THE EFFECT OF THE TRAUMA CAUSED BY THE LEBANESE CIVIL WAR: THE GENERATION THAT LIVED THROUGH IT, AND THE GENERATION THAT INHERITED IT.

By

Alexandra Banna

Presented to the Department of English & Communications
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts

American University of Armenia
Yerevan, Armenia

May 17, 2017

Abstract:

Considering the case of the Lebanese Civil War as an event that leads the Lebanese to reconsider their identity, and their individualism, it has affected on people's lifestyle, and their mentality. The issues that were investigated were the influence of collective memory on the society or a person of that society. How collective memory is relevant to cultural memory, and if it can be considered as factual history, it also argues the role of trauma and how it is inherited, especially in the condition of the Lebanese Civil war. Both the collective memory and inherited trauma is used to explain Marianne Hirsch's Postmemory Generation theory, what it means, what is considered to be a postmemory generation and how it has an effect on the people who were interviewed. The decision of the methodology was necessary because the interviewees are my family; mother, aunt, and two brothers and a little of autobiography as well. The purpose of the biography and he autobiography is because, I have two generations, with age gaps and different perspectives about the war, and how the war has impacted on them. As a person who considers as a member of the postmemory generation, it was purposeful to explain all these theories as a Lebanese and Armenian who has had already has relevance to the theories.

Introduction:

With the violence of the civil war and the consequences the Lebanese people had to go through from 1975-1990, created new circumstances of the last two generations that have been living in Lebanon. In addition to the ongoing conflict from time to time, disagreements between politicians such as the assassinations after the civil war and almost ten years after it, the new generation has inherited the memories of their parents and their past. Through these memories,

the post-generation have become more careful, and aware of what goes around them, making them less vulnerable towards inhumane crises.

The side effects of the Lebanese Civil War is the general idea of how it has inclined on a generation that experienced the war, the post-war generation and the countries that were involved in the war. Since Lebanon has a confessionalism governmental system, which has accepted 18 religions having power in making decisions in the parliament, people attach their identity towards their religions and political parties, rather than being just accepting a unified nationality. Although 28 years have passed, this crisis has still created a contradiction, miscommunication within each other, extremism, and violence.

The post-war generation still has the repercussion of their social boundaries around them, that their family, their neighborhood, or even the environment might affect them. These decisions are made based on the cultural memory they have passed on by through the society they lived, the people they are surrounded by. These cultural memories have also been inherited trauma that they have taken from their parents or their grandparents. This generation is also known as the Post-memory generation.

Literature Review:

The Lebanese civil war has affected several aspects of the community and its neighbors. It is considered to be one of the most complicated conflicts in the 20th century. The war has destroyed not only the infrastructure and the economy of the country but the people's spirit of living a healthy and normal life as well. The people who lived by it faced many struggles of understanding what was going on; they had to either face their fears and live with the circumstances, seek asylum elsewhere or even be a part of it. Being a part of it meant to

experience the trauma, to collect those memories, and turn them in a term that explained as Collective Memory. The trauma behind those memories caused by the war is what the old generation hold on to, and the new generation looks forward to changing and prosper. However, in case of Lebanon, the situation of the hybridity is severe, how discourse is colluded and often miscommunicated due to the scars of the war.

The situation of Lebanon during the war and after the war:

The mere demonstration of the Lebanese Civil War has been through the experiences of the people, and the evidence given by them surrounding culturally diverse atmosphere of their place of living. Larkin contributes two academic resources, "Memory and Conflict in Lebanon: Remembering and Forgetting the Past," and "Beyond the war? The Lebanese Post-memory experience." These articles have demonstrated the evidence and experiences, from the people who were witnesses of the war, with each person expressing their coarse emotions about the war. The impact of the book gives rawness and savagery occurrences from the war and leaves traces into the nowadays world. In his previous book that was published two years ago, (Larkin, 2012) "Beyond the war? The Lebanese Post-memory experience," he emphasizes the outcome of the war, with the unusual use of the theory of Marianne Hirsch, he then later concludes the nowadays situation with the citizens of Lebanon and their living circumstances through the perspective of Hirsch. Larkin's works have managed to present the complete coverage of individual perception, of the violence, and the conflicts that were going in a detailed manner, rather than emphasizing it conflictingly. He has given the opportunity for each person represented in his work, to express their story with absolute neutrality.

Post-memory is often described as the second generation of an age that has passed through traumatic experiences because of a political dispute of aftermath consequences. The theory and Larkin's analysis has given the sustainable specific credibility of the existing issue, which still continually renews from one generation to another in Lebanon, and maintains the hybridity of the country.

"Hybridity, or the Cultural Logic of Globalization" distinguishes the different positions of society between Lebanon and other countries. Explained what hybridity is from different aspects, regarding vocabulary, and terminologies; how words can change the subject of race and the cultural mix in Lebanon and in general. In a different term demonstrated how hybridity had been used in public discourse and media as well. (Marwan M. Kreidy, 2005)

Discourse and Context of the war:

Often what academic resources, and found the discourse of the Lebanese Civil War tends to validate from the perspective of the victim, how the victim was indirectly involved in the war, and what impact the war has left on the victims. What is interesting is through these narratives, there were the other parts of the people who were directly involved in the war, and the ones who perpetuated to act violently, commit crimes, and unimaginable inhumane atrocities because of either their ideology, their religion, or act of property rights. Kreidie, L. H., & Kristen Renwick Monroe's case study "Psychological Boundaries and Ethnic Conflict: How Identity Constrained Choice and Worked to Turn Ordinary people into Perpetrators of Ethnic Violence during the Lebanese War." (Kreidie) Documented from the interviewees who were obliged to commit such crimes against humanity, and who had the destiny of the people in their hands, frequently

maximized the situation rather than minimizing it. The purpose of the political parties and religious parties was to recruit more youngsters, and more people to serve in the war and act as militiamen. In the study, the selection was random, because the war consisted of many religions, different political parties, and the same religion with different ideologies; thus the effect of the random selection is apparent. Kreidie and Monroe have tried to diversify their study; as in have different people from different religions, it is, however, it had lacked in the different political parties. Since each political parties had members of the same religion and the same sect of that religion, they have not diversified with more interviews to explain furthermore from different ideologies and mindsets. Two of the scholars tried to absorb the cause of how people who lived carefully, in the same neighborhood, or were from the same society managed to change themselves and became regular citizens, with their criminal acts wiped clean.

History repeats itself, undoubtedly Lebanon was not the only specific country of a dense civil war.

To understand the start of any war, several structures should go through to understand why war has been declared. It is critical to revealing certain similarities with incidents to similar wars that were not far away from the Lebanese civil war, because similarities show a string of the main base of a war to collide. "Bosnia-Herzegovina and Lebanon: Historical Lessons of Two Multi-Religious States. (No. 2 ed., Vol. 21, pp. 269-281)" (Bieber) Bieber has insisted on actual occurrences for the cause of both wars, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Lebanon. He has described the success of finding the similarities of both civil wars, was after the fall of the Ottoman Empire, how each nation has taken actions to govern their states. This has helped understand different outlooks from different cultures towards civil war and different analysis of both of the wars. However, the impression that Bieber has left from his research is that both wars indicated that

the one assured similarity was the different ideologies of the people with the same nationality that led the indifference to a heated civil war.

Cultural, Collective memory and its Trauma:

When war is discussed, it is usually between two nations, or several nations are disagreeing on a particular dogma that leads to bad diplomatic relations and ends in chaos. However, when Civil war is discussed, it is often when the people living in one nation turn against each other, based on the defense of their religion, different cultural traditions, or different political ideologies. These indifferences cause people to commit crime, atrocities, become vigilance towards each other, etc. The crimes committed, without the level of the crime affects the person who is involuntarily involved in an unwanted war. These experiences become the memory of the person, perhaps a traumatic memory as well. "Finding meaning in memory: A methodological critique of collective memory studies." (Kansteiner 2002) Has presented the methodology of what is and can be described as collective memory, what is critical about collective memory, and if collective memory can be looked in the category of credible history. The research has the depth of the explanation the variation of memories. Specifically, collective memory has given specific and important theories demonstrated by known sociologists and argued by double standardizing of finding the meaning in memory. Within these memories Kansteiner has pintsized of how trauma can effect on people's perception of the memory, by using explanations from Freud, but (A.Lazar & T. Litvak-Hirsch) have described how these traumas have caused a symbolic boundary in the culture who lived through it. "Cultural Trauma as a Potential Symbolic Boundary" contextualized the case of Holocaust and with the help of three students who have inherited the experiences and the traumas of their parents to them. Both of the scholars have

contributed to suggest how the transference of cultural and collective memory is relative for the coming generation to experience syndromes from the trauma itself or at least understand the effects of it.

Postmemory Generation:

The outcomes of memories, and trauma leads to discoveries of a person's mind. These characteristics helps define what postmemory generation is, what is considered to be in the generations. Marianne Hirsch has excelled in the

Methodology & Central Research Questions:

The used methods which utilized to prepare the research were:

Data Collection: To have sufficient and well-researched credible background, some of the information was taken from several resources to ensure the double standard of the research. Since the information that was obtained from various sources was varied from neutral to somewhat bias, and because of the fragility of the subject chosen "the Lebanese Civil War," the approach is taken for further research was based on the empirical theory, with a mix of theoretical methodology. The reason why I have to merge theoretical theory as well, is to understand the possibility of possible outcomes, as I have decided to show a different approach by the end of the research, as I have decided to add a creative aspect to the paper as well. I have done acquired biographies of my family members, who have experienced the war, family members specifically my parents, my brothers, my aunt and my uncle. I have added myself to interview, because the idea behind interviewing my family, and my memoir is to go through my

perspective and how I perceived it through their stories, and how it affected on me as a part of my identity with an exquisite mother, with many stories, and my uncle growing up and living in the war, to the point that my father has been shot in his leg.

Findings:

French Mandate

After the end of World War I, leaving Lebanon and other districts under the French military administration, also known as the French mandate. Lebanon and Syria were given to the French by the League of Nations in 1923. Since there was a Christian majority; the Maronites in Lebanon, they were pro-French by their values, and for the 20 coming years, which led them to be more preferred by the French. One of the main reasons for the pre-war conflict between the Lebanese, was when Greater Lebanon changed the balance of the population. The Maronites were still the most significant element; however, after the expansion of Lebanon, they were no longer a majority. The situation created conflict between the Christians and the Muslims, on the fact that the Christians accepted the rule of the French, but the Muslims wanted to join more significant part of Syria or the Arab States. To ease the tensions between the both, in 1932 it was decided that each side should be represented in public offices equally. Therefore, giving the presidency of the republic to the Maronites, the Prime Minister as a Sunni Muslim, and the speaker of the Chamber to a Shiite Muslim.

With Beirut being the center of the trade of Lebanon and its surrounding countries as well, came with its advantages and disadvantages, one of the benefits was that the middle class grew, the economy grew and improved, but the agriculture declined because of the depressive world economy and the silk industry. As a result, the people demanded more independence. In 1936 the

wish of the people became a reality because a Franco-Lebanese treaty was signed to pursue

friendship and freedom, but it was not accepted by France, during the same years, France was

controlled by the Vichy Regime. After the fall of the Vichy regime in 1940, Lebanon was

controlled by the British army and the Free French troops temporarily, until it was regained back

to the Free French representatives. In 1943 since the Free French representatives were

unwarrantable, they refrained from permitting elections for further independence, which resulted

for the nationalists to win. When the nationalists took partial control over the government, they

made amendments in the constitutions that eliminates the French influence; the French did not

approve the bills. On November 11, 1943, the President of Lebanon, and almost its entire

government got arrested. The arrest of the national officials led to insurgency towards the French

control, and on November 22, 1946, Lebanon became entirely independent, and already a

member of the United Nations and the Arab League.[1]

Independent Lebanon

After the independence, the Lebanese parliament kept its democracy despite its disputes. The

primary issue for Lebanon was the unequal unwritten separation of power-sharing of Christians

and Muslims on National terms. The president of Lebanon, Bechara Al-Khoury kept his relation

well with the Prime Minister Riyadh-Al-Soleh. They permitted an amendment that made the

president run for the second term; the parliament re-elected Khoury, sometime later, the

president's manipulation towards the constitution led him to accusations of corruption and made

him quite unpopular. With his unpopularity, the assassination attempt and the strike against his

---

[1] Traboulsi, F. (2012). Greater Lebanon: The Dialectics of Attachment and Detachment (1915–1920). In *A History of Modern Lebanon* (pp. 75-87). London: Pluto Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctt183p4f5.11

government, in 1952 he was forced to resign, that lead to the parliament to vote for Kamil

Chamoun as the successor of the presidency.

1958 Crisis

After the independence of Lebanon, the parliament maintained its democracy, however Lebanon

had one main problem that stayed from during the French Mandate, which was the unevenness of

power separation between the Christians and the Muslims. It was mostly violated from time to

time due to the fact that it was an unwritten agreement. The escalation to further tension in

Lebanon was caused by during the early years of the independence by the call of the Pan-Arab

Unity. The president Khoury closely cooperated with the Sunni prime minister, leaving Khoury

to temporarily amend the constitution to allow him for a second six year term of presidency. This

caused him to be unpopular after the re-elections, especially after the accusations of corruption

and the manipulation of the elections. With all of the situation that was going on inside Lebanon,

several revolutionary acts were on going in the neighbor countries of it, resulting for the

opposition to conduct a general strike, that lead the president to resign, and have Camile

Chamoun to be elected by the parliament for the presidency. Chamoun's enmity rose with Gamal

Abdel Nasser's, Egypt's president, and things we getting more tough for the middle-east,

especially when Chamoun decided to side with Britain and was Chamoun was accused of

aligning Lebanon with the Western Treaty Organization also known as the Baghdad Pact.

In 1957 Chamoun was accused of manipulated the parliamentary elections, for the reelection of

his presidency. Irrespective to the accusations in 1958 Syria joined along Egypt and formed

Union Arab Republic (February 1958- September 1961.) The Muslims in Lebanon praised the

Union and wished for the president to join them as well, however with Chamoun's decisions, he

lead to create more separation between the Christians and Muslims rather than creating peace.

After Chamoun's presidency ended, Fuad Chehab the General of the Army, succeeded him

leaving the prime minister seat for Rashid Karami.

The Chehabi administration finally put all the tension to rest, the president and his administration

helped Lebanon prosper, by promoting national unity of Lebanon, by refusing to involve the

army to attack against the general strikes done by the Lebanese Muslims. After solving the

confessional issues bared from the past, the administration started to fix the socio-economic

concerns, which resulted Lebanon's economy to boom and develop to a better nation.[2]

The War

After the succession of Fuad Chehab, Charles Helou was elected as president, and over the years,

he tried to keep Lebanon as vigorous as the Chehabi administration did, but unfortunately, as

much as his administration tried, at a certain point, it failed, which resulted in the outbreak of the

civil war. One of the reasons for the outbreak was the imbalance of the social mobility, and lack

of diverse group integration. Due to the difference of the economical classes, by mid-70s a

poverty belt had sprung around the city. Rigidities was occurring around the country and

polarization was increasing by the guelliras of Palestine, the increase of the Palestinian refugee

state in Lebanon, to a certain point that in 1973 one-tenth of the Lebanese population were

Palestinians. With the end of Helou's term, Sleimen Franjieh was elected as the president of

Lebanon in 1970, he was the leader of the Maronite clan in Zgharta; a region in northern

[2] Traboulsi, F. (2012). Shihabism and the Difficult Autonomy of the State (1958–1970). In *A History of Modern Lebanon* (pp. 139-156). London: Pluto Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctt183p4f5.15

Lebanon, with lack of understanding with what the country needed.

The social and political mobilization became dangerous after the increase of Palestinian guelliras that were led by Musa-Al-Sadr and several other political movements as well. The monopoly of force was getting out of hand, so terribly that violence was increasing and along the way destroying the social and political aspect of the country. In the mid-70 the escalation had deepened, giving increased powers to both sides, the Christian Phalangists led by Pierre Gemayel, Muslim Lebanese National Movement (LNM) led by Kamal Jumballat.

On April 13, 1975 the Phalangists attacked a bus, full of Palestinians, on the way to a refugee camp, next to Tall a-Za'tar, also known as "1975 Bosta incident", this generated a battle against LNM and the Phalangists. Within months, Beirut the capital of Lebanon, was separated with a "green line" drawing a line between West Beirut, and East Beirut. The line was in action until 1990, a year after the war ended. The separation of the capital gave move power to militias, as they controlled the borderline. Arbitration between militias was out of option, consequentially foreign interferences increased, several sectarian communities disputed against each other due to unstable negotiations.

One of the first foreign interferences was Syria, in June 1976 it hurled a massive scale against the power imbalance of favoring the Christians that steered Israel to intervene on the behalf of Christians, by providing arms and finances to fight against the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), eventually not to escalate tensions both parties decided to retreat, although not for long. On June 6, 1986 Israel invaded Lebanon this time not only to secure its border territory from the north to stop the PLO raids, but they managed to get close to the suburbs of Beirut and laid siege to the capital particularly West Beirut. The purpose of the invasion was to remove PLO from Lebanon with the help of foreign supervision, the mission was successful and

the PLO moved its headquarters to Tunisia. This invasion also helped Syria to retreat to Al-Bekka, however the invasion resulted for other militias to merge including Hezbollah, the Iranian backed militia.

The war intensified by many other foreign interventions, which led the war to be more complicated, inter and counter conflicts categorized by the militias of each sectarian community. The purpose of the war was merely changed, and suddenly each sect rivaled against each other, what one started as the unbalance of ratio of the religious characters in the government turned into thrive for more power, leading to Christians killing Christians and Muslims killing Muslims.[3]

Tal Zaatar

Tel Zaatar was a camp full of Muslim Palestinians in east of Beirut, which was targeted by the Christians as the core of their enemies. Most of the camps that were inhabited by Palestinians who backed PLO. At the same time the camps of Jisr-Al-Basha, Karantina, Sin-el-Fil and Nabaa were inhabited by Muslim Lebanese and Palestinians. The reason why Tel Zaatar was the essential target of elimination, because it was the string of the stronghold reinforcement of the other camps as ideologically and its strategic location. The location was causing the Christian militias to have difficulties strategically between East Beirut (Ashrafieh), and the comers from North of Lebanon. Two reasons why the Christians did not have this strategy during the early stages of the war: The Christians militias thought non-involvement would mean less intervention

---

[3] Fawwaz Traboulsi (2012). Reform by Arms (1975–1976). A History of Modern Lebanon. 193-210. London: Pluto Press.

of the Palestinians in the war, and second was the shortage of the militia manpower and weapons. The first siege took place on January 1, 1976, blockading food and medical supplies in attempt to reassign the redistribution of Muslim forces with the heavy engagement in the hotel and the port areas. At the end of March 1976, the Christians were able to takeover Tel Zaatar and other camps as well. The camp held approximately 20,000 inhabitants before the conflict, and through the siege of it, many families feared and escaped. [4]

Black Saturday

Following the death of four Phalangist members, they plotted and attacked workers who were getting out of their work at the port of Beirut, killing around 200 innocent Muslim citizens. It is said that they killed people with "ID cards" since there was the specified religion on the ID cards.[5]

Sabra and Shatila

After the invasion of Israel in 1982 with the help of the Phalangist party, and other Christian militias, with the purpose of eliminating PLO, attacked camps of Sabra and Shatila. Israeli forces invaded all the way to the capital of Beirut, bombarding the western part of the city, where the

[4] Fawwaz Traboulsi (2012). Reform by Arms (1975–1976). A History of Modern Lebanon. 206-207. London: Pluto Press.
[5] Fawwaz Traboulsi (2012). Reform by Arms (1975–1976). A History of Modern Lebanon. 198. London: Pluto Press.

majority were Palestinians and Shiite Muslims. The Headquarters of PLO was in Shatila next to the camp of Sabra.

The US-brokered ceasefire with PLO leaders and promised that more than 14,000 fighters were to be evacuated from the country with the assurance of the safety of the thousands of Palestinians left behind. With the agreement, PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat left Beirut, with the fighters per the ceasefire agreement. However a couple of months later, the leader of the Phalangist party and the elect President Bashir Gemayel was assassinated.

The following day on September 15, the Israeli army surrounded Sabra and Shatila, the next day the Israeli military allowed around 150 Phalangist militiamen into the camps. The Phalangists believed that it was the PLO that had assassinated their leader, which enraged them and encouraged them to commit unimaginable atrocities, killing around 3000-3500 Palestinian and Lebanese civilians most of them Shiite Muslims. The victims were mostly children, women and elderly. The forces surrounded Sabra and Shatila came to be known of the civilians were being butchered, and they did nothing to stop it. The whole massacre took two to three days; the captives were found executed after being interrogated by the Phalangists,

Safra Massacre:

The Safra massacre which is also known as "Day of the long knives," was the killings of 500 militiamen, named as "The Tigers." The Tigers were the army of the National Liberal Party, led by ex-president Kamil Chamoun. The Tigers were more hostile than the Phalangists, however on July 7, 1980, the Phanalgists carried out an operation of "Day of the long knives" wiping out all 500 of them in Safra, a Mediterranean coastal village.

Most studies of memory represent specific events with particular settings, these specific settings are mostly chronological, geographical, and the aspect of media. However there are other aspects as well, the representation of the psychological and neurological memory also explained as autobiographic memory. Some of the autobiographical content may contextualize with the settings mentioned above, and some of them might be receptive to the consequences of the events taken place. It is critical to understand the power of representation and how it can be perceived. If the power of observation is handed to collective memory, then it can disrupt and misrepresent the facts of the specific event. According to Wulf Kansteiner "collective memory studies have not yet sufficiently conceptualized collective memories as distinct from individual memory." As such collective memory is not sufficient enough to be credible for the sociological aspect of the historical representation of that specific event.

Kansteiner continues to explain the definition of collective memory as the result of three types of historical factors which are the cultural traditions that represent the past, the persons who select and manipulate specific events that intervene the traditions, and the people who use the memory in use and control for their interest. We can understand from Kansteiner that collective memory is not history, it is popular consciousness of the contemporary of the happening. However, this popular consciousness of the modern is building the coming generations, the perception of the people and the society towards each other. Despite the fact of the many historical and academic resources of the civil war, people still have acknowledged what happened, have witnessed it, and understood why it happened. Given an example, in the visual or written documentaries, the resources vividly demonstrated how aware the people were of the war through their "individual memory." The participants of the recorded oral history can explain the loopholes and the mistakes of the war in their opinion. They can guide the audience to a particular building

shattered with bullets from the 70's and the 80's, and they can precisely recall the memory of the incident which caused the bullets on the building.

In Kanstein's theory, he further explains how Assman develops "cultural memory" into further research to maintain and understand Halbwachs's emphasis on "materiality of memory."

He demonstrates that cultural memory is characterized by instability, disorganization, and non-specialization which forms everyday communication. These communications have a lifespan of eighty to hundred years, which he argues that "they are by definition strongly influenced by contemporaries of the events in question."

He further describes that cultural memory is made up of materialistic concepts such as pictures, texts, buildings, statues, and monuments presented for the specific events to stabilize the society's image. Since cultural memory consists of objectified and materialized culture, thus the culture serves the purpose of recalling events in the history of collective. To understand Assmann's theory furthermore, he initiates an essential differentiation between potential cultural memory and actual cultural memory. He argues that the internal cultural memory of the representations of the past that archived in museums, libraries, etc. These representations become the real cultural memory when it effects on the society and gives a new meaning of social and historical context. During the transference from potential to actual, the intensity, the purpose and the social depth changes, thus creating a gap of bias I n the transformation of the interpretations.

If cultural memory is only the objectified culture; then recorded history is as bias as the objectified culture. If this theory is taken and perceived from a Lebanese perspective, it is arguable that recorded history and cultural memory are both objectified. Regarding speaking

only according to the Civil War, the potential memory is addressed to be one of the reasons why the war started in the first place, after the French Mandate the actual cultural memory affected the people and gave a new meaning and new social depth to them. After the end of the war, the same transference process caused the new generation to have yet another social depth change. In Lebanon's case, if the transfer of the interpretation has a bias gap, then it is understandable that a biased history has been spread for almost a century.

As mentioned Kansteiner explained the three types of collective memory, the first one was the cultural traditions representing the past. One of the causes that the Lebanese clashed and turned against each other was because of the values and the principles of their cultural traditions, since many Christian Lebanese adopted traditions. The acceptance of some cultures from the French and the want to continue to spread their religion as well, the same applied to the Muslim Lebanese, they wanted to continue to practice their religion, be able to exercise their values and traditions as well. A country with religious people have cultural traditions, for a country like Lebanon and it is known hybridity cultural tradition is a part of their history as well.

The second type is when the persons who select specific memories, and specific events that try to intervene the cultural traditions. These people tend to manipulate the perception of someone towards the specific events, or can even blur the historical facts. If these collective memories do contextualize with specific settings in the taken place events, and if the second type is somewhat the receptive form of the consequences of the events, then type two collective memory is applied on Lebanon and the war, it can be explained in different forms. During the war, each militia, and each political or religious party had their propaganda and their way of manipulating the memories and the memories of the traditions to keep the party intact. To take example of the

Phalangists, the memory and the concept of receiving the news of the death of their four soldiers in the Mount Lebanon, triggering a small army of the Phalangists to attack and massacre hundreds of innocent Muslims, coming out from their work on a Saturday at the Port of Beirut somewhat leads to be factual history (Black Saturday). If one collective memory pointed a community to result in the historically recorded massacre, then collective memory is somehow sufficient enough to be credible and undifferentiated from individual memory. Lastly, the third type which Kansteiner proposed, is when a person uses the memory to use or control according to their interest. This can be explained in the form of more individuality in the collective memory, where each person uses the memory to control the situation or to tell a story that will be biased to their advantage. In the case of Lebanon this has been a proper type of collective memory, since everyone who lived in Lebanon during the war was indirectly involved, and witnessed something horrific to an extent. Thus the memory of these terrible events has passed to effect individually transforming it into individual memory. These memories tend to be controlled by the emotions of the person, using it for control for their interest. In the interviews done by my family members, it is interesting to find several perspectives from two siblings, and two generations, my mother, and my aunt. It is arguable if collective memory is considered collective, or cultural memory, if it not passed to other people, making it collective, my aunt's decisions on passing the memories are different than my mothers. My aunt decided not to tell her kids, or her surrounding people for the reasons of "I didn't like to share my war experience with my children, the main reason was that they didn't grow up in Lebanon, and because of that I didn't see sharing these horrific experiences with a child outside that warzone would be any of help. After they grew up and became over 20 years old, I told them small episodes while we are watching a movie that had war scenes, or anything that related to heavy violence, or any similar

news we hear on TV. I share something very briefly without exporting my feelings of those days into them. Generally, I didn't find any reason to inherit those emotional memories to them, because those memories aren't pleasant ones."

As for my mother, she had a different opinion on why she decided to inherit us those memories "because my memories were just horrible. I was already married, with toddlers, by the end of the war in 1990, and people thought that the war had ended. However, the bombings had started. The politicians and the leaders of the political parties were assassinating each other starting from the President of Lebanon. I had lived in a Christian neighborhood all my life, and I saw how our peaceful and friendly neighbors turned into murderers and criminals...because of that, I lost trust in everyone. After having children, I made sure they understand of how people can be bad as well, I wanted them to be careful from their friends and acquaintances. On top of that, me being an Armenian and neutral during the war it made up more targeted because they thought that since we are not with them, then we are with the Muslims. I told the stories and the memories of my experiences so that they can know how to protect themselves and be careful with everyone."

That memory has effected on her to make sure that she passes on to us, to understand what it means to know someone with a background of these political parties. It is more than the memory that makes the person recall the traumatic scenes and the let those traumatic memories symbolize and change a person's coping mechanism towards life.

These traumatic memories raise questions, individually and culturally. To understand furthermore, the definition of trauma is a profoundly and distressing experience affected the mind of the person. However, cultural trauma is acclaimed to be the occurrence of the collective members who have been subjected to horrific events continued by one cause, these events leave

inevitable scars on the people's consciousness, making these events hard to forget, to the point that it might influence fundamentally on the identity of the person. Alexander suggests that the construction of cultural trauma in social groups and national societies, sometimes cognitively identify the source of the suffering, and take significant responsibility for it. As a result, they understand the cause of the trauma, and as a moral responsibility, they tend to share their sufferings and others sufferings as moral responsibility. I recall it was my mother's responsibility to tell me her pains, as an Armenian Lebanese, living in Lebanon during the war, and having the fear that her family would be the next victim of the war, especially after hearing and seeing the aftermath of the Tal al Zaatar in 1976, she recalls "One of the other horrific events was the massacres in Tel Zaatar , I remember this quite well, I was sitting with my mother and I at the balcony, we heard loud noises as we saw a tank arrive at our street, where our neighbor a commander in Bejin got out of the tanks with his associates. They were acting very odd, and it was obvious that they were intoxicated under drugs, we saw them playfully hitting each other with some glove which was not understandable form a first sight, but as we looked closer it was vivid that it was an arm of a human being and they were playing around by pulling the nerves from the arm to make it move! One of the associates carried a huge bag from the tank, and they emptied it on the street and started counting ears! Ears of human beings with all different sizes, they were counting to see how many people they slaughtered! All these murderers had a badge on their arms, on the badge were signs of big crosses and a small piece of wood claimed to be from the cross where Jesus Christ was crucified. We were horrified and shook with fear."

As Lamont and Molnar explain the concept of symbolic boundaries shape the relations in the aspects of social sciences such as social classes, ethnic background, and possibly gender.

However, in the research of social sciences, they tend to forget to acknowledge the damage and the impact caused by the symbolic boundaries.

"Individuals and groups treat symbolic boundaries as cognitive frameworks, which guide their behavior and relations with other." The individuals who have the understanding of the outcome of their different cognitive framework from the inherited trauma they have been passed to, it is justifiable to conclude that it affects the individuals or groups to be in those symbolic boundaries. Furthermore, it merely explains that whatever my mother has passed on me during my teenage years, where I had to out socializing people other than my mono-ethnic high school, she made sure I understand who I was socializing with. With that, I was taught at a young age to ask about the person's background and use my cognitive skills that belong in the symbolic boundaries to understand the context of the person, and who their families might have been during the war. After knowing, it was my judgment to understand what kind of a relationship I should have maintained with the person. It merely puts into the form of understanding Kansteiner's type three purpose of collective memory: to use the memory for their interests. (Kansteiner, 2002)

Between my family's decisions to inherit their traumatic experiences through the collective memories they had gathered during their experiences, and from their parents before the civil war started, by the explanation of Marianne Hirsch, my siblings and I are considered as the post-memory generation.

"At stake is precisely the "guardianship" of a traumatic personal and generational past with which some of us have a "living connection" and that past's passing into history. At stake is not only a personal/familial/generational sense of ownership and protectiveness, but also an evolving theoretical discussion about the workings of trauma, memory, and intergenerational acts of

transfer, a discussion actively taking place in numerous important contexts outside of Holocaust studies."

These passing of history into us reshapes our personal, familial, and generational sense of belonging and a part of our identity. It affects to a certain point that we protect it and we own the trauma and the memories as if it is our own. The question is what do we owe the victims? And how can we carry these memories without appropriating them?

We owe the victims by understanding their share in a circumstance that was not by their choice, in regards of if these circumstances are recorded in history, or visually, their individual stories are essential to be considered, because it is different from each other. There is a pattern in which we think appropriating them can be justifiable. According to Hirsch the terminology that we use for to explain the combination of collective memory, and inheritance of trauma have clarified to be a symptom more than a memory, thus formatting the description of post-memory in other words such as "absent memory," "inherited memory," "Post memory." These terms reveal that the descendants of the victims of the traumatic occurrences have been provoked by the depth of the previous generation's remembrances. Their remembrances turn into memories, and these memories can transmit to the descendant as an event, which they were not alive to be involved in.

Hirsch described postmemory as a relationship between the first generation and the second, and its transmission of horrific and traumatic experiences. These experiences led to establishing memories in the second generation, almost creating it similarly as the first generation.

Marianne further argues that postmemory is indeed not an idea or a method, but observe it "as the structure of inter- and trans-generational transmission of traumatic knowledge and experience."

She uses the word "consequences" for traumatic recall, but what if it not consequential and it is justifiable for someone to pass on their trauma. My oldest brother was born in 1985, by the time the war ended he was just six years old. However, he recalls memories, which was not his.

"They talked about some horrific happenings every once in a while, like putting people behind cars and pulling them all around the area, but the worst was Sabra and Shatila where a lot of Palestinians were killed and thrown in a big hole they dug as a grave, collective grave, with no names, and with no nothing because they were Palestinians. The Muslims and the Christians knew who was behind these massacres; everyone knew that Elie Hobeika and Samir Geagea were the ones who ordered the mission to Sabra and Shatila. It was like mass murder, and it was recorded in history.

Lebanese forces were the worst and mom being an Armenian living in the area where Phalangists and Lebanese Force were. The same Lebanese forces who tortured people raped women, and killed children. Mom was well protected and terrified of what could happen to her and her family.

I've learned one thing that people have seen a lot of blood and killing, and eventually, you understand what fear does, and I understand my mother why she told me the stories, but I would

never those bad memories to them ultimately. It's terrible for them because it's not a story, and surely isn't a Cinderella story either, it's just blood and killings."

There is a particular pattern where the postmemory generation accepts the inter and the trans-generational transmission. The pattern has to with the closeness between the generations, in the case of my brother, he has been transmitted through his mother, and that has helped him comprehend the situation, recognize the purpose of the transmission. Another example is with my elder brother where he validates why his parents passed on these stories

"The reason my parents told me these stories, it's because we have to know the reality of the war, look at it from a different perspective without inflicting any emotions, but be reasonable and realistic, the war identified the real enemy after it was finished. The enemy was in the last place they ever looked, inside themselves, they were triggered somehow to kill each other. "

What is interesting is that between my mother, and my aunt there are 11 years of age difference, and the gap has effected on their decisions whether to transmit the memory or not, same goes with my brother. Both my aunts' and my brother's decision not to transmit these memories to their children is because they were not under the influence of the civil war, as much as my mother and her brother.

She notes that postmemory is not arbitrated by the reminder of the past, as is it constructed by imagination, projection, and creation. By using these three characteristics with the inherited memories, the person goes through a dilemma on their reflection. Postmemory is the events happened in the past but continues in the present. In my experience with my mother's stories, I do have those dilemmas, and how I take her stories personally and try to include it in my

identity. One example is the story of the cutoff ears since I know where it took place, and I have visited the destination most of my childhood, and with the imagination that I have, I can understand her fear, and profound experiences with the Phalangists, the Lebanese Forces and so on. The question is whether it is ethical to appropriate them. The appropriation follows depending on the severity of the person who has inherited it, it follows on how personal the story is to the person who has inherited it, and it follows on why it is essential and achievable with appropriation. After all postmemory portraits the role of the family in the transmission of the remembrance.

Conclusion and further research questions:

In all understandings, people who have been through trauma, transmit their memories to their children, or people who are close to them, to mark their history of the suffering. These memories carry on for generation making it the responsibility of the coming generation to endure the suffering of their previous one.

The Lebanese civil war had impacted on its citizens, and the region, it has nudged the world with its complicated escalation, of violence, atrocities, and all the world problems in one place. The intensification of the war was because of political views, religion, and power over each other. The foreign interventions caused more backlash and separation between the Lebanese which resulted in 25 years of indiscretion, horrific conditions, and caused trauma to the Lebanese. The memories that were imprinted, defined as collective memory, and many other definitions explained by famous sociologists often trying to argue what collective memory means, and how it can be traced, and how it can be credible. These methods of arguments lead to the depth of the

story, the meaning of what is the memory in the collective, and often it is the trauma. The trauma that we as Lebanese carry on after not only 25 years, but for 43 years.

For further research, will all the effort of explaining the situation, and preserving of the theories from another point of view, would be impressive to research this thesis, as more of a psychological field, rather than an incommunicative political discourse of a hybrid cultured nation.

Annotated Bibliography:

Larkin, C. (2012). *Memory and Conflict in Lebanon: Remembering and Forgetting the Past.* Routledge.

Dr. Craig Larkin is a senior lecturer at the King's College London. He has a doctorate in Middle East studies and had several books, concerning conflicts in the Middle East. This book is about the Lebanese civil war that occurred from 1975-1990, and how it depicted on the generation that were living at that time. Through the chapters, it emphasizes on how the war affected on the coming generation, and how the war has affected the cultural identity of a Lebanese citizen as well. What is interesting is that the book not only gives information, and happenings of the war, but memoirs of the generation after the war too, how they are trying to move on. This is essential because it gives the cultural background of the post war effects on the people.

Cestor, E. (2010). Music and Television in Lebanon. In M. Frishkopf, *Music and Media in the Arab World* (p. 98). American University in Cairo Press.

It is important to discuss how music and media affected on the Lebanese War, and how people have been influenced and survived these horrific years because of the war. In page 98, Cestor discusses the most influential singer during the Lebanese war, which was Fairuz. Fairuz refused to sing in public, and give concerts during the war because she didn't want to put tension on the sects during the war, as she was Maronite Christian herself. This helps my thesis in explaining why the media and the entertainment culture was strongly moved and separated because of religion as well.

Larkin, C. (2010). Beyond the war? The Lebanese postmemory experience. 615-635.

Dr. Larkin has conducted a memoir with about 100 young Lebanese citizens that have postmemory experience of the war. He gives the stories and different perspectives of the situations around the country, implying that not every family had the same experience, not every family was affected the same way as others have, and not every district in the country was damaged because of the war.

Kraidy, M. M. (2005). Structure, Reception, and Identity: On Arab-Western Dialogism. In *Hybridity.* Temple University Press.

Professor of Communication, founding director for the Advanced Research Center in Global Communication at the University Of Pennsylvania, written over 100 scholarly articles and 6 books, explains the identity crisis cause by the civil war. The author narrates and explains in details of

how Christians were trying to define and justify their Christianity and how Muslims were defining theirs. This chapter really accentuates on the division of Lebanon, and how the media has done their job in separating the people as well.

Horowitz, D. L. (1985). Ethnic Groups in Conflict. In D. L. Horowitz, *Ethnic Groups in Conflict* (pp. 6-8). University of California Press.

The writer explains the ethnic divisions and how it is structured in society. He also explains how it is somehow created and rooted into the mandatory explanation of "who are you?" question. Including children, at a young age and emphasizing the importance of having the pride of the ethnicity. The writer sort of explains the legitimacy and the privileges that can be given or gifted to the people who acknowledge their strong ethnic background, especially in multiethnic countries that suffer from conflict. I highly respect the author of trying not to make his thesis bias in anyway, he further affirms of his non bias opinion by writing "even in the most severely divided society, there are also other issues. Nor do ethnic affiliations govern behavior at all situations. If they did, the bonds across ethnic lines that make a multi-ethnic society possible could not develop."

Bieber, F. (2000). Bosnia-Herzegovina and Lebanon: Historical Lessons of Two Multireligious States. In F. Bieber, *Third World Quarterly* (No. 2 ed., Vol. Vol. 21, pp. 269-281). Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

These pages talk about how two civil wars are alike, and how scholars have compared both of them in order to find the core issues of the beginning of both of the wars. The author talks about

the two multi-religious states and what led to war in the first place. The author stresses that both

of the countries were under the rule of The Ottoman Empire, and after the fall of the Ottoman

Empire, how each state took actions to govern their own states. I think this will help understand

different perspectives from different cultures towards civil war, and different analysis of both of

the wars.

Slone, M. (2000). *Responses to Media Coverage of Terrorism.* Sage Publications, Inc.

This report is dedicated to understand how Media coverage of terrorism is prone to effect on

people. The report gives the explanation of the experiment and what the ideology is behind it.

The result of the experiment was quite anticipated. Although the whole experiment is conducted

in Israel and my thesis is of Lebanon thus the fusion of enemy states, the psychological impact

that media coverage on people is more or less the same, judging that both states are not far from

each other having geopolitical and cultural similarities.

Kreidie, L. H., & Kristen Renwick Monroe. (2002). *Psychological Boundaries and Ethnic*

Conflict: How Identity Constrained Choice and Worked to Turn Ordinary People into

Perpetrators of Ethnic Violence during the Lebanese. Springer.

The report is vulnerable and sensitive since it is about ordinary people into perpetuating ethnic

violence during the Lebanese war, and how they committed serious crimes. The report really

gives the interviewees the opportunity to express what was required from them to do, and why

they did it in the first place. The report also explains how the experiment was conducted based

on what theory, and the how the questions were asked based on the theories as well. I plan to use

this, to explain the mere delicacy of what different identity is defined and the entitlement of the soil a person lives on. The capstone will be going back to the history briefly, to explain the Lebanese war, and focus on specific incidents, and massacres that occurred to be able to comprehend the core of the issue that will be further spoken.

Wulf Kansteiner (2002). Finding Meaning In Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies. 2, 41, 179-197

Dr.Wulf Kansteiner is a cultural-intellectual historian of the 20th century, specified in interest of mass media representing events and their impact on postwar history and philosophy. He teaches modern historiography, and memory studies. Kansteiner has written over a dozen of articles and chapters in book, other than writing three book of his own. The article discusses intensely the theories of collective memory, and what collective memory means, and the theories differentiating the distinct memories. What is interesting to find in this article is that, the author has given a diversity of ideas, and several perspectives towards the critique of the methodology of collective memory.

Alon Lazar and Tal Litvak-Hirsch (2009). Cultural Trauma as a Potential Symbolic Boundary. Memory and Media Space, 22, 183-190

Alon Lazar, with a doctorate in Psychology from Ben Gurion University of Negev, Israel, is a lecturer and expert in society and culture. With the collaboration of Tal Litvak-Hirsch, PhD in psychology, have conducted a study that explains cultural trauma and how it effects on people. The study contains interesting theories of how cultural trauma has inherited through generations

and how it has an impact on social boundaries. This theory is applied on the Holocaust and the studied on three different groups of Jewish students. It will be helpful to take the theory and apply it on the Lebanese Civil War, since the society went through trauma as well, making it a culturally mutual trauma.

Marianne Hirsch (2012). 1. The Generation of Postmemory. 103-128. Columbia: Columbia University Press.

Marianne Hirsch, with a doctorate from Brown University, a lecturer career at the Colombia University, and many more. She has accomplished to write five books that have impacted and influenced the studies in many research fields. Her theories have given many scholars the opportunity to explore more into their field. "The Generation of Post-memory" has made an uproar for answering questions that was difficult to response to, it has given scholars of psychology, sociology, genocide studies (specifically Holocaust studies) the prospect of understanding the generations, and how traumatic occurrences are affected and passed on to many generations ahead. This theory has helped understand the situation in Lebanon as well, since there are many characteristics that are relatable between her theory and the Lebanese civil war.