

A Persian - Muslim Approach to Diplomacy

Ahmad Naghibzadeh*

Abstract

Conventional history has been invariably transcribed by conquerors and based on certain cognitive foundations. The history of diplomacy, international relations and their governing policies have not only not remained immune to this orientation, but specifically been affected and accordingly developed. The expansion of Western domination which gradually took place after the Renaissance, brought along with itself a development in Western epistemology, summarized as the denial of existents and approval of appearances. Machiavelli and Hobbes were the bearers of this shift in the political sphere. As a result of these changes, morality and human dignity were undermined by the false rationalization of realism. Unfortunately, coinciding with these changes in the West, the Islamic East was going through a downward spiral which started with the Mongol assault and the governance of newly converted Muslim military men who inevitably distorted the facets of theoretical discussions. However, when we skip this era of the Islamic East and go further back to study the scripts of Ancient Iran and the period of Islam's vast development, we will come to find factual and valuable statements derived from fundamental and comprehensive interpretations regarding politics and diplomacy from original sources. This is the exact aim of this study, i.e. to re-extract an Iranian-Islamic approach to diplomacy from proper sources.

Keywords: Diplomacy, International Relations, Indigenize, Iranian-Islamic, war, peace

* Professor of Political Sciences, Tehran University.

Introduction

Today, history in its totality is what Western thinkers write, and undisputed solutions are what they present. Every sphere of thought in Europe, till the end of the Middle Ages, was dominated by the church. In the modern era, the church was criticized as it was not able to offer convincing answers; thus, philosophy, metaphysics and ethics set out on oblivion of the past and history. Objectivity, pragmatism and positivism were eventually recognized as criteria for distinguishing the two realms of science and religion from one another. However, a vast category of propositions that claimed to be scientific could not be proven, and supposed scientific theories were nothing but general and ideological descriptions. “The Prince” by Machiavelli and “Leviathan” by Hobbes, which turned into greatly credited references of political science, were prominent paradigms paving the path for writings which followed this approach. In the 18th century, when reason was set as the primary pre-requisite for reaching modernity, it was never consistently characterized and seemed to refer to instrumental reason. Not only was it not capable of entering the realm of the existents as well as the essence of entities and elements, but it did not show any inclination towards it. What is interesting was that those of intellect and reason perceived reason to be what they possessed and did not value other kinds of intellects (*aq̣l*). As a result, this rationalism led to bloody wars and brutality. Objection against this condition was simply a step back to romanticism, explicitly displayed in Victor Hugo’s novel “The Miserables”. In fact, a poem of his truly portrays the situation of that time and the subsequent years”:



*Six thousand years have the warriors cherished and embraced war
And God still wastes his time creating stars and beautiful flowers.
Massacre, victory, this is our love.
Glory is illusory, found under the wheels of triumphant tanks.
That crush poor mothers and their children.
Our prosperity is disgusting, we must go and die.
And blow the trumpets of war forever. (V Hugo: 473).*

But this restoration was imprisoned in the margins of its literature, lacking a lasting effect on social relationships. In general, the outcome of this development in diplomacy and international relations was the elimination of morality, while, on the contrary, deceit, scheming and finally violence became prevalent tools of this field of human relations.

Even though better paradigms for human interaction can be found in the East, these patterns were overshadowed by the West's dominance and its literature. No one has taken a step to revive and place them, once more, on the table in today's world. These paradigms must be re-extracted from the texts of the ancient history of Iran and between the pages of Islamic sources, and reformed in academic literature and presented to the world of science. This, so the paradigms can be revived in academic language and introduced to the world. This study aims to take a step towards this objective.

I- Western Diplomacy and Morality

What we have understood from occidental diplomacy is that morality is of little consequence in international relations, while deceit, schemes, violence and brutality are common. In the Western world, moral teachings regarding abstinence from violence and fellowship between everyone were practically neglected. In effect, the most dreadful history of violence belongs to the followers of Christian West. This violence has manifested itself not only before followers of other religions, such as during the Crusades, but can also be seen in wars among Christians themselves, such as the tragic First and



Second World Wars. The first effort to observe the human rights of non-European nations was made by the faithful authorities of the church and naturalist jurists, such as Victoria & Grotius. They presented their findings in the last years of the Middle Ages; findings which never had an effective outcome. This mentality expanded to the point where European colonizers and aggressors who had brutally massacred the Native American people had asked the church, in an attempt to remedy their conscience and quell the voice of their weak and remotely disturbed inner voices, to send a group to verify the human nature of the natives.

After the propagation of Hobbes' and Machiavelli's doctrines, which were the product of the pervasive European thought, politics was referred to as power, aggression and even deceit, making Machiavelli's works the most prominent writings of European society and "The Prince" the gospel of politicians, in which means were justified by ends.

In the Age of Enlightenment, when all human affairs were comprehensively based on reason, morality was once again neglected. Kant linked intelligence and morality and revived it by introducing it as the basis to practical intelligence revolving around the Golden Rule of "one should treat others as one would like others to treat oneself", which was mentioned not years but centuries ago in a vast and everlasting manner in Persian literature. Morality as such, must pervasively and invariably be acknowledged as the foundation of human behavior and consequently prevent the occurrence of wars and bloodshed. However, the Europeans, who considered themselves as the manifestation of intelligence and were supposed to abstain from any kind of violence - especially given that Kant's philosophy interpreted war as lack of intelligence - carried out unprecedented wars.

The only practical effort to elevate morality was carried out by Henry Dunant from Switzerland, who devoted all of his possessions to injured soldiers of the Battle of Solferino (1859) between France



and Austria and founded the International Red Cross. The next time the West showed consideration towards morality in international relations was after the First World War, when Americans - namely President Woodrow Wilson - tried to propagate a collective security system in international relations based on Christian morality, liberalism, positivist rights and Kant's ethical theory in order to stop war (J. Chanteur, 1989: 209). The instability of peace and the emergence of the preliminary stages of World War II proved the failure of normative theories and idealism in international relations. Consequently, theorists returned to Hobbes' theory and set the instinct of seeking power as the base of human relations. This is why the school of thought named realism, led by H.J. Morgenthau, was immensely followed and re-developed. Realism was expanded into a vast span of theoretical discussion as the dominant paradigm for three to four decades. Even a critic of Morgenthau such as Raymond Aron considered himself as a realist and expanded Morgenthau's work. With respect to the Cuban missile crisis in 1962, Aron believed that the implementation of morality in international relations was risky and dangerous and thought Hitler had moral justifications to commit his genocide. He warned that the usage of morality may be followed by catastrophic disasters (R. Aron, 1962: 567 – 597)

In the closing years of the 20th century, as a process among sociologists around the world to reconcile all dualities and contrasts of modernism - such as the contrast of structure and subject, individual and society as well as subjectivity and objectivity - an effort had commenced in international affairs to somehow integrate realism and idealism, and authors such as Huffman and a group of neo-conservatives, cosmopolitans and supporters of critical theory stressed on the necessity of ethics and normative data (H. Mushirzadeh, 1384: 229 – 2250). Still, the unanswered question that stands is: why do not governments truly practice the principles of morality and why do we have to hear horrible reports of violations of the rights of immigrants, minorities, prisoners of war as well as the



raping of women and children by soldiers throughout the world? Noam Chomsky, the American left-wing thinker, in his book “Terrorism Autopsy”, presents some advanced and sophisticated examples of American crimes in Sudan, Lebanon, Somalia and other places in the world (N. Chomsky, 2001: 3–30).

To answer the questions, one must note that human behavior at all levels and areas is a product of the perceptions, contemplations and thoughts formed in a person’s mind throughout his or her lifetime. Among these factors, cultural, religious and historic data have prominent influence. These factors create the imaginary world that humans reside in and express through a set of symbols, codes and signs that resemble them in order to relate to others and communicate. Therefore, if one intends to partially reform human affairs, one must initially reform the world of one’s mind. To reconstruct the former governing pattern, i.e. the Western perspective on international relations, we must assess the history of States that were renowned when it comes to paying attention to morality.

II- Iranian Culture and Moral Diplomacy

Iran is one of the rare countries that hold a rich legacy of myths cultivated on morality. The guidelines extracted from Iranian history to free the world from the current stalemate might be the most helpful lesson we can learn from the history of countries. Its respect for the rights of the embattled and defeated, granting of religious and cultural freedom as well as constructive interaction with foreign cultures all make Iran the historical center and standard bearer of human rights observance and cultural dialogue. This behavior has been generated from a wide and collective viewpoint rooted in a divine religion.

Valuable documents suggest that the humanitarian hospitality Ancient Iran displayed towards defeated soldiers and prisoners of war evidence devotion to high and humanitarian principles in its foreign relations. Obviously, this behavior is founded on a certain philosophy



and ideology, since neighboring countries experienced tyranny and resorted to violence. The latter implies that the comprehensive mentality in international relations was dominated by the implementation of violence. This Iranian behavior was evidently influenced by another source. Therefore, we must assess the fundamental underlying thought in order to understand why Iranians regarded morality so prominently in international affairs.

In a world which is ruled by the basic notion of “everybody against everybody”, the message of Iranian history is not only a precious cure for human distress and despair, it also offers valuable instructions for how to halt the destruction of the environment. In other words, the typical Iranian cannot attain his worthy position in modern history via nuclear bombs or any other destructive weapons, and will only be successful in reaching this aim by presenting his or her ancestors’ messages of peace and friendship, which have been forgotten by the lapse of time, efforts of hostile powers and compatriots’ ignorance. As Amir Mahdi Badi’ writes in volume 13 of “Greeks and Barbarians”, these messages have deliberately been forgotten in Western history so as to represent Iranian history as “Eastern Autocracy”. Today, modern media continues to unfortunately propagate this idea by producing insubstantial films such as “300” with the assistance of some Iranians.

Iranian ideology stems from a holy entity that links the three elements of the universe; the spiritual world (*Labuu*), the material world (*Nasuu*) and mankind. In other words, it connects the sacred entity, nature and human beings and there are special regulations for each of these three elements to guarantee their reconstruction and consistency.

In accordance with the existential relationship between mankind and the spiritual world, human beings are obliged to respect the rights of others as a segment and connection to the spiritual world. According to this perspective, which is reminiscent of the Iranian - Islamic mystical doctrine, the oneness of one’s existence surpasses an



ethical viewpoint such as Kant's ethics and is more of a divine duty. Thus, nature and its elements are included to observe moral principles. Nature is in no way separate from man and God and any kind of disrespect to it is inevitably disrespect to the universe as a whole. Whoever creates the smallest gap in this connection is considered a devil and deserving of punishment. The fight between good and evil has continued day and night from the start of creation, and man is the battlefield (K. Hawar, 1996, P. Brian, 1999, A. Arab Golpayegani, 1996). When man faces the devil, is inclining towards evil and gives in to wretchedness, he will lose his humanity and deserves to be doomed. It is also permissible and even called upon as a duty for all to eradicate wicked creatures, and if this duty is not properly accomplished, natural disasters will be imminent. The next step towards building and implementing the Iranian moral paradigm is to transform these beliefs into symbols, concepts and legends, which will then create an extensive, inclusive and applicable moral plan.

It can be said that Iranians were the first people who characterized human rights, elaborated on it in detail and actually practiced it. Fereydoon Jonaidi thoroughly discusses these rights and laws and refers to ancient writings and stone tablets as evidence. (Jonaidi, 2005: 55-86). It must be mentioned that in a period of history when other countries would exploit war prisoners as slave labor, according to the Persepolis clay tablets, all workers - both domestic and foreign - were paid. All of this comes from a certain philosophy that believes in the unity of the universe and the universal relation of all creatures. This ideology cannot be found anywhere in the West, where the actual opposite can be found; battle and conflict have been the axes of common dialogue instead of unity, dating all the way back to the era of Heraclitus.

Raymond Aron said "the relationship between two countries is either peace or war" (Aron, 1962) and each of these two conditions are under the deep influence of a set of requirements that must be



headed to avoid chaos and commotion. Furthermore, in addition to the requirements at a time of war, there are a set of principles embedded in the civilization of a country – other than laws governing international relations - that are required. In other words, a soldier carries moral principles of society along with his backpack. This is exactly what we mean when we intend to study the behavior of Iranians in the past, whether during war or peace-time.

According to the religious teachings and characteristics of Iranian civilization, Iranians were bound to two principles in their peaceful relationships with other countries: respect for mutual agreements and respect for one another. The violation of treaties was seen as unacceptable and foul in the religious and traditional literature of Iran. In *Mebrish*, from the holy book of Zoroaster, we read: “You must not break your treaty or word, both among friends and enemies, because the treaty set with both of these groups is worthy of respect whether they are right or wrong (PourDavood, 1995: 424-425). This religious inspiration eventually rose to become one of the common values of Iranian society and was manifested in famous Iranian masterpieces of literature, such as the *Shahnameh*, where one can read that: “When you turn away from a treaty and honesty, deficiency will appear everywhere.”

Lying is one of the worst and most hideous sins in the Iranian religions. Dariush the Great, the Achaemenid king, asked the God of the Zoroastrians, Ahura Mazda, to keep his nation safe from three disasters: enemies, drought and lies. Perjury was considered to be the same as lying, and all followers of righteousness and truthfulness were instructed to refrain from it. These moral concepts became fundamental principles in Iranian foreign relations. The moral concepts were also set as criteria for trust and reliability; when a person or country committed perjury, it was no longer trusted. It must be noted that it took centuries for positive rights like treaties and agreements to find their way into international relations in bilateral or multi-lateral forms in Europe. In fact, in the years between



the two World Wars, European nations sought these rules as the base of international security. However, due to the fact that it was imposed upon them from the outside, as opposed to being an intuitive call from the depth and collectivity of their religion, it didn't last long.

This is one of the factors that denigrates the longevity and value of collective security systems and the school of thought named realism. In this school of thought, it is argued that normative approaches do not succeed, and governments are advised that committing themselves to such approaches would not guarantee anything. The prominent example of this is Hitler and how he effectively broke all international contracts, concluding that reliance on morality in international relations is preposterous. However, in ancient Iran, military power and political as well as social discipline were the fundament of international treaties. The backbone of this behavior was another religious belief: "Weakness brings along with itself crookedness and defect, while power is a tool for honesty and righteousness". These concepts acted as pillars of the roof of a self-reinforcing structure. Therefore, we must recognize the moral foundation in Ancient Iran as an intertwined whole and constituents of a civilization. This is how the Iranians backed their commitments with their power, so that if an enemy betrayed them, such action was conceived as satanic (*Abriman*) and responded to as a religious duty.

Mutual respect was another principle in Iranian foreign relations. Of course, at that time, there was no other country as large and vast as the Iranian empire. Other countries were much smaller compared to Iran, and were not as developed. However, the Iranians remained committed to smaller relations and maintained relations with them based on mutual respect. One example of this behavior was Cyrus the Great's behavior towards the King of Lydia. Lydia had preserved its independence, and the Iranian king respected it and behaved accordingly. He even respectfully accepted the deposition of the King of Lydia, *Korçus* and assigned him as an advisor in the affairs of Asia Minor (Mashkour, 1984: 171).



The frontier where morality can be better observed is in battles and conflicts, because both sides do whatever they are capable of with the least consideration and limitation in order to save their lives. The Iranians were almost always anxious to walk within the boundaries of morality and humanitarian ethics.

On the ethics of war, first, we must take a glance at the deep and thoughtful words of Hegel: “The Iranian empire takes us to the depth of history. The Iranians were the first people who had undergone many exceptional changes and revolutions in their history while China and India were in a static condition. At first, a light was emanated which then clarified something else. This was the light of *Zoroaster*, that which appeared from the world of conscience and spirit. Then, the Iranian empire rose to a sensitive and pure unity that its government governed based on enhancing its capabilities, validity and growth. This is how the evolution of history was commenced and this is exactly why the Iranian history is also the history of the world. Man is freed to face his purpose. A universalism emerged in Iran, and its starting point was *Zoroaster* and his high doctrine that blows the soul into the human body.” After admiring the nature of Iranians, in the section about the Achaemenids, Hegel argues: “The Iranian empire was truly a modern empire, just like the German or Napoleon empire. It was composed of several states in correlation with the central government, committed to protecting and preserving it and would never attempt to refute its legitimacy. They would willingly and honestly take part in the maintenance of the empire and the Iranian government was like the sun that shines on everything without taking their independence. Some of these states even had their own language, army and lifestyle. The Iranian empire was a collection of different people who were given the freedom of a honorable life. This empire was an empire of peace (A. M.Badie, 1984: 337-389)

One of the significant actions of the Iranian civilization was its behavior towards defeated states and its offering of cultural as well as religion freedom. We witness this behavior in the conquest of the



Babylonian Empire by Cyrus the Great in 538 b.c. First off, he promised the Babylonians better lives rather than intimidating them, and introduced himself as their savior from a cruel dictator. Then, he paid tribute to the lord of Babel, *Marduck* who he referred to as the Great God of everyone and maintained that he was able to conquer Babel and sit on the throne of the kings of Babel without any bloodshed with the help of *Marduck*. This softened the people's hearts towards him, as he kept praising *Marduck*. (Mashkour, 1984: 176).

Another case that can be cited is the behavior of *Cambyses* towards the Egyptian pharaoh before his madness. He initially acted with honor before *Psamtik* and respected Apies, the sacred cow of the Egyptians. Unfortunately, after his illness became worse, he resorted to corruption and exploited his good name in the history of Egypt. Russian historians narrate from a well-off Egyptian man who had entered the camp of Cambyses: "When the great king of all countries, i.e. Cambyses, entered Egypt, he brought along Berbers from various countries and gave them shelter and a place to live. He ruled all of Egypt and those Berbers resided there. His holiness designated me as the senior physician and asked me to serve as the head of the court (Pigoloscaya, 1963: 22). In fact, every nation that would enter the empire would be equally respected and whichever nation that wanted to exist in peace existed in peace.

Amir Mehdi Badi' quotes Herodotus as saying: The fact that there were seven councils in Ancient Iran proves that the proper regime for Iran is democracy, and they were the ones who taught democracy to the Greeks (Badi', 1963: 33). Finally, in response to European historians who consider Iran as a country behind conspiracies and believe Iranians created divisions between the Greeks via bribery, this author says: "Most Greeks would seek refuge in lands governed by Iran to preserve their lives and possessions against the assault of other Greek compatriots (Badi', 1963: 33).

Another example of the morality of Ancient Iran is the tolerance and humanitarian behavior they displayed towards prisoners of war



and the defeated. This behavior, which has been mentioned in the writings of historians from ancient Iran and Greece as well as other nations, was exceptional and unprecedented when compared to what the Babylonian and Assyrian governments did. The Iranians never enslaved prisoners who surrendered, and paid for their work. However, there are a few exceptional cases when someone committed a betrayal and made the king furious. It is clear that what is mentioned here displays the respect shown towards other governments and peoples of that time.

III- Islamic Sources of Moral Diplomacy

There are a few societies that still possess the same culture and identity despite thousands of years of history, such as that in Iran. This continuity is most evident in the moral and human rights sphere more than anywhere else, because Islam stresses and emphasizes the exact cultural and moral concepts we witness in Ancient Iran. Islamic texts are full of moral and human rights teachings. However, Islamic history, which experienced non-moral governments such as those of the Bani Umayyad and Abbasids or the Ottoman Empire, is full of corruption and injustice. The only reliable historical periods are the eras of the governments of Prophet Mohammad, and the fourth Caliph, the first Imam of the Shia's, Imam Ali. During these periods, there were no attempts to conquer land and no one's rights were denied. All battles that took place in this period were defensive. Our goal is to reconstruct Islam's essential teachings and principles in a period when power is the objective of all political actions which lead to superficial victory. Iranian morality, both traditional and Ancient, can play out as soft power tools as opposed to weapons of mass destruction.

The Qur'an is the main source of Islamic rules and principles, and contains many verses offering recommendations regarding the rights of minorities, prisoners of war and non-Muslims at the individual and international level. The observance of the rights of



religious minorities can be found in the words of Imam Khomeini as well (Mehran Alipour, 1390: 8) and have been fortunately been reflected upon in the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran (Mehrshad Imani, 2011: 8).

Several verses of the Qur'an explicitly point to the importance of contracts and the fulfillment of obligations stipulated in them. They address both Muslims and non-Muslims. Sometimes, the Qur'an is so adamant about the fulfillment of obligations that one may think of God as a party to the contract. It says: "O you who have believed, fulfill all contracts." (Ma'idah: 1). In another verse, it says "fulfill the covenant of Allah when you have made a covenant and do not break the oaths after making them." (Nahl: 91). In another verse, it argues that "how can there be for the polytheists a treaty in the sight of Allah and with His Messenger, except for those with whom you made a treaty at al- Masjid al – Haram? So as long as they are upright toward you, be upright toward them. " (Tewba: 7) These verses were revealed when there was no positive law in Europe and what was called canon law was imposed unilaterally on people and was claimed to be the will of God. Also, clerical governments and Christian states did not make any contracts with non-Christians, and if they did, it was out of coercion or weakness, and they would not abide by them as soon as they became stronger. This is because they considered belief as something more important than a bilateral treaty. What is mentioned from the Qur'an are only some examples of an approach echoed in other holy books of the Muslims, including the "Nahj al-Balagha". That book, which is attributed to Imam Ali, frequently mentions the necessity of fulfilling obligations. In an order to the Governor of Egypt at the time, Malik Ashtar, Imam Ali said: "Take very particular care of promises made, never go back upon the words given. Deception and fraud, even against your enemy, is a deception against Allah and none but a wretched sinner would dare do that" (Amid Zanjani, 1379:37).

Even among some Muslims, the false notion that Islamic is a



religion of the sword has been spread. All of the wars during the early days of Islam were defensive, and there is not any case recorded in history in which the Prophet resorted to war to conquer a territory or to force people to convert to Islam. On the contrary, there are numerous verses in the Qur'an which show that peace and tolerance are essential principles, unless the lives or religion of Muslims are in danger. We read in the Qur'an: "If they (your enemies) incline to peace, then incline to it and rely upon Allah." (Anfal: 61). In another section, we read: "If they (your enemies) remove themselves from you and do not fight you and offer you peace, then Allah has not made for you a cause (for fighting) against them" (Nisa: 90). The Prophet's behavior towards non-Muslims is considered as an important model for Muslims. Both the Prophet and Imam Ali emphasized the security of non-Muslims living in Islamic lands, and the necessity of safeguarding their lives and properties. If we find warnings against non-Muslims in the Qur'an or sayings of in the Qur'an, it is said that they should be decimated. Meanwhile, Allah warns that "When you go forth [to fight] in the cause of Allah, investigate; and do not say to one who gives you [a greeting of] peace "You are not a believer" (Nisa: 94). The interpretation of Qur'anic verses is the work of experts and everyone cannot interpret it as they wish. At least this applies in Shi'a Islam. Perhaps, for this reason, there are no Shi'a terrorist groups, because Shi'as do not allow themselves to implement their interpretation of the Qur'an, but in some Islamic sects, people themselves interpret verses and commit incorrect actions. These distortions and misunderstandings should not be considered as conforming with Islam.

Islam emphasizes the virtue of human beings, irrespective of their color and race, unless someone destroys it by committing evil actions. The Qur'an, as the main source of Islamic law and principles, is fraught with verses about the rights of religious minorities and prisoners of war. It is recommended that Muslims observe their human rights when dealing with them. The observance of the rights



of religious minorities is manifested in Imam Khomeini's words as well as in the Qur'an and sayings of the Prophet (Alipoor, 1390:8). Fortunately, this is also reflected in the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran (Imani, 1390:8). Some argue that jizya, the tax which non-Muslims living in Islamic lands should pay to the government, is a kind of discrimination. However, it should be noted that this tax is collected to ensure security and the delivery of services. Its amount is determined by mutual agreement so that non-Muslims can afford it, and finally some categories of people are exempt from paying "jizya", such as clerics, the elderly, the handicapped and the insane. It has even been narrated that Imam Ali designed pensions for people who paid jizya but became handicapped. (Amid Zanjani, 1379: 115-137)

Similar recommendations exist for prisoners of war and every person who needs help. Of course, the behavior towards prisoners of war was subject to conditions governing that period of time. If they were captured during war, they were enslaved. We can also find strong recommendations showing that freeing captives and their equal status are essential. The Prophet said that nobody has a right to mistreat someone who has been captured or surrendered himself. He also advised that if the captive is a scientist, you should use his knowledge and treat him with respect, and if he is illiterate, teach him to read. Fortunately, Iranians can be proud of themselves for having displayed humanitarian behavior towards Iraqi prisoners of war, while the regime of Saddam Hussein treated Iranian prisoners of war indecently.

Unfortunately, after the era of the first four Caliphs, the history of Islam derailed from its main route and a wealthy, power-mongering seized control over the government. These rulers were even worse than the most bloodthirsty kings of that period. Some of them did not have any pity for the descendants of the Prophet and killed them. Hence, it is necessary to refine works on the history of Islam so as to offer a correct model of Islamic behavior so that a few terrorists won't be able to hurt the image of Islam in the world.



Conclusion

In most cases, there is total agreement between Iranian thought before Islam and Islamic views and there is no gap between Islam and Iranian identity. Islamic-Iranian ethics and the publication of historical texts can be one of the soft power sources that Iran can use to enhance its position in the international arena. It can offer a new method and approach to diplomacy to the world, which suffers from tyranny and violence. In other words, with its rich legacy, Iran should stand as the role model of morality and ethics. At a deeper look, this can be considered as Iran's soft power; we cannot find a country that can rely on a 3,000-year-old heritage of morality. This is truly exceptional.

References

In Persian

- Imani, Shadmehr. 1390. "Minority Rights in the Iranian Constitution", Shargh Newspaper, Thursday, 19, Aban.
- Badie, Amir Mahdi. 2010. "The Greeks and the Berbers", vol. 8, various translations, Tous Publications, 2003-2009.
- Amid Zanjani (Ayatollah) Abbassali. 2000. *International law and Islamic Diplomacy*, Tehran Samt (1379).
- Brian, Pierre. 1999. "The History of the Achaemenid Empire", Translated by Mahdi Semsar, Forozan Publication.
- Pigoloscaya. N. V. & others. 1984. "Iran's History from Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century B.C", Translated by Karim Keshavarz, Payam Publications, Fifth edition.
- Joneidi, Fereydoon. 2005. "International Rights in Ancient Iran", Balkh Pub.
- Arab Golpayegani, Esmat. 1996. "Legends of Ancient Iran", Hirmand Pub.
- Alipoor, Mehran. 2011. "Democracy and Minority Rights in the View of Imam Khomeini", Shargh newspaper, Thursday, 19 Aban.
- Ghadyani, Abbas. 1997. "History of Religions and Denominations in the History of Iran", Anis Pub.
- Moshirzadeh, Homeira. 2005. "Transformation in international Relation Theories", Samt Pub.
- Mashkoor, Mohammad Javad. 1994. "Iran in Ancient Times", Ashrafi Pub. Fourth edition.
- Naghibzadeh, Ahmad. 2002. "The Effect of National Culture on Foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran", Political and International Studies Office.
- Howar, Cleman. 1996. "Iran and the Iranian Civilization", Amir kabir Pub.

In English

- Aron, Raymond. 1962. *Paix et Guerre entre les Nations*, Paris. Calmann-Lévy.
- Badie, Amir Mehdi. 1984. *La Paix du Roi*, Lausanne, Payot.
- Badie. 1968. *Les Grecs et les Barbares*, Lausanne, Payot, Vol 3.
- Chamsky, Noam. 2001.11/9: *Autopsie des Terrorismes*, Paris, Le Serpent à Plume.
- Chanteur, Jean. 1989. *De la Guerre à la Paix*, Paris, PUF.
- Hugo, Victor, *Les Morceaux Choisis*, Paris, Librairie Delagrave, sans date.