



João Sigalho
2007008862

Advisor: Professor Carmen Amado Mendes

The Securitization Process as the main strategy for the
establishment of the Israeli State and the consequent
definition of its boundaries

International Relations Master Programme

Volume I



UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA

Image developed by the author

Abstract

The Securitization Process as the main strategy for the establishment of the Israeli State and the consequent definition of its boundaries focuses on the development of an alternative perspective regarding the establishment of the State of Israel and the consequential definition of its boundaries.

In order to avoid any methodological mistakes based on the premise of a partial analysis, the author of the present dissertation initially focuses on the analysis of the concept of “Securitization”, provided by the Copenhagen School, since the standard established by the previous allows to verify the influence of the discursive acts performed by the recognized leaders that are involved throughout the key events of the conflict in analysis. The acts in question were determining factors for the evolution of the conflict, since, as it is approached in the first chapter, the discursive acts of the leaders are able to affect the creation of perceptions, not only by the affected population but, as well, by the International Community. As a result, the author felt the need to explore the theoretical conception of the “Securitization” process, with a special focus on the consequences that the previous allows, in order to contribute as well for the discussion of the theme in question, within the field of Security Studies.

Afterwards, the author develops an analysis of the Zionist ideology, with the goal of verifying that its leaders, through the use of discursive acts, directly

influenced the perceptions of the community that was covered by it, being that the Jewish population, and, as well, the leaders of the States that had the capability to directly influence the issues identified by the previously referred ideology. By doing so, the author will try to prove that the establishment of the State of Israel, even before the development of the Nazi doctrine, was an achievable goal, since the structures to do so had been, until then, created.

Consequently, after proving that the establishment of the State of Israel is a result of a successful developed process of “Securitization” of the Jewish community survival, by the Zionist leaders, the author will focus on an analysis directed to the events that allowed the strengthening of the Israeli sovereignty, in its territory, and, afterwards, on the definition of the territory that was subject to it. By doing so, together with a brief scrutiny regarding the facilitating element that the structures created by the Zionist movement added to the relationship between Israel and the remaining States, the author will try to prove that the State of Israel possesses a regime of exception, within the International Community, which was acquired through the development of successive processes of “Securitization” of the Jewish identity.

Keywords: Securitization, Zionism, Israeli-Palestinian Conflict.

Resumo

Intitulada *O Processo de Securitização como a estratégia principal para o estabelecimento do Estado de Israel e a consequente definição das suas fronteiras*, a presente dissertação foca-se no desenvolvimento de uma perspectiva alternativa relativamente ao estabelecimento do Estado de Israel e a consequente definição das suas fronteiras.

De modo a evitar a falácia de desenvolver uma análise que seja parcial, o autor da presente dissertação começa por analisar o conceito de “Securitização”, elaborado pela Escola de Copenhaga, visto que, segundo o padrão estabelecido pela anterior, é possível verificar a influência dos atos discursivos proferidos pelos líderes das partes envolvidos ao longo de eventos chave do conflito em análise. Os atos em questão foram fatores determinantes para o modo como o conflito se tem vindo a desenvolver, na medida em que, como é abordado no capítulo inicial, os atos discursivos dos líderes afetam diretamente a criação de perceções, não só por parte da população afetada diretamente pelo estabelecimento do Estado de Israel mas, também, por parte da Comunidade Internacional. Como tal, o autor sentiu a necessidade de explorar a conceção teórica do processo de “Securitização”, tendo um especial enfoque nas consequências que o processo em causa permite, contribuindo assim para a discussão da temática teórica em causa, no seio dos Estudos para a Segurança.

Posteriormente, o autor desenvolve uma análise da ideologia Sionista, com o intuito de verificar que os líderes da mesma, através do ato discursivo, influenciaram diretamente as percepções da comunidade que estava abrangida pela ideologia em causa, sendo a comunidade em causa a população Judaica, e, também, os líderes dos Estados que tinham a capacidade de influenciar diretamente as problemáticas identificadas pela referida ideologia. Como tal, o autor irá tentar provar que o estabelecimento do Estado de Israel, ainda antes do desenvolvimento da doutrina Nazi, era um objetivo alcançável, visto que as estruturas para tal já tinham sido, até então, criadas.

Consequentemente, após provar que o estabelecimento do Estado de Israel é o resultado do desenvolvimento de um processo de “Securitização” da sobrevivência da comunidade Judaica, por parte dos líderes Sionistas, o autor ir-se-á focar numa análise direcionada aos eventos que permitiram a cimentação da soberania Israelita, no seu território, e, posteriormente, na definição do território que é abrangido pela mesma. Desse modo, juntamente com uma breve abordagem relativamente ao elemento facilitador que as estruturas criadas pelo movimento Sionistas adicionam na relação com países terceiros, o autor irá tentar provar que o Estado de Israel possui um regime de exceção, no seio da Comunidade Internacional, o qual foi adquirido através do desenvolvimento de sucessivos processos de “Securitização” da identidade Judaica.

Palavras-Chave: Securitização, Sionismo, Conflito Israelo-Palestiniano.

Acknowledgments

Since the beginning of my Academic journey, I realized that more than a personal achievement this work was part of a collective effort accomplished not only by myself but also by those that continue to be next to me.

First of all, I would like to address to the Ms. Professor Carmen Amado Mendes, mostly due to all the patience and endeavor that she had in order to turn me into a responsible student. The fact that the Professor was able to combine pedagogic instruments with a tireless support, throughout my entire Academic path, was fundamental to my development as a human being.

Regarding my learning experience in the Faculty of Economics of the University of Coimbra, I would like to acknowledge the importance that the academic staff of the International Relations field had in fomenting my passion for the theme, besides guiding my development, in special regarding the work developed by the Professors André Barrinha, Daniela Nascimento, José Pureza, Maria Raquel Freire, Teresa Cravo and, as it was referred previously, Professor Carmen Amado Mendes.

It is with a special and nostalgic feeling that I would like to address the importance that my friends Khair A. Barham and May Jubran had during my staying in the Occupied Territories of Palestine. They were essential throughout my period in

there, not only due to the friendship that started to exist between us, which helped me to pass the absence that I had from home but, as well, due to the tireless support they gave me in arranging meetings and translating documents, which gave me a clear picture of the reality in there. Besides them, I would like to highlight the fortunate chance that I had to interact with the Professor Abdel Sattar-Qassem and the Professor Nayef Abu-Khalaf, during my period in the An-Najah National University, being both essential to provide me a strong insight of the complexity that shapes the Palestinian political system.

Most important, among all the acknowledgments are those related with my family. All of you were fundamental for my development, especially due to all the efforts that you made in order for me to study in Europe and in the Middle East. To you, my dear mother, I would like to thank you for all the investment that you made in me, represented by all the love and support that you were able to supply me throughout all my life until now. To you, my dear father, I would like to thank you all the support that you gave me, represented by the patience and enthusiasm that you showed in order for me to travel and discover the realities of the unknown. To you, my dear brother, I would like to thank you for all the caring that you showed for my development as a person, which is integral to whom I am today.

It is important as well to address the support and belief that you, Andreia Silva, had in me throughout this last year. Besides understanding my absence, you were able to be a tireless friend that was always there for me. For all those moments

that you have given up in order for me to accomplish my personal projects, is from the bottom of my heart that I thank you.

In order to conclude the present section, I would like to show my respect for all of those who I was able to meet in Warsaw, Beirut, Moscow and Nablus. Due to the fact that you are so many and were equally important to my development as a person, I cannot highlight anyone of you. I will be in peace by knowing that you are able to understand to whom I'm referring to.

Index

1. Introduction	1
2. The Securitization Theory	11
2.1. The main actors and outcomes produced by them	17
2.1.1. The Creation of Predispositions	19
2.2. The sectors that are accountable for the securitization process	25
2.2.1. The Political Sector	29
2.2.2. The Military Sector.....	31
2.2.3. The Societal Sector.....	34
2.3. The securitization process as a promoter of new paradigms.....	39
3. The Securitization of the Jewish question until the establishment of the State of Israel.....	45
3.1. The development of the Zionist ideology	46
3.2. The final road to the establishment of the State of Israel.....	60
4. The 2 nd process of securitization developed by the Jewish Leaders.....	73
4.1. The Palestine War	75
4.2. The 6 Day War	80
4.2.1. The beginning of the War.....	89
4.2.2. The reaction of the International community	91

4.3. The late legal basis for the annexation of the West Bank and Gaza – The Oslo Agreements	94
5. The State of Israel as a State of exception	97
5.1. The Jewish Diaspora	98
5.2. The Israeli Government and its ruling particularities	107
6. Conclusion	110
7. Bibliography	120

List of Maps

- Map 1: Map that defines the territories that were annexed by the State of Israel, p. 90.

List of acronyms

Congress of Jewish Religious Communities – KEROOR

European Union – EU

European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia – EUMCRX

Ex-Soviet Union Frontier – SUF

Federation of Jewish Communities of Russia - FEOR

General Armistice Agreement – GAA

Jewish National Fund – JNF

Moscow Jewish Religious Communities – MERO

Palestinian Liberation Organization – PLO

Plan Gimmel – Plan C

Plan Dalet – Plan D

Russian Jewish Congress – REK

Security Council of the United Nations – SC/UN

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics – USSR

United Nations General Assembly – UN/GA

United Nations Secretary General – UN/SG

United Nations Special Committee on Palestine – UNSCOP

United States of America – USA

United Nations Emergency Force – UNEF

1. Introduction

The present dissertation will be developed around the evolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The author understood that the dissertation would be more relevant to analyze the social construction of the conflict with a special incidence on the construction of the Israeli identity, not in terms of the conceptual values that it holds, but on the strategy that it was adopted by the Zionist leaders, at the time, which resulted in the settlement of a State, in the region, by an identity community that, at the time, was foreign to the region itself.

With that in mind, the author considered that it would be appropriated to consider the framework of analysis developed by the Copenhagen School, which is based around the Securitization process, due to the fact that it relates the importance of the speeches developed by the recognized leaders in order to maximize the interests that are identified by them. By taking in consideration such a theoretical framework, the author considered that it would be appropriate to relate it to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, since all the dynamics in the region are defined by the need to provide security to the societies that are affected, being that included in the field of Security Studies and, more precisely, analyzed in a theoretical perspective by the Copenhagen School.

That social interaction, between the ruling elite and the target audience, is considered to be, by the author, one of the most relevant steps in the political world,

since it defines the possibilities that the ruling elite have in order to address the problems that are identified by them, resorting to the structural instruments that they possess to affect the beliefs that are held by the common individual. This specific case turns into an interesting challenge, since the field of International Relations, in the opinion of the author, hasn't been able to attribute the necessary importance to the psychological field, which is fundamental for the shaping of beliefs and values constructed by a national identity, resulting in the shaping of the identity itself.

As a consequence, despite the fact that the field of International Relations is complemented by other social sciences, the author considered that there was a missing component, which was the development of a general understanding regarding the interaction between the leaders, the executive branch and the audience itself, and the possibilities that the exploitation of those relations would allow. To do so, since the development of such an animosity between nationals of different States is marked by a constant development of common beliefs towards the "other", the author considered that the analysis of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict would serve as a good basis for the theoretical exploitation of the previous premises, while providing a correspondent empirical framework that would verify the relevance of the exploitation of the fear in the world of politics.

Initially, the present dissertation will try to provide a relevant insight regarding the theory developed by the Copenhagen School, which has created the concept of "securitization". To do so, the author withdrawn the basic explanation of the previous from the work "Security - A New Framework for Analysis", which was

written by Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde in 1998, being that the starting point for the development of what the author considers to be a pertinent debate that is being developed within the field of Security Studies, regarding the definition presented by the authors, the importance that each actor has in the development of “securitizing processes” and so on. The previously referred conceptualization focus on the discursive act that is fulfilled by the recognized elite, which defines an issue as an existential threat, allowing the adoption of extraordinary measures to deal with it, in the case of the acceptance of the process, by the target audience. In order to complement the approach that is developed by the Copenhagen School, regarding the sectors of analysis, the author felt the need to explore deeper the development of a securitization process focused on the societal sector, since it is within the referred sector that is inserted the securitization processes related with the sense of identity. To do so, the author analyzed the debate that was being developed between Matti Jutila and Paul Roe, throughout the year of 2006, which focused on the particularities of the outcomes provided by an effective securitizing move, regarding the minorities that exist within the society.

It will be also relevant to take in consideration the work developed by Matt McDonald, in 2008, since its positions contest some premises of the Copenhagen School, while promoting other insights regarding the subject under analysis. By doing so, the work developed by Matt McDonald provided a good basis for this author to search for complementary theoretical analysis, regarding all the dynamics inherent to the interaction between the different actors that exist within a society.

As a result of the analysis that Matt McDonald elaborated, the author felt the need to explore deeper the importance of the mass media sector, which is an important actor regarding the establishment of relations between the elite and the target audience. That insight was mostly given by the work developed in 2008 by Sarah Oates which produces an analysis of the different models of relations between the ruling elites and the mass media actors, regarding the shaping of behavior that is adopted between the previous actors and the outcomes that produces in the creation of perceptions by the target audience, being that the ruled population.

Due to the fact that the previous author produces a general analysis of the mass media sector, without exploring in a deeper sense the importance that some models have in the inference on the daily life of the common individual, the author also took in consideration the work developed by Jervis, since this intellectual develops a broad analysis of the importance of the creation of perceptions, and misperceptions, not only by the ruling elite but also by the targeted population, with a special focus on the field of International Relations. Despite the fact that his work was developed in 1976, it stills remains quite up-to-date and a reference for the subject in analysis. By taking in consideration the work developed by the Copenhagen School, and the consequent debate that it has produced, and the work developed by Jervis, the theoretical backbone of the present dissertation is constituted, since it will analyze in a broad sense the outcomes that the adoption of specific measures by the ruling elite, which produces the occurrence of events, have in the social construction that is the evolution of a collective identity.

The development of the theoretical chapter is extremely important for the rest of the dissertation, since the goal is to prove that when there is the occurrence of a successfully developed securitization, the outcome will also affect the perceptions held by the target-audience that legitimized the process, resulting in the creation of new beliefs and values, which will influence the social construction that is the constant development of a collective identity. As a result, the dissertation will try to prove that a well succeeded securitization process will define the occurrence of events, due to the new values that are inserted into the collective identity, resulting in the alteration of a supported paradigm, in the cases where the process is powerful enough to do so.

The goal of the section that will follow the theoretical analysis, will focus on the narration of the historical evolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, with a special incidence on the strategies adopted by the Zionist leaders, also taking in consideration the production of speeches, which were aimed to identify the occurrence of several events as part of one major trend, worldwide, that aimed at the destruction of the Jewish identity. Due to the fact that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is considered as one of the most mediatic conflicts in the modern history, the author of the present dissertation tried to deviate the most from the common trend, which focused on the measures adopted by the Nazi regime against the Jewry, in order to prove that the adoption of a consistent and coherent strategy, by the Zionist leaders, occurred previously to the rising of the Nazism in Germany. By proving it, the author will try to depart the present work from the constant claim that is made by different

leaders, regarding the creation of the State of Israel, which is attributed to the terrifying event that was the Holocaust.

In the case that the author will manage to prove the previous, afterwards he will try to coherently analyze the securitization process that was developed by the Israeli leaders, regarding the Israeli existence, due to the belligerent positions adopted by the leaders of the Arab countries neighboring Israel. It is important to refer that the occurrence of the previous evolution, in the case that it is proven the initial premise regarding the strategies adopted by the Zionist leaders, is due to the exceptional measures, being here “exceptional” applied to every event that goes against the standard ones¹, that were allowed by the international community, taken by the Jewish leaders, in order to deal with the scourge that was the anti-Semitism, which resulted in the imposition of the creation of the State of Israel, in prejudice of the claims made by the Arab Palestinians.

To do so, the author based his work on the historical narration made by Fred J. Khouri, which provides a deep analysis of the historical development of events, regarding the routes of the Arab-Israeli conflict, until the year of 1976. Besides providing a good historical basis, the work in question also provides a strong insight regarding the official documents that were released by different organizations, ranging from governmental to international ones, which will be quite important for the development of an impartial analysis of the events. To complement the work developed by the previously referred author, this dissertation will also take in

¹ Definition elaborated by the author.

consideration the works developed by Edward Said, in 1980, and by Ilan Pappé, in 2006, with the difference that these authors developed not only a strong insight into the less known policies adopted by the Zionist leaders but, important as well, also attached an extremely thorough analysis of the ideology held by them.

On the other hand, since the present dissertation will try to maintain its neutrality, towards the outcomes of the conflict under analysis, it will be also important to analyze primary documentation, specially from the United Nations, due to the fact that it is produced by an international organization that should possess a deep level of impartiality regarding the occurrence of belligerent events all around the world. Besides that, the author will also try to provide samples of positions adopted by different leaders, which are shown by the analysis of discursive acts developed by them, in order to provide a causal relation to the occurrence of events.

By elaborating the previous sections, initially the author will try to prove that the evolution of the Zionist policies, which focused on the constant development of securitization processes, affected in a positive way the consolidation of the Jewish identity, due to the efforts that were made in order to achieve the establishment of a sovereign State. In the case where the previous proposition is correct, the author will try to verify if its establishment, followed by the occurrence of a belligerent event, had the power to reinforce the Israeli identity, which in the case of a positive outcome, might had created a predisposition for the acceptance of the development of extraordinary measures, by the Israeli government, in order to safeguard the existence of the Jewish identity. The work will also try to prove that the adoption of

those extraordinary measures not only affected the social construction of the Israeli identity but allowed the State of Israel to define the boundaries of the territory until nowadays as well.

In the case that the author will be able to prove the previous, it will be developed a brief analysis regarding the outcomes that the successfully developed securitization processes had on the daily life of the Israeli citizens and the behavior adopted by the international community regarding the disrespect of the international law, by the State of Israel, due to the outcomes that resulted of the occurrence of belligerent events, opposing the previous to its neighboring States. In order to analyze the structural conditions that provided a permissive position, by the international community, regarding the development of policies by the State of Israel in order to achieve its foreign interests, the author of the present dissertation will take in consideration the work developed by Gabriel Sheffer, in 2005, which analyzed the dynamics inherent to the Jewish Diaspora and the particular characteristics that allow the collective group in question to strengthen ties between the Jewry, worldwide, and the State of Israel. In order to strengthen that evaluation, the present dissertation will also take in consideration the work developed by John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, in 2006, due to the analysis that they make of the impact that the Jewish Diaspora has on the framing of the foreign policy of the United States of America (USA).

The present dissertation, by developing the previous enounced steps, will try to add some factors that are considered within the theoretical debate related with the

Securitization theory, since the author considers that the debate hasn't consider, so far, the relevance of the outcomes produced by the development of securitization processes and, important as well, the importance that the psychological constraints have regarding the success of the development of the previously referred processes. By doing so, the author will try to prove that the development of securitization processes are able to define the historical outcomes of the construction of a collective identity, in opposition to other identities. In that case, a new paradigm is established, framing the pattern of behavior adopted by the leaders, conditioned by the predispositions of the target audience.

In order to prove it, the author will analyze the development of the historical conflict that is established between the State of Israel and its Arab neighbors, with a special interest in the establishment of the Israeli State and the definition of its boundaries. To do so, it will analyze the strategies adopted by the Zionist leaders until 1948, the consequent independence of the Israeli State, the belligerent events that occurred until then and its outcomes, in order to define the importance of the occurrence of certain events for the creation of perceptions. Afterwards, the present dissertation will focus on the reasons for the occurrence of the 6 Day War, since it was the belligerent event that allowed Israel to acquire territories and the Oslo Accords, signed in 1993, due to the fact that they were the legitimizing factor for the acquisition of territories, by the Israeli government, since the Camp David Accords didn't focus in establishing a relevant solution for the definition of the territories assigned to be under the Israeli/Palestinian sovereignty. Besides that, other events occurred during the period between 1896 until nowadays that, despite affecting the

development of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, didn't have the power to alter the geopolitical situation in the region.

In the beginning of the academic year, the author stipulated that the present dissertation would develop a deep understanding around the subject, with the purpose of understanding the main obstacles to the resolution of the conflict. Due to the contact that the author had, in Palestine and Israel, with part of the particularities that help to define the complexity of the conflict, not only in a macro but, as well, in a micro perspective, the author understood that it would be impossible to present, through a simple dissertation, a solid basis for the development of a peaceful settlement of the conflict. Despite the sense of grievance that have evolved between both parts since the beginning of the last century, it was possible to verify in both societies that there is the desire to achieve a sustained peace, in the region, being that prevented due to the fact that both parts demand that only their terms will be implemented, without taking in consideration the premises that the other part considers fundamental for their cause.

With time, the author understood that the better solution to apply in the region would be related with the progressive implementation of a state-owned entity that would embrace both societies and that would take in consideration the particularities of both nations, with the aim of establishing a solid structure that would lead to the healthy acquaintanceship among both collective identities. Even so, to take all the factors that would be needed to analyze, in order to develop a concise analysis of such a program wouldn't be possible in a simple Masters dissertation.

2. The Securitization Theory

To address the Securitization Theory we have to take in consideration the fact that the theory addresses security issues that are approached by the field of International Relations, more precisely the field of Security Studies. To do so, the present work will appropriate the concept of *security* that was developed by Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde in the theoretical field where *security* is defined as an issue that “is presented as posing an existential threat to a designated referent object” (Buzan et al., 1998: 21). According to the referred school of thought, to securitize an issue means that a political community presents an issue as an existential threat (McDonald, 2008: 567) which demands extraordinary emergency measures to deal with, justifying like that the implementation of actions that fall beyond the normal spectrum of political procedures.

It is important to understand that to apply the concept of *security* to a precise issue it does not mean by consequence that there is a real threat to the referent object but that the issue is presented as a threat, requiring the use of measures that fits outside the spectrum of normal politics (Buzan et al., 1998: 21 – 24). By analyzing the conceptualization of *security* in the previous way, the Copenhagen School considers that the securitization process is a reactionary move, since the securitization process is only observed after the development of the threat, which narrows the framework of the securitization itself (McDonald, 2008: 563 – 565).

When a defined group considers something as a “threat” we are witnessing a *securitizing move*, which does not mean that to present an issue as an existential threat will automatically *securitize* the issue in question. To do so, the argument needs to be accepted by the audience in question and by *acceptance* the author does not mean that the securitizing move will not be contested by parts of the audience itself but that a significant part of the audience considers that the existential threat legitimizes the use of measures that suspend the norms. According to the previous statement, it is important to refer that the securitization speech is also an act since it creates a precise interaction between the decision-makers and the target audience according to the circulation of the speech and consequent acceptance/refusal/contestation of the same, which will be a result from the debate among the different actors in a precise society (Huysmans, 2011: 372 – 375).

The process of acceptance is also dependent on the political, historical and social contexts that define the social conjuncture of a certain audience (McDonald, 2008: 573) and even so, besides the development of a certain perception by the individuals and the actions developed with basis on that, the political communities are dependent on the implementation of the actions by the individuals that work in the specific sectors related with combating the threats. By being dependent on the individuals to implement those actions, the political communities are dependent not only on the acceptance of the securitization moves but they are also dependent on the successful implementation of the securitization measures by certain groups of individuals, creating a process of gravitational power that swings between the decision makers and the executive branch (Huysmans, 2011: 378 – 380). That also

means that a certain issue, do the fact that is securitized, is withdrawn from the public sphere since that the usual access to information could harm the special measures being taken to deal with the existential threat (Buzan et al., 1998: 23 – 27).

So, taking in consideration what was previously written, it is possible to define the securitization process as a discursive act (being the leaders recognized by a certain society more prone to do it) that defines a certain issue as a threat to survival of a certain referent object, which is dependent on the extent of the acceptance by the audience, being that the factor that defines the scope of actions that can be taken by the actor to deal with the securitized issue (McDonald, 2008: 567). According to Huysmans, the speech act includes two political elements. The first one makes a rupture with the normal state of affairs, providing a basis for the development of new policies to address the threat, being that step the second political element, which provides a deviation of the normality of the political rules, justified by the exceptionality of the situation (Huysmans, 2011: 372 – 375).

That also means that it is possible to consider “security” as the reverse of “politics” due to the fact that in the political sphere there is the possibility to establish a broader dialogue and interaction between the actors established among the society (McDonald, 2008: 555 – 558), since politics is not about controlling the power itself but by applying measures that rely on the others to be implemented with the purpose of achieving certain social goals.

In the case of the development of a securitization act it is important to understand that the action of securitizing something will become a productive moment, a chance to reconfigure the State itself in some situations, without the participation of a majority of the actors that exist inside the society (Wæver, 2011: 465 - 468). On the other hand, the securitization move is also dependent on the perception that the target audience will have from the threat and the solutions presented by the securitizing actor, since the securitizing actor promotes a sense of fear that in a way overpowers the capability of the solutions presented to deal effectively with the threat in question, which people will tend to underestimate and avoid such an evidence, due to an unconscious development of a perceptual defense. So, by accounting the previous premise, the securitization move can also fails due to an over-securitization due to the promotion of a behavior of inertia from the target audience (Jervis, 1979: 372 – 378).

The securitization process is a definition that has been widely debated by different scholars due to the fact that is included in a framework for analysis of different political realities. By doing so, the academics that developed the theory, in the opinion of the author, provided a framework that was too narrow due to the fact that they wanted to provide us with a defined framework that was able to analyze consistently the reality. The present sub-chapter will try to analyze the influence that the actors (both the elite groups and the target audience) suffer during the securitization move, whether it is during the social construction of the society where both work within, whether it is related with the facilitating conditions.

According to the basis of the theory, the actors that are able to perform a securitization process are those that are situated in a defined position of power which must be inserted in the structure of authority, becoming “voices of security”. Taking that in consideration, the *securitizing actors* are those that declare an issue or something, being that defined as the *referent objects*, as being threatened, dependent on the acceptance of that categorization by the target audience. Moreover, according to the authors, security is a field of actors that are competing between themselves, with an historic supremacy of the State, due to the fact that is an actor that includes the security tasks and the adequate structure to perform the role itself. Being the securitization a social constructed concept, the securitization of a referent object is dependent on different conditions, being those nominated as the *facilitating conditions* (Buzan et al., 1998: 31 - 39). Those conditions are defined by the way that the act of securitizing is performed, the position of the actor that is securitizing and the historical resonance of specific threats (McDonald, 2008: 567).

The act of securitizing, according to the indicated school of thought, is an act developed through the use of the linguistic capability by the actor that is legitimized by a certain audience. As it was previously said, the State has an historic supremacy within the field of actors, and as result, usually the actors that are more prone to securitize an issue are those inside the organizational structure that rules the State (Buzan et al., 1998: 35 – 42), the government. The government, in the present work, will be considered as “the group of people who officially control a country” (Cambridge Dictionaries Online, n/a). The rising of the previous referred group to the government of a country is dependent on the history of the country in question,

the problems that directly/indirectly affect the reality of the society within the country and the process of social construction that results in the definition of the characteristics of the society in the present, according to the predispositions that are deeply ingrained in the society to the point where there is no possibility of alternatives (Jervis, 1979: 217 – 285).

It is important to understand that, according to the securitization theory, there is a limited spectrum of sectors that includes all the issues that are able to be securitized, since sectors are “views of the international system through a lens that highlights one particular aspect of the relationship and interaction among all of its constituent units” (Buzan et al., 1993:31). The groups of sectors that are able to be securitized are the Political sector, the Military sector, the Societal sector, the Economic sector and the Environmental one.

In the following sub-chapters, the work will develop an approach that will take in consideration not only the conceptual framework that was developed by the Copenhagen School (with a special focus on the actors that are able to influence the acceptance of the process in question) but also the consequences of the process in question in the development of predispositions that will affect the behavior that will be adopted not only by the decision-makers but by the target audience in the case of future similar situations, as well.

2.1. The main actors and outcomes produced by them

The previous elements that were presented, are the factors that mostly influence the relationship between the elite group and the target audience, due to the fact that the political dialogue that is established between the ruling actor and the ruled one is the process that promotes the development of policies, whether in a legitimized process (in the cases where the population supports the policies that are being developed), whether in a spurious one (in the cases where the population is forced to accept the policies in question). It is also important to stress the role of the mass media organizations in the transmission of the message between the decision-makers and the target audiences since the information that is transmitted to the target audience it is mostly shaped by the mass media, resulting in a process of transmission of information in “second” or “third” hand (McCombs; Shaw, 1972: 176).

By being the intermediary actor, the mass media organizations are the ones that disclose the context in which a political event have occurred, the main actors of those events and the resulting consequences of those events to the target audience, establishing the communication among the societies and the decision-makers (Oates, 2008: 1). Despite the characteristics of the processes, they are developed in a precise context which is the result of the conjugation of the events that developed the situation in question, the concerns that affect the ruling groups of a State, the relation created among all the actors that were previously referred and the predispositions

that dominates the previous groups during a precise moment in history (Jervis, 1979: 143 – 155).

The decision-makers, which are the members of the ruling groups, are deeply affected by historical events (whether those that are associated with the personal experiences, whether those that are associated with collective experiences) that help to shape the predispositions that will constitute the backbone of the perceptual capability of the actor in question. By doing so, the occurrence of a precise event will affect the lessons that a person withdraws from it - resulting in the definition of the future behavior of that person in similar situations, especially when the behavior in question proves to be the most successful to apply in those type of events (*Ibid.*: 215 – 274). Those predispositions are also influenced, according to the “manufacturing consent” school, by the role of the mass media in the society since they are the actors that work to mobilize the support of the target audience for the positions adopted by the decision-makers in relation with a particular event (Robinson, 2001: 525 – 528).

The role of transmitter assumed by the media actors is one of the factors that will affect the creation of political predispositions, since it will shape the way of receiving the information and the social responses that will be developed in reference with the policies the decision-makers will promote, also affecting the learning process of the decision-makers since they will fall in the fallacy of oversimplifying the understanding of the event being analyzed, according to the interaction between all the actors that work in the society. That factor is due to the common attitude of paying more attention to the outcomes that the development of a concrete solution

will promote before the target audience instead of searching for the most prominent factors that influenced the occurrence of an event, being that the most effective behavior in order to create an accurate perception of the pattern of the event (Jervis, 1979: 222 – 239).

As a consequence, the decision makers will apply measures to deal with precise situations according to the factors that were considered, by the actors in question, the important ones to the occurrence of a similar event in the past, instead of analyzing all the factors that defined the conditions and the circumstances where the event has occurred with the blind belief that the situation will be dealt successfully. In the case of being a successful measure, the decision-makers create a systematic implementation of precise measures to deal with precise situations, neglecting the constant modification of the world that is possible to observe between events. In the case of being an unsuccessful measure, there will be a strengthening of those who had different views, shaping the way to a different approach in a future similar event (*Ibid.*).

2.1.1. The Creation of Predispositions

In the case where a designated leader considers a subject as a “threat”, there is the need to interact with the society where he is integrated with the purpose of legitimizing the special powers that are being invoked by him. By doing so, the leader in question will also insert the issue that is being securitized in the group of

situations that are prioritized to be dealt with, even if the issue in question is not an actual threat but a socially constructed definition (Buzan et al., 1998: 23 – 27). That consideration is dependent on the support that the decision-makers are able to gather, which is defined not only by the historical events that shaped the priorities that were established by the actor in question, but also by the rest of the population, especially if the event in question happened to members that are still part of the society, factor that will affect the behavior that was adopted to deal with the previous similar event, since the success, or lack of it, of that decision will affect the way the decision-makers will address the issue that is being securitized (Jervis, 1979: 262 – 282).

It is important the evaluation of the predispositions and the mechanisms that the decision-making actors sustain, since they are the mirror of the society they represent in the process of developing policies due to the fact that their predispositions are going to be defined mostly by the historic events that they participated in, the social reality that they had until the moment of assuming a position of power and the consequent perceptions, or on the other hand, the misperceptions, in the case that they misperceived the situation that was transmitted to them, which is more probable in cases of *indirect* participation in the event in consideration, that will shape not only their beliefs but also the beliefs of their generation (*Ibid.*: 239 – 275).

The generational connection, which is analyzed in the previous paragraph, is even more important due to the fact that people tend to empathize with others that share the same beliefs regarding important issues, defining the choice of the

decision-makers by the democratic societies and the support/lack of support of the leaders in less democratic States. The previous tendency will create a cycle of implementation of certain political measures, since policies will be aimed to maximize the most important values that are held by the decision-makers and, by consequence, the majority of the population at the minimal cost (*Ibid.*: 124 – 145). In the cases where the implementation of those measures create a new reality, especially if those measures develop a sudden negative consequence towards the target audience, there is a change in the values that were being held or in the perspective of how to shield those values, opening space for the uprising of new decision-makers or even new political paradigms (*Ibid.*: 289 – 315).

The influence of an experience of a precise event in the predispositions that are developed by a person is deeply related with the personal involvement of the actor in question within the event, since the role of the defined actor within the referred event will influence his present perception and the future predispositions, defining the perceptual sensitivities that the actor will absorb. As a consequence, the firsthand experience can be an influential determinant of the image that is created about different actors and different events, in such a deterministic way that will resist to information that goes against the created predisposition. The same predispositions will also affect other actors besides the ones that experienced it in first hand due to the interaction between the actors in question, since the categorization of an issue will determine the way that the incoming information will be seen (*Ibid.*: 162 – 239). That relation is problematic since there is the possibility of a different comprehension of the event, by the receiver of the information, since there is the

probability that some of the predispositions that the receiver holds are different from those of the provider, resulting in the creation of a good environment for the development of misperceptions (*Ibid.*: 239 – 246).

It is in the process that was previously described that the mass media organizations make their participation in the interaction developed between the decision-makers and the target audience due to the role of the mass media organizations in providing information to the public, shaping the relationships between the elites and the target audience, assuming an important role in the creation of perceptions/misperceptions since they have a prominent role in the established relationship that was referred previously, mostly due to the fact that people are more receptive to the information that supports their beliefs and are more likely to react better and more actively to messages according to their existent predispositions, creating the conditions for the mass media actors to explore the political predispositions and the recognized ideologies of the target audience. By exploring it, the mass media actors are able not only to reproduce the reality but to do so in a way that will frame a precise understanding of the event which in consequence will reinforce a certain predisposition that is being held previously by the target audience, since they are the actors that have access to the occurrence of events.

That specific process is even more relevant in cases where there is an uncertainty about the policies that will be adopted to address a specific situation, which will result in a debate between the elites and the promotion of particular interests by the concerned parties (Robinson, 2001: 531 – 534), especially in events

that happen abroad, due to the fact that they are able to shape the circumstances in which those events have occurred and the direct consequences that derived from it. That process will reinforce the credibility not only of the mass media actor towards the population that is able to reach, but as well of the elites, having as a consequence the strengthening of the ability to gather as much as possible the support of the target audience, according to the interests of the elites (Hayes; Guardino, 2010: 61 – 64).

Besides the previous considerations, it is relevant to note the importance of the credibility that the actor that gives information sustains towards the listeners, since the validity of the coincident/discrepant information is dependent on the representation of judgments developed by the listeners and the fact that the acceptance of the information that is provided is bounded not only by the content of the information but also by the judgments about the source (Jervis, 1979: 291 - 297). That precondition is also affected by the role of the news media actors since they have the ability to highlight or conceal political failures, being one of those actions taken when there is a political consensus, in the first option, or political struggles among the members of the elites, in the second one (Robinson, 2001: 525 – 528).

When the credibility of an actor is well regarded by the listeners, even in the case of the information provided being proven false, there is the chance of a considerable acceptance by the listeners, since they will try to develop a justification that is not related with the speaker but with the actors that are trying to undermine the credibility of the speaker (Jervis, 1979: 291 - 297). That is not only regarding the elites but as well includes the transmitters of information, the mass media actors. In

the first case, as it was referred previously, the elite tries to discredit those that are transmitting the message that is affecting their reputation and they may also try to allocate the responsibility in individuals/groups that were responsible for the implementation of definite measures or they try to blame the circumstances that conditioned the development of those measures. In the case of the mass media actors, usually they use official sources, with the focus on those that are included in the decision making group, so they can support the claims that are being held by the information provided to the public in general (Hayes; Guardino, 2010: 61 – 64). Independently of that, the credibility of the source is affected by the relationship between the information that is being provided and the discrepancy of that information with the values that the listeners hold, creating a situation where the provider can undermine its own credibility if it provides information that shocks with the values of the listeners (Jervis, 1979: 291 - 297).

The credibility it is the last major factor that the present work will take in consideration regarding the ability of the decision-makers to shape the reaction to major events that are included in the category of possible securitization targets. According to the present work, the securitization process is deeply influenced by the credibility of the actors that are developing and by the predispositions that were created massively, as it was appointed, due to events that were able to re-shape the values held by the gross of the society. Other factors are also important for the shaping of the behavior that the leaders assume regarding a certain event, as for example the personal experience that each and every single individual had concerning the event in question, but the previous are the ones that directly affect the

relationship between the actors that are being considered in the present work, since those are factors that precondition the positions being taken by the decision-makers to deal with a certain occurrence and the behavior of the mass media agents regarding the information that they will transmit to the target-audience, while protecting the interests of the ones that are able to control the referred sector, resulting in the framing of the acceptance of that information by the public in general.

2.2. The sectors that are accountable for the securitization process

The sectors that are important to take in consideration within the framework developed by the Copenhagen School, and that were referred previously, have the characteristic of being all interrelated, since the occurrence of a securitization of an issue within one of those sectors will affect the behavior that not only the decision-makers but also the mass media organizations and the target audience will adopt regarding the prioritization of the rest of the issues that belong to the same sector of the issue being securitized. Despite the fact that all the sectors are interrelated since the outcome of a securitization inside one of the sectors will affect all the others, the political sector is the one that definitely will be related with all the securitization processes since, according to some authors, all the security is political (Buzan et al., 1998: 141 – 145).

In the present work, the economic sector and the environmental one are considered to be secondary since those are sectors that include events that affect the daily life of the common man in a progressive way, losing the ability to alter the perceptions of the target audience, since they do not take in consideration events that, normally, have the ability to alter in a drastic way the beliefs of the common man. Those factors are important to the analysis in question, since predispositions are more prone to change in the case of events that are experienced in first-hand and that affect in a deep sense the style of life that individuals tend to adopt in their national territories (Jervis, 1976: 239 – 257), being important as well, in this particular factor, the relevance of the mass media since that particular actor tend to reveal more information regarding the critical perspectives that are being held in the debate that the event in question created, because of the lack of a defined mainstream consensus that shapes the values being held not only by the elites but as well by the individuals (Hayes; Guardino, 2010: 62 – 65).

That disclosure of different information will be extremely important to shape the in consequence of a defined event, since that factor will only prejudice the achievement of a possible consensus, especially if it is taken in consideration the increasing number of actors involved and the fact that the individuals tend to assimilate more easily the information that fortifies the predispositions that are being held by him, which in this case will promote a bigger dissensus among individuals with different predispositions (Jervis, 1976: 187 – 191). Even so, the author considers that is important to understand which is comprehended by the sectors in question, due to the relevance of the work developed by the Copenhagen School.

In order to comprehend the economic sector, it is important to understand that due to the nature of the capitalist system the very own co-existence between all the economic actors should be based on the fact that there is no guaranteed existence, which results in a constant feeling of insecurity by them. So, by taking in consideration the role of the actors that participate in the economic relations created within the structure of the market, it is important to refer the positions held by the *mercantilists* and the *neomercantilists*, the *liberals* and the *socialists*.

The *mercantilists* and *neomercantilists* believe that the State is the responsible for maintaining the social and political responsibilities for which the wealth is generated, while providing the necessary conditions to safeguard the operations of firms and markets. The *liberals* defend that the economy exists to define the social fabric and, due to that, the market should work independently from the State, being the State only necessary to provide regulations and politico-military security. The *socialists* agree that the purpose of the State is to be able to generate wealth with the goal of providing social and political justice and equity. Those definitions are important due to the fact that, despite the supremacy of the liberal ideology that it is possible to witness, which has been the main framing of the economic relations since the end of the Cold War, the other two still have some supporters all around the globe (Buzan, 1998: 95 – 99).

The agenda of the States is constituted by their ability to retain the capacity to sustain the military mobilization of the State, the insecurity held by States that are dependent from foreign interests, the fears that the actual global economic system

will create a deeper inequality among the wealthier and the poorer, the fears that the capitalism will promote an increasing in the flows of illegal trade and the fears that the combination of some factors, including a political weak leadership in different States, will result in a deep economic crisis, in an internationally manner (*Ibid.*). The sector that is currently being analyzed is more concerned with the connections that are established with all the sectors, since the political one, the military one and the societal sector would be heavily prejudiced due to the failure of the actual economic order, as it is possible to confirm in the fears that dominate the economic sector, as it was written previously.

In the case of the environmental sector, which is a subject that due to the lack of consensus in the debate that has been prompted in the academic and organizational field, isn't quite defined regarding the effectiveness of the securitization of issues that are included in the sector in analysis, despite the evolution that has been verified since the 1970's. While concentrating a political and a scientific agenda, it includes different actors that range from individualities to well structured organizations, factor that is also relevant to the fluctuation of facts that are presented in a continuous basis. The scientific agenda is regulated by the academic standards, which are also variable, and the political one includes the governmental, the media and the public standards, mostly dependent on the occurrence of specific events (Buzan et al., 1998: 71 -75.).

The issues that are included in the environmental agenda are issues that are mostly related with the rest of the sectors, being the subjects that are more accurately associated with the environmental sector the degradation of the ecosystems, the

problems related with energy and ecologic problems that directly affect the population (*Ibid.*). Since the sector in analysis is not quite consensual in terms of the possibility to securitize and even more due to the fact that the reasons for the degradation of the natural environment and the consequences resulting from that process have not been consensual or aren't still possible to verify, this sector hasn't been able to influence in a massive way the changing of perceptions of the individuals until now and, as a consequence, it will not be relevant as the political, military and societal sector to the present work, being those analyzed in the following sections.

2.2.1. The Political Sector

In the present work, the political security will be addressed considering the threats to the sovereignty of a country that are developed by non-military actors within the society. Those kinds of threats could range from pressuring the government in precise policies to overthrowing the government, usually with the goal, by these non-military actors, of achieving or denying some type of recognition, support, or legitimacy in a precise evoked set. It is important to refer that those kinds of actions are developed by the political units that exist in a defined social space, adding to the previous consideration of political threats the fact that those units are the central actors that promote the actions imbedded in the previous concept itself (*Ibid.*: 141 – 145). By doing so, the political sector takes in consideration the

preposition that the threats can also include ideological and sub-state threats, being able to also insert in that category the consideration of the government itself has one of the threats to elements of their own societies (Williams, 2003: 511 – 513).

The threats that are created by the political units are also influenced by the predispositions that other units will create about them, since those units, usually, are seen by the outsiders as being more centralized, planned and coordinated than they are. As a result, even the occurrence of accidents inside the perceived units usually are considered as elaborated plans, which will increase the level of the threat, especially in situations that the evolution of events affect directly the rest of the units, since people need to arrange justifications that do not affect the predispositions that are being held at the moment (Jervis, 1976: 319 – 342). On practical terms, the political units that are being securitized can be threatened regarding their internal legitimacy and/or regarding their external recognition, in other words, their external legitimacy (Buzan et al., 1998: 141 – 145).

It is also important to take in consideration the preposition that the processes that are being referred are also affected by the coherence and consistency that people tend to adopt, due to the fact that the outsiders consider the values that were trying to be maximized in the past, by the political unit in question, will be the same values that are going to be the aim of the struggle of a political unit, despite the different circumstances and the different periods of time, instead of seeing that process has the result of shifting interactions among different actors and interests. The previous details are important due to the fact that the external legitimacy is not only dependent

on the perceptions created by past events that resulted in the construction or solidification of beliefs by the outsiders, being prone to result in misperceptions that tend to solidify their beliefs, but as well resulting in an overestimation of their goals and their ability to actually affect the structure/s being considered threaten (Jervis, 1976: 319 – 342).

2.2.2. The Military Sector

After promoting a concise analyses of the importance of the political sector to the current work, the author will now try to advance a decomposition of the military sector, since the most drastic events that the world witnessed until the past century were related with the military sector, despite the fact that nowadays the States are mainly defined by the possession of sovereignty, which means that no one but the structure that governs the State in question has the legitimized power of developing and establishing measures to deal with the problems that affects the reality of the society in question, being that factor extremely embedded in the values protected by the entire international community. That reality magnifies the importance of the military security, since this is the sector that is used to maintain/establish the structure of the government, implementing an agenda that deal with issues ranging from external hostility to the levels of migration that affect the social stability of the referent unit in analysis. By being such a wide sector, it is important to understand that there is also the chance of this sector being used as the instrument that deals with

real external threats to the existence of a State or/and being used as the main instrument to establish and/or develop the internal/external legitimacy of a government (Buzan et al., 1998: 49 – 52).

By doing so and taking in consideration the previous sub-chapter, it is important to remember the importance of the occurrence of a event that affects drastically most of the population, since those events are able to affect a personal predisposition and influence people, acting like a dramatic provider of information regarding the way of how the world works, due to the fact that a military threat affects all the sectors of the society, especially regarding the cases where the behavior that is adopted to deal with the situation falls outside the normal rules of civilized behavior (*Ibid.*: 57 – 61).

Adding that preposition to the fact that military securitization is usually held as an instrument to deal with threats to the common values that hold the basic structure of a government, it is possible to conceive as a result, that a securitization of an issue, through the military sector will provide the society with a new paradigm that will shape the future behavior of the actors that work in that State, regarding the outcomes that resulted from the conjugation of the event in question and the policies that were taken to address that event (Jervis, 1979: 262 – 271).

Two events are regarded as the most influential ones, concerning the predispositions and values held by the actors of a State regarding the military sector, being the internal revolutions and the last major war that affected the State under

review. When a State undergoes through a revolution, those that in the end hold the ruling capability will define their behavior, taking in consideration the concepts and strategies that they adopted to achieve their goal, whether it is regarding policies that address daily issues, whether it is regarding the concepts and strategies being used by the opposition to suppress their leadership. The last major war that affects the State is also important regarding the predispositions and values that the population holds, since the war is considered to be a dramatic and pervasive occurrence, with the capability of forging new perceptions regarding the other actors in the international system according to their participation in the event. Besides that, a person that observes the unwind of a war for the first time will be more prone to be affected by it, since it will be the first firsthand experience that the actor in question will have regarding such an event and, as it was previously addressed, the first hand experiences with important events are quite important to shape the predispositions that are going to be developed. Those that have been through another military event will take in consideration mostly the information that is similar to their previous experience strengthening their previous beliefs (*Ibid.*).

In the case of a successful securitization of a military threat there is the case where the response will be collective and well organized, developed by the fact that there is a defined hierarchy inside the structure of power and also by the fact that the target audience has provided the decision-makers with power to organize that structure according to the priorities that they defined during the securitization move. In contrast, when a State isn't able to develop and sustain such a defined structure, the military security is extremely prone to erode the political basis of the State

(Buzan et al., 1998: 52 – 70). As a result of the first situation, the society will develop behaviors that are sustained by the consequences of such a dramatic event that will affect directly the shaping of the future, since the predispositions that are a result of the previous event will become, at some point, inherent to the society that was affected by it. Besides that, since people that were affected by the military securitization will share a precise point in history with the rest of their society and since there is a common marking event that affected them all due to the dramatic and pervasive nature of it, there will be an unconscious approximation of values throughout all society resulting in agreement effects that are observable in societies characterized by a mass amount of consensus (Jervis, 1979: 124 – 286).

This characteristic brings the present dissertation to the Societal Sector, which is the most important one for the work being developed.

2.2.3. The Societal Sector

The values that are previously referred are some of the values that are related to the societal security agenda, since they help to promote the self-conception of an identity among the society, resulting in the definition of communities, being usually fed by the establishment in a common geographical place, by a certain collectivity, and the common use of a language. That approximation between members of a community is a social construction that is deeply influenced not only by historical events but also by the policies that are developed throughout history that directly

affect the social construction of a community (Buzan et al., 1998: 119 – 123), due to the application of routinized practices that were taken in the first place to deal with certain threats that were affecting the preservation of defined identities, according to a determined event that occurred in the past, contributing to the creation of a new perception among the different communities, which is related with the type of interaction that should be developed among the different established communities, since that previous securitization will enhance the definition of what “we” represents and the values associated to that precise identity (Macdonald, 2008: 568 – 580).

Those considerations are primordial to the present dissertation, since the study case will analyze the importance of the development of a societal securitization, based on the conceptualization of a collective identity. To do so, it is also important to take in consideration a quite pertinent critique related with the societal sector that was developed along the debate related to the securitization theory, due to fact that there is a development of a concept that defines the *society* as having an *identity* when a society is always constituted by the relation promoted between the different identity communities since each community has the goal of promoting their values in the persecution of maintaining the values and behaviors that define them, resulting in a struggle among the different identity communities, which will be a strong pillar in the social construction of a State and its identity. The historical outcome of that struggle will be central in the definition of the referent objects that will be used in the securitization process, since the State will have in *sovereignty* the power to take independent measures and in the *identity* the basis to

define which issues will be addressed and the way of addressing them (Williams, 2003: 515 – 521).

The referent objects that are considered to be securitized in the societal sector are those units that possess a strong collective identity to the degree where it is possible to develop a consistent argument that the identity of the group is being threatened, the “we” identity (Buzan et al., 1998: 119 – 123).

That identity, within the society, must be considered to be a distinctive one, in order to enable the minority that possesses it to acquire rights. Those identities can be threatened by the forbiddance of the use of a specific language, names, and dresses or even by interfering in the dynamics that the religion or the education establish within a certain minority. If it happens, the way for the identity group to react will be by strengthening the social identity of the group itself, which usually is made by the development of speeches, by the leaders within the group, that results in a moment where it is possible to construct, to negotiate and/or to affirm a response to the demand for a collective image. By addressing a defined society as the dynamics of the relations between different identity groups, and by considering that the minorities and the majorities will try to maximize their identities, in order to capitalize their interests within the space of action, being that the society, the relation that is established among them can be of cooperation, competition or even indifference, depending on the historical moment that is addressed (Jutilla, 2006: 174 - 183).

When a referent actor believes that is being threatened, according to specific stimulus that creates a determined perception, it is possible to observe one of two kinds of reactions to deal with the specific issue. The first one, it will correspond to the development of measures, by the community/ies in question, to apply specific measures that will deal with the identified threat, using another structure than the one that the State possesses. In these situations, the actors are usually considered as minorities and in general they will address particular behaviors to control the existing governmental structure, to create their own government or to live outside the established society, within the specific State. In the second case, the specific communities will try to include the threat in the State agenda, promoting the defense of the values and behaviors of the community as a central issue to the survival of the State (Buzan et al., 1998: 119 – 123).

Despite that, when there is the development of an effective securitization process, by a certain collective identity leader/s, the outcome will produce a moment that allows the creation of mechanisms that will guarantee the survival of the collective identity, in exchange for the suppression of values held by other collective identities. As a result, if the community is able to succeed in that particular step, a precedent will be created, creating the possibility of the communities to use future analogies to adopt the same behavior in similar situations, with the consequence of framing a dominant perception that will directly affect the implementation of policies and their consequent stability since without a dramatic event, perceptions are slow to change (Jervis, 1979: 187 – 201).

In another perspective, the successful development of those movements will create the conditions for the alteration of the established structure, in terms of the interaction between the collective identities, which will be able to interfere in the perception that each and every collective identity has from the one that was successfully securitized and it will produce a securitizing response from the remaining collective actors, since they will be the ones who will have their identity threatened. As a consequence, since there is the existence of a polarity of collective identities within a society, an anarchical relation among them will be established, according to the interests that they defend, which will result in the impossibility of a permanent de-securitization of a certain issue, since the referent object will produce efforts in order to restore the previous structure that was favorable to it or, on the other hand, to alter the established structure in order to guarantee the inclusion of the values that it defends in the society itself.

The concept of societal sector is contested everyday by the evolution of a globalized world, which not only reduces the strength of the individual identity, according to the approximation not only of policies within the State actors but also due to the economic ties that are being developed constantly among all the actors that co-exist in the world order.

According to what has been previously described, the author considers that has been able to resume the main pillars that sustain the theory developed by the Copenhagen school, while taking in consideration the external factors that affect the securitization process. Those factors are extremely important to the work that is

being developed, since they will add new premises to the theory in question and reinforce the role of other actors besides the decision-makers and the target audience to the development of the securitization processes, as well. Those questions will be further analyzed in the following sub-chapter, according to the outcomes and the consequences that the creation/re-shaping of values will have in the behavior that the individuals and the collectivities will assume in future events, according to the thoroughness that the securitization processes have been able to achieve before.

2.3. The securitization process as a promoter of new paradigms

In the present chapter, the author has been trying to develop an analysis of the securitization theory, which was developed by the Copenhagen School, while trying to provide a theoretical analysis of the possible outcomes that are observable according to the type of relations that the actors involved have established. Those relationships are affected by the predispositions that are socially constructed through time and by the role that each actor assumes in a particular event. As a consequence, when there is the development of a securitization process, it is not possible to predict the precise consequences that will result from the process itself but, on the other hand, it is possible to understand some clear outcomes that will result from the process in analysis, since it will affect the created predispositions held by the agents involved, providing a better understanding of the dynamics involved in the

securitization processes, not only in a theoretical level but as well as on a practical one.

The present work has developed a deeper analysis of the roles that each actor assumes during the development of a securitization process and, while taking in consideration the role of the decision-makers in the evolution of a securitization process, the author considers that is relevant to include the influence that the mass media actors have in the creation of perceptions, which will affect the acceptance or refusal of the process being developed, by the target audience.

By doing so, the author considers that the decision-makers are key actors in the process due to the fact that they have the executive powers to define an issue as being threatening, which will provide them the capabilities to take the issue outside the normal spectrum of politics. On the other hand, that process is deeply influenced by the method that the mass media actors use to transmit the information regarding the issue being securitized, according to the interests of the decision-makers while taking in consideration the interests of the members of the elite that are inserted in a specific society, which will result in the imposition of their interests in order to influence the outcomes of the process that is being implemented, regarding a defined issue.

That dynamic is extremely important since the members of the elite of a defined society are able to apply a political leverage not only in the political debate that it is possible to witness inside the group of the decision-makers but, as well, to

influence the perceptions that are held by the other actors, through the use of the mass media actors, since they are the ones that define the relationship between the decision-makers and the target audience, using their capability to reach a massive number of individuals with the goal of affecting the judgments that are being developed by them, regarding the members of the decision-making group and the policies that they want to implement.

In the case where there is a plurality of political members and mass media actors, that are able to encourage a bigger diversity of values being held by the individuals, and since people are more prone to receive information that meets the values being held previously, the securitization processes are more complicated to be developed in these type of societies, due to the difficulties that will rise from the diversity of predispositions that people will held. In the opposite case, when the securitization processes are related with the survival of certain values intrinsic to the entire society, or its majority, the process of securitization will be able to capture more acceptance in the elite members, facilitating the acceptance that will be developed by the rest of the individuals that co-exist within the society in analysis. In that case, the concretization of the securitization move will be prone to influence the predispositions that are being held regarding a third actor or a certain social reality, or even reinforcing the negative values that were held by members of the society regarding the issue being securitized, creating a mark in history which, in the case of providing positive outcomes, will reshape the behavior adopted by people in general, while creating a new framework of policies to adopt in future similar events.

On the other hand, if a securitization process has a negative outcome, it will not be able to affect the behavior of people and it will be categorized as an attempt to deal with a certain issue, creating a reference for the use of analogies in a future attempt to securitize the issue in question.

So, if it is taken in forethought the previous explanation, each and every single securitization move that is able to gather support from the actors involved, in a way that it will enter in the sphere of public debate, regardless of the acceptance or not of that move, it will provide an historical event that will be used in a future political debate regarding the issue that is being referenced to securitize. In the case where there is a non-acceptance of that securitization move by the individuals and members of the elite and, after, there is a negative evolution of the issue being referred, those that were struggling for the fulfillment of that securitization move will be able to gather more support and more political leverage within the society, obtaining better conditions for the concretization of the process being analyzed.

If the issue being referred as a threat, by some members of the society, is not securitized and it does not present a visible threat to the rest of the society in a short-term period, as a consequence, the political debate and the social interaction among the actors involved in the social space will not address the issue until one of the actors in analysis is able to include it again in the political debate being developed among all of them. In that case, a new securitization move will be developed, starting again a new cycle as it was previously described.

In the case where a securitization move is able to be successful and to influence enough the predispositions that are held by the members of a society in a way that will develop an acceptance by them, the debate about the issue will be withdrawn from the public sphere so it could create a favorable atmosphere to develop measures to deal with the threat in question, resulting in the adoption of measures that will create new realities, influencing the dynamics of the relationships established among the actors of the society, due to the extraordinary nature of the situation. That process will directly affect the nature of the relationships, which will create a new structure that defines the behavior that should be adopted by each actor within a society, resulting in a change of the perceptions that each actor has regarding the new reality, in favor of achieving the interests by the elites within a certain social context.

The acceptance of a securitization move will also affect the status of the referent object, according to the acceptance of the referent object as being threaten, and the consequent need to take measures to deal with its survival since it will be a situation that will affect the reality of all the actors within a society, re-shaping the behaviors that are considered as necessary to the correct evolution of relationships within the society, by the actors, and, in some cases, it will be powerful enough to alter the perceptions that were held by them as well. If the securitization process being developed is actually strong enough to provoke a modification of the values held by the actors in analyses, in particular cases, it will affect as well future cases of securitization moves since the actors that will be interested to develop them will use analogies regarding events that were powerful enough to affect the society, in a way

that was necessary to develop extraordinary measures to sustain the existence of a precise referent object, with the goal of appealing to the values that promoted the acceptance of the previous securitization processes. So, to conclude this precise evolution, it is important to refer that a securitization process that is successful will create predispositions that will facilitate the acceptance of future securitization moves, especially if those issues that are securitized, in the future, are included in the same sectors as the ones that were previously securitized.

To conclude the present chapter, it is important to refer that any securitization move has the ability to create cycles, despite their length and dependent on the ability of the interested actors to make it succeed, which will result in the creation of new predispositions and behaviors adopted by the members within the society, shaping the social construction that defines the society itself. That factor is extremely important to form the development of behaviors adopted by all the actors, especially within the boundaries of a concise State, and the possible outcomes that result from the adoption of those behaviors, which will affect the sustainment of accepted paradigms or, on the other hand, to discredit sustained paradigms and the promotion of others.

3. The Securitization of the Jewish question from the development of the Zionist project until the establishment of the State of Israel

The present dissertation has the goal of analyzing the Arab-Israeli conflict due to the fact that is the most known political situation that derived from the development of socially constructed identities. In order to do so, this work will take in consideration two different timeframes of analysis, since there were two different moments of securitization that marked the development of the Zionist ideology, until the establishment of the State of Israel and the conservation of that status, regarding the opposition of the Arab States in the region of the Middle East.

In order to prove the argument that was previously referred, the present dissertation will focus on different speeches that were pronounced by different leaders of the Zionist cause, within the Zionist Congress, and the consequent reactions by the most prominent leaders back then, being those the leaders or representatives of the government of Britain until the 2nd World War and, afterwards, the leaders that were more focused on establishing the State of Israel, such as the American ones, since the USA was one of the States that came out from the 2nd World War as a super power, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), since it played as a balancing factor within the United Nations.

3.1. The development of the Zionist ideology

According to history, anti-Semitism started in central and eastern Europe, due to the fact that the Jewry used to live in closed communities and tried to affect the policies being taken to safeguard their own style of life. Due to the different social conditions that affected the Jewry, only those that have the economic capability were able to avoid the persecution that was felt in Western Europe and, those that weren't able to avoid it, started to emigrate to the Eastern part of Europe, while managing to work in industries that needed a lot of manpower. Due to the discrimination that was felt in that part of the European continent, some members of the Jewish communities started to struggle for more rights among the eastern societies, colliding with the uprising of nationalistic movements that were starting to be felt across the entire Europe (Qassem, 2011).

With some articles and debates regarding the Jewish question being developed since the 1840's, the first coherent and planned idea related with the Jewish nationalism was presented by Leon Pinsker, a Russian Jew, and afterwards explored by Theodor Herzl, an Austrian one. Herzl, an Austrian Jewish journalist, which witnessed in first hand a wave of rage against the Jewish people, in 1895, during one of his trips to Paris, wrote a book called the "*Der JudenStaat*" in where he explored the suffering of the Jewish people, with the goal of promoting what could be called as "political goals", as it is possible to verify in the following excerpt:

[...] No one can deny the gravity of the situations of the Jews. Wherever they live in perceptible numbers, they are more or less persecuted. Their equality before the law, granted by statute, has become practically a dead letter. They are debarred from filling even moderately high positions, either in the army, or in any public or private capacity. [...] Attacks in Parliaments, in assemblies, in the press, in the pulpit, in the street, on journeys [...] become daily more numerous. [...] In Russia, imposts are levied on Jewish villages; in Rumania, a few persons are put to death; in Germany, they get a good beating occasionally; in Austria, Anti-Semites exercise terrorism over all public life; in Algeria, there are travelling agitators; in Paris, the Jews are shut out of the so-called best social life and excluded from clubs. [...] it is not true that, in countries where we live in perceptible numbers, the position of Jewish [...] employees of all descriptions becomes daily more intolerable? [...] Let the sovereignty be granted us over a portion of the globe large enough to satisfy the rightful requirements of a nation; the rest we shall manage ourselves. [...] (Herzl, 1896: 11 - 13).

According to the author, Theodor Herzl, the Jews were a community that suffered discrimination and constant persecution, independently of the place where they were inserted. For as much is possible to ascertain, the discrimination and persecution that the Jews were being targeted in Russia, in Rumania, in Germany, in Algeria and in Paris, was only different in the manner that was being developed, since its existence was undeniable. In order to solve the issue, Theodor Herzl proposes a solution that fits outside the normal rules, which is the attribution of sovereignty to the Jews “over a portion of the globe large enough”. By doing so and in accordance to what was written previously, it is possible to define its book as a “securitization move”, since its author identifies an existential threat, anti-Semitism, to a defined referent object, being that the Jewry, and proposes a solution that fits outside the normal boundary of politics, being that the attribution of a State to the previous community.

The development of the Zionist ideology, which had the final goal of establishing a State for the Jewry, was accepted and debated within the Jewry itself, thanks to the organization of the 1st Zionist Congress, which resulted from the acceptance of the previous securitization move by the Jewry. At that point, already some individuals embraced the Zionist cause and, in order to make it flourish, started to support the construction of 11 Jewish settlements in Palestine (Qassem, 2011). More than an experiment, the creation of settlements was aimed at creating a social platform that would increase the conditions of the newcomers, by channeling the Jewish manpower to the agricultural sector and, consequently, entering in the local market (Pappe, 2006. 13).

In the 1st Zionist Congress, it was extremely clear the acceptance of the Zionist doctrine, not only due to the speeches that were delivered but, as well, due to the policies that were adopted within. According to Max Nordau, a prominent physician and literary figure, being him the responsible to make the opening speech of the Congress, the case of the Jewry was experienced in the following terms:

[...] Everywhere, where the Jews have settled in comparatively large numbers among the nations, Jewish misery prevails. It is not the ordinary misery which is probably the unalterable fate of mankind. It is a peculiar misery, which the Jews do not suffer as human beings, but as Jews, and from which they would be free, were they not Jews. Jewish misery has two forms, the material and the moral. In Eastern Europe, North Africa, and Western Asia -- those regions which shelter the vast majority, probably nine-tenths of our race -- the misery of the Jews is understood literally [...]. In Western Europe, the struggle for existence has been made somewhat lighter for the Jews, although of late the tendency has become visible even there to render it difficult for them again. The question of food and shelter, the question of the security of life, tortures them less; there the misery is moral. [...] (Nordau, 1987).

The speech that was pronounced signifies, for the present dissertation, the recognition of the threat that was haunting the Jewish identity, since the community in question was suffering, as it is possible to ascertain from the excerpt that affirms that “the Jews do not suffer as human beings, but as Jews, and from which they would be free, were they not Jews”. Despite the speech, several measures were adopted throughout the Congress that provided good indicators to understand the acceptance of the securitization move that was being held by Theodor Herzl. Among other decisions, the Congress decided that it would be planned the establishment of a fund that would serve the purpose of fomenting the immigration to Palestine, by the “Action Committee”, which was, afterwards, denominated as the “Executive Committee” (Lehn, 1974: 74 – 77).

On the 2nd Zionist Congress, in Basel, was accorded between the members the establishment of a Bank that would sustain different sectors of the Zionist goals, being named as the “Jewish Colonial Trust Limited”, as a result of the insistence of Theodor Herzl in the creation of such an institution. On the 5th Zionist Congress, in 1901, it was finally adopted a resolution that would aim to the establishment of the “Jewish National Fund” (JNF), with the purpose of becoming “a trust for the Jewish people, which (...) can be used exclusively for the purchase of land in Palestine and Syria” (Said, 1980: 96 – 98).

In order to complement the institutional development that the Jewish leaders were implementing, a diplomatic network started to be created, with the different European regimes, since it was necessary the assistance of different major European

countries to develop a concrete program of technological expansion in Palestine, by the Jewry, in order to create a self-sustainable society. To do so, it was necessary to make clear to the Western civilizations that the Jewish State would be the linkage between the Western and the Eastern World and that the emigration of Jews to Palestine would be important, as well, to increase the conditions of the surrounding Arab population. At the eyes of the Zionists, that Arab population was considered inferior and to be controlled and positively influenced by an outsider, a greater civilization, especially if the reader bears in mind that most of the members of the World Zionist Organization were actually nationals of European countries. To promote that belief, within the Zionist members, was extremely important to establish a basis of understanding between the Zionist leaders and the colonial powers in Europe, since it was in that basis that the Colonization Era was based on (*Ibid.* : 68 – 82).

Until the beginning of the 1920's, the JNF wasn't able to consummate its goal, mostly due to restrictive laws applied by the Ottoman regime, which included the need of cultivating the bought lands and the restriction, implemented by the 6th Zionist Congress, of the leasing of the lands to Arab Palestinians. In order to address such problems, initially the Actions Committee decided to incorporate the JNF in England, in April of 1907, as the "*Juedischer National-fonds (Keren Kajemeth Le Jisroel) Limited*", which had the primary purpose of acquiring any kind of territories, despite the legal procedures implicated, in the regions of Palestine, Syria and any other parts of Turkey in Asia and the Peninsula of Sinai, with the goal of settling Jews on them (Lehn, 1974: 82). Afterwards, based on the fact that the Action

Committee didn't possess conditions to oversee the development of the Jewish settlement in Palestine, it was decided on the 8th Zionist Congress, in August of 1907, the establishment of a "Palestine Office" in Jaffa, followed by the establishment of the "Palestine Land Development Company Limited", as an agency of the JNF, which would serve to organize the measures required for the acquisition and maintenance of lands in Palestine (Said, 1980: 96 – 98).

Meanwhile, with the occurrence of the 1st World War, and with the consummation of the fact that the JNF wasn't fulfilling its duties, the Arabs managed to arrange some compromises by the British government, regarding the establishment of an independent entity in the Arab countries under the rule of the Ottoman Empire. It happened during 1915 and 1916, when Sir Henry McMahon² exchanged letters with Sherif Husain³, where it was affirmed that "Great Britain is prepared to recognize and support the independence of the Arabs in all the regions within the limits demanded by the Sherif of Mecca", being those limits detailed in a letter previously sent by the Emir, which clearly included the boundaries of Palestine. That fact is also reinforced by other messages exchanged between British officials and the Sherif Husain, being that extremely important for the course of the Arab-Israeli conflict and for the understanding of the present work (UNISPAL, 1978).

With the unfolding of the 1st World War, and after the death of Theodor Herzl, Dr. Chaim Weizmann⁴ and Nahum Sokolow⁵ assumed the role of dealing with

² Sir Henry McMahon was the British High Commissioner in Egypt.

³ Sherif Husain was the Emir of Mecca, considered as the Keeper of Islam's most holy cities.

⁴ Dr. Chaim Weizmann was a distinguished British chemist.

⁵ Nahum Sokolow was a Russian member of the Zionist executive.

the British government, in order to arrange a legal basis for the pretension of establishing a Jewish state in Palestine (Khoury, 1976: 4 – 6). With that in mind, it was raised links with Lloyd George, Arthur Balfour, Herbert Samuel and Mark Sykes⁶. In the end of January of 1917, Dr. Weizmann presented to Sir Mark Sykes the “Outline of Programme for the Jewish Resettlement of Palestine”, which focused on the recognition of Palestine as the Jewish Nation, by the British government, while allowing the establishment of a Company that would have the aim to promote and boost the existence of Jewish people in Palestine and to help to support the Jewry all around the world to settle in Palestine, through the increment of organized emigration or even by facilitating in the selling of lands to Jewish people (Said, 1980: 96).

Taking in consideration what happened during the 1st World War, which resulted in the assignment of Jewish people to the Russian “duma”, by the Kerensky government, the entrance of the United States in the conflict, while the Jewish members of its society showed indifference to what was happening in Europe, and the attempt of the German government to gather the support of the Jewry worldwide, the British government realized that was necessary to, as well, assemble the support of the Jewry and responded to the previously referred outline of program with the Balfour Declaration. The Balfour Declaration is the first example that shows that the securitization process that was being developed by the Jewish leaders was being accepted not only within the Jewish communities, since the British Government, which in the future started to have the responsibility of ruling Palestine, after the 1st

⁶ Lloyd George, Arthur Balfour, Herbert Samuel and Mark Sykes would assume key roles in the development of the Foreign Policy of the British government.

World War, but was also starting to support the main core of the Zionist strategy (Khouri, 1976: 3 – 6).

The Balfour Declaration represents the acceptance of the securitization move, since it took in consideration the fact that the Zionists had a legitimate claim, which was reinforced by the recognition that they had a “historical connection with Palestine” despite the fact that its choice was just related with the fact that the Zionist leaders needed to gather the Russian Jewish support to the cause. Even so, the Balfour Declaration considered that the British government:

[...] view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object [...]. (Balfour, 1917).

The British government also struggled for the sustainment of the unlimited migration to Palestine, by Jewish individuals. That factor is proved by what Prime Minister Lloyd George defended, when he said that “(...) the notion that Jewish immigration would have to be artificially restricted in order that the Jews should be a permanent minority never entered the head of anyone engaged in framing the policy. That would have been regarded as unjust and as a fraud on the people to whom we were appealing. (...)”, being the institutional recognition, at the time, the most important indicator of success by the Zionist leaders in convincing the “outsiders” to join their cause (UNISPAL, 1978).

Besides others, the most important clauses were related to the “recognition of the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine (...), the establishment

of a Jewish agency to be recognized as public body for the purpose of advising and cooperating with the Administration of Palestine (...), the facilitation of Jewish immigration” while maintaining the rights of the sections and the establishment of Hebrew, Arabic and English as the official languages (Khouri, 1976: 16 – 17). If it is taken in consideration what was previously written, regarding the societal sector, it is important to remind that the facilitation of mass immigration, the official establishment of a certain dialect and the historical connection with a certain territory are all connected with the development of a group identity and, the official position of the British government towards the Zionist claims, represented nothing more than the acceptance of the securitization of anti-Semitism, which lead to the legitimization of the claims that were being held by the Zionists, being the solution presented connected with a territory that was unrelated with the British government.

Furthermore, Palestine was assigned to be under the British Mandate, from 1923 until 1948, according to the Covenant of the League of Nations and the San Remo Resolution of 25th of April of 1920 (Grief, 2004). That support was extremely important for the unfolding of the Zionist cause since it provided the legal basis for the Zionist leaders to claim the territory of Palestine, with the Balfour Declaration.

Within “the Palestine Mandate” it is established the following:

The Administration of Palestine [...] shall facilitate Jewish immigration under the suitable conditions and shall encourage [...] close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes (The Council of the League of Nations, 1922, Article VI).

The Jewish community, until 1935, when the “Nuremberg Laws” started to be applied, had already increased in Palestine by 302.294 individuals, since 1922. From that growth, in average, 81,20% was due to the immigration. According to “An Interim Report on the Civil Administration of Palestine” that was presented to the League of Nations in 1921, Palestine had “hardly 700.000 people”, from which “the Jewish element of the population numbers 76.000” and “almost all have entered Palestine during the last 40 years” (League of Nations, 1921). In 1922, and influenced by the Palestine Mandate as well, around the time that the Zionist securitization started to be accepted by the different world leaders, about 83.790 Jewish members have already inhabited in Palestine, in a universe of 752.048. In the following decade, the Jewish community in Palestine grew until the value of 180.793 members. Despite the 1926-1927 economic crisis that affected the Jewish investment in the region, which resulted in the reduction of the Jewish community growth in the region to 0,19%, the average growth rate of the Jewish community in Palestine between 1923 and 1932 was around 7,16%. From that, around 81,20% of the Jewish growth, during the period in analysis, was due to the immigration (League of Nations, 1937).

Another facilitating factor, attributed by the British Mandate to the Zionist enterprise, was related with the establishment of different companies and organizations in Palestine, having those the purpose of organizing the incoming of new immigrants, the purchase of lands that would serve to sustain them and the establishment of security forces, for the settlers. According to the Palestine Mandate:

An appropriate Jewish agency shall be recognised as a public body for the purpose of advising and co-operating with the Administration of Palestine in such economic, social and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish national home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine, and, subject always to the control of the Administration to assist and take part in the development of the country. The Zionist organization, so long as its organization and constitution are in the opinion of the Mandatory appropriate, shall be recognised as such agency [...] (The Council of the League of Nations, 1922, Article IV).

The article 11 of the Palestine Mandate also provides a legal basis for the previously referred institution to “construct or operate” public works and the right to “develop any of the natural resources of the country”, which represented a certain civil power that the organization inherited. The acceptance of the securitization move, developed by the Zionist leaders, was already a fact, within the diplomatic level, as the memorandum that Lord Balfour sent to Lord Curzon, on the 11th of August of 1919, shows:

[...]The four Great Powers are committed to Zionism. And Zionism, be it right or wrong, good or bad, is rooted in age-long traditions, in present needs, in future hopes, or far profounder import than the desires and prejudices of the 700.000 Arabs who now inhabit that ancient land. [...] (Balfour, 1919).

The previous excerpt makes even clearer the fact that the solution that was presented, in order to deal with the identified threat, it was an exceptional⁷ one, since it was “far profounder import than the desires and prejudices of the 700.000 Arabs who” back then inhabited Palestine. The previous exclamation was the fruit of the implementation of a strong diplomatic network, as it was referred previously, which

⁷ “Exceptional” is considered to be applied to every event that goes against the standard ones, in the present work.

also affected the position held by the United States House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which approved in 1922:

[...] The passage of this resolution [...] it is merely an expression of our sympathetic and favorable attitude in establishing in Palestine a refuge for the persecuted Jews of the world [...]. We of America should be glad to give our moral support to a project which is based upon Justice and humanity. To give this recognition to so laudable an endeavor of a people seeking to create a haven of refuge for the oppressed and homeless of their race is to get in consonance with the loftiest American ideals. The Jews have suffered greatly during the war [...]. They are seeking a home where with the generous help of their brethren of other lands who are in more comfortable circumstances, they may re-create their own forms of life and realize their ideals [...] (The United States House of Representatives, 1922).

As it is possible to retrieve from the previous excerpt, it is considered that the acceptance of the Zionist project “is based upon Justice and humanity”, mostly due to the fact that they were “oppressed” and “have suffered greatly during the war”, providing here the justification for the exceptionality of the “race”. By doing so, the United States House Committee on Foreign Affairs position goes in accordance with the previous ones referred. Besides the USA, there was a feeling, as well, of sympathy and recognition of the relevance of the Jewish question in what was starting to be the USSR, according to the position adopted by Vladimir Lenin, the first Chairman of the Council of People’s Commissars of the Soviet Union, between 1922 and 1924, in which he stated that:

ANTI-SEMITISM is defined as the spreading of enmity against the Jews. When the damnable Tsarist monarchy was living out its last hours, it attempted to divert the illiterate workers and peasants into pogroms

against the Jews. The Tsar's police in union with the landlords and capitalists organized Jewish pogroms [...]. (Lenin, 1919).

While not accepting the proposed solution, since Vladimir Lenin believed that it was possible to unite all the races and religious beliefs in a united effort to eradicate the capitalism, it is possible as well to perceive that there was an acceptance of the securitization move, since the Jews were victims of pogroms.

Regarding the unfolding of the Zionist cause in Palestine, the Zionist Movement was able to create different organized structures with support and/or with consent of the British government. Through the diplomatic ties that the Zionist members were able to develop, they've reached Orde Charles Wingate, who believed that the idea of a Jewish statehood had to be linked with the creation of an army that would be able to protect the Jewish settlements throughout the territory and he also considered that the involvement of armed aggression would be important to prevent a possible future resistance by the locals. In 1920 it was created the "Hagana"⁸, which in 1929, after the 16th Zionist Congress was integrated under the "Jewish Agency"⁹, with the purpose of defending the Jewish settlements from the attacks of the Arab population. The assistance of Orde Charles Wingate was essential in order to the members of the "Hagana" to be incorporated in some missions of the British Forces, which had the goal of providing the Jewish individuals with experience on the field and, not less important, to teach them measures that should be adopted in order to apply reprisal attacks to Arab villages (Pappe, 2006: 15 – 23).

⁸ "Hagana" means "defense" in Hebrew.

⁹ The "Jewish Agency", after its creation on the 16th Zionist Congress, assumed the role of the main governing body in Palestine (JAFI, n/a).

Besides that, 2.800 members of the paramilitary force were incorporated in the police forces of the British Mandate, which had an important role in suppressing the Arab revolts that started to occur in Palestine. Those occurred in 1921, 1929, 1933 and 1936, which, after being investigated by different commissions, were always related with the discontent that the Arab section of the population felt with the positions that the British government was adopting, at the time (UNISPAL, 1978). During that period, the Arab population has suffered a hard repression by the British authorities related with the rebellions they organized, leading to the incarceration of its leaders and part of its members, especially in the 1936 rebellion, which destroyed the paramilitary basis that the Arabs had built until then (Pappe, 2006: 22 – 23).

After the rebellions, several commissions were established to analyze the root of the problems and it was consensual among the members that produced the final reports that, besides other minor problems, the Arab population was worried about being economically and politically subjugated by the Jewish community and, as well, it was feared that the continuous immigration and land purchases, by the Jewish members of the society, would result in the Arabs becoming a minority in their own country. That problem was aggravated due to the fact that, after the start of the persecution of Jews in Europe, different Western countries started to block the immigration of Jewish members to their countries, which allowed the Zionist members to convince not only those countries to support their cause but, as well, to have more powerful arguments to convince the Jewish communities to immigrate to Palestine (UNISPAL, 1978).

In order to deal with the rebellions, the British government established the Peel Commission, which had the goal of analyzing the causes to the grievance that started to be inherent to the different sects in Palestine and to propose recommendations to deal with the underlying causes of the rebellions, as well. To do so, the Royal Commission proposed that it would be important to develop a Partition of Palestine, in order to attend the demands of both sides, and to be reduced the number of Jewish immigrants that were heading to Palestine, being that suggestion accepted by the British Government through the release of the White Paper of 1939 (Khouri, 1976: 21 – 27).

3.2. The final road to the establishment of the State of Israel

It is necessary to understand that due to the persecution that the Jews were suffering during the 2nd World War and to the fact that the British position regarding the unlimited immigration of Jews to Palestine had cooled down, as it was expressed by the White Paper elaborated in 1939, the Zionists leaders organized an extraordinary Zionist Conference at the Biltmore Hotel, in New York City, on the 11th of May of 1942. At that point, the demands for a Jewish National home changed to the establishment of a “Jewish Commonwealth”. As the Biltmore Program expresses:

[...] 6. The Conference calls for the fulfillment of the original purpose of the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate [...] to found there a Jewish Commonwealth. The Conference affirms its unalterable rejection of the White Paper of May 1939 and denies its moral or legal validity. The White Paper seeks to limit, and in fact to nullify Jewish rights to immigration and settlement in Palestine, and, as stated by Mr. Winston Churchill in the House of Commons in May 1939, constitutes 'a breach and repudiation of the Balfour Declaration'. The policy of the White Paper is cruel and indefensible in its denial of sanctuary to Jews fleeing from Nazi persecution [...]. 7. In the struggle against the forces of aggression and tyranny, of which Jews were the earliest victims [...] recognition must be given to the right of the Jews of Palestine to play their full part in the war effort and in the defence of their country, through a Jewish military force fighting under its own flag and under the high command of the United Nations. 8. The Conference declares that the new world order that will follow victory cannot be established on foundations of peace, justice and equality, unless the problem of Jewish homelessness is finally solved. The Conference urges that the gates of Palestine be opened; that the Jewish Agency be vested with control of immigration into Palestine and with the necessary authority for upbuilding the country [...] and that Palestine be established as a Jewish Commonwealth integrated in the structure of the new democratic world [...] (Extraordinary Zionist Conference, 1942, Article 6; 7; 8).

As it is possible to notice, the Biltmore Program showed an alteration in the strategy that was being adopted by the Zionist leaders, once more, based on the fact that there was a threat directed to the Jewish community. Until this event, the Zionist leaders had only appealed to the systematic and structural persecution of the Jews, which was being perpetrated by the European societies. After the occurrence of this gathering, it is possible to affirm that the emergency of the previous demand, which was the establishment of a "Jewish National home" in Palestine, was no longer sufficient to solve the issue. According to that, it was established the goal to develop measures that would allow the Jewish community to establish a "Jewish Commonwealth". It was also defined that the Jewish Commonwealth would be "integrated in the structure of the new democratic world", that the "Jewish Agency"

would “be vested with control of immigration into Palestine” and the desire to establish a “Jewish military force fighting under its own flag”.

Those three previous conditions, the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine, which would be integrated in the future structure of the World order, the attribution of the migratory control to Jewish Agency and the establishment of a military force with its own flag, represents an extremely comprehensive demand, since all those 3 conditions, if applied, would mean that the Jewish community that 50 years before had chosen Palestine to be their haven, would be entitled to control the sovereignty of a territory that was inhabited, even at that time, by an Arab majority.

It is important to understand the role of the 2nd World War for the Zionist cause. Mostly because of the terrible things that the Jewry in Europe suffered under the Nazi extremism, the members that belonged to the Zionist Movement doubled from 1.000.000 in 1939 to more than 2.000.000 in 1946, which amounted to 19,6 percent of the world Jewry, while the number of countries with Zionist branches rose from 50 to 63, in order to maintain a closer contact with the local Jewry of the chosen countries. Besides that, the 2nd World War improved the evolution of the Jewish paramilitary groups, since most of them continued active during that tremendous moment in history, for different reasons. The “Hagana” agreed to fight for the British, during the war, which lead to an increase of the experience of the organization and its members in war situations while, for example, the “Stern Gang” searched for the help of Fascist Italy to struggle against the British Administration in

Palestine (Khouri, 1976: 27 – 48). At that point, the “Hagana” was composed of 40.000 settlers and towns folks, besides a field army that was constituted by 16.000 individuals and a full-time force called “Palmach”, which was constituted by two sub-groups - the peace establishment and the war establishment - comprehending a total of 8.000 members. In addition to the “Hagana”, there were 2 armed groups¹⁰ that comprised from 3.200 to 5.300 members (UNISPAL, 1978).

The 2nd World War was also important to change perceptions worldwide. Due to the extension of the cruelty inflicted by the Nazis to the Jewry in Europe, leading to a movement of forced emigration by the members of the previous community to countries such as USA, resulting in the creation of a strong influence on the position adopted by the President Harry Truman regarding the goals of the Zionist Organization. So, as a consequence, the American administration pressured the British government to allow the immediate entrance of more 100.000 Jewish individuals, without its own participation in the expenditures related with that phenomenon (Khouri, 1976: 27 – 36).

Due to that divergence, afterwards it was decided that both sides would establish a commission to study the situation on the field, concluding that Palestine couldn't sustain the arrival of all the Jewish people that wished to go there, while suggesting that 100.000 permits to entry in Palestine should be issued. As far as Palestine is concerned, it should be placed under the control of the United Nations as a trust area, in order to allow the Trustee to prepare both sides for an ultimate

¹⁰ The Jewish paramilitary forces were constituted by the “Hagana”, the “Irgun Tzeva’I Leumi” and the “Stern Group”.

independence. Despite that, it is also important to refer that the Anglo-American Commission also realized that the Jewish community on Palestine was able to develop a “virtual Jewish non-territorial State”, due to the structures that were established until then, which could be compared to the Mandatory Administration (UNISPAL, 1978).

In May of 1947, there was the first Special Session in the United Nations to deal with the situation of Palestine. As a result, after a long debate, it was established the “United Nations Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP)”. Between the second half of May until the 31st of August, members of the UNSCOP had meetings with representatives from both sides in different places of the globe, in order to attain a full picture of what was happening in the territories of Palestine. The Zionist members took advantage of that situation and, during the visit of some members of UNSCOP to Palestine, they’ve sent the ship “Exodus” with 4.550 illegal immigrants, in order to influence the decisions of the committee and, as well, in order to embarrass the position being taken by the British government (Khoury, 1976: 43 – 48).

Due to the constitution of the UNSCOP and to the fact that the Zionist members were allowed to present their case in the General Assembly of the United Nations, despite not being a certified State, the Arab leaders started to boycott the negotiations. Therefore, the Zionist representatives assumed a position of bilateral negotiation that allowed them to ask for 80% of the territory that was assigned to Palestine, which was not conceived due to the demographic composition of the

territory in analysis. As a counter-offer, the UNSCOP members offered 56% of the territories to a community that was built in the previous 50 years and that it was still a minority, while Jerusalem would be assigned as an international city due to its religious significance (Pappe, 2006: 29 – 33).

As a result, the Partition Plan was presented with the admission of the arguments held by the Biltmore Program, since it understood that the evolution of the Jewish community in Palestine and the persecution that the Jewry felt by the Nazism created the need to attribute a sovereign piece of the territory of Palestine, being the difference that the Biltmore Program demanded the entire Palestine, as it is addressed in the article 3 of the United Nations General Assembly (UN/GA) Resolution 181, that states:

Independent Arab and Jewish States and the Special International Regime for the City of Jerusalem, set forth in Part III of this Plan, shall come into existence in Palestine two months after the evacuation of the armed forces of the mandatory Power has been completed but in any case not later than 1 October 1948. The boundaries of the Arab State, the Jewish State, and the City of Jerusalem shall be as described in Parts II and III below. (United Nations General Assembly Resolution 181, 1947, Article III).

The adoption of the previous UN/GA Resolution was made at the 128th plenary meeting, which accounted for 33 votes in favor, with 13 members voting against, while 10 abstained. From those that voted against the adoption of the Resolution, the majority were constituted by the Arab Nations (such as Egypt, Lebanon, and Syria, which are the neighboring countries of the territory that was being analyzed). During that process, different members of the United Nations

assumed that the Arab representatives were non-cooperative, resulting in the consideration that the attitude in question was damaging their cause at the eyes of the rest of the world. One of the existing examples is the case of the Delegation of the Netherlands, whom stated that “we found the Arabs, whose case we had considered to be a very strong one, to be in a weaker position than the Jews, partly because their attitude of non-cooperation deprived them of many opportunities to influence the course of events”. Regarding that question, the Zionist representatives were quite aware of it and, due to that, even while the Partition Plan was being debated in the UN/GA, the “Jewish Agency” started to organize different structures regarding the protection and organization of the future Jewish State (Khouri, 1976: 48 – 67).

Being the UN/GA considered the most democratic structure within the United Nations, since attributes one vote per State and every State that was recognized by the international community had a representation in there, the favorable outcome provided the Zionist leaders with the legitimacy for their claims and, regarding the purpose of the present dissertation, it provides as well the proof that the international community, despite their interests, accepted the securitization move made by the Zionists regarding the anti-Semitism, which justified the attribution of the sovereignty of a defined territory to them. Of course, in Palestine, after the adoption of the Resolution 181 by the UN/GA, clashes started to occur between the Jewish community and the Arab one.

On the 29th of November of 1947, the Partition Resolution was adopted, which prompted the Palestinian Arabs to protest, using vandalism as an instrument to

make their voices heard. As a response, in the beginning of December of the same year, it began to take place attacks perpetrated by Jewish individuals against Palestinian villages and neighborhoods, prompting an exodus of 75.000 Arab Palestinians. Those occurrences prompted the Arab States to encourage the sending of volunteer armies, that had the goal of defending the local Arab people, being that considered as the beginning of the Palestinian War that erupted in the beginning of 1948 (Pappe, 2006: 39 – 42).

At the time when the British representatives of the Mandate were heading to leave the country, between the approval of the Partition Resolution and the official date for the completion of the progressive withdrawal of the British staff, two plans were implemented by the Jewish community. The Plan Gimmel (Plan C) and Plan Dalet (Plan D), being both complementary of each other, since the goal of Plan C was to maintain the control of the settlements outside the territory assigned for the future Jewish State, while maintaining a constant pressure against the Palestinian Arabs and the Plan D was elaborated in order to maintain the control of the territories that were assigned to the future Jewish State, while maintaining the control of the settlements outside its boundaries, after the conclusion of the British Mandate, in the case of an invasion by the Arab armies (Khalidi, 1988: 15 – 16).

The Plan C is the best example regarding the Zionist propaganda back then, since it had in its structure the application of retaliatory attacks that should be justified to the Arab population, while undermining their sense of security. At the same time, the use of propaganda regarding the attacks that were successful against

Arab rebels was used to largely affect the Arab population, in order to provoke a deterrent role. On the other hand, in cases where it was necessary to respond to limited or single Arab operations, it was made a warning to the Arabs regarding what should be expected in the future, while taking “the widest possible media coverage” with the Jewish military. On the 10th of March of 1948, Plan D was implemented and focused, initially, in controlling the urban centers of Palestine. At this stage, about 250.000 Arabs were forced out by the Zionist military forces (Pappe, 2006: 40). It is important to understand that the brutality of Plan D included different stages like, for example, the destruction of villages by setting them on fire, blowing them up and by planting mines, or the wiping out of armed forces within villages and the expulsion of its population outside the borders of the State (Khalidi, 1988: 20 – 29).

In order to sustain the conflict, the Zionist leaders reached an agreement with King Abdullah of Jordan, which defined that the latter could maintain Transjordan if its military forces wouldn't participate in the offensive, that it was easily predicted, by the Arab neighbors, against the future Jewish State. It was agreed, as well, that the Jewish State would not comprehend the area that today it is defined as the “West Bank” and, in return, the biggest Arab army wouldn't join any all-Arab military operation against the future Jewish State (Pappe, 2006: 42 -44). That strategic alliance was extremely important to deal with the size of the possible enemy forces but, as well, it was central to the disunity that the Arab regimes were starting to face within their own alliance, since they had different interests to defend, which affected the agreed outcomes that were to be achieved by them (Khoury, 1976: 68 – 70).

At the same time, in the diplomatic forum, on the 14th of May of 1948, which was one day before the complete withdrawal of the British Mandate from Palestine, the Jewish Agency announced its independence. Taking in consideration the fact that only at the end of that day the British Mandate would officially terminate and that the Arab leaders were afraid of taking any kind of measures to deal with the conflict that erupted within the borders of Mandated Palestine, the Zionist leaders took a strategic step and gathered at the Tel Aviv Museum with the goal of announcing “The Declaration of Independence of the State of Israel” which, among others, declared:

[...]In the year 5657 (1897), at the summons of the spiritual father of the Jewish State, Theodore Herzl, the First Zionist Congress convened and proclaimed the right of the Jewish people to national rebirth in its own country. This right was recognized in the Balfour Declaration of the 2nd November, 1917, and re-affirmed in the Mandate of the League of Nations [...]. The catastrophe which recently befell the Jewish people - the massacre of millions of Jews in Europe - was another clear demonstration of the urgency of solving the problem of its homelessness by re-establishing in Eretz-Israel the Jewish State [...]. Survivors of the Nazi holocaust in Europe, as well as Jews from other parts of the world, continued to migrate to Eretz-Israel, undaunted by difficulties, restrictions and dangers, and never ceased to assert their right to a life of dignity, freedom and honest toil in their national homeland. [...] On the 29th November, 1947, the United Nations General Assembly passed a resolution calling for the establishment of a Jewish State in Eretz-Israel; the General Assembly required the inhabitants of Eretz-Israel to take such steps as were necessary on their part for the implementation of that resolution. This recognition by the United Nations of the right of the Jewish people to establish their State is irrevocable. This right is the natural right of the Jewish people to be masters of their own fate, like all other nations, in their own sovereign State. ACCORDINGLY WE, MEMBERS OF THE PEOPLE'S COUNCIL, REPRESENTATIVES OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY OF ERETZ-ISRAEL AND OF THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT, ARE HERE ASSEMBLED ON THE DAY OF THE TERMINATION OF THE BRITISH MANDATE OVER ERETZ-ISRAEL AND, BY VIRTUE OF OUR NATURAL AND HISTORIC RIGHT AND ON THE STRENGTH OF THE RESOLUTION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, HEREBY DECLARE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A

JEWISH STATE IN ERETZ-ISRAEL, TO BE KNOWN AS THE STATE OF ISRAEL [...] ¹¹ (Gurion, 1948).

The “Declaration of Independence of the State of Israel” is the official document that, once more, comes to certify what was previously written. The reasons that justify the implementation of the State of Israel is the need to protect the Jews all over the world, with a special incidence on what the Nazi’s had done to the Jews in Europe since it was the most recent event that massively affected the Jews and had the power to affect the perception of the Zionist cause¹² but, important as well, was the measures and positions adopted by the different actors all along the process that legitimated all the demands that the Zionists had until then. So, in the beginning of the Zionist quest, the Balfour Declaration legitimated the right for the Jews to immigrate to Palestine and to develop institutions in there that would sustain that flow of immigration and, afterwards, the UN/GA legitimated and even “required the inhabitants of Eretz-Israel” to create the conditions for the implementation of a Jewish State. Once more, it is important to remember that at the beginning of the Zionist project, it was demanded a safe-haven for the Jewish community while coexisting with the Arab one, within the territory of Palestine.

Only 16 minutes after the proclamation was made, the following recognition was released to the press, by the United States Government:

¹¹ The words that are in capital are presented like in the original document.

¹² Please read the section 2.1.1. of the present dissertation for more information.

This Government has been informed that a Jewish state has been proclaimed in Palestine, and recognition has been requested by the provisional Government thereof. The United States recognizes the provisional government as the de facto authority of the new State of Israel (Truman, 1948).

This recognition, by the USA was done so rapidly that the official announcement had some mistakes that were corrected with the handwriting of a special counsel to the President, Clark Clifford¹³. In another case, the USSR recognized the existence of the State of Israel on the 17th of May of 1948, through the following letter that was exchanged between Vyaschelav Molotov, a member of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and Moshe Shertok, the Foreign Minister of the State of Israel, that had as a base the resolution 181 of the UN/GA:

Confirming receipt of your telegram of May 16, in which you inform the Government of the USSR of the proclamation, on the basis of the resolution of the United Nations Assembly of November 29, 1947, of the creation in Palestine of the Independent State of Israel [...] I inform you on this letter that the Government of the USSR has decided to recognize officially the State of Israel and its Provisional Government. (Molotov, 1948).

So, with the aim of concluding the present chapter, and after all the dissection regarding the causes and the consequences of the most important actions, in the optic of the author, regarding the establishment of the State of Israel, it is possible to verify that the securitization move that was initially started by Theodor Herzl was efficiently conducted, since it was able to gather the support of the Jewish audience, which lead to the organization of the Zionist Congress's, and the support of the International community, shown by the disclosure of the Balfour Declaration, the

¹³ For more information, please read the article written by Yitzhak Benhorin, "Truman's battle for Israel's recognition revealed", that is available in the website of YNetNews.

positions assumed by different leaders and the resolutions passed in the United Nations, that have resulted in the legitimate instauration of the State of Israel.

4. The 2nd process of securitization developed by the Jewish Leaders

In the previous chapter, it was described the historical background behind the instauration of the State of Israel. That event is crucial for the understanding of the history in the Middle East region, since it marked the official beginning of the Arab-Israeli conflict. With the end of the British Mandate in Palestine and the instauration of the State of Israel, on 80% of the historical Palestine, the Arab States in the region dispatched part of their military forces into Palestine, which marked the beginning of a number of specific armed disputes between both parts (Goodwyn, 2005: 8 – 11).

At the diplomatic level, the Arab League released the following statement, on the same day as the Declaration of Independence made by the Israeli leaders:

1. [...] The overwhelming majority of the population of Palestine were Arabs. There was in it a small minority of Jews that enjoyed the same rights and bore the same responsibilities as the [other] inhabitants, and did not suffer any ill-treatment on account of its religious beliefs [...]. 3. In 1917 England issued a declaration in which she expressed her sympathy with the establishment of a National Home for the Jews in Palestine. [...] It was interpreted by England to aim at no more than the establishment of a spiritual centre for the Jews in Palestine, and to conceal no ulterior political aims, such as the establishment of a Jewish State. The same thing was declared by the Jewish leaders. [...] 5. England administered Palestine in a manner which enabled the Jews to flood it with immigrants and helped them to settle in the country [...].¹⁰ Now that the British mandate over Palestine has come to an end, without there being a legitimate constitutional authority in the country, [...] the Governments of the Arab States declare the following: *First*: That the rule

of Palestine should revert to its inhabitants, in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations and [the Charter] of the United Nations and that [the Palestinians] should alone have the right to determine their future. *Second:* Security and order in Palestine have become disrupted. The Zionist aggression resulted in the exodus of more than a quarter of a million of its Arab inhabitants from their homes and in their taking refuge in the neighbouring Arab countries [...]. *Third:* This state of affairs is threatening to spread to the neighbouring Arab countries [...]. *Fifth:* The Governments of the Arab States, as members of the Arab League, a regional organisation within the meaning of the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, [...] view the events taking place in Palestine as a threat to peace and security in the area [...]. *Sixth:* Therefore, as security in Palestine is a sacred trust [...], the Governments of the Arab States have found themselves compelled to intervene in Palestine [...] (Arab League, 1948).

As it is possible to verify, even the Arab League accepted the securitization on anti-Semitism developed by the Zionist, by omission, while, at the same time, affirming that the factor in question did not occur in Palestine, since the “small minority of Jews that enjoyed the same rights and bore the same responsibilities as the [other] inhabitants, and did not suffer any ill-treatment on account of its religious beliefs”, as it is possible to verify on the Declaration. It is possible to verify, as well, the realization, by the concerned Arab States, that it was promised to establish a “spiritual center for the Jews in Palestine”, which didn’t comprehend the establishment of a Jewish State but, as the Arab States understood, even that political aim was a misleading one since the British administration allowed a “flood of immigration” to the country while helping the immigrants to settle. According to the Arab States that participated in this joint declaration, the people from Palestine were facing an aggression from the Zionists, which had armed themselves and tried to seize the control over the territory, with the contribution of the British government

and, due to that, it was necessary to intervene militarily in order to prevent that the state of affairs would spread to the neighboring countries.

4.1. The Palestine War

After the declaration released by the Arab League and after promoting the dispatch of volunteers to fight in Palestine, the Arab States sent about 20.000 to 25.000 troops to the conflict, while providing them with ill-equipment and lack of preparation, to fight with a newly created army that comprised between 35.000 to 80.000 soldiers that were strongly backed by the Jewish community and constantly reinforced by new arrivals of immigrants. In this first stage, due to the offensive posture adopted by the Arab military forces, they were able to acquire some territories. After that, the State of Israel addressed the Security Council of the United Nations (SC/UN), being able to gather the support of the USSR, the USA and even the United Nations Secretary General (UN/SG), Trygve Lie, regarding the categorization of the action being developed by the Arab countries as an “aggression”, which violated the United Nations Charter (Khoury, 1976: 73 – 81).

So, in order to achieve an extended truce and the so intended mediation, among others resolution, the United Nations passed the UN/SC Resolution 54 (S/RES/54), already after the application of the 1st truce, which stated that:

The Security Council, Taking into consideration that the Provisional Government of Israel has indicated its acceptance in principle of a prolongation of the truce in Palestine; that the States members of the Arab League have rejected successive appeals of the United Nations Mediator, and of the Security Council in its resolution 53 (1948) of 7 July 1948, for the prolongation of the truce in Palestine; and that there has consequently developed a renewal of hostilities in Palestine, 1. Determines that the situation in Palestine constitutes a threat to the peace [...]; 2. Orders the Governments and authorities concerned [...] to desist from further military action and to this end to issue cease-fire orders [...] not later than three days from the date of the adoption of this resolution; 3. Declares that failure by any of the Governments or authorities concerned to comply with the preceding paragraph of this resolution would demonstrate the existence of a breach of the peace [...] requiring immediate consideration by the Security Council with a view to such further action under Chapter VII of the Charter[...] ; 4. Calls upon all Governments and authorities concerned to continue to co-operate with the Mediator with a view to the maintenance of peace in Palestine in conformity with resolution 50 (1948) [...]; 5. Orders as a matter of special and urgent necessity an immediate and unconditional cease-fire in the City of Jerusalem [...]; 7. Instructs the Mediator to supervise the observance of the truce and to establish procedures for examining alleged breaches of the truce since 11 June 1948 [...]; 9. Reiterates the appeal to the parties contained in the last paragraph of its resolution 49 (1948) of 22 May 1948 and urges upon the parties that they continue conversations with the Mediator in a spirit of conciliation and mutual concession [...] (United Nations Security Council, 1948).

Taking in consideration the fact that the previous excerpt served as the basis for the armistice negotiations, it is important to notice that the UN was able to provide an impartial position regarding the conflict, by addressing both sides, while just clarifying the fact that the Arab States weren't available to extend the armistice. Besides that, the SC/UN was critical about the conflict, which was considered to be a threat to peace in the region, while demanding a termination of the conflict with consequences to those that didn't comply with the previous orders. Since the Arab population was being deceived by their leaders, there was a certain pressure for the

resuming of the conflict, which showed that the Israeli troops were able not only to organize themselves during the truce but also to acquire military and man-power, resulting in a switch in the balance of power, favorable to them.

Even so, some Arab leaders desired to continue to fight, which resulted in the imposition of a second resolution, on the 15th of June of 1948, which blamed the Arabs for the failure of arriving at a truce and imposed a permanent cease-fire within three days, which in the case of not being accepted would result in the imposition of sanctions. On the other hand, the Israeli military forces were opposing the acceptance of a second truce, since they were being able to acquire more parts of the Arab territory, resulting in the application of strong diplomatic pressure, by the USA, in order for them to accept this resolution (Khouri, 1976: 77 – 81).

In January of 1949, a delegation from Egypt and another from Israel accepted to start to discuss the armistice, after a formal United Nations cease-fire was adopted on the 7th of the referred month. Despite all the differences, a General Armistice Agreement (GAA) was signed on the 24th of February, which prompted the Lebanese and Syrian parts to engage in the armistice negotiations with the State of Israel. Those agreements, took in consideration, inter alia, the demarcation of the demilitarized zones. That is possible to be verified in the GAA between Egypt and Israel:

[...] Article V [...] 2. The Armistice Demarcation Line is not to be construed in any sense as a political or territorial boundary, and is delineated without prejudice to rights, claims and positions of either Party to the

Armistice as regards ultimate settlement of the Palestine question [...] (United Nations Security Council, 1949, Article V).

In the GAA between Israel and Syria:

[...] Article V [...] 1. It is emphasized that the following arrangements for the Armistice Demarcation Line between the Israeli and Syrian armed forces and for the Demilitarized Zone are not to be interpreted as having any relation whatsoever to ultimate territorial arrangements affecting the two Parties to this Agreement [...] (United Nations Security Council, 1949, Article V).

In the GAA between Israel and Jordan:

[...] Article VI [...] 9. The Armistice Demarcation Lines defined in articles V and VI of this Agreement are agreed upon by the Parties without prejudice to future territorial settlements or boundary lines or to claims of either Party relating thereto [...] (United Nations Security Council, 1949, Article VI).

In the GAA between Israel and Lebanon:

[...] Article II [...] 2. It is also recognized that no provision of this Agreement shall in any way prejudice the rights, claims and positions of either Party hereto in the ultimate peaceful settlement of the Palestine question;

(a) The provisions of this agreement being dictated exclusively by military considerations

[...] Article IV [...] 2. The basic purpose of the Armistice Demarcation Line is to delineate the line beyond which the armed forces of the respective Parties shall not move [...] (United Nations Security Council, 1949, Article II; IV; VI).

So, as is possible to verify, all the GAA that were signed explicitly affirmed that the “Armistice Demarcation” Lines had the purpose of establishing a buffer region between the actors involved in the conflict and it wouldn’t be valid, regarding the permanent terms. Concerning other sensitive subjects, the State of Israel, after the termination of the conflict, started to advocate that the acquirement of those territories was a *fait accompli* and that the returning of the refugees would have to be decided only by negotiating with the States involved in the question, in exchange for the full recognition of the State of Israel and its boundaries (Khouri, 1976: 95 – 101).

Even so, in practical terms, the State of Israel was accepted by the UN/GA, through the approval of the Resolution 273 (III), despite the fact that controlled territories that were meant to be attributed to the Arab State, as it was described in the Partition Plan.

By providing a positive answer to the request that was being developed by the Israeli leaders, the United Nations disrespected not only its principles but, as well, the GAA that it had previously demanded from the parts involved in the conflict, since it allowed the effective control, by the State of Israel, of regions that it had conquered in the conflict, which represents the application of an exceptional measure to an actor within the International community, by the United Nations. By allowing it, a direct consequence emerged from the conflict, since the regimes that were implemented in Egypt, Syria and Jordan were overturned and replaced by governments that appealed for the grievance of the Palestinians, regarding the State of Israel, in order to get support from their population (Khouri, 1976: 99 – 101), leading to the occurrence of a new securitization, by the Israelis, concerning the

belligerent statements made by the Arab leaders. The important factor of the previous conflict is related with the capability of the State of Israel deeply alters the geopolitical reality of the region, by introducing in there a completely fabricated State, which completely controlled all the variants that occurred within its defined territory.

4.2. The 6 Day War

After the Palestine War, the population that was living in the Arab countries neighboring Israel started to demonstrate an increasing discontent with its governments, due to the policies that were being adopted regarding the internal situation of each one of them and due to the policies that were being adopted in order to solve the question of Palestine, which started to be considered as a cause of the Arab world. Taking that in consideration, Yasser Arafat and Salah Khalaf organized themselves since “the Palestinians could rely only on themselves” (Cobban, 1984: 21 – 22). By reorganizing the Palestinian Student’s Union, in Cairo, they were able to create a strong core of intellectuals that redefined the Palestinian cause, mostly by getting it away from the more Universalist views that were being attached to it. After the 1956 Middle East war, a Palestinian commando battalion was created, with the goal of helping the Egyptian war effort.

It is important to understand that during that time, the Palestinian population was considered to be one of the most qualified in the Middle East, a factor that was important to the dispersion of the student's activists, since they assumed different positions in different countries in the Arab world. With time, the countries that were neighboring Israel started to impose several restrictions to the Palestinians activists, since they were considered to be a destabilizing factor within the societies where they operated. As a result, the founding of "Fateh" dates from a reunion that was held in Kuwait, on the 10th of October of 1959, despite the fact that until 1962 its members just worked on managing to strengthen the organization in terms of subsistence. The goals of "Fateh", initially, was based on five basic points, which addressed the common goal of liberating Palestine, the need for armed struggle to attain the previous goal, the reliance on Palestinian self-organization, the co-operation with friendly Arab forces and the co-operation with friendly international forces. By reversing the slogan "of Arab unit as the way to liberate Palestine" to the need of existence of unit among the Palestinians in order to liberate Palestine and consequently achieve the so desired Arab unit, they were able to start the military action in 1965 (*Ibid.*: 21 – 30).

In the decade of 1960, several political events defined the propensity to occur a new war between the Arab countries and Israel. The most influential actor throughout this period was Gamal Abdel Nasser, the president of Egypt, which declared several times the need to go to war with the State of Israel, in order to recover Palestine, being one of those the following:

[...] We do not deny that we want war. We want war; this is our right. The return of Palestine is impossible without war [...] (Nasser, 1960).

On 27 of September of 1961, Gamal Abdel Nasser affirmed the following, at the United Nations Assembly:

[...] The only solution to Palestine...is that matters should return to the condition prevailing before the error was committed – i.e. the annulment of Israel's existence [...] (Nasser , 1961).

In 1964, after a summit in Cairo that gathered 13 Arab kings, emirs and presidents of the Arab world, it was decided that due to the emergence of such organizations as the "Fateh", the Arab Nationalist's Movement, the Palestinian Liberation Front and the Palestinian Arab Youth, that were focused in the liberation of Palestine, it was necessary to establish a single entity that would represent the Palestinian people in the international forum and that would organize the efforts that were being developed by every single organization that was emerging, which resulted in the creation of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), despite the fact that there was the opposition of the major political faction, the "Fateh" (Cobban, 1984: 28 – 30). Besides that, in the same meeting it was released a common declaration, by the Council of Kings and Heads of State, stating the following:

The Council of the Kings and Heads of State of the Arab League held its second meeting, at Al-Montasah Palace, Alexandria, 5 to 11 September 1964 [...]. The Council of Kings and Heads of State of the Arab League studied the report of the Secretary General of the Arab League on the resolutions and principles adopted by the first session of the Arab Summit Conference, the implementations of these resolutions and means of strengthening them. [...] The Council was unanimous in defining national objectives for the liberation of Palestine from Zionist colonialism [...]. The Council stressed the necessity of [...] mobilization of their resources and capabilities, in order to counter the challenge of [...] Israel's continued aggressive

policies and its insistence on denying the rights of the Arabs of Palestine to their homeland. [...] It approved the Organization's decision to establish a Palestinian Liberation Army and defined the commitments of the member States to assist it in its work. [...] The Council expressed its appreciation for the support given by foreign countries to Arab causes in general and the Palestine cause in particular [...] (Arab League, 1964).

As it is possible to notice, and being the Arab League composed, at the time, by Jordan, Tunisia, Algeria, Republic of Sudan, Republic of Iraq, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Arab Syrian Republic, United Arab Republic, Yemeni Arab Republic, State of Kuwait, Republic of Lebanon, Libya, Kingdom of Morocco and the PLO, the declaration that was issued showed that the main focus of the external policies regarding the Arab goals were related with the gathering of International support to achieve the liberation of Palestine. Being the Arab League a regional organization that represented the will of the majority of the Arab countries and being the previous objectives elaborated in a unanimous platform, the previous declaration is extremely important to understand the platform that the Israeli leaders had to steer the world opinion towards them.

As a response to the Arab League Summit declaration, came in a speech by the Israeli Prime-Minister, Levi Eshkol, where he declared the following:

[...] A few days have passed since the conference of the Arab Heads of State broke up, and it is important that the world should be aware of the deplorable significance of the decisions it adopted and the statements it issued. All the States that took part in the conference are members of the United Nations Organization. Under the Charter of the United Nations, it is their duty to refrain not only from the use of force but from any *threat* of force against any other country. Compliance with these principles of the United Nations Charter

is humanity's only hope of emerging from the nightmare of war and building a better world founded on justice, law and peace. [...] And it is just in these days that the Heads of the Arab States openly and expressly proclaim that they planned acts of aggression against another State entitled to equal rights in the family of nations [...]. While it is not yet clear what the practical results of the Cairo conference will be, it has already brought out into the clear light of day aggressive and destructive aims that should shock the conscience of every lover of peace. [...] How deplorable it is that the purpose of their meeting was not the social and economic advancement of their tens of millions of people. How horrifying that the only aim that could bring them together under one roof was their lust for aggression against a neighbouring State. [...] I note with satisfaction that the world in general has not been convinced by this theory of hostility and hatred. It is becoming clearer and clearer to the world that the arguments of the Arab countries [...] are meant to deny Israel's right to exist. [...] Israel will oppose unilateral and illegal measures by the Arab States and will act to protect its vital rights. [...] This area needs [...] the advancement of peace and not the fomenting of war. The more firmly world public opinion rejects hostility and aggression, and encourages useful and constructive development, the more it will help the Arab Governments to abandon a policy of reckless adventurism [...] (Eshkol, 1964).

In order to understand the previous, is necessary to refer that the main topic of the statement is related to a plan elaborated by the Arab league, to divert water from Lake Kinnereth. Even so, both the Arab leaders and the Israeli ones weren't able to avoid the question without referring to the possibility of an engagement with each others, in order to protect themselves. The most important thing from the previous excerpts are related with the fact that the Arab leaders unanimously considered the Zionist ideology and, consequently, the State of Israel as the primary enemy, in the region, which demands a full preparation of the military conditions that they possessed and the creation of an army that would be solely directed to fight against the "Zionist colonialism". Besides that, it is important to notice that at the diplomatic level, the Arab countries focused in many causes but, in the Arab League declaration,

it is highlighted the importance of the Palestine cause and the support that different countries provided to it, which lead to the consideration that the liberation of Palestine was the major goal not only in a military level but, as well, in the diplomatic one, by the Arab League.

On the other hand, the Israeli prime-minister made sure to adopt a position that provided a Western insight, by initially directing the critics to the fact that the members of the Arab League are participants of the UN and, as a consequence, are disrespecting the international law and he appealed as well to the human feeling of dreaming for a better world, which is an universal trend. Afterwards, Levi Eshkol made sure to clarify that the State of Israel possessed the same status of the remaining States, by affirming that “they planned acts of aggression against another State entitled to equal rights in the family of nations”, followed by the assurance that any clash between the Israeli military forces and the Arab ones would be due to the “unilateral and illegal measures by the Arab States”.

It is important to notice, as well, that Levi Eshkol, throughout the speech, made sure to direct the arguments towards a more universal understanding of the situation, by declaring that the position assumed by the Arab leaders “has already brought out into the clear light of day aggressive and destructive aims that should shock the conscience of every lover of peace” and declaring, as well, that “The more firmly world public opinion rejects hostility and aggression, and encourages useful and constructive development, the more it will help the Arab Governments to abandon a policy of reckless adventurism”. In the middle of the speech, the Israeli

leader made sure to bring out that the Arab countries weren't focused on "the social and economic advancement of their tens of millions of people" but only on "their lust for aggression against a neighbouring State".

By doing so, Levi Eshkol creates a perception that the Arab States try more firmly to attempt against the existence of the State of Israel, while not providing the necessary conditions for the development of their inhabitants and that, at the eyes of the international community, the Arab countries are disrespecting the international law by appealing to a state of belligerence which would directly affect the development of the region. The final outcome of doing that is related with the ability of the Israeli leader in diverting the attention of the international community from the underlying causes for the Arab discontent regarding the inflexibility of the State of Israel towards the refugees, the discrimination that the Arabs suffered within its boundaries and the constant punctual armed missions that the State of Israel developed against targets within the boundaries of its neighboring countries.

At this point, the USA started to have a stronger influence in the region by providing different types and amounts of aid not only to the State of Israel but, as well, to King Hussein, in Jordan, in order to prevent that the conflict would erupt in the region (Johnson, 2008: 34 – 44). On the region, due to the strengthening of the organizations that were struggling for the liberation of Palestine, whether in the political arena, which provided them with the ability to develop training camps in different Arab countries neighboring Israel, whether in terms of military supply, the State of Israel started to increase the raids in Syria, Egypt, Lebanon and Jordan,

which occasionally resulted in serious clashes between the military forces of the different Arab countries with the military forces of Israel, resulting in an escalation of the tensions during the early months of 1967 (Lea, 2002: 39 – 40).

To aggravate the situation, in May of 1967, the president of Egypt, Gamal Abdel Nasser, demanded the United Nations Emergency Forces (UNEF) to withdraw from the demarcation lines, since they were established to work as a buffer between the Arab countries and Israel, mostly in the disputed territories, since they weren't considered to be successful. That move, at the eyes of the international community and even Israel, was considered to be a political one, since it was considered to be taken in order to alleviate the contestation that the Egyptian president was suffering from its population and the rest of the Arab countries. At this point, the buildup of the Egyptian forces in the Sinai and Gaza Strip areas and the strengthening of the Arab unit in the region, which was showed by the signing of mutual defense agreements between different countries, the increase in the level of alert of different military forces and the proclamation of bellicose statements by its leaders arose the tension in the region to a point where it was just a matter of time for the beginning of the clashes (Khoury, 1976: 242 – 260).

From all those statements, the following ones are enough to understand that the Arab countries produced extreme belligerent statements, like “(this battle will be)...followed by more severe battles until Palestine is liberated and the Zionist presence ended”, which was said by the Syria's Information Minister of the time, Mahmoud Zabi (Sobel, 2012).

The President of Egypt, Gamal Abdel Nasser, affirmed on the 26th of May of 1967, the following:

[...] With regard to military plans, there is complete coordination of military action between us and Syria. We will operate as one army fighting a single battle for the sake of a common objective - the objective of the Arab nation. The problem today is not just Israel, but also those behind it. If Israel embarks on, an aggression against Syria or Egypt, the battle against Israel will be a general one and not confined to one spot on the Syrian or Egyptian borders. The battle will be a general one and our basic objective will be to destroy Israel [...] (Nasser, 1967).

As it is possible to verify, both actors identify the State of Israel as the target (by referring to the “Zionism” and to “Israel” in the respective statements) while connecting it with a belligerent move. In the first case, the declarer identifies several battles that would be necessary until the liberation of Palestine and Nasser is even more precise and considers that the ultimate goal is the destruction of Israel. Due to this type of speeches proclaimed by the Arab leaders and due to the mobilization of the troops to the frontiers by the Egyptian and the Syrian forces, the Israeli Prime-Minister Levi Eshkol broadcasted, on the 28th of May of 1967, the following excerpt:

The Cabinet today held a meeting to discuss the situation. At the end of the deliberations the following decisions were adopted: 1) The danger which confronts Israel as a result of the concentration of the Egyptian Army in Sinai, and as a result of the blockade of Israeli shipping in the Red Sea, is in full force [...] and [...] the Israel Defence Forces are fully prepared to defend the security of Israel [...] 2) The Government of Israel expresses its view that the blockade of the Straits of Tiran against Israeli shipping is the equivalent to aggression against Israel[...]. The Government laid down directives for the continuation of political action in the world arena, which is designed to stimulate international forces to take effective measures to ensure free international passage in the Straits of Tiran [...]. The Government states that the Israel Defence Forces are

sufficiently strong to defeat any aggressor and to ensure the sovereign rights of Israel. I shall tomorrow have the opportunity to clarify the position of the Government and the nation in my statement to the Knesset. (Eshkol, 1967).

So, as it is possible to conclude, the position that was assumed by the Israeli Prime-Minister was related with the fact that the blockage of the Strait of Tiran was considered as an “aggression” and, as a consequence, would legitimate the use of force, at the eyes of the international community, according to the international law. Besides that, a characteristic that is present in the speeches that are pronounced by the Israeli leaders in the discussions held within the UN body is the need to state the sovereignty of the State of Israel and, inherently, the right for Israel to protect it. By accepting it, the majority of the members that constituted the International Community provided the Israeli leaders with the legal legitimization of the outset of a defensive attack, in order to protect its vital interests, and, as a consequence of the fight, the possibility for the State of Israel to acquire new territories that would be annexed to its boundaries, through the ability of the previous entity to monopolize the use of force.

4.2.1. The beginning of the War

The previous considerations resulted in an attack, realized by the Israeli forces, against the Egyptian air force, on the 5th of June of 1967. A few hours later, an offensive was taken by the Israeli military forces against the State of Jordan. After

the Israelis captured the Gaza Strip, Sharm al-Sheikh and a big part of the Sinai Peninsula, from Egypt, the Old City of Jerusalem and the entire territory on the west bank of the Jordan River, from Jordan, a cease-fire was agreed between the belligerent parts, on the 8th of June, between the referred actors. On the 9th of June, the Israeli Army focused its attacks on the north, resulting in a demolishing defeat by the Syrian military forces that was consummated only two days after, on the 11th, after a cease-fire that was imposed, mostly due to the fact that the USSR was advocating an International intervention in the conflict, within the United Nations, that made the USA and other members of the SC/UN to pressure the State of Israel to halt the conflict (Khouri, 1976: 242 – 267). At the end of the conflict, several realities had been completely changed. In terms of the territorial composition of the region, the State of Israel, by adopting a defensive attack in order to prevent an invasion, was able to annex what is considered to be the “West Bank”, which was under the Jordanian rule before the conflict, and Gaza, which was under the Egyptian rule.



Map 1: Map that defines the territories that were annexed by the State of Israel

(British Broadcast Corporation, n/a).

It is important to refer that after the conclusion of the conflict, the State of Israel became responsible for approximately 540.000 Palestinian Arab refugees and about 500.000 Jordanians, Egyptians and Syrians refugees, in the occupied territories, besides forcing the exodus of almost 300.000 Arabs from the conquered areas to neighboring countries, which aggravated the situation related with the Arab refugees (Khouri, 1976: 171 – 177).

Due to their lower standard of living, mostly because they were unemployed or underemployed, several strikes and demonstrations occurred, in a period marked by a policy of non-cooperation with the Israeli authorities. In order to deal with the new reality on the ground, the Israeli Prime-Minister created a committee that had the goal of establishing contacts with the population on the conquered territories and, afterwards, to make recommendations. As a result, it was recommended that the State of Israel would administrate the West Bank “as a separate administrative and economic unit”, which would be defined by the use of emergency powers in order to establish an effective civilian regime (Adler, 2007).

4.2.2. The reaction of the International community

During the conflict, the United Nations tried to impose a cease-fire to all the involved parts. To do so, it passed four SC/UN resolutions (being those the SC/UN resolutions 233, 234, 235 and 236) which demanded the implementation of a cease-

fire or/and the consequent respect of its implementation. At the point where all the involved parts were able to reach an agreement regarding the previous demands, the SC/UN passed the resolution 237, which declared the following:

The Security Council, [...] 1. Calls upon the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities (United Nations Security Council, 1967)

So, regarding the territorial annexation of the West Bank and Gaza, the SC/UN considered, at an initial stage, that the most important factors were the establishment of humanitarian principles that would directly determine the condition of the population in the region. Afterwards, five months later, in November of 1967, the SC/UN was able to find a common position within its members, regarding the implementation of a solution:

[...] 1. Affirms that the fulfillment of Charter principles requires the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which should include the application of both the following principles: (i) Withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict; (ii) Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force [...] (United Nations Security Council, 1967).

Concerning the future of the sovereign control of the West Bank and Gaza, the members of the SC/UN considered that it would not be important to define in a proper way the territories that would be necessary for the Israeli armed forces to withdraw from, especially if it is taken in consideration the fact that the Israeli

government negotiated all the rest of the annexed territories (the Sinai Peninsula and the Golan Heights) with Egypt and Syria, while considering that would be irrelevant to take in consideration the will of the occupied people, being those the Palestinians, regarding the implementation of a possible solution to apply to the West Bank and Gaza. That factor was taken in consideration by several Israeli diplomats, as is the case of David Kimche, who affirmed the following:

[...] A clear picture emerged from their conversations: The Palestinian Arabs-except for a minority with special interests did not want to return to Jordanian rule. [...]Those of us who had been in daily touch with the Palestinian groups, felt that we had before us an opportunity to reach an agreement with representative Palestinians which should not be missed even if it meant giving up some of the land we considered to be ours [...] (Kimche, 1991, pp. 241 – 248).

As it is possible to verify, even a high-level Israeli diplomat considered that it would be fruitful to insert a new actor in the peace negotiations, which would be the Palestinian leaders, in order to provide a new reality in the region, being that the peaceful relation between the State of Israel and part of the Arab community. To do so, Kimche considered that it would be necessary to abdicate “some of the land we considered to be ours”, regardless the fact that part of the land considered to be Israeli was just a provisory measure, bounded by a judicial document, being that the GAA’s that the State of Israel opted to sign, as it was discussed previously.

The same situation occurred regarding the future of the West Bank and Gaza, since both were considered to be territories covered by a separate military administration, through the application of different military orders that were

developed by the Israelis. That implied that the presence in the territories wasn't considered to be an occupation but an "administration in absence of sovereignty", creating what is considered to be the "illegal occupation of the Palestinian territories" by the State of Israel (Khalil, 2003: 24 – 27).

4.3. The late legal basis for the annexation of the West Bank and Gaza – The Oslo Agreements

Even so, despite the fact that the attribution of the previous categorization represented the disrespect for countless judicially binding agreements and, adding to it, the fact that the UN/GA has an annual ritual of approving resolutions against the positions adopted by the military administration within the Palestinian lands (Krusch, 2004), the State of Israel was able not only to maintain the control over the referred region, due to security reasons but, as well, to institutionalize the need to control the civil law and participate in the elaboration of the laws that would be applied in the territory, through the signature of the "1993 Oslo Accords (Declaration of Principles)" which was signed by the State of Israel and the PLO, by stating that:

[...] ARTICLE VIII PUBLIC ORDER AND SECURITY In order to guarantee public order and internal security for the Palestinians of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, the Council will establish a strong police force, while Israel will continue to carry the responsibility for defending against external threats, as well as the responsibility for overall security of Israelis for the purpose of safeguarding their internal security and

public order. ARTICLE IX LAWS AND MILITARY ORDERS [...] 2. Both parties will review jointly laws and military orders presently in force in remaining spheres. [...] (PLO, State of Israel, 1993, Article VIII).

By accepting the previous, the PLO agreed with the continuation of the presence of Israel military forces in the region, which was the main instrument under the military administration of the territories in question, due to the need to protect the “overall security of Israelis” within. Besides that, the PLO agreed, as well, to the following minutes:

[...] AGREED MINUTES TO THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES ON INTERIM SELF-GOVERNMENT ARRANGEMENTS [...] Article VII (5) The withdrawal of the military government will not prevent Israel from exercising the powers and responsibilities not transferred to the Council. [...] Annex II it is understood that, subsequent to the Israeli withdrawal, Israel will continue to be responsible for external security, and for internal security and public order of settlements and Israelis. Israeli military forces and civilians may continue to use roads freely within the Gaza Strip and the Jericho area [...] (*Ibid.*, Article VII).

This previous excerpt is extremely important for the case study since, one of the main achievements by the PLO was considered to be the withdrawal of the Israeli security forces from the Gaza Strip and the Jericho area, which was comprehend in the accords, and as it is possible to verify, the government of Israel made sure to maintain the possibility of using the roads included in the previous regions not only by militaries but, as well, by Israeli civilians.

It is important as well to understand that since 1967 the State of Israel has been supporting the establishment of settlements in territories that, under the International Law, are under dispute, amounting nowadays to around 121 settlements

and 102 illegal outposts, at the eyes of the Israeli law, just in the West Bank, comprehending around 462.000 settlers, which makes possible to verify that the existence of the article VII , together with Annex II, makes sure that the State of Israel will continue to exercise a strong influence in the territory under analysis, even more since the PLO provided a legal basis to do it so. Besides that, it is important to clarify the fact that the 1st article of the accords defines a “transitional period not exceeding five years” that it wasn’t respected by both parts.

So, in order to conclude, it is necessary to refer that, once more, the basis for the continuation of the military control, by the Israeli military forces, in the occupied territories, is an expanded and institutionalized version of the goal of the “Hagana”, since in both cases the aim is to promote the security of citizens that were established in territories that didn’t belong neither to the Zionists, before 1948, and neither to the State of Israel, after 1967, which complemented the expansionist goals that have been constant since the beginning of the Zionist doctrine. As a result, the Oslo Accords proven to be just a symbolic peace agreement, since the situation on the field remained under the control of the Israeli military forces, which is deployed according to its strategic interests, besides creating a Palestinian governmental structure that possesses an extremely limited authority, even regarding the social issues.

5. The State of Israel as a State of exception

In the present dissertation it was approached the concept of “securitization” and it was analyzed the practical development of the process, by analyzing the case-study of the Israeli-Palestinian situation, with a special focus on the historical development until the 6 Day war, since it was the last event that provoked a practical change in the geopolitical constitution in the region of the Middle East.

Regarding the development of a securitization move, by the Zionist leaders, there were two facilitating conditions that had a major importance for the effectiveness of its development, being those the historical resonance of the anti-Semitism, which was a common practice at the end of the 19th Century and has resurged near the starting period of the 2nd World War. Even so, another facilitating condition was the major dispersion that the Jewish community had, since it was spread all around the world, with a special incidence on certain States, resulting in a constant interaction between the Jewry that is spread outside Israel and the nationals of foreign countries. Besides that, what is defined as the “Jewish Diaspora” provides a strong instrument used by the Israeli government that has the capability to affect the perception that the foreigners have regarding the policies adopted within the Israeli boundaries and those that shape the foreign interests of the State of Israel.

In order to provide an insight of the importance of the Jewish Diaspora and the strategy adopted by the Israeli government regarding the foreign interests of

Israel, the next sub-chapters will analyze the exceptional¹⁴ case that is the democratic regime of Israel and the “public relations” effort, as some like to classify, that the Israeli government has been establishing since the beginning of the Zionist project.

5.1. The Jewish Diaspora

The Jewish Diaspora has been one of the main contributors for the international support that the Israeli State receives. Used to be identified as a Diaspora, through history, the Jewish one has maintaining its identity due to the need that they have to justify the maintenance of their ethno-national identity. That strategy performs a dual function, since it transmits a certain image of practical need for its existence for the ones considered “outside” of their group, which should be understood as the nationals of each State where the Diaspora exists, and as well, to transmit the need for the existence of maximal members on it, in order for them to survive as an organized group. In the Jewish Diaspora, several values are held strongly, being those the belief that they are the chosen people by God, the historical age of the Diaspora, the traumatic experiences that they have dealt with, and so on (Sheffer, 2005: 1 – 3).

It is important for the present work to address the fact that after the 2nd World War, there were 2 million people that assumed themselves as being Jewish and, since

¹⁴ Being “exceptional” applied to every event that goes against the standard ones.

then, the Jewry rose until the 13 million, being the four largest Jewish communities outside Israel established in the USA, with the particularity that the Jewish community there is bigger than the one existing in Israel, in Russia, in France and in Britain. As well, it is important to refer that there is an increasing number of individuals, within the Diaspora under analysis, that believe that the revival of a healthy Jewish identity is intrinsically linked to the idea of Israel. So, as a consequence, there is no surprise that some influential members of the Israeli society still expect that the Diaspora continue to support their “homeland”, by providing it with resources and unquestionable loyalty (*Ibid.* : 8 – 15).

With the establishment and consequential development of the Zionist Movement, it was demanded the emigration of the Jewish individuals to Palestine, in order to achieve the constitution of a “homeland” for them but, after the establishment of the State of Israel, it was perceived through time, by certain members of the Israeli society, that it was accepted the existence of the Jewish Diaspora and, consequentially, it was necessary to maintain a close connection between the State and the later, while allowing them to pursue their independent interests (*Ibid.* : 5 – 8). Despite the fact that the different communities within the Diaspora have been able to pursue their own interests, there is a patent readiness to gather and send money and human resources to the State of Israel, by the Diaspora. Furthermore, there is also the common practice to provide political and diplomatic support for the policies that the government of Israel develops, particularly after the victory that the military forces of Israel have been able to achieve in 1956 and, as well, the military strength that the State in question shown in the 1967 war. The

support that the State of Israel received from the Diaspora was fundamental for the establishment of direct contacts that the previous has been able to develop with most of the European leaders and, especially, with the American ones (*Ibid.* : 26 – 30).

In the previous case, the strategy adopted by the Jewish Diaspora within the USA, the outcome is obvious. By far, the State of Israel is the biggest receiver of foreign assistance, attributed by the American government, allowing the later to invest that assistance in any sector that it might interest to it, such as the building of settlements in the West Bank, despite the fact that the previous measure is opposed by the American cabinet. That kind of behavior has been condemned by several diplomats all around the world, even in the United Kingdom, considered to be one of the biggest allies of the USA (Mearsheimer; Walt, 2006).

The Jewish lobby within the USA was able to develop a certain institutional structure that facilitates the interaction among the several Jewish institutions that are established within the American soil, providing a strong instrument of pressure regarding the positions adopted by the Congress and the executive branch, besides facilitating the development of pressures regarding the media corporations, which is a main facilitator towards the creation or strengthening of perceptions, by the Americans (Jhally; Ratzkoff, 2004).

Even so, despite the fact that there is a solid popular machine, that aims to influence the American policies and public, the State of Israel also developed a large number of institutional structures within the USA, by establishing 9 Israeli consulates in there. Those consulates aim to strengthen the public relations campaign

within the American territory, by developing strong relations with the local media's and by monitoring the media outlets. That effort is complemented by the hiring of major public relations companies that help to shape the strategies adopted within the effort of approaching the American society towards the Israeli interests (*Ibid.*).

The Israeli effort explores the feeling of injustice, regarding the measures adopted against the Jewish communities, throughout history, with a special incidence on the Holocaust, which results in the common perception, by the Americans, that the Jewish community deserves a homeland that protects them from what they have passed in the past. Besides that, the Israeli strategy also passes through the development of measures that provides an insight of the region, passing the image that the State of Israel is the only democracy that is established in there, or in other words, that they possess similar values held by the American society, in opposition to the Arab neighbors, that work against the interests of the American people (Mearsheimer; Walt, 2006).

In the case of the European Union (EU), being that considered as a governmental body, its constitution provides a different atmosphere regarding the development of the previous measures. Even so, during the last years, the international organization has been trying to implement a successful "European External Action Service" that would serve to homogenize the positions adopted by its countries regarding an external diplomatic situation (EUEA, n/a). Taking in consideration the role that is desired by the governments within the EU for its centralization of the Foreign Policy, the Jewish Diaspora considered that would be

relevant to create a structure that would be able to influence the central institutions of the EU, in order to create a rising support for the State of Israel (Barkat, 2004).

The major victory is related with the adoption of a working definition of “Anti-Semitism” within the “European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia”¹⁵ (EUMCRX), which is attributed to the capacity of the American Jewish Committee capacity to influence the previously referred center, in 2004. As a result, some criticisms of the behavior adopted by the State of Israel towards the Arabs can be included in that categorization, which results in a discredit of those who perform it. The inclusion of the working definition in the EUMCRX was recognized by some members of the European Parliament, as a negative one, as Luisa Morgantini¹⁶ affirmed, when she said that “(...) they are using the holocaust as blackmail (...)” (Abdullah, 2010).

In the present millennium, the Jewish Diaspora has recognized the importance of lobbying the EU, as it was previously said, and that situation is proven by the fact that during the last years the “European Jewish Congress”, the “B’nai B’rith”, the “European Friends of Israel”, which is composed by members of the European Parliament, and the Transatlantic Institute have opened offices in Brussels (Cronin, 2010). The later, the Transatlantic Institute, is considered to be the most prominent group of pressure in Europe, which resulted from the acknowledgement, by the American Jewish Committee, that the European Jewish organizations weren’t being successful in interceding for the State of Israel with the European political

¹⁵ The Europe Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia was renamed as the “Fundamental Rights Agency” in 2007.

¹⁶ Luisa Morgantini is the former Vice-President of the European Parliament.

representatives (Barkat, 2004). After the allocation of the Transatlantic Institute, as Jeffrey Blankfort¹⁷ notices, “(...) Over the past year the EU has moved away from a relative support for the Palestinians to adopting one position after another reflecting Israeli demands. (...)”.

At the institutional level, the EU has signed an Association Agreement with the State of Israel, which has the purpose of increasing the political dialogue between both, the establishment and liberalization of services, the free movement of capital and competition rules, the strengthening of economic cooperation and cooperation on social matters. Despite the fact that the State of Israel is one of the States that until now has been considered to commit war crimes, according to different International Organizations such as the United Nations or the International Committee of the Red Cross, the EU as imputed in the Association Agreement that the relation between the parts would be based on respect for human rights and democratic principles, which provides them a legal basis to refute those accusations (Abdullah, 2010).

Nevertheless, it is considered by part of the European population that the Israeli lobby in the EU hasn't been able to influence significantly whether the media, whether the political agenda. The most significant cases, according to the population of certain countries in Europe¹⁸, are observed in France and Germany, where 10% to 13% believe that the Jewish Diaspora has been able to influence the media outlets of their countries and the political positions adopted by their leaders (Middle East

¹⁷ Jeffrey Blankfort is a Jewish individual that was raised in a non-Zionist family. He produces Middle East analysis and radio programs.

¹⁸ The countries included in the analysis of the “Public Perceptions of the Israel-Palestine Conflict”, which was realized by the “Middle East Monitor”, are France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Netherlands and Spain.

Monitor, 2011). That inquire, only strengthens the belief that due to the variety of institutions and organizations within the space of the EU, the establishment of entities by the Jewish Diaspora with the goal of affecting the policies taken by the later, will just add to the public debate (Barkat, 2004).

In the case of the Russian Federation is possible to verify the opposite case. With an history of persecution, regarding the Jewish communities that were established within its territory, especially during the time of the USSR, it was possible to witness a positive development of the flux of migration, regarding the Jewish individuals that were considered to be Russian nationals, towards the State of Israel, since the 70's (National Conference on Soviet Jewry, n/a).

After the fall of the "Berlin Wall", the emigration to the State of Israel, by members of the ex-Soviet Union Frontier (SUF), steadily rose, achieving almost to the number of 1.000.000 Russia-speaking Jews living in Israel and, on the other hand, the Russian Federation has in its territories the 4th biggest Jewish community worldwide. Due to that particular case, the Russian Federation has, until now, kept always in mind the fact that there is an enormous cultural connection between the two States, which promotes the two actors to maintain a minimum level of diplomatic relations in order to protect their cultural interests, despite their conflicting interests (Freedman, 2001). Afterwards, several Jewish institutions were established, like the Congress of Jewish Religious Communities (KEROOR), the Moscow Jewish Religious Community (MERO), the Russian Jewish Congress (REK) and the Federation of Jewish Communities of Russia (FEOR). Those

communities, although do not usually cooperate between them, have the same purpose of re-creating the Jewish identity within the Russian territory and to perpetuate it, through the establishment of different religious schools and activities, while implementing a welfare network for its members (National Conference on Soviet Jewry, n/a).

In the present century, which has been marked by the ruling of Vladimir Putin in the Russian Federation, there was an increment of the political, religious and civic rights of the Jewish communities within the Russian territory. The rise of anti-Semitism, mostly provoked by the ruling of Boris Yeltsin and the strong influence of the Nazi ideology in Russia, has been considered as one of the threats that the Russian society has to deal with and, as consequence, the Russian government has been increasing the support on the strengthening of the Jewish activities in its society (*Ibid.*).

On the other hand, at the State level, the Russian Federation and the State of Israel have been quite pragmatic in their relations, mostly due to the change of strategy by the Putin governance, which has pursued the goal of improving the economic conditions of Russia and, at the international level, a more preponderant role in the international affairs. In order to do so, it has played with the interests of the State of Israel and its neighboring countries, maintaining a strategic balance that provides Russia with a strong leverage true to the resolution of the conflict (Freedman, 1997: 1 – 9).

Despite the fact that it is analyzed just a small sample of the Jewish effort regarding the positions adopted by the International community, the author of the present dissertation tried to provide a perception regarding the influence that the Israeli State has on the outcome produced by the International community, resulting in the inclusion of two major powers within the previous and, in the other case, a regional organization that is considered to be the main defender of human rights worldwide. That effort, facilitates the securitizing processes that are developed by the State of Israel, since it results in the consideration that the previous one is considered to be an exceptional one, within the International community, since it pursues its security through the development of measures that disrespects the International Law, resulting in the constant condemnation of the Israeli annexation of the city of Jerusalem, the constant disrespect of Human Rights (Glickman, 2012), the settlement expansion and so on (Shlaim, 2012), by the majority of the International community, without allowing the development of concrete measures that would address the situation.

So, taking the present section in consideration, is possible to verify that the State of Israel possesses a status of “exceptional”, since its policies, that are considered illegal by the international law, are not only allowed by the International community but, as well in some cases, those measures are even aided to be implemented, through the delivery of financial/military aid or, in the case of the EU, through the development of economic and cultural ties.

5.2. The Israeli Government and its ruling

particularities

The securitization processes that were developed by the Israeli government, since the beginning of its creation, also allowed it to take exceptional measures within its boundaries that directly affect the daily life of the Israelis. Since the War of Independence, which is regarded as the Palestinian War in the present dissertation, a state of emergency was adopted by the Israeli government. That condition allows the government to rule by decree, besides enabling the government to alter or suspend the application of any primary legislation, despite the fact that creating a change in the gravity of power within its institutions, since the most democratic institution, the Knesset, does not have any competence regarding the application of the state of emergency (Gross, 2004). Despite that, the policies regarding the military service in the country is also a unique case, since both genders are obliged to serve in the military forces, with the exception of those that fall under some conditioning factors and, not surprisingly, the Arab population within Israel, since they are considered to be fellow countrymen of the enemy (GlobalSecurity.org, n/a).

In terms of the democratic regime that is established in the State of Israel, which should encompass its ideological values as well, it is possible to verify several measures that are adopted by the government against the Arab-Israelis, based on the fact that they aren't considered to be Jewish. Besides that, the State of Israel has created measures to prevent the interaction between the Arab-Israelis and the Arabs

that live within the West Bank and Gaza (Rinawie-Zoabi, 2006: 9 – 12). The previous only adds to the increment of the void between the Israelis and the Arab-Israelis, resulting in the creation of opposing positions by the both collective groups. As a result, 50% of the youth within the Israeli population considers that the Arab-Israelis shouldn't possess the same rights that they do and, on the other hand, 40% of the Arab-Israelis distrust the Israeli legal system, being that a situation that shouldn't be verified in a democratic system (Ramahi, 2010).

It is also necessary to refer that the policies that are developed within the State of Israel, most of them related with the survival of the Jewish identity and the provision of secure conditions to its inhabitants, also affect the Israeli citizens. In that case, there were cases of discrimination against the Jews that weren't considered to be orthodox, regarding their personal and civil status, cases of societal violence against women, discrimination against disabled people, and so on (Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, 2006). Adding to that, there are several cases of censorship being applied due to "security reasons", which, once more, provides a strong insight regarding the policies that are developed by the Israeli government that directly affect the daily life of its citizens (Martin, 1988: 3 - 13).

The previous facts are just a sample regarding all the measures that are adopted by the Israeli government, under the umbrella of "security". As a result of the constant securitization moves that are developed by the Israeli leaders, from which some are accepted and others rejected, its political elite is able to develop several measures that not only restrict the capacity of the most extremist Arabs to

apply terrorist attacks, but also affects the daily life of millions of Jewish Israelis, which are the main core of the Israeli State and, as it was explored throughout the section 3 of the present dissertation, the reason for its existence. Even so, the securitizing processes that are accepted by the Israeli population, enables the Israeli State to tighten those measures and, as well, to legitimize measures that limit the freedom of the Israelis. To conclude, all these previous considerations create the conditions to define the Israeli State as an exceptional, regarding the treatment that it applies to its citizens, especially if it is taken in consideration that it assumes itself as a democratic State.

6. Conclusion

The present dissertation approaches the concept of securitization, developed by the Copenhagen School, while providing an empirical analysis of the securitization process developed by the Jewish leaders. By doing so, the author tries to relate the exceptional case that was the creation of the State of Israel and the consequent behavior its leaders have adopted throughout the modern history with the development of securitization processes. With an internationally recognized success, regarding the social cohesion and the economic sustainability, it was a State that was created around the Jewish identity, which was strengthened as a response to the rise of anti-Semitism, being that the most expected outcome of such a situation, as it is argued in the section 2.2.3 of the present dissertation.

The Jewish leaders of the time were directly affected by historical events, being that the accentuation of the nationalistic movements, which directly affected the perception that the communities within those movements had from the Jewish identity. That alteration of perception, regarding the Jewish identity, directly affected the daily life of the majority of the Jewry, resulting in the consideration of the anti-Semitism as a priority to be dealt with, which facilitated the acceptance of the securitization move, as it is discussed in the section 2.1.1 of the present dissertation.

Through the evolution of the anti-Semitism, back then, it was developed a common belief, by the Jewry, related with the need to unite the Jewish community in

order to achieve a solution that was considered to be exceptional but, even so, possible. As a consequence, a generational connection was developed, throughout the time, which provided a strengthening of the values that were inherent to the Jewish life. At that point, the collective identity of the group was considered to be threatened, and there was place for the development of a securitization process that affected the societal sector, in particular, the threat presented to the Jewish community, due to the opposition of communities inserted within the national identities where the Jews were part of.

Besides that, it is important to understand that, as it was approached in the section 2.1.1, the influence of an experience of a precise event in the development of predispositions, by an individual, being that deeply related with the personal involvement of the actor in question within the event and, since most of the Jewry was affected by the scourge that was the anti-Semitism, efforts were made to achieve the important goal that was to establish a “national home” for the Jews. The option to develop this measure falls within what was written in the section 2.2.3, when it is affirmed that in general the minorities “[...] will address particular behaviors to control the existing governmental structure, to create their own government or to live outside the established society [...]” (Buzan et al., 1998: 119 – 123), in order to deal with an identified threat to their existence.

According to what was written in the section 2.2.2 of the present dissertation, a military threat is able to “affect a personal predisposition and influence people, acting like a dramatic provider of information regarding the way of how the world

works”, especially in the cases where the “behavior that is adopted to deal with the situation falls outside the normal rules of civilized behavior”¹⁹ (*Ibid.*: 57 – 61), providing a framework of behavior to the ruling elites, since they will take in consideration the strategies and concepts that influence the opposition. In the case of the Jewish community, this was an extremely important factor, since they were able to organize a security force, being that the “Hagana”, that by protecting the Jewish communities that were being introduced in the Palestinian territory were able to gather experience and knowledge regarding the strategies adopted by the popular resistance that the Arabs and the Palestinians started to develop, as it is possible to verify in the section 3.1.2.

After the establishment of the State of Israel, which corresponds to the achievement of the goal that was defined by the securitizing agents, several outcomes were produced that deeply altered the geopolitical constitution in the region. First of all, it provided legitimacy to the claims that the Zionist leaders had elaborated until then, since it was a securitizing move that was able to gather the support not only of the Jewish community but, as well, of the International community, resulting in the constitution of the State. Second of all, as it was referred in the section 2.1, by providing an event that was categorized as being successful, the Jewish leaders withdrawn the predispositions that were considered to be the primordial ones for the achievement of their goals, which shaped the behavior that were adopted in the future, regarding the safeguarding of their interests. Since the establishment of the State of Israel was an outcome that was also affected by the 2nd World War, when the

¹⁹ For more information please read the section 2.2.2 of the present dissertation.

Jewish people was massively targeted by the Nazis, the leaders of the Jewish State possessed a facilitating condition in order to re-securitize the anti-Semitism, being the identified threat, at this point, the position that the Arab countries had regarding the creation of the State of Israel in the region.

At that point, the facilitating conditions that were created due to the 2nd World War and the fact that the Israeli leaders were sensitive enough to influence the world media²⁰, in order to shape a favorable predisposition towards them, resulted in a non-condemnation by the International community of the belligerent goals that were established by the Jewish leaders that lead to the Palestine War, which aimed at the reinforcement of the control within the boundaries that they had pre-defined, despite the resolutions that were previously released, regarding the conflict in the region. The outcome produced by the Palestine War, which the Israelis are considered to be victorious, reinforced the Israeli cohesion, at a critical point when the State of Israel was working on the progressive transformation that the Zionist structures had to suffer in order to be implemented as governmental ones. Once more, the fact that there was an antagonized identity, being that the Palestinians and consequently the Arabs, served as a propellant to the strengthening of the Israeli identity, especially in the final stage of the transposition of religious values to the core of a national identity.

The outcome of the Palestinian War provided a new reality in the field, since the State of Israel was established, resulting in the attribution of the legal premise

²⁰ For more information please read “The Holocaust Industry”, by Norman Finkelstein, and “The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine”, by Ilan Pappé.

that is the sovereignty, to the government of Israel, within its boundaries. By doing so, the question of the flux of immigration, that was considered to be the biggest impediment to the goal of the Zionist leaders when the territory was under the British Mandate, disappeared, providing conditions to alter the demography in the region, and, by consequence, to develop policies that would guarantee the survival of the Jewish identity. As a result, the alteration of the demography in the Israeli State provided a new basis for the claims that were initially developed by the Zionist leaders, as it is possible to verify in the beginning of the section 3.2 of the present dissertation, regarding the size of the territory that would be appropriate to conceive to the Jewish control.

At this point, after the termination of the conflict that involved the newly born State of Israel and its Arab neighbors, a new facilitating condition started to develop, being that the grievance that started to mark the identity of the Arab population, in the region. As a result, between 1949 and 1967, a perception of enmity was created in the Arab population, towards the State of Israel, which resulted in the development of belligerent statements by the political leaders of the Arab countries, from which is possible to verify just a small sample throughout the section 4.2. The identification of that threat started to be a constant, in the speeches produced by the Israeli cabinet, as it is possible to verify in the speeches that the Israeli Prime-Minister produced in 1964 and in 1967, while at the same time providing some indicators that the values held by the Israeli government were according to the values defended in the International forum, by the Western countries, in order to maintain the perception

that the State of Israel was being the targeted one and not the cause for the animosity in the region.

Those opposing positions, by the identified leaders, resulted in the attack of the Israeli air force towards the Egyptian military forces, which was the official beginning of the 6 Day War. As it was referred in the section 4.2 of the present dissertation, that event resulted in the annexation not only of the West Bank and Gaza and in the inclusion of around 1.000.000 Arabs under the Israeli sovereignty, besides strengthening the position of the Israeli State in the region. In this case not only the State of Israel was able to apply the rule of law in the West Bank and Gaza but, as well, created conditions to populate the region with Israeli communities, as it is widely known and admitted in the Oslo Accords.

The predispositions that were created within the International community regarding the Middle East conflict were fundamental for the outcome of the 6 Day War, since the SC/UN was unable to pass any resolution that would force the retrieval of the Israeli control from the region. Once more, as it is described in the Oslo Accords, which are analyzed in the section 4.3 of the present dissertation, the occupation of those territories are based on the premise that there is the need to provide security to the Israeli communities that live within the Israeli State and, due to the development of colonization measures by the previous, within the West Bank and Gaza. That apathy of the International community towards the political measure that has been developed since the 6 Day War, until nowadays, resulted in the need

for the Palestinian political elite to promote the arrangement of an agreement between the parts involved, which resulted in the signature of the Oslo Accords.

The previous agreement resulted, once more, in the consequent legitimization of the Israeli measures, towards the West Bank and Gaza, since the political elite that officially represents the Palestinians signed the Oslo Accords, where is stated that “[...] in order to guarantee public order and internal security for the Palestinians of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, the Council will establish a strong police force, while Israel will continue to carry the responsibility for defending against external threats, as well as the responsibility for overall security of Israelis for the purpose of safeguarding their internal security and public order [...]”.

Regarding the polices that are developed by the Israeli State, not only in the occupied territories but as well within its boundaries, there is a sense of impunity regarding the measures adopted by the International community towards the disrespect of several international laws, mostly directed to the Palestinians, and, in terms of domestic legitimization, the constant securitizing moves that are developed, which identify the Arabs as the threat to the Israeli existence, are able to legitimize several measures that limit their freedom, in the name of security, as it is explored throughout the section 5.2 of the present dissertation. Those results are mainly owned to the outcome of the Palestine War, since it was a major event that helped to shape the common perception regarding the Israeli neighbors, as it is explained in the section 2.2.2 of the present dissertation.

The occurrence of the previous event is extremely important for the present dissertation, since it has provided a basis for the creation of perceptions, by the Israeli population, due to the fact that it was an event that consummated the establishment of the State of Israel, being that the primordial goal of the Zionist leaders. On the International forum, it was more important the occurrence of the 6 Day War, due to the constant expression of hatred towards the Israeli State and its population, by the Arab leaders, which resulted in the perception that the attack developed by the Israeli army was within the umbrella of a pre-emptive attack.

The author believes he was able to provide an analytical work that proved that the establishment of the State of Israel resulted from a mass securitization developed by the Zionist leaders, being the target the anti-Semitism that started to occur worldwide. By accepting that securitizing move, also due to the effect that the Holocaust had on the perceptions that world population held towards the Jewish problem, the International community allowed an exceptional measure to be applied in order to solve the existential threat that affected the Jewry. Afterwards, due to the positions adopted by the Arab neighbors of the newly created State, which opposed its establishment in the region, another securitizing move was developed, being accepted as well due to the attempt that the Arab countries developed, in order to prevent the continuation of the perpetration of attacks by the Jewish community towards the Arabs, in Palestine.

That acceptance resulted in the creation of the predisposition that the State of Israel, and consequently the Jewish identity that was attached at this point to the

Israeli nationality, needed to develop exceptional measures to deal with the exceptional situation that was to be surrounded by enemies, creating a new basis for the development of securitizing moves that, by being accepted, would provide more power to be concentrated at the hands of the Israeli government. The constant development of securitizing moves, which all couldn't be analyzed in the present work, due to the methodological limitations, provided a unique case in the history of International Relations since, due to a securitizing move, not only a State was established but, as well, the behavior that has adopted since then was based in the idea that was necessary to tighten the security measures within its boundaries, in order to survive. The exceptional status that the State of Israel holds, also allowed it to annex parts of territories that were attributed to other sovereign actors, despite the fact that the event in question occurred during the contemporaneous history of the world, once more due to security questions, resulting in the empowerment of the belief that the State of Israel is allowed to develop several kind of measures, in order to maintain conditions that it would allow it to survive.

In order to conclude, the author considers that he was able to prove its main argument, which was related with the preposition that the successful securitization processes that were developed initially by the Zionist leaders and, afterwards, by the Israeli ones, all around the Jewish survival²¹, resulted in the creation of the State of Israel and the consequent definition of its boundaries, while creating the perception that the State of Israel possesses an exceptional status, regarding the International community and its internal policies, as well. Being so, it is the only case in the

²¹ Being that an important factor as well, since it allocates the securitization process within the Societal Sector.

modern history that possesses such contours, especially if it is taken in consideration the geopolitical alterations that provoked in the region and the produced negative outcomes, regarding the interaction between the Western world and the Arabic one.

7. Bibliography

- Abdullah, Daud (2010), *Working paper|| Dr. Daud Abdullah The impact of the Israeli Lobby on European Foreign Policy in Palestine*. Beirut: Al-Zaytouna Centre for Studies and Consultations, <http://www.alzaytouna.net/en/conferences-and-seminars/134023-the-impact-of-the-israel-lobby-on-european-foreign-policy-in-palestine.html#.T82HGbBYt2A> [12th of March of 2012].
- Adler, Gerald M. (2007), *Remember –The Six Day War – June 1967 and its Aftermath* SixDayWar, <http://www.sixdaywar.co.uk/sixdaywar-gmadler.pdf> [07th of March of 2012].
- Arab League (1948) *Declaration on the invasion of Palestine*. Jerusalem: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, <http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Foreign+Relations/Israels+Foreign+Relations+since+1947/1947-1974/5+Arab+League+declaration+on+the+invasion+of+Pales.htm> [1st of May of 2012].
- Arab League (1964) *Declaration issued by the Council of Kings and Heads of State of the Arab League at its Second*. MidEastWeb, <http://www.mideastweb.org/arabsummit1964.htm> [6th of May of 2012].
- Balfour, Arthur (1917). Letter to Lord Rotschild (Balfour Declaration). Washington: The United Nations Information System on the Question of Palestine, <http://unispal.un.org/unispal.nsf/5ba47a5c6cef541b802563e000493b8c/d442111e70e417e3802564740045a309?OpenDocument> [15th of March of 2012].
- Balfour, Arthur (1919). Letter to Lord Curzon. Washington: The United Nations Information System on the Question of Palestine, <http://unispal.un.org/unispal.nsf/5ba47a5c6cef541b802563e000493b8c/d442111e70e417e3802564740045a309?OpenDocument> [15th of March of 2012].
- Barkat, Amiram (2004) “An American Jewish lobby at the European Union” Haaretz, <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/features/an-american-jewish-lobby-at-the-european-union-1.114421> [05th of March of 2012].
- British Broadcast Corporation (n/a) “Israel & the Palestinians | Key Maps”,

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/static/in_depth/world/2001/israel_and_palestinians/key_maps/5.stm [12th of May of 2012].

- Gurion, David Ben (1948) “The Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel”. Jerusalem: Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, <http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Peace+Process/Guide+to+the+Peace+Process/Declaration+of+Establishment+of+State+of+Israel.htm> [18th of April of 2012].
- B'tselem (2012) “Fatalities in the First Intifada”. Jerusalem: http://www.btselem.org/statistics/first_intifada_tables [15th of April of 2012].
- Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (2006) *Israel and the Occupied Territories*. Washington: U.S. Department of State, <http://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/hrrpt/2005/61690.htm> [23rd of May of 2012].
- Buzan, Barry et al. (1993), *The logic of Anarchy: Neorealism to Structural Realism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Buzan, Barry et al.(1998), *Security: A New Framework For Analysis*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Cambridge Dictionary Online (n/a) *Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/government_1 [02nd of February of 2012].
- Churchill, Winston (1920) *Zionism versus Bolshevism*. David Irving's Website, <http://www.fpp.co.uk/bookchapters/WSC/WSCwrote1920.html> [19th of April of 2012].
- Cobban, Helena (1984) *The Palestinian Liberation Organisation: People, Power and Politics*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Cronin, David (2010) *Pro-Israeli lobbies target Europe*. Brussels: The Electronic Intifada, <http://electronicintifada.net/content/pro-israel-lobbies-target-europe/8660> [3rd of March of 2012].
- Croteau, David; Hoynes, William (2002), *Media/Society: Industries, Images, and Audiences*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Eshkol, Levi (1964). Jewish Virtual Library, <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/History/isresp.html> [4th of May of 2012].
- Eshkol, Levi (1967). Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, <http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Foreign%20Relations/Israels%20Foreign%20Relations%20since%201947/1947->

1974/12%20Broadcast%20to%20the%20Nation%20by%20Prime%20Minister%20Eshko [7th of May of 2012].

- European Union External Action (EUEA) (1995 – 2012), *European External Action Service*. Brussels: http://eeas.europa.eu/background/index_en.htm [5th of March of 2012].
- Extraordinary Zionist Conference (1942) “Biltmore Program”. MidEastWeb, http://www.mideastweb.org/biltmore_program.htm [29th of April of 2012].
- Freedman, Robert O. (1997) “Russia and the Middle East under Yeltsin Part II” *Digest of Middle East Studies*. Vol. 6, n3, 1 – 31.
- Freedman, Robert O. (2011) *Russian Policy Toward the Middle East Under Yeltsin and Putin*. Jerusalem: Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, <http://www.jcpa.org/jl/vp461.htm> [10th of March of 2012].
- Gad, Ulrik; Petersen, Karen (2011) “Concepts of politics in securitization studies” *Security Dialogue*. 42, 315 – 328.
- Gallup (2012) *Middle East*. Washington: Gallup, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/1639/middle-east.aspx> [13th of April of 2012].
- Glickman, Aviad (2012) “Beinisch bids farewell to Supreme Court, laments `growing violence’”. YNet: <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4196039,00.html> [26th of May of 2012].
- GlobalSecurity.org (n/a) *Army*. GlobalSecurity.org, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/israel/army.htm> [26th of May of 2012].
- Goodwyn, Reid M. (2005) *The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict – A Case Study for the United States Military in Foreign Internal Defense*. Kansas: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College.
- Grief, Howard (2004) *Legal Rights and Title of Sovereignty of the Jewish People to the Land of Israel and Palestine under International Law*. Shaarei Tikva: Ariel Center for Policy Research, <http://www.acpr.org.il/ENGLISH-NATIV/02-issue/grief-2.htm>.
- Gross, Oren (2004) “Providing for the unexpected: Constitutional Emergency Provisions” *Israeli Yearbook on Human Rights*. Vol. 33, 13 – 44.

- Hayes, Danny; Guardino, Matt (2010) “Whose Views Made the News? Media Coverage and the March to War in Iraq” *Political Communication*. 27:1, 59 – 87.
- Herman, Edward S. (2003) “The Propaganda Model: A Retrospective” *Propaganda, Politics, Power*. Vol. 1, 1 – 14.
- Herzl, Theodor (1986) *Der Judenstaat*. Orange: MidEastWeb, www.mideastweb.org/jewishstate.pdf [17th of March of 2012].
- Huysans, Jef (2011) “What is an act? On security speech acts and little security nothings” *Security Dialogue*. 42, 371 – 383.
- Isserof, Ami (2005) *The Anti-Zionism of Edwin Montagu and his opposition to the Balfour Declaration*. Zionism & Israel Information Center, http://www.zionism-israel.com/hdoc/Montagu_balfour.htm [18th of March of 2012].
- Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs (IMFA) (2001) *Introduction to the series on the Holocaust*. Jerusalem: http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/MFAArchive/2000_2009/2001/6/Introduction+to+the+series+on+the+Holocaust.htm [20th of April of 2012].
- Jews for Justice in the Middle East (JFME) (2001) *The Origin of the Palestine-Israel Conflict*. El Cerrito: If Americans Knew, http://www.deiryassin.org/pdf/origin_booklet.pdf [14th of March of 2012].
- Jewish Agency for Israel (n/a) *JAFI*. Jerusalem: <http://www.jafi.org.il/JewishAgency/English/Home> [1st of March of 2012].
- Jervis, Robert (1976) *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Jhally, Sut; Ratzkof, Bathsheba (2004) *Peace, Propaganda and the Promised Land*. USA: Media Education Foundation.
- Johnson, Robert (2008) *Lyndon Johnson and Israel: The Secret Presidential Recordings*. Tel Aviv: The S. Daniel Abraham Center for International Studies.
- JStreet (2009) *National Survey of American Jews*. Washington: JStreet, <http://jstreet.org/polling-of-american-jews/> [18th of April of 2012].
- Jutila, Matti (2006) “Desecuritizing Minority Rights: Against Determinism” *Security Dialogue*. Vol. 37, no. 2, 167 – 185.

- Kelman, Herbert C. (2007) “The Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process and its Vicissitudes” *American Psychologist*. Vol. 4, n. 8, 287 – 303.
- Keramati, Yashi (2007) “Twenty Years in the Making: The Palestinian Intifada of 1987” *Nebula*. 4.2, 107 – 122.
- Khalidi, Walid (1988) “Plan Dalet: Master Plan for the Conquest of Palestine” *Journal of Palestine Studies*. 18 (1), 4 – 33.
- Khalil, Asem (2003), *Which Constitution for the Palestinian Legal System?*. Rome: Pontificia Università Lateranense.
- Khouri, Fred J. (1976), *The Arab-Israeli Dilemma*. Villanova: Syracuse University Press.
- Kimche, David (1991) *The Last Option*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
- Krusch, David (2004) *Israel Bashing at the United Nations: A Yearly Ritual*. American-Israeli Cooperative Enterprise: <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsourc/UN/annual.html> [17th of April of 2012].
- Lapidus, Ilga (n/a) *Russian Jewry Resources: A History of the Jewish Community in Russia (and former USSR)*. Jerusalem: <http://www.jewishagency.org/JewishAgency/English/Jewish+Education/Resources-h.htm> [10th of March of 2012].
- Lea, David (Ed.) (2002) *A Survey of Arab-Israeli Relations 1947 – 2001*. London: Europa Publications Limited.
- League of Nations (1921) *An Interim Report on the Civil Administration of Palestine*. UNISPAL: New York, <http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/349B02280A930813052565E90048ED1C> [22nd of April of 2012].
- League of Nations (1937) *Report by his Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Council of the League of Nations on the Administration of Palestine and Trans-Jordan for the year 1937*. New York: United Nations Information System on the Question of Palestine, <http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/7BDD2C11C15B54C2052565D10057251E> [20th of April of 2012].
- Lehn, Walter (1974) “The Jewish National Fund” *Journal of Palestine Studies*. Vol.3, No.4, 74 – 96.

- Lenin, Vladimir (1919) *What Lenin said about the Jews*. Marxists Internet Archive, <http://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/sections/britain/pamphlets/xx/jews.htm> [17th of April of 2012].
- Livingston, Steven (1997) *Clarifying the CNN Effect: An Examination of Media Effects According to Type of Military Intervention*. Harvard: John F. Kennedy School of Government's Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy at Harvard University.
- Lloyd, David George (1923) *The Jews and Palestine*. Ein Shalom, <http://einshalom.com/archives/210> [19th of April of 2012].
- Malik, Iffat (2001) *Analysis of the Oslo Accords*. Islamabad: The Institute of Strategic Studies, Islambad, http://www.issi.org.pk/old-site/ss_Detail.php?dataId=175 [4th of April of 2012].
- Martin, Brian (1988) “The Issue of Intellectual suppression” *Philosophy and Social Action*. Vol. 14, N.1, 3 – 13.
- McArthur, Shirl (2008) *A Conservative Estimate of Total Direct U.S. Aid to Israel: Almost \$114 Billion*. Washington DC: The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs, <http://wrmea.org/component/content/article/245/3845-congress-watch-a-conservative-estimate-of-total-direct-us-aid-to-israel-almost-114-billion.html> [5th of March of 2012].
- McCombs, Maxwell E.; Shaw, Donald L. (1972) “The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media” *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Vol. 36, 176 – 187.
- McDonald, Matt (2008) “Securitization and the Construction of Security” *European Journal of International Relations*. 14, 563 – 586.
- Mearsheimer, John J.; Walt, Stephen M. (2006) *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*. London: London Review of Books, <http://www.lrb.co.uk/v28/n06/john-mearsheimer/the-israel-lobby> [2nd of March of 2012].
- Middle East Monitor (MEMO) (2011) *Public Perceptions of the Israel-Palestine Conflict*. United Kingdom: http://www.middleeastmonitor.org.uk/downloads/other_reports/public-perceptions-of-the-palestine-israel-conflict-FINAL-REPORT-icm.pdf [13th of March of 2012].
- Nasser, Gamal Abdel (1960). The Center for Online Judaic Studies, http://cojs.org/cojswiki/Quotes_by_Gamal_Abdel_Nasser,_1954-1967. [05th of May of 2012].

- Nasser, Gamal Abdel (1961). The Center for Online Judaic Studies, http://cojs.org/cojswiki/Quotes_by_Gamal_Abdel_Nasser,_1954-1967. [05th of May of 2012].
- Nasser, Gamal Abdel (1967). Jerusalem: Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs (IMFA) <http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Foreign%20Relations/Israels%20Foreign%20Relations%20since%201947/1947-1974/7%20Statement%20by%20President%20Nasser%20to%20Arab%20Trade%20Unio> [8th of May of 2012].
- National Conference on Soviet Jewry (NCSJ) (n/a) *Russia Country Page*. Washington D.C.: <http://www.ncsj.org/Russia.shtml> [22nd of May of 2012].
- Nordau, Max (1897) *Address at the First Zionist Congress*. Basel: MidEastWeb, <http://www.mideastweb.org/nordau1897.htm> [18th of April of 2012].
- Oates, Sarah (2008), *Introduction to Media and Politics*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Palestinian Liberation Organization; The State of Israel (1993) *1993 Oslo Accords (Declaration of Principles)*, signed in Washington on the 13th of September of 1993.
- Pappé, Ilan (2006), *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications Limited.
- Qassem, Abdul Sattar (2011). Attendance of the subject “Zionist Ideology””. Nablus, Occupied Territories of Palestine. Academic Professor.
- Ramahi, Sawsan (2010) *Israel’s discrimination against its Arab citizens*. United Kingdom: Middle East Monitor, <http://www.middleeastmonitor.org.uk/resources/briefing-papers/1230-israels-discrimination-against-its-arab-citizens> [22nd of May of 2012].
- Rinawie-Zoabi, Ghaida (2006) *The Future Vision of the Arabs in Israel*. Nazareth: The National Committee for the Heads of the Arab Local Authorities in Israel.
- Robinson, Piers (2001) “Theorizing the Influence of Media on World Politics” *European Journal of Communication*. Vol.16, n.4, 523 – 544.
- Roe, Paul (2006) “Reconstructing Identities or Managing Minorities? Desecuritizing Minority Rights: A Response to Jutila” *Security Dialogue*. Vol. 37, no.3, 425 – 438.

- Ruby, Robert (2007) *A Six-Day War: Its Aftermath in American Public Opinion*. Washington: The Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, <http://www.pewforum.org/Politics-and-Elections/A-Six-Day-War-Its-Aftermath-in-American-Public-Opinion.aspx> [14th of March of 2012].
- Said, Edward W. (1980), *The Question of Palestine*. New York: Times Books.
- Sheffer, Gabriel (2005) “Is the Jewish Diaspora Unique? Reflections on the Diaspora’s Current Situation” *Israeli Studies*. N.10 (1), 1 – 35.
- Molotov, Vyacheslav (1948) in “Recognition of Israel”. Brown, Phillip (1948) “The Recognition of Israel” *The American Journal of International Law*. Vol. 42, No.3, 620 – 627.
- Shields, Jacqueline (n./a.) *Arab Riots of the 1920s*. American-Israeli Cooperative Enterprise, <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/History/riots29.html> [20th of April of 2012].
- Shlaim, Avi (2012) “Obama must stand up to Netanyahu”. Oxford: University of Oxford, <http://politicsinspires.org/2012/03/obama-must-stand-up-to-netanyahu/> [25th of May of 2012].
- Sobel, Jerrold (2012) *In their own words*. Canada Free Press: <http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/45433> [7th of May of 2012].
- The Council of the League of Nations (1922) *The Palestine Mandate*. MidEastWeb (2003), <http://www.mideastweb.org/mandate.htm> [22nd of April of 2012].
- The United States House of Representatives (1922) *National Home for the Jewish People*. Atlanta: Institute for the Study of Modern Israel, <http://www.ismi.emory.edu/PrimarySource/jnh1922part1.pdf> [11th of April of 2012].
- Truman, Harry S. (1948) *Press Release about Recognition of Israel*. Maryland: National Archives and Records Administration, <http://www.archives.gov/education/lessons/us-israel/> [1st of May of 2012].
- United Nations (2003) *The Question of Palestine & the United Nations*. New York: United Nations Department of Public Information, <http://www.un.org/depts/dpi/palestine/> [3rd of April of 2012].

- United Nations General Assembly (1947) *United Nations General Assembly Resolution 181*. Jerusalem: Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, <http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Peace%20Process/Guide%20to%20the%20Peace%20Process/UN%20General%20Assembly%20Resolution%20181> [24th of April of 2012].
- United Nations General Assembly (1949) 273 (III). *Admission of Israel to membership in the United Nations*. New York: <http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/83E8C29DB812A4E9852560E50067A5AC> [14th of May of 2012].
- United Nations General Assembly (1949). 54. *Application of Israel for admission to membership in the United Nations (A/818) (continued)*. New York: [http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/85255a0a0010ae82852555340060479d/1db943e43c280a26052565fa004d8174?OpenDocument#Mr.%20EBAN%20\(I%20understood%20that\)](http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/85255a0a0010ae82852555340060479d/1db943e43c280a26052565fa004d8174?OpenDocument#Mr.%20EBAN%20(I%20understood%20that)) [14th of May of 2012].
- United Nations Information System on the Question of Palestine (UNISPAL) (1978) *The Origins and Evolution of the Palestine Problem: 1917 – 1988 | Part I*. New York: United Nations, <http://unispal.un.org/unispal.nsf/0/AEAC80E740C782E4852561150071FDB0> [20th of February of 2012].
- United Nations Information System on the Question of Palestine (UNISPAL) (1979) *The Origins and Evolution of the Palestine Problem: 1917 – 1988 | Part II*. New York: United Nations, <http://unispal.un.org/unispal.nsf/5ba47a5c6cef541b802563e000493b8c/d44211e70e417e3802564740045a309?OpenDocument> [15th of March of 2012].
- United Nations Security Council (1948) 54(1948). *Resolution of 15 July 1948[S/902]*. New York: UNISPAL, <http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/2E2BCB7CBAFD9B70852560C2005B5EEC> [2nd of May of 2012].
- United Nations Security Council (1949) *Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel*. New York: <http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/9EC4A332E2FF9A128525643D007702E6> [14th of May of 2012].
- United Nations Security Council (1949) *ISRAELI-SYRIAN GENERAL ARMISTICE AGREEMENT*. New York: <http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/E845CA0B92BE4E3485256442007901CC> [14th of May of 2012].
- United Nations Security Council (1949) *HASHEMITE JORDAN KINGDOM-ISRAEL: GENERAL ARMISTICE AGREEMENT*. New York:

<http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/F03D55E48F77AB698525643B00608D34> [14th of May of 2012].

- United Nations Security Council (1949) *LEBANESE-ISRAELI GENERAL ARMISTICE AGREEMENT*. New York: <http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/71260B776D62FA6E852564420059C4FE> [14th of May of 2012].
- United Nations Security Council (1967) *Resolution 237 (1967)*. New York: <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/240/89/IMG/NR024089.pdf?OpenElement> [12th of May of 2012].
- United Nations Security Council (1967) *Resolution 242 (1967)*. New York: <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/240/94/IMG/NR024094.pdf?OpenElement> [12th of May of 2012].
- Wæver, Ole (2011) “Politics, security, theory” *Security Dialogue*. 42, 465 – 480.
- Williams, Michael (2003) “Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics” *International Studies Quarterly*. 47, 511 – 531.
- Zaytoun (n/a) 6. *Land & Settlements*. London: http://www.zaytoun.org/files/Get%20involved_Resource LAND.pdf [27th of March of 2012].
- Zogby International (2010) *American Opinions on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. Washington: Arab American Institute, <http://www.aaiusa.org/page/-/Polls/AmericanOpinionsOnIsraeli-PalestinianConflictReportMarch2010.pdf> [17th of April of 2012].