering of the world [. . .] to make sense of it for collectivities and thus make it binding to them" (ibid., 23). Furthermore, he points to the role of myths in maintaining collective memories, especially through "the exclusion of certain events from public consciousness" (ibid., 26).

Zerubavel argues that "myths constitute sacred narratives that shape the understanding of the past and articulate values that are considered central to the nation's spirit" (Zerubavel 2013: 173). "Mythical constructions of the past", she writes, "affect perception of the present and, in turn, the pressures that a changing political reality places on the interpretation of the symbolic meanings of the past" (ibid., 184).

Similarly to Zerubavel and Schöpflin, Bouchard regards myths as a part of the symbolic foundation of collectivity. "Myths feed identities and belongings", he writes:

> they set forth visions of the past and the future of a society, they promote symbols that allow for collective mobilization [. . .] they foster resilience, and they reinforce social ties so that they may bring together even competing or conflicting actors.
>
> (Bouchard 2013: 3)

In Bouchard's account of the process of mythification, national myths nourish a certain "ethos" that in turn dictates the nation's general political orientation, such as "equality" or "social justice" (ibid., 5). He also regards the construction of narratives as a part of the continuous process of remembrance and points to the "intervention of a social actor or a coalition of social actors (institutions, labor unions, political parties, Churches, medias, . . .) who construct and promote myths and use them as a tool to advance their agenda". Accordingly, social myths are "part of and contingent upon a web of power relations" (ibid.). As a symbolic device, Bouchard argues, myths belong to the sphere of the sacred and have the potential to promote or obstruct social change (ibid., 3).

Myths and narratives cannot be fully severed from one another. Bottici and Challand claim that whereas political myths consist of narratives, they cannot be simply defined as narratives for "there are plenty of narratives that are not myths" (Bottici and Challand 2010: 15). Despite this analytical difficulty, different kinds of identity-shaping myths are defined in the literature. The most central are:

1 Myths of territory that center around the claim that "there's a particular territory where the nation first discovered itself or assumed the form that it aspires to, or expressed itself in its finest form in and through that territory" (Schöpflin 1997: 28);
2 Myths of redemption and suffering, claiming that the nation "has undergone a process of expiating its sins and will be redeemed or indeed, may itself redeem the world" (ibid.);
3 Myths of election or of a civilizing mission, in which "the nation has been entrusted, by God or by History, to perform some special mission, some particular function, because it is endowed with unique virtues" (ibid., 31);
4 Myths of rebirth and renewal that relate to the idea that "the present is tainted and must be cleansed" (ibid., 32);
5 Myths of foundation, in which some constituting events mark the emergence of the collective (ibid., 33). Myths of foundation, it should be emphasized, are connected to what Schöpflin describes as myths of "ethnogenesis and antiquity" that indicate the "ethnic" and primordial sources of the collective's existence. Similarly, "myths of kinship" aligns with the idea of the "organic nature of the ethnic group" and with the concept of the "nation as family" (ibid., 34). These types of myth "can become more than just self-legitimation when used to try to establish primacy over all other ethnic groups in a given territory. The argument is that, because one group was there first, it has a superior right to that territory over all others" (ibid.).

In Bouchard's view, the collective imaginary relies on two main types of myths: first, "master-myths" of the nation, designed for the "longue durée", and second, "derivative myths" that are "more attuned to the ever-changing contexts" (Bouchard 2013: 4). He identifies myths as a hybrid mixture of "truth and falsehood, consciousness and unconsciousness" (ibid., 2).

Schöpflin, Bouchard, and Zerubavel note that myths contain some degree of truth or some relation to historical events. Yet the absolute value of truth cannot

be aligned with any degree of falsehood. "Treating political myths as if they were advancing a claim to truth", Bottici and Challand argue, "means bringing them to a terrain (that of science) that is not their own". Political myths, they add, "do not aim to *describe* the truth, they tend to *create* it precisely because they are oriented toward action" (Bottici and Challand 2010: 11). It would be perhaps more accurate to argue that national myths and narrative are involved in the process of establishing a prism through which the collective and national "self" is viewed, subsequently constituted as reality.

The presented framework enables to understand national identities as collective identities that are formed by political memory and spread through political/national myths and narratives. Collective memory is understood here as a sphere in which groups and social agents engage and shape the image not of their past, but rather of what they conceive of as their past. This is also a realm of forgetfulness in which certain historical events and upheavals remain obscure or are removed from collective awareness.[8]

In line with J. Assmann's work (1998), myth and narrative are discussed not as antonymous to truth but rather as a form of imaginary, as perceptions which are deeply entrenched in the national collective self-understanding. By connecting the national collective's past to the present, political/national myths and narratives are nourished by the sphere of collective remembrance and tend to rationalize existing social relations and social hierarchies.

Congruently, these political/national myths and narratives not only have a crucial role in engendering a broad notion of collectivity, uniformity, and national belonging, but they are to be seen as the base upon which such notions are built – the building blocks of political memory. National myths provide justifications and the overall legitimation for national collective existence. At the same time, they frame the desired directions of future political courses. Therefore, by viewing the sphere of the political myths, one is exposed to the mechanism of national identity formation at work.

A. Assmann (2008: 53) claims that the common term ideology began to fade from discourse and was thereafter replaced by the notion of collective memory. Collective memory cannot only be dispatched from political ideologies, for it is the very sphere to which political ideologies turn to obtain legitimation, forming what is referred to throughout this book as "political memory". Hence, throughout this book, the terms ideological system, political memory, and collective identities are applied interchangeably to refer to different aspects that characterize a social environment or groups which are often recruited to national political ends and dominated by an ever-evolving collective and political memory.

The political mythology of Zionism

Zionism is the political ideology of the Zionist movement – a late 19th-century national movement that was a part of the historical rise of nationalism in Europe. As one of the "isms" that appeared during this period, Zionism can be qualified as having the same "common temporal structure" shared among other "movement

concepts (Bewegungsbegriffe)", as defined by Koselleck (1997: 21). According to Koselleck's categorization, such movements

> serve in practice to socially and politically realign the resolving society of estates (Ständegesellschaft) under a new set of aims. What is typical about these expressions is that they are not based on a predefined and common experience. Rather they compensate for a deficiency of experience by a future outline which is supposed to be realised.
>
> (ibid.)

While embedded within fin de siècle European discourse and meta-narratives of progress, modernization, and *mission civilisatrice* (most evident in Herzl's writings [Masalha 2013]), the Zionist movement developed its own symbols of identification, historical narratives, collective rituals, and a new spoken language (Modern Hebrew) – all of which became the foundation for the 20th-century development of Zionist-Israeli political culture, political memory, and political mythology. Such political cultural has developed vis-à-vis the historic settler colonization process that the Zionist movement has carried out in Palestine.

Throughout the past three decades, scholars working within the postcolonial framework have viewed the political program and practices implemented by Zionist movement as a case of settler colonialism (Kimmerling 1983; Pappé 2008; Piterberg 2008; Ram 1993; Said 1979; Sand 2012; Shafir 1989, 1999, 2005; Veracini 2006, 2011; Wolfe 1999, 2006).

In the field of Israel studies, postcolonial approaches, underscoring the interrelation between the Zionist settler-colonial project and its modes of knowledge production, are mainly associated with the works of the "new historians" (Kimmerling 1983; Pappé 1992, 2008, 2014; Raz-Krakotzkin 1994; Yiftachel 1998; Ram 1995, 2011; Shafir 1989, 1999, 2005; Piterberg 1995, and others). This cohort of scholars, composed of mainly contemporary Israeli academics, revisits Zionist historiography and discourse, emphasizing the "role of power in the construction of a representation of the past and the ways in which these representations empower or disempower specific groups" (Silberstein 1999: 171). This circle of academics criticizes the essentialist construction of national memory in Israel. Based on critical theory, these scholars sought to challenge "the consensual Zionist interpretation of the Idea of Israel" (Pappé 2014: 8) and question the basic categorical assumptions prevailing in Zionist discourse ("nation", "people", "homeland", "exile", etc.). The examination of these categories uncovers how the discursive, historiographical construction of Israeli nationalism was dominated by hegemonic views of Zionism. To do so, it is deemed necessary to address the early intellectual tendencies that have formed Zionism's political mythology.

The intellectual history of Zionism

The Zionist movement, being a product of late 19th-century European imaginaries, pursued the goal of establishing Jewish self-rule in a territory of its own, as

professed in T. Herzl's *Der Judenstaat* (1988 [1896]) and the "Baseler Programm" (1897). The movement arose as a reaction to numerous interrelated macro-historical political and socio-economic tendencies which occurred in Europe beginning in the 18th century. These tendencies have ushered in changes in how European Jewry, and its intellectuals, perceived their position in the new civil sphere after the Napoleonic Code had failed in making Jews into equal political civil subjects (Chowers 2012: 25). The most central among these were the interconnected processes of secularization and the making of modern historiography; democratization, the crystallization of the civil sphere, and the nation-state; and most importantly, the rise of anti-Jewish racism, which had far-reaching implications to the social mobility of Jews and their precarious status as a persecuted minority.

First, the process of secularization, interwoven with the rise of the Enlightenment discourse, has established an intellectual environment where individuals were allowed unmediated access to the sacred scriptures. This novelty has paved the way for a new community of interpretation and interpreters whose readings of the Holy Scriptures constituted a vernacular sphere where religious texts were discussed without being necessarily subjected to religious imperatives. The new 18th-century hermeneutical approach to the Bible has thus formed a scholarly collective whose discourse was located outside of the realms of ecumenical control. This process contributed first and foremost to imagining a secular political order, where the religious and political powers are constituted as separated spheres (Arendt 1963: 26). These newly established secularized spheres have not only set the conditions for the political revolutions of the late 18th century but have also contributed to the rise of modern historiography, and Jewish historiography as part of it, in the first third of the 19th century.

Second, based on the Enlightenment discourse of equality, freedom, political rights, and self-rule, the political revolutions of the late 18th century – marking the breakdown of the feudal orders – have given rise to a vast movement of human groups who began to demand to rule themselves for and by themselves, to obtain participation in power and representation in governing mechanisms.

This process, known as democratization, was rooted in a shift in the structure of legitimacy which henceforth was no longer based on divine rights but rather on the power of the new emerging and socially constructed collective – "the people". The symbolic construction of "the people" has in turn facilitated two additional phenomena: The first is the emergence of the civil sphere, where individuals and groups were considered as political subjects that can lay out their claims in relation to the state and/or other citizens, demand their rights, and engage in a public discourse where ideas and different strategies for shaping public lives are debated. The second phenomenon relates to the formation of the nation-state and the rise of a new form of collective identity: national identity.

Whereas the democratic revolutions embedded a universal call for civil self-rule, the nation-state – being a political structure that aims to serve, represent, and execute the will of a particular "demos", a particular "people" – played a major role in producing a national consciousness and national belonging. Simultaneously, the understating that political and cultural units should overlap became

exceedingly dominant in the formative period of the nation-state. This understanding stood in sharp contrast to the tremendous cultural and linguistic diversity that characterized 19th-century Europe.

Contributing to the making of the modern notion of peoplehood were the scholars of the proto-Romantic era: Most prominent among them was Herder and his concept of "national spirit" (*Volksgeist*), which attributes spiritual essence to different "people" according to their lingual traits. In his work, *The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry* (1833 [1782/1783]), Herder explains the uniqueness of the Hebrew people in light of the aesthetics of the Hebrew language (Almog 2013: 344), thereby enabling to associate the Jewish communities of his times with the ancient Hebrews. Later Fichte has also contributed to articulating and subsequently reifying the notion of "people" (*Völker*) in his *Addresses to the German Nation* (1922 [1808]).

Being part of the cultural unification projects of the 19th century, the spread of standardized national languages and the establishment of mandatory education were among the tools by which the new members of the nation developed national identifications (Gellner 2006 [1983]). Two relating tendencies were tied to the spread of national cultures: The first was the idea of a national territory, where "the people" fulfill their right to self-rule. Given that national borders could not correlate with the gamut of the different cultural identifications or represent the great linguistic heterogeneity of European societies, the boundaries of the nation's territory had to be taught to the public to become widely shared knowledge.

The second tendency in this process was the symbolic construction of an ancient national history, "stretching back to primeval times" (Sand 2010: 62). "Every nation had to learn who its 'ancestors' were", avers Sand, "and in some cases its members searched anxiously for the qualities of the biological seed that they propagated" (ibid.). National movements, emphasizing and reinventing the nation's glorious period (Hobsbawm 1990), used the concept of people "to stress the antiquity and continuity of the nationality it sought to construct" (Sand 2010: 27). Corresponding with the rise of modern historiography, the significance given to the nation's past has subsequently changed the roles and status of intellectuals and professional historians, who gradually became the leading agents bridging the nation's ancient past and present by establishing the narratives of the people's imagined origins.

The surging othernization of Jews in the changing sphere of mass democratic politics and the failure of making European Jewish minorities into equal civil and legal subjects has also played a crucial role in shaping the perception of European Jewish identity towards the later part of the 19th century. Historian Sand maintains that in addition to the rise of modern theories of race, anti-Jewish racism emerged from

> a series of economic crises during the 1870s [. . .] created a sense of economic insecurity that was immediately translated into anxieties of identity. The decisive victory of 1870 and the unification of the Reich "from above" soon lost their unifying glory, and the people blamed for the crises were, as always, the "others" – the religious and "racial" minorities. The progress of mass democracy

> also stimulated the rise of political anti-Semitism – an effective means of rallying mass support in modern times. From the streets through the press to the corridors of imperial power, venomous propaganda was aimed at the "Orientals" who had come from the East and claimed to be Germans.
>
> (ibid., 84)

Reacting to all of the aforementioned historical changes, the Wissenschaft des Judentums was an Enlightenment-inspired intellectual movement whose scholarship developed along the rise of German nationalism. Situated in the Romanticist era (Myers 1997: 636), the movement was founded in 1819 in Berlin and was composed of the first generation of Jewish intellectuals who attended universities and yet were prevented from attaining positions within academia due to their religious affiliation (Sand 2010: 68). "Through the illuminating powers of critical scholarship", these scholars aimed at producing a secular and scientific analysis of the Jewish past (Myers 1997: 630), using the historical methodology that became "one of the hallmarks of nineteenth-century European thought" (Yerushalmi 2012 [1982]: 84).

Sand underscores the historical causes preceding the Wissenschaft's intellectual project:

> The rise of nationalism in the surrounding societies – Russian, Ukrainian, Polish and others – in addition to the systemic discrimination in the Tsarist realm, worsened the situation of the growing Yiddishist community, whose more dynamic element was driven to migrate westward. The nationalist feelings that began to simmer in the remaining communities, especially after the wave of pogroms in the early 1880s, had no parallel in any contemporary Jewish community. There arose intellectuals and movements that were both pre-nationalist and nationalist – from the numerous supporters of autonomy to the handful of early Zionists – all searching for an independent collective expression with which to scale the walls of discrimination, exclusion and alienation presented by most of their neighbors.
>
> (Sand 2010: 89)

Highly influenced by Kantian moral philosophy and its cosmopolitan humanism – which philosophers like M. Mendelssohn in the second half of the 18th century and H. Cohen in the 19th century thought to correspond with Judaism's universal ethical vision (Chowers 2012: 27–34) – the studies produced by the Wissenschaft have supported the participation of Jews as equal subjects of the emerging German nation (Sand 2010: 68). Guided by the aspiration of civil emancipation (ibid., 69), these scholars regarded Judaism as one of the many symbolic pathways through which one could potentially enter into German civil lives.

This historical claim is supported by historian Sorkin, who defined the main tension which characterized the Wissenschaft as follows:

> The new ideal of *Wissenschaft* brought with it the idealist and romantic notion that each people's (*Volk*) culture was both inviolable and developed

> according to an innate logic and dynamic. Each people was an individual with its own integrity. The founders of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* thus faced a crucial problem. Could they reconcile this romantic assumption with the *Aufklärung* idea of regeneration to meet the needs of emancipation? [. . .] The urgency of the problem cannot be underestimated, for it reiterated, if in a different form, the ideology's fundamental paradox of the relationship between universalism and particularism, between separation and integration.
>
> (Sorkin 1987: 135)

Immanuel Wolf's essay "On the Concept of a Wissenschaft des Judentums" (1882) exhibits many of the orientations that shaped modern Jewish studies; the most central of these are seen, first, in the very attempt to approach Judaism historically, that is, to identify it as an object of historical investigation, and second, to analyze it as a history of a "people". "If we are to talk of a science of Judaism", Wolf argues,

> then it is self-evident that the word "Judaism" is here being taken in its comprehensive sense – as the essence of all the circumstances, characteristics, and achievements of the Jews in relation to religion, philosophy, history, law, literature in general, civil life and all the affairs of man – and not in that more limited sense in which it only means the religion of the Jews. In any event, it is the religious idea which conditions all the ramifications of Judaism and the one on which they are based. [. . .] In the diverse unfolding of the whole life of a people there do of course exist aspects and tendencies which are remote from the sphere of religion; but in Judaism, more than anywhere else, the influence of the basic religious idea is visible in all the circumstances of human life.
>
> (Wolf 1957 [1882]: 194)

Formulating the fundamental objectives of the science of Judaism from a Hegelian perspective, Wolf's essay locates the "spiritual principles" of the "Jewish people" in the ancient "Jewish State" (ibid., 195). In doing so he contributed to producing the central motives in the historiographical making of the "Jewish people".

Following Wolf, another prominent scholar of the Wissenschaft circle was historian H. Graetz, whose *History of the Jews* began to appear in 1853. In this "classic" historiographical piece, Graetz unfolds the epos of the "Jewish people" from antiquity until his own days. He begins his historical account where the story line of *Exodus* ends, namely, at the moment when the "*Hebrew* or *Israelite* tribes" entered "the land of Canaan" (Graetz 1891 [1853]: 1). "The growth of Israel as a distinct race [*Volksstamme*]", he writes,

> commenced amidst extraordinary circumstances. The beginning of this people bore but very slight resemblance to the origin of other nations. Israel as a people [*Völker*] arose amidst peculiar surroundings in the land of Goshen, a territory situated in the extreme north of Egypt, near the borders of Palestine.

> The Israelites were not at once moulded into a nation, but consisted of twelve loosely connected shepherd tribes.
>
> (ibid., 7)

In their attempts to locate and identify the origins of "the Jewish people" as a historical subject, the 19th-century Wissenschaft's scholars and their studies of the Jewish past have founded modern Jewish historiography and engaged the discursive construction of the "Jewish people" in the form of an ancient "Volk". Adhering to the Wissenschaft project, Zionist scholars propagated a notion of Jewish "peoplehood" and regarded Judaism as the base for and as a form of Jewish nationhood.[9] Whereas the theological term "the Jewish people" referred to a religious community of belief, practicing and interpreting the sacred commands of "Halacha", Zionist scholars have re-conceptualized the term and interpreted it as a modern national collective defined by presumed common ancestry.

Zionism has fundamentally secularized the concept of "the Jewish people", transmuting it from a theological religious concept to a political-historical one (Sand 2010). The shift from the theological to the political, as Zerubavel argues, has enabled the Zionist movement to replace the primary religious aspects of Judaism "with a political-historical framework that highlighted Jews' experience as a nation" (Zerubavel 2013: 174).

Similar to other 19th-century European national and pan-movements (Arendt 1973 [1951]), which were inspired by Romantic nationalism and aimed to arrange populations within specific national units, Zionism assumed that political boundaries should correlate with "ethnic" ones.

Apart of its conceptual development, Zionism emerged out of the historical context and socio-political conditions of the post-19th-century national revolutions, and was inherently intertwined with the surging othernization of Jews, both in Western and Eastern Europe, as well as with the economic deterioration in Eastern Europe (Chowers 2012: 2).

Zionism, however, did not emerge as one cohesive body of political ideas, but rather as an amalgamation of different streams of thought that circulated in the discursive sphere of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. As with any national movement, the Zionist movement was too subjected to geopolitical changes and historical contingencies which played a role in shaping its ideological trajectories and practices. It was shaped through different phases and was formed by various agents who came from diverse cultural backgrounds and held different political conventions and aspirations.

The Zionist movement, represented by and embodied in the World Zionist Organization, was not the only organized movement to react to the crisis that European Jewry experienced. The Bund, for example, was an Eastern European social and political movement that regarded Jewish communities as part of their existing local political frameworks. Before 1933, Shafir writes, "only a small minority chose Zionism" (Shafir 1989: 8). After the Holocaust, Jewish communities – which cannot be seen as one coherent body – have faced different historical pathways, aside from the trajectory which Zionism has offered (Slezkine 2004).

Assuming the right of "the Jewish people" for a "a national home" ("The Declaration" 1948), the Zionist movement developed its perception of Jewish past and Jewish peoplehood, which were crucial in creating a national collective identity, based not only on the earlier historical works of 19th-century Wissenschaft intellectuals, but also on later 20th-century writers such as A. B. Gordon, B. Katznelnson, B. Borochov, N. Syrkin, N. Sokolow, M. Ussishkin, A. Ruppin, and others. In addition to their contribution to the growing body of Zionist literature, these key figures have been active actors in the colonization process of Palestine. Many of them embedded socialist agendas in their perception of Zionism and of the future nation, a program which indeed became one of the founding elements of Israeli politics and welfare system.

The later generation of mid-20th-century Zionists scholars, such as Ben-Zion Dinur, Y. Baer, and M. Stern – all of whom were faculty members at the Hebrew University – has strengthened the positioning of the Jewish people as a national group that holds territorial rights, impelled by its "historic and traditional attachment" ("The Declaration" 1948). During the formative period of the Israel early statehood this cohort of scholars – with whom Eisenstadt was familiar – has constituted the "Jerusalem school of Jewish historiography", a school which according to Gelber

> suggested a new unifying power – the nation's affiliation with its homeland. [. . .] the continuity of this bond from ancient times through the Middle Ages to the modern era was the principal inspiration for Zionism and consequently the main driving force of modern Jewish history.
>
> (Gelber 2007: 50)

The term "Jewish history", distinguished from "the history of Jews" by assuming a unified Jewish historical subject, is also one of the ideological products of the school. Connecting the research of Jewish history to the rise of Israeli nationalism (Ram 2011), Dinur's biblical historiography, Baer's studies of exile, and Stern's later research of the Second Temple period (Dinur 1938; Baer 1947; Stern 1976 [1969]) were among the central works which engendered the hegemonic representations of the nation's collective past. Although several scholars at the Hebrew University, such as Y. Leibowitz and Y. Talmon, have voiced their critical positions in the course of time, Eisenstadt's cohort of university teachers was amid the intellectuals who contributed to the making of Zionist historiography "into a historical consciousness of a community" (Ram 2011: 25).

Zionist political myths

By the mid-1940s, the growing corpus of Zionist scholarship, emphasizing the unity and continuity in the history of "the Jewish people" and its rights over its ancestral land, have incorporated the main hegemonic narratives on which Israeli nationalism and its political memory were built and from which they attained legitimacy (Ram 2011: 7, 9; Zerubavel 1995: 26; Kimmerling 2001: 16). In this

late phase of historiographical construction, "the Jewish people" are depicted as a historical protagonist that returned to its homeland, despite "spatial depression and temporal ruptures persevered its common identity" (Ram 2011: 9). This narrative unfolds Zionism's mythical views that continued to developed vis-à-vis the settlement-colonization of Palestine in the first part of the 20th century. These views consist of mainly three governing myths that pertain to elements of origins, space, and temporality: the myth of common ancestry; the myth of land; and the myth of exile, return, and revival. The myth of common ancestry addresses the biblical, theological notion of God's "chosen people" in terms of a modern national group. It depicts "the Jewish people" (*Am Yisrael*) as a primordial entity and draws a continuous line that connects the ancient Hebrews with contemporary Jews. In this mythic perception Jews, depicted as the descendants of the Davidic dynasty (Sand 2010), are seen as having common ethnic-related ties. An equivalent use of the same governing myth can be found in the case of the Afrikaners. Driven by "neo-Calvinist elements", Afrikaners too considered themselves "a Chosen People with a God-given destiny" (Thompson 1985: 29).

The second is a territorial myth in which the "Land of Israel" is conceived as "the common property of the Jewish people".[10] *Eretz Yisrael* originated as a theological concept, denoting a sacred space, not physical but symbolic. Similar to the concept of the "Jewish people", "the Land of Israel" has also been secularized and re-conceptualized in terms of concrete national territory. In line with the Romanticist perceptions that connect a certain landscape with the character of its people, *Eretz Yisrael* is perceived as the "birthplace" of "the Jewish people". This specific locus, which was considered to be "terra nullius" (vacant land), is depicted in "The Declaration" (1948) as the space in which the "spiritual religious and political identity" of "the Jewish people" has stemmed from, where its "cultural values of national and universal significance" were created, and where these "cultural values" ought to be restored (ibid.).

From a theological concept, *Eretz Yisrael* has transformed into a political, ideologically laden notion. This notion is deliberated in the *Historical Dictionary of Zionism*, which defines *Eretz Yisrael* as "parts of the region that were under Jewish sovereignty at different times" (Medoff and Waxman 2008: 68). This definition not only evinces an anachronistic use of the term "sovereignty", but also attests to circular reasoning by equating *Eretz Yisrael* with places in which Jewish sovereignty was employed and vice versa.

The third myth is that of exile, return, and revival. It draws on the previous ethnos-based and territorial dimensions, tying them together into a single narrative. This narrative, portrayed in "The Declaration" (1948), identifies Palestine as the land from which Jews were "forcibly exiled" in the first century CE and to which they have returned, realizing their right "to national rebirth".

According to "The Declaration" (1948), Jews in "exile" ("Galut" in Hebrew) have "never ceased to pray and hope for their return to it and for the restoration in it of their political freedom". Due to their "attachment" to the Land of Israel, they "strove in every successive generation to re-establish themselves in their ancient homeland". "The Declaration" also depicts the emergence of the Zionist

movement as a factor that enabled Jews to return "in their masses". The element of revival is portrayed in the source as follows:

> Pioneers, defiant returnees, and defenders, they made deserts bloom, revived the Hebrew language, built villages and towns, and created a thriving community controlling its own economy and culture, loving peace but knowing how to defend itself, bringing the blessings of *progress* to all the country's inhabitants, and aspiring towards independent nationhood.
>
> ("The Declaration" 1948, emphasis added)

As it framed in the rhetoric of the Enlightenment movement, such "revival" is manifested in the projects of settlement, nation and language building. The emphasis of progress is notably similar to the reasoning and meta-narratives typifying European colonial enterprises (Balandier 2013 [1951]; Pappé 2008: 612). The use of the meta-narrative of progress corresponds with Zionism's self-image as the embodiment of the force of Western modernization in the Middle East (Pappé 2008).

At the core of the narrative of exile and return lies the concept of the diaspora which refers to Jewish existence outside *Eretz Yisrael*. As indicated in the *Historical Dictionary of Zionism*, "exile" and "diaspora" are often equated (Medoff and Waxman 2008: 62, 73). The term "diaspora" presumes a certain origin. In Zionist political culture, this origin is embodied in the concept of the Land of Israel, where Jewish sovereignty emerged in antiquity and where it has been revived, according to the narrative, with the rise of the modern state of Israel ("The Declaration" 1948). These concepts, "Diaspora" and the "Land", are positioned as oppositions of one another. The dichotomous relations between these two abstract spheres are essential elements in Zionist political culture. Raz-Krakotzkin (1994), pointing out the centrality of this dichotomy, has shown how Zionist political culture constituted itself in relation to the "negation of Exile", a fundamental rejection of Jewish lives outside "the Land of Israel". Zerubavel, arguing that Zionism interprets the Jewish past "through the national-political prism", indicates the inherent selectiveness in the narrative of exile, return, and revival:

> [Zionism] regarded itself as an essentially revivalist movement. Unlike revolutionary movements, it did not seek a total break with the past. Rather it introduced a *renewal paradigm* that preserved a sense of historical continuity with a selected past and incorporated it into a broader vision of the future. Zionism's national project thus involved a symbolic return to Antiquity through a *return* to the ancient homeland, and the *renewal* of the ancient Hebrews' national spirit and culture, suppressed by the Jewish exilic experience.
>
> (Zerubavel 2013: 174, emphasis in original)

The main function of the myth of exile, return, and revival is to provide reasoning and legitimacy to the Zionist colonization process. "Jewish immigrants and settlers in Palestine never regarded themselves as colonialists, or their movement as

a part of the world colonial system" Kimmerling notes. "Rather, they saw themselves as a people 'returning to their homeland' after two thousand years of forced exile" (Kimmerling 2001: 26). Narratives of return are also found among other colonizing movements, most evident in the case of the "Basel Mission" (Pappé 2008: 263).

Historian J. Winter places the state of Israel as one of the 20th-century emerging "(minor) utopias". Winter employs three main criteria to define utopian characteristics: the aim to transform society, the goal of constructing an ideal society, and the embracement of a narrative concerning "radical acts of disjunction" from the past (Winter 2006: 4–5). All of these are present in the Zionist political culture, and whereas Zionism propagates a sense of continuity from antiquity to modernity, the element of disjunction is reflected in the "negation of exile" narrative.

Based on these myths, the Zionist movement not only sought to establish a Jewish nation-state but also to create a new individual, "a new Jew" (Wolfe 2006: 390) who would set up the model for the future members of a new national Jewish collective "self". These myths, with which Zionism drew the borders of the national group, were cradled by the newly created national language of Modern Hebrew and prevailed in Israeli society through different social actors and institutions, the military and education system serving the central tools of implementation.

Settler colonialism

Settler colonialism is a relatively new field of academic inquiry, which according to Bateman and Pilkington (2011) "describes how, fortified by modernizing narratives and ideology, a population from the metropole moves to occupy a territory and fashions a new society in a space conceptualized as vacant and free: as available for the taking" (ibid., 1).

Viewed as "a particular structure of privilege", Elkins and Pedersen (2005) define settler colonialism as a phenomenon characterized by mainly four patterns: (1) settlers compose a dominant minority in the colonized space; (2) settler populations "intent on making a territory their permanent home while continuing to enjoy metropolitan living standards and political privileges" (ibid., 2); (3) settlers engage intense struggles over land (ibid., 8); and (4) settler colonies are marked by "pervasive inequalities", where the "division between the settler and the indigene is usually built into the economy" (ibid., 4). Elkins and Pedersen hence argue that it is difficult to apply the concept of civil society to settler colonies, as the institutions built by settlers mirror an inherent "settler-indigene" division (ibid., 12).

In other words, settler colonies are constituted as a latent form of apartheid[11] or lay out the conditions for one. These include a minority group, perceived as superior, which establishes its political and economic domination over the foundations of another collective. Elkins and Pedersen draw attention to intellectual products which are derived from such unequal power structure, viewed as settler colonies turn to "racial or 'civilizational' distinctions" (ibid., 13).

Veracini establishes an analytical distinction between the term migration and settler colonization. He defines settler colonialism as a distinct form of colonization "related to both colonialism and migration" (Veracini 2011: 2). Settler colonialism, his study shows, "is structurally distinct from both migration and colonialism" as "not all migrations are settler migrations and not all colonialisms are settler colonial" (ibid., 3). Whereas by definition migrants "move to *another* country", settlers move "to *their* country" (ibid.). Veracini notes that "settler projects are inevitably premised on the traumatic, that is, violent, replacement and/or displacement of indigenous Others [. . .] settler colonialism also needs to disavow any foundational violence" (ibid., 76).

Pertaining to the abstruse aspects of settler colonialism within social theory, Wolfe argues that

> in settler-colonial formations, it was not so much that structural-functionalism organized colonial power as that it hid it [. . .] an atomized representational paradigm masked the practical expropriation of settler-colonized indigenes, an ideological effect that relied on a synchronic mode of representation.
>
> (Wolfe 1999: 52)

Political memory in the context of settler-colonial projects entails a denial of the colonial premises that constitute its foundation. Based on the theoretical and historical inquiries of settler colonialism, it is possible to see how in the late 19th century and beginning of the 20th century, Zionist groups, which appropriated models of European settler colonization, began to create Jewish-exclusive settling nuclei in Palestine (Shafir 1989; Piterberg 2008; Kimmerling 2001; Shenhav et al. 2015).

Shafir, for example, points out similarities between late 19th-century French agriculture colonization of Tunisia and Algeria and the Rothschilds' tutelary administration deployed in Rishon Letzion and Zichron Ya'acov (Shafir 1989: 10, 52, 187). He also argues that "members of Hashomer ('The Guard') organization [. . .] longed to emulate the Cossacks' military colonization of parts of south-eastern Russia" (Shafir 1989: 10–11).

In a similar vein, Piterberg shows how the model employed by the "German Colonization Committee" in the Poznan region during the late 19th century was adopted by the World Zionist Organization (Piterberg 2008: 80). Based on this model, newly established Zionist institutions such as the Jewish National Fund (JNF), the Jewish Colonization Association (ICA), "Palestine Jewish Colonization Association" (PICA), and the Palestine Land Development Company (PLDC) were in charge of purchasing lands in Palestine and for their population by Zionist settler groups.[12]

The terms "colony" and "colonization" were commonly used in the official documents of the Zionist movement and in naming some of its central institutions, as mentioned above. The term "Jewish colonization" appears in Herzl's *Jewish State* (1988 [1896]), where it is was posited as a "right" (ibid., 60). The terms "colony" and "colonization" were also used by the German Zionist

sociologist Franz Oppenheimer in his address at the 6th Zionist Congress in Basel (Oppenheimer [1903] 1958). By the mid-1940s, however, the term "colony" was replaced by the supposedly more neutral Hebrew term "Moshava" (also related to the term "Yishuv"), as Zionist emissaries began to sense that the term "colony" carries imperialistic connotations (Shenhav 2002: 529–530). Kuzar indicates that the terminological shift from "colony" to "Moshava"/"Yishuv" – which the neologism of Modern Hebrew enabled – was significant in obscuring the meaning of the colonial practices which the Zionist movement engaged, stressing its national character over the colonial one (Kuzar 2015). To date, the commonly used Hebrew word "settlement(s)" ("Hityashvut") is the euphemized version of the term "colonization".

The far-reaching geopolitical transformations brought about by World War I, the dismantling of the Ottoman Empire, and the Balfour Letter (1917) have signified a major turning point in the history of the Zionist settlement movement in Palestine. The movement significantly expanded after the British Empire was granted a "mandate" over the region in 1922 (Sand 2012: 229). Before it had distanced itself from the Zionist movement, British support of Zionist goals resulted, as Kimmerling argues, "from a mixture of traditional religious feelings towards the 'People of the Bible', British imperial interests vis-à-vis French aspirations in the region, and the expectation that Jewish immigrants would play the white settlers' role in the territory" (Kimmerling 2001: 29). Shenhav too underscores the close collaboration between the British Empire and the Zionist movement, which he depicts as a joint colonization endeavor that correlated with interests of both parties, despite ostensible conflicts (Shenhav 2006: 34–35).

Based on the study of settler colonialism, the Zionist project can be qualified as a settler-colonial project for the several reasons. First, informed by fin de siècle European colonial ideology, European Zionist emissaries pursued land resources as their permanent national territory. By 1947 this form of land appropriation was also followed by a violent displacement of Palestinian populations. Second, the institutions which the Zionist movement established have operated and on behalf of Zionist settlers, with a clear separation of resources between settlers and indigenes. Third, the Zionist project included a clear theo-ideological motive, where the act of colonization was perceived as the fulfillment of a divine will and as the embodiment of a civilizational mission to bring about progress and modernity to the Middle East. The practice of settler colonialism as a tool of nation-building is, however, not unique to the case of the Zionist movement. It is possible to point out similar characteristics in the cases of the Afrikaners in South Africa or the Basel Mission, both of which have also developed their own national political mythologies to explain and legitimize their modes of existence and control of native populations.

The Zionist imaginary – definition

The array of mythical assumptions and historical narratives, embedded within Modern Hebrew, has framed Zionism's political goals and assisted in creating a

collective consciousness, an omnipresent national imaginary. This imaginary, in which "collective memory is considered objective history" (Kimmerling 2001: 16), is deeply entrenched in Israel's Zionist political culture, its public institutions, and present everyday life.

Drawing on Castoriadis's concept of the social imaginary (Castoriadis 1987 [1975]), the book employs the paraphrase "Zionist imaginary" to refer to the pervasiveness of Zionism's political memory, which is rooted in both late 19th-century Romanticism and settler-colonial episteme. This particular political memory was developed vis-à-vis the colonial process and was formed in relation to the socio-economic order that the Zionist movement sought to establish.

The Zionist imaginary assumes its own irrefutability and preempts the possibility of adopting an external critical view of it, as it glosses over the colonial premises that lie at its core. In Zionist political culture, Zionism and its political program is not and cannot be depicted as a historical case – not of colonialism, and not in the form of a national identity construction project. The mythical foundation of Zionism provides the external and internal legitimation to its political program (Kimmerling 2001: 4), tending to obfuscate the very possibility of thinking about this project critically.

The Zionist imaginary not only constitutes the discursive realm through which the social and political reality in Israel is thought, but it also establishes its political mythology as a sphere of "truth". Congruently, such sphere is also constituted as a sphere of social normativity, where the challenging of these "truths" can potentially be considered an act of social deviancy.

Eisenstadt: biographical and intellectual background

"A legend of modern sociology", "a towering and inspiring scholar", and "a sociological giant" are among the expressions that the academic community uses to address and remember Eisenstadt (Wittrock 2006). Eisenstadt, one of "the leading contemporary Weberian sociologists" of the second half of the 20th century (R. Bellah, quoted in Robertson 2011: 304), was a prominent social theorist. He was well known for his monumental macro-comparative studies on social change, structural differentiation, and agency, and most notably for his contribution to the discourse on modernity.

At the core of Eisenstadt's scholarly concerns, which addressed "the deepest problems of human existence", as E. Shils has noted (Shils 1985: 4), stood sociology's fundamental problem "of coming to grips with modernity" (Tiryakian 1985: 131). Eisenstadt was also one of the scholars who laid out the base for a sociological analysis of Israeli society (Herzog et al. 2007: 8), for which he is known as "the father of Israeli sociology" (Weil 2010: 252).

The formative period of Eisenstadt's sociology witnessed the social and political transformations that accrued in the post–World War II era, its "waves of democratization", and their ensuing "crises and tribulations" (Eisenstadt 2003a: 1). It has also witnessed the establishment of the state of Israel, "the processes of its crystallization and the development of Israeli society" (ibid.). These two major poles, the

global and the local, provide the broad context in which Eisenstadt's sociological analysis was located and to which it responded. Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt was born on September 10, 1923[13] to a family of Jewish origins in Warsaw, Poland (then the Second Polish Republic). Fatherless, he left Warsaw at the age of 12 with his mother, first to the United States[14] – whose gates remained closed for most immigrants and refugees from 1924 – and later to Mandatory Palestine. Alexander portrays Eisenstadt's course of life as that of "a displaced European Jew" who "made a pilgrimage to Palestine only years before Nazism made virtually every European Jew a Zionist". "He came to maturity", Alexander adds, "in an aspiring nation that was itself buffeted by eschatological expectations and secular agonies and by the grinding experiences of war" (Alexander 1992: 86). Based on personal communication with Eisenstadt's wife, Shulamit, Spohn writes that Eisenstadt was born "into [a] Jewish-Zionist family" (Spohn 2011: 238). Koenig also describes Eisenstadt's family as strongly influenced by Zionism (Koenig 2006: 699). Nevertheless, the specific causes that led the Eisenstadts to leave Warsaw remain unclear.

As a high school pupil in Tel Aviv at the age of 14, Eisenstadt joined the Haganah, an armed paramilitary organization that was ideologically associated with the Zionist Labor Movement (Kimmerling 2001: 30). Herzog notes that Eisenstadt was assigned different duties within the Haganah, both in Mandatory Palestine and abroad (Herzog et al. 2007: 8). Eisenstadt's exact role in the organization is not entirely clear, and his involvement in the organization has been omitted from his autobiographical account (Eisenstadt 2003).

It was nevertheless known, as was noted by Shils, that Eisenstadt "was involved, in ways of which he did not speak, in the political and military affairs of Palestine and in the establishment of the new Jewish state" (Shils 1985: 3). Spohn adds that as "a young Zionist", Eisenstadt "was a member of the Israeli army" (Spohn 2011: 238). The nature of this involvement remains unknown as well.

In 1940, after graduating from high school, Eisenstadt began his academic studies at the Hebrew University in the departments of history, Jewish history, and sociology of culture.[15] His education was shaped by the intellectual figures and tendencies that developed at the Hebrew University during the 1940s. Among his university teachers were Y. Baer, Ben-Zion Dinur, and Y. Kaufmann (Eisenstadt 1992a: v), all of whom were ardent Zionists, known for their contribution to the construction of Zionist historiography.

Several European scholars of Jewish background arrived at the Hebrew University after the rise of Nazism to power; among them were Eisenstadt's master's supervisor, Richard Koebner (1885–1958), a historian known for his studies of *Empires* (Koebner 2008 [1961]) and *Imperialism* (Koebner 1964),[16] and Eisenstadt's doctoral supervisor, Martin Buber (1878–1965) (Shils 1985: 2). Buber was a prominent figure in intellectual and public life during Israel's pre- and early statehood that had a significant scholarly influence on Eisenstadt (Weil 2010: 453).[17]

Buber, a student of G. Simmel who left National Socialist Germany in 1938 (Yair and Apeloig 2005: 98–99), was a thinker "whose major sociological concern",

according to Eisenstadt, "was to identify those situations wherein there exist the greatest chances for human creativity in the social and cultural realm" (Eisenstadt 2003: 2). Eisenstadt referred to Buber's teachings, mainly the reading of Confucian scriptures, as the most memorable intellectual challenge he faced as a student and as an experience which continued to resonate in his thought (Eisenstadt 1992b: 6). Buber himself recognized Eisenstadt's intellectual capacities: In a letter to Leo Strauss from January 1950, Buber mentioned "Dr. Eisenstadt" as "a capable and knowledgeable man particularly versed in modern methods" (Buber 1996: 548).

Many of Buber's observations were explicitly and implicitly incorporated into the Eisenstadtian corpus. Eisenstadt's focus on human creativity, namely, human agency and the conditions that enable it, apparently derives from Buber's social philosophy. Turner and Susen claim that Buber equipped Eisenstadt "with a deep understanding of the creative potential of human cultures" (Turner and Susen 2011: 230). Indeed, Eisenstadt's "immense familiarity with German sociological literature" (Shils 1985: 2), mainly with Weberian sociology, as well as with American sociology, was the result of the intellectual seeds that Buber had planted. It is therefore hard to imagine Eisenstadt's macro-sociology without the comparative approaches which Buber exposed him to (Eisenstadt 1992b: 7). Some scholars, however, are critical of Eisenstadt's interpretation of Buber's intellectual heritage, which they argue tend to obscure its radical potential and critique of Zionism (Shamir and Avnon 1998).

During the 1930s and 1940s, the Hebrew University was an arena of different, at times contesting, political ideas and aspirations. In this context, Buber was a "spiritual mentor" for many of the members of "Brith Shalom" (Covenant of Peace/The Peace Association) (Raz-Krakotzkin 2011: 88). This circle of scholars advocated the idea of binationalism and envisioned a civil framework of "absolute" political equality between Jews and Palestinians (Brith Shalom [1926] 2005: 74; quoted in Raz-Krakotzkin 2011: 88). Buber, being "the most devoted public advocate of the idea" (ibid., 89) embraced a version of Zionism which included a "federated state jointly and equally administrated by 'two peoples'" (Butler 2012: 76); his version of cultural Zionism has adhered to the myth of return and spiritual revival of Jews in their land on the one hand, and has rejected "the claims to territorial sovereignty for the Jewish people" on the other (ibid., 36).

The existence of "Brith Shalom" is evidence to the various prospects, the different modes of imaging the future political framework in Palestine, that emerged during the rule of British Mandate and to which Eisenstadt was exposed. Buber "was a devout Gemeinschaft thinker", "a scholar of the romantic nationalism" who imagined a small Jewish community in Palestine based on internal solidarity and communalism (Ram 2015: 101). Buber's utopian vision of the Jewish community has echoed in Eisenstadt's early depictions of Israel, which nevertheless altered this vision by emphasizing the modern character of this community.

Buber did not just influence Eisenstadt intellectually. In a dialogue with D. Rabinowitz from 2007, Eisenstadt spoke about how Buber provided him the model for remaining intellectually independent: "I was indeed close to different centers", Eisenstadt said in retrospect,

> and yet I did not become, nor did I wanted to be, a part of their [Labour Zionist] establishments, and I especially did not wish to be a part of the political establishment nor of a movement of any kind [. . .] Nevertheless, there were a few fundamental assumptions which I accepted and identified with: *a Jewish state, the building of the nation*. This mixed formula has always remained, in some form or another. I was tied to the center, but not really a part of it, and especially not a part of the establishment. I always kept some distance, criticism. The one providing me the model, of which I was maybe not fully aware, was Martin Buber, a central man, a part of the center, who refused to be a part of the movement and the political establishment.
>
> (Eisenstadt and Rabinowitz 2007: 495, my translation)

Prior to Buber's arrival in Jerusalem, it was A. Ruppin (1876–1943) who founded the Department for Jewish Sociology at the Hebrew University. This title exhibits a distinction between two kinds of sociologies: "general" sociology and "Jewish" sociology. Like Buber, Ruppin was a member of "Brith Shalom" (until 1929) and one of Eisenstadt's teachers (Eisenstadt 1992a: v; Shils 1985: 2). Ruppin, a prominent figure in the Zionist movement, played a key role in the colonization of Palestine and in the establishment of colonizing institutions such as the Palestine Land Development Company (PLDC) (Bloom 2011: 2–4; Shafir 1989: 159). The fact that Ruppin was one of Palestine's chief colonizers while also a member of "Brith Shalom" attests to the inherent inability of "Brith Shalom" to see the Zionist settlement project as a form of colonizing, which by definition prevents the possibility of "absolute political equality", as stated in Brith Shalom's "Statutes" ([1926] 2005: 74). Ruppin's studies, influenced by the discourse of eugenics and social Darwinism (Falk 2006: 145, 155), sought to prove the existence of a Jewish "Volk" bearing distinguishable "racial" characteristics which originated in the "Land of Israel" (Ruppin 1930; Sand 2010: 233).

Buber, chairing the newly established Department of Sociology and the Committee on Social Sciences, held the position from 1947 until his retirement in 1950 (Eisenstadt 1992b: 1). Buber's teachings, which emphasized both the "analytical and the concrete", introduced Eisenstadt to the "central problematics of modern social thought and analysis" and familiarized him with

> The major classics of sociology, such as Marx, Durkheim, Tönnies, Simmel, Max and Alfred Weber, and to such writers as Lorenz von Stein, Vico and Sorel; as well as [. . .] to the various utopists and to analysis of the classical texts of the great civilization – the Greek, the Chinese, and of course the Jewish.
>
> (ibid., 6)

Eisenstadt notes that Buber's tutorials introduced him to works of classical and modern anthropology, "from Tyler, Fraser, Jane Harrison to Franz Boas, A. Kroeber, Margaret Mead, Malinowski and his school – and to American sociology, from Lester Ward [. . .] to George Herbert Mead up to the early Talcott Parsons" (ibid., 6).

Eisenstadt completed his doctoral studies in 1947, on the verge of the outbreak of war. He spent the next year conducting postdoctoral studies at the London School of Economics (LSE), one of the centers of British social anthropology that gained academic status after World War II (Asad 1995 [1973]: 9). At the LSE Eisenstadt met "Parsonian-Weberian sociologist Edward Shils". Through Shils, Eisenstadt "established his first link with American academia, toward which he would thereafter turn for theoretical inspiration" (Ram 1995: 24). Alexander notes that Parsons was Eisenstadt's intellectual "father" and Shils his intellectual "'Godfather' and patron" (Alexander 1992: 85–86). Eisenstadt's encounter with Shils has deepened the former's understanding of Max Weber's theory of charisma and made him familiar with the theoretical notion of center and periphery (Shils 1982 [1961]).[18]

Shils recalls Eisenstadt's great hunger for knowledge as a student, and notes that during the time Eisenstadt spent at the LSE he read all of the available literature in sociology in English, French, German, and Polish (Shils 1985: 2). Shils also refers to Eisenstadt's special interest in the works of Morris Ginsberg and Fred Nadel (ibid., 3). Attesting to Eisenstadt's strong familiarity with British social anthropology, Shils writes, "I don't think that he [Eisenstadt] was my pupil any more than he was Morris Ginsberg's and Fred Nadel's or Raymond Firth's or Audrey Richards' or David Glass'" (ibid.).

In the Hobhouse Memorial Lecture in 1981, Eisenstadt described Ginsberg's seminar at the LSE as an "intellectual treat", a place of "lively discussions" for sociologists, anthropologists, and historians, "many of whom became leaders of their disciplines" (Eisenstadt 1981: 155). In his autobiographical notes, Eisenstadt mentions a group of British anthropologists, including T. H. Marshall, E. E. Evans-Pritchard, M. Fortes, Edmund Leach, and Max Gluckman, who introduced him to the "great tradition of comparative studies" (Eisenstadt 2003: 2).

The year Eisenstadt spent at the LSE proved to be of great significance to his future research. To a large extent, Eisenstadt "imported" the approaches, comparative methods, analytical tools, and intellectual sensitivities – contextualized by British colonial domination – which he acquired at the LSE to the Hebrew University. Eisenstadt's return to Jerusalem occurred earlier than expected due to the outbreak of war (Herzog et al. 2007: 8). In September of that year, Eisenstadt married Shulamit Yerushvski (passed away in 2014),[19] with whom he raised three children.

Upon returning to his alma mater, Eisenstadt led the research seminar that Buber originally established, focusing on the empirical study of immigrants in the newly declared state of Israel. Eisenstadt's first research reports on the "Oriental Jews" in Jerusalem were written within this framework (Eisenstadt 1951, 1992b: 6, 2003: 3).[20] This seminar, as Kimmerling notes, "was conducted under the auspices of the Department of Oriental Jews of the Jewish Agency" (Kimmerling 1992: 448). Eisenstadt's first monograph, *The Absorption of Immigrants*, was composed with the support of the Israeli Ministry of Education (Eisenstadt 1954: xii). This sheds light on the connection between the sociology department and the newly established Zionist institutions.

Eisenstadt became involved in developing the social science department along with J. Ben-David, Y. Katz, Y. Talmon, and others (Kimmerling 1992: 449). In 1951, upon Buber's retirement, Eisenstadt was appointed the head of the sociology department, a position that brought with it some degree of institutional power, enabling him to establish a community of knowledge. Appointed full professor in 1959, Eisenstadt continued to chair the sociology department until 1969, serving as the dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences between 1966 and 1968 and fulfilling other academic senior and administrative roles at the Hebrew University (Herzog et al. 2007: 8).

Eisenstadt was one of the founders of the Israeli Sociological Society and chaired as its first president during 1967–1970.[21] In addition, Eisenstadt was the chairman of the academic advisory council of "Yad Ben-Zvi", an institution that operates by the power of Israeli law, whose goal is to "deepen the awareness of the continuity of the Jewish Yishuv among the people ['Am'] and to promote, for this purpose, the study of the history of the Yishuv" (The Knesset, "Yad Ben-Zvi Law" 1969, my translation). Yad Ben-Zvi Law is considered to be among the discriminatory laws in Israel's codex (Kassim 2000: 139).

Eisenstadt rarely "voiced his opinions on hot and sometimes existential issues which were on the national agenda" (Kimmerling 2007: 171). Nevertheless, he was not detached from Israel's civil sphere. One example of his active involvement in civil life in Israel is evident in his participation at the 1959 "Wadi Salib Public Commission of Inquiry", to which he was invited as an expert. The Wadi Salib "riots" was a series of events that occurred in Haifa that year in reaction to the socio-economic oppression of Jewish immigrants from Arab backgrounds. These events were violently suppressed by the state, yet they remain inscribed in Israel's counter-memory as a rebellion against the labor movement's discriminatory policies directed at Mizrahi immigrants. The "Report of the Public Commission of Inquiry into the July 9, 1959 Disturbances in Wadi Salib", attempting to locate the sources of discontent, evinces an orientalist and stereotypical image of Arab Jews/Mizrahi communities. According to Kalekin-Fishman, it was in the mid-1980s that Eisenstadt, as a keynote speaker at the Israeli Sociological Society's annual conference, openly admitted that "we were wrong in many of our analyses" concerning Arab Jews/Mizrahi communities (Kalekin-Fishman 2010: 8).

After his retirement in 1989, Eisenstadt remained an active scholar affiliated with various research institutions such as Harvard University, Michigan University, the University of Chicago, MIT, Stanford, and many others. In 1970 he joined the Van Leer Institute in Jerusalem as Senior Research Fellow (Herzog et al. 2007: 8–9). Eisenstadt was affiliated with other institutions including the Israeli Academy of Sciences and Humanities, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Philosophical Society, the National Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Sociology of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, and the London School of Economics (Yair 2010: 222).

Eisenstadt's frequent appearances at conferences and research groups around the world contributed significantly to the formation of a broad network of peers. It included researchers and scholars who were inspired by Eisenstadt's sociological

approach, embedding it or parts of it in their fields of research. This network expanded also due to Eisenstadt's visits to Germany, where he attended the Max Weber Kolleg (Eisenstadt and Schluchter 1998).

It was in Germany that Eisenstadt's study of axial civilizations began to take shape vis-à-vis "the revival of interest in comparative civilizational analysis in a Weberian mode" (Eisenstadt 2003: 17). Eisenstadt's studies of the axial age – a theme that would prove central in his comparative civilizational analysis – were later supported by Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, affiliated with the Christian Democratic Union of Germany.[22]

Eisenstadt's collaboration with J. P. Arnason and B. Wittrock was crucial in re-introducing axiality to the sociological discourse and in establishing multiple modernities as an extended research program. Through a process of interpretation and criticism, Eisenstadt's interlocutors, Arnason and Wittrock, have contributed to illuminating various aspects in Eisenstadt's thought and developing it into an intellectual corpus that shaped the comparative thinking in the social sciences (Smith 2002: 226).

Furthermore, Eisenstadt met several scholars with whom he formed scholarly collaborations; these included Bernhard Giesen, Dominic Sachsenmaier, and others. As the representative of Israeli sociology around the world, and having lost relatives at the death camps of National Socialist Germany, Eisenstadt's connection to scholars of German origins, Giesen argues, marks a symbolic reconciliation of German and Israeli scholars after the Holocaust.

Eisenstadt, as Giesen portrays him, was "committed" to his country.[23] Eisenstadt, notwithstanding, is known in the academic community as a cosmopolitan scholar, one who mastered many languages and to whom various cultures were familiar. "He was a cosmopolitan intellectual", Robertson writes, "in the sense that he was profoundly acquainted with virtually every region of the contemporary, early modern, primal and ancient worlds; and, in addition, he interacted closely with intellectuals all over the world" (Robertson 2011: 304). Turner and Susen add that "Eisenstadt was a thorough-going, let us say, practical cosmopolitan" (Turner and Susen 2011: 230).

The plethora of awards and honorary doctoral degrees that Eisenstadt received attests to the positive reception of his work and his growing prestige.[24] The Rothschild Prize, the Israel Prize, and the EMET Prize, which Eisenstadt won, are awarded by Zionist institutions and bear a Zionist orientation. Both the Israel Prize and the EMET Prize are state-funded prizes, attesting to some degree of the state's approval and embracement of Eisenstadt's contribution. The most central among the honors which Eisenstadt received was the Holberg Memorial Prize (2006), marking the academic community's acknowledgment of his enrichment of the discourse of modernity. The awarding of the Holberg Prize was followed by a discussion of the thesis,[25] which provided the academic community the opportunity to reflect on the thesis' emphasis on the interconnectedness of different cultures, as was expressed by Alexander:

> He [Eisenstadt] places western culture back into a universal history in a non-chauvinistic way, and in so doing he brought western theory and sociology

> to bear on and to intermingle with non-western social theory and sociology, and he has allowed us to see that we all come from the same roots, that we all have essentially [. . .] the same kind of civilization, an axial civilization, in common, that there isn't an irredeemable difference between us, there isn't an inherent necessity for conflict, in this sense his notion of multiple modernities is a fundamentally global theory and a relatively optimistic one for the 20th century.
>
> (Alexander 2006)

According to his secretary, Miriam Bar-Shimo'n, Eisenstadt continued to work on his manuscripts until his very last days (Friedman-Peleg 2010: 11). "The Axial Conundrum" (Eisenstadt 2011, published posthumously), was the last piece he delivered for publication. Eisenstadt passed away in September 2010, leaving a rich intellectual heritage. Giesen and Alexander eulogize Eisenstadt in the following words:

> As a human being, Shmuel Eisenstadt embodied his own intellectual paradigm. He was a gentleman of cosmopolitan manners, complex imagination, and critical mind. He was an inveterate traveler between Chicago and Budapest, Uppsala and Tokyo, Jerusalem and Konstanz. He was a mastery of irony who never got entangled in pedantic details and who kept an elegant distance from the slaves of methodological virtue. Not only was he at home everywhere, but it often seemed that everywhere was his home. [. . .] Usually, however, Shmuel was easygoing, folksy, and earthy. He laced his lectures with jokes, whimsical paradoxes, and digressive asides. His gift for synthesizing different, seemingly antagonistic strains in a debate were legendary, and it was his openness and sensitivity to interdisciplinary dialogue that inspired so many to join him in his intellectual endeavors. Yet, as amicable and charming as he was in person, his scholarly judgment was uncompromising and occasionally even merciless, right up to the very end.
>
> (Alexander and Giesen 2011: 18)

The research of Eisenstadt's scholarship is broadly divided into two main fields of interest: The first concerns the study and critique of his comparative historical sociology and focuses on his contribution to social theory discourse. These accounts attempt to locate Eisenstadt's position in relation to other social theorists or a theoretical question. The second type of studies concerns Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel. These accounts mainly point out Eisenstadt's connection to the hegemonic power of the Labor Zionist movement and its social policies. The literature is evidently bifurcated: Accounts of Eisenstadt's general sociology have paid little or no attention to his scholarship being contextualized by Israel's political culture.

The Political Systems of Empires (1963), the first monograph to attract scholarly attention to Eisenstadt's work,[26] presents an analysis of the rise of bureaucratic empires, and "translated Weber's theory of patrimonialism into functionalist language" (Alexander and Colomy 1985: 12). Since the publication of *The Political*

Systems of Empires, key studies of Eisenstadt's oeuvre engage comparative and evaluative discussions of his macro-sociology, sociology of history, and civilizational analysis. The majority of these works underline Eisenstadt's shift from revised functionalism, seen in his early works, to an agency-focused approach (Ichijo 2013) in his later scholarship, an approach that advocates "the independent role of cultural codes" (Alexander 1992: 85) and emphasizes the role of elites in facilitating the "bottom-up" processes.

Other accounts emphasize specific elements in Eisenstadt's work, such as the meaning of tradition in modernity (Tiryakian 2011), path dependency (Knöbl 2010), or the concept of transcendence in his comparative historical sociology (Silber 2011). Others scholars present critiques (Delanty 2006; Schmidt 2006; Bhambra 2007b, 2014; Knöbl 2010; Fourie 2012; Trakulhun and Weber 2015) or adaptations of multiple modernities (Göle 2000; Eickelman 2000; Kaviraj 2000; Weiming 2000; Spohn 2003; Kaya 2004a, 2004b; Kamali 2006; Ichijo 2013; and others).

In his account of Eisenstadt's late "turn toward meaning", Alexander discusses Eisenstadt's theoretical transformation regarding his view of stability, which "has haunted and inspired" his work (Alexander 1992: 86). In his account, Alexander contributes to mapping the three major periods that frame Eisenstadt's sociological analysis. He does so mainly by showing how each of these periods related to Parsons's understanding of institutionalization. First, Eisenstadt's "early" period is marked by the publication of *From Generation to Generation* (1956a) and reached its "highest theoretical point" in "Institutionalization and Change" (Eisenstadt 1964). This phase "combined social anthropology and Parsonian functionalism to develop an increasingly innovative, revisionist theory of comparative social change" and was marked by "a fundamental reconceptualization of the key functionalist questions and toward neo-functionalism itself" (Alexander 1992: 91–92); Second, Eisenstadt's "middle" Weberian period began with the editing of Weber's *On Charisma and Institution Building* (1968) and was guided by the "new developments in the theory of Edward Shils and [. . .] by a new sensitivity to charismatic centers and the role they play in social differentiation" (Alexander 1992: 92). Last, following the turn toward civilizational analysis, Eisenstadt's third phase has centered on the acknowledgment of the irresolvability of the tensions inherent to modernity (ibid.).

During his revisionist period, Eisenstadt understood institutionalization in a "structural way, introducing a critical variation on Parson's differentiation theory of social change" (ibid., 86). In his critiques of Parsons, Eisenstadt suggested that differentiation cannot result in equilibrium because with "each new phase of differentiation [. . .] new conflicts emerge" (ibid.). In Alexander's view, this critique represented a "fundamental breakthrough for functionalism" (ibid.). Alexander, nevertheless, points out the flaws of this early neo-functionalism, the most central of these being Eisenstadt's Western-centrism (ibid.).

In his second Weberian phase, Eisenstadt shifted to civilizational analysis, focusing on the tensions between the "this and other-worldly" chasm. According to Alexander, in this phase, Eisenstadt has exhibited

> a fundamental shift in sensitivity, one that revealed a new more inner-directed sensitivity to spiritual, moral, and symbolic concerns [. . .] from an emphasis on the "challenges" of social change and modernity to the "dilemmas" they pose, from a focus on the central role of "organization" to the energizing force of "ideas", from the role of "entrepreneurs" as key agents to the critical position of "intellectuals", from "system" as the primary social referent to "civilization".
>
> (ibid., 87)

Eisenstadt's later work constitutes a rejection of Parsons's and Shils's understating of institutionalization (ibid.). It did so not only by emphasizing the attempt "to make earthly a transcendental ideal" (ibid.), as articulated in his civilizational sociology, but rather by regarding institutionalization as "the putting into place and spreading throughout society of the perception of an irremediable tension between the sacred and the profane and of the need [. . .] to overcome it" (ibid.). It is therefore that Alexander regards Eisenstadt's perception of modernity as a sphere in which "there can only be claims for resolution, never resolution itself" (ibid.).

To demonstrate Eisenstadt's new direction, Alexander claims that the civil sphere, which appears to be a unique European idea, is considered the most "perfect institutionalization of the tension that has marked the post-Axial age" (ibid., 89). Following Weber, Eisenstadt referred to the civil sphere in his "middle" theoretical phase as a sphere of salvation, where the chasm between the mundane and transcendental world is mediated (ibid.). However, in Eisenstadt's later work, the civil sphere is seen as an embodiment of the tensions of the Axial code, not a resolution of it. The civil sphere was hence no longer seen as a mediator of the Axial chasm but rather as the institutionalization of this fundamental tension (ibid., 90).

Hamilton discusses Eisenstadt's attempt to construct historical sociology that is "distinct from but related to structural functionalism" (Hamilton 1984: 87). He evaluates Eisenstadt's sociology of history within the context of other sociologies of history, particularly Marxist theory. There, Hamilton points out Eisenstadt's attempt to grant structural functionalism the same "empirical bent" that was developed in Marxist sociology, an attempt that in Hamilton's view "did not go far enough" (ibid., 118).

Hamilton contributed to this discourse by emphasizing Eisenstadt's notion of open-endedness, claiming that "modernity does not breed conformity. [. . .] Change is always open" (ibid., 107). Thus, Eisenstadt's view of the possibility of social change is presented as a critique of Marxism and structural functionalism. It encapsulates an optimistic viewpoint that lends itself to the deterministic notion of social lives and regards the interaction of culture and structure as the tension that bears the potential to generate change.

Other accounts of Eisenstadt's scholarship were published in the *Journal of Classical Sociology* in "the Special Issue on Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt" (Turner and Susen 2011) in the year following his death. In their editorial piece, Turner and Susen stress that "through his lifelong research on civilizational complexes

and historical turning-points and breakthroughs", Eisenstadt has made a "major contribution to undermining methodological nationalism" (ibid., 230). To support their claim, they argue that Eisenstadt "made every effort not to use the concepts of 'society' and 'nation-state' interchangeably. Eisenstadt's work continually brought out the differences between civilizational complexes and their deep historical contingency" (ibid.).

Moreover, in their account, Turner and Susen discuss Eisenstadt's idea of multiple modernities as a rejection of "any simple notion of developmental convergence towards a unitary model of modernity" (ibid., 231). "In opposition to Parsons", they argue, Eisenstadt "conceived of culture as inevitably unstable, malleable, and dynamic" (ibid.). The two also emphasized the "profound influence" that Buber had on Eisenstadt, which led the latter to be aware of "the genuine possibility and normative significance of dialogue across cultures and the acceptance of otherness" (ibid.). "Eisenstadt was interested in moral orientations to the world", they maintain, "especially those that were conditioned by a sense of religious transcendence" (ibid.). They describe his "neo-Weberian perspective in his approach to cultures, which allowed him to avoid the tendency, common among Marxist theorists of globalization, to neglect cultural and religious factors in shaping the development of the modern world" (ibid.).

Last, Turner and Susen referred to Eisenstadt as being "primarily the heir of Max Weber's historical and comparative sociology of religious systems and their ethical teaching" (ibid.). "It seems legitimate", they write, "to regard Eisenstadt, in terms of both his scope of interests and his depth of understanding, as the late embodiment of the comparative and historical sociology of Max Weber" (ibid., 236). "Both Weber and Eisenstadt", they explain, "grappled with the comparative differences between North America, Europe, and Asia through the analytical framework of what we may call 'life orientations', or in Weber's terms, 'personality and life orders'" (ibid.).

Levine examines Eisenstadt's relation to sociology's "perennial vulnerability" as a discipline that is "absorbed into other intellectual traditions or social roles" (Levine 1995: 32). According to Levine, Eisenstadt regarded the crisis that broke in the field during the 1970s as "a call for searching diagnostic analysis", one that resulted in a pluralistic perspective, seeking to enrich the existing research paradigms and the general framework of sociological analysis (ibid.). Levine's account of Eisenstadt's approach uncovers an additional aspect in Eisenstadt's view of sociology, namely, one that does not seek a refutation of ideas but rather the coexistence and synthesis of different sociological approaches.

Notes

1 Arendt connects the concepts of progress to imperialism and the process of a never-ending accumulation of power and capital (Arendt 1973 [1951]: 143). She locates the roots of the concept in 17th-century pre-revolutionary France, as represented in the works of Pascal and Fontenelle (Arendt 1970: 25), where progress was conceived as "criticism of the past to be a means of mastering the present and controlling the future; progress culminated in the emancipation of man" (Arendt 1973 [1951]: 143).

She argues that in the 18th century the term received a new meaning, exemplified in Lessing's concept of education of mankind (*Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts*), a concept which by the 19th century made the idea of progress a widely accepted dogma (Arendt 1970: 25), foreshadowing "the rise of imperialism" (Arendt 1973 [1951]: 143).

2 Mannheim regards Weber's classification of the "purposeful-rational" and the "traditional" as an attempt to contribute "evaluative emphasis to the rationalistic tendencies in capitalism" (Mannheim 1954 [1929]: 273).

3 Initially including the term "love" (Comte 1876).

4 Notable works in the field consist of Stark (1958), Berger and Luckmann (1966), Luhmann (1997), and Swidler and Arditi (1994).

5 The Foucauldian notion of "episteme" is defined as a "historical a priori", "a discursive code of which the users are unaware that is common to all discourses in a given period of time" (Heilbron et al. 1998: 6).

6 The constitutive role of language was also underscored by Sapir (1951) and Whorf (1956).

7 The discourse of collective memory in and of itself constitutes a discursive sphere of memory. For a broader sociographical account of memory studies, see Olick et al. (2011).

8 A plethora of examples can be found for cases of historical forgetfulness. In her *Origins of Totalitarianism*, Arendt depicts how during the Stalinist era it was possible to "to circulate a revised history of the Russian Revolution in which no man by the name of Trotsky was ever commander-in-chief of the Red Army" (Arendt 1973 [1951]: 353).

9 This perception still prevails in Zionist-Israeli political culture. According to Shafir (1989: 7) it was also adopted by contemporary scholars such as H. Seton-Watson (1977).

10 Stated at the interim Zionist Conference held in July 1921 at Karlovy Vary with regards to the aims of the policies to be carried out by the JNF. In *Reports of the Executive of the Zionist Organisation to the XII Zionist Congress* (1921: 95) (cited in Shafir 1989: 197). The term "property" was also mentioned in a similar context by M. Ussishkin when discussing the establishment of a Jewish state in the Land of Israel (Ussishkin 1964 [1904]: 105, cited in Shafir 2005: 42).

11 As defined by the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998 [Article 8 (2)]).

12 One of the main figures active in purchasing lands was A. Ruppin, who was also the founder of the Department for Jewish Sociology at the Hebrew University (see "Eisenstadt: Biographical and Intellectual Background").

13 The information is taken from Eisenstadt's curriculum vitae. The document was found at the History and Sociology Department at Konstanz University.

14 Bernhard Giesen, personal conversation (June 23, 2014); Alexander and Giesen (2011: 18).

15 Eisenstadt's curriculum vitae.

16 Published posthumously. Koebner evinces a critical tone toward the Zionist movement as he connects the common aim of "imperialism and Zionism" to "suppressing the Arabs and taking away their lands" (Koebner 1964: 296).

17 Two new studies of Buber's life and scholarship were published recently; see Bourel 2015; Ram 2015.

18 Bernhard Giesen, personal conversation (August 2, 2015).

19 Marriage announcement. *HaTzofe*, September 24, 1948, p. 5.

20 Kimmerling claims that "the breaking point" between Buber and Eisenstadt was due to the latter's opposition to a type of scholarly academic work "which was removed from the empirical reality in the Yishuv" (Kimmerling 2007: 151). However, this opposition contradicts Eisenstadt's later account, in which he describes how Buber encouraged students to pursue "different empirical research projects" (Eisenstadt 1992b: 6).

21 Information published on the Israel Sociological Society's online website. Eisenstadt's curriculum vitae refers to the years 1969–1971 as the period in which he serves as the president of the association.
22 Bernhard Giesen, personal conversation (June 23, 2014).
23 Bernhard Giesen, personal conversation (June 23, 2014).
24 Among the institutions bestowing such honorary degrees were Harvard University, Duke University, the University of Helsinki, Tel Aviv University, the Hebrew Union College, the Central European University Budapest, the University of Warsaw, and the University of Haifa (Yair 2010: 222); Among the numerous awards Eisenstadt received were the MacIver Award of the American Sociological Association (1966), the Kaplun Prize (1969), the Rothschild Prize for Social Sciences (1970), the Israel Prize for Sociology (1973), the International Balzan Prize (1988), the European Amalfi Prize for Sociology, the Max Planck Research Award for Social Sciences (1994 with W. Schluchter), the Amalfi Prize for Sociology and Social Sciences (2001), the Humboldt Research Award (2002), and the EMET Prize in Sociology (2005) (Herzog et al. 2007: 9; Yair 2010: 222).
25 Members of the Holberg prize symposium included scholars such as Bernhard Giesen, Jeffrey C. Alexander, Jack A. Goldstone, Jonathan Friedman, Sverre Bagge, Donald Levine, Shalini Randeria, Fredrik Barth, Rajeev Bhargava, Said Amir Arjomand, Luis Roniger, Nina Witoszek-FitzPatrick, Yehuda Elkana, and Bernt Hagtvet. Information taken from the Holberg Prize online website.
26 The book won the MacIver Award.

References

Adams, J., Clemens, E. S., and Orloff, A. S. (2005) *Remaking Modernity: Politics, History, and Sociology*, Durham: Duke University Press.

Alexander, J. C. (1992) "The Fragility of Progress: An Interpretation of the Turn Toward Meaning in Eisenstadt's Later Work", *Acta Sociologica* 35 (2): 85–94.

Alexander, J. C. (2006) "One or Many Modernities: The Idea of Multiple Modernities", The Holberg Symposium 2006: The Processes that Change the World, Bergen: Holberg Prize.

Alexander, J. C., and Colomy, P. (1985) "Towards Neofunctionalism. Eisenstadt's Change Theory and Symbolic Interactionism", *Sociological Theory* 3 (2): 11–23.

Alexander, J. C., and Giesen, B. (2011) "Shmuel Noah (S. N.) Eisenstadt 1923–2010", *ASA Footnotes* 39 (3): 18.

Almog, Y. (2013) "Sublime Readings: The Aesthetic Bible in Herder's Writings on Hebrew Poetry", *Simon Dubnow Institute Yearbook* 12: 335–350.

Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso.

Arendt, H. (1963) *On Revolution*, New York: Penguin Books.

Arendt, H. (1970) *On Violence*, New York: HBJ Books.

Arendt, H. (1973) [1951] *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Asad, T. (1992) "Conscripts of Western Civilization?", in: Gailey, C. (ed.) *Dialectical Anthropology: Essays in Honor of Stanley Diamond, Vol. 1*, Gainesville, FL: University Presses of Florida, pp. 333–351.

Asad, T. (1995) [1973] "Introduction", in: Asad, T. (ed.) *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.

Assmann, A. (2006) "Memory, Individual and Collective", in: Goodin, R. E., and Tilly, C. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Assmann, A. (2008) "Transformations Between History and Memory", *Social Research* 75 (1): 49–72.

Assmann, A., and Assmann, J. (1988) "Schrift, Tradition, Kultur" [Writing, Tradition, Culture], in: Raible, W. (ed.) *Scriptoralia: Vol. 6 Zwischen Festtag und Alltag*, Tübigen: Narr, pp. 25–49.

Assmann, J. (1995) "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity", trans. Czaplicka, J., *New German Critique* (65): 125–133.

Assmann, J. (1998) *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Assmann, J. (2011) "Communicative and Cultural Memory", in: Meusburger, P., Heffernan, M., and Wunder, E. (eds.) *Cultural Memories: The Geographical Point of View, Vol. 4*, Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 15–27.

Baer, Y. (1947) *Galut [Exile]*, New York: Schocken Books.

Balandier, G. (2013) [1951] "The Colonial Situation: A Theoretical Approach", in: Dubow, S. (ed.) *The Rise and Fall of Modern Empires, Vol II, Colonial Knowledges*, Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 3–30.

Balfour, A.J. (1917) *The Balfour Declaration*, London: British Foreign Office.

Barthes, R. (1981) [1967] "The Discourse of History", trans. Bann, S., in: Shaffer, E.S. (ed.) *Comparative Criticism: Volume 3: A Yearbook, Volume 4*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 7–20.

Barthes, R. (2001) [1977] "The Death of the Author", *Contributions in Philosophy* 83: 3–8.

Bateman, F., and Pilkington, L. (eds.) (2011) *Studies in Settler Colonialism: Politics, Identity and Culture*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Berger, P.L., and Luckmann, T. (1966) *The Social Construction of Reality*, New York: Doubleday.

Bhabha, H. (1997) [1991] "'Race', Time and the Revision of Modernity", in: Moore-Gilbert, B., Stanton, G., and Maley, W. (eds.) *Postcolonial Criticism*, London and New York: Longman, pp. 166–190.

Bhambra, G.K. (2007a) *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bhambra, G.K. (2007b) "Sociology and Postcolonialism: Another 'Missing' Revolution?", *Sociology* 41 (5): 871–884.

Bhambra, G.K. (2014) *Connected Sociologies*, London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Bloch, M. (2011) [1925] "From 'Memoir e collective, tradition et coutume: Apropos d'un livre recent'", in: Olick, J.K., et al. (eds.) *The Collective Memory Reader*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 150–155.

Bloom, E. (2011) *Arthur Ruppin and the Production of Pre-Israeli Culture*, Leiden: Brill.

Bottici, C.H. (2007) *A Philosophy of Political Myth*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bottici, C.H., and Challand, B. (2010) *The Myth of the Clash of Civilization*, London and New York: Routledge.

Bouchard, G. (2013) "The Small Nation with a Big Dream: Québec National Myths (eighteenth-twentieth century)", in: Bouchard, G. (ed.) *National Myths Constructed Pasts, Contested Presents*, London: Routledge, pp. 1–23.

Bourdieu, P. (1991) [1977] "On Symbolic Power", trans. Raymond, G., and Adamson, M., in *Language and Symbolic Power*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 163–170.

Bourdieu, P. (1994) "Rethinking the State: Genesis and Structure of the Bureaucratic Field", *Sociological Theory* 12 (1): 1–18.

Bourel, D. (2015) *Martin Buber. Sentinelle de l'humanité*, Paris: Albin Michel.

Brith Shalom. [1926] (2005) "Statutes", in: Mendes-Flohr, P. (ed.) *A Land of Two Peoples: Martin Buber on Jews and Arabs*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Buber, M. (1996) *The Letters of Martin Buber: A Life of Dialogue*, eds. Glatzer, N. N., and Mendes-Flohr, P., trans. Winston, R., Winston, C., and Zohn, H., New York: Syracuse University Press.

Butler, J. (2012) *Parting Ways: Jewishness and the Critique of Zionism*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Castoriadis, C. (1987) [1975] *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, trans. Blamey, K., Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Chowers, E. (2012) *The Political Philosophy of Zionism: Trading Jewish Words for a Hebraic Land*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Comte, A. (1876) *System of Positive Polity: Social dynamics: Or, the General Theory of Human Progress*, London: Longmans, Green and Company.

Delanty, G. (2006) "Modernity and the Escape from Eurocentrism", in: Delanty, G. (ed.) *Handbook of Contemporary European Social Theory*, London: Routledge, pp. 266–278.

Delanty, G. (2015) "Cosmopolitanism as a Critique of Neoliberalism", The 12th ESA Conference, Prague, August 26, 2015.

Derrida, J. (1978) [1967] *Writing and Difference*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Dinur, B. (1938) *The History of Israel: Israel in Its Land*, Tel Aviv: Dvir. [Hebrew]

Dumont, L. (1969) "Homo Hierarchicus", *Social Science Information* 8: 69–87.

Durkheim, E. (1954) [1912] *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (*Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse*), London: Allen & Unwin.

Eickelman, D. F. (2000) "Islam and the Languages of Modernity", *Daedalus* 129 (1): 119–135.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1951) *Absorption of Immigrants in Israel (with Special Reference to Oriental Jews)*, *Research Seminar in Sociology*, Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the Jewish Agency [Private circulation]. *The Absorption of Immigrants: A Sociological Analysis*, Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jewish Agency for Israel, Department of Oriental Jews and Research Seminar in Sociology. [Hebrew version]

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1954) *The Absorption of Immigrants: A Comparative Study Based Mainly on the Jewish Community in Palestine and the State of Israel*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul LTD.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1956a) *From Generation to Generation: Age Groups and Social Structure*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1963) *The Political Systems of Empires*, New York: Free Press of Glencoe [New edition with new Introduction. New Brunswick: Transaction (1993)].

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1964) "Institutionalization and Change", *American Sociological Review* 29 (2): 235–247.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1968) "Introduction", in: Weber, M. (ed.) *On Charisma and Institution Building: Selected papers*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. ix–lvi.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1981) "Cultural Traditions and Political Dynamics: The Origins and Modes of Ideological Politics. Hobhouse Memorial Lecture", *The British Journal of Sociology* 32 (2): 155–181.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1992a) *Jewish Civilization: The Jewish Historical Experience in a Comparative Perspective*, New York: SUNY Press.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1992b) "Introduction: Intersubjectivity, Dialogue, Discourse and Cultural Creativity in the Work of Martin Buber", in: Eisenstadt, S. N. (ed.) *Martin Buber*

on Intersubjectivity and Cultural Creativity, Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 1–22.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (ed.) (2003) *Comparative Civilizations and Multiple Modernities* I, Leiden: Brill.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (2011) "The Axial Conundrum Between Transcendental Visions and Vicissitudes of their Institutionalizations: Constructive and Destructive Possibilities", *Análise Social* XLVI (199): 201–217.

Eisenstadt, S. N., and Rabinowitz, D. (2007) "On Israeli Social Science, Judaic Studies, Modernization, and Globalization", in: Herzog, H., et al. (eds.) *Generations, Locations, Identities: Contemporary Perspectives on Society and Culture in Israel – Essays in Honor of Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt*, Jerusalem: The Van Leer Jerusalem Institute and Hakibbutz Hameuchad, pp. 481–527. [Hebrew]

Eisenstadt, S. N., and Schluchter, W. (eds.) (1998) *Max-Weber-Kolleg für Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Studien*, Erfurt: Max-Weber-Kolleg.

Elkins, C., and Pedersen, S. (eds.) (2005) *Settler Colonialism in the Twentieth Century: Projects, Practices, Legacies*, New York and London: Routledge.

Falk, R. (2006) "Zionism, Race and Eugenics", in: Cantor, G. N., and Swetlitz, M. (eds.) *Jewish Tradition and the Challenge of Darwinism*, Chicago, IL and London: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 137–165.

Fichte, J. G. (1922) [1808] *Addresses to the German Nation*, trans. Jones, R. F., and Turnbull, G. H., Chicago, IL and London: The Open Court Publishing Co.

The First Zionist Congress. (1897) "Baseler Programm".

Foucault, M. (1972) [1969] *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, trans. Sheridan, Smith A. M., New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, ed. Gordon, C., New York: Random House.

Foucault, M. (2005) [1966] *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, London and New York: Routledge.

Fourie, E. (2012) "A Future for the Theory of Multiple Modernities: Insights from the New Modernization Theory", *Social Science Information* 51 (1): 52–69.

Freyre, G., and Horton, W. R. (1986) *Order and Progress: Brazil from Monarchy to Republic*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Friedman-Peleg, K. (2010) "An Interview with Miriam Bar-Shimo'n", *The Israeli Sociological Society's Information Booklet* 42 (1): 11–12. [Hebrew]

Frye, N. (2015) [1957] *Anatomy of Criticism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gadamer, H. (1975) [1960] *Truth and Method*, trans. Weinsheimer, J., London: Continuum.

Gandhi, L. (1998) *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Gelber, Y. (2007) "The History of Zionist Historiography: From Apologetics to Denial", in: Morris, B. (ed.) *Making Israel*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, pp. 47–80.

Gellner, E. (2006 [1983]) *Nations and Nationalism*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Giesen, B. (1998) *Intellectuals and the Nation: Collective identity in a German Axial Age*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Göle, N. (2000) "Snapshots of Islamic Modernity", *Daedalus* 129 (1): 91–117.

Graetz, H. (1891) [1853] *History of the Jews, Vol. I*, Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. Project Gutenberg.

Halbwachs, M. (2011) [1925] "From 'The Collective Memory'", in: Olick, J.K., et al. (eds.) *The Collective Memory Reader*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 139–149.

Hall, S. (1996) "Introduction: Who Needs 'Identity'?", in: Hall, S., and Du Gay, P. (eds.) *Questions of Cultural Identity*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 1–17.

Hamilton, G. (1984) "Configurations in History: The Historical Sociology of SN Eisenstadt", in: Skocpol, T. (ed.) *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 85–128.

Harrison, R. (2004) "History and Sociology", in: Lamberts, P., and Schofield, P. (eds.) *Making History: An Introduction to the History and Practices of a Discipline*, London: Routledge.

HaTzofe (1948) "Marriage Announcement", September 24, 1948, p. 5. [Hebrew]

Heilbron, J., et al. (1998) "The Rise of the Social Sciences and the Formation of Modernity", in: Heilbron, J., Magnusson, L., and Wittrock, B. (eds.) *The Rise of the Social Sciences and the Formation of Modernity: Conceptual Change in Context, 1750–1850*, Dordrecht, Boston, MA and London: Kluwer Academic Publisher, pp. 1–33.

Herder, J.G. (1833) [1782/83] *The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, trans. Marsh, J., Burlington.

Herzl, T. (1988) [1896] *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, New York: Dover Publications.

Herzog, H., et al. (eds.) (2007) *Generations, Locations, Identities: Contemporary Perspectives on Society and Culture in Israel – Essays in Honor of Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt*, Jerusalem: The Van Leer Jerusalem Institute and Hakibbutz Hameuchad. [Hebrew]

Hobsbawm, E.J. (1962) *The Age of revolution, 1789–1848*, New York: New American Library.

Hobsbawm, E.J. (1990) *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hobsbawm, E.J., and Ranger, T. (1983) *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ichijo, A. (2013) *Nationalism and Multiple Modernities: Europe and Beyond*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jones, H.S. (ed.) (1998) "Introduction", in: Comte, A. (ed.) *Comte: Early Political Writings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kalekin-Fishman, D. (2010) "Shmuel Eisenstadt Dies at 87", *Global Dialogue Newsletter for the International Sociological Association* 1 (1) (September): 4–5, 8.

Kamali, M. (2006) *Multiple Modernities, Civil Society and Islam: The Case of Iran and Turkey*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Kassim, A.F. (ed.) (2000) *The Palestine Yearbook of International Law, Vol X 1998/1999*, The Hague: Kluwer Law International and Al-Shaybani Society of International Law.

Kaviraj, S. (2000) "Modernity and Politics in India", *Daedalus* 129 (1): 137–162.

Kaya, I. (2004a) *Social Theory and Later Modernities: The Turkish Experience*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Kaya, I. (2004b) "Modernity, Openness and Interpretation: A Perspective on Multiple Modernities", *Social Science Information* 43 (1): 35–57.

Kedourie, E. [1960] (1993) *Nationalism, Fourth Expanded Edition*, Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell.

Kimmerling, B. (1983) *Zionism and Territory: The Socio-Territorial Dimensions of Zionist Politics*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kimmerling, B. (1992) "Sociology, Ideology, and Nation-Building: The Palestinians and Their Meaning in Israeli Sociology", *American Sociological Review* 57 (4): 446–460.

Kimmerling, B. (2001) *The Invention and Decline of Israeliness: State, Society, And the Military*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kimmerling, B. (2007) "The Exhaustion of the Primary Zionist Program: S. N. Eisenstadt Between Dynamic Conservatism and Critical Perspective", *European Journal of Sociology* 48 (1): 149–172.

The Knesset. (1969) "Yad Ben-Zvi Law", *Laws of the State of Israel*, Israel: Government Printer. [Hebrew].

Knöbl, W. (2010) "Path Dependency and Civilizational Analysis Methodological Challenges and Theoretical Tasks", *European Journal of Social Theory* 13 (1): 83–97.

Koebner, R. (1964) *Imperialism: The Story and Significance of Political World, 1840–1960*, trans. Schmidt, H. D., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koebner, R. (2008) [1961] *Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koenig, M. (2006) "Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt: Kulturtheoretische Zivilisationsanalyse", in: Moebius, S., and Dirk, Q. (eds.) *Kultur. Theorien der Gegenwart, 2., erweiterte und aktualisierte Auflage*, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden: Springer, pp. 699–707.

Koselleck, R. (1997) "The Temporalisation of Concepts", trans. Sondermann, K., *Finnish Yearbook of Political Thought I*, Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, pp. 16–24.

Kuzar, R. (2015) "The Neologisms 'Yishev', 'Yishuv', and 'Moshava' in the Beginning of Modern Hebrew", in: Shenhav, Y., et al. (eds.) *Zionism and Empires*, Jerusalem: Van Leer Institute Press and Hakibbutz Hameuchad. [Hebrew]

Lamont, M., and Molnár, V. (2002) "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences", *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 167–195.

Levine, D. N. (1995) *Visions of the Sociological Tradition*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (2001) [1978] *Myth and Meaning*, Routledge: London and New York.

Luhmann, N. (1997) *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Mannheim, K. (1954) [1929] *Ideology and Utopia*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Marx, K., and Engels, F. (1975) [1846] "The German Ideology", in *Karl Marx & Frederick Engels Collected Works*, London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Masalha, N. (2013) *The Zionist Bible: Biblical Precedent, Colonialism and the Erasure of Memory*, London: Routledge.

Medoff, R., and Waxman, C. I. (eds.) (2008) *Historical Dictionary of Zionism* (Second Edition), Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Myers, D. N. (1997) "The Ideology of Wissenschaft des Judentums", in: Frank, D. H., and Leaman, O. (eds.) *History of Jewish Philosophy*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 629–641.

Nisbet, R. A. (1993) *The Sociological Tradition*, New Brunswick: Transaction.

Nora, P. (1989) "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire", *Representations* 26: 7–24.

Olick, J. K., and Robbins, J. (1998) "Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices", *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 105–140.

Olick, J. K., et al. (eds.) (2011) *The Collective Memory Reader*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oppenheimer, F. [1903] (1958) "A First Program for Zionist Colonization", in: Bilski, I. H. (ed.) *Means and Ways towards a Realm of Justice: A Collection of Articles Dedicated to the Memory of Professor Franz Oppenheimer (1864–1943)*, Mesharim: Tel Aviv, pp. 71–82.

Pappé, I. (1992) *The Making of the Israeli-Arab Conflict*, London: I.B. Tauris.
Pappé, I. (2008) "Zionism as Colonialism: A Comparative View of Diluted Colonialism in Asia and Africa", *South Atlantic Quarterly* 107 (4): 611–633.
Pappé, I. (2014) *The Idea of Israel*, London and New York: Verso.
Pavlich, G. (2014) "Administrative Sociology and Apartheid", *Acta Academica* 46 (3): 151–174.
Piterberg, G. (1995) "The Nation and Its Narrators: National Historiography and Orientalism", *Theory and Criticism* 6: 81–103. [Hebrew]
Piterberg, G. (2008) *The Returns of Zionism: Myths, Politics and Scholarship in Israel*, London and New York: Verso.
The Provisional Government of Israel. (1948) "The Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel", *Official Gazette*: Number 1, Tel Aviv, May 14, 1948.
Ram, U. (1993) "The Colonization Perspective in Israeli Sociology: Internal and External Comparisons", *Journal of Historical Sociology* 6 (3): 327–350.
Ram, U. (1995) *The Changing Agenda of Israeli Sociology*, New York: SUNY Press.
Ram, U. (2011) *Israeli Nationalism: Social Conflicts and the Politics of Knowledge*, New York: Routledge.
Ram, U. (2015) *The Return of Martin Buber*, Tel Aviv: Resling. [Hebrew]
Raz-Krakotzkin, A. (1994) "Exile Within Sovereignty: Toward a Critique of the 'Negation of Exile' in Israeli Culture (Part I and II)", *Theory and Critique* (4–5): 6–23, 113–132. [Hebrew]
Raz-Krakotzkin, A. (2011) *Exile and Binationalism: From Gershom Scholem and Hannah Arendt to Edward Said and Mahmoud Darwish*, Berlin: Forum Transregionale Studien.
Renan, E. (2011) [1882] "From 'What Is a Nation?'", in: Olick, J.K., et al. (eds.) *The Collective Memory Reader*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 80–83.
Reports of the Executive of the Zionist Organisation to the XII Zionist Congress (1921) Parts III: Organisation Reports, London: National Labor Press.
Ricoeur, P. (1979) "The Human Experience of Time and Narrative", *Research in Phenomenology* 9 (25): 17–34.
Ricoeur, P. (1981) "Narrative Time", in: Mitchell, W.J.T. (ed.) *On Narrative*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 165–186.
Robertson, R. (2011) "S.N. Eisenstadt: A Sociological Giant", *Journal of Classical Sociology* (*Special issue on Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt*) 11 (3): 303–311.
Rodney, W. (1981) [1972] *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa?* Washington, DC: Howard University Press.
Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. (1998) 2187 UNTS, no. 38544.
Rosen, S. (1997) "Horizontverschmelzung", in: Hahn, L.E. (ed.) *The Philosophy of Hans-Georg Gadamer (Vol XXIV)*, Chicago, IL and La Salle: The Library of Living Philosophers.
Rousseau, J.J. (1762) *The Social Contract: Or, The Principles of Political Rights*, trans. Harrington, R.M.; Walter, E.L., New York: Putnam's Sons.
Rousseau, J.J. (1994) [1755] *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ruppin, A. (1930) *Soziologie der Juden, Vols. 2*, Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag.
Said, E.W. (1978) *Orientalism*, New York: Vintage Books.
Said, E.W. (1979) "Zionism from the Standpoint of Its Victims", *Social Text* 1: 7–58.
Sand, S. (2010) *The Invention of the Jewish People*, London and New York: Verso.
Sand, S. (2012) *The Invention of the Land of Israel: From Holy Land to Homeland*, London and New York: Verso.

Sapir, E. (1951) *Selected Writings in Language, Culture and Personality*, ed. Mandelbaum, D. G., Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schmid, M. (1992) "The Concept of Culture and Its Place Within a Theory of Social Action: A Critique of Talcott Parsons's Theory of Culture", in: Münch, R., and Smelser, N.J. (eds.) *Theory of Culture*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 88–120.

Schmidt, V. (2006) "Multiple Modernities or Varieties of Modernity?", *Current Sociology* 54 (1): 77–97.

Schöpflin, G. (1997) "The Function of Myth and a Taxonomy of Myths", in: Hosking, G., and Schöpflin, G. (eds.) *Myths and Nationhood*, London: Hurst, pp. 19–35.

Seton-Watson, H. (1977) *Nations and States*, London: Methuen.

Shafir, G. (1989) *Land, Labor and the Origins of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, 1882–1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shafir, G. (1999) "Zionism and Colonialism: A Comparative Approach", in: Pappé, I. (ed.) *The Israel/Palestine Question*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 81–96.

Shafir, G. (2005) "Settler Citizenship in the Jewish Colonization of Palestine", in: Elkins, C., and Pedersen, S. (eds.) *Settler Colonialism in the Twentieth Century: Projects, Practices, Legacies*, New York and London: Routledge, pp. 41–57.

Shamir, R., and Avnon, D. (1998) "Martin Buber and Israeli Sociology", *Theory and Criticism* 12–13: 47–55. [Hebrew]

Shenhav, Y. (2002) "The Phenomenology of Colonialism and the Politics of 'Difference': European Zionist Emissaries and Arab-Jews in Colonial Abadan", *Social Identities* 8 (4): 521–544.

Shenhav, Y. (2006) *The Arab Jews: A Postcolonial Reading of Nationalism, Religion, And Ethnicity*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Shenhav, Y., et al. (eds.) (2015) *Zionism and Empires*, Jerusalem: Van Leer Institute Press and Hakibbutz Hameuchad. [Hebrew]

Shils, E. (1982) [1961] "Center and Periphery", in: *The Constitution of Society*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 93–109.

Shils, E. (1985) "S. N. Eisenstadt: Some Personal Observations", in: Cohen, E., Lissak, M., and Almagor, U. (eds.) *Comparative Social Dynamics: Essays in Honor of S. N. Eisenstadt*, Boulder and London: Westview Press, pp. 1–8.

Silber, I. F. (2011) "Deciphering Transcendence and the Open Code of Modernity: S. N. Eisenstadt's Comparative Hermeneutics of Civilizations", *Journal of Classical Sociology (Special issue on Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt)*11 (3): 269–280.

Silberstein, L. J. (1999) *The Postzionism Debates: Knowledge and Power in Israeli Culture*, New York: Routledge.

Slezkine, Y. (2004) *The Jewish Century*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Smith, A. D. (1983) "Nationalism and Classical Social Theory", *The British Journal of Sociology* 1 (34): 19–38.

Smith, J. (2002) "Theories of State Formation and Civilisation in Johann P. Arnason and Shmuel Eisenstadt's Comparative Sociologies of Japan", *Critical Horizons* 3 (2): 225–251.

Somers, M. R. (1994) "The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A relational and Network Approach", *Theory and Society* 23 (5): 605–649.

Sooryamoorthy, R. (2016) *Sociology in South Africa: Colonial, Apartheid and Democratic Forms*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sorel, G. (2004) [1908] *Reflections on Violence*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sorkin, D. (1987) *The Transformation of German Jewry, 1780–1840*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spivak, C. (1988) "Can the Subaltern Speak?", in: Nelson, C., and Grossberg, L. (eds.) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, pp. 271–316.

Spohn, W. (2001) "Eisenstadt on Civilizations and Multiple Modernity", *European Journal of Social Theory* 4: 499–508.

Spohn, W. (2003) "Multiple Modernity, Nationalism and Religion: A Global Perspective", *Current Sociology* 51 (3/4): 265–286.

Spohn, W. (2011) "An Appraisal of Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt's Global Historical Sociology", in: Turner, B.S., and Susen, S. (eds.) *Journal of Classical Sociology (Special issue on Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt)* 11 (3): 281–301.

Stark, W. (1958) *The Sociology of Knowledge: An Essay in Aid of a Deeper Understanding of the History of Ideas*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

The State of Israel. (1959) "Report of the Public Commission of Inquiry into the July 9, 1959 Disturbances in Wadi Salib", Submitted to the Cabinet on August 17, 1959.

Steinmetz, G. (2013) "A Child of the Empire: British Sociology and Colonialism, 1940s – 1960s", *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 49 (4): 353–378.

Stern, M. (1976) [1969] "The Period of the Second Temple", in: Ben-Sasson, H.H. (ed.) *History of the People of Israel*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 185–303.

Swidler, A., and Arditi, J. (1994) "The New Sociology of Knowledge", *Annual Review of Sociology* 20 (1): 305–329.

Thompson, J.B. (1990) *Ideology and Modern Culture*, Oxford: Polity Press.

Thompson, L. (1985) *The Political Mythology of Apartheid*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Tiryakian, E.A. (1985) "The Changing Centers of Modernity", in: Cohen, E., Lissak, M., and Almagor, U. (eds.) *Comparative Social Dynamics: Essays in Honor of S.N. Eisenstadt*, Boulder and London: Westview Press, pp. 131–147.

Tiryakian, E.A. (2011) "A Sociological Odyssey: The Comparative Voyage of S.N. Eisenstadt", *Journal of Classical Sociology (Special issue on Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt)* 11 (3): 241–250.

Trakulhun, S., and Weber, R. (eds.) (2015) *Delimiting Modernities: Conceptual Challenges and Regional Responses*, Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Turner, B.S. (2006) "Citizenship, Nationalism and Nation-Building", in: Delanty, G., and Kumar, K. (eds.) *The Sage handbook of Nation and Nationalism*, London: Sage Publications.

Turner, B.S., and Susen, S. (2011) "Introduction to the Special Issue on Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt", *Journal of Classical Sociology* 11 (3): 229–239.

Ussishkin, M. 1964 [1904] *Sefer Ussishkin* [The Book of Ussishkin], Jerusalem: Havaad Lehotzat Hasefer.

Veracini, L. (2006) *Israel and Settler Society*, London: Pluto Press.

Veracini, L. (2011) *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wagner, P. (1994) *A Sociology of Modernity*: *Liberty and Discipline*, London: Routledge.

Weber, M. (1949) [1904] " 'Objectivity' in Social Science and Social Policy", in: Shils, A., and Finch, H.A. (eds.) *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, New York: Free Press, pp. 50–112.

Weber, M. (1949) [1917] "The Meaning of 'Ethical Neutrality' in Sociology and Economics", in: Shils, A., and Finch, H.A. (eds.) *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, New York: Free Press, pp. 1–47.

Weil, S. (2010) "On Multiple Modernities, Civilizations and Ancient Judaism, An interview with Prof. S. N. Eisenstadt", *European Societies* 12 (4): 451–465.

Weiming, T. (2000) "Implications of the Rise of 'Confucian' East Asia", *Daedalus* 129 (1): 195–218.

White, H. (2002) [1974] "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact", in: Richardson, B. (ed.) *Narrative Dynamics: Essays on Time, Plot, Closure, and Frames*, Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, pp. 191–210.

Whorf, B. L. (1956) *Language, Thought and Reality*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Wieviorka, M. (2003) "An Old Theme Revisited: Sociology and Ideology", in: Ben-Rafael, E. (ed.) *Sociology and ideology*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 79–99.

Winter, J. (2006) *Dreams of Peace and Freedom: Utopian Moments in the Twentieth Century*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Wittrock, B. (2003) "Sociology and the Critical Reflexivity of Modernity: Scholarly Practices in Historical and Comparative Context", in: Ben-Rafael, E. (ed.) *Sociology and Ideology*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 101–118.

Wittrock, B. (2006) "About Shmuel N. Eisenstadt", see: holbergprisen.no/en/shmuel-n-eisenstadt/about-shmuel-n-eisenstadt.html

Wodak, R., et al. (1999) *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wokler, R. (2002) "Repatriating Modernity's Alleged Debt to the Enlightenment: French Revolutionary Social Science and the Genesis of the Nation State", in: Joyce, P. (ed.) *The Social in Question: New Bearings in History and the Social Sciences*, Routledge: London and New York, pp. 62–80.

Wolf, I. (1957) [1822] "On the Concept of a Science of Judaism", *The Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 2 (1): 194–204.

Wolfe, P. (1999) *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*, London and New York: Cassel.

Wolfe, P. (2006) "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native", *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (4): 387–409.

Wright Mills, C. (2000) [1959] *The Sociological Imagination*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Yair, G. (2010) "Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt (September 10, 1923 – September 2, 2010)", *Social Evolution & History* 9 (2): 221–223.

Yair, G., and Apeloig, N. (2005) "Sociology in Jerusalem: The Shadow of It History", *Israeli Sociology* 7 (1): 95–122. [Hebrew]

Yerushalmi, Y. H. (2012) [1982] *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*, Washington: University of Washington Press.

Yiftachel, O. (1998) "Nation Building and the Division of Space: Ashkenazi Domination in the Israeli 'Ethnocracy'", *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 4 (3): 33–58.

Zerubavel, Y. (1995) *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Zerubavel, Y. (2013) "Transforming Myths, Contested Narratives: The Reshaping of Mnemonic Traditions in Israeli Culture", in: Bouchard, G. (ed.) *National Myths: Constructed Pasts, Contested Presents*, London: Routledge, pp. 173–190.

Part I

The “problem” of social integration

2 Mediated identity

Early Eisenstadt, the Zionist utopia, and the orientalist gaze

> The ideal type [. . .] in its conceptual purity [. . .] can not be found empirically anywhere in reality. *It is utopia*.
>
> —Weber (1949 [1904]: 90)

The chapter examines Eisenstadt's early studies of Israeli society (1947–1956) and discusses their two dominant and interrelated approaches: utopianism and orientalism. The first concerns Eisenstadt's utopian portrayal of Israeli society, where members of society work toward the realization of their political salvation and redeem themselves from previous forms of "diasporic" existence ("negation of exile"). In this imagined utopia, individual identities attain significance by serving the dominant collectivist ethos. Integration into the normative sphere is thereafter understood as taking a constructive role in the nation-building project. The second issue discussed in the chapter relates to how Eisenstadt's utopian perspective enabled him to mark the boundaries between those which according to him engaged in the Zionist state-building project – namely European Jews – and the non-European Jews (the Arab Jews/Mizrahim) whom Eisenstadt considered to be languishing in a state of "anomie". The chapter attempts to show how early Eisenstadt's use of structural-functionalist sociological terminology and use of political myths reproduce the existing hierarchization of Europeans and non-Europeans. Last, the chapter presents a Saidian interpretation of these corresponding tendencies of utopianism and orientalism and explains them in relation to the ideological mechanisms of the Zionist project.[1]

First utopian signs

In his first published article, "The Sociological Structure of the Jewish Community in Palestine" (1948a), Eisenstadt embarked upon his research of Israeli society with a set of key assumptions which shed light on his understanding of social lives, structure, and institutionalized patterns, as well as the potential social problems characteristic of the settlements on the basis of which the state of Israel was established. Published in January 1948, this article can be seen as the product of a liminal phase that led to the establishment of Israel, a time when

Israel's sovereignty had not yet been declared, though it had been acknowledged by the UN Assembly in November 1947. This was also a time of violence and turmoil that eventually changed the face of the region and its geopolitical arrangements. The 1948 Arab-Israeli War, known in Zionist political culture as the "War of Independence" or the "War of Liberation", and as the "Nakba" (the "disaster") as inscribed in Palestinian collective memory (Auron 2013: 45), was a war that determined the establishment of one society over the ruins of another (Said 1980: 83). It is in light of this liminality, a time when the formulation of Israeli collective identity was still malleable, that Eisenstadt's 1948 article will be examined.

It is most likely that "The Sociological Structure" was written on the verge of the 1948 War that began in November 1947 and lasted until summer 1949 (Morris 2008). The presence of war is nevertheless absent from Eisenstadt's early analyses, as the events which took place during 1947–1948 are erased from the narrative depicted in the article. The absence of this context creates a notion of timelessness characteristic of Eisenstadt's early accounts.

"The Sociological Structure" presented the new Zionist entity and its sociological characteristics to the international academic community for the first time. Although the article "Some Remarks on Demographic Factors in a Situation of Culture Contact" (1948b) was Eisenstadt's first academic work published in a peer-reviewed journal for an English-speaking audience, it was the "The Sociological Structure" which presented a more explicit account of Zionist settler society. For this reason this is a key text, written in a context of uncertainty, one that was nourished by the emerging national narratives of the time on one hand while disclosing a reflective tone on the other. It opens with the following assertion:

> The sociological structure of the Jewish community in Palestine can be understood adequately only in the light of the sociological basis of the origin of this community. This point of origin is determined by the primary underlying aim of the *yishub* [*sic*] to build a new and independent Jewish society in Palestine. This aim is the powerful and dynamic motive force which had molded the social existence of the *yishub*.
>
> (Eisenstadt 1948a: 3)

Several significant issues arise from this central paragraph. The first is Eisenstadt's suggestion to identify a "point of origin" and to locate a sociological basis with which to account for the "social existence" of the Jewish "community" in Mandatory Palestine. This point of departure enables Eisenstadt to analyze the "Jewish community in Palestine" in its pre-state settlement condition (known as the "Yishuv")[2] in light of the "underlying aim" to establish "a new and independent Jewish society in Palestine". The shift from "community" to "society" highlights the modern character that Eisenstadt attributed to Israeli society, given that the term "community" (*Gemeinschaft*) was associated in classic sociological discourse with pre-modern or "traditional" groups, and "society" (Gesellschaft) with "modern" ones, as was initially formulated by Tönnies (2001 [1887]).

The sociological approach presented above addresses a political project, its aims and practical ends, as the primary criteria with which the social existence of a society can be explained. This political project is regarded as a "force" capable of shaping social reality. In Eisenstadt's article from the same year, "Some Remarks on Demographic Factors", this collective motivation was reiterated as Eisenstadt noted that the ultimate goal of the "modern Jewish community" in Palestine was "the realization of the Zionist ideal" (Eisenstadt 1948b: 101).

The term "Yishuv", which appears in Modern Hebrew secular literature in a Zionist context as early as 1898 (Kuzar 2015: 46), is charged with political and symbolic meanings. It is mostly translated and used in the sense of "settlement" or "settling down". The latter also connotes a state of normativity.[3] In Modern Hebrew, the meaning of residing outside of the "Yishuv" is tantamount to being deviant. In this case, because the term "Yishuv" is employed only in relation to Jews, it is essentially used to mark the borders of a collective outside of which deviation awaits. Therefore when Eisenstadt addresses the "Yishuv", one can infer that he refers only to the settling communities exclusively defined as Jewish.

The "Jewish Yishuv" is thereafter portrayed as having reached "a high degree of social and political matureness"; it is perceived as possessing "full political and public awareness and organization" (Eisenstadt 1947b [2002]: 24), fulfilling the necessary conditions for the establishment of a state. "The Sociological Structure" identifies the pursuit of national independence as the main principle for organizing social lives. This insight corresponds with Yiftachel's view of the nation-building project as an attempt to achieve an "overarching" collective political identity exclusive to Jews (Yiftachel 1998: 34).

An example of how the "The Sociological Structure" engages loaded nationalized language is seen in its use of the term "independence". This term is puzzling because in Modern Hebrew ("atzma'ut") it assumes a past of subordination or some direct dependency, which is in clear opposition to the relative cultural, economic, and political autonomy the Zionist settlement nuclei maintained during the rule of the British Mandate. The term independence, in this context, signifies the importance of a structural change that settler nuclei had to undergo – to evolve from a non-recognized settling entity to a sovereign nation-state. As "The Sociological Structure" emphasizes, all social phenomena are derived and sociologically categorized in relation to the process of transforming from settlement nuclei to a state, which is perceived as inevitable. National recognition and state-building, therefore, provide the sociological key with which the social existence of the pre-state "Jewish community" could be deciphered.

Following this observation, Eisenstadt points to another complementary factor which functions as a mobilizing force in the evolvement of the new, soon to become nation-state. He writes:

> A large segment of the Palestinian community came there as a result of a conscious negation of Jew[i]sh life in the various lands of the Diaspora, and out of a desire to overcome this negation through the creation of a new society in Palestine.
>
> (Eisenstadt 1948a: 3)

The increase in the Jewish population in Mandatory Palestine is described as a process driven by a collective and conscious will to establish a social frame which is radically different in character from that shared by Jews in their lands of origin ("Diaspora", as appears in the source). Here one can witness how "the negation of Diaspora" (also known as "the negation of exile") – a central narrative in the Zionist discourse, especially in the time of pre- and early statehood – explains the process of immigration and the motive for nation-building.

The Diaspora narrative is repeated several times in Eisenstadt's early studies. In "Some Remarks on Demographic Factors", for example, Eisenstadt notes that the "conception of Jewish nationalism was in a sense based on a revolt against the traditional life of the Diaspora" (Eisenstadt 1948b: 101). Therefore this narrative establishes a symbolic border that distinguishes Jewish lives under the Zionist program from previous forms of collective existence.

As Raz-Krakotzkin argued in his "Exile within Sovereignty" (1994), the negation of "Diaspora/Exile" functioned as a mobilizing narrative that enabled the establishment of a border between the old "Jewish life", prior to the Zionist state-building project, and the new form, which is encapsulated in the Zionist existence in "the Land of Israel" – the origin and source of Jewish lives according to Zionist historiography. The mobilizing power of this narrative is derived from the negative representation of the social and political lives of the pre–World War II European Jewry, lives which were depicted in this narrative framework as unfruitful, passive, and meaningless. The imaginary sphere of Exile ("Galut") stands in contrast to the Zionist collective national existence and is defined as its opposition (Raz-Krakotzkin 1994: 33). This negative model is but one element distinguishing the sphere of "Exile" from that of the "Land", one that attributes positive/negative connotations to each of these contrasting categories.

With this in mind, the Jewish presence in Palestine is understood in the paragraph as the direct result of this negation that embeds a primary "desire" to "overcome" it collectively. The observation thus stresses the centrality of the Diaspora/Exile narrative in the process of collective crystallization and regards it as its original motivation and not as part of the narrative that followed. Whereas the historical causes that led to the increase in the Jewish population in Palestine are not mentioned, the narrative itself is regarded as the moving force and the leading cause that enables social change, and not as the result of ideological construction. This post hoc observation provides the first example in which a national narrative is interwoven with Eisenstadt's sociological descriptions.

According to Eisenstadt, the desire to "overcome" the diasporic life and to create "something new" aimed to solve what appeared as "the lack of independence of social existence in the Diaspora" (Eisenstadt 1948a: 3). The emergence of the new Jewish(-Zionist) society, bearing an "extreme social paradox" (ibid.), embodies the aspiration to correct a social problem that is rooted in the imagined construct of the Diaspora. Eisenstadt's explanation hence attests to an utopist tendency expressed in the aspiration to radically break with the past (Winter 2006: 4–5). The sources of such "desire", on which the "novel character of the [Zionist]

movement" was established, are portrayed as meta-historic and seen as rooted "in a period which saw the disintegration of Jewish religious civilization" (Eisenstadt 1948a: 3).[4] This view of the past interprets Jewish lives prior to their "disintegration", that is, before the establishment of the Zionist program, as deterministically leading to their dissolution.

In this context, the use of the term "Diaspora" assumes a specific notion of peoplehood, given that only a "people" with a defined base, or origin, can potentially form a diaspora. The same spatial notion can be applied to the concept of Exile, since one can be exiled only from a defined original "land". These difficulties make it clear that the use of the term "Diaspora" pertains to a narrative in which the "Land" was and is the center of the transformed Jewish lives. This dichotomous distinction exemplifies how the Zionist narrative was incorporated in Eisenstadt's early sociology and how its utopist tendencies marked the sphere of the present as the ultimate negation of the past.

Sources such as "The Sociological Structure", as depicted by Ram (1995: 30–34), provided the foundation that enabled the early Eisenstadt to refer to pre-state society in terms of a close and homogeneous social unit, not subjected to external influences. In line with Ram, it's also possible to argue that this sociological interpretation was possible due to loaded language, as seen in the aforementioned use of the term "Yishuv", denoting a defined small community, characterized by certain closeness and internal cohesion that are attributed only to those recognized as Jews. Hence, these observations provide the opportunity to view how the sociological attempt to define a particular social structure results in propagating a specific notion of an exclusive "we".

Imagining closeness and inner cohesion is a sign of utopianism which is inherent to settler societies. It expresses a radical visioning of a desired social order as closed and cohesive. Concomitantly, identifying a social structure as having to correspond with a political program, simultaneously overlooking the cultural and political heterogeneity, attests to Eisenstadt's utopian tendency which is guided by an imagined representation of a reformed contemporized present.

Mediated memory

Eisenstadt stresses the significance of the devotion to the state-building process as the central axis around which social order and national identity revolve. This emerging national identity is perceived as replacing a previous identity, namely, the imagined social structure of "exile". It is noticeable how Eisenstadt's early sociology acts here as a mediator of an evolving political memory: The negative depiction of the past in terms of "exile" frames the Zionist program as a project of return. This is accomplished by describing a rupture from the Jewish past, a fracture upon which new modern Jewish society is established.

Another example of how memory is mediated in Eisenstadt's early writing is most evident in those instances when he refers to Jewish society and not *societies*. This use of words embeds a perception that relates to Jews as a single coherent and homogeneous group, one consistent subject, and not as a variety of heterogeneous

communities with various cultural differences and sensitivities. This is but one example of how a cohesive perception of Jewish society is being reproduced.

Eisenstadt maintains that "the *yishuv* faced the necessity [. . .] of [formulating] a new conception of the nature of a Jewish society" (Eisenstadt 1948a: 4). In line with the utopian orientation observed above, the Jewish settlements in Mandatory Palestine are perceived as the place in which the very "nature", the very essence, of Jewish society can be redefined. Here lies a paradoxical argument, for "nature" is the very thing that cannot be changed. A reinterpretation of the concept of nature is, however, possible. The attempt to reformulate the concept of the nature of Jewish society – namely, to alter the very definition of the basic inner constitution of what has been perceived as a Jewish society – articulates one of the main utopist endeavors of the Zionist political movement of that period.

The segment above addresses what is referred to in this chapter as the "collectivist ethos" (also known in Hebrew as "*mamlachtiut*"). This term refers to Israel's political culture in its early phase of statehood, when the interests of the Jewish population were the central concerns in addition to Zionism being relevant to all contexts of social lives. This approach stressed the importance of national cohesiveness and unity. As Shafir and Peled have argued, the "collectivist ethos" denotes "the shift from sectorial interests to the general interest, from semi-voluntarism to binding obligation, from foreign rule to political sovereignty" (Shafir and Peled 2002: 17–18). The term most notably pertains to the centrality of the state and denotes the etatist approach that was implemented mostly during Ben-Gurion's rule (Ram 1995: 43, 63).

Eisenstadt captures the collectivist approach and formulates it in his 1954 monograph, *The Absorption of Immigrants*, as "the constant emphasis on the unity of the *Jewish people* and on the common task of *re*building the *homeland*" (Eisenstadt 1954a: 92, emphasis added). Beyond the fact that the concept of "absorption" contains an ideologically loaded connotation that refers to immigration as a process in which immigrants are "absorbed" in a broader system of social norms and values (Ram 1995: 38), Eisenstadt's understanding of the collectivist ethos is formulated in relation to two major national imaginaries: The first is seen in his use of the term "Jewish people", a term that connotes a primordial entity; the second concerns the "homeland", a term that refers to the ancient "Land of Israel". Both of these terms are tied by the verb "rebuild", which narrates the story of return, revival, and reconstitution of the primordial Jewish existence into the contemporary world. This segment provides one of the most explicit examples of how Eisenstadt's accounts were rooted in the Zionist narrative of exile, return, and revival of the Jewish people.

Eisenstadt distinguishes the Jewish-Zionist society from other immigration societies. He claims that unlike immigration societies "which are built by immigrants interested primarily in economic security" (Eisenstadt 1948a: 4), the ideological fervor and determination, perceived here as a virtue, make the Jewish-Zionist society unique. Had the Jewish-Zionist society been depicted simply as a society of immigrants,[5] or merely as a profit-economy-based society, the sense of national cohesion and a unified culture would have been devaluated in this context.

The collectivist ethos and social stratification

Eisenstadt defines the collective "desire" to overcome the diasporic past – the devotion to the collectivist ethos – as the criterion according to which social stratification is analyzed. Hereafter Eisenstadt defines each stratum in light of its level of fervor and ideological devotion to the Zionist idea and program. National fervor is taken as an indication of the ability to reach full "integration". To connect these two ends (national fervor and social capital), Eisenstadt employs a set of terms such as primary groups, motivation, reference groups, cultural transformations, re-socialization, a negative/positive disposition to change, role, and anomie – terms which belonged to the scientific jargon of late 1940s British anthropology.

Hence the structural classification of Jewish society in Palestine is not defined by economic criteria but rather by each of the group's affinity with the Zionist idea and program. In this light, three main social groups are identified: (1) non-Zionist groups affiliated with the "old" Jewish settlements known as "the old Yishuv" (ibid., 4); (2) ideologically driven immigrants (ibid., 5); and (3) non-ideological immigrants (ibid.).[6]

1 Non-Zionist groups

The first stratum, included in the "old Yishuv", consists of mostly non-European Jews from Middle Eastern and North African origins. Eisenstadt defined these groups as "not subjected to the same creative social desire which is found at the basis of the development of the yishub" (Eisenstadt 1948a: 4) and subsequently as not having a substantial part within the Zionist nation-building project.

Ram notes that in this context the "old Yishuv" was perceived as a "Diaspora within Palestine" (Ram 1995: 34). The "old Yishuv" signifies Arabic speaking Jewish populations that resided in Palestine under the Ottoman Empire before the Zionist project began. Herzog (1984: 100) adds that the very distinction between the "Old Yishuv" and the "New Yishuv" reflects a value judgment of groups who had already gained political dominance and were in a position to distinguish "new" from "old". The adoption of the terms "new" and "old", according to Herzog, has assisted in setting the borders of collectivity, shaping thereafter the image of an entire public which was seen as unproductive (ibid.).

In light of its lack of ideological fervor, this group is seen as socially isolated and disconnected from "other elements of the yishub [*sic*]", that is, from the Zionist settlers, despite its Jewish character. This group is subjected to "de-moralization", derived from its incapacity to integrate into the progressive economic sphere of the [new] Yishuv (Eisenstadt 1948a: 5).

The members of this group are portrayed in a negative manner given that ideological fervor and determination, which they supposedly lacked, were previously perceived as virtuous. This group is thus seen as missing the passion for taking part in the national project of state-building, and it is therefore

viewed as a group which does not share the aforementioned "sociological base" that has the power to link it to the hegemonic center. It is categorized as a socio-economically weak stratum, one that would be potentially difficult to mobilize politically.

The portrayal of these non-European groups as socially unqualified to participate in the nation-building task demarcates the first inner societal boundary that Eisenstadt defines. This can be considered the foundation of the negative model that identifies the non-European, or "Oriental Jews" in Eisenstadt's words, as the "Other within".

2 Ideologically driven immigrants, immigrating prior to World War II

As opposed to the first stratum, which is defined as lacking modern Zionist ideological imagination, the second is composed of those who "came to Palestine motivated by a will for a new society" (Eisenstadt 1948a: 5). According to Eisenstadt, these highly ideological committed immigrants possessed a desire that may have been "either entirely conscious or was born out of the strong influence of the social atmosphere in which people found themselves (youth movements, colonizing organization, etc.)" (ibid.). This stratum is then identified as having the ideal members, the ground upon which the future society could flourish.

"This stratum", Eisenstadt elaborates, "is made up of the first three *aliyot* and certain parts of the fifth *aliyot*" (ibid.). Whenever early Eisenstadt chooses not to translate a Hebrew term it most likely functions as part of a national narrative. The term "Aliyah" – or "Aliyot" in the plural – does not have an English equivalent since it carries two interrelated meanings: The first is the verb "to immigrate" (exclusively to the "Land of Israel") and the second is "to ascend" ("*aufgehen*" in German). The use of the term Aliyah, which is part of the Zionist narrative that regards immigration as a miraculous event, applies in this context uniquely to Jews immigrating to "Zion" in the act of ascendance.[7] It is important to explain that the ideologically constructed term Aliyah eclipses its original meaning, which denotes religious pilgrimage. In this light, immigrants included in the second stratum are not regarded simply as immigrants but rather as those who have "ascended" to the "Land of Israel". Given that the diasporic existence is affiliated with the notion of a "low" place, from which one can only ascend to the "heights" of Zion, this stratum's act of immigration is perceived as virtuous.

This stratum differs from the former stratum in one central aspect: Its aspiration to immigrate was by and large driven by a modern political framework which sought to establish a Jewish national sovereign unit.

Whereas the class characteristics of the first stratum remain vague, Eisenstadt regards the second stratum as a group whose members "came to assume the key position in the sociological structure of Palestine Jewry" (Eisenstadt 1948a: 5). Characterized not just as ideologically driven but as a productive manufacturing stratum, this group is presented as an ideal example, a model that negates and renounces the image of diasporic Jewry.

3 Non-ideological immigrants, immigrating after World War II

The third stratum, composed mostly of people immigrating to Palestine after World War II, is the main group constituting the new Zionist society. Eisenstadt ties the two former groups by creating a sub-category of immigrants who are not ideologically driven but are most likely to be mobilized toward national ends. At this point, Eisenstadt distinguishes between the two groups:

> Immigrants who came to Palestine not as a result of the motive force of desire, but by and large as refugees who did not assign to their country of refuge any particular significance as compared to other countries of refuge began to come in the early twenties, but increased tremendously after the rise of Nazism. For these people, migration to Palestine did not differ essentially from the ordinary process of migration.
> (Eisenstadt 1948a: 5)

The first generation of this stratum exhibits, according to Eisenstadt, "adjustment and assimilation side by side with partial isolation and conservatism" (ibid., 5–6). Eisenstadt does not address the historical circumstances that led Jewish refugees to seek refuge. This lacuna is typical of the period that began in Israel's early statehood and lasted until the Eichmann trials (1961–1962), a period during which the Holocaust remained an unspoken trauma and was not directly addressed in public discourse. Throughout this period, Holocaust survivors were viewed either as having cooperated with the perpetrator or as victims who showed no resistance (Oron 2005: 25). Only in 1951 did Eisenstadt first mention the displaced person camps in an internal document of the Hebrew University's Research Seminar in Sociology. This is the sole reference, albeit an indirect one, to the Holocaust in Eisenstadt's early writings (Eisenstadt 1951a: 20). Eisenstadt, instead, uses the term "disintegration" to refer to the annihilation of Jews in Europe, a term that does not directly engage the matter of trauma and its implications.

For those refugees, Eisenstadt maintains, "Palestine was from the very beginning a land of immigration in which it was necessary to assimilate with the majority" (Eisenstadt 1948a: 6). Here one may note that the use of the word "majority" frames the in-group boundaries. Within this framing, ideologically committed settlers of the second stratum are considered a majority in a space without a defined border. This type of majority could only rest on the exclusion of non-Zionist and non-Jewish communities from the boundaries of the collective.

Eisenstadt's analysis does not refer to the Arab-Palestinian autochthonic communities. Their social existence is not accounted for in this source. As Ram noted, Eisenstadt almost completely omitted the Arab Palestinian from his analysis of the nation-building process, and only in his 1967 *Israeli Society* did he refer to the Palestinian existence in terms of a "minority problem" (Ram 1995: 32, see Chapter 1). It is therefore possible to conclude that by using the word "majority", Eisenstadt refers to what can be seen as a form of cultural-political hegemony rather than a demographic-defined majority.

The three degrees of "desire" that Eisenstadt defines correlate with an inner hierarchy that draws on different levels of ideological fervor that each group possesses. Groups which share the aforementioned "desire" are seen as competent to assume key positions in this social structure, while those who do not are subjected to marginalization, or are simply discarded from the analysis, as in the case of non-Jewish groups.

The key to integration and gaining social capital in this new and not yet acknowledged society of settler-immigrants, as reflected from this source, is based mainly on ideological orientation. In this light, the more likely a sector is to be ideologically mobilized, the higher the chances it has for successful integration. The same logic repeats in various other sources, where Zionist fervor is presented as a criterion indicating the likelihood of successful integration of a particular group. Strong identification with "the Jewish nation" (Eisenstadt 1951a: 13) is hence observed as a factor that attests to a "positive disposition to change". Immigrants with such a "positive disposition" are more likely to integrate, while immigrants with a "negative disposition to change" are less likely to do so (ibid., 224).

Scales of modern values

After mapping the different strata, Eisenstadt discusses the problem of cultural heterogeneity, to which he refers as the process of "cultural neutralization". Neutralization is perceived here as a synonym for integration or diffusion of cultural and institutional tensions. It is therefore regarded as a "dynamic process . . . intensified as time goes by" that eventually resolves itself. The process of neutralization, according to Eisenstadt, began to take effect in the sphere of the economic structure of the settler society, its political institutions, and the educational organizations which are all geared toward "social stabilization" (Eisenstadt 1948a: 12). This description depicts a highly driven society focused on attaining collective national ends.

From here on, Eisenstadt addresses the "positive" values that "serve as constant motive forces for social criterion" and have the capacity to "mold social relationships within the *yishub* [*sic*]" (ibid., 10). The mobilizing potential of these values stems from their being "directly and unconditionally related to the establishment of the independence of the Jewish society" (ibid., 9). Based on this dialectic, where values stem from a collective ethos and shape the social structure, Eisenstadt lays out his analysis of social stratification according to three main values: The first two concern "colonization" and "agricultural work", which are thereafter connected to ideas of "social justice and national service" (ibid.).

Prior to examining these assertions, it is first crucial to note that in this context the term "colonization" is synonymous with the term "settlement". The use of the term "colonization" was not uncommon in the discourse that evolved among Zionist circles during and prior to the period when this source was published (Shenhav 2006: 61). Second, the ideas of "social justice" and "national service" which have been depicted in the sources are closely associated with the narratives

of "Conquest of the Land" and "Conquest of Labour" (Shafir 2005: 45; Piterberg 2008: 86). These narratives, utilizing the mythic status and secularized sacredness of the Land of Israel, were developed to support the socio-economic order that Zionist settler movement aimed to establish, as Wolfe argues (2006: 390).

The second scale concerns the urban occupational sector which embeds "some elements of pioneering" and focuses on the idea of "service" (Eisenstadt 1948a: 10). It is related to a "working class" that enjoys a wide degree of "cultural and social possibilities" (ibid.). The third stresses "economic and occupational advancement" common among independent individual entrepreneurs and professionals (ibid.). This last group is depicted as depending on the development led by the last two groups. It includes those who engage the reproduction and spread of symbols (e.g. teachers, intellectuals), influencing "to no minor degree the development of the *yishub* [*sic*]" (ibid.).

An example of the concept of service is found in Eisenstadt's earlier text from 1947 titled "The Student's Role in the Yishuv". There he noted that

> the Hebrew student must study well and delve into his[8] field so he could later serve the society from the public institutions of the Yishuv and the Zionist movement [. . .] Upon graduation, the student must use the general vision and introduce it to the institutions he will work in.
>
> (Eisenstadt 1947b [2002]: 26, my translation)

According to this source, university students do not earn their degrees to gain individual professional advancement or to receive education as an end in itself. Rather, they acquire knowledge to apply it in the service of the state, as all "institutions" in this context are affiliated with the state. Academia is seen as an institution whose educational program should be directed to service and towards the "revitalization of the public institutions" (ibid.). "The Student's Role" depicts a model of a new individual, utterly obligated to the realization of the values of their society, one whose professional aspirations are expected to be fulfilled as part of the national project.

The value scale that Zionist society in Palestine is built on is connected to the ideal of pioneership (Halutz, Halutziut) ("The Declaration" 1948). This ideal guides Eisenstadt's analysis of social stratification in which a class structure is seen as stemming from a value scale. Hence, the three different socio-economic groups (agricultural, urban working class, and middle class) are regarded as united by a common goal. Class tensions remain marginal in relation to the "creative" force that this collective effort embeds. This view, one can infer, also articulates a structural-functionalist perspective which tends to regard societies as organic units whose spheres are directed toward self-stability.

Revolutionary conservatism

The aforementioned value scales, demarcating the future developmental paths that the "Jewish society in Palestine" can take, embed a "dialectical contradiction"

(Eisenstadt 1948a: 12). This contradiction is rooted in the tension between the original political motivations and the "entrenchment of social reality" (ibid.). This dynamic is therefore understood in two ways: structural and historical. First, it is viewed as a part of "the very essence of the process of the creation of a new society" (ibid.). Second, it is understood in relation to the Zionist institutions and organizations which developed in the early 1920s and to which Eisenstadt refers as "almost revolutionary creations" (ibid., 11). In an earlier article Eisenstadt noted that these institutions were disconnected from one another, because each acted "in its own way without observing the full public reality in which it acts" (Eisenstadt 1947b [2002]: 26).

The establishment of the institutions in the pre-state phase, such as the school system, local administrations, and other central "political agencies", was followed by a disproportional expansion that did not match "the growth of the *yishub*" and subsequently failed to adjust to its "new needs" (Eisenstadt 1948a: 11). Although these institutions faced stagnation (Eisenstadt 1947b [2002]: 26), their centrality was nevertheless maintained due to what Eisenstadt identifies as "revolutionary conservatism" (Eisenstadt 1948a: 11).

The intellectual roots of the concept of revolutionary conservatism can be traced back to Buber's scholarship that emphasizes the revolutionary and the conservative dimensions as the two sides that typify culture and generate cultural processes (Eisenstadt 1992: 9). "Revolutionary conservatism", and its later development "dynamic conservatism", would remain one of the central concepts in Eisenstadt's understanding of Israeli society up to his later scholarship (see Chapter 4). The revolutionary representation of the Zionist project is also a part of a narrative in which Zionism is depicted as revolutionary (e.g. Mapai's Elections Platform 1949).

Eisenstadt uses this concept to assess pre-state institutions which seem to him "divorced from reality" (Eisenstadt 1948a: 11). He offers two main reasons for these institutions having remained in power: The first was the need of many groups who immigrated throughout the 1930s to maintain the status quo as an end in and of itself (ibid.). This discloses a need to follow existing establishments, a dynamic in which the familiar is preferred over the unknown. The second reason that Eisenstadt traces concerns the failure of other "leading institutions to adjust themselves to the expanding character of the community" (ibid.).

The tension between the "revolutionary" aspect, seen in the attempt to modernize Jewish social lives by the very act of their institutionalization in the form of a state, and the "conservative" aspect, which aims to maintain the existing forms of organization, expresses an inherent contradiction that characterizes the social dynamics of the pre-state phase. This view was also maintained in Eisenstadt's later writings, where he argued that "Normalization had become a revolutionary goal" (Eisenstadt 2010: 189, 190). According to Eisenstadt this dynamic seems to characterize immigrant societies where former avant-garde establishments are maintained by a status-quo-seeking layer of immigrants. In this sense, the revolutionary conservatism approach is explained as the tendency to keep society from the unknown on the one hand and limit its degree of institutional change, which

is perhaps inevitable in the context of growth, on the other. By drawing attention to this contradictory dynamic, Eisenstadt points to the growing gap between the emerging state's cultural goals and the institutional means to attain them. From a structural-functionalist perspective, this gap is problematic because it threatens the stability and continuity of the system.

This link was made in R.K. Merton's work (e.g. Merton 1938: 677), which became a central reference in Eisenstadt's early 1950s studies. Concomitantly, the discussion regarding the revolutionary conservatism that characterizes the pre-state settlers' society is perhaps the first expression of a reflective attempt to shed light on the problematic gap between political ends and means.

To "Judaize" the Jewish community

Eisenstadt notes that in the sphere of daily existence "the *yishub* [*sic*] has as yet failed to find an adequate creative outlet to replace tradition" (Eisenstadt 1948a: 13). At this point it is important to stress the difficulty of speaking of a single Jewish culture, or even a single Jewish tradition, given the great heterogeneity that characterizes Jewish believers and Jewish communities. The latter can differ in their spoken languages, mundane practices, and in their relation to the material world while still being regarded as part of the same community of faith. This distinction between religious beliefs and cultural practices is, however, blurred in the Zionist political discourse which imagines Jews as a "people" – an idea which assumes cultural cohesiveness.

Although Eisenstadt does tend to speak of *a* Jewish tradition, he underscores the "fundamental lack of clarity and of unity" of everyday life expressions (ibid.). He asserts that the lack of a shared cultural tradition "is no small factor in the failure to 'Judaize' [*sic*] the Jewish community of Palestine" (ibid., 15). In this context, the verb "to Judaize" renders the meaning of becoming a part of the "Jewish people", that is, to become a part of the Jewish nation. To "Judaize" is thus synonymous with "to nationalize".

Eisenstadt completes these sets of arguments by marking that

> For the first time since the disintegration of the Jewish religious society of the Middle Ages there is the attempt to build an independent Jewish social existence. This new creation is not being erected according to religious and traditional precepts. It is an attempt to bring into reality a social existence for Judaism, and therefore the necessity for defining in new terms the content and nature of Jewish culture and society.
>
> (ibid., 18)

Eisenstadt's main working assumption is of a society whose creative resources are all directed towards the common goal of attaining formal external recognition as an independent and a self-sustained national unit. Such form of devotion, which the source regards as the center of social lives, corresponds with the context of the 1948 War, which is left unmentioned, similar to the atrocities of World War II.

In the liminal context, society's boundaries were not fully defined, yet the omnipresent "desire", which constitutes its organizing principle, is seen as so powerful that it actually has the capability to determine the character of social relations, to define value scales, and to weld together cultural differences more than any other factor. It is this inherent utopian "desire" which acts as an ideological force – "a creative power" in Eisenstadt's Buberian formulation – that establishes categories of belonging and otherness.

According to Eisenstadt's observation, social "reality" is where the very concept of the "nature" of Jewish social lives transforms. This understanding captures the ethos and logic of the evolving Zionist imaginary and its hegemonic perspective, aiming to uproot the very "essence" of diasporic Jewish existence and frame it in "modern" political settings. This ethos of transformation radically rejects the past (Negation of Diaspora/Exile), avoids the question of diverseness, and enables dichotomies such as "new" and "old" to emerge. These, as well as other dichotomous distinctions, set the imagined boundaries of this national collective, a collective that is perceived as having distinguished traits. This necessarily conveys the notion of a homogeneous Jewish tradition, a Jewish past, a Jewish society – rather than tradition*s*, past*s*, and societ*ies*. Such terminology provides the groundwork for the narrative of a coherent and unified society and paves a way to imagine Jews as a "people" – a national, cohesive collective.

Social continuity

The making of a unified society that maintains a certain degree of continuity and "collective wholeness" (Ram 2011: 7) is the main concern of Eisenstadt's 1952 article, "The Social Significance of Education in the Absorption of Immigrants", published in Hebrew.[9] More explicitly, this text discusses the conditions in which social and cultural continuity could be bestowed on the younger generation through the formal and informal educational processes. The focus on social continuity is linked with the post-1948 Arab-Israeli War period, a time in which Israel's sovereignty was already attained and its collective borders were beginning to solidify. The article opens with the following assumption:

> This discussion's point of departure is the fact that the educational act is one of the important tools in formatting a unified society in the social situation of "*Ingathering of the Exiles*" [Kibbutz Galuyyot] and absorption of immigration [Aliyot].
>
> (Eisenstadt 1952a: 330, emphasis added)

The expression "Ingathering of the Exiles" is worthy of attention. In the narrative of the "Ingathering of the Exiles", immigration to Israel is seen as a metahistorical event in which exiled Jews, scattered across the world, came to rejoin in their ancient homeland and to be redeemed in the land of Israel after two millennia of being in Exile/Diaspora, constituting a part in the Zionist myth of return and revival. How then does this narrative interact with the sociological analysis?

Eisenstadt's perspective on education focuses on its potential to "re-establish" or to "re-format" a unified society (ibid.). Symbols of social identification are acquired in the process of education "to nourish an independent personality that is suited to perform various social roles" (ibid., 331). Hence the process itself is understood as a central tool in achieving integration and establishing national identification. In this context, individual development is assessed in relation to the national collective.

In addition, the prefix "re-" in "re-establish" or "re-format" is significant because it denotes the existence of a unified society in the past. This society can be revived in the present, in a time in which the "Exiles ingathered", through an educational process. The function of education, in the context of the narrative of exile and return, is to regain the lost social cohesiveness and to form a "unified society of new and old" (ibid., 339). Education is hence a means by which the lost ancient Jewish entity could be reestablished in the present.

Similarly to Eisenstadt's 1948 analysis of the Yishuv's social stratification, here too the motivation to participate in the national project plays a significant role in the degree that the educational process fulfills its primary goals to create a unified national society. It is therefore "the lack of *readiness* to be educated within the acknowledged educational frameworks" (ibid., 330, emphasis added) that Eisenstadt identifies among immigrants ("Olim"), which can lead to problems of integration. This factor is seen as the main obstacle that prevents the educational goals from being accomplished. The reluctance to comply with the educational program "that every society organizes according to its character and main social goals" derives, in Eisenstadt's view, from the immigrants' unwillingness to accept social roles upon themselves and to fulfill them in a "correct and proper" way (ibid., 330).

According to the source, the educational process in the state of Israel, which is conducted in formal schools "as in any modern society" (ibid., 333), serves several functions within this institutional frame. The first is to convey the basic knowledge and orientation that pupils would need in order to act in concrete situations throughout their life (ibid.). The second is to support the pupils as they gradually experience the "transformation from the family structure [. . .] to the formal-social structure" (ibid.). In this continuous process the "pupils' identification shifts towards adults outside the family, focusing especially on the teachers while developing discipline towards objectives, universal, non-personal norms" (ibid., 334). The third is to develop "through special fields of study, especially the studies of history, literature etc., the general-formal social identification consciousness" (ibid.).

How are these three functions, which reflect a structural-functionalist perspective, to be understood in the context of immigration and state-building? "The very fact of immigration [Aliyah]", Eisenstadt argues,

> places the youth in a dual transformative situation: the natural transformation from the parent's house to the general society, which is the base for the entire educational process, as well as the transformation from the familiar social structure of *Exile* to a new social structure.
>
> (ibid., emphasis added)

The task of the educational institutions, which rests on the narrative of exile and return, is to bridge the gap between the "old" diasporic existence and the new social surroundings, which are imagined as the negated version of the former. The educational process therefore encompasses a paradox: to assure continuity in a context of rupture. As seen previously, for this process to succeed it must rely on the assumed willingness of social groups to accept the new order.

The dual transformative situation of the younger generation is a notion that Eisenstadt continued to develop in *From Generation to Generation* (Eisenstadt 1956a), a monograph that Shils considered "an intellectual accomplishment of the first order" (Shils 1985: 4). There Eisenstadt deals with the inter- and cross-generational transformation of trust, while arguing that youth groups tend to rise in all societies – "whether primitive, tribal, archaic, historical, or modern" – where there are tensions between "particularistic and ascriptive principles regulating behavior within family and kinship groups" and "universalistic principles" regulating the "broader sectors of institutional formations" (Eisenstadt 2003: 3–4).

These theoretical abstractions, which involve the evolutionary paradigm in anthropology, have clearly stemmed from Eisenstadt's observation of the emerging youth movements in Israel which were a significant tool of political mobilization. It is crucial to see how *From Generation to Generation* brings the case of Israeli youth movements as the empiric example of how age groups are formed in modern societies (Eisenstadt 1956a: 92–114). In contrast to modern Israeli society, Eisenstadt discusses the case of Ireland as a peasants' society, and the case of the Nuer, the Nandi, and the Yako as examples of primitive societies (ibid., 59–92). Such categorization has reproduced the scientific terminology of late 1940s British anthropology. *From Generation to Generation* also encloses how Eisenstadt's scholarship in the late 1950s was not fully disassociated from the evolutionary paradigm, whose inherent hierarchical categorization of groups was embedded in Eisenstadt's general sociology at that time.

Educational potential, causes of immigration, and intra-societal hierarchies

In "The Social Significance", Eisenstadt argues that the "educational potential" cannot be considered "equal for all immigrants [Olim]". He maintains that this potential "is distinctive in every social type of immigrants [Olim] and its own unique social traits" (Eisenstadt 1952a: 335). Eisenstadt's underlying assumption is that certain immigrant groups are more or less inclined to integrate into the education system, a system that similar to other state institutions was dominated from the early 1950s on by European elite (Kimmerling 2001). Eisenstadt suggests considering the "cultural transformations" exhibited in each of the three groups he thereafter defines as a means of assessing whether integration would be successful or not.[10]

"Cultural transformations" signify criteria of cultural background. To have a better grasp of Eisenstadt's use of this term, one should refer to his earlier 1950 article, "Towards a Sociology of Youth in Modern Society", also published in

Hebrew. There Eisenstadt describes two main steps in socialization that individuals experience in the early stages of life. The first phase concerns children's identification with their parents, a step that Eisenstadt regards as a "the foundation of education and socialization which is supported by the inherent inclination of the child to imitate his parents and to obey them" (Eisenstadt 1950b: 55). The second step refers to the transformation this identification undergoes as it shifts from the family circle to the general society, its values, and perceptions. The parents, Eisenstadt concludes, function as mediators who link the individual to society in a process which in modern societies aims to prepare the members of the new generation to fulfill their role within an "existing division of labor" (ibid.). In this sense, immigration is tantamount to re-socialization, a process in which the elite undertakes the equivalent role of a parent as it mediates values and social perceptions to broader social strata. The use of parent-child relations discloses a paternalistic attitude towards immigrants.

In Eisenstadt's 1952 "Social Significance", he defines three social layers, or sectors, defined in light of the possibility that the educational potential, and the sense of continuity it seeks to convey, would be successfully realized or not. This measure of success is determined apropos "the causes and social images that have pushed the immigrant [oleh] to immigrate [to make Aliyah]" (Eisenstadt 1952a: 335). Such an equation leads to the following conclusion: The stronger a connection a group has to Zionism prior to the act of immigration, the more likely its educational potential will be reached.

This approach, which links the historical background of specific groups to their potential of being "absorbed" into Israeli society, can be found in other early writings, most importantly *The Absorption of Immigrants* (1954a). In this monograph, the link between the original motivation of groups, their predispositions and their role expectations, predicts the degree of success of their absorption (Ram 1995: 38). This link reflects an approach that relates the success or failure of integration as predetermined. Eisenstadt's 1952 analysis of the different sectors is worthy of attention, for it sheds light on how each group is characterized and viewed in relation to the Zionist ethos. The first group is identified as the "traditional sector"; the second is affiliated with the "flawed transformation" sector; and the third is recognized as the "proper [unblemished] transformation sector" (Eisenstadt 1952a: 335). These groups are neither socially isolated nor fully distinguished from one another. Eisenstadt's general categorization of these particular groups, attempting to define and assess their potential to be politically mobilized, involves a form of tagging ("proper" or "flawed") – a practice that discloses external judgment.

Bearing this in mind, the following paragraphs unravel Eisenstadt's early view of the social structure of Israeli society and exhibit the distinctions drawn between European and non-European Jewish immigrant communities. These groups are examined and assessed according to their educational background and hence potential to integrate, determined by the causes that initially led them to immigrate. The main query that guided Eisenstadt's analysis was under which conditions can successful integration to the formal education system be achieved. The answers to this question generate a hierarchy of superiority and inferiority of

these groups, depicting non-Europeans as having less potential to social integration than Europeans.

According to Eisenstadt, the first sector, the "traditional sector", includes non-secular, non-European Jews ("the Yemenite Jews community and some parts of North Africa Jewry"), namely, Jews of Arabic background, or Arab Jews. The group is divided into units which are parts of an extended familial foundation "linked by particularistic relations" (Eisenstadt 1952a: 335). The main "cultural values" of this sector, which is characterized by its religious orientations, are maintained by the religious elite through "a continuous cultivation of cultural symbols" which are then passed on to all layers of "*the people*" ("Am") (ibid., 336, emphasis added). These elite act as a social agent whose influence is extended to broader parts of society, namely "the people". In this regard, it is crucial to note that use of the term "the people" ("Am"), especially in relation to the context in which it is applied, equates the civil collective with the borders of the Jewish collective.

At this point in the analysis, one may wonder, first of all, why the role of the religious elite is emphasized, especially given that Zionist political culture was led by a secular agenda. Second, the issue of how this matter can be linked to the question of education is unavoidable. Eisenstadt's following description sheds light upon the general process of the transformation of symbols among all parts of society (within its Jewish borders). He argues:

> The shared cultural symbols, the symbols of social identification, define the Jewish society's solidarity against the foreign, hostile, environment in which it exists and with which it must endlessly deal. This engagement takes a cultural collective form and is not perceived as an individual struggle. The individual field [. . .] is completely subjected to the cultural and social frame of the Jewish society.
>
> (ibid., 336)

Israeli society, defined here solely as Jewish, is viewed as a closed unit that must sustain itself amid a "foreign, hostile, environment". Here lies another example of the perspective which corresponds with a structural-functionalist theoretical framework that Eisenstadt employs, an approach that views Israeli society as a closed and self-maintained unit (Ram 1995: 30). Although Israeli society – or more accurately, the society under Israeli authority – was composed of non-Jewish communities, Jewish society itself is seen in this source as the sphere outside of which individual existence cannot be socially possible. The idea that Eisenstadt communicates here is even stronger: A cultural void awaits for those crossing the borders of Jewish society. This notion of hostility rests to a high degree on the external and undefined geopolitical threat, in light of which Israel later on developed its military ethos.

Within the closed dynamic described above, the religious sector, according to Eisenstadt, fulfills a social role by providing some degree of "moral support", which he refers to as a "cultural-religious consciousness of superiority" (Eisenstadt 1952a: 336). Thus this sector seems to consist of those who have access to

divinity and take the lead in nourishing a complementary cultural-religious consciousness that exists alongside the Zionist national-secular agenda by serving it. This view highlights Eisenstadt's early understanding of the religious rabbinical communities' social role of nourishing a sense of superiority in Israeli society. This form of superiority paves the way for these communities to enter Israel's collective sphere and to find their place within it.

The causes that led the traditional sector to immigrate – the main factor in assessing the potential to integrate – is derived, according to Eisenstadt, from "the will to abolish the tension between the future [messianic] perspective and the particularistic action in the present [. . .]; to intensify the same identification and social solidarity that existed in the origin society" (ibid., 336–337). The manner in which the "traditional" sector is discussed provides an example for how non-European and non-secular sectors, consisting mostly of Arab Jews/Mizrahim, was perceived: first, in how these two communities are coupled and seen as part of the same cultural group, although the cultural differences found among its members are substantial; and second, in the view of the causes that led these artificially conjectured groups to immigrate. Such a view coincides with the hegemonic portrayal of these communities, a portrayal which tends to emphasize messianic motives over other factors that shaped the histories of these communities.

Additional sources shed light on what appears to be a central point in the portrayal of the Arab Jews/Mizrahim. In *The Absorption of Immigrants*, the messianic factor was understood as one of the main causes leading the Arab Jews/Mizrahim to arrive in Palestine (Eisenstadt 1954a: 92). However, the sources state that no sufficient historical evidences were found on which to base this assumption (ibid., 93). This focus emerges in various other texts (e.g. Eisenstadt 1948b: 101). This messianic religious orientation, described as a messianic "urge", is viewed as inconsistent with the "Zionist ideal" (ibid.). It specifically contradicts the Zionist orientation of the state or the pre-state settlements whose ideology was based on "secular national premises similar to that of Western rationalistic civilization" (ibid.).

Eisenstadt's account does not raise the various historical reasons which played a part in non-European immigration to Palestine and later Israel, reasons which according to some scholars were not rooted in a fully voluntary motivation to immigrate (Smooha 2004: 53). These factors, however, could not have been accounted for at the time these works were published. Furthermore, the perspective which regards the state of Israel as the political institutionalization of Judaism, and as the place where religious messianic aspirations can be realized, is a highly distinctive feature in the Zionist historical view of non-European immigration. The degree to which non-European communities actually ascribed to these religious messianic tendencies, and the part these tendencies may have played in their immigration, is disputed.

The educational potential that this sector is likely to attain is assessed in light of three additional factors: (1) the sector's readiness to "shed the traces of *exile* and political subordination"; (2) to "integrate into the *Hebrew* nation"; and (3) to "fulfill the fundamentals of the *original* cultural and social tradition" (Eisenstadt

1952a: 337, emphasis added). Members of this sector attain, through the process of cultural transformation, a "measure of personal and social confidence" and acquire "general solidarity which assists in the concrete daily role inside of family life" (ibid., 336). This specific sub-group of Arab Jews is expected to adopt the national logic, to uproot its past "exiled" patterns, and to take on Zionist identity. Given that this group has a role in the national project ("moral support"), it is seen as having the potential to integrate. It therefore not subject to othernization. This, however, cannot be applied to other groups that are viewed as socially unfit to contribute to the Zionist project, as seen in the following paragraphs.

The "flawed transformation sector" is associated with Moroccan Jewish immigrants from an urban background. Eisenstadt mainly addresses the social lives this sector had before immigration, lives which were shaped by colonial rule in Morocco. These colonial settings have significantly affected the process of cultural transformation and determined the causes that led to immigration (ibid., 337). According to Eisenstadt's historical observation, the colonial regime in Morocco prevented Moroccan Jewish communities from fulfilling their social aspirations and hindered their social mobilization (ibid.). The values that were prevalent in this sector have led to a "problematic" form of identification with the Jewish collective (ibid.). This view emphasizes the difficulty of Moroccan Jews in integrating into Israeli society and also regards their past lives as the basis from which a social problem ascends. The explanatory power of this observation lies in how it connects the Moroccan Jews' past to the present of the early 1950s, when this group was marginalized and subject to discriminatory policies (Smooha 2004: 53).

This fractured process of cultural transformation, according to Eisenstadt's sociological analysis, resulted in two types of collective insecurity: The first is derived from "the specific Jewish insecurity" – a view that reproduces motives of passiveness and weakness in the imagery of the diasporic Jew; the second is viewed as a result of "the shift from a traditional familial society to a general formalistic-universalistic society based on a distinct formal stratificational criterium" (Eisenstadt 1952a: 337). This is why this dual insecurity led this group to immigration – a need that rose from the "will to erase this ambivalence and tension by achieving an immediate approval of personal and social status as well as a collective security in the land [Ha'aretz]" (ibid., 338).

This sector is described negatively, as a group driven by a self-centered quest for higher social status. In this light, Eisenstadt determines that it has "excelled in its lack of readiness to change", and the educational potential it possesses is mainly "coupled with this central motive" (ibid.). This socio-historicist observation draws a somewhat pessimistic assessment concerning the non-European community of immigrants, especially with reference to its ability to become an integral part of the national collective. In the case of the urban Moroccan Jews, immigration to Israel is perceived as an opportunity to achieve improved social status. This explanation sheds light mostly upon how this community was recognized as a group that is not driven by virtuous ideological aims but by instrumental reasons.

As seen in the previous case, here one re-encounters the hegemonic narrative of the non-European immigration to Israel which omits a plethora of relevant historical circumstances that led to immigration. These included the organized activity of the Jewish Agency which arranged and organized mass immigration from North Africa in an attempt to increase the demographic presence of Jews in the new state of Israel (Shenhav 2006: 188). Unlike this sector, which is described as lacking modern ideological passion and driven by self-interest, the following discussion, which focuses on European Jews, portrays a very different image.

The "proper [unblemished] transformation" sector relates to the case of European Jews from Bulgarian and Serbian origins. In Eisenstadt's view, the "assimilation" of these communities in European societies "did not involve the annihilation of the Jewish consciousness" (Eisenstadt 1952a: 338). This group's ability to view itself as part of a Jewish collective, an ability rooted in conditions that preceded its immigration, and its subsequent potential to integrate into Israeli society position its members as more advanced in relation to others. Eisenstadt's description of the history of these communities focuses on the period immediately preceding their immigration – a time that was accompanied by the activity of Zionist organizations and groups. The past Jewish social lives associated with this sector are seen as highly intertwined with "general [European] society", whereas its practice of Judaism in familial religious contexts did not play a role in the financial-professional field or in politics (ibid.). Eisenstadt explicates that the inner "Jewish scale" maintained by this group correlates with the "general social scale". The adoption of an external, modern social structure enabled the Jewish community to regard itself as a minority within a wider social structure, a view that led to "full social cooperation" (ibid.).

In Eisenstadt's view, this reason explains why this sector has a "stronger and more [culturally] active" layer of merchants, holders of free professions, and intelligentsia. It also has "a budding intellectual layer of secular Hebrew teachers, Zionist intelligentsia etc." (ibid.). This group maintained formal educational institutions that held a "modern curriculum" and "special Hebrew schools" (ibid., 339). Given that this sector was already familiar with Zionist ideas and goals, it was better positioned to integrate into Israeli society.

As mentioned, the potential of each of the sectors to integrate is assessed in light of the groups' predetermined potential to integrate into the Zionist education system, which is tantamount to integrating into Israeli society itself. Simultaneously, Eisenstadt draws his conclusions that embed a critique of the prevailing "melting pot" policy of the time.[11] He maintains that the educational program which each of the sectors is exposed to does not take into account their differences. Under these circumstances, the overall educational potential and the continuity it aims to convey are bound to be weakened. In most cases, Eisenstadt argues, "the proper conditions for the success of the educational act in formal schools do not exist" (ibid.). Among the first two non-European sectors, he contends, various "sociological assumptions" that formal education requires are lacking. It is only in the last sector, composed of European members, that "general compatibility to the social conditions of the formal education exists" (ibid.). Under these conditions,

he assesses, "the educational act could not only fail, but it may become a starting point of social disintegration" (ibid., 340).

Elites

This last observation reveals Eisenstadt's concern with the stability of Israeli society, one that has led him to suggest general guidelines for social policies to prevent the prospect of deviation, disintegration, and social crisis. He thus suggests developing a complementary "social action" within the frame of non-formal education that could build social-educational "bridges" which would suit the changing sectorial needs. In Eisenstadt's vision of "the social future" (ibid., 341), such social actions, which include intervention in the familial unit, should be carried out by "elite circles" (ibid.). These groups hold "key social and cultural positions" as well as "a strong orientation toward the institutional structure of the country [Ha'aretz]" (ibid.). Based on Eisenstadt's sectorial analysis, it is possible to infer that only Jews from European background could fit this profile. Eisenstadt's suggested social policy provides another example of the hierarchic relations that he draws between European and non-European immigrants. Whereas Europeans are depicted as active social agents and mediators in the process of integration, non-Europeans are observed as passive and in need of guidance as they integrate into a "modern" education system.

Eisenstadt's view of elites is found in an earlier theoretical article titled "The Place of Elites and Primary Groups in the Absorption of New Immigrants in Israel", published in 1951. In this text, the elites are perceived as the layer that mediates the "general values" to new communities of immigrants and is able to provide these groups with a sense of security in the new social context. The elites decipher the political and social reality for immigrant groups and assume the role of mediators in creating a sense of "positive" identification among the group's individuals (Eisenstadt 1951b: 224). The elites are therefore the main form of the agency through which groups' participation in the collective lives could be reached. Given that "integration into the new social system could be effected only by changing the roles, values, and social perspectives" (ibid., 223), it is the elite that perpetuates this social change and determines "the directions and types of integration" (ibid.). This view would become central in Eisenstadt's later comparative historical sociology that emphasizes the role of elites in the process of social change.

Whereas Eisenstadt's 1951 article theorizes the role of the elite in cultivating and mediating collective forms of identification, his 1952 article presents a concrete suggestion to actively and intentionally involve elites in the educational sphere, that is, in the service of the identity construction process. This suggestion, which deviates from the realm of social theory, attests to the large extent in which Eisenstadt's early sociology engages the question of social continuity and deals with the problem of creating, maintaining, and instilling a sense of collectivity and national unity. In this regard, Eisenstadt's suggestion to involve the elites is linked to the collectivist ethos in which Israeli society – or the "people of

Israel" – is perceived as a united entity that centered on an overarching system of political goals and interests. The prospect of social disintegration also plays a part here. Eisenstadt's concern for the future, in which national integration could either fail or succeed, regards the collectivist goals as the central axis around which social categories are set and defined. This form of mediation therefore speaks in the name of future national unity as it imagines it. Most important to this endeavor is the question of how to avoid the threat of social disintegration – a recurring theme in the sources hitherto analyzed.

Due to its controversial sociological observations, Eisenstadt's "Social Significance" drew attention in the scholarly literature. Piterberg (1996: 137), for example, underscores Eisenstadt's "twin underlying dichotomies" that rest on the contrasts of tradition/modernity and East/West. Based on this dichotomous view, Eisenstadt was able to suggest

> that the state should invest in their non-formal education according to the particular nature of each Oriental case. This [. . .] would make sure that these children would successfully become part of a uniform Western education-system and would not threaten the coherence of Jewish/Israeli society.
>
> (ibid.)

An additional account suggests that the "Social Significance" acknowledges cultural and social differences that existed among European and non-European Jews. This acknowledgment, however, reflects an attempt to relinquish these differences (Ben-Amos 1994: 46).

Intermediate conclusions

The article "Social Significance" establishes social categories and defines identity borders accordingly. It does so based on sociological terminology (e.g. the concept of cultural transformations) which enables positive and negative tagging of groups. Such categories, which articulate a hierarchy of superiority and inferiority between non-European and European groups, reflect and perpetuate the hegemonic position of the latter. The source analysis has shown that "Social Significance" calls for the mediation of Zionist identity. Such mediation, as the source illustrates, takes the form of a social policy of elite intervention. This kind of mediation rests on a dichotomous understanding of East/West and modern/traditional – in other words, on the problematic separation rooted in modernization theory (Bhambra 2014: 25).

Such a perspective is framed by just as it supports Israel's early 1950s national utopian collectivist ethos aimed at attaining social cohesiveness – a sphere in which cultural and political identities overlap. In this narrative of cohesiveness, all identities are observed according to their potential to contribute to the Zionist project. Thus the article "Social Significance" actively aims to mediate the idea of unity and is hence seen as the primary factor that directly connects sociology and national ideology in Eisenstadt's early view of Israeli society.

"Re-socialization" and the search for homogeneity

The idea of homogeneity, derived from the Zionist political and cultural program that portrayed the Jewish settlers-immigrants society as a coherent body of people with shared primordial historical roots, can be seen as the axis around which Eisenstadt's early sociological accounts revolved, and as their premier concerns.

As previously discussed, these accounts imagined homogeneity when in fact cultural diversity had dominated Israel's social sphere in the early 1950s. The emphasized uniformity played a central role in identifying the cultural (or "ethno"-cultural) Jewish identity as a political, Zionist identity. The emphasis on the correlation between these two types of identities reflects a quest of legitimation. The accounts also reveal a utopian quest to shape the social sphere in light of ideals dictated by a collective ethos. Thus, unity and social homogeneity are the basis for an imagined national collective. This perspective goes hand in hand with the assumption that groups are able to undergo social change and adjust to a new social structure. This assumption that refers to a social system as a malleable entity is vital to Eisenstadt's early social theory.

In 1956, Eisenstadt observed the social sphere in Israel in terms of a "relatively homogeneous community" (Eisenstadt 1956b: 5). However, Eisenstadt acknowledged the "cultural heterogeneity of the immigrants" as early as 1951 (Eisenstadt 1951a: 27). It can be argued that the gap in Eisenstadt's approaches to the question of homogeneity derives from the type of exposure these texts received. Whereas the 1951 paper was intended for "private circulation only" (ibid., 3), the 1956 article was presented at an international conference on the integration of immigrants. One explanation can be linked to a dynamic where what has been acknowledged "at home" could not be recognized in front of a wider international audience. Another possible explanation can assume a certain shift in Eisenstadt's perspectives which enabled him to acknowledge cultural heterogeneity that was apparent with the early 1950s wave of immigrants, but not toward the second half of the 1950s when Zionist ideology became even more dominant. More sources could shed light on this tension which is embedded in Eisenstadt's 1950s work.

Published in Hebrew, the 1952 article "Some Problems of Leadership among New Immigrants" demonstrates the main tendencies that have been discussed so far. "Problems of Leadership" reveals, first, how central the element of homogeneity in Eisenstadt's early work was, and second, how substantial the idea that groups are subjected to collective change was to his understanding of the process of integration. To a large extent, this article was supported by the findings that were presented in two related pieces, "The Process of Absorption of New Immigrants in Israel" and "Institutionalization of Immigrant Behaviour", both published in 1952 in *Human Relations* (Eisenstadt 1952b, 1952c). The "Problems of Leadership" focuses on the emergence of leaders among the immigrating communities. It opens with the assumption previously presented in "Towards a Sociology of Youth in Modern Society" (Eisenstadt 1950b), where immigration was depicted as a process that entails "re-socialization". The concept of re-socialization, an idea that is linked to the development of "homogenous social continuity", repeatedly

appears in many of Eisenstadt's early works. The concept was presented publicly in a working paper given at UNESCO's "Conference on the Cultural Integration of Immigrants", where Eisenstadt argued that "assimilation should be mainly seen as the re-socialization of immigrants" (Eisenstadt 1956b: 4).

Although the desired degree of re-socialization is left undefined in "Towards a Sociology of Youth" from 1950, the 1956 conference paper referred to re-socialization as "the institutionalization of their [immigrants] rôle-expectation within the limits and possibilities set up by the absorbing society" (ibid.). In "Problems of Leadership", the term "re-socialization" addresses the acceptance and implementation of the values of the absorbing society. "Re-socialization" is attained when identification with the general "social attitudes" is not only gained but also channeled toward an actual "social activity" (Eisenstadt 1952d: 185).

In "The Process of Absorption of New Immigrants in Israel", integration is envisioned as an "extension of the immigrants' field of social participation through mutual adaptation of their role-expectations and the institutionalized norms of the absorbing society" (Eisenstadt 1952b: 226). In the sequential "Institutionalization of Immigrant Behaviour", the criteria that define immigrant behavioral institutionalization relate to "(a) participation within the social system; and (b) identification with its values and symbols" (Eisenstadt 1952c: 379). The kind of identification to which the article specifically refers is directed towards the "Jewish nation and with the State [*sic*]" (ibid., 385). Accordingly, the "Problems of Leadership" emphasizes that integration is a process of group change (Eisenstadt 1952d: 182), one that can only be reached collectively (ibid., 183).

"It is obvious", Eisenstadt notes, that immigrant groups "could not continue living according to their old patterns without any change within the Israeli reality" (ibid., 182). The inevitable change that immigrants were expected to undergo was linked with a behavioral, social, and cultural change (ibid.). This type of change, it is argued, depends on the leadership's ability to effect a transformation. As those who "provide the main communication channels with the general, absorbing society", the immigrants' leaders are observed as playing a significant role in maintaining "homogeneity in Israel" (ibid., 184).

The immigrants' leaders are those "able to pass on the main social values to their own groups of immigrants ['Olim'] and to channel them toward social activity in different fields (political, cultural, etc.)" (ibid., 185). The focus on the leadership's process of change, which according to the source must include some degree of genuine identification with the new values and behavioral patterns (ibid., 184), stems from the perception of the leaders' role as identity agents that have the potential to mediate and spread "social values" to their communities. Perceived as such, their path of change is crucial in the overall process of integration and creation of homogeneity.

Eisenstadt explains why this specific study, which deals with the conditions in which immigrants' leaders rise to prominence, carries importance. He argues: "inability or unwillingness to pass values or to encourage a broad social act could subvert the foundation of the consolidation and social integration" (ibid., 185). By raising this argument, Eisenstadt ascribes the value of his sociological account to

its descriptive qualities. It can be inferred that these qualities have the potential to shed light on how disintegration could be prevented. In this light, it can be said that this article does not engage sociology that seeks an explanation to the dynamics of social lives, but rather offers a descriptive account through which a practical notion might emerge. This instrumental account that Levy observes as being not "merely descriptive, but prescriptive" (Levy 2002: 96), is guided by the constant emphasis of the conditions in which homogeneity could thrive. Based on a structural-functionalist theory that examines the conditions under which certain social phenomenon occurs, this example demonstrates how Eisenstadt's sociology is tied to the Zionist image of manufactured homogeneity.

The focus on homogeneity appears once again in "Problems of Leadership", where Eisenstadt argues that the main (and unresolved) problem that his study faces is the degree to which the processes of social mobilization could lead to social change among immigrants and to "formalization of social and cultural unified, homogeneous frameworks in the land" (Eisenstadt 1952d: 186–187). Based on K. Lewin's emphasis on the importance of group dynamics in social and cultural change (ibid., 183), Eisenstadt notes that a behavioral change among immigrants is more likely to transpire in groups with stronger inner solidarity (ibid.).

The connection between solidarity and inner strength is based on another intellectual source. As Eisenstadt argued in an autobiographical note from 2003, the links between the levels of "solidarity and trust" that groups demonstrate, and their ability to "adjust or adapt themselves in situation of change", were based on the work on primary groups which E. Shils developed (Eisenstadt 2003: 3). Shils's views concerning the attachment to primary groups, as taught in the London School of Economics in the late 1940s, were primarily shaped, as he himself noted, by "observation of the German armed forces during World War II" (Shils 1985:4). The correlation between the construction of solidarity, trust, and social change, as appears in several other early sources (for example Eisenstadt 1952b: 234; Eisenstadt 1995), was considered in retrospective to be the main concern of the studies of immigrant absorption (Eisenstadt 2003: 3). Based on this link, Eisenstadt would conclude that a solidarity-building leadership, which nourishes an "organic and gradual path of group change", is crucial to the making of a homogeneous society. The article ends with the call to encourage this specific kind of leadership and elites that can pave the way for homogeneity (Eisenstadt 1952d: 190–191).

In summary, the 1952 article "Problem of Leadership" demonstrates the centrality of the idea of homogeneous society, one which is part of the utopist tendency this chapter has argued for. This source also demonstrates how Eisenstadt's sociological analysis is focused on homogeneity-facilitating agents, those who could establish bridges of identification and connect their communities to the hegemonic collective identity. Sources such as the "Problem of Leadership" demonstrate the basic tension this section entangled: Whereas Israeli society is perceived in Eisenstadt's view as relatively homogeneous – an observation that corresponds with the Zionist imagery which refers to the Jewish state as a homogeneous cultural and political unit – a contradicting view emerges, one that depicts Israeli

society as subject to the threat of disintegration due to insufficient homogenization. Hence the study examines the conditions under which this homogeneity can be attained through "re-socialization". Additional use of sociological jargon (e.g. "primary groups") demonstrates how Eisenstadt's early structural-functionalist terminology has been tied to the need to imagine a homogeneous society.

Predestined to otherness: the Arab Jews/Mizrahim

Eisenstadt's early quest for social homogeneity was highly intertwined in the topic of the Arab Jews/Mizrahim and has occupied a significant part of his early publications. One of Eisenstadt's first published research reports focusing on the "Oriental Jews" (Eisenstadt 1947a) was written under the auspices of the seminar on the "empirical study of the social structure of the Yishuv", directed by Martin Buber at the Hebrew University (Eisenstadt 1992: 5). The research continued under Eisenstadt's supervision and was framed within the general question of

> whether the problems of absorption of immigrants can be considered as outcomes of different cultural patterns, as *distinct ("primitive") mentalities*, or whether they should mostly be attributed to the dynamics of the social situation, the differences of power and value orientation, the social disorganization of immigrants' groups, etc.
>
> (Eisenstadt 1956b, emphasis added)

Eisenstadt's early research, as reflected from the source, engages the conception of "primitive societies", taken from evolutionist anthropological approach whose terminological traces were still present in the early 1950s British social anthropology, mainly in the works of London School of Economics scholars such as Evans-Pritchard, Firth, and Nadel whom Eisenstadt encountered during his post-doctoral studies. Such analytical categories, assuming the cultural superiority of the Europeans over the examined non-European and colonized societies (Asad 1995 [1973]), were "imported" by Eisenstadt and embedded in the study of Israeli society.

The Arab Jews/Mizrahim's patterns of social behavior are viewed in Eisenstadt's accounts as antithetical to the fundamentals of Israeli collective ethos. More specifically, Eisenstadt argued that the Arab Jews/Mizrahim "came to Palestine without any basic Zionist motivation or ideology" (Eisenstadt 1954a: 103), that they maintain the same "traditional social and cultural structure" (ibid.), and were "not consciously prepared to alter either their economic and occupational structure" (ibid., 94) by showing no willingness to change the "basic tenets of their social and cultural life and their traditional religious Jewish consciousness" (ibid.). The Arab Jews/Mizrahim were found to be "sociologically very different from the national-secular identifications of the new Jewish community in Palestine" (ibid.). The group's alleged lack of ability to identify with the national collective attested to something inherently flawed in its potential to integrate into Israeli society that was seen first and foremost as modern and homogeneous.

Observed as lacking the modern imagination that the Zionist nation-building process entails, the Arab Jews/Mizrahim were generally categorized in Eisenstadt 1950s sociology as groups that share "some characteristics which differentiate them from the modern community" (Eisenstadt 1948b: 101). Unlike the European Jews, Eisenstadt maintained the Arab Jews/Mizrahim whose immigration into Palestine "did not imply a break with their traditional social and cultural structures" (Eisenstadt 1954a: 93). Immigrants of non-Western origins were hence seen as contradicting the modern image of Israeli society.

It is crucial to see how Eisenstadt's relation to Arab Jews/Mizrahi communities was discussed by several scholars whose contributions provide a critical outlook on the issue. Smooha points out Eisenstadt's emphasis on Mizrahi communities' shortcomings as the framework of his analysis, a framework which was guided by the dominant viewpoint of the European elite (Smooha 1978: 58). Smooha, like Ram (1995: 38), maintains that Eisenstadt's view of integration propagated the erasure of non-hegemonic identities. Smooha identifies Eisenstadt's approach to integration as a process in which "newcomers" had to shed their previous identities and "to merge into the newly integrated society" (Smooha 1978: 58). Immigrants of European origins were nevertheless seen as "readily 'absorbed' due to their modernized background, willingness to change and other ideological commitments" (ibid.). Deviation was generally equated with everything that failed to follow European patterns (ibid., 59). This perspective, according to Smooha, has nourished "practices of institutionalized discrimination" (ibid., 90).

In a similar vein, Shohat argued that in Eisenstadt's view the "absorption" of Mizrahi communities "entailed the acceptance of the established consensus of the 'host' society and the abandonment of 'pre-modern' traditions" (Shohat 1988: 22). Shohat adds that "while European immigrants required only 'absorption', the immigrants from Africa and Asia required 'absorption through modernization'" (ibid., 22). In this light, Shohat claims that "the Oriental Jews had to undergo a process of 'de[-]socialization' – that is, erasure of their cultural heritage and of 're[-]socialization' – that is, assimilation to the Ashkenazi way of life" (ibid.).

Eisenstadt's sociological descriptions of the Arab Jews/Mizrahim presume their failure to integrate into the center of Israeli society and to the socio-economic order established by Zionism. In this descriptive frame, the Arab Jews/Mizrahim are predestined to be positioned as the "Other". The orientalist gaze, as discussed throughout this chapter, attends to the Orient, the non-European, as contrasting the modern European. The tendency invites a reading of Eisenstadt's early studies in light of E. Said's postcolonial critique of Western scholarship.

Said maintained that the categories employed to depict "the East" in Western scholarship were mediated by the dichotomous distinctions of "us" and "them"; of an Oriental "other" as against a Western/civilized hegemonic "self". According to Said, it is through this constructed image of the "Other" that the West reassured its self-image (Said 1978: 1). "Defining the other", according to Bhambra's interpretation of Said, "is also an aspect of understanding oneself" (Bhambra 2007: 18).

Second, drawing on Said, it is possible to discern that Eisenstadt's use of sociological terminology and practices of group classifications in relation to Arab Jews/

Mizrahim contributed to reifying constructed social hierarchies of superiority and inferiority among European and non-European Jews. To a large extent, the process in which existing social hierarchies were provided with the support of academic discourse resulted in the sociological "invention" (Shohat 1999) of Arab Jews/Mizrahim.

To further develop the idea of how Eisenstadt's sociological analysis of non-European Jews was nourished from an orientalist perspective, the use of three central terms is hereby examined: (1) "predisposition to change"; (2) "reference group"; and (3) "anomie".

1 Predisposition to change

Following the link that has been made between the original motivations to immigrate and the likability of successful absorption, Eisenstadt utilizes the term "predisposition to change" to describe the potential of groups to adjust and integrate. In this classification, certain groups are seen as possessing a predisposed capacity to change. Those who are positively predisposed to change are linked with European groups, while those who are deprived of this capacity are associated with non-European groups. Drawing on this theoretical term, it was possible to argue that the Arab Jews/Mizrahim "have not displayed the complete transformation and institutionalization" (Eisenstadt 1947a: 90).

2 Reference group

Another form of group classification is seen in the distinctions that prevailed, as Ram and other scholars indicated, in *The Absorption of Immigrants*. In this monograph, immigrants from Arab-oriented cultures were categorically distinguished from the European immigrants who were considered to be "modern pioneers" ("Halutz") (Ram 1995: 34). In this "typology of immigrants", which was first found in Buber's scholarship (Shafir 1989: 47) and later used by Eisenstadt in the late 1940s, immigrants were tagged and marked according to their social status, place of origin, and role in the nation-building process (Ram 1995: 32).

In this context, the Arab Jews/Mizrahim were seen as those who were not bestowed with the mythic affiliation that comes with the title "oleh" (the one who ascends), nor were they granted with the title "pioneers". They were rather seen simply as "immigrants" ("mehager") – a category deprived of any social capital or virtue that was linked mostly with non-European groups. This hierarchy of immigrants positions the pioneer as the epitome of the Zionist ideal – a model that each individual should aspire to adopt. While the idea of pioneership was depicted as early as 1948, it was in 1951 that the "pioneers" were defined as a social group which "established a new universal Jewish identification, oriented towards the establishment of a new, modern, Jewish nation" (Eisenstadt 1951a: 28).

In Eisenstadt's sociological terminology, groups of the pioneer kind were regarded as a "reference group" with the ability to determine "individual behavior, attitudes, opinion and belief", all of which are acquired through

identification with the group and by the will to join it (Eisenstadt 1954b: 191). In the article "Studies in Reference Group Behaviour", where Eisenstadt suggests this observation, he explains that "specific groups may become the main reference points [. . .] in so far as they become the symbol of a given norm or value" (ibid., 213). The symbolic significance that such a reference group possesses has a direct connection to the maintenance of social control (ibid., 197).

In this 1954 article, whose theoretical roots are found in the works of E. Shils, H. Kelly, T. Parsons, R. Merton, M. Sherif, and R. Linton, Eisenstadt claims that "a group may become the main reference point for an individual if he has aspirations to become a member of it, and if it is in the direction of his mobility aspirations or role-choices" (ibid., 213). In this light, one can say that if the idealized category of the "pioneer" is equated with a "reference group", it can be assumed that the depiction of the pioneer provides the ideal model of "Israeliness". This model is a channel of identification through which some degree of social control could be assumed. The image of the Arab Jews/Mizrahim is depicted in opposition to this reference group.

Another scholar whose writings were influenced and guided by the same line of thinkers, most notably Merton and Parsons, is Robin M. Williams Jr. Williams's 1951 monograph *American Society* has affinities with *The Absorption of Immigrants* in its research questions and aim, which sought to provide a sociological account of their respective societies and their societal mechanisms that enable social sustainability and change. The two monographs, however, diverge in their perception of integration. Whereas in Williams's case integration is a matter of interdependence of the different parts of society (Williams 1960 [1951]: 542), in Eisenstadt's early view integration is tied to homogeneity.[12] To better Eisenstadt's idea of integration, it is necessary to understand its conceptual opposition, namely, disintegration. The following section discusses the notion of disintegration, seen in the application of the term "anomie", and examines its connection to identity politics in Israel's first decade of statehood.

(3) Anomie

Originally coined by Durkheim in *Le suicide* (1897), the term "anomie" denotes, as E. Tiryakian claimed, a structural condition that addresses "the breakdown of social discipline, the lack of commitment to social rules [. . .] the lack of motivational commitment to the welfare of society in preference for immediate fulfillment of gratifications" (Tiryakian 1974: 123). In the article "The Oriental Jews in Israel" (Eisenstadt 1950a), for example, Eisenstadt borrowed Merton's definition of the concept, as formulated in his 1938 essay "Social Structure and Anomie". There it is understood as a state

> in which a social system lacks integration of end and means in institutionalized roles [. . .], a situation in which the activities of the individual members and their goals are not integrated in a common unified and stable system of ends and institutional roles.
> (Eisenstadt 1950a: 204–205)

Such use of the term anomie signifies a socially empty space, a decline of the social structure, and a form of social "limbo" in which a group cannot adjust to a new social structure and is therefore no longer able to live in its previous surroundings as before.

Anomie was the overarching term used to theorize a variety of negative characteristics of the Arab Jews/Mizrahim and one of the most central sociological observations to be repeatedly attributed to the Arab Jews/Mizrahim in several instances in Eisenstadt's early studies.[13] Its application designated this group as a distinguished "sociological block" (Eisenstadt 1954a: 103), separate from the "rest of the Jewish community in Israel" (ibid., 91). This stance also marked this group as a threat to social stability.

One of these negative characteristics concerns the "many symptoms of the lack of integration", which include "certain indications of unstable social relations and deviant tendencies" such as "juvenile delinquency, criminality, instability of family life, etc." (ibid., 91–92). Women of Arab-Jewish/Mizrahi background were depicted as practicing prostitution (Eisenstadt 1947a: 33), while the general statistics concerning this phenomenon was not presented. In other cases thievery and other forms of deviancy were also mentioned as characterizing Mizrahi youth (ibid., 27, 31). Furthermore, individuals from Mizrahi background were described as endowed with an imagination which is "more visual than abstract" (ibid., 23) and as being driven by jealousy of European Jews (ibid., 31).

Additional tendencies include the inability to set behavioral borders for the new generation due to lack of "fixed frames of references of new roles" (Eisenstadt 1954a: 98); frequent change of employment, which attests to the preference of higher wages over "stability" or "prospects for the future" (ibid., 99); the inability to perform well in the education system (ibid., 99–100); the inability to maintain social relations which are not based "on chance factors – residence in the same neighborhood, common participation in the same escapades" (ibid., 100); and an inclination toward politics which emphasize "external symbols of identification, a type of 'phraseological' identification with extremist nationalistic movement and groups" (ibid., 101).

These descriptions show that Arab Jews/Mizrahim are observed as a group that carries some sort of social illness. The use of the word "symptoms" (which is repeated in this source [Eisenstadt 1954a: 104]) supports the impression that the group's behavior borders on the pathological. This notion is further supported as Eisenstadt argues that these patterns are not grounded in external reasons. Rather, they are inherent features of this group because the provided external conditions were "exceedingly favorable" and enabled "full absorption and integration" (ibid., 92). The "expansive nature of the Jewish economic system in Palestine" and the lack of any "negative ideology on the part of [the] European[s]" (ibid.) are presented as support for this claim. Last, "deviant activities" (ibid., 97) that were associated with the Arab Jews/Mizrahim were not compared with the scope of deviant tendencies that prevailed in other sectors.

The apparent anomic state of the Arab Jews/Mizrahim interferes with the "normative" model of national lives based on Zionism's fundamentals and ethos of collectivity. It can therefore be observed as an explicit expression of how Eisenstadt's 1950s sociology placed the "imagined" group of Arab Jews/Mizrahim outside the borders of collectivity, subjecting them to otherness while paving the way for a definition of improper/unwanted social behavior and/or the social performance expected from civil subjects of the nascent state. The application of the term anomie, a profound example of the use of sociological terminology in relation to the Arab Jews/Mizrahim, relies on an orientalist view of tagging groups, one that introduces the existing social perceptions to the new expanding realms of Israeli sociology.

The orientalist marking of the Mizrahi "other" in Eisenstadt's early accounts also resonated in the "Report of the Public Commission of Inquiry into the July 9, 1959 Disturbances in Wadi Salib", Eisenstadt being one of its authors. The report locates the source of "disturbances", which was followed by police brutality against Jewish immigrants of North African origins, as rooted in the Mizrahi immigrants' own inability to fit into a modern order. The report also maintains that the Mizrahi immigrants' claim of institutional discrimination does not coincide with the civil investment directed to Mizrahi communities by the state, without considering "a structural bias" or any "responsibility of the part of the state" (Ram 1995: 41).

Many of the claims that Eisenstadt raised in the mid- and late 1950s regarding the Arab Jews culminated in the concluding section of *Israeli Society* from 1967 titled "Israel, a Modern Society". There, Eisenstadt refers implicitly to immigrants of Arab background as an example of the problems in Israel's development. He describes the risks of the growing expansion and differentiation in Israel's social structure caused by the influx of new immigrants arriving in Israel. The most significant among these risks is "the possible cleavage between 'Oriental' and 'Occidentals', and [. . .] the possibility of creating 'Two Nations' within Israel" (Eisenstadt 1967: 415).

Eisenstadt's accounts of the Arab Jews/Mizrahim have assisted, to no small extent, to conceptualize these heterogeneous communities as a distinguished social group. The sources scrutinized here provide the opportunity to observe the roots of this discursive "invention" through the marking of social boundaries, which resulted in long-term social marginalization. It indicates how the roads to social mobilization became, to some extent, blocked for non-European groups to begin with, and most importantly it shows that otherness is not "earned" but rather presumed.

Between legitimacy, identity boundaries, and sociological knowledge

The term and discourse of integration, assuming a given origin in which one has to assimilate, bear a discriminatory connotation. The analysis presented in this chapter tackles the tensions between the way in which Eisenstadt's early sociology was

nourished from the Zionist imaginary and the way it mediated and reproduced this imaginary. Eisenstadt's early studies of Israel – coinciding with existing social and political perspectives, the prevailing Zionist myth of original people, and the myth of exile, return, and revival – provided scholarly justifications and reassurance to Israel's emerging collective boundaries, bringing them one step closer to being shared social constructions.

Eisenstadt's early accounts view Israeli society as a cohesive national unit, although it was all but socially cohesive. These representations have rendered a sense of selfhood and self-sameness. During the formative period of Eisenstadt's early sociology of Israel, the national collective subject could not have been imagined in a way which differed from the hegemonic Zionist ethos. Eisenstadt's accounts thus became part of the mechanisms that discursively mediated Zionist collective identity. Eisenstadt's addressees were, first and foremost, the local intellectual elite and the state institutions. Zionist hegemonic representations of Israeli society hence affected how Israeli society was sociologically perceived, and vice versa: Eisenstadt's sociological portrayals of Israeli society echoed the reflection of hegemonic identity by drawing its borders using sociological terminology and adopting mythical ideological elements as sociological explanations.

Eisenstadt's early scholarly endeavor exemplifies the process in which political legitimation is constructed and where existing perceptions and political ideologies are reified through scholarly discourse. The potential of these early studies to provide legitimacy to the Zionist imaginary is directly connected to the use of nationalized and ideologically laden Hebrew terms.

Based on prevailing political myths and narratives, Israeli society was imagined in Eisenstadt's early sociology as a Western-oriented utopia: a coherent and homogeneous distinguished unit of people sharing a line of historical continuity, without bringing into account the rupture and upheaval that the period in which these accounts were composed has witnessed, and especially without considering that during this period Palestinian citizens of Israel were under the restrictions of military rule. In this context, groups that posed a challenge to the collective utopian ideal were either represented in a negative manner – a matter that affected their public image – or simply remained outside of the sociological accounts altogether, as in the case of Palestinians.

Eisenstadt's early analysis of Israel emphasizes its modern character on the one hand and portrays it as a small, homogeneous, and organic society on the other. Although this analysis has clearly shifted from Buber's Gemeinschaft vision, it seems that it was influenced by its utopian premise. Eisenstadt's analysis depicts the proto-national settlements as an ideal society motivated by ideological passion. The model of the "Yishuv" was used as an ideal type, which was uprooted from the social conditions that Eisenstadt's sociology was aiming to study. Eisenstadt's early studies of Israel hence portray a utopia. Such utopia is to be understood in the sense that Max Weber renders to utopias, namely, as a "conceptual purity" nowhere to be found (Weber 1949 [1904]: 90).

The interrelated tendencies of utopianism and orientalism in Eisenstadt's early studies can be explained by looking into the ideological mechanisms of

the Zionist imaginary: The Zionist project, which by definition is an exclusivist project, has offered political "redemption" to European Jews. Although Zionism attempted to dissociate itself from Europe, it was nevertheless deeply enmeshed in Western-centrism. As mentioned, Zionism was highly influenced by the discursive sphere of late 19th-century Europe and its colonial ideology, regarding itself as modern in character and its presence in Palestine as the bringing of "civilization", "Western democracy", and "progress" to the "East" (Said 1979: 12; Pappé 2008: 612, 624). The gist of these tendencies is present in Eisenstadt's early accounts. Therefore, the practice of hierarchization and othernization of groups were not just a corollary of this political project but rather intrinsic to it.

The orientalist gaze could not have been established in Eisenstadt's account without the colonial premise where the West was positioned as the assessing criterion or model for social normativity. As a national colonizing movement, Zionism could not have observed non-Europeans as agents that could take an active part of the ideal society it aimed to create. The non-Europeans, who were never the addressee of the Zionist project, have nonetheless served its utopian mechanisms by providing it with a negative model, an exception that proves the rule (*exceptio probat regulam in casibus non exceptis*), which assisted in defining the boundaries of its hegemonic "Self". In that sense, the Arab Jews were objectified and reduced to sheer means in the pursuit of utopian ends.

Eisenstadt's Europocentric view is one of the crucial factors explaining the attitude towards non-Europeans – Jews and non-Jews alike. The othernization of non-Europeans was integral to imagining Israeli polity in utopian terms; it attests to the unequal power relations that emerged in Israel's early phase of statehood, power relations which the sociological accounts analyzed in this chapter mirror. It is here that the Saidian postcolonial perspective of this analysis unravels itself – by seeing that the dichotomous categorization of "East" and "West" collapses; that the "European" is a category that could only be defined in relation to its negation, namely the "non-European", and thus cannot be fully separated from it; and that the orientalist mode of discourse was not just a tool of Zionist identity construction, but also a medium by which sociology has rendered its legitimation and support of this identity.

Notes

1 The chapter focuses mainly on Eisenstadt's published articles that specifically refer to Israeli society, chronologically following the developments of the aforementioned trends. The chapter analyzes Eisenstadt's articles from the late 1940s to the mid-1950s, two monographs that were published in this period, and correlative documents (such as publications for internal circulation of the Hebrew University, research reports, conference papers, and autobiographical notes). In many cases, Eisenstadt's early perceptions are presented and compared with later ones in order to point out certain continuities, contradictions, or shifts in perspectives. An additional attempt was made to resolve certain gaps in the sources by providing historical explanations and/or a technical answer, for example, by pointing out the differences between public and internal publications.

2 I will use the phonetic transcription of the word spelled as "Yishuv" and not "Yishub", as spelled in the source.

3 *Mishnah*, Nashim, Kiddushin, Chapter 1, 10.
4 This is the first time that Eisenstadt uses the term "civilization" in relation to Judaism. The idea of a Jewish civilization, it can be inferred, emerged at a very early stage of Eisenstadt's work, and yet it would fully develop only toward the last third of the 20th century (see Chapter 3).
5 The term "immigrant" is, in and of itself, an ideologically loaded term and should therefore be understood in the contexts in which it is used.
6 The demographic and statistical data concerning the origins of immigrant groups, percentage in the population, and time of immigration, were based on different sources, among them the Jewish Agency's reports (e.g. *Housing in Jewish Palestine*, 1938), as was mentioned by Eisenstadt (1954a: 49); the studies of Prof. R. Bacci [Bachi] of the Hebrew University (see e.g. Bacci 1944). Some of Bacci's studies were published by the Jewish Agency.

   Eisenstadt also relied on A. N. Poliak's historic research (see Poliak 1945), further problematizing this issue. At that time, Poliak was studying the historic origins of European Jews. In *Khazaria: History of a Jewish Kingdom in Europe* (1951), Poliak challenges the "formal" Zionist myth of origin by shedding light on the vast conversions to Judaism that presumably took place around the second half of the eighth century and the ninth century, across the Volga River and in the area of the northern Caucasus. Given that Eisenstadt was at least familiar with Poliak's earlier works, it is safe to assume that he was familiar with this historical theory.
7 In Eisenstadt's later works the term "Aliyah" was occasionally replaced by the literal equivalent of the term immigration: "Hagira" (see e.g. Eisenstadt 2010: 188).
8 Eisenstadt's analysis tends to employ a specific masculine-oriented language. This androcentric perspective, which focuses almost entirely on men as the main actors of society, is also derived from the Hebrew language which is, by and large, a masculine-oriented language. This pattern has tended to fade in Eisenstadt's later writings, where he included feminine pronouns.
9 Given that this article was not translated into English, all of the following quotations were hereby translated by the author.
10 Although Eisenstadt stresses that these three groups do not represent all the various types of immigrants, they nonetheless "demonstrate the diverseness of the social-educational problem" (Eisenstadt 1952a: 335).
11 This observation coincides with Yair and Apeloig's analysis of the Jerusalem School's approach to the melting pot policy (Yair and Apeloig 2005: 107). For a critical account of the melting pot policy, see Leshem and Shuval (1998: 30) and Kimmerling (2007: 150).
12 Eisenstadt was familiar with Williams's work and mentioned his analysis of the acceptance of common norms, as presented in Williams's *American Society* (see Eisenstadt 1954a: 188).
13 For example: Eisenstadt 1947a: 7, 31, 35–37, 1950a: 204, 1951a: 39, 1951c.

References

Asad, T. (1995) [1973] "Introduction", in: Asad, T. (ed.) *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.

Auron, Y. (2013) *The Holocaust, the Rebirth and the Nakba*, Tel Aviv: Resling. [Hebrew]

Bacci, R. (1944) *Marriage and Fertility in the Various Classes of the Jewish Population of Palestine*, Jerusalem: Jewish Agency for Palestine.

Ben-Amos, A. (1994) "An Impossible Pluralism? European Jews and Oriental Jews in the Israeli History Curriculum", *History of European Ideas* 18 (1): 41–51.

Bhambra, G. K. (2007) *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bhambra, G.K. (2014) *Connected Sociologies*, London and New York: Bloomsbury.
Durkheim, E. (1897) *Le suicide: étude de sociologie*, Paris: Alcan.
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1947a) *The Sociological Structure of the Oriental Community: An Introductory Analysis*, Jerusalem: Henrietta Szold Foundation for Child and Youth Welfare, pamphlet 35. [Hebrew]
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1947b) "The Student's Role in the Yishuv", *Adanim* 3–23. Reprinted in (2002) *Igeret* (November): 24–26. [Hebrew]
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1948a) "The Sociological Structure of the Jewish Community in Palestine", *Jewish Social Studies* 10 (1): 3–18.
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1948b) "Some Remarks on Demographic Factors in a Situation of Culture Contact", *Man* 48: 101–102.
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1950a) "The Oriental Jews in Israel (A Report on a Preliminary Study in Culture-Contacts)", *Jewish Social Studies* 12 (3): 199–222.
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1950b) "Towards a Sociology of Youth in Modern Society", *Megamot* 2 (1): 52–72. [Hebrew]
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1951a) *Absorption of Immigrants in Israel (with Special Reference to Oriental Jews)*, *Research Seminar in Sociology*, Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the Jewish Agency [Private circulation]. *The Absorption of Immigrants: A Sociological Analysis*, Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jewish Agency for Israel, Department of Oriental Jews and Research Seminar in Sociology. [Hebrew version]
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1951b) "The Place of Elites and Primary Groups in the Absorption of New Immigrants in Israel", *American Journal of Sociology* 57 (3): 222–231.
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1951c) "Delinquent Group Formation among Immigrant Youth", *British Journal of Delinquency* 2: 34–35.
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1952a) "The Social Significance of Education in the Absorption of Immigrants", *Megamot* 3 (4): 330–341. [Hebrew]
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1952b) "The Process of Absorption of New Immigrants in Israel", *Human Relations* 5 (3): 223–246.
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1952c) "Institutionalization of Immigrant Behaviour", *Human Relations* 5 (4): 373–395.
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1952d) "Some Problems of Leadership among New Immigrants", *Megamot* 4 (2): 182–191. [Hebrew]
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1954a) *The Absorption of Immigrants: A Comparative Study Based Mainly on the Jewish Community in Palestine and the State of Israel*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul LTD.
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1954b) "Studies in Reference Group Behaviour: 1. Reference Norms and the Social Structure", *Human Relations* (7): 191–216.
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1956a) *From Generation to Generation: Age Groups and Social Structure*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1956b) *"The Present Situation of Research in Social and Cultural Absorption of Immigrants on Israel", Given at a Conference on the Cultural Integration of Immigrants*, Paris: UNESCO. UNESCO/ss/Mig.Conf./8, pp. 1–7.
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1967) *Israeli Society*, New York: Basic Books.
Eisenstadt, S.N. (1992) "Introduction: Intersubjectivity, Dialogue, Discourse and Cultural Creativity in the Work of Martin Buber", in: Eisenstadt, S.N. (ed.) *Martin Buber on Intersubjectivity and Cultural Creativity*, Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 1–22.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1995) *Power, Trust, and Meaning: Essays in Sociological Theory and Analysis*, Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (ed.) (2003) *Comparative Civilizations and Multiple Modernities* I, Leiden: Brill.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2010) *Multiple Modernities*, Tel Aviv: The Van Leer Jerusalem Institute and Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing House. [Hebrew]

Herzog, H. (1984) "The Terms 'Old Yishuv' and 'New Yishuv' – A Sociological Approach", *Cathedra* (32): 99–108. [Hebrew]

The Jewish Agency for Palestine. (1938) *Housing in Jewish Palestine*, Jerusalem: The Economic Research Institute of the Jewish Agency.

Kimmerling, B. (2001) *The End of Ashkenazi Hegemony*, Jerusalem: Keter. [Hebrew]

Kimmerling, B. (2007) "The Exhaustion of the Primary Zionist Program: S.N. Eisenstadt between Dynamic Conservatism and Critical Perspective", *European Journal of Sociology* 48 (1): 149–172.

Kuzar, R. (2015) "The Neologisms 'Yishev', 'Yishuv', and 'Moshava' in the Beginning of Modern Hebrew", in: Shenhav, Y., et al. (eds.) *Zionism and Empires*, Jerusalem: Van Leer Institute Press and Hakibbutz Hameuchad. [Hebrew]

Leshem, E., and Shuval, J. T. (eds.) (1998) *Immigration to Israel: Sociological Perspectives*, New Brunswick: Transaction.

Levy, G. (2002) "Ethnicity and Education: Nation-building, State-formation and the Construction of the Israeli Education System", PhD Dissertation. London School of Economics.

Mapai Elections Platform (1949) *The Municipal Historical Archives*, Tel Aviv: Mapai.

Merton, R.K. (1938) "Social Structure and Anomie", *American Sociological Review* 3 (5): 672–682.

Morris, B. (2008) *1948: A History of the First Arab-Israeli War*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Oron, Y. (2005) *The Pain of Knowledge: Holocaust And Genocide Issues In Education*, New Brunswick: Transaction.

Pappé, I. (2008) "Zionism as Colonialism: A Comparative View of Diluted Colonialism in Asia and Africa", *South Atlantic Quarterly* 107 (4): 611–633.

Piterberg, G. (1996) "Domestic Orientalism: The Representation of 'Oriental' Jews in Zionist/Israeli Historiography", *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 23 (2): 125–145.

Piterberg, G. (2008) *The Returns of Zionism: Myths, Politics and Scholarship in Israel*, London and New York: Verso.

Poliak, A.N. (1945) *The Jewish Community at the End of the World War*. Tel Aviv: Hashomer Hatzair. [Hebrew]

Poliak, A.N. (1951) *Khazaria: History of a Jewish Kingdom in Europe*, Tel Aviv: Bialik. [Hebrew]

Ram, U. (1995) *The Changing Agenda of Israeli Sociology*, New York: SUNY Press.

Ram, U. (2011) *Israeli Nationalism: Social Conflicts and the Politics of Knowledge*, New York: Routledge.

Raz-Krakotzkin, A. (1994) "Exile within Sovereignty: Toward a Critique of the 'Negation of Exile' in Israeli Culture (Part I and II)", *Theory and Critique* (4–5): 6–23, 113–132 [Hebrew]

Said, E.W. (1978) *Orientalism*, New York: Vintage Books.

Said, E.W. (1979) "Zionism from the Standpoint of Its Victims", *Social Text* 1: 7–58.

Said, E.W. (1980) *The Question of Palestine*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Shafir, G. (1989) *Land, Labor and the Origins of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, 1882–1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shafir, G. (2005) "Settler Citizenship in the Jewish Colonization of Palestine", in: Elkins, C., and Pedersen, S. (eds.) *Settler Colonialism in the Twentieth Century: Projects, Practices, Legacies*, New York and London: Routledge, pp. 41–57.

Shafir, G., and Peled, Y. (2002) *Being Israeli: The Dynamics of Multiple Citizenship*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shenhav, Y. (2006) *The Arab Jews: A Postcolonial Reading of Nationalism, Religion, And Ethnicity*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Shils, E. (1985) "S.N. Eisenstadt: Some Personal Observations", in: Cohen, E., Lissak, M., and Almagor, U. (eds.) *Comparative Social Dynamics: Essays in Honor of S.N. Eisenstadt*, Boulder and London: Westview Press, pp. 1–8.

Shohat, E. (1988) "Sephardim in Israel: Zionism from the Standpoint of Its Jewish Victims", *Social Text* (19/20): 1–35.

Shohat, E. (1999) "The Invention of the Mizrahim", *Journal of Palestine Studies* 29 (1): 5–20.

Smooha, S. (1978) *Israel: Pluralism and Conflict*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Smooha, S. (2004) "Jewish Ethnicity in Israel: Symbolic or Real", in: Rebhun, U., and Waxman, C.I. (eds.) *Jews in Israel: Contemporary Social and Cultural Patterns*, Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press, pp. 47–80.

The State of Israel. (1959) "Report of the Public Commission of Inquiry into the July 9, 1959 Disturbances in Wadi Salib", Submitted to the Cabinet on August 17, 1959.

Tiryakian, E.A. (1974) "Reflections on the Sociology of Civilizations", *Sociology of Religion* 35 (2): 122–128.

Tönnies, F. [1887] (2001) *Community and Civil Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weber, M. (1949) [1904] " 'Objectivity' in Social Science and Social Policy", in: Shils, A., and Finch, H.A. (eds.) *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, New York: Free Press, pp. 50–112.

Williams, R.M., Jr. (1960) [1951] *American Society: A Sociological Interpretation*, New York: Knopf.

Winter, J. (2006) *Dreams of Peace and Freedom: Utopian Moments in the Twentieth Century*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Wolfe, P. (2006) "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native", *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (4): 387–409.

Yair, G., and Apeloig, N. (2005) "Sociology in Jerusalem: The Shadow of It History", *Israeli Sociology* 7 (1): 95–122. [Hebrew]

Yiftachel, O. (1998) "Nation Building and the Division of Space: Ashkenazi Domination in the Israeli 'Ethnocracy'", *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 4 (3): 33–58.

Part II
Civilization

3 The short road from antiquity to modernity

The Jewish past and Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis

This chapter concerns Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis and focuses on his perception of the Jewish past as a history of an ancient civilization. The chapter suggests viewing Eisenstadt's attempt to think of the "Jewish historical experience" in Weberian civilizational terms, not only as an effort to lay out a comparative account that moves beyond his early structural-functionalist view of Israeli society, but rather as an endeavor to reaffirm the Zionist historiographical perception of Jewish history and to provide a sociological base for a definition of Judaism as a culture.

Eisenstadt's observation of Jews as "bearers" of a civilization (Eisenstadt 1992: 1), a position that stands at the center of his analysis, is interwoven with some of the dissonances and tensions that Israel's identity politics in the last third of the 20th century unfolded. Eisenstadt's attempt to apply the term "civilization" to the history of Jews draws on the Zionist historiographical perception of the "Jewish people" as the protagonist of Jewish history. According to this view, the term "Jewish people" does not connote a community of belief, but rather as a historical subject – a national collective that reclaims its place in history and its historical rights to a national territory. In this light, Eisenstadt's *Jewish Civilization* (1992) is examined as a source whose primary historical assumptions are based on Zionist historiography and as a sociological analysis whose ends is to provide further legitimation to this the ideological historiographical line.

To support this argument, the chapter shows how Zionist historiography, which conflates modern-day Jews with those of pre-modern times, plays a role in Eisenstadt's comparative historical sociological understanding of Jews and Jewish history. The chapter analyzes Eisenstadt's *Jewish Civilization* and other related writings in relation to Israel's shifts in identity politics: It does so particularly as it relates to the prevailing understating of Judaism as a culture.

The conception of Judaism as a culture can be seen as a counterreaction to the decline of the state-founding Labor Movement succeeding its temporary removal from power, after its loss of the 1977 elections, which has marked the end of its etatist rule. Conceptualizing Judaism as a culture reflected the growing need among intellectual elites of defining Judaism not according to religious criteria. This endeavor, however, resulted in a definition of Judaism which revolves across ethnocentric lines, a tendency that corresponds with the segregative practices Israel and its expanding military control administrated after the 1967 War.

The perception of Judaism as a culture – manifested for example in the works of Malkin (2003, 2006) and Schweid (2008) – regards Jewish identity separate from the religious dimensions of Judaism. While emphasizing secular humanistic values, this approach reiterates a concept of Judaism formulated in terms of national belonging. It argues for the uniqueness of the "Jewish people" and considers Zionism to be its "liberation" movement (Malkin 2003: 14, 18).

Eisenstadt's shift toward the civilizational approach, the foundation for his later multiple modernity thesis, reflected a significant revision of his initial structural-functionalist theoretical agenda. This revision and its application to the Jewish case can be understood in relation to the Zionist elite's need to redefine its relation to Judaism. This redefinition was especially crucial after 1977, when Jewish identity became a central mobilizing factor in Israel's electoral politics. This necessity also corresponds with one of the main socio-cultural processes that Israeli society underwent following the traumatic October 1973 War, namely, the growing emphasis of Jewish religious elements in the constitution of its collective national identity (Kimmerling 2001b: 35).

Jewish Civilization can thus be viewed as an attempt to provide the Israeli elite with a way of reformulating the initial Zionist secular agenda as a reaction to the rise of religious tendencies. In this context, defining Judaism within the civilizational frame provided a new and seemingly inclusive, secular definition of Judaism, depicting the latter as a form of "cultural vision". Yet this attempt can also be seen as an endeavor to provide the elite with the vocabulary and conceptual framework with which it could distinguish itself from the new religious-popular identity that emerged after 1977. *Jewish Civilization* can hence be seen as one of the main sources that heralded the emergence of a relatively new secular current in Israel's identity politics, one that sought to redefine Judaism as a distinct culture, shared by Jews regardless of their location and despite the absence of shared cultural practices common to all members.

Judaism is a significant criterion in the constitution of national belonging and group boundaries in the Israeli context. Attempts to define or re-define Judaism hence carry sociological meaning, for they directly relate to Israel's ethnic politics. Focusing on the Jewish civilizational vision enabled Eisenstadt to provide a secular redefinition to Judaism and Jews while leaving the socio-ethnic boundaries propagated by Zionism intact.

Eisenstadt's *Jewish Civilization* presents a Zionist-based comparative historical sociological analysis that draws on the Zionist historical imaginary of a contemporized Jewish past. Throughout Eisenstadt's analysis – an analysis that is tightly linked to the declining state-founding hegemony's efforts to re-imagine and re-conceptualize the borders of its identity – the Zionist national project is depicted as a part of an ancient civilizational vision.

Following this line of argument, the chapter underscores the moments when Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis of Jews and Judaism not only meets Zionist historiography but also rationalizes the ethnocentric notion of a primordial "Jewish people".

The analysis this chapter offers attends to two fundamental problems that illustrate the extent to which Zionist historiography is articulated and reproduced in Eisenstadt's *Jewish Civilization*. The first is the conceptual problem that deals with the question of continuity, a question presented in Eisenstadt's early writings, where it was linked to the problem of intergenerational continuation of value transmission (see Chapter 2). At the core of this discussion lies the assumption that the emphasis of continuity in Jewish history is a historically constructed notion that reflects a Zionist view of the Jewish past, aiming to draw an unbroken, continuous line from the ancient Hebrews to the Jewish communities of the present. The second problem deals with the application of contemporized terms and concepts in the historical depiction of antiquity. This form of anachronism, which Zionist historiography embeds, will be examined in relation to Eisenstadt's descriptions of the Second Temple period. This period is a central point of reference, often compared with the contemporary dynamics of Israeli society within the Zionist political discourse and national rituals.

This comparison, which idealizes the nation's glorious past and rests on the myth of return and revival (see Chapter 1), conveys the impression of circularity and repetition in the course of Jewish history, primarily by equating the ancient Hebrews with the modern Jews, and thereby reaffirming the notion of linear historical continuity. In attempting a critical reading of *Jewish Civilization*, it is crucial to understand Eisenstadt's turn to the civilizational approach, the theoretical shifts from which it ascended, and most importantly, its meaning as a synthesis of Max Weber's civilizational analysis and a revised version of structural functionalism.

The civilizational turn

The concept of civilization is the product of the discourse of Enlightenment (e.g. Rousseau [1755] 1994). In post-revolutionary times, the concept is most evident in Comte's early writings, where "the course of civilization" and the changes it necessitated are bound up with the term "the human race" (Comte 1998 [1822]: 103). The concept, which was tied to the rise of a "middle class" society in that period, denoted a society committed to civil laws, one "refined and mannered as well as virtuous in their social existence" (Mazlish 2004: 14). Mazlish regards the term as the part of "western reflection on the bonds that hold peoples together" and underscores its role in distinguishing the "civilized" from the "non-civilized" (ibid., 15). The idea of "civilization" emerged into the sociological discourse along with other terms and analytical categories used in the social sciences, such as "society" and "culture" (ibid.). As such, the term should be seen as an essential pole of the discourse of modernity, one that to this day refers to a broad array of social forms, relations, and structures.[1]

Tiryakian (2004: 30) notes that although the discourse of civilization was closely connected to the "ideology of modernity", it should be distinguished from the sociological tradition of civilizational analysis that discusses large-scale social structures. According to Delanty (2003: 15), in the framework of comparative

historical sociology the terms "civilization" and "civilizational constellation" are analytical concepts aimed at describing macro-social structures composed of diverse social units extending beyond the structure of the nation-state.

A civilizational constellation is thus identified as a social structure that has a geopolitical basis and is "primarily organized around evolving cultural models which are to varying degrees embodied in institutional frameworks" (ibid.). Apart from its geopolitical configuration, a civilizational constellation encompasses a "cultural or interpretative dimension" and entails a "socio-cognitive process". The term civilization, to sum, can be seen as an "ideal type" that is employed to describe a heterogeneous social structure that undergoes "continuous change" (ibid.).

Congruently, the civilizational perspective, as depicted by Delanty, "has the advantage of drawing attention to the importance of cultural factors in the shaping of history". The foundations of this analysis center on macro-cultural, social and historical units, and presupposes that the "macro sociocultural reality [. . .] has least common denominators greater than nation-states and lesser than a global unitary socioeconomic totality" (Tiryakian 2004: 32). Such a foundation can be traced back to a few constituting moments in the history of sociology, mainly in the works of Max Weber (2001 [1905]), Durkheim and Mauss (1971 [1913]), Elias (1978 [1939]), Jaspers (1956 [1949]), Voegelin (1956), and Nelson (1973).[2] Most notable was Alfred Weber's cultural sociology, where the concept of civilization was formulated in terms of a process rather than of an analytical unit (1998 [1921], 1935).

According to Levine (2004: 67), Max Weber's approach to civilizational dynamics, which played a crucial role in introducing the discourse of civilization into the comparative empirical study of societies, is fundamental in understanding Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis. Weber's understanding of civilizational dynamics emerged from his comparative sociology of religion and is found mainly in the central analytical concept of "Wirtschaftsethik" with which he linked Protestantism to capitalism and examined the ethical and economic spheres in relation to one another (Weber 2001 [1905]).[3] Within this conceptual framework, Weber underscored the potential of symbolic systems (culture) to facilitate institutional transformations (Eisenstadt 1968: xlvi).

In Eisenstadt's interpretation of Weber's "Wirtschaftsethik", cultural visions are understood as "constitutive elements of the construction of social order and institutional dynamics" (Eisenstadt 1989: 218). The constitutive function of these cultural visions is seen as they are transformed into the

> basic premises of different patterns of social interaction, i.e., into systems of rules that address themselves to the basic problem of such order [. . .] namely, the organization of the social division of labor, the construction of trust (or solidarity), the regulation of power, and the construction of meaning.
>
> (ibid.)

This process of institutionalization formation involves "the principles that regulate different arenas of social interaction". It is hence connected to the establishment

of a collective, or "the boundaries and criteria of membership in communities and collectivities, and the basic contours of the social centers" (ibid.).

According to Arnason, Weber approached the "major domains of social life as a framework of meaning, with an inbuilt tendency to become self-contained worlds, but also coexisting, competing and sometimes colliding within a broader field" (Arnason 2010: 72). Weber's civilizational analysis outlines how the economic spheres have emerged and remained sustained by ethical commitments leading to the creation of a "self-propelling system" (Arnason 2010: 80). In Eisenstadt's view, the process by which the "self-transformative power of charismatic symbols and activities" (Eisenstadt 1968: xlv) leads to an institutional change and transforms the societies in which it is grounded constitutes the core of Weber's approach to civilizational dynamics. These sociological observations which discuss the process of institutionalization, "the conditions under which new problems of order and meaning emerge" (ibid., l), and the upsurge of new social organizations established through "charismatic innovation and transformation" (ibid.) have laid the groundwork for Eisenstadt's Weber-oriented analysis of civilizations.

The sociographical roots of Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis

Eisenstadt's first preliminary accounts of the concept of civilization arise in the early 1970s following his reading of Weber's *Economy and Society* (*Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 1978 [1922, 1923]) and *Sociology of Religion* (*Religionssoziologie* 1993 [1920]). The foundation for Eisenstadt's comparative study of large-scale social units can be traced back to *The Political Systems of Empires* (1963), where he argued that the dynamics of different pre-industrial political systems could be understood in terms of "differentiation and the problems it engenders" (Eisenstadt 1990: 24).

Breaking from evolutionary assumptions (Eisenstadt 2003a: 6), Eisenstadt's comparative study of imperial formations, as presented in *The Political Systems of Empires*, was the first step heralding the "paradigmatic shift from structural-functional to civilization perspectives" (Arnason 2003a: 52). Nevertheless, it was not until his 1974 essay, "The Implications of Weber's Sociology of Religion for the Understanding of the Processes of Change in Contemporary Non-European Societies and Civilization",[4] that Eisenstadt drew attention to the transformative capacities of religions on "individual behavior and social organization in particular" (Eisenstadt 1974a: 88).

With Weber's "Wirtschaftsethik" in mind, Eisenstadt began to focus on the relations between symbolic belief systems and their possible institutional derivatives. This led him to withdraw to a certain degree from "mainstream modernization research" and examine large-scale structures such as empires and civilizations (Spohn 2001: 502). This resulted in a perceptual turn in which the nation-state could no longer be considered the "unquestioned analytical unit" as it was within the framework of structural functionalism (ibid.). Eisenstadt's critical reappraisal of Weber's comparative sociology rejected Weber's Eurocentrism on the one hand, and on the other hand accepted its "insistence on the configurational impact

of religion on socio-economic, legal and political structures in a universal comparative perspective and the particular importance of heterodox world-views and movements" (ibid.).

This critical reappraisal of Weber marked a new scholarly phase which Eisenstadt entered in the late 1960s, a stage that corresponded with broader meta-theoretical shifts that appeared in the field of sociology. Eisenstadt's revised stage is hence rooted not only in the critical reading of Weber but also in the rejection of certain basic structural-functionalist theoretical assumptions, succeeded by a new emphasis on the "role of institutional entrepreneurs", mostly "by recognizing the *autonomy of cultural visions* and in turn, their impact on the promulgation of various goals by both rulers and other groups" (Eisenstadt 2003a: 6, emphasis added).

The rediscovery of Max Weber in the early 1970s has led to a focus on a more fundamental problem that rose from "the nature of the processes through which the charismatic dimensions of human action became interwoven with processes of institution building or with the crystallization of institutional formations" (ibid., 12). This perceptual shift, emphasizing the role of cultural visions, laid out the groundwork for Eisenstadt's civilizational turn. It cannot be viewed separately from the crisis that social theory underwent in the 1970s. This crisis evolved from controversies in the social sciences, which according to Eisenstadt centered on the "non-givenness of any institutional formations and on the necessity of explaining the process through which such formations are crystalized and change" (ibid., 13).

These controversies, which would later be known as a part of the "cultural turn", were interwoven in a critical revision of the structural-functionalist approach and in the emergence of "counter-models" that emphasized "the symbolic dimension of social life", seen for example in Levi-Strauss's structuralism and the "Neo-Marxist dialectical-historical models" (Eisenstadt 1974b: 148). Alexander described this moment as a turning point in the history of social thought, "a period of intensive and extensive conflict over definitions of disciplinary boundaries, over the methodological choices that would distinguish this discipline from others, over ideological and philosophical concerns" (Alexander 1977: 658).

Hence, Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis ran parallel to the rejection of some of the prevailing assumptions in social theory attributed to the structural-functionalist approach. According to Eisenstadt, this rejection centered on "the social division of labor as being at the core of the constitution of social orders", and has subsequently led to a "reconsideration of the epistemological and ontological standing of the major concepts of sociological analysis – especially those of culture, social structure, and individuals – and of the relations between them" (Eisenstadt 2003a: 13).

The theoretical problems which emerged during the 1970s engendered various developments in social theory. One of these is Wallerstein's *The Modern World System* (1974). Ramirez (1982: 12) notes that Wallerstein's comparative large-scale study of structures and long-term processes is one of the most profound expressions attesting to the theoretical change of approaches. According to Eisenstadt, such developments have led to shifts in the "definition and status of both culture and social structure" (Eisenstadt 2003a: 16). As Eisenstadt himself

claimed, the repositioning of the term "culture" was interwoven with his own theoretical shift of perspective, leading him to shift from the study of comparative institutions to comparative civilizational analysis (ibid., 17; Delanty 2004: 392).

The attempts to discuss the autonomy of culture were the primary goal of what came to be known as the "civilizational turn". In his key article, "The Civilizational Dimension in Sociological Analysis", Eisenstadt maintained that the civilizational turn is "best understood as an attempt to do full justice to the autonomy of culture" (Eisenstadt 2000: 1). This view was guided by two main priorities: first, to observe culture separately from the process of structural differentiation, a process that until the early 1970s provided the main criterion by which societies were compared (ibid.); and second, to theoretically approach culture without "conceding the issue to cultural determinism" (ibid.). As explained in the succeeding chapter, the new understanding of culture as independent from structure provided the theoretical foundation of multiple modernities thesis.

Cultural ontologies

During the early and mid-1970s, the term "civilization" was not yet clearly distinguished from the terms "religion" and "society" in Eisenstadt's work (e.g. Eisenstadt 1974a: 84). In that early stage in the development of Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis, "civilization" denoted vast social changes that occurred over centuries. It was only in the following decade that the concepts diverged from one another, leading Eisenstadt to adopt a far more inclusive theoretical view that regards civilizations as "cultural ontologies" – according to Arnason's paraphrased interpretation of Weber's "cultural worlds" (Arnason 2003a: 87–88, 2010: 96).

The concept of cultural ontologies relates to the visions, universals, and perceptions of the world that are deeply entrenched in social lives. From this theoretical perspective, the concept of civilization was theorized as cosmological visions which account for both the profane and the sacred, the correlation between the two, as well as for their potential to constitute a social order, to transform it, and to established new orders according to the changing interpretations of those visions (Arnason 2004: 106).

Eisenstadt's "cultural ontologies" is a theoretical synthesis that has its sociographical roots in two main theoretical standpoints, or critiques: The first is the aforementioned critique of Weber, where Eisenstadt called to examine how "structural and cultural potentialities" – potentialities that provided the enabling conditions of the development of capitalism – can be applied to "other Great Civilizations" – non-Occidental societies in particular (Eisenstadt 1996: 237).

The second element of the synthesis concerns Eisenstadt's refusal to abandon altogether the structural-functionalist emphasis on institutional formation (Eisenstadt 2003a: 17). This objection is part of Eisenstadt's broader critique of the rejection of the structural-functionalist approach, a rejection connected to the "growing dissociation between the studies of culture and those of social structure" (ibid., 16). Eisenstadt regarded this dismissive approach that characterized the new shifts in

the "definitions and statues of both culture and social structure" as theoretically flawed due to the analytical neglect of the "construction of the division of labor, and of rules and norms, rates and institutions" (ibid.).

For Eisenstadt, the importance of those elements in the constitution of social lives was either "taken for granted, simply ignored, or seen as derived from culture [. . .]. In a sense what took place here was that the 'baby' – division of labor, rules, norms, and institutions – was thrown out with the 'water' of the closed structural functional analysis" (ibid.). Eisenstadt's notion of "cultural ontologies" thus enabled him to (1) withdraw from his earlier structural-functionalist dichotomous distinction between "modern" (Western, developed) and "traditional" (non-Western, undeveloped) societies – a distinction which is most evident in his *Social Differentiation and Stratification* (Eisenstadt 1971b, see also Eisenstadt 1970a); (2) to withdraw from the tendency to regard societies as "closed units" (Eisenstadt 1977a: 63);[5] and (3) to establish his own theoretical framework that rested on a revised version of elements from both Weber's civilizational analysis and structural functionalism.

During the mid-1980s and early 1990s, Eisenstadt's complete account of the term "civilization" was formulated in relation to his aforementioned dual critique and was defined as a social framework that includes

> attempts to construct or reconstruct social life according to an ontological vision that combines conceptions of the nature of the cosmos, of transmundane and mundane reality, with the regulation of the major arenas of social life and interaction of the political arena, authority, the economy, family life and the like.
>
> (Eisenstadt 1992: 13)

Nearly a decade afterward, Eisenstadt presented a more concise formulation of the dynamics described above, defining civilizational formations as based on "combinations of cultural visions of the world with regulative frameworks of social life" (Eisenstadt 2000: 1). The relations between the "two levels" – the visional and the regulative, the "structural and ideational" (Eisenstadt et al. 2002: 10) – are defined as "open to conflicting interpretations and strategic use of them" (ibid., 1). It is here that Eisenstadt identified the "cultural" in relation to the institutional derivatives of the ontological.

In an autobiographical note, Eisenstadt revealed that the broad framework of comparative civilizational analysis aimed to focus on "the process through which relations between the construction of trust (solidarity) and of meaning, and their impact on institutional and cultural dynamics", are interwoven in the shaping, reproduction, and change of social formation (Eisenstadt 2003a: 17). In addition, it has attempted to theoretically "redefine the relations between agency, culture and social structure" (ibid.).

In this late theoretical version of the term, Eisenstadt drew a distinction between the concept of civilization and religion, arguing that although civilizations and religions are tightly interwoven, religions are to be seen as "only a part or a component of civilization and not necessarily the most central component"

(Eisenstadt 1992: 13). As mentioned earlier, this distinction was absent from his earlier accounts and application of the term.

Eisenstadt's comparative civilizational analysis rests on several additional assumptions, the first being the analytical difference between the religious aspects that constitute "components of the basic cultural premises" and their "later 'secular' perspective", seen in "patterns of belief, rituals and worship" (ibid., 13–14). The second assumption centers on recognizing that those aforementioned premises are rooted in ontological visions that play a crucial role in the process of institutionalization (ibid., 14).

Based on these assumptions, Eisenstadt's civilizational approach accounts explicitly for "the interrelation between ontological visions or conceptions of the world, on the one hand, and the major arenas of institutional life patterns of social stratification on the other" (ibid.). Two main aspects are derived from these interrelations between the "ontological" and "institutional": The first concerns the reinterpretation of basic ontological visions, while the second refers to the "symbolic and ideological – i.e. cultural – definitions of the different arenas of human activity in general and the political arena in particular" (ibid.). The second concerns the idea of culture, which in the specific sense Eisenstadt renders, mediates "definitions of the major arenas of social activity" and sets the "ground rules that regulate social interaction and the flow of resources" (ibid.).

Culture is thus a meta-regulative framework in which the "contours and boundaries of the major institutional arenas" are constructed (ibid.). This framework is also characterized by built-in tensions. The existence of those rests on the assumption that any institutional formation, system, or pattern of social interaction cannot be fully stable in the long run given that "the very processes of control, symbolic and organizational alike, through which such patterns are formed [. . .] generate tendencies to protest, conflict and change" (ibid., 16).

The existence of such perennial tensions supports the assumption that institutional systems are never "fully 'homogeneous'" (ibid.). In his article "Center Formation, Protest Movements" (Eisenstadt et al. 1987), Eisenstadt sheds light on the basic assumptions of the civilizational approach relating to protest and dissent: "It is not possible", he writes, "to understand fully many central aspects of political process by taking the definition of the state and of political institutions solely in terms of political power and of the activities of different political and administrative agents" (ibid., 1). "The crux of this approach", he elucidates,

> is that the analysis of the formation and the dynamics of institutional settings of different societies has to take into account the basic premises of civilizations and the implications of those processes through which social action is structured and perduring normative order is established.
>
> (ibid., 7)

Eisenstadt ties this approach to dimensions of dissent and protest in the formation and emergence of social orders. Given that "every social order contains a strong element of dissent", the possibility of an "anti-system" is always present (ibid., 7). It is the existence of "anti-systems" in the form of protests – "social

movements and cultural and religious heterodoxies" – that has the ability to constitute "systemic change" (ibid., 8).

Eisenstadt's civilizational approach is presented as a dialectical process, acknowledging that "the very construction of such a civilizational or social system also generates conflict and contradictions which may lead to transformation or decline, that is, to a different mode of reconstructing their boundaries" (ibid.). Therefore these tendencies have had an immense influence on "the directions of institutional change" and on the entire shaping of institutional orders (ibid.). Protests, rebellions, and elements of dissent are primary factors in the transformation of the social structure (Eisenstadt 1978).

Axiality

Eisenstadt's acknowledged contribution to comparative civilizational analysis draws on another no less significant idea: the concept of axial civilizations (Arnason 2010; Tiryakian 2011; Mandalios 2003). The idea of the axial age emerged in the late 18th century from the work of Anquetil DuPerron (J. Assmann 2005: 39) and was further developed in 19th-century scholarship (A. Assmann 1989, mentioned in Arnason 2005: 21f).

The concept's development within the sociological discourse continued into the 20th century (Wagner 2005: 90), when axiality appeared in the works of Max Weber (1996 [1916]) and Alfred Weber (1935). The latter introduced the concept of secondary breakthroughs (Giesen 2012: 105), which Eisenstadt later adopted to depict modernity as a "second axial age". The notion of Axiality reemerged in the post– World War II period in the works of two of Alfred Weber's students: Jaspers (1956 [1949]) and Voegelin (1956) (Arnason 2005; Wagner 2005: 90; J. Assmann 2005: 39).

The discourse about the axial age regained momentum with the works of Eisenstadt, who along with Schluchter, Arnason, Wittrock, and other scholars reintroduced the concept of axiality to the sociological discourse (Thomassen 2010: 330; Eisenstadt et al. 2005), making it the focus of "a sustained research program" (Wittrock 2005: 62).

Eisenstadt's studies of axiality were deeply informed by Jaspers's *The Origin and Goal of History* (1956 [1949]), where the latter employed the concept of axial age (Achsenzeit) to point to the main cultural centers that have shaped "world history", namely "the common frame of historical self-comprehension for all people – for the West, for Asia and for all men on earth" (Jaspers 1956 [1949]: 1). Profoundly influenced by Jaspers's understanding of axiality, Eisenstadt employed the concept to underscore the simultaneous emergence of

> those (great) civilizations which developed in the first millennium before the period between ca. 500 BCE and the Christian era – namely in Ancient Greece, in Ancient China in the early Imperial period, Hinduism and Buddhism and much later, beyond the Axial Age proper, in Islam.
>
> (Eisenstadt 2004: 220)

According to Wittrock, Jaspers's axial age hypothesis assumes an "intellectual and cosmological shift" that coincided in the "Eurasian hemisphere". This period was marked by the transition from *Mythos* to *Logos*, the breakthrough in critical reflectivity, the development of historical consciousness and agentiality (Wittrock 2005: 62, 63, 67).[6]

Eisenstadt understood Jaspers's concept of axial age as a major macro-structural change that took place in antiquity, and as "one of the greatest and revolutionary breakthroughs that have shaped contours of human history" (Eisenstadt 2003a: 91, 2003c: 280). Eisenstadt regarded the axial civilizations as societal formations to be linked by common tensions rooted in a fundamental chasm between the mundane and transcendental worlds. In Eisenstadt's view, these axial civilizations shared "concomitant stress on the existence of a higher transcendental moral or metaphysical order which is beyond any given this- or other-worldly reality" (Eisenstadt 1986a: 1).

Giesen further sheds light on the tensions that defined the axial transformations, arguing that during this "epoch"

> the order of the transcendent world was not restricted in terms of time and space; rather, it exists at all times and everywhere and claimed universal validity. The sacred, the divine, and principled order had no longer a special place nor moment in this world. It became disembodied, timeless and placeless. Everything that opposed this universality or that claimed an exception challenged the unity of the world. The problem of salvation emerged.
>
> (Giesen 2012: 102)

In the sphere of axiality, which Jaspers identifies as a liminal period (Thomassen 2010: 333), the tensions between the sacred and the profane emerge from the attempt to represent the divine in the material world. These are considered the base from which new institutional patterns and forms of agency developed in those civilizations (Eisenstadt 1986a: 1). Following Jaspers, Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis regarded the chasm between the sacred and mundane as one that every "working social order would have to find a way to bridge" (Alexander 1992: 85). Concomitantly, such epistemic tensions and the attempts to solve them are seen as playing a crucial role in constituting the civilizational sphere.

According to Eisenstadt's understanding of Jaspers's concept of axiality, order-establishing tendencies are associated with elite groups whose role is to implement the cultural visions that are formed as a solution of the sacred/profane tension. Concomitantly, for Eisenstadt, agency is that which ties culture to structure. In this scheme, agents are carriers of a cultural/civilizational vision and those who mediate it into the institutional sphere. This connection, according to Eisenstadt, was created by a new form of agency that emerged during the axial age.

The "axial revolutions" of the first millennium BCE and their "irreversible effects" facilitated a new type of agency which Eisenstadt referred to as "a relatively new social element", manifested in the rise of new intellectual elites that

> became aware of the necessity to actively construct the world according to some transcendental vision. The successful institutionalization of such conceptions and visions gave rise to extensive re-ordering of the internal contours of societies as well as their internal relations. This changed the dynamic of history and introduced the possibility of world history or histories.
>
> (Eisenstadt 1986a: 1)

Elite groups, according to Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis, have a crucial role in carrying out the process of institutional formation and setting society's institutional structure, "including the boundaries of different collectivities and the center of societies and sectors thereof" (Eisenstadt 1990: 26). Elite groups are seen as the regulators of political power, and as those that "tend to exercise different modes of control over the allocation of basic resources" (Eisenstadt 1992: 15, 16). Eisenstadt does not identify the elite as a heterogeneous stratum. In his 1990 "Modes of Structural Differentiation, Elite Structure and Cultural Visions", Eisenstadt enumerates three types of elites: the first is political elites that deal most directly with the regulation of power; the second is concerned mainly with the creation of meaning; and the third "articulates solidarity [. . .] and addresses itself to the construction of trust" (Eisenstadt 1990: 25). According to this division, social change is generated "through the activities of the secondary elite" aiming to mobilize resources and groups in order to change aspects of social orders set by the coalition of the "ruling elite" (Eisenstadt 1992: 16–17).

Based on the new emerging agency of the elite that paved the way for processes of institutionalization, the attempt to bridge and reconstruct the chasm between the mundane and transcendental order was central to the axial civilizations (Eisenstadt 1990: 44). This attempt was carried out by a new elite that monopolized "production and control of symbols and media" (Eisenstadt 1986a: 4), bringing about internal tensions and ushering in "a new type of social and civilizational dynamics in the history of mankind" (ibid.).

This analysis, most importantly, tends to emphasize the autonomy of culture over structural variables, although it does take "political-ecological settings" and intersocietal factors into account when discussing the process of social change (Eisenstadt 1986b: 315).

Wittrock maintains that in order for modernity to be meaningfully understood, it should be analyzed "in relation to other processes of cultural crystallization in global history, in particular [. . .] Axial Age" (Wittrock 2005: 61). Indeed, Eisenstadt's great contribution to comparative civilizational analysis is evident in the link he established between axial, post-axial civilizations, and modernity as a second axial age. According to Eisenstadt, one of the main factors linking those civilizations to one another is heterodox movements, which paved the way for the great political revolutions of modernity, heralding institutional/social change (Eisenstadt 1987a: 9–10, 2003a: 178). In Alexander's interpretation of Eisenstadt, the former adds that whereas pre-axial societies maintained "homologous relations between the divine and the mundane", post-axial societies "are convicted of a profound dualism, a wrenching split between the sacred and profane" (Alexander 1992: 88–89).

Moreover, Eisenstadt argues that these long-term processes were accompanied by tensions and antinomies that led to "the high degree of symbolic orientation and ideologization of the major aspects of the institutional structure". Eisenstadt adds that this applies in particular to "the structure of collectivities, social centers, social hierarchies, and processes of political struggle" (Eisenstadt 1986a: 6). Such a sociological analysis can be traced back to Buber's social philosophy that regarded aspiration for collective liberation as the secular embodiment of religious longing for redemption (Buber 1961; see Ohana 2012: 48).

Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis discusses vast institutional changes caused by the tensions that the axial age generated. Among them were the new "structuring of legitimation", "center formation", "emergence of multiplicity of visions", and "the growth of reflexivity" – all of which provided the groundwork for the "civilization of modernity" to emerge (ibid.).

Eisenstadt's civilizational approach in the context of Israel

Eisenstadt's theoretical shift toward the civilizational approach should be explained in light of socio-political changes that occurred in Israel. Ram, associating Eisenstadt's civilizational approach with the "wake of Max Weber's comparative sociology of religious ethics" (Ram 1995: 51), regards this theoretical turn and its embedded pursuit of the "charismatic dimension of social order" in Israel as a result of the declining status of the Labor Zionist elite and the breakdown of "the normative consensus" it established (ibid., 51–52). According to Ram, Eisenstadt, an "entrenched Zionist and sociological idealist", could not "accede to an 'Israeli society' devoid of a 'normative core' or 'charismatic center', which was once occupied by the Labor movement" (ibid.). Ram maintains that Eisenstadt's shift of approaches was

> tantamount to arguing that the functional equivalent of that missing core or center is from now on "Jewish Civilization". While Eisenstadt has now accomplished a radical meta-theoretical shift from a functional paradigm of systematic modernity to an idealistic paradigm of civilizational traditionality, the deep structure of his analysis of Israel remained intact. From this recent angle present tendencies in Israeli society are simply conceived as manifestations of the civilizational tensions between universality and particularism that run through Jewish history, just as previously such tensions were attributed to the "pioneering ideology" of Labor.
>
> (ibid., 52)

Whereas Ram frames *Jewish Civilization* as a reaction to the decline of the Zionist Labor movement hegemony, this chapter analyzes *Jewish Civilization* by focusing on its reproduction of the mythic foundation of Zionist identity and historiographic construction of the Jewish past, and in light of the rising tendency to regard Judaism as a culture. Zionist historiographical perspectives were essential in sculpturing Eisenstadt's initial understanding of *Jewish Civilization*.

Images of the Jewish past

Jewish Civilization begins by pointing out the inadequacy of the terms with which the "Jewish historical experience" is discussed:

> The best way to look at the Jewish historical experience is to analyze it as a history of a civilization [. . .] and not only as a history of people, religious, ethnic, or national group. Indeed, the very fact that all these terms can be applied to the analysis of the Jewish historical experience indicates that none of them is sufficient.
>
> (Eisenstadt 1992: 2)

As depicted in the text, "religion", "nation", "ethnic group", and "people" are considered important concepts – albeit insufficient – to describe the Jewish historical experience (ibid., 5). The terms "nation" and "ethnic group" are found particularly insufficient because they refer to "types of collectives that have developed in modern times" (ibid.). "Religion", Eisenstadt writes, "is inadequate to explain all aspects of their [Jews] historical experience, because there's more to it than religion" (ibid.). Eisenstadt traces one example of this insufficiency back to "the Jews' ideological and metaphysical attitudes toward the land of Israel, from which they were exiled for so long" (ibid.).

This claim corresponds with a Zionist prism that regards Jews not just as a religious community but as an ideological community. Exile from and longings for the "land of Israel" are deemed evidence of the ideological consciousness shared by all Jews. In this regard, it's important to view the aforementioned motives – "Exile" and the "Land of Israel" – as elements in a narrative in which the Zionist project is being imagined as a return to the ancient territory and as the end of diasporic existence. Hence, Eisenstadt's claim is based on Zionist presuppositions and is not detached from its discourse.

Eisenstadt views the problem of the fundamental inadequacy of the terms with which Jewish identity is discussed with the question of continuity, which according to him has characterized Jewish history:

> Though all these terms [religion, nation, ethnic group] contain important elements of truth, their inadequacy becomes apparent when we attempt to explain the great variety of Jewish historical experience from the early Israelite era up to modern times, and above all when we consider what probably is the greatest riddle of the Jewish historical experience: its continuity through some three millennia.
>
> (ibid., 6)

Eisenstadt's emphasis on the continuity of the Jewish historical experience assumes it to be a cohesive frame that carries a set of essential characteristics that have been maintained throughout "three millennia". This claim of continuity is an assumed given, that is, a historical fact, and not a politically constructed idea. This

presumed continuity of the Jewish historical experience is especially problematic because Jewish communities, existing on different continents and geographically detached from one another, lived amid different cultural surroundings and as such were subjected to fundamentally different historical processes. The cultural diversity that characterized different Jewish groups, especially in the absence of modern means of communication, makes it difficult to trace cultural continuity among different Jewish communities.

The question of "Jewish continuity"

Examining the various definitions that may or may not be attributed to Jews and "Jewish continuity", Eisenstadt suggests the possibility of observing this continuity "as that of a 'people'" (ibid., 9). However, this suggestion is found equally lacking because in Eisenstadt's view, it is impossible to speak of people as a group that has no territory, but "only *memories* or *hopes* of *return* to a territory, and a strong political orientation, but no autonomous or independent political entity or political-territorial continuity" (ibid., 9, emphasis added). To a large extent, not only does this argument rest on a Zionist view in which the pre-state stage of "Exile" represents an abnormal phase in Jewish history, but it furthermore evinces a Romanticist perception that regards political-territorial continuity as the primary criterion defining peoplehood.

Eisenstadt's emphasis on continuity appears in other related sources. In a paragraph from *The Transformation of Israeli Society* (1985), Eisenstadt notes that many different political structures, such as those of the "Assyrians or Babylonians – and of course the Egyptians" became mighty empires. Yet, these empires, he maintains, "did not create the type of civilizational, cultural distinctiveness – and continuity – that the Jewish people did" (ibid., 9). This perception is related to the Zionist discourse, where "the Jewish people" is viewed as the most ancient people that survived from antiquity (Sand 2010: 16).

In his preface to *Explorations in Jewish Historical Experience* (2004), Eisenstadt's central assumption on which his analysis of the Jewish historical experience rests is that "there is a strong kernel of continuity and specificity in this experience throughout the ages and across different places" (ibid., ix). This form of continuity was mentioned in an earlier text, from the early 1980s, where it was formulated as "collective religious-national-primordial identity which continuously incorporated, transformed, selected and referred to earlier elements and which spanned the early periods" (Eisenstadt 2004 [1981]: 8).

Continuity, as a form of cross-generational transformation of earlier elements of Jewish collective identity is being distinguished from forms of territorial continuity and is also seen as detached from "relatively distinctive political territorial boundaries" (Eisenstadt 2004a: xii). It is this interpretive practice, disconnected from the territorial dimension, which seems to distinguish the Jewish civilization from other axial age civilizations (ibid.). This interpretive mode was founded in the axial period and has stretched into modernity, and is observed as a "distinctive feature of the modern Jewish experience". The continuity of the "Jewish

experience" is hence sociologically characterized as a "continuity of mutual relations, mutual references, and foci of common interest and of continual – contestual and contestational – discourse that developed among the various Jewish communities of the different Diasporas and later on between them and the state of Israel" (Eisenstadt 1992a: 252). As such, the continuity of the "Jewish experience" is shaped by an internal discourse that grapples with Jewish identity, spread across different time spans, and shared by various Jewish communities.

Eisenstadt's use of the term "experience" should be deciphered. The term "experience" connotes a sense of subjectivity, of a history that is being observed, in this case, from the perspective of Jews. The term has two different meanings: The first signifies an encounter with the historical realm (*Erfahrung*), whereas the second refers to some form of existential state, the phenomenological aspect of the human encounter with the world (*Erlebnis*). This equivocal term thus enables Eisenstadt to speak of a "historical experience" and not of history. Methodologically speaking, this means that *Jewish Civilization* does not ask to follow what historical study entails. The term "experience" therefore enables Eisenstadt to include in his civilizational analysis interpretations concerning the subjective perspective in his approach to Jewish history. In this light, the text should be addressed as a meta-historic analysis of collective consciousness rather than a critical historical study that grapples with contested historical "truths". This is a problematic goal given that collective consciousness is also historically constructed and cannot be addressed as an object that lies outside the realm of history.

Eisenstadt's *Jewish Civilization* therefore does not ask to entangle a historical question, but rather goes on to claim that "the external facts of Jewish history are well known" (ibid., 6), leaving the impression that the history of Jews is a sealed set of agreed facts. The latter presupposition, it can be argued, enables Eisenstadt to adopt a hegemonic view of Jewish history, dominated by Zionist historiography. *Jewish Civilization* can therefore be observed as a source from which one can learn about how the Jewish past is being represented using the framework of civilizational analysis, and as a text that sheds light upon how historical political memory was being shaped in Israel in the last decade of the 20th century.

Eisenstadt offers his civilizational approach as a conceptual framework to provide an adequate explanation of the Jewish historical experience, as well as adequate terminology to account for its continuity: "only if one looks at this experience in civilizational terms", Eisenstadt maintains, "may one begin to cope with the greatest riddle of that experience; namely, with its *continuity* despite destruction, exile, loss of political independence, and loss of territorial continuity" (ibid., 2, emphasis added).

This extract exemplifies Eisenstadt's adaption of Zionist political memory and its narrative of Jewish history – a view that focuses on the loss of "political independence" and "territorial continuity", which eventually resulted in exile, as its central motives. These events are depicted as having occurred in ancient times, yet they are anachronistically described in modern national eyes, centering on political independence and territorial continuity as evidence of pre-modern expressions of Jewish nationalism.

This view, which assumes continuity despite the existence of historical ruptures, appears in several other places throughout *Jewish Civilization* as well as in Eisenstadt's former texts, such as *Comments on the Continuity of Some Jewish Historical Forms in Israeli Society* (1977b). In this text, Eisenstadt identifies the roots of Jewish political and social-religious in the Second Temple period, "in time the [Jewish] people set on *its* land" (Eisenstadt 1977b: 27, emphasis added). This claim embeds a contemporized perception of national territorial relations of belonging and collective ownership.

Eisenstadt's concise description of Jewish history maintains that it has

> emerged sometime in the middle of the second millennium before the Christian era (BCE). Its first decisive encounter was the conquest of the land or infiltration to Canaan by the Tribes of Israel, according to biblical tradition, and the leadership of Joshua, presumably already bearing the stamp of legislation attributed to Moses; and the settlement of these tribes in Canaan. Such conquest, quite natural in those times in that part of the world, necessarily entailed a continuous encounter and conflict with their neighbors, the various nations or tribes that also had settled in that territory. This was initially, in the period of the Judges, a relatively dispersed one, with the different tribes leading relatively separate existences, yet with some common sacred places, coming together to some degree in times of war, and maintaining some *continuous* common transtribal identity.
>
> (Eisenstadt 1992a: 6, emphasis added)[7]

Eisenstadt's constitutive moment of Jewish history begins with the period of the Joshuaian conquests – a period strongly emphasized in the Zionist historiography as a formative moment of the Jewish collective (Sand 2010). This specific choice, to describe Jewish historical experience starting from the period of the Joshuaian conquests, is not arbitrary (Kimmerling 2001a: 17). It is the moment in which the Bible begins to narrate a series of events that took place as the "people of Israel" entered the "promised land". In the corpus of Zionist historiography, these events depicted in the Book of Joshua are perceived as actual historical events and their biblical description as historical accounts. The focus on the Joshuaian conquests emphasizes the ancient presence of ancient Hebrews in the ancient territory, thereby highlighting the historical right to the "land of Israel". The biblical narrative of the Joshuaian conquests – one of the foundations for the Zionist myths of origin and territory – provides legitimacy to the territorial claims Zionism made in relation to "the land", the politically imagined space which Zionists saw themselves historically entitled to as the descendants of the ancient Hebrews.

In addition, the source quoted above regards the common tribal identity and the wars it was involved in as the first signs of national consciousness. This anachronistic position rests solely on the Bible, which is regarded as a reliable historical source while its theosophical aspects are overlooked. The practice of accepting the Bible's historical descriptions as historical facts without considering their theosophical or pedagogical dimensions is essential to Zionist historiography.

Correspondingly, the narrative in which national awareness is traced to antiquity is reproduced in Eisenstadt's opening words describing the Jewish historical experience.

According to Eisenstadt's description, the most important features of the ancient period, which was characterized by a "relative profusion" and "heterogeneity of social, economic and cultural forms" (Eisenstadt 1992a: 6), is seen first and foremost in the "covenant ideology" (ibid., 30). The second feature is the rise of a new elite, consisting of priest and prophets, who mediated this ideology. These two features distinguished the ancient Jewish civilization from its "seeming counterparts in neighboring societies" (ibid., 6).

The prophets and the moral vision they preached are perceived in Eisenstadt's account as charismatic elements in the ancient Jewish collective identity. As such, these charismatic elements provide a base for the process of institutional formation to evolve, and would remain present in Jewish lives until modernity (Eisenstadt 2004a: 31). In addition, the prophets are perceived in Eisenstadt's account as an elite whose moral vision was directed to bridging the chasm between the mundane and transcendental order (Eisenstadt 1992a: 17).

Eisenstadt's emphasis on Jewish prophecy drew Alexander's attention. He commented that Eisenstadt's "civilizational sociology" regarded the ancient Hebraic experience as one that "could become the prototype for future systems of accountability, that the prophetic model could become secularized and civilized, that it could form a basis for the routine functioning of a wide range of social institutions" (Alexander 1992: 90).

Eisenstadt's emphasis on prophecy and the moral fervor of the prophets defines the axial dimension of the Jewish civilization, a dimension that eventually stretched into modernity. Its most visible expression in modernity is seen in the adoption of the prophets' moral stand by the modern state of Israel, as an integral part of its political vision (seen for example in "The Declaration" [1948]).

The focus on the moral fervor of prophets, with which Eisenstadt "identifies himself and his work" (Alexander 1992: 90), can be viewed as another dominant element which Zionist historiography stresses. The latter tends to portray the morals of the prophets as a secularized proto-humanistic ethics that is disconnected from the Bible's theosophical roots or from the world-view of the biblical editors who propagated it. This kind of moral notion is seen as unique to the "Jewish People" and as the ethical vision that shaped the institutional patterns in which Jews lives were maintained.

Eisenstadt refers to the "period of the monarchy established first under Saul, then David and Solomon", that dates back to the tenth century BCE (Eisenstadt 1992a: 6), and points to the attempts to centralize it as "the First Temple was erected under Solomon". Eisenstadt later refers to the division of the realm into the two Kingdoms of Judah and of Israel and specifies that the disintegration of the latter, which occurred when "the Assyrians destroyed the Kingdom of Israel in 722 [BCE]", caused the ten Israelite tribes to almost "disappear as a distinct cultural and political entity" (ibid.). "The Davidic monarchy", he summarized,

> the priestly cults and the prophetic tradition in Judah with its center in Jerusalem faced ultimate destruction in 586 [BCE]. Large parts of the population, especially its leaders, were exiled to Babylon, and the dispersion to other lands, especially to Egypt, began.
>
> (ibid., 6–7)

"Up to this point", Eisenstadt argues,

> the story, although very dynamic and to some degree dramatic, was not unique, and the Israelite *nation* would have disappeared from the face of subsequent history as did so many other *nations* in this region at that time. But they did not disappear and in this they are unique.
>
> (ibid., 7, emphasis added)

Here the question of continuity reappears as one may ask, what is it that enables the continuity of this identity which is formulated in terms of *nation*? Eisenstadt turns to describe a series of historical events that led to the building of the Second Temple:

> many of the exiles kept the *dream of returning to Zion*. After the Persian conquests of Babylon [. . .] they – or rather some of them – started to *return* to *Erez Israel* and joined those who remained there in a state of decline. Then under the vigorous leadership of Ezra and Nehemia they reestablished and reconstructed their religious and communal-political institutions, rebuilt the temple, and forged a new *national identity* (yet one based on continuous reference to the former period and its symbols) and new political organizations.
>
> (ibid., 7, emphasis added)

This description correlates entirely with the Zionist narrative concerning the Jewish past. The vocabulary it is discussed with – as a *dream of returning to Zion*, the *return to Eretz Israel* that is perceived as a national territory and not as a theosophical motive, as well as the attempt to create a new *national identity* during this period – all point to a highly romanticized and nationalized view of Jewish history that corresponds with the dominant view of Zionist historiography.

The anachronistic application of the terms *nation* and *national identity*, employed in the last fragment, ought to be explained. It is impossible to identify a sense of nationalism in antiquity, for nationalism is a notable modern phenomenon, as Eisenstadt himself has argued (ibid., 143).[8] Furthermore, the biblical narrative that centers on the return to Zion is also being accepted as a historical fact and not as a late literary construction of the Deuteronomistic editors. In fact, critical theories that account for the Bible as a literary source, subject to historical analysis, are missing from Eisenstadt's account.

Eisenstadt then recapitulates the late history of the Second Temple during the Hellenistic period, stretching from the Hasmonean theocracy, the inner Jewish Wars, and the Roman rule in Judah which led to "the great war or rebellion against

the Romans (66–7 CE)", and resulted in the destruction of the second temple in 70 CE and "the loss of political independence, and ultimately dispersion" (ibid., 8). Eisenstadt identifies the Second Temple era as a critical period that shaped Jewish collective identity:

> the *Jewish nation* continued its encounters with mighty pagan Empires and nations, and also with a new type of civilization [. . .] with the Hellenistic and Roman Empires whose claims to some universal validity were rooted not just in conquest or the mightiness of their gods but in their philosophical and legal traditions. [. . .] At the same time there was a great internal cultural creativity, giving rise within the *Jewish nation* to many new religions, cultural and social visions.
>
> (ibid., emphasis added)

As this fragment illustrates, Eisenstadt's historical description of the Second Temple centers around the idea of a "Jewish nation" and regards it as the main framework from which the Jewish civilization stemmed. In this context, the denotation of the term "nation" is not distinguished from that of modern politically established nations, but it is rather used, similarly to the term "independence", as a general synonym denoting political power.

Given that it is impossible to identify the phenomenon of nationalism in antiquity, it can be determined that the sense in which the term "nation" is used in this context was borrowed from Zionist historiography. The latter regards the Second Temple period as one of the seminal moments in the history of the "Jewish people". In this historiographical perception, the Second Temple period (which Eisenstadt refers to as the "Second Commonwealth") is seen as the golden age of Jewish sovereignty, and as the rise of Jewish self-rule. Zionist historiography retroactively constructed this ancient political entity in the form of a nation-state, a construct from which it drew legitimacy for its political project. The claim for the right to self-determination, for example, is based on the nationalized image of the Second Temple period, represented as an independent Jewish political entity (ibid., 3, 7, 8).

Furthermore, Eisenstadt draws a direct connection between the Second Temple period and contemporary Israeli society, identifying common social, religious, and political characteristics among the two entities, which he considers to be one. A notable example of the resemblance that Eisenstadt attributes to both the modern state of Israel and the Second Temple period is his suggestion that similar political tendencies, which "undermine the viability of the institutional framework of the Israeli State", existed in the Second Temple period (ibid., 201; Eisenstadt 1995b: 65).

The Second Temple period, according to Eisenstadt, shaped the particular orientations of the Jewish civilization and determined "Jewish collectivity" (Eisenstadt 1997: 17, 2003a: 365, 2004a: 48) in an additional, not less crucial aspect that centers on the "covenant ideology" (Eisenstadt 1992a: 30). This "ideology", which is analyzed as one of the charismatic bases of Jewish civilization, enabled all members of the community "direct access to the sacred" (ibid.).

This "ideology" has emerged as an interpretation of some of the "original premises of the early tribal confederacy, but in a new, nontribal setting" (ibid.).[9] The "covenant" thus constituted a "semicontractual relation" between the "People of Israel" and divinity, based on "God's selection of the people of Israel, of his own free will, as His chosen people – but contingent on their acceptance of His commandments" (ibid., 24). This "semicontractual relationship with a higher power", as Levine noted, opposed "the absolute status of the transcendental symbols in the other axial age civilizations" (Levine 2011: 321).

This "covenantal dimension" was related to the basic monotheistic orientation from which institutional implications have emerged. The legal codices found in the Bible are one example of such institutional implications (Eisenstadt 1992a: 24). These institutional spheres were formed during the Second Temple period, creating "the distinctive cultural identity of the Israelite nation, the Jewish people, and its civilizations" (ibid., 25). According to Eisenstadt's comparative view, those emerging institutional formations were a response to the "basic problems of All Axial civilization", defining the "relationship between the universalistic religious and earlier primordial orientations" (ibid.). Eisenstadt argues further that the charismatic base established by the "covenant ideology" in antiquity has been stretched into modernity, and was reinterpreted by modern Zionist ideology which sought to revive Jewish "national collective life" and imagined "a renewal of the covenant between the People of Israel and Eretz Israel" (ibid., 144).

Eisenstadt describes the Second Temple period as a phase in which the promulgation of the visions and cultural themes discussed above was

> combined in the ancient Israelite and in the later Jewish civilization with the construction of a distinctly "national" (or "ethnic") political community or collectivity, which entailed the concomitant interweaving of universalistic and particularistic orientations and of continuous tensions between them, in the definition of this collectivity.
>
> (Eisenstadt 1997: 14, 2004a: 48)

The Second Temple period can thus be seen as the cradle of Jewish civilization, and as the base from which "national" and "ethnic" characteristics of Jewish "collectivity" have emerged. In addition, this paragraph supports the claim raised in the introduction to the chapter, arguing that Eisenstadt's analysis of the "Jewish historical experience" draws a direct line between contemporary Jews and those of antiquity.

According to Eisenstadt, the post–Second Temple period is understood as a crucial phase in the "Jewish historical experience". It is characterized as a time when "a new institutional mold emerged that evinced rather special frameworks of civilization, religion and collective identity despite loss of independence and continuous dispersion" (Eisenstadt 1992a: 8). This period is not framed in time. It is rather known as the period of exile that lasted until the emergence of the Zionist project. It is depicted as a "situation" in which

> the Jews were not just a *national* or religious minority in some "alien" environment. They became such a minority in civilizations whose historical roots and basic premises were closely interwoven with Jewish history and faith, which not only developed historically out of the Jewish fold, but for whom continuous Jewish existence always constituted an ideological challenge and an ambivalent and negative reference point for whom the Jews' adherence to their faith and mode of life was not just curious and strange, but an ideological threat to the very legitimacy of their own civilization.
>
> (ibid., 8–9)

It is here that Eisenstadt describes the period of exile, when Jewish continuity seemed to be challenged, as a time when the Jews became a part of other related "host civilizations" (ibid., 2), without referring to the historical processes that followed the transformation from self-rule to the ensuing stage. The leap between the Second Temple period and the succeeding period is noticeable.

In describing the relations between Jews and their "hosts", Eisenstadt points to the main reason why Jews were perceived negatively, the reason mainly attributed to the ideological challenge and the threat the Jews seemed to pose. The very idea of "host" civilizations is worthy of attention and critique. In this context, the concept of a host civilization assumes that Jews maintained their own separate civilization and regards them as "guests" in the society of others. By marking Jewish existence as an existence of a "guest", it is possible to infer that according to Eisenstadt's views, Jews could not have been an integral part of their local cultures. This view corresponds with the tendencies of Zionist historiography, its myths of exile and Diaspora in which the "Jew" is represented as detached from the political and social lives as well as from the non-Jewish society.

From nation to civilization

Eisenstadt's analysis of the exile period, as seen in his description, is profoundly connected to the question of continuity, which is the main problem *Jewish Civilization* explores. Continuity, as discussed previously, is understood in this context as the defining and essential motive of Jewish historical experience, and is thereafter explained as the ability to establish a new "particular way of life", religion, as well as a "political and collective identity". This pattern of continuity is, however, valid to the post–First Temple period, whereas for the post–Second Temple period it remained "an even greater enigma". "Obviously", Eisenstadt concludes, "this was more than just continuity of a religious sect, although even in such terms it would be unique" (Eisenstadt 1992a: 9).

From this point on, Eisenstadt discusses the exile period and ceases to apply the term "nation" which he replaces with the term "civilization" when referring to "the Jewish historical experience". Given that this semantical shift is not explicitly explained in the sources, one infers that "civilization" is the residue of the institutional patterns that have "survived" the disintegration of the ancient "Jewish nation". It substitutes for Jewish national institutional structure that Eisenstadt

identifies in antiquity. Eisenstadt thereafter summarizes the "two poles to the continuity" that constituted Jewish history and civilization in exile:

> first, the development of international and cultural frameworks and social networks that made possible the continuity of the Jewish people and civilization in a situation of dispersion of Jews in many lands; and second, the strong ambivalent attitude of the "host" civilizations, reciprocated by a parallel ambivalent attitude among the Jews toward these civilizations.
>
> (ibid.)

At this point, it is possible to observe the inherent difficulty that *Jewish Civilization* encompasses. According to Eisenstadt, continuity is the distinctive feature identifying Jewish civilization; it is seen as the single factor that supports the argument for Jewish civilization being a structure of "international and cultural frameworks and social networks". Yet at the same time, the term "civilization" is recruited to account for the same continuity that is seen as the founding characteristic of Jewish historical experience. The term "civilization" thus accounts for a specific phenomenon that simultaneously defines it. This problem aggregates to Eisenstadt's proclaimed assumption of continuity, a claim that can be viewed as politically constructed in line with Zionist historiography, which assumes a linear historical line that connects the Jews from antiquity to modernity without taking into account the context of historical rupture, and without bearing in mind that the people of the present cannot be seen as the people of the past.

"Civilization" as a critique: Eisenstadt's response to Weber and Toynbee

Eisenstadt considered the term "civilization" a critical tool for examining prevalent views of Jewish historical experience, views that were "influential in modern historiography and social science" (ibid., 9–10). The application of the term "civilization" to the "Jewish historical experience" is therefore offered as an answer to two main points of view that Eisenstadt grapples with: the first being that of the British historian, Arnold Toynbee's "rather unsympathetic", "anti-Semitic and certainly anti-Zionist" perspective (ibid., 10),[10] and the second being Weber's perspective that is considered "more philo-Semitic, even sympathetic to the beginnings of Zionism" (Eisenstadt 1992a: 10).

Weber, implicitly, and Toynbee, explicitly, "were talking in terms of civilizations", arguing that

> the best way to explain this historical experience is by comparing it with those great civilizations that were closely linked with religions but cannot be understood solely on the basis of patterns of belief or worship. These civilizations constituted something more complex than religious communities or belief systems: the construction of the way of life of entire societies: that is,

> the organization of their ways of life in some distinct way according to some vision or premises.
>
> (ibid.)

Both Weber and Toynbee regarded the Jewish historical experience as "exceptional". Toynbee viewed the exilic rabbinical Jewish civilization as a "fossilized civilization", while Weber spoke of the Jews as a "pariah people" and considered them, from the post–Second Temple period, as a religious community and not as a political one (ibid.).

Eisenstadt's critique of the views articulated by both Toynbee and Weber focuses on two main points: He first claimed that both scholars were mistaken in assuming that the post-Christian Jewish historical experience ceased to be a civilization; and second, that both accounts fail to explain the continuity of the Jewish historical experience (ibid., 11). He therefore mentioned "Medieval Jewish creativity" as evidence to refute Toynbee's claim of "fossilization".

More concretely, Eisenstadt mentions the historically controversial case of the Khazars which he refers to as proof that "Judaism existed – or at least was conceived – if even only for a brief time in the post-exilic period, as a potentially active actor on the intercivilizational scene" (Eisenstadt 2009: 244). The alleged conversion of the Khazars to Judaism in the second half of the eighth century and the ninth century is a case that challenges the foundations of Zionist historiography which presupposes Jewish continuity from antiquity to modernity (Sand 2010: 218). Eisenstadt, who was familiar with Poliak's studies of the Khazars from the early 1950s, uses the case of the Khazars as an example that supports his claim. Nonetheless, Eisenstadt's view evidently undermines its historical significance and implications.

As for Weber's claims, Eisenstadt first argues that the concept of the pariah "derives from the analysis of Indian society and refers to the Untouchables". He regards this analogy, which he finds to be "poor at best", as flawed, because unlike the "host" civilizations in which the Jews existed, the "Brahminic superiority was never questioned [and] needed no active affirmation by the pariahs". If the concept of pariah was true in the case of the Jews, Eisenstadt claims, then "these host civilizations would not have needed to keep proving their superiority, nor would they have constantly attempted to convert the Jews" (Eisenstadt 1992a: 12). Weber's second claim, in which he depicted the Jews of the post–Second Temple period as a "purely religious" community, meets Eisenstadt's disapproval. Based on the studies of A. Momigliano and of Y. Baer – the latter being Eisenstadt's former teacher at the Hebrew University and one of the "architects" of Zionist historiography – Eisenstadt argues that "there has always been a political component to the Jewish collective identity" (ibid., 12–13). Each of the arguments that Eisenstadt challenges overlooks or fails to account for the question of continuity. Moreover, Eisenstadt views Weber's and Toynbee's failed arguments as evidence that indicates the "inadequacy" of analyzing the "Jewish historical experience" in terms of "religion, people, nation or the like" (ibid., 13) – the assumption with which *Jewish Civilization* opens.

Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis of the "Jewish historical experience" suggests using the term "civilization" in the sense of an "ontological vision" that facilitates different institutional formations. This analysis can therefore be understood as an attempt to answer to Weber's and Toynbee's claims which are seen as "partial and distorted" (ibid., 49). It describes this "experience" by emphasizing the prophecy and the "covenant ideology" as the charismatic base that enabled continuity, while stressing the constant tension between "different components of Jewish collective identity, especially between the universalistic and particularistic ones" (ibid., 31).

Zionism as a reconstruction of the Jewish civilization

According to Eisenstadt, the evidences wielding the power to refute the "fossilization" argument provide the reassurance of the very existence of the Zionist movement, an existence rooted in the same civilizational vision whose character unfolds in *Jewish Civilization*. In Eisenstadt's view, the Zionist movement and its raison d'être can be deciphered "*only* by reference to what we have called Jewish civilization and the Jewish civilizational frameworks" (ibid., 142, emphasis added). Zionism, when discussed in light of Eisenstadt's civilizational approach, is regarded as an attempt to "reconstruct many elements of Jewish civilization in a revolutionary way [. . .] of creating a new civilizational mold" (ibid., 151).

The relation between the civilizational vision embodied in Zionism and its institutional formation is described as follows:

> Zionism [. . .] saw itself as the carrier of a revolutionary reconstruction of Jewish civilization [. . .]. Zionism insisted that this vision could be attained only by establishing a national, territorial, and ultimately political entity in *Eretz Israel* [. . .]. Zionism gave rise to the full articulation and far-reaching reformulation of several cultural and ideological themes or emphases that were latent, secondary or taken for granted in the traditional rabbinic mold and largely negated within the assimilated groups. The most important of such themes were the *rebirth* of the Hebrew Language and the reemphasis of the *Land of Israel* and the biblical component of the Jewish historical tradition.
>
> (ibid., emphasis added)

Zionism is discussed in terms taken from its own ideological vocabulary and historiographical perspective: The highly ideologically charged words such as "rebirth" – which tends to obfuscate the construction of Modern Hebrew as a historic process which evolved as a part of the Zionist project – and the use of the Zionist myths of land ("the reemphasis of the *Land of Israel*"), attest to this tendency, which is depicted in several other places in Eisenstadt's analysis (e.g. Eisenstadt 1992a: 152–153).

Based on this Zionist-centric view, Eisenstadt describes Zionism as a project of "reformulation" and "reconstruction" of the Jewish civilizational vision. Yet

the civilizational themes that Zionism has aimed to reconstruct are explained on the basis of the basic and common conjectures of Zionist discourse. However, it would be incorrect to claim that Eisenstadt's analysis of Zionism nullifies any critical dimension, for such perspective is found, for example, when Eisenstadt examines the validity of the argument that supposes that Zionism has "re-entered Jews into history". Although he finds this claim "valid to a certain extent" (Eisenstadt 2004a: 110), it manifests a degree of criticism in relation to the Zionist historiographical discourse that shows that he did not follow it dogmatically. Notwithstanding, Eisenstadt's approach evinces a problematic application of the term civilization to this case, due to its framing within the borders of Zionist discourse. In addition to the teleological dimension that Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis of Zionism discloses (as elaborated in the next section), it is possible to see how the term civilization and the civilizational approach are employed to describe Zionism as a bearer of a civilizational vision. By depicting Zionism as a "carrier of a revolutionary reconstruction of Jewish civilization", Eisenstadt can assume a direct line connecting Zionism with antiquity, a line that de facto reassures the basic historiographical conjectures of Zionism. This link enables to establish a conceptual connection between what Eisenstadt observed as the "Jewish civilizational vision" and Zionism's *mission civilisatrice*.

Critique of Jewish civilization

As a unit of sociological analysis, the term "civilization" or "civilizational formations" accounts for the macro-sociological processes in which attempts to "construct or reconstruct social life" correspond to cosmological visions and their institutional implications. By defining the relations between visions and their institutional derivatives, Eisenstadt ties the *ontological* with the *regulative*. Theorizing these macro-sociological processes was followed by the assumption that those aforementioned visions are bound to be reinterpreted and that the institutional systems they generate are fundamentally heterogeneous and contain an inherent element of dissension. In this framework, Eisenstadt's view of axial age civilizations emphasizes the simultaneous rise of a new type of agency, one that is seen explicitly in the role that elite groups have had in regulating power, allowing access to resources, extending trust, and engendering social change.

The chapter has pointed out several problematic aspects in Eisenstadt's application of his civilizational analysis to the case of the "Jewish historical experience". These problems center on three main and interrelated difficulties: the first being the applicability of the term "civilization" to the case of the Jews and Judaism; the second concerning Eisenstadt's assumption of continuity, which not only essentially defines Jewish civilization, but for which the term "civilization" aims to account; and the third relating to the historical descriptions of the Jewish past on which Eisenstadt based his civilizational analysis. These historical descriptions, as argued in the chapter, are based on the historical imagery that has been depicted and reproduced in the corpus of Zionist historiography. These main problems are hereby discussed in detail.

The applicability of the term "civilization" to the "Jewish historical experience" and the presumption of continuity

Based on his civilizational approach, Eisenstadt views Zionism and its establishment in the form of a state as a profound expression of the institutionalization of the Jewish civilizational vision. Similarly to how Weber accounts for the Protestant ethic, *Jewish Civilization* regards the basic premises of Judaism, mainly its "covenant ideology", as an ontological vision that adopted particular institutionalized, nationalized forms. These institutional patterns, which were not disconnected from their primordial context – rooted mainly in the Second Temple period – have been reestablished, according to Eisenstadt, with the rise of Zionism and its state-building project.

Eisenstadt's application of the term "civilization" to the "Jewish historical experience" has aimed to solve two main conceptual problems: The first is the contested definition of Jews, Judaism and the "Jewish historical experience"; the second is the aspect of continuity by which Eisenstadt characterizes and defines the aforementioned terms. Apart from the problematic semantic inconsistency which the term "experience" exhibits, more crucial is the very assumption of unique historical experience, identified distinctively as "Jewish", and separated from other historical contexts. This is problematic mainly for its underlying essentialism, which postulates a coherent, non-fragmented collective Jewish historical subject.

Only by assuming a predefined Jewish historical subject was Eisenstadt able to place a teleological line of argumentation by which he describes the path of Jewish history as leading to the emergence of the Zionist project. The representation of Israel's historical past as "an inescapable necessity" (Diner and Templer 1995: 150) is a dominant element in Zionist historiographical constructions of the history of Jews, one that tends to obscure historical ruptures and contingencies (ibid., 154). It is the teleological perceptions of the past that enables to interlink Eisenstadt's view of the Jewish past to the Zionist historiographical understanding of it.

In light of this account, it is possible to argue that in the case of "Jewish civilization", the term civilization is not applied to describe large-scale social structures. Rather, Eisenstadt's "Jewish civilization" focuses on a specific unit whose origins are inscribed in primordial and ethnic settings. Whereas in theory the term "civilization" is understood as a macro-sociological analytical unit, it refers to the "Jewish" particular case and corresponds with the meaning which Zionist historiography renders to it. Such application cannot be untrue and cannot be refuted because it is based on a tautological premise: All societal forms act, according to the civilizational approach, within given civilizational frames. Furthermore, the connection Eisenstadt draws in this specific case between the visional and the regulative does not point out the necessary conditions which enabled the emergence of the distinguished institutional traits of the Jewish civilization, as Eisenstadt understands them. Although Eisenstadt emphasizes that ontological visions alone cannot facilitate social change (Eisenstadt 2003a: 55), the connection he establishes between the ancient Jewish civilizational vision and their structural derivatives is a contingent proposition that holds a degree of possibility, but not a necessity.

Zionist-based historical descriptions of the Jewish past

Jewish Civilization frames Jewish history within a specific timeline, stretching from antiquity, mainly the Second Temple period, directly to the modern state of Israel. These historical highlights were not arbitrarily chosen. As this chapter has endeavored to show, Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis of the "Jewish historical experience" is based on a representation of the past which has been shaped by Zionist historiographical imagination. In this historiographical perception, the state of Israel is perceived as the successor of the Second Temple. Eisenstadt portrays the "Jewish historical experience" based on the Zionist narrative of exile and loss of ancient territory. The ancient Jewish past is therefore observed from a Zionist-centric view that identifies the ancient Jews as a national community and anachronistically projects a sense of nationalism on the ancient past, despite this being a distinctly modern phenomenon. Eisenstadt's historical analysis of the ancient Jewish civilization, therefore, exhibits Gadamer's notion of "fusion of horizons", a hermeneutical process in which the past is interpreted through the perspectives and needs of the present.

Despite the wide-ranging civilizational frame under which it is theorized, Eisenstadt's perception of the history of the Jews supports an essentialist view that speaks of an ancient nation whose visions were reconstituted and reinstitutionalized in modernity. Additionally, such historical descriptions give the impression of being purely factual, even though they are based on politically constructed perceptions that rely on representations of the past rather than on critical historical research.

The chapter has offered to consider *Jewish Civilization* as an attempt to bridge certain paradoxes within Israeli politics of identity, paradoxes that are rooted mainly in the increasing tensions between religious and secular dimensions within the social lives of Israel.

The notion of Judaism as a culture is a corollary of the basic ideas of *Jewish Civilization* that ties the visional and institutional together. *Jewish Civilization* provides a sociological justificatory account – a sociodicy – of the notion of Judaism as a culture and for the secular Zionist elite who sought to redefine its relationships to Judaism using this notion. Despite its claim to at least partial inclusiveness, this new perception of "Judaism as a culture" adopts Zionism's ethnocentric viewpoint in which the criterion of belonging is determined by kinship and not in light of subjective identification with a particular vision or cultural orientation. Despite its emphasis on culture, *Jewish Civilization* does not explicate which subject belongs to this civilization and what are the criteria to be or become one of its members, namely, what shared cultural elements connect one to the Jewish civilization.

Furthermore, Eisenstadt does not attend to the material and economic dimension in the rise of civilizations. Although he acknowledges the interaction of the material dimension and the symbolic realm, he does not present an account that pertains to the material aspects in the constitution of civilizations. Similarly, Eisenstadt's account of the Jewish civilization does not include a discussion of the economic and material culture that such civilization must have developed.

Here lies one of the underlying inconsistencies in Eisenstadt's conceptualization of the Jewish civilization: No tangible artifact can be sufficiently defined or qualified as essentially belonging to Jewish culture, because Judaism essentially rejects being qualified in relation to the material world. Thus the validity of discussing a civilizational framework unrelatedly to its material products remains questioned.

Finally, the reliance of Jewish civilization on Zionist historiography draws attention to the broader problem of adhering to historical accounts that embed biased and/or nationalized perceptions of history in the field of comparative historical sociology. Huntington's *The Clash of Civilizations* (1996), a thesis based on a polarized depiction of Islam and the West (Bottici and Challand 2010), is but one equivalent example of a study that draws on particular biased and polarizing historiographical notions of the West and non-West. Such accounts are especially problematic insofar as they lack reflective understanding of the histories and political myths they utilized. Subsequently, these scholarly products encapsulate political memories and hence ought to be seen as discursive representations that mirror a contemporized understanding of the present rather than an accurate account of the past.

Notes

1 For an account of the multilayered use of the term civilization, see Szakolczai (2004).
2 For a comprehensive account of Durkheim, Elias, and Nelson's historical sociology, see Mandalios (2003).
3 This aspect is not to be confused with Weber's account of civilization as rationalization (Alexander 1990: 5), which the next chapter discusses.
4 This article was based on an earlier account that concerns Weber's sociology of religion; see Eisenstadt (1971a).
5 For a more comprehensive account of the problems that characterize the dichotomist distinction between "modern" and "traditional" societies, see Eisenstadt (1974c).
6 Arnason argues that Jaspers's conceptualization of the axial age derives from Jaspers's existential philosophy. For Arnason's critique and analysis of Jaspers's axial age hypothesis, see Arnason (2005: 26–37).
7 This section, as well as all other historical descriptions quoted in the chapter, appears also in Eisenstadt's *The Transformation of Israeli Society* (1985).
8 Eisenstadt acknowledged that nationalism is "a phenomenon of modern history". He nevertheless considered the works of Gellner and B. Anderson as "provocative analyses" (Eisenstadt 1992: 142).
9 Given that confederations are late political structures, the term "confederacy", which Eisenstadt attributed to the ancient tribal society which the Bible depicts, attests to anachronism.
10 It should be noted that A. Toynbee was considered a controversial figure in Israeli Zionist circles.

References

Alexander, J. C. (1977) "Book Review: S. N. Eisenstadt; Curelaru, M. (1976) The Form of Sociology: Paradigms and Crises", *Contemporary Sociology* 6 (6): 658–661.

Alexander, J. C. (1990) "Differentiation Theory: Problems and Prospects", in: Alexander, J., and Colomy, P. (eds.) *Differentiation Theory and Social Change: Comparative and Historical Perspectives*, New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 1–16.

Alexander, J.C. (1992) "The Fragility of Progress: An Interpretation of the Turn Toward Meaning in Eisenstadt's Later Work", *Acta Sociologica* 35 (2): 85–94.

Arnason, J.P. (2003) *Civilizations in Dispute: Historical Questions and Theoretical Traditions*, Leiden: Brill.

Arnason, J.P. (2004) "Civilizational Patterns and Civilizing Processes", in: Arjomand, S., and Tiryakian, E.A. (eds.) *Rethinking Civilizational Analysis*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 103–118.

Arnason, J.P. (2005) "The Axial Age and Its Interpreters: Reopening a Debate", in: Eisenstadt, S.N., Wittrock, B., and Arnason, J.P. (eds.) *Axial Civilizations and World History (Vol. 4)*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 19–49.

Arnason, J.P. (2010) "The Cultural Turn and the Civilizational Approach", *European Journal of Social Theory* 13 (1): 67–82.

Assmann, A. (1989) "Jaspers' Achsenzeit, Oder: Vom Glück und Elend der Zentralperspektive in der Geschichte", in: Harth, D. (ed.) *Karl Jaspers. Denken zwischen Wissenschaft, Politik und Philosophie*, Stuttgart: Metzler, pp. 187–206.

Assmann, J. (2005) "'Axial' Breakthroughs and Semantic 'Relocations' in Ancient Egypt and Israel", in: Giesen, B., and Šuber, D. (eds.) *Religion and Politics: Cultural Perspectives*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 39–53.

Bottici, Ch., and Challand, B. (2010) *The Myth of the Clash of Civilization*, London and New York: Routledge.

Buber, M. (1961) *People and Universe*, Jerusalem: The Zionist Library. [Hebrew]

Comte, A. (1998) [1822] "Plan of Scientific Work", in: Jones, H.S. (ed.) *Comte: Early Political Writings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Delanty, G. (2003) "The Making of a Post-Western Europe: A Civilizational Analysis", *Thesis Eleven* 72: 8–25.

Delanty, G. (2004) "An Interview with S.N. Eisenstadt: Pluralism and the Multiple Forms of Modernity", *European Journal of Social Theory* 7 (3): 391–404.

Diner, D., and Templer, W. (1995) "Cumulative Contingency: Historicizing Legitimacy in Israeli Discourse", *History and Memory* 7 (1): 147–170.

Durkheim, E., and Mauss, M. (1971 [1913]) "Note on the Notation of Civilization", trans. Benjamin, N. *Social Research* 38 (4): 808–813.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1963) *The Political Systems of Empires*, New York: Free Press of Glencoe [New edition with new Introduction. New Brunswick: Transaction (1993)].

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1968) "Introduction", in: Weber, M. (ed.) *On Charisma and Institution Building: Selected papers*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. ix–lvi.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1970) "Israel: Traditional and Modern Social Values and Economic Development", in: Eisenstadt, S.N., Bar-Yosef, R., and Adler, C. (eds.) *Integration and Development in Israel*, London: Pall Mall Press, pp. 107–122.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1971a) "Some Reflections on the Significance of Max Weber's Sociology of Religions for the Analysis of Non-European Modernity", *Archives de Sociologie des religions* 32: 29–52.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1971b) *Social Differentiation and Stratification*, Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Co.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1974a) "The Implications of Weber's Sociology of Religion for the Understanding of the Processes of Change in Contemporary Non-European Societies and Civilization", *Diogenes* 85: 83–111.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1974b) "Some Reflections on the Crisis in Sociology", *Sociological Inquiry* 44 (3): 147–157.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1974c) "Studies of Modernization and Sociological Theory", *History and Theory*, 225–252.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1977a) "Sociological Theory and an Analysis of the Dynamics of Civilizations and of Revolutions", *Daedalus* 106: 59–78.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1977b) *Comments on the Continuity of Some Jewish Historical Forms in Israeli Society* [Study Circle on Diaspora Jewry in the Home of the President of Israel, Ninth Series, Booklet 2], Jerusalem: Shazar Library, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. [Hebrew]

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1978) *Revolution and the Transformation of Societies: A Comparative Study of Civilizations*, New York: Free Press.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1981) "The Format of Jewish History: Some Reflections on Weber's 'Ancient Judaism'", *Modern Judaism* 1: 54–73.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1985) *The Transformation of Israeli Society: An Essay in Interpretation*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1986a) "Introduction: The Axial Age Breakthroughs: Their Characteristics and Origins", in: Eisenstadt, S.N. (ed.) *The Origins and Diversity of Axial Age Civilizations*, Albany: State University of New York Press, pp. 1–27.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1986b) "Culture and Social Structure Revisited", *International Sociology* 1 (3): 297–320.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1987) "Introduction: Historical Traditions, Modernization and Development", in: Eisenstadt et al. (eds.) *Patterns of Modernity: Beyond the West. Vol. 2*, London: Frances Pinter.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1989) "Max Weber on Western Christianity and the Weberian Approach to Civilizational Dynamics", *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 14 (2): 203–223.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1990) "Modes of Structural Differentiation, Elite Structure and Cultural Visions", in: Alexander, J.C., and Colomy, P. (eds.) *Differentiation Theory and Social Change. Comparative and Historical Perspectives*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1992) *Jewish Civilization: The Jewish Historical Experience in a Comparative Perspective*, New York: SUNY Press.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1995) "Jewish Civilization: Approaches to the Problems of Israeli Society", in: Dešen, Š.A., Liebman, C.S., and Shokeid, M. (eds.) *Israeli Judaism: The Sociology of Religion in Israel* 7, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1996) "Japan – Non-Axial Modernity: Japan and the Multiplicity of Cultural Programmes of Modernity", in: Hall, J.A., and Jarvie, I. (eds.) *The Social Philosophy of Ernest Gellner*, *Poznan Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities* 48: 237–256.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1997) "Sectarianism and Heterodoxy in Jewish History: Some Comparative Civilizational Notes", *Jewish Studies* 37: 7–59.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2000) "The Civilizational Dimension in Sociological Analysis", *Thesis Eleven* 62: 1–21.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (ed.) (2003a) *Comparative Civilizations and Multiple Modernities* I, Leiden: Brill.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2003c) "Interdisciplinary Reflections on the Civilizational Dimensions of Modernity", in: Camic, C., and Joas, H. (eds.) *The Dialogical Turn: New Roles for Sociology in the Postdisciplinary Age*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, pp. 275–295.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2004) *Explorations in Jewish Historical Experience: The Civilizational Dimension*, Leiden: Brill.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2009) "Tensions as Resources in Jewish Historical Civilizational Experience", *European Journal of Sociology* 50 (2): 233–271.

Eisenstadt, S.N., et al. (1987) (eds.) *Center formation, Protest Movements, and Class Structure in Europe and the United States*, London: Frances Pinter.

Eisenstadt, S.N., Sachsenmaier, D., and Riedel, J. (2002) "The Context of the Multiple Modernities Paradigm", in: Eisenstadt, S.N., Sachsenmaier, D., and Riedel, J. (eds.) *Reflections on Multiple Modernities – European, Chinese and Other Interpretations*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 1–23.

Eisenstadt, S.N., Wittrock, B., and Arnason, J.P. (eds.) (2005) *Axial Civilizations and World History (Vol. 4)*, Leiden: Brill.

Elias, N. (1978) [1939] *The Civilizing Process, Vol. 1: The History of Manners*, trans. Jephcott, E., New York: Pantheon Books.

Giesen, B. (2012) "On Axial Ages and other Thresholds between Epochs", in: Kozlarek, O., Rüsen, J., and Wolff, E. (eds.) *Shaping a Humane World: Civilizations, Axial Times, Modernities, Humanisms*, Bielefeld: Transcript.

Huntington, S. P. (1996) *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York: Simon and Schuster.

Jaspers, K. (1956) [1949] *The Origin and Goal of History*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Kimmerling, B. (2001a) *The Invention and Decline of Israeliness: State, Society, And the Military*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kimmerling, B. (2001b) *The End of Ashkenazi Hegemony*, Jerusalem: Keter. [Hebrew]

Levine, D.N. (2004) "Note on the Concept of an Axial Turning in Human History", in *Rethinking Civilizational Analysis*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 67–70.

Levine, D.N. (2011) "The Dialogue of Civilizations: An Eisenstadt legacy", *Journal of Classical Sociology* 11 (3): 313–325.

Malkin, Y. (2003) *Judaism Without God: Judaism as Culture and Bible as Literature*, Jerusalem: Keter and The Library of Secular Judaism. [Hebrew]

Malkin, Y. (ed.) (2006) *Secular Jewish Culture: New Jewish Thought in Israel*, Jerusalem: Keter and The Library of Secular Judaism. [Hebrew]

Mandalios, J. (2003) "Civilizational Complexes and Processes: Elias, Nelson and Eisenstadt", in: Delanty, G., and Isin, E.F. (eds.) *Handbook of Historical Sociology*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 65–79.

Mazlish, B. (2004) "Civilization in a Historical and Global Perspective", in: Arjomand, S., and Tiryakian, E.A. (eds.) *Rethinking Civilizational Analysis*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 14–20.

Nelson, B. (1973) "Civilizational Complexes and Intercivilizational Encounters", *Sociological Analysis* 34 (2): 79–105.

Ohana, D. (2012) *Modernism and Zionism*, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan Press, pp. 19–51.

The Provisional Government of Israel. (1948) "The Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel", *Official Gazette*: Number 1, Tel Aviv, May 14, 1948.

Ram, U. (1995) *The Changing Agenda of Israeli Sociology*, New York: SUNY Press.

Ramirez, F.O. (1982) "Comparative Social Movements", in: Armer, J.M., and Marsh, R.M. (eds.) *Comparative Sociological Research in the 1960s and 1970s*, Brill: Leiden.

Rousseau, J.J. (1994) [1755] *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sand, S. (2010) *The Invention of the Jewish People*, London and New York: Verso.

Schweid, E. (2008) *The Idea of Modern Jewish Culture*, trans. Hadari, A., and Levin, L., Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press.

Spohn, W. (2001) "Eisenstadt on Civilizations and Multiple Modernity", *European Journal of Social Theory* 4: 499–508.

Szakolczai, A. (2004) "Civilization and Its Sources", in: Arjomand, S., and Tiryakian, E.A. (eds.) *Rethinking Civilizational Analysis*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 86–102.

Thomassen, B. (2010) "Anthropology, Multiple Modernities and the Axial Age Debate", *Anthropological Theory* 10 (4): 321–342.

Tiryakian, E.A. (2004) "Civilizational Analysis", in: Arjomand, S., and Tiryakian, E.A. (eds.) *Rethinking Civilizational Analysis*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 30–47.

Tiryakian, E.A. (2011) "A Sociological Odyssey: The Comparative Voyage of S.N. Eisenstadt", *Journal of Classical Sociology (Special issue on Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt)* 11 (3): 241–250.

Voegelin, E. (1956) *Order and History. Volume I, Israel and Revelation*, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Wagner, P. (2005) "Palomar's Question. The Axial Age Hypothesis, European Modernity and Historical Contingency", in: Eisenstadt, S.N., Wittrock, B., and Arnason, J.P. (eds.) *Axial Civilizations and World History (Vol. 4)*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 87–106.

Wallerstein, I. (1974) *The Modern World-system I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-economy in the Sixteenth Century (Studies in Social Discontinuity)*, New York: Academic Press.

Weber, A. (1935) *Kulturgeschichte als Kultursoziologie*, Leiden: Sijthoff.

Weber, A. (1998) [1921] "Fundamentals of Cultural-Sociology: Social Process, Civilizational Process and Cultural-Movement", in: Mennell, S., and Rundell, J.F. (eds.) *Classical Readings in Culture and Civilization*, London and New York: Routledge.

Weber, M. (1978) [1922, 1923] *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weber, M. (1993) [1920] *The Sociology of Religion*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Weber, M. (1996) [1916] *Die Wirtschaftsethik der Weltreligionen: Hinduismus und Buddhismus, Max-Weber-Gesamtausgabe*. Bd. 20, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

Weber, M. (2001) [1905] *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus)*, London: Routledge.

Wittrock, B. (2005) "The Meaning of the Axial Age", in: Eisenstadt, S.N., Wittrock, B., and Arnason, J.P. (eds.) *Axial Civilizations and World History (Vol. 4)*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 51–85.

Part III

Modernities

4 The Jewish democracy and multiple modernities

Multiple modernities is a Weberian-based thesis that Eisenstadt developed in the mid-1980s.[1] The thesis evolved into a research program that offered a renewed understating of modernity in the discourse on social change. The chapter examines Eisenstadt's application of the multiple modernities thesis to the case of Israel and discusses Eisenstadt's account of how Israeli society has developed its institutional patterns as a particular interpretation of the modern premise. The chapter maps the sociographical roots of multiple modernities, presents the recent critiques of the paradigm, and shows how it was formulated as a theoretical defense of the autonomy of culture. The chapter inquires how the application of the multiple modernities thesis to the case of Israel fares vis-à-vis the borders of Israeli collectivity, whose institutional core is paradoxically defined as Jewish and democratic. The chapter offers to see that Eisenstadt's sociological interpretation of the "Jewish democracy", viewed as a unique institutional expression that is part of the modern institutional variability, incorporates governing Zionist narratives underlying Israel's political framework, provides a theoretical base to reassure the existing political structures of Israel, and obfuscates the pervasiveness of the exclusivist and essentialist dimensions inherent to the Zionist imaginary. It is argued that just as multiple modernities refrain from addressing the broad historical and structural conditions from which the multiple forms of modernity emerged, its application to the case of Israel reproduces the meta-narrative of the West as modernity's reference point and overlooks the fact that the Zionist project shares affinities with other patterns of settler colonization.

The sociological construction of the term modernity

The term "modernity" denotes different meanings. In Western historiography the term refers to a long-term and multidimensional transformation that began in the mid-16th century and had a profound effect on European political, economic, and social orders. These transformations were tied to the expansion of European colonial power as well as to the concurrent intellectual developments of the Enlightenment movement.

This development culminated in a series of political revolutions, the French Revolution being the most notable among them. Concurrently, this era witnessed

the rise of the two Industrial Revolutions that facilitated the growth of a broadly defined middle class and had crucial bearings on the emergence of a working class ("the fourth estate"). Yet, apart from pointing out the centrality of the "dual revolutions" (Hobsbawm 1962) in the making of post-feudal orders, the term modernity unfolds a retrospective "reading of history", as Latour (1993 [1991]: 47) has argued, signifying a denial of the world preceding it, as was noted by Koselleck (1988 [1959]: 5, cited in Wittrock 2009: 82).

Most importantly, the term "modernity" conveys the notion of a sharp break from the economic and social structures of the feudal era, when social mobility was exceedingly limited. In addition, "modernity" pertains to the rise of a new type of civil subject, one who masters his/her faith, hosts under the universal premise of human rights,[2] and claims a right to political representation and equal participation in power. Therefore "modernity" is generally associated with an overarching and omnipresent "notion of a conceptual and epistemic revolution coterminous with the formation of the political and technological practices" (Wittrock 2009: 78).

As a master category, "modernity" was, and to some extent still is, tied to different ideological-political ends; it connotes the political and economic superiority of the West (which has been "forcibly created as a consequence of the West's imperial adventure" [Asad 1992: 340]) and was often seen as synonymous with it. Hence, the category of "modernity" has a constitutive role in the invention of the West.

Furthermore, the terms "modernity" and "progress" were part of the constitutive imaginaries which followed and enabled late European colonialism. The pervasive meaning of the term "modernity" renders a sense of linear progress that heads toward social and moral advancement (Asad 1992: 334). Postcolonial critique suggests viewing the term "modernity" as a historically constructed term as well as an ideologically loaded concept, subsumed in the history of Western domination (Bhambra 2007). The different applications of the term should hence be viewed critically and subjected to a continuous deconstruction that deciphers the power relations it unfolds.

In social theory, the terms modernity and modernization are often employed as analytical tools to account for far-reaching macro-changes in societal structures (Haferkamp and Smelser 1991). The question of social change, a major theme for which social theory aims to account, is not disconnected from the overwhelming effect that the breakdown of the feudal orders had on Western and non-Western societies alike. These sweeping historical changes constitute the general point of departure that enables the theorization of the question of social change as changes in the process of social differentiation.

Most important to this context is the period which Koselleck named "Sattelzeit" – the post-Napoleonic era during which most of the key institutional changes, with direct bearings on the present, were consolidating (Koselleck 1972: xiii). Arnason maintains that the historical turmoil created by the "dual revolutions" provided the "main empirical basis for interpretations of modernity as a sequence of patterns" (Arnason 2003b: 452). In a similar vein, Eyerman notes that in classical

sociological theory, the term "modernity" is associated with "the effects of industrialization, urbanization, and political democracy on essentially rural and autocratic societies" and encapsulates the "meaning and significance of the social changes occurring in Europe in the latter half of the nineteenth century" Eyerman 1991: 37). Eyerman additionally notes that for Marx, Weber, and Durkheim, modernity was "more than a heuristic concept" (ibid., 37); in the spirit of Enlightenment – which called for "man's emergence from his self-incurred immaturity" (Kant 1784: 481) – modernity was "a world constructed anew through the active and conscious intervention of actors and the new sense of self that such active intervention and responsibility entailed" (Eyerman 1991: 37). A self-reflective and active agent would thus define sociology's "ideal type" notion of the modern subject, one that carries the potential to engender social change. Such an ideal type bears affinities with Eisenstadt's view of modern agency.

Most significant to the discourse on modernity is Weber's view of modernization as a process of universal rationalization (Taylor 1995: 25). Such a process has not only manifested itself in the emergence of the "capitalist civilizations, [. . .] the bureaucratization of different forms of social life" (Eisenstadt 1987b: 2), but it also bore a radical tendency to *Entzauberung*, the " 'disenchantment of the world'" (Weber 1948 [1919]: 155), and subsequently for depersonalization and oppressive routines (Gerth and Mills 1948: 50). Weber regards rationalization as a liberating force that "stripped illusions from men's minds and created the possibility for active and mastering behavior" (Alexander 1987: 192). This force, like many of modernity's mechanisms and devices, has nevertheless enabled the prevalence of institutional coercion, which in turn made modern subjects become increasingly dominated (Alexander 1987: 192) and trapped within an "iron cage" of advancing bureaucracy (Wittrock 2009: 85). As Alexander argues, the Janus-faced character of rationalization was liberating as it simultaneously began paving the way for what Weber has poetically envisioned as "the polar night of icy darkness and hardness" (Weber 1948 [1919]: 128). Weber's iconic metaphor echoes in most accounts addressing modernization, drawing attention to its constraining aspects and inherent tensions between its evolving structural dimensions and novel forms of agentiality.

The conceptualization and critique of modernity (Arnason 2003b: 454), as a reflection on the relationships between the sphere of the "system" (perceived as the rational) and the "social" (perceived as non-rational) (Habermas 1984; Bhambra 2007: 876), has been one of sociology's constituting distinctions. This reflective effort has in turn engendered the basic categories used in the sociological discourse, one which leads social thinkers to be "enmeshed" with the social world they were trying to understand (Wagner 1994: iv). The rise of sociology as a discipline and its discursive invention of the term modernity cannot be disconnected from one another (Bhambra 2007: 872).

Relating to the distinction between the "system" and the "social", Eisenstadt's multiple modernities thesis formulates a defense of the autonomy of culture, stressing "the independent role of cultural codes" (Alexander 1992: 85) and its separation from the structural sphere. Multiple modernities thesis takes this position by

diverging from modernization theory in its understanding of the relation of the structural (material and institutional) and the symbolic (cultural) dimensions in the constitution of social order.

The autonomy of culture as multiple modernities' point of departure

> In contrast to nation states, demarcated by clear-cut boundaries, cultures have no such things as boundaries, cultures consist of translation, transitions, narratives, performances, interpretations; it is more a process than a structural unit.
>
> (Giesen 2006)

Giesen's reflection, depicting culture as a process of constant reconstruction and interpretation, sums up the Eisenstadtian notion of autonomy of culture. The sociographical roots of this perception hark back to Eisenstadt's revision of structural functionalism and of the relations between the structural and symbolic sphere.

Structural functionalism regards modernization as an all-encompassing and unprecedented process of growing social differentiation (Eisenstadt 1970b: 24). In an attempt to address the problem of social differentiation, an intricacy posited by Durkheim in *The Division of Labor in Society* (2014 [1893]), the founder of modernization theory, Talcott Parsons, has claimed modernization to be a process by which the different spheres of society, as he defined them in his A-G-I-L scheme, gradually became more autonomous from one other (Parsons 1970). Structural differentiation constitutes "an adaptive response by the social system to strains" (Alexander 1992: 86), while the system itself strives to restore equilibrium. In Parsons's differentiation theory, as depicted by Alexander,

> The power of economic forces to dominate other spheres is markedly diminished. Politics can constitute itself through its own organizational choices. Religious beliefs become more tolerant because they do not control power or community membership. Status anxiety increases because the distribution of rewards depends on individual achievement rather than group membership and ascribed status.
>
> (Alexander 1990: 7)

The critiques concerning Parsons's differentiation theory have centered on a few main points, the most significant among these emphasize its failure to (1) "incorporate national or regional specificity"; (2) relate to "a concept of social development"; and (3) "describe how particular conflicts and modes of collective action were linked to particular phases of social development or to the structural characteristics of different institutions" (Alexander 1990: 8).

Yet apart from the theory's "negation of process" (Alexander 1990: 8), its "static", "closed", and "ahistorical" character which was assigned to its analytic unit (Eisenstadt 1973: 47; Eisenstadt and Curelaru 1977: 36; Eisenstadt 1981b: 333),

one of the key arguments which Eisenstadt and other social theorists raised has targeted Parsons's understanding of the relations between the cultural and structural dimensions in the constitution of social systems. The Parsonian assumption that attends to the symbolic dimensions as "inherently and necessarily interwoven with the structural one" (Eisenstadt 2001b: 28), became highly questionable and played a role in the withdrawal from the hegemonic modernization theory.

Early modernization studies, according to Eisenstadt's retrospective understanding, assume that even if cultural and structural dimensions were not analytically distinct, "they had become historically inseparable" (Eisenstadt et al. 2002: 3). Culture, as the organizing logic of values, norms, and symbols, was in Parsons's terms a form of symbolic mediation (Schmid 1992: 95–97). Culture was thereby included as a part of the mechanisms that secured pattern maintenance (Eisenstadt 1986: 279) and was conceptualized as a sub-system that operates within the confines of the social system (Schmid 1992: 88). This means that culture had no status of its own, for it was subjected to structural constraints. For Eisenstadt, this perspective overlooks symbolic factors, treats them as indistinguishable from structural dynamics, and regards them simply as "residual categories" (Eisenstadt 1986: 299). Consequently, the Parsonian perspective fails to account for the "dialectic between order-transforming and order-maintaining aspects", a "dialectic" that in Eisenstadt's view stems from the tensions between culture and structure (ibid., 316).

Eisenstadt's critique also challenges non-Parsonian perceptions of culture, perceptions which emerged in the mid-1960s as social theory witnessed a significant shift in its basic concepts (Eisenstadt 1992c: 65). Most notable of such theories was the Marxist view. According to Eisenstadt, Marxism refers to cultural orientations as the mere reflection of "social forces" (ibid., 66–67). Eisenstadt rejects this view on the basis that it could not account for the "various aspects of praxis and the construction of changing mentalities" (ibid., 66). Another noteworthy theory that Eisenstadt challenges is that of Swidler (1986), which regards culture as the "aggregate result of pattern of behavior, structure or power" and treats it as a "tool kit of different strategies of action that can be activated in different situations according to the 'material' and 'ideal' interests of different social actors" (ibid., 67). Eisenstadt criticizes this view on the ground that it "implies that culture is merely a mirror" of choices made by "individuals and groups without any autonomy of their own" (ibid.).

Eisenstadt's objection to regard culture as undistinguished from structure, or being subsumed by it, has constituted one of the multiple modernities' fundamental points of departure, one which sought

> to combine the analysis of the crystallization of different aspects of social structure in the processes of social interaction in which individuals act as autonomous agents and where power and control are also connected with different aspects of "culture".
>
> (Eisenstadt 1986: 299–300)

Macro-societal change is hence theoretically derived neither from structure alone – the process of institutionalization which may "generate tendencies to conflate and change" (Eisenstadt 2003c: 279) – nor by "historical contingency" (Eisenstadt 2003a: 55), but from the inherent tensions that exist in-between culture and social structure (Eisenstadt 2000a: 19). Moreover, Eisenstadt understands all patterns of social change as a combination of the three factors: "Historical contingency, structure, and culture" (Eisenstadt 2003a: 55).

"Culture" is defined as "the basic premises of social interactions and the reservoir of models, themes, and tropes that are prevalent in a particular society" (Eisenstadt 2000a: 19). In this type of relationship, where the symbolic and structural dimensions of social lives constantly interact, the dynamic of culture is assumed to be autonomous, i.e. to constitute an analytically separate component in the construction of social order (Eisenstadt 1998: 230). The autonomous aspect of these symbolic components and their inherent role in constructing and maintaining the social order cause them to "bear the seeds of social transformation" (Eisenstadt 1992c: 84). Whereas such "seeds" are "common to all societies", their concrete expressions "greatly vary among different societies, giving rise to different patterns of social and cultural dynamics" (ibid.).

Eisenstadt's acknowledgment of the existence of different modes and patterns of change (Eisenstadt 1989: 102) paves the way for a theory that accounts for different societal constellations and cultural ontologies, one that lays out the theoretical basis of multiple modernities.

Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis, which interconnects culture, structure, and agency, emphasizes the "great importance" of the central dimensions of "culture" "in shaping instructional formations and patterns of behavior" (Eisenstadt 2000a: 19). As Eisenstadt argues:

> The crystallization of such central aspects of social interaction, institutional formations, and cultural creativity is best understood in terms of the processes through which symbolic and organizational aspects or dimensions of human activity and social interaction are interwoven. [. . .] Such changes are not caused naturally by the basic ontologies of any civilization, or by structural forces or patterns of social interaction in themselves, but rather by the continuous interpenetration of these two dimensions – the "cultural" and the "social structure". [. . .] At the same time, the rise of new forms of social organization and activity entails new interpretations of the basic tenets of cosmological visions and institutional premises, which greatly transform many of a civilization's antecedent tenets and institutions.
>
> (ibid., 19)

This analysis, which stresses the interpretative dimensions of both symbolic and institutional spheres, provides the basis for a theoretical account of the emergence and change of social systems. It attempts to explain how the major components, the institutional and the symbolic, operate in relation to one another:

> The first component is the level and distribution of resources among different groups in society, that is, the type of division of labor that is predominant in a given society. The second component is the institutional entrepreneurs or elites that are available – or competing – for the mobilization and structuring of such resources and for the organization and articulation of the interests of major groups generated by the social division of labor. The third component is the nature of the conceptions or, especially, ontological "visions" that inform the activities of these elites and that are derived from the major cultural orientations of codes prevalent in a society. The institutionalization of these visions provides the arena for both concretizing the charismatic dimension of social order and striving for a meaningful social order. This institutionalization is effected and crystallized by the activities of the major elites.
>
> (Eisenstadt 1991: 412–413)

Eisenstadt's Weberian perspective regards cultural visions, implemented by elites, as categorically different from structure and exterior to it. Cultural visions are seen as autonomous in that they provide "the starting point for articulating the premises and institutional contours of any patterns of social interaction and especially of institutional and macrosocietal formations" (Eisenstadt 1992c: 83).

Such a theoretical break from modernization theory has its roots in Eisenstadt's early attempts to revise structural functionalism in the 1970s (e.g. Eisenstadt 1970b; Eisenstadt and Curelaru 1977: 36), a step that had crucial bearings on how the modernization process, as a profound case of social change, was henceforth understood and re-conceptualized: If culture is autonomous from structure, it is possible to assume the variability of cultural systems.

Eisenstadt's shift to a perception of a multiplicity of systems derives from a change in the conceptualization of agency. As recently suggested by Abrutyn and Van Ness (2015: 53), Eisenstadt understood the agency in the earlier stages of his scholarship in terms of institutional entrepreneurs who emerged when facing a crisis, emphasizing collective goals in an attempt to sustain the system.[3] Eisenstadt altered this view arguing that it had taken for granted "the emergence of the social order" and negated "the creative autonomy of groups or individuals" (Eisenstadt 1981b: 334). At this revised phase, agents, according to Eisenstadt, mediate change in the sense that they "translated" ontological conceptions into institutional patterns, carrying thereby the potential to weld together the structural and symbolic dimensions.

Eisenstadt's renewed understanding of agency has roots in his civilizational analysis, where he depicts the rise of elite groups in the axial age – attempting to bridge the "this and other-worldly" gap – as a novel form of agency. Furthermore, the emphasis on the role of an autonomous elite in forming different civilizations (Eisenstadt 1980: 856–860), in demarcating collective boundaries (Eisenstadt and Giesen 1995), and in mediating cultural dimensions (Eisenstadt 1991: 412–413) enabled Eisenstadt to claim that there is no substantial contradiction between the order-maintaining and order-transforming aspects of culture (Eisenstadt 2003c: 289), for they both articulate modes of exerting power by and

of the elite. The concept of autonomous agents made it possible to base the claim for the autonomy of culture and the diversity of cultural and institutional patterns thereafter.

Eisenstadt's view of the autonomy of culture, a notion that can be traced to Buber's scholarship which emphasized the "cultural types and areas which are totally independent" (Buber 1962: 386, quoted in Eisenstadt 1992b: 10). This perception provides the basis for a model in which the interactions between a variety of institutional constellations and cultural programs, which also vary in the intra-societal sphere (Weil 2010). Tensions that emerged from the institutional and cultural level interacting with one another generate a civilizational process in which continuous interpretations of cultural visions and the way to realize them are established, re-established, and mediated through autonomous social agents.

The fundamentals and critiques of multiple modernities thesis

As a Weberian-based macro-sociological thesis, the principal contribution of multiple modernities is found in the assumption that modernity is not a uniform phenomenon but rather a process that takes various forms (Eisenstadt 2000b; Delanty 2006: 271). Modernity, as a process of social change, is then explained by a model that brings into account diverse cultural contexts and their localized institutional constellations, emphasizing the universal mechanism in the constitution of social systems. This model indicates a self-propelling process driven by tensions that emerged from these two levels, the cultural and the institutional, the symbolic and the structural, interacting with each other. The model which multiple modernities thesis attempts to break with is the classical view of European and Western modernity, seen as the "ideal type" which eclipsed the understanding of contemporary societies.

The thesis was endorsed by the academic community, mainly for its pluralistic and seemingly non-Eurocentric approach to analyzing modernity,[4] an analysis which, as Eisenstadt notes, had been "depriving the west of its monopoly on modernity" (Eisenstadt 2003c: 286). The Holberg Prize awarded to Eisenstadt in 2006 attests to the broad recognition the theory had gained. Several social theorists, including Arnason, Wittrock, and Sachsenmaier, are associated with the program. Thomassen notes that from the late 1990s, social theorists like Giesen (1998), Lambert (1999), Therborn (2003), J. Assmann (2005), Szakolczai (2006), Alexander and others have also become engaged in the discourse of axiality and multiple modernities (Thomassen 2010: 331).

Alongside the critiques which the program was subjected to, a growing number of studies in the social and political sciences began to implement the program mainly because it provides a theoretical basis to discuss modernity's non-Occidental forms (Göle 2000; Eickelman 2000; Kaviraj 2000; Weiming 2000; Kaya 2004a, 2004b; Kamali 2006; Ichijo 2013; Mota and Delanty 2015).

The primary challenge of multiple modernities is to account for the question of cultural variability, typifying contemporary societies. The program includes several presuppositions about the character of contemporary societies: First, it assumes that "the existence of culturally specific forms of modernity" forms that are "shaped by distinct cultural heritages and sociopolitical conditions"; second, it supposes that "differentiated structures, modes of openness, and ways of questioning the basic premises vary greatly across cultures and historical periods"; and third, it maintains that "unique forms of modernity are created by different activists and social movements that hold distinct views of what makes a society modern" (Eisenstadt et al. 2002: 1).

These assumptions are derived from Eisenstadt's late theoretical view of social change, where he argued that although the problems created by the process of modernization are common to most societies, "the concrete institutional answers to these problems tend to vary greatly. This variation is closely related, of course, to the basic conceptions of social and political order that have developed within each society" (Eisenstadt 1991: 429).

Based on the autonomy of culture, the theory of multiple modernities explains the variability of cultural systems, and the presumed inner diversity of a given cultural system (Weil 2010), as it accounts for the diversification of institutional patterns on a global scale. In so doing, it establishes a new narrative of modernity, one in which modernity is regarded as a novel and distinct type of "civilization" (Eisenstadt 2000b: 7) or "civilizational patterns" (Eisenstadt 2001b: 28). Such civilization, defined according to Eisenstadt's analysis of the axial age, gave rise to multiple cultural and social formations that "go far beyond the homogenizing and hegemonizing aspects" as developed in the West (Eisenstadt 2003c: 286).

The reconceptualization of modernity and modernization not as a systemic break from history but as continuity embodied in new civilizational patterns (Eisenstadt 2001a: 321; Eisenstadt and Schluchter 2001: 2), enabled Eisenstadt to argue that the fundamental ontological civilizational conceptions on which modernity is based were reinterpreted and later imbued all across the world, creating a multiplicity of localized institutional formations.

According to Eisenstadt, such conceptions were originally developed in Europe in response to the same existential problem rooted in the breakdown of an "ethical postulate", that is, in the perception that the world is meaningful, ethical and God-ordained (Eisenstadt 2001b: 28).[5] Such epistemic meta-cultural change – a change defined as modernity's threshold and that can be linked to the Weberian concepts of rationalization and disenchantment – gave rise to the variety of modern societal forms which at once connects and diversifies human societies.

Based on a few fundamental assumptions, the theory argues for an epistemic change which generated a variety of institutional formations. The major poles of the program's theoretical views are hereby arranged according to four interconnected constituting moments: a Kantian (agency/reflectivity), Weberian (civilization), Jasperian (axiality), and an additional aspect derived from Kołakowski and Buber (interpretation/open-endedness).

Constituting moments in multiple modernities

The Kantian moment of multiple modernities is most evident in what Eisenstadt identifies as the rise of a new form of agency, a rise that marked a transformation in the very "conception of human agency and of its place in the flow of time" (Eisenstadt 2001b: 28). This new form of agency is conceptualized according to the assumption that only conscious autonomous beings can act freely, and vice versa, that intentional actions directed toward change can be carried out only by autonomous agents. Thus the very existence of the new modern agent encapsulated the potential for the possibility of social change as it "exacerbated the tensions between the constructive and destructive potentialities of the construction of social orders, highlighting the challenge of human autonomy and self-regulating and of consciousness thereof" (Eisenstadt 2003b: 562).

To a great extent, this concept is associated with the emergence of the modern subject as portrayed by the Enlightenment movement and its motto "Sapere aude!" ("Dare to think!"). This new type of subject relies on its reason and employs it without external mediation (Kant 1784). Hence, according to Eisenstadt, these "ideal type" modern agents were the ones facilitating and implementing "the continuous reconstruction of multiple modernities" [. . .] through interactions with broader sectors of their respective societies" (Eisenstadt 2003c: 276).

An additional crucial aspect in this Kantian moment, exceeding Eisenstadt's initial concern of individual autonomy, centers on themes of self-reflectivity and criticism as tendencies that are imminent to the modern civilizational vision. These tendencies are essential elements in defining Eisenstadt's modern agent as they demarcate and enable the agents' frame of action and thus its freedom.

According to Ichijo's interpretation of Eisenstadt's thesis (Ichijo 2013: 114), social events involving elements of self-reflectivity are evidence of the self-constitutive character of the modern subject. Such events can take the form of a symposium, public debate, or any kind of social performance in which agents refer to themselves, relating to or objecting to the idea of modernity, collectivity, belonging, and so forth. On this basis, Eisenstadt was able to regard anti-Western movements as part and parcel of the modern civilizational vision (Eisenstadt et al. 2002: 5).

Based on human autonomy, modernity's frame of action is characterized by increasing freedom which can be seen as "*the* guiding normative element of the cultural programme of modernity" (Aakvaag 2015: 345). In this light, multiple modernities theory is conceptualized as an agency-focused approach (Ichijo 2013: 104) that accounts for the problem of cultural variability. This approach emphasizes events in which agents refer to themselves in light of and in relation to some aspects of the modern cosmological visions and institutional premises. Such self-referential activity is regarded as evidence of modern development and dynamics.

Weber's concept of Wirtschaftsethik, depicting a "self-propelling system" in which epistemai shape institutional realities, manifests itself in multiple modernities through the understanding of globalization as the interplay between common and open to interpretation vision(s) of modernity, and their localized institutional responses that vary from society to society (Eisenstadt 1987a: 5, 2005a: 31).

This idea lies at the core of Eisenstadt's definition of globalization as a process in which new multiple common reference points provide the basis for cultural networks and channels of communication. The reach of such diverse and yet culturally connected networks extends far beyond "the confines of any institutional boundaries, especially those of the nation-state" and maintains the "growing diversity in the continuous reinterpretation of modernity and the development of multiple global trends and mutual reference points that is characteristic of the contemporary world" (Eisenstadt 1999a: 294).

Based on Weber's understanding of the emergence of cultural systems (i.e. civilizations) and by assuming that culture is autonomous from structure, Eisenstadt was able to theorize modernity as a civilization, namely, as a set of ontological visions that bifurcated into various institutional derivatives. Through continuous interpretations of both the symbolic and structural, the social order in its multiple institutional expressions is established (Eisenstadt 2000a: 19). Therefore the inherent variety of symbolic and institutional interpretations explains the diversification of contemporary societies, all of which are included in the frame of the "civilization of modernity" (Eisenstadt 2000b: 7). Eisenstadt's Weberian-based approach to modernity as a civilizational process perpetuated by the interpretive role of elites leads to the two subsequent constituting moments of multiple modernities: the Jasperian aspect that supports Eisenstadt's concepts of a "second axial age" and the emphasis of elements of interpretation and openness that rises from Kołakowski's scholarship.

Based on Jaspers's concept of axiality (see Chapter 3), Eisenstadt was able to theoretically tie modernity to historical macro-societal changes that occurred in antiquity. Modernity is hence viewed not only in relation to an epistemic rupture but as a point of change in a long-term continuance process. In turning to axiality, Eisenstadt has paved a way to withdraw from the "idea of 'western' civilization as opposed to or even simply distinguished from other civilizations", an idea "imbued with evaluative assumption" (Bottici and Challand 2010: 123).

In the case of the axial age, as in modernity, the changes preceding the rise of the axial civilizations involved the emergence of new types of agents (elite groups). During the axial age, such elites regarded their respective societies and their worldly activities as a sphere in which the chasm between the transcendental-cosmic world and the mundane world becomes loci of salvation (Eisenstadt 1980: 856). In modernity, similar shifts in the concept of agency have led to changes in the "sociopolitical and economic order – according to transcendental vision" (Eisenstadt 1996: 13). The Jacobin dimension of modernity (Eisenstadt 1999b) – the uncompromising, violent and ruthless use of coercive means directed to bring about progress – is one example that demonstrates this tendency. Ideological politics, to name another example, is a phenomenon that Eisenstadt associates with the axial age (Eisenstadt 1981a: 158).

According to Eisenstadt, the conditions that enabled the expansion of modernity share similar structural characteristics with the conditions preceding the rise of the axial civilizations. Coupled with the shift in the form of agency, this meta-historic comparative view enabled Eisenstadt to regard modernity as a "second

axial age" (Eisenstadt 2001a: 321; Delanty 2004: 392), whereas the question of whether modernity should be analyzed as "civilization in the sense applicable to premodern formations, or as a new type of civilizational formation" is still a matter of debate (Arnason 2003b: 36). In the more concrete sense, modernity, like the axial civilizations, has been conceptualized by Eisenstadt as a social sphere in which different charismatic centers emerge simultaneously as they all relate to primary and common premises.

This basic premise of modernity is engraved in the emergence of European and Western civilization, and consists of the following core elements: (1) revolutionary orientations which led to the "far-reaching transformation of the nature and content of the centers of the social and cultural orders"; (2) a fundamental transformation of the relations between center and periphery, "an obliteration of the differences between center and periphery" which caused membership in the collectivity to be "tantamount to participation in the center"; (3) the growing secularization of the centers; (4) changes in the legitimation of authority, that is, from a "mandate of heaven" to a mandate of the people; (5) changes in the concept of human autonomy – the opening up of the possibility of "active formation of crucial aspects of social, cultural, and natural orders by conscious human activity"; (6) the expansion of the idea of equality and growing participation of citizens in the center; (7) a high degree of congruence between the cultural and political identities of the territorial population; and (8) an ideology of economic development (Eisenstadt 1987a: 6–7).

The causes which led to the emergence of such transformations in Europe are explained in Eisenstadt's theory by pointing to the prevalence of medieval heterodox and heretic movements that challenged the existing structure of legitimation and established a prospect of structural change thereafter. Such changes, associated with those aforementioned movements, occurred first in the theological-moral sphere (e.g. Protestantism), in the jurist sphere (e.g. the right of property; Eisenstadt 1999b: 54), and finally in the social-civilian sphere (e.g. nationalism; ibid., 123). Eisenstadt concluded that forms of religious deviance were paving the way for revolutionary movements to act and accelerate processes of change.

Despite the notion that the modern and pre-modern eras appear incomparable, Jaspers's concept of axiality and his comparison of the deep structural changes that define modernity to those occurring in antiquity enable Eisenstadt to form multiple modernities in light of another crucial focus: non-linearity. Modernity was henceforth theorized as a process that cannot be assessed in light of a "linear evolution or theories of the existence of different historical 'stages' or 'phases'" (Wittrock 2009: 95), but rather as a process that is nourished from and corresponds with previous structural changes. These changes reveal their traces, only after they had vanished from the social sphere ("latent pattern" in Eisenstadt's terms), and after the reinterpretations of new agents had revived them.

The focus on interpretation is an aspect that Kołakowski's "endless trial" (1990) contributes to multiple modernities. Whereas Jaspers provides the basis to refer to the emergence of modernity in non-linear terms, Kołakowski's concept

of modernity – as a project that encompasses continuous, inevitable clashes and conflicts (Kołakowski 1990: 138) – enables Eisenstadt to address modernity in a non-teleological manner. The "civilization of modernity" (Eisenstadt 1987b: 6), its multiple cultural programs and their institutional implications are characterized by their inherent "antinomies, tension and contradictions" (Eisenstadt 1999a: 62). Seen as an "endless trial", the major identity propelling mechanism of modernity is viewed as the

> crystallization and development of [a] mode or modes of interpretation [. . .] of a distinct social "imaginaire", indeed of the ontological vision, of a distinct cultural program, combined with the development of a set or sets of new institutional formations – the central core of both being [. . .] an unprecedented openness and uncertainty.
>
> (Eisenstadt et al. 2002: 28)

The openness which Eisenstadt refers to in this context is embedded in a conception of the social sphere in which "various possibilities that can be realized by an autonomous human agency – or by the march of history – are open" (ibid., 29). The emergence of this conception, which harks back to the ideas of the Enlightenment movement, reflects a shift in the legitimization of "the social, ontological, and the political orders", a shift that attests to a new degree of reflectivity that exceeds the one developed in the axial civilizations (ibid., 30). Such modern reflectivity, according to Fourie's interpretation of Eisenstadt, "places agents outside of their time and place" and thereby enables them to bring about "an unprecedented historical consciousness" (Fourie 2012: 57).

Kołakowski's concept of modernity as an "endless trial" enables Eisenstadt to regard modernity as reference point (Eisenstadt 2000b: 24) from which various and ever-evolving interpretations are derived and to view the history of modernity as "a story of continual constitution and reconstitution of a multiplicity of cultural programs" (ibid., 2). The notion of an "endless trial" diverges, for example, from Habermas's understanding of modernity as the incomplete project that began with the socio-pedagogical vision of Enlightenment (Habermas 1993) – and reads modernity as a framework that is subject to constant reflection that constitutes an open-ended framework of interpretations and reinterpretations of what it means to be "modern" (Eisenstadt 2003c: 276).

Such non-teleological view is a corollary to Eisenstadt's emphasis of the antinomies, tensions, and paradoxes that are inscribed to any social system (Eisenstadt et al. 1987: 7) and holds the potential to instill the process of interpretation. According to this thesis, and as opposed to what has been underscored by classic sociology (Eisenstadt 1987a: 3–4), modernity is not led by progress, and progress alone cannot be viewed as the telos of modernity, nor can it account for it.

To some extent Kołakowski enables multiple modernities to answer to postmodernism by arguing that modernity has defined and yet opened to interpretation narratives. These narratives do not operate as a mere reflection of sourceless epistemai but are rather continually being interpreted; in the course of

interpretation new meanings are generated, and the limits of these narratives are continuously examined.

These aspects, which rise from the scholarship of Kant, Weber, Jaspers, and Kołakowski, with Buber's notion of agency and interpretation being constantly in the background, have established multiple modernities' theoretical framework which accounts for the non-linear and non-teleological path of the modern civilization. Given that agency is a common thread in all of these adumbrated aspects, the multiple modernities thesis can be understood primarily as an agency-based theory whose main socio-philosophical account of modernity emphasizes the importance of agents whose self-reflective activities have set the conditions for the emergence of the new civilizational sphere of modernity.

Sociographical sources of multiple modernities

Along with other new theories of modernity, such as Bauman's "liquid modernity" (Bauman 2003) or Beck's "reflexive modernity" (Beck et al. 1994), the multiple modernities thesis is an expression of the reappearance of the fundamental sociological problem of modernity at the turn of the 21st century (Giddens 1991: 1). As a multilevel sociological account of modernity and cultural variability, the theory of multiple modernities is rooted in several discursive events that paved the way for the programs' emergence: Most notable was the disciplinary crisis in sociology that culminated during the 1960s and 1970s, around the time when it possible to identify Eisenstadt's move toward a revised stage of structural functionalism. This crisis was generally rooted in the breakdown of modernization theory and subsequently led to the Weberian wake and the "cultural turn" in which

> the master narratives that treated historical processes as variations of one structural or ideational norm came under attack from a wide array of positions. As a result scholars [. . .] become far more sensitive to the culturally specific character of historical phenomena and societal processes.
>
> (Eisenstadt et al. 2002: 7)

As mentioned in the previous chapter, this shift in the field of social theory laid out the conditions for Eisenstadt's turn to civilizational analysis and its emphasis on the interconnectedness of agency, structure, and culture. The shift toward civilizational analysis supposedly illustrated Eisenstadt's withdrawal from methodological nationalism – from "the arena of the nation-state, to an arena in which different movements and different societies continually interact" (Eisenstadt 2003c: 278). In addition, increasing awareness of the intellectual fragmentation in the field of sociology (Camic and Joas 2003: 1–3) and a growing sensitivity to Eurocentric/Western-centric tendencies (Delanty 2006: 267–268) also played a role in shaping multiple modernities. The Eurocentric/Western-centric tendencies in classical sociology – generally assuming that "the cultural program of modernity as it developed in modern Europe and the basic institutional constellations

that emerged there would ultimately take over in all modernizing and modern societies" (Eisenstadt 2000b: 1) – are a central discursive element that multiple modernities theory rejected.

Eisenstadt's rejection of Western-centrism manifested itself in his critique of two competing theories that emerged at the end of the Cold War: Fukuyama's *The End of History* (1992) and Huntington's *The Clash of Civilizations* (1996). Fukuyama's theory, equated with the earlier convergence theory of industrial societies (Eisenstadt 1999a: 283), suggests that the fall of the Soviet bloc marked the end of ideologies and the beginning of "the homogenization of the liberal world-view and predominance of market economy" (ibid.). *The End of History* announces the triumph of "the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government" (Fukuyama, cited by King 2002: 149). An opposing view, offered by Huntington, suggests that the process of globalization does not necessarily lead to a universal homogenization but rather to a "clash of civilizations", that is, to an inevitable conflict between Western and non-Western civilizations (Eisenstadt 1999a: 283). Eisenstadt criticized Huntington's dichotomic view of the modern and anti-modern civilizations, claiming that movements which are anti-Western are nevertheless distinguishably modern (Eisenstadt et al. 2002: 5). For Eisenstadt, Fukuyama's and Huntington's theories simply fail to provide an account of globalization that is consistent with the post–Cold War reality.

Eisenstadt traces Fukuyama's and Huntington's failure back to the hegemonic view of modernization studies and classical sociology in which it was assumed that (1) Western civilization is "the seeming epitome of modernity" (Eisenstadt 2000b: 3); (2) the "basic institutional constellations" that were developed in European modernity carried "homogenization tendencies"; and (3) that these institutional constellations would not only sustain themselves in the West but would eventually "prevail throughout the world" (ibid., 1).[6] It is crucial to see that in Eisenstadt' earlier phase, this set of assumptions pervaded his understanding of modernization, which he defined in 1966 as

> the process of change toward those types of social, economic, and political systems that have developed in western Europe and North America from the seventeenth century to the nineteenth and have then spread to other European countries and in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to the South American, Asian and African continents.
>
> (Eisenstadt 1966: 1)

As opposed to this set of assumptions which he held before turning to the civilizational analysis, Eisenstadt suggests first acknowledging that such a view is not consistent with the diversification of the 20th century's social realities, and is neither universally nor empirically valid. Eisenstadt's claim for a multiplicity of modern programs is also based on the understanding that the West itself cannot be seen as heterogeneous (Eisenstadt 1999b: 196), and that the homogenization argument which classical sociological thought introduced does not bear the test of time.

In Eisenstadt's view, the great variety that characterizes the major cultural and institutional arenas of contemporary societies is derived from the "multiple institutional and ideological patterns" that lie at the core of modern development as he understands it (Eisenstadt 2000b: 1–2). This perspective defined multiple modernities theory as a deep discursive rejection of how modernization studies and classical sociology understood the expansion of modernity. This rejection was premised on Eisenstadt's observations and reading of the post–Cold War reality which he regarded to be "radically different" from the later predicaments of classical and Parsonian sociology (Eisenstadt et al. 2002: 4).

The breakdown of the Soviet bloc is one of the seminal historical events which led multiple modernities theory to become a central theory accounting for the institutional variability and the cultural diversity that were becoming more apparent around that time (ibid., 2). Multiple modernities theory gained momentum, especially with the end of the Cold War, which galvanized the understanding that modernity does not necessarily lead to the cultural and institutional (Western) unification and universalization, a change which modernization theorists viewed as positive in character (Wagner 1994: xiii). Bhambra argues that the collapse of Communism in Europe not only "pointed to the different routes to modernity", but it also "dramatically altered the context for sociological self-understanding of the discipline and its worlds" (Bhambra 2014: 11, 12). The multiple modernities thesis is clearly one of the products of this change.

Several other historical events are relevant to the program's sociography, among them the decreasing value of the nation-state, a process which Eisenstadt referred to as "demystification" (Eisenstadt 1980: 4). According to Eisenstadt, this processes led to a growing need to re-conceptualize the cultural and institutional arena toward the turn of the 21st century and ever more after the post–Cold War era, which challenged the artificial binary of Western democracies and Communist totalitarianism. Multiple modernities then has to be understood as a corollary of the post–Cold War era, a theory that attempts to break with such binaries by providing an explanatory base for a globalized social sphere, where cultural changes transcend the boundaries set by national units.

Critiques of multiple modernities

Multiple modernities theory, as previously mentioned, gained wide recognition in academic circles mainly for its pluralist approach to modernity. The program, nevertheless, was criticized for several reasons: First, as depicted by Giesen, the program tended to overlook the historical conditions from which the multiple forms of modernity have emerged.[7] Although the multiple modernities thesis sporadically refers to imperialism and colonialism as the context in which modernity developed (e.g. Eisenstadt 2000b: 14), it does not refer to the historical conditions within which Western modernity had become the central reference point among non-Western contemporary societies.

Second, drawing on Dirlik (2003), Bhambra (2007, 2013) posits a postcolonial critique of multiple modernities. She argues that whereas multiple modernities theory understands modernity in terms of institutional constellations and cultural

programs, the very idea of what it means to be modern – that is, the original categories of modernity as rooted in the concept of the West – remained unchanged (Bhambra 2013: 302, 2014: 35). This critique is supported by the findings this chapter presented, showing that the agential perception that lies at the core of multiple modernities is based on the Enlightenment's Western-centric conception of man as the modern subject.

Furthermore, in Bhambra's view, multiple modernities theorists have tried to disassociate themselves from Eurocentrism while simultaneously "embracing its core assumptions, namely, the Enlightenment assumption of the centrality of a Eurocentered type of modernity" (Bhambra 2007: 877, 2014: 35).

Bhambra maintains that the European experience is conceived in multiple modernities as the fundamental category of modernity, while "other histories simply provide local colour" (Bhambra 2007: 878). According to Bhambra, multiple modernities paradigm assumes the pre-existing category of modernity "as opposed to a positive engagement with it" (ibid.). Despite the theory's attempt to break with sociology's Eurocentric approaches, it paradoxically reproduces and reinforces the notion of the "original Western modernity advocated in modernization theory" (Boatcă and Costa 2010: 18).

Third, additional critiques indicating multiple modernities' cultural essentialism were raised by Knöbl (2010), Fourie (2012), Trakulhun and R. Weber (2015), and Schmidt (2015). Fourie draws attention to a vast array of methodological problems found in the theory, the most central of these being the theory's difficulty in defining "the primary unit of analysis without succumbing to cultural essentialism" (Fourie 2012: 62). This problematic aspect is also tied to what Fourie identifies as a far too inclusive definition of modernity which results in incoherency (ibid.). "On the one hand", she writes,

> Multiple modernities is attempting to deconstruct established notions of the "modern" in order to explain the plurality of socio-political forms around the world. On the other, it realizes that it is not enough to simply posit infinite, meaningless variation, and therefore often reverts to exactly the casual cultural generalizations it is hoping to avoid. In so doing, it lays itself open, at the one extreme, to charges of essentialism, cultural determination and ahistoricism [. . .], while, at the other, it can be accused of stretching the boundaries of modernity so far that they begin to collapse.
>
> (ibid.)

Delanty's critique, directed at the theory's explanatory power, points to the risk of modernity becoming a "numerical conditions that can be infinitively pluralized to the point that it is devoid of analytical clarity" (Delanty 2006: 273). Delanty claims that the debate on multiple modernities was not further developed and did not "advanced beyond the general recognition that modernity takes more than one form" (ibid.).

Moreover, in Trakulhun and R. Weber's view, who also challenge the workability of the program, the program's intellectual roots are found in the sociological research of the 1960s, when "modernity" was understood "both as a goal and an

evaluative standard that held promise and claimed validity for the entire world" (Trakulhun and R. Weber 2015: xv). According to the two, multiple modernities, in principle, did not radically question the paradigm of modernity but rather "decentralized its sources" (ibid., xvii).

Trakulhun and R. Weber explain the theory's appeal in the new and "less Eurocentric" narrative it has established, a narrative in which "non-European histories became more important since Non-Western civilizations were no longer considered as bystanders, victims, or latecomers of the modernizing process but as principal forces operating at the heart of this global long-term process" (ibid., xvii). It was in this discursive sphere that longed for a new narrative, one that was capable of breaking with the dichotomic view of East versus West in which "Eisenstadt's cosmopolitan perspective called for a greater sensitivity for non-European norms and alternative historical trajectories" (ibid., xvii). Nevertheless, Trakulhun and R. Weber argue that Eisenstadt "offered little to explain the effects of cross-cultural exchanges, because he viewed civilizations as mutually independent entities predominantly driven by internal dynamics. His model is therefore prone to producing and reifying essentialist cultural distinctions largely drawn along religious lines" (Trakulhun and Weber 2015: xvii).

In a similar vein, Schmidt (2006, 2015) criticizes the corpus of multiple modernities literature in his "varieties of modernity" thesis. His critique is grounded in two main arguments: First, he argues that Eisenstadt's appeal for a cultural conceptualization of modernity "does not yield any novel insights [and is] unlikely to improve our understanding of modern society" (Schmidt 2015: 64–65). Second, Schmidt underscores the fragility of a civilizational-centered approach in thinking of modernity and of contemporary societies' identities. If multiple modernities theory turns out to be mistaken, as Schmidt believes to be the case, it risks losing its entire empirical applicability (Schmidt 2006: 87–88).

Finally, Knöbl (2010: 90–91) criticizes Eisenstadt and other civilizational analysts for not demonstrating convincingly how the civilizational constellations that emerged during the axial age survived for more than a millennium and how they influenced contemporary societies. Knöbl, who finds Eisenstadt's claim for path dependency insufficient, argues that in failing to account for the stability of Axial civilizational trajectories and their connection to the multiple forms of modernity, theorists of multiple modernities have left this question, which was originally raised by Mauss and Durkheim, unresolved (Knöbl 2010: 91). The following section presents a different type of critique, one that is concerned with the interconnectedness of multiple modernities to Israel's collective identity.

The application of multiple modernities to the case of Israel

Under the framework of the multiple modernities thesis, the core definition of the state of Israel as a "Jewish and democratic" state is understood as a unique institutional interpretation that the civilization of modernity has given rise to.[8] Two main difficulties arise from Eisenstadt's observations of the particular elements that make Israel "a modern democratic state" (Eisenstadt 1985: 565; Eisenstadt

2002: 89). The first difficulty concerns defining the Israeli regime as a "Jewish democracy" (Eisenstadt 2004a: 195; Eisenstadt 2008: 212), while the second refers to the transformations that Israeli society has undergone from the point of its establishment to the political turn of 1977 as an exhaustion of the original Zionist program (Eisenstadt 2004a: 142).

To start, the unique modern patterns that developed in Israeli society were rooted, according to Eisenstadt, in

> the repercussions of the combination of the political-ecological condition of a small society and the primordial-national and historical revolutionary-ideological orientations of the Zionist movements and of the relations of these Zionist movements to the major themes of Jewish culture.
>
> (Eisenstadt 2008: 212)

This paragraph, published in a late phase of Eisenstadt's writing, reveals many of the motives through which Israel's hegemonic self-understanding is mediated. It depicts the developmental path of Israeli society as a corollary of Zionism's symbolic orientations and its structural limitations. Without attempting to contradict or approve this proposition, it can be said that it essentially reproduces numerous narratives prevalent in Israel political memory, narratives such as a "small society" – "small" being a subjective judgment.

Furthermore, Eisenstadt's use of the attribute "revolutionary", which he systematically associates with the Zionist movement and Israeli society, warrants special attention: The revolutionary representation of Israeli society appears in Eisenstadt's early scholarship (Eisenstadt 1948: 11, 1967; see Chapter 2) and is repeated frequently in his later scholarship Eisenstadt 1996: 13, 2004a: 149, 2004b: 22). Most notable is Eisenstadt's analysis presented in *The Transformation of Israeli Society*, where he described the "story" of Israel as a "story of a small society built up by groups of revolutionary pioneers" who aimed to create "a place of refuge and of national security for an old-new nation" (Eisenstadt 1985: 557).

The repetition emphasizes the centrality of the "revolutionary" element in Eisenstadt's perception of Zionism and Israel society as the embodiment of an "old-new nation". Yet in what sense can Israel and the Zionist project be described as revolutionary? Kimmerling has argued that in the late 1960s Eisenstadt regarded the source of the revolutionary aspect as having been promoted by the Labor Zionist movement, making Israel a socially, culturally, and economically innovative society (Kimmerling 2007: 154). This explanation, however, does not bring into account that the attribute "revolutionary" is one of Zionism's self-referential depictions.

Zionism observes itself in terms of a revolutionary movement which introduced the idea of Jewish nationalism to nation-less Jews in Europe. In this sense, it has "revolutionized" the Jewish belief system by exposing it to the idea of secular nationalism. Therefore, only within the self-referential discourse of Zionism can one understand the latter as being a revolutionary movement. The Zionist movement, however, did not significantly manage to break with the existing power

relations that made Jewish communities an object of otherness, nor did it ever attempt to. Moreover, the Zionist movement did not seek to revolutionize the institutions and institutional structures that have already existed in the pre-state phase, nor did it attempt to introduce new institutional forms of its own. Instead, it maintained standing institutions such as the British judicial system and the bureaucratic administration system which was founded by the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, the Zionist movement did not challenge the imperial dynamics that dominated Zionism's formative period. Instead, some of its currents sought to be assisted by imperial tendencies, as reflected for example by Jabotinsky's central essay, "The Iron Wall" (1937 [1923]).

Eisenstadt's grasp of the revolutionary component being one of the distinctive traits of the Zionist movement unravels his view of Israel as sharing affinities with a Western nation-state:

> These basic characteristics of collective consciousness, especially the strong emphasis on primordial historical, linguistic, territorial components of Israel's collective identity bring Israel closer to the Western European nation state. But the similarities to the European nation states were only partial, and they were rooted, as we have seen, in the revolutionary dimension of the Zionist movement.
>
> (Eisenstadt 2004a: 248)

The depiction of Israeli society as revolutionary, then, not only reproduces one of the central self-referential narratives of Zionism but also enables Eisenstadt to argue for the affinities which Israeli modern patterns share with the West. However, the similarities which Eisenstadt point out do not mean that the Western patterns are to be seen as identical with those of developed in Israel.[9]

A Jewish democracy

Eisenstadt defines the fundamental characteristics of the political patterns developed in Israel as those of a constitutional and consociational democratic system (Eisenstadt 2004a: 196, 2010: 192), a modern economy (Eisenstadt 2010: 192), and a modern collective whose cultural identity interweaves with Jewish history (Eisenstadt 1985: 557). All of these characteristics have enabled this political frame to maintain certain sustainability. The emergence of such a "unique" pattern, in which a strong military ethos has developed (Eisenstadt 2010: 194), is connected to the cultural and ideological institutional pattern that emerged during Israel's pre-state phase, characterized by complex religion and state relations in which no clear division between these two institutional spheres exists (ibid.). In this case, the borders of the Israeli collectivity are also found to be the source of its tensions, as most of its key problems connect with

> the possible contradictions between the Jewish and democratic components of the Jewish-democratic state; the closely related problem about the exact

> nature and definition of the Jewish components of the State; of the relations between the primordial or cultural and civil, and between the Israeli and the Jewish components in the construction of Israeli identity.
>
> (Eisenstadt 2008: 212)

One of the central tensions created by the definition of the Jewish state is seen in the discriminative approach toward the non-Jewish population and the lasting occupation of Palestinian land which has had "far-reaching – indeed radical – impact on the internal structure of Israeli society, changing many of its major features and subverting many of its basic premises" (Eisenstadt 2004a: 169). This tendency has lead according to Eisenstadt to the "continual brutalization of behavior within many sectors of Jewish society in Israel" (ibid., 148).

Eisenstadt's aforementioned critical observations attest to his growing discontent with national zealotry and the erosion of civil lives. Similar to what Kimmerling argued (2007), it is possible to see that in his late scholarship Eisenstadt evinces a critical overtone when referring to certain political tendencies that prevailed in Israel around the turn of the century. Among these were "the continuous Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, the continual expansion of the settlements, the seeming unwillingness of the governments since 1977 (with the partial [. . .] to enter into some serious negotiations with the Palestinians)" (Eisenstadt 2004a: 146).

This critique, nonetheless, has a marginal place in Eisenstadt's late writings. The definition of a state as both Jewish and democratic, the inherent paradox that outlines the borders of Israel's collectivity, political discourse, and the civil sphere, is not only left unchallenged in Eisenstadt's account but is rather understood as a given. Despite recognizing its paradoxical character, Eisenstadt accepts the definition of a "Jewish democracy" without questioning its exclusivist ethnocratic implications, or discussing the meaning and viability of a democracy established in colonial settings. Eisenstadt perceives the idea of a Jewish state or a Jewish democracy as valid and tangible, despite the fact that the state of Israel does not claim to belong to, represent, or serve all its citizens.

The exhaustion of the Zionist program

Internal contradictions characterize the institutional foundation established by Zionist elites in the pre-state phase, according to Eisenstadt. Such contradictions, he iterates, exist in "every modern society" (Eisenstadt 2010: 196). As Kimmerling notes, Eisenstadt describes this institutional pattern using the concept of dynamic conservatism. Similar to Buber's early use of the paradox of revolutionary conservatism (see Chapter 2), the concept of dynamic conservatism can be traced in Eisenstadt's earlier scholarship that emphasized the revolutionary and the conservative dimensions typifying culture (Eisenstadt 1992b: 9). By emphasizing the revolutionary core in the constitution of Israel, Eisenstadt identifies and element of active agency. According to him, such dynamics has "attempted to solve new problems through the adaptation and expansion of existing structures

[and. . .] to absorb new forces while maintaining the broader framework of power, social organization, values and ideologies" (Eisenstadt 2004a [1976]: 128). It was "dynamic" in the sense that

> it openly took on new problems and demonstrated readiness to give up narrow vested interests and to integrate new groups into its organizational frameworks. But at the same time the attempt was to solve those problems without altering the existing ideological or institutional structures.
>
> (ibid.)

"Dynamic conservatism" has enabled certain institutional flexibility on the one hand, while preventing marginalized groups from developing their own autonomy or entering the center of society on the other (Eisenstadt 2010: 196–197). At the same time, the "dynamic conservatism" approach embedded, according to Eisenstadt, the conditions for the erosion of the hegemonic program of the Zionist Labor movement which implemented it. This is the core of Eisenstadt's critique regarding the consequences of the decline of the state's founding movement.

Eisenstadt's analysis of Israel's original institutional pattern reveals certain ambivalence towards the question of the colonial tendencies in which these patterns evolved: Whereas in the early 1970s and later on, Eisenstadt pointed out the central role of the different "Jewish-colonizing activities", "colonizing agencies", and the "'institutional' entrepreneur colonizer" in the process of shaping Israel's original institutional framework (e.g. Eisenstadt 1970a: 109, 110),[10] his later scholarship evinces a distinction between what he regards as a "settlement" and a "colonial" society (Eisenstadt 2004b: 25). In the way Eisenstadt uses the terms, the two exclude one another (Kimmerling 2007: 167–168), although they are semantically identical.

Eisenstadt argues that during the British Mandate the Jewish Yishuv envisioned "an independent non-colonial process of settlement" and a "Jewish economy based on Jewish labor". Hence, the Zionist project, according to Eisenstadt, was not based on the exploitation of land, populations, and resources, but rather on "economic independence and self-support" (Eisenstadt 2004a: 169). Semi-colonial tendencies have nevertheless increased, according to Eisenstadt, only after the 1967 War (ibid.; Eisenstadt 2004b: 25).

The erosion of what Eisenstadt understands as the "original Zionist program" culminated, according to him, in the 1977 political shift, marking the rise of the Likud party to power. For Eisenstadt, this shift embodied "the beginning of far-reaching changes and transformations in Israeli social, economic and political systems" (Eisenstadt 2004a: 139). These transformations refer, first, to the change of the economic policies on which the state was originally established (Eisenstadt 2008: 209), and second, to the change in the dynamics of political representation in Israel, reflecting the demands of marginalized groups not merely to be incorporated into the hegemonic center, but to take an active part in shaping the symbols of collective identity (Eisenstadt 2004a: 153).[11] "From the late eighties and above all in the nineties", Eisenstadt writes, "ethnic or 'immigrant' parties or parties

in which the 'ethnic' ('oriental') or 'immigrant' component was very strongly emphasized – became, in contrast to some of the earlier rather small ones, a very central factor on the political scene" (ibid., 141). In Eisenstadt's view, sectorial politics and the attempts to "reconstruct" the symbols of collective identity have led to

> a strong emphasis on various nationalistic and religious themes which were hitherto, as it were, "dormant", a continual enhancement of primordial territorial symbolism, couched now more and more in religious terms, as well as the intensive promulgation of particularistic, national exclusivist themes. (ibid., 150)

Eisenstadt mentions two political streams which emerged after 1977 and attest to the change mentioned above: The first is "Shas" party, emphasizing religious and Mizrahi orientations, and the second is the National Religious Party, "who spearheaded the settlements in Judea and Samaria, that became the major promulgators of this ideology, imbuing it with strong religious, indeed 'Messianic' motives" (ibid., 145).

Finally, Eisenstadt also underscores the changes in the political economy of Israel that began to take place from the late 1970s, changes that concern the "strong capitalistic direction" (ibid., 168) which Israeli society began to pursue. Eisenstadt sharply criticizes the tendencies toward "corporate capitalistic oligopolitic arrangements" manifested in the practices of "liberalization, privatization, marketization, and deregulation" (ibid.).

Eisenstadt frames the new post-1977 economic and political ethos in terms of the exhaustion of the original Zionist, socialist, and secular program. All of the tendencies and new political actors that have risen since are viewed as "challenging and contesting the institutional and ideological hegemony of the Labor Zionist mold" (ibid., 172).

Eisenstadt's concept of exhaustion assumes a certain withdrawal from the original Zionist ideological program, focusing mainly on the shift toward a neoliberal approach marked by M. Begin's rise to power in 1977. These policies have had a far-reaching effect on Israeli society, leading to growing inequality and disparate wealth distribution (Ram 2008).

This critique has been expanded in one of Eisenstadt's latest articles (Eisenstadt 2011b), which evinces a severe concern regarding Israel's increasing religiosity and "the fragility" of its political frameworks.

Eisenstadt's "exhaustion" argument nevertheless provides a problematic explanation of these orientations, for several reasons: First, equality and social solidarity were not fully granted during the Labor movement's rule. Social rights were not implemented equally among all Israeli citizens or those under Israeli rule. It is difficult to discuss the distribution of welfare sources at a time when marginalized groups were deprived of civil rights, as in the case of Arab Palestinians which were subject to physical segregation under the military rule that ended in 1966, just before the 1967 military occupation began. Furthermore, prior to 1977

state distribution of resources created privileged and underprivileged strata, and after 1977 Israel's political economy remained divided on an "ethnic, national, or ethno-gender basis" (Shenhav 2013). In fact, the very idea of equality, as articulated within what Eisenstadt regards as the original Zionist program, could not have coincided with the definition of a "Jewish state" in the first place, mainly because it preempts the possibility of civil equality.

Second, regardless of the economic approach propagated by the main political actors in Israel, be it socialism or neoliberalism, political "left" or "right", Zionism has continued to be the overarching ideology that defines the border of political discourse. Being Zionist was and to date still is a prerequisite for holding parliamentarian or governmental power (The Knesset, "Basic Law: The Knesset" 1958). Given this condition, it is difficult to speak of a process of "exhaustion". Moreover, the seeming intensification of Zionist ideology, fervor, and rhetoric in the first decade of the 21st century, followed by delegitimation of non-Zionist or post-Zionist proponents in the political and civilian discourse, is not consistent with Eisenstadt's "exhaustion" argument. This argument provides an example of how Eisenstadt's sociological interpretation of the socio-political changes that Israeli society underwent takes the Zionist Labor movement's ethos as well as the social order it aimed to establish as its reference point.

The definition of Israel as a Jewish democracy and the transformation of its society, formulated in terms of "exhaustion", are considered unique examples which demonstrate how Israel has developed its own unique pattern of modernity. Eisenstadt's late analyses of Israeli society accept prevailing Zionist assumptions concerning social order, statehood, and the ethnocentric orientation in Israel, mainly by not seeking to challenge them.

Critique

The questions of the one and many, change and continuity, are some of the problems that pre-Socratic, Platonist, and Aristotelian philosophy engaged. Multiple modernities theory attends to the intricacy of multiplicity and unity, and the civilizational analysis addresses the question of continuity and change. Both theories, however, do not contribute to solving these underlying metaphysical questions, neither do they refer to these preceding philosophical debates. Congruently, the analytical categories which Eisenstadt employs in these analyses perpetuate at times dualistic dichotomist distinctions, for example, when distinguishing culture from structure, despite assuming their analytical interconnectedness. Instead, the two theories aim at providing an answer to the problems that the discipline of sociology faced prior to the cultural turn.

Multiple modernities re-theorizes modernity as an overarching cultural program that was interpreted into different institutional forms, depending on the given local conditions, problems, and orientations. Modernity, unlike what classical sociology assumed, was a phenomenon that has taken multiple shapes and forms, not necessarily Western. However, according to postcolonial critiques, multiple modernities thesis does not challenge the concept of the West. On the

contrary, despite the positioning of modernity as a theoretical construct aloof from historical analysis, the thesis notwithstanding views Western modernity as the reference point for other non-Western societies. In so doing, it continues to reproduce a narrative of modernity associated with the West.

Modernity, for Eisenstadt, is the most immense and far-sweeping institutional macro-change that has been seen since the axial age, an era which was also accompanied by the emergence of a new form of agency. Eisenstadt's conceptual grasp of modernity involves a renewed understanding of the relation between agency and structure: If modernity is constituted as a major change of social structure, then it must entail a shift in the form of agency. Furthermore, Eisenstadt emphasizes the precedence of culture over structure in the constitution of social orders. As an agency-focused theory, the multiple modernities thesis is based on the concept of the autonomy of culture and is directed to defend it. By taking on this kind of working assumption, the multiple modernities thesis goes beyond functionalism by emphasizing the transformative impact that cultural visions possess (Delanty 2004: 392).

The examination of Eisenstadt's application of the multiple modernities thesis to the case of Israel shows that his view concerning the social transformations in Israel reproduces prevailing Zionist assumptions with reference to Israel's political definitions. The form of a "Jewish and democratic" Israeli state is seen as one of unique institutional interpretation of the modern premise, attesting to the independent capacity of agency. However, the self-contradictory quality of this framework remains unsettled and is attributed to the inherent paradoxes that characterize social systems in general.

Eisenstadt's account portrays Israeli regime as constitutional, consociational, and democratic in character. These attributes are based on problematic premises, for several reasons: First, no binding constitution has ever been passed in Israel. Although Basic Laws have a constitutional "status", they are nevertheless reversible by a majority vote of parliament members (The Knesset, "Basic Law: Freedom of Occupation" 1994). Second, it is difficult to regard Israel's political framework as consociational in character for the same reasons that make it difficult to view the state as being essentially democratic: Despite its electoral system, and despite parliamentarian representation attained by Arab Palestinians, "the State of the Jews" declares itself as not belonging to all of its citizens but rather to one specific group defined across "ethnic"-religious lines. Such political sphere, in which non-Jews do not possess full political and civil rights, attests to a rather majoritarian tendency, one that cannot coexist within a consociational[12] democracy, nor can it be formulated within a democratic interpretation of the Israeli political framework.

Eisenstadt's analysis of Israel within the framework of multiple modernities provides the basis for rendering the existing political frames and discourse in Israel legitimate. For Eisenstadt, the constitution of Israel as a modern enterprise is necessarily bound up with its definition as a Jewish and democratic state, Zionist at its core. The ahistorical character of multiple modernities thesis also enables Eisenstadt not to attend to the historical conditions on which it was

possible for this core to develop. Although Eisenstadt was familiar with how collective identities can be constructed from "above" (Eisenstadt 2005b: 325), he fully accepts Israel's constitutive definitions and its "primordial-national" character as given.

Most significantly, just as the multiple modernities thesis refrains from addressing the historical process of colonialism (Bhambra 2014: 35), its application to the case of Israel obfuscates the broader context of colonialism which was a substantial part of the history of the Zionist movement and the establishment of the state of Israel. By doing so, the application of multiple modernities thesis to the case of Israel overlooks the fact that the historical emergence of the state of Israel has affinities with other patterns of settler colonialist practices (Pappé 2008). Similarly, multiple modernities does not address or acknowledge Palestinian modernity as a social sphere that was already taking shape as the building of Zionist society began. Failing to recognize the modern pattern that consolidated in Palestine before and during the rise of Zionism hence constitutes a withdrawal into methodological nationalism, for it is evident that the modern social patterns that Eisenstadt describes in this context relate only to the national unit that is Israel. Furthermore, the thesis does not account for the modernity of Israel society in relation to processes of modernization other than those generated by the Zionist movement, for it is aloof from any account of geopolitical or economic process. Finally, Eisenstadt's late sociological interpretation of Israel is grounded within the constituting narratives that shape Israel's political reasoning and its inherent ethnocentric dimensions. Whereas this sociological interpretation depicts Israel as being similar to Western states, it adheres to and draws on the narrative of Israel as a "Jewish state", a narrative that by definition preempts civil openness and stands in contrast to the ideal type of Western liberal democracies. Multiple modernities does not contest what it means to be modern or Western, and similarly it does not seek to challenge the core political and self-contradictory definition of Israel as a "Jewish democracy". Despite its theoretical novelty, the application of the thesis to the case of Israel proves postcolonial critiques correct, for it exemplifies how the theoretical program of multiple modernities is utilized in this case to perpetuate the meta-narrative of the West as modernity's focal point, masking thereafter the impact of colonialism in shaping contemporary social orders, including the one practiced by the Zionist movement.

Notes

1 The foundation of the thesis was laid out in Eisenstadt's civilizational analysis. The term "civilization of modernity" can be traced back to the late 1970s (Eisenstadt 1978: 177).
2 Whereas political rights can be traced back to antiquity, most notably to the Greek "polis", the concept of human rights is distinctively modern.
3 Support for this claim is found in Eisenstadt (1970b: 19).
4 Bernhard Giesen, personal conversation (June 23, 2014).
5 Eisenstadt issues this observation based on Faubion's interpretation of Weber (Faubion 1993: 113–115).

6 On the sources of these Eurocentric conceptions in the social sciences, see Wittrock (2009: 83).
7 Bernhard Giesen, personal conversation (June 23, 2014).
8 The sources presented and analyzed in this section include texts in which Eisenstadt directly addresses the core tensions of Israel at the turn of the 21st century.
9 In his last interview, Eisenstadt problematized this assumption by pointing out Israel's inner diversity as he argued that "there is no doubt that on the one hand Israel represents one, or maybe a few, illustrations of multiple modernities; but at the same time it is different from the multiple modernities of, say, India, or of Europe, and so on" (Weil 2010: 254).
10 The term "colonization", in the sense that Eisenstadt employs in this context, is synonymous with the term "development" (Eisenstadt 1970a).
11 This view appears in an earlier article; see Eisenstadt (1983).
12 Kimmerling's critique of A. Dowty (1998), an advocator of the constitutional approach in analyzing Israel's political framework, supports this argument. Kimmerling argues that Dowty – claiming that Israel's constitutional tendencies are rooted in the "democratic manners" of the Diaspora Jewish communities – has "failed to detect the mechanisms and institutional arrangements of consociationalism that traditionally excludes Arabs from the system" (Kimmerling 2001a: 9).

References

Aakvaag, G.C. (2015) "Institutional Differentiation and Individual Freedom", *Acta Sociologica* 58: 343–356.

Abrutyn, S., and Van Ness, J. (2015) "The Role of Agency in Sociocultural Evolution Institutional Entrepreneurship as a Force of Structural and Cultural Change", *Thesis Eleven* 127 (1): 52–77.

Alexander, J.C. (1987) "The Dialectic of Individuation and Domination: Weber's Rationalization Theory and Beyond", in: Whimster, S., and Lash, S. (eds.) *Max Weber, Rationality and Modernity*, London: Allen & Unwin, pp. 185–206.

Alexander, J.C. (1990) "Differentiation Theory: Problems and Prospects", in: Alexander, J.C., and Colomy, P. (eds.) *Differentiation Theory and Social Change: Comparative and Historical Perspectives*, New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 1–16.

Alexander, J.C. (1992) "The Fragility of Progress: An Interpretation of the Turn Toward Meaning in Eisenstadt's Later Work", *Acta Sociologica* 35 (2): 85–94.

Arnason, J.P. (2003) "Sociology, Critique and Modernity: Views Across the European Divide", *Comparative Sociology* 2 (3): 441–461.

Asad, T. (1992) "Conscripts of Western Civilization?", in: Gailey, C. (ed.) *Dialectical Anthropology: Essays in Honor of Stanley Diamond, Vol. 1*, Gainesville, FL: University Presses of Florida, pp. 333–351.

Assmann, J. (2005) "'Axial' Breakthroughs and Semantic 'Relocations' in Ancient Egypt and Israel", in: Giesen, B., and Šuber, D. (eds.) *Religion and Politics: Cultural Perspectives*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 39–53.

Bauman, Z. (2003) *Liquid Modernity*, Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Beck, U., et al. (1994) *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bhambra, G.K. (2007a) *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bhambra, G.K. (2007b) "Sociology and Postcolonialism: Another "Missing" Revolution", *Sociology* 41 (5): 871–884.

Bhambra, G. K. (2013) "The Possibilities of, and for, Global Sociology: A Postcolonial Perspective", in: Go, J. (ed.) *Postcolonial Sociology*, Bingley: Emerald, pp. 295–311.

Bhambra, G. K. (2014) *Connected Sociologies*, London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Boatcă, M. M., and Costa, S. (2010) "Postcolonial Sociology: A Research Agenda", in: M. Boatcă et al. (eds.) *Decolonizing European Sociology: Transdisciplinary Approaches*, Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 13–31.

Bottici, C., and Challand, B. (2010) *The Myth of the Clash of Civilization*, London and New York: Routledge.

Buber, M. (1962) *The Face of Man*, Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik Institute. [Hebrew]

Camic, C., and Joas, H. (2003) "The Dialogical Turn", in: Camic, C., and Joas, H. (eds.) *The Dialogical Turn: New Roles for Sociology in the Postdisciplinary Age*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Delanty, G. (2004) "An Interview with S. N. Eisenstadt: Pluralism and the Multiple Forms of Modernity", *European Journal of Social Theory* 7 (3): 391–404.

Delanty, G. (2006) "Modernity and the Escape from Eurocentrism", in: Delanty, G. (ed.) *Handbook of Contemporary European Social Theory*, London: Routledge, pp. 266–278.

Dirlik, A. (2003) "Global Modernity? Modernity in an Age of Global Capitalism", *European Journal of Social Theory* 6 (3): 275–92.

Dowty, A. (1998) *The Jewish State: A Century Later*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Durkheim, E. (2014) [1893] *The Division of Labor in Society*, New York: Simon & Schuster.

Eickelman, D. F. (2000) "Islam and the Languages of Modernity", *Daedalus* 129 (1): 119–135.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1948) "The Sociological Structure of the Jewish Community in Palestine", *Jewish Social Studies* 10 (1): 3–18.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1966) *Modernization: Protest and Change*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1967) "Israeli Identity: Problems in the Development of the Collective Identity of an Ideological Society", *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 370: 116–123.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1970a) "Israel: Traditional and Modern Social Values and Economic Development", in: Eisenstadt, S. N., Bar-Yosef, R., and Adler, C. (eds.) *Integration and Development in Israel*, London: Pall Mall Press, pp. 107–122.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1970b) "Introduction: Social Change and Development", in: Eisenstadt, S. N. (ed.) *Readings in Social Evolution and Development*, Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 3–33.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1973) "Varieties of Political Development: The Theoretical Challenge", in: Eisenstadt, S. N., and Rokkan, S. (eds.) *Building States and Nations (Vol. 2)*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1978) *Revolution and the Transformation of Societies: A Comparative Study of Civilizations*, New York: Free Press.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1980) "Cultural Orientations, Institutional Entrepreneurs, and Social Change: Comparative Analysis of Traditional Civilizations", *American Journal of Sociology* 85 (4): 840–869.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1981a) "Cultural Traditions and Political Dynamics: The Origins and Modes of Ideological Politics. Hobhouse Memorial Lecture", *The British Journal of Sociology* 32 (2): 155–181.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1981b) "The Schools of Sociology", *American Behavioral Scientist* 24 (3): 329–344.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1983) "Some Comments on the Ethnic Problem in Israel", *Israel Social Science Research* 1 (2): 20–29.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1985) *The Transformation of Israeli Society: An Essay in Interpretation*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1986) "Culture and Social Structure Revisited", *International Sociology* 1 (3): 297–320.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1987a) "Introduction: Historical Traditions, Modernization and Development", in: Eisenstadt et al. (eds.) *Patterns of Modernity: Beyond the West. Vol. 2*, London: Frances Pinter.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1987b) *European Civilization in a Comparative Perspective: A Study in the Relations Between Culture and Social Structure*, Oslo: Norwegian University Press.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1989) "Structure and History: Introductory Observations", *International Political Science Review* 10 (2): 99–110.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1991) "A Reappraisal of Theories of Social Change and Modernization", in: Haferkamp, H., and Smelser, N.J. (eds.) *Social Change and Modernity*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 412–430.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1992a) "Introduction: Intersubjectivity, Dialogue, Discourse and Cultural Creativity in the Work of Martin Buber", in: Eisenstadt, S.N. (ed.) *Martin Buber on Intersubjectivity and Cultural Creativity*, Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 1–22.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1992b) "The Order-Maintaining and Order Transforming Dimensions of Culture", in: Münch, R., and Smelser, N.J. (eds.) *Theory of Culture*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 64–87.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1996a) *Japanese Civilization: A Comparative View*, Chicago, IL and London: University of Chicago Press.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1996b) "The Struggle Over the Symbols of Collective Identity and Its Boundaries in Post-Revolutionary Israeli Society", in: Ginosar, P., and Bareli, A. (eds.) *Zionism: Actual Debates*, Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University Press. [Hebrew]

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1998) "The Construction of Collective Identities: Some Analytical and Comparative Indications", *European Journal of Social Theory* 1 (2): 229–254.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1999a) "Multiple Modernities in an Age of Globalization", *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 24 (2): 283–295.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1999b) *Fundamentalism, Sectarianism and Revolution: The Jacobin Dimension of Modernity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2000a) "The Civilizational Dimension in Sociological Analysis", *Thesis Eleven* 62: 1–21.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2000b) "Multiple Modernities", *Daedalus* 129 (1): 1–29.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2001a) "The Civilizational Dimension of Modernity: Modernity as a Distinct Civilization", *International Sociology* 16: 320–340.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2001b) "The Vision of Modern and Contemporary Society", in: Ben-Refael, E., and Sternberg, Y. (eds.) *Identity, Culture and Globalization*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 25–47.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2002) *Democracy and its Tortuosity: Paradoxes in Modern Democracy*, Tel Aviv: Ministry of Defense Publications. [Hebrew]

Eisenstadt, S.N. (ed.) (2003a) *Comparative Civilizations and Multiple Modernities I*, Leiden: Brill.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2003b) "Interdisciplinary Reflections on the Civilizational Dimensions of Modernity", in: Camic, C., and Joas, H. (eds.) *The Dialogical Turn: New Roles for Sociology in the Postdisciplinary Age*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, pp. 275–295.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2003c) "Interdisciplinary Reflections on the Civilizational Dimensions of Modernity", in: Camic, C., and Joas, H. (eds.) *The Dialogical Turn: New Roles for Sociology in the Postdisciplinary Age*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, pp. 275–295.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2004a) *Explorations in Jewish Historical Experience: The Civilizational Dimension*, Leiden: Brill.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2004b) *Changes in Israeli Society*, Tel-Aviv: Ministry of Defense. [Hebrew]

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2005a) "Modernity in Socio-Historical Perspective", in: Ben-Rafael, E., and Sternberg, Y. (eds.) *Comparing Modernities Pluralism versus Homogeneity*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 31–56.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2005b) "Shmuel N. Eisenstadt's Honorary Doctorate", *Polish Sociological Review* 4 (152): 319–327.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2008) "Collective Identities, Public Spheres, Civil Society and Citizenship in the Contemporary era – with Some Observations on the Israeli Scene", *Citizenship Studies* 12 (3): 203–213.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2010) *Multiple Modernities*, Tel Aviv: The Van Leer Jerusalem Institute and Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing House. [Hebrew]

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2011) "Collective Identities, Public Spheres, Civil Society and Citizenship in Contemporary Era: With Some Observation on the Israeli Scene", in: Ben-Porat, G., and Turner, B.S. (eds.) *The Contradictions of Israeli Citizenship: Land, Religion and State*, London: Routledge, pp. 23–39.

Eisenstadt, S.N., and Curelaru, M. (1977) "Macro-Sociology: Theory, Analysis and Comparative Studies", *Current Sociology* 25 (2): 1–73.

Eisenstadt, S.N., and Giesen, B. (1995) "The Construction of Collective Identity", *European Journal of Sociology* 36 (1): 72–102.

Eisenstadt, S.N., and Schluchter, W. (2001) "Introduction: Path to Early Modernities – A Comparative View", in: Eisenstadt, S.N., Schluchter, W., and Wittrock, B. (eds.) *Public Spheres and Collective Identities*, New Brunswick: Transaction, pp. 1–19.

Eisenstadt, S.N., et al. (eds.) (1987) *Centre formation, Protest Movements, and Class Structure in Europe and the United States*, London: Frances Pinter.

Eisenstadt, S.N., et al. (2002) "The Context of the Multiple Modernities Paradigm", in: Eisenstadt, S.N., Sachsenmaier, D., and Riedel, J. (eds.) *Reflections on Multiple Modernities – European, Chinese and Other Interpretations*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 1–23.

Eyerman, R. (1991) "Modernity and Social Movements", in: Haferkamp, H., and Smelser, N.J. (eds.) *Social Change and Modernity*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 37–54.

Faubion, J.D. (1993) *Modern Greek Lessons: A Primer in Historical Constructivism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fourie, E. (2012) "A Future for the Theory of Multiple Modernities: Insights from the New Modernization Theory", *Social Science Information* 51 (1): 52–69.

Fukuyama, F. (1992) *The End of History and The Last Man*, New York: Free Press.

Gerth, H.H., and Mills, C.W. (eds.) (1948) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, London: Routledge.

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Giesen, B. (1998) *Intellectuals and the Nation: Collective identity in a German Axial Age*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giesen, B. (2006) "One or Many Modernities: The Idea of Multiple Modernities", in: The Holberg Symposium 2006: The Processes that Change the World, Bergen: Holberg Prize.

Göle, N. (2000) "Snapshots of Islamic Modernity", *Daedalus* 129 (1): 91–117.

Habermas, J. (1984) *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume I: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, London: Heinemann.

Habermas, J. (1993) "Modernity – An Incomplete Project", in: D'Entrèves, M. P., and Benhabib, S. (eds.) *Habermas and the Unfinished Project of Modernity: Critical Essays on The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, pp. 38–55.

Haferkamp, H., and Smelser, N. J. (eds.) (1991) *Social Change and Modernity*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hobsbawm, E. J. (1962) *The Age of Revolution, 1789–1848*, New York: New American Library.

Huntington, S. P. (1996) *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York: Simon and Schuster.

Ichijo, A. (2013) *Nationalism and Multiple Modernities: Europe and Beyond*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jabotinsky, W. (1937) [1923] "The Iron Wall", *The Jewish Herald*, November 26, 1937.

Kamali, M. (2006) *Multiple Modernities, Civil Society and Islam: The Case of Iran and Turkey*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Kant, I. (1784) "Beantwortung der Frage: 'Was ist Aufklärung?' [An Answer to the Question: 'What is Enlightenment? '"], *Berlinische Monatsschrift*, H. 12, pp. 481–494.

Kaviraj, S. (2000) "Modernity and Politics in India", *Daedalus* 129 (1): 137–162.

Kaya, I. (2004a) *Social Theory and Later Modernities: The Turkish Experience*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Kaya, I. (2004b) "Modernity, Openness and Interpretation: A Perspective on Multiple Modernities", *Social Science Information* 43 (1): 35–57.

Kimmerling, B. (2001a) *The Invention and Decline of Israeliness: State, Society, and the Military*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kimmerling, B. (2007) "The Exhaustion of the Primary Zionist Program: S. N. Eisenstadt Between Dynamic Conservatism and Critical Perspective", *European Journal of Sociology* 48 (1): 149–172.

King, A. Y. C. (2002) "The Emergence of Alternative Modernity in East Asia", in: Eisenstadt, S. N., Sachsenmaier, D., and Riedel, J. (eds.) *Reflections on Multiple Modernities – European, Chinese and Other Interpretations*, Leiden: Brill.

The Knesset. (1958) "Basic Law: The Knesset", no. 244, *Laws of the State of Israel*, Israel: Government Printer. [Hebrew]

The Knesset. (1994) "Basic Law: Freedom of Occupation", no. 1454, *Laws of the State of Israel*, Israel: Government Printer. [Hebrew]

Knöbl, W. (2010) "Path Dependency and Civilizational Analysis Methodological Challenges and Theoretical Tasks", *European Journal of Social Theory* 13 (1): 83–97.

Kołakowski, L. (1990) *Modernity on Endless Trial*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Koselleck, R. (1972) "Einleitung", in: Koselleck, R., Conze, W., and Brunner, O. (eds.) *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland. Bd. 1*, Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta pp. XIII–XXVII.

Koselleck, R. (1988) [1959] *Critique and Crisis: Enlightenment and the Pathogenesis of Modern Society*, Oxford: Berg.

Lambert, Y. (1999) "Religion in Modernity as a New Axial Age: Secularization or New Religious Forms?", *Sociology of Religion* 60 (3): 303–333.

Latour, B. (1993) [1991] *We Have Never Been Modern*, trans. Porter, C., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mota, A., and Delanty, G. (2015) "Eisenstadt, Brazil and the Multiple Modernities Framework: Revisions and Reconsiderations", *Journal of Classical Sociology* 15 (1): 39–57.

Pappé, I. (2008) "Zionism as Colonialism: A Comparative View of Diluted Colonialism in Asia and Africa", *South Atlantic Quarterly* 107 (4): 611–633.

Parsons, T. (1970) *The Social System*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Ram, U. (2008) *The Globalization of Israel: McWorld in Tel Aviv, Jihad in Jerusalem*, London and New York: Routledge.

Schmid, M. (1992) "The Concept of Culture and Its Place Within a Theory of Social Action: A Critique of Talcott Parsons's Theory of Culture", in: Münch, R., and Smelser, N.J. (eds.) *Theory of Culture*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 88–120.

Schmidt, V. (2006) "Multiple Modernities or Varieties of Modernity?", *Current Sociology* 54 (1): 77–97.

Schmidt, V. (2015) "Varieties of Modernity? Conceptual Prerequisites and Empirical Observations", in: Trakulhun, S., and Weber, R. (eds.) *Delimiting Modernities: Conceptual Challenges and Regional Responses*, Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, pp. 49–78.

Shenhav, Y. (2013) "The Carnival: Protest in a Society with no Oppositions", *Theory and Criticism* 41: 121–145. [Hebrew]

Swidler, A. (1986) "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies", *American Sociological Review* 51 (April): 273–288.

Szakolczai, A. (2006) "Global Ages, Ecumenic Empires and Prophetic Religions", in: Arnason, J.P., Salvatore, A., and Stauth, G. (eds.) *Yearbook of the Sociology of Islam, Vol. 7*., Bielefeld: Transcript-Verlag, pp. 258–278.

Taylor, C. (1995) "Two Theories of Modernity", *The Hastings Center Report* 25 (2): 24–33.

Therborn, G. (2003) "Entangled Modernities", *European Journal of Social Theory* 6 (3): 293–305.

Thomassen, B. (2010) "Anthropology, Multiple Modernities and the Axial Age Debate", *Anthropological Theory* 10 (4): 321–342.

Trakulhun, S., and Weber, R. (eds.) (2015) *Delimiting Modernities: Conceptual Challenges and Regional Responses*, Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Wagner, P. (1994) *A Sociology of Modernity: Liberty and Discipline*, London: Routledge.

Weber, M. (1948) [1919] "Science as Vocation", in: Gerth, H.H., and Mills, C.W. (eds.) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, London: Routledge, pp. 129–156.

Weil, S. (2010) "On Multiple Modernities, Civilizations and Ancient Judaism, An interview with Prof. S.N. Eisenstadt", *European Societies* 12 (4): 451–465.

Weiming, T. (2000) "Implications of the Rise of 'Confucian' East Asia", *Daedalus* 129 (1): 195–218.

Wittrock, B. (2009) "History and Sociology: Transmutations of Historical Reasoning in the Social Sciences", in: Hedström, P., and Wittrock, B. (eds.) *Frontiers of Sociology*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 77–111.

5 From Zionist to radical sociology

This book has embarked upon a critical investigation of sociology as a discourse which is deeply rooted in modern imaginaries. It situated sociology within the basic categories of the Western tradition of thought, categories which engage, just as they reflect, Western dominance. Using the theoretical framework of the sociology of knowledge, postcolonial and post-structuralist critique, it has been argued that sociology, similarly to all cultural constructs and artifacts, is not only informed by its socio-historical context but also embodies practices of power encapsulated in cultural hegemonies.

One of this study's central working assumptions has centered on the quintessential understanding that the social sciences have played a role in constructing the basic terms employed in discussing modern identities, thereby contributing to the discursive construction of those identities. An additional, no less central assumption is the understanding that scientific analyses constitute their object of study. It is through its analysis that the object is discursively constructed.

As discussed in the book, the term "modernity", for example, functioned as an analytical category which sociology has helped to "invent" during its period of disciplinary formation. This is the underlying fundamental intricacy that shapes the scope of sociology as a science: first, in its attempt to analyze what it assumes as given without succumbing to circular reasoning (petitio principii); and second, in its endeavor to account for modernity and "modern societies" while being a profound product of the social settings and epistemic conditions for which it strives to account.

The disciplinary use of sociological terminology has thus the potential both to produce representations of society and reify existing ones. These representations have in turn shaped the sociological discourse, framing the social sciences as a reflection *of* modern identities rather than a reflection *on* those identities. As a discipline that emerged along with the nation-state, it has been argued that sociology cannot be untethered from the historical emergence of national collective identity and memory, or from their inherent mythologized dimensions.

The relations between Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel and the Zionist imaginary are thus situated within the general relationships between sociology and the social conditions in which it is formulated. Just as the works of the early sociologists

were imbued within the discourse of modernity, Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel was not disconnected from Zionism's settler-colonial episteme.

Notwithstanding, Eisenstadt's work is never deemed to surrender to one-dimensional conclusions. The very process of problematizing social life can be seen as one of the defining elements of Eisenstadt's intellectual legacy. Multi-dimensionality, along with dimensions of self-reflectivity, are precisely what make Eisenstadt's sociological analysis an exceptional source that mirrors Israel's self-understanding. Eisenstadt's studies of Israeli society are thus understood not merely as a collection of academic writings, but rather as a scholarly corpus that encapsulates Israel's image of its national collective "self".

The knowledge of Israeli society Eisenstadt produced was filtered through a particular political culture and political memory. Eisenstadt's studies of Israel were not only nourished by the Zionist imaginary to account for what Eisenstadt himself perceived as the social reality of Israel, but these studies assumed an active role in mediating and reproducing this imaginary, exercising the power of sociological argumentations and terminology.

These tendencies were most dominant in Eisenstadt's early studies, which evince an interrelating utopist and orientalist approach to the study of Israel, seeking to portray the latter as a homogeneous and modernized national unit. Supported by the theoretical framework of structural functionalism, Eisenstadt's early studies were followed by an attempt to provide legitimacy to the nascent Israeli state, its social policies and its collectivist, largely conformist ethos. These studies have also laid out a hierarchical classification of Europeans and non-Europeans, which was based on the dichotomous meta-narratives of "East" and "West", "modern" and "traditional" societies.

Eisenstadt's later studies of Israel, framed by the civilizational analysis, have demonstrated what Gadamer referred to as a "fusion of horizons", namely, the viewing of the ancient past through the eyes of the present: Eisenstadt's analysis of the "Jewish historical experience" identifies Israel as the profound expression of the axial Jewish civilization. Concurrently, this analysis reproduces the Zionist myth of origin by drawing a direct line between the Second Temple period and Israel's contemporary political patterns. Informed by Zionist historiography, such analysis addresses the state of Israel as the pinnacle fulfillment of a meta-historic telos, an accomplishment of the moral Jewish civilizational vision that originated in antiquity. It is here that the myths of revival and return are most present in Eisenstadt's understanding of Israel's as the recreation of its primordial civilizational center. Reading Jewish history as a history of a civilization corresponded with a tendency to refer to Judaism as a distinct culture, a perception that prevailed among Israeli elites after the political shift of 1977. *Jewish Civilization* has thus functioned as a sociodicy for the elite who sought to redefine their relationship to Judaism, which by that time became a significant factor in Israel's electoral politics.

Eisenstadt's late analysis of Israel, informed by the framework of multiple modernities, evinces a critical tone toward certain economic and political changes that were seen in Israel in the turn of the 21st century. Corresponding to a large

extent with Eisenstadt's ascending status as a world-leading sociologist, Eisenstadt pointed out Israel's evolving oligopolistic tendencies and mode of continual brutalization, which he conceptualized as part of "the exhaustion of the Zionist program", that is, as a deviation from what liberal Zionism originally aimed to achieve. Despite its theoretical novelty, the application of multiple modernities did not evince a significant break with the narrative of Israel being modern and Western in character, nor did it acknowledge Israel's diverse non-Western cultural orientations as an integral part of its character.

Eisenstadt's macro-sociological abstractions in the framework of multiple modernities have resulted in the omission of fundamental historical factors: For example, his theoretical account of globalization omits the geopolitical conditions, shaped by American imperial dominance in the post–World War II era, which enabled the phenomenon to emerge.

Similarly, the historical conditions which enabled the Zionist political project (e.g. settler colonialism and 19th-century European colonial discourse) are neutered in this analysis. Israel's exclusivist and essentialist political definitions and narratives – the "state of the Jews" and a "Jewish democracy" being the most central of these – remained uncontested in Eisenstadt's multiple modernities analysis.

Although Eisenstadt's general sociology is considered contradictory to methodological nationalism (e.g. Turner and Susen 2011: 230), this investigation has shown that Eisenstadt's studies of Israel do not reveal a substantive break with methodological nationalism an any of its phases: Epitomizing this tendency is Eisenstadt's incorporation of the definition of a "Jewish state" as one of modernity's cultural variants. Therefore the underlying assumptions that Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel encompasses challenge the very tangibility of his general sociology.

Although Eisenstadt's perceptions of Israeli society did not remain static, his studies maintained the same core representations of Israel as an imagined modern "old-new" nation of a historical primordial people that return to its ancient civilization. Like Buber before him, Eisenstadt has observed the imminent destructive potential of the political system in Israel (Eisenstadt 2004, 2011). Yet unlike Buber, who imagined a binational political foundation, Eisenstadt never advocated the possibility of altering the "Zionist program", its framework, or its symbols. Whereas Buber lacked the analytical distance that might have led him to "fail to criticize Israel as a form of settler-colonialism" (Butler 2012: 36), Eisenstadt's accounts have tended to neuter, if not to overlook completely, the colonialization of Palestine. Eisenstadt's studies of Israel did not ask to challenge the taken-for-granted power relations that were operating in Israeli society. Rather, he tended to accept the pre-givenness of many of Zionism's exclusivist and essentialist perceptions.

Eisenstadt's studies of Israeli society did not seek to challenge Zionist myths and narratives. On the contrary, their incorporation into the sociological analysis resulted in their reproduction as unquestioned truths. This process of reification was made possible due to a series of factors: First, Eisenstadt's studies were sculpted by the highly politically loaded language of Modern Hebrew.

This language has evolved as part and parcel of the Zionist project, providing it with the symbolic means to cradle its political ideals. Modern Hebrew has contributed to obfuscating the very possibility of examining these ideas separately from the meanings encapsulated within the language, that is, of the possibility of thinking them critically.

Second, the Zionist myth of an ancient people, the myth of land, and the myth of return and revival do not lend themselves to critical historical scrutiny. Being part of the imaginary foundation on which Zionist political culture was established, the power of these myths and narratives to shape identity lies in their collective acceptance as irrefutable and self-evident. The pervasiveness of these myths and narratives corresponds to some degree with what Castoriadis (1987 [1975]) has described as part of the imaginary constitution of society, that is the unquestionable constitutive perceptions which stand outside the realm of critique.

The ideologically loaded Modern Hebrew plays a crucial role in rendering this notion irrefutable and in bringing these myths and narratives into the sphere of the ordinary. Modern Hebrew was not only the profound product of Zionist political culture but also the medium through which Zionist mythologized political memory was instilled and maintained.

Third, Eisenstadt's own symbolic capital as an intellectual with some degree of institutional power who rose to world prominence played a role in rendering these myths and narratives truthful. These can be seen as "truths" in the Foucauldian sense, that is, as being part of a discourse that engages forms of power. Eisenstadt's symbolic power as an intellectual was accumulated in a specific context that enabled such power to emerge: In its first two decades, Israel nurtured an etatist political culture, where individuals including intellectuals and academics had to take an active role in the nation-building project. The elite, as reflected from Eisenstadt's own early writings, was perceived as responsible for mediating the hegemonic identity for the new masses of immigrants who were unfamiliar with Zionist political culture; mediation of Zionist identity was hence expected from the academic elite.

The academic environment of the Hebrew University during Israel's first two decades by and large produced studies which corresponded with the fundamental perceptions of Zionist political culture. Faculty members of the Hebrew University such as Y. Baer, M. Stern, and Ben-Zion Dinur, for example, were among the prominent scholars who developed and shaped Zionist historiography. The perspectives embedded in Zionist historiography constitute the dominant view, if not the only legitimate one, from which any claim concerning the Jewish past could have been made. This intellectual environment not only framed Eisenstadt's own adherence to Zionist historiography but also paved the way for the incorporation of Zionist myths and narratives into his sociological analysis and to their unrefuted acceptance thereafter.

Serving as an expression of societal reflectivity, Eisenstadt's studies of Israel can also be considered as a site of memory, where Israel's political memory has been structured and mediated, produced and reproduced. As all sites of memory, textual and spatial alike, Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel was closely connected

to the social and cultural dimensions in which it was immersed. Emerging during the formative years when Israeli political memory was constructed, Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel has played a crucial role in mediating Israeli collective identity. In its reflective acts, it bequeathed the Israeli collective a sense of coherence, continuity, and distinctiveness; it provided the rationalization for Israel's image as a modern society and nation-state, and hence its collective subjectivity.

Presuming the character of a national "Self", Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel has discursively constructed and shaped the image of its object of study, namely, "Israeli society", according to predefined categories shaped by a mythic national imaginary. By analyzing and reflecting on Israeli society, Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel has constructed and enhanced, defined, affirmed, and reaffirmed Israel's sense of collective self.

Stretching over half a century, the discursive construction of Israeli society and collective identity in Eisenstadt's analyses ought to be viewed first within the broader discourse-object relations, that is the process by which a discourse shapes its objects of analysis; and second, as a manifestation of sociology's inherent problem as a discourse that cannot be detached from its times and the power relations which it reflects and engages. Eisenstadt's use of loaded language and incorporation of national historiographies in his sociological accounts exemplify how the discipline of sociology may function as a means in the service of identity construction projects.

Being a site of memory, Eisenstadt's studies of Israel have also constituted a realm of forgetfulness: In this mnemonic sphere, counter-narratives have all been omitted from Eisenstadt's sociological analysis, despite their historic and social significance. Such counter-narratives include the linguicide of the Yiddish language, the Palestinian Nakba, the existence of a military rule on Palestinian citizens of Israel that lasted until 1966, ethnic segregation, an omnipresent military ethos, military occupation and control of Palestinian Territories since the 1967 War (which was not discussed in Eisenstadt's writings until the mid-1990s [Eisenstadt 1995: 69]), the Sabra and Shatila massacre of 1982, violations of international law, and many other forging events and tendencies which did not correspond with the Zionist hegemonic representations of the social, economic, cultural, and political existence. Eisenstadt's oversight of Palestinian modernity is a profound example of his omission of the Palestinian subject from the discourse of modernity. Furthermore, Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel eclipses a collective identity which emerged out of the conditions and episteme laid out by a settler-colonial project, that is an identity that was built on the forgetting of "*violent* replacement and/or displacement of indigenous Others" (Veracini 2011: 77), the governing and control of one hegemonic settler group over the indigenous one, and the forgetting of the artificial social hierarchies that the Zionist project has established to serve its ends.

Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel masked a collective identity which did not emerge in antiquity but was rather built out of the ideological elements of late 19th-century colonial discourse. Such an elision is inherent to settler-colonial projects, which by definition are contraposed to the idea of equality. This underlying

rejection of equality contradicts the state of Israel's self-declaratory democratic claim. Eisenstadt's studies of Israel implicitly rationalize a non-equal social order, trivially considered to be normative and self-evident, by rendering an explanatory base to its existing political formation without bringing into account the ideological premises which shaped it. Eisenstadt's studies of Israel, therefore, obscure the very historical foundation which it aims to account for and hence result in active denial of a social order dominated by ethnic hierarchization.

Eisenstadt's general sociology nonetheless paves the way for new channels of remembrance: The social world that is reflected from Eisenstadt's macrosociology is one that is continuously constructing and re-constructing itself; similarly, it lends itself to new interpretations, to new agents and social entrepreneurs who could bring to the social surface the latent tensions and antinomies, thereby triggering a long-term process of social change. The results of these changes are always open, unfolding new tensions that encapsulate new courses of transformation. It is a sphere in which rupture and continuity can be reconciled, one in which every institutional frame is built upon the ruins of its former, creating self-perpetuating social worlds where transformation emerges as a non-linear process.

This is Eisenstadt's perception of culture, as reflected in his social philosophy: one that highlights the non-structural dimensions of social order, assumes the autonomy of culture, and emphasizes the power of agential freedom over structure. Eisenstadt's intellectual legacy asks us to situate ourselves within the "endless trial", and as such it enables us to envision new horizons, new prospects of change which can be developed in relation to different societal self-understandings, and hence, it also has the capacity to establish a new kind of memory, one from which new collective selves are mirrored.

This book has attempted to envisage the national mythology that underlies Eisenstadt's sociology of Israel. In this framework, it sought to deconstruct the hegemonic sociological account of modernity, which tended to overlook the reality of colonial domination. Pointing out the inherent dimensions of (colonial) power that are rooted in sociology's analytical categories, this endeavor can begin by demythologizing sociological analyses and by rendering significance to the interrelation between textuality, identity, and loaded language. These steps could lead towards what Bhambra and others view as a postcolonial reconstruction of sociology: a decolonized sociological knowledge which thinks its discursive power through a conceptual and historical analysis of its categorical units and their preconditions. Such meta-deconstruction could pave the way for a sociology that does not only dialectically oscillate between paradigms but breaks altogether from its inherent circular reasoning; a sociology which understands itself as being exposed to social forces, to political mythologized memories, and to the different and fused temporal horizons through which it views the present and the past. By means of such reflection, it is possible to conceive of radical sociological thought that accounts for its epistemic roots and is attentive to the pervasiveness of the social imaginaries within which it is written.

References

Butler, J. (2012) *Parting Ways: Jewishness and the Critique of Zionism*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Castoriadis, C. (1987) [1975] *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, trans. Blamey, K., Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1995) "Jewish Civilization: Approaches to the Problems of Israeli Society", in: Dešen, Š.A., Liebman, C.S., and Shokeid, M. (eds.) *Israeli Judaism: The Sociology of Religion in Israel* 7, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2004) *Explorations in Jewish Historical Experience: The Civilizational Dimension*, Leiden: Brill.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2011) "Collective Identities, Public Spheres, Civil Society and Citizenship in Contemporary Era: With Some Observation on the Israeli Scene", in: Ben-Porat, G., and Turner, B.S. (eds.) *The Contradictions of Israeli Citizenship: Land, Religion and State*, London: Routledge, pp. 23–39.

Turner, B.S., and Susen, S. (2011) "Introduction to the Special Issue on Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt", *Journal of Classical Sociology* 11 (3): 229–239.

Veracini, L. (2011) *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Index