

Dimosthenis Giannisopoulos,
Dr. (PhD) FCE , MCJ Boston University /B.Sc. Bellevue University
Security Critical Infrastructures Specialist
RR, Subway, Construction Mega Projects, Maritime ISPS

THE MEDINA CONSTITUTION AND IT'S APPLICATIONS TO TODAY'S PALESTINIAN PROBLEM

Конституция Медины и ее применение к сегодняшней палестинской проблеме

Introduction

The Constitution of Medina is an essay attributed to Islamic prophet Muhammad written in 622. It consists of an account of the rights and duties the people of Medina, which today is located in Saudi Arabia, should follow generally. It also poses regulations concerning the Muslims and other communities' relations based on their religion. Medina charter, and use it as an input for peaceful and prosperous arrangement of the national and state life. Medina Charter is not only important as a first constitution it is also considered contemporary in the sense that it was promulgated for a plural society. The solutions of the key issues concerning conflict are very well presented in the Medina Charter and can be applied to the issues regarding dialogue and conflict of today' scenario.

The historical background

It is a tripartite essay and CM comprises the core of what could be considered as the Muhammad's constitutional legislation which he could provide as the Prophet of God. The corpus in question includes his institution of *brotherhood* that should prevail among the Quraysh's *emigrants* and the Medina *helpers* at first.

It was prepared as the basis of the Medina city-state which was established by Prophet Muhammad and is considered as the first written constitution of Islam. It is also considered as the first kind of constitutional law in society. The document contained governing rules for the people of Medina, addressing also specific social issues concerning the community which aimed, among others, in ending the conflict and the chaos it was provoking in the region for centuries¹.

The city of Medina at the time of Muhammad had a population of approximately 10,000 who were organized in about 22 tribes. Of the above population almost, half was Jewish and half was Arab. Religion was a major factor of controversy however it wasn't the only one. The tribes pursued power through military dominance over other tribes and for that reason they also forged alliances between warring tribes a fact that contributed even more to the aggression in the area.

As a result, the tribes were at a situation of constant war with numerous people killed and injured. The antagonism was grave that it was also difficult to reach an agreement over accepting a single leader who would come from one of the tribes. However, even if they could reach an agreement over the leader, it is doubtful if he would be able to form a political organization, impose his authority and create a common military force for the city.

Any leader chosen would have a number of challenges to deal with. Firstly, the tribal hostility was very difficult to be diminished. Secondly, exactly because of this hostility defining the

¹ Hamidullah, M. (1975). The First Written Constitution in the World: An Important Document of the Time of the Holy Prophet. Lahore, Pakistan: Ashraf Printing Press, 39.

population's local rights and obligations was not possible either. Additionally, there was a constantly growing refugee population coming from Mecca².

Muhammad, after experiencing the above situation for months decided to address the issues as a third-party mediator which was accepted by the local tribes. There are a number of reasons he was accepted. Firstly, the area already needed a kind of leadership for a long time. Secondly, it was not uncommon practice of the Arabs to ask foreigners to take an active role their conflicts' resolution. Furthermore, Prophet Muhammad had already a positive reputation following him as an able mediator since he had already helped resolving conflicts in Mecca for which he was also given the title of "The Trustworthy". After all, there was anyway a lack of alignment on what concerns religious lines, which gave Muhammad the opportunity to use to use religious sanctions in order to exert his influence to the tribal leaders.

The last ones provided their consultation to Muhammad while he was negotiating and drafting the constitution, showing among others his willingness to take into consideration the needs of all the tribes³.

The medina constitution and its provisions

The regulations posed in the Medina Constitution had the intention of protecting the totality of inhabitants of Medina, independently of their religion and it explicitly states that Jews and Muslims are free to practice their religion.

In detail, the Charter was the first declaration of Medina as a city-state containing the rights and duties of the city's citizens independently if they were Muslims or not. The Charter provided the first means of justice based on the law and community and no on tribal military actions. The Medina Constitution made possible the establishment of a plural society granting equal rights and duties to the totality of citizens of the city state who were coming from a variety of religious and social groups⁴ promoting a unified citizenry that would be different from the other populations of the world.

Even though there are no information concerning the process Muhammed followed to form the Medina Charter it is estimated that the methods used could be compared to those presented in modern conflict resolution theories, such as fractionation, putting emphasis on interests and goals and also making an attempt to differentiate the idea of power among the participants.

In more detail, out of 47 sections the first 23 refers to the Muslim immigrants from Mecca and Muslims of Medina while the rest 24 concern the Jewish part of the population⁵.

The city was greatly benefited by the Charter and the way the Prophet treated the conflict. The first important step was the way he treated the dispute as a case between individuals or groups, an example that could work even avoiding disputes between nations and benefit from the advantage of establishing crosscutting conflicts.

Between the tribes there were many sources of disagreement and the tribal loyalties were fueling the conflicts. Muhammad succeeded in overcoming this obstacle by aligning the parties to the conflict along religious lines and not tribal ones. In this way the two big groups of Muslims and Jews were able to recognize common grounds to agree that overcame the tribal divisions⁶.

² Hamidullah, M. 1975. *The First Written Constitution in the World: An Important Document of the Time of the Holy Prophet*. Lahore, Pakistan: Ashraf Printing Press.

³ Gulen, M. Fethullah. (2004). *Toward a Global Civilization of Love and Tolerance*. Somerset, NJ: The Light, Inc.

⁴ Kassim Ahmad. (2008). *A Short Note on the Medina Charter*. <http://www.constitution.org/cons/medina/kassim2.htm>.

⁵ Fisher, R., & W. Ury. 1991. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. New York: Penguin Books.

⁶ Fisher, R. 1971. "Fractioning Conflict," in C. G. Smith (ed.), *Conflict Resolution: Contributions of the Behavioral Sciences*. London: University of Notre Dame Press.

Furthermore, establishing crosscutting conflicts he provided as a common ground for the two big religious groups the Medina population as an integrated community. As a result, he provided the base to address issues concerning community justice and protection and established the right to seek justice to the central community instead of the individuals. The people of the community of Medina were obliged according to section 44 to help one another against any attack from an outsider.

Furthermore, in case of an outside attack, sections 37 and 38 provided a detailed expenses plan for Jews and Muslims. They were also encouraged to provide mutual consultation and advice. Muhammad introduction of the ideas of community justice and mutual protection introduced above the idea of collective responsibility reducing in this way the conflict sources⁷.

Moreover, the Muhammad made good use of principle in order to reduce conflict in the area. Even though he did not try to intervene in the way the irreligious tribes were organized he addressed the deeply instilled values of Islam and Judaism to strengthen the agreement. Muhammad managed to render the Medina Constitution the first alignment of the city's residents following religious lines enabling the residents to act overcoming the tribal conflicts and alliances.

One of the main principles the prophet used was that somebody can still loyal to his principle without insisting that his opponent be disloyal to his own. Generally, the Medina Constitution does not try to reject the tribes' principles. On the contrary, it recognized them, held them valuable and at the same time conveyed independent identity to each faith at the same time it encouraged them co-work as a community. This collaboration overcame the tribal differences rendering, finally their tribal lines indistinct.

Theoretical Framework of the Medina Charter Conflict Resolution

Conflict can be interpreted as a disagreement between two or more members of an organization, community, or group, which is usually triggered by their competition over an access to resources and power, and or because of their difference in status, goals, values and perceptions. People who are in disagreement usually insist on seeing what they agreed upon from their point of view⁸.

The methods applied in the Medina Constitution can be considered a very fruitful source of the notion of mediation and conflict resolution and providing effective means for setting a dialogue procedure between Islamic and non-Islamic communities.⁹

When it comes to conflict one of its main elements is interest. Muhammad and contemporary international relations have shown that dwelling on rights or power is not an effective way of conflict resolution especially when the interconnection between the participants is so strong. On the contrary, evaluation of transaction costs, outcome satisfaction, relationship effects, and recurrence in dispute resolution are proving much more effective means of conflict resolution¹⁰.

The parts to a conflict tend to focus to the position they can possess and this defines the real purpose of the fight. As Fisher and Ury support in their theory focusing on positions is not as advantageous in providing collaboration opportunities as reconciling interests¹¹.

⁷ Hamidullah, M. 1975. *The First Written Constitution in the World: An Important Document of the Time of the Holy Prophet*. Lahore, Pakistan: Ashraf Printing Press.

⁸ Mrc. Howard Ross, *The Manajemen Of Conflict: Interpretations and Interests in Comparative Perspective*. Yale University Press, 1993.

⁹ Armstrong, Karen. (1986) *Sept. Muhammad: A Prophet for Our Time*, New York: Harper Collins.

¹⁰ Ury, W., J.M. Brett, & S. B. Goldberg. 1988. *Getting Disputes Resolved: Designing Systems to Cut the Costs of Conflict*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

¹¹ Fisher, R., & W. Ury. 1991. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. New York: Penguin Books.

A group is able to dictate the goals they pose to a conflict by underlying their interests. The usual and main types of group goals are process, content, relational, and interaction¹². When the parties of a conflict realize or believe that their goals can be cooperative, competitive, or independent then the conflict takes a different form and the outcome has many possibilities to be much more satisfying for parties. Also, the idea of independent goals can be the trigger for shared ideas, productivity and open-minded consideration.

The Medina Constitution was the result of such a process as well. Before Muhammad produce the Charter had a consultation with the leaders of each participant group who provided their ideas and wishes. After that the participants were more willing to enter a general agreement and accept most of the binding conditions, implement to the whole of the community, included in it.

An intriguing part in a conflict resolution, Muhammad had to face as well, was the content goals of each party because they tend to be incompatible. Muhammad addressed this problem in sections 4-11 in which among the others there were regulation requiring the release and redemption of all tribal prisoners of war.

Moreover, apart from the content goals the parties have their relational goals as well. Those concern the way each party wants to be treated by the others parties as well as the degree of interdependence that can acquire¹³. Muhammad tried and succeeded in altering the tribal alliances by uniting the Muslim tribes that were dominant and for that reason very antagonistic in the region. When the Muslim tribes were united Jewish ones forshaw the augmented power the Muslims would acquire and for this reason they endorsed the protective cooperation the Charter suggested.

The Medina Charter identified a vast number of relational goals. For example Section 13 stated that *God-fearing believers shall be against the rebellious* including the person which may spread animosity among the participants of the agreement sets a relational goal. Furthermore, the population of the city including both Muslims and Jews treated them as a unity in Sections 25-35 who should act in good faith with one another. The relationship between the two religious communities was defined in Section 37 by explaining that even though each of them should bear their own expenses, however they should be ready to be mutually helped in case the city they shared would be attacked by an outsider force. This Muhammad's tactic of relational definition is crucial in shifting the focus of attributions from groups to relationships¹⁴. Medina Constitution was successful in eliminating the hostilities shifting the focus of the population of Medina from tribal rivalry to a religion-based alliance.

Moreover, the Medina Constitution aimed and succeeded in realigning the participants' agreement and by this way protecting the individuals' identities. It is about setting and aiming at interaction goals. In detail interaction goals concern the participants desire to maintain their sense of self-identity. In the Medina context one's identity was deriving by being part of a certain tribe. The Constitution did not interfere the tribe arrangement but rendered the source of the population's identity the religion instead.

In the conflict resolution theory ones and other's identity and power perception can be a determinant factor. Even defining power is highly dependent on the way it is regarded. More specifically, the definitive three orientations of power are y distributive, integrative, and designated¹⁵.

¹² Wilmot, W. W., & J. L. Hocker. 2001. *Interpersonal Conflict*, Sixth Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

¹³ Wilmot, W. W., & J. L. Hocker. 2001. *Interpersonal Conflict*, Sixth Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

¹⁴ Knapp, M. L., L. L. Putnam, & L. J. Davis. 1988. "Measuring Interpersonal Conflict in Organizations: Where Do We Go From Here?" *Management Communication Quarterly* (1): 414-429.

¹⁵ Wilmot, W. W., & J. L. Hocker. 2001. *Interpersonal Conflict*, Sixth Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Power is considered distributive when the parties emphasize power as a zero-sum resource. It is usually perceived as a coercive kind of power because the rivals tend to hold power over another. On the contrary, integrative power is the case when the rights and needs of the rival parties believed more important than the power. An emerging integrative power could be the outcome of a well-designed and effective conflict resolution process. Designated power derives from the existence of a higher authority which has the power to make the important decisions. Muhammad in its Constitution tried to convert distributive power to integrative and designated power¹⁶.

Muhammad succeeded in shifting distributive power of the tribes which were in a continuous crisis by establishing common goals for them that would result to the benefit of the whole community. He used the mutual influence or circular behavior as the main basis for integration as clearly is stated in Section 37 of the Constitution. In this Section Muhammad supports that the two religious groups *must seek mutual advice and consultation, and loyalty is a protection against treachery* and Section 44 continues by providing to parties a binding agreement for mutual help in case of an attack of an outside enemy and Section 45 continues in dictating the appropriate behavior for establishing mutual influence by stating *If the Jews are called to make peace and maintain it they must do so; and if they make a similar demand on the Muslims, it must be carried out*. Finally, what caused shifting from distributive to integrative power was reinforcing the idea of a common community to both Muslims and Jews¹⁷.

Designation was also used to reduce distributive power. Muhammad used the idea of a higher authority in Sections 23 and 42 supporting that disputes *must be referred to God and to Prophet Muhammad*. The idea of the God as the source of the agreement and power attributed to the last one a unique balance and rendered the Charter a testament of their unified power. The same target aimed as Sections 15 and 17 which prohibited independent contention by participant groups.

Finally, Muhammad succeeded in using the Charter as a factor of restructuring the power and encouraged the peace establishment in the area since it rendered the power in the area integrative and fortified the interdependence between the parties.

The Palestine Conflict

As made clear by the previous chapter, the story begins many thousands of years ago. The claims for this land go back to 1400 BC which is believed to have been inhabited by the children of Israel in the area, until their removal, in 136 BC, from the Roman Empire. At that time the region was renamed Palestine and an Arab population took control. Palestine population was governed by the Arab population - for the most part, even under the domination of the Ottoman Empire until its defeat in World War I¹⁸.

The massive waves of the Jewish population inhabiting the area of Palestine were the result of two main factors. The first factor was the expulsion of the Jews, during the Russian pogroms in 1903. It is noted that thousands of Jews were persecuted in the years that followed, in many European countries after those first Russian pogroms¹⁹. The second factor was the rise of a modern political movement, known as Zionism. Zionism aimed at creating a state and establishing a place as natural homeland of the Jews.

¹⁶ Ury, W., J.M. Brett, & S. B. Goldberg. 1988. *Getting Disputes Resolved: Designing Systems to Cut the Costs of Conflict*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

¹⁷ Follett, M. P. 1942. *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

¹⁸ Thiel Melissa <https://twu.edu/media/documents/history-government/The-Israeli-PalestinianConflict.pdf>.

¹⁹ Dershowitz A., (2003) *The Case for Israel*, Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley, σελ. 30.

The majority of the Palestinian people were predominantly Muslim while minorities of Christians and Jews also lived in the area all together in big cities²⁰. The first waves of migration Jewish population were accepted from Palestine with no much resistance; however their views began to change when the motives for an exclusive settlement became Jews clear intentions²¹. This land was presented as an opportunity to create a Jewish state away from anti - Semitic expressions and oppression²².

Quest of power is always the main source of conflict in international relations however religion is a crucial factor as well. The interrelationship between religion and peace is complex and multidimensional. Nationalist ideas began to develop with the more prevalent one to push the Arabs - Palestinians to find another place of land to live following the rhetoric "a land without a people for a people without a land"²³.

During 1908, Palestinian patriotism nationalism began to rise as well being a logical response to an ever-increasing expansive rhetoric flourishing on the Jewish side. After the end of the WW I., British and French who controlled areas in Palestine after its territories were divided by the Ottoman Empire with the Treaty of Sevres. Both forces were determined not to relinquish their influence in Palestine and that any form of independence would be allowed as long as their interests in the region were secured. As a result of these plans, they "promised" Palestine to the Jews²⁴.

The end of the WW I brought new terms in the international relations and the international community, European states most of all, were seeking for new equilibriums. The British side with the goal to overthrow the Ottoman Empire in the region due to the alliance of the second with Germany, promised to support the creation of one and independent Palestinian state if the Arab people rebelled against the existing until then, regime. While these events occurred in 1915-1916, in 1917 the British adopting the Balfour Declaration announced that the government supports the creation of a Jewish state in the region that was inhabited by Palestinians.

At the same time British and French with the permission of the Society of the Nations became the colonial authority of the region taking the control of the formation of the new regime. The UK had begun to build the state apparatus of Palestine with a large participation of Jews and very few Palestinians. The first Palestinian uprisings against Britain occupation and the low-intensity concession of their lands to the Jews started.

The period 1936-39 was characterized by the armed Palestinian attacks against Jewish organizations and Jewish areas posing, at the same time, their political demands on the British authorities²⁵. For the first time British side proposed the removal of the Arab population from Jewish areas.

The creation of the Israel State

The end of World War II marked the beginning of monumental changes and huge rearrangements in the international system. The horror of the Holocaust that took place in Europe, by Europeans, led to another big wave of European immigration of Jews in Palestine²⁶. The atrocities

²⁰ Milton Edwards B. (2009) *The Israeli – Palestinian Conflict. A people's war*. New York : Routledge, σελ. 11.

²¹ Smith, C. D. (2013) *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict. A History with Documents*, 8th ed., Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, σελ. 147.

²² Milton Edwards B. (2009) *The Israeli – Palestinian Conflict. A people's war*. New York : Routledge, σελ. 12.

²³ Milton Edwards B. (2009) *The Israeli – Palestinian Conflict. A people's war*. New York : Routledge, σελ. 17.

²⁴ Milton Edwards B. (2009) *The Israeli – Palestinian Conflict. A people's war*. New York : Routledge, σελ. 21.

²⁵ Makdisi, S. (2008) *Palestine Inside Out. An Everyday Occupation.*, New York: W.W. Norton, p. 245.

²⁶ Smith, C. D. (2013) *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict. A History with Documents*, 8th ed., Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 189.

committed against the Jews in Europe were one of the determining factors for the events that followed. The end of the war brought new protagonists in the international system the US and the USSR. The first created and maintained a very strong alliance with the Jewish side and the second supported the Palestinian side in its struggle for independence. But except for the USA and the Soviet Union another major actor made his debut at the same period, the United Nations²⁷.

The forces that were dominant until then, France and the United Kingdom, had to recover from the devastating war and lost their interest in the region due to the fact also that their power of influence was now diminished. In February 1947, the British abandoned their obligations and in November the General Assembly adopted UN Resolution 181. Resolution 181 marks the beginning of the loss of the lands by the Palestinians. The proposal of the resolution was inspiration of the Special United Nations Commission on Palestine, concerning the division of Palestinian land with the aim of creating an Arab state and a Jewish one. The final date for the completion of the transfer of Palestinians from the Jewish land would be May 1948. The resolution voted for by 33 states, including both post-war superpowers, had 10 abstentions including the United Kingdom and was voted against by 13 states²⁸. Britain withdrew its forces from the Jewish territories in 1948 and reinforced the Jews with military equipment. As for the forces that were on the Palestinian side, remained there and pursued a policy of disintegration of the Palestinian people²⁹. In May 1948, the establishment of the state of Israel was announced and the beginning was made for a war that the Jewish side called the "War of Independence" and the Arabic side "Nakba" meaning disaster³⁰. In 1949 the war between Israel and Palestine officially ended the signing of armistice agreements. The area was divided into three parts, the Israel controlled 77% of the region, Jordan controlled East Jerusalem and the West Bank and Egypt the Gaza Strip.

In the years that followed, although a truce was signed, the controversy was going on and the war was a matter of time. In 1956, Israel, United Kingdom and France allied against Egypt with Israel and took of the control the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula, an occupation that did not last due to pressure from the United Nations. Since the beginning of the decade 1960 the area was a "hot" issue for the main rival forces of the Cold War, as the US and the USSR competed for power and influence in the area. The Palestinian side emerged as a political and military force after the Six Day War and formed the Palestine Liberation Organization, known as PLO³¹.

Israel introduced to the occupied territories - West Bank and Strip of Gaza - a regime of military administration. This resulted in deprivation of civil rights and freedoms from the now occupied Palestinian people, such as freedom of expression and denial of politics participation and representation, as well as the criminalization of any exposure of a national symbol. Land confiscations, imprisonment and torture of dissidents became a daily occurrence. The argument of Israel concerning the persistent violations of international law, was that these areas were not under his occupation, as long as they did not belong to any state, but that they were are under Israeli administration. The efforts of the Palestinians to resist the regime that imposed by the state of Israel never ceased. The first massive and organized act resistance is the Intifada which has been active since December 1987 where Palestinians revolted in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. It also became

²⁷ Milton Edwards B. (2009) *The Israeli – Palestinian Conflict. A people's war*. New York : Routledge, sel. 59.

²⁸ S/RES/181, 1947.

²⁹ Sakkas DG (2005) *THE PALESTINIAN, Zionism, the Arabs and the International Factor 1882-1948 part α* Athens: Patakis publications, p. 154.

³⁰ Pappé I. (2006) *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oxford: Oneworld, 164.

³¹ Khalidi W. (2014) *Palestine and Palestine Studies: One Century after World War I and the Balfour Declaration*. Journal of Palestine Studies, Vol. 44 No. 1 (Autumn), p.147.

known as the Stone War and ended on August 20, 1993, with the Oslo Accords, an agreement between Yasser Arafat and Yitzhak Rabin who initiated the processes for the creation of the Palestinian state. The death toll from this uprising was 2,500 Palestinians and 400 Israelis. The second Palestinian Intifada began in September 2000 and lasted 5 years.

The dead Palestinians reached the 3,500 with a war cost of \$ 1 billion and the Israelis with 1,000 dead with war costs to rise to 40 \$ billion. In 2005, Mahmoud Abbas took over the presidency of the Palestinian Authority, Hamas and prevailed in parliament and Israelis withdrew from the Gaza Strip. In 2008, the Gaza war with the Israelis began in September firing rockets at targets towards the Gaza Strip. Bombing continued until January 2009 and was strengthened by land operations.

On January 8, Hamas representatives, the Palestinian president and the Israeli president met in Cairo after an Egyptian initiative, aiming at a ceasefire and the creation of a mixed surveillance mission³².

Although the first and second Intifada did not end the occupation, they rendered clear that the regime was ambiguous. They also pose the conditions for the Palestinian side to build a stable strategy since it gained support from many countries and civil societies since the practice and persistent violations of Israel were made known to the world.

The hope for an end of hostilities between two sides began to emerge after a period of negotiations between Israel and Palestine, which lasted nine months and took place in Oslo³³. The Oslo agreements, as they became known, were mainly about reciprocity recognition of Israel and the PLO and the withdrawal of Israeli forces from areas of the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. However there was not in them any kind of agreement on thorny issues such as the issue of Jerusalem, the Palestinian refugees, Israeli settlements in the area, security and borders.

In September 1993, the two parties signed the "Declaration Principles for a Temporary Government "in Washington, as an effort to end negotiations and aiming at the introduction of a period of peace targeting also at a substantial and final peace agreement to follow a few years later³⁴.

The "Statement of Principles for a Temporary Regime of Self-Government" was a negotiating success for Israel, which was clearly in advantageous position, and Palestine degraded, with reduced bargaining power. The deals were crowned with a complete failure, showing that negotiations were not an effective tool in highly unstable situation. The signature of the Principles of 1993 was followed by the second Intifada, the construction of the fence, the siege of Gaza which lasted over ten years and a series of failed attempts for extra negotiations³⁵.

In 2014 Israel aimed at stopping rocket launching by Hamas troops so they initiated another deadly operation in Gaza Strip. The company was called Protective Peak and lasted two months³⁶. The situation maintains the same physiognomy, the resistances, attacks, expulsions, deportations, imprisonment, killings and torture continues with high intensity.

One of the most important issues of the dispute is the occupation of Jerusalem. In 1980, the State of Israel declared Jerusalem - West and East - the "unique and indivisible capital of state ". The eastern part of Jerusalem is under the occupation of Israel since 1967. Israel proceeded to build a wall of 730 km in the West Bank and Jerusalem. The construction of the wall that its inspirers call,

³² Litvak M. (1998) The Islamization of the Palestinian- Israeli conflict: the case of Hamas. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 34:1, 148-163.

³³ Smith, Charles D. (2013), *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict. A History with Documents*, 8th ed., Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 196.

³⁴ Milton Edwards B. (2009) *The Israeli – Palestinian Conflict. A people's war*. New York : Routledge, 192.

³⁵ Naqib F.M. (2003) Economic Aspects of the Palestinian- Israeli Conflict: The Collapse of the Oslo Accord. *Journal of International Development* 15, 499–512, 501.

³⁶ Dokos Th. (2010) *Strategic Alphabet Book of Arab-Israeli Conflict*, Text Labor No 12/2010 ELIAMEP.

"separation wall" or "anti-terrorism wall" is significantly affecting the lives of residents, affecting their freedom of movement and their economic activities, 10% of the city is the historic center, where the al-Aqsa Mosque is located, which is considered a holy place of all Muslims. The Palestinians' goal is for East Jerusalem to become capital of their independent state. In 1980, at 30 June, the Knesset - the Israeli parliament - passed the Law on Jerusalem with which he recognized the de jure annexation of the city, while in the law states declares that "the whole and united Jerusalem is the capital of Israel".

The UN role

The Security Council, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations has the responsibility to maintain international peace and security. Under this obligation it has adopted a number of resolutions in the effort of finding a solution, alleviating the situation in the area as well as numerous resolutions denouncing the attitude and practice of the State of Israel, addressing some of them to the General Assembly.

As mentioned earlier the first Resolution concerning the conflict in Israel was the Resolution of the General Assembly 181 concerning the formation of the Israeli state. Most members of the, UNSCOP committee, wanted to split and create two separate states and a minority proposed a single government that would coordinated the Arab and Jewish communities. The representative of Palestine called for the creation of an independent state and rejected any plans for division and occupation of territories by the Israelis. While their representative of the last ones agreed to the division, if the Jewish side included the Jerusalem and Galilee³⁷. The plan was rejected by the committee votes and the matter was referred to the General Assembly³⁸ The Jewish lobby in the US, but also the US determination to resolve the Israeli issue and the pressures that exercised, led to the adoption of the bifurcation plan and to legalization of the State of Israel in Palestine³⁹.

Palestine disagreement on the partition plan and the hostilities that followed did not allow the plan to be implemented. US and the Security Council proposed a new guardianship for Palestine and the ending of hostilities⁴⁰. The following year, Israel's request was granted and acquired membership in the UN⁴¹ while the UN Reconciliation Commission for Palestine, UNCCP was established to assist the two parties to reach an agreement⁴² as well as the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, UNRWA⁴³. The mandate to continue the work of UNRWA has been extended dozens of times due to the lack of finding a solution and the need of coverage of significant needs, since in 2019 the data confirm that the Service responds to the needs of 5 million refugees, with the latest extending its service until June 30, 2020.

The S.C. with resolutions 242 of 1967 and 338 of 1973 set the basic principles of peace negotiations with the plan "Land, in exchange Peace"⁴⁴. Its resolutions reflect the Council's clear opposition to Israel's stance, confirming this opposition after it has repeatedly asked Israel to stop the settlements and the transfer of those already settled from areas that were not meant to do so according to the 1947 resolution, while it has stated that it considers superficial and ineffective the measures of

³⁷ Sakkas DG (2005) THE PALESTINIAN, Zionism, the Arabs and the International Factor 1882-1948 part α' Athens: Patakis publications, 138.

³⁸ Moors A. (1995) Discourse and Palestine Power, Text and Context. Amsterdam : Het Spinhuis, 234.

³⁹ Milton Edwards B. (2009) The Israeli – Palestinian Conflict. A people's war. New York : Routledge, 68.

⁴⁰ Milton Edwards B. (2009) The Israeli – Palestinian Conflict. A people's war. New York : Routledge, 71.

⁴¹ S / RES / 273, 1949.

⁴² A / RES / 194, 1949.

⁴³ A / RES / 302, 1949.

⁴⁴ S / RES / 242, 1967, S / RES / 338, 1973.

the regime with regard to Jerusalem. From the beginning of the conflict until today, it calls for the continuation or the activation of negotiations between the two sides.

In 1975 General Assembly passes one of the most radical resolutions in the history of the Organization, the 3379 one, defining Zionism as a form of racism and racial discrimination in a resolution condemning the relationship between Zionism and apartheid regime in South Africa⁴⁵. In 1991, also GA annulled the decision resulting from the 1975 resolution.

UN, EU, USA and Russia formed the Quartet whose diplomatic efforts were highly regarded by the Security Council passing a series of resolutions in which he supported their activities including 1397 of 2002 the vision of create two independent states was presented , Palestine and Israel which would exist operate side by side with clear, recognized and secure borders⁴⁶. A few months later, with resolution 1515, it gives a clear vote of confidence in the Quartet's diplomatic efforts⁴⁷.

In 2011 Palestine submitted a proposal / resolution to the General Assembly concerning the recognition of the state of Palestine by the UN. The proposal originally mentioned the borders before the 1967 occupation and East Jerusalem as the capital of Palestine. Because of the turmoil it would cause this move - US, Israel and EU - worked to get the resolution through the General Assembly and not by the Security Council, so as not to be needed for the US to exercise its veto power in the SA something that would cause diplomatic episode and would deprive the US of the right to participate in a future peace negotiation process. Resolution 67/19 with EU assistance, reached the General Assembly without creating any obstacles in Israel.

So, one of the most important resolutions in the history of the dispute, the 67/19 of the General Assembly, was adopted on December 4, 2012.

Having regard to the opinion of the International Criminal Court, the fact that 132 Member States recognize the State of Palestine, recalling that in accordance with international law the proposal of the two states concerns the borders that proposed in 1947, Palestine gained observer status⁴⁸. The change in status while it has not changed essentially the situation in the region is a diplomatic victory for Palestine which gave it additional legitimacy and paved the way for its participation in other organizations such as the ICC.

The role of the UN has given rise to competing views in terms of effectiveness but also the importance of substantial implications for the issue following the resolution on secession. Part of the public debate concerns a more general debate on effectiveness of the Agency with a key argument being that dominated by states like the US and one that the international community confirms that Israel is above the law.

The stance taken by the International Court of Justice in The Hague (ICJ) is decisive. In 2004, it issued an Advisory Opinion on the wall erected by Israel in the West Bank. The D.D.X. denounced the construction of the wall as illegal, and called for its destruction, as it is an obstacle to Palestinian self-determination, granting territory to Israel without a legal basis. He also called on the international community not to recognize this act (International Court of Justice, 2004). However, the reaction from both Israel and the international community was not desirable, as the former ignored it, and continued the previous practice, while the latter continued not to take a position on the issue⁴⁹.

⁴⁵ S / RES / 3379, 1975.

⁴⁶ S / RES / 1397, 2002.

⁴⁷ S / RES / 1515, 2003.

⁴⁸ A / RES / 67 / 19, 2012.

⁴⁹ Turner, Mandy (2012), "Completing the Circle: Peacebuilding as Colonial Practice in the Occupied Palestinian Territory", in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (November), p. 492-507.

Analogies between Medina and Palestine Conflict

Palestine is located in a small area which, however, is densely populated, and is characterized as of great religious value for three of the largest religions in the world. It is located in the Eastern Mediterranean region, and is surrounded by five Arab states which, in the past, were involved in the conflict over its territory.

Both sides claim to have strong ties to the place, wanting their positions to create a state in the region to be accepted. The Israeli side maintains its proximity to the region, looking back to biblical times - regarding the promise of the land of Israel to the people of God, but also the persecution they faced in previous years, especially in Europe, due to increased anti-Semitism. For their part, the Palestinians base their claim on the fact that they have been living in the area for the last 2000 years⁵⁰.

In the Middle East, it is common for people to be politically / ethnically involved in religious conflicts. Similarly, in the region of Palestine, although the primary issue is the coexistence of two different races in the same region, there are secondary issues, of a religious nature. The two peoples are divided on the basis of religion, as the Israelis are Jews and the Palestinians are predominantly Sunni Muslims⁵¹.

For the Israelis, religion was a key element in claiming a state in the Palestinian territories, but also in rallying the Jews of the Diaspora to return to Israel. On the other hand, the Palestinians, through their religion, found allies in the Middle East. However, some extremist groups that have emerged - especially after the occupation of the claimed Palestinian territories - have hampered dialogue between the two sides⁵².

The Jerusalem a new Medina?

Jerusalem, of course, is a serious issue, with religious implications. For Jews and Christians, Jerusalem is the most important religious city, while for Muslims it is the third most important⁵³ (Landau Y., n.d.). The importance it has for these three religions, but also the desire of the two peoples to define it as the capital, prove exactly how important its possession is, but also the reason why the UN. wanted its international control⁵⁴ Even in the debates taking place today, the issue of Jerusalem is one that seems difficult to resolve⁵⁵.

In the Middle East there are never easy answers. One of the difficult questions is which is the capital of Israel. The answer depends of the person is asked. Israel says its capital is Jerusalem. It houses the Prime Minister's Office, the Knesset (ie the Israeli parliament), the Supreme Court and most ministries. However, no other country recognizes Israel's sovereignty over Jerusalem as it is considered a disputed area and is subject to negotiations with the Palestinians. Today all the embassies in Israel are located in Tel Aviv, 70km west of the Holy City.

Today all the embassies in Israel are located in Tel Aviv, 70km west of the Holy City. For all these reasons, it is now considered that the announcement of the relocation of the US embassy in

⁵⁰ Khalidi, Walid (2014), "Palestine and Palestine Studies: One Century after World War I and the Balfour Declaration", in *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. 44 No. 1 (Autumn), p. 137-147.

⁵¹ Smith, Charles D. (2013), *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict. A History with Documents*, 8th ed., Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 135.

⁵² Reiter Y. (2010) Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies – Study no. 406 – Barriers to Peace in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. Available at: http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_22213-1522-2-30.pdf?110316110504.

⁵³ Negotiations Affairs Department (2016) On the 12 year anniversary of the ICJ advisory opinion. Available at: <https://www.nad.ps/en/node/50426>.

⁵⁴ Reiter Y. (2010) Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies – Study no. 406 – Barriers to Peace in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. Available at: http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_22213-1522-2.

⁵⁵ Negotiations Affairs Department (2016) On the 12 year anniversary of the ICJ advisory opinion. Available at: <https://www.nad.ps/en/node/50426>.

Jerusalem also means the recognition of the city as the capital of Israel and would give a new special weight to the demands of the Israelis on the city.

Jerusalem is a leading center of religious and historical significance for the followers of the largest monotheistic religions in the world. Judaism, Christianity and Islam. There Solomon built the majestic Jewish temple that was destroyed centuries later by the Babylonians. Today only a part of the wall from the period of the Second Temple survives, the well-known "Wall of Tears" or "Western Wall" which is the holiest place of worship of the Jews.

Also in Jerusalem is the Temple of the Holy Sepulcher, a leading place of worship for Christians as it is believed that they buried the body of Jesus Christ after the Crucifixion and other sacred places for Christianity such as the Garden of Gethsemane and the Mount of Olives.

In 1947, the United Nations decided to divide British-occupied Palestine into two separate states: Palestinian and Israeli, but neither side wanted to control Jerusalem precisely because of the Holy City's importance to the three religions. So it chose to declare it an "international zone" to be governed by the relevant UN Council.

The Arab states rejected the UN plan for Palestine and thus began the war with the newly formed state of Israel which effectively gained control of West Jerusalem where most of the Jewish population lived. Jordan took control of the eastern part, where the Arab element dominates and the holiest pilgrimage sites are located. During the "Six Days" war in 1967, Israel occupied East Jerusalem and effectively annexed these parts of the city to form a municipality under Israel.

In fact, in 1980, parliament passed a bill referring to a united and indivisible Jerusalem, which is also the capital of Israel. Most states did not recognize the Holy City as the capital of Israel - with the exception of Costa Rica and El Salvador - but in the end they too relocated their diplomatic missions to Tel Aviv under international pressure.

This seems impossible in the current circumstances. Moreover, the US, Russia, the EU and the UN have concluded that in the context of the necessary negotiations for peace in the region, the two sides should co-decide. The Palestinian side has accepted this position and wants dialogue on the future and fate of Jerusalem⁵⁶.

To this day, however, it remains one of the thorniest issues in any peace negotiation effort - since the first Israeli-Palestinian agreement in Oslo in 1993. The Palestinians want East Jerusalem to be the capital of their state. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has insisted to this day that Jerusalem is the eternal and indivisible capital of Israel⁵⁷.

The Medina Constitution's application to the Palestine Conflict

In almost all the religions of the world one could find sources that promote peacemaking and sources that promote hostility, exclusion and violence⁵⁸. Sometimes it is also a matter of interpretation or a matter of fanaticism.

The need to worship has been an important human need almost as old as the appearance of humanity on earth. The source for this need was and still is the need of the human being to explain the mystery of a greater power controlling life. However, the social and power structures than dominate societies as well as the organized religions has caused societies great struggles among

⁵⁶ Negotiations Affairs Department (2016) On the 12 year anniversary of the ICJ advisory opinion. Available at: <https://www.nad.ps/en/node/50426>.

⁵⁷ Khalidi W. (2014) Palestine and Palestine Studies: One Century after World War I and the Balfour Declaration. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. 44 No. 1 (Autumn).

⁵⁸ Mouffe, C. (2013). *Agonistics. Thinking the world politically*. London and New York: Verso, 99.

religious and political leaders. Especially on the occasions that those leaders claim that their authority is based on a divine mandate.

However, this is not the exact case on what concerns Judaism and Islam. Judaism is a unique example of the religion becoming the foundation of a national identity as well, including both secular and religious Jews. On the other hand Islam is still struggling among numerous schools of thoughts and factions.

Those two religions along with Christianity share many religious as well as human values in common while they are in conflict over certain political matters. The Arab-Israeli conflict regarding the Occupied Palestinian is the most polarized conflict between Jewish state and Islamic movements who claim that this is a religious conflict that should only be dealt with as a religious struggle.

However as Ziad AbuZayyad supports there is *the possibility of reversing the process by seeking alternative options using religion to bridge the gaps between peoples and promote and disseminate the values of justice, equality, tolerance and co-existence that are shared principles at the foundations of all religions and humanistic philosophies*⁵⁹.

This is possible using religious diplomacy as Muhammad did with the Medina Charter. Generally, the relationship between religion and politics seems to be one structural feature of human civilization in general political scientist Andrew Heywood characteristically points out that *the most important aspect of its growing political importance culture undoubtedly concerns the awakening of religion and the emergence of religious movements*.

Although, modernity as a concept and historical period is articulated around the process of secularization, the radical religious revival in the form of militancy of fundamentalism from the 1970s onwards on a global scale, mainly around major monotheistic religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, changed beyond the traditional view of the relationship between religion and politics, especially on what concerns international relations, to the extent that the new state of coexistence takes in place in the context of globalization.

Modernity does not by definition imply a reduction in religious belief or practice or much more the repulsion and degradation of religion in the private sphere marked mainly by the emergence in late modernity of new forms of religiosity. The reorganization of the religious field in the West, with relativization and liberation at the same time the so-called bond identities, and the strengthening of fundamentalist religious trends in the East, did not merely awaken latent religious attitudes and behaviors of people all over the world weakening the politician's argument rationalization and secularization.

One the contrary they contributed to the emergence of new religious movements, ie the establishment, as it is emphatically called, of new religions on the borders of traditional major religions, taking off the power of religious experience itself moment but bringing back the issue of religious fanaticism and the violence it causes in forefront of international politics.

The political and social role of religion has always been the favorite subject of modern social sciences. According to the great social and political scientists of modernity, both religious belief and religious ritual seem to be linked deep with human collectivities. Religion, as paradoxical as it may seem for the theory of secularization, enables not only a correct approach of the social phenomenon, but also effective political organization of human collectives formations.

Apart from Muhammad in Medina, this is exactly the socio-political and functional dimension of religion, already on beginnings of modernity, as Niccolò Machiavelli had clearly captured on the

⁵⁹ AbuZayyad Ziad (2021), Defeating Religious Fanaticism Using Their Own Tools. <https://pij.org/articles/1628/defeating-religious-fanaticism-using-their-own-tools>.

republican side of his theory, although he did not accept any form of moral interference in politics, he believed that religion could, under certain conditions, strengthen the *raison d'État*. It is no coincidence that almost all the major social and political thinkers of modernity raised the question of religion in relation to the political organization of societies at the heart of their work⁶⁰.

In Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1859), religion has a clear social function, to the extent that it can even mitigate democratic passions. Max Weber (1864-1920) is known to have attributed capitalist progress to the ethics of Protestantism, enrolling it sociology of religion in a political sociology or sociology of sovereignty⁶¹.

Max Weber directly connected religion and its ecclesiastical forms of religiosity with the tendency of man to be integrated into smaller or larger groups. The same religion, in other words, as such is a form of archetypal collectivity, highly organized, when it involves bureaucratic structures, dogmas, hierarchies, members and an institutional order that resembles in secular systems of power⁶².

The community of religion as a kind of *sui generis* political community, emphasizes Max Weber, emerges through the daily updating of the gift of the religious leader. Not thus avoids arguing that "relations between political power and religious community, from which give rise to the concept of 'confession of faith', belong to the analysis of power"⁶³.

The return of religion from the 1970s onwards on a global scale revived the traditional interest in socio-political dimensions of the religious phenomenon. To the extent that the revival religious sentiment was linked to what is now defined as the politics of identity (identity politics), giving even national-political characteristics to religious groups and collectivities, it is easy to see how the link between religion and politics can positively or negatively affect human societies and consequently international security and peace in the field of transnational and transnational relations.

Religion, either as an archetypal and powerful expression of the cultural and moral diversity of the planet, or as a dimension of collective characteristics in the human condition, now acquires a critical role in shaping the international politics, especially when in many countries and in many cases it is expresses with its extreme political face fanaticism and fundamentalism.

It is no coincidence that political scientists like the American thinker Samuel Huntington, used the religious field to formulate his theory of the clash of civilizations, which is, arguably, one of the most popular and controversial, at the same time, political theories of International Relations in the 21st century⁶⁴.

The religious revival after 1970, unfortunately did not bring a tolerant religiosity, capable of imposing, perhaps, a kind of mild Kantian eternal peace (perpetual peace)⁶⁵, what Nikos Mouzelis defines as a spiritual religiosity⁶⁶ but another type of religiosity, which, according to Fotis Terzakis, "it is highly politicized" and, without a doubt, as the international situation from the 11th September 2001 onwards, "characterized by intolerance and aggression towards those who do not share his own vision of the world and history and he is ready at any moment to impose his will in the name of God by power".

⁶⁰ Makris, S. (2014b). The strategic role of the United States in the 21st century. American power and diplomacy in the Middle East at the crossroads of the post-Cold War era. Balkan Mixed. Periodical Publication of the Blood Peninsula Studies Foundation. Thessaloniki, vol. 16, 2005-2014, 221-234.

⁶¹ Hervieu-Léger, D., Willaime, J.-P. (2005). Social theories and religion. Athens: Kritiki, 111.

⁶² Giddens, A. (2009). Sociology. Athens: Gutenberg, 584.

⁶³ Weber, M. (2007). Economy and society. 3 Sociology of religion. Religious communities. Athens: Savvalas, 73.

⁶⁴ Heywood, A. (2013). International Relations and Politics in the World Era. Athens: Kritiki, 207.

⁶⁵ Makris, S. (2010). Hegemonism. American foreign policy & international society. Brussels: Bruylant, 77.

⁶⁶ Mouzelis, N.P. (2015). Modernity and religiosity. Secularization, fundamentalism, ethics. Athens: Polis, 186.

The return of God, according to the expression of the special scholar of the new religious movements for the conquest of the world Gilles Kepel, in the 1970s, literally takes off through Arab-Israeli conflict. The radical religious fundamentalism is identified as a key issue in international politics in sensitive and geopolitically unstable field of the Middle East⁶⁷, with the three dominant monotheisms to be in a constant state of sacred struggle and destructive conflict. The Arab-Israelis war and the successive waves of intifada in the Palestinian territories cannot be overshadowed by the semiotic fact that the Middle East, as the epitome of post-war international relations, takes place in the biblical land, exactly where the major monotheistic civilizations were born⁶⁸.

We can say that although the relationship between religion and politics touches his innards human culture or, more accurately, major or minor world or local religions have archetypal connected with the very need of people in every latitude and longitude of the planet for social and political agglomerations⁶⁹, the religious revival in the 20th century and the fundamentalist project of a warring God has brought the relationship between politics and religion to the brink a point of terrorism with international characteristics (international terrorism)⁷⁰.

However, despite the growing stuttering voices of pessimism and despite the apparent weakness of the organized international community, especially of the United Nations Security Council, to form an institutional *modus vivendi* in the field of international relations, whether the point of reference is religion or politics, during the modern era, theology itself and the field of religious belief in general attempt through the cultivation and consolidation of a spirit of religious universality, which has now naturalized as ecumenical theology, to show in practice that the formation of a world community of religions is perhaps the only realistic solution to alleviate its religious hatred and its serious implications for international security and peace.

As Swiss Catholic priest, theologian and author Hans Küng, a keynote speaker on how the universal theology can be transformed into theology of religions⁷¹, "that there can be no peace between nations without peace between religions "and that consequently" there can be no peace between religions without dialogue between religions ", does not only mark the deeper ontological tensions between politics and religion, but now boldly proposes the importance of interreligious dialogue in the soft consolidation of international security and peace, that is, without hegemonic wars, with an axis of a common world ethos.

Need for interreligious dialogue

Interreligious dialogue as a tool of international politics highlights the importance of religious diplomacy in international relations or the role that the religious community not as a source of tension and conflict, as in the case of the extreme and radical religious fundamentalism, but as a source of cooperation, peace and security in on a global scale, thus satisfying the basic condition of the transformation of ecumenical theology into theology of religions. This implies by definition the courageous review of the relationship between religion and international politics and the strengthening at transnational and transnational level of existing institutional channels of communication between at least the world religions.

⁶⁷ Spyropoulos, G.M. (2011). Middle East. Arab-Israeli conflict. History - political diplomacy. Thessaloniki : University of Macedonia Publications, 75.

⁶⁸ Kepel, G. (1992). The return of God. Islamic, Christian, Jewish movements in its recovery of the world. Athens : Nea Synora - AA Lebanis, 17.

⁶⁹ Charlworth, M. (2014). Philosophy and religion. Typology of their relationships from antiquity to today. Heraklion : University Publications of Crete , 9.

⁷⁰ Bonanate, L. (2009). International terrorism. Athena : Kedros, 88.

⁷¹ Gibellini, R. (2009). Twentieth century theology. Athens : Artos Zois, 631.

The theology of religions, attempts, as Rosino Gibellini emphasizes emphatically, “with this transformation, the major world religions "ultimately" to be seen as the unique divine reality, which include different conceptions, which have been formed in different historical and cultural environments”⁷². Thus, interfaith dialogue could be perceived as part of cultural diplomacy, to the extent that religion is clearly the archetypal and permanent expression of culture. This means that religious communities will they must cooperate with states and international organizations, that is, with the organized international community, for the systematic promotion of the values and positions of the dialogue of religions. As much as this sounds paradoxical, it confirms both Machiavelli and Alexis de Tocqueville, who believed that religious orthodoxy could contribute to the moralization of democracy⁷³.

It thus becomes apparent that the major role of religion in international politics through the need to tackle religious fundamentalism further highlights the importance of diplomacy and in particular of religious diplomacy in world security and peace. This is a historical finding which, as we have said above, has been exacerbated in the age of globalization, especially after the end of the Cold War (end of the Cold War) and the cosmogenic terrorist incident of 11 September 2001, primarily concerns the crucial role of religious diplomacy in this regard with the cooperative and therefore soft politics of the escalation of the conflict of religions as of the most acute version of what Samuel Huntington identifies, in his classic book of the same name, as clash of cultures⁷⁴.

From a particular point of view, this primarily means to strengthen the role of both the clergy (religion) and the people (politics) in the institutional and diplomatic processes of world peace. The problematic that develops around the religious diplomacy is now referred to as the so-called religious peacekeepers. This suggests that the purpose of formal and informal religious diplomacy today, it is not just religious pluralism and Lokian liberal tolerance⁷⁵, important emerging elements that led Europe to modernity, beyond of the Middle Ages and the scourge of religious wars, unequivocally fundamental cultural and constitutional conquests of modernism, other than religious reconciliation, with a view to the political, economic, social and ecological prosperity and balance of the areas that face serious conflicts first and finally of the planet. With terms of the theory of International Relations, therefore, it is reasonable to consider the relationship between religion and diplomacy as a very critical field, possibly for reasons of strategic enforcement of international peace and security could be integrated even into the realm of so-called high politics⁷⁶.

It is no coincidence that the relevant academic disciplines of Politics Science and International Relations are now included in their individual thematic and research fields the systematic scientific study of the relationship between international politics and religion, while the relevant university departments have in recent years formed a number of specialized undergraduates and postgraduate programs, which systematically highlight the catalyst influence of religion and consequently religious attitudes, beliefs and attitudes on international security and peace, putting cultural and religious diplomacy at the forefront of the so-called power politics, especially in the cognitive fields of management crisis and conflict management in the world political scene, demonstrating institutionally the influence of religion in general on the function of national states, on the other

⁷² Gibellini, R. (2009). *Twentieth century theology*. Athens : Artos Zois, 631.

⁷³ Hervieu-Léger, D., Willaime, J.-P. (2005). *Social theories and religion*. Athens : Kritikh, 77.

⁷⁴ Makris, S. (2007a). *Political system and International Relations. The Greek case through the comparative perspective*. Athens : Papazisis and Center for European Constitutional Law – Foundation Themistoklis and Dimitris Tsatsou, 340.

⁷⁵ Makris, S. (2007b). *Liberalism. Philosophical beginnings and modern trends. From Aristotle to John Rawls*. Athens : I. Sideris and the Konstantinos Karamanlis Institute for Democracy, 51.

⁷⁶ Terzakis, F. (2013). *Rationalism, fundamentalism and religious revival. Its colors chessboard*. Athens : The publications of colleagues, 34.

hand, non-state and, above all, non-governmental actors in international politics. The organic interaction thus of religion, of state diplomacy and international politics is an indisputable feature of modern globalized era, recognized both in practice and in theory⁷⁷.

Religious diplomacy has an ad hoc character or may acquire it in the future permanent institutional manifestations at various state and non-state levels? An issue that seems to concern experts today is the growing importance of the relationship between religion and politics after the end of the Cold War and the effect that this sui generis can have on both players of international politics as well as the nature and structure of the international political system itself⁷⁸.

The relationship between religion, diplomacy and international politics and in particular the demand religious diplomacy is increasingly focused on relevant academic and scientific forums and what, is being explored in depth is whether the religious leaders and political diplomats can map out a common field of interests and goals, with a view to religious reconciliation and therefore global security and peace.

Usually at the center of this expanded cultural encounter, more and more after the end of the Cold War (1989-1991), as we have shown above, the relationship between Western and non-Western, especially the West's relationship with political Islam and in particular critical geopolitics relationships in Arab and Islamic security and peace subsystem (Near and Middle East).

It is interesting to note here that in this context of the intensifying interaction of religious and political diplomacy, an approach to the relationship between religion and politics, which on the one hand is defined as the religionization of politics, while on the other hand it is delimited as a politicization of religion, apparently implying that religion plays a catalytic role in international politics and diplomacy either as cultural mediation *latu sensu* or as one of the key inspirers and shapers of international becoming. Above all, the major role is highlighted of the religious leaders in shaping the attitudes, morals and attitudes of believers or, expansion of religious citizens in the face of political and technological developments that, rapidly, take place on the modern cosmic level of the planet⁷⁹.

Conclusion

The Constitution of Medina is the first document concerning peacemaking in the area of the Middle East between Muslims and Judaists. It was a successful attempt using the religion in order to divide the adversaries into only two groups based on religion. The document contained governing rules for the people of Medina, addressing also specific social issues concerning the community which aimed, among others, in ending the conflict and the chaos it was provoking in the region for centuries.

The Medina Constitution made possible the establishment of a plural society granting equal rights and duties to the totality of citizens of the city state who were coming from a variety of religious and social groups promoting a unified citizenry bringing finally peace in the region. The region experiences a similar fight for decades between Arabs and Jews focusing on Jerusalem. The basic ideas of the Constitution of Medina can be applied today in the context of religious diplomacy.

⁷⁷ The Working Group on Religion and Diplomacy. Ανακτήθηκε από http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/papers/2013/11/us-islamic-world-forumpublications/religion-and-diplomacy_english_web.pdf.

⁷⁸ Mouffe, C. (2013). *Agonistics. Thinking the world politically*. London and New York : Verso.

⁷⁹ Terzakis, F. (2013). *Rationalism, fundamentalism and religious revival. Its colors chessboard*. Athens : The publications of colleagues, 7.

Sources

- AbuZayyad Ziad (2021), Defeating Religious Fanaticism Using Their Own Tools <https://pij.org/articles/1628/defeating-religious-fanaticism-using-their-own-tools>.
- Armstrong, Karen. (1986) Sept. Muhammad: A Prophet for Our Time, New York: Harper Collins.
- Bonanate, L. (2009). International terrorism. Athena: Kedros.
- Charlworth, M. (2014). Philosophy and religion. Typology of their relationships from antiquity to today. Heraklion: University Publications of Crete.
- Dershowitz A., (2003) The Case for Israel, Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley.
- Dokos Th. (2010) Strategic Alphabet Book of Arab-Israeli Conflict, Text Labor No 12/2010 ELIAMEP.
- Fisher, R., & W. Ury. 1991. Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In. New York: Penguin Books.
- Fisher, R. 1971. "Fractioning Conflict," in C. G. Smith (ed.), Conflict Resolution: Contributions of the Behavioral Sciences. London: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Follett, M. P. 1942. Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.
- Gibellini, R. (2009). Twentieth century theology. Athens: Artos Zois.
- Hamidullah, M. 1975. The First Written Constitution in the World: An Important Document of the Time of the Holy Prophet. Lahore, Pakistan: Ashraf Printing Press.
- Heywood, A. (2013). International Relations and Politics in the World Era. Athens: Kritiki.
- Hervieu-Léger, D., Willaime, J.-P. (2005). Social theories and religion. Athens: Kritiki.
- Giddens, A. (2009). Sociology. Athens: Gutenberg.
- Gulen, M. Fethullah. 2004. Toward a Global Civilization of Love and Tolerance. Somerset, NJ: The Light, Inc.
- Kassim Ahmad. (2008). A Short Note on the Medina Charter. <http://www.constitution.org/cons/medina/kassim2.htm>.
- Kepel, G. (1992). The return of God. Islamic, Christian, Jewish movements in its recovery of the world. Athens: Nea Synora - AA Lebanis.
- Khalidi W. (2014) Palestine and Palestine Studies: One Century after World War I and the Balfour Declaration. Journal of Palestine Studies, Vol. 44 No. 1 (Autumn).
- Knapp, M. L., L. L. Putnam, & L. J. Davis. 1988. "Measuring Interpersonal Conflict in Organizations: Where Do We Go From Here?" Management Communication Quarterly (1): 414–429.
- Litvak M. (1998) The Islamization of the Palestinian- Israeli conflict: the case of Hamas. Middle Eastern Studies, 34:1, 148-163.
- Makdisi, S. (2008) Palestine Inside Out. An Everyday Occupation., New York: W.W. Norton.
- Makris, S. (2007a). Political system and International Relations. The Greek case through the comparative perspective. Athens: Papazisis and Center for European Constitutional Law – Foundation Themistoklis and Dimitris Tsatsou.
- Makris, S. (2007b). Liberalism. Philosophical beginnings and modern trends. From Aristotle to John Rawls. Athens: I. Sideris and the Konstantinos Karamanlis Institute for Democracy.
- Makris, S. (2014b). The strategic role of the United States in the 21st century. American power and diplomacy in the Middle East at the crossroads of the post-Cold War era. Balkan Mixed. Periodical Publication of the Blood Peninsula Studies Foundation. Thessaloniki, vol. 16, 2005-2014, 221-234.

- Milton Edwards B. (2009) *The Israeli – Palestinian Conflict. A people's war*. New York: Routledge.
- Moors A. (1995) *Discourse and Palestine Power, Text and Context*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Mouffe, C. (2013). *Agonistics. Thinking the world politically*. London and New York: Verso.
- Mouzelis, N.P. (2015). *Modernity and religiosity. Secularization, fundamentalism, ethics*. Athens: Polis.
- Mrc. Howard Ross, *The Management Of Conflict: Interpretations and Interests in Comparative Perspective*. Yale University Press, 1993.
- Mouffe, C. (2013). *Agonistics. Thinking the world politically*. London and New York: Verso.
- Naqib F.M. (2003) *Economic Aspects of the Palestinian- Israeli Conflict: The Collapse of the Oslo Accord*. *Journal of International Development* 15, 499–512.
- Negotiations Affairs Department (2016) *On the 12 year anniversary of the ICJ advisory opinion*. Available at: <https://www.nad.ps/en/node/50426>.
- Pappé I. (2006) *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oxford: Oneworld.
- Reiter Y. (2010) *Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies – Study no. 406 – Barriers to Peace in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. Available at: http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_22213-1522-2.
- Sakkas DG (2005) *THE PALESTINIAN, Zionism, the Arabs and the International Factor 1882-1948 part α'* Athens: Patakis publications.
- Smith, C. D. (2013) *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict. A History with Documents*, 8th ed., Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Spyropoulos, G.M. (2011). *Middle East. Arab-Israeli conflict. History - political diplomacy*. Thessaloniki: University of Macedonia Publications.
- Terzakis, F. (2013). *Rationalism, fundamentalism and religious revival. Its colors chessboard*. Athens: The publications of colleagues.
- The Working Group on Religion and Diplomacy. Ανακτήθηκε από http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/papers/2013/11/us-islamic-world-forumpublications/religion-and-diplomacy_english_web.pdf.
- Turner, Mandy (2012), “Completing the Circle: Peacebuilding as Colonial Practice in the Occupied Palestinian Territory”, in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (November), p. 492-507.
- Ury, W., J.M. Brett, & S. B. Goldberg. 1988. *Getting Disputes Resolved: Designing Systems to Cut the Costs of Conflict*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Weber, M. (2007). *Economy and society. 3 Sociology of religion. Religious communities*. Athens: Savvalas.
- Wilmot, W. W., & J. L. Hocker. 2001. *Interpersonal Conflict*, Sixth Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- S / RES/ 181, 1947.
- S / RES / 273, 1949.
- A / RES / 194, 1949.
- A / RES / 302, 1949.
- S / RES / 242, 1967.
- S / RES / 338, 1973.
- S / RES / 3379, 1975.
- S / RES / 1397, 2002.
- S / RES / 1515, 2003.
- A / RES / 67 / 19, 2012.