



Israel: Controversy over Judicial System Changes and Proposals

August 4, 2023

In July 2023, the Israeli Knesset passed a law to limit the judiciary's use of "reasonableness" in reviewing government decisions. This law was one of the government's January proposals from Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's coalition to reduce the judiciary's power to check government action.

The proposals—which Netanyahu and supporters say would provide corrective balance within an Israeli system that lacks explicit constitutional boundaries to judicial review—have triggered a charged national debate, including mass protests. Some opponents to the proposals have asserted that they might alter the character of Israel's democracy, potentially impacting the ongoing criminal trial against Netanyahu and worsening tensions with Palestinians. Such changes could have implications for U.S.-Israel relations.

The coalition passed the July reasonableness law after compromise talks with opposition leaders stalled. These talks began after Netanyahu delayed other proposals in March that would have given the government control over Israel's Judicial Appointments Committee (JAC) and allowed the Knesset to override most decisions of the High Court of Justice (HCJ). Netanyahu instituted that delay in the face of major civil disobedience, saying he wanted to "prevent civil war."

The July legislation amends Israel's quasi-constitutional Basic Law on the judiciary by preventing judges from overturning administrative decisions they find "unreasonable in the extreme." Supporters of removing the reasonableness test argued that it infringed on the government's popular mandate, and also that courts could still invoke other common law doctrines—like proportionality, anti-discrimination, and conflict of interest—to review government decisions. Opponents maintained that the reasonableness standard was necessary to protect uncodified rights and prevent public corruption.

The Knesset may consider additional legislation affecting the JAC. Netanyahu has said that the coalition is willing to try until sometime in November to "reach a comprehensive agreement" with the opposition, but opposition leader Yair Lapid has demanded an 18-month moratorium on further judiciary-related legislation before resuming talks.

Congressional Research Service https://crsreports.congress.gov IN12214

Popular Reactions and Potential Court Review

The proposed judicial changes have polarized much of the Israeli populace, with broad divisions manifest between:

- **Opponents**, many of whom are members of the largely secular and Ashkenazi (Jews of European origin) communities that have traditionally held leading roles in government, the military, and the burgeoning high-tech sector; and
- **Supporters**, including many from certain groups with growing populations like West Bank settlers, Jewish nationalists, and the ultra-Orthodox (some of whom hail from a Mizrahi, or Middle Eastern Jewish, background).

Since January, hundreds of thousands of opponents have joined in regular non-violent protests against the proposed changes, with thousands of supporters engaging in non-violent counter-protests. A July poll suggested that Israelis support a compromise-based judicial reform process over the government's proposals by a more than two-to-one margin, and that majority approval of popular protests does not extend to disruptions of traffic or airport access, or to refusals to report for military reserve duty.

The HCJ is planning to hold a hearing on petitions challenging the reasonableness law on September 12. Disagreement between the HCJ and Knesset majority on the law's implementation could spark a national crisis. To date, the HCJ has not invalidated any of Israel's Basic Law provisions, but has indicated it could reverse provisions that fundamentally change the nature of democracy in Israel or abuse the constitutional process. One Israeli legal expert has speculated that possible red lines for the HCJ could be if the government tries to replace the attorney general or change the composition of the JAC.

General Assessment

The following implications of the judicial system changes and proposals have relevance for Members of Congress contemplating legislative and oversight options.

Israel's security and economy. Reportedly, thousands within Israel's military reserves have threatened to suspend their service, and some in the workforce (including doctors) have gone on strike or warned that they might. Consequently, observers have raised questions about effects on the country's defense readiness and economic strength. According to a media report citing an unnamed U.S. official, the Pentagon "is concerned that the crisis facing the Israeli military could have negative implications for Israel's deterrence strategy and encourage Iran or Hezbollah to conduct military provocations that could escalate the situation in the region."

Reportedly, the Israeli military may be more concerned about reduced cohesion, readiness, and recruitment over the long term than an immediate breakdown in performance. One source argues that highly-skilled reservists like fighter pilots who stop volunteering would probably return in the event of a crisis.

Possible democracy, governance, and regional/international implications. Much debate surrounding potential changes to the judiciary focuses on their meaning for Israeli democracy and governance. Some argue that weakening judicial review could enable certain government actions, such as expanding Israel's West Bank control at Palestinians' expense, increasing economic preferences and military service exemptions for ultra-Orthodox Jews, or altering minority rights and the religious-secular balance in Israel. Some debate whether Israelis might face legal prosecution in international fora if the independence of Israel's judiciary arguably erodes. Additionally, developments regarding Palestinian issues could impact ongoing U.S. efforts to facilitate Israel-Saudi Arabia normalization.

Netanyahu's legal future. Some have speculated that legislative changes could lead to Netanyahu replacing the current attorney general with one amenable to dismissing the legal case against Netanyahu. One source quoted Netanyahu as saying he would not make such a move, while citing an Israeli legal expert who questioned Netanyahu's credibility.

U.S. reactions. President Biden's efforts to steer Netanyahu toward compromise have generated debate about U.S. input into Israel's domestic politics. Members of Congress have voiced varying opinions on Israel's legislative proposals and U.S. involvement. Some have joined letters or a proposed resolution expressing support for judicial review and liberal democracy in Israel. Others have stated support for Israel to handle its own democratic decisions and/or advised U.S. officials to stay out of the process. Some observers question the potential impact on U.S.-Israel relations of a perceived divergence in core values.

Author Information

Jim Zanotti Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.