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**Appendix A**

**The 24th Knesset**

**Highlighted in yello**w **are the MK’s that are in the sample of 72 MK’s.**

**Highlighted in green – the MK’s that at some point resigned their seat either by the “Norwegian Law “to become ministers or left their MK seat for other reasons were and replaced by the next in their party list. At any given time, there are 120 MK’s**

**Those that were part of the sample and part of the time were not MK’s are highlighted with both colors.**

: **Likud 30 MK’s**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Benjamin Netanyahu | Yuli Edelstein | Israel Katz | Miri Regev | Yariv Levin |
| Yoav Galant | Nir Barkat | Gila Gamliel | Avi Dichter | Galit Distel-Atbrian |
| Haim Katz | Eli Cohen | Tzahi Hanegbi | Ofir Akunis | Yuval Shtainitz |
| David Amsalem | Gadi Yabarkan | Amir Ohana | Ofir Katz | Eti Atia |
| Yoav Kish | David Bitan | Keren Barak | Shlomo Karhi | Miki Zohar |
| Orly Levi-Abukasis | Kati Shitrit | Patin Mula | May Golan | Tali Pluskov |

**Yesh Atid 17 MK’s**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yair Lapid | Orna Barbibai | Meir Cohen | Karin Elharar | Merav Cohen | Yoel Rozbozov |
| Elazar Stern | Miki Levy | Merav Ben-Ari | Ram Ben-Barak | Yoav Segalovitz | Boaz Toporovsky |
| Idan Rol | Yoray Lahav Hertzanu | Vladimir Bliak | Ron Katz | Nira Shpeck | Tania Mazersky |
| Yasmin Fridman | Inbar Bazak | Moshe Tur-Paz | Simon Davidson |  |  |

**Shas 9 MK’s**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Arie Deri | Jacob Margi | Yoav Ben-Zur | Michael Malkieli | Haim Biton |
| Moshe Arbel | Ynon Azulay | Moshe Abutbul | Uriel Bosu | Yosi Tayeb |

In January 2022 Arie Deri resigned from the Knesset and was replaced by Yosi Tayeb

**Cahol Lavan 8 MK’s**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Benny Gantz | Pnina Tamanu-Shete | Hili Truper | Michael Biton | Orit Farkash-Hacohen | Alon Shuster |
| Eitan Ginsburg | Yael Ron Ben-Moshe | Mofid Maryi | Ruth Waserman-Landa | Alon Tal |  |

**Haavoda 7 MK’s**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Merav Michaeli  | Omer Bar-lev | Emili Muati | Gilead Kariv |
| Efrat Raiten | Ram Shefa | Abtiasam Mareana | Naama Lazimi |

**Yahadut Hatora 7 MK’s**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Moshe Gafni | Yaacov Litzman | Uri Maklev | Meir Porush | Yaacov Asher |
| Israel Aichler | Isaac Pindrus |  |  |  |

**Israel Beitenu 7 MK’s**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Avigdor Liberman | Oded Forer | Yevgeni Soba | Eli Avidar | Yulia Malinovsky | Hamed Amer |
| Alex Kushnir | Yosi Shein | Limor Magen-Telem | Elina Bardech-Yalov | Sharon Rofe-Ofir |  |

**Hzionot Hadatit 7 MK’s**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bezalel Smotriz | Michal woldiger | Itamar Ben-Gvir | Simha Rotman |
| Orit Strok | Avi Maoz | Ofir Sofer |  |

**United Arabic List 6 MK’s**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Aiman Ude | Ahmed Tibi | Sami Abu-SHjade |
| Aida Toma-Sliman | Usama Saadi | Ofer Casif |

**Tikva Hadasha**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gideon Saar | YIfat Shasha-Biton | Zeev Elkin | Yoaz Hendel | Sharen Haskel |
| Zeev Benjamin Begin | Meir Isaac Halevy | Zvi Hauzer | Michal Shir | Mishel Buskila |

In August 2022 Michal Shir resigned from the Knesset and left her party in order to join Yesh Atid party and was replaced by Mishel Buskila.

**Meretz 6 MK’s**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Nitzan Horovitz | Tamar Zandberg | Yair Golan | Jida Rinaui Zoabi | YIsawi Fredj |
| Mosi Raz | Michal Rozin | Gabi Laski | Ali Salalha |  |

**Yamina 7 MK’s**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Naftali Bennet | Ayelet Shaked | Nir Orbach | Abir Kara | Idit Silman |
| Yom Tov Chalfon | Orna Shtarkman | Matan Kahana | Shirli Pinto | Amichay Shikli |

Amichay Shikli opposed his party from the beginning and practically joined the Likud because he was against nominating Bennet as prime minister and forming the Lapid -Bennet coalition government.

Matan Kahana decided to resign his ministerial post and return to being an MK in order to make Yom Tov Chalfon to have to resign his seat, so he won’t be able to act against the Bennet government.

Idit Silman left the coalition followed by Nir Orbach and these caused the fall of the bennet government.

**Raam 4 MK’s**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Mansur Abas | Mazen Ganaim | Walid Taha | Said Alharumi | Iman Chatib-Yasin |

|  |
| --- |
| Said Alharumi died in the middle of his term as MK and was replaced by Iman Chatib-Yasin  |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**The study population consists of 72 MK’s that represent 60% of the 120 total members of parliament, the Knesset. Segmented as follows:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Segment** | **Study population** | **%** | **Of total MK’s** | **%** |
| Liberals | 25 | 35 | 38 | 32 |
| Conservatives | 28 | 39 | 50 | 42 |
| Religious jews  | 11 | 15 | 22 | 18 |
| Non jews  | 8 | 11 | 10 | 8 |
| Total  | 72 | 60% | 120 | 100% |

**Appendix B**

**Examples from the research sub chapters**

The following are examples from the study extracted from the vast scope of material.

**1.Constitution and Basic Laws**

There are isolated issues, not central ones, that require more legislative work, and there is another question of ensuring the special status of a number of Basic Laws. However, both in content and concept**, the necessary infrastructure for the creation of a written constitution in Israel has been completed** (Lin, 1993) stated Uriel Lin, Chairman of the Committee of “Constitution, Law and Justice” during the twelfth Knesset.

This view is joined by many senior jurists and politicians who believe that the time has come to incorporate the Basic Laws and establish a constitution as an essential step in defense of democracy. Some of the Supreme Court justices think that in practice the Basic Laws already constitute a constitution, and all that remains is to formalize it.

This position of many of the judges on the Supreme Court, headed by the President of the Supreme Court, Justice Aharon Barak, who said and wrote the following as part of his reference to the Basic Laws as laws with a supra-legal status similar to the Constitution:

**"By virtue of these changes, Israel has transformed from a Westminster-style parliamentary democracy to a constitutional parliamentary democracy, indeed Israel is a constitutional democracy, the Knesset as a legislative authority is not omnipotent, the legislation of the Knesset is subject to the Basic Laws. “(**Barak, 2006)

Already in 1993, the President of the Supreme Court, Justice Aharon Barak expressed his views about Israel being a constitutional democracy that have joined the community of democratic countries, including the United States, Canada, Germany, Italy, South Africa, which have a constitutional Bill of Rights. Israel have become part of the human rights revolution of the second half of the twentieth century. Indeed, the lessons of World War II, especially the Holocaust of the Jewish people, as well as the suppression of human rights in totalitarian countries, have put human rights at the top of the global agenda. International human rights documents have been drafted. Israel joined them. International human rights tribunals have been established. The new constitutions include extensive chapters – usually at the top of the constitution, and with unique assurances of human rights. Judicial review of the constitutionality of laws that violate human rights has become the domain of the vast majority of countries. This revolution that we joined in March 1992 has not spared us either. (Barak, 1993)

Changing the Basic Law according to political necessity

Benjamin Netanyahu was accused of bribery, fraud and breach of trust, offenses he allegedly committed while serving as prime minister, and in the subsequent elections when the president charged him with forming the government, petitions were filed with the High Court of Justice in an attempt to prevent a situation in which a criminal defendant during the legal process would serve as prime minister.

 The High Court decided that according to existing laws, there is no impediment to his being able to serve as prime minister. (verdict known as the 11-0).

Along with the petitions to the High Court of Justice regarding the fitness of a criminal defendant to serve as prime minister, petitions were also filed opposing the change in Basic Laws, since the establishment of the exchange/rotation government, Netanyahu- Gantz (in which two prime ministers are appointed and it is predetermined who serves as prime minister first, when will the exchange occur and the second will assume the position of prime minister) requires a broad change in Basic Law: The Government. A bill on this matter was submitted to the Knesset on April 23, 2020, and in addition to the sections dealing with an exchange government, the bill deals with additional amendments to Basic Law: The Knesset and Basic Law: The Government. The bills were approved by the Knesset on May 7, 2020.

Although the establishment of the replacement government and its characteristics drew much public and media criticism, mainly due to claims that it would change the system of government in Israel, the petitions were rejected. Despite his legal situation, Netanyahu received the High Court's approval to serve as prime minister, subject to signing a conflict-of-interest agreement, whichhe did notsign and has avoided to this day,

The President of the Supreme Court presented the questions on the agenda, centered on two: Does the amendment to the Basic Law severely harm the core of democracy until it is necessary to cancel it by the court? The second is whether the court is authorized to invalidate a Basic Law. In legal words: Is there such a thing as an "unconstitutional constitutional amendment?"

Attorney Eliad Shraga, chairman of the Movement for Quality Government, in a speech that combined law and politics, argued: "This is a mega-dramatic event... Our liberal democracy is becoming a monarchical mafio-cracy. – a defense alliance of corrupt people – whose vertices are involved in criminal activity. And this joins forces with the alliance struggling to change the Basic Laws, for a built-in trampling of the regime system. The motive is an attempt to escape Netanyahu's fear of justice."

Supreme Court President Esther Hayut replied: "This is a political analysis, not a legal one. You have to argue that harming the core of democracy necessitates the repeal of the amendment."

Attorney Berman, who represents petitioners against changing the law: "This is not what a constitution looks like. It's an insurance policy, it's an underworld agreement."

Attorney Feldman, who represents petitioners against the change in the law, cried out: "I don't need the damage to the core of democracy, I need the Basic Law. When I cast a ballot, I did not dream of an exchange/rotation government. And why an exchange/rotation government? Because they don't trust Netanyahu. And the exchange/rotation government is vaccinating him from the Deri-Pinhasi ruling. Take down the clauses around and we will be left with a rotation government with a coalition agreement that does not require a constitutional amendment. And that's okay. I come and demand to honor and not insult the Basic Law: The Government, which established a certain structure, a certain order, fixed and known times, and techniques. Who are you, members of Knesset, to change the mission, the rules of the game. The Basic Law does not allow you. A Basic Law, like any constitution, should have a broad perspective. Here they made a rag out of him for their own sake, and now they are demanding his honor when it is clear that he is suitable for fleeting concrete needs."

Attorney Mordechai Rabillo on behalf of the Likud and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu: "The petitioners ask you to be the sovereign. After three readings in the Knesset, we will come here to the Supreme Court for a fourth reading. The sovereignty of the people must be recognized, and the court must be removed from the political arena. "

The position of the Likud and the Prime Minister: "There is no place to criticize Basic Laws of the Knesset. Even if she's wrong. Even if it seems unacceptable to have it on the statute book. Everyone is wrong, but who has the authority to cancel a Basic Law without a source of authority in the law? If we accept the petitioners' arguments, we will lead the country into anarchy. Of course, there are extreme cases, but then the public is expected to express its opinion. The Knesset cannot legislate everything it wants."

Attorney Nurit Elstein, former legal advisor to the Knesset, wrote on Facebook in April 2020:

"Benjamin Netanyahu, there is a real basis for your fear. The court can decide that you lack the normative capacity to be prime minister under indictment for serious offenses of integrity that are disgraceful in nature. ......... The question of your continued tenure is the only one that concerns you........... No legal model has been born that will absolutely guarantee that a fundamentally crooked issue will gain legitimacy as long as Israel is a democracy............... You will have to abolish democracy altogether.

Because in extreme cases, when a prime minister is accused of serious harm, ........... And as part of the tactic of defending himself against accusations, he is working to corrupt democracy – justification arises, by virtue of the doctrine of defensive democracy, to prevent its collapse from forces that threaten its very existence. Democracy is not a recipe for suicide. History has taught us that sometimes, when democratic means are misused, which harms its very existence, it is necessary to protect it even by exceptional means. For example, when it is necessary to enlist to defend "the face of the government in Israel," in the words of Justice Meir Shamgar. You chose to harm all government institutions.................. In order to undermine the public's trust in them and escape justice.

You turned law enforcement into defendants, and you managed to portray yourself as being persecuted by the police, the prosecutor's office, and the attorney general.............. Being a talented and charismatic person, you manage to create a delusional reality in which the boundaries are blurred. The public is convinced that the institutions are persecuting you, and all your talent is directed towards achieving one goal: to distance yourself completely from the investigation of the law........... That is why, Netanyahu, the High Court should stop you, since, unfortunately, politics has failed in this task. Therefore, Netanyahu, you have reason to fear the High Court." (Elstein, 2020)

**2.Jewish and democratic**

Since this debate is taking place in the shadow of the different approaches of the parties regarding prayer and reading Torah scrolls at the Western Wall, the symbol of Judaism, and according to religious conservatives, non-Orthodox Jews should not be allowed **to** worship and pray in accordance with their faith, meaning that Judaism trumps democracy and is more important.

This conflict between Judaism and democracy is expressed in lively discourse on social networks, for example, with an emphasis on the fact that this is one of many posts addressing the issue, writer Roni Sayegh in May 2022 also incorporates quotes from Dr. Shuki Friedman, who defines himself as a jurist, researcher, writer, who dealt with international law in the Prime Minister's Office and was vice president of the Jewish People Policy Institute, in addition to being a lecturer in law at the Peres Academic Center. The combined post reads:

"The state is familiar with the ultra-Orthodox sector and is standing in a long series of surveys showing that the ultra-Orthodox public is the most anti-democratic public in Israel................. Pindros expressed a deep ideological perception that is prevalent among the ultra-Orthodox public and a very serious distortion of values that threatens Israeli democracy. Only determination in teaching democracy and applying core curriculum to ultra-Orthodox education could, perhaps, save the Supreme Court and with-it Israeli democracy from an "explosion.".................. These moral perceptions stem from a lethal combination of life in a closed religious’ framework and an inherent ignorance of everything related to the state and its institutions.

The basic Haredi approach gives absolute exclusivity to Jewish values in their ultra-Orthodox interpretation..................... A long series of surveys in recent years repeatedly show that the ultra-Orthodox public is the most anti-democratic public in Israel. Most Haredim (81%) would like the State of Israel to be a halakhic state; 72% of ultra-Orthodox respondents believe that Israel "needs a strong leader" (compared to 44% of secular respondents); 67% of the ultra-Orthodox believe that the democratic component in Israel is too strong. The value of equality, a basic value in democracy, is also unacceptable to the ultra-Orthodox. 76% of them believe that Jews in Israel should have more rights than non-Jews (compared to 20% of secular Jews). Most Haredim (65%) also disagree that the state should budget Jewish and Arab localities equally. Finally, the Haredim's level of trust in the Supreme Court is almost zero. Only 5%........................... At the same time,

Most Haredim are completely or almost completely innocent of a structured and orderly acquaintance with the state's institutions, values, and the founding Jewish-democratic ethos. While some Haredi girls study some civics as part of a program that has "undergone conversion," among Haredi boys civics studies simply do not exist. Thus live among us 1.2 million citizens, most of whom deliberately withhold knowledge that is the civic backbone of every graduate of the education system in another democratic country.......................... This situation, together with the rapid demographic growth of ultra-Orthodox society, poses a moral threat to Israel as a democratic state. As the political weight of the ultra-Orthodox increases, and as their representatives continue to express positions that reject state institutions and democratic values, Israeli democracy will erode and become, at best, a technical democracy in which the only expression of its being "democratic" is voting." (Sayegh and Friedman, 2022)

The following is an excerpt from the social networks, which reflects the worldview of local leaders in a segment of the population with great influence on the government in Israel:

Says Benny Katsover, head of the Samaria Settlers' Committee: "Israeli democracy has finished its function, it must disintegrate and bend to Judaism."

To this, Rabbi Dov Lior, one of the settler right-wing rabbis, adds: "Democracy is the idolatry of our time."

Rabbi Moshe Levinger, also a right-wing settler rabbi, says: " Democracy must be subjugated to the needs of the people of Israel " And another right-wing settler rabbi, Rabbi Yitzhak Ginzburg, adds: "The Zionist spirit must be sterilized... We must break the court."

And this is already a public statement by Knesset member Avi Maoz, a conservative from the Religious Zionist party, who heads the Noam party, which is part of Otzma Yehudit: "We are a Jewish state. Take down democracy."

The examples and quotes cited above represent an extensive public discourse taking place in the media and social networks, which attests to and points from different angles to the inherent epistemological differences that exist, and constitute the conflict between elected officials who represent that part of the people whose perception of democracy is the central value in their perception of the essence of the state, versus leadership and elected officials in the other part who believe that Judaism is more important, and that democracy is supposed to serve Judaism and should be respected only as long as it serves the religious need and can be dispensed with.

The Arab Minority and Democracy

Rotman has said many times that Arabs by virtue of being Arabs are terrorists or supporters of terrorism:

"The heart hurts. Terrorism must be eradicated from its roots. And its root is the struggle of the Arabs of the Land of Israel against the return to Zion. As we counted just one day ago, this war began long before the establishment of the state, before the "occupation" before the "settlements," and we will win this war only when we cut off the enemy's hope" (Rothman, 2022)

On the other hand, Arab Knesset member Sami Abu Shahada complained to the Israeli law enforcement authorities that they treated a murdered Arab who participated in the demonstration in a discriminatory manner, indicating the patronizing attitude and proving that inequality is undemocratic:

" A group of settlers shot dead a martyr........ who was on his way home after participating in a victory demonstration for Jerusalem and Sheikh Jarrah and Aqsa in the city ............Mozes was killed without any guilt because he was an Arab, the murderers are known to the police and they were interrogated for a short time and released......... And today it is clear from the facts obtained by the Center for Legal Justice that former Public Security Minister Amir Ohana exerted great pressure on the court that was afraid to release the murderers, because the victim is an Arab and the murderer. A Jew and according to the racist way of thinking in Israel, this is a legitimate act and is supported by most of the political and security parties in the country. In any normal country in the world, such facts should put this minister in jail and everyone who conspired and collaborated with him to cover up this heinous crime.We will continue to work on every available platform locally and internationally to expose this crime and all the crimes of the settlers and the occupation, and we demand through the Attorney General that the murderers, Minister Ohana and all those involved in these crimes be brought to justice, and on this occasion we must salute the Center for Legal Justice and the team of lawyers for their tremendous efforts in this case. Mercy for the soul of dear Martyr Musa Hasuna, patience and strength for his family, wife and children, shame on murderers and criminals" (Shehadeh, 2021)

Noted this in a succinct but enlightening statement by MK Moshe Tor-Paz:

**"**Ra'am has taken a historic step towards Jewish-Arab relations by choosing to join a coalition in Israel. It chose Netanyahu's coalition first, but Smotrich destroyed it, so they came to us. The partnership with you is important to Israeli society as a whole. Don't give in and. Don't give up. " (Tor-Paz, 2021)

In the framework of the public discourse, MK Mansour Abbas emerges as a pragmatic leader who believes that democracy can be maintained in Israel without getting dragged into a debate about whether democracy means "a state of all its citizens" or whether integrating the minority into the existing frameworks in the country while realizing their status as equal citizens is the right way.

One of his statements was quoted and posted by Hadar Segal on Facebook, and is presented here as an example of things that were said on different occasions and in different forums but in the same spirit:

"Abbas in his statement: Ra'am has decided to take the initiative and take responsibility and advance this process. Together with our partners, we stabilized the political system after four elections and did our job. We promoted resolutions in order to provide solutions to the distress of Arab society. We decided in light of the Temple Mount events and the disproportionate use against worshippers................. This is a blessing for Arab and Israeli society...................... We reached the conclusion in the faction and in the council to give an opportunity to return and fulfill our duty in accordance with the coalition agreements." (Segal, 2022)

At a later stage, when the government of change was about to dissolve and there was already talk of dissolving the Knesset and going to a fifth election, Abbas was interviewed by one of the leading Arab journalists who is very popular with the Israeli media, Muhammad Majadele, on Nas Radio, in Arabic, and the following sentence from the interview was published by the reporter in Hebrew on social networks:

Ra'am Chairman Mansour Abbas in an interview with Nass Radio: I could have dismantled the coalition long ago and emerged as a Palestinian national hero, but I am a responsible leader who cares about the future of Arab society and Israeli society as a whole. " (Majadele, 2022)

With the dissolution of the 24th Knesset and ahead of the elections for the 25th Knesset, the Arab Joint Party disbanded, and the Balad Party intended to run in the elections alone, and the Central Elections Committee disqualified Balad from running for the Knesset, as described in Rogel Alper's column in Haaretz newspaper from September 30, 2022:

"The Central Elections Committee's decision to disqualify Balad from running in the elections rests this time on its refusal to recognize Israel as a Jewish state. In the language of the petition, Balad's support for turning Israel into a state of all its citizens negates its existence... As a democratic state. This disqualification has both symbolic and existential significance. It must be understood that the daily life of Jewish society in Israel today, the ability to get up in the morning and conduct a routine, is based on a massive, hermetic, desperate repression of a terrible truth from its point of view: the existence of Israel as a Jewish and democratic state has already been denied. It is a Jewish state only within the matrix within which citizens were imprisoned. " (Alper, 2022)

Of course, Balad petitioned the High Court of Justice and it changed the decision and allowed Balad to run in the elections, but this party did not pass the electoral threshold and will not be a member of the 25th Knesset.

These blunt remarks by Rogel Alper illuminate the mood of the public, with which parts of it, and of course also those represented in the Knesset, identify with them, and emphasize the problematic nature of defining the state as Jewish and democratic.

IDF as part of the discussion

In February 2022, a series of discussions were held in the Knesset on the subject of the draft law, and the newspaper Hafels published an article by N. Zeevi that begins with the headline:

**" Ongoing constitutional hypocrisy: This is how the judicial system evades its obligation to regulate by law the question of the recruitment of Israeli Arabs "**

**"**Not many people know that in 1999, the state undertook in the High Court of Justice that the principled norm set by Aharon Barak requires that legislation be formulated regarding minorities as well. However, since the challenging decision, a legal marathon of serial and embarrassing evasions has begun, designed to leave only the issue of yeshiva children on the agenda." (Zeevi,2022)

The writer does not mention the names of Knesset members who participated in the discussion but reiterates several times in generality – members of Knesset who represent Israeli Arabs, mentions the High Court of Justice and the Tal Law, and refers to the lawyers and Supreme Court justices who discussed the issue.

Zeevi's article describes at length and in detail the moves, the legal discussions, and the Knesset regarding the comparison between the issue of recruiting Israeli Arabs and the recruitment of yeshiva students. Without taking a stand, the writer manages to explain the conflict and its significance, but it is recommended to go to the appendix and read the entire article.

Settlements

In a very long post, of which only a small part is quoted here, MK Bezalel Smotrich , as a clear leader and representative of Religious Zionism, which advocates settlement in Judea and Samaria and the Jewish right to the territories, on Facebook, on June 7, 2022 , explains his doctrine regarding Jewish settlement in Judea and Samaria in light of the need to extend the Judea and Samaria regulations, as every year, in order to enable government actions in the territories, defined his view of the supremacy of Judaism over democracy.

"The lives of the settlers and their supporters throughout the country, our vote tonight against extending the Judea and Samaria regulations has reignited the debate about the relationship between this government and the settlements, and what we should do for the benefit of the settlements. And this is a good opportunity to put some things in order.........Their dream and vision was and remains to divide the country. They see the settlement as a serious disease and do not stop saying it even now. As soon as they can, God forbid, establish a terrorist state in the heart of the Land of Israel and expel all the settlers if they do it without blinking.................The Jewish and Zionist values on which the State of Israel is based, on which the settlement is based, and which give it its right to exist – are the values of the national camp of which we are a part. We cannot support a government that harms Zionism and Judaism so badly. A government that relies on anti-Zionist terror supporters and undermines the most basic foundations of Zionism.........." (Smotrich, 2022)

Further to MK Smotrich's above remarks, the following is another example:

Anna Barsky and Arik Bender, writing in Maariv on 17/2/22:

"Conference of members of the Eretz Israel lobby in Sheikh Jarrah"

"Last night, members of the Eretz Israel lobby came to the Knesset for a special and charged meeting in the Sheikh Jarrah neighborhood of Jerusalem. The event took place near the home of the Yeshobayev family, which was attacked over the weekend, in the presence of opposition Knesset members Yoav Kish, Miki Zohar, Kati Shitrit, Yuli Edelstein, Gadi Yabarkan of the Likud, Orit Struk of Religious Zionism and Yossi Taib of Shas....... We came to Jerusalem to the neighborhood of Shimon HaTzadik for a simple reason – to maintain the personal safety of Jews in Jerusalem, Kish said, ............... According to Strzok, chairman of the Eretz Israel Caucus, the lobby's role is to ensure that Jews can live in Jerusalem, the capital of Israel.............. MK Itamar Ben-Gvir of Religious Zionism, chairman of Otzma Yehudit, who also visited the parliamentary office he established nearby, thanked them for coming to strengthen the residents........... Following the events in Sheikh Jarrah, MK Mossi Raz of March submitted a bill yesterday to repeal the Absentee Property Law......" (Barsky and Bender, 2022)

In one of the newspaper clippings dealing with this (out of many), Anna Barsky writes in Maariv:

"Training tens of thousands of Palestinian communities on our backs, the heads of the Young Settlements Forum, who have been waging a campaign to regulate the young communities for more than two years, held a press conference yesterday against the background of MK Nir Orbach's ultimatum to the coalition, after receiving a commitment from Prime Minister Naftali Bennett on the eve of the elections to fully regulate them............ On the back of the young settlement, whose pioneers they claim were sent to prevent the establishment of a Palestinian state..............." (Barsky, 2022)

**3.Separation of powers, rule of law and governance:**

Following MK Yitzhak Pindros, of Torah Judaism party, religious, about his desire to blow up the Supreme Court, MK Simcha Rothman responds:

"My dream is to turn the Supreme Court into a court that no one wants to blow up, because it won't engage in politics and won't try to impose the values and perceptions of the justices on the public.

An override clause and a change in the method of appointing judges, together with judicial conservatism and judicial modesty, is the way to ease tensions in the struggle between the authorities in Israel."(Rothman, 2022)

Rotman continues to try to convince him that his conservative belief, **which subordinates the judiciary to the legislative branch and in effect abolishes** the separation of powers, can be presented as a democracy, and in this context flattens his view of the issue of choosing judges:

"Any step that promotes more transparency in the Judicial Selection Committee is welcome, but of course the Justice Minister's proposal does not provide a solution to the main problem in the appointment of Supreme Court justices: the veto of the sitting Supreme Court justices over the appointments. The selection of judges, especially the justices of the Supreme Court and the President of the Supreme Court, should be by the Knesset, and the hearing should be held in public by elected officials. Only then will we not find ourselves with "conservative" committee members who are "forced" to appoint activist and progressive judges" (Rothman, 2022)

An analysis of the discourse of Knesset members who define themselves as "conservatives" indicates that in many cases the conflict over the issue of separation of powers is expressed in criticism and bashing of the judiciary by members of the legislative branch, whether it is criticism of the Supreme Court while sitting **as the High Court of Justice**, or whether it is an attack on the institution of the Attorney General and its status as the decisive authority regarding the legality of the actions of the legislative and executive branches.

Not only did the Movement for Quality Government and politicians respond to Pindros, there was also an awakening among the public and there were reactions, such as a comment in Yair Aloni's Facebook post:

"Pindros.

Eventually, the splinter comes out of the bag and in a moment of truth you have said what is on your mind about the Supreme Court - "bring in a D9 and blow up this building."

Let's be honest, you don't want democracy here, you want a halachic state that will be run according to Torah law and senile rabbis, aged 90 and over, will mumble unclear things to their grandchildren, who will convey the meaning of the murmur to the masses of the people who will wait for their mouth to come out........... I waited for your response, and indeed it appeared—"metaphorical matter," you mumble, you prefer more sessions to courts, that is, let us perpetuate ignorance and exploitation of the secular over democracy." (Aloni, 2022)

And a second example from the Facebook remarks of MK Yair Golan of the Meretz party, who emphasizes the government's action to try to restore governance both from the parliamentary and public aspects of maintaining and enforcing the law and proper administration:

"The extreme right - messianic and the populist right - Bibist have no respect for the laws of Israel - the law of all of us. They have no respect for the state, its institutions, its elected government, its legislature, its symbols, or its servants. They have only one thing: respect for an obscure divine decree that they are the sole interpreters of, ..........

The current government is a national rescue government in every possible area – in the economy, in foreign policy, in the defense of state institutions and the rule of law, and of course also in security............... Israel is in clear and present danger................... There are extremist groups in Israel that see violence as a blessing, hatred as a solution, corruption as a way of life, and a cult of personality as wishful thinking. These elements – hatred, violence, corruption and a cult of personality – are destructive to any nation, but in Israel, planted in the heart of a particularly sensitive region, their impact could be deadly

. ................... In the meantime, we have restored a sense of normalcy to all government ministries. There is respect for public servants, there are orderly work procedures, there are sensible appointments, there are staff jobs, there are decision-making procedures, there is long-term planning. Not everything is perfect, and will never be perfect, but there is order, there is a method, there is a desire to give the best service to the citizen. Suddenly, the citizen returned to the center of government making. Yes, you and you, you are at the center, and we public servants and elected officials are supposed to provide you with the best service. Not the leader in the center, not God in the center, not power, money and honor in the center, but you citizens, you in the center."(Golan, 2022)

Here only two examples will be presented, one supporting and the other opposing:

MK Yariv Levin expressed his support for Silman and was apparently largely responsible for persuading her to take the step of quitting with the intention of dissolving the government:

"I congratulate MK Idit Silman, who did the right thing this morning, the Zionist act, and announced the termination of her membership in the left-wing coalition.

Silman, in her step, saves the State of Israel from a dangerous and unprecedented process of deep damage to the Jewish character of the state and the foundations of its existence.

I call on all those elected by right-wing voters to follow the path paved by MK Silman and do the same." (Levine, 2022)

On the other hand, MK Boaz Toporevsky of the Yesh Atid party, who served as Silman's deputy and after her retirement was given the position of coalition chairman, wrote:

"I'm not willing to give up

Ten days ago, the Coalition of Change experienced its most serious political crisis since its inception. ......... They predicted only a few minutes until the other side found another dissident, and the sane majority in the State of Israel, which chose the unity government, lost faith, lost hope.

I am not willing to give up because for three years and four elections we stood together at bridges and intersections, demonstrating against corruption and in favor of cleanliness. We were the defensive wall of Israeli democracy.

I am not willing to give up because, despite all the speculation and gloomy forecasts, we have formed a unity coalition that brought under its wings right, center and left. Jews and Arabs together.

I am not willing to give up because this government has made a big change in priorities ............ Because I am a great believer in the path that the government has done in the last ten months......... We worked to mend the rifts in society, strengthen democracy, strengthen the Israeli economy, improve Israel's image in the world, and most importantly, restored the belief that it is possible to live here together.

Undoubtedly, running the country is a complex business............. So I, I'm not willing to give up. (Toporovsky, 2022)

**4. Majority rule, tyranny of the majority**

MK Galit Distel, of the Likud, right-wing, according to her, is conservative, expresses the populist view, shared by other MKs, which holds that the majority is entitled to impose its opinion – **the tyranny** of the majority – this opinion is heard in statements by MKs from all sides of the political map, but even more so from those who define themselves as conservatives and come from the political right, and many in this political camp perceive as their right:

" 1. First of all, a French law for 120 Knesset members. That way the State Attorney's Office can't tailor cases for anyone. 2. Override clause. 3. Change the method of appointing judges. 4. A state prosecutor who spends public money on investigations from which nothing comes of them will pay out of his own pocket. " (Distel, 2022)

We will analyze the issue that arises from this discourse using the four steps for analyzing Faircliff's critical discourse, which are: focusing on a particular performance, identifying factors in the discourse that influence the correction of the situation, while exposing the interplay between language and power relations in reality. And an attempt to discuss the question of whether what is perceived as injustice is inherent to the social order and the subject at hand, and to what extent does the discourse reinforce it. And we will try to deduce the ways in which this wrong can be rectified. (,1992, Fairclough)

MK Atabrian's quote above, which joins the quotes below, focuses on a show in which a glaring contradiction is revealed in the concept of the tyranny of the majority when Knesset members express their intention to exercise their power and impose their will, once they become a majority in the Knesset, while they cry out bitterly about the conduct of their opponents, and claim the tyranny of the majority, as long as they are in the minority.

This view is also expressed by MK David Amsalem, and even more bluntly and crudely, he says:

"When we return to power, we will run over the left to the end. We'll trample on them. Let's start with the Supreme One, we'll put it in order. Then we will kick them out of the plenum and the committees........ We will cancel the laws they passed" (Amsalem, 2021)

Similarly, other Knesset members such as Shlomo Krei, Simcha Rothman, Miri Regev, Yitzhak Pindros, and others who define themselves as conservatives and come from the right side of the political sphere have spoken out. Of course, these expressions were met with more or less blatant condemnations from many Knesset members and public figures.

Likud members find it difficult to accept the same rules when the majority is of their opponents and the Likud is in opposition, as MK Yariv Levin, former Knesset Speaker, expresses:

" Such a low has not yet occurred in the history of the country. A group of activists who deceived their voters and hijacked the country's leadership do not shy away from any means to buy a few more days on the throne. Bribes amounting to NIS 1.5 billion, dissolution of any Zionist value, and blatant discrimination between citizens of the state – everything is kosher.

From the judicial system that needs to stop the dance of bribery, I have no expectations. Not even from the media. With the exception of a few genuine and courageous individual journalists, this is the most miserable hour of what we call "journalism." The watchdogs of democracy guard only one thing – the failed left-wing government. ........................ We will not give up. We will not give in to any blackmail and will patiently bring about the replacement of this bad government. When we do so, we will carry out a fundamental reform of the judicial system and allow new forces to enter the world of communication. This is necessary for the future of the country. This is essential for democracy." (Levine, 2022)

A prominent example of the use of this tool in the 24th Knesset, which caused a radical change in the ability to govern and function of the executive branch, which needs the support of the legislative branch, is MK Idit Silman's resignation from her position as coalition chairwoman and her joining the opposition through cynical use of the Knesset bylaws.

In order for her not to be officially ousted from her Yamina party, which in fact joined MK Amichai Shikli, who acted in this manner from the moment the government was formed, despite being elected to the Knesset in Prime Minister Bennett's party, this conduct was later joined by MK Nir Orbach, who served as chairman of the Knesset Committee, and this backlog of MKs who switched from one side to the other changed the balance of power and led to the fall of the government.

One of the greatest traumas the State of Israel has known is the assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, and this disaster also serves as a confrontation between the parliamentary majority and those who are unwilling to accept the legitimacy of this majority, and this was used by MK Yair Lapid, the alternate prime minister and foreign minister in his speech from the Knesset podium about the behavior of the opposition and the latter's use of violence both verbally and physically in the street. In a column written in Haaretz newspaper Rogel Alper on October 22, 2021, he talks about the issue:

" Yigal Amir's ideological descendants are sitting here," declared [Yair Lapid](https://www.haaretz.co.il/news/politi/.premium-1.10304485) at the plenum, "if we had not created the miracle of the government of change, they would be government ministers today." His remarks were accepted as a consensus in what might be called the Rabin camp. Who was Lapid referring to? It was agreed that they were Kahanists, Smotrich, Ben-Gvir and Co. The immediate suspects. But this is terrible blindness. What ideology was Lapid referring to? .................. Fascism, racism fueled by messianic religion, placing rabbinical moral and executive authority above the authority of the elected government. According to this more expansive and precise definition, Miri Regev, Dudi Amsalem and Galit Distal Atabrian, for example, are also ideological descendants of Yigal Amir............... Regev slammed Ram Ben-Barak, "Shut up, you hate Israel," and Rabin's camp erupted and cried out that all borders had been crossed. After all, Ben-Barak is chairman of the Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee! Former deputy head of Mossad................. The Yigal Amir camp in Israeli society called Rabin a traitor even though he was a former chief of staff and defense minister. The Amir camp told Rabin: You will shut up. Since we are dealing with ideology and not actions, Regev is certainly an ideological descendant of Yigal Amir, no less than Ben-Gvir."

In this subchapter dealing with majority rule and the tyranny of the majority, statements by and about**30**Knesset members were discussed and analyzed, including 9 liberals, 12 conservatives, 5 religious, 4 non-Jews. AS part of 10 articles from the press, and 9 posts from Facebook. (From dozens of newspaper clippings and posts)

**5.The importance of religion, freedom of religion and freedom from religion**

Dr. Rina Anati wrote about this in a Facebook post on August 19, 2022 titled "The Injustice Done to the Haredi Public":

" If I had to point out the greatest injustice done to any public in Israel, it would undoubtedly be the injustice against ultra-Orthodox society. This is a long and protracted injustice in which its leaders have stripped the public of the possibility of making almost every important decision a person makes during his life, first and foremost what to study and what profession to pursue.............. This routing has one goal: control, control over the entire ultra-Orthodox public, total control..........

And this injustice......... Exceeding an injustice to their communities, this is an injustice to all citizens of the state, those who bear the economic and military burdens........... For many years, the ultra-Orthodox public has been held captive by its parishioners and rabbis, and as in any prolonged captivity, it gave rise to Stockholm Syndrome.......... There is hardly anyone who opposes this distorted model that expropriates the first commandment in the Bible, "With the sweat of your nose you shall eat bread." " (Anati, 2022)

In order to present a non-Haredi but certainly conservative and religious perspective, a typical example was chosen as a statement by a leader in Religious Zionism who is not an elected official but has a great influence on his public and on his elected representatives, below from the "Strengthening" website what Rabbi Levinstein, head of the Ali Preparatory School, one of the leaders of public opinion and one of the leaders of Religious Zionism, said:

" In a preparatory class called "Democratic Regime vs. Democratic Government," Rabbi Levinstein talks about how he "accepts democratic rule... I don't accept the basket of values... We need to examine what fits the Torah and what doesn't."

"Then he says, 'Why does it look like a culture war broke out here? It's because someone decided to turn democracy into a democratic culture. the character of the state as a state with a liberal character, when the Jewish majority does not have a sei in the public domain." (Reinforcers, 2022)

On the other hand, in an attempt to deal with the gaps, and as part of his desire to allow the ultra-Orthodox public to use the media, democratically and protect individual rights, Minister of Communications MK Yoaz Hendel found himself responding to MK Smotrich's call to prohibit elected officials who make up the coalition from entering synagogues, that is, to boycott them on the basis of their opinions and worldviews, and briefly outlined his worldview regarding the status of religion:

**6.Human Rights, Equality**

MK Eitan Ginzburg, Chairman of the Blue and White faction, said when he raised the Equality Law in the Ministerial Committee on Legislation:

 "The time has come to anchor the value of equality in the Basic Law of the State of Israel. Equality of individual rights is one of the most basic principles in every democracy and in Israel. In a Jewish and democratic state, it is important to legislate, alongside the Nation-State Law, which anchors the Jewish character of the state, also the Equality Law, which will anchor the obvious in democracy" (Berger, 2021)

Likud MK Shlomo Krei responded to this statement: "This is absolute madness, even on the part of those who seek to transfer the de facto government to the High Court of Justice and the jurists. Such a proposal would impose an ultra-activist High Court of Justice on us, and completely remove the checks and balances that are already almost never used. This fraudulent government is galloping like a frenzy towards the destruction of the only Jewish and democratic state in the world." (Berger, 2021)

We see statements by two MKs, the first a liberal from a centrist party, the second a conservative from a right-wing party, each of whom has a completely different conception of democracy, and each of them actually represents the perception of his political camp, while the former is aimed at asserting that basic human rights – in this case the value of equality – despite being ostensibly self-evident and should be perceived as such, should be anchored in law in order to establish binding norms.

The second interprets this as a danger, not because of the value of equality but in order to reduce the power of the judiciary, which in his view is supposed to be subordinate to the legislative and executive branches, which is related to his and his party's political struggle over the status of the judiciary, the High Court of Justice and the courts. A struggle, which actually originated in the cult of personality and the criminal trial of his party leader Benjamin Netanyahu.

**7. Populism and opportunism**

As part of the Likud's struggle against the government of change, MKs tried to start a public debate on what they call "Jewish governance," a racist populist approach that promotes an agenda that shows unequivocally what their concept of democracy is, and which has received public expression – **one of many.**

MK Miki Zohar:

"The public in the State of Israel is a public that belongs to the Jewish race, the entire Jewish race is the highest, smartest and most understanding human capital." (Glamour, 2022)

Matthew Norovetti writes a post in which he criticizes the conduct of Likud MKs who boycott Knesset committees and despite not working continue to receive very respectable salaries, and quotes Gustave Flaubert: " We are not standing on the brink of a volcano or an abyss, but we are dancing on a board above the toilet, which seems quite rotten to me " and ends the post with the following words: " I am deeply disgusted by these people. They do not serve their senders and take advantage of the trust placed in them. " (Norberti, 2022)

MK Shlomo Krei, Likud, who in the 24th Knesset, while in opposition, manages to create an image for himself as a diligent and leading parliamentarian among the conservative right, and speaks out a great deal publicly.

"The Likud and the other parties of the National Camp have expressed unprecedented support for Benjamin Netanyahu. Nearly two million people said at the ballot box that they unequivocally supported him. Now, people from the left come and say: 'We will determine for you who will be prime minister.' They sew indictments, slander him and his family in the media night after night, all just to topple someone who is stronger than them.... Even though they know very well what most of the people think." ..... So, what do they want? The people want it and choose it time and time again. If you need something stronger. ........"The Likud is a democratic party with institutions and secret elections at the ballot box. Tens of thousands of party functionaries decide who will lead them, and according to this, choose a leader. " (Cohen, 2021)

In this statement by a member of Knesset, who defines himself as a conservative, from the right, we see a concept of democracy that "ostensibly" ignores the rules of the parliamentary game in Israel. Defining a populist democracy in which the leader is the façade of everything, and once elected he is omnipotent. This is an expression of a lack of trust in state institutions and a worldview that is not open to dialogue with the political opponent while diminishing it and disrespecting its values. According to the Fokian approach, an attempt is identified here to expose the relations of power by focusing on the conventions, values and rules used to create discourse. And we see how this discourse is used to reproduce power relations by rules and values built into this discourse.

Typically, this example clarifies his positions by analyzing the language he uses in a political context, indicates the meaning and understanding of the concept of democracy by a Knesset member who, at the time of this broad interview, was only on the margins, and in doing so managed to position himself at the top of the party, which had been in power for many years, and for whom it is difficult to accept political change, and among other things, his attempt to deduce from intra-party conduct to management of the state.

The following is an example of a bill to change the process of selecting judges, a process that may need a kind of reform and change, but what is proposed here illustrates the lack of understanding of the rules of the democratic game by a number of Knesset members.:

"A random sample of what we are facing: On Sunday, the Ministerial Committee on Legislation will discuss a bill proposed by May Golan and Dudi Amsalem of the Likud. They propose that the process of appointing judges on the Supreme Court be transferred from the Judicial Selection Committee to the government and the Knesset; The government will choose the judges. Will forward their names to a parliamentary committee that will hold a hearing for them. The candidates who succeed in the hearing will be submitted to the Knesset plenum for approval. Complete, blatant politicization in the image of the bidders. It was signed by representatives from all corners of Bibi's dream coalition, including Ben-Gvir of Otzma Yehudit, Avi Maoz of homophobic Noam, Yitzhak Pindros of Torah Judaism and Shas party MK’s.

**Appendix C**

**Types of democracy and methods of government**

Democracy is a system of government in which citizens exercise their rights and their power directly by electing representatives to the governing bodies.  Healthy democracies can be classified as flawed when one or more key elements of government are missing or failing to interact properly with each other. All democracies provide universal suffrage, free and fair elections held regularly, a multi-party system, multiple sources of information in the country, universal rights, and voter decision-making without interference from state elites or external factors.

There are several types of democracy:

Liberal democracy**;** Also called **substantive democracy**, **full democracy** or **Western democracy** is a form of [government](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%9E%D7%A9%D7%9C) based on [representative democracy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94_%D7%99%D7%99%D7%A6%D7%95%D7%92%D7%99%D7%AA) that involves limiting the [political power](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%98%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%94)  of its elected representatives by subordinating it to [the rule of law](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A9%D7%9C%D7%98%D7%95%D7%9F_%D7%94%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A7) and fundamental values, in order to protect civil rights . The principles of the system are usually enshrined in [a constitution](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%94) or [Basic Laws](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A7_%D7%99%D7%A1%D7%95%D7%93) that determine the protection of [basic human rights](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%96%D7%9B%D7%95%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%90%D7%93%D7%9D) , as well as checks and balances between the various branches of the political system, which prevent too much concentration of power in the hands of only one branch of government. Liberal democracy tries not to interfere in the private lives of citizens more than necessary, and it emphasizes freedom (freedom of expression, [freedom of religion](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%A9_%D7%93%D7%AA), [freedom of movement](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%A9_%D7%94%D7%AA%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%A2%D7%94) , etc.).

Liberal democracy does not see majority rule as the supreme political value. In liberal democracy [Majority rule](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A9%D7%9C%D7%98%D7%95%D7%9F_%D7%94%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%91) Withdraws from the protection of individual rights and freedoms. In a liberal democracy, the majority, however large, cannot violate the protected rights of the individual, unlike [Republican democracy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94_%D7%A8%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%AA), Seeing in [Sectoriality](https://he.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%D7%A1%D7%A7%D7%98%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%90%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA&action=edit&redlink=1) and Individualism A threat to the state, and therefore weakens the protection of individual rights. This fear of what was called by [Alexis de Tocqueville](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%9C%D7%9B%D7%A1%D7%99%D7%A1_%D7%93%D7%94_%D7%98%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%95%D7%99%D7%9C) and [John Stuart Mill](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%92%27%D7%95%D7%9F_%D7%A1%D7%98%D7%99%D7%95%D7%90%D7%A8%D7%98_%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%9C) "[Tyranny of the majority](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A2%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%A6%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%91)" Guaranteed through the combination of [Representative democracy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94_%D7%99%D7%99%D7%A6%D7%95%D7%92%D7%99%D7%AA), and the existence of [constitution](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%94), The existence of [Checks and balances](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%9D_%D7%95%D7%90%D7%99%D7%96%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%9D) and [Separation of powers](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%A4%D7%A8%D7%93%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%A8%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA) are Characteristics of liberal democracy.

[The human and](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%96%D7%9B%D7%95%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%90%D7%93%D7%9D) [natural rights](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%96%D7%9B%D7%95%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%98%D7%91%D7%A2%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA) protected by constitutions in liberal democracies are varied, but they often include the right to [due process](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%9A_%D7%94%D7%95%D7%92%D7%9F), [privacy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA), [property](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A7%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%99%D7%9F), equality before the law,[freedom of speech](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%A9_%D7%94%D7%93%D7%99%D7%91%D7%95%D7%A8), [association,](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%A9_%D7%94%D7%94%D7%AA%D7%90%D7%A8%D7%92%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%AA)  and religion. In liberal democracies, these rights are usually guaranteed constitutionally.

Liberal democracies are characterized by [tolerance](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A1%D7%95%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%AA) and [pluralism](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%96%D7%9D). Sometimes a variety of opinions, even extreme or exceptional opinions, are protected, and they are allowed to compete in an arena in which ideas are weighed and political power is granted on a democratic basis.

**Deliberative democracy** is a form of democracy in which informed debate ([reasoned](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%99%D7%90%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%92) [,](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7) free[, and](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%A9) egalitarian [debate](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%95%D7%99%D7%95%D7%9F)) in [the public sphere](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%A8%D7%97%D7%91_%D7%94%D7%A6%D7%99%D7%91%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%99) is a central tool for making. It often adopts elements of [consensus decision-making](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A7%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%97%D7%9C%D7%98%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%91%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%A6%D7%A0%D7%96%D7%95%D7%A1) and rule. The system differs from traditional democracy in that authentic deliberation and debate, rather than just voting, is the main source [of legitimacy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9C%D7%92%D7%99%D7%98%D7%99%D7%9E%D7%A6%D7%99%D7%94) for decisions concerning the public and as a central way to realize democratic in society.

Deliberative democracy is close to consultative democracy, in which public consultation with citizens is central to democratic processes.

Deliberative democracy is also a current of thought in [political science](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%A2%D7%99_%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%94) and a normative and practical approach in theory. The approach contrasts with other approaches, which view the democratic process as a process of aggregative democracy or [bargaining](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A9%D7%97%D7%A7_%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%97) between politically .

Proponents of deliberative democracy emphasize the debate that precedes the act [of voting](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%A6%D7%91%D7%A2%D7%94) and support social arrangements and political institutions that encourage the participation of citizens in such discussions. Proponents of the approach distinguish between egalitarian debate based on [argument](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%98%D7%99%D7%A2%D7%95%D7%9F), persuasion, and weighing evidence, and [market](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A9%D7%99%D7%97_%28%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%A2%D7%99_%D7%94%D7%97%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%94%29)  [discourse](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%A7_%28%D7%9E%D7%A1%D7%97%D7%A8%29), in which individuals in positions of power who are interested in realizing their [private interests](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%98%D7%A8%D7%A1) negotiate .Proponents of deliberative democracy point to various advantages of debate-based communication, such as its educational and the ability of citizens to exercise [their autonomy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%95%D7%98%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%94)  through it, to shape as a based on agreed values, to achieve a fairer and more just society, and to achieve epistemological  diversity and better decisions.

**Participatory democracy** is a [democratic](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94) and political concept that advocates public decision-making forums. This concept believes that [civil](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%98%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%94) society political activity [can expand the number of participants in decision-making processes in an organization, community, state and international system. The concept is based on ideology but also sometimes stems from disappointment in the decision-making processes and the functioning of](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%94_%D7%90%D7%96%D7%A8%D7%97%D7%99%D7%AA) [Representative democracy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94_%D7%99%D7%99%D7%A6%D7%95%D7%92%D7%99%D7%AA) and on the claim that in decades there has been a decrease in citizens' trust in the governmental system. Participatory democracy is expressed in participatory budgets, [referendums](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A9%D7%90%D7%9C_%D7%A2%D7%9D), civic legislative initiatives, community managers, citizens' committees, and many other examples, aimed at developing citizens by imparting political knowledge and experience, and on the other hand reducing the gaps that exist between citizens and government institutions and policy makers.

The term **defensive democracy** in [politics](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%98%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%94) and [political science](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%A2_%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%94) refers to a mechanism of [laws](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A7), [regulations](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%A7%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%AA_%D7%9E%D7%A9%D7%A0%D7%94) and [judgments](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%A1%D7%A7_%D7%93%D7%99%D7%9F) that limits some of [the human and](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%96%D7%9B%D7%95%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%90%D7%96%D7%A8%D7%97) [civil rights](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%96%D7%9B%D7%95%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%90%D7%96%D7%A8%D7%97) in [democratic](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%94) [countries](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94) in situations where there is an apparent danger to the very existence of the state, its democratic character, other elements of its character, life and civil rights of minority groups in the population And so on. This term describes one of the main conflicts that may arise in a democratic state between upholding democratic principles, especially [freedom of association](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%A9_%D7%94%D7%94%D7%AA%D7%90%D7%A8%D7%92%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%AA) and the, and preventing non-democratic elements from abusing these principles.

In various democratic countries, there are additional special reasons, supported by a significant part of the population, that justify the use of a defensive democracy approach. However, there is disagreement as to under what circumstances it would be justified to behave as a defensive democracy, without it being considered an unnecessary suppression of acceptable civil rights.

**Orderly democracy**, or [**Agreements**](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%A1%D7%9B%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA), It is a model first proposed by the researcher [Arend Leaphart](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%A8%D7%A0%D7%93_%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%A4%D7%94%D7%A8%D7%98), "consociationalism democracy", Leefhart's research focused on companies Democracies characterized by deep social and political rifts. This term was translated in Israel in a number of terms: associational democracy, settlement democracy and consensual democracy. He proposed the term 'orderly democracy’ Asher Because it expresses the essence of the phenomenon – the politics of settling disputes.

**Electoral democracy** is a type of [representative democracy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94_%D7%99%D7%99%D7%A6%D7%95%D7%92%D7%99%D7%AA) and is conceptualized in science. In an electoral democracy as in [a liberal democracy,](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94_%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%AA) citizens elect representatives to power in free and fair elections. However, while liberal democracy has a commitment and limitations on the government to safeguard civil , including minority rights, the [rule of law](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A9%D7%9C%D7%98%D7%95%D7%9F_%D7%94%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A7), and the independence of the judiciary, and [freedom of expression](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%A9_%D7%94%D7%91%D7%99%D7%98%D7%95%D7%99) , this commitment is weak in electoral democracy. In an electoral democracy, the right to vote is preserved, elections are held, and citizens are able to choose from among several candidates for each appointment Political, but it does not necessarily protect civil and minority rights, freedom of expression, the rule of law, or the independence of the judiciary.[[1] A](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94_%D7%90%D7%9C%D7%A7%D7%98%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%AA#cite_note-1)  widely accepted typology refers to the distinction between electoral democracy, in which there are free, fair, multi-party elections, and liberal democracy, which is characterized in addition to elections by having effective legislative and judicial oversight of the executive branch, as well as protection of individual freedoms and the rule of law.

[Grassroots](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%A9_%28%D7%91%D7%95%D7%98%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%94%29)  democracy is a [category that includes](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%94%D7%95%D7%9C)  [democratic-decentralized](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94) management [models](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%91%D7%99%D7%96%D7%95%D7%A8)  in which the authority to make practical decisions is vested in the [most basic geographical](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%97%D7%9C%D7%A7%D7%94) or [social](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%92%D7%90%D7%95%D7%92%D7%A8%D7%A4%D7%99%D7%94)  [departments of an](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%94_%28%D7%A1%D7%95%D7%A6%D7%99%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%92%D7%99%D7%94%29)  organization [or society](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%A8%D7%92%D7%95%D7%9F) .

There are a variety of types of management models that implement grassroots democracy; the model is chosen or formed depending on the type of organization and its goals. These can be unstructured and non-hierarchical organizations run by all members, or by any member who wishes to take the initiative.

[A national democratic grassroots movement](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%AA%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%A2%D7%94_%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%A9%D7%99%D7%AA) will place decision-making power as much as possible in the hands of local departments, squads or even individual members rather than a central headquarters. The principle is that in order for democratic power to be exercised in the best possible way, it must serve local communities and individuals and for this to happen they need to hold power instead of an opaque minority group. Organizations run on the basis of grassroots democracy can be run in the form of participatory. Systems based on grassroots democracy differ from democratic systems based on the election of delegates for a fixed period of time on behalf of each community in that the community continues to be continuously involved in decision-making.  Many [political parties](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A4%D7%9C%D7%92%D7%94_%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%98%D7%99%D7%AA) in the world, mainly, libertarian green parties and libertarian-socialist parties [are interested in implementing models of grassroots democracy at the state level, one of the best known of which is](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A1%D7%95%D7%A6%D7%99%D7%90%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%96%D7%9D_%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%90%D7%A0%D7%99) the German Green Party[.](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A4%D7%9C%D7%92%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%99%D7%9D_%D7%94%D7%92%D7%A8%D7%9E%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%AA)

**A flawed democracy** is a concept proposed in the early [21st century](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%90%D7%94_%D7%94-21) to clarify the distinctions between [totalitarian](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%98%D7%95%D7%98%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%98%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%96%D7%9D), [authoritarian,](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A9%D7%98%D7%A8_%D7%A1%D7%9E%D7%9B%D7%95%D7%AA%D7%A0%D7%99)  and [democratic](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94) political systems. The term is based on the idea of embedded democracy. There are four forms of flawed democracy, according to how each country has reached the point where democracy is flawed. Other causes of flawed democracies are the level of modernization, economic trends, [social capital](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%95%D7%9F_%D7%97%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%AA%D7%99), [civil society](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%94_%D7%90%D7%96%D7%A8%D7%97%D7%99%D7%AA), political institutions, and [education](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%9A).

**Types of flawed democracies:**

**Exclusive democracy** One possible form of flawed democracy is democracy in which there is no universal, so that the regime is determined by elections but the voters do not represent all citizens. Different countries have different restrictions on the right to vote, which some countries deny because of crimes.

**Limited democracy** When armies, entrepreneurs, landowners, local militias, or multinational corporations gain a foothold in political areas and take power out of the hands of democratically elected officials, the result is limited democracy.

**Illiberal democracy** Another possible flaw in democracy is when, despite the existence of free elections and the right to vote for all, the power of elected officials allows them to violate constitutional and other norms, individual civil rights are partially nullified or are not established in law. Illiberal democracy is the most common form of flawed democracy.

**Democracy of representation** In a representative democracy, the executive branch has full control and the legislative and judicial branches have very limited power over the executive branch. Constitutional norms are rarely implemented, and the checks and balances of power necessary for a healthy democracy are undermined.

**Anocratic regimes** are dictatorships with a democratic institution of a legislature. They have a mixture of democratic and autocratic characteristics, which can cause an increase in conflicts in the country. Such governments can exist when the ruling elite avoids serious infringement of rights and does not steal or cancel elections. The ruling party makes sure that rights violations do not receive much publicity so as not to upset the public it controls.

[Cuba](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%91%D7%94) , for example, is an anocratic regime with both autocratic and democratic features. In Cuba, the has full control over the country but still has democratic features, such as the National Assembly of Popular Power, whose 600 members are elected to five-year terms by popular vote. However, in elections for assembly offices, the Communist Party has no competition.

**Radical democracy** is a type of [democracy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94) that advocates a significant expansion of [equality](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%95%D7%99%D7%95%D7%9F) freedom. According to this view, democracy is an inclusive, ongoing, and reflexive process. Within radical democracy there are three approaches: agonistic, procedural, and autonomous.

**Islamic democracy** is [a](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%99%D7%93%D7%90%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%92%D7%99%D7%94) [political ideology](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%98%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%94)  that seeks to implement Islamic principles for [public policy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%A6%D7%99%D7%91%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%AA) within a [democratic](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94) framework. Islamic political theory establishes three basic characteristics of Islamic democracy: Leaders must be elected by the people, subject to [Sharia law,](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A9%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%A2%D7%94)  and must practice Shura, a special form of counseling of the Prophet [Muhammad](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%97%D7%9E%D7%93), which can be found in various hadiths. Countries that fulfill the three basic qualities areAfghanistan, Iran and Malaysia. On the other hand, [Saudi Arabia](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A1%D7%A2%D7%95%D7%93%D7%99%D7%94), [Qatar,](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A7%D7%98%D7%A8_%28%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%94%29)  and [the United Arab Emirates](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%99%D7%97%D7%95%D7%93_%D7%94%D7%90%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%A2%D7%A8%D7%91%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA) are examples of countries that do not uphold the principles of Islamic democracy despite being Islamic countries, since these countries do not hold elections. The expression of Islamic democracy differs in Muslim majority countries, as interpretations of Sharia vary from country to country, and the use of Sharia is more comprehensive in countries where Sharia forms the basis of state law.

Supporters of Islamic democracy believe that the concepts of liberalism and democracy already existed in the Islamic world in the Middle Ages, and the [caliphate](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%27%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%AA) during the [Rashidun period](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%A9%D7%99%D7%93%D7%95%D7%9F)  is seen by them as an early example of a democratic state. In their opinion, democratic development in the Islamic world was finally halted by the Sunni [split](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%A1%D7%9C%D7%90%D7%9D_%D7%A9%D7%99%D7%A2%D7%99).

**Types of regimes:**

**A presidential system** is a system of government in which the public elects the head [of the executive branch](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%A8%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%91%D7%A6%D7%A2%D7%AA), independently of its choice of branch. Presidential elections are usually [direct elections](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%91%D7%97%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%99%D7%A9%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%AA), but they may also be indirect, as in the [United States](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%A8%D7%A6%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%AA) where the president is elected by College. In countries with a presidential regime, [the head of the executive branch](https://he.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%A9_%D7%94%D7%A8%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%91%D7%A6%D7%A2%D7%AA&action=edit&redlink=1) is referred to as the "[president](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A0%D7%A9%D7%99%D7%90)", and he also serves as the state. The president does not need a majority in parliament to be elected or to continue in office, and parliament can remove him only through a special procedural procedure that requires a and on certain grounds.

In a presidential regime, the president appoints the ministers, and they report directly to him. One of the main features of a presidential regime is the principle powers. There is no functional link between the legislative and executive branches. The president can veto legislation of parliament, but parliament can override the veto by a special majority of members. In a presidential regime[, there is usually a constitution](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%94), due to the wide scope of powers enjoyed by the head of the executive branch, and the role of the constitution is to limit the power of the president. Without mechanisms of [checks and balances](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%A4%D7%A8%D7%93%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%A8%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA#%D7%90%D7%99%D7%96%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%9D_%D7%95%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%9D) and without [a powerful judiciary](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%98%D7%AA) to protect the Constitution,

**Characteristics of the presidential regime**

The elections for the president and parliament are separate.

1. A president does not need the confidence of parliament, and parliament cannot remove him arbitrarily.
2. In order to maintain the democratic character of the presidential regime, an effective constitution and a powerful judiciary are needed.

**The Presidential Regime and Israel**

The idea for [direct election](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%91%D7%97%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%94_%D7%99%D7%A9%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%94) of the prime minister was first raised in a bill published in 1987 by a number of law professors from [Tel Aviv University](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%A1%D7%99%D7%98%D7%AA_%D7%AA%D7%9C_%D7%90%D7%91%D7%99%D7%91). The idea arose after the elections for [the tenth](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%91%D7%97%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%9C%D7%9B%D7%A0%D7%A1%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%A2%D7%A9%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%AA) and [eleventh](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%91%D7%97%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%9C%D7%9B%D7%A0%D7%A1%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%90%D7%97%D7%AA_%D7%A2%D7%A9%D7%A8%D7%94) Knesset’s, when there was a situation of equality between the left and right parties, which greatly increased the political power of the small parties in the Knesset. The existing approach reached its lowest point during the coalition crisis in March 1990, when the and the large parties tried to form personal coalitions, causing Knesset members to move from one bloc to another in exchange for political appointments and favors. Public pressure grew, resulting in government support for changing by most parties. Proponents of changing the system of government argued that:

* The change will ensure more efficient and presentable governments.
* The change will reduce sales and the receipt of favors from Knesset members.
* The change will weaken the power of the small parties.
* The change will prevent lengthy coalition negotiations.
* The change will increase the sovereignty of citizens, who will be able to directly choose who is at the disposal of the government.

Opponents of the change, who were mostly from the academic community, argued that:

* The change will result in too much political power being concentrated in the hands of one person.
* The change will turn elections into a personal contest and weaken the ideological dimension of politics.
* Change; It will harm the power of the large parties in the Knesset, since many voters will split their votes.
* Change is a dangerous experiment, since this method has not been tried in any Western democracy.

Between 1996 and 2001, elections were held in Israel that included the direct election of a prime minister. Since then, two [additional bills dealing](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%AA#%D7%94%D7%A6%D7%A2%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A7)  with the form of presidential government have been submitted: one is the Basic Law of the President of the State (new version), submitted in 2003 by[Haim Ramon](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%99%D7%99%D7%9D_%D7%A8%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%9F) , and the other is the [Basic Law: The Government](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A7_%D7%99%D7%A1%D7%95%D7%93%3A_%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%9E%D7%A9%D7%9C%D7%94)  (Separation of Powers and Presidential Regime), submitted in 2006 by [Avigdor Lieberman](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%91%D7%99%D7%92%D7%93%D7%95%D7%A8_%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%9E%D7%9F).

**A semi-presidential regime** is [a republic](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%94)  [in which a](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A0%D7%A9%D7%99%D7%90) president [coexists with](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%A9_%D7%9E%D7%9E%D7%A9%D7%9C%D7%94) a prime minister [and](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A7%D7%91%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%98_%28%D7%9E%D7%9E%D7%A9%D7%9C%D7%94%29) cabinet, the [latter two of which are responsible for](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%91%D7%99%D7%AA_%D7%9E%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A7%D7%99%D7%9D)  the country's legislature. It differs from [a parliamentary republic](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%94_%D7%A4%D7%A8%D7%9C%D7%9E%D7%A0%D7%98%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%AA) in that it has a publicly elected [head of st ate](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%A9_%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%94) , who is more than a ceremonial figure, and [from the presidential regime](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A9%D7%98%D7%A8_%D7%A0%D7%A9%D7%99%D7%90%D7%95%D7%AA%D7%99) in that the cabinet, despite the name of the president, is responsible for [the legislative branch](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%9E%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A7%D7%AA), which may force the government to fall in [a motion of no confidence](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%A6%D7%A2%D7%AA_%D7%90%D7%99-%D7%90%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%9F).

**definition**

Maurice Duverger's original definition of semi-presidency stipulated that the president should be elected, hold significant power, and serve a permanent term. Modern definitions merely state that the head of state must be elected, and that a separate prime minister dependent on parliamentary confidence should lead the executive branch.

**Subtypes**

There are two distinct subtypes of semi-presidential regimes: the prime minister-presidential and the president-parliamentary.

Under **the Prime Minister-Presidency** system, the Prime Minister and the Cabinet are solely responsible to Parliament. The president may elect the prime minister and cabinet, but only parliament may approve them and remove them from office with a vote of no confidence. This system is much closer to a pure parliamentary republic. This subgenus is used in: [Algeria](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%9C%D7%92%27%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%94), [Burkina Faso](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%91%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%A7%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%94_%D7%A4%D7%90%D7%A1%D7%95), [Cape Verde](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9B%D7%A3_%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%93%D7%94), [Democratic Republic of the Congo](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%A8%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%94_%D7%94%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%AA_%D7%A9%D7%9C_%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%92%D7%95) ([de facto](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%94_%D7%A4%D7%A7%D7%98%D7%95), [de jure](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%94_%D7%99%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%94) The Democratic Republic of the Congo is[a dictatorship](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%98%D7%98%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%94), [East Timor](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%96%D7%A8%D7%97_%D7%98%D7%99%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A8), [Egypt](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A6%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%9D), [France](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A6%D7%A8%D7%A4%D7%AA), [Haiti](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%90%D7%99%D7%98%D7%99), [Lithuania](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%98%D7%90), [Madagascar](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%92%D7%A1%D7%A7%D7%A8), [Mali](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%90%D7%9C%D7%99), [Mongolia](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%92%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%94), [Niger](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%96%27%D7%A8), [Poland](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%9F)(de facto, de jure Poland is[a parliamentary republic](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94_%D7%A4%D7%A8%D7%9C%D7%9E%D7%A0%D7%98%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%AA)), [Portugal](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%95%D7%92%D7%9C), [Romania](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%9E%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%94), [São Tomé and Príncipe](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A1%D7%90%D7%95_%D7%98%D7%95%D7%9E%D7%94_%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%A1%D7%99%D7%A4%D7%94), [Serbia](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A1%D7%A8%D7%91%D7%99%D7%94) (de facto, de jure Serbia is a parliamentary democracy), [Sri Lanka](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A1%D7%A8%D7%99_%D7%9C%D7%A0%D7%A7%D7%94) [and Ukraine](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%94) (since 2014; previously, from 2006 to 2010 it was also used by Georgia ( 2013–2018).

Under the **president-parliamentary** system, the prime minister and cabinet are jointly responsible to the president and parliament. The president elects the prime minister and cabinet but must receive the support of a parliamentary majority of his choice. To remove a prime minister, or the entire cabinet, from power, the president can dismiss them, or parliament can remove them through a vote of no confidence. This form of semi-presidency is much closer to a pure presidential regime. The method is used in:  [Azerbaijan](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%96%D7%A8%D7%91%D7%99%D7%99%D7%92%27%D7%9F), [Republic of the Congo](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%AA_%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%92%D7%95), Guinea-Bissau[,](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%92%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%90%D7%94_%D7%91%D7%99%D7%A1%D7%90%D7%95) Mauritania[,](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%90%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%98%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%94) Mozambique[,](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%96%D7%9E%D7%91%D7%99%D7%A7) Namibia[,](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A0%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%91%D7%99%D7%94) [the Palestinian](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%A8%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%A4%D7%9C%D7%A1%D7%98%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%AA) Authority, [Russia](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%A1%D7%99%D7%94), [Syria](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A1%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%94) and Taiwan. It was also used in Ukraine (first from 1996 to 2005; then from 2010 to 2014), Georgia (from 2004 to 2013), South Korea under the Fourth and Fifth Republics, and [Germany](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%92%D7%A8%D7%9E%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%94) during [the Weimar Republic](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%AA_%D7%95%D7%99%D7%99%D7%9E%D7%90%D7%A8).

**Hybrid regime** is a regime that combines features of regimes [Democrats](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94), For example ,[elections](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%91%D7%97%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%AA) Permanent ones open to the general public with features of regimes [Authoritarians](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A9%D7%98%D7%A8_%D7%A1%D7%9E%D7%9B%D7%95%D7%AA%D7%A0%D7%99) For example, [oppression](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%99%D7%9B%D7%95%D7%99) political.

Despite the combination of characteristics, in the absence of the ability to establish a real democratic regime, hybrid regimes are generally considered essentially authoritarian. In research, they are not generally considered a subtype of authoritarian regimes, nor are they considered to be "on the way" to a democratic/authoritarian regime but are defined as a separate type of regime with unique characteristics.

Hybrid regimes have existed in most [developing countries](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%94_%D7%9E%D7%AA%D7%A4%D7%AA%D7%97%D7%AA), especially since the end [of the Cold War](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%9C%D7%97%D7%9E%D7%94_%D7%94%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%94), by some definitions, hybrid regimes have become the most common form of governance at the beginning [of](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%90%D7%94_%D7%94-21) the 21st century[,](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%95%22%D7%97_%D7%97%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%91%D7%A2%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%9D)  according to the definition of the Freedom House [World Freedom Report](https://he.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Freedom_House&action=edit&redlink=1), about a third of the regimes in the world in recent decades have been hybrid regimes, and it is especially common in [Eurasia](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%90%D7%A1%D7%99%D7%94) .[The Economist Group](https://he.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%D7%A7%D7%91%D7%95%D7%A6%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%90%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%A1%D7%98&action=edit&redlink=1) , which tracks regimes in countries around the world, publishes an analysis every year called [the Democracy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%93_%D7%94%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94) Index, which classifies about a quarter of countries as hybrid regimes.

**Properties**

Hybrid regimes may have a wide range of characteristics, and the definitions that seek to distinguish borderline cases of hybrid regimes are vague. Therefore, typologies were created in order to identify the different characteristics of hybrid regimes and distinguish them from other types of regimes.

 The [research team of](https://he.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%D7%A7%D7%91%D7%95%D7%A6%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%90%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%A1%D7%98&action=edit&redlink=1) the Economist Group, which annually publishesthe Democracy Index, defines hybrid regimes by their suitability for several key characteristics: elections, which are a common feature of these regimes and have significant irregularities that often prevent them from being free and fair; In many cases, government pressure is exerted on [opposition](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%96%D7%99%D7%A6%D7%99%D7%94) parties; regimes with many weaknesses in various parameters that are examined and relate to political culture, the free ability of citizens to participate and influence political reality, a functioning system of checks and the degree of power held by elected officials as opposed to other unelected entities, such as military or terrorist elements ;[Government corruption](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A9%D7%97%D7%99%D7%AA%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%A9%D7%9C%D7%98%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%AA) tends to be widespread and the rule of law is weak; the capacity of civil society is weak ,[journalists](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A2%D7%99%D7%AA%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%90%D7%99)  are pressured and the is not independent.

There is strong [empirical evidence](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%9E%D7%A4%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%A6%D7%99%D7%96%D7%9D)  that distinguishes hybrid regimes from democracies or authoritarian regimes in terms of regime performance and actions as well. A systematic comparative study has found that hybrid regimes are more likely to go to war than democracies or authoritarian regimes (Mansfield and Snyder, 2005), and more prone to national crises (Goldstone, 2000) with lower confidence rates than business [investment entities](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%A9%D7%A7%D7%A2%D7%94)  (Kenyon and Nahuy, 2010). Namely, The intermediate situation between democracy and authoritarianism is correlated with higher levels of certain economic, political, and international problems, compared to each of the extremes. However, as of 2010, the nature of the correlation is unclear, and it is difficult to say with certainty whether the hybrid regime is the cause of these factors or whether [the causal relationship](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A7%D7%A9%D7%A8_%D7%A1%D7%99%D7%91%D7%AA%D7%99_%D7%A2%D7%95%D7%91%D7%93%D7%AA%D7%99) is the opposite, and the earlier existence of fundamental problems is what causes the formation of the hybrid regime.

Compared to purely authoritarian regimes, leadership in hybrid regimes does take [public opinion](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%A2%D7%AA_%D7%A7%D7%94%D7%9C) into account. Nor can the leadership be offered real competition in election rounds; opposition candidates, despite their political limitations, can exploit negative public opinion to undermine other power elements that support its stability, or even create so much drift of voting for the opposition in the elections that it will be difficult and unreliable to falsify another result. In fact, the elections themselves also serve as part of a mechanism of influence on public opinion aimed at creating a permanent impression that the majority of the public supports the government. Hale and McFaul's studies have shown that party changes Such regimes usually occur during the rule of the least popular leaders, and from this they have deduced the great importance of public opinion

**Authoritarian regime** is a type [Regimen](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A9%D7%98%D7%A8) Characterized by tight social control and expectation on the part of the [population](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%95%D7%9B%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%A1%D7%99%D7%99%D7%94) To obey the regime, often using repressive measures. In authoritarian regimes there is usually [Hierarchy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%A8%D7%9B%D7%99%D7%94) Clear governmental and social. Authoritarianism counts in [Political science](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%A2_%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%94) To the type of regime separate from the [Liberal democracy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94_%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%AA) But also from the [Totalitarianism](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%98%D7%95%D7%98%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%98%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%96%D7%9D). The democratic form of authoritarian rule is sometimes referred to as [Democracy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%98%D7%98%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%94) or [Process democracy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%98%D7%99%D7%94_%D7%AA%D7%94%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%9B%D7%99%D7%AA).

This regime differs from totalitarianism in that the latter relies on passive acceptance of power by the masses, while the former relies on widespread support. Totalitarianism is considered the extreme version of authoritarianism. Authoritarianism differs from totalitarianism mainly in that the regime allows the existence of economic and social institutions that are not under government control.

The main characteristics of the authoritarian regime:

* [There is limited pluralism](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%96%D7%9D) ; there is no power sharing in government; the branches of the regime and the authorities are interconnected; there are no [parties](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A4%D7%9C%D7%92%D7%94) beyond the ruling party, or they exist but are limited in power and operate freely for appearances only.
* There is no mechanism of [checks and balances](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%A4%D7%A8%D7%93%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%A8%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA#%D7%90%D7%99%D7%96%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%9D_%D7%95%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%9D).
* There is no system of [legitimizing](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9C%D7%92%D7%99%D7%98%D7%99%D7%9E%D7%A6%D7%99%D7%94) power through [free](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%91%D7%97%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%AA)  elections.
* [Ideology](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%99%D7%93%D7%90%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%92%D7%99%D7%94) is not dominant, or it is not comprehensive and inclusive.
* There is no widespread [social mobility](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%A2%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%97%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%AA%D7%99%D7%AA) ; there is no governmental [motivation](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%98%D7%99%D7%91%D7%A6%D7%99%D7%94) to fundamentally change society.
* Suppression [of human rights](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%96%D7%9B%D7%95%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%90%D7%93%D7%9D) with restrictions on [freedom of expression](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%A9_%D7%94%D7%91%D7%99%D7%98%D7%95%D7%99), [association](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%A9_%D7%94%D7%94%D7%AA%D7%90%D7%A8%D7%92%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%AA) and [conscience](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%A9_%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%A6%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%9F).
* Separation of the state from civil [society, as](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%94_%D7%90%D7%96%D7%A8%D7%97%D7%99%D7%AA) opposed to totalitarian regimes.

The term probably originated from the French adjective authoritarian. However, already in antiquity similar terms were used. Among other things, authoritarian regimes often represent a lack [of confidence](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%9F) in democracy's ability to solve problems and advance [society](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%94_%28%D7%A1%D7%95%D7%A6%D7%99%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%92%D7%99%D7%94%29), and a preference for the rule of an "elite" over democracy. Thus, there is an affinity between authoritarian regimes and [elitism](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%98%D7%99%D7%96%D7%9D) of the kind promoted [by political](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%97%D7%A9%D7%91%D7%94_%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%AA)  philosophers Anti-democrats such as [Robert Michels](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%98_%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%9B%D7%9C%D7%A1) and [Carl Schmitt](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%9C_%D7%A9%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%98).

Examples of authoritarian rulers and regimes:

* [Spain under Francisco Franco](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%94_%D7%94%D7%A1%D7%A4%D7%A8%D7%93%D7%99%D7%AA)
* [Cuba](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%91%D7%94) Under rule Fulgencio
* [Uganda](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%95%D7%92%D7%A0%D7%93%D7%94) under [Idi Amin](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%99%D7%93%D7%99_%D7%90%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%9F)
* [Egypt](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A6%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%9D) ass [Anwar Sadat](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%90%D7%A8_%D7%A1%D7%90%D7%93%D7%90%D7%AA), [Hosni Mubarak](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%A1%D7%A0%D7%99_%D7%9E%D7%91%D7%90%D7%A8%D7%9B)
* [Syria](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A1%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%94) under [Bashar al-Assad](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%91%D7%A9%D7%90%D7%A8_%D7%90%D7%9C-%D7%90%D7%A1%D7%93)
* [Iraq](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A2%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%A7) under [Saddam Hussein](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A1%D7%93%D7%90%D7%9D_%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A1%D7%99%D7%99%D7%9F)
* [Russia](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%A1%D7%99%D7%94) under [Vladimir Putin](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%93%D7%99%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%A8_%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%98%D7%99%D7%9F)

**Although Israel presents itself as "the only democracy in** [**the Middle East**](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%96%D7%A8%D7%97_%D7%94%D7%AA%D7%99%D7%9B%D7%95%D7%9F)**," the treatment** [**of Palestinians**](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%9C%D7%A1%D7%98%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%9D)**under the governments** [**of Benjamin Netanyahu**](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%91%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%9F_%D7%A0%D7%AA%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%94%D7%95)**and** [**the Likud party**](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A4%D7%9C%D7%92%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%9B%D7%95%D7%93)**is considered harshly authoritarian, for preventing** [**Knesset members from marking Nakba Day**](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%99%D7%95%D7%9D_%D7%94%D7%A0%D7%9B%D7%91%D7%94)**, blocking the establishment of a sovereign Palestinian state, and not even complying with UN resolutions.**

**Military rule** is a type of regime in which political power is in the hands of the army and [the state](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%94) is directly controlled by the military. As with any [dictatorship](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%98%D7%98%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%94), martial law can be official or informal (some military rulers, such as [former](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%A0%D7%9E%D7%94)  Panamanian [ruler Manuel Noriega](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%90%D7%9C_%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%99%D7%92%D7%94), have even established a civilian government subordinate to them). In some cases, martial law is combined with a civilian government, so that the army has great power, even though there is a civilian government.

The typical military regime in [Latin America](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%9E%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%94_%D7%94%D7%9C%D7%98%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%AA)  is governed by [a junta,](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%98%D7%94_%D7%A6%D7%91%D7%90%D7%99%D7%AA)  a word derived from [Spanish](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A1%D7%A4%D7%A8%D7%93%D7%99%D7%AA) and meaning committee or committee of military chiefs. In other cases, the military regime is ruled by [a single dictator](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%98%D7%98%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%94) who is usually also the commander of the army. In both cases, the dictator or head of the junta is considered the [head of state](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%A9_%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%94).

In [the Middle East](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%96%D7%A8%D7%97_%D7%94%D7%AA%D7%99%D7%9B%D7%95%D7%9F) and Africa, military rule is more often ruled by a single individual and constitutes an in addition to being a military government. Leaders such as [Idi Amin](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%99%D7%93%D7%99_%D7%90%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%9F), [Muammar Gaddafi](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A2%D7%9E%D7%A8_%D7%A7%D7%93%D7%90%D7%A4%D7%99) , and [Gamal Abdel Nasser](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%92%D7%9E%D7%90%D7%9C_%D7%A2%D7%91%D7%93_%D7%90%D7%9C_%D7%A0%D7%90%D7%A6%D7%A8) cultivated a [cult of personality](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%97%D7%9F_%D7%90%D7%99%D7%A9%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA) and became representatives of their country inside and outside it.

Most military regimes were established after [a coup](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%A4%D7%99%D7%9B%D7%94), but there are also other examples, such as [Saddam Hussein](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A1%D7%93%D7%90%D7%9D_%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A1%D7%99%D7%99%D7%9F) establishing martial law on the basis of the Baath Party regime.

In the past, military juntas justified their actions with the need to politically stabilize the country against dangerous ideologies. This has been justified by constructing a threat from these ideologies. In Latin America it was usually a threat from [communism](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%96%D7%9D) , while in the Middle East it was usually a threat from [Israel](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%99%D7%A9%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%9C) or Islam. Military regimes tended to portray themselves as necessary, taking the lead in times of turmoil, and portraying civilian rule as corrupt and ineffective. One of the most common features of military rule is the imposition of martial law or a perpetual emergency law.

Although there are exceptions, most military regimes attach little importance to [human rights](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%96%D7%9B%D7%95%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%90%D7%93%D7%9D) and do everything in their power to silence political opponents. A military regime rarely relinquishes its power unless it is pushed to do so by a popular, active or sizzling movement.

The most common places where military regimes are found are Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East. One possible reason for this is that the military is more cohesive and organized than most civilian bodies.

In other types of dictatorships, there are power factors that prevent the military from seizing power. For example, in communist regimes, the center of power is in the hands of a party, and a special mechanism (political officers or rotations) prevents the army from establishing an independent center of power.

Beginning in the 1970s, military regimes began to become less common and are being replaced by democratic regimes and regimes masquerading as democracy. The collapse [of the Soviet Union](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A2%D7%A6%D7%95%D7%AA) and the decline of bingo Shi tension made it difficult for military regimes to use communism to justify their existence and receive support. As a result [of the end of the Cold War](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%9C%D7%97%D7%9E%D7%94_%D7%94%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%94), most military regimes in Latin America disappeared and were replaced by democracies. In the Middle East, most military regimes (as in Syria and Egypt) have become other types of tyranny. Researchers Sergei And [Daniel Treisman](https://he.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%D7%95%D7%93%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%90%D7%9C_%D7%98%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%96%D7%9E%D7%9F&action=edit&redlink=1) argues that there are still openly and fully repressive rulers, but they are gradually being replaced [by spin-dictators](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A1%D7%A4%D7%99%D7%9F-%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%98%D7%98%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%9D) Overtly repressive regimes such as military rule requires violence and rules through fear. But many rulers have concluded that it pays more to masquerade as a democratic state and rule through [propaganda](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%AA%D7%A2%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%94)—the easier it is to win people's trust and cooperation—especially in economies that require [human](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%95%D7%9F_%D7%90%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%A9%D7%99)  capital and involve areas such as industry or services. In addition, open dictatorship makes it difficult to maintain [international trade](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A1%D7%97%D7%A8_%D7%91%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%9C%D7%90%D7%95%D7%9E%D7%99) , international investment, and integration into [globalization](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%92%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%96%D7%A6%D7%99%D7%94).

**conquest**

[Occupation](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9B%D7%99%D7%91%D7%95%D7%A9) is the existence of temporary military rule over another people. Unlike annexation or [colonialism,](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%90%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%96%D7%9D)  occupation is temporary .Annexation or colonialism used to be common, even by democratic countries, but they are gradually becoming accepted by non-democratic countries, especially powers like Russia or China.

Notable cases of occupation by democratic states include the [German occupation zones](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%96%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%99_%D7%94%D7%9B%D7%99%D7%91%D7%95%D7%A9_%D7%91%D7%92%D7%A8%D7%9E%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%94)  controlled by [the Allies](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%91%D7%A2%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%AA) from 1945 to 1949, the occupation [of Iraq](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A2%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%A7) in[2003](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/2003) to [2011](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/2011) by the United States and its allies as part of the [Iraq War](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%9C%D7%97%D7%9E%D7%AA_%D7%A2%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%A7) , and [the Israeli occupation of Judea and Samaria](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%A9%D7%9C%D7%98%D7%95%D7%9F_%D7%94%D7%99%D7%A9%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%9C%D7%99_%D7%91%D7%99%D7%94%D7%95%D7%93%D7%94_%D7%95%D7%A9%D7%95%D7%9E%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%9F) from 1967 to the present.

**Sultanism regime** is also rarely a classification in [political science](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%A2_%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%94) of a [tyrannical](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%95%D7%98%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%98%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA) [authoritarian regime](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A2%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%A5) characterized by high involvement of the ruler in all areas of government. The ruler may also be involved in [the economy](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9B%D7%9C%D7%9B%D7%9C%D7%94) and social life. If there is no such involvement, there may be some [pluralism](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%96%D7%9D) in them, but in any case the political power is in his hands.

The term "sultanism" originates from the term sultan, describing a sovereign ruler, usually monarch. The sultan usually held a "[secular](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%99%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA)" public role, while the caliph played the role of a religious ruler. However, the term describes modern regimes rather than those found in [the Middle East](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%96%D7%A8%D7%97_%D7%94%D7%AA%D7%99%D7%9B%D7%95%D7%9F) or Muslim countries.

[Max Weber](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A7%D7%A1_%D7%95%D7%91%D7%A8) wrote that sultanism may arise in any situation where the army and the administration are tools in the hands of their master; and power is exercised not on the basis of pre-agreed rules, but on the discretion of the tyrant.

The term was coined by [Juan Linz](https://he.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%D7%97%D7%95%D7%90%D7%9F_%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%A5&action=edit&redlink=1) and [Alfred Stefan](https://he.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%D7%90%D7%9C%D7%A4%D7%A8%D7%93_%D7%A9%D7%98%D7%A4%D7%9F&action=edit&redlink=1), among others .According to Linz and Stefan:

"The essence of existence in sultanist regimes is that all individuals, groups and institutions are constantly subject to the tyrannical involvement of the Sultan, so all pluralism is fragile."

A sultanist regime may be associated with [one ideological movement](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%99%D7%93%D7%90%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%92%D7%99%D7%94)  or another, but the sultan himself is never subject to ideological rules, not even his own ideology. The sultan may also use his powers to fulfill his personal will, establish [personal militias](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%A6%D7%99%D7%94) and/or [gangs](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9B%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%99%D7%94), or appoint relatives to key positions.

Linz and Stefan also gave examples of sultanist regimes:

* [Haiti under the](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%90%D7%99%D7%98%D7%99) Duvalier family ([François Duvalier](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%A8%D7%A0%D7%A1%D7%95%D7%90%D7%94_%D7%93%D7%95%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%94) and his son [Jean-Claude](https://he.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%D7%96%27%D7%90%D7%9F-%D7%A7%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%93_%D7%93%D7%95%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%99%D7%94&action=edit&redlink=1))
* [Dominican Republic](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%A8%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%94_%D7%94%D7%93%D7%95%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%AA) under [Rafael Trujillo](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%A4%D7%90%D7%9C_%D7%98%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%97%D7%99%D7%95)
* [Central African Republic](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%A8%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%91%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%94_%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%A8%D7%9B%D7%96_%D7%90%D7%A4%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%90%D7%99%D7%AA) under [Jean-Bedel Bokassa](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%96%27%D7%90%D7%9F-%D7%91%D7%93%D7%9C_%D7%91%D7%95%D7%A7%D7%90%D7%A1%D7%94)
* [Philippines](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%A4%D7%99%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%A4%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%9D) Under the rule of the Marcus family (headed by the father [Ferdinand Marcos](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%A8%D7%93%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%A0%D7%93_%D7%9E%D7%A8%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%A1))
* [Iran](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%90%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%9F) under [Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%97%D7%9E%D7%93_%D7%A8%D7%96%D7%90_%D7%A9%D7%90%D7%94_%D7%A4%D7%94%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%95%D7%99)
* [Romania](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%9E%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%94) Under the rule of the Ceausescu family (headed by [Nicolae Ceausescu](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%90%D7%94_%D7%A6%27%D7%90%D7%95%D7%A9%D7%A1%D7%A7%D7%95))
* [North Korea](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%90%D7%94_%D7%94%D7%A6%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%AA) under [Kim Il-sung](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A7%D7%99%D7%9D_%D7%90%D7%99%D7%9C-%D7%A1%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%92) and his son [Kim Jong Il](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A7%D7%99%D7%9D_%D7%96%27%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%92_%D7%90%D7%99%D7%9C)

It may be possible to include other regimes that have carried or carry a personal touch in this category, such as [Syria](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A1%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%94) under the rule of the Assad family ([Hafez al-Assad](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%97%D7%90%D7%A4%D7%96_%D7%90%D7%9C-%D7%90%D7%A1%D7%93) and his son [Bashar al-Assad](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%91%D7%A9%D7%90%D7%A8_%D7%90%D7%9C-%D7%90%D7%A1%D7%93) ;[Iraq](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A2%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%A7) under [Saddam Hussein](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A1%D7%93%D7%90%D7%9D_%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A1%D7%99%D7%99%D7%9F), [Cuba](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%91%D7%94) under the Castro brothers (led by [Fidel Castro](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A4%D7%99%D7%93%D7%9C_%D7%A7%D7%A1%D7%98%D7%A8%D7%95)) and [Venezuela](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%A6%D7%95%D7%90%D7%9C%D7%94) under [Hugo Chavez](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%94%D7%95%D7%92%D7%95_%D7%A6%27%D7%90%D7%95%D7%95%D7%A1).

**A popular democracy** or **people's republic is a** one-party [socialist-communist](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%A4%D7%9C%D7%92%D7%94) form of government [.](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%A7%D7%95%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%96%D7%9D)The term is also used by non-communist countries, and not all communist countries have been so named.

**The term** popular democracy means a [euphemism ,adopted](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%9E%D7%9B%D7%91%D7%A1%D7%AA_%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%9D) by communist regimes under the rule or occupation of [the Soviet Union](https://he.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%AA_%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A2%D7%A6%D7%95%D7%AA) or communist parties.