Protecting the Jewish Identity Through Digital Privacy Within the Context of Created World (ARZ-I MEVUD)

Furkan İlker Akın[a],*

[a] Istanbul Nişantaşı University, Faculty of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences, Department of International Relations Research Assistant, Istanbul, Turkey.
*Corresponding author.

Abstract

The State of Israel has been adopted as a form of government that has a population of about six million and remains in an area of about twenty one thousand square kilometers, not included in the nation-state structure. The area where the state is located is where the Kingdom of Yehuda is. Culturally, it has hosted many religions, especially Judaism, Christianity, Druze and Bahaili. There is a long depth of political history and awareness of political culture that makes it behind the establishment of the state.

The identity foundations of Judaism are Jewish society chosen as determined by the Torah. In terms of politics, it is seen that Israeli Political Systematics was created within the framework of Zionism and diversified from different political ideologies formed among Zionist party groups.

The subject of Arz-ı Mevud, the Promised Lands, is an issue that is based on religious foundations and interacts on politics. According to the Judaic belief, it is a region that is shown by Jehovah as an area belonging to the Israelites and is included in a large area between the Euphrates and the Nile. However, its exact boundaries are not clear. When evaluated in the context of Judaism belief, Hz. Mose's all the lands traveled until he entered the Palestinian territory form the border of the Promised Land region.

The purpose of this study; The aim of this course is to evaluate the sensitivities of transforming the issue of "Arz-ı Mevud" (Promised Land) into a policy tool today. The promised land issue is still an ideologically valid issue. It is possible to say that the Israeli State focuses on this issue, which is based on the ideology of religion, and that it has ideological dreams and sanctions in the region mentioned in the Promised Land. In this context, the Promised Lands issue is important for the State of Israel and it aims to reconstruct its ideological sustainability by reconstructing the state identity in the region with digital diplomacy in the framework of the changing bureaucracy order. In this sense,the existing literature has been examined and the findings have been evaluated and presented as a whole.

Key words: Israel; Promised land; Digital diplomacy; Foreign policy

INTRODUCTION

Since the establishment of the State of Israel, there has been a persistent insistence on having all Jews from around the world settle in Israel in order to balance and strengthen the Jewish population in the face of the Palestinian population. This call has not gone unanswered, and Jews living in Arab countries in the Middle East and North Africa have migrated to Israel. This group has also played a significant role in the population growth of Israel. However, Jews from different cultures have faced identity issues in Israel. Despite efforts to create a unified Israeli identity under a common framework, success has been elusive. One of the main reasons for this is the fragmentation of the Jewish identity itself, which presents not only as an identity issue but also as an ethnic problem. Even today, this factor can be said to contribute to the

social crises that Israel experiences, affecting various aspects from economics to politics, bureaucracy to culture.

On the other hand, the issue of "Arz-ı Mevud," also known as the Promised Land and rooted in the Torah, has returned to the agenda with the resurgence of topics proposed by Israeli strategists over time. In a world where information and communication technology has rapidly developed, digital diplomacy has gained significant importance in global politics. Solving foreign policy issues using computer and internet technologies has emerged as a new means of communication. Therefore, a digital perspective and approach have become integral to contemporary diplomacy. The issue of "Arz-ı Mevud" remains relevant in today's world as it is historically linked to the state of Israel and its ongoing non-peaceful national and ideological attitudes. Furthermore, this issue continues to hold a prominent place in Israeli policies towards the Middle East through digital diplomacy, utilizing Israel's capabilities while preserving its historical ideology. Thus, it remains a significant topic in the global agenda and Israel's policies in the Middle East.

This research highlights the shift from traditional diplomacy to digital diplomacy in the world and emphasizes the powerful impact of shaping public opinion based on the historical foundations of the State of Israel.

This study examines the sociocultural context of the State of Israel and the factors behind the social crises it has experienced up to the present day. It discusses whether the issue of "Arz-ı Mevud" has an impact on the social crises experienced by the State of Israel.

The study is divided into three main sections. The first section discusses the factors behind the social crises experienced by the State of Israel. The second section examines the issue of "Arz-ı Mevud" in a theological context. The final section discusses the governing policies of the State of Israel.

In this study, the importance of the issue of "Arz-ı Mevud" in shaping the Israeli identity is explored. It highlights the place of this phenomenon in Israeli bureaucracy and its significance in Israeli foreign policy. It also draws attention to how the issue of "Arz-ı Mevud" is shaped by the goals and desires of Israeli foreign policy within the framework of Jewish beliefs. The study evaluates the facts investigated in the study and the foundations on which they are based using qualitative research techniques. Furthermore, in line with the changing world order, the study aims to minimize bureaucracy in order to achieve sustainable diplomacy. In this context, Israel has adapted to the changing world order. However, Israel has never abandoned its goals and desires rooted in historical and theological origins. In this context, Israel, while adapting to the changing world order, continues to use digital diplomacy as a tool to demonstrate Arab hostility.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The aim of this study is to determine how Israel has consistently brought its thesis regarding the Promised Land, or "Arz-ı Mevut" in Arabic, to the global agenda, transforming it into a state policy, and how it has effectively turned this ideological sensitivity into a societal philosophy through digital diplomacy. Furthermore, the study emphasizes Israel's efforts to justify itself through digital diplomacy in its occupation of Palestinian territories since 1948, providing concrete examples of digital communications. Additionally, the study is expected to contribute to understanding Turkey's relations with Israel in terms of negative aspects concerning national interests and priorities.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Israel's ideological approach to the Promised Land remains relevant today, as it consistently focuses on this topic based on its religious ideology, continuing to nurture its ideological dreams and actions in the regions mentioned in the Promised Land. This is evidenced by Israel's ongoing use of maps depicting Eastern Anatolia as part of its territory, indicating that it has not abandoned its ideological aspirations concerning our country. In this context, the issue of the Promised Land holds great importance for the future and continuity of the State of Israel. To achieve this goal, Israel's desire to establish dominance in the region through digital diplomacy continues vigorously within the framework of a changing bureaucratic order. Israel's efforts to maintain its mythological state identity, which undermines world peace, necessitate research on this issue. Therefore, existing literature has been reviewed, and the findings have been evaluated, with the study presented as a whole.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1.Identity Management

Identity management is an organizational tool for examining the concept of public diplomacy. According to Cheney and Christensen (2001), the ongoing rhetorical struggle within organizations that takes shape in many areas is crucial for organizations to clearly distinguish themselves and establish awareness of their own identities. It serves as a means to create strong and convincing connections with more general contexts through powerful and persuasive data (p. 233).

The identity that a nation-state uses to distinguish itself is not only for legitimization purposes but also of vital importance for its influence on external observers. In the process of "constructing a different identity," five main strategies are primarily used (Meisenbach McMillan, 2006, p. 120). The first strategy is "common ground,"

which involves finding shared values or ideas between two groups or external observers. The second tactic is antithesis, which involves creating a common enemy between two groups or external observers. The third strategy is the assumption that there are common solutions and topics that can be presented in the context of identity issues. "Transcendent we" is a concept discussed by M. McMillan, attempting to develop the concept by referring to the notion of transcendent experiences. It is a strategic concept that aims to overcome differences related to the inherent structures of different groups. In addition to these strategies, Cheney (1983b) added another strategy called 'Unifying Symbols.' According to Cheney and Christensen, the symbolism surrounding an organization's identity can define what the organization is or is not, as well as explain it in relation to other symbols (p. 242).

The concept of "Rhetorical Closure," introduced to the literature by Bostdorff and Vibbert (1994), suggests that organizational identity also focuses on promoting values. These strategies are not only applicable to corporate organizations but also ensure the implementation of consolidation techniques that establish the nation-state structure. Cheney and Christensen (2001) have stated that organizational communication fundamentally creates meaning and is a negotiated and managed process. Moreover, according to them, identity is part of a problem system in many organizational processes (p. 241). This statement implies that the transmission of identity between generations is clearly seen as a communicative entity that has occurred beyond the borders of the nation-state. However, identity is not the only reason for external communication. National identity has been included in all issues, whether considered internal or external (Cheney Christensen, 2001). Because the nation-state's issues and identity are intertwined, it can be said that organizations "communicate not only for information exchange with their 'environments,' but also importantly for protecting themselves and affirming their identities" (p. 252).

An applicable example of a nation-state's identity management is Holliday's (2010) examination of Iran's national identity. Holliday's (2010) study focused on Iran's national identity during President Khatami's term. Holliday argues that Iran's national identity under Khatami's administration was a resistance identity created through ideological debates within the nation. These debates deeply affected Iran's communication with the world. Khatami explicitly stated that his identity was Iran-Islam, thereby strengthening Iran's identity (Holliday, 2010, p. 5). Khatami sought to redefine the dimensions of his identity by primarily creating a new Islamic definition through ideological debates. The concept of Islamic civilization and its connection became the main theme of Khatami's speeches. Khatami focused on the need to cope with Western civilization as a dominant civilization (Holliday, 2010).

Khatami allowed for the creation of a unique national identity that changed Iran's interface with the global community. In 2001, Khatami made speeches promoting interaction between countries and enhancing international cooperation. Clearly, Khatami saw that the global community favored a Western and Christian perspective, which he found contrary to the principle of equality. The efforts to strengthen the Iranian identity were actually efforts to increase Iran's soft power. The phenomenon of increased soft power usage will increase Iran's influence in the global community and strengthen its ties with the Islamic community. The identity redefined by Khatami later faced opposition. On the other hand, Holliday's (2010) study illustrates the vitality of having a strong national identity for movements within the global community. Identity planting, as Khatami did in Iran, is increasingly common among governments. Kunczik (2009) argues that governments need identity to interact sufficiently in the global community. Kunczik (2009) asserts that governments must have identities to withdraw support for the national agendas and values of nations' international interaction. The concept of soft power and identity sustainability are interrelated concepts. Identity interaction increases in times of crisis such as war. When a nation-state develops its values and identity, if it is attractive to the global community, it will increase its soft power. When considering the values and identity awareness of the nation-state, if there is an identification with the global community, the global community will prefer the nation-state even in the face of any crisis.

In conclusion, the process of creating a unique and different identity as a nation-state before a crisis is of great importance. In the event of a problem, communication channels should be ready for identity management during and after the crisis.

2. Legitimacy Identity

Legitimacy is "the process of legitimizing or supporting organizational existence" (Meisenbach & McMillan, 2006, p. 115). To put it another way, legitimacy is a struggle to gain power and recognition (Motion & Leitch, 2009). Legitimacy actions aim to create a network for nation-states and their societies (Ordeix-Rigo & Duarte, 2009).

Chadwick (2001) argues that the state can obtain legitimacy through the use of technological tools. Marmura (2008) claims that "the internet has changed the rules of competition among actors and provided new tools for disseminating information" (p. 152). Marmura (2008) shares the idea that the internet is a tool that disseminates government and state-owned information, creating credibility for the nation-state and thereby enhancing legitimacy.

3. Public Diplomacy

The discipline of public diplomacy focuses on the scrutiny

and evaluation of communication patterns that arise from the interactions between a nation-state and other states worldwide. Public diplomacy can be concisely defined as the act of engaging in direct communication with foreign populations in order to mold their perspectives and, ultimately, exert influence over the policies and decisions made by their respective governments (Taylor, 2008, p.12).

Furthermore, public diplomacy can also be defined as persuasive powers that a nation-state uses to influence the attitudes of foreign public opinion (Gerber, 2008; Ordeix-Rigo & Duarte, 2009).

Gerber (2008) argues that rhetorical approaches are most suitable for public diplomacy studies "due to the recurring elements in such discourses" (p. 130).

According to Thomas Goodnight (1998), Western culture appears more comprehensive when considered as a whole, with concerns about rhetorical arts and increasing levels of interest and expectations regarding foreign relations. Public diplomacy and its rhetorical features provide essential definitions to enhance our understanding of a country's identity and issue management strategies, encouraging narrative assessment.

In a significant study that combines international relations and rhetoric, Mitchell (2009) argued that it challenges the power struggle focus of the realist theories of the past. Realism was the dominant diplomatic orientation during the Cold War. Realism is not a theory but an orientation or worldview. Realism, or realpolitik, governed much of the diplomatic theory before the collapse of the Soviet Union (Donnelly, 2000). Realism can be categorized with the following features: Firstly, the interests of the nation-state are the cause of action. Secondly, moral principles should be disregarded when conducting political analysis. Thirdly, as long as the nation-state uses its military, it survives. In this context, it is evident that nation-states will not shy away from pursuing war-oriented policies. Finally, nation-states seek power and calculate their interests in terms of power beyond mere survival (Donnelly, 2000). These features have been observed to align with diplomatic theories when the period from the fall of the Berlin Wall to the collapse of the Soviet Union is taken into account.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, many diplomatic theories were reevaluated (Beer Hariman, 1996; Goodnight, 1998; Krebs Jackson, 2007, Mitchell, 2009). Public diplomacy continues to work on integrated theories that were once aimed at constantly changing the power balance during the Cold War. According to Francis Beer and Robert Hariman (1996), the post-Cold War period represents a theoretical turning point for public diplomacy. In this context, when the discourse in international relations was systematically overlooked, and when theoretical and academic studies examining international relations through a rhetorical lens became inevitable, Nye (2004) proposed a more sophisticated perspective.

This perspective was centered on the concept of soft power. Nye (2004) defines soft power as "the ability to shape the preferences of others" (p.5). He argued that the increasing use of attractive "power" by nation-states would change the nature of public diplomacy. Soft power is "an intangible attraction that persuades us to move in alignment with the goals of others without the use of any explicit threat or exchange" (Nye, 2004, p.7).

4. Digital Diplomacy

Dizard (2001) argues that the foundation of indicators of digitization dates back to the time when governments employed the first telegraph clerks to establish open communication with other government officials. Indeed, in recent years, the use of telecommunications related to public diplomacy has increased significantly on a global scale. Gilboa (2002) contends that media diplomacy was in its early stages at the beginning of the century and would continue to grow as technology advanced, and the global community became increasingly interconnected. Diplomacy involving the media has been referred to by various names, including Cyber Diplomacy (Potter, 2002), Real-time Diplomacy (Gilboa, 2002), Intermediary Diplomacy (Shaefer Shenhav, 2009; Shaefer Gabay, 2009), or Digital Diplomacy (Dizard 2001). The use of different names for media and diplomacy is an attempt to describe the ever-changing nature of diplomacy in the digital world (Gilboa, 2002).

When Dizard (2001) conducted research on the development of digital diplomacy, he addressed the prevalence of new media in diplomatic relations. However, Dizard noticed that in the increasingly digital world, diplomacy had entered into a close relationship through digitalization with foreign relations. New media is directed at convincing the state's external and internal populations of their attitudes towards foreign relations. In other words, digital diplomacy pursues an online state understanding that uses new media tools to express views and values in order to persuade.

Potter (2002) conducted a study on the influence of digital media on international relations. In his research, he presents a concise overview of his findings, which can be categorized into five primary themes. Firstly, the implementation of digital diplomacy necessitates a concerted effort from foreign ministries to guarantee the authentication and durability of precise and dependable messages disseminated through mass media. Secondly, while mass media is used to increase transparency and legitimacy, it can also be used for national security operations. Thirdly, Potter suggests that governments need to proactively engage with the media. Fourthly, new media allows global communities to hold governments accountable for their actions. Finally, foreign ministries are increasingly using the internet, which will compel these groups to publish quality presentation materials for the public.

Shaefer and Shenhav have argued that Israel uses digital diplomacy to persuade other Israeli values and increase Israel's influence and power. Entman (2008) explains that digital diplomacy is an attempt by a government to use the media to influence and persuade foreign nations' audiences.

Nye (2004) suggests that success in diplomacy in the 21st century will involve using new media to capture people's minds. Nye argues that the utility of soft power will involve emphasizing transparency, involving information dissemination rather than information gathering, which was a common practice by nation-states during the Cold War. The conceptualization of digital diplomacy has been systematically developed (Entman, 2008). Competition for power is central in international relations. To compete for power using soft power, nation-states must use new media outlets.

In conclusion, nation-states need to engage in online communication. The use of media tools and their qualities in an organizational context are no longer independent practices. Traditional diplomacy patterns or patterns of asymmetric information dissemination have transformed user-friendly content into symmetrical public diplomacy patterns accessible to anyone with access to information anywhere in the world (Makikiza Bornman, 2007; Wiley, 2004).

ARZ-I MEVUD

The promise mentioned in the Bible and said to be made to Prophet Abraham is described as follows: "from the river of Egypt to the great river, the Euphrates River" (Genesis, 15/8), and the promise made to Prophet Moses and Joshua is stated as "every place where the sole of your foot treads shall be yours" (Deuteronomy, 11/24; Joshua, 1/3).

The boundaries of the Promised Land, as detailed in the Old Covenant, are as follows: The southern border is described as follows: "From the wilderness of Zin along Edom, your southern border shall run; and your southern border shall turn to the western side of the Salt Sea. And your border shall turn south of the ascent of Akrabbim, and cross to Zin, and its limit shall be south of Kadesh-Barnea. Then it shall go on to Hazar-Addar, and pass along to Azmon. And the border shall turn from Azmon to the Brook of Egypt, and its limit shall be at the sea" (Numbers, 34/3-5; Deuteronomy, 15/2-4).

Here, the mentioned Zin wilderness is located northeast of Kadesh and corresponds to the southern border of the Promised Land. The Salt Sea is the present-day Dead Sea. Akrabbim Ascent is situated to the south of the Dead Sea and corresponds to Nab es-Safa today, Hazar-Addar is in the northwest of Kadesh-Barnea, and Azmon is located to the west of Vadilkudeyrat. The Egyptian valley corresponds to the region opening to the Mediterranean Sea from the southwest of Gaza. This statement clearly defines the southern border of the Promised Land, and it aims to include a significant portion of the Negev in the land of promise, although it belongs to the Rabbinical text.

The western border is described as "And your border shall turn westward to the Great Sea and the coast" (Numbers, 34/6; Joshua, 1/4). This "Great Sea" is the Mediterranean Sea.

The northern border is stated as follows: "And this shall be your northern border: From the Great Sea you shall draw a line to Mount Hor. From Mount Hor you shall draw a line to Lebo-hamath, and the limit of the border shall be at Zedad. Then the border shall extend to Ziphron, and its limit shall be at Hazar-enan. This shall be your northern border" (Numbers, 34/7-9). The northern border of the Promised Land corresponds to the region called Lebanon in the Old Covenant (Deuteronomy, 11/24; Joshua, 11/4). Although some argue that Mount Hor refers to the Taurus Mountains in Southern Anatolia, the prevailing opinion is that this region is the Mount Lebanon (Jabal Lubnan). In fact, in the Old Covenant, the northern border of the Promised Land is never stated to exceed the region of Lebanon.

The eastern border is described as follows: "And your eastern border shall be the Sea of Kinnereth to the Jordan River and the border shall run down to the Salt Sea. This shall be your land as defined by its borders all around" (Numbers, 34/10-12). The Sea of Kinnereth is the Sea of Galilee. Although in the Old Covenant, the eastern border is also referred to as "the great river, the Euphrates River" (Genesis, 15/8; Deuteronomy, 11/24; Joshua, 11/4), Numbers, 34/10-12 specifies that the eastern border set by the Lord Yahweh to Moses includes the region to the east of the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea. Extending the eastern border to the Euphrates River is considered a reasonable measure, but it has never been realized in Jewish history. Even during the heyday of the Israelites under King Solomon, when it is stated that "Solomon ruled over all the kingdoms from the Euphrates River to the land of the Philistines and to the border of Egypt" (1 Kings, 4/21), the eastern border of the kingdom never reached the Euphrates.

In conclusion, the Promised Land was first promised to Prophet Abraham and his descendants (Genesis, 13/14-17). However, the tradition of the Bible later excluded Ishmael and asserted that the promise belonged to the descendants of Isaac (Genesis, 26/2-3), Jacob and his descendants (Genesis, 28/4, 13; 48/4), Joseph (Genesis, 50/24), Moses (Exodus, 3/8, 17; 6/4, 8; 32/13; 33/1; Numbers, 34/1-12; Deuteronomy, 11/24-25), and Joshua (Joshua, 1/2-4). The Promised Land was given to Prophet Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses, as well as their descendants, as an eternal possession and inheritance (Genesis, 17/8; 28/4, 13; 48/4; Exodus, 6/8). However,

this promise is not an unconditional and absolute one, as it is linked to certain conditions, with obedience to God being the foremost requirement (Al-Ma'idah, 5/12). Nevertheless, the Israelites did not submit to God's commandments, they did not fulfill the covenants made, and they even killed the messengers of God and caused mischief (Al-Baqarah, 2/61, 100; An-Nisa, 4/155-156; Al-Ma'idah, 5/13). Furthermore, the Quran asserts that only righteous servants, not specific racial groups, will inherit the "land" and that this divine law applies to all the sacred scriptures (Al-Anbiya, 21/105; cf. Psalms, 37/29; 69/32-36).

On the other hand, the concept of the "Promised Land" in Jewish belief carries the character of a "covenant." A covenant, in its literal sense, refers to a command, advice, oath, and treaty. In the context of beliefs, it emphasizes that people have an obligation to God and that they are responsible for fulfilling this obligation. The Jewish faith posits that adherence to the covenant and upholding one's word will result in divine favor, wherein God will designate them as a "chosen people" and bestow upon them dominion over other nations, thereby enabling them to attain sovereignty over their land. Nevertheless, the Israelites have been known to repeatedly violate their commitments and transgress the covenant, even resorting to constructing a conception of God based on material objects and natural phenomena, rather than embracing the God depicted in their sacred texts. As per the Jewish Holy Scriptures, God has punished them for their transgressions, leading to their expulsion from their ancestral territories. According to the Jewish Holy Scriptures, God later took pity on them, offering a new covenant and a fresh chance by promising to give them the Promised Land as long as they believed. This new covenant states that God will grant them dominance over other nations by giving them the Promised Land. The Quran maintains that a promise was made to Prophet Abraham and Prophet Moses, and that it would be fulfilled by allowing them to reach a blessed land.

The concept of the Promised Land appears to have evolved gradually, with three distinct stages when examining the goals outlined in the Jewish Holy Scriptures and those pursued by Zionists. In the first stage, the focus is on Jerusalem and its surroundings; in the second stage, the area from the Nile to the Euphrates, essentially the broader Middle East, comes into play; and in the third stage, a configuration that would impact the entire world is envisioned. Consequently, in the Sacred texts, Jerusalem is declared the capital of the world.

To achieve the ideal of the Promised Land, political avenues have been explored. Dr. Theodor Herzl is the prominent figure who adopted these methods and elevated it as a political concept. When the Promised Land ideal, significant both in the Holy Scriptures and among Jewish communities, emerged, the majority of the territories specified in the Sacred Books were under Turkish rule. The Turks showed tolerance not only to other minority groups living on their lands but also to Jews. In fact, in Spain, Jews were either forced to convert to Catholicism or subjected to persecution, leading to their expulsion from Spanish territories. However, the Turks intervened against this inhumane treatment by the Spanish. Sultan Bayezid II welcomed the Jews into Turkish lands, allowing them to make a living and sustain their lives within these territories.

On the other hand, after Arabs were separated from the Turks, they fragmented among themselves into "Arab States" instead of forming a unified "Arab State." In this context, external powers have exploited Arab territories for many years by parceling them among themselves. Even in today's world, the formation of an Arab Union is not allowed. One of the most significant reasons for this situation can be traced to the Saddam Hussein era, an approach that opposed the Faisalite ideology, which is perceived by some as an heir to King Faisal and his views. Saddam Hussein was well aware of the goals and power of Zionism, and he even played a role in steering Iraq towards a stance against Zionism. Nevertheless, despite all of this, in the last four decades, through his political policies, he did not consistently pursue a coherent stance, ultimately facilitating the reshaping of Iraq's political landscape.

ISRAELI POLITICAL IDENTITY AND FOREIGN POLICY

Israel, demographically, is a state primarily comprised of Jewish immigrants. According to V.D. Volkan, a synthetic national structure has been adopted (Volkan, 2002: 12). Migration culture dominates the origins of nearly all Jews. This cultural diversity poses a systemic problem in the creation of a homogeneous Jewish identity in Israel. Even though a Jewish identity is embraced, citizens still preserve their primary identities. Jews remain distinct in terms of identity. These different identities include Ashkenazi, Sephardic, Mizrahim (Eastern Jews), and Beta Israel (Falasha). Since Ashkenazi Jews were the first community to migrate to this land and make up the majority, they shape the dominant culture in the country.

The identity crisis in Israel began to emerge systematically from the establishment of state functions. Two main reasons contribute to this identity crisis. The first reason can be attributed to the factor of religion. Incompatibilities over religious factors stem from the cultural differences between European secular Jews and Mizrahi Jews, which hinder the unification of the Jewish society under a common umbrella. The second factor is ethnicity. The problem evolved into an ethnic dimension due to ethnic disputes among Mizrahim, Ashkenazi, Eastern Jews, and Falasha Jews (Ben-Rafael, 2002: 16).

Furthermore, during the early years of the state, Arab minorities, Druze, Circassians, and other ethnic groups within the Jewish community did not embrace the Jewish identity, leading to a systematic issue. When the state gained independence, even the Zionists could not reach a consensus on what to name the country. Three proposals existed for the name of the state: Israel, Judah, and Zion. Each name was seen as a complicating factor in decision-making due to its potential role in shaping the country's identity and citizenship policies. In the first option, if the country were officially named "Judah," all inhabitants (including citizens of other ethnic identities) would be recognized as Jewish. In the second option, with the country's official name as "Zion," the residents would be identified as "Zionists." However, this would essentially expose the "Zionist Movement," and all its activities would be conducted openly. Therefore, the only option left was to name the country Israel (Sand, 2011: 344-345).

Israel's national consciousness has been centered around war, conflict, terrorist acts, genocide, hate speech, and anti-Arab sentiments. According to Israeli officials, Israel has been intentionally isolated both geographically and culturally as part of a Middle Eastern policy, which naturally resulted in becoming vulnerable to external threats and the absence of a developed concept of alliance. Consequently, Israel continuously relies on military power as a means of defense.

Israel's foreign policy stance is a cause for concern for the international community. From the perspective of theorists who support Israel, the country is engaged in a solitary struggle against Arab nations displaying aggressive behavior. Therefore, the main objective of Israel's foreign policy and security policy tools is to find peaceful solutions through negotiations and develop systems for effective defense to secure the country in a region where hostile intentions prevail. Ultimately, Israel's foreign security policy will be determined by its relations with Arab countries and the political crises it faces with Palestine.

The Israeli Government prefers to pursue collaborative and peaceful policies with Palestinians and neighboring Arab countries. This approach is crucial for Israel to preserve its identity in the long term. In this regard, it can be evaluated as the cornerstone of Israeli foreign policy. However, the policies of the Israeli Government, which are based on security and threat principles as their main instruments, are evident in the significant portion of the Israeli budget allocated to military expenses and defense systems. In this sense, it is clear that Israel uses more modern and technological systems in defense and military fields compared to other world states, thanks to the material and moral support it receives from its biggest ally, the United States.

Due to the threat-oriented approaches of Arab states and its geographical isolation, Israel is obliged to develop and enhance its relations and cooperation with states outside the region. When examined in this context, Israel has preferred to strengthen its ties with European Union countries, Asian countries, Canada, Australia, and third-world countries. Through this means, Israel aims to build a global public opinion in its favor. It is observed that Israel is attempting to create a public opinion regarding the Palestinian issue, which is one of its most significant problems. While trying to create public opinion, Israel is not only using media or political tools but also planning to create public awareness by utilizing its economic and bureaucratic advantages.

Therefore, in today's world, where the age of information and communication prevails, it is evident that diplomacy's position is being strengthened and even rebuilt. In this context, Israel is trying to increase its diplomatic means and diplomacy policy in line with the requirements of the era to achieve its goals and objectives. Within this framework, it is clear that Israel will use all diplomatic and bureaucratic means to reach its goals and objectives.

In conclusion, Israel evaluates its relations with the Arab world based on zero-sum games, structured on the basis of realist theory.

METHOD

This article, which aims to reveal the extent to which Israel utilizes digital diplomacy and the factors related to this situation in today's world where social reactions to digital diplomacy are responded to in digital environments, and which describes Israel's state policy inspired by Christianity and based on a terrorism strategy to implement digital diplomacy, is conducted in the form of a case study.

MODEL OF THE RESEARCH

In many Muslim countries in the Middle East, conflicts that have been ongoing for many years have resulted in internal wars, causing millions of people to die, become disabled, or flee their countries. Among all the countries affected by these conflicts, Israel is the only one that has not suffered, but rather has strengthened. This study, which aims to determine Israel's ideological attitudes and behaviors aimed at dividing Middle Eastern nations, especially as an outcome of the conflicts that have occurred for many years in the Middle East, employs a survey model. The survey model is a type of case study that aims to reveal the current situation in all its clarity. In general, a "case study" is an approach preferred when the questions of how and why arise, and when the researcher has very little control over the events. Case studies are used when investigating a current phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between

the phenomenon and its environment are not clearly defined, and when multiple sources of evidence or data are available (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2003: 190).

FINDINGS AND COMMENTS

It is evident that Israel has not abandoned its religious and ideological policies aimed at the peoples of the Middle East since its establishment. The continuous encouragement of these policies by the Western world, particularly the United States, has made Israel a dominant force in world politics. Israel ranks among the countries that use digital diplomacy most effectively through computer and internet technologies to pursue its philosophy of statehood and national interests. The disgraceful incident of Israel's treatment of our ambassador and the attack on the Mavi Marmara incident, which were aimed at denigrating our state and nation in the political arena, are still vivid in the conscience of the world public opinion.

CONCLUSION

In Israel, the religious structure is not only used as an authority tool but is also considered a component of identity. In addition to all these factors, it is regarded as the source of a value system. The dominance of a monopolistic policy over the interpretation and implementation of religion for the Orthodox sector, while the status quo mentality still prevails, has transformed the State of Israel into not a secular state as the Zionists hoped but rather a religious state.

On the other hand, the societal crises in Israel, which have persisted to the present day, have not only negatively affected Israeli domestic politics but have also been received unfavorably by neighboring countries and even other world powers. In this context, the underlying factors of societal crises have been individually investigated. Particularly in recent years, with the significant development in technology, Israeli diplomatic relations have been examined, and Israel's position in digital diplomacy has been determined.

The concept of Arz-ı Mevud is seen as a foreign policy tool determined by the State of Israel, but in fact, it is a matter with ties rooted in religious foundations. In this context, when considered, it holds a power aspect for Israel but, on the other hand, its diplomatic position has been discussed by determining its place in the evolving world in terms of diplomatic significance. In this regard, Israel has focused its foreign policies on issues that have historically existed in its politics with the aim of strengthening its position in the changing new world order and evolving technological conditions.

In our era, as information is used to create an information society, there is a need for a pure, clean, and reliable digital diplomacy to avoid confusing people's minds. States are now trying to establish superiority over each other through digital diplomacy, even attempting to disrupt societal balances with a tweet from their leaders. Israel is among the most active and effective countries in using digital diplomacy. Following the Mavi Marmara raid on May 31, 2010, which resulted in the deaths of nine Turks, Israel tried to justify itself in front of the international public opinion, and to get rid of negative and incorrect perceptions, it moved its diplomatic relations to the virtual environment and tried to make its presence flawless and visible through digital diplomacy. Again, the audacious threat of an operation against our country by Israel on October 8, 2019, is an example of digital diplomacy, an effort to create world public opinion.

-In the digital age, where information and communication technologies are rapidly advancing, the present world, especially in the field of foreign policy, should stay away from diplomatic discourse and messages that include religious and dogmatic goals, which may endanger peace.

-Digital diplomacy should not be used to create strategies for occupying the territories of other countries.

-The United Nations and the World Peace Organization should help Israel break free from its fantasy based on the Arz-ı Mevut belief, and if necessary, impose sanctions on Israel.

-High-level officials of the state and bureaucracy should establish communication through digital diplomacy without interfering with the internal and external affairs of other countries, while also building perceptions of their people and respecting their freedoms.

-In today's world, where digital diplomacy is increasingly rendering the classical diplomacy concept ineffective, applied digital diplomacy courses should be included in international relations programs at universities.

-To compete with Israel, one of the pioneers of the 'Digital diplomacy' movement, which emerged with the use of social media tools in foreign policy relations, Turkey must develop an advanced digital diplomacy system that safeguards its national interests.

-In the realm of digital diplomacy, countries should collaborate and support each other to make their accurate and reliable messages more effective through mass media.

-Steps should be taken to prevent Israel from using its Arz-ı Mevud policy as a weapon in its own interests and to prevent it from using this situation as a means of power and pressure in the field of digital diplomacy.

REFERENCES

Abdi Atik (Tanab). *Tekvin, XIX*, 118-21.

Abdi Atik. *Çıkış, XLII,* 6.

Abdülhamid'in Hatıra Defteri. (Ed. İsmet Bozdağ). *İstanbul,* 71.

Ancien Testament (Traduction Oecumenique de la Bible). Paris, 326.

BEN-RAFAEL, Eliezer. (2001). *Jewish Identities: Fifty Intellectuals Answer Ben Gurion.* Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 59.

BEN-RAFAEL, Eliezer. (2002). "Samoidentifikatsiya Razlıçnıh Sotsialnıh Grupp V Sovremennom _zrailskom Ob_estve". In A. Epstein, A. Federchenko (Eds.), *Ob_estvo i Politika Sovremennnogo _srailya. Moskva-Erusalim: Evreiskiy Universitet v Erusalime*, "Mostı kulturı" – Otkrıtıi Universitet _zrailya, 16-18.

Bustanay Oded. Canaan, Land of. In *EJd., V,* 99-100.

Chadwick, A. (2001). The electronic face of government in the internet age: borrowing from Murray Edelman. *Information, Communication & Society, 4*(3), 435-457. doi: 10.1080/13691180110069482

Cheney, G. (1983a). On the various and changing meanings of organizational membership: A field study of organizational identification. *Communication Monographs, 50,* 343-363.

Cheney, G. (1983b). The rhetoric of identification and the study of organizational communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 69*(2), 143-159.

Cheney, G., & Christensen, L. (2001). Organizational identities: Lingaes between internal and external communication. In F. Jablin, & L. Putnam (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication: Advances in Theory, Research and Method* (pp. 231-269). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Cheney, G., & McMillian, J. (1990). Organizational rhetoric the practice of criticism. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 18*(2), 93-115.

David, Ben Gourion. *La Palestine*, 19-20.

Dillard, W. (2001). *Digital diplomacy: U.S. foreign policy in the information age.* West Port: Praeger.

Donnelly, J. (2000). *Realism and International Relations.* Cambridge: Oxford University Press.

Entman, R. (2008). Theorizing mediate public diplomacy: The U.S. case. *Pres/Politics, 13,* 87-102. doi: 10.1177/1940161208314657

Gerber, M. (2008). On the consideration of 'public diplomacy' as a rhetorical genre. *Contemporary Argumentation & Debate, 29,* 118-133.

Gilboa, E. (2002). Real-time diplomacy: Myth and reality. In E. Potter (Ed.), *Cyber-Diplomacy* (pp. 83-109). Quebec: McGill-Queens University Press.

Goodnight, G. (1998). *Public argument and the study of foreign policy.* Retrieved February 12, 2010, from American Diplomacy: http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/AD_Issues/amdipl_8/goodnight.html.

Herzl'in Faaliyetleri Hk. Bkz. Prof. Dr. Hikmet Tanyu. (2011). *Tarih Boyunca Yahudiler ve Türkler, İstanbul, 976,11*/364-410.

Holliday, S. (2010). Khatami's Islamist-Iranian discourse of national identity: A discourse of resistance. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, 37*(1), 1-13. doi: 10.1080/13530191003661088

Krebs, R., & Jackson, P. (2007). Twisting tongues and twisting arms: The power of political rhetoric. *European Journal of International Relations, 13*(1), 35-66. doi: 10.1177/1354066107074284

Kunczik, M. (2009). Transnational public relations by foreign governments. In K. Sriramesh, & D. Vercic (Eds.), *The Global Public Relations Handbook* (pp. 769-794). New York: Rutledge.

Kur'an, *A'rif. VII,* 136-141; *XVI; XI,* 128-141; *V/* 21-26; *XX* 1116; *XXVIII*/5-6.

Kurtubi. *Tefsir, VI,* 12:i.

Louis lsaac Rabinowiz. *«İsrael», IX,* 106.

Louis lsaac Rabinowiz. *"İsrael, Land of", IX,* 108-123.

Marmura, S. (2008). *Hegemony in the digital age.* Lanham: Lexington Books.

Meisenbach, R., & McMillian, J. (2006). Blurring the boundaries: Historical developments and future directions in organizational rhetoric. *Communication Yearbook*, 99-141.

Mitchell, G. (2009). Rhetoric and international relations: More than cheap talk. In A. Lunsford, K. Wilson, & R. Eberly (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Rhetorical Studies* (pp. 247-263). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Motion, J., & Leitch, S. (2009). The transformational potential of public diplomacy discourse. *Organizational Studies, 30*(10), 1045-1061. doi: 10.1177/0170840609337640.

MUMINOV, N. (2014). İSRAİL'DE DEMOKRASİ VE KİMLİK KRİZİ. *Journal of International Social Research, 7*(34).

Nasr, Mohammed. (2012). *The Role of Industrial Sector in Palestinian Economic Development.* Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute. http://www.mas.ps/2012/sites/default/files/Industry.pdf (Accessed: 08.03.2020).

Nye, J. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics.* New York: Public Affairs.

Ordeix-Rigo, E., & Duarte, J. (2009). From public diplomacy to corporate diplomacy: Increasing corporation's legitimacy and influence. *American Behavioral Scientist, 53*(4), 549-564.

Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS). (2012). The Press Report of the Economic Forecasting 2012. *Ramallah, Palestine.*

Potter, E. (Ed.). (2002). *Cyber-diplomacy: Managing foreign policy in the twenty-first century.* Quebec: McGill-Queens University Press.

Sabri, Nidal Rashid. (2020). Financing the Palestinian Agricultural Economy. *Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute.* http://www.mas.ps/2012/sites/default/files/summary%20english.pdf (Accessed: 08.03.2020).

SAND, _lomo. (2011). Yahudi Halkı Nasıl _cad Edildi?. *Çeviren: I_ık Ergüden, stanbul: Do_an Kitap*, 344-345.

Shaefer, T., & Shenhav, S. (2009). Mediated public diplomacy in a new era of warfare. *Communication Review, 12(*3), 272-283. doi: 10.1080/10714420903124192.

Sheafer, T., & Gabay, I. (2009). Mediated public diplomacy: A strategic contest over international agenda building and frame building. *Political Communication, 26*(4), 447-467. doi:

10.1080/10584600903297240

Taberi. *Tefsir, XVII,* 80-81.

Tanah، *Yeremya. XXXI*/31.

Taylor, B. (2010). A hedge against the future: The post-cold war rhetoric of nuclear weapons modernization. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 96*(1), 1-24. doi: 10.1080/00335630903512721

Taylor, M. (2008). *Toward a relational theory of public diplomacy.* Conference Papers- National Communication Association. Retrieved from Communication and Mass Media Complete database.

VOLKAN, Vamik D. (1999). *Kanba_ı: Etnik Gururdan Etnik Teröre. Çeviren: Süreyya Evren, _stanbul: Ba_lam Yayınları,* 37-38.

VOLKAN, Vamik D. (2002). *Large-Group Identity: Border Psychology and Related Societal Processes.* German Psychoanalytic Association Annual Meeting, Leipzig, Almanya, 2-12.

VOLKAN, Vamik D. (2005). *Körü Körüne nanç: Kriz Ve Terör Dönemlerinde Geni Gruplar Ve Liderleri.* Çeviren: Özgür Karaçam, _stanbul: Okuyan Us Yayınları, 43-45.

Wiley, S. (2004). Rethinking nationality in the context of globalization. *Communication Theory, 14*(1), 78-96. Retrieved from Communication & Mass Media Complete database.

Yaşar Kutluay. (1973). *Siyonizm ve Türkiye, Ankara.,* 108-109.