



The Guardians of the Cedars Party issued the following communiqué:

If the political establishment is incapable of finding solutions to the current crisis and has to resort to outside mediation, then this clearly means that it is bankrupt, sterile and lacks a minimum sense of patriotism. As such, it is unfit to lead the country and it should no longer remain in a position of responsibility.

As we speak, the crisis is now at its 50th day and the country has been ushered into a state of total fragmentation and paralysis. Nothing on the horizon indicates an imminent solution or a forthcoming d é tente.

And if some people continue to bet on outside initiatives, be they Arab or Turkish, all the evidence points to serious hurdles facing them in achieving a permanent solution that will firmly set the country on solid foundations and close the door to further new or renewed crises. There are many reasons to this assessment, including:

- Because the parties to the conflict talk to mediators with both sides of their mouths. On the surface they display outward flexibility, but internally they hold on to their demands and raise their price for a solution by the day.
- Because all initiatives essentially are predicated on an understanding between the parties to the conflict, which is not available to begin with. Otherwise, the Dialogue Conference that lasted several months, followed by the Consultative Dialogue, would not have failed and the state of affairs would not have reached this point of complications and worsening.
- Because the mediators start with the premise of no winner-no loser as a basis for their mediation. This means that any solution will be a mere temporary compromise to chronic problems, or rather a deal at the expense of Lebanon and the Lebanese that will ultimately lead to a winner and a loser: The winner is the political establishment and the loser are Lebanon and the ordinary Lebanese people.
- Because the mediators are concerned by the symptoms of the crisis and not by its substance. The symptoms are the national government and the International Tribunal, whereas the substance is the conflict over the identity of Lebanon and its external role.

Based on the experiences of the recent past, we assert that each compromise settlement that ended a crisis led to a new crisis. A compromise ended the crisis of 1958, which led to the crisis of 1975, and the Taef compromise, which “ended” the 1975 crisis led to the present crisis. And the present compromise, should it be concluded along the same pattern, will lead to a new crisis, and so on and so forth.

Messrs. the mediators, Lebanon needs solutions and not compromises. Otherwise, it is condemned to move from crisis to crisis until the parties to the conflict recognize and admit the Lebanese identity of Lebanon and the neutrality of its regional policies.

Lebanon , at your service  
Abu Arz  
January 19, 2007