



Lebanon's National Security

Constitutional Legitimacy and Judicial Independence as Foundational Pillars of National Security!

By
Brigadier General Dr. Riad Shayya

June 2026

Introduction

Over the past decades, the concept of National Security has occupied a central place in political and strategic studies. Traditional approaches to National Security, however, have primarily focused on military capabilities, border protection, and regional and international balances of power. Yet the transformations witnessed across the world, particularly in states suffering from institutional fragility and internal divisions, have demonstrated that National Security cannot be reduced solely to its military dimension. Rather, it extends to encompass political, constitutional, judicial, social, and economic security. In this context, Lebanon represents a particularly complex case of a state facing a structural crisis within its constitutional institutions and a significant decline in the rule of law and judicial independence. This reality has directly affected domestic stability and public confidence in the state.

Since independence, Lebanon has experienced successive political crises. However, recent years have revealed more clearly than ever the extent of the institutional erosion affecting the state. Repeated obstruction of constitutional processes, presidential vacancies, governmental paralysis, selective interpretations of constitutional provisions, and political interference in the judiciary have all contributed to weakening state legitimacy and reducing its ability to exercise authority effectively and fairly. The absence of accountability, the politicization of justice, and the spread of corruption have further undermined citizens' confidence in public institutions, rendering Lebanese stability fragile and vulnerable to disruption whenever political, economic, or security crises arise.

Against this backdrop, the relationship between National Security, constitutional legitimacy, and judicial independence becomes particularly significant. A state that loses respect for its Constitution, or one in which justice becomes a political instrument, becomes incapable of ensuring sustainable security. Genuine security rests not merely on deterrence but on the legitimacy of authority and the confidence of citizens in public institutions. When citizens perceive that the law is applied selectively and that the judiciary is subject to political and sectarian considerations, the concept of citizenship weakens, societal divisions deepen, and both civil peace and national stability are threatened.

This paper seeks to analyze the relationship between constitutional governance, judicial independence, and the sustainability of Lebanese National Security. It examines how constitutional circumvention and political interference in the judiciary contribute to weakening state legitimacy and destabilizing national order. It also explores the reforms required to rebuild confidence in public institutions and strengthen the rule of law as essential pillars of National Security.

a. The Concept of National Security

In the modern era, the concept of National Security is no longer limited to the defense of borders or the confrontation of external military threats. Rather, it has evolved into a comprehensive concept encompassing political, economic, social, and legal dimensions. A state cannot achieve sustainable security if it suffers from institutional collapse or from a loss of political and legal legitimacy.

Today, National Security is understood as the state's capacity to safeguard political stability, preserve national unity, protect the rights of its citizens, and maintain the integrity of its constitutional

institutions. Consequently, the rule of law and judicial independence constitute integral components of the National Security framework, as they ensure the stability of the political system and prevent state fragmentation or descent into disorder.

This reality is particularly significant in states characterized by political and sectarian pluralism, such as Lebanon, where constitutional and judicial institutions serve as the principal guarantors of national equilibrium and civil peace. The absence of a fair legal reference point undermines security, fuels internal conflicts, and encourages reliance on sectarian and partisan loyalties rather than loyalty to the state.

Lebanon's National Security is therefore closely linked to the state's ability to enforce respect for the Constitution, apply laws fairly and equally, and prevent any political actor from exploiting public institutions to advance factional interests at the expense of the national interest. Consequently, the weakness of constitutional and judicial institutions should not be viewed merely as an administrative or political problem; it constitutes a direct threat to National Security.

b. Constitutional Legitimacy as a Pillar of Lebanese National Security

The Constitution constitutes the supreme legal framework that defines the nature and structure of the political system and regulates the functioning of public authorities as well as the relationship between the state and its citizens. It is the primary source from which institutions derive their legitimacy. Respect for the Constitution is therefore a fundamental prerequisite for the stability and continuity of the state.

Constitutional governance entails the subordination of political authority to the Constitution, adherence to the principle of separation of powers, and the exercise of governance within a framework of legal and institutional constraints. It extends beyond the mere existence of a written constitution to encompass the effectiveness of institutions in implementing and respecting constitutional provisions. A state operating under sound constitutional governance secures several elements essential to National Security, including sustainable political legitimacy, orderly transfers of power, the reduction of internal disputes over authority and governance, the prevention of power monopolization, and the avoidance of institutional collapse.

When constitutional rules are respected, the state becomes less vulnerable to internal instability and severe divisions because all actors operate within a framework of clear rules and legitimate institutions. Conversely, when constitutional provisions are suspended or interpreted according to shifting balances of power, the state enters a condition of institutional fragility that gradually erodes its authority and its capacity to manage crises.

In this sense, sustainable National Security requires what may be termed “constitutional security”: the stability of the constitutional order itself and its protection from becoming a permanent arena of conflict among political, sectarian, or military actors.

In Lebanon, the Constitution assumes heightened importance because of the country's pluralistic social structure and the sensitivity of its political and sectarian balances. Following the reforms introduced through the Taëf Accord, the Lebanese Constitution established a framework for political participation and the distribution of powers among state institutions with the objective of safeguarding civil peace and preventing a return to civil war. Nevertheless, practical experience has revealed a significant gap between constitutional texts and political practice. Over the past decades, Lebanon has witnessed repeated disregard for constitutional provisions, as well as attempts to circumvent them through interpretations shaped by political interests and expediency. This has resulted in recurring institutional paralysis, delays in elections, extensions of parliamentary mandates, presidential vacancies, and other practices that stand in contradiction to constitutional principles. This raises a fundamental question: **How does the repeated circumvention of the Constitution, or its selective interpretation, contribute to undermining the legitimacy of the Lebanese state and weakening national security?**

I. Circumvention of the Constitution and the Erosion of State Legitimacy

The repeated circumvention of the Lebanese Constitution, or its selective interpretation according to political and sectarian balances of power, constitutes one of the principal causes of state fragility and a direct threat to National Security. The Constitution does not merely regulate public authorities; it represents the political compact upon which state legitimacy and institutional unity are founded. When this compact becomes subject to suspension, manipulation, or interpretation according to temporary interests, the state enters a condition of chronic weakness that directly affects national stability and undermines citizens' confidence in the state's ability to govern fairly and effectively. State legitimacy derives from adherence to constitutional rules. In Lebanon, repeated violations of constitutional principles and the obstruction of constitutional mechanisms have significantly weakened public confidence in official institutions. Presidential elections have been suspended for prolonged periods; governments have been delayed, overthrown, or obstructed outside normal constitutional procedures; and the work of Parliament and the Council of Ministers has repeatedly been disrupted for political reasons. The problem has not been limited to institutional paralysis. The concept of “consociational legitimacy” or “mithaqiyyah” has often been expanded beyond constitutional limits, while political and at times security power has been used to impose particular constitutional interpretations.

This reality has fostered a widespread perception that actual authority is governed not by constitutional norms but by power balances. As a result, citizens' confidence in the state has declined, while national belonging has increasingly been replaced by sectarian and partisan affiliations. The

repeated obstruction of constitutional processes has entrenched a political culture based on temporary compromises rather than constitutional compliance. Recurring presidential vacancies have demonstrated the fragility of the constitutional system and its inability to enforce constitutional deadlines. Governmental paralysis and the suspension of executive decision-making have disrupted public affairs and diminished state effectiveness. Consequently, constitutional institutions have lost a significant portion of their legitimacy and credibility. Once a state loses its moral legitimacy, its capacity to enforce the law and manage crises becomes severely constrained.

Furthermore, selective constitutional interpretations have generated persistent ambiguity and political instability. Rather than serving as a stable reference point, the Constitution has frequently become itself the subject of political contestation. Instead of functioning as a common framework through which political disputes are resolved, it has increasingly become a source of dispute. This development has weakened the concept of a unified state. Constitutional legitimacy has lost part of its unifying character and has become another arena of political and sectarian conflict. As a consequence, disputes have often moved beyond institutional channels toward sectarian mobilization, security confrontations, and street politics. It is at this stage that National Security begins to erode from within.

II. The Impact of Weak Constitutional Legitimacy on National Security

Weak constitutional legitimacy affects not only political performance but also National Security and social stability. When citizens perceive that institutions do not operate according to the law, confidence in the state declines and feelings of marginalization and injustice increase.

In Lebanon, declining trust in public institutions has reinforced political and sectarian divisions. Many citizens increasingly rely on political parties and sectarian groups for protection and services rather than on state institutions. This reality weakens the concept of citizenship and elevates sub-national loyalties above national allegiance. Weak constitutional legitimacy also reduces the state's capacity to confront crises. A state suffering from political fragmentation and institutional paralysis becomes less capable of making effective decisions in response to economic, social, and security challenges. This phenomenon became particularly evident during Lebanon's economic collapse after 2019. The financial crisis exposed profound institutional deficiencies, a lack of accountability, and weak governance. Likewise, the Beirut Port explosion revealed the inability of the state to manage sensitive national issues in a transparent and effective manner.

Among the most dangerous consequences of weakened constitutional legitimacy is the erosion of the rule of law and the encouragement of dual authority structures. When constitutional violations occur repeatedly without accountability, respect for law diminishes and the perception grows that political or military power is stronger than legal norms. As constitutional decisions become increasingly dependent on political balances, parallel centers of authority emerge within the state whether political, sectarian, security-related, or financial. Such duality constitutes one of the most serious threats to

National Security because it undermines the state's monopoly over the legitimate use of force, weakens sovereign decision-making, and increases vulnerability to external interference.

The constitutional dysfunction produced by repeated constitutional circumvention and selective interpretation fuels sectarian and societal fragmentation through the rise of sectarian discourse and the weakening of a shared national identity. This, in turn, creates conditions conducive to internal conflict. Lebanon's experience demonstrates that when the state is unable to preserve internal cohesion or exercise sovereign authority, an environment emerges in which multiple centers of power, weapons, and decision-making coexist. Under such circumstances, National Security becomes heavily influenced by regional and international rivalries. The gravest consequence of constitutional circumvention is therefore not merely the obstruction of a particular institution or the postponement of a political process. Rather, it is the transformation of the state itself into a fragile entity lacking a unified source of legitimacy. The Constitution provides the framework through which authority derives legitimacy, institutions maintain coherence, and political disputes are prevented from evolving into existential or security conflicts.

For this reason, protecting Lebanese National Security begins with restoring the Constitution as a binding reference for all political actors not as a subject of political bargaining or selective interpretation. A state that is not governed by stable constitutional rules ultimately becomes incapable of protecting either its sovereignty or its long-term stability.

III. Judicial Independence and Its Role in Protecting National Security

An independent judiciary constitutes one of the fundamental pillars of the modern state, as it serves as the principal guarantor of the rule of law and the protection of rights and freedoms. Judicial independence refers to the ability of the judicial authority to perform its functions free from political, partisan, or sectarian pressures, thereby ensuring the fair and impartial administration of justice. The rule of law is founded upon the principle that all individuals, including those who exercise political authority, are subject to the law without exception. It represents a fundamental safeguard against arbitrary governance and against the replacement of legal norms by power politics. Consequently, there can be no genuine rule of law without an independent judiciary.

The importance of judicial independence extends beyond the legal sphere. It also carries significant political and security implications, because justice constitutes the foundation of social stability and public trust in institutions. A state possessing an independent judiciary is better equipped to resolve disputes through legal mechanisms and to prevent political and social disagreements from escalating into conflicts that threaten National Security. This raises a central question: **How does political interference in the judiciary affect citizens' trust, institutional credibility, and the state's ability to achieve justice and stability?**

1. Political Interference in the Judiciary

Political interference in the judiciary represents one of the most serious manifestations of state weakness because it affects the institution that is supposed to serve as the ultimate guarantor of justice and the rule of law. In fragile states, or in societies marked by deep divisions such as Lebanon, the consequences of such interference extend far beyond the judicial process itself. They affect the legitimacy of the political system, citizens' trust in the state, internal stability, and ultimately National Security. The judiciary is not merely an administrative mechanism for resolving disputes. It is the institution that provides citizens with confidence that their rights can be protected within the framework of the state rather than through power, influence, or sectarian affiliations. When judicial independence is compromised, the state begins to lose one of its most important sources of legitimacy. In Lebanon, the judiciary has for years been affected by clear political interventions that have significantly undermined both its independence and effectiveness. Such interventions have appeared in judicial appointments, pressures exerted upon judges, and the obstruction of sensitive investigations involving corruption and major crimes. Recent years have also witnessed a significant decline in public confidence in official institutions as a result of economic, political, and financial crises, as well as the absence of accountability and justice. This situation poses a direct threat to National Security because a state that loses the confidence of its citizens becomes more fragile and less capable of preserving stability. The politicization of the judiciary deprives justice of its neutrality and subjects it to political and sectarian considerations. As a consequence, citizens increasingly perceive that justice is not applied equally but rather according to political or sectarian influence. One of the most prominent examples of this phenomenon has been the repeated obstruction of the investigation into the Beirut Port explosion. Political and legal pressures delayed the investigation for extended periods, negatively affecting the image of the Lebanese state both domestically and internationally while reinforcing citizens' perception that justice remains unattainable. Political interference has also contributed to the spread of corruption and impunity. When accountability mechanisms are weakened, public officials become more willing to abuse authority without fear of legal consequences.

2. The Erosion of Citizens' Trust in the State

Public confidence in state institutions constitutes one of the essential foundations of political and social stability. Citizens who trust their institutions are more likely to respect laws and participate constructively in public life. Conversely, the erosion of institutional trust contributes to declining national belonging, rising sectarian and regional loyalties, and increasing emigration, particularly among young people and highly skilled professionals. Trust in institutions is fundamentally linked to the belief that the law is applied equally and

fairly to all. This principle lies at the heart of a state governed by the rule of law. However, when the judiciary becomes subject to political, sectarian, or financial interference, citizens begin to perceive justice as selective and discriminatory. Such perceptions are reinforced when major investigations are obstructed, influential individuals are shielded from accountability, courts are used against political opponents, judicial appointments are politicized, or judges are pressured and transferred for political reasons. Under these circumstances, citizens lose confidence in the judiciary's ability to protect their rights and provide justice. Many become convinced that influence matters more than law. This is a particularly dangerous development because it encourages individuals and groups to seek protection through sectarian leaders, political organizations, or other alternatives to the state itself. Judicial weakness therefore becomes a direct factor in the erosion of the social contract. An independent judiciary provides the state with both legal and moral credibility. A politicized judiciary, by contrast, transforms institutions into instruments of political conflict. When citizens and the international community observe that investigations are opened or closed according to political considerations, that judgments are influenced by power, or that certain actors remain beyond accountability, confidence in state institutions inevitably declines. This damages the authority of the state, weakens respect for public administration, and ultimately erodes the legitimacy of political authority itself. Moreover, the absence of judicial credibility has serious economic consequences. Investors require a trustworthy judicial system capable of protecting contracts, property rights, and commercial obligations. Without such guarantees, economic recovery and sustainable investment become significantly more difficult.

3. Weakening the State's Capacity to Deliver Justice and Stability

Justice is not merely a matter of issuing judicial rulings; it is a fundamental component of political and social stability. A state that fails to deliver justice loses its ability to contain disputes through peaceful means. When political actors interfere in judicial affairs, accountability is obstructed, impunity becomes widespread, and inequality before the law is reinforced, leaving citizens with a growing sense of injustice and discrimination. This deterioration in the functioning of the state generates dangerous levels of social tension, as citizens increasingly perceive the state as a biased actor rather than an impartial arbiter. In societies characterized by deep divisions, such as Lebanon, this dynamic contributes to the rise of sectarian rhetoric and fuels tendencies toward retaliation and violence. In the absence of justice, conflicts move beyond institutional channels and gravitate toward instability and disorder. Political interference in the judiciary does not merely undermine justice or weaken the legal order; it directly threatens National Security itself. Sustainable security requires a legitimate state capable of enforcing the law equally

and effectively. When judicial independence is compromised, the state's ability to combat corruption diminishes, the prosecution of organized crime becomes less effective, and accountability in major security cases is weakened. Furthermore, a weak judiciary increases the state's vulnerability to external pressures and interventions. The absence of justice creates opportunities for the internationalization of domestic crises and reduces the capacity of national institutions to manage sensitive issues independently. If such conditions persist, networks of mutual political and judicial protection emerge within the state, shielding individuals from accountability. This accelerates the spread of systemic corruption, further weakens public confidence in state institutions, and increases the likelihood of social unrest or security breakdown. Beyond ensuring justice among citizens, one of the primary functions of the modern state is the preservation of stability. The rule of law remains the principal mechanism through which such stability can be achieved. The rule of law requires that all individuals and institutions, including political authorities, remain subject to legal norms without exception. It is one of the essential principles of modern democracy because it guarantees equality before the law and prevents the arbitrary exercise of power. National Security cannot be achieved in the absence of the rule of law. Sustainable stability requires institutions capable of applying the law fairly and effectively. When citizens perceive the state as incapable of protecting them or delivering justice, the legitimacy of the political system declines and the risks of disorder increase.

4. The Impact of Corruption on National Security

Corruption constitutes one of the most serious threats facing Lebanese National Security because it weakens state institutions, drains public resources, and undermines public trust. Corruption is not limited to bribery or financial mismanagement; it also includes the abuse of public authority to advance private interests at the expense of the public good. In Lebanon, systems of corruption and sectarian patronage have contributed to obstructing reforms, weakening public administration, and degrading essential services, thereby intensifying economic and social crises. Corruption also reduces the state's capacity to make effective strategic decisions because institutions become driven by political and sectarian interests rather than by the national interest. This reality has direct consequences for National Security, as the state becomes increasingly incapable of managing crises or confronting domestic and external challenges. The discussion of political interference in the judiciary ultimately leads to a broader conclusion: judicial independence is neither a constitutional luxury nor an elite demand. It is a fundamental condition for the survival of the state itself. A state in which the judiciary loses its neutrality and independence gradually transforms into a state governed by influence rather than law, where justice becomes subject to power relations instead of legal standards. When citizens no longer believe that

the judiciary can protect their rights, they lose confidence in the state itself. Internal stability deteriorates, and institutions become increasingly vulnerable to crises and divisions. For this reason, protecting the judiciary from political interference constitutes a national and strategic imperative. It is directly linked to citizens' trust, the credibility of state institutions, the administration of justice, and the preservation of sustainable National Security. Consequently, there is an urgent need to adopt constitutional and judicial reforms aimed at restoring the rule of law.

IV. Constitutional and Judicial Reforms Required to Restore the Rule of Law in Lebanon

Restoring the rule of law in Lebanon is not merely an administrative or legal reform process. Rather, it constitutes a comprehensive project aimed at rebuilding the state itself as the sole source of authority, legitimacy, and sovereign power. The Lebanese crisis is no longer simply a governmental or economic crisis; it has evolved into a constitutional and institutional crisis that directly affects National Security, as the state's capacity to enforce the law has weakened and multiple centers of decision-making, influence, and armed power have emerged.

Accordingly, any serious approach to Lebanese National Security must begin with constitutional and judicial reforms that restore the primacy of the constitutional state and the rule of law as essential components of long-term national stability.

This section examines the constitutional reforms required, the judicial reforms required, the relationship between these reforms and National Security, and finally the principal challenges facing the reform process.

A. Required Constitutional Reforms

1. Reaffirming the Principle of the State's Exclusive Authority

The state's monopoly over the legitimate use of force and sovereign decision-making constitutes the foundation of any stable constitutional order. Consequently, the first priority of constitutional reform should be: (1) Reaffirming the exclusive authority of the state over security and military decisions (2) Preventing the emergence of parallel authorities operating outside constitutional legitimacy, (3) Strengthening the authority of constitutional institutions in matters of war, peace, and foreign policy. A genuine rule of law cannot be established under conditions of dual authority or competing security and political references.

2. Developing Mechanisms to Prevent Institutional Paralysis

Lebanon's constitutional experience has demonstrated that the current constitutional framework allows prolonged institutional paralysis. Repeated presidential vacancies, delays in government formation, and the obstruction of executive and legislative institutions have revealed structural weaknesses in the constitutional system.

The persistence of constitutional vacancies weakens the state and transforms the political system into a permanent crisis-management structure rather than a functioning constitutional order. To address these shortcomings, reform should include:

- a.** Establishing binding constitutional deadlines for major constitutional processes, including presidential elections, government formation, and parliamentary elections.
- b.** Creating automatic constitutional mechanisms to prevent institutional vacuum.
- c.** Limiting the use of political obstruction as a bargaining tool.

3. Strengthening the Independence of Constitutional and Oversight Institutions

This objective requires:

- a.** Strengthening the Constitutional Council and guaranteeing its genuine independence by expanding its authority to safeguard constitutional compliance and prevent institutional imbalances. Also, restoring its authority to interpret the Constitution, consistent with the constitutional framework established by the Taëf Accord.
- b.** Shielding oversight institutions from political interference.
- c.** Establishing transparent mechanisms for constitutional and administrative accountability. Effective constitutional oversight prevents the concentration of unchecked power and reinforces institutional legitimacy.

4. Gradual Transition from Political Sectarianism to a Citizenship State

Although Lebanon's sectarian system emerged as part of a historical political settlement, its continued operation in its current form has contributed to weakening the central state, institutionalizing patronage, and prioritizing sectarian loyalties over national allegiance. National Security cannot be built upon fragile sectarian balances. Rather, it requires a shared national compact based on citizenship and equal rights. Accordingly, constitutional reform should include: "Establishing the National Committee for the Abolition of Political Sectarianism" as stipulated in Article 95 of the Constitution, strengthening the principle of equal citizenship and building institutions based on merit and competence rather than sectarian allocation. Such reforms would contribute to the development of a stronger constitutional order capable of fostering national cohesion and sustainable security.

B. Required Judicial Reforms

1. Guaranteeing Judicial Independence

Judicial independence is a fundamental prerequisite for rebuilding public trust and ensuring national stability. It represents the cornerstone of the rule of law. This requires:

- a.** Strengthening the role of the High Judicial Council as a genuinely independent institution.
- b.** Protecting the independence of public prosecutors from executive interference.
- c.** Reforming judicial appointment procedures to ensure transparency and prevent political influence.
- d.** Guaranteeing the financial and administrative independence of the judiciary.
- e.** Protecting judges from political pressure and arbitrary dismissal.

2. Combating Impunity

One of the most significant causes of declining confidence in the state is the absence of accountability. States that fail to hold individuals accountable gradually lose legitimacy. Necessary reforms include:

- a.** Lifting unjustified legal immunities.
- b.** Accelerating judicial proceedings in major corruption cases.
- c.** Establishing specialized courts and prosecutorial bodies for financial and administrative crimes.
- d.** Ensuring full equality before the law.

3. Modernizing Judicial and Administrative Structures

Institutional modernization should include:

- a.** Judicial digitalization and automation.
- b.** Accelerating judicial procedures.
- c.** Enhancing judicial training and professional development.
- d.** Improving the living and working conditions of judges.
- e.** Increasing transparency in the publication of judicial decisions and procedures.

V. Challenges Facing Constitutional and Judicial Reform in Lebanon

Despite the importance of constitutional and judicial reforms, their implementation faces a number of complex challenges rooted in the nature of Lebanon's political system. The sectarian power-sharing system subjects many institutions to political calculations and communal balances rather than to standards of merit, efficiency, and institutional effectiveness. Political actors often view the judiciary and constitutional institutions as instruments within broader political struggles rather than as independent authorities that must be protected and preserved. As a result, reform initiatives frequently encounter resistance from vested interests that benefit from maintaining the status quo. In addition, the severe economic and social crises experienced by Lebanon have significantly weakened state institutions and reduced their capacity to undertake meaningful reforms. The financial collapse has increased poverty, unemployment, and emigration rates, while simultaneously diminishing the administrative and financial capabilities necessary to implement institutional change. Regional and international interference in Lebanese affairs constitutes another major obstacle. Internal political divisions are frequently intertwined with broader regional conflicts and geopolitical rivalries, making institutional reform dependent not only on domestic consensus but also on external dynamics. Nevertheless, despite these considerable challenges, reform remains an urgent necessity rather than a secondary policy option. The continuation of current conditions threatens further institutional deterioration, deeper political fragmentation, and a prolonged crisis of state legitimacy.

Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that Lebanese National Security cannot be separated from constitutional legitimacy and judicial independence. A state suffering from institutional paralysis, selective constitutional interpretations, and political interference in the judiciary becomes incapable of ensuring sustainable stability or safeguarding civil peace.

Lebanon's recurring political crises, the absence of accountability, and the erosion of the rule of law have significantly weakened public confidence in state institutions and deepened internal divisions. Likewise, the politicization of the judiciary and the spread of systemic corruption have undermined institutional credibility and diminished the state's ability to confront economic, social, and security challenges.

Constitutional supremacy and judicial independence are therefore not merely theoretical democratic principles. They constitute fundamental requirements for National Security. Genuine security begins with the existence of a state that respects its laws, administers justice equally, and protects the rights of all citizens without discrimination. Restoring stability in Lebanon requires

rebuilding institutional authority within the framework of the Constitution, strengthening judicial independence, combating corruption, and fostering a culture of citizenship and the rule of law. The success of any reform project also depends upon the existence of genuine political will capable of placing the national interest above sectarian and factional considerations. In light of the multiple crises confronting Lebanon, constitutional and judicial reform has become a prerequisite for the survival of the state and for restoring the confidence of both citizens and the international community. Only a state that restores respect for law and justice can build a sustainable National Security framework founded upon legitimacy, stability, sovereignty, and civil peace.

Authors' Short Bio

Brigadier General (Ret.) Dr. Riad Shafiq Shayya is a retired senior officer of the Lebanese Army

Served in a wide range of operational, command, security, and judicial positions throughout his military career, complemented by advanced military training in France, the United States, and Italy. He is a Professor of International Law, Human Rights Law, Constitutional Law, and Political Science at the Lebanese University, the Center for Strategic Studies and Research, and the Fouad Chehab Command and Staff College, and serves as a lecturer in International Humanitarian Law with the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Holding Bachelor's and Master's degrees in Law and a Ph.D. in International Law, he is a member of the Lebanese Writers' Union and the author of numerous legal, constitutional, and political studies, including **The 1949 Lebanese-Israeli Armistice Agreement in Light of International Law (2003)**, **Minority Rights in Light of International Law (2010)**, and **Lebanon: An Anxious Identity (2023, co-authored with Dr. Mohammad Shayya)**. He is fluent in Arabic, English, French, and Italian.

Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung e. V.

<https://www.kas.de/en/web/libanon>



The text of this publication is published under a Creative "Commons license: Creative Commons Attribution-share Alike 4.0 international" (CC BY-SA 4.0), <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode>

Civic Influence Hub

<https://cihlebanon.org>

Beirut Central District - Allenby St.,


Port136 Bldg., 4th floor. Beirut - Lebanon

info@cihlebanon.org


Phone: +961 1 986 760

Mobile: +961 81 624 012

+961 3 002 797

 CIHLebanon

   CIH_Lebanon

 CIHCivicInfluenceHubLebanon

Disclaimer: The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the "Civic Influence Hub" (CIH) and the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung or its Lebanon Office.