

To whom it may concern,

The Lebanese problematic has never been truly dissected, like say the Belgian issue. History has been so twisted and concealed that even the top-rated schools in the world as in your case, have succumbed to the erroneous platform from which you build your survey. Of course, I do not blame you. But i will give you some examples that will make it clear:

1) Lebanon is a historical land. It is not the name of a people or a culture or a civilization. It was inhabited by Canaanites (= Phoenicians as per the Greco -Roman name) who became Christians and later part of them became Muslims, and more Muslims were brought in to subdue the remaining Christians in the mountains, who were able to resist from year 638 till 1920. These Christians, who had lost their true scientific name as a people, "Canaanites", chose to themselves the name "Lebanese" in year 676 to distinguish themselves from the Arab "Islamic state" besieging them. With the help of the French, in 1920, the Christians elaborated on the land of Lebanon a recognized state, the republic, with recognized borders, obliging Muslims that now share the land with them since year 638, to be part of it, when the latter wanted to be part of the surrounding (Syria for some reasons), whereby Lebanon as a concept or independent administrative entity did not matter for them, and they were right in their feelings.

Thus, Lebanon cannot be a single homeland (watan) for those who are nowadays "Lebanese", because "Lebanese" is an adjective based on the passport that the Republic issues to its inhabitants. To all these "Lebanese", Lebanon is a country (balad). The homeland varies according to the geography on which a people can live its freedom. And it is clear that freedom of Christians on all of Lebanon's territory is a problem for Muslims, and vice-versa.

2) Christianity is a religion. It enters cultures and societies, or it does not. It does not change them. It can shape them in a certain way, not more, and it should not: any shaping that has been carried out is due to teachings related to daily life elaborated by the Church, outside Christianity doctrine as understood by Jesus's teachings. Islam and Judaism are not religions only, they are religions and "worldliness", meaning there is a sharia with a whole cultural package from how the world is perceived to how one should live the daily life in all its details (not to mention the need for a State: dawleh).

This is to say that while Christians in Lebanon are scientifically Canaanites culturo- "civilizationalwise" (I will not go here into the details of how), Muslims are of Muslim culture (by Muslim culture we mean the way of living, besides the religious side as to faith issues, with relatively superficial elements retained from their cultures previous to Islam, namely, in Lebanon, Canaanite and Arab).

Hence, what is Lebanese nowadays is just administrative. We have two peoples. The Lebanese people is just an administrative concept. There are Canaanites and Muslims (I am speaking culturally). So there are 2 peoples in Lebanon (not one people with 18 religions + atheists). So the administratively Lebanese people is pluralistic like in Belgium! Are Belgians a homogeneous people?

For Canaanites, the idea of Lebanon supersedes that of the surrounding, contrary to the Muslims, and none is faulty. Of note, many Muslims are living a dilemma, because of not totally living as per the Muslim sharia. I will not elaborate here on that, neither on where atheists fit, whether listed as Christians or Muslims. In short, Muslims refusing the part of the sharia as to Islam being [religion AND state] and/or Muslims living the "Christian" compatible lifestyle can be accused by other Muslims as to being outside Islam, and that is true according to Islam teachings, not to mention the conflict of being a Muslim with going for a pure Lebanese sentimental affiliation, and not only administrative affiliation, which can collide with the "Arab" _ truly "Muslim" _ surrounding interests: here the dilemma is even deeper. And all that has occurred mostly because of brainwashing by Christians.

Of course, the contrary is also true: one cannot be of Canaanite - Lebanese sentimental affiliation and go for Arabism, except with brainwash, which has truly occurred.

As for "so-called in Lebanon Muslim and Christians" atheists (scientifically, Canaanite and Muslim atheists), they live the cultural aspect of their respective (Muslim and Canaanite) social entities without the belief and its customs and habits, but they do not form, until now, a third homogeneous entity.

3) Because Islam was presented mainly as a religion and culture came along, naming of the peoples in the Levant took a religious turning. However, in fact, the 12 Christian communities are totally integrated within each other and they admix, socially and geographically (also, 3 of those represent 88% of Christians and are Canaanite descendants, whereas the others are originally Coptic, Assyrian, Chaldean, Armenian or Syriac Christians). Meaning, it is "normal" for a Maronite, for example, to marry from another Christian community. Within Muslims, this does not apply: the Muslims sects are integrated but usually do not socially admix.

4) I could go on but I will stop. Soon i will contact you through the email proposed. Go on with what you started, we need your study. It can help us prove my points as a sole explanation to the Lebanese problematic. And that could lead us more towards federalism, to end up the clashes. But keep these words in mind. Replace "Lebanese" by "Belgian": what would be the effect? Sorry I was long, but i have spent years looking into that. And I am ending my work these few weeks. In lack of the truth, no side is understanding the cause of the other's position. Nothing can save us but the truth, bearing in mind one condition: love and forgiveness.