

The Attitude Of The Vatican And Other Christian Churches On The Issue Of Jerusalem (1967-2019)

Abdulla Rashed AlArqan

Abstract: Jerusalem occupied a religious position in the followers of the three monotheistic religions and had its own sanctity. In this study the importance of Jerusalem to Christian followers was noted, especially the position of the Vatican. The study answered its main question: What is the position of the Vatican and other Christian churches on the issue of Jerusalem since 1967-2019?. The Study sought to achieve several objectives, the first of which was to clarify the position of the Vatican and other Christian churches towards Jerusalem since (1967-2019), and consequently to draw conclusions and perceptions through which the Arab and Islamic world pressured the Vatican to change its positions in favor of Jerusalem and Palestine. The study used a combination of historical and international system approaches.

Index Terms: : Jerusalem, Israel, Vatican, Palestine.

1. INTRODUCTION

Jerusalem, in its various dimensions, occupied a lofty status as a result of its sanctity among the followers of the three heavenly religions, "Islamic, Christian and Jewish." Jerusalem therefore continued to be the city, civilization and history living in the minds of scholars and scholars. Based on this fact, the researcher saw that in this research addresses the attitude of the Vatican on the issue of Jerusalem since 1967 – 2019.

2 IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The importance of the study comes to clarify the attitude of the Vatican and other Christian churches on the issue of Jerusalem during the study period and thus clarify this influential attitude on most of the world and especially the Christian world to be influenced to adopt fair and equitable attitude s on the issue of Jerusalem.

3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The problem of the study lies in the seriousness of the situation surrounding the city of Jerusalem from the Judaization and change of religious and historical landmarks and change the reality on the ground and thus study the impact of the Vatican's attitude towards these procedures and the problem is centered on a main question:

1. What is the attitude of the Vatican and other Christian churches on the issue of Jerusalem since 1967 - 2019?

4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The study aims to achieve several objectives as follows:

1. Statement of the attitude of the Vatican towards Jerusalem in the period under study.
2. Statement of the attitude s of other Christian Churches towards Jerusalem.
3. To draw conclusions and perceptions whereby the

Arab and Muslim world can press the Vatican to change its attitude in favor of Jerusalem and Palestine.

5 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The methodology to be followed follows the correlation between the historical approach and the time division and the methodology of the international system as appropriate for this study in terms of addressing the attitude of an influential international actor such as the Vatican and its implications for Jerusalem in the future. Accordingly, the objectives of the study and the answer to its main question will be dealt with through the methodology that shows the Vatican's attitude on the issue of Jerusalem through the stages of time that were divided according to the demands of the study.

6 THE ATTITUDE OF THE VATICAN ON THE ISSUE OF JERUSALEM 1967 – 1973

The attitude of the Vatican in relation to the status of the city of Jerusalem is particularly important in light of the fact that there are Christian sanctuaries in the eastern part of the city, which makes it a prominent place among the followers of the various Western and Eastern Churches, as well as the influence of the Vatican's attitude on the attitude s of a number of Western countries [1] on the topic of Jerusalem with religious dimensions. The Vatican's attitude in this regard is reflected in the Catholic Church's refusal to recognize Israel's declaration of the western part of Jerusalem as the capital of the Jewish state

The Vatican also considered East Jerusalem to be an occupied territory like the rest of the West Bank occupied in 1967 [2]. However, even before Israel established a attitude calling for the internationalization of Jerusalem, Israel was in favor of the United Nations recommendation for partition, which included the project for the internationalization of the Jerusalem area, which was issued, as it was, by a two-thirds majority on 29 November 1947 [3]. The Vatican maintained its attitude until 1967. After 1967, the Catholic Church in Rome adopted attitude calling for Jerusalem to be "open" with two municipal councils, one in Jerusalem: "Arab Jerusalem" and the other in "Jewish Jerusalem". The United Nations should draft a constitution for Jerusalem, The city is divided by an international body [4]. It is noted that this proposal by the Catholic Church has tended to grant the eastern part of the

1956

• *Abdulla Rashed AlArqan is currently an Associate Prof in the Bayt Al- Hekmah Institute in Al al-Bayt University, Jordan.
E-mail: abdalalah.alarqan@aabu.edu.jo*

city a special status only (the Old City), emphasizing the need to grant all communities the right to access places [5]. The Vatican's assessment of the Vatican's principled attitude differs from that of the Jewish state, while some believe that although the Vatican did not maintain relations with Israel during this period, there was no doubt about the Holy See's recognition of Israel as a state [6] Such as Dr. Al-Kiswani, that the Vatican (never agreed to the project of making Palestine a national homeland for the Jews) [7] is a discrepancy that indicates, however, ambiguity in the Vatican's attitude on this important and sensitive issue. The Vatican, however, continued to view with great concern the emigration of Christians from the city by Israeli practices, laws and policies [7], and thus opposed Israeli measures in East Jerusalem as occupied territory (the Vatican has no legal implications for Israel's occupation) (East Jerusalem) in 1967, does not recognize the measures taken by the occupation authorities to Judaize them, nor does it recognize the situation resulting from Israel's occupation of New Jerusalem in 1948 and does not recognize the transfer of its capital to Jerusalem or claim sovereignty over it [7]. In fact, this attitude adopted by the Vatican in relation to the status of Jerusalem during the period under study was shared by the rest of the Orthodox churches, the Churches of the Middle East, the World Council of Churches and the Coptic Church in Egypt [8].

7 THE ATTITUDE OF THE VATICAN TOWARDS JERUSALEM 1973 – 1978

The Vatican insisted on its position on the internationalization of the city in accordance with the UN General Assembly resolution. However, this position was contradicted by a clear ambiguity. In an April 1974 speech, Pope Paul VI called for "international guarantees for the city of Jerusalem and appropriate guardianship over the holy places" [4]. This position is not consistent with the Israeli position that internationalization should be limited to the religious places in the city (without the status of Jerusalem as a city subject to reconsideration in terms of sovereignty) [7]. However, a spokesman for the Vatican announced on 5 February 1974 that "the Roman Catholic Church in Rome no longer aspires to the internationalization of Jerusalem because such an act is unrealistic and that the Church wishes to be free to oversee the holy places" [4]. The Vatican's view in this regard was probably founded on the fact that the fate of the city of Jerusalem, sanctified by the followers of the three major monotheistic faiths in the world by the will of one group, should not be permitted, if Pope Paul VI declares that "the perpetuation of situations that lack a legal and recognized basis and to take into account the rights of all can only make the realization of such a solution more difficult" [4], referring to the solution of the problem of Jerusalem. Bishop Naama Al-Samaan, patriarch of the Latin community and a member of the Royal Committee for Jerusalem Affairs in Jordan, had developed a project to solve the problem of Jerusalem after having discussed with the Pope about it. The project, which is believed to have the views of the Catholic Church, was presented on September 23, 1977, with the following [5]:

1. That the entire Arab Jerusalem return to its legitimate right as it was before the 1967 war.
2. That the UN should establish a constitution that includes Arab Jerusalem and Jewish Jerusalem without distinction or discrimination and preserves unity in the city of Jerusalem with its Arab and Jewish

sections.

3. This constitution, in addition to the unity of Jerusalem, guarantees the following:
 - Jerusalem should be an open city, not a war, in order to guarantee and preserve its sanctities from destruction.
 - That this Constitution guarantees free access to worship for all religions without hindrance or difficulty.
4. The Arab Authority is implementing this constitution in Arab Jerusalem and the Israeli authority is implementing this constitution in Jewish Jerusalem while ensuring unity between them.
5. The United Nations is overseeing the implementation of this Constitution.

Some researchers argue that the Vatican believed that Arab Jerusalem was the capital of a Palestinian state but stressed that the Old City and Jerusalem as a whole were of special status and that the Vatican was seeking its patronage of the Christian holy sites that it had been responsible for over successive historical periods [9]. In any case, there is a clear decline on the part of the Vatican on the idea of internationalization and perhaps the failure of this policy and the absence of signs looming on the horizon and heralding the possibility of success behind the Vatican to search for another position under which Jerusalem is open, although the attitude of freedom of religion and supervision of holy sites did not change as an official spokesman for the Catholic Church in Rome said. But Vatican attitudes remain governed by what can be considered a balanced diplomatic approach to the Catholic Church. Some scholars believe that these attitudes differ in detail and not in essence. The Vatican does not recognize Israel's sovereignty over Arab Jerusalem and has not set a specific solution for the future of Jerusalem. [8]. The Vatican, however, has been more concerned with the religious dimension of Jerusalem, which is to administer the holy sites without paying much attention to political sovereignty, a position which sometimes had to come closer to the Israeli position than to the Arab position, which still refused to separate the political Jerusalem from its control Israel and another religious can be negotiated.

8 THE ATTITUDE OF THE VATICAN TOWARDS JERUSALEM 1978 - 1991

This period witnessed a clear retreat from the Vatican on its previous demands to internationalize the city, Pope John Paul II focused on the demands of free access to the holy sites of the followers of the three religions. During his meeting with US President Ronald Reagan on 21 June 1980, the Pope stressed that the problem of Jerusalem is the focus of the world in particular and is the center of a just peace in the region because it includes the interests and hopes of different peoples [8]. In his statement, the pope was satisfied with the demands for free access to the holy sites for followers of religions. The pope also emphasized this position when he sent a message to "citizens of the Holy Land in particular and the Middle East in general, on the occasion of the glorious Easter of the Catholic and Jewish religions, in which he urged to secure an international status for the city of Jerusalem and to give the Palestinians a national homeland and ensure the security of Israel" [8] "Pointing out the need to reach a final, lasting and just solution to the issue of Jerusalem within the framework of" special international guarantees to protect the

interests of the three holy religions without discrimination. "The Vatican may have sought to adopt a neutral stance on a thorny issue at the spiritual and political levels, but its focus on the need to resolve the issue in its spiritual dimension is based on ensuring the free access of the followers of the three religions to their holy sites in the city which, in our opinion, is close to the Israeli position, which insists on overcoming the political dimension of the issue. However, the Pope returned in 1984 to mention in his remarks on the occasion of Easter (the special status of the city of Jerusalem and the need to take account of this status in the political and administrative status of the city) [9]. In the end, the position of the Vatican is ambiguous regarding the status of the city of Jerusalem at this stage, as he was in a position to explain his position on the need to guarantee freedom of worship for the followers of the three heavenly religions in Jerusalem without addressing the future of the city political and legal.

9 THE ATTITUDE OF THE VATICAN TOWARDS JERUSALEM 1991 - 2019

This stage has seen more clarity in the attitude of the Vatican on the issue of Jerusalem and Israeli policies towards it. Although the previous stage was ambiguous due to conflicting signals issued by the Vatican, the signing of an agreement between the Vatican and Israel on December 30, 1993 [10] began as if this conflict had been resolved. On the one hand, the agreement affirmed the Vatican's recognition of the State of Israel and pledged to cooperate with it (by working to find a peaceful solution that would end disputes between states and peoples without violence and terrorism) [11]. This principle applies especially to disputes over land and borders [10], which could be considered a renunciation by the Vatican of any commitment to the Arab-Israeli conflict. According to some observers, this abandonment is a reflection of what could be considered "the domestication of the Vatican and the Western Church" [12]. The outcome of the position stipulated in Article II of the agreement is the Vatican's agreement to adopt a neutral position on the conflict and its developments in exchange for retaining (at every opportunity the right to exercise moral and spiritual guidance) [11]. It should be noted here that this position has raised more complications among the Palestinians themselves and raised questions about the future of relations between different Christian communities on the one hand and between them and the Vatican on the other. Monsignor Rauf Najjar, the Apostolic Vicar at the Vatican representation in Jordan, said the agreement did not change the Vatican's traditional position on the occupied territories and around the disputed holy city. Signing an agreement with Israel does not mean recognition of the state's position on Jerusalem or on the occupied territories or the safe borders. In fact, the position of the Vatican in relation to Jerusalem must be rectified within the framework of peace talks and direct contacts between Palestinians and Israelis because the Vatican continues within this concept by demanding the need to find international guarantees for this city and certainly that the party exercising its sovereignty over the Holy City individually or in partnership with other parties must provide guarantees of international support in respect of respect for the holy places and the rights of religious communities and freedom of worship and the access of believers to places of worship and other matters in general and especially followers of the heavenly religions distinct and unique in the world. The Vatican has neglected the political dimension of the Jerusalem

issue and left it to the Palestinian-Israeli peace talks. It tried to focus on the religious dimension only by demanding international guarantees of freedom of worship in the city for all sects regardless of the sovereign party. This concept is reinforced by a paper issued by the Vatican in May 1993 under the title "Jerusalem". This paper states that Jerusalem, which the Israelis regard as their capital, is in fact three sections:

1. Within the walls, which is the sacred part of the three heavenly religions and includes the main places of worship and residential neighborhoods, including the gatherings that have developed around them.
2. The part that lies outside the walls and runs westward, northwest and southwest, which is indisputably part of being an Israeli.
3. The part that lies outside the walls and extends to the east, northeast and south-east, which is called the part of Arab Jerusalem and which the Israelis have forcibly annexed [6].

The paper goes on to say that "the Holy See, while not ignoring the other aspects, takes into account only" Jerusalem within the walls "[6]. In other words, the Vatican saw in the paper that there are two factors that must be taken into consideration when dealing with the issue of Jerusalem (they are certainly connected but can be viewed separately) [2]:

1. A geopolitical factor that concerns who has the right to sovereignty over the city.
2. A more comprehensive factor related to the identity of the city and its value in all its characteristics: religious, historical, urban and demographic) [2]. The last paragraph distinguishes between the religious mandate and the political mandate of the city, which confirms the paper that the Vatican recognizes full Israeli sovereignty over its western part, but avoids determining its position on its eastern part outside the walls, which is close to the Israeli perception.

However, the Vatican's position in this way is a retreat from its previous position in support of the internationalization of the city and the Vatican's signing of such clauses as "the State of Israel reaffirms its commitment to preserve the status quo in the Christian holy places and to respect the rights of the Christian communities in the Holy Places" [12] bears witness to the status quo and its legitimacy or at least its neutrality in the face of Israel's seizure of the city of Jerusalem. Moreover, the timing of the agreement between the Vatican and the Jewish state came after the signing of the Oslo Accords, which, as stated earlier, did not address the issue of Jerusalem except by postponement which means for the Vatican (the consecration of the status quo in the city) [13]. The Pope declared that the spiritual sovereignty of the three religions over the Holy Places in Jerusalem is the backbone of the Vatican's view and that he sees the issue of Jerusalem as two dimensions: spiritual, religious, and political [14]. It is noted that the harmony of what is stated here on the tongue of the Pope with the paper mentioned above from the Vatican's abandonment of the internationalization and adoption of the final stage talks to resolve the dispute over Jerusalem also notes that the Vatican is concerned and to a large extent religious dimension of the case is a concern perhaps reflects a desire to practice a role that enables him to supervise the Christian side, despite the presence of Orthodox shrines belonging to the Russian Church and the Coptic Church of the Egyptian Church, which was disputed by the Ethiopian Church

as in the case of the monastery of Sultan. In addition to this, the Vatican is keen to point out the fact that, despite abandoning the idea of internationalization, it favors a greater role for the United Nations. In an article published by the Italian Jesuit journal *Civileta Cattolica* on the Vatican's view of Jerusalem, the Vatican declared that the role of the international guarantor for the future status of the Holy City could be entrusted to the UN General Assembly, backed by the UN Security Council, while restoring the spirit and objectives of Resolution 181 and coordinating its work with Israelis and Palestinians. With the co-sponsors of the peace process (AFP, 1996) and that - in the words of the magazine - even if entrusted with this role to another institution or to a group of States, it may seem necessary for the United Nations to agree on the final result. These loose words reflect a soft attitude towards the party that would impose its political sovereignty over the city in return for a hardline stance on religious sovereignty and the rights of followers of heavenly religions to practice their religion in the city. Pope John Paul II commented on the Camp David II negotiations on July 23, 2000, at the end of a Mass held at his summer residence in southern Rome. "Jerusalem must have a special status and international guarantees ... I want to invite the participating parties not to ignore the importance of the spiritual dimension of the city of Jerusalem with its holy places and the existence of groups of the three monotheistic religions in it I believe that only a special situation with international guarantees can safeguard the holiest parts of the Holy City and guarantee freedom of belief and religious practice for all believers in the region and the world who aspire to Jerusalem as a forum for peace and coexistence" [15]. It is noteworthy from this statement confirming the change in the position of the Vatican, which has been demanding for years to internationalize Jerusalem to be resolved through negotiations with international guarantees of places of worship. In late January 2012, substantial progress was made in ending the material and economic differences between Israel and the Vatican over the property of the Catholic Church in the Holy Land. The two sides agreed that the date of June 11, 2012, would be a deadline for a meeting at the Vatican to reach a legal agreement on the issues outstanding in this context. It is noted that the Holy See focused in the conclusion of this Convention on the demand for full and complete recognition of the legal and inherited rights of Catholic organizations, and the confirmation of the tax exemptions that benefited the church when the establishment of the Zionist entity in May 1948, which the United Nations asked the State of Israel to respect it at the time. With the agreed date in June 2012, many leaks began about the form of the agreement, which the parties intend to begin with, and fears began that the agreement bears no hint that the Vatican has changed its position committed to the international resolutions valuable to the status of Jerusalem and the focus of these concerns include the agreement to recognize the situation which was imposed by Israel as a military occupation force in the wake of the occupation of Jerusalem on 5 June 1967 and on Christian areas and churches belonging to the Catholic Church. [16]. Thus, these fears were expressed through effective Arab parties such as the League of Arab States, where Ambassador Mohamed Sobeih, Assistant Secretary-General for Palestine and Arab Lands, expressed the Arab League's concern about the Vatican's intention to sign such an agreement, saying it was unfair to the Palestinian people and

the Palestinian cause against Jerusalem and its population of Muslims and Christians. He called on the Vatican not to be under any pressure to change its position towards Jerusalem [14]. The Palestinian Authority expressed its fear of this agreement through the invitation of Nabil Shaath, the external relations commissioner of Fatah, to confirm to the Holy See his historical position in favor of the rights of the Palestinian people in accordance with international law and UN resolutions, Shaath pointed out that in 2010 the Middle East Synod had referred to Israel's illegal policies that threaten peace and Christian existence in Palestine [17]. It is clear here that the inconvenience caused by the signing of such an agreement has officially called on the Palestinian Authority to assign a high-level diplomatic delegation to go to the Vatican and meet officials there, and then to affirm that the position of the Vatican and the Holy See has been and is still inalienable with the Palestinian rights of the Palestinian territories in 1967, including East Jerusalem. It was confirmed that the Holy See assured them that the agreement with Israel in the future does not include the property of the Catholic Church or any institutions that follow it in East Jerusalem [18]. In fact, the response of the Vatican, "Archbishop Ituri Balistrero," the position of the Holy See did not change regarding East Jerusalem, following a new round of work for the joint committee between the Vatican and the Hebrew state and that since a certain time it was decided that the agreement that will be signed in the future will be addressed only to some property that does not exist in East Jerusalem and the West Bank and that the confusion and anxiety among the Palestinians is due to the unjustified use of work that has been overdue for some time and in any case is still developing. Thus, we note through the statements of the Cistrillo that the position of the Vatican has not changed from East Jerusalem and it has been confirmed in the basic agreement between the Holy See and the Palestine Liberation Organization has been repeated in different circumstances and thus have been cut on the Palestinian airspace, which was uncertain and disturbed by the media leaks unsuccessful by some media that did not envisage accuracy and caution in the matter with such sensitivity and importance. It was noticed through the statement of the Council of Chiefs of Churches in the Holy Land in an agreement between Patriarch Fuad Al-Tawal, the President of the Council and Patriarch Michel Al-Sabah, Chairman of the Justice and Peace Committee, on the road and the removal of doubts. He pointed out that this agreement is not a surprise event decided overnight but it is part of a long process within the terms of the 1993 Basic Agreement between the Holy See and Israel and that this agreement began to talk about and discussed about ten years ago and has not been agreed on all points, which means that the agreement is not imminent as some think and that the Committee will return to the meeting in January 2013, according to the statement of the Holy See issued on 12 June 2012 [19]. The statement of the Council of Church Chiefs in the Holy Land was alert to the great fear that gripped the Palestinians first and foremost, the rest of the Palestinians and the rest of the Arab and Muslim world, namely, the possibility that such a convention would implicitly recognize Israel's sovereignty over occupied East Jerusalem. On May 13, 2012, part of the text of the message of the Foreign Minister of the Vatican, Archbishop Magperty, was addressed to Mr. Akmal El-Din Ihsanoglu, the Secretary-General of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, in which he stated that the Church in its

financial institutions is asking Israel to deal with these institutions in a fair manner Where Israel exists in practice and without distinction between the sovereign State of Israel and Israel as an occupying power and without political considerations. This means that this agreement has no political consequences "[16]. Thus, we can conclude that the Holy See insisted on its position, which adheres to its legal and moral responsibilities and the occupied Palestinian territories, to which international law applies as an occupied territory, and that Israel's law does not recognize them. In a remarkable move to confirm its position on Jerusalem and Palestine, the Vatican Observer State of the United Nations officially recognized the State of Palestine in an agreement that was finalized on 13 May 2015 but has yet to be signed [19] to the State of Palestine and therefore this step will have implications for the activities of the Catholic Church in the Palestinian territories. In a remarkable development, Pope Francis during a meeting with delegations on December 6, 2017, called for respect the status quo in Jerusalem and to be wise and cautious, at a time when the world was waiting for the announcement of the US President Donald Trump to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. He said in this regard, "I cannot conceal my great concern about the situation that has arisen in recent days about Jerusalem I make a heartfelt appeal for everyone to respect the status quo in the city in accordance with relevant UN resolutions". (amp.dw.com, 6/12/2017). In this context, Pope Francis believes that Jerusalem should remain open to all, because it is unique and sacred to the three monotheistic religions, where everyone can worship at the sacred site of his religion. The Vatican newspaper (Auxerre Fattoria Romano) said that US President Donald Trump has become lonely on the world stage in his decision to recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital. (Italian news agency, AKI, 9/12/2017). This prompted Pope Francis to reject such a decision, raising questions of Catholic Christians about their future visit to Jerusalem, as the Pope is considered the religious leader of Catholic in the world. Therefore, we see that the position by the Vatican indicates its firm adherence to the fact that Jerusalem is always open to all, it also supports the two-state solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, if the two sides agree to put Jerusalem in the framework of the peace process. Finally, it should be noted that the position of the Vatican was not consistent with the positions of some Eastern Churches, especially the Coptic Church in Egypt, where Pope Shenouda stressed that the Copts would not enter Jerusalem except with their Muslim brothers. (The Copts who went to Jerusalem were few and did not receive the blessing for disobeying the Church) [20]. His Holiness said that Jerusalem is a holy city for all religions but it is also an Arab city and must return to Arab sovereignty as it was (Patriarchate, p. 12). Stressing that he will enter the city only with the Sheikh of Al-Azhar [20]. Pope Shenouda, the Coptic patriarch, refuses to limit the problem of the Copts in the Deir al-Sultan case in Jerusalem, a monastery owned by the Coptic Church, which Israel contributed to the Church of Abyssinia in response to Pope Shenouda's positions. The Pope adds in this context: (The problem is Israel is greater than the problem of the monastery) [20], expressing the position of the national principle of the Coptic Church of the Arab-Israeli conflict in general and the problem of Jerusalem in particular is the link between the religious and political dimensions of the case and not to separate the position of the Coptic Church on the Arab and Islamic position. 10 The other

Christian churches The number of Christian churches and their attitudes towards Jerusalem were as follows: First: The Orthodox Church: The position of these communities on Jerusalem was expressed by Patriarch Athanasius Hazeem, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch and the rest of the East. He said: "We absolutely reject the Judaization of Jerusalem and the distortion of its Arab Christian-Muslim character. We categorically reject the annexation of Jerusalem to sovereignty Zionism and that the fate of the city is not in itself and separate from the issue of the Palestinian people in which he lives and pray, people do not care about the stone in Jerusalem, which must remain the city of peace and an example of coexistence between religions and peoples. (Al-Nahar Al-Arabi International Magazine, Issue 169). "Our blood today is ready to be shed for the sake of liberating holy Palestine and restoring our Arab sanctity, which is the hope of both Christians and Muslims," he said in a speech delivered by Patriarch Thikka I, Patriarch of the Holy See of Antioch and the rest of the East, at the inauguration of the Patriarch of Damascus on 14 September 1980. Al-Qabas newspaper, February 14). Second: Churches of the Middle East: The Council of Churches of the Middle East affirmed its solidarity and cooperation with Muslims in order to protect the Holy City. At the end of an emergency meeting in Damascus headed by Patriarch Ignatius IV, the Council condemned the Zionist Arab decision to annex the Arab city of the entity The Council denounced this decision and confirmed that this is a violation of the resolutions of the United Nations, the Council also took practical steps to contact the Vatican and the World Council of Churches in order to take joint measures to establish the Arab right in Jerusalem and to contact the Islamic and Jewish organizations in support of the Arab right to cooperate together to thwart what the occupying authority has begun to make Jerusalem its capital. A committee was formed at the end of the meeting, headed by Patriarch Ignatius IV, whose task is to follow up the recommendations of the Council (Al-Qabas, Kuwait, February 7). Third: The World Council of Churches: The World Council of Churches has prepared a draft in which it objected to the declaration of the Zionist state as the capital of Jerusalem. The draft resolution also affirms that this declaration constitutes a threat to world peace and calls upon the 100 member states of the Council in order to exert pressure on the Zionist state through its governments to stop taking any action on Jerusalem (University of Islamic Peoples, the Palestinian issue, 47) Fourth: The International Christian Association: It expressed the position of its President, Mr. George Montaron, by saying: "By what right does Zionism allow the racist state to declare its will to the Arab city of Jerusalem, the center of millions of Christians and Muslims?" [8] where the city of Jerusalem is a theater of war, violence and resentment rather than a city of love and peace. He also called on the international community to take a firm stand to stop the Judaizing measures of the Holy City [8]. Fifth: The Coptic Community: The Coptic community rejected the Zionist occupation of the city of Jerusalem and described it as illegitimate. The occupation authorities took the monastery of the Sultan from this community and inflicted it with Ahabash. It is noteworthy that the Copts have important documents proving their right to the monastery as proof of proof of restoration done by the Coptic in the monastery and issued by the Court of Jerusalem on 22/8/1686 This includes the argument on the so-called monastery Nasari Coptic Church in the sanctuary of Jerusalem [19]. Sixth: Protestant Church: The

Protestant Church expresses the most dangerous American churches in support of Zionism, where the center of gravity lies in its political influence within American society, especially after the introduction of Hebrew studies in Protestant universities, which contributed to the development of relations and thought of the Protestant Church to bring closer to the Jews. [10] This church includes dozens of denominations, for example: the community of Evangelists, Lauris, Mittor Sitt and Baptists. In September 1980, the Evangelists established a widespread organization called the International Christian Embassy in Jerusalem. [2].

1. Great interest in the Jewish people and modern Zionism.
2. Encourage Christians to pray for Jerusalem and the Land of Israel.
3. Inform the Christians of what is going on in Palestine.
4. To incite church leaders and Christian organizations to be influential in their country for the benefit of Israel.
5. The establishment of development projects in Israel.
6. To exert influence in conciliation between Arabs and Jews.

This organization established a radio station called Voice of Hope in southern Lebanon in 1979.

11 CONCLUSION

The follower of the position of the Vatican on the issue of Jerusalem after 1967 finds that there are some contradictions, but the firm declared that the Vatican supports all resolutions of international legitimacy for his conviction that Jerusalem will remain one of the major obstacles to the achievement of a just, comprehensive and lasting peace based on a solution that satisfies the parties to the conflict because of each side holds conflicting views on the future of this city. Thus, we note that the Vatican was a supporter of the resolutions of international legitimacy, which convinced him by reading the evolution of his position on the issue of Jerusalem and as reported by the study. There is no doubt that this study proved the validity of the problem of the study and its main question, which started from it: What is the position of the Vatican on the issue of Jerusalem since 1967-2015? Finally, in light of the Vatican's positions on the issue of Jerusalem and the large Judaization campaign against Jerusalem, the study reached the following conclusions and recommendations:

1. Talks with the Vatican must be pressured by the Arab parties, which, if not exercised, can not achieve any of the Arab and Islamic aspirations in the city.
2. The Arab and Islamic side is trying to convince the Vatican that any solution that is being reached and under which Jerusalem will remain under Israeli control with symbolic gains for the Arab side will remain subject to vibration because it is based on a strong balance that does not meet the aspirations of the Muslim and Arab peoples and that any political settlement of the conflict must resolve this issue to satisfy the various parties to ensure stability of this settlement.
3. The way to solve the issue of Jerusalem in light of the current reality is to exert Arab and Islamic pressure on the major powers, especially the Christian world, to force Israel to resolve this issue, a solution that

satisfies both sides of the conflict, Muslims and Christians on the one hand and Jews on the other.

4. The Vatican must be made aware that any comprehensive solution to the Jerusalem issue cannot be achieved without the agreement of the Arab and Islamic parties.
5. The development of the Vatican's various positions on the issue of Jerusalem did not convince the Israeli side to move away from its position that "united Jerusalem is the eternal capital of Israel." Other international positions have witnessed profound changes that pave the way for reaching a compromise solution to go halfway to meet the rest of the anxious positions on peace and see it as a single option to deal with the conflict.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Ahmed Said, French-Arab relations through France's position on the basic elements of the Palestinian cause. Kuwait: Kazma Foundation, 1984.
- [2] A. Mahmoud Jerusalem in UN Resolutions since 1947. Amman: National Library, 1995.
- [3] F. Ezzeddine "The Case of Jerusalem in the Context of International Relations," presented at the International Studies, Beirut, 1974.
- [4] A.-K. Salem, "The Status of Jerusalem in Arab, Islamic and International Forums," Palestine Studies Institute, Beirut, vol. 2, 1991.
- [5] F. Jabir, "The Political Future of Jerusalem," presented at the The General Islamic Conference of Beit Al-Maqdis, Annual Symposium on Jerusalem Affairs, 1994.
- [6] A.-N. Monsignor Rauf, "The Vatican has not and will not give up its place Jerusalem."
- [7] A.-K. Salem, The Legal Center of the City of Jerusalem. Amman: Jordan Press Workers Association, 1991.
- [8] H. Muhammad, "Jerusalem in the Arab-Israeli Conflict," Master University of Jordan, University of Jordan, 1989.
- [9] A. Mahmoud, Jerusalem's Importance and Reality, Attitudes and Solutions. Amman: Royal Commission for Jerusalem Affairs, 1996.
- [10] A. A. Ziad, "The American Comparison on the Palestinian Issue," Journal of Palestinian Studies, vol. 17, 1994.
- [11] S. Ghassan "Jerusalem in Peace Settlement Projects," Samed Economic Review, vol. 85, 1991.
- [12] G. McClellan, "The Lost Solution to the Eternal Dispute over Jerusalem," in Political Witness, London, 1996, vol. 6.
- [13] A.-D. Ibrahim, "Journal of Approach," Damascus, 1994.
- [14] A.-N. Newspaper, "Jerusalem," ed: December 20, 1995.
- [15] B. Jerusalem, "Royal Commission for Jerusalem Affairs," Jerusalem Bulletin, vol. 7, 2000.
- [16] E. Amin, "Has the Vatican's Diplomatic Position changed from Jerusalem?," Middle East Journal, no. 12036.
- [17] A.-H. website, "Vatican denies concessions to Israel on East Jerusalem," in Al-Hurra website, ed, 2015.
- [18] T. w. o. t. I. n. Haaretz, "The position of the Vatican

- has not changed," in The website of the Israeli newspaper Haaretz, ed, 2012.
- [19] A.-Q. A.-A. newspaper, "Israeli disappointment after the Vatican officially recognized the state of Palestine," ed. London, 2015.
- [20] P. o. t. C. Orthodox, "Coptic Church and the Cause of Jerusalem," ed. Cairo: Media Center, 1995.