For a lecture at INDC:

**National Security and the Imperative of Protection of National Interests**

Gershon HaCohen

Critical discussion of the behavior of officials appointed by public ministers - an alternative paradigm to the prevailing paradigm in political science.

Definition of National Security in IDF Theory:

**"National Security is the arena that deals with ​​ensuring the national ability to effectively deal with any threat to national existence and national essential interests ..."** (IDF - Torah and Training Division, Basic Torah Operations, 2007, p. 7)

**Who determines and what authority determines national interests?**

**The duty of officials in charge of public service to the national vision as an outline for their "professional" considerations**

From Dina Silver's book **"Bureaucracy in Politics"**

**"My argument is that in the administrative state, the importance of public administration is first and foremost. It is therefore important that the clerical level recognizes its power to shape cardinal issues. The important trend is the relocation of the center of government's gravity and practical decision-making ability, on policy questions, from the elected political level, to the appointed clerical level. These processes take place under the guise of objective neutrality and expertise, bypassing the democratic process and its risk, without giving account to the general public whose fate is determined at the official level. "**

**The issue of the security contribution of the settlements as an example of the debate’s actuality on the "national essential interests".**

This issue rests on the Israeli government and the security system’s desks as a topical issue in the debate is renewed every day.

In a series of high court petitions filed by human rights organizations and Palestinian residents to the Supreme Court in recent years, the court was required to re-examine the Israeli settlement law on land seized for security purposes. Indeed, by 1979, homes were built in veteran communities in Judea and Samaria, such as Beit El, Ma'ale Ephraim, on land seized in declaration of security need. In a petition against houses built in Beit El in a security order - HCJ 5165/15 - the issue was addressed by Supreme Court President Miriam Naor:

**"The question now is about construction on land that is private but is in the historic order of capture."**

The hearing prompted a renewed validation of the security need for the settlement hold. Judge Naor, in her appeal to the state, chose to formulate with caution:

**"Before concluding the petition, we considered it appropriate, without taking any rivets, to ask the state's respondents for reference to the petitioners' claim that there has been a change in international law since the Ayoub case (HC 660/78 in 1979) in which the order was approved on the grounds of a basic security need."**

In another petition against the Gitit settlement - HC 7713/16, which was headed by Judge Elyakim Rubinstein, the question of the form was explicitly formulated:

**"This petition concerns Order No. 12/72 applicable to lands processed by the Gitit settlement in the Jordan Valley, and the request to cancel it for lack of a security need as claimed."**

On the basis of these petitions, the argument is made that the definition of the security need depends on a transient circumstantial context and is therefore required for examination and renewal in the change of circumstances.

It should be emphasized that the question of the legality of land grab orders for security purposes was discussed in the Supreme Court as early as the first years after the Six Day War. In 1970, clearly the question of security need for the construction of the Bethel settlement, the Supreme Court accepted the security opinion - HCJ 606/78 - and relied on it to petition attorney Elias Khoury against the justification for building the settlement on land seized for security needs. In 1979 - HC 610/78 -

In his reasoning for the ruling, Judge Landau quoted the opinion of Gen. Abraham Orly, who was then coordinator of operations in the Occupied Territories:

**General Orly's opinion: "The establishment of the Bethel settlement not only does not conflict with the military need, but it also serves it, as part of the government's security concept, which, among other things, bases the security system on Jewish communities. In the territories held by the IDF, they form part of the IDF's spatial defense system. "**

From the requirement for a reconsideration of the legality of the seizure orders for security purposes, the security system was required to reconsider the validity of the security need for holding settlements in Judea and Samaria and in the Jordan Valley. .

Chief of Staff Gadi Eizenkot, sought to release the IDF from having to express an opinion on this issue, arguing that it was a clear political issue and it was better for the army not to take a stand. **It is worth noting what has changed since the opinion of the Coordinator of Operations in the Occupied Territory, Major General Orly, who was apprehended in 1979 as a professional security position?**

Major General Orly represented an opinion that was widely held in the entire security system, according to Moshe Dayan, about the need for settlement in the Baka and Judea and Samaria areas:

**"For the sake of Israel's security, there must be Jewish civilians in these areas. If our military units and facilities are among a pure Arab population, they are considered foreigners and eventually forced to evacuate. In Samaria, IDF units can be found in these areas not as foreign occupiers, but for the purpose of securing the peace of Israel, whose dense population is concentrated in a narrow region on the Mediterranean coast.** "(Moshe Dayan, shall the sword devour forever?, p. 12)

**What has changed?**

**What can be learned from the discussion on this issue:**

Fundamental questions of national security, such as the security interests of the State of Israel in Judea and Samaria, are always based on basic assumptions beyond professional techno-tactical questions. The issue, of course, is required for constant scrutiny of its professional dimensions, but this discussion, as it is held at the high level of the concept of national security, is intertwined with policy assumptions that are essentially political. In this respect, the chief of staff's choice to refrain from taking a stand on the issue also carries a political tinge. In every way, the question of the security contribution of the deployment of settlement in Judea and Samaria and the Jordan Valley has broad practical implications.

**The Methodological Framework - Professional discussion of ideological basic awareness**

**Basically, the question of whether settlements in Judea and Samaria are a security or an asset burden is an overall strategic issue. As such, it cannot be ascertained solely by security professional standards, which are fundamentally technical and tactical.**

The discussion is similar to the question: Is child rearing an asset or a burden? One can agree on the facts about the total cost of raising children and still from different value perspectives, different answers to the question will be provided. Among the considerations included in the discussion on the contribution of the settlements to national security are, among other things, national values ​​and interests as defined by national security in the IDF theory: "National Security is the area of ensuring national ability to effectively deal with any threat to **national existence and national essential interests .**.." (IDF - Torah and Training Division, Basic Torah Operations, 2007, p. 7)

In the background of our discussion of the contribution of the settlements to security, as a magnetic field that shapes the broad context of the discussion, lies a fundamental question: **What are the national interests of the State of Israel in Judea and Samaria?**

Clearly this fundamental question involves beliefs and conceptions and therefore methodologically, there can be no professional decision without taking into account values. As in medical science, decoding an X-ray of an ankle fracture is an action of a professional technical nature, free from a worldview and political biases. However, the same doctor who dealt with an ankle fracture, when attending a discussion at the Ministry of Health, to formulate a government policy for a basket of drugs and treatments in government insurance - finds himself required not only for his professionalism as a physician, but also for his worldview and value judgment. The State of Israel, for example, provides unique support for fertility treatments, beyond what is customary in other developed countries. The difference stems from a different value priority, and not from another medical science.

In a report published by MOLAD (the Center for the Renewal of Israeli Democracy) that presents the settlements as a security burden, I presented my position on an ideological bias: "Most of the security claims of Maj. Gen. Cohen are in fact ideological statements formulated in security language." (MOLAD Report, p. 38) as if their position presented the settlements As a burden, it is an ideology-free professional position. After all, this is a strategic question and a critical observation on the suitability of the settlements as a means for a purpose. From a logical perspective, it is clear that a dispute over Israel's national interests in space, which defines a strategic purpose, will lead to a dispute over the compatibility of measures. The desire to convey in this discussion, a line separating the space of unpublished professional discussion, and the space of discussion involving a worldview, is an expression of modern scientific positivism, which for decades has been recognized in the philosophy of science as a methodological illusion.

**The question of the line separating professional and political considerations is indeed a central question in political science. On complex issues, this line is largely determined by those who hold political hegemony and thus expresses a dictate that is consciously and unconsciously dictated, of course, socio-political.**

In 2008, under the leadership of Prime Minister Olmert and with the support of the defense establishment, negotiations with the Syrians again opened for a peace agreement involving withdrawal from the Golan Heights. When I expressed my appreciation as a member of the General Staff that giving up the Golan entailed risks that would be better avoided, they argued that I was talking politically. I then replied that their very criticism of their perception of my professional criticism as political, expressed a political stance.

**In technical areas of action, the line between the professional and the political is quite clear. This is not the case when it comes to definite strategic issues. However, the very recognition that a strategic position is based on fundamental values ​​does not detract from the ability to hold a substantive and rational professional discussion.**

Before reaching the technical security debate, recognizing the basic controversy over Israel's national interests in Judea and Samaria is needed, as it shapes the debate. On the one hand, there has been decades of consensus for conceding territorial aspirations beyond the borders of June 4, 1967, as determined by the end of the War of Independence, on the other, there is a conscious, national aspiration for an ancestral land beyond these borders and readiness to fight for its realization. Adequate awareness and disclosure of these basic assumptions in the background for discussion are a prerequisite for methodological honesty and professional discussion.

The Israeli quest for control of the West Bank was not born after the Six Day War. In the midst of the War of Independence, ahead of a UN discussion on the UN's delegate program, Bernadotte, for ending the war, Ben-Gurion explained:

**"I am with those who did not believe that there is a contradiction between the entire claim of Western Israel as a Jewish state, and the agreement to establish a state in part of Western Israel. We demanded what we deserved and received what we could achieve. But we never declared it our maximum. We emphasized with great emphasis that this is our minimum”** (September 27, 1948, in Fighting Israel, page 266)

**The outline of the vision under which Ben Gurion acted**

In April 1948, in a clash with the General Staff, Ben-Gurion demanded the relocation of troops from all fronts and concentration of effort to Jerusalem. His arguments in the confrontation were exemplary for making an astagic decision ..

On April 6, 1948, Ben-Gurion appeared before the Zionist General Council and spoke about the place and role of Jerusalem - in light of that "oath on the Babylonian rivers" (If I forget you, Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its skill):

**"Jerusalem is second to Tel Aviv in the number of its Jewish residents, and that alone makes this place the most important, but this does not only determine its importance. Needless to say, the Zionist General Council explains the value of Jerusalem in the history of the Jewish people and of the country and the world. As one of those who were more prepared back in 1937 to receive a Jewish state with enthusiasm in part of the country, I was in the minority management who voted against the division of Jerusalem. The value of Jerusalem cannot be measured and weighed and counted. Because if Israel has a soul, then Jerusalem is the soul of the Land of Israel, and the battle for Jerusalem is crucial not just in military terms, then not only must the road to Jerusalem and the defense of our independence within it be secured, but its status must be strengthened. Jerusalem demands and is entitled to stand with it. That oath on the rivers of Babylon, is binding today. Otherwise we will not deserve the nation of Israel there. "(David Ben-Gurion, 1975, In Fighting Israel, pp. 91-90)**

**This makes it clear how the professional discussion of strategic questions is fundamentally based on a worldview that is based on values and on national interest consciousness.**

**Pragmatic strategic behavior is oriented to a perpetual vision**

A pragmatic, perpetual vision is dealt daily between the conditions of reality here and now, and the vision aimed at eternity.

Ben-Gurion is well aware of this tension and in his conduct he created a masterpiece and inspiration that influenced both Hassan al Bana. the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood as well as Khomeini.

During my time as commander of the INDC, Ben-Gurion's comments on his agreement with the Peel Commission, appeared on a poster at the INDC plenum.

His speech at the Zionist Congress on August 20, 1937 shows how a point of equilibrium is changing balance between the circumstances of reality and the eternal vision.

**"As far as the fulfillment of Zionism is concerned, a Jewish state should immediately - and even in part of western Palestine - continue the British mandate, under conditions that exist throughout the west of the country. And before I clarify my reasons, I should make a principled comment. If the question was asked: Jewish state in all of western Israel in return for giving up on our historic right for Israel as a whole - I would reject the state. No Jew is allowed to give up the right of the Jewish people in this land. This is not the authority of any Jew, it is not the authority of any Jewish body. This is not the authority of the entire Jewish people living with us today - To give up any part of it in the country. It is the right of the nation for generations. "** (David Ben-Gurion, 1950, in War A, p. 249)

In Ben-Gurion's practical logic, in his conduct that embodies the greatness of the wisdom of the deed, he explained in a speech to the Poalei Zion Union in July 1937:

**"This Jewish state offered to us now ... is not the Zionist goal, in this area the Jewish question cannot be solved. However, it can serve as a crucial stage in the way of the realization of Greater Zionism. It will establish in the shortest time the real Jewish power, which will bring us to our historical objective." (Ibid., P. 128). This is the essence of the "stage theory" adopted by Fatah and Hamas leaders. In Arabic, it is known as “Marhalya”.**

**Khaled Mash'al in the phrase represents pragmatism in the stage theory - in which a comparison with Ben-Gurion's logic can be conducted.**

His remarks were made at the Islamic World Conference held in Rabat on November 28, 2012, at the end of Operation Pillar of Defense:

**"Our agreement with Hamas on a state along the 1967 borders, there are those who worry that it might be a path which we previously took, which at the end of the day, the big dream will dwarf and I say not. I believe that the liberation of Palestine within the 1967 borders is (now) a practical goal. I believe that those who liberate Palestine within the 1967 borders from Israel will liberate the rest of Palestine, but at present it is necessary to consolidate the Palestinian position and the Arab position on a common ground. And this dictates to us that in Hamas andin other resistance movements to advocate this view and position, provided it does not come at the expense of Palestinian land and does not include waiving any right to any part of our land or any recognition in Israel. "**

**--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

Here lies the big difference between the vision of pragmatists, and Harvard rational decision-making experts. There is a fundamental difference between the concept of vision and its validity, as understood by the Harvard decision-making expert, and the vision, as the believer understands it, in his eternal loyalty to the kind of vision beyond the horizon of human intelligence in his life. So what is the difference? For Jews who, for example, long for the redemption of Zion, the vision is an eternal destination, above and beyond the ability of any concession, whatever the circumstances are. In this aspect, **dreams are not negotiable**, and dreams play a role in practical judgment, even in leading life here and now.

**--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**Moshe Dayan on the discussion of the status of the "liberated territories" - Who deserves to deal with this issue - 12.12.1967**

**Jerusalem that liberated us**

**In recent days there has been an attack on public inquiries on foreign policy and security questions. The rage went out on ministers and poets and ad writers and unions. I do not share those who rule out public inquiry on these questions. I do not agree with the definition that the discussions that will determine the new map will take place not at the Culture Hall, but at the discussion table, between us and the other party. I do not think that the questions presented to us need to be decided more by Foreign Office officials than by Nathan Alterman and Amos Oz. I do not think that Yitzhak Tabenkin and Lahar Smilansky have less right or less obligation to express their views on these questions.**

**However, to my dismay, I do not share the comments of my friend Izhar Smilansky about the "annexation poets." There must be a lot of truth in his words, especially regarding the concept of "liberated territories" and "liberated people." There is a formal truth and perhaps an objective truth in his words. But all of our essence here stands and is based on three elements: the longing for the people of Israel to return to their homeland, the territories of this country, which we have not forgotten as a homeland and which have not ceased to be our homeland, and during the long period when we were far from it, and the people who came to fulfill this yearning. In this country. Without these, the State of Israel would not have arisen and the return of Zion, which is larger than the State of Israel, would not have arisen. Any speech disproves the formula of "liberated territories" because there are people in these territories who certainly do not see us as liberators, which does not express my approach to this issue.**

**Perhaps Yizhar Smilansky was right in saying this differently, in a way that we understand that when we talk about physical Jerusalem, we certainly do not mean to say about the Arab residents of East Jerusalem that we liberated them. But we are talking about ourselves - of liberating ourselves from the disconnection from Jerusalem. There may be more appropriate phrases to use, but that's the content.**

**And I am very sorry when trying to disqualify what was a mainstay in the longing for the return of the people of Israel to its homeland and its fulfillment.**

**Speech of Moshe Dayan at the Rafi Conference, National Buildings, December 12, 1967**

**Why the Zionist Vision Consciousness is essential for every official and public servant in the State of Israel**

The existence of the State of Israel without the Zionist vision leaves it no more than a longing for a safe haven in "a fun country to live in." Without the longing consciousness of generations of Jews for something transcendent, significantly more than the OECD revised states, the full complexity of the State of Israel cannot be managed.

Ben Gurion perfectly clarified it wafter the establishment of the State:

**"Security is only a condition of our existence and independence. The State of Israel has a special purpose, every state must take care of the welfare of its residents. Our state also commands this, but that is not the essence. The supreme trend of the State of Israel is the salvation of Israel, Kibbutz Galuyot.”** (Stars and Dirt, p. 32)

**A year later he found it necessary to emphasize again:**

**"The State of Israel has been the product of the redemption vision of the Jewish people for generations ... and with the rebirth of the state, the vision of redemption has not been fulfilled. Because the vast majority of the Jewish people are still scattered in the world, and the Jewish state is still not the Jewish redemption, it is the only instrument and means of redemption."** (Stars and Dirt, pp. 92, 1954).

Prime Minister Golda Meir wrote similar things in plain language:

**"I know that Israel is not just a small, besieged country where three million people struggle hard to hold on ... Israel is a Jewish state that has come into the world as a result of the longing for faith and the determination of an ancient nation ... because Israel exists, Jewish history has changed forever. And to my deepest knowledge, very few Israelis today do not understand their full historical responsibility as Jews**." (Golda Meir, My Life, Maariv Library.)