Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga dan Hukum Islam
Volume 10 No. 2. July 2026
ISSN: 2549 – 3132; E-ISSN: 2549 – 3167
DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

Siyāsah Dauliyah and the Global Crisis: A Fiqh Siyasah Perspective on the U.S.–Israel–Iran Conflict and Indonesia's Strategic Role in Peace Diplomacy

Gani Jumat
Universitas Islam Negeri Datokarama Palu, Indonesia
Hamlan Andi Baso Malla
Universitas Islam Negeri Datokarama Palu, Indonesia
Ahmadan
Universitas Alkhairaat (UNISA) Palu, Indonesia
Nasaruddin Mera
Universitas Islam Negeri Datokarama Palu, Indonesia
Idrus M.Said
Universitas Alkhairaat (UNISA) Palu, Indonesia
Email: ganijumat@uindatokarama.ac.id

Abstract: Geopolitical tensions between the United States, Israel, and Iran have developed into one of the most dangerous hotspots in today's world political constellation. This reality confirms that the dynamics of contemporary warfare have transcended traditional geographic boundaries and demand a response that blends diplomatic dimensions with deep ethical considerations. In the midst of such complexity, the tradition of Islamic political thought offers a relevant perspective through the concept of siyāsah dauliyah a normative framework in fiqh siyasah that governs the relationship between nations. This concept lays the foundation for the values of justice, recognition of the sovereignty of other states, loyalty to the pacts and agreements concluded, as well as strict restrictions on the use of armed violence. This study intends to examine the trilateral conflict using the lens of siyāsah dauliyah as the main analytical lens. Methodologically, this study relies on a qualitative approach by combining literature studies and normative studies on the treasures of Islamic political jurisprudence, combined with the latest international relations literature. The findings reveal that the spirit of siyāsah dauliyah actually puts forward the peaceful path - through negotiations, open communication, and multilateral cooperation as the main mechanism for resolving disputes between countries, not through armed confrontation. Interestingly, this orientation has a strong resonance with Indonesia's foreign policy doctrine known as the "bebas aktif" principle."Indonesia's commitment to continuously promote the alleviation of tensions and peaceful settlement of international disputes reflects similar values. Furthermore, Indonesia's willingness to take on the role of a dialogue facilitator or potential mediator in the US–Israel–Iran conflict shows the country's seriousness in realizing global peace. Thus, the integration of ethical principles from the Siyasah Fiqh tradition into contemporary diplomatic practice has the potential to strengthen Indonesia's capacity as a significant actor in conflict resolution and international peacebuilding efforts.
Keywords: Fiqh Siyasah, Siyāsah dauliyah, U.S.–Israel–Iran Conflict, Peace Diplomacy, International Relations

‖ Submitted: May 04, 2026 ‖ Accepted: July 06, 2026 ‖Published: July 31, 2026

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

Abstrak: *Ketegangan geopolitik antara Amerika Serikat, Israel, dan Iran telah berkembang menjadi salah satu titik api paling berbahaya dalam konstelasi politik dunia saat ini. Realitas ini menegaskan bahwa dinamika peperangan kontemporer telah melampaui batas-batas geografis tradisional dan menuntut respons yang memadukan dimensi diplomatik dengan pertimbangan etis yang mendalam. Di tengah kompleksitas tersebut, tradisi pemikiran politik Islam menawarkan perspektif yang relevan melalui konsep siyāsah dauliyah, sebuah kerangka normatif dalam fiqih siyasah yang mengatur tata hubungan antarbangsa. Konsep ini meletakkan fondasi pada nilai-nilai keadilan, pengakuan atas kedaulatan negara lain, kesetiaan terhadap pakta dan perjanjian yang telah disepakati, serta pembatasan ketat terhadap penggunaan kekerasan bersenjata. Kajian ini bermaksud menelaah konflik trilateral tersebut dengan menggunakan lensa siyāsah dauliyah sebagai pisau analisis utama. Secara metodologis, penelitian ini mengandalkan pendekatan kualitatif dengan menggabungkan studi kepustakaan dan telaah normatif atas khazanah yurisprudensi politik Islam yang dipadukan dengan literatur hubungan internasional mutakhir. Temuan penelitian mengungkapkan bahwa spirit siyāsah dauliyah sejatinya mengedepankan jalur damai melalui perundingan, komunikasi terbuka, dan kerja sama multilateral sebagai mekanisme utama penyelesaian sengketa antarnegara, bukan melalui konfrontasi bersenjata. Menariknya, orientasi ini memiliki resonansi kuat dengan doktrin politik luar negeri Indonesia yang dikenal dengan prinsip "bebas aktif." Komitmen Indonesia untuk senantiasa mendorong peredaan ketegangan dan penyelesaian damai atas perselisihan internasional mencerminkan nilai-nilai serupa. Lebih jauh, kesediaan Indonesia untuk mengambil peran sebagai fasilitator dialog atau mediator potensial dalam konflik AS–Israel–Iran menunjukkan keseriusan negara ini dalam mewujudkan perdamaian global. Dengan demikian, pengintegrasian prinsip-prinsip etis dari tradisi fikih siyasah ke dalam praktik diplomasi kontemporer berpotensi memperkuat kapasitas Indonesia sebagai aktor signifikan dalam upaya resolusi konflik dan pembangunan perdamaian internasional.*
Kata kunci: *Fiqih Siyasah, Siyāsah dauliyah, Konflik AS–Israel–Iran, Diplomasi, Perdamaian, Hubungan Internasional.*

Introduction

Over time, the triangular dynamics among the United States, Israel, and Iran have become one of the most tension-producing factors in modern geopolitics, growing increasingly complex due to conflicts involving major powers and regional actors. This conflict has a long history rooted in hostility, ideological differences, security concerns, and strategic rivalry—it is not merely a contemporary political issue. The strong relationship between the United States and Israel since the post–World War II era contrasts sharply with the strained relations between the United States and Iran following the 1979 Islamic

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

Revolution. This condition has produced a recurring pattern of antagonism in various forms, ranging from economic sanctions and diplomatic pressure to limited military escalations.[1] On the other hand, Israel views Iran's nuclear ambitions and its expansion of influence in the region as an existential threat, while Iran positions itself as a force of resistance against Western dominance and the Zionist project in the Middle East.[2]

This tension does not stand alone, but rather evolves through proxy conflicts in various regions such as Syria, Lebanon, and Yemen, ultimately expanding the scale of conflict from local to global. This situation shows that the conflict affects stability in the Middle East and the entire international system. Given that the Gulf is a center of global oil production, instability in this region has a direct impact on global energy security. Changes in energy distribution routes and fluctuations in oil prices affect the global economy, including the economies of developing countries that are highly dependent on stable energy markets.[3] Moreover, the increasing practice of unilateral actions, such as unilateral sanctions and limited military strikes, indicates a shift in the norms of international relations, where the principles of international law are often overlooked.

In situations like this, the ethical dimensions of global conflict are often not adequately explained by the realist approaches that have long dominated the study of international relations. As a result, alternative methods are needed that can incorporate normative and moral elements into the analysis of international relations. The fiqh siyasah approach—particularly the concept of *siyāsah dauliyah*—is among the most relevant. This approach analyzes the governance of international relations within the framework of Islamic principles. It emphasizes that justice (*'adl*), public interest (*maṣlaḥah*), and peace (*ṣulḥ*) are essential pillars in international relations.[4] Unlike purely power-based approaches, fiqh siyasah places political actions within a broader ethical framework, so that national interests must not disregard moral responsibility toward humanity.

[1]Stephen M. Walt, *The Hell of Good Intentions: America's Foreign Policy Elite and the Decline of U.S. Primacy* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2018), p. 45. Trita Parsi, *Losing an Enemy: Obama, Iran, and the Triumph of Diplomacy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), p. 63.

[2]Thomas Juneau, "Iran's Policy towards the Houthis in Yemen: A Limited Return on a Modest Investment," *International Affairs* 92, no. 3 (May 2016), p. 647–63.

[3]Anthony H. Cordesman, "The Changing Gulf Balance and the Iranian Threat," *Center for Strategic and International Studies* (Washington D.C), p. 2016, 87, https://www.csis.org/analysis/changing-gulf-balance-and-iranian-threat; Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*, 1st ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 321, https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511491252.

[4]Mohammad Hashim Kamali, *Maqasid Al-Shariah Made Simple* (Kuala Lumpur: International Institute of Islamic Thought (IIIT), p. 2008), p. 215.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

The concept of *siyāsah dauliyah* also gives significant attention to issues such as war, peace, international treaties, and the protection of non-combatants. In both classical and contemporary literature, scholars have formulated principles that are highly relevant to modern humanitarian law, such as the prohibition of killing civilians, the importance of upholding agreements, and the obligation to prioritize peace when there is an opportunity to achieve it.[5] This shows that Islam has significant potential to contribute to building a more just and peaceful world. However, this potential has not been widely explored in practical terms within the context of modern geopolitical conflicts, such as the war involving the United States, Israel, and Iran.

In this situation, Indonesia has a significant strategic role in international diplomacy amid current global conflicts. Indonesia has the moral authority to participate in global peace efforts, as it is the country with the largest Muslim population in the world and has a long history of maintaining pluralism. The principle of a free and active foreign policy upheld by Indonesia affirms that it does not align with any particular power bloc, but remains actively engaged in promoting world peace.[6] This principle enables Indonesia to act as a relatively neutral mediator that can be accepted by various parties.

In practice, Indonesia has demonstrated its commitment through international forums such as the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. Indonesia has also consistently supported the Palestinian cause and has sought to resolve conflicts through diplomacy and dialogue. This approach aligns with the values of *siyāsah dauliyah*, but has not been explicitly defined within the framework of fiqh siyasah. Studies show that Indonesia's foreign policy contains strong normative elements, with moral and humanitarian considerations playing an important role in diplomatic decision-making.[7] This positions Indonesia as a potential actor in developing an ethics-based model of diplomacy.

However, there are significant differences in academic discourse regarding the integration of contemporary geopolitical analysis with the perspective of *fiqh siyasah*. The realist approach, which emphasizes power, security, and strategic interests, remains the dominant framework in studies of the

[5]Khaled Abou El Fadl, *Speaking in God's Name: Islamic Law, Authority and Women*, 48952nd edition (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2001), p. 233; Majid Khadduri, *War and Peace in the Law of Islam*, Lawbook Exchange ed., [reprinted]; [Nachdr. der Ausg. Baltimore,] The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1955 (Clark, NJ: Lawbook Exchange, 2010), p. 145.

[6]Dewi Fortuna Anwar, "Indonesia and the ASEAN Outlook on the Indo-Pacific," *International Affairs* 96, no. 1 (January 2020), p. 111–29, https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iiz223.

[7]Yanyan Mochamad Yani, "Change And Continuity In Indonesian Foreign Policy," *Sosiohumaniora* 11, no. 1 (March 2009), p. 1–16, https://doi.org/10.24198/sosiohumaniora.v11i1.5575.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

U.S.–Israel–Iran conflict.[8] On the other hand, studies on *fiqh siyasah* tend to be normative and historical in nature, without much connection to the realities of contemporary global conflicts. This separation indicates an urgent need to develop an interdisciplinary approach capable of bridging these two perspectives.

Furthermore, Indonesia has not been widely studied regarding its role in Middle Eastern conflicts, particularly in terms of incorporating Islamic values into global diplomacy. However, as a country that has successfully managed internal conflict and diversity in a peaceful manner, Indonesia possesses social and cultural capital that can be utilized in international diplomacy. Indonesia has the opportunity to become a leader in developing a more moral and just approach to international relations by integrating *siyāsah dauliyah* into diplomatic practice.

Based on this background, this study aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the conflict between the United States, Israel, and Iran from the perspective of *fiqh siyasah*, particularly through the concept of *siyāsah dauliyah*. In addition, the study seeks to examine how Islamic values influence responses to global crises and to explore Indonesia's strategic role in peace diplomacy. Therefore, it is expected that this research will contribute theoretically to the development of international relations studies grounded in Islamic values, as well as offer practical implications for how Indonesia can help foster global peace.

More broadly, this study emphasizes that understanding the dynamics of international relations requires a combination of strategic and ethical approaches. Methods that rely solely on power are no longer adequate in an increasingly complex and uncertain world. A new paradigm is needed—one that prioritizes humanity as the foundation of international policy and integrates national interests with global responsibility. In addressing this issue, *fiqh siyasah* offers the concept of *siyāsah dauliyah* as a relevant and contextual normative framework.

.

The Concept of Fiqh Siyasah in Islamic Politics

The concept of *fiqh siyasah* is one of the important branches of Islamic political thought that discusses the governance of power, public policy, and the relationship between rulers and society within the framework of the sharia. Terminologically, *fiqh siyasah* refers to a deep understanding of sharia principles applied in managing public affairs to achieve the common good. Ibn Taymiyyah emphasized that *siyasah* encompasses any action that brings people closer to welfare and distances them from harm, even if it is not explicitly mentioned in the textual sources.[9] This definition was later expanded by contemporary scholars such as Mohammad Hashim Kamali, who views *fiqh siyasah* as a normative

[8]John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2008), p. 89.

[9]Syakhul Islam Ibn Taimiyah, *Al-siyasah al-shar'iyyah fi Islah al-ra'i wa al-ra'iyyah* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr al-Lubnani, 1992), p. 13.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

framework that integrates law, ethics, and public policy in Islam.[10] Thus, *fiqh siyasah* is not merely legal-formal in nature, but also encompasses moral and contextual dimensions that are adaptive to changing times.

In recent developments, the study of *fiqh siyasah* reflects a growing effort to contextualize this concept within modern political systems. In building governance that is moral, transparent, and oriented toward public welfare, *fiqh siyasah* plays a crucial role. For instance, Auda argues that the principles of *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah* serve as a foundation for public policymaking that emphasizes sustainability and social justice.[11] Meanwhile, a study also highlights that the integration of Islamic values into contemporary politics can serve as an alternative to the crisis of legitimacy faced by modern political systems. These findings indicate that *fiqh siyasah* is not only theoretically relevant but also holds practical potential in addressing global political challenges.

Based on universal principles such as justice (*'adl*), trust (*amānah*), consultation (*shūrā*), and public welfare (*maṣlaḥah*), Islamic political ethics form the foundation of *fiqh siyasah*. In *al-Aḥkām al-Sulṭāniyyah*, Al-Mawardi emphasizes that safeguarding religion and governing worldly affairs with justice are the primary objectives of political authority.[12] The principles of justice and *amānah* require rulers to uphold rights and exercise accountable authority before both God and society. These values align with modern good governance, emphasizing transparency, accountability, and public participation.

Contemporary studies indicate that Islamic political ethics are highly relevant in responding to global crises such as conflict, inequality, and crises of legitimacy by emphasizing the values of justice, reconciliation, and peace. The Islamic approach to international relations offers an inclusive, peace-oriented ethical framework, as reflected in the foreign policy of Iran, which prioritizes strategies of non-violence and resistance in pursuit of positive peace.[13] Other studies also emphasize that integrating Islamic principles with modern conflict resolution theories enriches dispute resolution methods by incorporating values such as patience, forgiveness, and culturally sensitive ethical leadership.[14] Thus,

[10]Mohammad Hashim Kamali, *Shari'ah Law: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2008), p. 217.

[11]Jasser Auda, *Maqasid Al-Shari'ah as Philosophy of Islamic Law* (London: International Institute of Islamic Thought (IIIT), p. 2022), p. 89.

[12]Imam al-Mawardi, *Al-Ahkam al-Sulthaniyyah* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah, 1996), p. 15.

[13]Daniyal Ranjbar et al., "Positive Peace in the Islamic Perspective of International Relations: The Case of Iran's Foreign Policy," *Vestnik RUDN. International Relations* 23, no. 2 (June 2023), p. 278–95.

[14]Qudsia Firdous and Muhammad Zahid Yasin, "Integrating Islamic Ethical Perspectives with Modern Conflict Resolution and Professional Ethics: A Framework for Multicultural Workplaces," *Social Sciences & Humanity Research Review* 3, no. 2 (2025).

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

fiqh siyasah functions not only as a normative framework in domestic politics but also as a source of ethical guidance in broader international relations.

Siyāsah Dauliyyah and the Ethics of International Relations

Islamic international ethics are built upon a balance between political interests and universal moral responsibility within the framework of *siyāsah dauliyyah*. In Islamic tradition, diplomacy is regarded as a strategic instrument not only for maintaining stability, but also for fostering trust and preventing conflict. The history of Islamic diplomacy dates back to the time of Prophet Muhammad, including the sending of envoys to regional political powers and the reception of delegations from other states to engage in dialogue and pursue peace.[15] From a normative perspective, Islamic diplomacy emphasizes the values of dialogue (*ḥiwār*), reconciliation (*ṣulḥ*), and respect for differences, which align with the principle of peaceful coexistence in modern international relations. A study suggests that an ethics-based approach to diplomacy in Islam can serve as an alternative to coercive diplomatic practices that tend to dominate contemporary global politics.[16]

In the context of the law of war, Islam develops a set of strict principles aimed at limiting violence and protecting humanity. Contrary to the assumption that religion promotes conflict, classical literature emphasizes that war in Islam is defensive in nature and considered a last resort after all peaceful efforts have failed. Al-Shaybani, as one of the pioneers of Islamic international law, formulated rules concerning the treatment of prisoners, the prohibition of killing non-combatants, and the protection of civilian property.[17] These principles demonstrate clear parallels with modern international humanitarian law. Research by Ahmed Al-Dawoody affirms that the norms of Islamic law of war have the potential to strengthen compliance with humanitarian law in Muslim-majority countries, particularly in the context of contemporary conflicts.[18] Furthermore, Islam consistently encourages peaceful resolution and prioritizes the cessation of hostilities when there is an opportunity to achieve a just peace.

Another important factor is the tradition of international treaties in Islam, which reflects a strong commitment to stability and inter-state relations. Various agreements between Muslim and non-Muslim states demonstrate that treaty-making has long been an integral part of Islamic political history. The primary

[15]Muhammad Hamidullah, *The Prophet's Establishing a State and His Succession*, 1st ed (Islamabad, Pakistan: Pakistan Hijra Council, 1988), p. 187.

[16]Roxanne L. Euben, "Comparative Political Theory: An Islamic Fundamentalist Critique of Rationalism," *The Journal of Politics* 59, no. 1 (1997), p. 28–55.

[17]Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan Shaybānī, *The Islamic Law of Nations: Shaybānī's Siyar* (Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966), p. 78.

[18]Ahmed Al-Dawoody, "Islamic Law and International Humanitarian Law: An Introduction to the Main Principles," *International Review of the Red Cross* 99, no. 906 (December 2017), p. 995–1018.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

principle underlying these agreements is the obligation to fulfill promises (*wafā' bi al-'uhūd*), which is regarded as both a moral and legal duty. Violating treaties is considered a form of injustice that disrupts social and political order. In contemporary analysis, the concept of treaties in Islam aligns with the principle of pacta sunt servanda in modern international law, which holds that every agreement must be honored and implemented in good faith.[19] Thus, *siyāsah dauliyyah* offers a comprehensive ethical framework in international relations, one that not only emphasizes political stability but also upholds moral integrity and global justice.

The U.S.–Israel–Iran Geopolitical Conflict in International Relations Studies

The geopolitical conflict involving the United States, Israel, and Iran represents one of the most complex dynamics in contemporary international relations, rooted in a combination of historical, ideological, and strategic factors. The origins of this conflict can be traced to the geopolitical shift following the Iranian Revolution, when Iran adopted an anti-Western stance and openly opposed the existence of Israel, thereby reshaping alliance configurations in the Middle East.[20] Since then, relations between Iran and the United States have evolved into a pattern of sustained hostility, characterized by economic sanctions, diplomatic isolation, and competition for regional influence. The United States has imposed extensive sanctions targeting Iran's financial system, energy sector, and international trade in order to pressure Tehran over issues such as its nuclear program and regional activities.[21] Meanwhile, Israel perceives Iran as a primary threat, particularly due to its nuclear program and its support for non-state actors such as Hezbollah and Hamas, which intensifies the dimensions of asymmetric and proxy conflict in the region. These tensions have further escalated as diplomatic negotiations reached a deadlock, ultimately triggering direct military confrontation between the United States, Israel, and Iran in 2026.[22]

From an international relations perspective, this conflict reflects the interplay between a realist approach—emphasizing security and power—and ideological dimensions that intensify antagonism. The security dilemma emerges as a key factor, whereby each effort by one party to enhance its military capabilities is perceived as a threat by others, thereby triggering a spiral of

[19]Muhammad Husni Abdulah Pakarti et al., "Application Of Legal Maxims In Contract Law: Pacta Sunt Servanda And Islamic Rules On Promises," *Lex Scientia Law Review* 9, no. 1 (2025), p. 1223–51.

[20]Farshad Roomi, "The Iran-Israel Conflict: An Ultra-Ideological Explanation," *Middle East Policy* 30, no. 2 (2023), p. 94–109.

[21]PT Indo Premier Securities, "Middle East war: global economic fallout," IPOTNEWS, March 23, 2026.

[22]Yaohui Wang, Richard Xuetao Wang, and Jiajia Zhang, "Is High-Intensity Conflict Escalation Inevitable in the Future? A Two-Level Game Analysis on the Causes of US-Iran Risky Rivalry," *European Journal of Futures Research* 12, no. 1 (2024), p. 17.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

escalation that is difficult to control.[23] In addition, the struggle for influence in the strategically vital Middle East rich in energy resources and possessing significant geostrategic importance renders this conflict not merely regional, but global in scope.[24]

This conflict carries far-reaching consequences at both regional and global levels. On a regional scale, military escalation has led to political instability, intensified proxy conflicts, and heightened security risks for Gulf states. Approximately 20% of the world's oil and gas supply has been disrupted due to attacks on energy infrastructure and critical distribution routes such as the Strait of Hormuz. This has had a direct impact on global energy security.[25] In addition, the conflict has triggered a humanitarian crisis, increased civilian casualties, and caused widespread damage to infrastructure in countries both directly and indirectly involved.

This conflict has caused significant disruptions to the international economy, including financial market instability, inflation, and rising energy prices. International institutions even estimate that its impact could slow global economic growth and increase pressure on developing countries. Moreover, the conflict has disrupted global supply chains, affected industrial sectors, and raised the cost of living in many countries.[26] In a broader context, the U.S.–Israel–Iran conflict has evolved into a global crisis that requires a multidimensional approach to resolution. This is because the conflict has the potential to deepen polarization across the international system and weaken the capacity of international organizations to maintain global peace and security.

Indonesia's Diplomacy in Global Conflicts

Indonesia's diplomacy in responding to global conflicts is shaped by the doctrine of a *free and active* foreign policy, which has been formulated since the early years of independence as a strategy to safeguard national sovereignty while contributing to international peace. The principle of "free" affirms that Indonesia is not aligned with any particular power bloc, while "active" reflects its commitment to playing a constructive role in promoting a just and peaceful global

[23]Rob Geist Pinfold, Clive Jones, and Anoushiravan Ehteshami, "Collision Course: How Iran and Israel Brought the Middle East to the Brink of War," *Global Policy* 16, no. 2 (May 2025), p. 289–98.

[24]Naser M. Tahboub and Muhammad Ihsan Sandjaya, "Reshaping the Middle East: Exploring the New Balance of Power and the Decline of U.S. Influence," *Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences* 53, no. 1 (2026), p. 7836–7836.

[25]Nathan Howard, "The Iran War's Global Economic Impact," Council on Foreign Relations, March 20, 2026, https://www.cfr.org/articles/the-iran-wars-global-economic-impact.

[26]Guardian correspondents, "How the Iran War Has Sent Shocks Rippling across the Globe," World News, *The Guardian*, March 20, 2026, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2026/mar/20/iran-war-shocks-across-globe-effects-key-takeaways.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

order.[27] Conceptually, this approach reflects a synthesis between national interests and global responsibilities, enabling Indonesia to maintain an independent stance in international conflicts without losing its normative legitimacy.[28] According to Leifer, this orientation positions Indonesia as an actor capable of maintaining diplomatic flexibility while simultaneously preserving its credibility in multilateral forums.[29] In contemporary developments, the free and active foreign policy is also articulated through a *middle power diplomacy* approach, in which Indonesia leverages its diplomatic capacity to bridge the interests of conflicting parties.[30]

Indonesia's role in peace diplomacy is reflected in its active participation in United Nations peacekeeping missions, multilateral initiatives, and conflict resolution efforts at both regional and global levels. Indonesia has developed an inclusive diplomatic approach that combines formal diplomacy with cultural and religious engagement to foster trust among conflicting parties. As a norm entrepreneur, Indonesia promotes moderation, non-intervention, and peaceful conflict resolution in international forums. This approach highlights a balance between strategic interests and ethical commitments, positioning Indonesia as a credible mediator in global conflicts, including those in the Middle East. Consequently, Indonesian diplomacy serves as a model of international relations that integrates political pragmatism with a commitment to sustainable peace.

The US–Israel–Iran Conflict in the Perspective of a Global Geopolitical Crisis

The conflict between the United States, Israel, and Iran in recent years demonstrates a significant transformation from indirect confrontation (*proxy warfare*) toward open military escalation, reflecting a deepening crisis within the global geopolitical order. In 2024, the confrontation between Israel and Iran shifted from indirect hostility based on proxy networks to direct military exchanges.

On April 1, an alleged Israeli airstrike on the Iranian consulate building in Damascus, Syria, reportedly killed two generals and five Iranian military advisers. In response, Iran launched more than three hundred aerial attacks, including drones and missiles, marking the first time it directly targeted Israel in such масштаб. In October 2024, following Israel's killing of Hamas and

[27]Siti Mutiah Setiawati, "The Role of Indonesian Government in Middle East Conflict Resolution: Consistent Diplomacy or Strategic Shifts?," *Frontiers in Political Science* 6 (2024).

[28]M. Ganesh Musyaffa A, Priyanto Suharto, and Suhirwan Suhirwan, "A Study of Indonesian Perspectives on the Future of the South China Sea: Navigating the Dynamics of Asymmetric Warfare," *Journal on Education* 6, no. 2 (2024), p. 12672–79.

[29]Michael Leifer, *Indonesia's Foreign Policy* (London; Boston: Published for the Royal Institute of International Affairs by Allen & Unwin, 1983), p. 23.

[30]Bruce Gilley and Andrew O'Neil, eds., *Middle Powers and the Rise of China* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2014), p. 86.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

Hezbollah leaders, Iran launched a large-scale missile attack involving approximately 180 ballistic missiles against Israel. Subsequently, Israel conducted its largest direct strike on Iran, targeting air defense systems and missile production facilities.

In the same period, the weakening of Hamas and Hezbollah leadership structures, along with the fall of Bashar al-Assad's regime in Syria, significantly undermined Iran's so-called "axis of resistance," thereby reshaping the strategic balance of power in the region.[31]

From the perspective of structural realism, this phenomenon can be understood as a logical consequence of the anarchic structure of the international system, in which the absence of a supranational authority compels states to rely on self-help mechanisms to ensure their security.[32] In this context, Iran's growing military capabilities, including its nuclear program, are perceived by Israel as an existential threat, which is then responded to through a doctrine of preventive strikes. Iran, on the other hand, views the strategic alliance between the United States and Israel as a security environment that threatens its sovereignty and national stability. A *security dilemma* emerges from this mutual perception of threat, thereby accelerating the escalation of the conflict.[33]

In addition to structural factors, the conflict is shaped by ideological and identity-based elements that cannot be fully explained through materialist approaches. From a constructivist perspective, collective identities and historical narratives influence threat perceptions and the legitimacy of political actions. As Wendt argues, "anarchy is what states make of it," indicating that conflict is determined not only by power distribution but also by the social structures governing interstate relations. Iran portrays itself as a force resisting Western hegemony, while Israel frames itself as facing existential threats, legitimizing a more assertive security posture. The United States further reinforces these dynamics by pursuing its strategic interests in the Middle East while seeking to preserve the liberal international order amid growing challenges.

From an empirical perspective, this escalation indicates a growing tendency toward the use of limited warfare, which has the potential to develop into a large-scale conflict. Recent studies in *International Affairs* emphasize that the Iran–Israel conflict has transformed from a shadow war into an open confrontation, thereby increasing the risk of a broader regional war.[34] Meanwhile,

[31]Center for Preventive Action, "Iran's War With Israel and the United States," Global Conflict Tracker, 2026, https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/confrontation-between-united-states-and-iran.

[32]Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, 1st ed (Boston, Mass: McGraw-Hill, 1979), p. 102.

[33]Robert Jervis, "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma," *World Politics* 30, no. 2 (1978), p. 167–214.

[34]Anoush Ehteshami and Mahjoob Zweiri, *Iran and the Rise of Its Neoconservatives: The Politics of Tehran's Silent Revolution* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007), p. 135.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

geopolitical rivalry in the Middle East is driven not only by security factors but also by ideological competition and struggles for regional influence involving global actors.[35] This finding reinforces the argument that the conflict is systemic in nature and cannot be understood in a fragmented or partial manner.

The conflict has broadly affected international stability in an interconnected manner. At the regional level, its escalation has increased political and security instability in the Middle East, including through intensified proxy conflicts and rising interstate tensions. Within the framework of *Regional Security Complex Theory*, conflicts within one region tend to spill over and affect neighboring states through patterns of security interdependence.[36] This is driven by rising tensions in the Gulf region as well as threats to strategic shipping routes such as the Strait of Hormuz, which serves as a critical global energy distribution corridor. In particular, fluctuations in oil prices and energy market uncertainty mean that disruptions to this route have a direct impact on international economic stability.

This conflict also weakens international law and global institutions. Organizations such as the United Nations are expected to function as mechanisms for reducing tensions and promoting cooperation, as argued by liberal institutionalism. However, in practice, these institutions are often ineffective in addressing disputes involving the strategic interests of major powers.[37] Studies in *Global Governance* indicate that the crisis in the Middle East reflects a deficit in global governance, where multilateral mechanisms are unable to keep pace with evolving power dynamics.[38]

In addition, this conflict has significant global economic implications. According to research published in *Energy Research & Social Science*, geopolitical conflicts in strategic regions have a direct impact on global economic stability. Instability in the Middle East affects global energy markets, drives up oil prices, and triggers inflation in various countries.[39] Furthermore, this conflict deepens global polarization among major powers, which ultimately hinders international cooperation on other critical issues such as climate change and global security.

Therefore, the findings of this study indicate that the US–Israel–Iran dispute has evolved into a global geopolitical crisis, reflecting a complex interplay of structural, ideological, and institutional factors. The escalating dynamics of the

[35]Raymond Hinnebusch, *The International Politics of the Middle East:* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), p. 147.

[36]Buzan and Wæver, *Regions and Powers*, p. 44.

[37]Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005), p. 85.

[38]Stewart M. Patrick, "Good Enough Global Governance," Council on Foreign Relations, January 6, 2014, https://www.cfr.org/articles/good-enough-global-governance.

[39]Jeff D. Colgan, "Oil, Domestic Politics, and International Conflict," *Energy Research & Social Science* 1 (2014), p. 198–205.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

conflict, along with its adverse implications for international stability, underscore the necessity of a more comprehensive approach that extends beyond power politics and incorporates ethical considerations as well as a broader framework of global governance.

Principles of *Siyāsah Dauliyah* in *Fiqh Siyasah*

The principles of *siyāsah dauliyah* in *fiqh siyasah* constitute an ethical framework for international relations that emphasizes a balance between political authority and universal moral responsibility, particularly in the contexts of war, diplomacy, and humanitarian protection.[40] In terms of the ethics of war, Islamic law consistently regards war as a last resort (*ultima ratio*). It may only be undertaken when peaceful efforts are no longer possible. In Islam, war is justified only to protect fundamental human rights and to prevent oppression and harm.[41] This aligns with classical thought developed by jurists such as Abu Hanifah and Al-Shafi'i, who emphasized strict limitations on the use of force. In a modern framework, this principle can be analyzed through the theory of *just war*, particularly *jus ad bellum*, which requires a legitimate cause, legitimate authority, and proportional objectives in initiating war.[42] This similarity indicates that the ethics of war in Islam are coherent with contemporary global norms.

In addition, within *fiqh siyasah*, the ethics of war also encompass the principle of *jus in bello*, namely the rules of warfare that emphasize minimizing violence and protecting those who are not directly involved in the conflict. In classical Islamic literature, the killing of women, children, and the elderly, as well as the destruction of the environment and places of worship, is strictly prohibited (*haram*). This principle demonstrates that Islam consistently upholds humanitarian values even in situations of armed conflict.

Research published in the *International Review of the Red Cross* further confirms that these norms have substantial compatibility with modern international humanitarian law, particularly the Geneva Conventions.[43] Therefore, fiqh siyasah not only provides legitimacy for war under certain conditions but also imposes strict limitations to ensure that it does not exceed the boundaries of humanity,

Siyāsah dauliyah emphasizes that, in matters of diplomacy and peace, dialogue, negotiation, and reconciliation are the primary mechanisms for

[40]Muhammad Rusdi et al., "Islam and the Ethics of War: Deconstructing Jihad through the Principle of Humanism in Theological Discourses," *Pharos Journal of Theology* 105, no. 5 (2024), p. 1–13.

[41]Nayef Al-Shamari, "Islamic Paradigm of International Relations in Times of Peace and Conflict: A Conceptual Framework," *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization* 14, no. 1 (2024), p. 40–54.

[42]Michael Walzer, *Just And Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument With Historical Illustrations* (New York: Basic Books, 2006), p. 21.

[43]Al-Dawoody, "Islamic Law and International Humanitarian Law," p. 998.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

resolving conflicts. Even in politically unstable situations, states are expected to actively pursue peace (*ṣulḥ*) as the ideal condition. This concept closely resembles preventive approaches in international relations, where communication and cooperation are utilized to avert the emergence of conflict.

This perspective is also in line with liberalism in international relations theory, which stresses that diplomacy, interdependence, and international institutions play a crucial role in maintaining global stability.[44] However, what distinguishes *fiqh siyasah* is its stronger ethical dimension, in which diplomacy is not solely aimed at achieving strategic interests, but also at upholding justice and the common good.

All aspects of *siyāsah dauliyah*, including relations with adversarial parties, are grounded in the principle of justice (*'adl*). In Islamic thought, justice is universal, non-discriminatory, and must be upheld even toward enemies. This reflects the idea that ethical commitment takes precedence over short-term political gain. This approach can be linked to the concept of international justice, which emphasizes cross-border moral responsibility within the framework of normative international relations theory.[45] In this context, *fiqh siyasah* makes an important contribution to the development of a more inclusive and just paradigm of international relations.

One of the core principles of *siyāsah dauliyah* is the protection of civilians, including safeguarding vulnerable groups and prohibiting actions that cause unnecessary suffering. This reflects Islam's commitment to human rights even during armed conflict. Research published in the *Journal of Islamic Studies* indicates a strong correlation between the Islamic principle of civilian protection and contemporary global human rights regimes, particularly in conflict situations. These findings suggest that *fiqh siyasah* can serve as an alternative normative foundation for strengthening humanitarian protection globally. More broadly, *siyāsah dauliyah* offers a comprehensive ethical framework for international relations, emphasizing just war principles, diplomacy, peace, justice, and the protection of civilians as essential elements of a civilized global order.

These principles are increasingly relevant as an alternative to realist approaches, which often neglect moral considerations in contemporary geopolitical settings. There is, therefore, a viable possibility of building a more secure, just, and sustainable global order by integrating these principles into the practice of international relations.

Relevance of *Siyāsah Dauliyah* to Contemporary Global Conflicts

[44]Michael W. Doyle, *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism* (New York: W W Norton & Co Inc, 1997), p. 206.

[45]Thomas W. Pogge, *World Poverty and Human Rights* (Cambridge Malden: Polity, 2013), p. 175.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

Contemporary geopolitical conflicts, particularly those involving the US–Israel–Iran triangle, demonstrate an increasingly severe ethical crisis alongside the dynamics of power within the international structure. In this regard, *siyāsah dauliyah* as part of *fiqh al-siyasah* provides an appropriate normative framework for evaluating contemporary international relations practices.

A normative analysis of this conflict indicates that many political and military actions undertaken by state actors are not fully aligned with the principles of justice, proportionality, and humanitarian protection. The principles of *maṣlaḥah* (public interest) and *ḍarar* (the prohibition of harm), which require a comprehensive evaluation of the impacts of military operations, must therefore be applied within an Islamic perspective when the use of force is considered.[46] However, in practice, modern conflicts often demonstrate the dominance of power logic that neglects these ethical dimensions.

Empirical findings from previous studies indicate that strategic calculations outweigh moral considerations in driving conflict escalation in the Middle East. A study in *International Affairs* states that although major powers often use military force as an effort to maintain national security, the use of such force in practice tends to contribute to increased violence and regional instability.[47] From the perspective of *siyāsah dauliyah*, such actions can be critically assessed as they fail to meet the principle of proportionality and do not clearly lead to the achievement of sustainable peace. Moreover, the repeated use of military force further intensifies the security dilemma identified in previous findings, in which every defensive action is perceived as a threat by other parties.

Furthermore, the normative approach in *fiqh siyasah* emphasizes that the legitimacy of power is not determined solely by the ability to maintain security, but also by commitment to justice and the protection of vulnerable groups. In the context of modern conflicts, this principle is often neglected, particularly in cases involving attacks on civilian infrastructure and the rising number of non-combatant casualties.

Recent research in the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* shows that modern armed conflicts tend to produce disproportionate impacts on civilians, which is contrary to the norms of international humanitarian law.[48] In the framework of *siyāsah dauliyah*, this condition reflects a failure to uphold the principle of *ḥifẓ al-nafs* (protection of life) as one of the primary objectives of the Sharia.

---

[46]Mohammad Hashim Kamali and Tariq Ramadan, *The Middle Path of Moderation in Islam: The Qur'anic Principle of Wasatiyyah* (New York (N. Y.), p. Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 142.

[47]Fred Halliday, *The Middle East in International Relations: Power, Politics and Ideology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 87.

[48]Stathis N. Kalyvas, *The Logic of Violence in Civil War*, 1st ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 54.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

In addition, criticism of the realist paradigm that dominates international relations practice is an important contribution of *siyāsah dauliyah*. The use of military force is often considered a legitimate means of achieving national interests because realism views conflict as an inherent feature of anarchy. However, this approach has been criticized for neglecting ethical considerations and potentially encouraging prolonged cycles of violence.

In such a context, *fiqh siyasah* offers an alternative by integrating ethical principles into political decision-making. A study published in the *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, Bulletin of the Financial University* indicates that employing an ethics-based approach in international relations can strengthen trust among states and enhance the legitimacy of foreign policy.[49]

Other findings also indicate that the inability of international organizations to effectively carry out mediation and conflict resolution functions contributes to contemporary conflicts. This highlights the importance of building a more inclusive system of cooperation grounded in the principle of justice from the perspective of *siyāsah dauliyah*. In addressing today's global challenges, moral principles must be integrated into international governance, including in decisions regarding the use of military force.[50] Thus, *siyāsah dauliyah* can function as a normative framework for strengthening the legitimacy and effectiveness of global institutions.

The fact that militaristic strategies are ineffective in resolving conflicts in the long term further strengthens the critique of the use of military force. Conversely, strategies that prioritize diplomacy, dialogue, and reconciliation have proven to be more sustainable in achieving peace. Other studies indicate that conflict resolution involving negotiation and mediation is more effective than military intervention.[51] From the perspective of *siyāsah dauliyah*, these findings reinforce the principle that peace must be the primary objective of international relations, and the use of force can only be justified under very limited and strictly defined conditions.

Therefore, this discourse demonstrates that *siyāsah dauliyah* holds significant relevance in analyzing and critically assessing contemporary global conflicts. The normative method offers an evaluative framework for international relations practices as well as a more ethical and sustainable alternative. Criticism of militarized approaches suggests that the prevailing paradigm must shift from power-centered logic toward a greater emphasis on justice and humanity. In this

[49]H. Hakim and S. Gholami, "Ethics in International Relations," *Humanities and Social Sciences. Bulletin of the Financial University* 14, no. 2 (2024), p. 56–59.

[50]Thomas G. Weiss and Ramesh Thakur, *Global Governance and the UN: An Unfinished Journey* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2010), p. 78.

[51]Barbara F. Walter, Lise Morje Howard, and V. Page Fortna, "The Extraordinary Relationship between Peacekeeping and Peace," *British Journal of Political Science* 51, no. 4 (2021), p. 1705–22.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

context, integrating the principles of *fiqh siyasah* into global diplomatic practice can serve as a strategic step toward achieving a more just and peaceful world.

Strategic Role of Indonesia in Global Peace Diplomacy

Indonesia's strategic role in global peace diplomacy cannot be separated from the foundation of its *free and active* foreign policy, which was originally designed as a response to an imbalanced global power configuration. This principle not only reflects a pragmatic political choice but also contains a normative dimension that positions Indonesia as an actor committed to international justice and peaceful conflict resolution.

Mochtar Kusumaatmadja emphasizes that Indonesia's foreign policy should be directed toward creating a world order based on independence, enduring peace, and social justice.[52] This view demonstrates that Indonesia's diplomatic orientation is not solely based on narrow national interests, but also on a moral responsibility as part of the international community. From the perspective of international law, this approach strengthens Indonesia's position as a country that upholds the principles of peaceful coexistence and the peaceful settlement of disputes as stipulated in the Charter of the United Nations.[53]

Conceptually, the free and active foreign policy provides Indonesia with strategic flexibility to avoid being trapped in great power rivalries, while simultaneously enabling active engagement in various peace initiatives. In international relations literature, this position is often categorized as *middle power diplomacy*, in which a middle-capacity state leverages its normative legitimacy and diplomatic capabilities to mediate conflicts and build consensus.[54] In this context, Indonesia does not possess dominant military or economic power, but it has normative capital in the form of credibility as a democratic, pluralistic country with a moderate Muslim-majority population. This serves as an important asset in building trust among conflicting parties, particularly in conflicts involving ideological and religious dimensions.

Indonesia's diplomatic efforts in recent years show a growing tendency toward an expanded role in global peace issues. Indonesia has consistently participated in United Nations peacekeeping missions and is one of the largest contributors among developing countries. In addition, Indonesia is active in various multilateral forums such as ASEAN, G20, and the Organisation of Islamic

[52]Mochtar Kusumaatmadja and Etty R. Agoes, *Pengantar hukum internasional*, Ed. 2., cet. 1, with Indonesia (Bandung: Pusat Studi Wawasan Nusantara, Hukum dan Pembangunan bekerjasama dengan Penerbit P.T. Alumni, 2003), p. 18.

[53] Mangisi Simanjuntak, "Penyelesaian Sengketa Batas Laut Antara Indonesia Dengan Negara-Negara Tetangga Ditinjau Dari Konvensi Pbb Tahun 1982 Tentang Hukum Laut (UNCLOS 1982), p." *Honeste Vivere* 34, no. 2 (2024), p. 176–96.

[54]Jeffrey Robertson, "Middle-Power Definitions: Confusion Reigns Supreme," *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 71, no. 4 (2017), p. 355–70.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

Cooperation, where it plays a role in promoting dialogue and cross-border cooperation.[55] In this regard, Indonesia develops a diplomatic approach that integrates formal channels (*track one diplomacy*) with informal approaches (*track two diplomacy*), including interfaith dialogue and the involvement of civil society actors.[56] This approach enhances the effectiveness of Indonesia's diplomacy in building trust and reducing tensions.

However, the effectiveness of Indonesia's diplomacy cannot be separated from various structural and political challenges. In the context of global conflicts such as tensions in the Middle East, Indonesia's engagement is often constrained by geographical factors, limited political influence, and the complexity of conflicts involving major powers. Although Indonesia possesses strong normative credibility, its capacity to influence conflict outcomes remains relatively limited compared to major powers.[57] This indicates a gap between Indonesia's normative potential and its material capacity in diplomacy.

Nevertheless, Indonesia's potential as a conflict mediator remains significant, particularly when viewed from a constructivist perspective that emphasizes the importance of identity and norms in international relations. Indonesia can act as a *norm entrepreneur* by promoting values of moderation, tolerance, and dialogue as alternatives to confrontational approaches. In this context, Hikmahanto Juwana argues that Indonesia has strong potential to serve as a mediator because it does not have direct interests in many global conflicts, allowing it to maintain a neutral and credible position.[58] This position enables Indonesia to bridge differing interests and build constructive communication between conflicting parties.

Furthermore, countries with the identity of moderate Muslim democracies have an advantage in mediating conflicts involving religious and identity dimensions, as they are able to offer approaches that are more inclusive and sensitive to local values.[59] In this regard, Indonesia holds a unique position that is not shared by many other countries, enabling it to act as a bridge between the Western world and the Islamic world. However, to fully maximize this potential, Indonesia needs to strengthen its diplomatic capacity, including by

[55]Khoirunnisa Khoirunnisa and Didi Jubaidi, "Soft Power Strategy: The Role of Indonesia's Diplomacy in the Peace Mission to the Russian-Ukraine Conflict," *Papua Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations* 4, no. 1 (2024), p. 49–66.

[56]Ridwan Ridwan, Djayadi Hanan, and Tri Sulistianing Astuti, "Examining New Public Diplomacy and Interfaith Dialogue in Indonesia: Cases of World Peace Forum (WPF) and Religion Twenty (R20), p." *Studia Islamika* 31, no. 3 (2024), p. 477–510.

[57]I. Gede Wahyu Wicaksana, "Indonesia's Foreign Policy: The Need for a New Approach," *Southeast Asian Affairs* 2023, no. 1 (2023), p. 136–46.

[58]Hikmahanto Juwana, *Hukum Internasional Dalam Perspektif Indonesia Sebagai Negara Berkembang* (Jakarta: Yarsif Watampone, 2010), p. 92.

[59]Amanda tho Seeth, "Indonesia's Islamic Peace Diplomacy: Crafting a Role Model for Moderate Islam," *GIGA Focus Asia* 2 (2023), p. 1–11.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

improving the quality of human resources, expanding diplomatic networks, and ensuring consistency in foreign policy implementation.

Critically, Indonesia's role in global peace diplomacy lies at the intersection between substantial normative potential and real structural constraints. On the one hand, the free and active principle provides a strong foundation for Indonesia's active engagement in global conflict resolution. On the other hand, without adequate material capacity and an integrated strategy, this role risks becoming merely symbolic. Therefore, efforts are needed to integrate normative approaches with more pragmatic strategies, so that Indonesia does not only function as a moral actor but also as an effective actor capable of influencing global conflict dynamics.

Conclusion

This study shows that the conflict between the United States, Israel, and Iran is not merely a manifestation of geopolitical rivalry, but also reflects a broader ethical crisis in contemporary international relations. The dynamics of the conflict—marked by military escalation, security dilemmas, and ideologically constructed identities—demonstrate that power-based approaches alone are insufficient to explain or resolve global conflicts. These findings confirm that international instability is driven not only by the distribution of power, but also by the failure to integrate moral and humanitarian values into global political practice. In this regard, *fiqh siyasah*, particularly the concept of *siyāsah dauliyah*, proves to be an important normative framework for contemporary international relations. With principles such as justice (*'adl*), public interest (*maṣlaḥah*), peace (*ṣulḥ*), and civilian protection, the Islamic political tradition offers an approach that is not only ethical but also compatible with contemporary international legal standards. *Fiqh siyasah* positions peace as the primary objective and the use of force as a highly restricted last resort, whereas realist paradigms tend to normalize conflict as an inevitable condition. Therefore, global discourse can become more just and inclusive if these principles are integrated into the practice of international relations.

This study also highlights Indonesia's strategic role in global peace diplomacy. Indonesia holds a unique position as a relatively independent and credible international actor, supported by its free and active foreign policy doctrine. Its consistent commitment to peaceful conflict resolution is reflected in its participation in multilateral forums, peacekeeping missions, and dialogue initiatives. Moreover, Indonesia's identity as a moderate and democratic Muslim-majority country provides additional opportunities to act as a mediator in conflicts involving religious and ideological dimensions. To ensure the effectiveness of this role, strengthening diplomatic capacity and developing more integrated strategic frameworks are essential. Based on these findings, future research should develop an operational model of *siyāsah dauliyah* for contemporary diplomacy through

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

focused case studies and empirical analysis. Comparative studies between *fiqh siyasah* and international relations theories are also needed to identify areas of convergence and integration. Additionally, evaluating Indonesia's foreign policy in global conflicts can help assess the practical implementation of normative values. Overall, this study contributes both theoretically and practically to the pursuit of a more just and peaceful world order.

References

Journals and Books

Al-Dawoody, Ahmed. "Islamic Law and International Humanitarian Law: An Introduction to the Main Principles." *International Review of the Red Cross* 99, no. 906 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383118000310.

Al-Shamari, Nayef. "Islamic Paradigm of International Relations in Times of Peace and Conflict: A Conceptual Framework." *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization* 14, no. 1 (June 2024). https://doi.org/10.32350/jitc.141.03.

Anwar, Dewi Fortuna. "Indonesia and the ASEAN Outlook on the Indo-Pacific." *International Affairs* 96, no. 1 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iiz223.

Asakir, Ibnu, and Hikmat Zakky Almubaroq. "The Indonesian Defense Management Concept In Resolving The Israel-Palestine Conflict." *International Journal Of Humanities Education and Social Sciences (IJHESS)* 3, no. 6 (June 2024). https://doi.org/10.55227/ijhess.v3i6.1111.

Auda, Jasser. *Maqasid Al-Shari'ah as Philosophy of Islamic Law*. London: International Institute of Islamic Thought (IIIT), 2022.

Bowen, Glenn A. "Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method." *Qualitative Research Journal* 9, no. 2 (2009). https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027.

Buzan, Barry, and Ole Wæver. *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*. 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511491252.

Center for Preventive Action. "Iran's War With Israel and the United States." Global Conflict Tracker, 2026. https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/confrontation-between-united-states-and-iran.

Colgan, Jeff D. "Oil, Domestic Politics, and International Conflict." *Energy Research & Social Science* 1 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2014.03.005.

Cordesman, Anthony H. "The Changing Gulf Balance and the Iranian Threat." *Center for Strategic and International Studies* (Washington D.C), 2016. https://www.csis.org/analysis/changing-gulf-balance-and-iranian-threat.

Correspondents, Guardian. "How the Iran War Has Sent Shocks Rippling across the Globe." World News. *The Guardian*, March 20, 2026.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

https://www.theguardian.com/world/2026/mar/20/iran-war-shocks-across-globe-effects-key-takeaways.

Creswell, John W. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2014.

Dannhauer, Pia. "Elite Role Conceptions and Indonesia's Agency in the ASEAN Outlook on the Indo-Pacific: Reclaiming Leadership." *The Pacific Review* 37, no. 1 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1080/09512748.2022.2125999.

Doyle, Michael W. *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism*. New York: W W Norton & Co Inc, 1997.

Ehteshami, Anoush, and Mahjoob Zweiri. *Iran and the Rise of Its Neoconservatives: The Politics of Tehran's Silent Revolution*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2007. https://durham-repository.worktribe.com/output/1126769/iran-and-the-rise-of-its-neoconservatives-the-politics-of-tehrans-silent-revolution.

Euben, Roxanne L. "Comparative Political Theory: An Islamic Fundamentalist Critique of Rationalism." *The Journal of Politics* 59, no. 1 (February 1997): 28–55. https://doi.org/10.2307/2998214.

Fadl, Khaled Abou El. *Speaking in God's Name: Islamic Law, Authority and Women*. 48952nd edition. Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2001.

Firdous, Qudsia, and Muhammad Zahid Yasin. "Integrating Islamic Ethical Perspectives with Modern Conflict Resolution and Professional Ethics: A Framework for Multicultural Workplaces." *Social Sciences & Humanity Research Review* 3, no. 2 (June 2025). https://doi.org/10.63468/sshrr.006.

Flick, Uwe. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Fifth edition. Los Angeles, Calif.: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2014.

Gilley, Bruce, and Andrew O'Neil, eds. *Middle Powers and the Rise of China*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2014.

Hakim, H., and S. Gholami. "Ethics in International Relations." *Humanities and Social Sciences. Bulletin of the Financial University* 14, no. 2 (2024). https://doi.org/10.26794/2226-7867-2024-14-2-56-59.

Halliday, Fred. *The Middle East in International Relations: Power, Politics and Ideology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Hamidullah, Muhammad. *The Prophet's Establishing a State and His Succession*. 1st ed. Islamabad, Pakistan: Pakistan Hijra Council, 1988.

Hinnebusch, Raymond. *The International Politics of the Middle East:* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018. https://doi.org/10.7765/9781526137760.

Howard, Nathan. "The Iran War's Global Economic Impact." Council on Foreign Relations, March 20, 2026. https://www.cfr.org/articles/the-iran-wars-global-economic-impact.

Hu, Xiaoxiao, Ling He, and Qi Cui. "How Do International Conflicts Impact China's Energy Security and Economic Growth? A Case Study of the US

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

Economic Sanctions on Iran." *Sustainability* 13, no. 12 (June 2021). https://doi.org/10.3390/su13126903.

Jervis, Robert. "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma." *World Politics* 30, no. 2 (1978): 167–214. https://doi.org/10.2307/2009958.

Juneau, Thomas. "Iran's Policy towards the Houthis in Yemen: A Limited Return on a Modest Investment." *International Affairs* 92, no. 3 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.12599.

Juwana, Hikmahanto. *Hukum Internasional Dalam Perspektif Indonesia Sebagai Negara Berkembang*. Jakarta: Yarsif Watampone, 2010.

Kalyvas, Stathis N. *The Logic of Violence in Civil War*. 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511818462.

Kamali, Mohammad Hashim. *Maqasid Al-Shariah Made Simple*. Kuala Lumpur: International Institute of Islamic Thought (IIIT), 2008.

———. *Shari'ah Law: An Introduction*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2008.

Kamali, Mohammad Hashim, and Tariq Ramadan. *The Middle Path of Moderation in Islam: The Qur'anic Principle of Wasatiyyah*. New York (N. Y.): Oxford University Press, 2015.

Karingayi, Thaha Hamdan. "Islamic Political Thought and The Crisis of Global Governance: Towards a Non-Western Theory of Order." *International Journal of Islamic Khazanah* 15, no. 1 (2025). https://doi.org/10.15575/ijik.v15i1.49657.

Keohane, Robert O. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Khadduri, Majid. *War and Peace in the Law of Islam*. Lawbook Exchange ed., [Reprinted]; [Nachdr. der Ausg. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1955. Clark, NJ: Lawbook Exchange, 2010.

Khoirunnisa, Khoirunnisa, and Didi Jubaidi. "Soft Power Strategy: The Role of Indonesia's Diplomacy in the Peace Mission to the Russian-Ukraine Conflict." *Papua Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations* 4, no. 1 (2024). https://doi.org/10.31957/pjdir.v4i1.3447.

Kusumaatmadja, Mochtar, and Etty R. Agoes. *Pengantar hukum internasional*. Ed. 2., cet. 1. With Indonesia. Bandung: Pusat Studi Wawasan Nusantara, Hukum dan Pembangunan bekerja sama dengan Penerbit P.T. Alumni, 2003.

Leifer, Michael. *Indonesia's Foreign Policy*. London ; Boston: Published for the Royal Institute of International Affairs by Allen & Unwin, 1983.

Mawardi, Imam al-. *Al-Ahkam al-Sulthaniyyah*. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah, 1996.

Mearsheimer, John J., and Stephen M. Walt. *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2008.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

Muhsin, Ali, et. al, "Realisasi Identitas Politik Luar Negeri Indonesia Sebagai 'Peace Maker' Melalui Constructive Engagement Dalam Konflik Rohingya." *SOSMANIORA: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora* 4, no. 1 (2025). https://doi.org/10.55123/sosmaniora.v4i1.4787.

Musyaffa A, M. Ganesh, Priyanto Suharto, and Suhirwan Suhirwan. "A Study of Indonesian Perspectives on the Future of the South China Sea: Navigating the Dynamics of Asymmetric Warfare." *Journal on Education* 6, no. 2 (2024). https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v6i2.5087.

Pakarti, Muhammad Husni Abdulah, et. al, "Application of Legal Maxims In Contract Law: Pacta Sunt Servanda and Islamic Rules on Promises." *Lex Scientia Law Review* 9, no. 1 (2025). https://doi.org/10.15294/lslr.v9i1.20858.

Parsi, Trita. *Losing an Enemy: Obama, Iran, and the Triumph of Diplomacy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017.

Pinfold, Rob Geist, Clive Jones, and Anoushiravan Ehteshami. "Collision Course: How Iran and Israel Brought the Middle East to the Brink of War." *Global Policy* 16, no. 2 (May 2025). https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.70004.

Pogge, Thomas W. *World Poverty and Human Rights*. Cambridge Malden: Polity, 2013.

Putra, Bama Andika, et. al, "Middle Power Norm Entrepreneur: Indonesia's Advocacy of the ASEAN Indo-Pacific Outlook." *Sage Open* 14, no. 4 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241302149.

Ranjbar, Daniyal, et. al, "Positive Peace in the Islamic Perspective of International Relations: The Case of Iran's Foreign Policy." *Vestnik RUDN. International Relations* 23, no. 2 (2023). https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-0660-2023-23-2-278-295.

Ridwan, Ridwan, et. al, "Examining New Public Diplomacy and Interfaith Dialogue in Indonesia: Cases of World Peace Forum (WPF) and Religion Twenty (R20)." *Studia Islamika* 31, no. 3 (2024). https://doi.org/10.36712/sdi.v31i3.38376.

Robertson, Jeffrey. "Middle-Power Definitions: Confusion Reigns Supreme." *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 71, no. 4 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1080/10357718.2017.1293608.

Roomi, Farshad. "The Iran-Israel Conflict: An Ultra-Ideological Explanation." *Middle East Policy* 30, no. 2 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1111/mepo.12687.

Rusdi, Muhammad, et. al, "Islam and the Ethics of War: Deconstructing Jihad through the Principle of Humanism in Theological Discourses." *Pharos Journal of Theology* 105, no. 5 (2024). https://doi.org/10.46222/pharosjot.105.57.

Sachedina, Abdulaziz. "Islamic Ethics and the Genome Question." *Journal of Islamic Studies* 32, no. 1 (January 2021): 153–56. https://doi.org/10.1093/jis/etaa034.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

Securities, PT Indo Premier. "Middle East war: global economic fallout." IPOTNEWS, March 23, 2026. https://www.indopremier.com/ipotnews/newsDetail.php?jdl=Middle_East_war__global_economic_fallout&news_id=1724214&group_news=ALLNEWS&news_date=&taging_subtype=KOMODITAS&name=&search=y_general&q=West Texas Intermediate, brent, wti, &halaman=1.

Seeth, Amanda tho. "Indonesia's Islamic Peace Diplomacy: Crafting a Role Model for Moderate Islam." *GIGA Focus Asia* 2 (2023). https://doi.org/10.57671/GFAS-23022.

Setiawati, Siti Mutiah. "The Role of Indonesian Government in Middle East Conflict Resolution: Consistent Diplomacy or Strategic Shifts?" *Frontiers in Political Science* 6 (March 2024). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2024.1304108.

Shaybānī, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan. *The Islamic Law of Nations: Shaybānī's Siyar*. Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

Simanjuntak, Mangisi. "Penyelesaian Sengketa Batas Laut Antara Indonesia Dengan Negara-Negara Tetangga Ditinjau Dari Konvensi Pbb Tahun 1982 Tentang Hukum Laut (UNCLOS 1982)." *Honeste Vivere* 34, no. 2 (July 2024): 176–96. https://doi.org/10.55809/hv.v34i2.341.

Stewart M. Patrick. "Good Enough Global Governance." Council on Foreign Relations, January 6, 2014. https://www.cfr.org/articles/good-enough-global-governance.

Tahboub, Naser M., and Muhammad Ihsan Sandjaya. "Reshaping the Middle East: Exploring the New Balance of Power and the Decline of U.S. Influence." *Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences* 53, no. 1 (2026). https://doi.org/10.35516/Hum.2025.7836.

Taimiyah, Syakhul Islam Ibn. *Al-siyasah al-shar'iyyah fi Islah al-ra'i wa al-ra'iyyah*. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr al-Lubnani, 1992.

Walt, Stephen M. *The Hell of Good Intentions: America's Foreign Policy Elite and the Decline of U.S. Primacy*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2018.

Walter, Barbara F, et. al, "The Extraordinary Relationship between Peacekeeping and Peace." *British Journal of Political Science* 51, no. 4 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712342000023X.

Waltz, Kenneth N. *Theory of International Politics*. 1st ed. Boston, Mass: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Walzer, Michael. *Just And Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument With Historical Illustrations*. New York: Basic Books, 2006.

Wang, Yaohui, et. al, "Is High-Intensity Conflict Escalation Inevitable in the Future? A Two-Level Game Analysis on the Causes of US-Iran Risky Rivalry." *European Journal of Futures Research* 12, no. 1 (September 2024). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-024-00239-z.

DOI: 10.22373/7racgc30

Weiss, Thomas G., and Ramesh Thakur. *Global Governance and the UN: An Unfinished Journey*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2010.

Wendt, Alexander. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge Studies in International Relations 67. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Wicaksana, I. Gede Wahyu. "Indonesia's Foreign Policy: The Need for a New Approach." *Southeast Asian Affairs* 2023, no. 1 (2023): 136–46. https://muse.jhu.edu/pub/70/article/895951.

Yani, Yanyan Mochamad. "Change And Continuity In Indonesian Foreign Policy." *Sosiohumaniora* 11, no. 1 (2009). https://doi.org/10.24198/sosiohumaniora.v11i1.5575.

Zed, Mestika. *Metode Penelitian Kepustakaan*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia, 2004.