

An Analysis Parameter for Israel's Security Policy: The Old Testament

Zafer BALPINAR*

Abstract

This study aims at drawing the religious framework of security for Jews and laying its components through the position given by the Old Testament to Jews as the chosen people and the approach otherized the rest. In doing so, it utilizes the meaning of land, the function and the position of enemy as well as the chosenness acceptance as a tool in order to uncover the othering. It is also clarified what should be understood of the concept of security ascribed in the study, by fixing broadly its projection on the human life. And using this pattern, it is meant to define the concept of security for Jews in the context of the religious content created by the Old Testament. The conceptualizing purposes to attract attention to the potential to be effective in making security policy because the State of Israel was declared as Jewish state, but not intends to explain Israel's security policy via this content. The findings also present a reference body that can be used by other authors who deal with the policies made by Israel since the foundation of state.

Keywords: The Old Testament, othering, security, Israel's security

İsrail Güvenlik Politikası İçin Bir Analiz Parametresi: Eski Ahit

Özet

Bu çalışma, Eski Ahit'in Yahudileri seçilmiş halk kabulü üzerinden konumlandırması ve geri kalanları ötekileştirmesi üzerinden, dini açıdan güvenliğin çerçevesini çizmeyi ve bu kapsamdaki bileşenlerini belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu yaparken, seçilmişlik kabulünün yanı sıra toprağın anlamı, düşmanın işlevi ve konumunu, ötekileştirmeyi açığa çıkarmak için bir yöntem olarak kullanmaktadır. Genel hatlarıyla güvenlik kavramının insan hayatı üzerindeki iz düşümü belirlenerek, anlatımda atıfta bulunulan ifadeden ne anlaşılması gerektiğine de açıklık getirilmektedir. Eski Ahit'te güvenliğe ilişkin oluşturulan kapsamdan

* Dr., Institute for Middle East Studies, Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey.

yola çıkılarak, Yahudiler için dini bağlamda güvenlik kavramının tanımlanması hedeflenmektedir. İsrail'in bir Yahudi devleti olarak ilan edilmesi nedeniyle güvenlik politikası tesisinde etkili olabilme potansiyeline sahip olduğuna dikkat çekilmekte, ancak İsrail'in güvenlik politikasının bu içerik üzerinden açıklanması amaçlanmamaktadır. Tespitler, devletleşme sürecinden itibaren oluşturulan güvenliğe ilişkin politikalarının başka yazarlarca analiz edilmesi sırasında kullanılabilir referans manzumesi de oluşturmaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Eski Ahit, ötekileştirme, güvenlik, İsrail'in güvenliği

تحديد معالم سياسة الأمن الإسرائيلي: مضمون العهد القديم الخاص لتأسيس مفهوم الأمن

ظافر بالبينار

خلاصة:

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى رسم الإطار الديني لأمن اليهود ووضع عناصرها من خلال الوضع المقدم من العهد القديم لليهود كشعب مختار والفهم المختلف عن الآخرين. ويعمل ذلك، فإنها تستخدم معنى الأرض، ووظيفة وموقف العدو إضافة إلى قبول الأفضلية كأداة من أجل كشف الآخر. كما أوضحت ما هو الذي يجب فهمه من مفهوم الأمن المعزوف في الدراسة، وذلك بتركيز تصورها على الحياة الإنسانية. وباستخدام هذا النموذج، فإن هذه الدراسة تهدف لتعريف مفهوم الأمن لدى اليهود في سياق المضمون الديني الذي أوجده العهد القديم. إن أهداف المفهوم هي للفت الانتباه إلى احتمالية أن يكون مؤثرا في صنع سياسة أمنية لأن دولة إسرائيل كانت قد أعلنت كدولة يهودية، لكن لم تنوي توضيح سياسة الأمن الإسرائيلية بواسطة هذا المضمون. وتقدم النتائج أيضا هيئة مرجعية يمكن استخدامها من قبل مؤلفين (كتاب) آخرين والذين مع السياسات التي تصنعها إسرائيل منذ تأسيس الدولة.

الكلمات الدالة: العهد القديم، الآخريين، الأمن، الأمن الإسرائيلي.

Introduction

The othering through religion has potential to create an understanding that considers the rest's legitimacy and rights unequal to his own and to form a model, following this understanding, for counter-action behaviour. In this context, it is impossible to mention about seeking common points with the other and the superiority may be expressed even in a superlative fashion. While this approach affords an opportunity to design a homogenous "I" in the sense of refusing an integration with the other, it may as well turn into a thought that accepts a place of his own likes as a living space.

Accordingly, the othering comes to the scene as a factor that its depth is decided by the intention, the approach and the behavioral style and that effects the attitudes of communities against one another. In the frame of this logic, the othering built on a strong reference like religion makes simpler the perception of the other as bad or even hostile. After leaping over this stage, an understanding that may evolve to the struggle of moving the other into his line, if not, to destroy it, becomes a strong possibility. Because the depicted chain reflects a frequent circle in history reading relating to conflicts, it is suitable to use as a component in giving meaning to the concept of security.

When the general cycle dealt in the context of the othering is associated with the Old Testament, the othering quits being a natural process and becomes a content that describes the other through his own. This content has a crucial meaning because the State of Israel was declared as Jewish state.¹ Thus, the Old Testament's way of dealing, explaining and positioning the othering comes to being a reference and assessment point for the analyses and synthesis about Israel's security policy. However, this study does not aim at discussing the religious provisions given by the Old Testament as a base that builds Israel's security policy and at pursuing its traces in the policy, but at revealing the infrastructure that may be followed by the decision makers who want to issue the religion-oriented policies. From the other point of view, it intends to draw attention to the content that has a ground in favor of excessively conservative Jewish community wings who want to compel the politicians to make religion-security related decisions.

1 "The Declaration of The Establishment of The State of Israel, 14 May 1948", <http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/History/Modern+History/Historic+Events/Declaration%20of%20Establishment%20of%20State%20of%20Israel> (Date of Access, 19 November 2012)

In order to determine how the provisions of the Old Testament religiously compose the content of the concept of security, a frame, which includes a general projection of the concept of security on human and social life and which covers perceptual/factual components of security, is drawn. This frame is also used as a pattern in selecting security-based and security-related provision during reading the Old Testament.

The Concept of Security

German philosopher and political scientist Jurgen Habermas suggests that human being produces information regarding the use of force for his survival and controls his environment via this produced information.² It can be concluded from this statement that the security is an information-oriented fiction which enables primarily survival and secondly a stable climate for progressing safely. The concept of security, by considering the fiction may be changed according to the scope and the character of the information, can be generalized as a behavior to exist and an effort for the continuity of the existence. Although its content may vary according to the identifier entity, society and conjuncture, it can be accepted that the security embraces the psychological, sociological, political and economic aspects of the human and social life.³ And its emotional content can be portrayed as not being exposed to risk or jeopardy and not feeling doubt, anxiety and fear.⁴

In this frame, the security emerges as a value which is more or less owned and permanently demanded by nations. Hence, it can be asserted that the security hosts a content regarding not only being target of other nations but also being target of self-generated fears and expectations. So, the security is on one hand a need and a must, on the other hand an organized reflex based on communal perception. In order to conceptualize the security, which can also be dealt as an eliminating behavior of insecurity possibilities, it is necessary to fix how a community defines its own existence and how it motivates itself through this definition.⁵ Due to the fact that an absolute security is un-

2 Andrew Edgar, *Habermas: The Key Concepts*, (New York: Routledge, 2006), s. 10-11.

3 Beril Dedeoğlu, *Uluslararası Güvenlik ve Strateji*, (İstanbul: Derin Yayınları, 2003), s. 21-22.

4 Margaret O'Leary, "Security", *The Dictionary of Homeland Security and Defence*, (Lincoln: iUniverse, 2006), s. 417.

5 Dedeoğlu, 2003, s. 23.

reachable, to set its available or desired level is an important criterion for determining security-related activities.⁶

The security dynamics arise from the interaction between the threats that endanger the identity or/and existence and the counter-measures to discard these threats.⁷ So, in order to mention about a security case, there is a need for the actuality of one or more internal/external threat against preserving/maintaining of existence and the presence of existence-related perceptions or appraisements. From this association, it can be said that the security is defined goal/expectation-oriented, rested upon fictual ground and relativity, thus, it is as least perceptual as it is factual.⁸

The political, social and economic threats may reflect in the policy through military cause-effect relation.⁹ Under this connection, it can be accepted that the national security is a overt and/or covert fiction which activates national sources for reaching the identified military/political goals and which contains highly efficient practices and rules.¹⁰ And its responsive manner may comprehend the tactics of eradication of the enemy's inside/outside roots and the strategy of delivery of war to the foe before its attack, namely, the preemptive strike.¹¹

Because restoring and maintaining the security will cause potential sacrifices of other values, the security-sacrifice, in other words the cost-benefit portion, should be calculated well and the result must be nation-wide acceptable. The easiest way of the estimation for the security, which changes according to the society, the historical realities and the current/future needs, is to decide to which extent is bearable

6 Barry Buzan, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in The Post-Cold War Era*, (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishing, 1991), s. 3-5, 330.

7 Barry Buzan, *The European Security Order Recast*, (London: Pinter Publishers, 1991), s. 3.

8 Roger Carey, "The Contemporary Nature of Security" in Trevor C. Salmon (ed.), *Issues of International Relations*, (New York: Routledge, 2000), s. 51.

9 Randall Collins, *Weberian Sociological Theory*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), s. 3.

10 Baruch Kimmerling, "The Social Construction of Israel's National Security" in Stuart A. Cohen (ed.), *Democratic Societies and Their Armed Forces: Israel in Comparative Context*, (London: Frank Cass, 2000), s. 218-219.

11 Robert Dorff, "The Search For National and Homeland Security: An Integrated Grand Strategy" in Paul R. Viotti, Michael A. Opheim, Nicholas Bowen (eds.), *Terrorism and Homeland Security*, (Florida: CRC Press, 2008), s. 25-27; Gerry Simpson, "Law and Force in The Twenty-First Century" in David Armstrong (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of International Law*, (New York: Routledge, 2009), s. 204.

in case of absence. What is important is how much of the other values will be swap with it.¹² It can be historically concluded that the more defence does not mean the more security and that a survival-oriented security policy may not provide safety for the demanding community and may not bring about a secure environment for the surrounding nations.

Within the framework of this generalization, it can be argued that the concept of security comprises the goals regarding existing, the policies convincing or forcing the other to accept its actuality and the ideological objectives carrying its existence to the permanence. To designate a conceptual frame via positioning of the other by a self-starting approach and to seek a safe future with this design may transform the security understanding into a thesis-antithesis dialectic. A ground that converts this dialect into an othering-security relation can be seen in the Old Testament.

The Ground Created by the Othering for Security

The Old Testament says that God names the son of Israel as his own people, he will live among them, never abandon them and be their God forever, he is with them to protect.¹³ The success is promised by explicitly revealing the chosenness among nations as a sacred and unique people.¹⁴ The continuous statement of “God of Israel” emerges as a reminder of the costum-defined relationship and keeps the singularity alive.¹⁵ It is emphasized that God’s eyes will be on the son of Israel, even be with them and strengthen them. The emphasis on being chosen, which treats the others in nullity, is in a position to solidify the othering.¹⁶ This positioning is called to mind with the affection for the son of Israel and with the intention of protecing them eternally and it is

12 Lawrence Freedman, “The Concept of Security” in Mary Hawkwsworth, Maurice Kogan (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Government and Politics*, (London: Routledge, 1992, II), s. 730.

13 Leviticus 25:55; Cronicle (1) 11:2, 16:21, 17:8,22; Psalms 135:14; Isaiah 41:8-9; Jeremiah 1:8, 31:1; Exodus 29:45; Deuteronomy 26:18; Kings (1) 6:13; Nehemiah 9:15-19.

14 Deuteronomy 7:6-13, 26:19; Samuel (2) 7:23.

15 Exodus 10:3, 11:7, 12:13; Samuel (1) 1:7, 2:30, 12:7; Kings (1) 1:30, 48, 8:26, 14:7, 16:2,13,26,33, 17:14, 18:36, 22:53; Kings (2) 9:6, 10:30, 14:25; Cronicles (1) 4:10, 22:6, 28:4; Cronicles (2) 6:10, 14,16-17, 15:4, 13, 20:6, 30:1,5, 33:16, 34: 23, 26, 35:3; Ezra 1:3, 3:2, 4:3, 6:21, 9:4, 15; Psalms 41:13, 68:8, 69:6; Isaiah 24:15, 37:16, 45:3; Jeremiah 7:3, 21, 11:2, 16:9, 19:3, 21:4, 23:2, 24:5, 25:15, 27:4,21, 28:2, 14, 29:4, 8, 25, 31:23, 32:14-15, 36, 35:17-19, 38:17, 42:15, 18, 43:10, 44:2,7, 11, 25, 45:2, 46:25, 48:1; Ezekiel 44:2; Sephaniah 2:8.

16 Cronicle (2) 7:16; Isaiah 41:10, 13; Genesis 18:18.

implied that their names on the earth will not be wiped away.¹⁷ By getting beyond the unique positioning, that human being (the son of Israel) is blessed and that they will be a light for the others is indicated and the son of Israel is required to dominate the earth.¹⁸ The stress on the rest of the peoples, namely the others, regarding they will serve to the chosen one, also has a strengthening effect on the othering.¹⁹

The permanent emphasis on the God-the son of Israel togetherness is reflected as if it is accepted by other peoples. The other is expected to scare of God in favor of the son of Israel. This relationship chain is completed by the constant protection (including the use of force ability) and by the intermediary role among other peoples.²⁰ Thus, the source of power is defined for both the son of Israel and the other, and a mechanism which is based on positioning the parties is established.

This association mechanism builds a ground for the privilege and the immunity, that is to say, a private alignment apart from other peoples. Another emerging case is the overlapping of God's holiness and the position rendered a privilege to the son of Israel. On the point reached, that the son of Israel is separated from the others and blessed is fixed by an overt emphasis.²¹ The other evidences concerning the othering are the command that bans the son of Israel fight against each other and the provision that nobody (the other) can govern them but themselves.²²

It is possible to assert that such a clear demonstration of the othering and the definition of God-the son of Israel relation in identicalness may ease the other to be enemy and that the self-confidence produced by the privilege sense may strengthen an *a priori* legitimacy for any action against the other. In line with this linkage, it may as well be said that a systematic can much more easily be established, which transforms the concept of the chosenness into the concept of "the people with divine power". But, in order to enjoy this private relationship and the privilege in the defined frame, the son of Israel is expected to execute the provi-

17 Cronicle (2) 9:8; Ezra 3:11; Isaiah 62:4; Hosea 14:4; Kings (2) 14:27.

18 Genesis 1:1-31; Isaiah 42:6.

19 Isaiah 60:10.

20 Cronicles (2) 6:31-32; Genesis 9:3; 12:1-3, 7, 12, 21:22, 26:3-5, 24, 31:3.

21 Leviticus 20:26, 22:32.

22 Cronicles (2) 11:4; Deuteronomy 17:14-15.

sions commanded by the Old Testament. That means, being chosen people is not enough, it is necessary to deserve.

The durability of protection taking on meaning through the defined togetherness is accepted, providing loyalty to the agreement.²³ Thus, the agreement is placed in a position, which it is equalized with a guarantee of victory against foe and another guarantee of protection of the son of Israel's generations and which it starts a secure life understanding.²⁴ To obey this term is seen as a key to be bigger than the others and to solidify their presence.²⁵ In other words, God is indicated as the source of power for being strong. Furthermore, the principles of that those who are with God will not be alone and that God will abandon them in case they leave him and that they will be successful as long as they are with him are designated.²⁶ Besides, it is especially emphasized that those who do not obey the agreement will lose the chosenness and sooner or later be punished, the rest who remains in the end will be God's eternal people.²⁷ This depiction corresponds to an equation of the reward will increase with the sacrifice.

While underlining of that the disasters could be avoided complying with the agreement, it is also stressed that the son of Israel is judged according to their attitudes and that the reason of their security-related threats are the result of their faults. In order to hamper falling into the fault and to dispatch them to the required route and to punish, a lasting punishment mechanism is placed. This mechanism also clarifies a composition that preserves both the agreement and the solidarity through punishment, fear and threat.²⁸ Thus, a structure is formed, which makes possible on one hand preventing the erosion of union, on the other hand overlapping the power/use of power legitimacy identified in God with the son of Israel. The continual reference on the private relationship prepares a facilitator ground for defining it prospectively. The established reciprocal relationship is not one-sided

23 Genesis 28:14-15, 46:3-4; Jeremiah 4:2, 11:4. There is an agreement between God and the son of Israel in exchange for protection. One-way committing to God is out of question. Genesis 28:20-22.

24 Genesis 15:1,17:4-8; 28:15; Deuteronomy 21:10.

25 Deuteronomy 4:6-8; Chronicles (1) 17:8; Chronicles (2) 17:4-5.

26 Isaiah 30:15; Samuel (2)5:10; Chronicles (2) 24:20, 24, 26:5, 31:21; Ezeikel 34:27-28; Psalms 9:10.

27 Ezeikel 14:8-11,15:7-8.

28 Jeremiah 26:13, 32:40; Ezeikel 5:12-17, 6:10, 7:4,16:59, 36:19, 39:23-24.

alliance, but, it is an agreement that brings about God's response to the demands of the son of Israel. This identification is justified by the statement of "the request will be corresponded".²⁹

In case of disobedience to the agreement, it is underscored that the next generations will be punished, that the enemy of the son of Israel will be triumphant, that those who hate Israel will govern them, that they will fall into a bad situation in the eyes of other nations and that they will vanish off the promised land.³⁰ However, the punishment mechanism is seen as a tool, which is capable for reprovisioning the agreement.³¹

The emphasis on being chosen makes the other's position rigid. Because the son of Israel has an internal justice seeking and a predetermined future expectation and they do not want to carry these into the concept of universality, the position belonging to the other remains stable outside.³² The perceptual/fictual frontline to take through this positioning may add any prejudice about the other into the intellectual and behavioral process. And such a positioning may facilitate a code of principles that functions as a further stage descriptive for the chosenness and the existence understanding.

The revealed correlation proves a reciprocity on one hand from God to the son of Israel, on the other hand vice versa. This procedure builds a two-way mechanism, on one way God have his requirements make the son of Israel, on the other way the son of Israel make God facilitator for their expectations. The most important product of the identified mechanism is to legitimize the ability of use of force, normally under sole authority of God, in favor of the son of Israel. Such kind of relation may cause an understanding that can open a gate for using force by the son of Israel on behalf of God. Namely, the thinking of "if the son of Israel is the chosen people, then their enemies should be destroyed" may be accepted not as an inference, but as an emphasis with a strong ground.³³

29 Genesis 28:20-22; Ezeikel 36:37.

30 Exodus 20:5-6, 34:7; Leviticus 26:14-16, 23-25, 27-40; Numbers 14:41-43; Jeremiah 24:8-10, 32:18.

31 Kings (2) 23:1-3.

32 Zechariah 7:10.

33 Psalms 143:12.

Othering-Land-Security Correlation

While the first determinant of the othering is the acceptance of the chosen people, the second identifier is a land allocation solely belong to this chosen people. This allocation is concurrently the indicator of the private relationship with God. The promise is based on providing a national land for the son of Israel and settling them there.³⁴ The pledge not only covers a land estate but also includes a safe living space. So, the land is depicted as a place where the son of Israel will be away from their enemies, where they will be safe, where they will not be disturbed and where nobody can put pressure on them.³⁵ In next step, the continuity of ownership on the land and the capability of survival are defined together.³⁶ Thus, the equation of “having the promised land=security” is established.

In order to make the equation constant, the boundaries of the promised land are fixed and it is underlined that this land is under protection of God. The process in promising the land is described eternally in a way of pointing the next generations and this process is thought with the proliferation of the son of Israel together. These are important in terms of the lasting togetherness-permanence doubling in the promised land linkage. Thus, the promised land is positioned not only as a land estate but also as a place where their safe live is under divine guarantee and as a religious fact that is required to transfer from a generation to another.³⁷

The continual ownership of the land, namely safe living space, is conditional as is in protection of the chosen people position. The difficulties in this process is seen as a test of faith. The conjunction between the security and the land is considered as solidity of the agreement.³⁸ Togetherness with God and alignment against enemy, by obeying the provisions, are the requirement for clinging to the land.³⁹ Otherwise, it is drawn attention to the loss of the land and then the doom.⁴⁰ In spite

34 Samuel (2) 7:10-11; Jeremiah 30:3; Deuteronomy 11:7-8; Ezeikel 37:14, 39:27-28.

35 Deuteronomy 12:10; Jeremiah 32:37-39; Cronicles (1) 17:9-10.

36 Deuteronomy 4:1-4, 5:32-33, 6: 13-19; Ezeikel 20:38.

37 Genesis 13:14-17, 15:18, 35:12, 48:16; Joshua 1:3-5; Ezeikel 39:27-28, 47:13-20; Deuteronomy 11:7-8.

38 Deuteronomy 8:1-7, 13:3; Ezeikel 28:25-26.

39 Leviticus 19:37, 20:8,22-24; Deuteronomy 30:20; Kings (2) 21:8.

40 Kings (1) 9:6-7; Isaiah 1:18-20; Cronicles (2) 7:20.

of this approach, the statement of “the son of Israel will be assembled in the promised land even if they were driven away as a punishment” shows that they are identified with this land and there is no safer place other than the land.⁴¹ It is possible to say from the general aspect that the equation of “losing the land or being apart from it=endangering security” summarizes the relationship between the land and the security.

It is clear from the findings in the religious provisions that the relationship between the promised land and the son of Israel, regardless of time period, also forms an important stage of the relationship with God. And to symbolize the agreement through the land defines both the reward from God and the value to be defended. The joint identification of the land and the chosenness avoids thinking them apart. Between these ends, the security both acts a role as a conjunction and is a product of the process.

The issues discussed so far are to clear the relationship attributed by the Old Testament between the land and the security. In addition, a security association with the land of the enemy can be mentioned. It is possible to consider this dimension as the driving force for determining the position of enemy land and for directing security activities on this land.

The Old Testament says that the enemies will be driven away from the son of Israel, that their land will be owned, that there is a lot of land to be owned and that the son of Israel will be rewarded with these lands as long as they preserve loyalty. It is considered impossible for other nations to escape from this end.⁴² The drawn frame covers not only land but also the people living there. The cleansing of other nations from God's land is conveyed as a general expectation, but beyond this the son of Israel is also obliged to oust the inhabitants. Otherwise, the punishment mechanism is put into action.⁴³ In addition, it is accepted as a survival defining rule that the son of Israel should live in the occupied land according to the religious provision and that they should not live in a way the other do. Peoples in the seized land are defined in a position to damage the relationship between God and the son of Israel.

41 Ezeikel 17:1; Amos 9:15.

42 Isaiah 60:13; Joshua 13:1-6; 14:9; Deuteronomy 11:22-25; Exodus 33:2-5, 12-19, 34:10-11, 23-24.

43 Psalms 10:16; Numbers 33:55-56.

So, they are forbidden to agree with the others.⁴⁴ When the argument is carried to the promised land, it is emphasized that the people living there will be destroyed. The purpose of doing so is explained by hampering any damage to the agreement.⁴⁵ Thus, for the continuity of the absolute and legitimate power, to consider other people as a problem becomes a religious must and a frame for survival is fixed. Any opposition to this acceptance is equalized to a “do it or extinct” thought.

It is concluded from the findings that the land-security relationship is based on a land description that belongs to solely his own and on a land cleaned from other peoples. The linkage, which is not only a safe living space depiction but also a command of God, is put forward explicitly. Due to this fact, the land opens gate for an othering-oriented understanding.

Othering-Enemy-Security Correlation

To describe the othering in a position to control perceptual/factual processes eases to degrade the concept of hostile action to the secondary determinant in fixing the content of the concept of enemy. In other words, the concept of enemy, which is one of the main identifiers of the concept of security, moves away from being a fact that describes the concept through the action and the intention. The Old Testament brings the mentioned perceptual dimension to the fore by stating “other nations are the enemies of the son of Israel”.⁴⁶ In order to reinforce this assertion, it is also expressed that the enemies are in an agreement for destroying the son of Israel.⁴⁷ Against the defined enemy front, it is conveyed that the son of Israel will not be in fear, that they will be superior to the enemy and that the enemy will be driven away.⁴⁸ The Old Testament quotes that God says, by emphasizing his togetherness with them and accepting their enemy as his foe, the son of Israel will not be alone against the enemy. In this context, the Old Testament’s emphasis on those who threaten the son of Israel will be sentenced to become extinct, determines both the final status of the enemy and the basic principle created by the fiction.⁴⁹

44 Exodus 23:31-33, 34:15; Leviticus 18:1-5.

45 Deuteronomy 20:16-18.

46 Nehemiah 5:9.

47 Psalms 71:10.

48 Leviticus 26:6-13; Samuel (2) 3:18; Cronicles (1) 17:9-10.

49 Exodus 6:6-8, 23:20-23; Sefhaniah 2:8-15.

Within the defined principles, it is stressed that the togetherness of God and the son of Israel against the enemy builds a security guarantee. And according to this acceptance, a general enemy-security frame is created through the statements of that the son of Israel should not scare of the enemy, that God will fight for them, that God himself will defeat the enemy, that the enemy will not be triumphant even if they fight, that defeat of the enemy is inevitable, that the togetherness will cause fear on the enemy and that the enemy is *a priori* defeated.⁵⁰ From the panorama set out, it is concluded that God himself fights against the enemy rather than the son of Israel and therefore the defeat is a pre-rendered decision.⁵¹ The statement of that enemy should not rejoice with his interim victory, forasmuch as, the son of Israel will the final victor by virtue of God, is used for strengthening the reached conclusion. Thus, a condition, which the son of Israel can get rid of the enemy by means of God and the enemy can be defeated only when does God be with them, is defined.⁵²

While the salvation address is named as God, the expectation from God is the protection against the enemy. For this end, a direct help is requested from God. Keeping potential enemies away is another dimension of the request. This covers both a demand and a belief that God will defeat the enemy. Namely, the belief is equalized to the triumph against the foe.⁵³ The way of protection is characterized by the statements of that those who punish the son of Israel will be punished, that those who humiliate will be humiliated, that the son of Israel will not be shamed and that those who hate and put pressure will be damned.⁵⁴ The general framework of protectionism is described by the emphasis of that the enemies of the son of Israel will be eradicated from the earth. And the framework is solidified by the approach of that the fear/horror of the son of Israel will be carried to other nations.⁵⁵ Thus, the concept of security in the context of the enemy is placed a frame which is based on the defeat of foe through togetherness with God. This

50 Exodus 14:4; Deuteronomy 1:30-31, 3:21-22, 20:1-4, 23:14; Joshua 1:9, 2:9-11, 23:3,10; Job 5:20; Joel 2:27; Haggai 2:5; Zechariah 8:13, 9:15; Isaiah 59:19; Jeremiah 1:19, 15:20, 20:11, 33:9; Chronicles (1) 17:8.

51 Exodus 14:25; Joshua 10:8-10.

52 Mikah 4:10, 7:8-10; Habakkuk 3:18, Zechariah 9:8, 16; Joshua 10:19-21; Psalms 44:5.

53 Psalms 3:7, 7:1-2,6, 9:6,13:4, 17:9, 44:7, 59:1, 68:11,21,69:18, 108:12-13, 112:7-8,119:159, 136:24; Hosea 13:4; Zechariah 4:6.

54 Genesis 15: 13-15; Ezeikel 36: 6-7; Joel 2:19, 27; Deuteronomy 30:7.

55 Exodus 17:14; Deuteronomy 2:25.

frame clarifies that the Old Testament does not define the concept of security with solely military strategies and tactics.

Hence, the enemy's ability to expose a threat is defined inversely proportional with loyalty to the agreement. The protection against the enemy is considered possible by keeping the linkage with God. In same way the ability of the use of force against the enemy is indexed to continual fidelity.⁵⁶ In addition, those who trust God will not be given in the enemy hand and those who scorn God will be given in the hands of the talented killers. So, heading for God is inevitable as long as the survival is a request.⁵⁷ Because the son of Israel is protected by the presence of the agreement, the demands will be corresponded conditionally.⁵⁸ From different point of view, it may be said that the defeat of the enemy is used as an occasion for proving God's power to the son of Israel.⁵⁹ All these total emerge a finding that the ability of the use of force on the enemy is equated obeying the religious provisions.

Besides, the son of Israel who breach the agreement is positioned like enemy and they are threatened with the collapse of whole country and with the transfer of the land to who deserve it.⁶⁰ The statements of that the enemy will not be driven away, that they will be left in the heart of Israel as a punishment, that the enemy will be triumphant and that the son of Israel will be captive in the enemy hand, are placed as control key of the established religious alliance mechanism. The emerging picture clarifies that the punishments of disobedience are to be left on their own without God and to be dominated by other nations. And the power, namely the use of force, targeting the enemy is also applicable on the son of Israel for keeping them in the agreement circle.⁶¹

Thus, the enemy is positioned as both a threat element and a punitive tool. But, while the enemy is permitted to dominate the son of Israel, their roots are, providing abiding by the provision, not allowed

56 Psalms 56:4, 7, 9, 11; Proverbs 1:33, 2:23, 14:26; Kings (2) 17:39, 18:7-8; Exodus 19:3-6; Leviticus 25:18, 26:3-5.

57 Jeremiah 39:17-18; Ezeikel 11:9, 21:28, 31-32; Amos 5:6.

58 Numbers 21:1-6; Samuel (1) 7:10, 10:15, 28:19; Kings (1) 16:2-4; Kings (2) 13:2-3, 19:19-34, 20:6.

59 Hezekiel 29:15-16.

60 Isaiah 1:24-28; Amos 9:10; Jeremiah 45:4; Ezeikel 21:27, 22:21.

61 Judges 2:3, 5:10-11, 14-15, 6:1,10:7, 13:1; Ezra 5:12; Kings (2) 17:19-20, 21:13; Psalms 106:41; Ezeikel 39:21-22.

to become extinct. Furthermore, it is emphasized that God felt pity for them and didn't destroy them, even when they broke the rules. It can be concluded from this approach that the punishment threat is used both as a symbol of God's domination/possession on the son of Israel and a fear factor on them through the suppressive power over the enemy.⁶² This finding carries the argument to the presence of a logic which tests the son of Israel with other nations, namely the enemy. And the Old Testament itself emphasizes this clearly.⁶³ In other words, the existence of enemy draws the son of Israel near God, as a result, the foe is eliminated and a security provider agreement is formed. In the very end, the enemy is utilized for preventing the son of Israel to get dragged to an unsafe environment and then the religiously identified security is produced.

The provisions regarding the enemy show that obeying or not obeying rules matches up with surviving or not surviving. This equation also indicates that God uses the victory of the foe over the son of Israel as a punishment.⁶⁴ The enemy is located as a counter element against the status of security and its function and role are changed according to the attitudes of the son of Israel. Thus, the Old Testament establishes a mechanism that the security need of the son of Israel is steered by its adversary.

The Security Understanding Formed by Othering and Use of Force Relationship

The logic that constructs the enemy-security relationship also brings about an infrastructure which may produce the security through the use of force. The cycle of resorting means of violence, which is identified as both punishing tool against the son of Israel and destroying instrument against the enemy, is portrayed as a religious necessity in terms of keeping the intended goal.⁶⁵ As a result of this approach, a milieu, which the use of force may be understood as use of violence tools and it may gain a function in line with this understanding, becomes potential.

62 Ezikel 20:17,21-22,23:24-28, 25:7,30:19, 25; Amos 6:14; Nehemiah 9:27-28, 30-31; Jeremiah 24:6; 30:11, 33:7,46:28.

63 Judges 2:22, 3:4; Habakkuk 1:12.

64 Deuteronomy 28:58-59, 30:17-18, 32:26-27, 35; Proverbs 8:36; Ezeikel 18:21.

65 Genesis 4:1-8.

The first application of the use of force points the son of Israel. In the event of disobeying the provisions, the force will be used on the chosen people till they turn back to the agreement. In this pattern the use of force emerges as a sanction. For, the sanction is to be punished through use of violence, not a non-violent way such as deprivation of rights.⁶⁶ From another point of view, it can be said that the use of force is a necessary application on the son of Israel in order to prevent them to be driven from the promised land and to be scattered among other nations.⁶⁷ I can be concluded from the correlation that the use of force, in case of the son of Israel, means security because it keeps them in the status of agreement with God.

This association, that is to say being exposed to violence, paves the way for a understanding that can carry their punishability through a violent-based use of force to the other nations. Thus, the use of force on the other becomes more acceptable and legitimate. At this point very critical mindset emerges, namely, it is known from the previous correlations that the Old Testament describes God and the son of Israel nearly for each other. When these two findings overlapped, it is possible to think that the son of Israel may lean to apply the use of force on behalf of God.

Resorting to the force against the son of Israel by God finally aims at keeping the statue of security. This linkage is the first way of the two. The second way is regarding the use of force on the other.

The Old Testament conveys that God wants to defeat the enemy since he is angry with it, that he fights for the son of Israel, that he will defend their cause, that he wants to punish other nations for what they did to the son of Israel and that their revenge will be taken from the enemy. These statements are supported by the emphasis that those who are against the son of Israel will be destroyed.⁶⁸ A principle that the security will prevail the land after annihilation of nations who humiliate the son of Israel is adopted. Because the security is equalized to the absence of the enemy, it is expressed that the son of Israel will be helped to

66 Jeremiah 30:10-11; Isaiah 7:9; Numbers 6: 22-26, 15:39-41; Genesis 6: 5-7, 11-13; Amos 1:1-15, 2:1-5.

67 Ezeikel 5:10, 6:7, 12:15, 22:15-16.

68 Cronicles (2) 28:9, 32:8; Nehemiah 4:20; Samuel (1)15:2; Jeremiah 50:17-18, 51:36-40; Isaiah 41:11.

wipe out those who hate them. The reason of help is connected to the contentment coming from the agreement.⁶⁹ The table resulting from the association indicates that a chosenness-oriented othering may be the first ring in the chain of the behavior of the use of force.

The concept of the chosen people bring about the agreement to be inevitably determinant. Thus, the mechanism in which the loyalty dosage to the agreement decides the use of force ability on the enemy comes up again. The Old Testament defines the operation of the mechanism in direct proportion. The direct proportion shows that the use of force ability of the son of Israel on behalf of God is not perpetual and it is indexed to the agreement. This condition makes the loyalty primary step of the use of force.⁷⁰ As a result of this bond, a strategy, which enables the son of Israel to face the enemy with the protection guarantee coming from the agreement, becomes identifiable. The association logic produces a thinking that this strategy will be the determining factor for the frame of the use of force. Arising relationship clears that weapon is not the major determinant in the use of force, but, the power coming from the agreement and the application of this power on the enemy are. The portrayed context is also understood from the request that seeks God's leadership in the face of the adversary.⁷¹

The leadership means that God himself will fight and ensure the victory. The expected result is the annihilation of the enemy. Hence, two particular points come up, the first; the destruction of the foe by God without the son of Israel's presence in the process, the second; to enable the son of Israel to fight and win. Either case indicates that the leading fact is between God and the chosen enemy, thereby, the son of Israel is a secondary element.⁷² The wars related to the chosenness, namely the fights that are executed by the enemy due to the agreement, are suitable to be defined as God's war. Such a definition points out that the son of Israel is in a position of a tool in the use of force against the adversaries (that means God's adversaries).⁷³ As the war is defined belonging to God, it is necessary to get permission in advance and to ask whether God will defeat it or not. This statement sheds light

69 Ezeikel 28:26; Samuel (2) 22:41; Numbers 24:1.

70 Exodus 3:6-8, 6:6-8, 23:20-23; Sephaniah 2:8-15; Joshua 14:12.

71 Psalms 20:7, 27:11, 140:7; Cronicles (2) 14:11.

72 Joshua 10:42; Cronicles (2) 18:31; Isaiah 64:1-2; Lemantations 3:66; Psalms 35:1; Exodus 15:3.

73 Cronicles (2) 19:16-17; Samuel (1) 17:47; Zechariah 9:12-13.

on the points mentioned above.⁷⁴ And because the power is used on behalf of God, it may be said that to authorize or not for a war acts as both a belief test and a function to determine God's attitude towards the son of Israel.

The use of force during God's war against the enemy drags the character of the fight to not only a plain defeat but also a destruction proving almighty power. The statements of that God will act angry to the foe, that the angry will be in a disastrous and punitive form, that the enemies will be punished by blood, that their army will be wiped out are the evidences of the character of the fight.⁷⁵ The emphasises of that the son Israel should not afraid of other nations, that God will drive the enemies slowly, that God will make them bow to the son of Israel, that nobody can prevent the son of Israel till they destroy the foe establish general strategy.⁷⁶ The expression of that God is be with the son of Israel to cause fear on the enemy can be added to the strategic stage. Then, in the tactical process, an approach, which eases the destruction of the enemy through simultaneously enabling a capability for the son of Israel and an ambition for the enemy to fight against the son of Israel, is adopted.⁷⁷

Turning to God's approach for the son of Israel from the enemy, it is encountered with the statements that God's revenge must be taken and that the angry of son of Israel will continuously be on the adversaries.⁷⁸ It can be said that either approach contributes to a conception aiming total destruction of the enemy rather than defeating it. Dealing with the reflection of this conception to the tactical phase, the statement of "vengeance" that covers the killings without discrimination, the plunder of property and the burning of cities attracts attention.⁷⁹

This expression, especially in the context of the promised land, is also emphasized as an order in the form of the destruction of local people.⁸⁰ The frame of the use of force is drawn as captivity in case of surrender

74 Judges 20:23; Samuel (1)14:37,23:1,4; Samuel (2)5:19; Kings (2) 2:11; Kings (1) 14:10; Chronicles (2) 18:4-5.

75 Isaiah 59:18; Jeremiah 47, 48, 49, 50; Ezeikel 29:3-12, 38:18, 22, 39:11-13.

76 Jeremiah 10:5; Deuteronomy 7: 17-24, 9:5-6; Joshua 6:15; Chronicles (2) 20:29.

77 Nehemiah 6:16; Joshua 11:20.

78 Numbers 31:1,-3, 7; Joshua 10:25; Isaiah 66:14; Nahum 1:2.

79 Numbers 31:7-18; Jeremiah 50:30-32.

80 Deuteronomy 7:1-2, 16; Judges 1:8,17, 25, 8:16, 9:4-5.

and as total destruction without discrimination in case of fight.⁸¹ It must be said that the statement of "total destruction" is a common point in all provisions regarding the enemy. This method is brought forward as an understanding that God requires from the son of Israel till the annihilation of the foe, not a necessity of war.⁸² In order to keep the method intact until the destruction of the enemy, it is emphasized that the good will attitudes of the adversaries are deceptive and is stressed that rejoicing the fall of the enemy will decrease the angry of God against it.⁸³

Another element that can be added to the tactical phase in term of the use of force is the acceptance of retaliation between the son of Israel and the other.⁸⁴ The capital punishment is fixed for the perpetrator who kills or abducts a son of Israel. This fixation may be endorsed as a dictum that eliminates alternative punishive applications other than death penalty. The reached conclusion is justified by the retaliation of death for a death. This understanding is completed by the principles of that God is the pursuer of those who shed blood of human being (it must be the son of Israel according to the Old Testament) and that the blood of who sheds blood of human being will be shed by human being.⁸⁵

Within the content illustrated by the Old Testament, it is seen that the total destruction of the foe is asked and that the concept of use of force is positioned in line with this goal. Namely, the concept does not aim at creating a change in the behavior of the enemy. In any case, the use of force is God's requirement and is permitted only when it matches with God's cause. It must be emphasized that this approach is strenghtened by defining the enemy as revengeful. The statement of "total destruction of the enemy" both is used in an equation established with the concept of security and is used in depiction of the arrival of peace after war.⁸⁶ Thus, an understanding that brings peace through an accord becomes null and void. And continual presence of this statement in the religious provisions prevents the situation to be exceptional, it gives rise to the perception that is used and/or can be used as an usual war tactic.

81 Deuteronomy 2:33-36,3:6, 20: 10-15; Joshua 6:21, 8:1-2, 19, 22, 25, 27, 10: 28-30,32-33; Judges 1:28-34.

82 Joshua 10:40; Samuel (1)15:18; Samuel (2) 22:38-41; Cronicles (2) 18:10.

83 Proverbs 24:17-18, 27:6.

84 Leviticus 24:20-22.

85 Exodus 21: 14-16, 23-25; Genesis, 9:5-6.

86 Psalms 44:16, 54:5, 55:15, 59:10; Joshua 11:23, 14:15.

Conclusion

The identifiers of the concept of security such as that it is the sum of behaviors to be exist and to maintain the existence, that the behavioral pattern is closely related to how a community defines itself and the others, that due to this relativity the fictional needs are as determinant as the factual ones, that it is significantly open to the influence of the expectations, that it consists a mechanism deciding the way of threat identification and the way of reaction against it, that it aims a vision of the future away from fear and danger, that it is considered inalienable, non-substitutable and continual, that the use of force is accepted as tool to overcome insecurity, that it embraces dynamic processes in the context of cause-effect and action-reaction doublings, are overlapped with the content of the Old Testament.

The Old Testament conveys that the concept of security must contain religious obligations in order to take meaning for the son of Israel as a safe existence on an identified land without life-threatening risks. The religious dictum that builds a security concept for the son of Israel starts with defining their position. This process consists sometimes different sometimes reciprocal two phases. These make the position determination in the context of God and the other. In the mentioned security-related phases, the chosenness is put as the first ring in the chain, then the private relationship with God is attached as the second ring and these two rings are united by the provisions of the Old Testament, which stipulate obeying rules in order to functions the established structure properly. The structure may also be depicted as a mechanism that moves the son of Israel towards God as much as they send the other away and that associates the loss of the status of security with their disobedience to the provisions.

The Old Testament describes this action cycle as the guarantee of the victory against the enemy and as primary essentiality of getting the power that is crucial for acquiring the security. After the provision regarding the other, which is next step of the essentiality, is executed, the chosenness is perfected by the promise of lasting protection. In other words, The Old Testament delineates the status of insecurity for the other with the affinity between God and the son of Israel. From the view of the son of Israel, this situation makes the security not a absolute and *a priori* right, but a fact which is fragile and necessary to deserve. Namely, it is clearly emphasized that it is meaningless to try restoring the security without following the agreement.

The status of insecurity is characterized in a punitive context, the use of God's power on the son of Israel aims at gaining them back into the agreement circle and at reproducing the security for them again. Thus, the concept of enemy is positioned as the second security threat after breaching the agreement. The established positioning can be observed in the Old Testament as a "the other → the enemy → the agreement with God → the security" chain. That is to say, the security in the religious context identifies a status which all the enemies are destroyed by virtue of the togetherness with God. In this picture, the Old Testament deals with the security as a achievable/losable factual and does not accept it as a part of a process which the other may participate. And the reached point abstracts the security to be a concept which can be defined according to factual conditions, paves the way for a deeper perceptuality and prejudice, brings about a continual introversion risk.

The approach of driving the other away as far as possible eases the understanding, which aims at restoring security through the use of force and the defeat of the enemy, to become a usual acceptance. And this strengthens the possibility of fixing the position of the other in the security perception as threat. Achieving this result, the acceptances of that the Old Testament considers other nations as the enemy of the son of Israel and that it portrays them in a ready position to destroy the son of Israel play a crucial role. The behavior of obtaining security is, by determining the enemy's nature and intention and by associating directly the destruction of the foe with the security status, shifted in a direction that develops a confrontational model. At this stage, the Old Testament, by leaving no room for an inference, commands that the enemy of the son of Israel is the enemy of God and underlines that they will be helped for building a secure environment and that the agreement is the guarantee of the security.

The constructed association emerges a religious understanding that balances these three matters; the superiority against the enemy to the extent obeying the agreement, the ability of use of force and the possibility of restoring security. In this understanding either God will defeat the enemy or God will help to the son of Israel to overcome it, only then will a safe living space be realized. It should be emphasized that the Old Testament considers the concept of defeat as the termination of the enemy as much as possible, not as the attenuation of the enemy to the extent it becomes harmless. Connecting this, it draws attention

that the often referred the statement of “destruction” is employed to give meaning to the safe environment. In the very end, because the enemy-security relationship is also in a position of the religious provision, this relationship has a strong potential, both factual and perceptual way, to be included into the security building processes.

In addition, the content of the Old Testament, which moves the son of Israel away from the other and directs them complying with the religious provisions, is as strong as to create a joint security perception among the son of Israel. The same infrastructure also emerges an understanding that legitimize the use of force for the son of Israel on behalf of God (in case of keeping the agreement) in order to produce the security. The provisions do not deal the security building with merely military goals and means, even if the importance of military power is emphasized. God-security relationship is unequivocal. In other words, the Old Testament sees the weapon not a guarantee of security but a means.

The application field, namely the spatial dimension of security, of the Old Testament’s emphasis on the chosenness and its content aiming at defining the concept of security through the relationship between the source of power and the use of force on the enemy is the promised land. The land contributes to the concept of security in two ways. On one hand, the life which will carry on the promised land is considered safe, that is to say away from annihilation. On the other hand, the struggles to be performed in order to keep this living space in possession build the concept of security. The critical point in this association is to bring about a security status balance between the ownership of the land and the continuity of survival in the context of zero-sum logic. Placing the promised land in a position of sacred custody, prevents the son of Israel from making any earthly decision on the land as well as converts possible losses of the land into security weakness. But, continual possession is not found sufficient, the sustainability of security is indexed to the presence of the agreement.

While the land is connected to the concept of security, not another place, but, the promised land is meant. Thus, all efforts to be carried out under all kind of situations for the promised land contribute to the content of security and are called as security activities in the context of the religious provisions. Another dimension of including land into the concept is to seize the other’s living space. This dimension also adds the driving of the other away from the son of Israel in the frame

of defining the concept of security. If the other is located within the boundaries of the promised land, their expulsion is positioned as a basic essentiality of restoring security.

The provisions of the Old Testament deals with the status of security as a condition of that the active enemies are totally neutralized through an ongoing togetherness with God and that the potential enemies are kept away as far as possible. And it deals with the status of insecurity as a condition of that the existence of the son of Israel is threatened, that they are abandoned by God, that they are seized by the other, that they are exiled from the promised land to another place and that the other is placed in the promised land. It may be said for this association that it accomodates a potential which can prevent the son of Israel from defining the concept of security through solely earthly facts, that it can emerge an option/an obligation which enables/forces decision makers to establish a policy about the other through a ground cretaed by the provisions, that it can increase the sensitivity of the perceptual threat. Again in the the light of this sum, it is easy to say that this association contains an infrastructure which may cause the other to accept the son of Israel as enemy. Thus, a thesis-antithesis paradox, which can give meaning to the concept of security through a mutual struggle circle, comes up.

Since the provisions associated with the status of security use the same ground with the belief principles in the context of the agreement and the promised land, it may be asserted that it is difficult to flex the content of the concept of security, which is subjected and related to religious definition and that it can increase the potential of zero-sum logic to effect all connected processes and that it is easy to pave the way for an understanding that sacrifices the values belonging to the other for the security of the son of Israel.

Bibliography

Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, <http://www.mfa.gov.il>

The Old Testament, Trans. Ronald A. Knox, London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1953.

Buzan, Barry, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in The Post-Cold War Era*, (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishing, 1991).

Buzan, Barry, *The European Security Order Recast*, (London: Pinter Publishers, 1991).

Carey, Roger, "The Contemporary Nature of Security" in Trevor C. Salmon (ed.), *Issues of International Relations*, (New York: Routledge, 2000).

Collins, Randall, *Weberian Sociological Theory*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

Beril, Dedeoğlu, *Uluslararası Güvenlik ve Strateji*, (İstanbul: Derin Yayınları, 2003).

Dorff, Robert "The Search For National and Homeland Security: An Integrated Grand Strategy" in Paul R. Viotti, Michael A. Ophem, Nicholas Bowen (eds.), *Terrorism and Homeland Security*, (Florida: CRC Press, 2008).

Edgar, Andrew, *Habermas: The Key Concepts*, (New York: Routledge, 2006).

Kimmerling, Baruch, "The Social Construction of Israel's National Security" in Stuart A. Cohen (ed.), *Democratic Societies and Their Armed Forces: Israel in Comparative Context*, (London: Frank Cass, 2000).

Lawrence, Freedman, "The Concept of Security" in Mary Hawkeworth, Maurice Kogan (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Government and Politics*, (London: Routledge, 1992).

O'Leary, Margaret, "Security", *The Dictionary of Homeland Security and Defence*, (Lincoln: iUniverse, 2006).

Simpson, Gerry, "Law and Force in The Twenty-First Century" in David Armstrong (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of International Law*, (New York: Routledge, 2009).