

**The Neo-Internationalism:
Global Security, Democracy and Interventionism after 9/11**

Nassim Yaziji

(Comments are welcome)

www.yaziji.org
info@yaziji.org

CHANGING REALITY

After 9/11, the international system underwent a serious failure as regards the global security and international stability when the world's first power became under untraditional attack followed by many other similar attacks throughout the world. The international dangers and threats took a different nature blowing up the so-thought international security after the end of the Cold War. This incident indicates a new nature of the international dangers and threats exceeds the "state borders" and the related international norms and standards. The new nature and scope of the international dangers, represented by the international terror and its nourishing structure and environments around the world, imposed a necessary re-identifying of the "international border" and "state border" as the defense line in terms of international relations, politics and homeland security.

The Westphalian international system drove the international border towards 'closure' on the basis of the ultimate responsibility of the state, guarded by the norm of sovereignty. Currently, should the state began losing this responsibility due to many factors, many describe them with globalization, and the trans-border terror is one clear example of this diminished responsibility, the international border would be driven towards 'openness' by the international practice.

Hence, these changing realities in addition to the new realities, threats and insecurity on the interconnected global-local scene will lay themselves on the international politics, and consequently affect foreign policies and strategies in a direct way. The perception of threats and dangers has fundamentally changed after the September 11, which changed the insight into the world relations and politics in addition to the international perspective of security and its applied policies. What was acceptable before 9/11 is not so after 9/11.

THE IRAQ QUESTION

The WMD are a critical issue in the international politics and that is the case in the Iraqi question. The U.S.-led international community could not tolerate the proliferation of WMD and their possession by rogue regimes, especially after the

incidents of 9/11 due to the natural connection and interests between the various totalitarian entities in face of the western democratic world.

The American administration of President George W. Bush, which waged the war on terror, has recognized the question of the Iraqi WMD as a real threat to the U.S. national security and international security in light of the entrance of non-state actors in the international scene that may benefit from rogue states' capabilities, and therefore it considered this question intolerable anymore. Given the Iraqi unconvincing and elusive compliance with the international inspection and the UN relevant resolutions, this situation became an international issue and a dispute with the government of Iraq.

The resolution of this dispute could be achieved by many ways functioning in international politics, including the resort to force. Nothing yet is extraordinary in the conventional international politics, but a question should arise while considering the war's goal that is not about ensuring the full Iraqi compliance with the international inspection and the relevant international resolutions, but rather is to overthrow the Iraqi regime and change the governing system in Iraq. Then we could perceive a new dimension in tackling this international dispute; this dimension could be characterized as extraordinary in international politics apart from the motives and reasons of the American course of action on Iraq that I believe them to be of strategic and geopolitical nature.

A NEW DIMENSION

This dispute was supposed to be just ended by achieving the full and strict compliance of the Iraqi government with the U.N. inspection to dismantle any program or stockpiles of WMD regardless of the means by which this objective was realized, which might include the resort to war through a self or collective-defense measures.

The government of Iraq and the way of governing Iraq are domestic issues and the current international system immunizes them from the foreign intervention. The immunity of the state in its domestic affairs is maintained by the norm of sovereignty,

which is the basis of Westphalian international system, the modern age's form and structure of the international relations.

Although this system was evolved by the humanitarian intervention in the 1990s, which was unfortunately characterized as exceptional, selective, undefined and lacking in international legislation, the classical 'state sovereignty' norm is still the basic ground of the international system. This is simply because of two reasons. Firstly, states are reluctant to abandon any of their powers to a supranational entity when they are not enforced to do so; and secondly, there is no available realistic alternative international system supported and maintained by the world's leading powers.

The objective of overthrowing a governing regime has the full international recognition and replacing, consequently, the governing system of a nation-state exceeds the current norms and standards of the conventional international conduct. The conduct on Iraq would not be recognized or acknowledged by the current international norms, and even, someone could consider it as a breach of a country's sovereignty by interfering in the domestic affairs of an independent U.N.-member country.

This course of action, inspired and oriented by the United States and carried out by a US-led international coalition, has produced a new aspect in the international politics. In addition, it implies, in parallel, a new perspective of the 'foreign policy,' demonstrated in separating the state and the regime in authoritarian and totalitarian countries. This original idea of separation can explain this unprecedented international course in dealing with the Iraqi question. Overthrowing the Iraqi regime indicates that the United States was not considering this question traditionally, then acted towards the Iraqi regime not towards the state of Iraq. This indicates an unprecedented discrimination between the country and the regime in the US-led coalition's reaction against the Iraqi behavior. This reflects a qualitative change in the international relations of post-9/11 world.

THE IDENTIFICATION QUESTION

Exceeding the international system's norms with an unconventional act always needs a philosophical or ideological justification carries a moral appeal to be adopted by an international power or group of powers. Thus, the 1990s international intervention has been justified by the morality of universal human rights and international humanitarian duties. However, the humanitarian intervention has not formulated objective standards upon which the humanitarian situation can be identified as deteriorated, and then stipulate the nature and determinants of the required responsive international action. The absence of an agreed-upon international law deals with humanitarian intervention makes the latter subjective and selective in its practice. However, it is difficult to describe the international intervention in Iraq as a humanitarian action belongs to the same category of the international humanitarian activities as known in 1990s. Furthermore, there is nothing in the humanitarian intervention stipulates the democratic intervention in the authoritarian and totalitarian countries.

Another recent development in the international politics is the preemptive strikes approach. This approach was innovated by President Bush's administration after the terrorist attacks of 9/11. In fact, what applies to the humanitarian intervention as regards the absence of evident definition of the related terms and conditions applies also to the preemptive approach. However, the preemptive action could be categorized as a self-defense measure, and the collective action as a collective-security measure, the well-known terms and norms in the organization and institutionalization of 20th century's international relations. Hence, I suggest that the preemptive approach is a post-9/11 timely elaboration of the standing international politics given its very essence as self-defense.

Apart from discussing the preemptive approach, which however lacks the normative definition, I can suggest that the Iraq war does not emanate from the preemptive strikes approach because there was no imminent and direct terrorist danger coming from there. Moreover, the war was deemed related to the WMD issue according to the official declaration in the eve of war, and was preliminarily justified on that basis.

According to the international politics' standing norms, the war on Iraq is neither humanitarian intervention, as practiced in 1990s, nor preemptive. Actually, overthrowing the Iraqi dictatorial totalitarian regime and founding the democratic system in Iraq are untraditional practices in international politics. Hence, this course needs new terms to be described and an original reflection based on a realistic approach more than confining theoretical methodology, especially in light of the failing of typical theories in explaining and predicting the changes in the international relations and politics in the post-Cold War era.

CROSSING 'OLD BORDERS'

We may call this war a 'liberation' taking into account the nature and results of this war and its official name "Operation Iraqi Freedom." This is a new and controversial term to be used within the domain of the international politics, but it is the closest to the essence of this war. This extraordinary international phenomenon urges us to investigate and reflect on its nature and causes in its empirical context to understand its structure and relations.

This action of 'liberation' represents an effect of what I suggest to name the 'Neo-Internationalism'. This 'Neo-Internationalism' was prompted by the context of the post-9/11 world, as a reaction to the new facts of the world when the states find suddenly a new reality about their political borders as the lines of protection of the national territory. These borders became vulnerable to the new kind of threats, which are not from the other states in the classical meaning of the word. When borders cease to be the ultimate protection line or defense line, the state finds itself required to preempt dangers outside. The non-state actors defy the measures of the world of interstate relations. Apart from the classics of the international behavior, the non-state and trans-border threats prompt untraditional perspective in the world affairs, involving a foreign policy employing new measures for non-classical objectives. These measures are relevant to deal with foreign situations that became recently in concern, and are conventionally classified as 'internal affairs' like the governing system, public freedoms and democratic rights.

This post-9/11 global reality urges governments to act globally to ensure their each country's internal safety and national security. The old security policies and measures in the international relations and politics became outmoded and incompatible with the new non-state threats. This new reality would prompt a new discourse in the relations between states, accompanied by a new identification of the 'national interest,' which would include subjects are for a long time categorized within the international relations as 'internal affairs.'

REVIVING 'VALUES' INTERNATIONALLY

The advancement of the 'foreign policy' will be deficient without attaching to essential consideration concerning 'values'. Intrinsically, those values are coming to constitute some basis to states' behavior or policy described above. The meaning and the efficacy of the foreign policy's transformation from the traditional pragmatic shape to the new shape of 'Neo-Internationalism' are depending on the inclusion and the type of the values underlying the foreign policy. Actually, the first of the main qualities of the 'Neo-Internationalism' is the consideration of values in the foreign policy, the matter that was controversial and inapplicable previously.

The border porosity could not be at one side, when the border becomes porous to dangers and threats, it is normal to prompt a reaction on the same way. Then the border would be also porous to some relevant provoked values from outside to be promoted or even imposed internally as a result or reaction. The values to be imposed counter the dangers in this international context, employing the same portal or way—the very state's border, which is not firm anymore as previously in affording the state's internal safety, and also on the other side, in affording the government's exclusive and unquestionable internal mandate.

Those values are considered vital for national interests and security, and must be universal exceed the differences among cultures and national identities, and have the ability to be embodied into an applicable and institutional system. This quality makes this course applicable at the international organization level. In the international practice in the stage of the Iraq war, the value was set to be freedom that could be

embodied into the democratic system and international democratization wave or movement.

DEMOCRATIZING THE WORLD

The adoption of the values of freedom and democracy rests on a conviction by the U.S. Bush administration that the more the world is free and democratic, the more the world is safe, besides that eliminating the authoritarian and despotic regimes and their governance would undermine a basic nourishing environment for terror. In fact, this is, in essence, an adoption of the Democratic Peace Theory provided with a new dimension concerning trans-border and transnational terror.

In elaboration, the support of rogue regimes is a vital factor to the effectiveness and successfulness of the terrorist groups and consequently terrorist actions. The examples in this regard are many from 9/11 attacks to the present terror in Iraq. Furthermore, realizing freedom and democracy in the authoritarian states affects at two levels at first, the democratic freedoms eliminate the nourishing environment of frustration, desperation and political inability at the individual's level. Secondly, the free and democratic societies transparently strive against violence and thereby single out the violent groups and encompass them and their resources in the pursuit of overcoming the political violence that is the incompatible and outlawed means with the democratic system.

The promotion and support of freedom and democracy became an important part in the U.S. foreign policy and the linkage between the democratization and the national security was somehow established. The policy of democratization or democracy's support is the foremost aspect of the era of 'Neo-Internationalism' in the post-9/11 world. The democratic interventionism has the chance to take some room in the post-9/11 international relations, and may fill the gap of the chaos of the post-Cold War international system. Although the policy of democratization is in need of applicable format, plans, effective tools and international acknowledgment to form a systematic effort, this policy or effort as international phenomenon is under way and constitutes a part of the current world politics. The examples of this reality are many from Iraq to

Ukraine including Georgia and Lebanon with particular importance to the Middle East.

As this era of international relations inspires the relevant values underlying the international policies, it also provokes the creation of the relevant and effective means employed by these policies. These means include classic and original ones. The most prominent original means is the suggested preemptive strikes approach discussed above. Another means is the public and explicit pledge of supporting the democratic opposition groups in the authoritarian states. This pledge has been clearly made by the U.S. Bush administration and mainly targets the Middle East undemocratic countries. This pledge is extremely original and in the conventional perspective of the international relations, it could be considered as a breach of the international norms or somehow the international law under the title of intervening in internal affairs. However, the nature of adopted values and their impacts on peoples besides the balance of power and the new international realities in the post-Iraq world attenuate the ability of defying that policy and the related activities.

Moreover, adopting the principle of democratization or democracy promotion worldwide in the foreign policy would give rise to two levels of questioning in front of the decision makers. The first of all is the question on the ways of promoting democracy, in another wording, the fundamental requirements that democracy needs to arise from or to flourish in the countries of concern. The second level of questioning is about applying the findings of the first level questions to the foreign policy; the possibilities and prospects of these findings to be applicable and functioning within and by a foreign policy, which is a practice of the state's international relations. In fact, the first level of inquiry concerns an internal affair or subject, and the second concerns the international side. The feedback and the interaction between the answers and choices of the two levels will give the shape to the democratization policy, and the application will give the structure to the system of the Neo-Internationalism era.

THE INTERNATIONAL IMPLICATION

In spite of the outstanding lacking of clear and effective methods and means of democratization to be employed and applied internationally, there is a noticeable fact could be inferred from the occurrences concerning the democratic revolutions worldwide. This fact has two aspects, the first one is that the public democratic revolutions of the peoples of Georgia, Ukraine, Lebanon and Kyrgyzstan, which prompted the democratic governance or about to, did not wait for the ultimate international efforts and support in this regard; however, the international support was not absent all the way. This concludes that in many cases, the precedence in action was to the domestic side over the international side. Furthermore, the initiative can be taken by the domestic political movements apart from the international agenda, although the international support and the appropriate context is essential, taking into account that all these public movements and revolutions happened shortly after Iraq. This also serves as significant clue to the new realities of the international politics and, to a lesser extent, the international system after Iraq.

The second aspect is the somewhat fast response by the authoritarian regimes of a region constitutes an integrated and flourished environment of authoritarianism that is the Middle East. Those regimes initiated reform initiatives towards more democratic rights and public freedoms to their peoples. Although these initiatives and amendments came modest in most cases, these facts implies that the mere political will and rhetoric of the United States as regards the democracy promotion worldwide has given a relevant context for this objective regardless of the real policy on ground, which is indispensable in the end. In addition, these U.S. political will and rhetoric have inspired many peoples, providing them with a very important factor is the 'political cover' in a genuine interaction between the 'domestic' and the 'international'. It is actually as a prominent leader of the Lebanese public uprising, the Cedar Revolution, in light of assassinations and explosions targeting the uprising and its cadres, said, "We are not alone."

INSTITUTIONALIZING INTERNATIONAL DEMOCRATIZATION

In general, the realities of international politics create and develop the relevant shape of international system, and promote the related and compatible international organization. Nevertheless, it is early to talk about the international system of post-9/11 era. However, there are many signals of its nature and shape through the American initiatives and the way and the nature of the international reaction toward the world issues and affairs, especially in the Middle East.

The United States has acted internationally on several sides. The American party has introduced the democracy-support policy to the United Nation, to the G8 Sea Island Summit in 2004, and to the following NATO's summit in Istanbul besides other actions at the international level. These American initiatives convey an intention to internationally institutionalizing the democracy support policy. In spite of the adoption of the American initiatives by these international bodies, the present international structure, in normal reaction, attenuated these initiatives. However, in result, these initiatives produced unprecedented international official declarations on supporting the notion of democracy promotion worldwide, and in particular, the democratic reform in the Middle East. On the practical side, these initiatives resulted in a formal international endorsement at the G8 Sea Island Summit of practical plans of assistance in the fields of electoral process, education, small business, judicial reform, media, and civil society in the 'Broader Middle East' region.

The international declarations on supporting the democratic reform in the Middle East are original and definitely significant, but the action plan of G8 Sea Island Summit resolution is an extended plan of the same nature of the Middle East Partnership Initiative of the U.S. and the Barcelona Process of EU. The experiment and experience of Barcelona Process is very discouraging with more than a decade of reform-support agenda yielded just cosmetic and non-genuine actions by the involved ruling regimes.

ON DEMOCRATIZATION

The democratization is a process targets, at first, the power structure more than the other factors. The structure of power includes the distribution of power and its limitations, legitimacy and ideology and consequently, with particular concern, the public freedoms in the political society. The key political phenomenon in authoritarian states that must be dealt with by an effective democratization policy is the monopolistic and wide exertion of 'political violence' by authoritarian regimes to maintain their power monopoly and to encompass and paralyze the civil society. This policy by authoritarian governments is due to the fact that the civil society's capabilities and endeavors will be interpreted to a definite transformation in the structure of power towards achieving public freedoms and rights and political participation.

Any real democratization policy should consider a focal fact that the civil society in the authoritarian countries needs, first of all, the 'chance,' which is denied by the authoritarian regimes. Therefore, the assistance programs and plans in the society's capacity building, such as the 'reform-aiming' programs and initiatives by the U.S. and EU so far, are assisting development rather than democratization, without denying the connection between development and democracy.

NEO-INTERNATIONALISM?

The international politics is under evolution through the new emerging dimensions in international relations. This evolving system of international relations is associated with revitalization of 'values' like freedom and democracy in international politics, and untraditional objectives in the 'foreign policy'. This will eventually lead to an advanced and flexible norm of sovereignty.

The renascent Internationalism or 'Neo-Internationalism,' as I would like to name, is an evolved state of international politics after 9/11 in direction of a new system of international relations in which the 'internal affair' became an international concern due to the new state of 'international border,' demonstrated by trans-border terror and

dangers provoking trans-border democratization in a revived context of international concerted interventionism.

Hence, the opportunity is set for the international democratic interventionism to replace the chaotic aspect of the post-Cold War international order towards global security, stability and prosperity through a new international order. Nevertheless, the arising indispensable questioning this regard is would the international order and organization eventually aim democratization as a requirement for international peace and security?

However, there is still a significant indication of the changing international reality came from the Lebanese Cedar Revolution by one of its leaders saying, “We are not alone.”