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Abstract

Hebrewism, Globalized Israeliness and Mizrakhiut are examined as three major variants of Israeliness that struggle between them over dominance in the Israeli field of national culture. By discussing typical styles of literature and popular music associated with each variant, it is demonstrated how each is committed, albeit in a different way, to the belief in the idea of ‘one nation – one culture’, and to the construction of one, unique ‘Israeli Culture’. Israel serves as a case to support a general argument about contemporary national cultures being a ‘Bourdieusian’ field in which invented tradition, global culture and sub-national/‘ethnic’ culture are the major types of positions, struggling between them to define the dominant national cultural capital.
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During 1998 Israelis celebrated fifty years of statehood. The anniversary served as a general opportunity for public summaries and recapitulations of what ‘Israeliness’ is all about. Particular attention was given to the issue of indigenous, native ‘national’ culture. Events were held under questioning headlines such as: ‘Is there, by now, an indigenous Israeli culture? And if there is, what are its typical contents and meanings? What constitutes the “canon” of Israeli culture?’ These questions reflect a key belief in the ideology of nationalism. Namely, that a nation, being a cultural community, should have a set of cultural practices and art works ‘of its own’, an exclusive body of contents and meanings that express its uniqueness; and that it is through routine practice of and intimate acquaintance with this unique world of contents and meanings that membership in the nation, as well as ‘nationhood’ as cultural reality come into being. As differentiation from traditional, diaspora Jewish culture has been a major theme among the Zionist settlers in Israel/Palestine, Israeli culture, or ‘Israeliness’ had to be constructed, ‘invented’. Hence the preoccupation with the success of this project.

The sociological study of Israeli culture has recently shifted from
almost exclusive emphasis on ideological and religious dimensions (Liebman and Don-Yehiya 1983; Kimmerling 1985) to actual cultural practices, symbols, myths, the arts and the like (see, for example, Katriel 1986, 1991; Dominguez 1989; Handelman and Shamgar-Handelman 1990; Zerubavel 1994; Ben-Yehuda 1995; Ben-Ari and Bilu 1997).

Following them, I wish to provide here a general sociological overview of the field of Israeli culture, as materialized in specific cultural practices: literature and popular music. In doing this, I wish to present Israeliness as a case that exemplifies the intersection of three major processes in contemporary national cultures: the invention/imagination of the nation and its culture; the effects of the globalization of culture on national culture; the emergence of sub-national groupings, identities and cultures.

My general argument is that the effects of the globalization of culture and the emergence of sub-national groupings or identities, rather than undermining or eroding the belief in and commitment to the idea of ‘one nation – one culture’, produce additional variants of the national culture to the formative ‘invented’ one. National culture is thus transformed into an arena, a field of struggle over dominance, to which the ideology of nationalism serves as a doxa. Let me first elaborate briefly on this theoretical context before turning to the case of Israeliness.

**The field of national culture**

The existence of ‘national cultures’ as a major factor in the formation of nations and nation-states has been widely acknowledged (see the reviews: Calhoun 1993; Schudson 1994; Cerulo 1997). One language, myths of origin and common history, rituals consecrating the piece of territory which is the ‘homeland’, and a shared knowledge and taste for particular forms and styles in the arts, food and dress are believed to be essential components for a nation’s existence as a cultural community. ‘Primordialists’ (Armstrong 1982; Smith 1991) and ‘modernists’ (Anderson 1983; Gellner 1983; Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983; Hobsbawm 1990) have disagreed about the extent to which modern nations and national cultures are ‘natural’ transmutations of early, pre-modern ethnic entities. However,

since primordialists concede that the “past” is a selective and interpretive present construction, and since modernists concede that the “present” must make use of available past cultural repertoires of the collectivities in question, the gulf between the two is indeed minor (Ram 1995, p. 93).

Thus, in either case, the existence of a constructed national culture – in which narratives of ancestry and origin are presented as objective history, and where one ‘correct’ language, canons of works in various fields of
arts and specific forms of food and dress are consecrated as embodying the 'true', 'traditional' and 'native' character of the nation — is widely accepted. Fostering 'national' forms and works of art is of particular importance in this regard. The arts — literature, poetry, music, painting, sculpture, film — are believed to express the uniqueness and specificity of the nation and therefore to evoke, in their use and consumption, the deepest emotions and strongest feelings of attachment and belonging to the nation as community.

But much as the notion of one, singular, national culture is acknowledged, studies have been pointing at two phenomena that supposedly erode the singularity of national cultures in recent decades. These are the intensification of the globalization of culture and the (re)-emergence of sub-national groupings.

At the core of what has recently been called the globalization of culture stands the dissemination of products and materials of the international culture industry. Sometimes thought of as 'cultural imperialism' and as homogenizing world culture (Mattelart 1979; Ritzer 1993), it has been argued and demonstrated that the work of the globalization of culture is more subtle and complex in two major ways. First, the flow of cultural materials is multi-directional, not only from the West to the rest of the world but in other directions too. Second, the same cultural materials are used and decoded differentially across countries. That is, they are localized or 'nationalized' by typical uses and interpretations (Katz and Liebes 1986; Appadurai 1990; Featherstone 1990; Hannerz 1992; Regev 1997). Consequently, the current global flow of cultural materials, for which I use here the terms 'global culture' and 'world culture', should be seen primarily as having the effect of increasing the amount and variation of cultural materials available in a given national cultural setting, for the construction of a contemporary sense of that national culture.

The modern construction of nations has typically excluded from its invented, singular and homogenized national culture, and relegated to marginality and secondariness, at least some traditions, arts or languages of certain classes and regional, ethnic, or religious groups that exist within the same nation-state. In addition, recent forms of migration, most notably those of workers and ex-colonials, have created new forms of minority cultures within nation-states. Some of these more traditional sub-national groups tend to struggle for cultural or political autonomy. Yet, in many cases the struggle is for recognition, legitimacy and acceptance within the existing national culture. In these cases, 'minority' or 'alternative' discourses of the national history are constructed, as well as 'alternative' canons of art, accompanied by demands for inclusion in, or even for redefining the singular-dominant national culture. (The discourse of and about black culture within the UK is paradigmatic in this context. See Gilroy 1987, 1993; Hall 1991, 1996; see also Soysal 1994).
Rather than eroding the notion of national culture, then, the globalization of culture and the emergence of sub-national groupings have the effect of expanding the concept. With these phenomena, contemporary national cultures come to consist of three major variants, or types of identity positions: 1) 'pure' or 'traditional' variants, typically constructed and invented at the formative period of 'imagining' the nation; 2) 'globalized' variants, in which elements of contemporary global culture are mixed with 'traditional' elements to produce contemporary, '(post-)modernized' national cultures; 3) 'sub-national' variants, in which old or recently formed collectivities within the nation-state invent a different, separate identity vis-à-vis the traditional one. Each of these variants of the national culture is a construction, an invention or an 'imagined' version of the collective identity. Each is also a hybrid, a mixture of cultural materials taken, borrowed, confiscated, appropriated, adjusted and adapted from various sources.

The existence of these variants can be understood as 'pluralism', or as indicating that the 'nation' as one cultural community does not really exist. But individuals, organizations and other actors that represent such variants, do share in many cases a common belief in the idea of congruence between state and cultural community. As such, they are engaged, manifestly or implicitly, in a constant struggle over the definition of the dominant national culture. The arena of contest over the definition of the dominant and legitimate national culture, and its underlying doxa – the ideology of nationalism – can be therefore understood as a field, in Bourdieu's meaning of the concept (Bourdieu 1985; Bourdieu with Waquant 1992). The field of national culture is then a space of identity positions, each occupied by a set of collective actors. Each identity position is 'taken' by a specific variant of the national culture, whose believers and representatives struggle to gain recognition, legitimacy, dominance. The identity positions themselves, as cultural stances, tend to remain relatively constant. But the collective actors associated with each might vary through time. That is, different collective actors, at different times, might evoke or appropriate a certain variant of the national culture, according to their shifting and contingent interests.

The issue at stake, around which the field of national culture as an arena of struggle is organized, is the repertory of practices, tastes, sensibilities, elements of knowledge and canons of art forms and art works – or, in short, the specific cultural capital and habitus, or the institutionalized cultural repertoire (Lamont 1995) – that defines 'natural' membership in the given national culture. In the fields of art, both 'high' and 'popular', art forms and art works associated with the 'traditional' variant tend to be consecrated as 'national art', whereas those associated with other variants are engaged in struggles for 'national' legitimacy.

In what follows, I wish to portray Israeli culture along these lines. Three major variants of 'Israeliness' are presented and discussed:
Hebrewism (ivriot), the invented ‘traditional’ culture of Israel; Globalized Israeliness, the cluster of hybrids embodying the incorporation of ‘global’ cultural forms; and ‘Oriental’ Israeliness (mizrahhiut), the specific hybrid constructed by Israeli Jews from Arab and Muslim countries, as the major ‘ethnic’ or ‘sub-national’ grouping. Each of them is discussed by reference to two art forms: literature, as a highbrow art form; and popular music, as a lowbrow art form. Additional variants of Israeliness are also briefly discussed.

The underlying point of these discussions is to demonstrate that through their variance and disagreements, they are engaged in a struggle over the definition and ‘invention’ of Israeliness, expressing thereby an essential commitment to and belief in the idea of ‘one nation – one culture’. Stressing the conflicting variance and the commitment to ‘Israeliness’, this portrayal differs from discussions of Israeli society and culture, along modernization theory, as a ‘soon-to-be-integrated’ national entity (Horowitz and Lissak 1990), and from the counter argument which envisages the decline of the commitment to one ‘national culture’ (Ram and Yiftachel 1999). Let me also stress that I do not treat the process of struggle, the actual mechanism through which legitimacy and recognition are gained. I only describe here the particular meanings and the ‘taken position’ of each variant.

**Hebrewism (ivriot): traditional Israeliness**

Zionist settlement in Palestine began in the last two decades of the nineteenth century. By 1948, upon statehood, there were some 600,000 Jews in the country. The countries of origin of the overwhelming majority were East and Central Europe. Although clearly adapting Jewish religion and mythology to its modern, secular nationalistic purposes – exemplifying the perfect case of ‘diaspora nationalism’ (Smith 1995) – Zionism, as a set of cultural practices, evolved around two interrelated themes: the rejection of diaspora culture (the galut) and the invention of a ‘new Jew’, the Israeli. The Zionist vocabulary spoke about ‘normalizing’ Jewish life, with the model of ‘normalcy’ taken from European nationalism (Even-Zohar 1981; Schweid 1984; Raz-Krakotzkin 1993/4; Ohana 1995). From an early stage, the dominant cultural practices among Zionist settlers in Palestine were aimed at inventing a locally specific, ‘native’ Jewish culture, different from traditional, galut Jewish cultures (Shavit 1996). Initially, in the formative period, this logic resulted in the successful invention and public imposition of a dominant cultural package known as ‘Hebrew culture’ (tarbut ivrit), or ivriot – Hebrewism.

The core of Hebrewism was the institutionalization of a daily, routine use of Hebrew as a native tongue, as vernacular language. This was made possible following the so-called ‘conflict of languages’ among Zionist
highschool teachers in Palestine, which by the early 1920s established Hebrew as the language for teaching. By 1947 there were some 80,000 locally born Jews in Palestine aged between 10 and 25, daughters and sons of Zionist settlers (see Weitman 1982, 1987). Encouraged by their parents’ general view of them as ‘first generation of resurrection’, members of this generation started to cultivate during the 1930s a sense of difference, an ideology of Hebrew ‘native-ness’. This sense of identity evolved into the image of the ‘sabra’, as the somewhat Nietzschean image of a ‘new Jew’ (Almog 1996; Ben-Eliezer 1998). It has been materialized through various forms of cultural production, including secular adaptations and re-interpretations of Jewish religious and traditional elements, rituals invoking a mythic connection to the scenery of the land and to its ancient history, and attempts to design indigenous styles of painting and sculpture. Here I concentrate on two major cultural forms of Hebrewism: the body of literature of the writers collectively known as ‘dor ba-aretz’ (generation in the land); and the body of songs known as ‘shirei eretz Israel’ (‘songs of the Land of Israel’).

The literature and poetry of the ‘generation in the land’

Literature, including poetry, has been the major art form in the construction of Hebrewism. This stemmed from it being the art form in which language is most extensively used, as well as from the image of the writer, the ‘sofer’, as a person who in his writing does not merely ‘tell a story’, but produces a moral and evaluative commentary on the reality which he or she depicts (Cordova 1980). Literature emerged as a major factor in the invention of ivriut when the older leading group of Hebrew writers, for whom Hebrew was not a native language (poets Bialik and Tchernichovsky, and novelists Agnon and Hazaz are the prominent names here), lost its dominant position in the local literary field to a group of poets and novelists, born or educated in Israel, whose complete body of works was conceived in Israel/Palestine. Unlike the older group, whose members cautiously examined the transformation of Jewish life, the young Hebrew writers were completely mobilized to the concepts of ‘native-ness’ and the ‘new Jew’. The group of young writers, known as ‘dor ba-aretz’ (a generation in the land; S. Yizhar, Moshe Shamir, Hanoch Bartov, Natan Shaham are prominent names), took upon itself to express the literary and poetic voice of the Hebrew identity as separate and different from traditional Jewish identity.

That the young writers would provide it with the long awaited “New Hebrews” was the exigent expectation of the audience for Hebrew literature in the period after the Second World War ... this audience wanted the New Land to create a New Jew who would be absolutely different from the Galut Jew. (Shaked 1987, p.207)
Thus, Moshe Shamir’s famous opening line to the semi-autobiographical novel *be-mo yadav, pirkei elik* (With His Own Hands, 1951)—‘Elik was born from the sea’—blatantly symbolizes the rejection of (Jewish-diaspora) parenthood, the coming from nature and self-construction (apparently without the help of previous generations); while Uri, the protagonist of this same author’s novel *hu halach ba-sadot* (He Walked through the Fields, 1947) portrayed as the ideal-type sabra, made this book the most popular of its time. And S. Yizhar, in his novel *yemei tziklag* (Days of Ziklag, 1958), about whose ‘commanding place’ in the Hebrew fiction of the fifties ‘there is no controversy’,

typifies Israeli fiction of this period in his overriding concern with collective dilemmas and collective destiny: the real protagonist of his novel is not any one character but the peer group . . . What’s to be done? Yizhar’s troubled young men under fire ask themselves in interior monologue and tireless discussion. What do we do now, standing at this bloody historical crossroads, with the Diaspora legacy we are supposed to reject, the biblical past we are enjoined to reclaim, the national future our teachers and leaders have led us to imagine as messianic fulfillment? (Alter 1994, pp.92–3)

Indeed, the literature of *dor ba-aretz* stands as an assessment of the historical narratives and political aims of Zionism. It provided the protagonists, the plots and the depiction of social realities, which could be referred to as prime examples of the realization of Zionist ideology. Consequently, this body of literature was consecrated as the initial ‘authentic’ expressions and indigenous works of the ‘new’ Hebrew national culture.

‘Folk’ music: the songs of the land of Israel

Much emphasis has been given within Hebrewism to ‘popular’ practices. The corpus of folk songs known as ‘ashire erez Israel’ as a signifier of ‘authentic Israeliness’, and its accompanying ritual of ‘communal singing’ as a way of experiencing membership in the nation, are together a major example.

Songs expressing longings for the land of Israel in a modern Zionist mode already existed in Europe by the end of the nineteenth century. It was, however, only around 1930 that composers and lyricists started to produce the songs that were perceived as directly reflecting the experience of ‘constructing the Hebrew nation’. In the following twenty to twenty-five years, a group of composers, notable members being David Zehavi, Mordechai Zeira and Alexander (Sasha) Argov, wrote the songs that became the symbol of Israeli ‘rootiness’, of Hebrewism. The lyrics to these songs were often written by people like Yaakov Orland,
Alexander Pen and Natan Alterman, whose reputation as poets enhanced the belief in the cultural value of the songs. Texts from the Jewish prayer book and from the Bible were also adapted. These folk songs were designated to extol the spirit of the pioneer settlers, whether rural or urban; to depict the romanticized scenery of the land; to enhance the revival of Hebrew through settings of both biblical texts and modern lyrics; and to unify people through communal singing (Hirschberg 1995, p.146).

In the music itself, many of these composers attempted to incorporate ‘oriental’ musical elements into their essentially East-European dispositions. Shirei Eretz Israel range therefore in their atmosphere from pastoral Russian-like ballads, through the danceable rhythm of the ‘hora’ (originally Balkan folk dance) to Arab-style ‘debkas’.

Except for some notable exceptions, shirei erez Israel were rarely recorded at the time of composition. Their main form of dissemination was through small booklets (shironim), in which the lyrics and sometimes the notes were printed. The shironim were distributed to music teachers, youth guides and other culture professionals, who used them to teach new songs in all types of group gatherings. A particular form of music consumption emerged – shira ba-tzibur (‘singing in public’, or ‘communal singing’) – where the participants follow the lyrics from their shironim, and an accordionist acts as conductor. It is an oral ritual, the audience being the performer, and its central value is that of communal and emotional unity – much like a prayer.

During the first two and a half decades of statehood, the heritage of shirei erez Israel has been fostered by making them the major component of music lessons in primary schools, and by the music broadcasting policy of the state-controlled radio system. In addition, the entertainment units known as ‘lehekot izvaiot’ (‘army ensembles’), became the dominant phenomenon in Israeli popular music. Their main function was to serve as a framework for the creation and dissemination of new songs in the ideological vein of shirei erez Israel. After 1975, as Israeli pop/rock gained presence and dominance, a small group of musicians – the most notable being Naomi Shemer – kept producing new songs in the genre, sustaining it as a living musical culture.

Through this history, shirei erez Israel gained the status of ‘folk music’ in the local national context, symbolizing the formative years of nationhood, Hebrewism as grass-roots culture and faithfulness to Zionist ideology in general (see Shokeid 1988, on ‘communal singing’ events among Israeli emigrants to the USA in the 1980s).
Hebrewism: official and traditional culture

By the 1950s, during the first decade of statehood, Hebrewism became the major component of the official, state supported culture. The education system, the army, state ceremonies, the tourist industry, the public media all worked to present and impose Hebrewism as the One Israeli culture, the dominant national cultural capital and habitus.

The masses of immigrants who came to the country during this period were expected to become ‘Israelis’, to be culturally ‘absorbed’ into Israeliness, to acquire Hebrewism as their cultural disposition. Veterans were also expected to remain faithful to the ideologically mobilized mode of cultural performance and artistic practice of Hebrewism and to its values. But the acceptance of these values often created lack of patience with fully crystallized ideological formulations which began to seem obvious and trite’ (Eisenstadt 1967, p.385). By the 1970s, Hebrewism lost much of its dominant presence in everyday public culture, yet remained an active cultural actor in the Israeli field of national culture. Through various channels, state agencies and the education system Hebrewism secured its status as ‘traditional’ culture. Moreover, as an identity position, some of its practices re-emerged in public culture when they were appropriated in the 1980s by a new collective actor: the younger generation of the national-religious groups, the ‘neo-Zionists’ (Ram 1996).

Globalized Israeliness

The term ‘Globalized Israeliness’ is used here to refer to the set of cultural materials associated with the local adaptation of the effects of the globalization of culture. It refers to the emergence of Israeli consumerism, a strong sense of critique in the arts and a pervasive culture industry. By contrast to the emphasis of Hebrewism on Israeliness as a separate universe of meanings, different from others, Globalized Israeliness insists on, demands and constructs Israeliness as a local extension of contemporary world culture.

In the arts, Globalized Israeliness is practised with close affinity to the ‘transnational culture of critical discourse’ (Hannerz 1990) and as an integral part of contemporary ‘mediascapes’ and ‘ideoscapes’ (Appadurai 1990). Its ‘Israeliness’, or ideology of native-ness interprets the adoption of the cultural materials previously perceived as ‘foreign’ and ‘not fitting’ local culture, as an accomplishment of the ‘normalization’ theme of Zionist ideology. That is, making Israeli-Jewish culture stand in one line with the ‘enlightened’ national cultures of the world. Globalized Israeli culture, as hybrid, is therefore a mixture of materials and meanings inherited from Hebrewism and materials borrowed, adapted and adjusted from contemporary world culture. Globalized Israeliness is presented here by looking at the literary generation known as ‘dor hamedina’ (generation of the state) and Israeli rock music.
The literature of ‘dor ha-medina’

The inner sociological logic of the literary field almost dictated that after the ideologically mobilized generation of ‘dor ba-aretz’ writers, there will emerge a generational group of writers whose books examine, deconstruct and criticize Hebrewism. Indeed, towards 1960, and in the following decades, a group of novelists emerged as a new voice in Israeli literature.

The group included novelists like Avraham B. Yehoshua, Amos Oz, Amalia Kahana-Karmon, and Yaakov Shabtai. It was characterized by a revolt against the straightforward realism of the ‘dor ba-aretz’ group and its political mobilization; by positing, in contrast, psychologic writing where protagonists are portrayed from a humanist-universalistic angle; and by insisting on creative autonomy – literature for literature’s sake. Yet the writers retained belief in their public role, over and above art itself. Their body of work contains therefore non-fiction essays, expressing leftist critique of state policies towards the Palestinians. In other words, the ‘dor ha-medina’ writers modelled themselves on the modernist vein of the writer, the artist, as a critical-oppositional intellectual voice.

Thus, instead of accentuating in their stories the uniqueness and singularity of the Hebrew-Israeli experience, implicitly valorizing it, they tended to portray and examine their protagonist’s often troubled stream of consciousness. This gave their work a dualistic character of being at the same time ‘universal’ portrayals of individuals in situations of intimacy or general search for meaning, and critical allegories of the Israeli national situation. Avraham B. Yehoshua’s body of work is one salient representative of this duality. His innovation is the presentation of a model opposed to that of conventional Zionism. Yehoshua draws out of the collective subconscious awkward and vexatious questions about the accepted tenets of Zionism and gives expression to all the political uncertainties and fears that disturb the Israeli’s sleep. His work parallels the neurosis of the individual with the neurosis of national existence on the overall allegorical level. It should be clearly stated that Yehoshua’s stories, novels and plays have an independent poetic existence, beyond the allegorical plane; but in the context of Israeli society the writing acquires a multi-faceted significance, even though each work stands on its own merits (Shenhar 1991, p.109; see also Balaban 1988, making a similar point about the work of Amos Oz).

This pattern continued with the work of younger writers such as David Grossman and Meir Shalev. Since the 1980s, however, Globalized Israeli-ness literature, adjusting itself to trends in world culture, produced an
Israeli variant of ‘postmodern’ literature. In it, an attempt has been made—mostly by female writers such as Orly Castel-Blum, Savion Librecht, Yehudit Katzir and others—to abandon the stance of the sofer and the use of allegory. But

reality overcame the attempts to ignore it, and remained in the texts as one of the protagonists. It seems that Israeli reality, loaded with pressing existential problems, still cannot allow the Israeli writer to turn his or her eyes away from it completely (Balaban 1995, p. 76).

Despite its ‘universalistic’ aspects, then, Globalized Israeli literature remains a prominent actor in the field of national culture, expressing and influencing positions of Israeliness.

 Israeli rock

An attempt to bring the Beatles to perform in Israel in 1964 was rejected by a government committee on the ground that the band ‘does not possess the sufficient artistic and cultural level, and it would not be able to contribute to the spiritual and cultural life of youth in the country’ (Ha-Yir [The City], a Tel-Aviv weekly, 12 December 1980).

About thirty years later, by the mid 1990s, the songs and albums of the seminal rock band Kaveret (1973–1976) or the female rock musician, Yehudith Ravitz, have been widely recognized as ‘classics’ of Israeli popular music. At the same time, young Israeli rock musicians like Aviv Geffen, or bands like Eifoh Ha-Yeled (Where’s the Child) and Shabak S’ have been influencing the whole field of Israeli popular music with their adaptations of recent trends in Anglo-American rock (‘alternative’ rock and hip-hop).

The emergence of Israeli rock to prominence in the field of Israeli popular music thus epitomizes the position of Globalized Israeliness. Struggling first against the control enacted by the Hebrewist and state cultural establishment on anything ‘decadent’, it eventually succeeded in making its critical stance and appropriation of ‘foreign’ cultural materials into a legitimized, even dominant, variant of Israeliness.

Since approximately 1970, musicians in Israel have been constantly creating songs and records in Hebrew, in which they were consciously trying to incorporate into their local dispositions various elements of rock music. These included not only aesthetic components such as electrification and amplification, but the ideology of ‘authenticity’ that is integral to rock culture as well (Frith 1981). Consequently, making music in Hebrew with electrical instruments, consciously influenced in its rhythms, lyrics and vocal delivery by the Beatles, Bob Dylan and other sixties’ rock musicians, came to signify a revolt against the ideologically mobilized mood of shirei erez Israel.
During the 1970s a series of collaborations among a network of musicians produced the body of albums that was eventually consecrated as the beginning of Israeli rock (Regev 1992). The major figures in this network have been singer Arik Einstein, his various partner-composers (Shalom Hanoch, Miki Gabrielov, Shem-Tov Levi, Yoni Rechter) and members of Kaveret. Shalom Hanoch is the rock auteur whose body of work stands as the prototypical ‘Israeli rock’. Singing in a raucous voice songs composed by himself, with lyrics ranging from the most personal to political comment, he has covered a verity of rock styles. Each one of them - soft acoustic ballads or hard electric rock – has been interpreted by reviewers as ‘Israeli’. Thus his album Hatuna Levana (White Wedding, 1981) with its Bruce Springsteen-inspired dramatic sound defined a new standard for the term “an Israeli rock album”. It is important to stress that this is an Israeli album. Not an imitation of American rock, but a personal, Israeli creation, which fits our culture just like shirei eretz Israel (Kutner 1981).

After the initial success to gain legitimacy and recognition, rock musicians such as Corinne Alal, Shlomo Artzi or Rami Fortis, and bands like Benzeen, Tislam and Mashina, consolidated in the 1980s the prominent position of rock in the local field of popular music. Of particular note was the emergence of ‘ethnic’ rock, in which musicians like Yehuda Poliker or Ehud Banai incorporated oriental elements. Poliker, for example, has been mixing since the mid 1980s his basic rock dispositions with Greek and Middle-Eastern elements, achieving with his albums enormous commercial success and critical acclaim. Moreover, his album efer ve-avak (Ashes and Dust, 1988), examines his and lyricist Yaakov Gilad’s autobiographical experiences of growing up in Israel in the 1960s as sons of Holocaust survivors, marginalized by the male-heroic discourse of Hebrewism.

A strong indication of the success of Israeli rock to gain the status of ‘national’ music came with the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin: the musicians that performed in the mass gathering of commemoration, held in Tel Aviv exactly one week after the event, were almost exclusively veteran and young rock musicians who played old and recent songs.

Globalized Israeliness: heresy and continuity

When it emerged, Globalized Israeliness tended to present its works of art as reflecting a heretical break with Hebrewism. Criticizing the insistence of the latter on cultural separatism of the nation and ideological mobilization, Globalized Israeliness emphasized ‘openness’ to and participation in contemporary trends of global culture. Produced mostly within a market oriented culture industry, Globalized Israeliness art
works gained recognition and eventually dominance. In the process, the critique of Hebrewism has been gradually replaced by an emphasis on respect for Hebrewism as the formative phase of Israeliness. In other words, after heresy has been successfully employed as a cultural strategy for gaining presence and legitimacy in the field of national culture, it has been replaced by a strategy of ‘honouring the elders’, in order to produce and sustain a belief in the continuity of heritage for this variant of the national culture.

**Mizrakhhiut (Orientalism): ‘ethnic’ Israeliness**

A sense of difference between oriental Jews, that is, those who were living in Muslim countries (‘sepharadim’) and occidental Jews, those living in Christian countries (‘ashkenazim’), existed long before Zionism. Except for a few places (Latin America, or the old, pre-Zionist community in Palestine), these two categories of Jews hardly had opportunities for sharing life together. After the Holocaust, oriental Jews comprised, roughly, about 20 per cent of world Jewry. During the first two decades of Israeli statehood, the vast majority of oriental Jews emigrated to Israel, thereby making up about 50 per cent of the Jewish population of the country (Dellapergola and Cohen 1992). Their encounter with the local cultural reality has been characterized by the demand made upon them to join Hebrewism.

Viewed by the Hebrewist cultural establishment through a European ‘orientalist’ prism (in the meaning connoted by Said’s use of the term, 1978), oriental Jews were perceived as pre-modern and ‘primitive’, and were expected to ‘modernize’ and become ‘Israelis’: to adopt the image of the ‘new Jew’, the sabra. But these same perceptions produced mechanisms of discrimination and stratification that were crucial in causing the obvious failure of these immigrants to become ‘Israelis’ of the Hebrewist variant.

Socio-political and economic power relations in Israel were thus determined for generations to come. (On Israeli ethnicity in the spheres of politics and stratification see Smooha 1978; Ben-Rafael 1982; Cohen 1983; Swirski 1989; see also the work of early Israeli anthropologists: Shokeid 1971; Deshen and Shokeid 1974; Goldberg 1977.) However, by the 1970s and on into the 1980s, the second and third generations of these immigrants articulated their sense of difference, their local identity, into a set of cultural practices and products usually referred to in Israel as ‘mizrakhhiut’, orientalism. The term implies a position of ‘ethnicity’ vis-à-vis Hebrewism and Globalized Israeliness, which are generally regarded as ‘Western’ or ‘ashkenazi’ variants (Shohat 1988).

*Mizrakhhiut*, as a variant of Israeliness, is a cultural context in which materials from several sources fuse to construct its specificity as a hybrid. These sources include traditional Jewish culture from Arab and Muslim
countries, various Arab national cultures, Hebrewism and contemporary
global culture. Since the 1970s, cultural producers and speakers for
*mizrakhiut* have been insisting on the 'native-ness' and 'Israeliness' of
their particular cultural hybrid, demanding recognition and legitimacy
and rebelling against what they perceive to be a stigmatizing label of 'eth-
nicity'.

Like other 'new ethnicities' (Hall 1996) in recent decades, the cultural
endeavour of *mizrakhiut* is characterized by acceptance of its hegemonic
image of collective entity, of being an experience of sameness (despite
the obvious differences between, for example, Moroccan and Iraqi Jews),
but rejection of the meanings and connotations attributed to the entity
as a whole. Using this collective image to construct an affirmative sense
of difference, *mizrakhiut* then evolved into re-examination of its roots
and its relations with dominant culture.

**Mizrakhiut and its literature**

In 1994 a whole issue of *The Literary Review* was dedicated to *mizrakhi*
writers and poets (*The Literary Review* 37/2). The issue contained
excerpts from the work of various writers and poets (Shimon Ballas, Ronit
Matalon, Erez Biton, Bracha Serri and others), as well as interviews with
some of them. The issue editor, Ammiel Alcalay, introduced *mizrakhi*
literary work as expressing 'active resistance' against the 'utterly alienat-
ing circumstances' in which 'mizrakhi consciousness' as a whole was
placed by a 'tiny élite weaned on the narrowest ethnocentric, political, and
cultural assumptions regarding Israel's place in the world', an élite which
'consistently ignored, maligned, or, at best, misinterpreted this work'
(Alcalay 1994, p. 153). Comparing *mizrakhi* literature and poetry to non-
Western, 'reinvented' literary traditions, he further assessed that

... a case could be made showing that many of the major trends of Israeli
culture as a whole are the result of the initial and ongoing process
among *mizrakhi* artists in reassessing their past to create a unique new

In other words, the point of the issue was not simply to introduce
*mizrakhi* literature and poetry as an 'alternative voice' of Israeliness, but
rather to insist on and emphasize its position in the national culture.

The European 'orientalist' prism of Hebrewism on the one hand, and
their cultures of origin on the other, infuse the work of *mizrakhi* writers
with much ambivalence towards anything Arab. Writer Sami Michael,
for example, traces in his novel *Victoria* (1993), the life of its female pro-
tagonist from early childhood at the beginning of the twentieth century
in a traditional, almost pre-modern social context in the Jewish quarter
of Baghdad, to old age in modern affluence in Ramat Gan, one of
Tel-Aviv neighbouring towns. The novel describes in a plain, almost blatant way the life of Iraqi Jews throughout the century, with great emphasis on the feminine experience of oppression. Michael, declaring that he prefers 'to tell the truth and say that [he] came from a backward country to a more developed one', admits that he faces a dilemma in this regard, namely

... how to convey the truth about your life, your experience, about things the way they really happened, of the situation as it was, without hurting the pride of your fellow immigrants, without deepening the feeling of inferiority of one side, as it were, and encouraging the feeling of superiority of the other side? (Michael 1984, p. 32).

Working within a typically 'Western' cultural genre, yet using it to represent Jewish life in Arab countries and the experience of discrimination of Israeli 'mizrakhim', Israeli mizrakhi novelists best exemplify the problematic position in which mizrakhut is caught. On the one hand, the 'Western' perspective inscribed in literature as a cultural form dictates estrangement from the novelist's own biography; on the other hand, keeping faithful to the 'oriental' or Arab nature of the narratives results in persistence of marginality and hence feelings of discrimination.

Musica mizrakhit

The inclusion of oriental and Arab elements within Israeliness is practised and realized most clearly in the popular music genre known as musica mizrakhit (oriental or eastern music). Beginning in the early 1970s, musica mizrakhit gradually emerged and crystallized as a specific genre, fusing influences from several musical traditions that have been practised among various mizrakhi groups. The significant sound that emerged from this fusion is a mixture of Yemenite and Greek rhythms and melodies, sung in an Arab/Latin sentimental manner and played on basic rock instrumentation (electric guitar, bass, synthesizer and drums), next to occasional traditional instruments such as the qanoun, the oud and the bouzouki (Regev 1986).

In the early 1980s, after a decade of formative explorations by the bands Tsiiley ha-Oud and Tsiiley ha-Kerem, musica mizrakhit found its distinct sound and most salient exponents with singers Zohar Argov and Haim Moshe. These two had enormous success within the 'cassette music' market – the name given to musica mizrakhit at the time because of its extensive reliance on pre-recorded cassettes (as opposed to records) as a major means of dissemination – and in 1983 even 'crossed-over' to the mainstream music market, each with an album that later became a 'classic' of the genre: nakhon le-hayom (Argov) and ahavat hayai (Moshe).
The music and success of Zohar Argov and Haim Moshe became the vehicle for demands, raised by various _mizrakhi_ intellectuals and cultural commentators, to ‘de-ethnicize’ _musica mizrakhit_ and recognize it as ‘legitimate’ Israeli music. The main targets of their attack on the mainstream of Israeli popular music were the music play-lists of all major radio stations, which have been dominated by Hebrew and Anglo-American pop/rock. As until 1995 all radio stations in Israel were public (most of them as part of the Israel Broadcasting Authority system, and one being the influential Israeli Defense Forces station, Galei Zahal), this music broadcasting policy has been perceived by the _musica mizrakhit_ people as discriminatory, as aiming to keep _musica mizrakhit_ in its marginal position. Thus, it has been argued that

[The fact that _musica mizrakhit_ is essentially Western music overlaid with Eastern “codes” and ethnic “colors” accurately reflects the general position of Middle Eastern and North African Jews in Israel . . . On the one hand, Eastern music expresses the need for identity and cohesion that lies behind ethnicity – a feeling of “us” and “them” when contrasted to mainstream popular music, often associated with “Ashkenazin”. On the other hand, they have been socialized to Western popular music, and they are concerned that their music be seen as “Israeli” (Halper _et al._ 1989, p. 139; see also Cohen and Shiloah 1985).

The efforts to ‘de-ethnicize’ _musica mizrakhit_ have been moving along two paths. One, exemplified in the career of Haim Moshe, has been to incorporate elements of _shirei eretz Israel_ into the mix of _musica mizrakhit_, in order to blur the difference between them. The other one has been to insist on the Israeliness of _musica mizrakhit_, on its image as the voice of the marginalized ‘other’ who demands inclusion and equality within Israeli culture. Zohar Argov’s career and biography served this path. A seven-year career, during which he became the major exponent and symbol – the ‘king’ – of _musica mizrakhit_, ended abruptly with his death in 1987. The event, however, ushered in various cultural productions in which he has been portrayed as a tragic hero who authentically expressed, in his songs and life, the feelings of a large, culturally discriminated sector of Israeli society (Regev 1996).

With its well maintained image of having a mass appeal and of being grass-roots music of oriental Jews, _musica mizrakhit_ became by the 1990s the cultural form most unequivocally associated with _mizrakhiut_. Still being relatively absent from radio and television music broadcasting, speakers for this music culture continue to complain about discrimination and demand presence, recognition and legitimacy as Israeli music, without additional adjectives.
Mizrakhiut into Israeliness

Relegated by Hebrewism and by Globalized Israeliness to an inferior position of 'ethnic' culture, mizrakhi cultural practices have initially accepted and assessed this inclusive ethnic identity, in order to be able to insist later on the native-Israeli nature of their specific hybrid. Against the honour implied by the ‘traditional’ status of Hebrewism, and the contemporary dominance of Globalized Israeliness, Mizrakhiut presents itself as a major alternative, as the 'other' which, in fact, is the ‘true’ Israeliness.

Other variants

The three variants of Israeliness discussed in this article do not exhaust the possible range and variety of Israeli national culture. Two additional variants that should be mentioned, at least briefly, are religious Israeliness and the ‘Israeliness’ of the Palestinian-Arab citizens of Israel.

Religious Israeliness

In one way or another, most Israeli Jews observe at least some elements of Jewish religion (Kedem 1991). In this regard, even those who observe the minimum of religious laws enforced by state legislation can be categorized as belonging to one of several patterns of Israeli Judaism (Deshen 1978). Conventionally, however, the term 'religious' is conferred in Israel upon conscious observance of Jewish religion in its totality.

The commitment to culture as religion, to religion as totality, produces a variant of national culture that emphasizes Jewishness rather more than Israeliness. This is especially so among the ultra-orthodox fractions of this variant. The thinness of the discussion of religious Israeliness here stems from the relative absence of distinct artistic production within this variant, and the resulting absence of this variant in the arena of national culture as far as the production of national artistic ‘canons’ is concerned. It should be stressed that in other cultural spheres, such as the construction of historical myths and narratives, political ideology or public culture of everyday life, this variant is a salient presence. This is especially so in the case of the two fractions of religious Israeliness that can properly be called Israeli, because of their being indigenous hybrids of Jewish religion within the Israeli-Zionist context. These are the so-called Religious Zionist (or National-Religious) fraction and the mizrakhi fraction of orthodoxy.

Religious Zionism emerged to significant presence in the ideological field during the 1970s and 1980s, in the wake of the six-day war of 1967 and the consequent movement of Israeli settlement in the territories.
occupied in that war. Leading that movement, the younger generation of
the religious fraction of Zionism, adopted the image of being the ‘true’
inheritors of the spirit and practice of Hebrewism. They appropriated
various aspects of sabra culture and merged them with their modernized
practice of Jewish orthodoxy. The result, known in Israel as the culture
of the ‘mitnakhalim’ (settlers, mostly in the West Bank), emerged as an
indigenous hybrid of Israeli religious nationalism (Aran 1986; Ram
1996).

Rebelling against their subjugation to the patterns of ashkenazi ortho-
dodoxy in the earlier decades of statehood, religious mizrakhim created in
the 1970s and 1980s an indigenous hybrid of religious practices. In it,
some of the already incorporated patterns of ashkenazi orthodoxy have
been merged with elements of mizrakh religious practices. The result-
ing hybrid became a major fraction within religious Israeliness, and in
Israeli politics as well. In the urban periphery, one component of the
mizrakh orthodoxy has been the creation of local ‘saints’ (koshim) and
respective annual feasts (hilulot) in their honour. This practice ‘facili-
tated a process thorough which the inhabitants of these areas have
actively contended with their situation, become more rooted in their
localities, and strengthened local patriotic sentiments’ (Ben-Ari and Bilu
1987, p. 265).

A wider discussion of Israeli culture, which does not focus on the artis-
tic fields, would have to consider religious Israeliness more deeply. As
artistic production remains a relatively marginal practice within this
variant, the discussion here is concise. It serves to demonstrate that the
field of national culture in Israel contains additional positions to the ones
discussed at length.

‘Israeli Palestinianness’/‘Palestinian Israeliness’

Approximately 20 per cent of Israeli citizens are Palestinian Arabs.
Surveys and other research demonstrate that they perceive themselves as
an integral part of the Palestinian people (Smooha 1992; Rouhana 1997).
Yet their constant and continuous contact with Israeliness as a Jewish
national culture, their citizenship in the state of Israel and their relative
disconnectedness from the rest of the Palestinian people (especially in the
period of 1948–1967), has produced a specific cultural setting, different
from that of the Palestinians in the territories occupied by Israel in 1967.
Their identity as Israeli Palestinians is not just a legal-administrative one
enforced on them by historical circumstances, but an actual sense of
difference and uniqueness (Rabinowitz 1997). Their position in the field
of national culture is therefore marked by a certain dualism. On the one
hand, there is insistence on autonomy and Arab-ness, on being an ‘Israeli’
variant of a larger Palestinian identity. On the other hand there is a
demand for presence and legitimacy within Israeli culture, for being a
‘Palestinian’ variant of Israeliness. The language used for literary work is one indication of this dualism.

Distancing itself from Israeliness, Palestinian Arabic literature in Israel is characterized by resistance-based themes that attempt to undermine the ‘hegemonic control of the Hebrew-based culture’ (Snir 1995, p.163). Yet poets and writers who choose to write in Hebrew – notable examples being Naim Arayidi and Anton Shamas – represent a position that places itself within Israeliness. The cultural-political meaning of their use of Hebrew is most clearly expressed by Shamas, who in addition to his critically acclaimed novel Arabesqot (1987), has been active in public debates on Israeli identity.

What I’m trying to do – mulishly, it seems – is to un-Jew the Hebrew language. . . . to make it more Israeli and less Jewish, thus bringing it back to its Semitic origins, to its place. This is parallel to what I believe the state should be. As English is the language of those who speak it, so is Hebrew; and so the state should be the state of those who live in it. (Shamas 1989, quoted in Snir 1995, p.165; see also Hever 1987)

In other words, and for this present context, cultural practices that represent ‘Palestinian Israeliness’ have one major consequence for the existence of Israeli culture: they add a non-Jewish variant to the local field of national culture, and thus undermine its Jewish exclusiveness.

**Conclusion**

I have argued here that ‘Israeli culture’ is, in fact, a field, a space of struggle over the definition of ‘Israeliness’, in which several variants, or identity positions, participate. Each is occupied by collective actors associated with and representing that variant. I want to conclude, first, by arguing that it is precisely because of the logic of struggle at the bottom of the field of national culture, that a body of cultural materials that can be properly called ‘all-Israeli’ emerges; and second, by making some comments on the social construction of national uniqueness.

**The field of national culture in Israel**

The arrival in Israel of approximately one million immigrants from the former Soviet Union, many of whom maintain strong connections with Russian culture; the emergence of a large population of foreign workers from countries such as Ghana, Colombia, Romania and the Philippines; and the publicly perceived sharpening of political and ideological differences between existing variants of Israeliness, have invoked by the late 1990s portrayals of Israel as consisting of quasi separate communities (Kimmerling 1999). Indeed, whether these new phenomena will undermine the commitment to ‘Israeliness’ as an underlying doxa, is yet to be seen.
In the meantime, the struggle over recognition, legitimacy and dominance between Hebrewism, Globalized Israeliness, Mizrahiut, Religious Israeliness and Palestinian Israeliness includes practices of borrowing, adoption, adaptation, appropriation and co-optation of cultural materials between the different variants. That is, as part of one variant's attempt to gain legitimacy, claim continuity of heritage and demonstrate commitment to the nationalist idea, cultural producers associated with it sometimes use works originally associated with another variant in a mode typical to their own variant. Initially, most variants do this by using works and meanings associated with Hebrewism, the 'traditional' variant. But the logic of the quest for 'Israeliness' encourages other appropriations as well. Thus Globalized Israeliness appropriates elements of Mizrahiut, Mizrahiut adopts materials from Globalized Israeliness, Palestinian Israeliness borrows from all Jewish variants, and all Jewish variants appropriate Palestinian cultural elements. As a result, a body of cultural elements and specific works in various fields of art, comes to exist within different variants of the national culture, although with a slightly different meaning attributed to them within each variant. This body of elements and works, crossing the various variants and existing in most forms of Israeliness, comes to be identified as 'all-national', as the core of national culture.

World culture and the production of national uniqueness

The logic and mechanism of the production of Israeliness is but one case that exemplifies a global commitment to the production of national cultures as unique, singular worlds of meanings and contents. The cultural variance and uniqueness of collectivities is probably one of the most essential, taken-for-granted truths in social sciences and elsewhere. In modernity, each 'nation' — being the major type of collectivity into which humanity is divided (Calhoun 1995) — is believed and expected to be a unique cultural community. This belief and expectation stand in growing tension to the fact that in the late twentieth century, nation-states 'are structurally similar in many unexpected dimensions and change in unexpectedly similar ways', because

worldwide models define and legitimate agendas for local action, shaping the structures and policies of nation-states and other national and local actors in virtually all of the domains of rationalized social life — business, politics, education, medicine, science, even the family and religion (Meyer et al. 1997, p. 145).

The growing similarity of the 'rationalized' dimensions of the nation-state, I want to argue, enhances the interest to emphasize and sharpen the 'national' sense of cultural uniqueness, as an essential mechanism for
justifying the separate existence of any given nation-state. But the tools and patterns for doing this, for producing national cultural uniqueness, are also set by world culture models. Each nation attempts to produce what its members believe to be its own unique literature, music, poetry, painting and sculpture, cuisine and so forth. (See the logic behind the design of national flags, Weitman 1973.)

As the case of Israel demonstrates, however, ‘nations’ do not really exist as homogeneous cultural communities. There is a discrepancy between the attempted representation of national cultures as coherent wholes and the actual cultural divisions, plurality and variation within them. Ethnic, regional, religious, generational, class and gender divisions, as well as the contemporary inter-cultural flow of meanings, contents and forms make each ‘national culture’ into a site of contest, an amalgam of entities struggling to gain recognition and legitimacy. Or, in slightly different terms, ‘the scraps, patches and rags of daily life must be repeatedly turned into signs of a coherent national culture’ (Bhabha 1994, p.145). That is, ‘national culture’, as the coherent world of meanings through which the ‘nation’ as community comes into being, is constantly and continuously produced and reproduced from the plethora of cultural materials that exist within and flow into the national context. That this process of creation and recreation exists, is a result of the commitment to and belief in the idea of ‘one nation – one culture’.
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