SPEAKING ABOUT CIVILIZATIONS:

UNDERSTANDING VIKTOR ORBÁN AND BENJAMIN NETANYAHU THROUGH A NEW TAKE ON CIVILIZATIONAL DISCOURSE

By

Alexander J. Klein

Submitted to

Central European University

Department of International Relations

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Supervisor: Alexander Astrov

Word count: 15.543

Budapest, Hungary

2016

Abstract

Neither Ideology or Nationalism can fully explain the discourses of both Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. This thesis looks into a new discourse framework – Civilizational Discourse – as opposed to broadening the already broad definitions of both Ideology and Nationalism, in order to better understand the discourses of Orban and Netanyahu. While the scope of this thesis is to establish if the current debates in Europe and in Israel are civilizational debates, this is done by first looking at the International Relations literature on civilizations, in order to find ways of recognizing civilizational discourse. The findings of this thesis is that both Orban and Netanyahu have a civilizational dimension to their discourse, though to different extents. While Orban sees Europe as a Civilization and contextualizes Hungary within it, Netanyahu contextualizes Israel within the 'Free World,' and though this civilizational construct has a sizable ideological component to it, it is still mainly civilizational. As such, there is a civilizational dimension to the ongoing debates in Europe and in Israel, though more research is needed in order to understand the full extent of this phenomenon.

To my family.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my very great appreciation to my supervisor, Prof. Alexander Astrov, for helping me develop my interest in a broad topic such as Civilization and guiding me into realizing something that was actually doable in a MA thesis. I would also like to thank Zach Schenk, Anastasia Zabusova, and Clara Puig de Torres-Solanot, three amazing friends that took the time to read my thesis and then offer suggestions on how to make my argument clearer and stronger.

Table of contents

Introduction

On the 24th celebration of Europe Day 2016, a day that honors the establishment of the European Union in 1992, Vice-President of the European Commission Ms. Federica Mogherini confessed that "[F]or the first time in our history, our European Union faces an existential threat."[1] She quickly dismissed the terrorism that shook both Paris and Brussels in 2015 and 2016, and the refugee crisis that has divided Europe as the predominant cause to the Union's existential crisis. Assuring her readers and listeners that the EU has the capabilities to deal with these two issues, Ms. Mogherini continued, declaring that "[t]he existential threat comes from within [the Union's] own borders."[2] The European Union is currently at risk because various states are building walls instead of tearing them down. The migrant/refugee crisis, together with the terrorist attacks that struck Paris and Brussels, have unleashed a heated political debate in Europe which will determine the future of the European Union. While those who are in favor of Brussels prefer a European solution, the Eurosceptics, embodied by Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, do not want to hear anything about a 'European Solution' that deals with a quota system rather than preventing more refugees/migrants from coming into Europe.

Prime Minister Orbán is a controversial figure in European politics. Mr. Jean-Claude Juncker, the head of the European Commission once hailed him as 'dictator.'[3] The Economist stated that he is seen as "Europe's chief pantomime villain, [...] a cynical rabble-rouser who cheerfully flirts with

---

[1] Federica Mogherini, "Our Union Is at Risk When We Build Walls, instead of Tearing Them down," *European Union External Action*, May 9, 2016, http://eeas.europa.eu/top_stories/2016/090516_europe-day-message_en.htm.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Shaun Walker, "'Hello, Dictator': Hungarian Prime Minister Faces Barbs at EU Summit," *The Guardian*, May 22, 2015, http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/may/22/hello-dictator-hungarian-prime-minister-faces-barbs-at-eu-summit.

outright racism"[4] and 'the loudest of the anti-immigrant voices.'[5] The Guardian even went as far as to nickname him 'Orbán the awful,'[6] stating that Mr. Orbán's declaration that Muslims are a threat to 'European civilization' is disgraceful.[7] Looking at the Guardian's last critique, the fact that the Hungarian Prime Minister invoked the concept of a 'European Civilization' as common sense is, in itself, puzzling, considering the fact that he is branded a Eurosceptic.

While the traditional understanding of 'Euroscepticism' is that of "[a] person who is opposed to increasing the powers of the European Union,"[8] the Hungarian Prime Minister is much more complex than that in his World View. While, at the 2015 European People's Party Congress in Madrid, the Hungarian Head of Government stated that:

> [w]e cannot hide the fact that the European left has a clear agenda. They are supportive to migration. They actually import future leftist voters to Europe hiding behind humanism. It is an old trick but I do not understand why we have to accept it. They consider registration and protection of borders bureaucratic, nationalist and against human rights. They have a dream about the politically constructed world society without religious traditions, without borders, without nations. They attack core values of our European identity: family, nation, subsidiarity and responsibility.[9]

If this is what the Guardian means by invoking European Civilization, then the rejection of the EU – as the traditional definition of Euroscepticism would suggest – does not necessarily mean a rejection of Europe. Though there might be some ideological aspects to his speech, ideology cannot fully explain his discourse because he sees 'European identity' as a value, as opposed to a clear-cut

[4] The Economist, "Point Taken, Mr Orban," *The Economist*, accessed May 13, 2016, http://www.economist.com/news/europe/21667956-europes-migration-hardliners-have-some-reasonable-concerns-point-taken-mr-orban?zid=309&ah=80dcf288b8561b012f603b9fd9577f0e.

[5] The Economist, "Big, Bad Visegrad," *The Economist*, January 30, 2016, http://www.economist.com/news/europe/21689629-migration-crisis-has-given-unsettling-new-direction-old-alliance-big-bad-visegrad?zid=309&ah=80dcf288b8561b012f603b9fd9577f0e.

[6] The Guardian Editorial, "The Guardian View on Hungary and the Refugee Crisis: Orbán the Awful," *The Guardian*, September 6, 2015, http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/sep/06/the-guardian-view-on-hungaryand-the-refugee-crisis-orban-the-awful.

[7] Ibid.

[8] "Eurosceptic," *Oxford Dictionaries*, accessed May 13, 2016, http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/eurosceptic.

[9] Viktor Orbán, "Speech of Viktor Orbán at the EPP Congress," *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, October 26, 2015, http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/speech-of-viktor-orban-at-the-epp-congress20151024.

ideological one. In addition, though he might also have a nationalist aspect in his discourse, the fact that he links European identity with nationalism could also represent something different from the traditional assumed Eurosceptic discourse that tends to be based on both ideological and nationalist assumptions – national isolation rather than national contextualization.

Shifting the focus to a 'less' controversial place in the world, Israel, one might notice a similar phenomenon happening. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is seen by some as an even more polarizing figure than Viktor Orbán, especially because of his role in the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict and his objection to the International Community's nuclear deal with Iran. Even though the Obama administration believes that the deal will prevent the Islamic Republic from building nuclear weapons, [10] the Israeli Prime Minister firmly rejects it. Netanyahu sees the deal as an existential threat to Israel since he regards it not as a way of preventing the country to build weapons of mass destruction but a way to accelerate the process. As such, it is Israel's role to stop that from happening, being the lone guardian of civilization. In a speech he delivered at the United Nation's General Assembly in 2015, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu stated that:

> A thousand years before the birth of Christianity, more than 1,500 years before the birth of Islam, King David made Jerusalem our capital, and King Solomon built the Temple on that mount. Yet Israel, Israel will always respect the sacred shrines of all. In a region plagued by violence and by unimaginable intolerance, in which Islamic fanatics are destroying the ancient treasures of civilization, Israel stands out as a towering beacon of enlightenment and tolerance. [...] Ten miles from ISIS, a few hundred yards from Iran's murderous proxies, Israel stands in the breach – proudly and courageously, defending freedom and progress. Israel is civilization's front line in the battle against barbarism. So here's a novel idea for the United Nations: Instead of continuing the shameful routine of bashing Israel, stand with Israel. Stand with Israel as we check the fanaticism at our door. Stand with Israel as we prevent that fanaticism from reaching your door.[11]

---

[10] "The Historic Deal That Will Prevent Iran from Acquiring a Nuclear Weapon: How the U.S. and the International Community Will Block All of Iran's Pathways to a Nuclear Weapon," *The White House*, accessed May 28, 2016, https://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/foreign-policy/iran-deal.
[11] Benjamin Netanyahu, "PM Netanyahu's Speech at the United Nations General Assembly" (The Prime Minister's Office, October 1, 2015), www.pmo.gov.il/english/mediacenter/speeches/documents/speechun011015eng.docx.

There is an ideological and nationalist aspect to Benjamin Netanyahu's speech – ideological because Netanyahu defines Israel as a 'towering beacon of enlightenment and tolerance' and 'defending freedom and progress,' and nationalist because he uses a primordial interpretation on Jewish nationhood, saying that 'King David made Jerusalem our capital, and King Solomon built the Temple on that mount.' However, neither ideology nor nationalism can explain the statement that 'Israel is civilization's front line in the battle against barbarism,' which invokes the image of an Huntingtonian Clash of Civilizations. While 'barbarianism' represents a term through which Netanyahu defines 'militant Islam' – and thus correlating both ISIS and Iran to the same 'state of mind' – neither ideology nor nationalism can help present Netanyahu's World view.

Ideology and nationalism can explain some aspects of both Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's World views, especially because none of them talks about class struggle, the welfare state etc. However, there are elements in their discourses that cannot be seen as purely ideological or nationalist. This is because, while ideological discourse would imply a focus on issues such as class struggle, welfare, freedom, taxes etc., traditional nationalist rhetoric would imply an isolated group from the rest of the world. While there are many definitions currently available for these two phenomena, they tend to be either too narrow or too broad. While it is not the scope of this thesis to find a definition for ideology or nationalism, this thesis proposes to go beyond these two ideals in order to better understand both the Prime Minister's World view's by introducing a new dimension – a civilizational one. This is because, unlike nationalism and ideology which tend to be flexible terms, civilizations can be narrowed down into a more useful tool for analyzing this specific nuance of discourse instead of expanding both the definitions of ideology and nationalism. As such, can current debates in Europe and in Israel be understood as Civilizational debates? What would such a dimension imply?

This thesis will propose a new theoretical framework through which one can interpret civilizational discourse in order to better understand both Viktor Orbán's and Benjamin Netanyahu's world views. Through analyzing the notion of Civilizations in World Politics, one could gain a better insight into the nuances of discourse that cannot be understood through traditional ideological or nationalist perspectives. However, before being able to make the claim that both Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu have some civilizational aspects in their world view, this thesis will present a theoretical framework through which one can recognize this type of discourse. The reason why this thesis will specifically look at Orbán and Netanyahu is that they both come from different background, contexts, and have different worldviews. As such, by looking at whether these two Heads of Government have a civilizational dimension to their discourse can help further the argument that a civilizational dimension in their discourse does not necessarily imply that their case is specifically exceptional. This will be done first by looking at what Civilizations are, how they function in World Politics in a post-Cold War setting. After which, this thesis will isolate 8 characteristics through which one can identify civilizational discourse. This thesis will analyze the discourses of Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, both chosen because they are seen a controversial and hard to understand. Because their world views have a civilizational dimension, one would be able to conclude that their discourse is part of a wider debate within both Europe and Israel that can be seen as civilizational.

Chapter 1 - Civilizations and its Discourses

What does one mean by Civilizational debates and how can one best understand 'civilizational discourse' in today's post-Cold War world as an analytical tool? The historical context of the term Civilization first emerged during the eighteenth century in France. Originally meaning "the act or process of bringing out of a savage or uneducated state,"[12] this idea has had a huge impact on world history starting with the mid-eighteenth century up to today, though what constitutes a civilization has changed over time. While the image conjured up by the term 'civilizational debates' is that of the former imperial officials of the Great Powers of the nineteenth century arguing on how to best carve up the world, civilizational discourse, back then, was used to justify and give meaning to European expansion. This is most noticeable in the case of the French, especially because civilization stood as the central pillar of the country's official imperial doctrine, unlike other imperial powers that had some aspects of it within their imperial justification.[13] Despite the fact that "all European powers [...] claimed to be carrying out the work of civilization in their overseas territories,"[14] the French perceived themselves as being best suited to 'enlighten' the world due to their revolutionary past and industrial might as opposed to the other European great powers.[15] After the Imperial zenith passed, and with slow decline of the European Great Powers only to be replaced by the rise of the Soviet Union and the United States as the World's Superpowers, ideology slowly replaced Civilization as the defining lens through which one could interpret world order. Though this shift took some time after World War Two, the decolonization process picking up steam and a new division of the world emerged –

---

[12] "Civilization," Dictionary, *Dictionary.com*, accessed May 13, 2016, http://www.dictionary.com/browse/civilization.
[13] Alice L. Conklin, *A Mission to Civilize: The Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa, 1895-1930* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997). 1
[14] Ibid.
[15] Ibid.

from colonial powers and their colonies to the 'First, Second and Third World' division. However, the end of the Cold War and the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 marked the triumph of liberalism over communism and the world was left with one lone Superpower. It was under this context that the notion that the World had reached the 'end of history' took shape. Francis Fukuyama argues that Liberal Democracy's triumph over monarchy, fascism and communism marks the beginning of the end of history.[16] However, in retrospect, this was clearly not the case. This ideologically-driven optimism provided by Fukuyama, based on the assumption that the victory of liberalism would end the political divisions of world order, was short-lived. However, there are some, like Samuel P. Huntington, Peter J. Katzenstein, and Robert W. Cox (among other scholars), that argue that civilizations are playing a role in today's post-Cold War setting.

1.1 Civilizations in the Brave New, Post-Cold War, World

What exactly do civilizations mean in a post-Cold War context? In order to find an answer, this thesis will look at the work(s) of Samuel P. Huntington, Peter J. Katzenstein, and Robert W. Cox. This will be done in order to find its defining characteristics needed for developing a theoretical framework for recognizing civilizational discourse. Huntington provides us with a primordial definition of what civilizations are, how they differ from the idea of a 'global' civilization, and how they manifest themselves in world politics. Though heavily criticized, Huntington's work represents a good starting point for understanding how one can understand what civilizations are today and how to recognize civilizational discourse. Katzenstein, building on Huntington's argument, makes the case for a civilization of modernity in which multiple civilizations exist as 'contexts.' However, Cox offers a better insight into how civilizations influence one's perception on reality through shaping one's

---

[16] Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man.* (London: Penguin Books, c1992). xii-xiii, xx

subjectivity. While both Huntington and Katzenstein helps us identify ways of recognizing civilizations, it is through Robert W. Cox's article 'Thinking about civilizations' (from which this thesis inspires its name) and his follow up article 'Civilizations and the twenty-first century: some theoretical considerations' through which once can best recognise civilizational discourse.

In both his article in *Foreign Affairs* and his book *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order,* Samuel P. Huntington claimed that the collapse of the Soviet Union marked the beginning of a new phase in world history. Global politics was seen as transitioning towards a new, post-ideological, post-Western reality, where "the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations"[17] rather than ideology.[18] Huntington defines civilizations as 'cultural entities' based on different traditions, religions, histories, linguistics, and culture. While these differences weren't as noticeable during the Cold War, the triumph of liberalism would lead to them being exposed. These traits became even more significant as a result of the process of modernization. Together with the increase of inter-civilizational interactions, there is an increase in civilizational consciousness that results in both strengthening cultural differences and making them a more prominent defining factor in people's identity.[19] This is because modernization, defined through the processes of industrialization, urbanization, increase in literacy, education, wealth, and social mobilization[20] functions as a reaction to the West rather than an attempt to catch up to it and then join it – modernization instead of westernization. This represents a 'leveling of the playing field' which implies strengthening the rest against the West. Representing the highest cultural grouping of people other than that of mankind,"[21] civilizations:

---

[17] Samuel P. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* 72, no. 3 (1993): 22–49. 23
[18] Ibid.
[19] Ibid.
[20] Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* (London : Touchstone, 1996), http://it.ceu.hu/vpn. 68
[21] Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?", 25-26

have no clear-cut boundaries and no precise beginnings and endings. People can and do redefine their identities and, as a result, the composition and shapes of civilizations change over time. The cultures of peoples interact and overlap. The extent to which the cultures of civilizations resemble or differ from each other also varies considerably. Civilizations are nonetheless meaningful entities, and while the lines between them are seldom sharp, they are real. [22]

For Huntington, identity functions through a form of hierarchy – the village being the smallest form of identification to the nation-state and then the civilization. However, these cultural and non-political entities do not "maintain order, establish justice, collect taxes, fight wars, negotiate treaties, or do any of the other things which governments do."[23] They represent a state of mind that influences one's decision making process through the power of identity rather than a nation-state with political power. However, because his thesis is based on 'clash,' his predominant assumption is that it will be through war that civilizational awareness increases. Huntington argues that the nation-state will still play an important role, though civilizations play out through a natural desire to support other members that share a civilizational bond. [24] This state of mind can transcend into economic regional integration; the increase of economic integration is seen as being determined by and depending on civilizations – both by reinforcing inter-civilizational cooperation and by helping in the emergence of civilizational consciousness. [25] On matters concerning the idea of one 'universal' civilization, Huntington refutes its existence by arguing that, even though there are some common fundamental values shared by many civilizations such as murder being evil or a common understanding on the nature of the family, these are traits that define the human race rather than civilization.[26] While one might assume that Davos Culture,[27] consumer civilization, or the existence of a global culture might signify the emergence of a universal civilization, Huntington argues that they are too similar to Western Civilization in order to

---

[22] Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* 43
[23] Ibid. 44
[24] Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?" 35
[25] Ibid.
[26] Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.*
[27] Named after the location where the World Economic Forum takes place where the world's elite meet and discuss global issues. Symbolizes the 'culture' of Globalization which is cosmopolitan and global in scope.

be something different in the sense that they should be treated as the same thing rather than two distinct civilizations. Thus, any form of 'universalism' is a product of both western nativity and its past hegemony rather than anything 'universal.'[28]

Huntington's thesis has attracted a lot of criticism notably due to his apparent focus on 'religious essentialism', from scholars such as Edward Said, and due his focus on 'clash' rather than 'civilizational engagement', by Peter J. Katzenstein. Said argues that "[l]abels like Islam and the West mislead and confuse the mind, which is trying to make sense of a disorderly reality"[29] by suggesting that Huntington "is an ideologist, someone who wants to make 'civilizations' and 'identities' into what they are not: shut-down, sealed-off entities."[30] As such, Huntington is seen as using the paradigm of the Cold War's zero-sum game to justify the West against the Islamic World and China. Though this might be mainly true, it does not contradict the existence of civilizational discourse. If one is to accept Said's argument, then one can use Huntington's argument as a good example of civilizational discourse in itself. Though Huntington's thesis is controversial, the fact that he questioned the post-Cold War liberal paradigm is remarkable considering the Western hubris that was sparked by the dissolution of the Soviet Union.[31]

Another notable counter-argument is Peter J. Katzenstein's 'Civilizations in World Politics: Plural and pluralistic perspectives' from 2009. What Katzenstein attempts to do in his book is to bridge the gap between the 'universalism' and the 'particularisms' by critiquing the West's idea of civilization – the "all-embracing vision of the West, a universal, substantive form of perfectibility that incorporates

---

[28] Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* 57
[29] Edward W. Said, "The Clash of Ignorance," *The Nation*, 2001. 12
[30] Ibid.
[31] The Economist, "Huntington's Clash," *The Economist*, December 30, 2008, http://www.economist.com/node/12852885.

all parts of the world, based on the growth of Western reason."[32] Katzenstein defines civilizations as contexts through which political entities function. These contexts are not located in space or time. This is because they act as a process towards one, pluralistic, yet universal, civilization of modernity. As such, they are weakly institutionalized social orders which are influenced by a variety of processes and practices.[33] Due to the broadness of their cultural ties, civilizations tend to be contested from within, encouraging debate and thus changing over time. As a result of 'transcivilizational engagements and intercivilizational encounters' (which could also result in clash), a global civilization of modernity is emerging. In making the case for a 'world of plural civilizations' which is part of one civilization of modernity, Katzenstein is contradicting Huntington. This 'civilization of modernity' is characterized through individualism, diversity, ecumenism, and a loose sense of shared moral values. [34] While this explanation might seem more nuanced than the one provided by Huntington in the sense that civilizations are not as rigid and 'sealed off,' the insights provided by Katzenstein can help explain why, unlike Huntington's thesis would have predicted, the West (or the European Union) has not necessarily bandwagoned around Hungarian Prime Minister Orbán on the migrant/refugee crisis, or Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on the Iran threat.

Another perspective, and the one from which this thesis will derive its framework for recognizing civilizational discourse, is provided by Robert W. Cox. Unlike Huntington and Katzenstein, Cox sees civilizations as a result of the emerging dialectic between one's material conditions (today being influenced by globalization) and intersubjective meanings. Cox argues that "Civilizations represent continuities in human thought and practices through which different human

---

[32] Peter J Katzenstein, *Civilizations in World Politics : Plural and Pluralist Perspectives.* (London ; New York : Routledge, 2010., 2010). 3
[33] Ibid. 5-6
[34] Ibid. 2, 5

groups attempt to grapple with the consciousness of present problems.[35] While today's problems deal with the alienation caused by globalization, civilizational consciousness is increasing through the role it plays in attempting to 'make sense' of one's reality. This internally-driven dialectic is derived from the opposing forces which are the historically-driven divide between universalism and particularism. This is best exemplified through the Western divide between the universal aspect of the European Enlightenment and Romanticism – both cultural phenomena that attempted to make sense of the eighteenth and nineteenth century era. Both represent opposing European schools of thought through which one interprets the world by attributing different meaning to it. This divide led to Western consciousness being split "between a dominant universalistic [enlightened] perspective that sees civilization as a Western civilization encompassing the whole world, and a pluralistic [romantic] perspective that sees Western civilization (variously defined) as coexisting with and interacting with other civilizations."[36] It is through this historic dialecticism that Cox derives a working definition for civilization – the "fit or correspondence between material conditions of existence and intersubjective meanings."[37] While 'material conditions of existence' represents reality, intersubjective meanings represent one's perception on reality. On the question of intersubjectivity, Cox refers to the assumption that "there are different perspectives on the world, different understandings about the nature of the world, different perspectives of 'reality,'"[38] which is a social and historical construction that results from making sense of one's material conditions.

It is through this reflexivity between intersubjective meanings and one's material conditions that one's civilization influences the way one perceives reality. As such, the "self-awareness of the

---

[35] Robert W. Cox, "Civilizations and the Twenty-first Century: Some Theoretical Considerations," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 1, no. 1 (January 1, 2001): 105–30. 106
[36] Ibid. 109
[37] Ibid. 110
[38] Ibid. 110

social and historical conditioning of our own thought"[39] is the defining factor of civilizations, even if "[d]ifferent sets of intersubjective meanings may correspond to the same material conditions of existence."[40] The dimensions Cox lists (though he does say that there can be more) that are essential in understanding how civilizational discourse can be identified – especially in terms of intersubjective meanings are: that social economy,[41] dominance and subordination, spiritual consciousness, and time and space. *Social economy* looks at how globalization is challenged through the rising consciousness of civilization by 'localizing' capitalism within one's cultural tradition. *Dominance and subordination* looks at hierarchical relations between civilizations. As a consequence of civilizational subordination, one responds by 'reaffirming' one's civilizational authenticity and offering different meanings to an assumed common body of knowledge.[42] On the other hand, *Spiritual Consciousness*, unlike Huntington's understandings on religion, has more to do with the world being "animated by thought through both at an individual and collective level"[43] which are a consequence of coping within one's material conditions rather than the Huntingtonian homogeneous entities. Cox argues that there are three types of spiritual consciousnesses: monotheism, or the belief in an absolute truth, polytheism, or the acceptance of multiple truths and pluralism, and pantheism, or the idea that "everything is linked to and dependent upon the whole."[44] While these three types of spiritual truths are ideal types, they manifest themselves as competing trends within civilizations, their strength being part of the process of change and, as such, a defining factor that differentiates civilizations among themselves. Last but not least, *Time and space* represents the dialectic between today's globalization which is defined as the triumph of space over time due to the nature of production[45] and that of civilization which represents

---

[39] Ibid.
[40] Ibid.
[41] or social relations of production
[42] Cox, "Civilizations and the Twenty-first Century: Some Theoretical Considerations." 114 - 123
[43] Ibid. 117
[44] Ibid. 118-120
[45] Ibid. 123

a "sense of continuity and development from past origins; [...] the construction of alternative visions of a future – an escape from the inevitability of the eternal homogenized present of globalization into an active collective construction of future economies embedded in self-conscious societies."[46] What this means is that, while space represents the idea of the effect that globalization has on the material world by attempting to homogenize it, time represents a way through which one can justify the way the world functioned through their intersubjective understanding through which they can conserve their uniqueness – a way to manage globalization rather than being homogenized by its power.

What this thesis proposes to do is to use Robert W. Cox's definition of Civilizations and to create a framework in order to recognise civilizational discourse. While his theoretical perception on civilizations rests upon the dialectic between universalism and particularism, the ways through which one can recognize this within any form of discourse is by trying to find a debate which does not necessarily have to be civilizational. This is because the dialectic between universalism and localism does not necessarily has to be explicit. Due to the nature of the post-Cold War Pax-Americana, most people from the universalist camp do not have to necessarily invoke civilizations. However, the act of assuming that one's material conditions are universal (thus having a monotheistic spiritual consciousness) can be seen as primarily ideological, though it does have a strong civilizational dimension. These dimensions can be found by looking for:

- Directly invoking Civilization, and/or perceiving world order in a Huntingtonian manner.
- Alluding or referring to a supra-national culture which unites various states
- Attempting to adapt to a new world order by invoking a non-ideological rationale.
- Implying that there is a hegemonic way of life that does not take into consideration the local reality.

---

[46] Ibid. 223

- Assuming that one's supra-national reality is and/or should be universal, or accepting the particularism of various different realities which should not necessarily mix, while aspiring towards a homogenization within one's context.

- Affirming one's authenticity in order to define both the nation and its broader context.

- Contesting a larger context that the nation is part of, rather than rejecting it altogether.

- Attempting to convince other states that share a similar characteristic in order to promote a bandwagoning against an assumed common threat.

Though there might be other dimensions through which civilizational discourse could manifest itself, these eight dimensions represent a good start for looking for civilizational discourse. However, the method through which these eight factors will be identified is by first understanding how the 'self' defines the 'subject.' Because Civilizations function as contexts, understanding how the self contextualizes the subject within a broader context can help shed light on a possible civilizational dimension to one's discourse and, as such, on one's perception on World Order. All this being said, the next part of this thesis will analyze both Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's world view. This will be done in order to attempt to make sense of their World views which are hard to understand through conventional means such as ideology and nationalism, which would have implied a broadening of their definition and, as such, made this discourse analysis too vague.

Chapter 2 - The Characteristics of Viktor Orbán's Discourse

Viktor Orban is a controversial figure that is usually dismissed both by political commentators and by European Union officials as being a populist. Though this might be true if one is to analyze him from both an ideological and a national perspective, applying a civilizational dimension to his discourse can help shed light to his confusing rhetoric. This will be done by first looking at how he defines and perceives the *Self* and the *Subject* – Hungary. This is because one's perception on World Order tends to be derived from one's personal experiences which represents the link between the *Self* and the *Subject*. A recurring theme in his discourse is how he contextualizes the *Subject* into a broader context – Europe. As such, taking a look at the way in which he contests the broader context of the Subject – Europe – by othering both the European Union and the refugees/migrants, one can notice a strong civilizational dimension to his discourse and, as such, to his world view.

2.1 The Self and the Subject

A good starting point for analyzing Viktor Orbán's discourse is by going back to the empirical puzzle – the fact that the Hungarian Head of Government's discourse cannot be fully understood through ideology. It is safe to assume that even the Prime Minister would agree with this statement consciously, especially because he rejects ideology – both socialism and liberalism. Though it is self-evident that he rejects socialism, taking into account his political past as being a founding member of the Fidesz Party which, founded in 1988, was originally an anti-communist party,[47] his opposition to socialism can be found in his State of the Nation Address in 2016, where he explicitly rejected the

---

[47] The Editors of Encyclopædia Britannica, "Fidesz," *Encyclopædia Britannica*, December 15, 2014, http://www.britannica.com/topic/Fidesz.

Marxist idea of class struggle by arguing that "it must be rejected in the strongest possible terms, and adherents of common sense must combine their strength to keep it from the helm."[48] However, it is Orbán's infamous rejection of liberalism which turned heads, both from the foreign media and from the European Union.[49] Viktor Orban makes the claim, in his speech at the 25th Bálványos Summer Free University and Student Camp in 2014, that societies based on the principles of liberalism "will probably be incapable of maintaining their global competitiveness in the upcoming decades and will instead probably be scaled down unless they are capable of changing themselves significantly."[50] As such, his opposition to liberalism stems from its inefficiency – the consequence of "[t]he existing competition between the countries of the world, the competition between the world's existing power groups and alliances, is being supplemented with a new element"[51] which he believes to be globalization. As such, his rejection of liberalism derives from its inefficiency to mobilize the West and achieve economic growth. While the invocation of 'common sense' in dismissing socialism should be understood as a tool to reinforce his world view by showing that the alternative (and Fidesz's left-wing opposition) has failed, it is his rejection of liberalism which shows that his discourse cannot be truly understood through ideology.

For Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, 'time is of the essence.' Due to his tendency to periodize history into different eras, Orbán argues that time periods tend to be dominated by one central ideology which defines the era. As such, due to the volatile history of Hungary, Orbán tends

---

[48] Viktor Orbán, "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's State of the Nation Address," *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, March 1, 2016, http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-state-of-the-nation-address.
[49] Zoltan Simon, "Orban Says He Seeks to End Liberal Democracy in Hungary," *Bloomberg*, July 28, 2014, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2014-07-28/orban-says-he-seeks-to-end-liberal-democracy-in-hungary.
[50] Viktor Orbán, "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Speech at the 25th Bálványos Summer Free University and Student Camp," *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, July 30, 2014, http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-speech-at-the-25th-balvanyos-summer-free-university-and-student-camp.
[51] Ibid.

to dismiss ideologies as remnants of the past. Claiming that it was the Second World War that brought communism to Hungary and 1990 that brought liberalism to the country, so is the 2008 'Western financial crisis' following a similar pattern and ushering in a new post-liberalism era.[52] However, while history has already been written, the future is unknown and unable to be understood by using ideology. On this matter, the Prime Minister uses the metaphor to explain his point:

> It is better to think of the future as if we were rowers in a race, sitting with our backs to the bow. Like rowers, we can only see what is already behind us, and that which happens to come within our field of vision. We must direct the bow of the boat towards the future, and as the shore unfolds before our eyes, we must deduce the future from that which we already know. In other words, in thinking about the future we are not competing to looking far ahead of us, but rather competing to understand the past. The winners will be those who can better understand the past, and who can come to the right conclusions more swiftly and more courageously. This is the starting-point of political leadership and planning.[53]

The metaphor of 'rowers in a race' can show us two key ideas that are central in his world view – the importance of one's past and competition. While the bow (symbolizing the decision maker) steers the boat, the boat is steered by interpreting the past, thus showing the importance of history in his world-view as opposed to ideology, which would imply looking at the future through the lens of ideology. This is because ideologies present a framework for understanding one's future, and by arguing that it is impossible to do so, Orbán dismisses them. However, the past (history) is set in stone, while ideologies are seen as ephemeral (ending after a period of revolution), the nation is eternal, thus a source of stability. While the roots of Orbán's observations can be traced from the history of Hungary and its people, ideologies are seen as objects that are used to define the subject, and thus ignore its particularities that are best suited to make Hungary competitive because they are not grounded in reality.

---

[52] Ibid.

[53] Viktor Orbán, "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Presentation at the 26th Bálványos Summer Open University and Student Camp," *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, July 27, 2015, http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-presentation-at-the-26th-balvanyos-summer-open-university-and-student-camp.

Orbán argues that the sources of the sovereignty of Hungary stem from the Hungarian People rather than from abstract values. The 'subject' (Hungary) is defined as 'eternal' due to the continuity of the Hungarian state in opposition to the volatile predominant ideological order. As such, Orbán believes that the subject should be defined by the values of the people's culture – a romanticized notion of the Hungarian Ethos. It is through this process that some liberal values can be derived from Hungarian culture:

> the Hungarian nation is not simply a group of individuals but a community that must be organised, reinforced and in fact constructed. And so in this sense the new state that we are constructing in Hungary is an illiberal state, a non-liberal state. It does not reject the fundamental principles of liberalism such as freedom, and I could list a few more, but it does not make this ideology the central element of state organisation, but instead includes a different, special, national approach[54]

It is within this context that Orbán defines himself as a nationalist and, as such, perceives the sources of Hungarian sovereignty from the nation it represents. However, by aspiring towards building "what we think of as a civic Hungary, civic consolidation, a national Christian era,"[55] the next puzzle is to better understand what exactly is 'a national Christian era.'

A good place to start in order to best understand the role of Christianity in the Hungarian state is by looking at 'Hungary's fundamental laws' (or Constitution) which the Orbán government implemented in 2011. The Hungarian Constitution begins with 'God bless the Hungarians,' which is part of the Hungarian National Anthem which Orbán calls the 'National Prayer.[56] In addition, the preamble states that the Hungarian People "[...] [A]re proud that our king Saint Stephen built the Hungarian State on solid ground and made our country a part of Christian Europe one thousand years

---

[54] Orbán, "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Speech at the 25th Bálványos Summer Free University and Student Camp."
[55] Orbán, "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's State of the Nation Address."
[56] Viktor Orbán, "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Closing Speech at the Conference Held to Mark the 5th Anniversary of the Adoption of the Fundamental Law of Hungary," *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, May 9, 2016, http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-closing-speech-at-the-conference-held-to-mark-the-5th-anniversary-of-the-adoption-of-the-fundamental-law-of-hungary.

ago,"[57] and that the Hungarian people, "... [P]romise to preserve the intellectual and spiritual unity of our nation torn apart in the storms of the last century."[58] The fact that the constitution defines Hungary within Christian Europe is, in itself, civilizational in scope, even in the narrow Huntingtonian sense. However, there is more to how Christianity defines the subject. During a speech delivered on the 15th of March 2016, the day that commemorates Hungary's 1848 revolution against the Habsburg Monarchy, and which became part of the Hungarian national myth. Besides his usual segment in which he criticized ideology,[59] the Prime Minister argued that "Hungarian revolutionaries are not warriors for hare-brained ideologies, deranged utopias or demented, unsolicited plans for world happiness; [...] The 1848 Revolution is a solemn and dignified moment in our history, when the wounds of the glorious Hungarian nation opened once again."[60] This is in opposition to "the bloodline of the other tradition [which] leads from Jacobin European ancestors, through 1919, to communism after World War II and the Soviet era in Hungary. Life in Hungary today is a creation of the spiritual heirs and offspring of the '48 and '56 revolutions."[61] As such, European history is interpreted by Orbán as a dialectic between the 'Nationalism & Faith' and 'Ideology' – the essence of Europe being hindered by ideological paradigms that reinterpret it and attempt to change it from its natural state of being. This contextualization of the Hungarian nation within Christian Europe is a key pillar in understanding Orbán's definition of Hungarian sovereignty which derives from History and God rather than from an abstract ideological ideal. As such, it is clear that, in the world-view of Orbán, nationalism and faith represents the alternative to ideology and its universal dimension. However, the invocation of

---

[57] "The Fundamental Law of Hungary" (Website of the Hungarian Government, April 18, 2011), http://www.kormany.hu/download/e/02/00000/The%20New%20Fundamental%20Law%20of%20Hungary.pdf.
[58] Ibid.
[59] By saying that Hungarian motherland's soil is hostile to internationalism
[60] Viktor Orbán, "Speech by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on 15 March," *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, March 16, 2015, http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/speech-by-prime-minister-viktor-orban-on-15-march.
[61] Ibid.

'Christian Europe' as a source of sovereignty is, in itself, interesting, and can give a bigger insight into Orbán's civilizational dimension.

2.2 Contextualizing the Subject

Orbán interprets the context of Hungary's place in the world by arguing, in his State of the Nation address, that Hungary is somehow different and exceptional. By claiming that "Hungary is the only country in the world which has borders with itself,"[62] Orbán is mostly referring to the perceived injustice of the aftermath of World War One through the Treaty of Trianon in 1920 which divided the Hungarian nation. However, it can also give us insight into how he perceives Europe as a whole. The Prime Minister's Weltanschauung can be seen in the way he summarizes International Politics:

> We observe fixed stars against which we can gauge the position of our own ship. In the West the German-speaking nations are the land of the iron chancellors. In the East are the empire of martial, Slavic peoples a hundred times larger than ours. South of us are the colossal multitudes of the Crescent: the incessant hum and ferment of a wasp's nest. Today, also, there are our triangular points: Berlin, Moscow and Istanbul – or Ankara, to be more precise. [...] It is therefore the iron law of Hungarian foreign policy that we Hungarians have an interest in peace. [...] And why do we want to measure Turkey against our precious political yardstick, instead of recognising that – despite its Islamic foundations – it is mobilising an incredible amount of energy in order to westernise itself? No, my friends, our approach is not one of arrogance and bombast, rooted in feelings of moral superiority – an approach so tempting, and often so popular, in the western half of the continent, and also at times beyond the ocean.[63]

This long quote shows us two interesting things – how the 'self' is seen within the wider context of geo-politics and, again, a critique on liberalism. Orbán 'others' both Russia and Turkey by calling Russia the 'Empire of the Slavs' and Turkey (and, as such, the Crescent) as something 'mythical' which, though different, should not be judged based on Western Standards. As such, while Germany is also seen as 'the other,' it is done in a more relatable manner than both the 'Slavic Hordes' or the 'Saracens' in the sense that 'iron chancellors' go hand-in-hand with the 'iron law of Hungarian foreign policy.'

---

[62] Orbán, "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's State of the Nation Address."
[63] Ibid.

In addition, his description of Turkey as developing in a way that '*our* precious political yardstick' (notice the plural) cannot explain because 'our approach is not one of arrogance and bombast, rooted in feelings of moral superiority' in itself tells us two key things. First, Orbán perceives Hungary as being part of the West (thus the 'our political yardstick') and, at the same time, is contesting the West by arguing that 'our approach is not one of arrogance and bombast, rooted in feelings of moral superiority) which he sees as being popular in both the 'western half of the continent' (thus the Core of the European Union) and 'beyond the ocean' (the United States). Though analyzing Hungary's perception on the US is beyond the scope of this thesis, what is interesting is the way in which Orbán contests the European Union. In addition to this, the European Union, a a regional organization of integration, brings the perception of a shared civilizational identity to a political level, whereas the relationship is not established with the US.

As such, the question of how the European Union is perceived by the Hungarian Prime Minister is essential to better understand how he relates to the notion of Europe. This is because Orbán defines Hungary through being part of a metaphysical Christian Europe, yet he opposes the 'belief of moral superiority' that the West has. This is best summed up in the Prime Minister's State of the Nation address, where he states that:

> We Hungarians shall not reject Europe, despite all its weaknesses, emaciation and unsteadiness; and we shall not abandon it, despite its current bout of vertigo. We are the citizens of the same historical and spiritual Europe as Charlemagne, Leonardo, Beethoven, Saint Ladislaus, Imre Madách or Béla Bartók. Our Europe is built on Christian foundations, and we are proud that it has accomplished fulfilment of human and spiritual freedom. There are many of us in Europe, with many different ways of thinking. There are those who believe in the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity, and there are those who believe in the trinity of God, homeland and family, and the kingdom to come of faith, hope and love.[64]

The opposition between 'those who believe in the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity' (ideological Europe) and 'those who believe in the trinity of God, homeland and family, and the kingdom to come

---

[64] Ibid.

of faith, hope and love' (Christian Europe) embodies the same dialectic Cox wrote about when he mentioned the opposing forces of the enlightenment and romanticism. While the Enlightenment represents 'ideology' and is universal in scope, romanticism embodies 'national pragmatism,' the 'universalist moral superiority' on how the West judges Turkey and a 'localized Christian Europe.' This contestation of Europe is civilizational in scope, and as such, marks a civilizational dimension to Orbán's interpretation of Europe. As such, you have both the affirmation of Hungary's authenticity in order to define both the nation and its broader context, Europe, as well as the contestation of Europe rather than rejecting it all together.

If Europe is contested and not denied, one could argue that for Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, the European Union acts more like the 'redeemable other', rather than the 'clear other,' especially because he defines it as an ideological construct which is misguided:

> Europe no longer concentrates on the problem, but merely considers whether a given solution weakens or reinforces its own closed system of ideologies. Europe has become an ideological obsession; if something is reasonable and successful but strengthens the sovereignty of a nation state, it is to be discarded – indeed, it is seen as an enemy, and the more successful it is, the more dangerous. This is the essence of the Hungarian story. [...] What we Hungarians do is successful, beyond doubt, but it is not in accord with Brussels' ideological concepts; in other words, it does not weaken Hungarian national and state sovereignty, but reinforces them – and from this point of view it is to be condemned. This is why the European Union is unable to resolve the crisis in Greece, which is a practical problem calling for a practical solution.[65]

By claiming that 'Europe has become an ideological obsession,' Orbán is refuting the notion of the EU's *universalism* which uses ideology to attempt to redefine Hungary without taking into account the nuances of culture. As such, his idea of Christian Europe presents a different interpretation on what Europe should be, and this is how Europe, as a civilization, is being contested from within – similar to how Katzenstein wrote about debates within civilizations. By arguing that Hungary is successful through the use of nationalism (which he associates with pragmatism), Orbán presents a more

---

[65] Orbán, "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Presentation at the 26th Bálványos Summer Open University and Student Camp."

'localized' view on Europe which he sees as stagnating due to the appeared triumph of values over reality. This contestation is further reiterated in the Prime Minister's speech marking five years since the implementation of Hungary's fundamental law:

> We embarked on an enormous project, but at first perhaps we could not even see its entire outline. This is because we find it difficult to appreciate the vast change which has taken place between the mid-1990s and the beginning of the 2010s in our wider homeland: in the European Union – or, I could say, in Western Civilisation.[66]

While the context of this quote is a reaction to the European Union's objections to Orbán's reform that inserted God into Hungary's fundamental law, the fact that he calls the European Union 'our wider homeland' shows the nuances of Orbán's Euroscepticism by calling Europe misguided. While Orbán opposes the European Union, he does not oppose Europe. In other words, a misguided Europe, by accepting 'Christian Values,' can redeem itself.

However, with the refugee crisis and the terrorist attacks that shook both Paris and Brussels, Orbán's position on the European Union has become more nuanced. Though Orbán opposes the European Union as an ideological construct, he called for European solidarity following the Paris Attacks in November 2015:

> The European Union has been attacked, and we too are in danger. The esteemed President of the French Republic François Hollande has said that what has happened is an act of war. If this is the case – and it is – we must recognise that not only France and the French people are at war. France is a member of the European Union. In this respect, the entire European Union was attacked in Paris. We are a member of the EU, and this is therefore our affair, also. [...] We feel that the very existence of Europe is at stake. In Brussels, however, all the wrong messages are being sent: there are ever more invitations to migrants, instead of telling them firmly and honestly that what they will find here is not at all what they expect. [...] The fact and tragic events show that we need a new European policy. [...] I suggest we return from the realm of ideologies to common sense, and reconsider our European policy on the basis of four self-evident commandments. First of all, we must protect the external borders. [...] Secondly, we must protect our culture, because Europe's essence lies in its spiritual and cultural identity. Thirdly, we must protect our economic interests, because we Europeans must remain at the centre of the world economy. And fourthly, we must give the people the right to have

---

[66] Orbán, "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Closing Speech at the Conference Held to Mark the 5th Anniversary of the Adoption of the Fundamental Law of Hungary."

a say in European decisions, because the European Union must be based on democratic foundations.[67]

This speech further shows the nuances of Viktor Orbán's 'civilizational paradigm' – both in the Katzensteinian and a Coxian perspective. By invoking the Paris Attack in his critique of the European Union, Orbán is 'personifying' ideology through the European Union. The fact that he states that Hungary, as a member of the European Union, has been also attacked (thus triggering images of European security), shows the desire of Orbán to change Europe by using common sense in order to 1) protect Europe's external borders (thus critiquing the EU's position on the refugee crisis and, at the same time, assuming that the refugees and the terrorists are the two sides of the same coin), 2) reinforce the idea that Europe's essence lies in its spiritual and cultural identity (thus furthering contesting Europe's identity), 3) develop economic interests (thus reinforcing the notion of global competition) and 4), by invoking 'democracy,' further arguing that what he says is common sense because 'the people will obviously be behind him.' This goes hand in hand with the idea of Christian Europe, where Orbán states that:

> The destiny of the Hungarians has become intertwined with that of Europe's nations, and has grown to be much a part of the union that today not a single people – including the Hungarian people – can be free if Europe is not free. And today Europe is as fragile weak and sickly as a flower being eaten away by a hidden worm. Today, one hundred and sixty-eight years after the great freedom fights of its people, Europe – our common home – is not free. [...] In Europe today it is forbidden to speak the truth. [...] It is forbidden to say that the masses of people coming from different civilizations pose a threat to our way of life, our culture, our customs, and our Christian traditions. [...] It is forbidden to say that the purpose of settling these people here is to redraw the religious and cultural map of Europe and to reconfigure its ethnic foundations, thereby eliminating nation states, which are the last obstacle to the international movement. It is forbidden to say that Brussels is stealthily devouring even more slices of our national sovereignty, and that in Brussels today many are working on a plan for a United States of Europe, for which no one has even given authorisation.[68]

All of these quotes have one common denominator which is noticeable, the fact that Orbán is contesting the 'essence' of the European Union as an 'ideological union' and attempts to 'redeem' it

---

[67] Viktor Orbán, "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Address in Parliament before the Start of Daily Business," *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, November 16, 2015, http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-address-in-parliament-before-the-start-of-daily-business.
[68] Orbán, "Speech by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on 15 March."

by redefining it, and thus changing it. While the invocation of 'Western Civilization' is a clear-cut example of Orbán's civilizational discourse, the idea that a Europe of 'united nations' represents the contestation of the 'ideological' social construction of a United Europe which he sees as contradicting the idea of the nation. By contesting the fabric of this union through providing a 'localized' interpretation of Europeanness as 'a community of Christian, free and independent nations' where the liberal values he still sees as suitable for this new state are derived from, he portrays the nuances of this contestation. However, this can be seen more clearly in the way he interprets the refugee crisis, and this has huge implications on both the nature of the 'self' and the 'redeemable other.' However, the last important issue that must be analyzed is the invocation of the 'unredeemable other,' the migrants and the terrorists.

The migrant and the terrorist are, for Orbán, the two sides of the same coin. While Europe can still be redeemed, the migrants are seen as being 'foreign' to Europe. Even more, after Orbán followed his controversial policy of building fences to stop the refugees from entering Hungary, he goes as far as stating that, if it wasn't for him, "within a year or two, we would not have been able to recognise our own country; we would be like a refugee camp, a kind of Central European Marseille."[69] While this shows some form of cultural similarity between France and Hungary, it also shows that choices based on ideology lead to bad decision. As such, it is exactly through the othering of the refugee that Europe becomes redeemable and, as such, differentiates between the European and the Other. In a speech given at the European Parliament in Strasbourg, Orbán suggests that "we should clearly distinguish between the free movement of workers within Europe and migration coming from

---

[69] Orbán, "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Presentation at the 26th Bálványos Summer Open University and Student Camp."

outside Europe"[70] – thus redeeming a localized European 'liberalism' with a global 'liberalism.' Through this distinguishing between European migration and 'outside Europe' migration, Orbán is creating a hierarchy of othering in the sense of civilizational belonging:

> is abundantly clear that Europe is ancient Greece, not Persia; it is ancient Rome, not Carthage; and it is Christianity, not the caliphate. This is by no means a claim for superiority. The fact that there is a European civilisation does not mean that we are better or worse than others: it means that this is what we are, and that is what they are. To distinguish, to separate and to affirm European civilisation does not mean isolation; it only means – but it really means – that our openness will not be allowed to lead to our disintegration and our dissolution when we come into contact with the foreigners whom we take in.[71]

This continuous dialectic between the 'European' (be it ancient Greece, Rome, or Christianity) and the 'other' (be it Persia, Carthage, or the Caliphate) is clearly civilizational, and the idea of recognizing one's differences but saying that 'the other' is foreign to Europe's 'common sense' due to the fact that that they come from a different civilization is, in itself, what his civilizational discourse is stating. Orbán's rejection of both multiculturalism and the 'moral superiority' of the West shows that his world view is inherently civilizational.

As such, what civilizational characteristics apply to Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán? While the Hungarian Prime Minister directly invokes the term Civilization in his political discourse when referring to the refugees/migrants, his contextualization of Hungary within a Christian Europe represents an allusion to a supra-national culture which unites various states. While his rejection of ideology derives from his attempt to have Hungary adapt to a new world order by invoking a non-ideological rationale in order to reaffirm the authenticity of Hungary's local reality, Orbán also accepts a plurality of Civilizations while arguing that the West should protect its identity in face of the migrant 'hordes.' While he is a Eurosceptic, this is mostly driven by a desire to create a Europe of Nation-

---

[70] Viktor Orbán, "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Speech in the European Parliament," *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, May 20, 2016, http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-speech-in-the-european-parliament.

[71] Orbán, "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Presentation at the 26th Bálványos Summer Open University and Student Camp."

States, especially because he argues for a bottom-up approach to justify political order (the nations of Europe make Europe, not the European Union Europe). In addition, he attempts to convince the other states of Europe to unite in front of the migrant/refugee threat. All this being said, Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán has a strong civilizational dimension in his discourse.

Chapter 3 - The Characteristics of Benjamin Netanyahu's Discourse

Benjamin Netanyahu, similarly to Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, is also seen as controversial and often misunderstood by both foreign leaders and the press due to his portrayal of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. While this might derive from Netanyahu's right wing politics, analyzing him only through an ideological or a nationalistic dimension could hinder a better understanding into the nuances of his world view. As such, applying a civilizational dimension to his discourse can help shed light on his confusing rhetoric. Unlike his Hungarian counterpart, Benjamin Netanyahu's discourse does have a strong ideological aspect to it in addition to a nationalist one in defining the *Subject* – Jewish Sovereignty. However, it is through the way Netanyahu contextualizes the *Subject* within a *Family of Subjects* (also known as the Free World) that his discourse has a civilizational aspect to it. While this civilizational aspect of his world view has a strong ideological aspect to it, it is through the way he perceives this *Family of Subjects* and its opposition to the *Other* – Radical Islam – that his discourse has a strong civilizational dimension to it.

3.1 The essence of Jewish Sovereignty

The idea of Jewish Sovereignty is a complicated one. While its justification derives from Zionism, it has both national and ideological aspects to it. However, Jewish Sovereignty plays a very important role in the Israeli consciousness – a result of the Jewish experience during the era of the Diaspora. Due to the horrors of anti-Semitism and its culmination with the Shoah, the idea of joining the Family of Nations as a nation-state and to defend its sovereignty through a Hebrew army became a central pillar of achieving and then maintaining Jewish sovereignty. As such, it represents the *core* of

Israeliness, and it represents an important aspect in the manner in which the *Subject* defines itself –

self-recognition – and interacts with various different *Others* – searching for recognition.

One of the biggest differences between Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and

Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán is the fact that, while the latter rejects ideology, the former

does not. Going back to the empirical puzzle, the Israeli Prime Minister's discourse cannot be fully

understood through ideology because of the various different nuances in his world view, more

specifically the importance of nationalism and his invocation that 'Israel is civilization's front line in

the battle against barbarism.' However, because there is an ideological dimension to his discourse,

taking a look at it first in order to better understand how the subject, Israel, is defined, can give us a

better insight into the civilizational dimension of his discourse. This can be seen in the manner in

which Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu views the first prime minister of Israel, David Ben-

Gurion (who, unlike Netanyahu, was a Labor Zionist) can provide us with some insight into the way

the current Prime Minister defines the subject. David Ben-Gurion is one of the State of Israel's

'Founding Father,' thus symbolizing the national fulfillment of Jewish Sovereignty – the

implementation of the Zionist dream by creating *Der Judenstaat:*

> Though Ben-Gurion was not always right – not all his instructions stood the test of time –
> there is no doubt that these missed opportunities are insignificant compared to his prodigious
> activities to revive Jewish independence and sovereignty, build Israeli democracy, instill the
> notion of statehood in all aspects of life, advance settlement, *Aliyah*, education and the
> economy, strengthen the role played by spirituality in our national life and connect the People
> of the Book to the book, to the Bible. But before all else, Ben-Gurion realized that the essence
> of sovereignty is the ability to defend yourself, your people. [72]

There are three main ideas in this quote. The quote starts with the statement that 'Ben-Gurion was

not always right' which represents the Labor-Revisionist debate within Zionism, a debate that still

goes on today between the Zionist right wing (which Netanyahu is part of) and the Zionist left wing

---

[72] Benjamin Netanyahu, "PM Netanyahu's Remarks at the State Memorial Ceremony for David Ben-Gurion in Sde Boker," Prime Minister's Office, (November 18, 2015), http://www.pmo.gov.il/English/MediaCenter/Speeches/Pages/speechDavid181115.aspx.

(which is in opposition). However, the fact that Ben-Gurion is praised for reviving 'Jewish independence and sovereignty, building Israeli democracy, instilling the notion of statehood in all aspects of life, and the spiritual revival of national life by connecting the People of the Book with the Book' offers us a glimpse into the way Netanyahu defines the subject – Israel. Through the establishment of Jewish Sovereignty, the Jewish people regained their timeless identity through national revival. While this description defines the subject, the way it is phrased shows exactly what Jewish independence and sovereignty implies – democracy, education, economic development, and spirituality. However, though these qualities are usually interpreted as ideological, the idea that sovereignty is derived from the Jewish People rather than from ideology makes Netanyahu quite similar to Orbán in the sense that it's the nation, not values, that justify the existence of the state. The second part of the quote represents the link between the Subject and the 'other' – the idea that Jewish Sovereignty is based on one's capability to defend oneself. This represents a central tenet of Netanyahu's world view and the manner through which Jewish sovereignty is communicate to the outside world.

The idea of Jewish Sovereignty influences both the way Israel portrays itself domestically and the way it wants to manifest itself to the other. On the occasion of Israel's 68th Independence Day, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu started his speech by saying that "[t]he Israeli flag flies gloriously and a great light shines from Jerusalem. We are celebrating 68 years of Israeli independence." [73] This image represents the 'ethos' of Israel which is seen as the subject illuminating humanity – or at least the 'dark Middle East'. This is because the 'light of Israel' is seen as being the opposite to the 'dark Middle East' or, as Netanyahu said in his 2015 AIPAC speech, "[i]n a dark, and

[73] Benjamin Netanyahu, "PM Netanyahu's Greeting on Israel's 68th Independence Day," *Prime Minister's Office*, May 11, 2016, http://www.pmo.gov.il/English/MediaCenter/Spokesman/Pages/spokeinde110516.aspx.

savage, and desperate Middle East, Israel is a beacon of humanity, of light, and of hope."[74] In addition,

the fact that Jerusalem is accentuated is important in terms of diplomatic recognition. The CIA

Factbook, in its page on Israel, states that, though Israel sees Jerusalem as its capital since 1950, the

US, like all other countries, have their embassies in Tel Aviv.[75] As such, the US, 'like all other

countries,' question Israel's sovereignty over Jerusalem. This is because "implying that Israel is

sovereign over Jerusalem goes against a long-standing policy of the State Department, which has

stayed neutral on the question of who controls the Holy City since 1948.[76] This shows how the ideal

of Jewish Sovereignty is contested. However, the metaphor of Jerusalem being a 'beacon of light'

shows how Netanyahu interprets Israel, together with the need of maintaining Jewish sovereignty:

> [o]ne of the fundamentals requisites for independence is the willingness to fight for it, but that
> exacts a painful price – our fallen sons and daughters, brothers and sisters. We owe them
> everything. We know that we cannot exist without a defense force, we cannot maintain our
> independence if we do not build up our strength.[77]

The image of 'light' goes hand-in-hand with the idea of 'willing to fight' for it and the idea of self-

sacrifice for the greater good represents the importance of protecting the beacon of light. Netanyahu

continues his speech by claiming that:

> World leaders come to Jerusalem every day. They say to me in wonder: 'You have such a great
> country. It is a vibrant, entrepreneurial country, creative spiritually and materially' They see the
> roads, the construction, our technology, economy, society, art. Above all, they see you, the
> citizens of Israel, and your great skills and entrepreneurship, your sense of mutual
> accountability, the way you unify in times of trouble.[78]

It is through this image of economic and cultural development that the ideological notion of modernity

can be seen in Netanyahu's discourse. Netanyahu, by claiming that Jerusalem (and through extension

---

[74] Benjamin Netanyahu, "PM Netanyahu's Speech at the AIPAC Policy Conference," *Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs*, March 2, 2015, http://mfa.gov.il/MFA/PressRoom/2015/Pages/PM-Netanyahu's-speech-at-the-AIPAC-Policy-Conference-2-March-2015.aspx.
[75] "Middle East: Israel," *CIA World Factbook*, accessed May 25, 2016, https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/is.html.
[76] "Diplomacy and the Supreme Court: Presidential Prerogative," *The Economist*, June 8, 2015, http://www.economist.com/blogs/democracyinamerica/2015/06/diplomacy-and-supreme-court.
[77] Netanyahu, "PM Netanyahu's Greeting on Israel's 68th Independence Day."
[78] Ibid.

Israel) is a 'beacon of light' uses a metaphor to affirm Israel's mission to enlighten both the country and, through extension, the world. The way Israel portrays itself and the importance of foreign recognition (and, as such, the acceptance of Jewish Sovereignty), both through being strong and by doing what is right, represents the need of mutual recognition in Israel's quest for recognition and acceptance. The fact that Israel's societal outcomes – construction, technology, economy, society, and art – are presented as what makes Israel great in the eyes of the other – foreign leaders – presents us with an image of modernity and development. This, together with the idea of a 'beacon of light' represents the idea of enlightenment and human progress which is, in itself, ideological at heart. However, the idea of self-sacrifice symbolizes the image of a fusion between time and space, where the geographical implications of Jewish Sovereignty is dependent on the image of Jewish continuity and foreign recognition.

However, any form of sovereignty requires some form of recognition and acceptance from the 'other' through the way it is communicated towards the other. Unlike Ben-Gurion, who was part of the Zionist Labor camp, the Likud Party traces its ideology from 'the teachings of Ze'ev Jabotinsky.'[79] This is in addition to the fact that Netanyahu's father, Benzion Netanyahu, 'was one of Jabotinsky's pallbearers.'[80] According to the Financial Times, Benzion Netanyahu taught the current Prime Minister "how to correctly view reality, how to understand what it contains within it and draw the necessary conclusions."[81] As such, taking a look at the Prime Minister's 'remarks at the State Ceremony for Ze'ev Jabotinsky' can give us some deep insight into Netanyahu's world view. The

---

[79] "About the Likud Party," *Likud: National Liberal Party*, 2015, https://www.likud.org.il/en/about-the-likud/history-of-the-movement.

[80] Benjamin Netanyahu, "Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's Remarks at the State Memorial Ceremony for Ze'ev Jabotinsky" (The Prime Minister's Office, July 16, 2015), www.pmo.gov.il/MediaCenter/Speeches/Documents/speechJaboHar160715EN.doc.

[81] Tobias Buck, "Netanyahu, Father of Israeli PM, Dies," *The Financial Times*, April 30, 2012, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/763d5892-92aa-11e1-9e0a-00144feab49a.html#axzz49geMRlyP.

Prime Minister's speech begins by crediting Jabotinsky for the idea of establishing a 'Hebrew army.' After which, the Israeli Prime Minister states that:

> [f]or centuries, the nations of the world had been used to hearing the Jews were defeated here and Jews were protected there,' – either defeated or protected – 'and it is difficult to decide what was more humiliating: the defeats or being protected. It is time to show the world a Jewish rifle with a Jewish bayonet'. And to that Jabotinsky added another key dimension, which is known as the principle of the 'iron wall - an ongoing military might which grows stronger. This was an uncompromising belief in the justness of Zionism. This would clarify to our neighbors that we would not yield to their aggressions. Our continuing strength and resilience would lead them to eventually reconcile with our existence, and sooner or later turn them to the path of peace; and in any case it would guarantee our existence [82]

The emphasis on Jewish sovereignty and the image of the persecuted people of Israel during the diaspora exemplifies how the notion of Jewish Sovereignty has a sacred symbolism. The image Netanyahu portrays of the pre-sovereign Jew represents the universal need to maintain this sovereignty at all cost, something that is done by transforming the subject into something mythical. The idea of the 'justness' of Zionism, together with the idea of the Iron Wall – communicating strength in order to achieve recognition – represents the 'reaffirming' of the Jewish State's authenticity, which can be seen as Civilizational in scope in the Coxian sense. It is through military might that sovereignty is communicated, and the idea that you need an iron wall to achieve peace and/or guarantee the Jewish State's continued existence portrays how Jewish Sovereignty attempts to be accepted within a hostile neighborhood – something that goes hand-in-hand with reaffirming the Jewish State's authenticity within the region.

3.2 Contextualizing Jewish Sovereignty

Israel's place in the World is, in itself, a huge debate even within that country. An example of this debate can be seen in a book written by Alexander Yakobson, an academic, and Amnon Rubinstein, a former member of the Israeli Supreme Court, titled 'Israel and the Family of Nations:

---

[82] Netanyahu, "Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's Remarks at the State Memorial Ceremony for Ze'ev Jabotinsky."

The Jewish Nation-State and Human Rights.' In the book, the authors ask whether Israel can be both Jewish and democratic in order to join the 'family of nations.'[83] This long debate has left a mark on Israeli consciousness, predominately because the term 'Family of Nations' is closely tied in with the recognition of Jewish Sovereignty and what it implies. While Israel's declaration of Independence justifies and calls the Jewish State Israel, [84] the Jewish State has no finished constitution that explicitly defines Israel as a Nation State. While this lack of a finished constitution shows how the character of the state is contested within, the failure of Netanyahu's *Basic Law: Israel as the Nation-State of the Jewish People* shows how the debate on Israel and the Family of Nations is influencing political debates within Israel.[85] The Basic Law wanted to "secure the character of Israel as the National State of the Jewish People in order to codify in a basic law the values of Israel as a Jewish democratic state in the spirit of the principles of its Declaration of Independence."[86] However, it was seen as controversial because it discriminated against the Arab minority in Israel because the Jewish character of the state was placed before its Democratic one – something that was noted by the Economist. [87] This issue of contextualizing Israel tends to be always seen as problematic, something that shows the limitation of Jewish Sovereignty and can be noticed in the discourse of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

How does Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu contextualize Israel? If one takes a step back from the Israeli-centered debate on Israel's place on the world, Netanyahu, in his speech for Ben-Gurion's memorial day in 2015, argued that:

---

[83] Alexander Yakobson and Amnon Rubinstein, *Israel and the Family of Nations: The Jewish Nation-State and Human Rights* (London: Routledge, 2009).
[84] "Declaration of Establishment of State of Israel," May 14, 1948, http://www.mfa.gov.il/mfa/foreignpolicy/peace/guide/pages/declaration%20of%20establishment%20of%20state%20of%20israel.aspx.
[85] A Basic Law is a law that has constitutional status because they are seen as chapters for a future Israeli constitution
[86] "Basic Law: Israel as the Nation-State of the Jewish People" (Ministry of Justice, September 11, 2011), http://index.justice.gov.il/StateIdentity/InformationInEnglish/Documents/Basic%20Law%20110911%20(1).pdf.
[87] "Israel's Constitution: How Jewish a State?" *The Economist*, November 29, 2014, https://www.google.hu/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=Israel+Basic+Law+National+Home+Failure.

> [t]hese are crucial days for the free world, which is facing acute threats to its values and to peace. Israel is an integral part of the free world. In many ways, we act as the vanguard in fighting terrorism. Terrorism is washing over many lands and continents. Militant Islam's barbarism crosses boundaries in both the geographical and the moral sense. It is important to call this phenomenon by its name and not hide behind a barricade of political correctness. It is militant Islam that is perpetrating the horrors. Islamic fanatics are committing acts of murder everywhere they can reach. For them, we are all a target for enslavement or annihilation – children, adults, women, men, citizens, soldiers. This is what ISIS, which leads the Sunni branch of militant Islam, is doing, and this is what Iran's proxies, which lead the Shi'ite branch of militant Islam – Hezbollah, Hamas, Islamic Jihad – are doing.[88]

The construct of the 'Free World' is, in itself, abstract. While the notion of a 'Free World' is a construct dating back to the beginning of the Cold War, the idea of Israel being both an integral part and at the 'vanguard' of the Free World in fighting 'Militant Islam's barbarism' can be seen as civilizational in scope, depending on one's view on the notion of a Civilization of Modernity vs. the West. However, Katzenstein argues that the West is something separate from a Civilization of Modernity. Such a Civilization of Modernity in the Katzensteinian sense should include the Muslim World, something that Netanyahu does not necessarily do in regards to most Middle Eastern states. In addition, if one is to accept that Israel, as Huntington would argue, is a 'minor civilization,' then the Family of Nations can be seen as the Civilization of Modernity.[89] However, Benjamin Netanyahu is culturally American, the result of having lived his teens and most of his career before entering politics in the United States.[90] As such, if one is to accept the idea of a spectrum that Huntington proposed in understanding the Israel-Diaspora relations, in which Jews living in the diaspora fall into a spectrum between a Jewish Civilization and, in Netanyahu's case, the Western one.[91], this would inherently make Netanyahu a fusion between the West and Israel, something that can help explain the nuances of Netanyahu's contextualization of Israel within the West.

---

[88] Netanyahu, "PM Netanyahu's Remarks at the State Memorial Ceremony for David Ben-Gurion in Sde Boker."
[89] Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* 48
[90] "Benjamin Netanyahu," *Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs*, accessed May 14, 2016,
http://www.mfa.gov.il/mfa/aboutisrael/state/pages/benjamin%20netanyahu.aspx.
[91] Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* 48

The issue of contextualizing Israel, however, does not necessarily limit one's understanding of the Israeli Prime Minister's discourse as being civilizational. Assuming that the 'Free World' is a synonym for Western civilization, this image of 'clash' Netanyahu provides between the Free World and militant Islam is, in itself, Huntingtonian in scope. This can be seen in Netanyahu's speech at the AIPAC Conference of 2016 which coincided with the Brussels attack:

> I first want to send my condolences to the families of those murdered in today's terrorist attacks in Brussels. The chain of attacks from Paris to San Bernardino to Istanbul to the Ivory Coast and now to Brussels, and the daily attacks in Israel – this is one continuous assault on all of us. In all these cases the terrorists have no resolvable grievances. It's not as if we could offer them Brussels, or Istanbul, or California, or even the West Bank. That won't satisfy their grievances. Because what they seek is our utter destruction and their total domination. Their basic demand is that we should simply disappear. Well, my friends, that's not going to happen. The only way to defeat these terrorists is to join together and fight them together. That's how we'll defeat terrorism – with political unity and with moral clarity. I think we have that in abundance.[92]

The two dimensions Netanyahu portrays of militant Islam – geographical and moral – create a Cold War picture of 'us' (the good guys) vs. 'them' (the bad guys) both geopolitically and ideologically. This is something that Huntington was criticized for. In addition, the fact that Netanyahu makes it look like it would be common sense for the nations of the Western World to unite against militant Islam is also something that Huntington would have predicted, and something Netanyahu is trying to achieve by arguing that militant Islam is one homogeneous phenomenon that is confronting a heterogeneous and divided Free World. However, if one is to assume that this fight between the 'Free World' and 'Militant Islam' has more to do with spreading Civilization of Modernity rather than being a clash between two different civilizations, this can also be attributed to the 'monotheistic' spiritual consciousness of Netanyahu. Taking into account Cox's interpretation of spiritual consciousness, one could argue that the debate about the Free World as being either Western Civilization or the Civilization of Modernity can be solved by arguing that Netanyahu presents a 'monotheistic' world

---

92 Benjamin Netanyahu, "PM Netanyahu's Speech at the AIPAC Policy Conference 2016," *Prime Minister's Office*, March 22, 2016, http://www.pmo.gov.il/English/MediaCenter/Speeches/Pages/speechAIPAC220316.aspx.

view – something that could potentially explain the image of Free World fighting against Barbarianism. However, regardless of which framework applies to Netanyahu, it does not take from the fact that his discourse does have a civilizational dimension.

3.3 Perceiving the Free World

Militant Islam is presented by Netanyahu as aiming at destroying the national sovereignty of the Free World and usher in an era of 'medievalism.' As such, it is the role of the Free World to unite and vanquish this enemy. While national sovereignty and order are portrayed as being moral, terrorism is portrayed as being immoral – the consequence of the idea of Jewish Sovereignty as being the essence of the Jewish State. The claim that the terrorists have 'no resolvable grievances' best portrays this clash where communication is impossible between these two competing assumed monotheistic world views where only one truth can stand the test of time. Besides the domestic interpretation on Jewish and Democratic and the 'unredeemable other' – militant Islam – there are two 'redeemable others' worth analyzing which, regardless of one's definition of the Free World, would fall in both classifications – the United States and Europe (which is seen by Netanyahu as different than the European Union). This is in order to best understand how Israel views the Free World from within.

Probably one of the main highlights of the special relationship between Israel and the United States can be seen in Netanyahu's speech in front of the American Congress. While this speech was controversial because it bypassed and went against the policy of the Obama administration, analyzing Netanyahu's discourse can help us better understand whether the Free World is contested or not. The Israeli Prime Minister starts his speech by saying:

> I want to thank you, Democrats and Republicans, for your common support for Israel, year after year, decade after decade. I know that no matter on which side of the aisle you sit, you stand with Israel. The remarkable alliance between Israel and the United States has always

been above politics. It must always remain above politics. Because America and Israel, we share a common destiny, the destiny of promised lands that cherish freedom and offer hope.[93]

This idea of political unity and a common destiny which unites Israel and the United States, having a 'shared common historical experience of reaching a promised land, freedom, and hope,' portrays a picture of national unity. However, the idea of 'common destiny' would imply a similar justification of the state. As such, it wouldn't be hard to assume that Netanyahu, by perceiving Israel as being based on Jewish Sovereignty, interprets the United States as being based on the ideal of American Sovereignty. This can also be seen in Prime Minister Netanyahu's speech at the US embassy in honor of the United States independence day, where Netanyahu states that:

> This is a great day because on the 4th of July, all Israelis unite with our American brothers and sisters. It's our celebration too. That's because the history of our two countries is remarkably intertwined. The Founding Fathers of America were inspired by the Bible, and specifically by the Book of the Exodus, by the dream of building freedom in a new Promised Land. And as you stand in the Chamber of the American Congress, you see right across you the image of one man – Moses, with a quote from the Bible. And since the establishment of the United States, that's two and a half centuries, the vision of justice and the vision of peace espoused by the Prophets of Israel served as a guiding light for Americans from Thomas Jefferson to Abraham Lincoln to Martin Luther King to many others seeking to form a more perfect union. But just as our heritage inspired America, America inspired us. If you read the Founding Fathers of Zionism, you see how powerful and inspirational the American Revolution was – the ideas of freedom and liberty. They reverberated everywhere for people seeking liberty, but they reverberated powerfully for the Zionist movement and the ideas of reestablishing our land, our promise, our justice here.[94]

The invocation of the common destinies of both Israel and the United States through the act of mutual-inspiration is, in itself, unique. This relationship is probably a defining factor in Netanyahu's perception on the 'Free World', because Netanyahu's world view is based on the premise of national sovereignty. This is because the Free World comes in opposition to militant Islam, where the Prime Minister states that while "America's founding document promises life, liberty and the pursuit of

---

[93] Benjamin Netanyahu, "PM Netanyahu's Speech in Congress," *Prime Minister's Office*, March 3, 2015, http://www.pmo.gov.il/english/mediacenter/speeches/pages/speechcongress030315.aspx.
[94] Benjamin Netanyahu, "PM Netanyahu's Address at US Independence Day Celebrations at the US Ambassador's Residence" (The Prime Minister's Office, July 1, 2015), www.pmo.gov.il/english/mediacenter/speeches/documents/speechusaeng010715.doc.

happiness [,] Iran's founding document pledges death, tyranny, and the pursuit of jihad."[95] As such, one could argue that the perceived special relationship between Israel and the United States (at least from the Israeli point of view) is derived from historical circumstance.

However, if we go across the pound once more, another interesting thing that is worth analyzing is Israel's perception of Europe. In a speech delivered after the January 2015 attacks which, besides the Charlie Hebdo massacre also included an attack on a Parisian Kosher grocery store, Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu gave an interesting speech at the Great Synagogue of Paris:

> Today we bow our heads in memory of the victims in Paris. However, as representatives of an ancient and proud people, we stand tall against evil because we can overcome it. [...] Our shared enemy is radical Islam, not Islam and not just radicals – radical Islam. [...] Although the various factions of radical Islam are given to local bloody conflicts, including amongst themselves, they all share the same aspiration: To impose a dark tyranny on the world, to return humanity one thousand years to the past. They trample anyone who does not share their path, first and foremost their Muslim brothers, but their greatest hatred is saved for Western culture, that same culture that respects freedom and equal rights – all the things they so despise.*96*

While the United States' support for Israel is 'above politics,' it is interesting to note that Netanyahu has to justify his vision of 'militant Islam' and, explain why it is different from both Islam and 'just radicals' to a European crowd. In addition, the fact that he invokes the idea of Western culture rather than the 'Free World' further shows the image of clash Netanyahu's rhetoric is trying to portray. However, what makes an interesting analysis is the fact that Netanyahu perceives Europe through two dimensions – a National Europe and the European Union. Taking a step back to Netanyahu's speech 'at the State Memorial Ceremony for David Ben-Gurion,' we see him criticizing Europe by saying that:

> Militant Islam publicly declares its intention to demolish Europe, 'the Crusader kingdom' as it calls it, and to establish an Islamic caliphate on its ruins. And there are those in Europe who blame the Jews or link this with the Jews. This same shortcoming led the European Union to enact the shameful decision to label Israeli products last week. Instead of combining what transpires in Europe or Syria or Iran, there are those in the European Union who decide to excoriate the Jewish state and ignore the other 200 territorial conflicts around the world. And this is happening in Europe, where Jewish businesses were marked only eight decades ago.

[95] Netanyahu, "PM Netanyahu's Speech in Congress."
[96] Benjamin Netanyahu, "PM Netanyahu's Remarks at the Great Synagogue of Paris" (The Prime Minister's Office, January 11, 2015), www.pmo.gov.il/english/mediacenter/speeches/documents/speechparis110115eng.doc.

> Happily, there are also other voices in Europe, [...] with whom our friendship is steadfast, has been steadfast and will grow stronger.[97]

Netanyahu, by singling out the European Union, while claiming that there are 'other voices' that support Israel in Europe, can show us the nuances of the two dimensions he uses to interpret Europe. Netanyahu's appeal for Western Unity is done at the nation-state level, as opposed to a European Union level which he sees as an abstract concept though which he can communicate to the nations of Europe. This can be seen in the 'Statements by PM Netanyahu and High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Mogherini', where Netanyahu sees Europe as a collection of countries, while Mogherini speaks on behalf of the Union. While Netanyahu criticizes European countries that recognized Palestine unilaterally, Mogherini states that the European Union wants a new start in the region. [98] In addition, in a parliamentarian debate on March 7th 2016, Netanyahu stated that "[w]ith regard to Europe and European countries – because that is different from the European Union"[99]. This shows a form of contestation of the nature of who Israel is dealing with in Europe. Netanyahu's perception on Europe is derived from how he defines the essence of Israel – Jewish Sovereignty. This could potentially explain the way he relates to the states of Europe as opposed to the European Union. In addition, one could make the claim, based on comparing both Israel's 'special relationship' with the United States and Israel's relations with Europe, that Netanyahu defines the 'Free World' as a 'world of Nation-States.'

As such, how is Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's discourse civilizational? Though Netanyahu does not necessarily invoke the concept of Civilization in the sense in which Orbán does, he does give the illusion of clash between the 'civilized' and the 'barbarian.' Netanyahu does have a

---

[97] Netanyahu, "PM Netanyahu's Remarks at the State Memorial Ceremony for David Ben-Gurion in Sde Boker."
[98] Benjamin Netanyahu and Federica Mogherini, "Statements by PM Netanyahu and High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Mogherini," *Prime Minister's Office*, November 7, 2014, http://www.pmo.gov.il/English/MediaCenter/Events/Pages/eventEU071114.aspx.
[99] Benjamin Netanyahu, "Prime Minister Netanyahu's Remarks at the Knesset," *Prime Minister's Office*, March 7, 2016, http://www.pmo.gov.il/English/MediaCenter/Speeches/Pages/speechknesst070316.aspx.

monotheistic perspective on the legitimacy of the nation state on a global level. Though this monotheism can also explain Netanyahu's invocation of Israel as being a 'Beacon of Light' (a typically ideological idea that does have a civilizational aspect to it), this is also done in order to affirm and reaffirm Israel's authenticity and 'justness' within a Middle East plagued by radical Islam. As a result, Netanyahu contextualizes Israel within the Western World – the so called 'Family of Nations' – in order to make sense of the harsh realities of the Middle East and in order to incentivize bandwaggoning against threats to Israel – predominantly Iran. While Netanyahu does not contest the West to the degree in which Orbán contests Europe, Netanyahu's misunderstanding of the European Union by differentiating between the states of Europe and the European Union. This shows that Netanyahu perceives the European Union as a tool to communicate with the states of Europe rather than the European Union itself, thus showing the limitations of a assumed nation-state based World Order.

Conclusion

This thesis set up to look at whether the current debates in Europe and in Israel can be seen as civilizational debates. While both ideology and nationalism can provide explanations into the nature of both Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's discourses, there are some aspects of the way they perceive reality that cannot be fully understood using these conventional means. This is because both ideology and nationalism are limited through the need to broaden their definition in order to be able to capture the nuances of their discourse. It would be possible to categorize civilizations as either a new form of ideology or as a new form of nationalism, but such a thesis would have implied the broadening of two notions that are already very broad. By developing a method through which one can both understand and recognize the nuances of civilizations in today's post-Cold War international order by looking at the discourses of both the Hungarian Prime Minister and his Israeli counterpart, this thesis has shown that there is, in fact, a civilizational dimension to their discourses.

All this being said, this thesis has contributed to offering a new perspective through which one can analyze the current debates happening both in Europe and in Israel, and potentially globally. While more work needs to be done in order to put a civilizational framework in order to better understand public discourse, this thesis hopefully represents a beginning for a wider academic debate on this topic. While the idea of civilizations has existed since at least the emergence of the French Enlightenment in the eighteenth century, and it did play a role during the Age of European Imperialism during the nineteenth century, in the post-Cold War era this idea was predominantly defined as an intellectual debate on the nature of World Order rather than by looking at how policy makers perceive reality. As such, while the concept of civilization is highly theoretical, by

operationalizing Robert W. Cox's theory on civilizations and by using the empirical examples of both Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, this thesis aimed at determining if there is a civilizational discourse within the debates that are going on in both Europe and Israel. Though this thesis has proven that, it will refrain from making the claim that these debates are civilizational, especially because there is so much more to a debate then analyzing just one point of view among many. However, it is safe to say that these debates do have a civilizational dimension, though the extent of it is still unclear.

The first part of the thesis looked at what civilizations are and how they are thought to function in a post-Cold War era in International Relations literature. By looking at Samuel P. Huntington, Peter J. Katzenstein, and Robert W. Cox's ideas, this thesis was able to gain some insight into both what civilizations are and how one can recognize them through discourse. While the eight points enumerated are predominantly based on Cox's dialectic between intersubjectivity and one's material conditions, there can be more factors through which one can recognize civilizational discourse. While these points were derived from the empirical cases of both Viktor Orban and Benjamin Netanyahu, possibly looking at different political leaders besides these two can shed more light on more factors.

The empirical aspect of this thesis looked at both Viktor Orban and Benjamin Netanyahu's world view in order to deepen one's understanding of their perception on reality by highlighting their civilizational dimensions. Orban, through his rejection of both socialism and liberalism, provided an interesting case-study. He uses civilization in order to better define and contextualize Hungary, challenge the supremacy of the European Union within the European context, and further justify his anti-migrant position. On the other hand, Netanyahu did not reject liberalism. While, similarly to Orban, he did use nationalism to justify Jewish Sovereignty, the characteristics of the Jewish States were strongly influenced by ideas of the Enlightenment – the 'beacon of light' illuminating the 'dark

Middle East.' It is through this ideological characteristic that Israel is contextualized within the 'Free World.' However, similarly to the internal debate on Israel and the Family of Nations, the broader context of the Free World both complicates domestic politics and provides Israel a context through which it can define itself. However, due to the turbulent Middle East, radical Islam – which is interpreted by Netanyahu as a homogeneous threat – is used to promote a bandwagoning of the Free World's nation states. While both Heads of Government displayed a civilizational dimension in their discourse, this also shows how, depending on one's circumstance, this form of discourse can be different.

However, some observations made in this discourse analysis have also raised some questions that transcend way beyond the scope of this thesis. One interesting thing that this thesis has noticed is Netanyahu's misunderstanding of the European Union. While this point was made in order to explain how the Free World is being contested somewhat by Netanyahu, the idea that one's local reality should apply within a civilizational setting could potentially explain a lot of different aspects in the way multiple actors within World Order interpret both themselves and its surroundings. While this can also be found within Orbán's discourse arguing for a Europe of Nation-States rather than an ideological construct, the question of how sovereignty is communicated within a civilizational setting might be an interesting topic for further research.

Bibliography

"About the Likud Party." *Likud: National Liberal Party*, 2015. https://www.likud.org.il/en/about-the-likud/history-of-the-movement.

"Basic Law: Israel as the Nation-State of the Jewish People." Ministry of Justice, September 11, 2011. http://index.justice.gov.il/StateIdentity/InformationInEnglish/Documents/Basic%20Law%20110911%20(1).pdf.

"Benjamin Netanyahu." *Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs*. Accessed May 14, 2016. http://www.mfa.gov.il/mfa/aboutisrael/state/pages/benjamin%20netanyahu.aspx.

Buck, Tobias. "Netanyahu, Father of Israeli PM, Dies." *The Financial Times*, April 30, 2012. http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/763d5892-92aa-11e1-9e0a-00144feab49a.html#axzz49geMRlyP.

"Civilization." Dictionary. *Dictionary.com*. Accessed May 13, 2016. http://www.dictionary.com/browse/civilization.

Conklin, Alice L. *A Mission to Civilize: The Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa, 1895-1930*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Cox, Robert W. "Civilizations and the Twenty-first Century: Some Theoretical Considerations." *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 1, no. 1 (January 1, 2001): 105–30.

"Declaration of Establishment of State of Israel," May 14, 1948. http://www.mfa.gov.il/mfa/foreignpolicy/peace/guide/pages/declaration%20of%20establishment%20of%20state%20of%20israel.aspx.

"Diplomacy and the Supreme Court: Presidential Prerogative." *The Economist*, June 8, 2015. http://www.economist.com/blogs/democracyinamerica/2015/06/diplomacy-and-supreme-court.

"Eurosceptic." *Oxford Dictionaries*. Accessed May 13, 2016. http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/eurosceptic.

Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. London : Penguin Books, c1992.

Huntington, Samuel P. "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* 72, no. 3 (1993): 22–49. https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/1993-06-01/clash-civilizations

———. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. London : Touchstone, 1996.

"Israel's Constitution: How Jewish a State?" *The Economist*, November 29, 2014. https://www.google.hu/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=Israel+Basic+Law+National+Home+Failure.

Katzenstein, Peter J. *Civilizations in World Politics : Plural and Pluralist Perspectives*. London ; New York : Routledge, 2010., 2010.

"Middle East: Israel." *CIA World Factbook*. Accessed May 25, 2016. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/is.html.

Mogherini, Federica. "Our Union Is at Risk When We Build Walls, instead of Tearing Them down." *European Union External Action*, May 9, 2016. http://eeas.europa.eu/top_stories/2016/090516_europe-day-message_en.htm.

Netanyahu, Benjamin. "PM Netanyahu's Address at US Independence Day Celebrations at the US Ambassador's Residence." The Prime Minister's Office, July 1, 2015. www.pmo.gov.il/english/mediacenter/speeches/documents/speechusaeng010715.doc.

———. "PM Netanyahu's Greeting on Israel's 68th Independence Day." *Prime Minister's Office*, May 11, 2016. http://www.pmo.gov.il/English/MediaCenter/Spokesman/Pages/spokeinde110516.aspx.

———. "PM Netanyahu's Remarks at the Great Synagogue of Paris." The Prime Minister's Office, January 11, 2015. www.pmo.gov.il/english/mediacenter/speeches/documents/speechparis110115eng.doc.

———. "PM Netanyahu's Remarks at the State Memorial Ceremony for David Ben-Gurion in Sde Boker." Prime Minister's Office, November 18, 2015. http://www.pmo.gov.il/English/MediaCenter/Speeches/Pages/speechDavid181115.aspx.

———. "PM Netanyahu's Speech at the AIPAC Policy Conference." *Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs*, March 2, 2015. http://mfa.gov.il/MFA/PressRoom/2015/Pages/PM-Netanyahu's-speech-at-the-AIPAC-Policy-Conference-2-March-2015.aspx.

———. "PM Netanyahu's Speech at the AIPAC Policy Conference 2016." *Prime Minister's Office*, March 22, 2016. http://www.pmo.gov.il/English/MediaCenter/Speeches/Pages/speechAIPAC220316.aspx.

———. "PM Netanyahu's Speech at the United Nations General Assembly." The Prime Minister's Office, October 1, 2015. www.pmo.gov.il/english/mediacenter/speeches/documents/speechun011015eng.docx.

———. "PM Netanyahu's Speech in Congress." *Prime Minister's Office*, March 3, 2015. http://www.pmo.gov.il/english/mediacenter/speeches/pages/speechcongress030315.aspx.

———. "Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's Remarks at the State Memorial Ceremony for Ze'ev Jabotinsky." The Prime Minister's Office, July 16, 2015. www.pmo.gov.il/MediaCenter/Speeches/Documents/speechJaboHar160715EN.doc.

———. "Prime Minister Netanyahu's Remarks at the Knesset." *Prime Minister's Office*, March 7, 2016. http://www.pmo.gov.il/English/MediaCenter/Speeches/Pages/speechknesst070316.aspx.

Netanyahu, Benjamin, and Mogherini, Federica. "Statements by PM Netanyahu and High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Mogherini." *Prime Minister's Office*, November 7, 2014. http://www.pmo.gov.il/English/MediaCenter/Events/Pages/eventEU071114.aspx.

Orbán, Viktor. "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Address in Parliament before the Start of Daily Business." *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, November 16, 2015. http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-address-in-parliament-before-the-start-of-daily-business.

———. "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Closing Speech at the Conference Held to Mark the 5th Anniversary of the Adoption of the Fundamental Law of Hungary." *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, May 9, 2016. http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-closing-speech-at-the-conference-held-to-mark-the-5th-anniversary-of-the-adoption-of-the-fundamental-law-of-hungary.

———. "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Presentation at the 26th Bálványos Summer Open University and Student Camp." *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, July 27, 2015. http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-presentation-at-the-26th-balvanyos-summer-open-university-and-student-camp.

———. "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Speech at the 25th Bálványos Summer Free University and Student Camp." *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, July 30, 2014. http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-

minister-viktor-orban-s-speech-at-the-25th-balvanyos-summer-free-university-and-student-camp.

———. "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Speech in the European Parliament." *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, May 20, 2016. http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-speech-in-the-european-parliament.

———. "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's State of the Nation Address." *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, March 1, 2016. http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-state-of-the-nation-address.

———. "Speech by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on 15 March." *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, March 16, 2015. http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/speech-by-prime-minister-viktor-orban-on-15-march.

———. "Speech of Viktor Orbán at the EPP Congress." *Website of the Hungarian Prime Minister*, October 26, 2015. http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/speech-of-viktor-orban-at-the-epp-congress20151024.

Said, Edward W. "The Clash of Ignorance." *The Nation*, 2001. http://www.thenation.com/article/clash-ignorance/

Simon, Zoltan. "Orban Says He Seeks to End Liberal Democracy in Hungary." *Bloomberg*, July 28, 2014. http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2014-07-28/orban-says-he-seeks-to-end-liberal-democracy-in-hungary.

The Economist. "Big, Bad Visegrad." *The Economist*, January 30, 2016. http://www.economist.com/news/europe/21689629-migration-crisis-has-given-unsettling-new-direction-old-alliance-big-bad-visegrad?zid=309&ah=80dcf288b8561b012f603b9fd9577f0e.

———. "Huntington's Clash." *The Economist*, December 30, 2008. http://www.economist.com/node/12852885.

———. "Point Taken, Mr Orban." *The Economist*. Accessed May 13, 2016. http://www.economist.com/news/europe/21667956-europes-migration-hardliners-have-some-reasonable-concerns-point-taken-mr-orban?zid=309&ah=80dcf288b8561b012f603b9fd9577f0e.

The Editors of Encyclopædia Britannica. "Fidesz." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, December 15, 2014. http://www.britannica.com/topic/Fidesz.

"The Fundamental Law of Hungary." Website of the Hungarian Government, April 18, 2011. http://www.kormany.hu/download/e/02/00000/The%20New%20Fundamental%20Law%20of%20Hungary.pdf.

The Guardian Editorial. "The Guardian View on Hungary and the Refugee Crisis: Orbán the Awful." *The Guardian*, September 6, 2015. http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/sep/06/the-guardian-view-on-hungaryand-the-refugee-crisis-orban-the-awful.

"The Historic Deal That Will Prevent Iran from Acquiring a Nuclear Weapon: How the U.S. and the International Community Will Block All of Iran's Pathways to a Nuclear Weapon." *The White House*. Accessed May 28, 2016. https://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/foreign-policy/iran-deal.

Walker, Shaun. "'Hello, Dictator': Hungarian Prime Minister Faces Barbs at EU Summit." *The Guardian*, May 22, 2015. http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/may/22/hello-dictator-hungarian-prime-minister-faces-barbs-at-eu-summit.

Yakobson, Alexander, and Amnon Rubinstein. *Israel and the Family of Nations: The Jewish Nation-State and Human Rights*. London: Routledge, 2009.