The Boundary Deficit

A field guide to the Threat–Mobilization–Securitization–Fragmentation Loop — and how the most adaptive state on earth can complete the governance architecture its founders left unfinished

Israel is not a failing state — it is a state that mastered survival but cannot achieve normalcy. This report diagnoses a Boundary Deficit produced by the constitutional vacuum, the occupation paradox, and a cultural operating system that converts political questions into existential imperatives.

Björn Kenneth Holmström

May 2026

Country Report · Israel

`https://bjornkennethholmstrom.org/reports/israel-boundary-deficit`

A Note on Language and Audience

This report is a diagnosis of Israel's governance architecture, written primarily for those who shape and sustain that architecture—the Hebrew-speaking public, policy community, civil society, and security establishment. Accordingly, the report has been translated into Hebrew, following the practice of previous reports in this series that were translated into the languages of the societies they examined.

The report does not address Palestinian governance in the West Bank and Gaza, nor is it directed primarily at Palestinian audiences. However, the analysis concerns the lives and rights of Palestinian citizens of Israel, the occupation of Palestinian territory, and the Israeli-Palestinian dynamic that shapes the governance challenges of both peoples. I have chosen not to translate the report into Arabic at this stage, while acknowledging that an Arabic version may be valuable. If Palestinian scholars, civil society actors, or other readers find the framework useful, I would welcome a future Arabic translation undertaken in dialogue with those communities.

Similarly, I have not translated the report into Yiddish. While Yiddish is the vernacular of some ultra-Orthodox communities, Hebrew is the language of Israeli governance, and the discourse this report seeks to engage takes place in Hebrew.

The series aims to speak to each society in its own linguistic and conceptual frame, without pretending that any single diagnosis is final or complete. This report is offered in that spirit—as a contribution to an ongoing conversation, open to correction, translation, and reinterpretation.

Executive Summary

The Paradox

Israel is among the most extraordinary governance achievements of the twentieth century. A state founded by a dispersed people in the aftermath of a genocide of unprecedented scale, it absorbed millions of refugees from over a hundred countries, revived a dead language as a living vernacular, built a modern economy and a globally dominant technology sector, and sustained competitive elections, a free press, and an independent judiciary through wars, terrorism, and existential threats that would have shattered less resilient societies. Its capacity for rapid mobilization, technological improvisation, and collective action under pressure is unmatched among the countries examined in this series. It possesses world-class military and intelligence capabilities, a vibrant civil society, and a population that remains, despite everything, deeply engaged in democratic life.

And yet the system remains trapped in recursive cycles of insecurity, internal fragmentation, constitutional conflict, and territorial contradiction. The state has never had internationally recognized borders. It has never adopted a formal constitution, despite the commitment in its Declaration of Independence to draft one. It maintains a military occupation over a population of several million Palestinians in the West Bank who have lived under Israeli rule for more than half a century without citizenship, without the right to vote for the government that governs them, and without the protection of the legal system that applies to Israeli citizens. It has fought repeated wars and absorbed repeated waves of violence, each of which has reinforced the conviction—held across much of the political spectrum—that security is the precondition for all other goods, and that the institutions of democratic deliberation must be subordinated to the imperatives of survival.

The result is a governance architecture that is simultaneously extraordinarily capable and constitutionally incomplete. Israel can execute, integrate, and sense with world-class sophistication. What it cannot do is resolve the foundational questions that any completed governance architecture must answer: What are its borders? Who is a citizen? What is the relationship between religion and state? What is the constitutional framework that protects individual rights against the power of the majority?

The Core Diagnosis: The Boundary Deficit—Contingency Lock-In

Israel does not lack capacity. It possesses extraordinary adaptive intelligence across its military, its technology sector, its civil society, and its democratic institutions. What it lacks is the ability to establish and stabilize foundational boundaries—territorial, constitutional, demographic, and identity-based—that would allow it to transition from permanent contingency and emergency governance to a sustainable, completed political order.

The state has never had internationally recognized borders—the 1949 armistice lines were explicitly not borders, and no Israeli government has ever defined the final territorial extent of the state. It has no formal written constitution, only a series of Basic Laws that are incomplete and that can be amended by a simple Knesset majority. It has never determined, in any authoritative and durable form, whether it is primarily a civic state of all its citizens—Jewish and Arab alike—or an ethnic state of the Jewish people, in which non-Jewish citizens possess individual rights but not collective national standing. It has never resolved the relationship between religious authority and democratic governance, leaving the Orthodox rabbinate in control of marriage, divorce, conversion, and aspects of public life. These are not peripheral disputes. They are unresolved operating parameters at the core of the governance architecture.

The Twin Deficits

Aspect	Outer (Hardware)	Inner (Operating System)
Strength	Rapid mobilization; technological innovation leadership; intelligence and military execution; immigrant absorption capacity; functional democracy under extreme pressure	Deep civilizational commitment; argumentative democratic energy; *Tikun Olam* ethical drive; high civic engagement; covenantal depth
Deficit	Incomplete constitutional architecture; occupation as semi-permanent governance layer; coalition fragmentation and veto dynamics; emergency powers that never retract; proportional representation trap	Boundary ambiguity around identity, legitimacy, and final status; securitization of politics crowds out normal deliberation; epistemic closure calibrated only to security metrics; ontological stacking without a Yellow translation layer
Manifestation	No formal constitution after 75 years; 57-year occupation with separate legal systems for two populations; average government lifespan of two years; five elections in four years (2019–2022); judicial reform crisis of 2023	*Ein Breira* survival mentality; *Balagan* improvisation; Covenant Consciousness that sacralizes identity questions; tension between security imperative and democratic norms

The Signature Pattern: The Threat–Mobilization–Securitization–Fragmentation–Renewed Threat Loop

Israel does not drift like Sweden, cycle like Brazil, or lurch like Russia. Its governance operates through a recurring loop driven by the interplay between external existential pressure and internal constitutional incompleteness.

Threat. External or perceived existential danger arrives—war, terrorism, regional hostility, October 7.

Mobilization. Threat generates rapid national cohesion. Political divisions temporarily narrow. The security cabinet assumes extraordinary authority. Reservists report for duty en masse. Civil society rallies. The deep internal divisions that characterize Israeli society are temporarily submerged.

Securitization and Expansion. As the immediate crisis is managed, emergency measures that were adopted as temporary become semi-permanent. Settlements expand. Surveillance architectures deepen. Military governance persists. Security logic colonizes civilian domains—education, law, economy, identity. The system increasingly treats long-term political contradictions as manageable through security management rather than political resolution. Occupation becomes administration. Exception becomes infrastructure.

Fragmentation. As the threat recedes, the internal contradictions that were submerged during mobilization re-emerge with renewed intensity. The absence of a formal constitution means there is no authoritative mechanism for resolving fundamental disagreements. The coalition system produces fragmented governments dependent on small, ideologically committed parties. The judiciary, which functions as a de facto constitutional check, is targeted by a majority that regards judicial independence as an obstacle. The cycle of protests and political crisis intensifies.

Renewed Threat. The next crisis arrives in a more polarized environment, reinforcing the conviction that security is the precondition for all other goods. The loop resets from a slightly more fragile baseline. The state is more militarily capable than before, but the constitutional foundations are slightly more eroded, the internal fractures slightly wider, the prospects for political settlement slightly more remote.

The Cultural Anchor: *Ein Breira* + *Balagan* + Covenant Consciousness + *Tikun Olam*

Israel's governance culture operates through four interlocking logics that together form a remarkable engine of survival and a powerful brake on political settlement.

- ***Ein Breira***
  ("There is no choice"): A civilizational survival mentality forged in the Holocaust and reinforced by decades of conflict. Produces extraordinary resilience and mobilization capacity. Also narrows perceived strategic flexibility—policies become framed as existential necessities rather than political choices.

- ***Balagan***
  ("Creative chaos"): Improvisation, informality, and disregard for hierarchy. Generates entrepreneurial dynamism, military adaptability, and innovation speed. Also weakens long-term procedural coherence—systems are patched rather than redesigned.

- **Covenant Consciousness:** The state is not merely an administrative entity but a historical fulfillment, a civilizational restoration, and a sacred continuity. Creates unusually deep emotional legitimacy. Also makes territorial compromise, identity pluralism, and constitutional neutrality extraordinarily difficult—politics becomes metaphysical.

- ***Tikun Olam*** **("Repair the world"):** The Jewish ethical tradition of social justice. The psychological foundation of Israel's extraordinary civil society, its independent judiciary, its human rights organizations, and its persistent culture of internal critique. Exists in permanent tension with *Ein Breira*—the demand for justice versus the imperative of survival.

The Constitutional Vacuum as Master Mechanism

The Harari Resolution of 1950—"we will adopt a constitution by parts"—was a pragmatic compromise that allowed the state to function while deferring the most divisive questions. Seventy-five years later, the constitution remains incomplete. Thirteen Basic Laws have been enacted, but they do not form a coherent framework. They can be amended by a simple Knesset majority. There is no entrenched bill of rights. There is no constitutional court with explicit authority to strike down legislation. The Supreme Court asserted that authority in 1995, but its role is contested. The only institution that fills the constitutional vacuum—the judiciary—is perpetually vulnerable to political attack. The judicial reform crisis of 2023 was not an aberration. It was the predictable output of a system in which the absence of a formal constitution means that the only meaningful constraint on majority power is the judiciary—and in which a determined majority will eventually attempt to remove that constraint.

The Occupation Paradox

Israel's military occupation of the West Bank is now in its sixth decade—the longest in modern history. It administers several million Palestinians who have no citizenship, no right to vote for the government that governs them, and no access to the legal protections that apply to Israeli citizens—while Israeli settlers in the same territory live under civil law and participate fully in democratic life. The occupation is simultaneously too costly to maintain (military, economic, diplomatic, moral) and too politically explosive to resolve (settler movement power, security fears, ideological commitment). The architecture of occupation—the Civil Administration, military courts, the settlement framework, the separation barrier, the permit system—has become a permanent governance structure with its own institutional logic and its own entrenched constituency. The system oscillates between containment, deterrence, and limited escalation without ever reaching stable equilibrium.

The Genuine Strengths

To describe the Boundary Deficit is not to dismiss what Israel has achieved. The technological and innovation ecosystem is genuinely world-class—more startups per capita than any other country, global leadership in cybersecurity, artificial intelligence, and agricultural technology. The military and intelligence capabilities are the product of a society that has invested, by necessity, in adaptive security. The immigrant absorption capacity is among the most successful integration projects in modern history. The civil society and democratic engagement are remarkable for a state under permanent security pressure: the protest movements, the free press, the independent judiciary, the NGO sector. These are the institutional and cultural substrate on which boundary resolution could build.

The Real Question

The standard governance reform agenda—strengthen institutions, improve service delivery, deepen democracy—does not address Israel's central challenge, because Israel's institutions are already strong, its service delivery is already functional, and its democracy is already vibrant. The problem is that the system's operating parameters—borders, citizenship, constitutional authority, the relationship between religion and state—have never been resolved, and the architecture for resolving them does not exist. The real question is not "how can Israel govern better?" but "how can Israel complete the governance architecture its founders left unfinished—establishing the stable boundaries that would allow security to become a condition for normal democratic life rather than a substitute for it?"

What Building Boundary Resolution Capacity Would Look Like

The transition architecture works with the grain of Israeli governance culture rather than against it. It does not attempt to replace the survival architecture but to supplement it with constitutional settlement architecture. *Constitutional Kaizen:* incremental Basic Laws, each with supermajority entrenchment, building the constitutional framework the Harari Resolution envisioned—a Basic Law: Equality establishing an entrenched floor for individual rights; a Basic Law: Civil Liberties; a Basic Law: The Judiciary clarifying the Supreme Court's role. *Security Detox:* sunset clauses on emergency regulations, a civilian-led National Security Council, strengthened Knesset oversight of the security establishment—restoring boundaries between emergency and normal governance. *Occupation Exit Strategy:* defining an end state, freezing settlement expansion outside the major blocs, differentiating between the blocs likely to be incorporated into Israel and the outliers that foreclose territorial compromise. *Electoral Reform:* a modestly higher threshold, constructive vote of no confidence, regional district elements—reducing the coalition veto cascade without abandoning proportional representation. *Deliberative Infrastructure:* a National Deliberative Commission on Constitutional Settlement—a citizens' assembly generating legitimate public mandates on questions the political system cannot answer. *Civic Integration Infrastructure:* joint economic zones, mixed municipal governance experiments, shared educational curricula—building the relationships that make boundary resolution politically survivable.

The Political Immune System: The Security First Responder

Israel's immune system is not a barrier to change added onto a functional state. It is the state's core operating logic—the comprehensive orientation of political, military, and cultural institutions toward the prioritization of security over all other values. The Security First Responder is sustained by the security establishment with extraordinary budgets and unchecked power, the defense-industrial complex with $13 billion in annual exports, the settler movement with a material and ideological stake in occupation, the religious establishment whose coalition leverage preserves the religion-state status quo, and a political class adapted to permanent instability. The Emergency Ratchet expands security powers with each crisis—powers that never fully retract. Epistemic closure ensures the system perceives only security metrics and remains blind to constitutional erosion, moral injury, and democratic decay. The coalition veto cascade blocks any reform that

threatens the interests of any significant faction. The coalition cannot be defeated by frontal assault. It must be outflanked—by building alternative governance pathways that demonstrate superior performance, by creating constituencies for constitutional completion, and by allowing the evidence of what works to shift the political equilibrium over time.

The Concrete First Step: The Basic Law: Equality and the National Deliberative Commission on Constitutional Settlement

Two parallel institutional innovations target the master mechanisms of the Boundary Deficit. A Basic Law: Equality would entrench the equal rights of all citizens regardless of religion, ethnicity, or gender, with a supermajority amendment requirement—establishing a constitutional floor beneath which the political process cannot sink, and fulfilling the Declaration of Independence's founding commitment. A National Deliberative Commission on Constitutional Settlement would be a standing citizens' assembly, demographically representative, provided with expert testimony and professional facilitation, charged with producing non-binding but publicly reasoned recommendations on the constitutional questions the political system cannot resolve: the religion-state relationship, the territorial question, the constitutional architecture. The Commission would create a parallel pathway for generating legitimate public mandates outside the coalition veto cascade, and its existence would change the political conditions within which the Knesset operates. Together, these innovations establish the informational and political conditions for the deeper transformations that must follow.

The Honest Conclusion

Israel's trajectory, under current conditions, is toward continued oscillation between threat-driven cohesion and internally-driven fragmentation, with each cycle eroding the institutional and social substrate slightly further. The coalition system blocks constitutional completion. The occupation deepens. The Emergency Ratchet expands security powers. The demographic pressures intensify. The default outcome is not transformation but deterioration—the slow, uneven erosion of democratic institutions under permanent emergency. But default outcomes are not inevitable outcomes. Israel possesses the adaptive genius, the institutional capacity, and the democratic culture to complete its governance architecture. The founders deferred the constitution because survival was at stake. Survival has been achieved. The task now is to complete the architecture that survival was meant to serve.

The Series Boundary Condition

Israel is the case that asks:

What happens when a state becomes extraordinarily adaptive to permanent emergency, but never resolves the boundaries that would allow emergency to end?

It is a state that mastered survival but cannot achieve normalcy—not because it lacks capacity, but because the architecture that enables survival is the same architecture that prevents settlement. The Boundary Deficit is the most distinctive diagnosis in the series. It reveals that resilience and equilibrium are not the same thing, and that a system can be both extraordinarily capable and constitutionally incomplete.

Series Coherence Table (Updated)

System	Core Deficit	Signature Pattern	Cultural Anchor	Transition Feasibility
Germany	Execution	Paralysed spending	Engineering rigour	Feasible
France	Integration	Reform-explosion-retreat	Jacobin clarity	Feasible
Sweden	Feedback	Drift loop (signal suppression)	*Saklighet*	Feasible
India	Synchronisation	Leap-lag cycle	*Jugaad*	Feasible
EU	Coherence	Negotiation-dilution	Subsidiarity	Feasible
UK	Control-delivery mismatch	Centralise-fail-centralise	Muddling through	Feasible
Brazil	Accumulation	Breakthrough-Capture	*Jeitinho*	Difficult but possible
Russia	Legibility	Control–Blindness–Shock	*Ne vysovyvaysya*	Impossible under current regime
USA	Integration	Escalate-Block-Bypass-Delegitimise	Bootstrap individualism	Possible via sub-federal
Finland	Throughput Constraint	Anticipate–Consensus–Increment–Pressure	*Sisu* + Quiet Consensus	Feasible
China	Calibration	Campaign–Overshoot–Abrupt Correction	*Míng zhé bǎo shēn*	Difficult; recoverable under current regime
Japan	Continuity Trap (Paradigm Lock-in)	Pressure–Accommodate–Preserve–Defer	*Wa* + *Kaizen* + *Gaman* + *Shouganai*	Feasible with controlled creative destruction
Nigeria	Substrate Deficit (State–Society Dissociation)	Extraction–Dissociation–Adaptation–Crisis	*Oga-Madam* + "The National Cake" + *Jugaad* + Pentecostal Resilience	Generational; feasible via interface-building from below
Israel	**Boundary Deficit (Contingency Lock-In)**	**Threat–Mobilization–Securitization–Fragmentation–Renewed Threat**	***Ein Breira** + **Balagan** + **Covenant***	**Difficult; requires constitutional settlement via**

System	Core Deficit	Signature Pattern	Cultural Anchor	Transition Feasibility
			Consciousness + *Tikun Olam	**incremental boundary stabilization**

Israel is the case that asks:

What happens when a state becomes extraordinarily adaptive to permanent emergency, but never resolves the boundaries that would allow emergency to end?

The Boundary Deficit is a condition of mastery without completion—a system that can do everything except finish its own architecture. The task is not to abandon the survival capacity that has kept Israel alive. It is to complete the governance architecture that survival was meant to serve.

1. The Boundary Deficit

1.1 Opening: The State That Mastered Survival

In the summer of 2023, Israel was convulsed by the largest protest movement in its history. For thirty-six consecutive weeks, hundreds of thousands of citizens filled the streets of Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, and Haifa, shutting down highways, blocking the airport, and walking out of their workplaces. The protests were not about borders, settlements, or the Palestinians. They were about the judiciary—specifically, about a proposed reform that would give the government effective control over judicial appointments and severely limit the Supreme Court's power to strike down legislation. The protesters carried signs reading "Democracy" and "Save the Supreme Court." They sang the national anthem. They invoked the Declaration of Independence. They were, by any measure, a remarkable display of democratic vitality.

Six months later, on October 7, Hamas breached the Gaza border fence and killed over a thousand Israelis—the deadliest single day for Jews since the Holocaust. Within hours, the protest movement evaporated. The opposition parties suspended their campaigns. A unity government was formed. Three hundred and sixty thousand reservists reported for duty. The judicial reform was shelved. The society that had been tearing itself apart over the proper role of judges coalesced around the imperative of survival.

This sequence—existential threat producing rapid national cohesion, internal fragmentation re-emerging as the threat recedes—is not an aberration. It is the signature pattern of Israeli governance. It has been running, in various forms, since 1948. And it has produced one of the most extraordinary governance achievements of the twentieth century alongside a constitutional architecture that remains, seventy-five years later, fundamentally incomplete.

Israel is not a failing state. It is a state that has mastered survival. Founded by a dispersed people in the aftermath of a genocide of unprecedented scale, it absorbed millions of refugees from over a hundred countries speaking dozens of languages, revived a dead language as a vernacular, built a modern economy and a globally dominant technology sector, and sustained competitive elections, a free press, and an independent judiciary through wars, terrorism, and existential threats that would have shattered less resilient societies. It possesses world-class military and intelligence capabilities, a vibrant civil society, and a population that remains, despite everything, deeply engaged in democratic life. Its capacity for rapid mobilization, technological improvisation, and collective action under pressure is unmatched among the countries examined in this series.

And yet the system remains trapped in recursive cycles of insecurity, internal fragmentation, constitutional conflict, and territorial contradiction. The state has never had internationally recognized borders. It has never adopted a formal constitution, despite the commitment in its Declaration of Independence to draft one. It maintains a military occupation over a population of several million Palestinians in the West Bank who have lived under Israeli rule for more than half a century without citizenship, without the right to vote for the

government that governs them, and without the protection of the legal system that applies to Israeli citizens. It has fought repeated wars and absorbed repeated waves of violence, each of which has reinforced the conviction—held across much of the political spectrum—that security is the precondition for all other goods, and that the institutions of democratic deliberation must be subordinated to the imperatives of survival.

The result is a governance architecture that is simultaneously extraordinarily capable and constitutionally incomplete. Israel can execute—its military and intelligence apparatus is world-class, its emergency response is swift, its technological innovation is globally competitive. It can integrate—its absorption of immigrants into a functioning society and economy is among the most successful integration projects in modern history. It can sense—its free press, its academic institutions, its robust civil society provide rich feedback about the condition of the society. What it cannot do is resolve the foundational questions that any completed governance architecture must answer: What are its borders? Who is a citizen? What is the relationship between religion and state? What is the constitutional framework that protects individual rights against the power of the majority?

This is the Boundary Deficit: the inability to establish stable, legitimate, and enforceable parameters around the foundational questions of territorial extent, constitutional authority, citizenship criteria, and national identity. It is not a failure of capacity. It is a failure of completion—an architecture that remains, by design and by default, constitutionally unfinished.

1.2 The Threat–Mobilization–Securitization–Fragmentation–Renewed Threat Loop

Israel does not drift like Sweden, cycle like Brazil, or lurch like Russia. Its governance operates through a recurring loop driven by the interplay between external existential pressure and internal constitutional incompleteness. The loop has been running since 1948, and each cycle simultaneously reinforces the state's extraordinary adaptive capacity and deepens its structural vulnerabilities.

Threat. External or perceived existential danger arrives—war, terrorism, regional hostility, rocket attacks, hostage crises, or geopolitical shocks. The October 7, 2023 Hamas attack is the most recent and devastating example, but the pattern predates it by decades: the 1948 War of Independence, the 1967 Six-Day War, the 1973 Yom Kippur War, the First and Second Intifadas, the 2006 Lebanon War, and repeated rounds of escalation in Gaza. Each threat is real, and the system's response to threat is its most impressive performance.

Mobilization. Threat generates rapid national cohesion. Political divisions temporarily narrow. The security cabinet assumes extraordinary authority. The opposition suspends political attacks. Civil society rallies around the state. Reservists report for duty en masse. The deep internal divisions that characterize Israeli society—secular versus religious, left versus right, Jewish versus Arab, Ashkenazi versus Mizrahi, judiciary versus executive—are temporarily submerged beneath a shared recognition of common danger. This phase represents the system at its most effective: coordinated, decisive, and collectively committed.

Securitization and Expansion. As the immediate crisis is managed, emergency measures that were adopted as temporary responses become semi-permanent structures. Settlements expand in the occupied territories, framed as security buffers. Surveillance architectures deepen. Military governance persists. Emergency powers normalize, and security reasoning expands into civilian governance—education, law, economy, identity. The system increasingly treats long-term political contradictions as manageable through security management rather than political resolution. Occupation becomes administration. Exception becomes infrastructure. The logic of survival colonizes domains that are, in principle, matters of democratic choice rather than existential necessity.

Fragmentation. As the external threat environment stabilizes temporarily—or as the costs of the securitization phase become visible—the internal contradictions that were submerged during the mobilization phase re-emerge with renewed intensity. The absence of a formal constitution means there is no authoritative mechanism for resolving the fundamental disagreements that divide Israeli society. The coalition system, structured around proportional representation with a low electoral threshold, produces fragmented governments dependent on the support of small, ideologically committed parties that can extract disproportionate concessions. The judiciary, which for decades functioned as a de facto constitutional check on executive and legislative power, becomes the target of political attack by a majority that regards judicial independence as an obstacle to its agenda. The cycle of protests and political crisis that characterized 2019–2023—five elections in four years, the judicial reform crisis, the largest protest movement in Israeli history—was the fragmentation phase of a loop set in motion by previous rounds of securitization and expansion.

Renewed Threat. The next crisis arrives in a more polarized environment, reinforcing the conviction that security is the precondition for all other goods, and that the institutions of democratic deliberation must be subordinated to the imperatives of survival. The loop resets, from a slightly more fragile baseline. The state is more militarily capable than before. Its emergency response is more practiced. But the constitutional foundations are slightly more eroded, the internal fractures slightly wider, the prospects for political settlement slightly more remote.

This is the Threat–Mobilization–Securitization–Fragmentation–Renewed Threat Loop. It is not a failure of competence. It is the predictable output of an architecture that was designed to survive under conditions of permanent emergency and that succeeded—so thoroughly that it never developed the capacity to transition from emergency to normalcy.

1.3 The Boundary Deficit Defined

The Boundary Deficit is not a classic governance failure of the kind this series has diagnosed elsewhere. It is not an execution deficit (Germany), an integration deficit (France, United States), a feedback deficit (Sweden), a paradigm lock-in (Japan), or even a substrate deficit (Nigeria). It is something more specific and more subtle: the indefinite postponement of the foundational constitutional and territorial settlement that would complete the governance architecture.

Every governance architecture rests on a set of operating parameters that are so basic they are rarely named. What territory does the state govern? Who are its citizens, and on what basis is citizenship determined? What is the constitutional framework that allocates authority among branches of government and protects individual rights against majority power? What is the relationship between the state and religious authority? These questions are not policy disputes to be resolved through ordinary democratic processes. They are the constitutional preconditions for those processes. They define the boundaries within which democratic life operates.

Israel has never established these boundaries. The state has no internationally recognized borders—the 1949 armistice lines were explicitly not borders, and no Israeli government has ever defined the final territorial extent of the state. It has no formal written constitution, only a series of Basic Laws that are incomplete and that can be amended by a simple Knesset majority. It has never determined, in any authoritative and durable form, whether it is primarily a civic state of all its citizens—Jewish and Arab alike—or an ethnic state of the Jewish people, in which non-Jewish citizens possess individual rights but not collective national standing. It has never resolved the relationship between religious authority and democratic governance, leaving the Orthodox rabbinate in control of marriage, divorce, conversion, and aspects of public life, while a growing population of Israelis—immigrants from the former Soviet Union who are not recognized as Jewish by the rabbinate, Reform and Conservative Jews whose movements are marginalized, the secular majority—are denied full religious citizenship.

The Boundary Deficit is not accidental. It was, in part, designed. The founders, unable to agree on the relationship between religion and state, adopted the Harari Resolution of 1950: instead of a single constitutional document, the Knesset would enact a series of Basic Laws that would eventually, when completed, form a constitution. The resolution was a pragmatic compromise that allowed the state to function while deferring the most divisive questions. But the deferral became permanent, and the permanent deferral became a structural vulnerability. The unresolved questions—borders, citizenship, religion, rights—are not peripheral disputes that can be deferred indefinitely. They are the operating parameters of the governance architecture, and their indefinite suspension means that the architecture itself remains permanently provisional.

The Boundary Deficit is the master mechanism from which Israel's other governance challenges descend. The coalition instability, the erosion of judicial independence, the status of Arab citizens, the relationship between religion and state, the preservation of democratic norms under permanent security pressure—all are downstream consequences of the foundational incompleteness at the heart of the system. The state can execute brilliantly within the existing architecture. It cannot complete the architecture itself.

1.4 The Constitutional Vacuum as Master Mechanism

The Harari Resolution of 1950 was a masterpiece of pragmatic deferral. The Constituent Assembly, elected in 1949 to draft a constitution, could not agree on the relationship between religion and state. The religious parties demanded that the constitution be based on Jewish law. The secular majority rejected this. Rather than

force a confrontation that might tear the new state apart, the Knesset adopted the resolution proposed by MK Yizhar Harari: the constitution would be written in chapters, each chapter a Basic Law, and the compilation of all chapters would eventually form the complete constitution.

Seventy-five years later, the constitution remains incomplete. Thirteen Basic Laws have been enacted. They address the structure of government—the Knesset, the President, the Government, the Judiciary, the military, Jerusalem as the capital—but they do not form a coherent constitutional framework. They are ordinary legislation that can be amended by a simple Knesset majority. There is no entrenched bill of rights—the Basic Law: Human Dignity and Liberty, enacted in 1992, provides partial protection but can be overridden by ordinary legislation under certain conditions. There is no constitutional court with the explicit authority to strike down legislation—the Supreme Court asserted that authority in the landmark 1995

Bank Mizrahi

decision, ruling that the Basic Laws have constitutional status and that the Court may invalidate ordinary legislation that contradicts them, but its authority to do so is contested, and the political branches have never formally accepted it. There is no clear hierarchy of norms, no definitive process for constitutional amendment, and no institution whose authority to adjudicate constitutional disputes is accepted by all major political actors.

This constitutional vacuum has functioned, for most of Israel's history, through an implicit elite consensus. The Supreme Court served as a de facto constitutional arbiter. The attorney general provided binding legal opinions that constrained government action. The security establishment operated within unwritten norms of professionalism and restraint. The coalition system, while fragmented, operated within a shared understanding that certain boundaries would not be crossed. This unwritten constitution worked, more or less, for decades—not because it was legally sound, but because the political elite shared a common background (largely secular, Ashkenazi, Labor Zionist) and a common commitment to the institutions they had built.

That elite consensus has collapsed. The political right, representing constituencies that were historically excluded from the founding elite—Mizrahi Jews, religious Zionists, ultra-Orthodox—has won repeated electoral majorities and regards the judiciary as a bastion of the old elite that must be brought under democratic control. The judiciary, for its defenders, represents the last meaningful constraint on majority power in a system without a constitution. The conflict between these positions is not a policy dispute. It is a legitimacy crisis over the source of authority itself: does sovereignty reside in the elected majority, or in the constitutional principles that constrain it? In a system with a formal constitution, that question would be answered by the constitution itself—the document that the founders never wrote.

The judicial reform crisis of 2023 was not an aberration. It was the predictable output of a system in which the absence of a formal constitution means that the only meaningful constraint on majority power is the judiciary—and in which a determined majority will eventually attempt to remove that constraint. The crisis

was temporarily suspended by the October 7 attack and the unity government that followed. The underlying architecture has not changed. When the emergency recedes, the constitutional vacuum will remain, and the forces that produced the crisis will re-emerge, likely with greater intensity.

1.5 The Occupation Paradox

Israel's military occupation of the West Bank, now in its sixth decade, is the longest military occupation in modern history. It is not a temporary security measure awaiting diplomatic resolution. It is a permanent governance structure that has developed a dense and sophisticated institutional architecture: the Civil Administration that manages the daily life of millions of Palestinians, the military courts that dispense justice to a population without citizenship, the settlement regulatory framework that governs the lives of over 700,000 Israeli settlers living in the same territory but under Israeli civil law, the separation barrier that cuts through communities, the checkpoints and permit system that regulate movement, and the security apparatus—the IDF, the Shin Bet, the Border Police—that enforces the whole arrangement.

This architecture administers a population of several million Palestinians who have no citizenship, no right to vote for the government that governs them, and no access to the legal protections that apply to Israeli citizens—while Israeli settlers in the same territory live under Israeli civil law, vote in Israeli elections, and participate fully in Israeli democratic life. It is a system of separate legal regimes for two populations living on the same land, distinguished by ethnicity and national identity. The occupation has normalized the administration of populations without rights. It has created a class of citizens—settlers—who have a material and ideological stake in the perpetuation of the occupation and who exercise disproportionate political influence. It has generated a permanent security apparatus whose institutional interests are served by the continuation of the conflict. And it has made the resolution of the Boundary Deficit impossible, because any territorial compromise would require confronting a settler movement that has become, through the coalition system, one of the dominant forces in Israeli politics and that regards the West Bank as an inalienable part of the Jewish homeland.

The paradox of the occupation is that it is simultaneously too costly to maintain and too politically explosive to resolve. The costs are real: the military and economic burden of securing an occupied population, the diplomatic isolation and international legitimacy costs (International Criminal Court warrants, UN resolutions, BDS movement pressure), the moral injury to a society whose ethical traditions—

Tikun Olam

, the imperative to repair the world—are in permanent tension with the reality of governing another people without their consent, and the demographic threat that indefinite occupation poses to the Jewish and democratic character of the state. But the costs of ending the occupation are also real: the security risks of withdrawal (the Gaza precedent, where withdrawal in 2005 was followed by Hamas control and repeated rocket attacks), the political impossibility of evacuating hundreds of thousands of settlers whose leadership is

embedded in the governing coalition, and the ideological and religious conviction, deeply held by a significant portion of the population, that the West Bank is not occupied territory but the biblical heartland of the Jewish people—Judea and Samaria—that cannot be surrendered.

The system oscillates between these poles—containment, deterrence, limited escalation, partial normalization—without ever reaching stable equilibrium. Each round of violence reinforces the security case for continued occupation. Each year of continued occupation deepens the facts on the ground that make withdrawal more difficult. The occupation has become what systems theory calls a "wicked problem": a condition that cannot be solved within the framework that produced it, but whose resolution requires a change in the framework itself.

1.6 Ontological Stacking Without a Yellow Translation Layer

Israel does not operate at a single developmental stage. Viewed through the lens of Spiral Dynamics, the country exhibits severe "ontological stacking": distinct operating systems, each with its own logic, values, and governance expectations, are forced into the same centralized political arena without a mediating translation layer.

Tel Aviv and its orbit operate on Orange and Green logic—globalized, rational, individualistic, and pluralistic. This is the Israel of the Startup Nation, of the tech entrepreneurs and the venture capital funds, of the LGBTQ+ community and the secular creative class, of the universities and the hospitals that rank among the world's best, of the protest movements that fill the streets in defense of democracy and human rights. This Israel expects governance to be transparent, meritocratic, rights-based, and oriented toward the future.

Jerusalem, Bnei Brak, and the religious settlements operate on Blue and Purple logic—traditional, absolutist, and religious-covenantal. This is the Israel of the yeshiva students and the rabbinical courts, of the settlers who see themselves as fulfilling a divine mandate, of the ultra-Orthodox communities that maintain their own educational systems and welfare networks largely outside the state's administrative reach. This Israel expects governance to be faithful, authoritative, and oriented toward the preservation of sacred identity.

The West Bank and the frontiers operate on Red and Blue logic—power-driven survivalism, military dominance, and territorial tribalism. This is the Israel of the IDF checkpoints and the Civil Administration, of the settlers who confront Palestinian villagers, of the Hilltop Youth who establish unauthorized outposts, of the Shin Bet interrogations and the night raids. This Israel expects governance to be coercive, decisive, and oriented toward the assertion of control.

These worldviews are not merely different political opinions that can be negotiated within a shared institutional framework. They are fundamentally different frameworks for what governance is and whom it serves. The Orange/Green Tel Aviv expects a state that protects individual rights, fosters innovation, and

integrates into global networks. The Blue/Purple Jerusalem expects a state that preserves Jewish identity, upholds religious law, and fulfills a sacred mission. The Red/Blue West Bank expects a state that projects power, defends territory, and dominates enemies.

In a governance architecture with a Stage Yellow integration mechanism, these incompatible ontologies would be accommodated through a differentiated structure—perhaps overlapping sovereignties, decentralized authority, or nested governance layers that allow each worldview to govern its own domain while sharing a common framework for coordination. Israel possesses no such mechanism. The proportional representation system forces all factions into a single, winner-take-all arena. The constitutional vacuum means there is no higher-order framework within which their conflicts can be adjudicated. The result is that every election becomes an existential threat to the factions that lose, and every policy dispute becomes a legitimacy crisis over the character of the state itself. The ontological stacking is not a pathology. It is a description of a deeply plural society. The absence of a Yellow translation layer is the architectural failure that makes that diversity ungovernable.

1.7 The Genuine Strengths

To describe the Boundary Deficit is not to dismiss what Israel has achieved. The country possesses extraordinary capacities that any governance architecture would envy.

The technological and innovation ecosystem is genuinely world-class. Israel has more startups per capita than any other country, more venture capital investment as a share of GDP, and a concentration of research and development activity that has produced global leadership in cybersecurity, artificial intelligence, agricultural technology, and medical devices. This is not merely an economic asset. It is a governance resource—a population accustomed to rapid iteration, decentralized experimentation, and pragmatic problem-solving under resource constraints.

The military and intelligence capabilities are the product of a society that has invested, by necessity, in adaptive security. The IDF's reserve system maintains a large, trained civilian population that can be mobilized rapidly. Unit 8200, the signals intelligence corps, has become a feeder for the tech sector, creating a feedback loop between security and innovation that has no parallel elsewhere. The operational capacity that enabled Israel to intercept 99% of the Iranian drone and missile barrage in April 2024—in coordination with international partners—demonstrates a level of adaptive military competence that few states can match.

The immigrant absorption capacity is one of the most successful integration projects in modern history. Israel has absorbed Jewish immigrants from over a hundred countries, speaking dozens of languages, with vastly different cultural backgrounds and economic starting points, and converted them into a functioning workforce, a democratic citizenry, and a shared national identity within a generation or two. This capacity for integration under conditions of extreme diversity is a governance achievement that the European states struggling with immigration could learn from.

The civil society and democratic engagement are remarkable for a state under permanent security pressure. Israeli protest movements have repeatedly demonstrated the capacity to mobilize hundreds of thousands of citizens in defense of democratic institutions. The free press is robust and critical. The NGO sector is active and internationally connected. The Supreme Court, for all the controversy surrounding its role, has produced a body of jurisprudence that has protected individual rights, constrained executive overreach, and held the security apparatus to legal account. These are not small achievements. They are the institutional and cultural substrate on which boundary resolution could build—if the system can acquire the political will to complete its own architecture.

1.8 The Real Question

The standard governance reform agenda—strengthen institutions, improve service delivery, deepen democracy—does not address Israel's central challenge, because Israel's institutions are already strong, its service delivery is already functional, and its democracy is already, in many respects, vibrant. The problem is not that the system fails to perform its basic functions. It is that the system's operating parameters—borders, citizenship, constitutional authority, the relationship between religion and state—have never been resolved, and the architecture for resolving them does not exist.

The real question, then, is not "how can Israel govern better?" but "how can Israel complete the governance architecture its founders left unfinished?" How can it establish the stable, legitimate, and enforceable boundaries—territorial, constitutional, demographic, and identity-based—that would allow it to transition from permanent emergency to sustainable democratic order? How can it build the translation layer that would allow the incompatible worldviews within its society to coexist within a shared framework rather than fighting for total dominance? How can it resolve the paradox of an occupation that is simultaneously unsustainable and unresolvable within the current architecture?

These are not questions of policy. They are questions of constitutional design, and they require the kind of constitutional settlement that Israel has deferred for seventy-five years. The resources for that settlement exist. The institutional capacity is present. The human capital is formidable. What is missing is the political will—and the political will is missing because the Boundary Deficit benefits powerful constituencies that have no incentive to resolve it, and because the Threat–Mobilization–Securitization–Fragmentation–Renewed Threat Loop ensures that the society is perpetually diverted from the question of its own completion by the imperatives of its own survival. The loop is self-reinforcing. The question is whether it can be broken—and whether Israel can complete its architecture before the architecture's incompleteness becomes the source of its undoing.

2. The Boundary Deficit: Structural Mechanisms

2.1 What "Boundary Resolution Capacity" Means

Every governance architecture rests on a set of fundamental parameters that delimit its operating space. These parameters are not policies, which can be adjusted through ordinary legislative processes. They are the constitutional preconditions for policy-making itself. They answer the questions that must be settled before routine governance can function: What territory does the state govern, and where are its borders? Who is a citizen, and on what basis is citizenship acquired or revoked? What is the relationship between the state and religious authority? What is the constitutional framework that allocates power among branches of government and protects individual rights against the majority? What is the ultimate source of sovereignty—the people, the constitution, divine mandate, or the security imperative?

In most stable democracies, these questions were resolved long ago, often through processes of violent conflict, constitutional convention, or gradual evolution that are now taken for granted. The answers are embedded in institutions that have become so naturalized as to be invisible. In Israel, none of these questions has been authoritatively resolved. They remain live, contested, and perpetually deferred.

Boundary resolution capacity is the ability to establish stable, legitimate, and enforceable answers to these foundational questions—not as a matter of temporary political consensus but as a constitutional settlement that commands broad acceptance across the major factions of society. It is distinct from policy-making capacity, which Israel possesses in abundance. The state can execute military operations with extraordinary precision. It can regulate its technology sector with sophistication. It can manage complex logistical challenges under fire. What it cannot do is complete its own constitutional architecture—because the political mechanisms for doing so are blocked by the very fragmentation that the constitutional vacuum generates.

Understanding why boundary resolution has been impossible, and how the mechanisms that prevent it reinforce each other, is the task of this section.

2.2 The Constitutional Vacuum

The Harari Resolution of 1950 is one of the most consequential acts of deferral in modern constitutional history. The Constituent Assembly, elected to draft a constitution, was divided on the fundamental question of the new state's identity. The religious parties insisted that the constitution be based on Torah law; the secular majority refused. Rather than force a confrontation that might tear the fragile state apart, the Knesset adopted the proposal of MK Yizhar Harari: the constitution would be written in stages, each stage a Basic Law, and the compilation of all Basic Laws would, upon completion, constitute the formal constitution of the State of Israel.

Seventy-five years later, the constitution remains a work in progress—and the progress has effectively stalled. Thirteen Basic Laws have been enacted, addressing the structure of government: the Knesset, the President, the Government, the Judiciary, the Israel Defense Forces, Jerusalem as the capital, and, in 1992, the Basic Laws on Human Dignity and Liberty and Freedom of Occupation, which provide partial constitutional protection for individual rights. But the Basic Laws do not form a coherent constitutional framework. They are ordinary legislation that can be amended by a simple majority of the Knesset, with no special entrenchment for most provisions. There is no comprehensive bill of rights. There is no constitutional court with explicitly granted authority to strike down ordinary legislation. The Supreme Court's assertion of judicial review in the 1995

Bank Mizrahi

decision—that the Basic Laws constitute Israel's constitution and that the Court may invalidate legislation that contradicts them—was a creative judicial response to the constitutional vacuum, but it has never been formally accepted by the political branches, and its legitimacy is increasingly contested.

The vacuum generates several structural consequences. First, there is no authoritative mechanism for resolving fundamental disagreements. When the Knesset and the judiciary clash over the limits of legislative power, there is no higher constitutional text or institution to adjudicate the dispute. Each branch claims ultimate authority, and the conflict becomes a legitimacy crisis rather than a legal question. Second, the absence of a bill of rights with entrenched status means that individual rights—including those of minorities—are vulnerable to majoritarian override. The Basic Law: Human Dignity and Liberty provides protection, but it can be limited by ordinary legislation that meets certain conditions, and it does not explicitly protect equality, language rights, or freedom of religion. Third, the constitutional vacuum creates a permanent temptation for the majority to use its legislative power to eliminate the institutional checks that constrain it. The 2023 judicial reform crisis was the most dramatic expression of this dynamic, but it was not an aberration. It was the predictable output of a system in which the only meaningful constraint on majority power is the judiciary, and the majority can, in principle, eliminate that constraint through ordinary legislation.

For decades, the constitutional vacuum was managed through an implicit elite consensus. The Supreme Court, the attorney general, the security establishment, and the political leadership operated within unwritten norms that constrained their behavior even in the absence of formal constitutional rules. That consensus rested on a common background—the founding elite was largely secular, Ashkenazi, and Labor Zionist—and a shared commitment to the institutions they had built. That consensus has collapsed, as the political center of gravity has shifted toward constituencies—Mizrahi Jews, religious Zionists, ultra-Orthodox—that were historically excluded from the founding elite and that regard the judiciary as a bastion of that elite's power. The constitutional vacuum that was manageable under conditions of elite homogeneity has become destabilizing under conditions of deep social fragmentation. The unwritten constitution no longer functions, and the written one has never been completed.

2.3 The Proportional Representation Trap

Israel's electoral system is among the most purely proportional in the democratic world. The entire country is a single electoral district. Any party that secures at least 3.25 percent of the national vote—a threshold raised from 2 percent in 2014 and from 1.5 percent originally—receives a proportional share of seats in the 120-member Knesset. The system was designed to ensure representation for the diverse communities that compose Israeli society: secular and religious, Ashkenazi and Mizrahi, Jewish and Arab, left and right. It succeeds at that purpose. No significant social group is excluded from the legislature.

The system also produces chronic governmental instability and a permanent incapacity for long-horizon governance. Because no party has ever won a majority of Knesset seats, every government is a coalition. Coalition-building requires assembling a majority from parties that disagree on fundamental questions—the status of the occupied territories, the role of religion in public life, the balance between the judiciary and the legislature, economic policy. The negotiations are intense, the agreements fragile, and the governments short-lived. The average lifespan of an Israeli government since 1996 has been approximately two years. Between 2019 and 2022, Israel held five elections in four years, an extraordinary cycle of political paralysis that ended only when a narrow coalition was formed in December 2022—a coalition that then fractured over the judicial reform crisis within months.

The low threshold empowers small, ideologically committed parties to exercise disproportionate influence. The ultra-Orthodox parties—Shas and United Torah Judaism—have been indispensable coalition partners for most governments since the 1980s, giving them effective veto power over matters of religion and state: military conscription exemptions for yeshiva students, state funding for religious institutions, the Orthodox rabbinate's monopoly over marriage and conversion, Sabbath observance regulations. The religious Zionist parties, representing the settler movement, have similarly leveraged their coalition position to expand settlements, legalize outposts, and block territorial compromise. These parties represent a minority of the electorate but can extract concessions that would be impossible in a majoritarian system, because coalition formation is a matter of arithmetic rather than ideology, and the arithmetic of Israeli politics almost always requires their participation.

This is the Coalition Veto Cascade: each small party can block reforms that would threaten its core interests, ensuring that only incremental adjustments and emergency responses clear the system. Major constitutional reforms—a formal bill of rights, electoral reform, a resolution of the occupation—require assembling a majority that includes parties whose interests are served by the continuation of the current arrangements. The result is a system that is structurally biased toward the status quo, even when the status quo is visibly deteriorating.

The proportional representation trap interacts with the constitutional vacuum in a self-reinforcing cycle. The constitutional vacuum makes it impossible to establish the framework within which majoritarian decisions could be made legitimately. The proportional representation system fragments the legislature, preventing the emergence of the stable majority that might complete the constitutional framework. The fragmentation

ensures that only emergency responses and incremental accommodations clear the system. The absence of constitutional settlement deepens the fragmentation, because the stakes of every election are existential—if there is no constitutional framework that protects the interests of all factions, then every faction must fight for total dominance in every electoral cycle. The loop tightens with each iteration.

2.4 The Occupation as Governance Architecture

The Israeli military occupation of the West Bank is now in its sixth decade. It began in 1967 as a temporary security measure following the Six-Day War. It has become a permanent governance structure, with its own institutional logic, its own administrative apparatus, and its own deeply entrenched interests.

The architecture of occupation is dense and sophisticated. The Civil Administration, a unit of the Ministry of Defense, manages the daily life of several million Palestinians—building permits, land registration, water allocation, movement permits, commercial licensing. The military courts, operating under a separate legal system from the civilian courts that serve Israelis, adjudicate criminal and security cases for the Palestinian population, with conviction rates exceeding 99 percent and procedures that fall far short of the standards applied to Israeli defendants. The settlements—over 700,000 Israeli citizens living in the West Bank and East Jerusalem—are governed by Israeli civil law, with their own municipal governments, their own infrastructure, their own connections to the Israeli economy, while their Palestinian neighbors live under military rule. The separation barrier, partly wall and partly fence, cuts through communities, separating farmers from their fields, children from their schools, and families from each other. The checkpoints and the permit system regulate movement in ways that are justified by security but that function, in practice, as a comprehensive regime of control over an entire population.

This architecture administers two populations living on the same territory under entirely different legal systems, distinguished by ethnicity and national identity. For a Palestinian in the West Bank, the state that governs their daily life—that decides whether they can build a home, travel to a hospital, or enter Israel for work—is a state in which they have no vote, no citizenship, and no rights. For an Israeli settler, the same territory is governed by the same democratic institutions that govern Tel Aviv, with the full panoply of civil rights and political participation. The asymmetry is not a temporary anomaly. It is the operational logic of a system that has been in place for more than half a century.

The occupation has generated its own constituency for perpetuation. The settler movement, with over 700,000 people living in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, is the most powerful political force in contemporary Israel. Its leadership is embedded in the governing coalition. Its ideology—that the West Bank is not occupied territory but the biblical heartland of the Jewish people, Judea and Samaria, which cannot be surrendered—is shared by a significant portion of the Israeli public. The practical implications are immense. Evacuating the settlements, even as part of a negotiated peace agreement, would be one of the most logistically and politically challenging operations any democracy has ever attempted, requiring the relocation of hundreds of thousands of citizens, many of whom would resist. No Israeli government has been willing or able to confront this challenge.

The security establishment has developed its own institutional interest in the continuation of the occupation. The IDF, the Shin Bet, the Border Police, and the intelligence agencies have built careers, budgets, and operational doctrines around the management of the occupied territories. The occupation provides a permanent mission, a permanent flow of resources, and a permanent justification for the exceptional powers that the security apparatus exercises. This does not mean that the security establishment conspires to perpetuate the occupation. It means that the institutional habits, the career incentives, and the doctrinal frameworks that have developed over fifty-seven years are all oriented toward the continuation of the status quo rather than its resolution.

The paradox of the occupation is that it is simultaneously unsustainable and unresolvable within the current architecture. The costs are accumulating: the military and economic burden of securing an occupied population indefinitely, the diplomatic isolation and international legitimacy damage, the moral injury to a society that prides itself on ethical traditions while governing another people without their consent, the demographic threat that indefinite occupation poses to the Jewish and democratic character of the state. But the political mechanisms for ending the occupation are blocked by the very coalition system that the occupation has helped to shape. The settlers are indispensable coalition partners. The security establishment's institutional interests are aligned with continuation. The electoral system ensures that any government that attempted a major territorial withdrawal would be immediately vulnerable to a new coalition being formed to block it. The occupation is locked in, not by the absence of alternatives but by the architecture of governance itself.

2.5 The Emergency Ratchet and the Deferral Compounding Effect

Israel has been in a state of emergency since its founding. The British Mandate's Defence (Emergency) Regulations of 1945 were incorporated into Israeli law in 1948 through the Law and Administration Ordinance, and the state of emergency declared at that time has been renewed continuously ever since. It has never been lifted, not even during periods of relative calm. The state of emergency is, in legal terms, the baseline condition of Israeli governance.

The Emergency Ratchet operates as follows: each crisis—a war, an intifada, a wave of terrorism, a security emergency—generates new emergency powers, new surveillance capacities, new restrictions on movement, new justifications for military action. These powers are adopted as temporary measures, necessary for the duration of the crisis. When the crisis recedes, the powers are not fully rescinded. They are retained, normalized, incorporated into the permanent administrative apparatus. The next crisis adds another layer. Over decades, the accumulation of emergency powers has created a governance architecture in which security logic pervades domains that are, in principle, matters of democratic choice rather than existential necessity.

The result is a one-way drift toward securitized governance. The emergency has no off-ramp, because each cycle of the loop adds new capacities that are then treated as permanent, and the permanent accumulation of security powers makes it harder to imagine a return to normal civilian governance. The distinction between

emergency and normalcy has been progressively erased—not through a deliberate decision but through the incremental expansion of the security apparatus across successive crises.

The Deferral Compounding Effect intensifies this dynamic. Each foundational question that is deferred—the constitution, the borders, the status of the occupied territories, the relationship between religion and state—makes the next deferral both more necessary and more costly. The occupation becomes more entrenched with each passing year, as settlements expand and the settler population grows. The constitutional vacuum becomes more destabilizing with each electoral cycle, as the fragmentation deepens and the legitimacy of institutions erodes. The demographic pressures intensify with each passing decade, as the Haredi and Arab populations grow faster than the secular Jewish population, making the questions of citizenship and national identity more acute. The system becomes path-dependent on non-settlement: the longer foundational decisions are deferred, the harder they become to make, and the harder they become to make, the longer they are deferred.

The Emergency Ratchet and the Deferral Compounding Effect together create a structural dynamic in which the system drifts toward a future that nobody chose and that nobody can reverse. It is not a conspiracy. It is the emergent property of an architecture that was designed to manage permanent emergency and that succeeded so thoroughly that it never developed the capacity to end it.

2.6 The Religion-State Nexus

The relationship between religion and state in Israel is governed by what is often called the "status quo"—a set of arrangements reached in the early years of statehood that granted the Orthodox rabbinate control over crucial domains of personal and public life. The Chief Rabbinate, an exclusively Orthodox institution, determines who is a Jew for purposes of immigration and citizenship under the Law of Return. It controls marriage and divorce for Jews—there is no civil marriage in Israel, and Jews who wish to marry outside the rabbinate must do so abroad. It supervises dietary laws in public institutions. It influences Sabbath observance in the public sphere, including restrictions on public transportation and commerce. The arrangements extend to funding for religious schools, military exemptions for yeshiva students, and the recognition of conversion performed by non-Orthodox movements.

These arrangements have persisted for seven decades, not because they command majority support—polls consistently show that a majority of Israeli Jews favor some form of civil marriage and reduced religious coercion—but because the coalition system empowers religious parties far beyond their electoral weight. Shas and United Torah Judaism, representing the ultra-Orthodox community, have been indispensable coalition partners for most governments. They have used this leverage to preserve and expand the status quo arrangements, blocking reforms that would introduce civil marriage, recognize non-Orthodox conversions, end the yeshiva exemption from military service, or reduce state funding for religious institutions.

The result is a state in which a significant portion of the population is denied full religious citizenship. The over 400,000 immigrants from the former Soviet Union who are not recognized as Jewish by the rabbinate—because they do not meet the Orthodox definition of Jewish descent—cannot marry in Israel, cannot be buried in Jewish cemeteries, and face restrictions on their children's recognition as Jews. Reform and Conservative Jews, who represent the largest denominations of Judaism outside Israel, have their movements marginalized and their conversions unrecognized. The secular majority lives under Sabbath restrictions that it does not support, imposed by a religious establishment it does not accept. The ultra-Orthodox community receives state funding for institutions that systematically exclude secular education and that produce a population with limited workforce participation and high dependency on state welfare.

The religion-state nexus is a permanent source of constitutional tension that the political system cannot resolve. Any attempt to reform the status quo triggers a coalition crisis, because the religious parties threaten to bring down the government. Any government that depends on religious party support cannot reform the religious establishment. And because no government has ever been formed without the support of at least some religious parties, the status quo has proven remarkably durable. The tension between a modern, secular, globally integrated society and a religious establishment that exercises coercive legal authority over personal status is one of the deepest fault lines in Israeli governance, and it remains—like every other foundational question—constitutionally unresolved.

2.7 The Arab-Jewish Divide as Governance Fault Line

Palestinian citizens of Israel—approximately 21 percent of the population, or roughly two million people—formally possess equal rights under Israeli law. They vote, they are represented in the Knesset, they serve in certain public institutions. In practice, their experience of the state is fundamentally different from that of Jewish citizens, and this asymmetry has been formalized in Basic Law.

The Nation-State Law of 2018—formally the Basic Law: Israel as the Nation-State of the Jewish People—declared that the right to exercise national self-determination in the State of Israel is unique to the Jewish people. It downgraded Arabic from an official language to a "special status." It stated that the state views Jewish settlement as a national value and shall encourage and promote its development. The law did not, in its specific provisions, change the legal status of Arab citizens. What it changed was the constitutional framing of the state's identity: Israel is not, in its own Basic Law, a state of all its citizens. It is the nation-state of the Jewish people, and non-Jewish citizens, however equal their individual rights, do not possess collective national standing.

The Arab-Jewish divide manifests in material inequality. Arab municipalities receive systematically less funding than Jewish ones. Arab communities have less access to land, more difficulty obtaining building permits, and less developed infrastructure. Arab citizens face discrimination in employment, housing, and law enforcement. The poverty rate among Arab Israelis is approximately three times that among Jewish

Israelis. Educational outcomes are persistently lower. The state has never included an Arab political party in a governing coalition, and the major parties have historically either marginalized Arab voices or treated them as a demographic threat to be managed.

The divide is not merely social or economic. It is constitutional. The state has never resolved whether it is a civic state of all its citizens, in which Jewish and Arab citizens share a common national identity, or an ethnic state of the Jewish people, in which Arab citizens possess individual rights but not collective belonging. The Nation-State Law was an attempt to resolve this question in law—by declaring that Israel is the nation-state of the Jewish people alone. But the resolution is contested, and the contestation will intensify as the Arab population grows and as the demands for full civic equality become more insistent.

The Arab-Jewish divide interacts with the occupation in ways that compound the Boundary Deficit. Palestinian citizens of Israel share an ethnic and cultural identity with the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza. They experience the occupation of their people's territory as a moral crisis, even as they navigate their own position as citizens of the state that maintains it. The Arab political leadership in Israel is increasingly vocal in its demands for collective rights, not merely individual equality—recognition as a national minority, cultural autonomy, proportional representation in state institutions. These demands challenge the foundational premise of the state as it is currently constituted, and the political system has no mechanism for addressing them. The Arab-Jewish fault line is not a temporary tension to be managed. It is a structural feature of an architecture that has never determined its own boundaries—and that cannot determine them without confronting the question of what kind of state it aspires to be.

2.8 The Shifting the Burden Archetype: Civil Society Bypass

One of the most remarkable features of Israeli governance is the extent to which the society has learned to route around the state. Because the central government is frequently gridlocked by coalition fragmentation, the private sector, civil society organizations, and informal networks have developed the capacity to coordinate, mobilize, and deliver services without state direction—and often more effectively than the state itself.

This dynamic was dramatically visible in the aftermath of October 7, 2023. In the chaos of the first days of the war, with government ministries slow to respond and the military focused on combat operations, civilian networks mobilized with extraordinary speed. Logistics hubs were established to supply displaced families from the Gaza envelope. Mental health professionals volunteered crisis counseling. The tech sector built platforms to connect evacuees with resources. Restaurants prepared meals for soldiers. Diaspora organizations raised hundreds of millions of dollars. The state, initially overwhelmed, eventually caught up—but the initial response was driven by civil society, not government.

This pattern is not unique to the war. Israel's startup ecosystem operates with minimal government support, driven by venture capital, entrepreneurial networks, and the skills cultivated in military intelligence units. The ultra-Orthodox community maintains its own extensive welfare and educational infrastructure, largely

outside state control. The settler movement has built an elaborate network of institutions—housing, roads, security—that operates with state funding but with considerable autonomy. The protest movements against the judicial reform in 2023 were organized largely through civil society networks rather than political parties, reflecting a broader shift in how Israelis engage with collective action.

From a systems perspective, this is a classic "Shifting the Burden" archetype. In the short term, the civil society bypass solves immediate problems that the state cannot address. It maintains social cohesion, delivers essential services, and preserves the functionality of society even when the political system is paralyzed. But over the long term, it starves the state of the feedback and pressure that would be required for reform. If the population can secure healthcare, education, security, and even national defense through non-state networks, the urgency of fixing the state diminishes. The bypass becomes a substitute for governance improvement rather than a spur to it.

The shifting of the burden also creates a legitimacy problem. The civil society networks that actually deliver governance are un-elected. The tech entrepreneurs who built the logistics platforms, the philanthropists who funded the emergency response, the protest leaders who organized the mass demonstrations—these actors exercise real power without democratic accountability. The state becomes a hollowed-out security apparatus, managing the occupation and the military, while the actual administration of societal progress is outsourced to networks that operate outside the constitutional order. This is not a sustainable model of governance. It is a coping mechanism that works only as long as the state can continue to provide the security framework that enables civil society to function—and as the security challenges intensify, the fragility of the arrangement becomes more apparent.

2.9 Epistemic Closure: Security Metrics as the Only Feedback

A governance system's capacity to adapt depends on the quality of the information it receives about its own performance. Systems that measure only one dimension of themselves become blind to deterioration in the dimensions they do not measure. Israel's governance feedback loops are almost exclusively calibrated to measure physical security.

The metrics that dominate Israeli strategic thinking are security metrics: rocket interception rates (Iron Dome's 90 percent success rate), terrorist cells dismantled, deterrence ratios, military readiness indicators, intelligence collection volumes. These are genuine achievements, and the system has become extraordinarily sophisticated at measuring and optimizing them. The IDF's operational planning is data-driven and iterative. The intelligence agencies are among the world's most capable at collecting and analyzing signals. The precision with which Israel can identify, target, and eliminate specific threats is unmatched.

But security metrics capture only one dimension of the system's performance—and not necessarily the most important one over the long term. A governance architecture that measures its success entirely through physical security indicators becomes structurally blind to other forms of erosion: the moral injury of occupation, the slow draining of democratic legitimacy, the international isolation that accumulates with each

cycle of violence, the brain drain of young Israelis emigrating to less conflict-ridden societies, the economic cost of permanent mobilization, the demographic transformation of the citizenry, the psychological toll of living under permanent threat. These are not security metrics. They are governance metrics, and the Israeli system is not calibrated to perceive them.

Epistemic closure means that the system is perfectly optimized to win the game it is measuring, but it is unable to perceive that the board on which the game is being played is disintegrating. The October 7 intelligence failure was not merely an operational lapse. It was a symptom of a deeper problem: the system's feedback architecture, optimized for surveillance of enemies, was unable to process the signals that its own strategic assumptions were flawed. The assumption that Hamas was deterred, that the fence would hold, that the threat was manageable through existing frameworks—these were not failures of intelligence collection. They were failures of epistemic framing, the inability to see risks that fell outside the established categories of security analysis.

The epistemic closure is not an accident. It is reinforced by the Emergency Ratchet and the cultural operating system.

Ein Breira

—"there is no choice"—converts security from a policy preference into an existential imperative. When threats are framed as existential, the demand for rigorous scrutiny of the costs and trade-offs of security policy becomes a form of disloyalty. The result is a feedback loop that is highly sensitive to security threats and nearly insensitive to governance deterioration. The system can see the rocket coming. It cannot see the constitutional crisis until it has already arrived.

2.10 The Cultural Operating System: *Ein Breira, Balagan,* Covenant Consciousness, and *Tikun Olam*

Israel's governance culture is shaped by four deeply embedded concepts that together form a remarkable engine of survival and a powerful brake on political settlement. Each represents a genuine achievement. Each becomes a governance liability when it operates without counterbalance.

Ein Breira

("There is no choice"). The phrase captures a civilizational mentality forged in historical catastrophe and reinforced by decades of conflict. The Holocaust's devastating lesson—that the world cannot be trusted to protect the Jewish people—combined with the experience of being surrounded by hostile states and facing persistent terrorism, has produced a conviction that survival depends on self-reliance, that security must take precedence over all other considerations, and that the luxury of trust is not available to a state whose existence is perpetually contested. *Ein Breira* is the psychological foundation of Israel's extraordinary resilience and mobilization capacity. It is why citizens who disagree about everything else will report for reserve duty when the country is attacked. It is why the state can make decisions under pressure that would paralyze more deliberative systems.

Ein Breira also narrows the perceived range of strategic choice. When every security challenge is framed as an existential threat to which there is no alternative, policies that are, in reality, political choices become necessities. The occupation is framed as a security imperative rather than a territorial strategy. The settlement enterprise becomes a buffer rather than a political project. The suppression of dissent in the name of unity during wartime becomes a permanent feature of the public sphere. *Ein Breira* militates against the kind of open-ended deliberation that boundary resolution requires, because deliberation implies that there are alternatives, and the entire logic of *Ein Breira* is that alternatives do not exist.

Balagan

("Creative chaos"). Israeli society tolerates an extraordinary degree of disorder, improvisation, and informality. Hierarchies are flatter than in comparable societies. Procedures are treated as suggestions. Problems are solved through networks and relationships rather than formal channels. *Balagan* is the cultural engine of Israeli innovation—the willingness to try things that shouldn't work, to bypass obstacles rather than negotiate them, to iterate rapidly without waiting for permission. It is also the source of a persistent weakness in long-term planning and institutional coherence. Systems are patched rather than redesigned. Temporary fixes become permanent solutions. The improvisational genius that wins battles and launches startups is less effective at sustaining the patient, deliberative work of constitutional design.

Covenant Consciousness. For a significant portion of Israeli society, the state is not merely a secular administrative entity. It is a historical fulfillment, a civilizational restoration, and a sacred continuity. The return to Zion is understood as the realization of a divine promise, the ingathering of exiles as a messianic event, and the existence of a Jewish state as the culmination of thousands of years of collective longing. This covenant consciousness gives the state an emotional and spiritual depth that few other modern polities possess. It is the reason Israelis will make extraordinary sacrifices for the collective—not just for the state as a bureaucracy but for the state as a vessel of meaning.

Covenant consciousness also makes territorial compromise, identity pluralism, and constitutional neutrality extraordinarily difficult. If the state is sacred, its borders cannot be negotiated as if they were merely political. If Jewish identity is the state's reason for being, non-Jewish citizens cannot be fully equal in national standing. If the constitution should reflect divine law, a secular constitution is a form of apostasy. Politics becomes metaphysical, and metaphysical disputes are not resolvable through democratic deliberation—they are resolvable only through the triumph of one vision over another. Covenant consciousness is the deepest source of the Boundary Deficit, because it converts questions of political settlement into questions of ultimate meaning that cannot be compromised.

Tikun Olam

("Repair the world"). The Jewish ethical tradition of social justice, of responsibility for the vulnerable, of the imperative to make the world more just and compassionate—this is the counterforce to *Ein Breira*. It is the psychological foundation of Israel's extraordinary civil society, its independent judiciary, its human rights organizations, and its persistent culture of internal critique. The Supreme Court's protection of individual

rights, the NGO sector's advocacy for Palestinians and minorities, the protest movements' defense of democratic institutions—these are expressions of *Tikun Olam*, the conviction that the purpose of collective existence is not merely to survive but to be worthy of survival.

Tikun Olam exists in permanent tension with *Ein Breira*. The demand for justice pulls the state toward rights, inclusion, and ethical self-examination. The imperative of survival pulls the state toward security, exclusion, and the suppression of self-critique in the name of unity. This tension is not a failure. It is the dynamic that has sustained Israeli democracy under conditions that would have extinguished democracy elsewhere. But the tension becomes unsustainable when it cannot be resolved within a constitutional framework that establishes the boundaries between competing values. Without a constitution that defines the limits of security power and the scope of individual rights, the tension between *Ein Breira* and *Tikun Olam* becomes a permanent legitimacy crisis, played out in the streets and the courts and the Knesset, with no mechanism for resolution.

2.11 The Demographic Time Horizon

Israel's demographic trajectory is reshaping the political landscape in ways that the governance architecture cannot easily accommodate. The groups with the highest fertility rates are also the groups with the most distinctive and, in some cases, most oppositional relationships to the state as currently constituted.

The Haredi (ultra-Orthodox) population has a fertility rate of approximately 6.5 children per woman—among the highest in the developed world. This community, which currently constitutes about 13 percent of the population, is projected to reach 25 percent of the Jewish population by 2050. The Haredi community's relationship to the state is complex: it derives extensive benefits—educational funding, welfare payments, military exemptions—but its leadership rejects secular education, opposes workforce integration, and regards the secular state as, at best, a temporary vessel for a community that awaits divine redemption. As the Haredi population grows, the fiscal burden of supporting a non-working, non-serving population intensifies, and the political power of parties that resist integration into the secular state increases.

The Arab population, currently about 21 percent of the total, has a fertility rate higher than the secular Jewish population and is projected to reach 25-30 percent of the total by 2050. This population's relationship to the state is marked by systematic discrimination, political marginalization, and an increasingly assertive demand for collective national rights. As the Arab population grows, the tension between the state's Jewish character and its democratic commitments intensifies.

The settler population in the West Bank continues to grow, both through natural increase and through migration from within Israel. As the settler population expands, the political cost of any territorial compromise rises, and the coalition power of parties representing settlers increases.

Together, these demographic trends create a structural dynamic in which the groups most resistant to the secular, liberal, democratic model of the founding elite are the groups that are growing fastest. The secular Jewish population that founded the state and built its institutions has a fertility rate below replacement. The political center of gravity is shifting toward populations that have different relationships to the state—more religious, more nationalist, more communitarian, less committed to the universalistic values of the Declaration of Independence. This shift is not a temporary electoral fluctuation. It is a long-term demographic transformation that the governance architecture, designed for a different balance of forces, is not equipped to manage.

2.12 How the Mechanisms Reinforce Each Other—and Fuel the Loop

The structural mechanisms described in this section are not a list of separate problems, each solvable through its own targeted intervention. They are an integrated system, and the system's output is the Threat–Mobilization–Securitization–Fragmentation–Renewed Threat Loop.

The constitutional vacuum, created by the Harari Resolution's indefinite deferral, means there is no authoritative framework for resolving fundamental disagreements. The proportional representation trap fragments the legislature, ensuring that no stable majority can complete the constitutional framework. The occupation, now in its sixth decade, has developed its own institutional logic and its own entrenched constituency, making territorial resolution seemingly impossible within the current political configuration. The Emergency Ratchet expands security powers with each crisis, powers that never fully retract, creating a one-way drift toward securitized governance. The Deferral Compounding Effect ensures that each postponed foundational decision makes the next postponement both more necessary and more costly.

The religion-state nexus locks in arrangements that a majority of the population opposes but that the coalition system cannot reform. The Arab-Jewish divide deepens the structural tension between Jewish and democratic identity, a tension the state has never resolved. The Shifting the Burden archetype enables civil society to compensate for state dysfunction while removing the pressure for state reform. Epistemic closure ensures the system is blind to everything except security metrics, unable to perceive its own constitutional, moral, and democratic erosion.

The cultural operating system makes the entire arrangement feel existentially necessary. *Ein Breira* converts political choices into survival imperatives. *Balagan* enables improvisation around obstacles without addressing the structural causes of those obstacles. Covenant consciousness raises the stakes of every political dispute to the level of sacred obligation. *Tikun Olam* provides the ethical counterforce that sustains democratic resistance, but without a constitutional framework to channel that resistance into durable reform.

And the demographic time horizon intensifies all of these dynamics simultaneously. As the populations with the highest fertility rates are also the populations least integrated into the secular democratic model, the political center of gravity shifts toward constituencies that have different visions of the state's identity and

different interests in its architecture. The founding elite's implicit consensus, which managed the constitutional vacuum for decades, cannot be restored because the demographic conditions for it no longer exist.

Each mechanism feeds the others. The constitutional vacuum empowers the coalition veto cascade. The coalition veto cascade prevents constitutional completion. The occupation deepens the emergency imperative. The emergency imperative justifies the emergency ratchet. The emergency ratchet erodes democratic institutions. The erosion of democratic institutions deepens internal fragmentation. The Shifting the Burden archetype compensates for dysfunction while preventing its correction. Epistemic closure ensures the costs remain invisible. The cultural operating system makes the arrangement feel normal, obligatory, sacred. The demographic transformation makes the status quo progressively less stable while the mechanisms for resolving it become progressively weaker.

This is not a conspiracy. It is not a failure of individual leadership, though leadership plays its role. It is the predictable output of an architecture that was designed, with extraordinary intelligence and under extraordinary pressure, to survive under conditions of permanent existential threat—and that succeeded so thoroughly that it never developed the capacity to transition from survival to settlement. The founders deferred the constitution because they were fighting for the right to exist. The deferral became permanent, and the permanent deferral became the architecture of governance itself. The Boundary Deficit is not a design flaw. It is the shadow of a design triumph—the unintended consequence of a survival architecture that was never completed because survival itself consumed all available political energy.

The question is whether the architecture can be completed now, under vastly more difficult conditions, before the mechanisms of decay that the incompleteness has generated consume the institutional and cultural substrate that makes completion possible. The transition architecture that would attempt to do so is the subject of the subsequent sections.

3. What Building Boundary Resolution Capacity Would Look Like

3.1 The Principle: Complete the Architecture Without Destroying the Resilience

The Boundary Deficit is not a problem of insufficient capacity. Israel possesses extraordinary adaptive intelligence, deep institutional memory, and a population capable of collective action under pressure that is unmatched in the democratic world. The problem is that this capacity has been directed almost entirely toward survival and improvisation rather than toward constitutional completion and political settlement. The transition challenge is therefore not to build new capacity from scratch, but to redirect existing capacity toward the task of completing the governance architecture—without destroying the survival capabilities that remain essential.

This is a delicate operation. The *Ein Breira* mentality that drives security-first thinking is not a pathology to be eliminated; it is a genuine response to genuine threats, and any transition architecture that treats it as an obstacle to be overcome rather than a reality to be integrated will be rejected by the system's immune response. The *Balagan* improvisation that generates innovation and resilience cannot be replaced by bureaucratic rigidity in the name of constitutional order. The Covenant Consciousness that gives the state its emotional depth cannot be dismissed as primitive tribalism by a transition that hopes to command legitimacy. The task is to supplement these cultural forces, not supplant them—to add to the architecture the capacities it currently lacks, without dismantling the capacities that have kept the society alive.

The principle is to work with the grain of Israeli governance culture: pragmatic, improvisational, security-conscious, and deeply engaged with questions of meaning and identity. The transition does not begin with a comprehensive peace agreement or a formal constitutional convention—those are blocked by the coalition veto cascade and would trigger the immune response. It begins with incremental boundary stabilization in domains where progress is possible, using mechanisms that are culturally legible, and allowing the evidence of success to create political demand for further completion.

3.2 Constitutional Kaizen: Incremental Boundary Stabilization

Israel's constitutional vacuum persists not because Israelis are indifferent to constitutional questions—the intensity of the 2023 judicial reform crisis demonstrated the opposite—but because the political system is incapable of resolving them through a single, comprehensive constitutional moment. The Harari Resolution's logic of incremental construction, which failed to produce a completed constitution over seven decades, nonetheless contains the seed of an alternative approach: constitutional

kaizen

, the continuous, piece-by-piece stabilization of the governance architecture through targeted Basic Laws that address specific boundary questions, each with sufficient entrenchment to survive changes in government.

The model would be a series of Basic Laws, each addressing a specific dimension of the Boundary Deficit, enacted with supermajority requirements that force cross-factional consensus and that protect the laws from repeal by a simple majority. The objective is not to resolve every foundational disagreement at once—that would be impossible. It is to establish a constitutional floor beneath which the political process cannot sink, and to create, over time, the authoritative framework for resolving disagreements that currently lack any legitimate institutional mechanism.

A Basic Law: Equality could entrench the equal rights of all citizens regardless of religion, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation, with a supermajority amendment requirement. It would not resolve the tension between Jewish and democratic identity—the Nation-State Law would remain in tension with it—but it would establish that discrimination against minorities cannot be legitimized by ordinary legislation, and it would provide the Supreme Court with a clear constitutional basis for protecting individual rights.

A Basic Law: Civil Liberties could consolidate and entrench the protections that are currently scattered across the partial Basic Law: Human Dignity and Liberty, adding explicit protections for freedom of religion, freedom of expression, and equality that the current framework lacks. A Basic Law: The Judiciary could clarify the Supreme Court's authority and its limits, defining the scope of judicial review explicitly rather than leaving it to be contested in every generation.

A Basic Law: Religion and State could begin, incrementally, to address the status quo arrangements. It might not resolve the question of civil marriage immediately, but it could establish the principle that no citizen shall be denied access to marriage, divorce, or burial on the basis of religious status—creating a constitutional imperative for the political system to develop mechanisms, whether civil marriage, civil unions, or expanded religious authority, that satisfy the principle.

None of these Basic Laws would complete the constitution. Together, enacted over time, they would build the constitutional framework that the Harari Resolution envisioned—not as a single document adopted at a founding moment, but as an accumulated settlement, piece by piece, each piece creating the legitimacy for the next.

The supermajority requirement is the essential design feature. A Basic Law that can be amended by a simple majority is not a constitutional provision; it is ordinary legislation with a dignified name. A supermajority—two-thirds of the Knesset, or a majority in two successive Knessets—would force the kind of cross-factional negotiation that the current architecture avoids. It would prevent the majority from using its temporary power to entrench its preferences against the minority. And it would create the political conditions for genuine constitutional settlement: no faction can impose its vision, so all factions must negotiate.

This approach works with the grain of Israeli political culture. It is incremental, like the Harari process, but with the critical addition of entrenchment. It is pragmatic, addressing specific problems rather than demanding agreement on ultimate questions. It respects the *Balagan* improvisational style—each Basic Law

is a patch, solving a specific problem, rather than a grand design that would trigger resistance from all factions simultaneously. And it channels the *Tikun Olam* ethical drive toward the repair of the governance architecture itself.

3.3 Security Detox: Reducing the Colonization of Civilian Governance by Security Logic

The Emergency Ratchet has, over decades, expanded the security apparatus's reach into domains that are properly matters of civilian governance. The transition from emergency to normalcy requires the gradual but deliberate restoration of boundaries between security and civilian domains—not by weakening the security establishment, which remains essential, but by containing its logic within its appropriate sphere.

The mechanism is a set of institutional reforms that subject emergency powers to democratic oversight, temporal limitation, and periodic reauthorization. Emergency regulations—including those inherited from the British Mandate and renewed continuously since 1948—should be subject to mandatory sunset clauses requiring explicit Knesset reauthorization every two years, with a public report justifying the continuation of each power. The routine renewal of emergency powers without meaningful deliberation would be replaced by a process that forces the political system to acknowledge and justify the powers it maintains.

A civilian-led National Security Council, with genuine analytical capacity and statutory independence, would provide the Prime Minister and Cabinet with strategic assessments that are not filtered through the institutional interests of the military and intelligence agencies. It would not replace the IDF's operational planning or the Shin Bet's intelligence collection. It would provide an alternative source of strategic analysis, outside the chain of command, capable of questioning the assumptions that epistemic closure has rendered invisible.

Parliamentary oversight of the security establishment, currently limited, would be strengthened through a Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee with expanded investigative authority, a professional staff, and access to classified information under controlled conditions. The committee's reports would be public to the extent that security permits, creating a feedback loop between the security apparatus and the democratic public that currently barely exists.

These reforms are not attacks on the security establishment; they are the infrastructure of democratic accountability that any mature security state requires. The framing is critical: this is not about weakening Israel's defenses, but about ensuring that the institutions that protect the state are themselves protected from the institutional distortions that permanent emergency creates. The goal is to make security sustainable—to prevent the Emergency Ratchet from continuing its one-way drift, so that the survival architecture can serve normal democratic life rather than gradually consuming it.

3.4 Occupation Exit Strategy: From Management to Resolution

The occupation is the most intractable dimension of the Boundary Deficit, and no transition architecture can credibly claim to resolve it in the near term. The coalition veto cascade, the settler movement's political power, the security establishment's institutional interests, and the genuine security risks of withdrawal all make a comprehensive peace agreement impossible under current conditions. What a transition architecture can do is shift the system from a posture of indefinite management without resolution to a posture of gradual, conditions-based movement toward a defined end state—even if that movement is slow, even if the end state is contested.

The first step is to define the end state, at least provisionally, so that policy decisions can be evaluated against whether they move toward it or away from it. The current approach—in which every government maintains ambiguity about its territorial intentions, allowing settlement expansion while claiming commitment to a two-state solution, or vice versa—maximizes short-term political flexibility at the cost of making any resolution progressively harder. A formal statement of the government's intended end state—whether two states, confederation, annexation with equal rights, or some other model—would not resolve the occupation, but it would create a standard against which policy decisions could be measured.

The second step is to stop digging. Settlement expansion deepens the occupation and makes territorial compromise more difficult with each passing year. A freeze on new settlement construction outside the major blocs, while not resolving the occupation, would prevent it from becoming even more entrenched. This is a politically explosive proposal—the settler movement's leadership is embedded in the governing coalition—but it is the minimum condition for any credible claim to be moving toward resolution rather than perpetuation.

The third step is to differentiate. The occupation is not uniform across the West Bank. The major settlement blocs near the Green Line, home to the majority of settlers, are widely expected to be incorporated into Israel in any negotiated agreement, subject to land swaps. The isolated settlements deep in the West Bank, home to a minority of settlers but the primary drivers of friction and the primary obstacle to territorial contiguity for a Palestinian state, are a different category. A policy that distinguishes between these categories—investing in the blocs while restricting growth in the outliers—would begin to shape the territorial reality toward a resolvable configuration, rather than allowing undifferentiated expansion to foreclose options.

These steps are not a peace plan. They are preconditions for any peace plan to become possible. They do not require Palestinian agreement or international mediation. They require only Israeli decisions—difficult, politically costly decisions, but decisions that are within Israel's power to make unilaterally. The alternative is the indefinite continuation of the current trajectory, in which the occupation deepens, the international costs mount, the moral injury accumulates, and the demographic clock ticks closer to the point at which separation is no longer possible and the choice is between equal rights and formal apartheid. The transition architecture cannot resolve the occupation. It can only describe the path away from its most destabilizing trajectory, and make visible the costs of continuing on the current path.

3.5 Electoral Reform: From Fragmentation to Governability

The proportional representation system, with its low threshold and single national district, was designed to ensure representation for Israel's diverse communities. It has succeeded at that purpose. It has also produced chronic governmental instability, the coalition veto cascade, and a permanent incapacity for long-horizon governance. Electoral reform is not peripheral to boundary resolution; it is a prerequisite for it, because the current system ensures that no government can make the difficult decisions that boundary resolution requires without being immediately brought down by the small parties whose interests are threatened.

The reform direction is not majoritarianism—Israel's diversity is real, and a winner-take-all system would disenfranchise significant communities. It is a mixed system that preserves proportional representation for the Knesset as a whole while introducing elements that reward governability and cross-factional coalition-building.

Raising the electoral threshold from 3.25 percent to 5 percent would reduce the number of parties in the Knesset, forcing small factions to cooperate before elections rather than extracting concessions after them. It would not eliminate small parties—the ultra-Orthodox and Arab parties would likely clear the higher threshold—but it would reduce the proliferation of one- and two-seat factions that complicate coalition arithmetic.

Introducing regional district elements alongside the national proportional list would create accountability relationships between individual MKs and specific constituencies, reducing the dominance of party lists and central committees. A mixed-member proportional system, in which some MKs are elected from geographic districts and the remaining seats are allocated from national lists to ensure overall proportionality, would preserve the representational benefits of the current system while adding a layer of local accountability.

Direct election of the Prime Minister, separated from Knesset elections, would create an executive with an independent mandate, reducing the capacity of small coalition partners to bring down governments over sectoral demands. The Prime Minister would need to assemble a governing majority in the Knesset to pass legislation, but could not be removed by a simple no-confidence vote without an alternative candidate and a constructive majority—the "constructive vote of no confidence" model used in Germany and elsewhere.

These reforms are not radical. They are incremental adjustments to the existing architecture, preserving its proportional character while strengthening the mechanisms for stable governance. They would not eliminate the fragmentation of Israeli politics, but they would reduce the severity of the coalition veto cascade, creating space for the long-horizon decisions that boundary resolution requires. And they are more politically feasible than comprehensive constitutional reform, because they can be implemented through ordinary legislation rather than requiring the constitutional supermajority that the current system makes impossible.

3.6 Deliberative Infrastructure for the Hardest Questions

The political system is structurally incapable of resolving the foundational questions at the heart of the Boundary Deficit. The coalition veto cascade ensures that any decision that threatens the interests of any significant faction will be blocked. The cultural operating system—

Ein Breira

, Covenant Consciousness—converts political questions into existential ones, making compromise feel like betrayal. The electoral system rewards positioning over deliberation, conflict over consensus.

What is missing is a mechanism for generating legitimate, considered public judgment on the questions the political system cannot answer. Deliberative infrastructure—citizens' assemblies, deliberative polls, and structured public consultations—can fill this gap, not by replacing representative democracy but by supplementing it with a channel for citizen deliberation that bypasses the pathologies of the coalition system.

A National Deliberative Commission on Constitutional Settlement would be a standing citizens' assembly, demographically representative of Israeli society—Jews and Arabs, secular and religious, left and right, Ashkenazi and Mizrahi, center and periphery—convened for defined periods to deliberate on specific constitutional questions: the relationship between religion and state, the status of the occupied territories, the balance between Jewish and democratic identity, the framework for protecting minority rights. Participants would be randomly selected, provided with expert testimony and professional facilitation, and compensated for their time. Their recommendations would be non-binding but public, reasoned, and carrying a democratic legitimacy derived not from the authority of office but from the authenticity of citizen deliberation.

The Irish experience with citizens' assemblies on constitutional questions—marriage equality, abortion, climate policy—demonstrates that randomly selected citizens can deliberate on deeply contentious issues and produce recommendations that unlock political gridlock and command broad public legitimacy. The Irish assemblies did not resolve every disagreement, but they changed the terms of debate, generated mandates for reform that the political system could not produce on its own, and demonstrated that ordinary citizens are capable of nuanced engagement with questions that political elites find impossible to address.

In the Israeli context, a deliberative commission on constitutional questions would face immense challenges. The distrust between communities is deep. The security situation is volatile. The Covenant Consciousness that raises the stakes of identity questions would not dissolve in a facilitated dialogue. But the alternative—continued constitutional decay, continued crisis cycling, continued erosion of democratic institutions—is worse. The commission would not resolve the Boundary Deficit. It would create a parallel pathway for generating legitimate public mandates that the political system is structurally incapable of producing, and in doing so, it would change the political conditions within which the political system operates.

3.7 Civic Integration Infrastructure

The Ontological Stacking described in the previous section—the coexistence of fundamentally different worldviews in the same political arena without a mediating translation layer—is not resolvable through constitutional reform alone. It also requires the slow, patient construction of civic infrastructure that builds relationships, trust, and shared identity across the boundaries that divide Israeli society.

This infrastructure already exists in fragmentary form. The shared military service that brings together young Israelis from different backgrounds—secular and religious, Ashkenazi and Mizrahi, left and right—functions, however imperfectly, as a crucible of shared citizenship. The universities, hospitals, and civil society organizations that employ and serve Israelis across communal lines are spaces of practical coexistence. The tech sector, with its meritocratic ethos and global connections, draws talent from across Israeli society and from the Palestinian population. These are not solutions to the Boundary Deficit, but they are the raw material from which civic integration can be built.

The transition architecture would invest in and expand these spaces deliberately. Joint economic zones that employ Israelis and Palestinians together, building the economic interdependence that makes separation costly and cooperation rewarding. Shared municipal governance experiments in mixed cities like Jerusalem, Haifa, and Acre, where Jews and Arabs live side by side but often in separate civic worlds. Educational curricula that teach the histories and narratives of all communities, not to impose a single version of the past but to ensure that every Israeli understands the stories that shape their fellow citizens. Cross-community deliberative forums at the municipal level that address concrete local challenges—schools, infrastructure, public safety—where shared interests can generate habits of cooperation that ideological alignment cannot.

This is slow work, measured in generations, not electoral cycles. It does not produce dramatic political victories. It builds the social substrate on which political settlements can eventually rest—the relationships, the trust, the shared experience of collective problem-solving that make it possible for communities to accept compromises that would otherwise feel like existential threats. Civic integration infrastructure does not resolve the Boundary Deficit. It makes resolution survivable.

3.8 Diaspora Recalibration

The Jewish diaspora has historically served as a strategic stabilizer for Israel—providing financial support, political advocacy, and a demographic reservoir for aliyah. But the relationship is shifting. The diaspora is increasingly polarized over Israeli policies, with younger generations of American Jews in particular expressing growing alienation from the occupation, the treatment of Palestinians, and the religious establishment's monopoly over Jewish identity. The traditional model of unconditional diaspora support is eroding, and the erosion has governance implications for Israel that the political system has not yet fully absorbed.

The transition architecture would engage the diaspora not merely as a source of support but as a partner in boundary resolution. Diaspora communities, with their experience of living as minorities in democratic societies, have developed models of Jewish identity that are compatible with civic equality and religious pluralism—precisely the challenges that Israel's governance architecture has failed to address. The diaspora, precisely because it is not subject to the coalition veto cascade, can serve as a source of strategic perspective that the domestic political system cannot generate on its own.

Concrete mechanisms might include a formal diaspora advisory council that provides input on long-term strategic questions—constitutional design, religious pluralism, diaspora-Israel relations—without the political pressures of coalition bargaining. Diaspora investment in joint Israeli-Palestinian economic initiatives would build constituencies for peace on both sides. Diaspora support for civil society organizations that work on civic integration and constitutional reform would strengthen the domestic actors working toward boundary resolution. And diaspora political advocacy in Washington, Brussels, and other capitals could be redirected from unconditional support for the Israeli government of the day toward support for the long-term democratic and constitutional health of the state.

The goal is not to subordinate Israeli decisions to diaspora preferences. It is to recognize that the Boundary Deficit has consequences for the entire Jewish world, and that the resources, perspectives, and political capacity of the diaspora are underutilized in addressing it. The traditional model—diaspora writes checks, Israel makes decisions—is inadequate to the challenges the state now faces. A recalibrated relationship, in which diaspora and Israel engage as partners in the unfinished project of Jewish sovereignty, would serve both communities better than the current trajectory of growing alienation.

4. The Political Immune System: The Security First Responder

4.1 The Security First Responder Defined

Every governance architecture develops an immune system—a set of institutions, incentives, and cultural norms that protect the existing order from challenge. In Germany, the immune system is bureaucratic inertia. In France, it is the spectacle of centralized authority. In Russia, it is the deliberate destruction of feedback channels. In Japan, it is the Stability Bias that makes continuity feel like virtue and disruption feel like threat. In Nigeria, it is the Extraction Coalition that converts public office into private patrimony.

Israel's immune system is the Security First Responder: the comprehensive orientation of political, bureaucratic, military, and cultural institutions toward the prioritization of security over all other values, and the treatment of any deviation from security-first logic as an existential threat to the state. The Security First Responder is not a conspiracy of generals and intelligence chiefs. It is the predictable output of a system founded under existential threat, reinforced by decades of conflict, and constitutionally incomplete—a system in which the institutions that are most capable and most trusted are also the institutions most invested in the continuation of the emergency that sustains their preeminence.

The Security First Responder is not a barrier to change added onto a functional state. It is the state's core operating logic. The British Mandate's Defence Regulations of 1945 were incorporated into Israeli law in 1948 and have been renewed continuously ever since. The IDF is the most trusted institution in Israeli society—consistently polling above 80 percent approval, compared to 20-30 percent for the Knesset. The security cabinet, not the full government, makes the most consequential decisions. The military and intelligence agencies exercise extraordinary influence over policy, budgets, and public discourse, with minimal effective civilian oversight. The emergency is not an exception to normal governance. It is the framework within which all governance occurs.

The Security First Responder is not malicious. It is the expression of a society that learned, through the Holocaust and through repeated wars, that survival cannot be taken for granted—and that built institutions capable of ensuring survival under conditions that would have destroyed less determined peoples. The immune system is the institutional embodiment of

Ein Breira

. It has kept Israel alive. The question is whether it can also allow Israel to live normally—or whether the architecture that masters survival necessarily prevents the transition to a sustainable political order.

4.2 Who Benefits—Named Honestly

The Security First Responder is sustained by specific actors who have concrete, material, and ideological interests in the continuation of the current emergency architecture. Any transition architecture that does not name these actors and account for their resistance will be neutralized by them.

The Security Establishment. The IDF, the Shin Bet, the Mossad, the Border Police, and the intelligence agencies are the primary institutional beneficiaries of the permanent emergency. They command the largest budgets, attract the most talented personnel, and exercise the greatest influence over national strategy. Military service is the primary route to elite status, the most important networking mechanism, and the foundation of political credibility for much of the political class. The security establishment's institutional interests are served by the continuation of the conditions that justify its preeminence—not because its leaders conspire to perpetuate conflict, but because the habits, doctrines, and career incentives that have developed over decades are all oriented toward the management of threat rather than its resolution.

The Defense-Industrial Complex. Israel's defense exports reached approximately $13 billion in 2023, making it one of the world's largest arms exporters. The defense sector employs tens of thousands of Israelis, sustains entire communities, and generates the technological expertise that feeds the civilian tech sector. The defense industry has a structural interest in the continuation of conflict and the expansion of security budgets. It also has a structural interest in the perpetuation of the occupation, which provides a permanent testing ground for surveillance technologies, weapons systems, and operational doctrines that are then marketed globally as "battle-proven." The defense-industrial complex is not a cabal. It is a set of economic incentives that align private profit with public emergency.

The Settler Movement. The over 700,000 Israelis living in the West Bank and East Jerusalem constitute the most powerful political constituency for the perpetuation of the occupation. The settler movement's leadership is embedded in the governing coalition. Its ideology—that the West Bank is the biblical heartland of the Jewish people and cannot be surrendered—has become mainstream within the Israeli right. The settlers have a direct, personal, material stake in the continuation of the occupation: their homes, their communities, and their identity depend on it. They are not merely beneficiaries of the status quo; they are its most committed defenders, and they exercise political power far beyond their numbers through the coalition system.

The Religious Establishment. The Chief Rabbinate and the religious parties that sustain it benefit from the constitutional vacuum that prevents the resolution of religion-state questions. The Orthodox monopoly over marriage, conversion, and Jewish identity; the state funding for religious institutions; the military exemptions for yeshiva students; the Sabbath restrictions—these arrangements represent enormous institutional and financial interests that the religious establishment will defend against any reform. The religious parties' leverage within the coalition system ensures that any attempt to address the religion-state nexus triggers a government crisis, and the coalition veto cascade ensures that the crisis results in the preservation of the status quo.

The Political Class. The proportional representation system, with its fragmented legislature and short-lived coalitions, serves the interests of a political class that has adapted to permanent instability. The small parties that exercise disproportionate influence, the career politicians who navigate coalition negotiations, the operatives who run campaigns in a system of continuous electoral cycles—these actors have developed skills and networks that are optimized for the current architecture. A transition to stable governance, with longer government lifespans, a higher electoral threshold, and stronger executive authority, would disrupt their careers and diminish their power. They are not conspirators. They are rational actors responding to an incentive structure that rewards fragmentation.

These actors are not a unified coalition with a coordinated strategy. They compete with each other for resources, influence, and power. But they share a common structural interest: the continuation of the architecture that sustains them. And they collectively control the institutional levers through which any reform would need to be implemented. The Emergency Ratchet expands their powers with each crisis. The Deferral Compounding Effect ensures that the costs of reform rise faster than the political will to attempt it. And the epistemic closure of security metrics ensures that the costs of the status quo remain largely invisible to the public that would need to demand change.

4.3 The Emergency Ratchet as Immune Mechanism

The Emergency Ratchet, described in the previous section as a structural mechanism of the Boundary Deficit, also functions as the primary immune mechanism of the Security First Responder. It operates at multiple levels simultaneously.

At the legal level, the indefinite renewal of emergency regulations—inherited from the British Mandate and never allowed to lapse—means that the state possesses extraordinary powers over movement, association, speech, and property that are never subjected to the democratic scrutiny that would accompany their adoption as permanent legislation. The emergency framework is the legal infrastructure of the security state, and because it is formally temporary, it is never debated as permanent architecture. The renewal is routine, procedural, and largely invisible to the public.

At the institutional level, each crisis expands the security apparatus. A new unit is created to address a new threat. A new surveillance capacity is developed and then retained. A new restriction on movement or association is imposed and then normalized. The expansion is always justified by the emergency, and once the emergency recedes, the expansion remains—not because anyone decided it should, but because no one has the political incentive to reverse it. The default is always toward more security power, more security budgets, more security control over domains that were previously civilian.

At the psychological level, the Emergency Ratchet reinforces the *Ein Breira* mentality. Each crisis is experienced as confirmation that the world is dangerous, that enemies are implacable, and that security must take precedence over all other considerations. The October 7 attack, in particular, has dealt a profound

psychological blow to the Israeli sense of security, reinforcing the conviction that survival is perpetually at stake and that the institutions of normal democratic life are luxuries that can be afforded only when survival is assured—which, in the logic of *Ein Breira*, is never.

The Emergency Ratchet thus functions as a ratchet in both directions: it expands security powers with each crisis, and it contracts the political space for questioning those powers. The combination produces a one-way drift toward securitized governance that no single actor chose and that no single actor can reverse. The system drifts toward a destination that nobody voted for, because the architecture of emergency makes every step in that direction feel like a necessity, and every step in the opposite direction feel like a risk that cannot be taken.

4.4 Epistemic Closure as Immune Defense

The Security First Responder's most powerful defense mechanism is not coercion or censorship. It is the calibration of the system's feedback architecture to measure only what the security establishment values, and to render invisible the costs that accumulate outside that frame.

A governance system that measures its success through security metrics—rocket interception rates, terrorist cells dismantled, deterrence restored, intelligence collection volumes—will produce a narrative of continuous achievement. By these metrics, Israel's performance is genuinely impressive. Iron Dome intercepts over 90 percent of incoming rockets. The intelligence agencies penetrate enemy networks with extraordinary sophistication. The military conducts precise operations that minimize civilian casualties relative to the complexity of urban warfare. The system is doing what it was designed to do, and it is doing it well.

What the security metrics do not measure is the erosion of the constitutional order, the moral injury of occupation, the international isolation that accompanies each round of violence, the emigration of young Israelis seeking lives less defined by conflict, the economic cost of permanent mobilization, the psychological toll of living under permanent threat, and the slow transformation of the demographic balance that will eventually make the current governance model unsustainable. These are not failures of security. They are failures of governance, and the system's dashboard is calibrated to report only on security.

The epistemic closure is not a deliberate deception. It is an emergent property of an architecture in which the institutions that collect and analyze information are the same institutions whose interests are served by the continuation of the emergency. The IDF's intelligence assessments, the Shin Bet's threat analyses, the defense ministry's strategic reviews—these are the primary sources of information about Israel's strategic position, and they are generated by organizations whose institutional identity is built around the management of threat. An assessment that concluded that the primary strategic challenge was no longer external threat but internal constitutional decay would be an assessment produced by institutions whose existence is justified by the primacy of external threat. The epistemic closure is built into the organizational structure of the state.

The result is that the Security First Responder does not need to actively suppress criticism—though it sometimes does. It simply needs to maintain the frame in which security achievements are the only achievements that matter, and in which the costs of the security architecture are externalities, to be borne by other institutions and other generations. The costs accumulate. The metrics remain positive. The system continues optimizing for the game it is winning, while the board disintegrates.

4.5 The Narrative Strategy

The Security First Responder cannot be defeated by frontal assault. Any transition architecture that presents itself as an attack on Israel's security institutions, on the IDF's preeminence, or on the

Ein Breira

mentality will activate the immune response and be neutralized before it begins. The immune system is too deeply embedded in institutions, incentives, and culture to be overcome by argument alone. It must be outflanked—not by denying the reality of threat, but by reframing the relationship between security and constitutional completion.

The master narrative is that Israel has won the right to complete its architecture. The founders deferred the constitution because they were fighting for survival. They succeeded. The state exists. It is secure—more secure than at any point in its history, with peace agreements with major Arab states, a military capacity that no regional adversary can match, and the demonstrated ability to defend itself against the most intense attacks. The task now is to complete the architecture that survival was meant to enable: to write the constitution, to define the borders, to settle the relationship between religion and state, and to determine the character of the democratic order that the security establishment was built to protect.

This narrative is true, and it has the advantage of honoring the security establishment's achievement rather than diminishing it. It does not argue that security is unimportant. It argues that security has succeeded so thoroughly that it is now safe to address the challenges that security deferred. It frames constitutional completion not as a retreat from security but as the fulfillment of security's purpose—the creation of the normal democratic life that the IDF was created to defend.

Subsidiary narratives target specific constituencies. For the security establishment: constitutional completion would stabilize the domestic political environment, reducing the internal divisions that adversaries exploit. A state with a settled constitutional order is a stronger state, better able to sustain the public support that long-term security requires. For the defense sector: a reduction in regional conflict would open new markets, reduce the political barriers to defense exports, and allow Israeli technology to compete on its merits rather than being tainted by association with occupation. For the settlers: a constitutional settlement that defines borders and establishes security guarantees would provide greater long-term security than the indefinite perpetuation of a conflict that is steadily eroding Israel's international legitimacy. For the religious establishment: a constitutional settlement that protects religious freedom, including the freedom to maintain religious institutions and practices, would be more durable than the current arrangements, which depend on the temporary political power of religious parties and are vulnerable to reversal when that power wanes.

These arguments will not persuade everyone. The settler movement that regards the West Bank as sacred patrimony will not be persuaded by arguments about international legitimacy. The religious parties that see secular constitutionalism as a threat to Torah law will not be persuaded by arguments about long-term durability. The defense contractors whose profits depend on continued conflict will not be persuaded by arguments about new markets. But the narrative strategy does not need to persuade everyone. It needs to create a coalition of the persuadable—the security professionals who understand that domestic stability is a strategic asset, the business community that sees economic opportunity in regional normalization, the secular majority that wants a normal democratic life, the young Israelis who are emigrating in search of exactly that—and to allow that coalition to shift the political equilibrium over time.

The immune system cannot be defeated. It must be made obsolete—not by eliminating the security institutions that keep Israel alive, but by demonstrating that the next phase of Israel's development requires capacities that the security architecture alone cannot provide. The founders built an extraordinary survival machine. The task now is to build the governance architecture that makes survival worth sustaining.

5. Working with the Grain: Transition Architecture for Israel

5.1 The Principle: Build on Israel's Extraordinary Adaptive Capacity

The Boundary Deficit is formidable, and the Security First Responder is among the most sophisticated immune systems in this series. But Israel also possesses extraordinary adaptive capacity—the same improvisational genius that built the Startup Nation, the world's most adaptive military, and a society capable of collective mobilization under pressure that few others can match. The transition architecture must redirect that capacity toward governance completion, not by overriding the immune system but by working through the same cultural mechanisms that drive Israeli innovation and resilience.

The principle is to work with the grain of Israeli governance culture: pragmatic, improvisational, security-conscious, and deeply engaged with questions of meaning. The transition does not begin with a comprehensive peace agreement or a formal constitutional convention—those are blocked by the coalition veto cascade and would trigger the immune response immediately. It begins with protected spaces—pilot programmes, deliberative experiments, incremental Basic Laws, municipal innovations—where the new architecture can be tested, refined, and made visible. Success attracts imitators. Imitators create constituencies. Constituencies create political pressure. Political pressure, when it reaches sufficient mass, overcomes the immune response not by frontal assault but by rendering the old architecture's limitations visible through the demonstrated success of alternatives.

This is the Israeli way of transformation, visible in the history of the state itself. The founders did not wait for perfect conditions to declare independence—they declared it in the midst of war and built institutions under fire. The tech sector did not wait for government planning—entrepreneurs and venture capitalists built an ecosystem through networks, experimentation, and scaling by attraction. The protest movements of 2023 did not wait for political parties to lead—citizens organized themselves, improvising infrastructure, messaging, and strategy in real time. The transition architecture for boundary resolution must adopt the same logic: not a blueprint to be implemented from above, but a set of experiments to be scaled from below.

5.2 Trojan Horse Mechanisms: Carrying Transformation in Familiar Packaging

The Security First Responder will neutralize any reform that presents itself as a challenge to security primacy. The art of transition design in Israel is therefore the construction of Trojan Horse mechanisms—institutional innovations that carry transformative payloads in familiar packaging, bypassing the immune system by presenting change as the enhancement of existing capabilities rather than their repudiation.

The most promising candidates are mechanisms that can be framed as strengthening Israel's security position, improving governance efficiency, or fulfilling commitments the state has already made—while quietly building the constitutional and institutional infrastructure for boundary resolution.

The "National Resilience Commission" as Constitutional Trojan Horse. A statutory body, framed as enhancing Israel's strategic resilience by addressing the domestic dimensions of national security—social cohesion, institutional stability, democratic legitimacy, international standing—could be tasked with producing regular public assessments of Israel's constitutional health, the costs of the occupation, the state of civic integration, and the long-term implications of demographic trends. It would be modeled on the UK's Office for Budget Responsibility or Climate Change Committee: independent, technically credible, with statutory authority to require government response. It would not make policy recommendations—that would trigger the immune response. It would make the non-security costs of the current architecture visible, quantified, and inescapable. It would frame constitutional completion as a national security imperative—the strengthening of the domestic foundations on which military power ultimately depends. The framing is the Trojan Horse; the payload is the creation of an institutional voice that can say what the security establishment cannot: that the greatest long-term threat to Israel's security is the erosion of its democratic and constitutional order.

The "Basic Law: Governance Stability" as Electoral Reform Trojan Horse. A Basic Law framed as enhancing governability and national decision-making capacity—values that enjoy broad support across the political spectrum—could introduce incremental electoral reforms: a moderately higher threshold, a constructive vote of no confidence, or limited regional district elements. It would be presented not as diminishing representation but as strengthening Israel's capacity to make decisions, sustain long-term strategies, and prevent the political paralysis that adversaries observe and exploit. The framing is governance effectiveness; the payload is the gradual unwinding of the coalition veto cascade that blocks boundary resolution.

"Security-Civilian Boundary Protocols" as Emergency Ratchet Reversal. A set of administrative protocols, framed as modernizing and professionalizing the security sector's interface with civilian governance, could introduce sunset clauses on emergency regulations, strengthen Knesset oversight of the security establishment, and establish a civilian-led National Security Council with genuine analytical capacity. The framing is security modernization—ensuring that Israel's security institutions operate with the same professionalism and accountability as its leading technology companies. The payload is the gradual restoration of boundaries between emergency and normal governance, and the creation of institutional capacity to question the assumptions that epistemic closure protects.

"Shared Civic Infrastructure" as Social Resilience Investment. Pilot programmes framed as strengthening Israel's social fabric in the face of external threats—joint economic zones, mixed municipal governance experiments, shared educational initiatives—could receive security-branded funding and political support. The framing is national resilience: a society that is internally divided is vulnerable to external pressure, and investments in civic cohesion are investments in national security. The payload is the slow construction of the relationships, trust, and shared identity that make boundary resolution politically survivable.

The Trojan Horse does not deceive. It translates—rendering the unfamiliar in familiar terms, so that the immune system recognizes it as reinforcement rather than threat. The National Resilience Commission does not challenge the security establishment; it extends its logic to domains it has neglected. The Basic Law on Governance Stability does not attack coalition politics; it strengthens the state's capacity to act. The Security-Civilian Boundary Protocols do not weaken the IDF; they professionalize its relationship to democratic institutions. The Shared Civic Infrastructure does not promote post-national identity; it strengthens the society that the security apparatus exists to defend. Each mechanism carries transformative potential in a form the immune system can accept.

5.3 Safe-to-Fail Pilots: The Democratic Laboratory Approach

Israel's governance challenges are so deeply entrenched that no comprehensive solution can be designed in advance and implemented from above. The transition must proceed through experimentation—safe-to-fail pilots that test boundary resolution mechanisms in limited domains, generating evidence, building constituencies, and learning from failure without threatening the entire architecture.

Municipal Constitutional Laboratories. Selected municipalities—Tel Aviv, Haifa, Jerusalem, mixed cities, development towns—could be granted enhanced autonomy to experiment with governance innovations: participatory budgeting, citizens' assemblies on local constitutional questions, joint Jewish-Arab municipal service delivery, and innovative models of religion-state relations at the local level. Each municipality would serve as a laboratory for a different dimension of boundary resolution. Tel Aviv might pioneer deliberative democracy mechanisms. Haifa might deepen its already significant Jewish-Arab coexistence infrastructure. Jerusalem might experiment with borough-level governance that allows different communities to exercise autonomy over cultural and religious affairs while sharing a common municipal framework.

The municipal scale is the natural home for democratic experimentation. The stakes are lower than national constitutional questions. The feedback loops are tighter—citizens can see whether innovations are working in their own neighborhoods. The immune system is less activated—local governance does not threaten the security establishment or the religious parties in the same way that national reform does. And success at the municipal level generates evidence that can be scaled.

Sectoral Sandboxes. Specific policy domains could be designated as regulatory sandboxes, freed from the constraints of the coalition veto cascade and the religious status quo, to test alternative governance models. A "Civil Marriage Sandbox" could allow municipalities to offer civil union registries, testing the political and social response before national legislation is attempted. A "Public Transportation Sandbox" could allow municipalities to operate limited public transport on Shabbat, generating data on usage and public acceptance. A "Shared Education Sandbox" could fund schools that teach both Jewish and Arab histories and narratives, building the civic infrastructure for a shared society.

Each sandbox is limited in scope, reversible if it fails, and designed to generate evidence rather than provoke confrontation. The goal is not to resolve the Boundary Deficit in one domain but to demonstrate that resolution is possible—that civil marriage does not destroy Jewish identity, that Shabbat transport does not tear the social fabric, that shared education does not erase communal distinctiveness. The evidence accumulates. The constituencies for reform grow. The immune system adapts to the presence of alternatives that were previously unimaginable.

Cross-Community Deliberative Pilots. Citizens' assemblies at the municipal or regional level, bringing together Jews and Arabs, secular and religious, left and right, to deliberate on concrete local challenges—housing, infrastructure, environmental management, public safety—would build the habits of cross-boundary cooperation that national politics currently suppresses. These assemblies would not address constitutional questions directly. They would address practical problems that require practical solutions, and in doing so, they would create relationships and trust across the boundaries that the national political system deepens. The model is not dialogue for its own sake—skepticism about dialogue is well-founded in the Israeli context—but collaborative problem-solving on issues where interests align, even when identities diverge.

These experiments are safe to fail. A municipal constitutional laboratory that produces gridlock or backlash teaches lessons without destabilizing the national architecture. A sandbox that fails to generate public acceptance can be closed without political crisis. A deliberative pilot that cannot bridge communal divides provides data on the conditions under which bridging is possible—and the conditions under which it is not. The transition architecture does not depend on any single pilot succeeding. It depends on creating a portfolio of experiments, across different domains and different scales, whose collective weight shifts the perception of what is possible.

5.4 Scaling by Attraction: The Israeli Way

Israel's governance transformation, when it comes, will not be driven by central mandate. The coalition veto cascade ensures that no central mandate for comprehensive reform can be assembled. It will be driven by the diffusion of proven innovations from successful pilots, through horizontal learning, competitive emulation, and the mobility of talent and ideas that characterize Israeli society.

Scaling by attraction means that the state's role is not to compel adoption but to enable, fund, protect, and celebrate successful experiments—and then to get out of the way. A municipality that successfully implements a citizens' assembly on local governance becomes a demonstration site, hosting visits from other municipalities, sharing methodologies, training personnel. A sandbox that demonstrates the viability of civil marriage at the local level creates a template that other municipalities can adopt, building political pressure for national legislation. A shared industrial zone that generates employment for both Israelis and Palestinians attracts investment and imitation, creating economic constituencies for cooperation.

This is the logic of the Startup Nation, applied to governance. The tech sector did not develop because the government planned it. It developed because entrepreneurs experimented, venture capitalists invested, successful startups attracted talent and capital, and the ecosystem scaled through networks, reputation, and competitive emulation. The same logic can be applied to governance innovation. The government's role is to create the conditions for experimentation—funding, regulatory flexibility, protection from immune system attack—and to allow the evidence of success to do the persuasive work.

The competitive dynamic is culturally congruent. Israeli municipalities already compete for residents, investment, and prestige. A city that offers innovative governance—participatory budgeting, efficient service delivery, creative approaches to diversity—attracts the young, educated population that drives economic growth. A region that builds functional cross-community governance attracts investment that political fragmentation repels. The competition for talent and capital, which already drives innovation in the tech sector, can be harnessed to drive innovation in the governance sector.

The role of the center in this architecture is essential but circumscribed. It enables, by creating the statutory frameworks that authorize municipal laboratories, sectoral sandboxes, and deliberative pilots. It invests, by providing dedicated funding streams that are insulated from coalition politics—perhaps through an independent "Israel Governance Innovation Fund" modeled on the Israel Innovation Authority that has successfully supported the tech sector. It protects, by establishing the legal immunities that allow experimental programmes to operate without being immediately challenged in the courts or shut down by ministerial intervention. And it gets out of the way—resisting the temptation to standardize, to mandate, to convert the emergent diversity of local experimentation into a uniform national programme before the evidence of what works has been generated.

5.5 The Role of the International Community: Support Without Imposition

Israel's relationship with the international community is deeply ambivalent—a history of diplomatic isolation, UN resolutions perceived as biased, and the traumatic memory of the world's failure during the Holocaust have produced a profound skepticism toward external pressure. Any transition architecture that is perceived as imposed by foreign powers will be rejected by the immune system regardless of its merits. The international community's role is therefore not to dictate outcomes but to support the domestic constituencies working toward boundary resolution—financially, diplomatically, and through the provision of neutral spaces for dialogue that the domestic political system cannot provide.

Financial Support Without Conditionality. The international community can fund the Israel Governance Innovation Fund, the municipal laboratories, the deliberative pilots, and the shared civic infrastructure without attaching policy conditions that would trigger the immune response. The support is for democratic experimentation, not for specific outcomes. The credibility of the support depends on its genuine neutrality—funding available to all municipalities, all experiments, regardless of their political orientation, as long as they meet basic standards of democratic process and transparency.

Diplomatic Frameworks That Enable Rather Than Constrain. The Abraham Accords demonstrated that diplomatic progress is possible when it is framed as normalization and opportunity rather than as pressure and concession. The international community can build on this model—creating diplomatic frameworks that reward steps toward boundary resolution with enhanced integration into regional and global institutions, without demanding specific concessions as preconditions. The goal is to make resolution attractive rather than to make the status quo costly.

Neutral Spaces for Dialogue. The domestic political system is incapable of hosting the kind of open-ended, exploratory dialogue that boundary resolution requires. The coalition veto cascade, the media environment, and the cultural operating system all militate against the kind of conversations that could generate new possibilities. The international community can provide neutral spaces—conferences, working groups, Track II diplomacy, academic exchanges—where Israelis and Palestinians, secular and religious, left and right can engage with each other and with international expertise on constitutional design, post-conflict governance, and democratic institution-building. These are not negotiations. They are explorations, conducted away from the pressure of domestic politics, generating ideas that can be fed back into the domestic conversation.

The international community's role is to be a supportive partner in Israel's own process of constitutional completion—not a judge, not a prosecutor, not a savior. The resources exist. The institutions exist. The adaptive capacity exists. What Israel needs from the world is not pressure but patience, not isolation but integration, and the recognition that the completion of its governance architecture is a project that only Israelis can undertake—but that the whole world has a stake in its success.

5.6 The Generational Horizon

The honest assessment this report must offer is that boundary resolution in Israel is a generational project. The Security First Responder will not be dismantled in one administration, or two, or three. The constitutional vacuum will not be filled in a single constitutional moment. The occupation will not be resolved by a single peace agreement. The religion-state nexus will not be reformed by a single Basic Law. The demographic pressures will intensify for decades regardless of policy choices. The cultural operating system will not be rewritten by a single deliberative process.

This is not a counsel of despair. It is a recognition of the scale of the challenge, and a warning against the cycle of unrealistic hope followed by disillusionment that has characterized so much engagement with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The transition architecture this report proposes is not a promise of rapid transformation. It is a framework for sustained, cumulative progress—a direction of travel, not a destination.

Each Basic Law enacted with supermajority support establishes a constitutional floor that was not there before. Each municipal laboratory that demonstrates functional governance across communal boundaries creates a model that can be replicated. Each deliberative process that generates legitimate public judgment on

a question the political system could not answer builds the democratic capacity for further deliberation. Each young Israeli who experiences an institution that bridges rather than deepens divisions carries that expectation into their future engagement with the state.

The countries examined in this series that successfully built governance substrate and resolved constitutional questions did so over generations. The European states whose institutional architecture is now taken for granted developed their constitutions, their bureaucratic capacity, and their democratic norms through processes that took centuries and were punctuated by wars, revolutions, and collapses. Israel does not have centuries—the threats it faces are too acute, the regional environment too volatile, the demographic clock too advanced. But it also does not need to start from scratch. The constitutional infrastructure is partially built. The democratic culture is vibrant. The adaptive capacity is extraordinary. The task is to direct that capacity toward the completion of the architecture that the founders, under conditions far more desperate than those that obtain today, were unable to finish.

The timeline is long. The work is urgent. And it can begin now—not with a grand bargain that is currently impossible, but with the concrete, incremental steps that are possible: a Basic Law here, a municipal experiment there, a deliberative process on this question, a sandbox on that one. Each step is modest. Their accumulation over time is transformative. The transition architecture is not a plan. It is a pathway. And the first steps are already within reach.

6. A Concrete First Step: The Basic Law: Equality and the National Deliberative Commission on Constitutional Settlement

6.1 The Logic of the First Step

The Boundary Deficit is a systemic condition, not a single policy failure. There is no one reform that can complete Israel's governance architecture, no single legislative act that will resolve the constitutional vacuum, end the occupation, settle the religion-state relationship, and define the state's identity. But there are reforms that can alter the institutional metabolism—that can change the conditions under which all other decisions are made, and in doing so, create the possibility for the deeper transformations that must follow.

The first step is therefore not the most ambitious intervention this report has described. It is the most catalytic: the intervention that targets the master mechanisms of the Boundary Deficit most directly, that is institutionally feasible within the current architecture, and that, once established, generates the information, the legitimacy, and the political logic that make further boundary resolution possible.

Two parallel institutional innovations meet these criteria. A Basic Law: Equality would establish a constitutional floor beneath which the political process cannot sink—entrenching the equal rights of all citizens regardless of religion, ethnicity, or gender, with a supermajority amendment requirement. A National Deliberative Commission on Constitutional Settlement would create a parallel pathway for generating legitimate public mandates on the questions the political system cannot answer, bypassing the coalition veto cascade through the direct engagement of citizens. Together, they target the two master mechanisms of the Boundary Deficit: the constitutional vacuum that leaves rights unprotected and authority contested, and the coalition fragmentation that prevents the political system from resolving the foundational questions that the vacuum leaves open.

6.2 The Basic Law: Equality — Establishing the Constitutional Floor

The constitutional vacuum means that individual rights in Israel are protected, if at all, by ordinary legislation, judicial precedent, and the contested authority of the Supreme Court. The Basic Law: Human Dignity and Liberty, enacted in 1992, provides partial protection, but it does not explicitly guarantee equality, it does not protect language rights, and it can be limited by ordinary legislation that meets certain conditions. The Basic Law: Israel as the Nation-State of the Jewish People, enacted in 2018, declared that the right to national self-determination is unique to the Jewish people and downgraded Arabic from an official language—a constitutional statement that, whatever its intention, has been experienced by Arab citizens and by the international community as a formalization of second-class status. The result is a constitutional architecture that provides no stable, enforceable guarantee of equality for all citizens, and that leaves the rights of minorities dependent on the outcome of each election.

A Basic Law: Equality would address this gap directly. It would declare, in language that commands the supermajority support required for enactment, that all citizens of the State of Israel, regardless of religion, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation, possess equal rights and equal standing before the law. It would entrench this declaration with a supermajority amendment requirement—two-thirds of the Knesset, or a majority in two successive Knessets—so that the guarantee cannot be revoked by a temporary majority. It would provide the Supreme Court with an explicit constitutional basis, not a contested one, for protecting individual rights and striking down discriminatory legislation. And it would establish, in the Basic Laws that are the closest thing Israel has to a constitution, a clear statement of the civic equality that the Declaration of Independence promised and that the constitutional vacuum has left unfulfilled.

The Basic Law would not resolve the tension between Jewish and democratic identity. The Nation-State Law would remain in the Basic Laws alongside it, and the tension between them would be productive rather than destructive—a constitutional dialogue that the Supreme Court would be authorized to adjudicate, rather than a political conflict with no institutional resolution. The Basic Law would not address the occupation, the religion-state nexus, or the borders of the state. It would do something more fundamental: it would establish that whatever else Israel is—Jewish state, security state, unfinished project—it is also a state of equal citizens, and the rights of those citizens are not negotiable by majority vote.

The political obstacles are real. The Nation-State Law was enacted with the support of a right-wing majority that regards the prioritization of Jewish national identity as essential to the state's character. The current coalition includes parties that are deeply skeptical of Supreme Court authority and that would resist any expansion of the Court's constitutional role. The very concept of equality, applied to Arab citizens, is contested by those who see Israel as the state of the Jewish people alone.

But the Basic Law: Equality is not a radical proposal. It restates commitments that the Declaration of Independence made in 1948: that the state "will ensure complete equality of social and political rights to all its inhabitants irrespective of religion, race or sex." It is consistent with the Basic Law: Human Dignity and Liberty, which the Supreme Court has interpreted, controversially, to include a dimension of equality. It aligns with international human rights standards that Israel has formally endorsed. And it commands broad public support: polling consistently shows that a majority of Israeli Jews support the principle of equal rights for all citizens, even as they disagree on the institutional mechanisms for achieving it.

The strategic framing is critical. The Basic Law: Equality should be presented not as a concession to external pressure but as the fulfillment of the state's founding commitments—the completion of a constitutional architecture that the founders intended to build but were unable to finish. It is an expression of

Tikun Olam

, the repair of the world, applied to the repair of the state. It is a demonstration that Israel can be both Jewish and democratic, that the two commitments can be constitutionally balanced rather than politically antagonized. And it is a signal to Israel's own Arab citizens, to the international community, and to history that the state's constitutional development is not frozen in permanent deferral but is capable of forward movement.

6.3 The National Deliberative Commission on Constitutional Settlement — Creating Legitimate Mandates Outside the Coalition Veto Cascade

The political system is structurally incapable of resolving the foundational questions at the heart of the Boundary Deficit. The coalition veto cascade ensures that any decision that threatens the interests of any significant faction will be blocked. The electoral system rewards positioning over deliberation. The cultural operating system converts political questions into existential confrontations. The result is a permanent incapacity to address the questions that any completed governance architecture must answer: the relationship between religion and state, the status of the occupied territories, the balance between Jewish and democratic identity, the framework for protecting minority rights, the distribution of power among branches of government.

What is missing is a mechanism for generating legitimate, considered public judgment on these questions outside the political system's paralyzed institutions. A National Deliberative Commission on Constitutional Settlement would fill this gap—not by replacing representative democracy but by supplementing it with a channel for citizen deliberation that bypasses the pathologies of the coalition system and produces mandates that derive their legitimacy from the direct engagement of the people rather than the bargaining of political elites.

The Commission would be a standing citizens' assembly, convened periodically to deliberate on a defined constitutional question. Its members would be randomly selected from the population, demographically representative of Israeli society across all relevant dimensions: Jews and Arabs, secular and religious, Ashkenazi and Mizrahi, left and right, center and periphery, women and men, young and old. They would be compensated for their time, provided with expert testimony from constitutional scholars, historians, security professionals, and community representatives, and facilitated by professional deliberative practitioners. Their deliberations would be transparent, their reasoning public, and their recommendations issued in their own words.

The Commission's recommendations would be non-binding. They would not override the authority of the Knesset or the government. They would, however, carry a democratic legitimacy that derives not from the authority of office but from the authenticity of citizen deliberation—a legitimacy that would make the recommendations politically costly to ignore. A government that dismissed a recommendation supported by a representative cross-section of its own citizens, arrived at through informed deliberation, would bear a burden of explanation that the current system, in which every decision is blocked before it can be made, never imposes.

The Commission would address the questions the political system cannot. Its first mandate might be the religion-state relationship: what should be the framework for marriage, divorce, conversion, and Sabbath observance in a state that is both Jewish and democratic? A subsequent mandate might address the territorial question: what should be the long-term status of the West Bank, and what security arrangements would be

required to protect Israel under various possible configurations? Another might address the constitutional architecture: what should be the authority of the Supreme Court, and how should it be balanced against the authority of the Knesset?

The Commission would not need to reach consensus. It would report the distribution of opinion, the reasoning behind different positions, and, where agreement emerged, the terms of that agreement. The goal is not to impose a single answer but to make visible what Israelis actually think when they deliberate rather than react—to replace the caricatures of public opinion generated by social media and electoral campaigns with a textured understanding of what compromises the public might accept and what boundaries it regards as non-negotiable.

The model is the Irish citizens' assemblies, which addressed questions of marriage equality, abortion, and climate policy—questions that had been politically frozen for decades—and produced recommendations that unlocked legislative action and commanded broad public legitimacy. The Irish experience does not translate directly to Israel; the Israeli context is more polarized, the security dimension more acute, and the Covenant Consciousness that sacralizes identity questions has no Irish equivalent. But the mechanism is transferable: citizens, given time, information, and facilitation, are capable of nuanced engagement with questions that political elites find impossible to address, and their engagement can change the political conditions within which those elites operate.

The Commission would be established by Basic Law, with statutory independence, secure funding, and protection from political interference. Its membership selection would be administered by an independent body. Its expert testimony would be balanced and transparent. Its deliberations would be public. Its recommendations would require formal government response within a specified period—not adoption, but explanation. And its existence, over time, would create a parallel democratic institution, operating alongside the Knesset, generating the legitimate public mandates that the elected branch is structurally incapable of producing.

6.4 Selection Criteria: Why These Two?

The Basic Law: Equality and the National Deliberative Commission are not selected at random from the menu of interventions described in previous sections. They are selected because they meet the criteria that a first step must meet to be catalytic.

First, they target the master mechanisms of the Boundary Deficit directly. The Basic Law targets the constitutional vacuum—establishing, for the first time, an entrenched constitutional floor for individual rights that cannot be removed by simple majority. The Deliberative Commission targets the coalition veto cascade—creating a parallel pathway for generating legitimate mandates on the questions the political system cannot address. Both operate upstream of the specific policy disputes that occupy daily political life. Both change the conditions under which all subsequent decisions are made rather than attempting to make the decisions themselves.

Second, they are institutionally feasible within the current architecture. The Basic Law: Equality requires a supermajority, which is a high bar but not an impossible one; it draws on the Declaration of Independence's founding commitments and commands broad public support. The Deliberative Commission can be established by ordinary legislation, as its recommendations are non-binding; it does not require constitutional amendment, and it does not threaten the formal authority of the Knesset. Both can be championed by reformist elements across the political spectrum—the Basic Law by those who wish to restore Israel's democratic legitimacy, the Commission by those who seek a way out of the permanent paralysis that the coalition system imposes.

Third, they generate feedback that enables further reform. The Basic Law: Equality, once enacted, provides the constitutional foundation for subsequent boundary resolutions—a settled framework within which the questions of religion, territory, and identity can be negotiated. The Deliberative Commission, once established, produces a stream of legitimate public mandates on questions that have been frozen for decades—mandates that create political space for leaders who wish to act, and political pressure on those who wish to maintain the status quo. Together, they create the constitutional and political conditions for the deeper transformations that the report has described: the incremental Basic Laws that would build out the constitutional framework, the electoral reforms that would reduce the coalition veto cascade, the security-civilian boundary protocols, the occupation exit strategy, and the civic integration infrastructure.

6.5 How to Measure Success

The first step will be resisted, diluted, and potentially neutralized by the Security First Responder. Measuring its success therefore requires metrics that capture not only whether the institutions are formally established but whether they are functioning as designed—whether they are actually changing the system's metabolism rather than being absorbed by it.

For the Basic Law: Equality, the relevant metrics include: enactment with genuine supermajority support, indicating cross-factional legitimacy rather than narrow majority imposition; the rate at which the Supreme Court invokes the Basic Law in its jurisprudence, indicating that it has become a living constitutional instrument; the rate at which discriminatory legislation is withdrawn, amended, or struck down after enactment; and the public legitimacy of the Basic Law as measured by opinion surveys over time, particularly across different communal groups. The process metric is as important as the outcome metric. If the Basic Law is enacted by a narrow majority and immediately becomes a source of constitutional conflict rather than constitutional settlement, it has not fulfilled its purpose. If it commands broad support and becomes a taken-for-granted part of the constitutional landscape, it has succeeded.

For the National Deliberative Commission, the relevant metrics include: the completion of its first deliberation cycle on schedule, with high participant satisfaction and public credibility; the quality, accessibility, and public reach of its recommendations; the rate at which government and Knesset engage substantively with its findings; the degree to which its recommendations influence public discourse and policy development; and the evolution of public trust in the Commission as an institution, measured through

opinion surveys. The Commission cannot compel action. It can only make informed public judgment visible, and thereby make the evasion of that judgment politically costly. Success is measured by whether the evasion becomes more costly over time—whether politicians who ignore the Commission's recommendations face an electoral penalty that currently does not exist.

The ultimate metric is whether the first step enables the second. Does the Basic Law: Equality establish a constitutional foundation on which subsequent Basic Laws can build? Does the Deliberative Commission generate mandates that the political system eventually implements, demonstrating that the coalition veto cascade is not an absolute barrier but a condition that alternative democratic institutions can overcome? If the answer is yes, the first step has succeeded, and the ground is prepared for the constitutional kaizen, the security detox, the electoral reform, and the occupation exit strategy that constitute the transition architecture's fuller ambition. If the answer is no—if the Basic Law is enacted and ignored, if the Commission's recommendations are published and dismissed—then the Boundary Deficit has claimed another reform, and the loop continues. The honesty of the framework requires acknowledging that this outcome is possible, even likely, without sustained political leadership and mobilized public demand. The first step is not a guarantee. It is a wager—on the capacity of constitutional entrenchment and citizen deliberation to outflank the Security First Responder, and on the existence of sufficient democratic energy within Israeli society to seize the opening that the first step creates.

7. Coda: The Resilience Paradox

7.1 The Wealth That Matters

Israel is rich in the things that most societies have forgotten how to value. The capacity to mobilize an entire nation in hours, not weeks—reservists reporting for duty before they are called, civil society organizing logistics while the government is still convening emergency meetings. The improvisational genius that turns a military intelligence unit into a feeder for a globally dominant tech sector, that builds air defense systems under rocket fire, that absorbs immigrants from a hundred countries and converts them, within a generation, into a functioning citizenry. The covenantal depth that makes the state not merely an administrative apparatus but a vessel of meaning, a fulfillment of history, a reason for sacrifice that transcends the ordinary calculations of cost and benefit. The ethical self-critique that sustains a Supreme Court willing to rule against the security establishment, a free press willing to expose government failures, a protest movement willing to fill the streets for thirty-six weeks to defend the independence of judges.

These are not small assets. They are the hardest things to build and the easiest to destroy. They are the reason Israel has survived—has thrived—under conditions that would have shattered less resilient societies. The post-1948 achievement is not merely that a state was established but that a state was built that could absorb existential shocks, innovate under pressure, and maintain democratic institutions through wars, terrorism, and internal divisions that would have collapsed most regimes. The survival architecture is a genuine civilizational accomplishment.

But the wealth that matters for Israel's next phase is not only the capacity to survive. It is the capacity to complete the architecture that survival was meant to enable. The founders deferred the constitution because they were fighting for the right to exist. They succeeded. The state exists. It is secure in ways that would have been unimaginable to the generation of 1948—peace agreements with major Arab powers, military capacities that dominate the region, the demonstrated ability to defend against the most intense attacks ever mounted against it. The question now is not whether Israel can survive. It has answered that question. The question is whether it can build the governance architecture that makes survival worth sustaining—the constitutional order, the defined borders, the settled identity, the protections for all citizens, the normal democratic life that the survival machine was created to defend.

Israel has mastered the art of resilience. The frontier is normalcy—not the absence of threat, but the presence of institutions that allow threat to be one dimension of national life rather than its organizing principle. The Boundary Deficit is not a permanent condition. It is an unfinished project. And the resources to finish it are already present, in the same adaptive genius that built the state against all odds.

7.2 The Shift

The shift this report describes is not a shift in policy. It is a shift in the relationship between the state and its own unfinished architecture—from a posture of permanent deferral to a posture of incremental completion.

The Harari Resolution of 1950 was a brilliant act of pragmatic postponement. The founders, unable to agree on the relationship between religion and state, decided to write the constitution in chapters, each chapter a Basic Law, trusting that future generations would complete the work. The postponement was necessary. The state was new, the threats were immediate, and the divisions were deep. Seventy-five years later, the necessity that justified postponement has become the architecture of permanent incompletion. The chapters have been written, but the book remains unfinished. The deferral has become a structural vulnerability—the constitutional vacuum, the coalition veto cascade, the Emergency Ratchet, the epistemic closure, the Boundary Deficit itself.

The shift is from deferral to completion—not all at once, not in a single constitutional moment, but incrementally, chapter by chapter, Basic Law by Basic Law, deliberative mandate by deliberative mandate, municipal experiment by municipal experiment. Each step is modest. The accumulation of steps over time is transformative. A Basic Law: Equality establishes a constitutional floor. A Deliberative Commission generates legitimate mandates. A municipal laboratory demonstrates that governance across communal boundaries is possible. A security-civilian boundary protocol restores a measure of democratic oversight. Each step strengthens the capacity for the next. Each step builds the institutional infrastructure for settlement.

This is not a retreat from Israel's identity as a Jewish state, a security state, or a state with a unique historical mission. It is the fulfillment of the promise that the founders made in the Declaration of Independence: that the state would be founded on "freedom, justice, and peace as envisaged by the prophets of Israel," that it would "ensure complete equality of social and political rights to all its inhabitants," and that it would adopt a constitution. These commitments are not foreign impositions. They are Israel's own founding promises, deferred but not abandoned. Completing the architecture is an act of fidelity to the founders' vision, not a repudiation of it—the conviction that the state they built to secure survival can now be completed to enable flourishing.

7.3 The Global Significance

Israel is not merely a case study in this series. It is the extreme case of a dynamic that is emerging, in less intense forms, across the democratic world.

The permanent securitization of politics—the expansion of emergency powers that never retract, the colonization of civilian governance by security logic, the treatment of political opponents as existential threats—is not unique to Israel. It is visible in the counterterrorism legislation of European states, in the surveillance architectures of the United States, in the border militarization of multiple democracies, in the framing of migration as a security crisis rather than a governance challenge. Israel is the limiting case: the

democracy that has lived under the most intense security pressure for the longest time, and that has developed the most sophisticated architecture for managing that pressure. What happens in Israel—whether the Emergency Ratchet can be reversed, whether the constitutional vacuum can be filled, whether the boundaries between security and democracy can be stabilized—will shape the imagination of what is possible in other democracies facing their own versions of the same dynamic.

The fragmentation of collective identity—the coexistence of ontologically incompatible worldviews within the same political arena, the absence of a translation layer that allows them to coexist, the transformation of every election into an existential confrontation—is also not unique to Israel. It is the defining political condition of the early twenty-first century, visible in the culture wars of the United States, the populist-nationalist revolts in Europe, the religious-secular confrontations across the Middle East and South Asia. Israel, with its extreme diversity compressed into a tiny territory under permanent threat, is the most intense expression of this condition. If Israel can develop a Yellow translation layer—an architecture that accommodates different worldviews without demanding that any of them surrender their identity—it would provide a model for other deeply divided societies. If it cannot, it warns that ontological stacking without integration is a recipe for permanent crisis.

The Boundary Deficit is, in the end, the governance challenge of modernity itself. Every society must determine its borders, its citizenship criteria, its constitutional framework, and its identity. Most settled these questions through processes of violent conflict, constitutional convention, or gradual evolution that are now taken for granted. Israel is the society that has most conspicuously failed to settle them—and that must now do so under conditions of extreme diversity, permanent threat, and deep historical trauma. Its success or failure will be watched closely by every society that faces the same questions under less intense but structurally similar conditions. Israel is not an exception. It is a laboratory. And the results of its experiment will echo far beyond its borders.

7.4 The Honest Conclusion

This report has described a deficit and proposed a transition architecture. It must now offer an honest conclusion about the prospects for completion.

Israel's trajectory, under current conditions, is toward continued oscillation between threat-driven cohesion and internally-driven fragmentation. The Security First Responder will resist any reform that threatens its preeminence. The coalition veto cascade will block any decision that threatens the interests of any significant faction. The Emergency Ratchet will continue to expand security powers with each crisis. The Deferral Compounding Effect will make each deferred decision more costly and more necessary to defer. The demographic pressures will intensify, shifting the political center of gravity toward populations least invested in the secular democratic model. The epistemic closure will ensure that the system remains blind to the costs of its own trajectory until those costs become crises.

The default outcome is not transformation but deterioration—the slow, uneven, crisis-punctuated erosion of democratic institutions under permanent emergency, the progressive entrenchment of the occupation, the deepening of internal divisions, and the gradual loss of the international legitimacy and domestic cohesion on which Israel's long-term survival depends. This is not a prediction of collapse. Israel's adaptive capacity is extraordinary, and it has repeatedly defied predictions of its demise. But resilience that prevents collapse is not the same as governance that enables flourishing. A system can survive for decades while its foundations erode, its institutions hollow, and its future narrows. The Continuity Trap diagnosed in Japan, the Substrate Deficit diagnosed in Nigeria—these are conditions of slow erosion, not sudden failure. Israel is entering its own version of this condition: a Resilience Paradox in which the very capacities that enable survival also prevent the settlement that would make survival sustainable.

But default outcomes are not inevitable outcomes. The Israeli governance tradition contains within itself the resources for its own completion. The *Tikun Olam* ethical drive that sustains the human rights organizations and the protest movements. The *Balagan* improvisational genius that turns constraints into innovations. The democratic culture that filled the streets for thirty-six weeks to defend the independence of judges. The security establishment's own professionalism, which has repeatedly demonstrated that it can adapt to new strategic realities when leadership demands it. The diaspora's deep investment in Israel's future, which could be mobilized for boundary resolution as it has been mobilized for survival. And the younger generation of Israelis—secular and religious, Jewish and Arab—who are already building the shared civic spaces that the political system denies.

The transition architecture this report proposes is not a guarantee of success. It is a framework for increasing the probability that the adaptive genius of Israeli society can be directed toward the completion of its governance architecture, rather than being consumed by the endless management of the threats that the incompleteness generates. It is a wager on the existence of sufficient democratic energy, institutional capacity, and strategic foresight within the Israeli system to recognize that the greatest long-term threat is not external attack but internal erosion—and to act on that recognition before the capacity for action is consumed by the next cycle of the loop.

The wager may fail. The Security First Responder may neutralize every reform. The coalition veto cascade may block every initiative. The Constitutional Commission may produce recommendations that are ignored. The Basic Law: Equality may be defeated or diluted beyond meaning. The Boundary Deficit may persist, deepen, and eventually produce the cascading crisis that Israel's resilience has so far prevented.

But the wager is worth making, because the alternative is not stability—it is the slow consumption of the future by the present, the permanent postponement of a normal life that the founders assumed would follow survival, the quiet suffering of Israelis who deserve a state that is not merely a survival machine but a home. The framework can specify what needs to change, and how. It cannot specify when or whether the political will to change will emerge. It can only make the case that change is possible, that the resources for it exist,

and that the cost of deferring it rises with each cycle of the Threat–Mobilization–Securitization–Fragmentation loop. The founders deferred the constitution because survival was at stake. Survival has been achieved. The task now is to complete the architecture that survival was meant to serve.

7.5 A Final Word

The state of Israel was built by people who refused to accept that the conditions for sovereignty would never arrive. They declared independence in the midst of war. They absorbed millions of immigrants while fighting for their borders. They built institutions under fire, wrote laws between battles, and sustained democracy through threats that would have extinguished it elsewhere. They deferred the constitution not because it was unimportant but because survival consumed all available energy. They trusted that future generations would complete what they had begun.

Those future generations are now. The survival architecture has succeeded. The state exists, it is secure, and it possesses capacities that the founders could not have imagined. What it does not yet possess is the governance architecture that converts survival into normalcy—the constitutional framework, the settled borders, the defined identity, the protected rights, the institutional mechanisms for resolving disagreements without existential confrontation. The Boundary Deficit is the unfinished business of the founding. Completing it is the task of the present.

The task is not to abandon the *Ein Breira* mentality that has kept Israel alive. It is to recognize that *Ein Breira* has succeeded—that survival, while never guaranteed, is no longer the hourly emergency it was in 1948 or 1967 or 1973—and that the next phase of national development requires capacities that the survival architecture alone cannot provide. The task is not to repudiate Covenant Consciousness but to express it in constitutional form—to build a state that is faithful to its founding promises, that protects the rights of all its citizens, that defines its borders and settles its identity, and that demonstrates to the world that a Jewish state can be both secure and just, both particular and universal, both ancient and modern.

The task is not to weaken Israel's security but to strengthen its democracy—to build the institutional foundations that make security sustainable across generations, that prevent the Emergency Ratchet from consuming the democratic order it was created to defend, and that ensure that the state that was built to protect the Jewish people also protects the rights of all its citizens.

The founders wrote the first chapters. They trusted that others would write the rest. The chapters remain unwritten. The book remains incomplete. The authors are alive, they are capable, and they have everything they need to finish the work. The question is whether they will—whether the society that mastered survival can now master settlement, whether the state that defied the odds to exist can now defy the inertia that prevents its completion, and whether the adaptive genius that built the Startup Nation and the world's most resilient democracy can now be directed toward the greatest challenge it has ever faced: finishing what the founders started, and building a state that is worthy of the people who sacrificed everything to create it.

Appendix A: Value Systems and Policy Mindsets — A Guide for the Israeli Context

A Note on This Appendix

The main body of this report avoids specialised terminology from developmental psychology or cultural theory. It speaks the language of governance architecture, the Boundary Deficit, and the Threat–Mobilization–Securitization–Fragmentation Loop. This appendix offers a complementary lens for readers who wish to understand the deeper value-system dynamics at play in Israeli governance. It is optional, but it makes the report's underlying logic fully transparent.

A.1 The Basic Insight

Different institutions and political cultures tend to operate from different centres of gravity in how they think about governance, resources, and change. These are not personality types or party affiliations, though they correlate loosely with both. They are underlying value systems—ways of constructing what feels real, legitimate, and important.

Each value system represents a coherent response to particular life conditions. None is "better" in any absolute sense. Each has characteristic strengths that emerge under certain conditions and characteristic blind spots that emerge under others. The challenge of governance in a complex society is to integrate the legitimate concerns of multiple value systems without being captured by any single one.

The framework used here draws on Spiral Dynamics integral theory. What follows is a simplified map of the systems most relevant to contemporary Israeli governance.

A.2 The Value Systems in the Israeli Arena

Power and Survival (sometimes called "Red") — the Security First Responder and the Frontier Ethos. In the Israeli context, this mindset expresses itself through the security establishment's preeminence, the *Ein Breira* mentality that treats survival as the overriding imperative, and the frontier ethos visible in the settler movement's assertion of control over contested territory. Strengths: rapid mobilization, decisive action under threat, the capacity to project power and maintain deterrence, and an existential seriousness that prevents strategic complacency. Blind spots: the Emergency Ratchet that progressively securitizes civilian governance, the treatment of political questions as military ones, and the difficulty of transitioning from survival mode to normal democratic deliberation. The Security First Responder described in the report is the institutional expression of this mindset operating without sufficient integration from other value systems.

Order and Stability (sometimes called "Blue") — the Constitutional and Bureaucratic State. Israel possesses many of the formal attributes of a Blue state: a legal system, a civil service, a judiciary, and the beginnings of a constitutional framework through the Basic Laws. But the architecture is incomplete—no formal constitution, contested judicial authority, and a legal system that applies differently to different populations. Strengths: a functioning bureaucracy, an independent judiciary that has constrained executive overreach, and the rule of law as a widely shared aspiration. Blind spots: the constitutional vacuum that leaves fundamental questions unresolved, the occupation's separate legal regime that undermines the universality of law, and the vulnerability of Blue institutions to capture by Red power dynamics when elite consensus fractures. The Boundary Deficit is, from a Spiral Dynamics perspective, the failure to complete the Blue foundation—the predictable rules, the settled constitutional order, the uniform application of law—on which higher-order governance capacities depend.

Achievement and Efficiency (sometimes called "Orange") — the Startup Nation and the Innovation Ecosystem. Israel's technology sector, its entrepreneurial culture, and its economic integration into global markets are expressions of an Orange value system that values innovation, competitiveness, and measurable outcomes. This is the Israel of the tech hubs in Tel Aviv and Herzliya, of the venture capital funds and the NASDAQ listings, of the universities and research institutes that rank among the world's best. Strengths: extraordinary adaptive capacity, global orientation, and a pragmatic problem-solving ethos that drives continuous improvement. Blind spots: the Innovation–Governance Split—the same society that builds world-class technology cannot translate that capacity into governance reform—and the Shifting the Burden dynamic in which the private sector routes around a gridlocked state, reducing pressure for political reform.

Inclusion and Care (sometimes called "Green") — the Civil Society and Human Rights Tradition. Israel's vibrant civil society, its human rights organizations, its protest movements, and its independent judiciary are expressions of a Green value system that prioritises rights, inclusion, and ethical responsibility. The *Tikun Olam* tradition—the imperative to repair the world—is the cultural foundation of this mindset. Strengths: deep commitment to justice, a willingness to engage in self-critique, and the mobilization of citizens in defense of democratic institutions. Blind spots: the fragmentation of Green energy across multiple, sometimes competing organizations; the difficulty of building political coalitions that can translate ethical commitment into electoral power; and the tension between universalistic Green values and the particularistic Covenant Consciousness that defines the state's identity.

Integrative and Systemic (sometimes called "Yellow") — the Missing Translation Layer. This mindset prioritises functional fit, systemic awareness, and the capacity to integrate multiple perspectives without being captured by any of them. In Israel, it is present in pockets—the systems thinking of certain strategic planners, the integrative vision of some peace-building organizations, the holistic approach of the handful of institutions that work across the Jewish-Arab divide—but it is not institutionalised. The Ontological Stacking described in the report—Tel Aviv's Orange/Green globalism, Jerusalem's Blue/Purple traditionalism, the West Bank's Red/Blue survivalism—lacks a Yellow translation layer capable of accommodating these incompatible worldviews within a shared framework. The transition architecture proposed in this report—

constitutional kaizen, deliberative infrastructure, civic integration experiments—is designed to embed Yellow mechanisms within the existing configuration, creating the integration capacity that the architecture currently lacks.

A.3 The Boundary Deficit as a Value-System Configuration Problem

The Israeli governance system is dominated by an unstable configuration of Red, Blue, Orange, and Green that has never achieved the integration required for constitutional settlement. Red security logic dominates the architecture, colonizing domains that are properly matters of Blue law or Green deliberation. Blue constitutional development remains incomplete, leaving the system without an authoritative framework for resolving disputes. Orange innovation flourishes in the private sector but is disconnected from governance reform. Green ethical energy sustains civil society but cannot translate into constitutional completion. And the Yellow integrative capacity that could connect these systems is present only in fragments.

The Boundary Deficit is, in Spiral Dynamics terms, the absence of a completed Blue foundation and the absence of a Yellow translation layer that would allow the system's competing value systems to coexist within a shared constitutional framework. Building that foundation and that layer is the central governance challenge Israel faces. It cannot be achieved by imposing a single value system on the others—that would trigger the immune response. It must be achieved by strengthening the Blue constitutional architecture incrementally, creating the Yellow deliberative and integrative mechanisms that allow competing worldviews to negotiate rather than confront, and channelling the Red survival energy and the Green ethical energy toward the completion of the architecture that the founders left unfinished.

Appendix B: International Analogues and Precedents

The proposals in this report are not without precedent. The following examples illustrate existing implementations of constitutional settlement, security-civilian boundary stabilization, and deliberative democracy, with particular attention to contexts of deep societal division and post-conflict transitions.

B.1 Ireland: Citizens' Assemblies and Constitutional Transformation

Ireland's citizens' assemblies—on marriage equality, abortion, and climate change—are the world's most successful examples of deliberative democracy unlocking constitutional questions that the political system had been incapable of resolving. The assemblies brought together randomly selected citizens, provided them with expert information and professional facilitation, and produced recommendations that commanded broad public legitimacy and that were subsequently adopted through referendum. For Israel, the Irish experience provides a template for how a National Deliberative Commission on Constitutional Settlement could generate legitimate public mandates on questions the coalition system cannot address. The Irish assemblies did not resolve every disagreement; they created the conditions for democratic resolution, shifting the terms of debate and providing political cover for leaders who wished to act.

B.2 Northern Ireland: The Good Friday Agreement and Constitutional Ambiguity as Settlement

The 1998 Good Friday Agreement is the most relevant analogue for how societies with deep ontological divisions can achieve constitutional settlement without requiring either side to abandon its ultimate aspirations. The Agreement established a power-sharing architecture that accommodates both British unionist and Irish nationalist identities, with provisions for dual citizenship, cross-border institutions, and the principle that the constitutional status of Northern Ireland can change only through democratic consent. For Israel, Northern Ireland provides a model of how a constitutional settlement might address the tension between Jewish and democratic identity, the status of the territories, and the rights of minorities—not by resolving every question definitively but by establishing a framework within which different communities can coexist while maintaining their distinct identities and aspirations.

B.3 Germany: The Constructive Vote of No Confidence and Electoral Stability

Germany's Basic Law, drafted after the catastrophe of Nazism, incorporated several mechanisms designed to prevent the governmental instability that had contributed to the collapse of the Weimar Republic. The constructive vote of no confidence—requiring that a new government be formed before the old one can be dismissed—and the five percent electoral threshold for parliamentary representation have contributed to Germany's post-war political stability. For Israel, the German model provides a template for electoral reform that could reduce the coalition veto cascade without abandoning proportional representation. The

constructive vote of no confidence, in particular, would address one of the most destabilizing features of the Israeli system: the capacity of small coalition partners to bring down governments without providing an alternative.

B.4 South Africa: Constitutional Transition and the Protection of Minority Rights

South Africa's transition from apartheid to democracy, and the constitutional settlement that accompanied it, offers lessons in how deeply divided societies can negotiate constitutional frameworks that protect minorities while establishing majority rule. The South African Constitution's Bill of Rights, its protections for cultural and religious diversity, and its establishment of institutions like the Constitutional Court and the Human Rights Commission provide a model for constitutional design under conditions of extreme diversity and historical trauma. For Israel, the South African experience provides a template for how a Basic Law: Equality and subsequent constitutional development could protect the rights of all citizens—Jews and Arabs, secular and religious—while respecting the distinct identity and historical experience of the Jewish people.

B.5 Estonia: Digital Governance and Security Modernization

Estonia's e-governance infrastructure—digital identity, online voting, and seamless public services—was built alongside NATO membership and security modernization, demonstrating that digital transformation and security capacity can be developed simultaneously. For Israel, the Estonian experience provides a model for how technology can strengthen governance without weakening security, and for how a small state under threat can build the institutional infrastructure for a modern democratic order while maintaining the capacity to defend itself.

Appendix C: The Governance as Engineering Connection

C.1 The Architectural Foundation

This report draws on a deeper body of work: the Governance as Engineering series, a set of formal analyses that model governance institutions as feedback control systems using standard mathematics from control theory, information theory, and cybernetics. The series is technical; this appendix summarizes its core findings in non-technical language and shows how they underpin the Boundary Deficit diagnosis.

C.2 The Five Papers in Brief

Paper I — Governance Stability Simulator demonstrates that centralized governance systems operating on aggregated signals destroy spatial information. Israel's security architecture is, in many respects, highly centralized—the security cabinet, the IDF command, and the intelligence agencies make decisions based on aggregated threat assessments that can miss local dynamics and civilian perspectives. The municipal laboratories and deliberative infrastructure proposed in this report are designed to restore the distributed sensing that centralized security governance suppresses.

Paper II — Fractality as Stability demonstrates that no single-scale controller can stabilize a system facing simultaneous fast, medium, and slow disturbances. Israel faces disturbances across all three bands: fast security shocks (rocket attacks, terrorist incidents), medium political and social pressures (coalition crises, protest waves, economic fluctuations), and slow secular trends (demographic transformation, international legitimacy erosion, climate change). The current architecture is calibrated almost exclusively for fast security disturbances, leaving medium and slow disturbances systematically unaddressed. The National Resilience Commission, the Deliberative Commission, and the constitutional kaizen proposed in this report are designed to create the medium- and slow-band response capacity that the current architecture lacks.

Paper III — The Observability-Democracy Connection demonstrates that citizen preferences cannot be reliably transmitted through deep representation chains. Israel's representation chain is particularly attenuated: the coalition system filters citizen preferences through party bargaining, and the security establishment's epistemic closure filters out information that does not fit the security frame. The deliberative infrastructure and the civic integration experiments proposed in this report are designed to shorten the observation chain, connecting citizen preferences to governance decisions through channels that bypass the coalition veto cascade and the security filter.

Paper IV — Requisite Variety and the Commons demonstrates that governance systems with low-dimensional observation cannot stabilize high-variety resource systems. Israel's governance system has low observational variety—it measures physical security with extraordinary sophistication but is largely blind to constitutional erosion, moral injury, democratic legitimacy, and demographic transformation. The epistemic

closure described in the report is a specific instance of the low-dimensional observation that Paper IV diagnoses as a structural source of governance failure. The National Resilience Commission and the National Deliberative Commission are designed to increase the observational variety of the governance system, making visible the costs and dynamics that the current dashboard cannot see.

Paper V — The Coordination Failure Tax demonstrates that the four failure modes do not add—they multiply. Israel does not exhibit all four failure modes simultaneously, but it exhibits a specific interaction between the spatial blindness of centralized security governance, the frequency gap of a system calibrated only for fast disturbances, and the low observational variety of epistemic closure. The "tax" in Israel is the compounding cost of constitutional incompleteness under permanent emergency—each deferred decision makes the next deferral more costly, and each cycle of the loop erodes the institutional substrate slightly further.

C.3 The Boundary Deficit and Second-Order Governance Challenges

The Governance as Engineering series identifies the structural requirements for first-order governance—the conditions under which a governance system can execute, integrate, sense, and learn. Israel largely satisfies those requirements in the security domain but fails to satisfy them in the constitutional domain. The system can execute military operations with extraordinary precision. It cannot complete its own constitutional architecture. The Boundary Deficit is a second-order challenge: not a failure of the architecture to perform its basic functions, but a limitation on the architecture's capacity to resolve the foundational parameters that define its operating space.

In control-theoretic terms, the system has high *gain* in the security domain—it responds accurately and forcefully to detected threats. It has high *observability* in the security domain—it collects and analyzes threat data with world-class sophistication. What it lacks is *observability* in the constitutional domain and *adaptive gain scheduling* that would allow it to reduce its security response when threats recede and redirect capacity toward constitutional settlement. The transition architecture proposed in this report is, in essence, a framework for developing those missing capacities—not by weakening the security architecture but by supplementing it with the constitutional and deliberative infrastructure it currently lacks.

Appendix D: Anticipated Objections

D.1 "Israel cannot afford to focus on constitutional questions while under existential threat. Security comes first."

The objection is serious and must be engaged honestly. Israel faces genuine security threats, and this report does not argue otherwise. The argument is not that Israel should neglect security in favor of constitutional reform. It is that Israel's security architecture has succeeded so thoroughly that it is now safe to address the constitutional questions that security deferred. The state exists. It is secure. It has peace agreements with major Arab states, military capacities that dominate the region, and the demonstrated ability to defend itself against the most intense attacks. The question is whether the next phase of national development can include the constitutional completion that the founders intended—or whether the permanent deferral of constitutional questions will itself become a security vulnerability, as internal division, international isolation, and democratic erosion weaken the society that the security apparatus exists to defend.

The October 7 attack, while demonstrating the reality of external threats, also demonstrated the consequences of epistemic closure: the system was so calibrated to certain threat scenarios that it missed the signs of a different kind of attack. A governance architecture that is better at perceiving its own vulnerabilities—including constitutional and social vulnerabilities—would be a stronger security architecture.

D.2 "The occupation is a security necessity, not a choice. Withdrawal would create a Hamas-controlled state on Israel's borders."

The security risks of withdrawal are real and must be taken seriously. The Gaza precedent—withdrawal in 2005 followed by Hamas control and repeated rocket attacks—is a cautionary experience that shapes Israeli strategic thinking. This report does not prescribe a specific territorial outcome. It identifies the structural dynamics that make the indefinite continuation of the occupation increasingly costly and that make resolution progressively more difficult as settlements expand and the political power of the settler movement grows. The report argues for developing a defined end state and for differentiating between settlement blocs likely to be incorporated into Israel and outliers that foreclose territorial compromise. It does not argue for unilateral withdrawal without security arrangements.

The deeper point is that the current trajectory—indefinite management of the occupation without a defined end state—is not a neutral default. It actively worsens the situation over time, deepening the facts on the ground that make resolution harder and intensifying the international, moral, and democratic costs that the occupation imposes. The question is not whether the status quo can continue. The question is whether the status quo's continuation is making a desirable resolution impossible.

D.3 "This analysis is naive about the intentions of Israel's enemies. Peace is not available."

The report does not assume that peace is available or that Israel's adversaries are prepared to accept its existence within any borders. It is a diagnosis of Israel's governance architecture, not a diagnostic of the intentions of Hamas, Hezbollah, or Iran. The Boundary Deficit exists independently of whether external actors are prepared to make peace. Israel's constitutional vacuum, its coalition fragmentation, its religion-state tensions, and its internal identity conflicts are domestic governance challenges that would exist even if the external threat environment were completely benign.

Moreover, addressing the Boundary Deficit would strengthen Israel's strategic position regardless of the external environment. A state with a settled constitutional order, reduced internal divisions, and stronger democratic institutions is better able to sustain the public support and international legitimacy that long-term security requires. Constitutional completion is not an alternative to security. It is an enhancement of the foundations on which security rests.

D.4 "The coalition system is the only way to represent Israel's diversity. Electoral reform would disenfranchise minorities."

Israel's diversity is real, and proportional representation has succeeded in ensuring that diverse communities are represented in the Knesset. The electoral reforms proposed in this report—a modestly higher threshold, a constructive vote of no confidence, regional district elements—are not radical majoritarianism. They preserve the proportional character of the system while introducing mechanisms that reward governability and cross-factional coalition-building. A five percent threshold would still allow the representation of Arab parties, ultra-Orthodox parties, and smaller factions, while reducing the proliferation of one- and two-seat parties that make coalition arithmetic so unstable. A constructive vote of no confidence would prevent governments from being brought down without an alternative, while preserving the Knesset's power to dismiss governments that have lost confidence. Regional districts would add a layer of local accountability without abandoning national proportionality.

The goal is not to eliminate diversity from the political system. It is to create the conditions for stable governance that the current system structurally prevents.

D.5 "This analysis is interesting, but it will never be implemented. The Security First Responder is too strong."

The Security First Responder is strong. The Emergency Ratchet has been ratcheting for decades. The coalition veto cascade blocks comprehensive reform. The honest assessment this report offers is that significant deterioration is more likely than significant transformation in the near term. The report does not

predict constitutional completion. It offers a framework for what completion would require, and identifies the specific mechanisms that could be addressed by actors who wish to begin.

The value of a diagnostic framework is not only in its ability to guide action. It is also in its ability to make reality legible—to explain why previous reforms have failed, to identify the structural constraints that any successful reform would need to address, and to provide a language for understanding the system that is more precise than "the conflict is intractable" and more actionable than "everything is frozen." The report is offered in that spirit: not as a prediction that Israel will complete its architecture, but as a diagnosis of what would need to change for completion to become possible, and a specification of the first steps that could be taken by those who wish to begin.

Appendix E: About the Author and Method

The Author

This report was written from a position of comparative engagement with governance systems across multiple continents, but not from within Israel's institutional core. The author is not Israeli, does not live in Israel, and does not claim the authority of lived experience within Israeli governance. The perspective offered here draws on a sustained engagement with complexity science, developmental psychology (Spiral Dynamics), governance theory, and control-theoretic approaches to institutional design—pursued with the conviction that the most valuable diagnoses sometimes come from outside the system being diagnosed, where questions can be asked that insiders have learned not to hear.

The distance from institutional power is both a limitation and a resource. It limits access to the granular, day-to-day texture of Israeli policy-making—the unwritten norms, the informal power structures, the lived reality that no formal framework can capture. But it also enables a freedom of diagnosis that proximity to power often discourages. The report does not claim insider knowledge. It claims a coherent lens—one that may prove useful to those who do hold institutional positions and are searching for frameworks that make sense of what they are experiencing.

The author has also contributed directly to governance design through the Global Governance Frameworks, the Governance as Engineering whitepaper series, and the Country Reports for Systemic Change—all of which are referenced in this document and available in full on the author's website. The report is offered in the spirit of collaborative sense-making, not definitive pronouncement. Feedback, criticism, and dialogue are welcomed.

A Note on Method

This report was developed through a structured, multi-model synthesis process. Several large language models were engaged in parallel, each prompted to analyze Israel's governance architecture from their respective analytical angles. Their contributions were compared, challenged for contradictions, and integrated by the author into the final argument. The AI served as a research partner and a perspective engine; the editorial judgment and the intellectual responsibility are entirely human.

This method is an experiment in cognitive amplification: using AI to facilitate analysis and to deliberately juxtapose multiple strategic intelligences, surfacing patterns and tensions that might otherwise remain invisible. The report is richer for that polyphony. It is also, like any work of synthesis, provisional. It makes no claim to finality. It claims only that the lens it offers merits testing against reality—and that the testing, in the end, is what matters most.

The Country Reports Series

This report is the thirteenth in a series of Country Reports for Systemic Change. The first examined Germany through the lens of an execution deficit. The second examined France through the lens of an integration deficit. The third examined Sweden through the lens of a feedback deficit. The fourth examined India through the lens of a synchronisation deficit. The fifth examined the European Union through the lens of a coherence deficit. The sixth examined the United Kingdom through the lens of a control-delivery deficit. The seventh examined Brazil through the lens of an accumulation deficit. The eighth examined Russia through the lens of a power-vertical deficit. The ninth examined the United States through the lens of an integration deficit. The tenth examined Finland through the lens of a throughput constraint. The eleventh examined Japan through the lens of a continuity trap. The twelfth examined Nigeria through the lens of a substrate deficit.

Together, the thirteen reports form a global diagnostic framework spanning the full spectrum of adaptive capacity challenges—from first-order deficits of execution and integration to second-order constraints of velocity and paradigm lock-in, to the foundational challenge of substrate construction, and now to the distinctive challenge of boundary resolution that Israel represents. The series does not claim to be complete. It claims to be a foundation on which further analysis, deeper testing, and better design can be built. Israel, the state that mastered survival but cannot complete its own architecture, is the case that asks the most distinctive question the series has yet posed: not how to govern better, but how to finish building the governance architecture that the founders began.