Table of Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Lebanon's area does not exceed 10452 Km^2 with a location in the Middle East, south of Syria and north of Israel. Its location intensifies the political instability, along with the multiple civil societies with their respective international allies and foes. The capital is Beirut, with all confessions spread across the city, yet dominated by Maronites Christians in the West and Northern parts, Sunnites in the East and Shiites in the South. Lebanon's population is around 4 millions, with more than one and a half millions in the capital. There is approximately 14 millions of Lebanese origin living abroad. Its historical background of Ottoman Empire, Arabs, and European colonies, Persian Empire, Phoenician and the Crusades leaves the citizens torn apart regarding their origin. The constant discussion of belonging to the Arabs versus the opposite strengthens the tensions within the political frame (Hirst, D 2010:2-4).

1975 was the turning point of the Lebanese identity; the wide spread of tolerance and liberalistic societies with no distinguishing of different confessions was its earlier significance. Nowadays, Lebanon is proposed as a fanatical country with poverty and radicalism haunting some parts of its societies. "Libanisation" has become an official word in French, indicating the fragmentation of a state due to confrontation between different parts of civil society (Salibi, K 1988:1). Lebanon includes a mixture of multiple ethnic and religious groups, consisting of 18 different confessionals. In the occurrence of World War Two, Lebanon regained its independence from France and established a unique political system based on religious beliefs, referred to as "confessionalism". Each confession has subparts that prioritize differently: some may choose Lebanese patriotism, other chose confessionalism, and the rest chose ideologies. These different subparts constitute civil societies that played a major role during the occurrences of war. Ever since then, multiple political shifts in the world stage and especially in the Middle-East region have influenced Lebanese politics. The creation of an Israeli state while forcing Palestinians to regain other territories caused frictions between the left- and right-wing within the Lebanese government. The left desired granting the Palestinians territory while the right refused the proposition since they acknowledged Israel to be

their righteous nation. Also, "confessionalism" hindered equal rights to all parts as Maronites Christians were the majority in the government, yet minority in society. In the most recent census in 1932, Christians were accounted as 51.3 % of the population. This number have changed dramatically over the years due to the increasing Muslim population and the decreasing Christian, yet no other census has been approved! This indicates that confessionalism was less representative of the true population proportion and more on power measurements (Country Studies, 2011).

1.2 Purpose

The purpose of me writing about Lebanese political history is due to its effect on me since I am of Lebanese origin. Since early ages, I have been shattered by the thought of the different frictions in my country. The distaste between different parties was impossible to understand, especially since I live in a multicultural society in Sweden. Therefore, the background of the cause is to be discovered in my thesis. I strive to maintain unbiased opinions since it is easy to be influenced by others especially since my family belongs to "one-side of the story".

The paper will have a qualitative method with textual analysis of processed and unprocessed materials of the case study: Lebanon.

My purpose with this essay is to attempt to clarify the background of the war in Lebanon and its main intriguer:

- How can we explain the Lebanese War? An internal or external conflict based on different ideologies with influences from international relations that sparkled it?
- Who benefitted the most from the war and through which agreement?
- What is "confessionalism" based on?

My purpose is to create an understanding for the reader regarding the war, and to acknowledge the foreign influences and its benefits/costs towards the region. My focus will be mainly on civil society in Lebanon, based on confessionalism and ideologies, along with international relations and the different foreign policy of international powers that interacted in Lebanon.

1.3 Method & Material

I chose to use the historical research method to be able to define certain events by shedding light on the past in order to understand the present and foresee the future (Cohen & Manion 1994:45).

Due to time and space constraints, I will not go deeply into various events, as well as economic and political reasons, but use more comprehensive information satisfying to determine the interaction of civil society and international relations.

Also, materials from different websites have been used, especially websites with historical and political facts. These sites have been explored and evaluated to assemble as much information as possible regarding the topic. The main struggle with online books and information is that there is a lot of information, and decisions should be made to exclude some. Therefore, most information was read and decisions were taken of which should be included.

The method used for this paper is primarily analyzing the text of books. The library has been an important tool, as the research developed once books were found concerning the topic. These books were leafed through and the ones including interesting facts in the texts were read and summarized in small paragraphs used in the paper. Furthermore, searching the Internet to find different sources, mainly through search engines as *Google Scholar*, provides important book titles, found in the library, which were helpful to evaluate the paper.

Al-Jazeera documentary called War of Lebanon was a major source of inspiration for this essay since it provided basic knowledge regarding the war and important outlines. Also, a picture could tell more than thousands of words, a documentary of fifteen episodes offers billions! All who were interviewed in the documentary has been primarily witnesses, active and responsible participants in the civil war through their political positions. The different thoughts of these leaders offer incentives to investigate their stories and reach factual history. It would have been an honor to interview all leaders of the war yet the possibility was absent.

My materials are brought from different means. During my internship in Lebanon in summer 2010, I assembled different documents from political organs and libraries.

The main books to be discussed are the "House of many mansions" by Kamal Salibi and "Beware of Small States" by David Hirst. Both discuss the road of all political parties in Lebanon until today. Also, "The Ghosts of Martyrs Square" by Michael Young is significant to understand the events that lead us to today's political agenda.

1.4 Limitation

The temporal structure is set between the endings of World War Two in 1943 when Lebanon regained its independence, up until 2005 when Syria withdrew its last troops from Lebanese soil. This is the most interesting period in Lebanese history that explains the actions of all parts today and the development of the Civil War. Lebanon was known for its pluralism during centuries, yet the emergence of hatred between different confessions and social groups within society is interesting to understand. Also, pluralism is returning to Lebanese soil ever since 2005, once it regained its supremacy. Therefore, it is essential to understand why these civil societies' interactions changed.

1.5 Disposition

The thesis consists of five sections. The first includes the introduction part. The second category explains the definitions of important concepts used frequently in this paper, such as civil society, international relations etc. and the author's point of view: realism and liberalism. Realism accounts for war periods and the state's status while liberalism indicates the importance of pluralism, multiple civil societies within one state striving to coexist together to establish one wealthy, peaceful and just common state.

The third category consists of the main body with historical events in relation with the concepts explained in the former section. This will help you understand the multiple reasons of war and shape an opinion. The fourth will consist of an analytical part that discusses the role of civil society and international relations in Lebanon and answer the questions proposed in the introduction. The fifth section includes the conclusion as a finishing touch for this essay, while adding a philosophical perspective to enhance humanity.

2 Theoretical Approaches

This section will provide different understanding of concepts that are mentioned in the paper, it will help the reader understand definitions, which are not explained further in the forthcoming sections. Once all of the essay's key concepts related to the Lebanese Civil War are explained, the reader will find it easier to relate and comprehend the historical backgrounds in the next section and to extend his vision in acknowledging future political actions.

2.1 International Relations and the Measurements of Power

The definition of power differs from one context to another. Some may argue that power is the definition of strength, superiority in economical, political and moral grounds. Others argue that power is best defined as the availability of information about the counterpart. But we all agree that power is having an advantage on others in some way.

International relations is defined as the study of foreign policy, the latter is used to establish international relations between different nations. Functioning relationships in the international arena is essential to maintain a strong power position. Without allies, a nation could never reach its highest power peak. Therefore, a country should be careful in promoting sanctions towards a nation allied with a superpower.

In an international relation, power is often referred to as political power. Political power could be used to force the counterpart to interact by your obey. This influence on another state is essential for most superpowers, as it could control the decision-making process of a less independent state. Governments that lack power in some aspects, as economical or military aspects, may require the assistance of others; they may also be forced by other more powerful nations to act for the benefit of the latter (Agrell, Bergesen & Østreng, 2002:31-32).

As mentioned above, a state uses its power to gain an advantage on others. They could force sanctions (as examples; embargos, boycott of goods supply or refusal of participation in an event) on a state, which is not fulfilling international law. This boycott could do major harm on their economy, which will cause them to change behavior. It is seen as the last peaceful alternative. Other political power usage, and probably the most effective and the last alternative, is the military. The threat by a superpower state towards

a smaller state should be taken seriously, as the power measurements are usually accurate. Most countries usually retreat from its opinions once a military threat is established (Ray & Kaarbo, 2008:98).

Power could best be measured by a country's capabilities in military and economic resources. If a nation has a superior military force, they will probably be on the winning side in the occurrence of war. If it is superior economically, sanctions could be made to hurt the other nation's prosperity. Most superior economies possess a massive military, since they afford to finance it, and the quality also increases due to technology financing. Japan and Saudi Arabia are exceptions due to their ideologies (Japan's Pacifist constitution and Saudi Arabia's Sharia). Large populations are also a big factor for power measurements, as a small population cannot create a massive army. Many include reputation and moral as important factors of power, since the acceptance of the world is important (Ray & Kaarbo, 2008:99-107).

2.2 Foreign Policy and International Law

The implementation of the foreign policy includes the usage of informational, diplomatic, military power and economic tools. It is the composed goals to be reached; the administration sets goals and strives for them. Also, it is the following of values set by the government; the policy should follow a straight line. Furthermore, it is the decision-making process and the actions taken by the national governments to act on behalf of their external relations of national societies. It constitutes an attempt to design, manage and control the foreign relations in national societies.

International Law is the structure of rules that plays a major role in the relations between one state and another, followed by regulations designed by treaties. It is the guidelines set for the foreign policies of different nations. The Geneva Convention is a part of the International Law, which covers the human rights during time of war (Robertson, 2004:243).

A treaty is an agreement made between multiple parties to ensure that recommendations are discussed. Treaties are developers of the international laws and important to implement within foreign policy. Once a treaty is signed, all parts are entitled to follow the principles, but the consequences may not be severe if none is followed (Robertson, 2004:484).

International Law sets the standard for the "*right to go to war*", which is monitored by the International Court of Justice etc., an administration lacking effectiveness. The lack of effectiveness is due to the non-existing governing system. A country is not obliged to follow the "laws" of the International Law, it is rather used as a tool for co-operation improvements. US handling of the Iraq War is an example of that, no grounds were met to reach a "*right to go to war*", yet a war was started and no consequences were followed (Robertson, 2004:243-244).

One problem with the International Law that could occur is that nations usually only respect it when it suits their national interests, especially since no consequences are forced upon them. In order for International Law to become more powerful, the International Court of Justice could be legitimized by all nations, and their laws could be binding. Only then can we have efficient International Laws.

2.3 Realism Point of View

Realism is a perspective on international politics that contributes to the national interests by each nation. It takes into account only the states' actions, as they are the only righteous forces allegeable of sovereignty. It prioritizes national interests rather than the global security or ideology. Their main goal is to understand the underlying factors of military conflicts and the "state of war". According to realists, war could be avoided only if a balanced power is maintained within the state through diplomacy and autonomy.

The state is the only power with none above, and military resources are crucial to protect it from foreign and domestic enemies. Also, states should attempt to conquer as many resources as possible to increase in strength and economical advantages. The military power sets a standard on the international affairs and benefits the nation once in military or diplomatic disagreements. No higher authority can impose any threat on the national state; it is the interaction between different states that regulates further agreements.

International policies are known to realists as politics in absence of a government. It is an anarchical and decentralized system with the same function as a government but does not possess the same capabilities. This could provide tensions between nations and therefore, everyone should be ready for military conflicts; it is each nation's responsibility to protect itself. Humans are naturally competitive and egoistic in behavior; therefore

each state should raise awareness regarding any international actions (Heywood, A 2000:106).

Syrian policy could be acknowledged as pure traditional realism, due to its overpowering norm of rationalism, pragmatism and opportunism in their foreign policy, especially towards Lebanon. Its incentives to switch allies and erupt new wars with new enemies and former allies are clear evidence.

2.4 Civil Society

Civil society has emerged in the late twentieth century to improve civility in social relations due to harsh abuse of political power. The idea of political parties in Western democracies has ruled out the importance of social relations between the public, hence civil society offers it a chance to make an impact on the government. Civil society includes all confessionalism within a state, its social, political and economic institutions, NGO's and other influential associations to represent parts of the society. Civil societies tend to enforce themselves once political power is misused. Civil societies are important actors within the government as they can emerge to form political parties. Also, politicians seeking more power tend to overstate their purposes and candidate goals required by these civil societies to gain more votes (Khilnani, S 2001:11-12).

Civil society includes autonomous groups, either relatives or fellow citizens, sharing interests, goals and ideologies in life to defend themselves against others or against their own state. These social movements can emerge and establish international relations with foreign powers that share their opinions or benefit from their actions (Cohen, Jean L 1993:10).

Civil societies form private constitutions and laws that apply to the common norms and values of its followers. Only through a functioning society can the social differentiation be abolished. Civil societies require governmental influences to maintain peace between all and hinder tyranny from the leading part (Gellner, E 1995).

Three dimensions within civil society distinguish many scholars from each other. Some may refer to civil society through its "organizational form" by mentioning institutions, family domain and their interaction with the state. Another topic mentioned within the concept of civil society is the appearance of "specific quality in the relation between

state and society". Last but absolutely not least, "civility" is most important in the social interaction between all members of society by acceptance of multiculturalism, development of norms and values, and tolerance.

Civil societies can affect the decision-making process within a government through communication, disobedience, and boycotts and in worst case, military action. Civil societies do no strive to replace the functioning political system, but to survive and maintain its position within state. Habermas expresses that civil societies can emerge with the influence of economic powers and threaten the government by shaking the balance between all parts. Economic powers can influence decision-making outcomes and hence civil societies have become more powerful today (Habermas, J 1996b:49).

2.5 Liberal Pluralism

In order to understand Liberal Pluralism, we should strive to comprehend the three key concepts of it; political pluralism, it indicates the social life consisting of multiple springs of authority: civil societies, families, political and social institutions etc. These different authorities do not possess any dominant stance against the other; at least not on all occasions, rather the matters in which each authority may be specialized. Another key concept is value pluralism, with respect to norms and values within each alignment in society. Thirdly, expressive liberty takes into account the two previous key concepts and that each individual has the right to pursue whatever offers his life meaning and value.

Political pluralism understands the diverse groupings of human involvement rather than acting as a sovereign power. Family norms and values can be derived from this; families could recognize public law, yet they are not a direct cause of it. To help understand this assumption further, take into account environmental laws, they do not create the nature around us, yet they strive to maintain it. Humans are born different from each other's, with identities not consequential from any political organ or decision. Different social organs do not share the same norms and values as the political institutions, as the case within religious communities where gender discrimination could occur; which is opposed within political structures.

Value pluralism takes into account the different norms and values of different commu-

nities, based on their religious, cultural or ethnic affinities. The main idea is that there is no single and no ranked-ordered way of living: each individual or civil society follows their own norms and values. The state has no power to overthrow any lifestyle that does not harm its citizens.

Expressive liberty extends the previous mentioned key concepts by claiming that each citizen has the right to pursue whatever offers him meaning and value in life. It is the authority given to each individual to religious freedom, freedom of sexuality, freedom of pursuing happiness; simply our human rights!

Liberal pluralism understands politics as a tool rather than the definitive value that rules our societies. Yet political organs have an important part to play in solving possible differences and clashes between different civil societies; as their action should be limited to hinder any further aggressions or disrespect towards others. If a state's existence is threatened, it can act to defend itself against any danger. Each citizen has his rights, yet he is obliged to fulfill some responsibilities towards society, as showing respect to others and tolerate pluralism (Galston, W 2002:10ff)

3 The Interaction Between Civil Society and International Relations – The Case of Lebanon

This section will describe the political history of Lebanon from its establishment in the ending of World War One until its independence from Syria in 2005. The main focus will be on the civil war and its reasons. Civil societies and international relations are accounted as essential for the explanation of the tensions in Lebanon.

3.1 Birth of a state

Lebanon was born, as we know it today due to the ending of WW1 and the distribution of the Ottoman Empire among the winners. France was offered Lebanon in 1920 and seized a part from Syria even to expand Lebanon's territory. Most confessions in Lebanon gathered in one crucial meeting that included Christian Maronites, Orthodox, Armenian, Muslim Sunnites, Shiites, and Druze etc. to establish Lebanon, as we know it today. (Young, M 2010:19)

Lebanon gained its independence in 1943 from France once the citizens required autonomy over their state that was supported by Winston Churchill. The French detained the highest officials within the Lebanese parliament and only by common actions of all religious parts of the Lebanese were they released and the independence was realized. The patriotic atmosphere showed that Lebanon was the main actor and not each confession. The independence required a new constitution and a new rule of law (Workmall 2003). The constitution stated that the President should be Christian Maronites, Head of parliament should be Muslim Shiites and the Prime Minister should be Sunnites. The ratio within the parliament would be six positions for Christians for every five seats for Muslims. Most positions in the political sphere was given according to religious believes (Young, M 2010:22-23). This division was about to play a major role in the multiple wars to come. The Christian Maronites were strong advocates of the independence and opposed any interference from Syria, yet the Muslims required the reunion of both countries. This constitution was originally a pact between most politicians but it was never written; yet it is known today as a unique system recognized as "confessionalism". Lebanon was supposed to be independent from all foreign policy that was re-

quired by the Christians while the Muslims were to give up their demands to unify with Syria. This pact known as the "national pact" was dependent on the independency of Lebanon and the working relation between all religious parts.

The main principles of the National Pact were:

- Lebanon recognized as an independent democratic republic
- Lebanon enjoys an Arab face yet its different characteristics should remain its ties with western cultures
- Lebanon is a vital part of the Arab world and must uphold a healthy relation with them without division or partialities

The ideology was clear, solidarity and unity towards common goals (Salibi, K 1988:186-188). Lebanon joined the UN in 1945 and was recognized by all member states. More than 150 000 Palestinians immigrated to Southern Lebanon due to the first Arab-Israeli war in 1948 (Encyclopedia of the Orient 2002).

3.2 The Arab League

Kamil Chamoun was appointed as the new President in 1953 after the short "White" revolution that took down President El-Khoury, in peaceful manners, due to accusations of corruptions.

The same year a great Arab leader was born in Egypt that was about to play a major role in the instability of the Middle East, Jamal Abd el- Nasser (Salibi, K 1988:197-198).

Lebanon was an open country for international interferences and influences especially due to the Cold War between the United States of American and Soviet Union. The Arabs were divided into two parts; some required Arab unity while others required the protection and adaptation of westernized norms and values. The rise of communism in the Arab world forced the US to intervene and sponsor a treaty written by Turkey, Pakistan and Iraq, known as the "Baghdad Alliance" in 1954. The Egyptian who were the biggest force within the Arab League refused any pacts made outside their alliance, and therefore excluded Iraq from it. Lebanon was also divided into parts were some wanted to join the Arab League while others wanted westernized protection and "Baghdad Alliance", including the Lebanese President Kamil Chamoun. In 1955, he declared during a

visit to Ankara that Lebanon and Turkey share the same foreign policy yet he rejected to join any pact, a decision which was about to play a major role in the development of plenty of wars to come. The Arab defense alliance included Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Syria sponsored by Soviet Union.

Egypt wanted to regain its positions in the Suez Canal that was occupied by British and French Forces. This erupted a war in 1956 between these parties along with Israel. Kamil Chamoun played a major role in solving this problem by inviting them to a meeting with a peaceful outcome (Young, M 2010:24).

The Muslims in Lebanon rejected the constant interaction of President Chamoun with western countries especially since the eruption of the war in Egypt and required immediate stop to these communications. The growing popularity of El-Nasser increased the incentives to propagate against the non-members of the Arab League and soon ultimatums were proposed to either join or accept the consequences (Salibi, K 1988:197). This gave birth to the Eisenhower's Principle in 1957 that was a proposal by the US president Dwight Eisenhower to help any country that faces threats from the Soviet Union and its allies. This principle was suitable for Lebanon who began to fear the Arab League and communism and therefore Lebanese-American collaboration was established to ensure the protection of Lebanese independence according to President Chamoun (Korbani, G 1991:19-20). The foreign policy was not only the single reason of tension between Chamoun and the opposition, the latter also required more parliament seats due to the increasing number of Muslims in the country. The rejection of this proposal forced huge amounts of demonstrations to take place and many collisions were made between security forces and the demonstrators. The demonstrations did not decrease in number once it was announced that the oppositions leaders lost their mandates in the parliament due to lack of votes. This news boiled the feelings of the demonstrators due to their accusations of corruption and election faults (Young, M 2010:24-25).

 The regional events were cumulating as Syria accused Lebanon of conspiring against it through the "Baghdad Alliance". Turkey immediately sent troops to the Syrian Northern Border to protect Lebanon in case of a Syrian Attack, while Egypt sent an army to Damascus and declared a union in February 1958. The opposition, known as National Union Bloc, tried to force President Chamoun to resign through civil disobedience. The

Arab League supported the opposition. It was as if the Arab unity was more important than the Lebanese unity (Salibi, K 1988:188 – 190)! The Lebanese army stood on the President side and struggled to remain unified since religious and ideological believes could divide the army. Fouad Chehab was the general of the Lebanese army and had an efficient role in maintaining control over the situation. He barely took part on Kamil Chamoun's side; instead he took a position to limit the violence that was about to occur within this revolution and defended public utilities such as the harbor, airport, and Presidence palace etc. (Workmall 2003).

The opposition was increasing in force and the army barely limited this expansion. President Chamoun sent a complaint to the International Security Council in which he accused the Arab League of interfering in Lebanese matters and hindering stability. After the fall of King Faysal in Iraq, President Chamoun feared the loss of an ally and required from the western countries to interfere immediately causing the US marines to be sent to Lebanon (Young, M 2010:25).

31st of July Fouad Chehab was appointed as the new President since Chamoun's term was ended. The Chehabian rule was to prioritize the National Unity and to remove all threats of civil war. The laws implemented during his days are still used today; he also established many institutions to provide all the needs for all Lebanese. Time of prosperity was promised (Workmall 2003)!

3.3 Right & Left wing

The Arabs established in 1964 the Palestine Liberation Organization to reassure Palestine as an Arab nation. After the defeat of Syria, Jordan and Egypt during the 6 days war in 1967 against Israel, PLO was lost by the Arabs and now belonged to the Palestinians only under the leadership of Yasser Arafat. PLO started their training camps in Jordan but eventually moved to Lebanon, due to Jordan's expelling of Palestinian fighters, which was in its prime of growing due to the stability brought by the Chehabian rule. Charles Helou was elected after Fouad Chehab due to the ending of the latters term, yet Helou was a follower of Chehabian rue. Palestinian camps were established already in 1948 and were controlled by the Lebanese army up until 1967. After that, operations were fulfilled from Lebanese territory against the Israeli occupation force (Hirst, D

2010:88-94). Lebanon was punished by Israel for the actions of PLO by attacking Beirut's airport. The Lebanese army interfered to end the assaults of Palestinians and multiple battles were spreading all across the country. Charles Helou and Yasser Arafat met in Cairo to negotiate an agreement to end the fighting (Young, M 2010:24-26).

Once again Lebanon was divided into two parts, the ones against Palestine and the ones against Israel. The religious beliefs were now transformed into ideological beliefs, as the class system within the society forced people to protest to obtain more democratic rights. A right and a left wing were created, consisting of all different religious confessionals, yet wealthy Christians dominated the right wing and poor Muslims dominated the left (Salibi, K 1988:190).

The right wing rejected the Cairo agreement that included the right of PLO to own armed forces and territorial gains to battle against Israel. This was understood from the right wing as violence against Lebanese sovereignty (Hirst, D 2010:121).

It was decided in Cairo that Lebanon would not be a confrontational zone against Israel, yet the actions of the Arabs were totally contradictive (Young, M 2010:25).

The Syrian Defense Minister Hafez El Assad overthrew President Nour El Dinh Atassy and ruled the country for more than 40 years. On the other hand, Lebanon elected President Soulayman Franjieh who had close relations with El Assad and the Chehabian Course was lost (Schiff, Z 1984:195).

The first extensive Israeli invasion of South Lebanon was in 1972 due to the repetitive battles between PLO and Israel and the opening of PLO's headquarter in Beirut. The left wing in Lebanon joined the cause of PLO and the Lebanese army was forced to attack both sides. Many Arab states declared economic boycott on Lebanon due to the army's extensive use of violence on both Palestinians and Lebanese (Lebanon Wire 2010). President Franjieh immediately stopped all actions against the PLO and their allies to prevent Lebanon from undergoing poverty and even more instability. This opened patterns for the right wing to establish their own forces, known as the Lebanese Phalanges (Salibi, K 1988:188).

3.4 Civil War 1975-1990

3.4.1 And so it begins

The Lebanese Phalanges Party was established by Pierre el Gemayel in 1930's that was of Christian majority and main followers of President Chamoun (Salibi, K 1988:188). They acknowledged the lack of action of the army and therefore chose to take it in their own hands. The Phalanges Party was supported by the US and Israel. The right side consisted of the Phalanges Party, Free Patriots Party, under the leadership of former President Kamil Chamoun and Lebanese Forces. The right wing used to receive weapons through the Lebanese Army since the President was of right wing origin.

Left wing was composed of Amal; a Shiites Muslims group who felt left out of social, economic and political reforms, established by an Iranian mullah, Moussa Sadr, elected by the Iranian Shah (Delafon, G 1989:251). Also, it consisted of the Socialist Party and the Lebanese Communist Party who both consisted mainly of Christians and Druze (Petran, T 1987:167-168).

The PLO had an "expansionist outlook" to leave their camps and expand their territories into other Lebanese areas. This was believed to be the reason behind the start of civil war according to the right wing. It was not a war against the Palestinians wanting to return back to Israel, it was a war against the Palestinians seeking to occupy Lebanese sovereign territory to establish a new Palestine according to Pierre el Gemayel (Bachirspot 2011). The Palestinians are believed to account for up to 400 000 in Lebanon. They are denied neither citizenship nor work permit. Most of the Palestinians had a Marxist outlook, yet the lack of rights and necessities erupted a fundamentalist Islamic sense within their society (US Department of State 2005).

Lebanon was officially divided into pro- and anti-PLO, yet some battles did not even include PLO. It was simply about supremacy and who will lead the country in the future. The left side demanded substantial political reform by abolishing political sectarianism and offering equal mandates for all confessionals (Petran, T 1987:167-168).

The official date of the Civil War start was the 13th April 1975, a date which will for always be remembered by its effected. Gunmen shot at Pierre el Gemayel, and PLO was

accused, triggering a small massacre in Ain al-Remmaneh led by Christian extremists. The Arab hand could not hinder or even limit this war. The parliament resigned and the country was heading towards a dark period and President Franjieh appointed a military government (Young, M 2010:26).

Syria was the main country acting as a mediator between all parties in Lebanon. Rachid Karameh was appointed prime minister and hope was restored along with the parliament with the help of Syrian intervention. The relative calmness did not last due to Syria's involvement and fights carried on as the killings were based on ID cards, different religions, different ideologies and different villages all lead to mass murder. This is the darkest period in the Lebanese history (El-Khazen, F 2000:297-314)!

In 1975, Egypt signed a peaceful agreement with Israel known as Sinai 2 and the first named left the Arab League. Syria was left alone to handle the situation in Lebanon. PLO and the left requested help from Syria to limit the attacks of the right who were on their way to announce victory. The Muslims left Beirut's East area while the Left area was still highly mixed as many Leftist leaders and members were Christians. At this time, the army was split into ideological beliefs and loyal soldiers followed respective leaders. The left was insisting on President Franjieh's resignation but the latter collaborated with Syria to implement a new constitutional act that allowed more just mandates between different confessions. Yet the left felt that the solution was insufficient and the battles went on. Syria showed their willingness to intervene militarily in Lebanon with the approval of the US due to the failure of all diplomatic alternatives (Young, M 2010:26).

3.4.2 Syria Intervenes

The pace of events accelerated in Lebanon, regional and international factors exceeded their role in the developments. The right wing alliance was directly supported by Israel through economic benefits, weapons and military training. The right wing was interacting with both sides of the coin; only by the approval of Syria could they receive a newly elected favorable president. President Elias Sarkis was elected and immediately began his diplomatic tours to improve the left's relation with the President seat (Hirst, D 2010:121). After the failure of all diplomacy, Syrian Forces entered Lebanon on 1st June

1976 without any approval from any Lebanese side. It was a clear agreement between Syria, Israel and US to stabilize the atmosphere in Lebanon. All three parts wanted mainly to exclude PLO from Lebanese war while other Arabs, such as Egypt who established the organization, wanted their protection (Young, M 2010:26).

An Arab summit in Cairo shaped Arab Prevention Forces (APF), with the objection of Iraq and Syria, to prevent any foreign intervention. This peaceful solution did not hold for a longer while, and Lebanon returned to its conflict since Syria on one hand wanted to control the Palestinians while the Arabs, lead by the new Saudi Arabian superpower in the region, wanted PLO to have free movement in both Syria and Lebanon. Syrian forces assassinated Kamal Joumblat, the leader of the Left wing, probably since he was the main criticizer of Syrian politics (Hirst, D 2010:121).

Syria wanted more power in Lebanon and formed an alliance with PLO while ending their relation with the right wing after their knowledge of collaboration between the latter and Israel. The war between the Right and Syria began and Israel invaded Lebanon from the South to hinder the approach of Syrian and PLO troops (Schiff, Z 1984). International Forces sent by the UN were quick to respond to this conflict and sent troops to the Southern border (Young, M 2010:26). Israel withdrew but not before forming a Southern Lebanese Army (SLA), mostly Christians, to control the area. SLA were paid, trained and equipped by the Israeli government. Israel diverted the flow of the Litani River in Southern Lebanon towards Israel due to the latters water deficit. The Litani River satisfies more than 40 % of the Israeli water consumption and leaves Lebanese demand vulnerable (Geographical Review 1993:229). Up until today, this is still a major issue in the Lebanese-Israeli conflict. Syrians also withdrew once APF regained their stabilizing stand in Lebanon but eventually they withdrew also leaving a vulnerable yet hopeful nation behind them.

Bachir El Gemayel, son of the Phalanges Party establisher Pierre El Gemayel, formed the Lebanese Forces, a unifying force of all the right wing Christian parties with direct contact with Israel (Rabinovich, Itamar 1985:91).

The Shiites Muslims, belonging to Amal, had enough of all transgressions by PLO and therefore demanded them to unarm. This led to the kidnapping of Amal's leader, Mous-

sa Sader, and another conflict arose since the Shiites accused Libya of kidnapping their leader for the Palestinian cause. Libya was along with Egypt, before the latter's agreement with Israel of ceasefire in Camp David agreement, the main supporter of PLO (Hirst, D 2010:129-131).

During this time, Iran formed the Islamic Republic of Iran, a Shiite nation who will play a major role in the increasing strength of Shiites in Lebanon and the formation of Hezbollah (Salibi, K 1988:213).

Lebanon was transformed in the beginning of 1980's into controlled zones shared by Syrians, Palestinians, Israelis and the multiple Lebanese militias allied with them. President Sarkis was trying to make adjustments but he had no influence at all.

3.4.3 Israel's Wrath

The Iraq – Iran war casted a shadow on the Lebanese war on the international scene. Syria took the opportunity to bombard the Lebanese Forces next to the Syrian-Lebanese borders forcing Israel to intervene on behalf of the right wing. Israeli invasion began on June 4th 1982 to end the constant threats of PLO and Syria once and for all, after the murder attempt of the Israeli ambassador in London by PLO (Young, M 2010:26-27). The Shiites enjoyed the presence of Israeli troops to end the constant bullying of PLO in the region, but the brutal Israeli military tactics transformed this optimism into pure anger. The Shiites felt oppressed by Israel and SLA and mobilized to finalize this coercion (Norton, R 2007:33). Iran sent 1500 warriors from their national revolutionary guards from a direct order from Ayatollah Khomeini. Their main goal was to train radical Muslims and promote others, mainly from the already established but less Islamic, Amal Movement, to fight against Israel and to establish an Islamic Sharia in Lebanon. This was the first appearance of Hezbollah, a force to recognize in future events, especially today (Hamzeh, A 2004:25). Southern Lebanon was occupied with less resistance due to the collaboration with the Southern Lebanese Army. The only threat was PLO and few of their remaining left alliances in the South. Yet the Israeli army did not stop at the 40 KM line from the border, which is the distance required for the reach of PLO missiles, instead they continued the invasion into the surroundings of West Beirut. This "lie" created tensions between the right wing and Israel, and the first named did not as-

sist in the invasion as promised (Hirst, D 2010:135-136). The US Foreign Minister, Alexander Hague, and his staff including Philip Habib of Lebanese origin played a major role in negotiating cease-fire agreements between all parts, especially Syrians and Israelis without any approval (Schultz, G 1993:106-108).

The Lebanese Forces' leader, Bachir El Gemayel, became a candidate for the presidency and was accepted by most parts due to his increasing maturity in the political sphere. Syria was one of few opposing him along with PLO due to his former collaboration with Israel. Bachir was no longer the Christian leader anymore but the Lebanese one ever since he realized that the war is not a Christian – Muslim war, rather it is based on regional, international and ideological issues (Schiff, Z 1984).

3.4.4 Beirut Falls

West Beirut was surrounded for three months until PLO, Syria and Israel reached an agreement of accepting the return of multinational forces consisting of French, Italian, British and American troops in Beirut and especially a US commitment to protect the Palestinian refugees in the region. The multinational force stayed for only 2 weeks and three weeks after the election of the new President in September 14th 1982, Bachir El Gemayel, he was assassinated in a car explosion (Washington Report on Middle-East Affairs 2006). This caused low fighting spirit for the Lebanese and along with the Syrians and PLO out; Israeli army invaded West Beirut with no struggle but left it short after due to international pressure. The multinational responded immediately and returned their troops after the occurrence of massacres of the defenseless Palestinians in Beirut (Schultz, G 1993:106-108). The Lebanese Parliament elected Amine El Gemayel for President, older brother of Bachir, who was an American - Israeli candidate. President Amine El Gemayel pinpointed the importance of developing public institutions for a functioning society. Syria along with their ally Soviet Union felt left out and weakened in the Middle East region. Soviet Union offered Syria military forces along with cooperation with Iran to balance the power in the region (David, K 1988:4). Hezbollah was born with the support of Iran and their first attack was against the American Army base next to Beirut's International Airport with a car bomb that killed 241 marines. Vice-President George Bush Senior visited Beirut immediately and utilized the term "terror-

ism" to explain the actions of Hezbollah, this is a term that will be used more frequently in the future (Boyle, K 1983).

The multinational forces withdrew and left the matters into Syrian hands. President Hafez El Assad showed clearly his commitment to not offer anything freely for Israel and US. The fights in Lebanon between Lebanese Forces and the Left wing erupted and the Lebanese army was split once again. The Lebanese Forces were not able to hold the South from Amal, now lead by Nabih Birre, and Hezbollah guerillas and withdrew their forces to East Beirut. The Sunnites was a major factor within the left wing since the beginning of war, yet through the increasing capitalistic ideology, especially with the influence of Saudi Arabia, they were excluded from alliances with the far left.

Syrian-Iranian interests were colliding in the events of Amal and Hezbollah battles. The increasing power of Hezbollah reduced the influence of Amal militarily due to the economical and armed advantage received from Iran (Salibi, K 1988:214). Amal was supported by Syria to end PLO's influence in the region. Syria returned to Lebanese soil in February 1987 after being absent for more than 4 years. Prime Minister Rachid Karameh resigned from his position due to the occupation and the inefficiency of governmental policy. He was later on murdered and Samir Geagea was accused for it (Hirst, D 2010:129).

By the year 1988, after thirteen years of war in Lebanon, more than one hundred thousands citizens were killed. President El Gemayel's term was about to end and a new President was to be elected (Norton, R 1991:458). Yet the presidency election was not a Lebanese decision rather of regional and international interests, especially Syrian, Israeli, American and Iranian. After multiple negotiations and refusal of candidates, especially between Syrian and American delegates in Damascus, a provisional government was announced with Lebanese Army General, Michel Aoun, as Prime Minister, a direct blow towards the Sunnites who are entitled to that spot according to the National Pact in 1948 (Harris, W 1997:203). This provisional government was implemented to elect a new president in the nearest future, yet General Aoun did everything except of that (Delafon, G 1989:254). He acknowledged the importance of abolishing the roles of the militias; the government and the army are to be the main role takers within the state. Michel Aoun recognized the sovereignty allegeable for Lebanon and announced war

against Syria to withdraw their troops, with the help of Iraq, Syria's traditional rival. The Arab summit introduced a tripartite committee including Saudi Arabia, Morocco and Algeria who prioritized demanding Saddam Hussein, Iraq's President, to stop supporting Syria's enemies and instead find cease-fire agreements suitable for all parts (Harris, W 1997:208-209).

3.5 Taef Agreement and the Aftermath of the Civil War

Another Arab Summit in Saudi Arabian city, Taef, in September 30, 1989 was announced to find an agreement between all parts in Lebanon. 62 Lebanese Parliament Members agreed upon the National Reconciliation document known as Taef Agreement. Most Lebanese politicians, without the recognition of Michel Aoun but approval of Samir Geagea, elected René Mouawad as President (Norton, R 1991:461). The latter was killed short after by a bomb and General Aoun was accused for his murder. President Elias El-Hrawi was elected two days after and signed the Law of Political Reforms, given by the Taef agreement, to offer more mandates to the Muslims. The parliament seats increased from 99 until 108, which later became 128. The ratio was now based on 50-50, with equal shares to Muslims and Christians (Krayem, H 1997:421). General Aoun lost his last support in Iraq after the eruption of the Gulf war in August 1990.

Taef agreement declared Syrian supremacy on Lebanese soil once and for all; this dominance was legitimate in accordance with the documents signed. This document was the starting point to a dark period within Lebanese politics as territorial and authoritarian sovereignty was abolished; instead coercion was the main tool to follow. Taef agreement patterned the way for other Lebanese-Syrian treaties, which benefitted mostly the latter (Hiro, D 1993:161).

Syria was promised by the US in case of interaction on the Kuwaiti side to receive more power in Lebanon. The Taef agreement did announce the withdrawal of Syria within two years after stabilizing the atmosphere in the country; even though the date was never respected (Mark, C 1995).

Taef agreement included beneficial propositions, mainly for Syria and less for Lebanon

- The Lebanese government should be committed in signing any agreement with Syria "in all domains"
- The Syrian forces will assist the Lebanese government within two years to control the state's territory and regain its sovereignty.
- Lebanon should not become a pathway or base for any force, neither external nor internal, seeking to undermine its security or Syria's. Syria should not permit any act that poses threat to Lebanon's security, independence and sovereignty. (Maila, J 1992:95-98).

This was followed by General Aoun exile to France and his officers were moved to Syrian prisons. Samir Geagea was sentenced to lifetime prison in 1994 following the accusation of murdering former Prime Minister Rachid Karameh and other violations within the frame of war (Avi-Ran, R 1991: 218-223).

The following years introduced puppet regimes within the Lebanese government with nothing conducted unless Syria approved it. Elias Hrawi elected Rafiq Hariri as new prime minister, and Nabih Birre as speaker of parliament. Even if Syria approved any proposal, there existed always a threat of Israel forcing the government to change pattern through military abuse. Syria occupied Lebanon from 1988 with the biggest parts of West Beirut under its control, and northern and eastern Lebanon (Washington Report on Middle East Affairs 2006). Syria signed multiple agreements with the Lebanese government to ensure cooperation on economical, political, military, social etc. levels. These agreements were primarily for the benefit of Syria, with discriminating laws such as adjusting the role of the media, since it has always been free in Lebanon. Human rights were abused as imprisonment of all anti-Syrian personnel who demonstrated against the occupation force, along with their torture. This lead to a restrained Lebanese civil society that always has been freely oriented (Amnesty International Report 1997).

In May 2000, after the election of Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak, Israeli forces withdrew from South Lebanon due to the pressure of Hezbollah in the region after twenty-two years of occupation and after the divertive path of the Litani River were finalized. A great victory for the Lebanese peoples yet a high cost to pay (Young, M 2010:28-29)!

This was followed by Syrian total control over Lebanon before receiving independency in 2005 due to multiple assassinations of Lebanese political leaders who opposed Syrian command. The biggest occurrence was the assassination of former Prime Minister, Rafiq Hariri, in a car bomb in February 14, 2005. This led to collaboration between Druze, Christians and Muslims to hinder any further Syrian interference in Lebanese politics. The people collaborated once again, as the case in 1943 when Lebanon gained its first independence, by acknowledging the international tensions opposed on them and by illuminating the public of the strength of a patriotic unity (Young, M 2010:30-31)!

4 Analysis

4.1 Was the conflict External or Internal?

Lebanon remains, after 15 years of Civil War and anarchy and other dark periods, the only Arab state with democratic practice. The parliament, democratic institutions and judiciary system offer people their rights, yet it does not indicate that the Lebanese government is completely efficient due to the different needs of the different civil societies represented by the multi-parties system. Each party is unique, with few representing ideological believes and class systems, as communist, socialist and capitalistic parties. Others enjoy religious parties, such as Hezbollah for Shiites, Lebanese Forces for Maronites etc. Yet the importance of maintaining democracy, after undergoing so much horror throughout history, indicates the awareness of the Lebanese.

Throughout the war, alliances has been reshaped, shattered and self-destructed. All these changes of different blocks and alliances between these parties are mythical. It is as if all parties lack the ability to decide whether they should follow their ideologies' best interests, their nation's best interest or their confessions' best interest.

Civil society organizations (CSO's) emerged more powerfully during the war due to the lacking of political stability. They have been the main criticizers of Syrian domination, especially in accordance with media freedoms, elections and human rights. There are two major types of civil society in Lebanon; one representing the different associations with religious communities and the other corresponding to the non-confessional and liberal social movement and NGO's, known as civic civil society. Mostly Lebanese who enjoyed democracy in other countries and returned to implement another point of view established these civic civil societies. Due to pluralism in Lebanon, with respect to the 18 different confessions, it is hard to attain a clear understanding of civil society. Civil society is healthy for a functioning democracy since it provides a sense of belonging and importance within a political community. The different healthy civil societies also improve the quality of political discussions with no regards to any hostilities. It is about convincing other parts of their norms and values, rather than forcing them.

The interaction between civil society and international relations is more about which external part will benefit the internal part more, through economical, political and social benefits.

The Cairo treaty was probably the last agreement that could hinder the Lebanese Civil war, yet the sovereignty of Lebanese was threatened by the armed forces of PLO. The first was due to Lebanese sovereignty, no other army except of the national one is allowed on any sovereign territory. Also, if PLO took any actions, the responsibilities will be held on the Lebanese army and the mutual communication between Lebanon and Israel would be lost.

The support offered to the PLO by the Arabs was clearly confrontational, yet vague and hypocritical which allowed the Palestinian – Lebanese war to on go during 20 years. It seems as if the PLO was a contributory factor of the Lebanese civil war but not the main one. It was the social and economic injustice within the country between the different religious believes along with the different class systems. Also, the political injustices based on confessionalism were major factor of the war.

The parliament elected in 1972 remained in power for 20 years due to the civil war. It was impossible to maintain an election without every parts approval. Also, the results would be ridiculed due to corruption allegations. How can a government expect to improve if it is not renewed? The lacking of legitimacy and efficiency within the parliament was substantial and it required renewal of fresh thoughts far from pre-modern reflections.

The eruption of the Arab Israeli struggle in Lebanon, along with the left and right wing struggle, along with the Lebanese and Arab struggle in 1975 was due to the peaceful agreement between Arab countries and Israel. I do not believe that it was a coincidence. Had there been any way to fight another organized comprehensive war with Israel on their own territories it would have happened, yet the different relations with different superpowers in the Arab world and the West utilized Lebanese territory to undertake their own battles! The Lebanese war would have been much milder if this was not the case. We cannot separate the time and date of the civil war eruption in accordance with the peaceful treaties by these historical enemies. It is easier to approve this once you

understand the economical, political and social benefit of not going to war on own soil. Syria's strategy was to control Lebanon on one side and Palestinians on the other under its armpits as a matter of speech to face the region's political future with Syrian perspective. The decision to alienate PLO from the Lebanese scene was to attach Lebanon to Syria's policy without any Palestinian influence.

The Lebanese leaders had not yet realized that the war got out of control, that it was no longer a civil war but a game in which regional and international factors intertwined and in which the Lebanese have become just tools in a regenerated war in the Middle East region.

More than 30 years of war saw on Lebanese territory Syrian, Israeli, Palestinian, Iranian, and American, British, French, Italian, Arab and International peacekeeping forces. An indication of a conflict based on external tensions?

4.2 The role of Taef agreement and the Civil War winner

Can we find any clear picture between the assassination of all high positioned politicians and the accusation of other leaders? Was Syria implementing the famous model of "Divide and Conquer"? Syria was allied and rival with all parts included in the Lebanese war. The war could have continued up until today if Syria was incapable of achieving its ambition to control Lebanon. The extensive amount of rationalism, pragmatism and opportunism acted by the Syrian government demonstrated that ideology played little part in their foreign policy; Syria only considered and cheered for the winners during that moment only, with no distinction between long or short run winners, natural allies or enemies, rich or poor and left or right. Syria has exploited Lebanon in the international political scene to achieve its goals through unjust treaties between both nations that benefits the first named only. When a state imposes treaties over another through coercion, there clearly lacks approval from one part of the agreement. This treaty is to be invalidated according to the international law (Delupis, I 1974:142-143). Therefore, all treaties signed between Lebanon and Syria after Syrian domination of the first named should have been rejected by the government if it was not for the fear imposed on the politicians. The international scene should have interacted, as they were diligent-

ly during the war, to hinder such imposition on the Lebanese government that limited territorial sovereignty.

What is the result of the war? Usually civil wars lead to social, political, economic and cultural changes. The country might fall apart and restructure itself in different regions, as the case in Yugoslavia. It might transform totally to reassure that all groups reunite to establish common identity as the case of Spain; yet it required 50 years to erase the traces of Civil War. On the other hand, the Lebanese Civil War concluded as if it had never started except of the few mandates that were allegeable to Muslims. What occurred was the destruction of the country's infrastructure, economy, regional position and its existence was almost annihilated. One hundred and fifty thousands lives were taken! No one was left victorious except of Syria! To help understand how Syria was the victorious force, you need to understand the points within the Taef agreement imposed on the Lebanese government:

- The Lebanese government should be committed in signing any agreement with Syria "in all domains". This appoints the coercion imposed within the treaty from the Syrian government on the Lebanese one; a democratic state has the right to choose whether an agreement is suitable for its population or not, regardless of external forces.

- The Syrian forces will assist the Lebanese government within two years to control the state's territory and regain its sovereignty. This indicates that Lebanon will give its sovereignty to the Syrian forces for a period of two years; yet the Syrians did not respect this, they remained for 15 years instead of two. Also, Syrian forces were given the right to impose strategic positions in case of an Israeli Invasion in the Western and Northern part of Lebanon. Is it morally correct to defend a country on another state's soil?

- Lebanon should not become a pathway or base for any force, neither external nor internal, seeking to undermine its security or Syria's. Syria should not permit any act that poses threat to Lebanon's security, independence and sovereignty. This shows the biasedness of this treaty since it asks Lebanon to abolish all threats against Syria, yet the other way is not requested. Syria is only requested to not threaten Lebanon's sovereignty itself, even though they did through forth-

coming agreements, but it is not stated about any Syrian intervention in case external forces opposed Lebanon. Also, the treaty does not take into account Syria as the external force to use Lebanon as a pathway; it only indicates others, especially Israel. Nor do they mention the transport of weapons from Iran, through Syria and Lebanon, to finally reach Hezbollah.

To conclude this agreement, Lebanon is committed to respect Syria's security and to hinder any forces, internal or external to harm Syria or Lebanon. On the other hand, Syria has the right to intervene in Lebanese affairs, yet is not obliged to hinder any threats to Lebanon! This clarifies the lack of Lebanese sovereignty since a sovereign state is the righteous actor to control internal affairs without any external pressure (Delupis, I 1974:195).

Confessions	Before Taef 1989	After Taef 1989
Maronite	30	34
Greek Orthodox	11	14
Greek Catholic	6	8
Armenian Orthodox	4	5
Armenian Catholic	1	1
Protestant	1	1
Other Christian Minorities	1	1
Total Christians	54	64
Sunni	20	27
Shiite	19	27
Druze	6	8
Alawite	0	1

Total Muslims	45	64
Whole Parliament	99	128

Table 4.2.1 – Before and after Taef Agreement

This table is an illustration of the Lebanese Parliament before and after Taef agreement. It clearly balanced the power between Christians and Muslims, regardless of the real population proportion. Yet be aware that in recent days, the Sunni have a tendency to collaborate with the Christians, especially due to the assassination of multiple powerful politicians belonging to both parts, while blaming the Shiites and Syria for their deaths. The presidential power was also reduced since the executive authority was rearranged to the Council of Ministers as another mean to redistribute the power of both religions.

4.3 Efficiency of Confessionalism

Confessionalism is the division of political roles within a government based on religious beliefs. No other government rules its state through such system due to its inefficiency. The basic idea is to offer mandates to each political party depending on their confessions. The president should be a Maronite Christian, the Head of parliament should be Muslim Shiites and the Prime Minister should be Sunnites. During the years before the ending of the Civil War in 1990, the Christians had the majority, as seen in Table 4.2.1, with 54 places while the Muslims only had 45. Be aware that the Muslims are divided in two major parts, as the Sunnites and Shiites are proposed as natural enemies. It is assumed that Sunnites rather interact with Christians than a Shiite brother, due to historical differences. This lack of efficiency and injustices played a major role in the instigation of the Civil War. If the government responded to these injustices and granted the Muslims their rights, we could easily have avoided such destruction during 15 years.

According to the census in 1932, the Maronites were the majority with 51.3 % of the population. Yet the emigration of most Christians, along with the increasing amounts of Muslims in Lebanon leaves the population conspiring regarding the new true census. The government, especially the Christians, have rejected any further census in the near future due to the fear of losing power. It is stated in the constitution that the majority

should rule, and in case of Muslims attaining the majority, and then they are allegeable for the presidency.

One conclusion is clear; the virtue of confessionalism established in 1943 that distributed competences in its positions can no longer be followed. It had become incompatible with the obligations of economic, social, political progress and the demographic reality of the country. Either it leans toward abolishment of political sectarianism and adopts democracy, qualification and equality between all Lebanese or reconsiders the relations between confessions according to its current status and not in 1943. I believe in human equality and prefer the first named since the latter only leads to suppressing the minority as the case for 60 years.

5 Conclusion

The Lebanese War can never be described as internal nor external, it is clear that PLO's intervention and the injustices in the political arena that caused such inconvenience, yet the Civil War could never have erupted without the ambitions and help of foreign powers. The Cold War played a major role in adjusting the powers in the region, as the Soviet supported Syria and US supported Israel, two major strings within the war.

The fall of the Soviet ended the collaboration with Syria and the latter supported the US in the Golf War, which in turn was offered sovereign power over Lebanese territory. The Taef Agreement benefitted mainly Syria and the other agreements that followed were biased to increase the Syrian revenues.

Confessionalism lowers the value of human resources within this wonderful state; it robs the citizens from their nationalities and stamps them with religious beliefs. The Lebanese should have equal rights and only by neglecting a politician's confession can we proceed and establish a functioning society and political unity.

In the absence of a functioning government, the different nationalities within Lebanon took own matter into hands and fought for what they believe is suitable for the flourishing of their societies. Does any society have the right to act in such manner? For me the answer is simple if you analyze the statistics given below: 3.7 % of the population was killed during the war, 10 % were wounded, 25 % emigrated within the Lebanese borders and 33 % emigrated abroad (Catholic Center of Information 2002)! Whatever rights any society claim to have to interfere in governmental accountabilities, it is never satisfying and righteous to do it on others' account. Humanity within different societies failed in a war proposed to end all injustices; misery and destruction were the outcome.

The Lebanese war ended after being announced as a Civil war until being acknowledged as the War of Others. Yet the most important question to be asked is which identity belongs to Lebanon? Is Lebanon Arab, Western, Muslim, Christian, Israeli, Communist, Fascist, Nationalist, Capitalist or a state of all mixed ideologies, confessions etc.? What is clear is that it represents a group of tribes, denominations and dispersion, yet the future will remain unpredicted as long as this question is remained unanswered! What is Lebanon?

References

Agrell, W. Bergesen, H. O. & Østreng, W. (2002) *Internationella relationer – i en ny tid*. Malmö: Gleerups Utbildning AB

Amnesty International Annual Report. (1997)

Avi-Ran, Reuven. (1991) *The Syrian Involvement in Lebanon since 1975* Westview Press, Boulder

Boyle, Francis. (1983). *"The Illegality of the Invasion: A discussion of the Problems of Law of Armed Conflict in Lebanon,"* unpublished research paper presented to the Liber Group on the Laws of War

Cohen and Manion. (1994). *Research Methods in Education*, p 45

Cohen, Jean L & Arato, Andrew. (1993*). Det civila samhället och den politiska teorin*. Original title: *Civil Society and Political Theory* (1992).Göteborg: Bokförlaget Daidalos AB

David K. Hall. (1988). *Lebanon Revisited* (National Security Decision Making Department: The United States Naval War College)

Delafon, Gilles. (1989). *Beyrouth Les soldats de l'Islam–* Stock –

Delupis, Ingrid. (1974). *International Law and the Independent* State, The University Press, Glasgow

El-Khazen, Farid. (2000). *The Breakdown of the State in Lebanon 1967-1976* I.B. Tauris Publishers, London,

Gellner, Ernest. (1995). *The Importance of Being Modular*. Hall, John A (ed). Civil Society: The History, Comparison. Oxford: Polity Press

Geographical Review, Jul93, Vol. 83 Issue 3, p229, 9p

Habermas, Jürgen (1996b) *Between Facts and Norms: Contribution to a Discourse*

Theory of Law and Democracy. Cambridge: Polity Press

Hamzeh, A. N. (2004). *In the Path of Hizbullah.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Harris, William W. (1997). *Faces of Lebanon: Sects, Wars, and Global Extensions* Markus Wiener Publishers, Princeton

Heywood, H. (2000). *Key concepts in politics,* New York: Martin's press

Hiro, Dilip. (1993). *Lebanon: Fire and Embers, a History of the Lebanese Civil War,* Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London

Hirst, David. (2010). *Beware of Small States: Lebanon, battleground of the Middle East.* New York: Nation Books

Khalil, Gibran. (1935). *The Prophet*, p 49

Khilnani, Sunil. (2001). *The development of civil society.* Sudipta Kaviraj & Suni Khilnani (eds) Civil Society. History and Possibilities. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Korbani, Agnes. (1991). *US Intervention in Lebanon, 1958 and 1982: Presidential Decision Making* (New York: Praeger Publishers), 19-20.

Krayem, Hassan. (1997). *The Lebanese Civil War and the Taif Agreement.* Salem, Paul (ed) Conflict Resolution in the Arab World: Selected Essays. Beirut: American University of Beirut.

Maila, Joseph. (1992). *The Document of National Understanding: A Commentary*, p 95

Norton, Richard. (1991). *Lebanon after Taef: Is the Civil War Over*?, Middle East Journal, p 461

Norton, Richard. (2007). *Hezbollah.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Petran, Tabitha. (1987). *The Struggle over Lebanon* Monthly Review Press, New York

Rabinovich, Itamar. (1985). *The War for Lebanon, 1970-1985*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press

Ray, J.L. & Kaarbo, J. (2008). *Global Politics* (9th edition). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company

Robertson, D. (2004). *The Routledge Dictionary of politics*. London: Taylor & Francis Group

Young, Michael. (2010). *The Ghosts of Martyrs Square: An Eyewitness Account of Lebanon's Life Struggle*. New York: Simon and Schuster

Salibi, Kamal. (1988). *A House of Many Mansions: The History of Lebanon Reconsidered*. London: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd

Schiff, Ze'ev and Ehud Ya'ari. (1984). *Israel's Lebanon War*. New York: Simon & Schuster

Shultz, George. (1993*). Turmoil and Triumph: My Years as Secretary of State* (New York: McMillan Publishing Company), 106-108

U.S. Department of State, *Background Note: Lebanon*. August 2005

Galston, William. (2002). *Liberal Pluralism: The Implications of Value Pluralism for Political Theory and Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Documentary

Al Issawi, Omar. (2004). *The War of Lebanon* produced by Al-Jazeera and distributed by Sabbah Media Corporation.

Internet Websites

Bachir Quotes   Visited 4/11/11

http://bachirquotes.blogspot.com/

Catholic Center of Information   Visited 3/19/11

http://www.opuslibani.org.lb/Lebanon/ppframe.htm

Country Studies of Lebanon   Visited 4/7/11

http://countrystudies.us/lebanon/41.htm

Encyclopedia of the orient   Visited 3/19/11

http://i-cias.com/e.o/lebanon_5.htm

Lebanon History   Visited 3/19/11

http://workmall.com/wfb2001/lebanon/lebanon_history_index.html

Lebanon Wire   Visited 3/24/11

http://www.lebanonwire.com

Washington Report on Middle East Affairs   Visited 3/24/11

http://www.washington-report.org/Washington-Report_org/www/html/backissues.html