

Rudolph C. Barnes, Jr.

Legitimacy defines what is right. It provides the moral authority for political and military power, and religion is the primary source for what is right.

Sovereignty and human rights are opposite sides of the same coin—the former related to the projection of national power and the latter to restraints on that power—and there are contentious issues of legitimacy related to both sovereignty and human rights. A national security strategy that relies on clandestine strikes by commandos and unmanned drones is an inadequate defense against terrorism. When terrorist threats to Western libertarian democracies originate in Islamist cultures and have broad public support, then defensive measures must address the source, and Eastern Islamist cultures most often represent hostile human terrain.

A balanced US strategy requires both hard and soft military capabilities—those that not only can destroy an enemy force but that can also bridge the gap between the limits of diplomacy and combat operations. Training and advisory missions are an indirect means of providing military assistance to friendly governments and rely on indigenous forces to conduct lethal operations. In Islamist cultures where they are considered infidels, US personnel must be diplomat-warriors who keep a low profile and lead from behind. They must expect to encounter a hostile human terrain shaped by interwoven issues of religion, law and legitimacy.

The mission of these diplomat-warriors to train their indigenous counterparts is complicated by the requirement to promote the ideals of democracy, human rights and the rule of law. Operational law requires that US trainers and advisors ensure compliance with fundamental human rights while respecting local standards that can condone honor killings and brutality to women, discriminate against non-Muslims and deny the freedoms of religion and expression.

Military legitimacy is about might being right, and to require US trainers and advisors to report violations of fundamental human rights in Islamist cultures can seem like a mission impossible. Military legitimacy and mission success require clear guidance on local standards of law and legitimacy and what human rights are fundamental. If a mission is to be terminated for violation of human rights, those rights need to be clearly defined.

Standards of legitimacy, law and human rights are shaped by religion and reside in the realm of politics, and religion has always had an uneasy and often volatile relationship with politics. As an extension of politics by other means, military operations necessarily reflect a nation's concept of human rights and rule of law. Balancing political objectives with conflicting concepts of religion and human rights is a delicate matter that requires diplomat-warriors who can complement other direct action military capabilities such as commando raids and drone strikes that are needed to protect US national security interests from terrorist threats.

Military capabilities enable a nation to go to war, but their ultimate purpose is to preserve the peace. With the end of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the emergence of democracies in the Middle East and Africa, the relationship between religion, the rule of law and military legitimacy in that region has become evident. We should understand why there can be no lasting peace among nations until there is peace among religions, and religious reconciliation requires that Jews, Christians and Muslims find common

ground in matters of their religion, legitimacy and law. A *common word* of love for God and neighbor in *the greatest commandment* represents the hope of finding such common ground in a world where religions continue to promote hate and violence.