



LA AYMTAN

(TILL WHEN)

SUMMARY

The Lebanese Dilemma, from A to Z...

In all Honesty...

Yet with All the Love...

Dr. Marc ACHKAR

© 2023

Original photo in grayscale, 1976.

Author contact details: +961 3 50 42 45; markashkar@hotmail.com

Dr. Marc Achkar

Summary

More than 10 years of hard work to dissect the Lebanese dilemma has yielded the following:

N.B.: “Umma” literally means “a People”.

Lebanon is a country, but is also the historical name of the land on which the country was established. Yet it is not a sole nation / homeland to all Lebanese.

It yields a citizenship, not an identity. The Lebanese are an administrative People, not an ethnicity / umma / People / of a single identity (not a sociological People). This is similar to the administratively Swiss People, comprised of four ethnicities / ummas / Peoples; thus, Switzerland comprises four nations / homelands. Had the Republic of Lebanon been called the "Republic of the Cedar", we would be "Cedarians".

Christianity is a religion (deen in Arabic); it does not include a culture / worldliness (dunya) / identity. So - called Christians are ethnically **Canaanites** (this was genetically (less important) and culturally (more important) proven lately); they are the Canaanite ethnicity / umma / People, and their culture / worldliness (dunya) / identity is Canaanism. This is similar to Egyptian Christians being ethnically Copts and Iraqi Christians being ethnically Assyrians and Chaldeans (details aside), regardless of the Coptic, Assyrian and Chaldean churches, actually named after the ethnicities. And those Canaanites' current nation / homeland is the geographic area where they are the majority, currently limited roughly to the northern half of Mount Lebanon (and not “of Lebanon”).

“**Phoenician**” is the Greek name for Canaanites. **Maronites** and “**Rums**” (the Greek rites) are not ethnicities / ummas / Peoples, but sects / confessions / denominations (the latter terms intertwine); however, they are not confessional communities,* because they generally admix, at least nowadays.

* We reserve the term “confessional community” (“Ta’ifa” in Arabic) for sects (“Mathahib” in Arabic) that do not admix in everyday life. A good indicator is the admixture of the population registries and that of interfaith marriages.

Islam is a religion (deen in Arabic) and culture / worldliness (dunya) / identity. And it happens that its “dunya” relies on a sharia (social, of which moral, laws) founded on a religion. Thus, so - called Muslims, in Lebanon and elsewhere, are really a worldwide **Muslim** ethnicity / umma / People, and their culture / worldliness (dunya) / identity is Islam. This is similar to the Jews / Hebrews / Israelis, who are as well an ethnicity / umma / People. Both are specifically ethno - religions, that is religions that lay foundations for an ethnicity. Like Jews, Muslims should have one state, with one citizenship. They more or less had it before 1923, often fragmented due to internal strife. And the Muslims’ nation / homeland is the whole Islamic world.

Now often Muslims clash based on pre - Islamic ethnicities, e.g. Arab v/s Kurdish v/s Turkish v/s Persian Muslims, but they remain fused as one body as to their fundamental objectives. Islam rejects an additional label to identity, rejects terms such as "Canaanite / Arab / Lebanese / Persian Muslim" or "Muslim Canaanite / Arab / Lebanese / Persian ", and only accepts "Muslims in Canaan (if ever) / Arabia / Lebanon / Persia". Indeed, all Muslims have retained elements from their

ethnicities previous to Islam, but they are sociologically superfluous relative to core elements that direct a Muslim's daily life, which are Islamic teachings, common to the whole Muslim "umma" and Muslim homeland. All that explains for example Lebanese and Palestinian Muslim alignment. They are part of one "umma" that were separated by an administrative boundary in 1920.

Sunnis, Shiites, Druzes and Alawites are not are not ethnicities / ummas / Peoples but sects / confessions / denominations (the latter terms intertwine); yet more, they are confessional communities,* because they generally do not admix. Hence they are not integrated one within the other. This is because they are clashing over specific matters pertaining to their "umma". But they remain fused as one body as to their fundamental objectives.

* Refer to previous asterisk.

As for **Arabism**, it is a concept that was elaborated in its nationalistic aspect starting the 1860's based on a common literary language (and later official for the "Arab countries"), and it failed to unite Muslims of the later coined "Arab world".

So Muslims are Muslims, and Muslims of Lebanon are not Arabs, and certainly not Canaanites, though they retain elements of their previous pre - Islamic Arabism and Canaanism, just as other Muslims retain Persian, Turkish, Berber or Kurdish... pre - Islamic elements, but are practically Muslims. Yet Muslims who insist on considering themselves as Arabs in face of Muslims who insist on considering themselves as being of other ethnicities ought to be respected as to their consideration.

So these two Peoples in Lebanon, Canaanite and Muslim, have not fused into one People and not even integrated one into the other: there is pluralism in Lebanon. Furthermore, the Muslims do not generally admix among confessions, which is clear in their social organization into confessional communities. And keeping the expression "Christians and Muslims" in use in politics gives the impression of dealing with one (sociological) People but the latter following two religions, hence a misdiagnosis for the Lebanese dilemma.

Yet these two Peoples (and Muslim confessions) mingle, though relatively mildly considering the whole potential, in daily life, especially in Greater Beirut, or in the rare (10%) mixed villages in Lebanon (and, for the record, almost subtly demarcated), through neighborliness, educational, healthcare, and recreational activities, as well as at work, among others.

So diversity in Lebanon is cultural - civilizational, and not only religious, though religion remains a main aspect of any culture / civilization. This implies that the Lebanese dilemma's solution lies not in passing from sectarianism to secularism (the latter already being partially applied since 1926), nor in rooting within sectarianism, but in organizing the co - existence in a politically scientific manner, that which has not been efficiently carried out.

What was the outcome of that inefficiency?

A unitary political system through a centralized Constitution set up in 1926, rendering diversity - protecting laws secondary to the main generalized laws.

Hence,

→ Each law, whether concerning major or minor or even trivial issues, having to be applicable on all Lebanese soil.

→ A 1943 Pact stating Lebanon to be "of Arab face", considered by Christians a victory since not [strictly] stating "Arab", and considered by Muslims a victory because [at least] stating "Arab".

→ A 1958 truce stating "no winner, no loser".

→ A 1990 call for binary equality, yet never truly respected. Of note, Lebanon "suddenly becomes" "of Arab identity and belonging" as per the Constitutional amendment.

→ Almost all cultural, sociological and political events being antagonistically interpreted by Christians and Muslims, and, on a secondary level, by Sunnis and Shiites, as well as by Druzes.

→ Thus said factions fighting for seizing power, as the sole means for each to preserve itself within said unitary system.

→ Other factions calling upon external "sponsors" to rescue them and help them seize power (and nothing is for free).

→ Here the feudal / confessional lords step - up on stage: each presents himself as the savior of his own community, and "my corruption is a must for the good of our community": "If I am strong, so are you" (plural form), which implies: "If you (singular form) call upon holding me accountable, you will be hurting our whole community": self - flogging of the citizen by his own feeling of guilt. Despotism is the law, nepotism on the go.

The lord thus replaces the state as to social services. He has (or has had) his militia. And in the back stage, there is always a deal among the lords to perpetuate the issue into an endless loop, and this has been successfully achieved. Kings may fall, but not them. As has been said, each country has a mafia but only one mafia has a country: welcome to Lebanon. Here are the Lebanese, retained as hostages: no community can hold its leaders accountable, nor can it hold other communities' leaders accountable.

History has been concealed, hence no data, thus no diagnosis, and eventually no plan for peace: and why a plan when a change could jeopardize said lords?

No revolution will take place. The proof: being buried under tons of garbage, the Beirut 2020 explosion, a government having robbed its citizens through the central bank, and failed manifestations in 2019... what other explanation for the so - called "Lebanese people's inertia"? The main answer: two intertwined Peoples cannot undertake one sole revolution.

This is why the "Pact" was needed; this is why binary equality was needed: to try to counter absurdity. And we know that a unitary state cannot simultaneously respect more than one identity. Diversity / pluralism needs a federal system so that two or more Peoples be able to run their administrative affairs through one country, or simply needs partition.

Thus, a federation of present - day Lebanon would not be a division, but a union of its two components in such a way that would manage pluralism. Lebanon had been split into these two components since 634, and that until 1920, when they were administratively united through a centralized unitary political system instead of being united through a decentralized federal system.

This is the correction that at least should have been carried out, in light of one country having been the vision.

But still... we know that ethnicities around the world are organized into civilizational worldwide currents, such as the "Western world" (including Russia and eastern Europe in its large definition), the "Far - Eastern world", the "sub - Saharan world" and the "Indian sub - continent world"... and Islam defined in its sole ethnicity / umma / People a "Muslim world". This means that the diversity / pluralism rift is the deepest that can be with any other ethnicity: Muslims even have the "Charter for Human Rights in Islam".

The "Western world" at the dawn of Islam was actually a "Western - Eastern world" that spread from Scotland to Pakistan. Islam took the part that is know the Muslim world, adding some sub - Saharan and south - east Asian parcels, while Europe added the Americas and Oceania. However, Christian minorites of the Muslim world (Copts, Assyrians, Canaanites, Syriacs, Chaldeans...) remain part of what is know the Western world, that they actually founded since Sumerians, Copts and Canaanites strating 3500 BC, with specifically Canaanites having carried the concepts to the West.

Still more, the only People that remained through out 14 centuries, and persist to be, politically free to exerce their culture within the Muslim world are the Canaanites in their homeland on part of the Land of Lebanon, which now comprises not only two mere ethnicities, but two ethnicites of different worlds.

So it is even clearer now that even any relatively mild concession that both Peoples must accept, in order to maintain the Republic of Lebanon as an administrative entity even though throough a federal order, is unbearable to any of the two factions: any concession for Muslims means they are defying Islam, and any concession for Canaanites means they are accepting a "Sharia law". So it is better they go for peaceful partition, as Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Indonesia / East Timor, Sudan / South Sudan, Cyprus and India / Pakistan did. New states can then go for some confederation. That said despite each choice has its advantages and its inconveniences that we detail in our work.

The State of Lebanon, the country, the republic, has collapsed: no president for months, no cabinet for months, a same head - of - militia Speaker of the House of Representatives since 35 years, a collapsed judiciary system (judges resigning, or corrupt judges), armed militias controlling the politicians who control the Lebanese army and the Security Forces, collapsed banking system with no Central Bank governor... this is the prototype of a failed state.

Now what does partition bring?

- It resolves both Peoples' fears, in their believers and irreligious, in their seculars and theocrats,
- It is the way to slow the most any internal displacement,
- It ends up clashes as to change of circumscription, inter - communitarian marriages and nationalization,
- It ends up clashes as to ownership, rent, residency and work, and prohibits demographic sweeping,

- It solves social clashes such as week - ends and holidays,
- It ends up clashes as to taxes and revenues,
- It ends up clashes as to the clashes as to Lebanon's identity as a republic and all internal as well as foreign policies attached to that issue,
- It ends up clashes as to equality,
- It can be coupled to adoption of the Ombudsman tribunal for Human Rights cases, for protection of minorities from any distinctive abuse of their right, be it at the individual or at collective level, (as well as for cases of administrative corruption),
- It can be coupled to adoption of an "escape friendly" secularism or of theocracy,
- It can be coupled to a general optional secular civil status law,
- It achieves administrative decentralization,
- It thus promotes democracy while protecting regional minorities,
- Needless to say, it also allows each community to hold their "lords", as well as any later politician, accountable, ending the corruption loop,
- And it allows a reconciliation, which can lead to returning of detainees and deportees, as well as solving the issue of "the disappeared" inside the country, and descendants of the diaspora regaining their citizenship(s) and the right to vote, and reducing the voting age to 18, as well as women passing citizenship to their children.

All what preceded being understood, these are the primary causes of the Lebanese dilemma and the optimal treatment proposed.

This remains a summary for a 600 - A4 page book. Many political, social, biological, religious, linguistic, alphabetical, historical and geographical details are hereby overlooked. There is also a detailed proposal with maps pertaining to the application of a federal order in Lebanon if ever. The maps are based on a list of Lebanese towns approved by the Lebanese Army Directorate for Geographical Affairs, a map depicting the borders of the ~ 1450 Lebanese towns used by the United Nations and the electoral lists from the Ministry of Interior. These maps are also the basis of any partition proposal.

In the absence of initiative by politicians, but also by the Maronite Patriarchate, whose integrity is much questioned since at least the 1990's but all the more lately, we have lost faith in anyone in Lebanon as to the will (and not the ability) to reach out for the international community to help resolve the Lebanese crisis.

And while we firmly believe that we need a long term process to purify the Maronite Patriarchate, that accompanied with proper cultural / ecclesiastic education to prevent any recurrence, we also firmly believe that an "immediate" action should be implemented through the Patriarchate (the only option left) to move Lebanon from this status quo, or else, besides the heavy toll on our Muslims brothers, there will not be any Christian left for the Patriarchate to guide.

In conclusion, partition is the greatest act of love that the Lebanese can carry out for each other, in the interests of true positive pacific coexistence, so that Lebanon, though not as a country but as a land, and the land with the oldest name in History, remains a message of freedom and pluralism, as declared by Saint John - Paul II!

We remain at your disposal for further clarification.

Dr. Marc Achkar