



The Hebrew Concept of 'Arukah' in Nehemiah 4:7 in The Contexts of Community Security and Community Policing Operations.

Prof. Matthew Michael

Professor of Biblical Studies and,
A Research Fellow,
Stellenbosch University, South Africa,
Deputy Dean, Faculty of Arts,
Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies
Nasarawa State University Keffi (NSUK), Nigeria
Contact: +2347034289006 | mathewmichael@nsuk.edu.ng

Ajibade David Adebayo

Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies
Nasarawa State University, Keffi, (NSUK) Nigeria
Contact: +2348035852201 | ajibadeanoointed@gmail.com

Abstract

Studies in Nehemiah have engaged the book from the perspectives of history, ethics, gender, leadership and so on. However, the significance of the security architecture and its semantic importance of 'arukah' have not been engaged. Precisely, Nehemiah 4 narrative contains community security architectures which can be of use to human society. 'Arukah' (אַרוּכָה) is a derivative of arak, the Hebrew word used in Nehemiah 4:7 to denote 'repair' in the context of community defence against bandits. This paper explores, by means of expository narratology, the lexicography of "arukah" in Ancient Near East (ANE), in Nehemiah narrative, finds its nexus with contemporary community policing operations and argues 'arukah' to be the proactive security measure that drove community safety. The findings proved that, proactiveness is key not reactionary approach. It concludes that community policing is effective if its approach is preventive. The research recommends upgrade of Nigerian policing method from reactionary to proactive form.

Keywords: Nehemiah, *Arukah*, Security Architecture, Society, Community Policing.

Introduction

Studies in Nehemiah have engaged the book from the perspectives of history, ethics, gender, leadership and so on. However, the significance of the security architecture and its semantic importance of 'arukah' have not been engaged. Precisely, Nehemiah 4 narrative, among many Old Testament narratives contains community security architectures which can be of help to modern society in tackling insecurity that is caused by acts of terrorism and banditry in local communities.



Generally, insecurity has become a global challenge. Further still, people, communities, states and nations are becoming vulnerable to attacks on all fronts. Clearly, Nehemiah 4 narrative is situated within a context of social antagonism, verbal onslaughts, community vulnerability and insecurity, persistent ridicule and continued attempted physical brutality, threats and hostility. Specifically, “Nehemiah narrative demonstrates heroism, emphasises partnership, and inspires confidence *in the heat of hostility*” (Brown 1). Hence, the narrative described how the people of Judah in Persian-Jerusalem remained in distress, reproach, defenseless, its community insecure and vulnerable to enemies’ attacks because its walls were broken down and its gates were burnt with fire (Neh. 1:3).

The situation remained precarious, at the least, the possibility of the Jews destruction by those opposed to their return was real indeed” (Wagner 1-3).

From biblical standpoint, concerns for the welfare of the remnants in the Jewish community pushed Nehemiah to the action of rebuilding or repairing (*arukah*) the broken walls. Though scholars are divided as to what the main mission of Nehemiah was when he appeared before the king to obtain order to come to Judah community from Shushan. Further investigations in this context reveals that out of many studies, one stood out and asserted that, “defense and fortification of his people and the holy city was a priority in His heart. (Menon *et al*139). Menon *et al* context and position are in tandem with the spirit of this paper on defence and fortification of Jewish community.

Arukah indicates community attempt to repair the walls in order to secure the entire Jewish community and proactively prevent proposed coordinated terror onslaught from their hostile neighbours. Therefore, within this defense-mission discourses, Nehemiah mission of “*arukah*” became significant and community policing motifs in Nehemiah 4 became visible for reengagement. Thus, by means of expository narratology and readers friendly approaches, this study examines the lexicography of “*arukah*” in ANE, in Nehemiah, finds its contemporary relevance to community policing operations. Although, according to Masoretic text, the Hebrew word “*Arukah* (אַרוּכָה)” occurred in Nehemiah 4:1 but 4:7 in all English Versions. Meanwhile, for readers’ friendly reason this paper adopts English Version where the Hebrew word *Arukah* (אַרוּכָה)- is rendered in verse Nehemiah 4:7 as ‘repair’. Thus, the paper’s recommendation is centered on methodological overhauling in community policing and its conclusion connects the dots from ‘*arukah*’ on proactiveness to effective community policing.

Lexicography of ‘*Arukah*’ in ANE

Arukah (אַרוּכָה) is a feminine noun meaning the healing of a wound, restoration and repair. (Zodhiates, Baker, Kletzing 1809). This is a Hebrew word from the root word *rk* hose meanings basically captured healing, restoration, or soundness. ‘*Arukah*’ also connotes, ‘to restore to soundness’ or “to mend,”. *Arukah* suggested strongly restoration, health and perfection. Essentially, it implies a comprehensive, profound recovery that makes something or someone whole again. It is found in contexts of repairing, such as in Nehemiah 4:7 and 2 Chronicles 24:13 (referring to restoring walls or building repairs), and spiritual or physical healing, such as in Jeremiah 30:17 and 33:6. The word has Arabic cognates with the same meaning - healing and repairs. It connotes ‘properly the new flesh that grows at the wounded spot’ (BDB, Electronic).



The term אָרוּקָה (*’ărûkâ*) denotes the process or state of healing, restoration, or mending — whether of a body, a structure, or an entire community. The term evokes the picture of a wound knit together or a breach closed, emphasizing not merely relief but full wholeness, complete and durable recovery. Contextually, *arukah* connotes civic defence as a form of healing in Nehemiah. But broadly speaking, throughout the Bible, *arukah* has been used to mean healing in form of human body or physical structures (2Chron. 24:13, Nehemiah 4:7, Isaiah 58:8, Jer. 33:16). Again, in English sense the gerund - אָרוּקָה (*’ărûkâ*) was used two times only in the entire Old Testament; first in 2Chronicles 24:13 and the last one occurred in Nehemiah 4:7(Eng.) to denote repairs made to physical structures while more occurrences of the same existed in Old Testament to denote healing made to human body. Predominantly and in the context of physical structures, ‘*arukah*’ meant repairs made to existing buildings to fortify it to prevent enemies’ invasion.

Semitic Analysis of *Arukah*

Arukah as used in Nehemiah painted a security picture of repairs done to broken walls, to revive it and make it serve the purpose of preventing invaders into the community. There are cognates of the word *arukah* in Hebrew text such as ‘*badaq*’ (to mend, restore), ‘*chazaq*’ (to repair, to strengthen), ‘*azab*’ (to restore, repair), ‘*banah*’ (to build, make, repair) and ‘*chut*’ meant specifically to repair foundations. Besides, the dominant meaning of *arukah* (אָרוּקָה) in ANE, the feminine noun meant the healing of a wound, meanwhile, the intuitive meaning is healing caused by the fleshly covering of a physical wound (Zodhiates, Baker, Kletzing 1809). Though not exactly like *rapha* (אָרָפָה) which most scholars agreed to as healing or make healthier (Holladay 344), an act of healing which God typically performs. Therefore, *arukah* in medical context basically suggested a “new flesh in a healing wound”, “the new flesh that grows at the wounded spot” (Holladay 27).

The Hebrew ‘*arukah*’ medically implied transformation of vulnerability of a body and reduction of risk of infectious attack. Thus, ‘*arukah*’ has medical relevance which connotes a key medical procedure that grafts a new flesh into a bad wound in order to achieve healing. Interestingly, medical procedure that made new flesh to grow on a wounded spot existed. It is called skin or wound graft. According to online medical encyclopedia, a skin graft is a piece of healthy skin removed from one area of your body to repair (*arukah*) damaged or missing skin somewhere else on your body. This skin does not have its own source of blood flow.

Therefore, Aleman Paredes claimed that, loss of skin integrity due to infection, burns, or trauma leads to substantial morbidity and mortality, with burns alone causing around 180,000 deaths globally each year. Medically, wound coverage is crucial to minimize fluid loss, prevent infection, and alleviate pain. Skin grafting is vital in restoring tissue continuity for patients with burns, trauma, or chronic wounds. Key outcomes include graft survival, mechanical function, sensory restoration, cosmetic appearance, and overall patient satisfaction (54277). Also, skin grafting has evolved to treat surgical defects and chronic wounds, including venous and diabetic ulcers that fail to heal over several months. By covering wounds, grafting reduces infection risk and creates a moist, vascularized environment conducive to healing (Adams and Ramsey 1055-67). And key principles in skin grafting include thorough debridement of nonviable tissue and adequate coverage of exposed areas (Borda, Cushman & Chu 53652). Various graft types and techniques are available, primarily autografts, allografts, and xenografts. Autografts are harvested from the patient, allografts come from cadaveric donors, and xenografts are derived from animal tissue-



(Aleman 54277). The overall medical importance of ‘*arukah*’ is that of covering and restoration of the affected or damaged skin part to prevent infection and guarantees the whole-body safety.

***Arukah* in Nehemiah Narrative**

Arukah is a strategy employed to proactively repair the walls of Persian-Jerusalem as first line of defense for Jewish community against enemies’ invasion as recorded in Nehemiah 4:7. It says - “Now when Sanballat, Tobiah, the Arabs, the Ammonites and the Ashdodites heard that the repair of the walls of Jerusalem went on, and that the breaches began to be closed, they were very angry” (NASB). According to the verse, the Hebrew word for ‘repair’ was *arukah* (אָרוּכָה) (Holladay 27).

In fact, majority of Bible translators have *arukah* (אָרוּכָה) as ‘repair’; very few used ‘restore’ in its stead. Progressively, this term refers to the community efforts of fixing the gaps and broken sections of Jerusalem's walls in order to fortify the city against invasion of bandits and other local enemies.

Grammatically, *arukah* is a derivative of ‘*rk*’, the Hebrew word used to denote ‘repair’ in the context of community defense against bandits according to the text of Nehemiah 4:7. *Arukah* connotes community security efforts that is centered on repairing physical walls of the community in order to proactively deter enemies’ invasion into the community and forestall any possible bandit’s attack. True to this claim, the unrepaired walls, the rubbles in the community of Judah actually exposed the dwellers to dangers and guaranteed the enemy unlimited access to attack the community. So, when Nehemiah came to the community to repair it so as to block the possible medium of terror attacks and other forms of criminality in the community, the enemy became furious. In response, to enemies’ anger and aggression, Nehemiah simultaneously weaponized the people and continue to repair the walls. This is necessary because, the enemies were not ghosts, the Jewish community knew them and their arrowhead being Sanballat, their locations and their activities can be predicted.

Conversely from Nehemiah 4 narrative, Sanballat and Tobiah were prominent figures opposing Nehemiah's efforts to repair and rebuild Jerusalem's broken walls. Sanballat was the governor of Samaria, and Tobiah was an Ammonite official. Their opposition represents the broader resistance from surrounding regions to the restoration of Jerusalem, highlighting the political and social tensions of the time. This opposition can be seen as a reflection of the enmity between the Israelites and their neighbors, which is a recurring theme throughout the Old Testament. The Arabs, Ammonites, and Ashdodites’ groups represented the various peoples surrounding Judah. One of the enemies of Judah, the Arabs stood out. The Arabs connotes “ambush” and by this meaning, Judah community already aware of the kind of warfare that could befall them. (Zodhiates, Baker & Kletzing 1808). The Jewish community had understanding that guerrilla warfare could result. The Ammonites were descendants of Lot and traditional enemies of Israel, and the Ashdodites were Philistines from the coastal city of Ashdod. This coalition of adversaries underscores the widespread opposition to the Jewish community's efforts to reestablish and defend itself. Historically, these groups had vested interests in keeping Jerusalem weak and vulnerable.



Thus, the *arukah* made to Jerusalem's walls was a significant security undertaking, symbolizing community efforts to transform community vulnerability and secure restoration of the Jewish community to their covenant God. The progress of the *arukah* was a threat to the surrounding nations, as fortified Jerusalem would be a political and military power. Closing the gaps in the walls was crucial for the security and defense of Persian-Jerusalem that time. Literary investigation of the Hebrew text of Nehemiah 4:7 revealed the 'others' that *shama* (heard) the *arukah* (repairs) of Jerusalem's broken walls and were known in the community by their names, locations, identity and above all to have had evil intentions. According to the text, Sanballat was introduced first, and that characterization suggested, among others that he was the arrowhead, a person and not in any form close to a ghost. This characterization proved that where insecurity festers, political figures' fingers are in it. Thus, the community of Jews had knowledge of who the enemy was. Troublers of communities such as bandit and terrorists are not ghost, they have identity and locations. Sanballat was a Babylonian name meaning "Sin": (the moon god has given life). Tobiah means YHWH is good. (Brown 60). According to Neh. 4:1, only Sanballat was associated with heard.

The fact remained that, in vs 7, many heads of surrounding local communities have heard. How did the news spread? Did Sanballat have informants among the dwellers of Jewish community? What did they hear (*shama*)? Thus, the text read "...that the repairs (*arukah*) to the walls... progressed and gaps began to closed up..." captured what they *shama*. Meanwhile, what progressed that is, '*aletah*' in Hebrew was the *arukah* being made to the walls of Persian-Jerusalem so that the community can be made safe and that what could serve as an avenue for bandit's attack to be taken care of. Therefore, the progress of the '*arukah*' was the primary informants in the camp of Sanballat for it '*aletah*' vividly.

On a literal plane, the meaning of *arukah* implies a vulnerable condition of a person, physical structures or community. Since, it is logical to assert that an ailing person is vulnerable. So, the post-exilic community of Judah in Persian-Jerusalem was clearly vulnerable to enemies' attacks going by the metaphoric connotation of the word *arukah*. Therefore, the author's intention in Nehemiah 4:7 was to reveal literarily that Jewish community was in a vulnerable condition. Therefore, the *arukah* done to ameliorate the community vulnerability formed the news which the Sanballat's camp *shama*. Thus, the first set of hearings of Sanballat of this development was light in Neh. 2:10, 19, but 4:1(MT.) and 4:7(Eng.) critical and it could be paraphrased as "...when Sanballat and his cohorts heard *again* that the repairs (*arukah*) to the wall generally progressed...", they became hot with anger, aggression and plotted violence-*charah*. Syntactically, the relative clause object compliment of the repair (*arukah*)being the walls -*chomoth* of Persian-Jerusalem experienced progression (*aletah*), as a result, the community was thrown into panic because of the reactions of Sanballat and his cohorts.

Another thing that was heard (*shama*) was that 'the breaks and gaps in the wall began to close up'. For Holladay, the gaps (*parats*) meant, "breaches, tears and breaks in the wall" (Holladay 298). So, the author intended to relate that- breaks and gaps existed in the wall of Jerusalem, these breaks and gaps in the wall represented community security concerns and made its vulnerability to foreign invasion well pronounced. Therefore, the *parats* essentially made the community to be vulnerable to attack from the enemy. The long-abandoned breaks also suggest, lack of care and formed



insecurity for the community dwellers because, a wall is a representation of some form of defense for the community.

Interestingly, *arukah* which means ‘repair’ and *parats* which is gaps and breaks established convincingly that as at that time, Jerusalem was both defenseless and vulnerable to attacks. So, community vulnerability was the problem which Nehemiah community security approach proactively utilized community effort of repair to solve. Unfortunately, the enemy of the Jewish people were willing to utilize this window of vulnerability to unleash mayhem on the community.

The implication is that if the walls were left unrepaired, the community would have remained defenseless and terror upon the community would be a possibility. So, Nehemiah security strategy of *arukah* nipped this in the bud. And from the perspective of effectiveness, Nehemiah security strategy of *arukah* could be advanced as one of the community policing approaches that could help in solving security problems at the community level (Michael & Adebayo 17-18).

Significance of “Arukah” in Community Security

The uniqueness of *arukah* as is used in Nehemiah 4:7 was to convey the security significance which the walls of Persian-Jerusalem portrayed. In the ancient world, a wall represented first line of defense for the immediate community. Therefore, a break to the wall of a community is the break to its first line of defense. In the Ancient Near East (ANE), when a community wall is broken-down and is left unrepaired for a long time, it showed no one cares and bandit activities could fester. Historically speaking, during the era of Nehemiah (mid-5th century B.C.), Jerusalem was in a state of vulnerability due to its broken walls, making it highly susceptible to raids from bandits, local adversaries, and neighboring provinces. The lack of fortified defenses meant that travelers and the inhabitants of the city were not secure, as bandits often operated in these less-policed areas (Biblehub.com). The bandits in Nehemiah's time were a mixture of opportunistic criminals and state-sponsored marauders, such as those under Sanballat and Tobiah, who sought to maintain the weakness of Jerusalem to sustain their own power.

So, Nehemiah became proactive about Jewish community safety and initiated the *arukah* of the walls. Then moved on to arm the workers, stating that those rebuilding the wall carried weapons, with some holding spears, shields, bows, and armor, while others worked with one hand and held a weapon in the other. And finally established a watch (community guard and security system), with armed guards patrolling day and night to defend Nehemiah community against potential surprise attacks from the bandits and surrounding enemies.

Contemporary Relevance of “Arukah” to Community Policing.

Admittedly, research has shown that the term community policing is a difficult task. For Trojanowicz, the father of community policing provides the most common definition that has come to be identified as the ‘nine Ps’ of community policing. He notes that ‘Community policing is a philosophy of full-service personalized policing, where the same officer patrols and works in the same area on a permanent basis, from a decentralized place, working in a proactive partnership with citizens to identify and solve problems (2–3, 278-281). The ultimate goal here is to solve problems of insecurity caused by various forms of acts of terrorism, banditry, violence and aggressions in the community through prompt proactive security measures. For instance,



community policing has emerged as one of the main strategies to enhance the safety and security of human life and property. Community policing concept focuses on preventive measures needed to make a community and its dwellers live in peace of mind and safety. By default, where there are delapidated buildings in the community that are left unrepaired; and vast forest or bushy areas unengaged, it showed no one cares and crimes, terrorism and criminal activities can engage these windows to fester and unleash terrors on the closest human community.

Effective community policing has one key tenet that connects the Hebrew concept of *arukah* which is proactive security undertakings. However, effective community policing operations is different from traditional form of policing. Community policing operations concentrate on prevention of terror and crimes which makes its operation proactive, unlike traditional form of policing which is reactionary. Traditional form of policing specializes in investigating crimes and terror attacks after they have occurred. In Nigeria, and some other African countries facing the challenges of insecurity that is caused by acts of banditry and terrorism, traditional methods of policing as security approaches have not helped. Specifically, the unfortunate thing in Nigeria situation is that, traditional system of policing had reduced police function in the context of crime prevention to reactionary role rather than proactive roles. The twenty-first century scholarship discussions on method of crime prevention have centered on proactive rather than traditional or reactionary approach. Scholarships around police studies have advanced in the aspect of transition from traditional method to modern democratic method. M. H. Moore argued that the predominant model, which stresses strictly professional law enforcement, has proven ineffective in crime prevention and control, neglected the professionalization of policing, and perpetuated a detrimental disconnect between police forces and the communities, they serve, (99-158).

On community safety discourses, traditional method of policing has not yielded the fruits of crime prevention as it were in Nigeria. The reason is because, “the current form of policing in Nigeria operates majorly traditional style, reactionary in response and would wait for order from ‘above’ before security decisions can be taken in the local communities” (Michael & Adebayo 16).

Meanwhile, crime prevention is one key component that distinguishes functioning community policing system as proactive over traditional reactionary approach. Arguably, if the police devote a significant proportion of their time and energies to the prevention of crime, they will have less crime to investigate. Here prevention method is far preferred to investigative method. The former proactively saves lives, the later does not redeem lives lost in most cases

Precisely, functioning community policing is a shift from traditional or reactionary policing to proactive policing. This is to say that community policing in its truest form is different from traditional system of policing (Kpae & Adishi 47-53). According to the research, these scholars in police studies affirmed descriptively that community policing is a concept that is fast gaining ground in Nigeria especially among the police; though in project status. Its model emphasizes proactive rather than reactive policing. It is also principled on partnership and decentralization of powers for effective crime fighting.

Therefore, this paper underscores that, centralised form of security approach is too weak to win war against insurgency that is caused by banditry and terrorism. Centralised command structures



weaken proactive approach to policing but favours terrorists' operations in Nigerian local communities. In Nigeria context, the security operatives wait for signals from the central (Abuja) before security action can be taken in the community. This model is traditional, reactionary rather democratic model which is proactive in security decision making. In effect, the world has moved away from this. Okeke contested that, even US has a fully decentralized police system. It has the federal police called the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the state police called the state troopers, the local government police called the county sheriffs, and then the city, town and village police formations (22-24). How can Nigerian win the war against terrorists with central command structure? No way in it, because a country of the size of Nigeria cannot be realistically policed from Abuja.

Therefore, community policing model that will be effective in Nigeria to curb insecurity must be the one that accommodates decentralization of command structure, power, authority and control. Decentralization of command structure will translate proactive templates into profitable security actions within the community with multiple social blessedness. This is an antithesis to the doctrine of traditional form of policing. Community policing model that will defeat insecurity must not wait for signal from Abuja before terrorist hideout can be bombed, their operations stopped and opening of fire for them to safe the community must be achieved. Based on critical interrogation in the academic community, the media and the informed public, there is a general consensus that what is needed is "paradigm shift from the traditional policing of receiving orders from above to that of making decisions as situations arise in the community" (Kpae and Adishi 47).

Thus, the pain of traditional policing approach is enumerated by several studies which include 'fruitless' investigations, and above all, loss of lives and properties. Therefore, it is not out of place to assert that insecurity in Nigeria is strengthened by this traditional method. Insecurity is prevalent in Nigeria because, the communities are defenseless, vulnerable to enemies' attack and there is no proactive community policing structure to tackle it headlong. It is therefore worrisome, for instance in Nigeria of today, as cases of killings and kidnaping for ransom have surged across the country to the extent that nowhere is considered safe. Insecurity has so much taken root to the point that the terrorists would notify a community of planned attack, and the attack would be carried out as planned in the target community with little or no security effort to forestall it. Bandits would come to kill in the target community without security intervention in the sense that police and Army most times surface after the mayhem had been perpetrated. Central security operatives like police lodged several complaints for their inability to prevent terrorists coordinated attacks in Nigerian communities. The complaints include bad road network in those communities, bombs planting on the bad but main terrains which security operatives would follow, distance from the center station to the community distress point, lack of mobility and appropriate weapon to confront the terrorists.

Above all, 'order from above' to attack the terrorists proactively is not always predictable. So even if the security forces can overpower the terrorist and save the situation, they are arm-stringed by the Nigerian centralized security command structure that renders security forces incapacitated to take appropriate preventive actions as at when due. Albeit, all these would have been taken care of, if there exist proactive community security structures on ground which community members can trust.



Precisely, preventive security approach embedded in *arukah* and effective community policing is the way to secure the people and their communities. Therefore, until Nigeria, as a country in particular transit from this traditional method to proactive method of community policing, bandits, terrorists and insurgency will fester with no end in view. The police must be ready to devote a significant proportion of their time and resources to the prevention of crime, so that they will have less need to investigate crime, for there will be less crime committed.

The foregoing presumes what Nigeria needs to do to win the war against insurgency as it ought to be. The reason is that, functioning community policing operations in the light of proactive security actions is in tandem with Nehemiah concept of “*arukah*” that repaired, fortified the community and prevented planned coordinated attacks on Jewish community. Nehemiah did not wait until terror occurred, like in Nigeria cases, before he put in place strategies to deter and prevent the attacks. The community members were weaponized and recruited into community guards with relevant weapons of the time. And the security strategy deterred the planned attack on the Jewish community. Thus, the converging point between functioning community policing operations today and Hebrew concept of *arukah* in the context of community security approach then reveals security proactiveness.

Another area of convergence is that functioning community policing operations are built around Broken Window Theory (BWT). Literarily, it is not out of point to assert that BWT was built on Hebrew concept of *arukah* that had been practiced by Nehemiah as far back as the 5th Century BC. J.Q Wilson and George Kelling only discovered what had been in existence in the Bible around 1980s. Thus, the center of both Hebrew concept of *arukah* and BWT is repair in the context of community policing. When small or big damage is noticed in the neighbourhood that can increase crime in the community is quickly attended to, crime rate will be checkmated and it will indicate in the community that someone cares. This ‘care’ attitude alone can deter crime, criminals and criminal activities by bandits and the likes in the same community. The care attitude always by default, provide safeguards, promote defense and advance preventive security measures that are achievable, measurable and reliable for the citizens of the country or community. No effective community policing is less in this regard.

Conclusion

The Hebrew concept of *arukah* in the context of community security embodied proactive security measures to prevent terror attack. Preventive security culture is the heartbeat of effective community policing. This paper concludes that, centralised form of security approach is too weak to win war against insurgency that is caused by banditry and terrorism. Centralised command structures weakens proactive approach to policing but favours terrorists’ operations in Nigerian local communities. However, effective community policing can win war against insurgency at the local communities’ levels if the system accommodates decentralization of command structure and imbibe the culture of care and concerns to repair security target that is damaged in the community.

So far, *arukah* concept is hinged on repairing broken walls in order to proactively prevent further attacks on the affected community. The act of proactiveness has a common ground with the operations of modern-day functioning community policing and its theory-Broken Window Theory among others. This establishes the fact that, proactiveness is at the center of both the concept of



Hebrew ‘*arukah*’ and the operation of community policing operations anywhere in the world. Since, proactiveness is the driver of both the Hebrew concept of *arukah* and modern-day community policing operatives, putting preventive measures in place to deter attacks is highly recommended in community security approach.

Recommendations

- i. Traditional method of policing should be replaced with proactive method of community policing.
- ii. Nigeria security should be expunged from the presidency exclusive list.
- iii. Weaponizing indigenous community guard to defend themselves should be seriously considered.
- iv. Community indigenous guards should not take order from the central.
- v. Community collaboration with the police must be the one that secures the community.

References

- Aleman Paredes K, *et al.* “Comparative Analysis of the Outcomes of Various Graft Types in Burn Reconstruction Over the Past 24 Years: A Systematic Review” in *Cureus*. 2024 Feb;16(2), 2024. Also available at (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK564382/>).
- Adams, DC and Ramsey ML. “Grafts in Dermatologic Surgery: Review and Update on Full- and Split-thickness Skin Grafts, Free Cartilage Grafts, and Composite Grafts” in *Dermatol Surg*. Aug 31, 2005. Also available (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK564382/>)
- Borda, LJ, Cushman CS & Chu TW. “Utilization of Split-Thickness Skin Graft as a Treatment Option Following Mohs Micrographic Surgery.” in *Cureus*. 2024 Feb;16(2), 2024. Also available at (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK564382/>)
- Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon, Unabridged, Electronic Database. Biblesoft Inc., 2006.
- NAS Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible with Hebrew-Aramaic and Greek Dictionaries. The Lockman Foundation, 1998. Also available at Lockman.org
- Brown, Raymond. *The Message of Nehemiah*. England: InterVarsity Press, 2022.
- Holladay, William L. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978.



Kpae, Gbenemene & Adishi, “Eric. Community policing in Nigeria: Challenges and Prospects”, in *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Research*, 3(3). 2017.

Menon, Dev, Tze-Ming, Quek, Tan, Steven H C, & Wong, David W F. *It's Not About the Wall: The Message of Nehemiah*. Singapore: Finishing Well Ministries, 2012.

Michael, Matthew and Adebayo, Ajibade David. “Nehemiah Community Security Approach and Police-Community Partnership: Seeking Appropriate Community Policing Approach in Nigerian Context” in *International Journal of Religions and Cultural Practice*, (Online Version), Volume 10, No 7, 2025. (DOI: 10.56201/ijrcp.vol.10.no7.2025.).

Moore, M. H. *Problem-Solving and Community Policing. Crime and Justice*. Access from on the 15th March, 2025- <https://doi.org/10.1086/449194>, 1992.

Okeke, Dandison Ugochukwu. *Community Policing: Nigeria in Focus*. Enugu: SNAAP Press Ltd., 2006.

Trojanowicz, R. C. “The Future of Community Policing”. In *D. P. Rosenbaum (Ed.), The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1994.

Wagner, William L. *Nehemiah as a Model for Church Plantings*. Meadville, Park Avenue: Christian Faith Publishing, 2024.

Zodhiates, Spiros, Baker, Warren & Kletzing, Joel (Eds). *Hebrew-Greek Keyword Study Bible, New American Standard Bible* (NASB-Revised Edition). Chattanooga, TN: AMG Publishers, 2008.