

# Leadership without protocol

## A world in disorder



By Kamran Yeganegi  
Foreign policy expert

OPINION  
EXCLUSIVE

At the dawn of the 21st century, we face a world more interconnected, vulnerable, and in need of clear rules and responsible leadership than ever before. However, what we are witnessing in reality is a divergence from the very principles upon which modern civilization was built: multilateralism, respect for national sovereignty, diplomacy over violence, and predictability in the behavior of statesmen. Today, we clearly observe a form of leadership failure on the global stage — a failure stemming less from a lack of resources or external threats, and more from the presence of leaders who distance themselves from the protocols of international politics and sometimes deliberately undermine the rules of the global game.

The international order, though always relative and fraught with tensions, was built over the past decades on a minimal consensus among countries regarding fundamental principles. This order was born of bloody wars, difficult treaties, and decades of humanity's harsh experience in an insecure world. Yet, when leaders consciously or carelessly disregard these frameworks and reduce politics to personal preferences, media spectacle, or partisan competition, the outcome is nothing but global instability, weakening of multilateral institutions, and the spread of crises from one point to another.

This phenomenon is clearly visible in the conduct of some of today's prominent leaders — those whose decisions do not emerge from the think tanks of expert institutions, but rather from immediate impulses, digital polls, or instant reactions to events. A president who changes his rhetoric daily, violates his country's official positions with an unpremeditated tweet, or considers contradictory statements a sign of tactical intelligence, does not draw new boundaries in politics but rather erodes the public trust both domestically and internationally.

In such an environment, diplomatic wisdom gives way to political narcissism; negotiation does not replace confrontation but becomes merely a tool to manage appearances; and instability is not an unintended consequence but part of a conscious strategy



US President Donald Trump (R) signs a series of executive orders at the White House on January 20, 2025, the day of his inauguration.

JABIN BOTSFORD/  
THE WASHINGTON POST



A president who changes his rhetoric daily, violates his country's official positions with an unpremeditated tweet, or considers contradictory statements a sign of tactical intelligence, does not draw new boundaries in politics but rather erodes the public trust both domestically and internationally.

by leaders who accept order only insofar as it serves their immediate interests.

Gaza today is the tangible embodiment of this international disorder — where massive military attacks, the killing of civilians, and the destruction of vital infrastructure occur with almost no political consequences for the perpetrators. The world watches but does nothing because the language of power has replaced the language of law. Syria, from another perspective, is suffering chronic instability fueled by multilayered interventions, proxy competitions, and the failure of international organizations to manage complex internal crises. However, the root causes of these crises lie not only in the region's geopolitical structure or colonial legacy. A significant part stems from the absence of ethical lead-

ership at the global level — a void that has allowed states to violate their neighbors' borders without shame or fear of punishment, disregard national sovereignty, and turn international law into a tool for short-term security interests. When the Security Council remains silent in the face of such conduct, or great powers engage in blatant double standards, confidence in the global order collapses, yielding a kind of anarchy that is not theoretical, but the everyday reality of state actions.

Meanwhile, the decline in the authority of multilateral institutions such as the United Nations, the Security Council, and even international courts is not only the result of state pressures but also the consequence of a collective lack of will to restore the legitimate authority of these

bodies. These organizations, created to safeguard peace, justice, and global security, now face internal threats stemming from world leaders' disregard for recommendations, resolutions, and legal norms.

So, what is the way out of this deadlock? Undoubtedly, a return to politics based on rules rather than individual wills is essential. The world needs a redefinition of leadership in the 21st century — leadership founded not on media hype but on the credibility of institutions, historical experience, and sincerity in words and actions. We need statesmen who have the capacity to listen, not just to speak; who understand the difference between tactics and instability, and between flexibility and opportunism.

Leadership without protocol may yield short-term gains, but

these are built on the destruction of long-term relations, the erosion of public trust, and the instability of the global system. The experience of the 20th century has shown that whenever the world strays from the path of rationality, disaster follows. If we do not learn from history, we are doomed to repeat it — this time perhaps at even greater cost.

In conclusion, what is taking shape today is not a more just, secure, or sustainable world, but a more chaotic, unstable, and dangerous one — a world where the illusion of individual-centric leadership casts a shadow over the reality of collective diplomacy. Rebuilding this world requires a return to simple but vital principles: honesty, commitment, order, and above all, leadership based on ethics and law.



Israel's Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu (R) addresses the 79th session of General Assembly of the United Nations on September 27, 2024. Empty seats can be seen after most delegates walked out.

UN

## Criticizing Netanyahu moral obligation, not anti-Semitism



By Christopher Leonard  
Founder, CEO of OMG Media Partners

OPINION

In the months since October 7, 2023, when Hamas carried out an attack on Israeli civilians, the world has watched in growing horror as the Israeli cabinet — led by Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu — has unleashed a campaign of destruction across the Gaza Strip that has few modern parallels. Entire families

wiped out. Schools and hospitals reduced to rubble. Aid convoys bombed. Journalists silenced. Over 65,000 Palestinians killed, the vast majority of them women and children, according to the United Nations and humanitarian groups.

And yet, as calls for accountability and restraint rise, Netanyahu's response has been consistent and cynical: Any criticism of Israel is labeled "anti-Semitism". This is not only intellectually dishonest — it's dangerous. It cheapens the real, rising threat

of anti-Semitism globally by weaponizing it as a political shield for a cabinet engaging in what many experts now consider war crimes.

Let me be clear: Anti-Semitism is real. It is a hatred that has haunted Jewish communities for centuries and led to unimaginable atrocities, including the Holocaust. But the demand for human rights and dignity for Palestinians is not born from that hatred — it is born from the very lessons that the Holocaust taught the world.

What Netanyahu's cabinet is doing in Gaza — dehumanizing a civilian population, forcing displacement, destroying infrastructure, and killing indiscriminately — is not a defense of the Jewish people. It is a betrayal of Jewish values, international law, and basic human decency.

Many Jewish voices, both in Israel and around the world, have been among the most courageous in speaking out against this violence. Organizations like Jewish Voice for Peace, Breaking the Silence, and thousands

of Israeli and diaspora Jews have risked censure to declare: "Not in our name." These are not self-hating Jews. These are people who understand that silence in the face of injustice is complicity.

And yet Netanyahu clings to the narrative that he — and he alone — represents the Jewish people. He does not. He represents a right-wing cabinet clinging to power through fear, division, and war. A cabinet that has made permanent occupation its policy. That has expanded

settlements in violation of international law. That has rejected every viable path to peace and a two-state solution.

What we are witnessing is not an age-old ethnic or religious conflict. It is the logical endgame of a decades-long system of apartheid and impunity. And the world is finally beginning to say so.

That is not anti-Semitism. That is moral clarity.

The article first appeared on JudgeNap.com.