



◆◆ إصدارات مئوية الدولة الأردنية 2021 ◆◆

Mohammad Khaer Al-Dhmour

.....

# The Role of Hashemites in Preserving Jerusalem Political and Religions Status

الدور الهاشمي في الحفاظ على القدس والمقدسات



*The Role of Hashemites  
in Preserving Jerusalem  
Political and Religions Status*



**The Role of Hashemites  
in Preserving Jerusalem  
Political and Religions Status**

*By*

*Mohammad Khaer Faisal Ahmad Al-Dhmour*

*2021*

- **The Role of Hashemites in Preserving Jerusalem Political and Religions Status**
- **Mohammad Khaer Faisal Ahmad Al-Dhmour**
- **First Edition 2021**
- **Publisher: Ministry of Culture**

Subhi Al-Qotob Street. 20  
Off Wasfi Al-Tal Street  
P.O. Box 6140 - Amman - Jordan  
Tel: (962) 5696218 / (962) 5699054  
Fax: (962) 5696598  
Email : info@culture.gov.jo

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan  
The Deposit Number at The National Library  
(4262/8/2021)

327.209565

Al-Dhmour, Mohammad Khaer

**The Role of Hashemites in Preserving Jerusalem Political  
and Religions Status/ Mohammad Khaer Al-Dhmour.-Amman:**

**Ministry Of Culture, 2021**

(182 ) P.

Deposie No.: 4262/8/2021

**Descriptors: /Diplomacy//Foreign Relations//Jordan/**

يتحمل المؤلف كامل المسؤولية القانونية عن محتوى مصنفه ولا يعبر هذا المصنف عن رأي دائرة المكتبة الوطنية أو أي جهة حكومية أخرى.

• الإخراج الفني: سمير اليوسف هاتف 0799677569

ردمك: ISBN 978-9957-94-680-7

• جميع الحقوق محفوظة للناشر: لا يسمح بإعادة إصدار هذا الكتاب أو أي جزء منه أو تخزينه في نطاق استعادة المعلومات أو نقله بأي شكل من الأشكال، دون إذن خطي مسبق من الناشر.

• All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior written permission of the publisher.

### *Dedication*

**I would like to dedicate this achievement to His Majesty King Abdullah II Bin Al Hussein, Servant of the first direction of prayer, the third of the two Holy Mosques and protector of the holy sites,**

**I would also like to dedicate this achievement to the waterfall that always flows with affection and tenderness, my mother, who did her best, and to my father, as without you both this achievement would not be possible to attain.**



## *Table of contents*

DEDICATION	5
Table of contents	7
ABSTRACT	11
Introduction:	13
Research Questions:	15
Hypotheses:	16
Research Methodology:	17
Research Objectives:	17
Research Significance:	18
Problem of the study:	18
Literature review:	19
Structure of Research	24
Chapter One: Jordanian Diplomacy	27
Introduction:	29
1.1. Importance of the Existence of Diplomatic Relations Between States:	29
1.2. The Emergence Of Diplomacy:	32
1.3. Preventive Diplomacy:	37
1.3.1 Early Warning:	40
1.3.2. Preventive Deployment:	41
1.3.3. Demilitarized Zones:	44
1. 4. Types of Preventive Diplomacy:	44
1.4.1. First: Preventive Diplomacy Of An Optional Nature:	46
1.4.2. Mediation, Based On The Principle Of Conciliation,	48
1.5. Negotiation	49
1.5.1. The First Stage:	50
1.5.2. The Second Stage:	50
1.5.3. The ThirdStage:	50
1.6. International Judiciary:	53
Chapter Two: Jordanian Interest in the Palestinian Cause	57



2.1. The Role of The Hashemites as A Central And Permanent Pivotal Role	59
Introduction:	59
2.1.1. Historical Background	60
2.1.2. The Hashemites	64
2.1.2.1. The Hashemite Custodianship:	66
2.1.2.2. The Historical Role of the Hashemites:	70
2.1.2.3. Hashemite Custodianship Of Jerusalem Holy Sites:	72
2.2. The Contributions Of The Hashemite Kings In The Defense Of Palestine And Holy Sites:	77
Introduction:	77
2.2.1. Sharif Hussein Bin Ali:	78
2.2.2. King Abdullah I Bin Al Hussein:	80
2.2.3. King Talal:	84
2.2.4. King Hussein Bin Talal:	86
2.2.5. King Abdullah II:	90
2.2.5.1. King Abdullah II, The Concerns Of The Palestinian Cause And Holy Sites At The Local Level	90
2.2.5.2. King Abdullah's Interest In The Palestinian Cause And Holy Sites At The Arab And International Levels	94
2.2.5.3. King Abdullah II Receiving Templeton Prize	97
2.3. The Popular Jordanian Position On Trump Decision	100
Chapter Three: US Policy Toward Jerusalem	103
Introduction:	105
3.1. The Earliest Period:	106
3.1.1. Truman and Eisenhower	109
3.1.2. Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford and Carter	110
3.2. The Latest Era In Details:	114
3.2.1. The George H.W. Bush's Administration:	114
3.2.2. The Clinton Administration:	115
3.2.3. George W. Bush's Administration:	117
3.2.4. Obama's Administration:	119
Chapter Four: Jordan, the United States and Jerusalem	123

Chapter Five: Trump’s Decision To Move The Embassy, «The Application And Dimensions»	13
5.1. President Trump:	139
5.2. Historical Background Of The Decision:	140
5.3. Trump’s Administration:	141
5.4. Deal of the Century:	147
5.4.1. Trump and the Deal of the Century:	147
5.4.2. The Jordanian Position on the Deal of the Century:	150
5.5. The Dimensions Of The Shift In The Position Of President Of The Trump Palestinian Issue:	152
5.5.1. Internal Dimensions:	152
5.5.2. External Dimensions:	155
Conclusion:	163
Recommendations	167
References:	171
APPENDICES	177



## *ABSTRACT*

The study aimed at examining the role of the Hashemites in the preservation of Jerusalem and its holy sites. Jordan, under the Hashemite leadership, has assumed historical and religious responsibilities since the beginning of the last century through exerting every possible effort in various forums and at all levels to preserve, safeguard and reconstruct Al Aqsa Mosque, the Haram al-Sharif, and to stand against any attempts of judaization of the Holy City. The current study discussed the role of the Hashemites in the preservation of Jerusalem and Holy Sites under the administration of President Donald Trump as a case study.

The study addressed this subject through five chapters. The first chapter discussed the Jordanian diplomacy through the diplomacy concept between the countries and the early warning mechanisms. The second chapter discussed the Hashemites' pivotal role in supporting the Palestinian cause and Palestinian refugees on one hand, and the safeguarding of the holy places on the other. It also clarified the Hashemite kings' roles in that aspect, starting with Sharif Hussein up to King Abdallah II Bin Hussein. In the third chapter, the American diplomacy towards Jerusalem was discussed respectively, starting with President Wilson's era up to President Trump. In the fourth chapter, the dimensions of the Jordanian American relationship and its effects on Jerusalem was discussed,

and at last, the fifth chapter discussed trump's decision of moving the American Embassy to Jerusalem as a multi - dimensional case study on the Arab, Israeli and international levels.

For the purpose of achieving the research objectives, the study indicated Jordan's important role in facing the attempts of Judaizing, controlling and dividing Al Aqsa Mosque and the Haram al-Sharif. The Hashemite reconstructions of Al Aqsa Mosque and the vital projects are implemented through the Reconstruction Committee of the Al Aqsa Mosque and Dome of the Rock, which is responsible for management, safeguarding, maintenance and restoration of Al Aqsa Mosque, the Haram al-Sharif, in order to preserve it.

The methodology of the study was based on the analytical and descriptive approach.

The study concluded a number of results. The most important of which is that the Hashemite leadership adheres to preserving Islamic holy sites in Jerusalem, especially Al Aqsa Mosque, the Haram al-Sharif, and standing against the attempts of its Judaization and control over the Holy Sites.

Jordan has never hesitated to protect Al Aqsa Mosque, the Haram al-Sharif, as the Arab army carried out heroic epics on the walls of Jerusalem, despite the limited potential and difficult circumstances.

Jordan under the leadership of King Abdullah II has long opposed the attempts of Israel to control Al Aqsa Mosque.

## *Introduction*

The current study aims to explain the role of Hashemite kings in administering the Islamic holy places, especially after the USA president's decision to transfer the American embassy to Jerusalem, which led to a problem in the international relations, especially between USA and many Arab countries. The thesis will present the proponent and opponent views on the subject. (Liga Arab menghargai upaya Yordania pro-Jerusalem). The Jordan Times. July 2017 p 27)

The Hashemites are historically associated with a legal and moral bond with Mecca and the Islamic holy sites. They preserved their status that refrained them from the political dispute, as was their case with Al-Quds Al-Sharif, in line with their affirmation of their mission. (Liga Arab menghargai upaya Yordania pro-Jerusalem». The Jordan Times. July 2017 p 27)

Jordan has never hesitated to protect the Al-Aqsa Mosque - the holy site of Al-Haram Al-Sharif. The Hashemites continue to hold the responsibility of the custody towards the Holy City and its holy sites, especially the Holy Mosque of Al-Aqsa, where the Hashemite reconstruction of Islamic sites began in 1924 under the reign of Sharif Al-Hussein bin Ali, May his soul rest in peace, and the restoration of surrounding buildings, which suffered a structural damage as a result of the 1948 war. During the reign

of the late King Hussein Bin Talal, the Jordanian government made efforts in 1952 to restore the Dome of the Rock. The second restoration of the dome began in 1959 and was completed in 1964, while in 1969 the government reformed Salahuddin pulpit, in the late 1980s, King Hussein Bin Talal ordered the begilding of the Dome of the Rock with gold plates, rebuilding the roof struts and repairing the building's infrastructure. Special attention was given to the restoration of the Salahuddin pulpit and to the selection of materials similar to those used in constructing the original pulpit before it was burned.

King Abdullah II instructed the establishment of the Jordanian Hashemite Fund for the reconstruction of the Al-Aqsa Mosque in order to provide the necessary funding for the maintenance of Al-Aqsa Mosque, the Dome of the Rock and the Islamic holy sites in Jerusalem.

The Al-Aqsa mosque and the mosques of Jerusalem are undergoing continuous maintenance and follow-up. The decree of King Abdullah II was issued to renovate the Dome of the Rock. (Hattar, Mussa (16 November 2014). «Fearing backlash, Jordan asserts Al-Aqsa custodianship». The Times of Israel. Retrieved 18 February 2017 p18)

Royal support extends to the support of Waqf institutions supervised by the Ministry of Awqaf, where Jordan bears its expenses, and its employee's salaries.

The city of Jerusalem; of Arabic roots and Islamic cultural background, whose name acts as a title to the seemingly unsolvable Palestinian crisis, an issue where no final, just or sustainable solution could exist without guaranteeing fundamental Arab Islamic rights, specifically rights which relate to Jerusalem's holy sites. (Naim, Sofer ( 1976), The Political Status of Jerusalem in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, 1948-1967, Middle Eastern Studies ,p33)

The Hashemites of Jordan formed a strong relationship with the city of Jerusalem. This relationship was established in accordance with a religious, nationalist political stance. Therefore, they secured its holy sites, put it under their patronage and provided them with the appropriate upkeep. In adherence to this tradition, Jordan continues to provide proper services to all the holy sites in the city of Jerusalem.

### ***Research Questions:***

- 1- What is the role of the Hashemites in managing the conflict of Jerusalem?
- 2- What is the importance of the historical and religious city of Jerusalem to Jordan?
- 3- What is the impact of Trump's decision to move the US Embassy to Jerusalem?



4- How does Jordan react to Trump's decision of moving the US Embassy to Jerusalem?

***Hypotheses:***

This study is based on a number of hypotheses, the most important of which are:

1. The Hashemites play a major role in preserving the holy sites in Jerusalem.
2. The Hashemites role in preserving the holy sites in Jerusalem is a historical one and not by coincidence.
3. The Hashemites inherited the role of preserving the holy sites from one generation to another with determination and absolute will.
4. In order to preserve Jerusalem's holy sites, the Hashemites exerted all possible efforts on the Palestinian, Arab and international levels.
5. The Hashemites never hesitated to pay the necessary cost to rebuild the holy sites.
6. King Abdulla the Second's diplomatic role has the greatest effect on containing Trump's decision, and mobilizing the international and Islamic support to the Jordanian position, which supports Jerusalem's Arabism.

## ***Research Methodology:***

### The Analytical Approach

The study will be based on the descriptive analytical method as it is one of the most widely used methods in the study of human social phenomena. The study uses this method by analyzing the data regarding the nature of the framework of the legitimacy of the Hashemite guardianship over Jerusalem and the transfer of the American Embassy to Jerusalem. Therefore, the researcher considered that this method should be used in the current study as an appropriate tool.

## ***Research Objectives:***

The study aims to achieve the following objectives:

- 1- Identify the role of the Hashemite dynasty in handling the conflict over the holy city of Jerusalem.
- 2- Recognize the importance of the historical and religious city of Jerusalem.
- 3- The effect of Trump's decision to transfer the US Embassy to Jerusalem.

### ***Research Significance:***

The importance of the study stems from its focus on the role of the Hashemites in tackling the conflict taking place in the city and its holy shrines, especially after the American president's decision to move the US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, which is characterized by historical and political significance in the Islamic world as well as the international arena.

### ***Problem of the study:***

The problem of conducting such a study lies in explaining the Hashemite role in managing the conflict on the Islamic holy sites in Jerusalem, namely the Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock Mosque, especially after Trump's decision at the end of 2017, to transfer of the US embassy to Jerusalem.

This study is based on the theory that Jordan has adopted the policy of managing the conflict on the Islamic holy sites in Jerusalem as an integral part of its Arab Islamic heritage. The transfer of the American Embassy is a violation of the international conventions and resolutions.

In order to test the legitimacy of the aforementioned theory, the researcher answered the questions placed in his overall study through various scholarly approaches relying mostly on a historical, analytical and juristic approach. The study came to some

conclusions, the most important of which is that the Jordanian policy was sufficiently flexible when it dealt with many changes that occurred in regard to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the city of Jerusalem. With the passage of time, the conflict changed from demanding the return of Jerusalem's sovereignty, after the Israeli occupation, to keeping Jerusalem's holy sites under the Jordanian custody and guardianship. The study also offers a number of recommendations, such as requesting all Arab and Muslim countries to offer support, either political or economic, to Jordan as it plays the role of the guardian to Jerusalem's holy sites, as well as a supporter to the Palestinian residents of Jerusalem against the tyranny, and the ever looming threat of having their city's heritage erased by Israel.

All three of the world's major monotheistic faiths consider Jerusalem sacred, and the city is full of fascinating holy sites to visit. One doesn't have to be religious to appreciate the city's exuberant past & cultural significance.

### ***Literature Review:***

When we discuss the role of the Hashemites in the maintenance and preservation of Jerusalem and religious shrines, we are subject to a very important issue, for this reason it has been addressed by many writers and academics, and this will be presented in this section of the study:

The first study, «Jordan's Historic Guardianship of The Holy Sites in Jerusalem» Al Bayan Newspaper (2018). The study aims to clarify the role of Hashemites and their legitimate right of guardianship of Jerusalem. The Jordanian guardianship of the Islamic and Christian shrines in the city of Jerusalem began decades ago and continues to this day. The study shows that, the Jordanian guardianship focuses on these sanctuaries in terms of care, maintenance and protection of Al-Aqsa Mosque, the Dome of the Rock, the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, and other Islamic and Christian holy sites. The study concludes that Jordan is facing numerous political and legal challenges against the policies and practices of the Israeli occupation in Jerusalem, through international organizations and bodies such as the UN Security Council, the United Nations, UNESCO, ISESCO and others. Jordan is always involved in confronting the occupation measures in Jerusalem, especially defending Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock against Israeli attacks. This was manifested in Jordan's decisive position when the Israeli occupation authorities installed cameras and electronic gates at the entrances to Al-Aqsa Mosque.<sup>(1)</sup>

«Trump's Decision And The Current Reality of Jerusalem» by Ali Badwan (2017). The study aims to discuss President Trump's decision to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel after a deliberate, media and political preparation accompanied

---

(1) Abu Tair, Maher (2018). Jordan's historic guardianship of the holy sites in Jerusalem, Al Bayan newspaper, UAE.

by an impressive pressure on the official Palestinian status. The most recent was the threat to close the PLO delegation office in Washington and discuss reducing the US financial contribution to the Palestinian Authority. The decision came after Netanyahu's government completed a series of measures that affected the Palestinian presence in the city and culminated in the intensive celebrations it held last June on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the so-called «Unification of Jerusalem», i.e. the completion of the occupation of the entire city in its western and eastern parts. These unprecedented celebrations, in Netanyahu's words, were filled with expressions of demagoguery and falsification, As stated in the myth on which the Zionist movement relied upon and reproduced the Zionist narrative by saying that Jerusalem before its unity was at the bottom and today is important, Which is a negation of the truth anyway.<sup>(1)</sup>

«The Hashemite Guardianship Over The Holy Sites is Legitimate And Historical, And Cannot Be Misinterpreted» Al - DustourNewspaper Jordan (2014). The study aims to emphasize the role of the Hashemites in the great interest in the Islamic holy sites in Jerusalem by King Abdullah II in the form of continuity of the Hashemite approach in the care of these holy sites, and taking care of this institutional framework represented in the establishment of the Hashemite Fund for the reconstruction of Al Aqsa Mosque

---

(1) Badwan, Ali (2018). Trump's decision and the current reality of Jerusalem Al Hayat Saudi Newspaper.saudi ,December .

and the Dome of the Rock supervised by a law issued in 2007 after amending the law of the reconstruction of al-Aqsa Mosque No. 32 of 1954, and oversees the Fund Board of Trustees chaired by His Highness Prince Ghazi bin Mohammed's Personal Envoy, the Special Adviser of the King. In conclusion, the study counts on the Committee for the Reconstruction of the Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock, which is supervised by the Jordanian Law No. 32 of 1954, and focused on Al-Aqsa Mosque, domes, mihrabs and other cultural landmarks. Jordan has continuously worked hard to maintain and repair these monuments, with more than one third of the mosque area, in addition to the reconstruction of the Dome of the Rock Mosque, which dates back to 691 AD.<sup>(1)</sup>

«Emphasizing The Sanctity Of The City Of Jerusalem From The Islamic Point Of View And Stressing The Importance Of The Absence Of Fully-Fledged Specialized Arab Studies With Regards to Peace In The City Of Jerusalem» by Ahmed ALHorob (2013). The study aims to refer to other studies written in other languages, both in terms of the relationship of Jerusalem with Islam or with Judaism and Christianity. The study then moved to Jerusalem in the political perspective of Islam and the sanctity of the religion that it has received .<sup>(2)</sup>

---

(1) Almharmeh, omer (2014) title «The Hashemite guardianship over the holy sites is legitimate and historical, and can not be interpreted , Al - Dustour newspaper Jordan.

(2) ALhorob, Ahmed (2013). The study emphasizes the sanctity of the city of Jerusalem from the Islamic point of view, Classes of Palestinian Studies Institutions, Beirut.

«Jordanian Palestinian Relations: A Jordanian View» By Mohammad Awwad (2005). The study aims to present the evolution of Jordanian - Palestinian relations through history, since these relations have been both challenged by hardships and influenced by several other Arab states. The study concludes that the Jordanian - Palestinian relations are deeply rooted in history and they date back to the first quarter of the twentieth century, to the period of British and French involvement in the region in the aftermath of World War I, and the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948. Since the early days of the British mandate, both Jordanian and Palestinian people found themselves obliged to interact with each other due to geographic, social, economic and demographic considerations. Following the decision to unite the West Bank and Transjordan to form the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in 1950, the West Bank and its people were in the process of integration within Jordan up to the war that halted the progress in 1967.<sup>(1)</sup>

«Keys To Jerusalem, The Royal Sought» by Simon Hart (2010). The study aims to provide a brief overview of the history and religious significance of the Holy City of Jerusalem as a background to understand the current legal and political status of the city. Its rich history, location as a cross point between the three continents of Asia, Africa and Europe, and the spiritual wealth make

---

(1) Mohammad Awwad (2005) Jordanian-Palestinian Relations: A Jordanian View, Monterey, California.



Jerusalem - 'City of Peace', a unique microcosm for the interplay of the world's civilizations and religions. The study concludes that the Sakhronius, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem in the 7th century, named the ancient city «the magnificent sun of the world».<sup>(1)</sup>

«The Implications of Moving The U.S. Embassy In Israel To Jerusalem» by John Bolton (2017). The study discussed the recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's capital city where relocating the embassy there on incontestably Israeli sovereign territory would be sensible, prudent and efficient for the United States government. Indeed, fully regularizing the American diplomatic presence in Israel will benefit both countries, which is why, worldwide, the U.S. Embassy in virtually every other country is in the host country's capital city.<sup>(2)</sup>

## ***Structure of Research***

### Chapter One: Jordanian Diplomacy

- Importance of the existence of diplomatic relations between States.

-The emergence of diplomacy.

---

(1) Simon Hart (2010) Keys To Jerusalem, The Royal Islamic Strategic Studies Centre 2010 □ Jordan.

(2) John R. Bolton (2017) The Implications for Moving the U.S. Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem

- Preventive diplomacy.
- Types of preventive diplomacy.
- Negotiation.
- International Judiciary.

## Chapter Two: Jordanian Interest in The Palestinian Cause

The Role of the Hashemite's as a Central and Permanent Pivotal Role.

The Contributions of the Hashemite Kings in the Defense of Palestine and Holy Sites.

The Popular Jordanian Position on Trump's Decision.

## Chapter Three: US Policy Toward Jerusalem

The Earliest Period

The Latest Era in Details

## Chapter Four: Jordan, the United States and Jerusalem

Chapter Five: Trump's Decision to Move the Embassy, «The Application And Dimensions»

President Trump

Historical Background of the Decision

Trump's Administration

Deal of the Century

The Dimensions of the Shift in President Trump,s Position  
Palestinian Issue

*Chapter One*  
*Jordanian Diplomacy*



## ***Introduction:***

Diplomatic relations should be studied over the passage of time. Undoubtedly, the problem of defining systems and humanities is a matter that has led to many discussions at the international level as well as the domestic level due to the very strong desire to abandon the rigid divisions that separate the branches of science and to address the study of convergent areas. One has to understand the complexity of the «facts» and that states can sever their relations with a national liberation organization or even refuse to establish relations with them from the outset. The subject of international relations that binds people to international law is a matter of great importance, such as the Law on International Relations between States, the Law on Organizational Relations between International Organizations and States, and the Law on Organizational Relations between International Organizations.

### ***1.1. The Importance of the Existence of Diplomatic Relations Between States:***

The establishment of diplomatic relations is one of the hallmarks of the state according to the international law. The State attaches such importance to such relationships that, after the establishment of such relations, considers certain restrictions imposed on it in its domestic legal system. The law of diplomatic relations is one of the areas where it is difficult to find a new discovery in it. It

remains, however, that the problem of diplomatic relations raises many of the doubts, areas and problems that arise in practical life that can be dangerous or of minor importance. Diplomatic relations are therefore not only a matter of relations between states. It is essential that a diplomatic mission consists of not only ambassadors, businesspersons and attachés, but it also includes administrative personnel, technicians and service personnel. The law of international diplomatic relations is dynamic and extraordinary. It is a dynamic law, in a continuous motion, representing the states which have adopted it, negotiating with the government of the state in which it has been adopted and obtaining information in legitimate ways on the development of events and the interests of its nationals in the adopting state As well as the development of friendly economic, cultural and scientific relations, since there is no more important requirements in relations between states than the immunity of diplomats and embassies in order to achieve this goal. Diplomatic law is exceptional and out of the ordinary, limiting diplomats to certain privileges and immunities in the host country.

Is this the close relationship between public international law and diplomats, and on the other hand, it shows us that diplomacy is a tool or means to achieve lofty goals, and that the objectives of international and diplomatic law are the most effective to achieve these goals. (Mesbah, 1999, p.20)

1. Diplomacy is the opposite of force. It is one of the most important means of solving international problems and conflicts by peaceful means, thus serving the diplomacy of the international community, especially those enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the Charters of other international organizations.
  
2. Because of the density in current international relations and the overlapping and interdependence of interests, the existence of international law merely regulates a few external relations between human societies that are essentially based on the boundaries of a particular court.  

There is no doubt that diplomacy, through its multiple channels, creates coexistence among different peoples.
  
3. Diplomatic activity is currently the usual means of cooperation among states and aims to enhance cooperation among them in various areas on the basis of full respect for national sovereignty and freedom and independence for these reasons. Diplomatic functions and social relations are constantly evolving and diplomatic relations are increasingly evolving. Therefore, the current chaos that needs international relations is obvious, and the severance of diplomatic relations may be inevitable.



## ***1.2. The Emergence of Diplomacy:***

The official documents were widely used by the Romans and were called diplomas and after that the term was called Diplomacy during the middle ages to indicate the study, arrangement and preservation of documents at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the word diplomacy began to take its meaning as known nowadays, especially after the conference in Vienna in 1815. The word diplomacy emerged among politicians and government officials as (diplomatic) and moved from Greek to Latin and then to modern European languages and after that to Arabic.

The official leaders or the document that included the status of the envoy and the task provided. The concept of preventive diplomacy is the proper treatment done through the process of negotiation between States to resolve any dispute between them, as well as the actions taken by the organization or by any regional or international organizations with the aim of preventing conflicts between international bodies and preventing the escalation of existing conflicts without turning them into more hazardous conflicts and limiting their spread once they occur. Such issues and procedures shall include mediation, arbitration and settlement.

In this sense, diplomacy's philosophy is based on the exemplary considerations of the study of peace in international relations and the avoidance of manifestations of the use of force and international relations. (Majdlawi, 2004, p. 17) The main objective is to

strengthen the United Nations force through the Security Council to address issues of international peace and security and changing the terms of reference and calculating its mechanisms so that it is able to carry out its tasks better.

Diplomacy is the first instrument in the foreign policies of states, especially in time of peace, that is, the process of negotiation that takes place between the countries that struggle in their relations, transactions and interests.

Experts on the scope of preventive diplomacy may differ more broadly when it comes to the scope of various safeguarding. They may also differ in their assessments of the policies and strategies to be followed to prevent unfortunate events.

However, they do not differ on the importance of giving early warning of initial or slowly developing crises if preventive measures are to achieve any measure of success.

The end of the cold war has not diminished the importance of giving early warnings. The information society is currently monitoring and analyzing a growing number of factors as well as traditional indicators of potential conflicts such as environmental degradation, economic conditions and population trends. The increasing complexity of data collection and analysis in order to clarify early warning is due to the urgent need for rapid and effective response to ever-changing global events. In our age of

increasing demand for limited resources, this task is becoming more difficult. (Majdlawi, 2004, p. 18)

In recent years, the issue of access to early warning has attracted attention not only within the framework of the United Nations, regional organizations and governments, but also by NGOs and the academic circles. But the problem of achieving a rapid and effective early warning response has not received the same attention. This book seeks to emphasize the need to develop effective responses in the form of various preventive measures. It also emphasizes that the design and management of early warning systems must be closely linked with the task of responding to that warning. This view is based on the firm conviction that the ability to know and interpret the events duly at an early stage will lead to improved responses - a conviction shared by a number of politicians, state figures and those interested in the conscious public. This book does not provide specific policy recommendations to overcome the time gap between early warning and effective response, but it provides a conceptual approach that is applicable to the analysis of any problem. In conclusion, the paper discusses how alarm and response interact in the decision-making process. This interaction, if it has the conditions for success, can help to prevent violence. If it does not, the result is often a lost opportunity.

We are discussing these missed opportunities with some reservation because of the risks associated with analysis of the

facts. However, careful examination of missed opportunities - for preventive diplomacy - can provide lessons learned from past warning failures - response. (Mikled, 1991, p. 391)

There is some sort of disconnecting between the enormous efforts to improve early warning indicators and the link issue available with appropriate responses. Perhaps one of the most important reasons for this is the existence of different lines between data collection and analysis in the information society. Such may be justified, such as the precise specialization in the field of information in which analysts exclude any indication that they practice politics, that they focus their efforts on improving access to and analysis of information. Another explanation of this is the complexity of the policy industry in the contemporary international community, since it may be difficult for any office or body to keep abreast of global developments in order to anticipate, process and manage complex and multilateral policy responses.

But whatever the institutional reasons for the gap between warning and response, there is reason to believe that governments will act responsibly to prevent potential crises.

This belief is partly attributed to the fact that increased global population mobility coupled with the communications revolution (known as the impact of the CNN network) has helped to create and inform active and highly capable expert groups to extrapolate problems before they erupt. As a result, it is unpopular for

government officials to attribute policy stumbling or failure to the lack of correct information when needed (Mikled , 1991, p. 392)

The complexity of global events is intensified by the tight time period during which decision-makers need to formulate an appropriate policy to deal with such identified crises. This requires information analysts and policy makers to work within an integrated warning and response framework. The need for this integrated approach stems from the lesson learned from Pearl Harbor's surprise attack, which served as a starting point for post-World War II efforts to mainstream several systems and procedures to avoid this gap.

Preventive action to prevent crises in the post-cold-war era - as with the need for rapid and effective response to prevent a surprise attack - requires an integrated warning and response framework. But the problem of alerting and responding in such crises is more complex and difficult than avoiding a surprise attack. In this latter case, policymakers have seen that offensive acts are a clear threat to their country's security, which is a warning to respond to that threat. This does not necessarily apply to less severe emergencies such as ethnic conflicts or some blatant abuse of human rights. Since such situations - even in crisis situations - pose less of a threat to the interests of a third party, policymakers are less likely to demand, take seriously, or respond to early warning. (Mikled, 1991, p. 298)

The Question here is, «Were there any crises that were not preceded by warning, regardless of the poor perception and judgment? Experts predicted the war in Bosnia even after the Vance plan ended hostilities between Croatia and the Serb Republic in 1992. Experts also predicted the unfortunate events in Rwanda in 1994, several months before they occurred, despite the inaccuracy of the massacres in the projections.

Similarly, the invasion of Kuwait in 1990 by the forces of Saddam Hussein was not a big surprise to those who were observing events in the Middle East closely. If events such as those in Bosnia, Kuwait and Rwanda are already known (and predictable in a world that has become a small village), why not prevent them? There is no simple answer to this question, although it can be explained in part by examining how warnings are reported and communicated to policy makers, and their assessment of the implications of such warnings in terms of the need for appropriate action.

### ***1.3. Preventive Diplomacy:***

The most effective diplomatic effort is to reduce tension before it leads to conflict. If the conflict breaks out, it has to be quickly worked out to contain and remedy its underlying causes. The functions of preventive diplomacy can be undertaken by the Secretary-General personally, or by senior staff, through specialized agencies and programs, by the Security Council, by the

General Assembly or by regional organizations in cooperation with the United Nations. Preventive diplomacy requires confidence-building measures; it requires early warning based on formal or informal information-gathering and fact-finding; it may include preventive deployment of United Nations representatives and in some cases the establishment of demilitarized zones.

Mutual trust and goodwill are essential in reducing the possibility of conflict between States. Many of these measures are available to Governments that have the will to use them. Examples include the regular exchange of military missions, the creation of regional or sub-regional risk reduction centers and arrangements for the free flow of information, including the monitoring of regional arms agreements. I call on all regional organizations to consider any further confidence-building measures that could be applied in their regions and report the results to the United Nations. I will conduct periodic consultations on confidence-building measures with potential or current or past parties to conflicts, and with regional organizations, with all the advisory assistance of the Secretariat. (Holl& Alexander, 1997, p451)

Preventive measures must be based on accurate and timely knowledge of the facts. Moreover, an understanding of global developments and trends is required based on sound analysis. There must be a will to take appropriate preventive measures. Given the economic and social roots of many potential conflicts, the

information needed by the United Nations must include economic and social trends, as well as political developments that could lead to serious tensions.

(A) The fact-finding, in accordance with the Charter, must be increasingly resorted to, either at the initial stages to the Secretary-General, so that it can discharge its responsibilities under the Charter, including article 99 of the Security Council, different forms can be selected, as the case may require. Any request by a state to send a United Nations fact-finding mission to its territory should be considered without delay.

(B) Communications with member states should provide the Secretary-General with detailed information on issues of concern. I request that all member states be prepared to provide the necessary information for effective preventive diplomacy. I will add to my personal contacts senior officials regularly on missions aimed at consultations in capitals and elsewhere. Such contacts are necessary to reach a deeper understanding of the situation and assess its potential consequences. (Holl and Alexander, 1997, p451)

(C) The commission of official fact-finding may come from the Security Council or the General Assembly. Either body may choose to send a mission under its direct authority and may invite the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps, including the



appointment of a special envoy. In addition to the fact that the representative of the mission collects the information on which to decide on further action, in some cases, once it exists, it can help to calm the conflict, as the parties find that the organization, in particular the Security Council, is actively interested in the issue as a potential threat that threatens international security;

(D) In exceptional circumstances, the Council may meet outside of headquarters in accordance with the Charter, not only for the direct examination of facts, but also for the consolidation of the authority of the organization in the face of a given situation.

### ***1.3.1 Early Warning:***

In recent years, the United Nations system has developed a valuable network of early warning systems for environmental hazards, the risk of a nuclear accident, natural disasters, massive population movements, the risk of famine and the spread of disease. However, there is a need to strengthen the arrangements in a way that brings together the information from these sources and the political indicators, to ascertain the potential threat to peace and to analyze what the United Nations can take to mitigate this threat. This process requires a close cooperation from the various specialized agencies and substantive offices of the United Nations. As necessary, I will provide analyses and recommendations on preventive action to the Security Council and other United Nations

bodies. In addition, I recommend that the Security Council, after revitalizing and restructuring the Council, call upon the Economic and Social Council to provide reports, in accordance with Article 65 of the Charter, on economic and social developments that, if not mitigated, may jeopardize international peace and security.

Regional arrangements and organizations have an important role to play in early warning. I call upon those regional organizations that have not yet done so to seek observer status in the United Nations to do so and to relate, through appropriate arrangements, to the security mechanisms of this organization. (Holl and Alexander, 1997, p451)

### ***1.3.2. Preventive Deployment:***

United Nations operations are usually conducted in crisis areas after conflict. The time has come to plan to meet the conditions that call for preventive measures, which can happen in various forms and ways. For example, preventive deployment can be used in circumstances of national crisis at the request of the government or by all parties concerned, or with their consent. In disputes between states, such deployment can take place when the parties feel that the presence of the United Nations on both sides of their borders can prevent hostilities. Preventive deployment can also take place when a country feels threatened to demand an appropriate United Nations presence on its own side only from the border. In each

case, the mandate and composition of the elements of the United Nations presence should be carefully defined, and all this should be clear to all.<sup>(1)</sup>

In the event of a crisis within a country and when the government requires or agrees with all parties, preventive deployment can, in many ways, help alleviate suffering and reduce or control violence. Humanitarian assistance, if provided impartially, can be of crucial importance; assistance in the maintenance of security, whether through military personnel, police or civilian personnel, can create conditions of safety under which negotiations can be held; The United Nations shall assist in the conciliation efforts if the parties so desire. In certain circumstances, the United Nations may benefit from specialized skills and resources available throughout the United Nations system, and such operations may sometimes require the participation of non-governmental organizations.

In such internal crises, the United Nations must respect the sovereignty of the state; otherwise, it would be contrary to the concept of member states in accepting the principles of the Charter. The organization must continue to take into account the carefully negotiated balance, the balance contained in the guidelines annexed to General Assembly resolution 46/182 of 19 December

---

(1) (An Agenda for Peace Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peacekeeping Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the communiqué issued by the Security Council Summit in June 1992 Source: United Nations documents).

1991. These guidelines emphasized, among other things, that humanitarian assistance must be provided in accordance with the principles and impartiality; that the sovereignty, territorial integrity and national unity of states must be fully respected in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. In that context, humanitarian assistance should be provided with the consent of the affected country and, in principle, on the basis of an appeal by that country. The guidelines also emphasized the responsibility of states to care for victims of emergencies in their territory and the need to reach those in need of humanitarian assistance. In the light of these guidelines, the Government's request for the participation or consent of the United Nations would not be in violation of the sovereignty of that state or in contradiction with Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, which referred to issues already at the core of the internal affairs of states.

In disputes between states, if both parties agree, I recommend that, the Security Council should conclude that the risk of hostilities between two neighboring countries may be eliminated by the preventive deployment of United Nations forces in the territory of each state, such action should be taken. The composition of the United Nations presence is determined by the nature of the tasks to be performed.<sup>(1)</sup>

---

(1) (An Agenda for Peace Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peacekeeping Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the communiqué issued by the Security Council Summit in June 1992 Source: United Nations documents).

Where a state fears a cross-border attack, and if the Security Council concludes that a United Nations presence on one side of the border, with the consent of the requesting country only, would prevent the conflict, I recommend preventive deployment. In this case too, the mandate and the individuals required to carry out it depend on the situation itself.

### ***1.3.3. Demilitarized Zones:***

In the past, the establishment of demilitarized zones was done with the consent of the parties at the end of the conflict. In addition to the deployment of United Nations forces in those areas as part of peacekeeping operations, the usefulness of such zones as a form of preventive deployment on both sides of the border should now be considered, with the agreement of both parties at the request of one of the parties in order to remove any pretext for the attack. Such zones symbolize the international community's interest in preventing conflict. (An agenda for peace preventive diplomacy and peacekeeping report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the communiqué issued by the Security Council Summit in June 1992 Source: United Nations' documents).

### ***1. 4. Types of Preventive Diplomacy:***

The preventive diplomacy is divided into two modes. Both are not exercised except with the consent and agreement of the

conflicting parties. There is a fundamental difference between them. The first is that the results are not binding to the parties of the conflict, whereas the results of the second are obligatory. The first type is a preventive diplomacy of an optional nature.<sup>(1)</sup>

The modalities of its exercise vary according to the state of the conflict to be addressed. This diplomacy includes five main forms: direct negotiations, good offices, mediation, investigation, conciliation and reconciliation.

The direct diplomatic negotiations are one of the direct methods of conducting the negotiations, namely, the scientific, through which the exchange of views and direct performance between the two countries to search for a peaceful settlement of the dispute. The diplomatic envoy plays an important role in the normal negotiation process by exchanging verbal and specific notes with international officials in case it has failed diplomatically. (The Origin and Development of the Palestinian Question: 1917-1988 (New York: United Nations, 1990), pp. 189-191)

Second, preventive diplomacy with binding consequences is the recourse to the parties of the dispute to the judicial means in order to settle that dispute. Therefore, it is called diplomacy with binding consequences for the following reasons:

---

(1) (The Origin and Development of the Palestinian Question: 1917-1988- (New York: United Nations, 1990), pp. 189-191-)

1. The recourse to litigation is vested in the administration of states, especially in international affairs.
2. The resort of the parties of the conflict to international jurisdiction comes after the stages of negotiation and after the failure of the methods of preventive diplomacy of an optional nature.

#### ***1.4.1. First: Preventive Diplomacy Of An Optional Nature:***

##### ***1. Direct Conventional Negotiations:***

This is one of the most direct methods of conducting negotiations. It has been called the usual negotiator because it is the first usual way of resorting to it by two states to deal with a problematic dispute or conflict between them.

The direct negotiations are conducted directly by diplomatic commissioners or by higher level officials, such as ministers and heads of state or government, depending on the importance of the issue and the degree of its relevance to the national interest or national security of the two countries.

##### ***2. Good Offices:***

When two conflicting states do not reach agreement, through their exercise of the method of direct negotiations to resolve a dispute between them, the parties enter into another mode of diplomacy of an optional nature. This may be the intervention of a third party, which may be a state or several regional or international

organizations, either on its own initiative or at the request of either of the parties of the dispute or one of them, with a view to providing the parties with an objective and impartial advice and in order to bring the views closer and create conditions for the resumption of negotiations without Participation. This approach is called good offices.

There are many examples of good offices as one of the methods of preventive diplomacy: such as France's efforts during the Paris negotiations on the Vietnam issue between the United States and North Vietnam, which led to the signing of an agreement on 27 January 1973.<sup>(1)</sup>

### ***3. Mediation:***

The method of mediation in terms of form does not depart from the good offices approach, but is fundamentally different. Mediation is similar to good offices in that it is an endeavor by one or more states or an international or regional organization to resolve a dispute between two states on its own initiative or at the request of one of the parties of the conflict.

However, the role of mediation is more important than good offices because of its clarity and commitment to the parties of the conflict during the negotiation process. Mediation is a more effective intervention. Thus, good offices are transformed into

---

(1) (Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice, Supplement No. 1.)



mediation if the third party is not satisfied with the advice of the parties, but rather with the consent of the parties to the negotiations until they are terminated or interrupted, as the role of agreement is proposed and efforts are made to make it acceptable to both parties to the conflict. (Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice, Supplement No. 1.)

#### ***1.4.2. Mediation, Based On the Principle of Conciliation,***

There are situations in which recourse to mediation may be binding, including the conclusion of a treaty where one of its clauses requires recourse to the mediation of a third state or more when a dispute arises between the parties or contracting parties

Examples of mediation include the mediation of the United States of America to end the Russo-Japanese war, where then-President Theodore Roosevelt intervened to mediate between the parties of the conflict. Through that mediation, a peace treaty was signed between the parties on 5 September 1905, Port Smouth, as well as the mediation of Count Bernadotte appointed by the General Assembly as a mediator of the United Nations in 1948 to find a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, which was assassinated by the Zionist Stern Gang on September 1948. (Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice, Supplement No. 1.)

## ***1.5. Negotiation***

Negotiation may take two forms in international law: international arbitration and international justice.

International arbitration: the consideration of a dispute to determine the person or entity to which the contestants resort to their obligations to implement the decision in dispute. Article 37 of the Hague Convention of 1907 defined arbitration as follows:

International arbitration aims at settling disputes between states by judges elected by these states on the basis of respect for the right of recourse to arbitration. The obligation to submit to a solution on the basis of good faith is required. The arbitrator's authority or the conciliation commission, as mentioned above, stands at the limit of the presentation and the proposal. The arbitration authority, as the judge's authority and decision, is binding. The arbitration has several characteristics (Hafez, 1998, p33)

1. Arbitration is a method of resolving rights to current or anticipated international disputes.
2. The use of arbitration is optional and may become compulsory by means of a special treaty between states.
3. Compliance with the results of arbitration is mandatory in all cases.

International arbitration has gone through several stages:

### ***1.5.1. The First Stage:***

When the Pope and the medieval Roman Emperor were considered undisputed presidents of the rest of the heads of state, one of them would arbitrate naturally. Later, the princes replaced them in this jurisdiction, when every emperor of his empire became a king in the 16th century. (Hafez, 1998, p33)

### ***1.5.2. The Second Stage:***

The arbitration of mixed committees instead of individuals, and these committees are of two types, some of which are in an arbitral form and the latter type was made by a representative chosen by each of the rival teams of their subjects, if the two parties to the solution can take consular between them from one of the nationals of the same countries and this is what was done in resolving the differences between England and the United States of America on the delimitation of the border with Canada.

### ***1.5.3. The Third Stage:***

This was done in the last century on the occasion of the incident of the warship «Alabama» and its subject happened during the American war of separation (North and South War) as it was providing assistance secretly to the states of the South by allowing them to build vessels that were used in the war and funded by the

English ports were one of these ships. They were built in the city of Liverpool and then came out after arming them. They attacked the boats of the northern states, sank a number of them and caused great damage to these states. When the war ended with the victory of the northern states, England demanded compensation for these damages on the basis that this state was contrary to the principles of neutrality and angered by the entitlement to an American request and the negotiations between the two countries did not lead to the resolution of the conflict that almost ended in the war, and finally they could agree to bring the matter to international arbitration. Under a treaty concluded in Washington 1871, it was decided that the arbitral tribunal would be composed of five members. The Commission met in September 1872 in Geneva and issued its decision in favor of the United States of America, and obliged England to pay the appropriate compensation of \$ 50.5 million. (Sadek, 1947, p56)

One of the most famous cases in international arbitration is the Egyptian case of Taba. The Camp David Agreement concluded between Egypt and Israel on March 26, 1979 provided to the end of the war between the two countries and the withdrawal of Israel from Sinai and Egypt's full sovereignty over it. The international recognized boundary between Egypt and the territory of Palestine under the mandate. Article (4) of the treaty states that disputes arising from the application or interpretation of this treaty shall be

resolved through negotiations. For those disputes, which cannot be resolved through negotiations, conciliation or referral. When negotiations and Washington's mediation failed to reach a solution, the parties decided on 11 September 1986 to refer the dispute to the International Court of Arbitration, which was established by an agreement between them. The agreement provided that the city of Geneva would be the seat of the Court and that English would be the language of written and oral pleadings. And on September 29, 1988, the court issued a judgment in favor of Egypt. The ruling marked the first international arbitration process carried out within the framework of the peace treaty between the two parties. (Sadek, 1947, p56)

The case of the Greater Hanish Island between Yemen and Eritrea: The latest case in international arbitration, the area of the island is 82 km<sup>2</sup>, the Yemeni coast is about 28 nautical miles and the Eritrean coast is 82 nautical miles and is close to the Bab al-Mandab Strait, which is the southern key of the Red Sea. After independence, Eritrea claimed ownership of the island. On December 15, 1995, it launched an offensive attack and occupied it after unequal fighting with Yemeni security guards. Yemen did not resort to the use of force to restore the island, but proposed the use of peaceful means to resolve the dispute. Following the French mediation on October 3, 1996, an agreement was signed to establish an arbitration tribunal and two judges were appointed by Sana'a and Asmara (the capital of Eritrea).

## ***1.6. International Judiciary:***

International justice is mainly concentrated in the International Court of Justice. Even the establishment of the First World War did not allow states to accept the idea of a supreme international judicial authority to which states should refer in their disputes if they view this as restricting their freedom to act and to infringe upon their sovereignty. Meeting of States at the Peace Conference 1919 Article 14 of the League of Nations states that the League Council shall work on a draft of a permanent international court of justice and submit this draft to the member states of the League, as well as advisory opinions in all matters requested by the League Council or its General Assembly.

The League Council, as soon as it was formed, did not hesitate to implement this article. A committee of international jurists was entrusted with the work of the said project. The draft was submitted to the General Assembly in December 1920 and was adopted after minor amendments. The court has reached 51 states, and it has functioned for nearly a quarter of a century. It has been divided into many legal disputes and in advisory matters, Since the activities of the League of Nations after World War II had been liquidated, it had been reconstituted under the name of the United Nations system and is now called the International Court of Justice. The new court system has been built on the same basis as its predecessor, except for a few minor amendments. The court,

in accordance with article 92, is the principal judicial body of the United Nations and its activity is governed by a statute attached to the Charter called the Statute of the International Court of Justice. (Daoudi , 2001, p57)

The Court consists of 15 judges, who shall be considered for personal consideration in the sense that they are chosen in view of their specific qualifications. The basis for choosing these judges is that they do not represent their own states and, in accordance with article 16 of the Statute, may not assume political or administrative functions and they shall not be employed at any other profession. The judges of the court shall be chosen in accordance with article 2 of the Statute. Persons of high morals in their countries shall have the qualifications required to express themselves in the highest judicial offices or legislators recognized for competence in international law. Judges shall be elected for a term of nine years and renewable under Article 13.

*Optional Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice:*

States alone shall have the right to be parties of proceedings before the Court and the States participating in the Statute shall have the right to sue directly before them. Such States shall include all Members of the United Nations as well as non-member States that accede to the Statute in accordance with the conditions established by the General Assembly of the United Nations on the recommendation of the Security Council.

First: the jurisdiction of the Optional Court: does not extend beyond what the parties agree to refer to, both at the time of the dispute and preceding it. There has been a tendency to make the jurisdiction of the Court mandatory for State parties of the Statute and for disputes of a legal nature. (Daoudi, 2001, p79)

- Jurisdiction of the Court: Forced jurisdiction is confirmed on the basis of article 36, and the jurisdiction of the Court extends to the submission of advisory opinions and falls within the framework of the judicial activity of the United Nations in the International Court of Justice because it expresses the opinion of the law with respect to a particular dispute or conflicting views, in accordance with Article 96 of the Charter and 65 of the Statute.

The most recent advisory opinions of the court and most notable is the opinion on the separation wall that separates the areas of Israel and the areas of the Palestinian Authority which was considered a violation of human rights rules.





## *Chapter Two*

# *Jordanian Interest in the Palestinian Cause*



## ***2.1. The Role of The Hashemites as A Central And Permanent Pivotal Role***

### ***Introduction:***

Every time the Al-Aqsa Mosque is attacked by the Zionists, the Jordanian state finds itself at the heart of the event, as a result of the historical extension of Jordan's role towards Al-Aqsa, which is broadcasted annually to most Jordanians, through the official media and official curricula Such as national and Islamic education, whose definitions or terminology range from guardianship to care and reconstruction, which opens up questions concerning the nature, size, history and definition of this role. In light of the issue of the martyrdom of Jordanian citizens by a Zionist security officer in the Jordanian capital, and the group of colonial measures that were developed by the Zionist occupation authorities towards Al Aqsa, citing a commando operation in its courtyards, how do we understand this Jordanian role in Jerusalem. (Jabari, kamal, <https://www.7iber.com/politics-economics/jordanian-role-in-al-aqsa>, August, 24, 2017)

Before referring to the historical backgrounds to form the Jordanian role in the administration of the Al-Aqsa Mosque, it is necessary to point out an important issue, namely that this role is linked mainly to the administration of the Aqsa and Islamic Waqf in Jerusalem; the property of the Waqf and schools in addition

to the mosque. The Jordanian Ministry of Awqaf is the official body authorized to administer Islamic endowments, mosques and Islamic holy sites, and King Abdullah II, who maintains it through the Jordanian Ministry of Awqaf and the head of the Jordanian state. His attachment to this role is based on a historical legacy that was preserved by his Hashemite ancestors in the care of Al-Aqsa, although this care he focused on the reconstruction of the buildings, where it was the first Hashemite reconstruction of Al-Aqsa Mosque in 1924.(Jabari, kamal, [https://www.7iber.com/politics\\_economics/jordanian-role-in-al-aqsa](https://www.7iber.com/politics_economics/jordanian-role-in-al-aqsa), August, 24, 2017)

### ***2.1.1. Historical Background***

The concept of guardianship of the Al-Aqsa Mosque was officially restored on March 31, 2013, when King Abdullah II and Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas signed the Care and Guardianship Agreement, which considered Jordan as the guardian of the Aqsa Mosque. The concept of guardianship was not mentioned in any previous or subsequent international convention or resolution, while the nature of the relationship between Jordan and the Al-Aqsa State was repeatedly expressed as administration, the Jordanian state was recognized as the entity that administered the Al-Aqsa Mosque prior to its occupation in 1967. (Jabari, 2017).

The date of the establishment of the first independent Waqf circle specialized in Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Islamic Waqf in Jerusalem in 1843 was at the end of the Ottoman rule of the Levant. After the British occupation of Palestine and Trans-Jordan in 1917, the British occupation authorities seized Jerusalem endowments, and formed an endowment committee in 1920 under the direct supervision of the British High Commissioner (Herbert Samuel). Despite the Zionist intentions to attempt to capture parts of the Aqsa that began in the early stages of the British occupation of Palestine, which directed all the possibilities available to form a colonial project in Palestine to the Zionist movement , but the first comprehensive popular revolution in Palestine after the British Mandate, In 1929, which most of the cities of Palestine and most of the Palestinian people participated in, were the result of an attempt to attack part of Al-Aqsa, the Al-Buraq Wall. Following the revolution, the first international law issued by the League of Nations on 14/1/1930 recognized that the Al-Aqsa Mosque with all its facilities is a pure Islamic right and a holy place for Muslims only. Throughout its occupation, the British shall not make any attempts to change the Aqsa Mosque or its current situation. This made the British colonial project and the Zionists think carefully before trying to change the status quo of the Aqsa Mosque, and this does not mean the omission of the fact that the British desire to internationalize Jerusalem and the conflict.

After the 1948 war, the West Bank, including Jerusalem, underwent Jordanian rule. King Abdullah I of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan was quick to annex Jerusalem administratively to the kingdom. After the end of the fighting, Jerusalem was governed by a military ruler, Ahmed Hilmi, and later subjected to the Civil Administration. Jerusalem became officially part of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. This was confirmed by the 1952 Constitution under King Talal bin Abdullah. Jerusalem and its endowments, including the Al-Aqsa Mosque, became directly subordinate to the Jordanian Ministry of Awqaf. In 1953, Which is still considered the administration responsible for the administration of the mosque, and here is a Jordanian official role in the management and guardianship of Al-Aqsa.

After clashes with the Jordanian army that lasted for one day, Zionist occupation forces managed to occupy the city of Jerusalem in full, and the Zionist forces led by Defense Minister Moshe Dayan, entered to Al-Aqsa Haram, which has started a new phase in its history since then.

On May 3, 1967, the Zionist state subjected the city of Jerusalem to the Ministry of Religions, unlike the other directorates of the endowments in the occupied West Bank, which were subjected to the Ministry of the Zionist War, in a similar move to what the Zionists occupied Palestine in 1948.

The Hashemites have ensured the reconstruction and reform of the Islamic holy sites. It was a great responsibility that God honored them to carry the burden of the custody of the Islamic holy sites. Their position from Jerusalem that it is the first of the two Qiblas, and they always affirmed their adoption of the message they fought for: freedom of people and preservation of the nation's dignity. The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan remained responsible for Arab and Islamic holy sites in the city of Jerusalem with its mosques and churches. (Al-Rubaie, 2001).

The Hashemite Custody of Jerusalem is a part of the Jordanian principle in the defense of holy sites since Sharif bin Ali who was the first Hashemite monarch. King Abdullah I continued in this Hashemite guardianship of al-Aqsa and its holy places. The Hashemite guardianship continued under King Talal. King Hussein, who ordered the promulgation of the law of the reconstruction committee of Al-Aqsa Mosque No. 32 of 1954, where the second and third reconstruction process continued during the reign of King Hussein, which was the maintenance and restoration of buildings and domes and Haram, the Dome of the Rock and the Al Aqsa Mosque and all its decorations (Zahran and Amira, 2000).

The first Jordanian reconstruction of the city of Jerusalem and its holy sites began in 1959. The reconstruction included replacement of the Dome of the Rock. The reconstruction also included the building of the Al-Aqsa Mosque where the damaged parts were



removed and silver plating was installed, from the inside pillars to the marble columns with one piece. The Jordanian authorities after the fire that hit the Aqsa Mosque on 21 August 1969 formed a Committee for the Rehabilitation of Al-Aqsa Mosque in order to remove any effects of the fire, and the restoration of the mosque, which included the re-establishment of the destroyed part of the Al-Aqsa for (Al Hazaymeh, 2011).

### ***2.1.2. The Hashemites***

The Hashemite ruling class is considered one of the most prominent ruling families in the history of the Arabs in the Middle East. Its fame is attributed to the direct pedigree of Bani Hashem, to which the Prophet Muhammad belongs. The descendant of the Arab chief Quraysh is a descendant of the prophet Ismail, who himself is the son of the Prophet Ibrahim (Abraham). Historical records prove that Quraysh first came to the holy city of Mecca in the second century AD; however, they were unable to rule the city until Qusayy bin Kilab was promoted to the Mecca leadership in 480 AD. The latter's grandson, Hashem, was actually the great-grandfather of the Prophet Muhammad and the Bani Hashim tribe was named after him. Since then, several Hashemite rulers have ruled the Hijaz region (now Saudi Arabia) of the Arabian Peninsula from 967 AD to 1201 AD. The Hashemite rulers praised their direct pedigree to Prophet Muhammad through his daughter Fatima and

her husband Ali Ben Abi Talib, who was also a Hashemite, and the cousin of the Prophet, who later became the fourth Caliph of Islam. The story tells the intolerant people that they should not hold power after Caliph Ali Ben Abi Talib. However, in the Islamic reign of the last centuries, many Hashemite rulers ruled the government under the sovereignty of the Ottoman sultans.(Teitelbaum, 1998: 104).

After the collapse of the Ottoman Empire in 1916, many members of the Hashemite dynasty seized power in a small number of Arab local governments in Syria, Iraq and Jordan. Only in Jordan can the Hashemite family survive the collapse of the monarchy and the emergence of the revolutionary regimes of the 1940s and 1950s. For some historical records, when the Hashemites arrived in Transjordan (name of Jordan before independence), it was inhabited by Bedouins, Palestinians, Syrians and local tribes, as well as Circassians, Turks and Armenians. A large number of social and ethnic diversity; this diversity faced the challenge of establishing a unified Jordanian identity on many occasions (see Massad, 2001: 240, Salibi, 2006: 104). Since arriving in Jordan in the 1920s, the Hashemites have established minority ethnic groups. Initially, the Hashemites tried to merge with the dominant host of Jordan to condemn the two accusations: their legitimacy was imposed by the West (British) and imposed on the Jordanians (Lucas, 2008: 283). The successive rulers of Hashem secretly and

explicitly condemned these accusations, emphasizing that the great common social traditions between them and the Jordanians is that what is truly in common between them and Jordanians.

#### ***2.1.2.1. The Hashemite Custodianship:***

1924-1967, Sharif Hussein Ben Ali, established Hashemite's historic role in the guardianship and protection of East Jerusalem in 1924 under the supervision of Ahl Al-Quds movement, swearing in allegiance to the Palestinian Arab residents that he will protect the ruins and people of the holy city because they are the successors of the Muslim Nation's Islamic government. (See: Annex 1: Khilafah's loyalty to Sharif Hussein Ben Ali in 1924). When the Ottoman Islamic Caliph officially ended in November 1922, the Arabs in Syria, Jordan and Palestine sought a legal Caliph and, therefore, Hashemite Prince Abdullah Bin Sharif Hussein Bin Ali (later King Abdullah I) and the Palestinian Hajj Amin Hasseni are the first two figures people aspired. At that time, figures from neighboring Arab countries traveled to Amman to express their loyalty and brought Bay'at Al-Khilafah to the Arab King Sharif Hussein and the Great Arab Uprising against the Ottoman government. (Lucas, 2008: 283). Therefore, according to Bay'ah, the Holy Land of Jerusalem remains largely and legally subject to the sovereignty and custody of the Hashemites (because it was excluded from the decision to withdraw from the West Bank in 1988). (Key to Jerusalem, Royal Islamic Strategy Research Center 2010, Jordan).

As a declaration of the Arab position on Palestine, King Abdullah I of Jordan determined the consequences of Zionism's ambitions in Palestine. (The Key to Jerusalem, Royal Islamic Strategy Research Center, Jordan) in a statement he made to the American people in November 1947, King Abdullah's objection to Zionism was due to long-term ethnic or religious hatred, especially due the long history of peaceful coexistence between Jews and Muslims in the Middle East: no one on Earth is less «anti-Semitic» than Arabs. and has reached such an important position when Spain became under the reign of the Arabs. With few exceptions, Jews have lived in the Middle East for many centuries and are completely peaceful and friendly with their Arab neighbors. King Abdullah's Statement raises a question related to the legitimacy of Jewish claims against the historic sacred sites of Palestine and Jerusalem, especially in history, where Christian Europeans persecute the Jews much more than Arabs' resistance to the establishment of Israel. He believes it is unfair to make anti-Semitism a claim against Palestinians who should pay for crimes committed during the Holocaust. In response to the angry voices of Muslims around the world, King Abdullah questioned how Jews claimed to have the historical rights of Palestine, where Muslims were the majority for almost 1300 years. Despite regional and global efforts to keep colonial-Zionist ambitions intact, West Jerusalem fell into the Israeli army's hands in 1948. When the Palestinian-British mandate ended at the end of the year, the Zionists announced the establishment of the

State of Israel on May 14, 1948, and the Arab-Israeli war broke out. When the United Nations voted in favor of dividing Palestine in November 1947, Zionist Militant groups fought against armed groups and Palestinian groups. In that battle, the Zionist militia (soon to be reunited as the national army of Israel) has captured important territories (the land owned by 30,000 Arabs in the Jerusalem area was requisitioned). The sub-regional plan of the United Nations were assigned to the Arabs in that year, although Resolution 181 of the United Nations granted the city a special status, that is, according to international law, the city had an «independent body», so the city of West Jerusalem was under the control of Israel. During the 1948 war, Jordan successfully defended East Jerusalem and its Muslim and Christian holy sites. Then, on April 24, 1950, due to the Jericho Conference and the Declaration of Solidarity between the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the Palestinian leaders in the West Bank, subsequent territories, including Jerusalem, officially became part of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. This is a resolution signed by King Abdullah I, and by the National Assembly of Jordan (including representatives of the East and West Banks), which supported cross-strait reunification as the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, «without prejudice to the aspirations of the Palestinians in the country, cooperation among the Arab countries and the definitive solution of cases of justice in the field of international justice.» The signing of the resolution was also the end result of a series of

previous requests from Palestinian Arabs through meetings of the elected mayors of the major cities and villages of the West Bank (Map of Hebron, Ramallah, Al-Beereh, Jenin, Nablus), as well as a significant religious clergy (like Muslims and Christians), as well as many celebrities, tribal leaders, activists, university presidents, heads of Islamic judges and Mufti of Jerusalem Saed Ideen Al-Alami. After these meetings, King Abdullah I accepted the proposed constitutional amendment to expand the membership of the Jordanian Parliament to include all elected representatives of the West Bank constituency. The election to expand the parliament was held on April 11, 1950 and the new parliament was elected, half of which were elected from the West Bank. To resolve some of the Arab League's concerns, the Jordanian government adopted a declaration in 1950 that officially confirmed that harmonization with the Palestinian territories «does not hinder the final settlement of the issue of Palestine,» and therefore the Arab League accepted the declaration. Through this agreement, the Hashemite Kingdom has strengthened its protection of Jerusalem, has enacted laws to restore the Holy Land and continues to provide the tradition of Hashemite donations to the Holy Land and the Old City of Jerusalem. In July 1953, the Jordanian cabinet met for the first time in East Jerusalem, shortly after the parliament was held there. In 1959, the state of Jerusalem had been improved from Baladiya (Town hall) to Amanah (Municipality), making it comparable to Amman. King Hussein declared Jerusalem as the second capital of

the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the plans to build a palace in the north of the city. While Jordan maintains the physical, legal and political sovereignty over East Jerusalem, the special historical role of the Hashemites in Jerusalem continues to exist and persist. (Key to Jerusalem, Royal Islamic Strategy Research Center 2010, Jordan).

Until the Arab-Israeli war on June 5, 1967, Israel launched an offensive war against Egypt and began to seize East Jerusalem and the West Bank from Jordan, the Gaza Strip and the Sinai of Egypt and the Golan Heights of Syria.

#### ***2.1.2.2. The Historic Role of the Hashemites:***

The sacred site of East Jerusalem remains principally and constitutionally owned by the sovereignty of the Hashemite Royal House of Jordan, as it was legally excluded from Jordan's 1988 separation from the West Bank. Beginning with the Israeli occupation, the Hashemites of Jordan played the role of the guardian of the Muslim holy sites in Jerusalem. In 1918, British commander Hogarth was ordered to provide security to the father of Sheffield's founder Hussein Bin Ali-Mega Amir and Jordan Abdullah I: the Muslim shrine must be considered a Muslim authority. Since 1922, the Hashemites have carried out three major restoration projects in Jerusalem. Since 1948, Jordan has maintained the Awqaf Administration in the old city. Under

the auspices of Sharif Hussein, in cooperation with the Supreme Muslim Council, the first Hashemite restoration of the Dome and the Al-Aqsa Mosque was between 1922 and 1924. During the «British Empowerment», Jordan ruled East Jerusalem (1948-1967), and even after Israel occupied East Jerusalem (1967-present), this special historical role continued. Sharif Hussein Ben Ali donated 24,000 golden liras for the first renovation of Al-Aqsa Mosque and asked to be buried there before his death. During the supervision of Jerusalem by Jordan, the meeting of the Prime Minister was held in the Old City. From 1948 to 1967, Jordan spent more money in Jerusalem than its own capital, Amman. The 1988 legal and administrative relationship between Jordan and the West Bank clearly excluded East Jerusalem and its Islamic holy sites from the decision to withdraw from Jordan. Jordan aims to ensure that there is no gap or «protection gap» between the PLO and Israel, or that Israel can change the religious character and status of East Jerusalem as an occupied city. In other words, Jordan retains legal and administrative control over the Islamic Holy Land in East Jerusalem, in particular Al-Aqsa Mosque with the King of Jordan as its guardian. (Key to Jerusalem, Royal Research Center of the Islamic Strategy, 2010, Jordan).

Jordan declared Jerusalem its spiritual capital, but avoided it as a political center, because as in Mecca and Medina, most of the ancient cities are Islamic property (Waqf). The state of «Waqf»



makes the property remain a universal trust, so no state or ruling family can claim ownership. The «Washington Declaration» of 1993 and the «Jordan and Israel Peace Treaty» of 1994 further reaffirmed the role of Jordan, which states that Israel respects the special role of the Royal Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in the Muslim holy places of Jerusalem. When negotiating on issues of permanent status, Israel attach great importance to Jordan's historic role in these sacred places. King Abdullah II, as Hashemite guardian of the Holy City Holy Land, continues to personally support the maintenance and renovation of the Holy Land. In addition, the Hashemite royal family of Jordan spent more than \$ 1 billion from 1921 to 2010 to support the Awqaf government and its more than 600 employees, guards, Islamic courts and orphanages in East Jerusalem.

### ***2.1.2.3. Hashemite Custodianship Of Jerusalem Holy Sites:***

It refers to the role of the Jordanian royal family in Muslim and Christian holy places in the city of Jerusalem» Jordanian Christians put their weight in support of the pro-Jerusalem king». The Jordan Times. 19 December 2017. Retrieved 18 January 2018.)

The state's history dates back to 1924, and Islamic Committee, the highest Islamic institution responsible for the care of the Palestinian Muslim community affairs, and accepted Shareef Hussein Bin Ali as Al-Aqsa's guardian. The guardianship is a

history run by successive Jordanian kings. Jordan took control over East Jerusalem and the West Bank in 1948 and annexed them in 1951 until the loss of Israel during the Six Day War of 1967. Jordan abandoned its claim to the Territory in 1988 and signed a peace treaty with Israel in 1994. Article 9 stipulates that Israel be committed to «respect the special role of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in the Muslim holy places of Jerusalem» and «When the negotiations as regards the permanent state, Israel will attach great importance to the historic role of Jordan in these sacred places.» In 2013, the agreement between Jordan and the Palestinian Authority recognized the role of Jordan.

In the 20th century, the Hashemite dynasty carried out four renovations in Al-Aqsa and the Dome of the Rock. In 2016, King Abdullah II participated in the restoration of the tomb of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. In 2017, King Abdullah donated \$ 1.4 million to the Jordanian government of Jerusalem, which is responsible for the administration of Al-Aqsa.

An independent report estimates that, since 1924, Hashemites have spent more than \$1 billion on the administration and renovation of Al-Aqsa «Amid Temple Mount tumult, the who, what and why of its Waqf rulers». DovLieber. The Times of Israel. 20 July 2017. Retrieved 14 January 2018)

The intermittent violence between the Israel Defense Forces and the Palestinians on the Temple Mount has turned into a diplomatic dispute between Israel and Jordan.

Among the Sunni Muslims, the Temple Mount is widely considered to be the third sacred place in Islam. Known as the place of Muhammad's ascending to heaven, the place known as the « Temple» is also associated with the Jewish prophets who are well-regarded in the Muslim religion. Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock are built on the hill by the Umayyad caliphs. In the year 692 AD, the dome was built, making it one of the oldest Islamic holy sites. (Rizwi Faizer (1998). «The Shape of the Holy: Early Islamic Jerusalem». Rizwi's Bibliography for Medieval Islam.)

The history of the state dates back to 1924, and the Supreme Muslim Council is the most important institution of Muslims responsible for the affairs of the Palestinian Muslim community, accepting Hussein Bin Ali (Hashemite Sharif of Mecca) as the guardian of Al-Quds. Hashemites were descendant of Muhammad who ruled the holy city of Mecca for 700 years until 1924, when the House of Saud overthrew them. Custody became the Hashemite inheritance administered by the King of Jordan. Sharif Hussein was buried near the Al-Aqsa Mosque in 1931 and his funeral took place there. (Kingdom remembers Sharif Hussein Bin Ali». The Jordan Times. 3 June 2017. Retrieved 16 June 2018)

It is said that Sharif's son, Abdullah I (the First King of Jordan) personally extinguished the fire that swept the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in 1949. (Cohen, Raymond (2008). Saving the

Holy Sepulchre: How Rival Christians Came Together to Rescue Their Holiest Shrine. Oxford University Press p. 84. Retrieved 16 January 2018)

Jordan, under Abdullah I, controlled East Jerusalem and the West Bank during the 1948 War: War of Israel and annexed the territory in 1951. Abdullah was assassinated a year later when he entered the mosque to pray. («Assassination of King Abdullah». The Guardian. 21 July 1952. Retrieved 16 June 2018).

King Hussein ordered the construction of a palace in East Jerusalem in 1965 to symbolize the sovereignty of Jordan. After Jordan lost control of the West Bank of Israel during the Six Day War of 1967, it was abandoned and the palace has not yet been completed. («How Six-Day War Left Hashemite House's Dreams of Jerusalem Palace in Ruins». Haaretz. 17 May 2017. Retrieved 22 June 2018).

Jordan abandoned its claim to the Territory in 1988 and signed a peace treaty with Israel in 1994. Article 9 stipulates that Israel shall be committed to «respect the special role of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in the Muslim holy places of Jerusalem» and «When negotiations Regarding the permanent state, Israel will attach great importance to the historic role of Jordan in these sacred places.» In 2013, the Palestinian Authority (represented by Mahmoud Abbas) signed an agreement with King Abdullah II to recognize the role of Jordan and replace the verbal agreement

decades ago. (Jerusalem deal boosts Jordan in Holy City: analysts». AFP. The Daily Star. 2 April 2013. Retrieved 22 February 2017).

Jordan withdrew its ambassador to Israel in 2014 after the events of the Al-Aqsa Mosque between Israelis and Palestinians. In late 2014, King Abdullah met with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in Amman. The Jordanian ambassador relaxed the restrictions on the Israeli authorities and allowed men of all ages to return for the first time in a few months in Al-Aqsa. (Hattar, Mussa (16 November 2014). «Fearing backlash, Jordan asserts Al-Aqsa custodianship». The Times of Israel. Retrieved 18 February 2017).

In 2016, King Abdullah II participated in the remodeling of the tomb of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. In 2017, he donated \$ 1.4 million to the Islamic cleric of the Jordanian government responsible for the administration of Al-Aqsa. An independent report estimates that, since 1924, the Hashemites have spent more than \$ 1 billion on the administration and restoration of Al-Aqsa. Greek Orthodox bishops in Jerusalem comment on the king's donation to church reform: «The role of Jordan in protection The existence of Christians in the Holy Land is clearly undeniable, King Abdullah took the initiative in the efforts of All the Jordanians. The seeds of Love and fraternity are shown between Muslims and Christians and We are reaping the fruits of these efforts.

On July 24, after the Temple Mount crisis of 2017, Israel agreed to remove Al-Aqsa's metal detector after Abdullah called

Netanyahu. However, it is not clear if Jordan has affected Israel's decision.

After Israel set aside the bill to introduce new fiscal measures to the West Bank Church, the leader of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher issued a statement in support of Abdullah on March 1, 2018. The statement said: «you are committed to ensuring that the status quo is respected and protected, defending religious freedom and its leadership is vital to our ongoing efforts to protect the existence of Christians, especially in the Holy City of Jerusalem. « the statement read.

## ***2.2. The Contributions Of The Hashemite Kings In The Defense Of Palestine And Holy places:***

### ***Introduction:***

Since the establishment of the Emirate of East Jordan in 1921, the Jordanian policy has been linked to the land and people of Palestine. The Palestinian cause has remained the first in the Jordanian political agenda at the regional and international levels.

Over the past 63 years, Jordan, under its Hashemite leadership, has played decisive roles in the Palestinian cause, despite the circumstances. It has led to the survival of this issue as the first Arab issue and the center of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

It is natural for Jerusalem to occupy a pivotal role in the thinking and policy of the Hashemite leadership, which enjoys religious legitimacy as it descends from the heart of our prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), as well as the historical legitimacy of the Holy Sepulcher, Embodied in the Great Arab Revolt, and before it, the service of the Holy Mosque in Mecca. To examine the details of the Hashemite vision of Jerusalem, it is necessary to review the journey of the Hashemites towards Jerusalem from the era of Sharif Hussein bin Ali until the reign of King Abdullah II Ibn Al Hussein.

### ***2.2.1. Sharif Hussein Bin Ali:***

When all attempts by Sharif Hussein bin Ali, and efforts to grab a comprehensive autonomy of the Arab countries in the framework of the Ottoman caliphate failed, he resorted to the Arab revolution in 1916, with the aim of creating a single state inclusive of all the countries of the Arab East. Britain renounced its promises; and began to create the conditions for the implantation of the Zionist entity in the heart of the Arab world and divided the Arab region into areas of colonial power was Sykes Picot Treaty, and hence came the Balfour Declaration in 1917. (Sayegh, 1966).

Sharif Al-Hussein Bin Ali, Sharif Mecca, donated \$ 50,000 to build the Al-Aqsa Mosque and other mosques in Palestine in order to form the foundation of Islamic money for the reconstruction of

holy sites, being the first respondent to the call of the people of Jerusalem, when a delegation from Jerusalem visited him in 1924, Headed by Haj Amin Al-Husseini, Head of the Supreme Islamic Shari'a Council, and briefed him on the dangers threatening Al-Aqsa Mosque. The restoration process, which was blessed by Al-Sharif Bin Ali in Beit Al-Maqdis, contributed to the steadfastness of Al-Aqsa Mosque when a powerful earthquake struck the region in 1927.

In response to this request, the people of Jerusalem and their dignitaries buried Sharif al-Hussein, may God rest his soul, in the western part of the Haram al-Sharif in June 1931, confirming his position, in recognition of his efforts to save Islamic institutions in Jerusalem.

The Main Defense Stages of Al-Sharif Al-Hussein for Jerusalem, Palestine:

1. Sharif al-Hussein rejected the Sykes-Picot Treaty and Balfour's promise in essence. He began to oppose these projects with a focused awareness campaign to mobilize Arabs, especially Palestinians. «I accept Palestine only for its Arab people, I do not accept retail, I do not accept the mandate, and I do not stay silent while there is Arab blood in my veins from demanding the British government to fulfill the promises it made to the Arabs,» Sherif Hussein said in one of his cables. (Majali, 2011)



2. In 1924, the Arab people in Palestine signed a document containing the pledge of allegiance to Sharif Hussein Bin Ali, an expression of their faith honestly and sincerity of his intentions towards the nation's issues, and his commitment to the holy sites in Jerusalem. A delegation of Palestinian dignitaries headed by the head of the Islamic Supreme Council in Jerusalem, Haj Amin Al-Husseini and the governor of Jerusalem, Ragheb Pasha Al-Nashashibi, came to the house of Al-Sharif al-Hussein. Carrying the signed document signed by most of the dignitaries and figures of Palestine, trusting King Abdullah, who at that time was still a prince, to be directly responsible for the reconstruction of Al-Aqsa Mosque under the auspices of King Al-Hussein bin Ali
3. The rejection of all British projects schemes and bargains that do not lead to a single Arab state that includes all Arab countries, foremost of which is Palestine. Prompting the colonial powers to exile him to Istana. It was not forgiven but preferred to deny that the excessive rights of the Islamic nation and Arab, or any part of its holy land. Sharif Hussein died in 1931 in Amman, but was buried in the Al-Aqsa Mosque on the basis of his will.

### ***2.2.2. King Abdullah I Bin Al Hussein:***

King Abdullah I followed the footsteps of his father Sharif Hussein, May God have mercy on him, and followed his approach regarding the central issue of the Hashemites, the issue of Palestine

and Jerusalem. King Abdullah I was one of the fiercest enemies of the Zionist movement and its ambitions in Palestine. (Al-Shanak, 1997)

1. King Abdullah I called on the Arabs not to deal with the Jews or to sell property, mortgage or any land to them. He called on them to support Palestine by supporting the Fund of the Palestinian Nation.
2. The founding king has resisted all calls and projects for the partition of Palestine proposed since the early 1940s.
3. In 1946, the Founding King succeeded in achieving the full independence of the Trans-Jordan Emirate and the declaration of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and called its army the Arab Army, which he considered to be the nucleus through which a united Arab state would be established, bringing together all other Arab countries, including Palestine.
4. The Jordanian Arab Army under the leadership of King Abdullah I defended Palestine and Jerusalem. The late Imam saw that his life was meaningless without Jerusalem. He asked Captain Kloub Pasha, commander of the Arab army, to turn against him if the Jews were to conquer Jerusalem. He said, may God have mercy on him, that if this happens, «I will go there and die on the walls of the city.» And he insisted on leading the battles to defend the city itself in 1948, he asked the Cabinet to choose the

guardian of the throne of Jordan to take over the rule in case he died on the grounds of Jerusalem.

5. In 1950, the Palestinian Arab people living in the rest of the land of Palestine decided to unite with the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in its popular conference held in Jericho. The decision was approved by the Jordanian National Assembly in what was called the unity project of the two banks.
6. The founding king refused to give the Jews a passage to the wall of Buraq.
7. The founding king refused to comply with the internationalization of Jerusalem and declared that East Jerusalem is the spiritual capital of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.
8. It was predestined that King Abdullah I will pay the price of his positions in the defense of Palestine and Al-Aqsa Mosque when he entered to pray the Friday prayer in 1951.
9. He made a will to be buried in the courtyards of Al-Aqsa Mosque next to his father Sharif Hussein bin Ali, but compelling circumstances prevented the execution of his will. «I have made a will to my family that I should be buried in Jerusalem next to my father's grave in the courtyard of the Haram al-Sharif, I want Jerusalem with me while I am alive, and I want to stay in Jerusalem after death.» (Sayegh, 1966).

«The Palestinians are nothing but trees that grow every time they are uprooted,» said King Abdullah bin Al Hussein, during his meeting with Winston Churchill in Jerusalem on March 21, 1921, rejecting the Balfour Declaration and insisting that Palestine is left to its people to decide its future.

King Abdullah, who took power in trans-Jordan as an emir representing his father's responsibilities, had a forward-looking vision for the advancement of the region and its future. King Abdullah's positions towards Palestine remained steadfast and stubborn, especially in the post-Second World War, at the same time he was continuing in the dream of the Arab peoples and the dream of his father and his brother King Faisal to establish the Greater Syrian State of the Arabs.

In the era of the founding king, the course of events was difficult and critical away from what the Arab dreams desired. When Britain declared its resolution on 15 May 1948 on Palestine and turned its matter to the United Nations, Israel declared its state in Palestine simultaneously.

As a result of Israel's declaration of statehood, the 1948 war began. The Jordanian Arab Army took part in this war and fought fierce battles in Bab Al-Amoud, Latrun and elsewhere to save Jerusalem and the rest of the Palestinian territories, but this war ended with the defeat of the Arabs. And no one but King Abdullah initiated the launch of an invitation to restore Zakaria Holy site,

and the restoration of surrounding buildings that suffered from structural damage.

King Abdullah was not limiting his efforts to Islamic sites. He personally worked to extinguish a fire that almost destroyed the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in 1949. During his reign from 1921 to 1951, he was also the custodian of Christian holy sites in Jerusalem.

### ***2.2.3. King Talal:***

After the death of King Abdullah I Bin Al Hussein, the Hashemite rule was handed down to King Talal bin Abdullah. He remained faithful and steadfast in the Hashemite principles towards Palestine, Jerusalem, the rights of the Palestinian people in Palestine and the necessity of restoring them to Arab sovereignty

Jerusalem has received the attention and care of King Talal, and he has shown that interest on the short period of his reign in his visit to Jerusalem in 1951, where the King says in this context:

«I came to see you and visit your city, which remained Arabic with the help and grace of God and so I assure the world of its holiness, and I assure the Arabs that what is in their hands is one of the holiest sites”. But his illness prevented his continuation of the Renaissance project of Arab liberation, where the liberation of Palestine with its holy sites was the focus of this project and its starting point.

King Talal was a lover of military life. He was the first Jordanian officer to study military science at the British Sandhurst College in 1929. After his return to the country, he was assigned to the Jordanian army, where he was later promoted to the rank of lieutenant colonel. He participated in the battle of Gecher near the mosque bridge, and then fought with the Jordanian army units inside the city of Jerusalem, in the heights of the Prophet Samuel, the Radar, Sheikh Jarrah, Bab al-Amoud, BeitSurik and BeitExa, which had a great impact in raising the morale of the fighters.

When the fighting began in Palestine in 1948, Prince Talal moved to Ramallah and took a forward position with an artillery, which attacked the Zionist positions in Jerusalem. He spent a lot of time in the front lines urging soldiers and officers to fight, and to keep their positions. His heroic positions had the greatest impact on the army's love and admiration for him. Among the battles in which he participated is the Battle of (Gecher) at the mosque bridge; he was the first to come to the battlefield, and fought like a hero. The battles he fought in Jerusalem have achieved remarkable victories, which resulted in the Jordanian Arab Army controlling the area of Sheikh Jarrah, Bab Al-Amoud, Radar Hill and other sites.

King Talal ascended the throne after the assassination of his father, King Abdullah, in Jerusalem. His son, Hussein, was with his grandfather to perform Friday prayers, and was also targeted on the day of the assassination. On 20 July 1951, Prince Hussein

travelled to Jerusalem to perform Friday prayers at Al-Aqsa Mosque with his grandfather, King Abdullah I. Fearing that King Abdullah would establish normalization relations with Israel, he was assassinated on that same Friday.

In the 1952 constitution, King Talal affirmed Jordan's patronage of Jerusalem and its endowments, including Al-Aqsa Mosque, which became directly under the Jordanian Ministry of Awqaf. The Ministry established a special department for the endowments of Jerusalem in 1953, which continues until this day. The Jordanian official role in the administration and care of Al-Aqsa was formed.

#### ***2.2.4. King Hussein Bin Talal:***

King Hussein Bin Talal Bin Abdullah continued in the footsteps of his father and his ancestors in their commitment to the defense of Jerusalem and the holy sites, despite the occupation of Jerusalem in 1967, King Hussein Bin Talal kept on emphasizing that Jerusalem is not a subject of bargaining, because Jerusalem is part of the occupied Arab land, Israel must withdraw from it and from other occupied Arab cities, and without this, peace will not take place. King Hussein's vision was based on two dimensions; the religious and nationalist dimensions and it seemed clear in his words (Majali, 2011)

Among the countries involved in the conflict, Jordan paid the heaviest price. As a result of the war, more than 300,000

Palestinian Arabs became refugees and fled to Jordan. For many of them, this was the second uprooting in less than two decades since they were expelled from their original homes in 1948. The Jordanian economy has also been greatly affected. 70% of Jordan's agricultural land is located on the west bank of the Jordan River, accounting for 60% to 65% of its fruits and vegetables. Half of the kingdom's industrial facilities are located on the West Bank of the Jordan River, and the loss of Jerusalem and other places of worship have destroyed tourism. Overall, the Israeli-occupied area accounts for about 38% of Jordan's gross national product. (Keys to the Kingdom, National Anthem, The Office, History, <http://www.kinghussein.gov.jo> )

Despite the economic damage caused by the war, Jordan continues to assume its previous administrative and financial responsibilities to the West Bank. It continues to pay salaries and pensions for civil servants while managing religious or education donations.

Between 1967 and 1970, Jordan adopted a dual strategy of political and military initiatives to work for the return of Arab lands lost in the 1967 war. On November 22, 1967, the UN Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 242, calling on Israel to withdraw from the areas occupied by the recent wars, and called on all countries in the Middle East to respect the formulation and adoption of the landmark resolution of the right



to «peaceful life» of others. It is still the main reference point for the establishment of peace in the Middle East, and is largely the initiative of King Hussein. Jordan accepted the resolution as the basis for negotiations. (Keys to the Kingdom, National Anthem, The Office, History, <http://www.kinghussein.gov.jo> )

In March 1969, King Hussein held talks with US President Richard Nixon in Washington. He proposed to extend the six-point Arab peace plan in accordance with Resolution 242. In the second year, the United States sponsored the so-called Rogers plan. Although Jordan and Egypt publicly accepted the plan, the refusal of Israel, Syria and the PLO failed to materialize the plan.

While striving to find a peaceful solution to the conflict, King Hussein took the lead in defending Arab lands with the help of the thriving Palestinian Democratic Party. On March 21, 1968, Israeli forces conducted a major attack on the village of Karama in the Jordan Valley, where they began to destroy village houses with explosives. In the ensuing Battle of Karama, the Jordanian army launched a violent shelling of Israeli tanks and attacked Israeli forces. King Hussein paid tribute to the Jordanian army and the deaths of Fatah who participated in the battle, saying that «we all have reached such a status.» (Keys to the Kingdom, National Anthem, The Office, History, <http://www.kinghussein.gov.jo> )

- In 1978, he said (The Arabic Jerusalem is an Arabic Islamic trust since the reign of Caliph Omar Ibn Al-Khattab and no one

from the Arabs and Muslims world can dispose or waiver it, neither Israel nor others can change this reality even if it seemed possible).

The most prominent political decisions that reflect King Hussein's interest in Jerusalem:

1. Establishment of the law of the Hashemite reconstruction of Islamic holy places, especially Al-Aqsa Mosque.
2. Formation of the committee for the reconstruction of Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock in 1954.
3. The formation of the Royal Commission for Jerusalem Affairs in 1971, which focuses on the production of publications that are of a documentary nature to expose the Israeli Judaization policies of Jerusalem and its dangers. This committee is active in Jordanian official institutions, Jordanian universities, and in various Arab and Islamic institutions to keep Jerusalem a living issue in the minds of successive generations.
4. In 1982, Jordan succeeded in including Jerusalem on the UNESCO World Heritage List.
5. Excluding Jerusalem from the decision to disengage from Amman in 1988, Jordan continued to assume the responsibility of the government institutions in Jerusalem, especially the Jerusalem Waqf and Al-Aqsa Mosque. (Majali, 1997)

6. The insistence of King Hussein, May God have mercy on him, to respect the historic and special role of the Hashemite care of the blessed Al-Aqsa Mosque. This was stated in paragraph 9 of the peace agreement between Jordan and the Israeli occupation state in 1994.

### ***2.2.5. King Abdullah II:***

#### ***2.2.5.1. King Abdullah II, The Concerns Of The Palestinian Cause And Holy Sites At The Local Level***

The Islamic and Christian holy sites in Jerusalem received great attention during the reign of King Abdullah II and became an integral part of the programs of government work under King Abdullah. This great interest in the holy sites in Jerusalem by the King is a continuation of the Hashemite approach in the care of these holy sites for a long time. (Al-Abadi, 2017).

1. King Abdullah ordered the formation of the Hashemite Fund for the reconstruction of Al Aqsa and the Dome of the Rock in 2007, which aimed to provide the necessary funding for the care of Al Aqsa Mosque and the Islamic holy sites in Jerusalem to ensure the continuity of its reconstruction, maintenance and preserving. The fund is supervised by a board of trustees headed by His Highness Prince Ghazi bin Mohammed, the supreme advisor to the King for religious and cultural affairs.

2. King Abdullah II financed and conducted restoration and reconstruction projects inside Al-Aqsa Mosque from his personal assets. The reconstruction projects of the Islamic and Christian shrines in Jerusalem during the reign of the King included the reconstruction of the Al-Aqsa Mosque pulpit and its installation in its natural location on July 25, July 2006, the restoration of the southern and eastern walls of Al-Aqsa Mosque, and several restoration and maintenance projects for the various facilities and sections of Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock. (Al-Abadi, 2017)
3. King Abdullah II also affirmed Jordan's attachment to Jerusalem by emphasizing the concept of the Hashemite trusteeship of the holy sites of Jerusalem through the signing of the Trusteeship Agreement with the Head of State of Palestine and the Palestine Liberation Organization Mahmoud Abbas in 2013.
4. Directing Jordanian officials to adopt international organizations such as UNESCO to expose violations of Israeli occupation against Arab and Islamic heritage in Jerusalem. Under King Abdullah's leadership, Jordan has succeeded in issuing several resolutions condemning Israeli occupation practices in Jerusalem.
5. King Abdullah is keen to maintain regular contact with the families of Jerusalem by hosting them periodically at the Royal

Hashemite Court to hear from them about the conditions of the Holy City and the needs of preserving holy sites.

6. The formation of the Jordanian Council of Churches, which includes the main churches of Jerusalem.
7. Launching the restoration of the Holy Sepulcher in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher and contributing to its restoration in 2016. (Al-Abadi, 2017).

We conclude from the above that Jordanian support can be classified and monitored in six headlines aimed at empowering the Palestinian people to maintain their identity and political entity and continue their work to restore their rights as follows:

1. Supporting the policies of the PLO and adopting its projects and orientations to promote their rights and causes, both in the Arab League and the United Nations and its various specialized institutions such as UNESCO, the Human Rights Committees, the Security Council and the General Assembly, The Security Council on settlements and the decision of the Arab Dead Sea summit.
2. Preserving of Jerusalem and its Islamic and Christian holy site, in particular Al-Haram Al-Sharif and its annexed three mosques.
3. Supporting the children of the 48 regions, and providing them with Jordan multiple services, such as performing Hajj, Umrah and university education through scholarships for political

parties, to develop their abilities and enhance their presence and raise levels of services to the Palestinian Arab world.

4. Providing the children of the West Bank and the state with mobility and return facilities in such a way as to maintain the exit and entry rate as an accurate monitoring element that prevents delay, discharge and non-return.
5. Providing the children of the Gaza Strip with medical treatment services through mobile hospitals that facilitate their access to health, diagnostic and pharmacological services.
6. Caring for the children of camps in Jordan and displaced persons, and providing the minimum requirements for their needs, through the UNRWA and the direct support of the Jordanian treasury, just like Jordanian citizens.

The outcome of the Jordanian policy has led to the successes of the PLO at the international level in highlighting their issues, consolidating them and protecting their rights from elimination, retreat or fading, and strengthening the steadfastness of the Palestinians in the regions occupied in 1967, especially in Jerusalem, Thousands of men and women in the vicinity of the Temple Mount, in the face of incursions and flows of settlers and Jewish extremists, in addition to strengthening the national identity of the Palestinian and Arab nationalism for the children of the 48 areas and raise their academic sufficiency through admission to Jordanian universities, graduates from Jordanian universities

are the center of the Arab leaders, especially young doctors, pharmacists, engineers, lawyers and school teachers in various professional specialties.

#### ***2.2.5.2. King Abdullah II's Interest In The Palestinian Cause And Holy sites At The Arab And International Levels***

The Palestinian issue and the issue of Jerusalem (along with other regional and international issues) are still the focus of King Abdullah II's meetings with Arab leaders during the Arab summits and his individual meetings with Arab leaders. King Abdullah met with Egyptian President Abdel Fattah al-Sisi in Russia on 26 August 2015, contacted the Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques King Salman bin Abdul Aziz on September 18, the same year, and met with the King of Bahrain Hamad bin Isa Al Khalifa in Manama on November 8 of the same year. In all these meetings, King Abdullah II stressed the continuous existence of the issue of Jerusalem, The first central issue of Arabs and Muslims and that all settlement procedures and practices in Jerusalem are null and void and that a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East will not be achieved unless Israel withdraws from all Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since 1967, foremost of which is Jerusalem, calling for intensive efforts to advance the peace process, And to work with the Arab initiative leading to the establishment of an independent Palestinian state.

He pointed out that King Abdullah II called at the Arab summits held in Beirut in March 2002, the Arab summit held in Riyadh in 2007, the Arab summit held in Doha in 2009 and the Arab summit meeting in Kuwait in 2014 to develop unified Arab strategies to confront the project. The Zionist interest in Judaizing Jerusalem and expelling its people, and the Jordanian interest in the Arabization of the holy city, and adherence to the basic principles that the Jordanian political system stems from supporting Jerusalem and Palestine, refusing to recognize Israel as a Jewish state and calling on the Security Council to assume its responsibilities and take the necessary steps to develop mechanisms Process to resolve the Arab conflict - «Israeli.»

At the twenty-sixth session of the Arab summit held in Sharm el-Sheikh, King Abdullah stressed the need to push forward the peace efforts to reach a two-state solution, preserve Jerusalem, including Islamic and Christian holy sites, and join all Arab and Islamic efforts to achieve this.

King Abdullah II also announced on the unique status of Jerusalem for the Arab and Islamic nation. It is a red line and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan will stand in the face of all Judaization attempts against holy sites every day. At the special session of the Fifth Islamic Summit held in Jakarta, the Indonesian capital on March 7, 2016, the need for concerted international efforts to stop the escalation of the «Israeli» violations in Jerusalem, especially in Al-Aqsa Mosque.



In a speech delivered on behalf of King Abdullah II during the 13th session of the Islamic Summit Conference in Istanbul on April 14, 2016, Dr. Abdullah Al-Nisour stressed the Jordanian principles on the Palestinian issue and Jerusalem and the need for concerted international efforts to advance the peace process and achieve a two-state solution.

King Abdullah II at the Fourth Summit of the Arab and South American States held in Riyadh on November 9, 2015, and the King Abdullah II meeting in Amman on October 7, 2015, the delegation of the «Council of Muslim Mentors» to what is exposed to Jerusalem and the need to push the peace process to achieve the two-state solution and the establishment of a Palestinian state on its 1967 borders with East Jerusalem as its capital. «Jordan has many political and diplomatic options to push forward negotiations to achieve peace in the region,» he said.

In the meeting of King Abdullah II, the Arab members of the «Israeli» Knesset in Amman on 20 September 2015 confirmed his support for the steadfast people in Jerusalem and support efforts to stop the repeated «Israeli» attacks on Al Aqsa Mosque and stressed the Hashemite trusteeship of the Islamic and Christian holy sites in Jerusalem, The second Jordanian diplomat, who participated in the meetings of the Arab foreign ministers and the Arab League and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, stressed the necessity of emphasizing the justice of the Palestinian cause and supporting the Arab and international efforts to achieve the two-state solution.

At the international level, King Abdullah II used all means of visits, contacts and meetings with a number of Western leaders, opinion leaders and the media, and made great efforts to preserve the identity of Jerusalem. King Abdullah II's diplomatic efforts had the greatest effect in preventing Israel from continuing its violations against Islamic and Christian religious places in Jerusalem.

King Abdullah II in all his meetings discussed the latest developments on the file of the Palestinian negotiations, «Israel» and stressed the importance of supporting concerted international efforts to achieve a just and comprehensive peace and stability for the Middle East and people on the basis of a two-state solution that ensures the establishment of an independent Palestinian state on the Palestinian national territory , the 1967 borders with East Jerusalem as its capital and living in peace and security side by side with the State of Israel.

#### ***2.2.5.3. King Abdullah II Receiving Templeton Prize***

King Abdullah II, who has done more to seek religious harmony within Islam and between Islam and other religions than any other living political leader, was announced today as the 2018 Templeton Prize Laureate. (<http://www.templetonprize.org>)/

Known for his grace and humility, the King's long quest to promote peace-affirming Islam gained momentum in 2004 in the wake of the Iraq war when the fragile unity of Sunni and Shi'a

Muslims in the region was at a substantial risk. During that period, increasingly vocal rhetoric from marginal Islamic groups threatened to create deeper schisms within the Islamic community. In the face of these challenges, the King launched the breakthrough Amman Message that articulated a clear understanding of the central elements of Islam, and affirmed that terrorism and violence have no place in the religion. (<http://www.templetonprize.org>).

The following year, he assembled 200 scholars from 50 countries representing all schools of jurisprudence in Islam who, under his guidance, issued a declaration now known as the “Three Points of the Amman Message.” The first point recognized the validity of all eight legal schools of Islam. The second forbade declarations of apostasy (known as takfir) between Muslims, while the third established conditions for issuing fatwas, Islamic legal rulings. The three Points have come to represent an unprecedented and almost unanimous religious and political consensus by Muslims around the globe. Since then, more than 450 Islamic scholars and institutes from more than 50 countries have endorsed it.

In 2006, King Abdullah II supported and funded the initiative known as «A Common Word Between Us and You,» which led to a 2007 open letter from Islamic religious leaders to Christian religious leaders. A Common Word contains a call for peace and harmony between Muslims and Christians based on the twin commandments shared by both faiths, namely «love of God»

and «love of the neighbor.» Originally signed by 138 Muslim leaders and scholars from 52 countries, it has now more than 400 signatories including nearly 300 endorsements from a wide range of Christian leaders, and is considered by many to be the most important Muslim theological initiative towards Christians.

In 2010, he proposed the annual UN World Interfaith Harmony Week with a General Assembly resolution expanding the twin “love” commandments by adding «love of God or love of the good» to «love of one’s neighbor,» thus including all people of goodwill, with or without faith. Adopted unanimously by the General Assembly, the resolution was established in the first week of February as UN World Interfaith Harmony Week to stress the moral imperative of promoting and understanding the values of peace inherent in all religions. It is generally acknowledged as the first and only time that the United Nations approved a resolution explicitly citing belief in God.

Through these groundbreaking initiatives and many others, King Abdullah II has led a reclamation of Islam’s moderate theological narrative from the distortions of radicalism. But these efforts have come with great personal cost including condemnation and death threats from radical terrorist groups. As a result of Jordan’s key geographical location, his efforts have required extraordinary courage to advance cooperation within Islam and between Islam and other religions.

### ***2.3. The Popular Jordanian Position On Trump Decision***

The Jerusalem Council Associations confirmed that the decision to transfer the American Embassy to Jerusalem clearly indicates President Trump's desire to liquidate the Palestinian cause in favor of Israel. He called on the Palestinian Arab people in critical situations to stand up to their national obligations. The assembly said in a statement that the American president rushed to issue his decision to move the US embassy to Jerusalem, contrary to his previous comments to postpone this step until the preparation for the transfer before the end of 2019, which led to the transfer to the US consulate in Arnon in occupied Jerusalem. (<https://www.youm7.com/story/2018/2/26>)

He added that this decision raised many questions and speculations. The American president cannot do this work after most of the countries of the world, especially the US allies; have stood against the project of recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, because it is contrary to the international law and the resolutions of the UN Security Council. The occupied territory has a special status and cannot be changed.

The Jerusalem Forum in Jordan confirmed that the transfer of the American Embassy to Jerusalem is a hostile attitude towards Jordan, the country and the people (Addustour Newspaper, 7/12/2017).<sup>(1)</sup>

---

(1) <https://www.Addustour.com/articles>.

The forum said in a statement that since the first day of the American president's ascension to power, he is trying to blackmail the Arab and Islamic nations with the idea of transferring the American embassy to Jerusalem as the unified capital of the occupying state. He ignored the right of the Palestinian people in Jerusalem and that is contrary to the international law, and that Jerusalem is an occupied city. (Addustour Newspaper, 7/12/2017)

He said that the decision to transfer the American embassy to Jerusalem indicates a hostile attitude towards Jordan and the people and harm the Palestinian cause. This decision confirms the hostility of America and the war it waged against the Palestinian people, the Arab and Islamic nation.

He added that various American administrations have never been a fair party in any case concerning the rights of the Palestinian people. It is a flagrant violation of the international legitimacy and an American attempt to liquidate the Palestinian, Arab and Islamic rights.



## *Chapter Three*

# *US Policy Toward Jerusalem*





## ***Introduction:***

The US policy towards Jerusalem has gone through three stages. The first started since 1947 and continued until 1950, when it referred to the unity and internationalization of the city. But with the changes that have forced the city's division into an eastern part under the Jordanian patronage and the western part under the Israeli control, the United States has acknowledged that the UN is not qualified to run and internationalize the city.

The second phase of the US policy towards Jerusalem began with its commitment to the decision of the unity of the city and its practices on the basis that it is divided. The majority of the world states have begun to deal with the status quo. But America has declared its position, which refuses to recognize the sovereignty of Jordan over the eastern part of Jerusalem, and refuses to recognize Israel's sovereignty over the western part. This situation continued until 1967, when the third phase began. A stage that continues to be characterized by contradictory and even conflicting decisions. The high policy towards Jerusalem has changed from one president to another. Congressional intervention, which allowed itself to intervene in the affairs of Jerusalem, was added to the role of the presidency in the foreign policy-making. The central equation of US policy towards Jerusalem is that the final status of the city of Jerusalem must be reached through negotiations, but the city must remain united.

As a recognized representative of the Palestinian people in the United States, the relationship between the US government and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) has existed since the 1970s. The PLO was represented by a general delegation in Washington until October, 2018. The US government does not have any official representative offices in the management area, but there is a consulate in Jerusalem that deals with relations with the Palestinian Authority. When the PLO was founded in 1964, it did not receive official attention from the US government. However, an informal PLO press office was established in New York, managed by Sadat Hassan, who is the representative of Yemen at the United Nations. After the Six-Day War, in June 1967, plans and considerations for a Palestinian State in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip had begun. (Katzenbach, 1967) At the same time, the US officials began to consider establishing various Palestinian group partners to reach a settlement through a diplomatic process. (The paper was prepared by the National Security Council staff, October 24, 1970, US Foreign Relations, 1969-1976, vol. 23) However, no practical steps have been taken in this regard, as the National Security Council led by Henry Kissinger opposed such actions.

### ***3.1. The Earliest Period:***

Press News websites monitored the approach adopted by the US presidents towards the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, which

largely sided with Israel and disregarded the Palestinian rights, the establishment of the State of Israel in Palestine was known as the «Nakba», pointing out at the time of the British Mandate of Palestine between 1947 and 1948, where at least 750 thousand Palestinians were expelled or fled their homeland, as well as the deaths of another 100 thousand others .(Farahat, 2016)

Despite the fact that the United States was not active in the circumstances that led to the «Nakba», the country's long history with Israel was supportive only of what the report described as «barbarism» in that country - and this support has grown steadily in the United States, the press portrayed the Palestinian resistance as opposed to the Jewish state rather than portraying it as demanding the human rights of the Palestinians. Michael wrote in his book «American Journalism and the Palestinian Triangle between April 1936 and February 1947» .(Farahat, 2016)

«Despite the fact that there is a clear evidence of the extreme nationalist motivation behind the Zionist movement, and this motivation was its driving force, the American press defended the alleged goal of the Zionists to build a democratic Commonwealth in Palestine. How would this be possible if Arabs make up two-thirds of the population and oppose the Zionist movement? It seems that this question did not seem important to many newspapers. «(<https://www.sasapost.com/author/tarekfarahat>)

This was, of course, a complete violation of the doctrines of the United States, even those stipulated in the Declaration of Independence, which affirms that all men are endowed with some inalienable rights. In order to secure these rights, governments are formed among men and derive their fair powers from the consent of the governed. «If we take into account the consent of those sentenced in the Palestinian case, the Palestinians have not taken their consent into account.»

President Woodrow Wilson said months before the Balfour Declaration in November 1917, in which he announced Britain's support for the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, that there was an urgent need for self-determination. On May 27, 1916, Wilson said, «Everyone has the right to choose the sovereignty under which they live.» In his address to the Congress on February 11, 1918, Wilson said: «National aspirations must be respected. people will be governed by their consent.»

Wilson's speeches were a kind of concern for then-US Secretary of State Robert Lansing. In his own diary, Frank Edward Manuel, in his book *The Facts of Palestinian-American Relations*, Lansing wrote that these concepts were «laden with dynamite and created chaos, discontent, and rebellion.» Lansing said Wilson's remarks may be fraught with strange contradictions. «Cannot the Mahmoudists from Syria and Palestine, perhaps from Morocco and Tripoli, rely on that?» Lansing said. How can they be reconciled

with the Zionism to which the president has committed himself in practice?» .(Farahat, 2016)

### ***3.1.1. Truman and Eisenhower***

«After World War II, the world was keen to compensate the Jewish people for the Holocaust,» the report said. The United Nations' General Assembly Resolution 181 of November 29, 1947, effectively divided Palestine into two states.»

Although, the Jews owned only 7 percent of the land in Palestine and make up about 33 percent of the population, Israel was founded on 78 percent of the Palestinian territories. Hundreds of thousands of Palestinians have been displaced from their homes, with no compensation for the loss of their homes and land, and nowhere to go except in the refugee camps. By that time, Harry Truman was the president of the United States, and offered full approval of this plan for reasons of intense pressure exercised by the Zionist lobby. Truman also said that support for the establishment of the State of Israel would enable him to win a second term as president after the death of President Franklin Roosevelt. (<https://www.sasapost.com/author/tarekfarahat>)

Truman was elected as a president in 1948 and was succeeded four years later by General Dwight Eisenhower, who appointed John Foster Dulles as the secretary of state. According to the report, Dallas was familiar with the Palestinian-Israeli situation and was

clearly sympathetic to Israel. In 1944, he played an active role in collecting GOP support for the establishment of a Commonwealth State in Palestine, and also in the protection of the Jewish political rights.

### ***3.1.2. Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford and Carter***

At the beginning of John Kennedy's tenure as president, the report said that things were taking a new turn, especially with Kennedy's support for the right of return for refugees, as outlined in paragraph 11 of UN's General Assembly Resolution 194 of 1948.

«Refugees wishing to return to their homes and live in peace with their neighbours should be allowed to do so as soon as possible. Compensations must be paid for the property of those who decide not to return to their homes and for every missing or injured person.» (<https://www.sasapost.com/author/tarekfarahat>)

On the other hand, Israel under the leadership of David Ben-Gurion used what became a tried and true way to oppose this measure: Ben-Gurion, the founder of the state and the first prime minister, described the decision as a threat to Israel's national security. In the end, resolution 194 was passed, but it had no effect, the report said.

Despite the clear support for Palestinian refugees, the report said John F. Kennedy was the first president to elevate the relationship

between the United States and Israel from mere ties between allies to more strengthened relations.

Kennedy said in an interview with the Zionist Organization in America three months before his election «Israel's friendship is not a partisan issue, it is a national commitment.»

After Kennedy's assassination in 1963, he was succeeded by Lyndon Johnson, who did not care about his predecessor's solution to the refugee problem. The Democratic Party platform of 1964, the year Johnson was elected president of the United States, included «encouraging the resettlement of Arab refugees» while the right of return was suspended.

In January 1968, President Johnson's term expired when Vice President Richard Nixon was elected president. According to the report, Nixon had less commitment to Israel, having received only about 15 percent of the Jewish vote. In his memoirs, Nixon commented on Israeli arrogance after the Six-Day War in 1967, describing «Israeli intransigence in negotiating any peace agreement that includes the return of any of the territories they occupied.»

The report noted that, to the Palestinians' dismay, Nixon's closest adviser was Henry Kissinger, the National Security Advisor to the President, who later assumed the functions of the State Department. Kissinger's parents had fled Nazi Germany shortly before the start



of the Holocaust, visited Israel several times but never set foot in any Arab country. With Nixon preoccupied with what he saw as a communist threat, Kissinger took over the administration of the Palestinian-Israeli file.

When President Nixon resigned, his deputy Gerald Ford became president. Ford was the president until the next election, when he was defeated by Georgia Gov. Jimmy Carter.

Although Carter had recently become a strong supporter of the rights of the Palestinian people, this was not the case during his presidency. Carter was responsible for the Camp David Accords, and his efforts only resulted in the signing of a peace treaty between Israel and Egypt, with nothing to do with the Palestinian cause.

The positions of American presidents towards the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. He said that US President Ronald Reagan, who succeeded Jimmy Carter, believed that in order to counter the Communist expansion; relations with Israel should be strengthened, for fear of the Soviets controlling the situation in the Middle East. In 1982, Reagan declared that the United States did not support the establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

After the first uprising in 1987, Reagan sent his Foreign Minister George Schultz. In order to solve the problem, Schultz proposed a strategy that included three axes: an international conference; and

determine the period for negotiation spanning six months, which would lead to a transition to Palestinian self-determination in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip; and finally start talks between Israel and Palestine in December 1988 with the aim of reaching a definitive solution to the conflict.

On the other hand, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir refused to approve the plan, saying it would do nothing to resolve the peace issue. In response, the United States issued a new note, emphasizing the economic and security agreements with Israel and accelerating the delivery of 75 fighter aircraft F-16. This was to encourage Israel to accept the proposals for the peace plan, but Israel did not agree.

When the Vice of President Reagan, George HW Bush, took the presidency of the United States for one term, he continued to adopt a pro-Israel approach. The report cited what the writer Thomas Friedman stated in the New York Times, the US in 1991 that: (Although the Bush administration's approach to peace-making is based entirely on the conditions dictated by Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, it is nevertheless the Israelis who believe that the Bush administration is hostile). (Farahat, 2016)

## ***3.2. The Latest Era in Details:***

### ***3.2.1. The George H.W. Bush's Administration:***

In the first few months of President George H.W. Bush's presidency, the dialogue continued. The United States-PLO dialogue was suspended in June 1990 after the PLO refused to condemn the Palestinian Liberation Front's attempt to attack the Israeli coastline. After Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and the 1991 Gulf War, the Bush administration continued to hold negative views on the PLO and, at a press conference immediately after the Gulf War, asked about possible dialogue with the PLO, Bush said:

For me, they lost their credibility. They lost their credibility in the office here. They have this reason because they are very bad about their basic beliefs. (George Bush: Presidential Press Conference of Huntsville, Alabama «[www.presidency.ucsb.edu](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu))

However, the Bush administration made tremendous efforts throughout 1991 to convene a Middle East peace conference, including the Palestinian issue. At a press conference in early August, Bush said:

“In the Middle East, we are about to hold a meeting in October this year, which will hold direct talks between Israel, the Palestinians and the Arab countries. I welcome Prime Minister Shamir's statement that he supports our proposal and calls on Israel and the

Palestinians to clear the remaining obstacles and seize this truly historic opportunity for peace.”

Bush’s efforts were finally reached at the Madrid Peace Conference in October 1991, which for the first time accepted an official Palestinian delegation, although it did not publicly participate in the PLO.

### ***3.2.2. The Clinton Administration:***

The inauguration of President Bill Clinton changed the formal attitude of the United States to the PLO. He personally supported the goal of the Palestinian state, but did not publicly express this before the last months of his administration.

On September 10, 1993, on the eve of the signing of the «Oslo Accord» between the Israeli government and the PLO, President Clinton announced the resumption of the US-PLO dialogue, which was suspended in 1990 (Al Hayat Newspaper). [www.presidency.ucsb.edu](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu). 2017. The signing ceremony of the Oslo Accord on September 13, 1993 was held in Washington, DC, attended by Clinton, although the negotiations were conducted under the auspices of the Norwegian government. After that ceremony, Arafat became the White House’s frequent visitor, the first Palestinian leader to receive this honor. The US government was also more involved in the Israeli-Palestinian talks and invited both sides to come to Washington on certain occasions to advance the

peace process. The Clinton administration was in October 1996. The Israeli-Palestinian ceasefire agreement was negotiated, and in October 1998, Clinton facilitated the Israel's further redeployment of the West Bank agreement.

The Clinton Administration also assisted in the formation of the Palestinian Authority to a large extent by hosting the first donor conference held in Washington, D.C. on October 1, 1993. In October 1993, the Congress passed the 1993 Middle East Peace Promotion Act, authorizing the US government to supervise the PLO's compliance with the international law. (Clinton: Memorandum on Assistance in Establishing a Palestinian Police Force. «[www.presidency.ucsb.edu](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu). Retrieved until September 25, 2017)

Following the establishment of the Oslo Accords and the establishment of the Palestinian National Authority in 1994, the PLO office was upgraded and renamed the PLO mission to the United States.

The US government was actively involved in providing technical assistance to institutions that establish the Palestinian Authority. On March 30, 1994, President Bill Clinton ordered an allocation of \$4,000,000 for the construction of the Palestinian police, and on March 16, 1995 ordered an additional \$5,000,000 for the same purpose. In July 1995, the United States Congress passed the 1995 Middle East Peace Promotion Act, authorizing the President to

detain funds from the Palestinian Authority in the event that it did not meet the commitments of the Oslo Accords of December 1998 to the Israeli Government. President Bill Clinton became the first US president to visit the Palestinian Authority.

### ***3.2.3. George W. Bush's Administration:***

President Bush did not meet with Arafat and did not refer to him as «President Arafat» as the Palestinian officials said, but only as «Chairman Arafat.» In his first year in office, Bush only maintained a relationship with the Palestinian Authority on a technical level. Following another round of violence in the Palestinian territories, in June 2002, Bush expressed support for the Palestinian state after the negotiation process. On June 3, 2003, Bush met with Palestinian Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas at the multilateral meeting in Sharm el-Sheikh for the first time. This was a form of meeting that aimed to avoid direct meetings with Arafat. Bush and the Israeli leadership were treated negatively. On July 25, 2003, Abbas visited the White House for the first time. At that meeting, the two leaders formed the Palestinian Economic Development Group, a high-level United States-Palestine Joint Commission that ignored economic relations. (George W. Bush: Presidential Press Conference with Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas of the Palestinian Authority. «Presidency.ucsb.edu. Retrieved October 23, 2017».

After Arafat died in November 2004, the new Palestinian President Abbas became a frequent visitor to the White House. As Arafat did, Bush now called him «president» rather than «chairman» in the official newsletter. Abbas visited the White House when he won the honor of the head of state on six different occasions:

- May 26, 2005.
- October 20, 2005.
- November 26, 2007.
- April 24, 2008.
- September 25, 2008.
- December 19, 2008.

During his visit on May 26, 2005, Bush expressed support for the parameters of the Palestinian state:

Both parties must reach a final status agreement and both parties must agree to the change to the 1949 Armistice. A viable two-State solution must ensure the proximity of the West Bank and the decentralized regional state will not work. There must also be a meaningful connection between the West Bank and Gaza. This is the position of the United States today; and this will be the position of the United States in the final status negotiations. (George W. Bush: Presidential Press Conference with Prime

Minister Mahmoud Abbas of the Palestinian Authority. «[www.presidency.ucsb.edu](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu). Retrieved October 23, 2017).

Regarding the internal structure of the Palestinian Authority, Bush supported Israel's request for a new presidential election in January 2005 and a parliamentary election in January 2006. In January 2008, President George W. Bush visited the Palestinian Authority.

#### ***3.2.4. Obama's Administration:***

After President Barack Obama took office, relations between the two countries have improved. Obama's administration has pledged to support the establishment of a Palestinian state from the very beginning. Abbas visited the White House on May 28, 2009, June 9, and September 1, 2010, and March 17, 2014.

In July 2010, the Palestinian delegation upgraded and renamed the PLO's general delegation to the United States.

In December 2010, the United States Government and the Palestinian Authority launched a joint project on information technology capacity building. (Official news to the Congress on the 2012 United Nations bid for Palestine 13/01/2014 on Wayback Machine.)

In the fiscal year 2011, the US government provided \$200 million in direct budget support to the Palestinian Authority.



### **Tension in U.S.-Palestinian Relationship:**

Throughout 2011, the relations became worse as the Palestinian Initiative sought to join the Palestinian Authority and the US government supported Israel's opposition to the membership of the Palestinian Authority and returned to negotiations.

According to the Associated Press, in October 2011, a group of about 30 Palestinian protesters «talked to a US diplomatic mission to the West Bank of the Jordan River» in response to the possibility that the United States might end its assistance to the Palestinian Authority. In November 2012, on the eve of the United Nations General Assembly's vote on Palestinian statehood, the Palestinian Authority sent a message of comfort to the United States Congress, claiming that this move was not inconsistent with international law. In the United Nations General Assembly's vote to accept Palestine as an observer, the United States voted against the resolution. (Official news to the Congress on the 2012 United Nations tender for Palestine, on January 13, 2014 on the Wayback machine)

Following the UN General Assembly resolution on November 29, 2012, recognizing Palestine as a non-member observer, some US senators called for the closure of the PLO delegation in the United States of America. The head of the delegation, Areikat, issued an open letter stating that the closure of the delegation would

only worsen the status of the United States in the Middle East. In March 2013, President Barack Obama and Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas held a press conference in the West Bank of Ramallah). ([www.presidency.ucsb.edu](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu))



## *Chapter Four*

# *Jordan, the United States and Jerusalem*



The US Congress passed a law in 1995 under former President Bill Clinton. The law states that «Jerusalem must be recognized as the capital of the State of Israel,» and the transfer of the Washington embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, but presidents who preceded Trump blocked the implementation of the law every six months under the code of « protecting the vital interests of the United States,» but Trump made a promise to the Jewish community in the United States during his election campaign on his first day at the White House that he will proceed with this step.

Trump signed in January a memorandum to postpone the transfer of the embassy, as did other presidents, but recent reports have led to the belief that Trump intends to transfer the embassy to Jerusalem and recognize the Holy City as the capital of Israel, which will lead to the transfer of the embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

King Abdullah II warned the US President Donald Trump on the seriousness of any decision on occupied Jerusalem outside the framework of a comprehensive solution to achieve the establishment of a Palestinian state with East Jerusalem as its capital, he further stressed that Jerusalem is the key to achieving peace and stability in the region and the world. On December 6, US President Donald Trump announced in his speech from the White House the recognition of occupied Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. In response to this decision, King Abdullah II's

efforts accelerated, with King Abdullah II personally leading a diplomatic and political effort to deal with the consequences of the resolution, and to communicate with the capitals of the global decision, through a clear language rejecting the resolution and its implications, as illegal and contrary to international legitimacy (<http://rawabetcenter.com/archives/58274>)

In response to this decision, King Abdullah II participated in the Islamic Summit in Istanbul on December 13 to emphasize that «the region will not enjoy comprehensive peace except by solving the Palestinian-Israeli conflict based on the two-state solution according to international legitimacy and the Arab initiative, Palestinian territory with East Jerusalem as its capital. He stated that «The United States' recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel is a dangerous decision that threatens the security and stability of the peace process. We have always cautioned the US government of the danger of unilateral decisions affecting Jerusalem beyond the framework of a comprehensive solution that meets the legitimate rights of the brotherly Palestinian people and the independent state with East Jerusalem as its capital.» Attempts to Judaize the city of Jerusalem and change its Arab Islamic and Christian identity will trigger more violence and extremism because the city is sacred for the followers of the three heavenly religions. The Hashemite guardianship over the Islamic and Christian holy sites in Jerusalem is a historic responsibility that Jordan has the honor to carry on and

we will continue our role in countering any attempt to change the historical and legal situation in Al Aqsa Mosque. In the context of the rejection of Trump's decision, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan voted in favor of a UN General Assembly resolution calling on Washington to withdraw its decision to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. Despite the threat of Trump to cut aid from the countries that vote in favor of the resolution and it is known that Jordan is the recipient of such assistance, however, King Abdullah did not care about that decision. The Trump resolution formed a state of harmony established for a national political reality embodied by the Jordanians under the leadership of King Abdullah II when King Abdullah II praised the citizens' protests against President Trump's decision to consider Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. «The Jordanians are always the pulse of this nation, and what they showed today is a strong feeling towards Jerusalem, our first cause, with unmatched cohesion and solidarity, which reflects the dignity of our people and its people, and it is a source of pride for me and every Arab.» said the king, through his personal account on Twitter «He added: «May God keep Jordan and its people as a shield and a bond to our nation and its people.» The courageous position of King Abdullah II rejecting the decision of Trump stems from the historic role of the holy sites in Jerusalem, with the utmost seriousness and pride as the descendant of the Hashemites and that means that Jerusalem must be under his auspices, and here is the King and with all the power and boldness



continues to protect Jerusalem. King Abdullah cannot stand still as he is the descendant of the most honorable of the all creatures, peace and blessings be upon him, and Al-Aqsa is the holy spot that his grandfather has been entrusted to. It is the first of the two Qiblahs, the second of the two mosques and the third of the holy mosques. King Abdullah must feel the fear and concern of the Arab and international situation of defeat and weakness towards the holiest city and land. King Abdullah's concern is the concern of Palestinians, the Jordanians, the honorable Arabs and Muslims in this world. Jerusalem is worth being concerned about. Here we wonder if the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, under the leadership of King Abdullah II, the son of Al Hussein, who enjoys political and historical legitimacy, possesses natural resources, such as the possession of some Arab countries, which does not make use of them in serving Arab causes. If Jordan had its situation, it would have used it to defend the Arab nation's main causes headed by the cause of Palestine. The resolutions of the Arab Summit (Jerusalem Summit) hailed the efforts of King Abdullah II, the Custodian of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, to the Islamic and Christian holy places in the Holy Al-Quds (<https://www.alghad.com/articles/2207582>)

The resolutions of the summit which was concluded in Dhahran reiterated the rejection of all attempts by Israel (the occupying power) to violate the Hashemite's guardianship and care and to

value the Jordanian role in the care, protection and maintenance of the Islamic holy shrines and holy sites in Jerusalem, which the signed agreement Between King Abdullah II and Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas has re-confirmed it. The resolutions of the summit expressed their support to the Jordanian administration of the Jerusalem and Al-Aqsa Mosque's Awqaf in the role it plays in preserving and protecting it under Israeli violations and attacks on its employees and demanding that Israel stop its attacks on the administration and its staff.

This came at the end of the twenty-ninth session of the Arab Summit held in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia.

The Arab leaders stressed in the final communiqué of the summit the importance of promoting joint Arab action, based on a clear methodology and solid foundations that protect our nation from the dangers that threaten it, safeguard security and stability and secure a bright and promising future that holds hope and prosperity for future generations.

The leaders reiterated their rejection of all unilateral Israeli steps aimed at changing the facts on the ground and undermining the two-state solution. They called on the international community to implement the resolutions of international legitimacy, the latest of which is Security Council resolution 2334 of 2016 condemning settlement and land confiscation. Held on 15/1/2017, which renewed the commitment of the international community to the

two-state solution as the only way to achieve lasting peace. The final statement of the summit called for the implementation of all Security Council resolutions concerning Jerusalem, stressing the invalidity of all Israeli measures aimed at altering the features of East Jerusalem and confiscating its true Arab identity. We call upon the countries of the world not to transfer their embassies to Jerusalem or to recognize them as the capital of Israel.

King Abdallah stressed the need to implement the decision of the Executive Council of UNESCO issued by the 200th session on 18/10/2016, and called on the international community to bear its responsibilities regarding the Israeli violations and the reckless measures that affect Al-Aqsa Mosque and its worshipers, and consider the Jordanian administration of the Jerusalem and the Al-Aqsa Mosque's Awqaf as the sole legal authority of the Haram in its administration, maintenance, preservation and regulation of entry into it.

King Abdullah II met with the President of the Palestinian Authority, Mahmoud Abbas, at the Al Husseinia Palace in Amman. During the Jordan meeting, the two discussed «the threat on Jerusalem,» a statement from the government and Abbas's efforts to obtain the support of the international community for the Palestinian Authority's request that Jerusalem be the capital of the Palestinian state, the national media of Jordan, reported by Petra.

Shortly after the meeting, King Abdullah issued a public statement calling on the international community to «fulfill its responsibility to the Arab population in Jerusalem,» AFP reported and supported UNRWA after the United States cut funds.

«The international community must fulfill its responsibility to protect the rights of Palestinians, Arabs, Muslims and Christians in Jerusalem,» said King Abdullah as he continued saying that Jerusalem is the key to peace and stability in the region « (<http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/241305>).

Jerusalem is the emotional core of long-term conflicts, and Trump's policy changes have provoked protests and condemnations in Arab and Muslim countries.

It brought a dilemma to king Abdullah, a strong American ally whose political legitimacy was due in large part to the role of the Hashemites as guardians of an important Muslim site in Jerusalem. Any threat to Muslims in the city is considered a challenge for Jordan, since the majority of Jordan's population comes from Palestine. (<https://www.gazettenet.com/Jordan-urges-Pence-to-rebuild-trust-15033227>).

In a series of international criticisms, Jordan also rejected the US decision, saying it was legally «ineffective» because it consolidated Israel's occupation of the eastern part of the city. (<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/donald->

trump-israel-jerusalem-capital-benjamin-netanyahu-a8241036.html).

On Monday, the United States further isolated the issue when it blocked the UN Security Council's call for the declaration to be withdrawn.

Both the Vatican and Jordan supported the two-State solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, with which they agree as part of the peace process.

The Palestinians want East Jerusalem to be the capital of their future independent state, while Israel declares that the entire city is their «unified and eternal» capital.

The statement said both sides hope to encourage negotiations.

At that time, Jordanian protesters almost rushed to enter the Israeli Embassy in Amman and remained at a distance of about 100 meters from the main entrance of the embassy.

The second important factor is that Jordan's mission is to administer the holy sites of Jerusalem, including Al-Aqsa Mosque, in accordance with the tradition and the 1994 peace treaty with Israel. (<https://www.middleeasteye.net/columns/jordan-israel-jerusalem-trump-palestine>).

Any challenges to the status quo of the religion of the Holy City has hit the core of Hashemite's legitimacy in Jordan and throughout

the Arab world. In 2014, King Abdullah delivered a speech in parliament: «Jordan will continue to use various means to confront Israel's unilateral policies and measures in Jerusalem and protect its sacred Muslim and Christian sites.» Therefore, the majority of Palestinians and Arabs believe that the Hashemite monarchy is the guardian of the Islamic holy places of Jerusalem. Article 9 of the Treaty of Peace between Israel and Jordan in 1994 states: «Israel must respect the existing role of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in the Islamic Holy Land of Jerusalem. When the negotiations on the final state take place, Israel must attach great importance to the historical role of Jordan in these places. «

In other words, any change in the legal status of the city in any political negotiation of a peace agreement must take Jordan into account. In this article, the late King Hussein of Jordan managed to take advantage of the recognition of Israel and the United States for the role of Jordan in Jerusalem.

Therefore, Jordan must be an important party in the peace negotiations in the region. In addition, Jordan's current impression is that its role in the question of Palestine, especially throughout the region, is being marginalized. The recent reconciliation between several Arab countries, especially the Gulf region, does not include Jordan, which is what Amman believes to be a representation of a threat to the county and its identity, because Jordan is discussing the fate of millions of Palestinian refugees and Jerusalem. Since

the beginning of the political process in the Jordanian delegation, including the Palestinians, this attempt to marginalize Jordan has been a great transformation without precedent.

While Jordanian and Palestinian leaders nervously waited for a vision of the White House peace plan, Trump announced his unilateral decision to move the United States Embassy to Jerusalem. The reaction of King Abdullah was unprecedented. He rejected Trump's movement and warned of its terrible consequences. As head of the Arab summit, he ordered his Foreign Minister to launch a diplomatic offensive. He ignored the pressure of Saudi Arabia and participated in the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (IOC) in Istanbul on December 20, and delivered a harsh speech criticizing the decision of the United States.

The Vatican supports the Hashemite king as the guardian of the Muslims' holy places in Jerusalem. Pope Francis and King Abdullah of Jordan argued on Tuesday that the President of the United States, Donald Trump, decided to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. This movement shows that this is a danger to peace in the Middle East. ( <http://www.arabnews.com/node/1211466/world>)

King Abdullah and the Pope began a private meeting for about 20 minutes, while the king was visiting the Vatican and France. The Vatican issued a statement saying they discussed «promoting peace and stability in the Middle East, especially with regard to

the role of Jerusalem and the Hashemite monarch as guardians of the Holy Land.»

The Hashemite dynasty of King Abdullah was the guardian of the Muslim shrine in Jerusalem, which made Amman sensitive to any change in the state of the controversial city.

When Trump announced his decision on December 6, the Pope's response was to demand respect for the city's «status quo» and said that new tensions in the Middle East would further aggravate world conflicts.(<http://www.arabnews.com/node/1211466/world>)

In numerous international criticisms, Jordan also rejected the US decision, saying it was legally «ineffective» because it consolidated the occupation of Israel in the eastern part of the city.

On Monday, the United States further strengthened the issue by stopping the UN Security Council's call to withdraw the declaration. (<http://www.mei.edu/publications/king-abdullahs-pragmatism-keeps-us-jordan-ties-track>)

Both the Vatican and Jordan support a two-state solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict as part of the peace process.

Nevertheless, King Abdullah continues to push for a comprehensive solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict based on the Arab Peace Initiative of 2002. For Jordan, the two-state solution offers the Aqsa Mosque guarantee that the so-called «Jordanian election» often praised by right-wing politicians composed of the



coalition of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. At the heart of this solution is East Jerusalem, including the Old City, where the Hashemites serve as protectors of Christian and Muslim holy places as guardians.

After Trump's visit to Jerusalem, King Abdullah told the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, the umbrella organization of the 57-member Muslim states, to settle Jerusalem by consensus as «the key to ending the historic conflict in the Middle East.» The ICO was founded half a century ago in response to the arson attacks at the Al-Aqsa Mosque and in response to the political fire of the President of the United States by declaring East Jerusalem as the Palestinian capital. But it contains Jerusalem as the nucleus of a new religious war for any extremist who wants to dominate it. (<https://www.ft.com/content/62154e98-fac7-11e7-9b32-d7d59aace167>).

*Chapter Five*

*Trump's Decision To Move*

*The Embassy,*

*«The Application And Dimensions»*



### ***5.1. President Trump:***

(Born June 14, 1946) is the 47th President of the United States of America, since January 20, 2017. He is also an American businessman, billionaire, television personality, American author, and chairman of the Trump Organization, based in the United States. Trump founded and runs several projects and companies such as Trump Resorts, which runs many casinos, hotels, golf courses, and other facilities around the world. His lifestyle, his brand and his outspoken approach to politics have helped him to become a celebrity in both the United States and the world, in addition, he presented The Apprentice program on NBC. Trump is the fourth son of a family of five. His father, Fred Trump, was a wealthy and real estate owner in New York City, he was deeply influenced by his father, so he ended up making his career in real estate development, graduating from Wharton at the University of Pennsylvania and in 1968, Donald Trump joined his father's company: Trump. Upon giving control of the company, he changed its name to Trump. His career began with the renovation of the Commodore Hotel in the Grand Hyatt with the Pritzker family, followed by Trump Tower in New York City and many other projects in residential complexes. Later, he moved to the expansion of the aviation industry (the purchase of Eastern Shtet, Atlantic City Casino, including the purchase of the TajMahal Casino of the Crosby family, but the casino project went bankrupt.

This expansion of business has led to debt escalation. The news he reported in the early 1990s covered his financial problems and the scandals of his out-of-marital relationships with Marla Maples, the result of his first wife's divorce, Ivanka Trump.

## ***5.2. Historical Background Of The Decision:***

The US Congress passed a law in 1995 under former President Bill Clinton. The law states that «Jerusalem must be recognized as the capital of the State of Israel,» and the transfer of the Washington embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, but presidents who preceded Trump blocked the implementation of the law every six months under the Vital interests of the United States, «but Trump made a promise to the Jewish community in the United States during his election campaign on his first day at the White House.

Trump signed in January a memorandum to postpone the transfer of the embassy, as did other presidents, but recent reports have led to the belief that Trump intends to transfer the embassy to Jerusalem and recognize the Holy City as the capital of Israel, which will lead to the transfer of the embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

The White House spokesman said that President Trump was clear on this issue from the beginning. The question is not whether the embassy will be transferred from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, but the question is when will be transferred?

The Palestinians agree that the move will stop the peace process altogether, and that some parliamentarians have confirmed that it will show an American position biased towards the Israeli occupation state. According to the Washington Post, Palestinian officials warned against any American recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, which would undermine peace efforts between Palestinians and Israelis. The resolution means further blackmailing the Palestinians, bringing more frustration and extremism, rewarding the extremists in Israel, and weakening the Palestinian peace camp.

### ***5.3. Trump's Administration:***

US foreign policy changed its position on the Arab-Israeli conflict during President Trump's tenure. Many of the researchers and those who are interested in the American affairs have changed their positions. The radical changes in their positions have been transferred from that traditional behavior known for decades to a new reality. And religious currents on political institutions that are presumed to be ancient and have accounts and interests that transcend any pressure or religious influences class.

Trump and his advisers have also changed these convictions that the talk about the degree of the limited US president's influence on state institutions in making difficult political decisions is out of the question because Trump's personality and his conservative

advisers have prevailed in everything. Trump brags to everyone that he is the only American president who has carried out all his promises to the American people.

Although the majority of the evangelicals support the Republican Party and their alliance with the neoconservatives, the US president's religious background does not matter much to them. Giving their votes to the US presidential candidates does not protect religious beliefs as much as interests. Even Democratic presidents have never entered a real clash with the English, other currents and various religious groups, especially if it is about Israel, because these religious currents have relations and interests and control the bulk of the economy, media, research and other influential sectors within American society.

The influence of religious organizations on US foreign policy is not limited to media or political pressure, because Trump's foreign policy orientation began from the very first moment of announcing his candidacy to the presidency of the White House, and he was not fortunate enough to reach the presidency before his implicit signature on A political deal with the strong religious trend in the United States, which was the arrival of the President in return for the implementation of political promises to Israel, Trump case with the religious trend is unprecedented in US policy, especially that his promises on Jerusalem and withdrawal from the nuclear program Iran has not faced much internal opposition

despite the risks it poses to American relations and interests in the world. Trump's administration has revealed the state of slackness in other liberal or conservative movements that support Israel in the United States. Its impact on US foreign policy is not comparable to conservative religious trends. Its clear persecution of Muslims in the United States and its outright assault on the world demonstrates his lack of ability on the effect. US foreign policy has political, security, and welfare accounts, but the ideal environment for Trump's management in the Middle East has been instrumental in his policy toward the Middle East and the Arab-Israeli conflict in particular. (The Religious Dimension in Foreign Policy of the Trump Administration, Council on International Relations, Palestine, 2018).

US foreign policy changed its position on the Arab-Israeli conflict during President Trump's tenure. Many of the researchers and those who are interested in the American affairs have changed their positions. The radical changes in their positions have been transferred from that traditional behavior known for decades to a new reality. And religious currents on political institutions that are presumed to be ancient and have accounts and interests that transcend any pressure or religious influences class. (The Religious Dimension in Foreign Policy of the Trump Administration, Council on International Relations, Palestine, 2018).



Trump and his advisers have also changed these convictions that the talk about the degree of the limited US president's influence on state institutions in making difficult political decisions is out of the question because Trump's personality and his conservative advisers have prevailed in everything. Trump brags to everyone that he is the only American president who has carried out all his promises to the American people.

Although the majority of the evangelicals support the Republican Party and their alliance with the neoconservatives, the US president's religious background does not matter much to them. Giving their votes to the US presidential candidates does not protect religious beliefs as much as interests. Even Democratic presidents have never entered a real clash with the English and other currents. And various religious groups, especially if it is about Israel, because these religious currents have relations and interests and control the bulk of the economy, media, research and other influential sectors within American society. (The Religious Dimension in Foreign Policy of the Trump Administration, Council on International Relations, Palestine, 2018)

The influence of the religious organizations on US foreign policy is not limited to media or political pressure, because Trump's foreign policy orientation began from the very first moment of announcing his candidature to the presidency of the White House, and he was not fortunate enough to reach the presidency before

his implicit signature on A political deal with the strong religious trend in the United States, which was the arrival of the President in return for the implementation of political promises to Israel, Trump's case with the religious trend is unprecedented in US policy, especially that his promises on Jerusalem and withdrawal from the nuclear program. Iran has not faced much internal opposition despite the risks it poses to the American relations and interests in the world. Trump's administration has revealed the state of slackness in other liberal or conservative movements that support Israel in the United States. Its impact on US foreign policy is not comparable to conservative religious trends. Its clear persecution of Muslims in the United States and its outright assault on the world demonstrates his lack of ability on the effect. US foreign policy has political, security, and welfare accounts, but the ideal environment for Trump's management in the Middle East has been instrumental in his policy toward the Middle East and the Arab-Israeli conflict in particular.

The primary position of the Trump administration is to support Israel's position. On May 3, 2017, Palestinian President Abbas visited the White House for the first time during the Trump administration. On May 23, Trump visited the Palestinian Authority for the first time .Mitnik, Joshua (May 23, 2017). «The Palestinians are not interested in Trump's visit to the West Bank.» (Los Angeles Times).

On December 6, 2017, President Trump announced that the United States recognized Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. Trump's move was praised by Benjamin Netanyahu, who claimed it was a "historic milestone". According to Mahmoud Abbas, Trump's decision shows that the United States has withdrawn from its mediation role. Trump's decision was condemned by traditional American allies such as Saudi Arabia, France and the United Kingdom (Borger, 2017)

On September 10, 2018, the US President Donald Trump ordered the closure of the Palestinian diplomatic office in Washington, D.C., on the grounds that the PLO lacked progress in the peace process. US National Security Adviser John Bolton defended the decision. Dr. Husam Zomlot, Ambassador of the PLO, condemned the decision of the Trump administration to close its Palestinian mission. The mission ended on October 11, 2018. (Borger, 2017)

On October 18, 2018, US Secretary of State Mike Pompeo announced that the US Consulate General in Jerusalem will be merged with the US Embassy in Jerusalem. Pompeo announced that the United States will continue to build relations with the Palestinians through a special Palestinian affairs unit within the embassy. Palestinian officials, including the Palestinian Authority's chief negotiator Saeb Erekat, criticized the statement as support for Israel's claims against Jerusalem and the «Greater Israel». (Oliver, 2018).

## ***5.4. Deal of the Century:***

### ***5.4.1. Trump and the Deal of the Century:***

Trump's adoption of the deal of the century brought down the two-state solution; counting on the Saudi money and the oil weight of Riyadh to pass, relying on his adviser and son-in-law Jared Kushner, and his personal relations with Ibn Salman, which was consolidated by a secret visit to Riyadh last year. According to Western and Palestinian sources, the elements of the deal were limited to: (Al-Quds Al-Arabi, November 24, 2018).

- 1- The establishment of a Palestinian state that includes the Gaza Strip, Areas A and B, and parts of Area C in the West Bank.
- 2- Donor countries provide \$ 10 billion for the establishment of the state and its infrastructure, including an airport and seaport in Gaza, housing, agriculture, industrial zones and new cities.
- 3- Postpone issues of the status of Jerusalem and the return of refugees to subsequent negotiations.
- 4- Initiate negotiations on regional peace talks between Tel Aviv and Arab countries, led by Saudi Arabia.

The «Associated Press» report mentioned that «peace» between the Palestinians and the Zionist state allows Trump to establish an alliance with Tel Aviv, Riyadh, Abu Dhabi and Cairo to fight

Iran under his auspices, an alliance facing a formal Palestinian rejection of the American role; Because of Saudi Arabia's war against Yemen, its differences with Canada, and its blockade of Qatar.

The sources pointed out that the competent team did not discuss the subject since the official recognition of the crime, and the German site DW mentioned a Saudi Veto against the «Deal of the Century» (On 01/08/2018), and the rejection of King Salman of a deal that does not meet Palestinian demands, recognizing the nature of the challenges, which could lead to the completion of the «deal» without an Arab green light.

It should be noted that the project «Neom» aimed to open a new page with the Zionist state, and improve Arab-Zionist relations, especially that a part of the project that will be held in the Sinai desert. Zionist media reports have mentioned the interest of their companies in participating in the project, and researcher «Lorem Mittal» at Bin Goryon University, has previously stated for the Bloomberg American Newspaper that (Israel) will participate in the project, and the peace agreement with Cairo guarantees the Zionist state an outlet in the Red Sea. This was confirmed by the Al-Mashir Al-Sisi assigning the islands of Tiran and Sanafir, which will be crossed by the Neom bridge.

The success of the project is linked to the implementation of the century deal, and Bin Salman facilitated this with warm messages

to Tel Aviv, in which he recognized Israel's right to exist, an additional development to the strong Saudi relationship with the Zionist state.

King Salman and his crown prince cannot afford to reject the deal of the century. The site pointed to a major shift at the end of July 2018 when the Saudi press quoted the king rejecting the «deal of the century» unless East Jerusalem was to be included as the capital of Palestine, the return of refugees, and the Arab peace initiative of 2002.

According to the Palestinian ambassador's statement in Riyadh for Reuters, King Salman told Abbas that he would not abandon the Palestinians, that he will accept what they accept and reject what they reject. (Al-Quds Al-Arabi, November 24, 2018)

The German website pointed to what was published by the New Yorker magazine before, with the readiness of Arab leaders to support the American plan, but they retreated, because they found that the transfer of the American embassy to Jerusalem has caused widespread public condemnation. The media revealed months ago about Bin Salman's pressure on the Palestinian president to support the American plan, And King Salman's position made clear that Saudi Arabia is not prepared for a solution that did not accept Western capitals; it opposed the transfer of the US embassy to Jerusalem.

Observers questioned Trump's interest in Gaza, as if he knew nothing about it, and the fact that it is a maneuver to buy time to pass the deal. Has anyone followed a more contradictory and confused reality?

#### ***5.4.2. The Jordanian Position on the Deal of the Century:***

It is not an exaggeration to say that the deal of the century began with the first Zionist Congress in Basel in 1897, and what is happening today is the harvest of fruits and efforts of Zionist American and the weakness and confusion of Palestinian Arab good or bad faith. The march of the Zionist movement today succeeded in reaching the following facts: First; to drop the status of the occupation of the State of «Israel» and to consider Palestine as a disputed land between two parties, upset the equation so that the conflict between two parties; one party claims the right to that land «Palestinian people» on one hand, represents the right holders and they are «Israelis» on the other hand, and thus the Palestinian resistance and even peaceful that was considered lately as terrorism, and the right «Palestinian conflict has to be decided .»(Aalghad Newspaper).

Second, the Palestinian issue has shifted from an Arab issue to a local Israeli-Palestinian issue. The main Arab states are no longer a party of the conflict and they have turned into countries that are interested in resolving this conflict in a way that does not conflict

with their interests and international alliances. The Palestinian issue is now viewed as the basis of its own interests. It opposed the support of the issue with its international alliances, preferring its own alliances and interests.

Thirdly, America is openly turning from mediator to resolve the conflict to an agent for «Israel» in resolving the conflict. Frankly, it is an agent that does not care for the interests of Israel. It also uses its own resources and American taxpayer money for the interests of the occupying state. Despite the fact that Trump does not care about the world or America's reputation for the interests of «Israel», so that America came out of the International Council for Human Rights in protest against the Council's bias against Israel!

At the regional level, the map of the enemies in the region has been rearranged to be the Suni- Shia conflict at the top of the list, followed by the international conflict against the terrorist movements, the movements that America has set up and financed with money and weapons, thus creating new battlefields for the new enemies. In the face of the horror of war in the countries of the region, it is clear that the camp of resistance and the other alliance will not provide the interests of the Arabs on his personal interests and will not fight «Israel» alone and will remain at war with it as an interest for the continuation of his own projects.

Jordan is in a historic alliance with America and cannot escape this alliance now. Yet Jordan, led by the king personally, is the



only Arab state that still refuses the occupation of Palestine and upholds Palestinian rights throughout the West Bank. The deal appears to include the deportation or deployment of residents of the West Bank and Gaza in land annexed to Gaza from the Sinai «expanded Gaza» territory.

It is useful to emphasize in the final moments of the negotiations on the deal of the century that the Jordanian people, who cherish their country and their history, will not accept any solution at the expense of their identity or their nation, and will limit any attempt to attack it, a resistance that the world has never known before, especially the United States, that the Palestinian through the journey of struggle armed with their conscious and solidity will not get out of his land, even if they were bombarded or given dollars, and the Israeli agent will know that there are issues that cannot be bought with cash, So we may soon see the signing ceremony of the century deal, but I think it will continue and we will continue to say that it is strong until victory.

## ***5.5. The Dimensions Of The Shift In The Position Of President Of The Trump Palestinian Issue:***

### ***5.5.1. Internal Dimensions:***

The Gulf States, Israel and the United States of America do not want Iran to reap the full benefits of the victory of the Russian-

Iranian alliance in Syria. The aim is to rebalance the balance of power with Tehran in Syria, Iraq, Yemen and Lebanon. The only place that will facilitate the process is Jerusalem. The odds, risks and repercussions will result.

In the midst of these conflicts and the disastrous wars in the Middle East, Trump moves the US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem as a provocation to the Palestinians and their supporters, and a threat to America and supporters of this unprecedented step. Trump did it.

In the light of the foregoing, the peace process and the resolution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict have been abandoned by the United States and by the Israelis. If some politicians and rulers are still talking about the peace process, they will remain in the dream world, or will remain in their imagination only. Which says that peace in the Middle East has been prepared for him, was the reason behind why the Palestinians and many leaders of the world and the European Union criticized and condemned Trump's decision, Trump risked the outbreak of ethnic conflict in the occupied territories, because it tells the Arabs Muslims and Christians in every World Countries: «that their second holiest city, became only for Jews and they had no place in them.»

The first consequence of the US embassy's transfer to Jerusalem and the recognition of Israel is the establishment of a third Palestinian uprising. The recognition of Israeli sovereignty over Jerusalem as

a formal declaration of the death of the Oslo agreement, which calls for the establishment of an independent Palestinian state with East Jerusalem as its capital, a suitable opportunity for America and Israel to weaken and intervene in Lebanon, and we wonder here: were the wars in the Middle East not enough for Trump to open a new war without justification ? This American decision may plunge the entire region in a sea of blood and resentment.

As well as the implications of the repercussions of the transfer of the embassy and America's acceptance of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, this decision will affect the already tense relations between America and the European Union, and will undermine US relations with Canada rejecting the Israeli occupation as is known, Europe and Canada will not follow that, and certainly influenced America in supporting this decision, If we cannot imagine the European Union countries that still believe in the peace process transfer their embassies to Jerusalem, it is true that there are European consulates in Jerusalem, but they are located in East Jerusalem and the West Bank and not Israel, and this is a big difference.

Trump's decision will further complicate matters with the EU countries, which means it may isolate America from the Western world that rejects this resolution.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and his right-wing government to expand the settlements and Judaize Jerusalem

practically at the expense of the Arab territories, exacerbating the Palestinian anger and contributing to the launching of the Intifada, because the continuation of the theft of land from its original owners in this way will only rob the Palestinians from the hope of establishing their capital in East Jerusalem.

No one can prevent Trump from doing what he did in the White House or his European allies. Trump wanted to say: «What I've done is not only to transfer the embassy as a symbolic move, but to recognize that Jerusalem, the holy city of Muslims, Christians and Jews, will be the capital of Israel. «He said.

### ***5.5.2. External Dimensions:***

The determinants governing the US-Arab relationship:

The fixed determinant in US-Iranian relations is subject to the circumstances and stages of variables that affect the characterization of this hostility without causing any change in essence. Today, this factor is supposed to be strongly present in Trump's policies, given the presence of other factors that are greatly enhanced, which in general will determine the hostility that will govern relations over the coming years.

The «technical determinant»: This factor is due to the composition of the new administration dominated by «Iranophobia» starting from President Trump, who did not change his hostile speech,

and to the members of his team, who differ in views on internal and external issues, on «anti-Iran» and «political Islam», which is described as the regime of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and this is evident in their statements and positions, before and after the selection of Donald Trump as members of his team.

The composition of the new administration is a sharp return to the mentality that prevailed after the attacks of September 11, 2001, and this does not bode well at all.

Here, for example, and not limited to, we review the positions of the most important members of the new US administration towards the Palestinian cause:

**First:** US Vice President «Michael Pence»:

Supports attacking «Israel» Iranian targets to prevent it from «developing nuclear weapons».

Attacking the nuclear agreement with Iran, and considers it against the interests of «Israel» and the United States of America.

**Second:** National Security Advisor Michael Flynn:

He has strong statements against political Islam

***Dimensions at the Gulf and International Level:***

It is expected that the American position adopted by the current US administration will have different implications, especially in

relation to the future of the geopolitical and security situation in the region.

***Israeli Dimension:***

This factor has been one of the pillars and determinants of the Middle East policy of the United States since the sixties of the last century, and in this regard, draws its relations with the countries of the region.

In this regard, there are indications that this factor is likely to have a greater role during the next phase in shaping the features of US foreign policy in the Middle East.

***The most important indicators are:***

A: Donald Trump and most members of his administration, especially those in critical positions, were close to the extreme Zionist right. This was manifested first in Trump's promise to move the US Embassy to Jerusalem before the elections and was confirmed after the victory, according to the Israeli newspaper Yedioth Ahronoth. Zionism's participation in the West Bank in the inauguration ceremony in a rare precedent, as well as the talk about «Islamic terrorism» at the same ceremony, which is an important pillar in the media and political discourse of the Israeli right.

B: The statements of Donald Trump and his key ministers are in line with the Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and his ministers extremist view in the anti-Arab countries. This is not the agreement itself, but rather the right-wing ideology, which believes that agreement and consensus should not be dealt with in any form, but through the language of «force», «threat» and «options under the table.»

In this context, it does not seem strange that Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu will publish a video a day after Trump's inauguration, and before his contact with the latter, he addresses the Iranian people for the first time, attacking the Iranian government and appealing the feelings of its people.

According to the White House statement on the contents of the telephone call, Iran was the focal point of this contact, and the two sides are expected to discuss it at length in a meeting between them soon. All these indicators mean that the Zionist entity exploits the right wing approach of the new American administration to rearrange priorities for US foreign policy in the Middle East, and draw its features based on the strategy of «Iran first» in a purely hostile.

### ***Russian Dimension:***

There are indications that Donald Trump does not want to antagonize Russia, and that he looks forward to cooperate with it.

Trump and Putin may have been confused over the past period, either before or after the American elections. Then the White House announced, days after Trump's inauguration, with Russia in Syria coming in the context of the desire of both parties to open a new page in a relationship different from the days of President Obama.

On the other hand, the new US Vice President made statements against Russia and Putin earlier, but the majority of the members of the US government, led by Trump himself, suggest their support for dialogue with Moscow, and cooperation with them to resolve bilateral differences and deal with issues of common concern, such as the Middle East.

Of these new US officials, Foreign Minister «Rex Tillerson,» is known for his strong relations with Russian President Vladimir Putin, who in turn awarded him the medal of friendship after several years of Russian projects, headed by Tillerson in the country, and has significant economic interests in Russia. He was one of the opponents of sanctions in 2013, and the Kremlin welcomed his appointment as foreign minister, saying he was a professional and had good relations with President Putin.

The National Security Adviser, Michael Flynn, was one of the most important advocates of rapprochement with Russia and refused to take hostile positions. He said: «Let us be realistic. We



have to cooperate with Moscow to resolve the Syrian crisis. We cannot ask the Russians to return to their homes because it will never happen.»

These indications, along with the signs of Iranian-Russian differences over Syria, confirmed by the Kremlin before the start of the Astana negotiations and the strong Russian-Israeli relations, suggest that the coming period is likely to bring the US and Russia closer. If this happens, Tehran will probably be the first to suffer, and that «bargaining» in several files, including the Syrian file may be the first chapters of this convergence.

On the other hand, US-Russian cooperation is linked to the end of Russia's cooperation with the Islamic Republic of Iran in the region, officials close to Donald Trump told Bloomberg a few days ago.

### ***Implications At The Level Of Regional Conflicts***

The US president's position on Jerusalem and the adoption of a new US strategy toward Jerusalem are expected to increase the level of military and security tension, especially in the waters of the Arabian Gulf, and perhaps in the Arabian Sea, the Gulf of Aden and the Red Sea, as well as raise the level of polarization between Jerusalem and allied forces, with Saudi Arabia and the GCC, Syria, Yemen, Iraq and Lebanon. The expected results also

include the possibility of inciting the region into new conflicts and implicating them in an arms race, making it the most turbulent region in the world.



## *Conclusion*

The Jordanian side balances its interests and responsibilities, making it more competent in dealing with Trump's decision. On the official side, Jordan resorted to all diplomatic channels to alleviate this decision, with permanent emphasis on its rejection and its nullification. On the other hand, Jordan remains committed to the American role in the region, taking into account its economic and security interests. Therefore, the US-Jordanian relations will continue and will not be affected. Jordan will remain steadfast in its refusal to change the legal and historical situation in Jerusalem.

Perhaps the most important conclusion is that the relative separation of files in international Jordanian relations, between Palestinian files, in which Amman offers support and Jordanian national files, is essential and a feature of Jordanian and Arab policy at the present time.

### *Channels*

US foreign policy during the Trump era is still in the making, because of the lack of clarity of the Assistant team to the new US president so far, and the contradiction in some statements and political positions on many of the issues of the Middle East during the US presidential election.

Yet what can be emphasized is that US foreign policy toward the Middle East under President Trump will not be an extension of George W. Bush's policy of coarse force, or a continuation of Barack Obama's soft power policy, but rather a combination of both.

But Trump's move to recognize Jerusalem as the united and eternal capital of the State of Israel «contradicts the 1967 UN resolution recognizing that the West Bank, including» East Jerusalem «and the Gaza Strip, are occupied territories and contradicts UN Resolution 181, which placed holy sites under international protection, and contrary to Resolution 242, which considered the territories of the West Bank, including East Jerusalem and Gaza Strip, as occupied territories.

In addition, the United Nations demanded that Israel withdraw its diplomatic mission from Jerusalem in accordance with Resolution 478, after the Israeli parliament of 1982 decided to consider Jerusalem as the capital of a united «Israel.» Such a decision contradicts the 1993 Oslo Agreement Provided that Jerusalem is subject to final status negotiations.

What does it mean that Jerusalem become the capital of «Israel» and that the states officially recognize it?

- Abolish all international resolutions by preserving the cultural heritage of Islam and Christianity and its relation to its people,

on the pretext that Jerusalem has become the capital of Israel and has the right to control, expand and build its capital as it wants.

- Violation of all rights demanding freedom of visit of Palestinians and Arabs to the holy places in the city on the pretext of maintaining the security of the capital, which represents the security and stability of the state.
- Raising all international, Arab and Islamic mandates for the city of Jerusalem (the Jordanian Ministry of Awqaf) after it became the capital of Israel, which refuses to be the capital of the state under the protection of one because it is a form of occupation.
- The construction of military bases in Jerusalem, and the formal entry of the Israeli army into all parts of the city, however and whenever he wishes.
- The direct threat of the demolition of Al Aqsa Mosque and the alleged construction of the Temple.
- Expel all those who do not have an Israeli identity from the city and strip them of their original inhabitants.
- Abolish all official documents of the property of the people of Jerusalem and the control of «Israel» as state property.



## *Recommendations*

Due to the great value that was prepared and covered for the location of the city of Jerusalem in its political, cultural, religious, social and legal aspects, it was decided to print it in a documentary book and distribute it to Arab associations to be a reference document when needed. It is also translated into live languages and delivered to States and international organizations.

In this context, and in connection with the previous paragraph, the Arab writers and intellectuals confirm their deep resentment of the decision taken by US President Donald Trump, to recognize the city of Jerusalem as the eternal capital of Israel, and the transfer of the US Embassy on Arab land.

This is a blatant and flagrant violation of international conventions, covenants and treaties relating to the Palestinian issue and the status of the city of Jerusalem, including United Nations and Security Council resolutions, and the arrangements for negotiations between the Palestinian and Zionist sides. It also represents an infringement on the historic rights of the Palestinians in their land and holy sites.

The city of Jerusalem and the Palestinian cause must always be present in the Arab conscience, and in the creativity of Arab writers and poets, as the most important humanitarian issues of the modern



era, as a real wound in the face of the civilized world, which sees with the eyes the torment of the Palestinian people at home and Diaspora, and the excessive use of force by the occupation army, without stirring even a bit of condemnation and rejection.

The issue of the city of Jerusalem, and the Palestinian issue in general, is not a religious issue or a conflict between members of the divine religions, but it is a political and humanitarian issue where groups of immigrants who do not belong to a single heavenly religion gathered in the Arab land of Palestine in response to the call of states and international powers with interests in the region, based on an explicit promise written by the British Foreign Office at the time, forming terrorist groups, forced the Palestinian citizens to leave their land and established an occupation state over it. This is the worst form of military occupation in the world. Which have come a long way towards progress, respect for difference and non-aggression on public rights and personal freedoms.

Finally, the participants noted that the concept of «normalization» is not fixed or agreed upon in the cultural, political and intellectual circles in the Arab world, which makes it easy to exploit it and apply it to different standards according to political and cultural desires and blocs. Arab writers are responsible for assigning a special seminar to attend a future meeting in order to study the term and develop a fixed concept for it. Hence, the Jerusalem Conference in Abu Dhabi affirms that resistance to normalization of approach,

performance, mentality and culture, with the Zionist occupation, General of the Arab Writers, as the Arab normalization with the Zionist enemy is the adoption of his occupation and oppression and settlement by repression in novels and poetry, especially the occupied Jerusalem, and the pillar of the President of the Zionist penetration in the Arab region.



## *References*

- Abu Tair, M. (2018). Jordan's historic guardianship of the holy sites in Jerusalem, UAE: Al Bayan newspaper.
- ALhorob, A. (2013). The sanctity of the city of Jerusalem from the Islamic point of view, Beirut: Classes of Palestinian Studies Institutions.
- Almharmeh, O. (2014) The Hashemite guardianship over the holy sites is legitimate and historical, and can not be interpreted, Jordan: Al - Dustour newspaper.
- Awwad, M. (2005) Jordanian-Palestinian Relations: A Jordanian View, California: Monterey.
- Badwan, A. (2018). Trump's decision and the current reality of Jerusalem Al Hayat Saudi, Saudi: Newspaper. December 8
- Bolton, J. R. (2017) The Implications for Moving the U.S. Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, American Enterprise Institute, 8 (11)
- Hart, S. (2010). Keys to Jerusalem, Jordan: The Royal Islamic Strategic Studies Centre 2010.
- Hattar, M. (2014). Fearing backlash, Jordan asserts Al-Aqsa custodianship, The Times of Israel. Retrieved 18 February 2017.
- Kaminker, S. East Jerusalem: a Case Study in Political Planning,

## Palestinian-Israel

Journal of Politics, Economics and Culture, vol. II, no. 2, 1995:

Liga Arab menghargai upaya Yordania pro-Jerusalem. The Jordan Times. 27 Juli 2017.

Naim, S. (1976) the Political Status of Jerusalem in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, 1948-1967-, Middle Eastern Studies, 53 (3).

Zayed Abdullah Mesbah (1999), Diplomacy, Dar al-Jil, Beirut .

Farouk Majdawi (2004), preventive diplomacy in the Iraqi issue - the masterpieces Majdawi - Amman .

Ismail Sabri Mikled . (1991 ) International political relations - academic desk – Cairo

Missed Opportunities in Preventive the Warning (1997), Response problem and Diplomacy Jane E. Holl and Alexander L.

An Agenda for Peace Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peacekeeping Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the communiqué issued by the Security Council Summit in June (1992) Source: United Nations documents.

The Origin and Development of the Palestinian Question: 1917-1988 (New York: United Nations, 1990).

Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice, Supplement.

Mamdouh Abdel - Karim Hafez (1998) International Private Law  
- House of Culture Amman

HishamSadek (1997) Conflict of Laws - Knowledge Establishment  
– Cairo.

GhalebDaoudi (2001) International Private Law - Dar Wael –  
Amman.

Item 1 of General Assembly resolution 5550/, Jerusalem, 2001.

«The most prominent features of US foreign policy towards the  
Middle East after the victory of Trump,» a. Mansour Abu Karim,  
Al Bayader Center for Studies,2007

President Obama's Policy towards the Palestinian Issue 2009-  
2012», Dr. Salah Abu Khattla.

«Jordan's Christians throw weight behind King's pro-Jerusalem  
push». The Jordan Times. 19 December 2017. Retrieved 18  
January 2018.

«Amid Temple Mount tumult, the who, what and why of its Waqf  
rulers». DovLieber. The Times of Israel. 20 July 2017. Retrieved  
14 January 2018.

RizwiFaizer (1998). «The Shape of the Holy: Early Islamic  
Jerusalem». Rizwi's Bibliography for Medieval Islam.Archived  
from the original on 2002- 02- 10.

«Kingdom remembers Sharif Hussein Bin Ali». The Jordan Times. 3 June 2017. Retrieved 16 June 2018.

Cohen, Raymond (2008). Saving the Holy Sepulchre: How Rival Christians Came Together to Rescue Their Holiest Shrine. Oxford University Press.p. 84.Retrieved 16 January 2018.

«Assassination of King Abdullah». The Guardian. 21 July 1952. Retrieved 16 June 2018.

«How Six-Day War Left Hashemite House's Dreams of Jerusalem Palace in Ruins». Haaretz. 17 May 2017. Retrieved 22 June 2018.

«Jerusalem deal boosts Jordan in Holy City: analysts». AFP.The Daily Star. 2 April 2013. Retrieved 22 February 2017.

Hattar, Mussa (16 November 2014). «Fearing backlash, Jordan asserts Al-Aqsa custodianship». The Times of Israel.Retrieved 18 February 2017.

«King Abdullah II of Jordan funds Holy Sepulchre restoration work». Vacitan Insider. 11 April 2016. Retrieved 20 January 2018.

«Israel Agrees to Remove Metal Detectors at Entrances to Aqsa Mosque Compound». The New York Times. 24 July 2017. Retrieved 4 September 2017.

«Jerusalem Church leaders thank Jordan's King Abdullah for

support during Israel tax protest». The National. 1 March 2018. Retrieved 5 March 2018.

«Arab League values Jordan's pro-Jerusalem efforts». The Jordan Times. 27 July 2017. Retrieved 4 September 2017.

«Erdogan reaffirms Jordan's protection of Jerusalem's Islamic Awqaf». The Jordan Times. 10 May 2017. Retrieved 4 September 2017.

«We should listen to the wisdom of King Abdullah — Mogherini». The Jordan Times. 8 December 2017. Retrieved 28 December 2017.

Tariq Farahat, Presidents of the United States and Israel. A History of Prejudice, The Politics of Rank, Egypt, 2016

<https://www.sasapost.com/author/tarekfarahat>

Nicholas deBKatzenbach to President Johnson, June 27, 1967, Foreign Relations of the United States, 1964–1968, Volume XIX.

Paper Prepared by the National Security Council Staff, October 24, 1970, Foreign Relations of the United States 1969-1976-, vol. 23.

George Bush: The President's News Conference in Huntsville, Alabama». [www.presidency.ucsb.edu](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu).



William J. Clinton: Remarks on the Israeli-Palestinian Declaration of Principles and an Exchange With Reporters». [www.presidency.ucsb.edu](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu). Retrieved 22 October, 2018.

George W. Bush: The President's News Conference With Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas of the Palestinian Authority». [www.presidency.ucsb.edu](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu). Retrieved 22 November 2017.

Official Message to Congress on Palestine's 2012 United Nations Bid Archived201413-01- at the Way back Machine.

Mitnick, Joshua (May 23, 2017). «Palestinians underwhelmed by Trump's West Bank visit». Los Angeles Times.

Jerusalem, Julian Borger Peter Beaumont in (201707-12-). «Defiant Donald Trump confirms US will recognise Jerusalem as capital of Israel». The Guardian. ISSN 02613077-.

Holmes, Oliver (18 October 2018). «US downgrades consulate for Palestinians into Israel embassy unit». The Guardian. Retrieved 21 October 2018.

# *APPENDIXS*

## *APPENDIX NO. 1:*

[Official document of the Transjordan government]

Al-Sharq al-Arabi , March 13 and March 20, 1924

The loyalty of Khilafah to the Hashemites (the following are two excerpts from Al-Sharq al-Arabi on March 13 and March 20, 1924 [Official document of the Trans-Jordan government] Thousands of Arab political and tribal leaders of Palestine, Syria, Iraq, Lebanon and Jordan declared allegiance to Sharif Hussein Bin Ali, because Ataturk led the Turkish state to declare that Istanbul's Ottoman Islam, Hirafti, ended and declared the announcement of Turkey, all Muslim caliphs («Khalifah») as an independent secular state. In March 1924, Sharif Hussein Ben Ali received hundreds of loyalty letters from religious leaders in India, Pakistan, Egypt and the peninsula and Muftis. On Thursday, Sha'ban, in May 1342, a Palestinian delegation that included all the representatives of the Palestinian city visited the Great King Khalifa Sharif Hussein at his palace in the south of the Jordan Valley and declared their full loyalty to Sharif Hussein, as the only Muslim Khalifa. The Palestinian delegation included local leaders, noble figures, judges, mufti, Christian patriarchs, priests, academics and political leaders, including the President of the Executive Committee of the

Palestinian Arab Conference, Musa Katem Hussein, Haji Effing Di Amin Hussein, Grand Mufti of Beit Al-Maqdis and President of the Islamic High Council of Jerusalem and Lord Mayor Ragheb Basha al-Nashashibi of Jerusalem. Al-Karmi, President of the Supreme Court of Al-Sharq al-Arabi, Omar al-Kurdi, al-Madinah al-Monawarah Mufti of Hijaz, Saeed al-Khatib also announced the loyalty of the Palestinians to Sharif Hussein Ben Ali, the missionary from the Mosque of Al-Aqsa, Saeed al-Husseini, Mufti of Ghaza, Muhyildin al-Malah, Judge of Jaffa and Shiekh Mahmoud al-Lababidi, head of <Ako Nobles.



نشرنا في العدد الثاني بأمر الرمة العربية على الاحتفال بكرة الخلافة الاسلامية وقد انبأ رمة الحجاز والشرق العربي بالامامة الكبرى لجلالة الخليفة الاعظم والملك اليبوس الكبير بن علي ابيده الله واد نشرنا في صدر هذا العدد منشور الخلافة اعطس بها عن لولا نشر ثبات الية المباركة في البلدان العربية الاخرى.

<p>وجد انتهاء الصلاة والسلام فريضة الجمعة فقد قضيت الاستاذ الشيخ عبدالقادر الخطيب دارالبرق وايرق الى ميلا في الخلافة البرقية لآنية الخلافة - جلالة خليفة المسلمين الثقة الاعظم الحسين الاول بالحج والعمرة على ما اجمع عليه وستة اقدوسه ما استلمت واستنت ببعض التسمية على مير المسامح الاموي الكبير منصور آفاق المسلمين فعال الدار ما يحكم بالخلقة فنشكر الله تعالى على رجوع الحق لاهلها ببعض الله حصناً منيعاً صيانة للاسلام الافند نشرت مصنف دمشق مسامحة القائل دمشق وادبها وطولها هو تجارها من مرقبات الزبال بالبيعة المباركة وهذه احدى تلك المرقيات</p> <p>عمان امير المؤمنين وخليفة المسلمين الحسين بن علي نصره الله نعمي جلالتكم بنية المسالمة وزايكم البيعة التسمية على السمع والطاعة طاقن على ناصيتكم الفراء الآمال بكرة لاسلام ومهادن العرب وطي ذلك الاوضاع وقد تبع دمشق مدن حرس وجاه وحلب وفودت برسائل البيعة من معظم المدين الساجعية فكان هذا الإجماع الاقليمي بار الخلف المتقلا في جميع الامصار</p>	<p>الخلافة الاعظم واشهد على الزمة سماحة قاضي قضاء الشرق العربي الايتان الكريم فسيده فراه وقعه الشرق عمر الكروي عن المدينة المنورة بناها ثم القد من الخطبة اصحاب القبلة الشيخ سعيد الخطيب غطاب السجدة الفاص ودفني ازه الشيخ سما الحسيني وقاضي بقا الشيخ عبي الدين الكلاج وقرب الشراف عكا الشيخ محمود البيايدي واليه محمود الزين امير المؤمنين في الخطبة والشعر في صور الصوافف الاسلامية والمقاتل الصديقة وقد اند الاحتفال زهاء ساعة ونصف ثم دعت الرموز السلام على جلالة الخطبة الامام في الصديان الملك فتباه ابيده الله ثباتاً حسناً وقد بكتات مكر اذ ان على عزم جلالاته على مواصلة الجهاد كشروع في بيوت تقريب الامالي القوية وتا بيد العالم الاسلامية المقدسة ثم خرج ابيده الله بوكه اليب فاستعرض فرقة الخيرة العربية وكانت التورفي العسكرية تصدح بالانعام الحاشية الشجيرة وقد ناول الواقدون بعد ذلك طعام العشاء على لانة تانية وقتت مظهر السرور بالبيعة المباركة عانة تاه حتى ان القبل الساء عادت الرضيد بعد السلام والاستئذان الى خستطن تحمل الى العالم كما ينار هذا الخلافة القرشيه</p>	<p>البيعة فلسطين كان يوم الثالث الثاني الرابع عاشراً في هذه القاطنة القرية ان وقد على جلالة خليفة الاعظم والملك اليب في مقر الشونة بالبيعة من البلاد الفلسطينية جميع رجالها من قبا الشراف وقضاة ومفتين وعلماء وزعماء مع معاذة رئيس اللجنة التشيدية لوزر فلسطين امري موسى كامل بك الحسيني عاقى بيت القدس ورئيس المجلس الاسلامي الذي يطامح من اقصى البيوت ومعاونة رئيس البيعة الامم بك الشاذلي وسائر العلماء والاجمان والذكورين جميع اصحاب البيعة المباركة في تزييم ورواية الاذيرة طبع الطوائف الصديقة بقرت مراسم ربة فلسطين الرسمية بالخلافة اعطس والامامة الكبرى صاحب الجلالة الخاتمة المسلمين علي ابيده الله في الساعة الثانية عشرة يوالية وبعد ان ات البيعة المباركة يقف صاحب الاقبال رئيس التروان لخاني العالي السيد احمد السقا بلا منشور الخليفة الاعظم الذي مركت نصه في صدر هذا العدد على الموعر الخشدة فنوبل بالدهاء الخطف ثم تقدم قبيلة الشيخ يونس لخطيب ولادنا حار كين بيدي جلالة</p>
--	--	---

ضاق نطاق هذا العدد عن مرقبات الزبالي بالبيعة المباركة وهي لا تزال نرد يوماً بالمشات

The Palestinian people recognized an unpublished letter from the Kalifah of Emir Hussein (Date: 1924) by Haj Amin Husseini, His Highness Emir Abdullah, President of the Islamic High Council of Jerusalem. Al-Haram al-Sharif requested the pilgrimage on behalf of the Islamic High Council and the restoration of al-Haram al-Sharif's committee to be repaired by Emir Abdullah of Trans-Jordan, sponsored by the Majesty of the Emirate of Mohammad Hussein Bin Ali. Hajj Amin asked Emir Abdullah to regularly monitor all accounts and fees for the recovery process. Hajj Amin promised to start sending a monthly report to the restoration work of al-Haram for HRH Emir Abdullah. Note: it is worth noting that Hajj Amin al-Husseini referred to Sharif Hussein bin Ali as «Emir al-Mu'mineen», which means «Khalifa of all Muslims».

للاطلاع على قائمة منشورات وأخبار الوزارة  
يُرجى زيارة العناوين التالية :



موقع وزارة الثقافة الإلكتروني  
[www.culture.gov.jo](http://www.culture.gov.jo)



رابط صفحة وزارة الثقافة على الفيس بوك  
[www.facebook.com/culture.gov.jo](http://www.facebook.com/culture.gov.jo)

