

---

## So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by TonTon - 04-07-2008 06:13

---

Have I got this right? Does this mean that I am not allowed to say "I support Hezbollah in defending Lebanon from Israeli invasion", for example?

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by Femme Folle - 04-07-2008 07:15

---

I thought you said there was a ban on Lebanese restaurants.

Which would be a shame since I just found one that got great reviews in a nearby town.

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by Disco Sea Shanties - 04-07-2008 09:12

---

Now that would be an outrage. Lebanese food is possibly my favourite type of cuisine in the world.

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 04-07-2008 09:17

---

It means you're not allowed to "encourage support" for its "military wing". And yes, that is outrageous.

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by TonTon - 04-07-2008 09:22

---

I can "encourage support" for Israel in invading Lebanon, because they aren't terrorists. But I can't "encourage support" for Hizbollah in resisting such an invasion, because they are.

Nice and simple. Fucking hell.

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 04-07-2008 10:00

---

Why is it whenever there's a bit of mindless New Labour repression, McNulty's name is never far away?

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 04-07-2008 10:12

---

Major Rawls is right about that asshole.

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 04-07-2008 10:39

---

---

Major Rawls?

=====

**Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance**

Posted by Etienne - 04-07-2008 12:26

---

It's a reference to The Wire, GO.

=====

**Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance**

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 04-07-2008 12:37

---

I've never read any of wingco's music criticism.

=====

**Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance**

Posted by TonTon - 05-07-2008 19:16

---

The thing is, I do support Hizbollah's military wing, and I do encourage you all to do the same.

I can't imagine it's going to be much of a problem, but it could be, couldn't it?

=====

**Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance**

Posted by nefertiti - 05-07-2008 23:41

---

Yes it is. Hizbollah are a load of evil bastards. Ask a Lebanese who is dealing with their military take-over of Beirut. Vile undemocratic racist anti gay fundamentalist bullies.

=====

**Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance**

Posted by TonTon - 06-07-2008 08:15

---

Oh, the idea itself could be a problem, yes, that's certainly true, and worth talking about.

Were I to accept your characterisation, the point would remain, though, wouldn't it?

(It's certainly true that there are Lebanese people who would agree with your characterisation of Hizbollah. It's also certainly true that there are Lebanese people who wouldn't. So now we've got the "testifying" out of the way, you can have your own opinions.)

=====

**Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance**

Posted by nefertiti - 07-07-2008 07:56

---

If you're saying that you should have a fundamental right to state your political position, then I agree with you (and am delighted by your implicit support for Enlightenment values).

I thought you might be presuming a general agreement with your support for Hezbollah- which I would want to challenge, not least because of their opposition to Enlightenment values in almost every area of human activity.

---

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by TonTon - 07-07-2008 11:01

---

I don't think I'm saying either. I'm certainly very unlikely to be making any appeal to "Enlightenment values". Though I would hope for general support for the defence of Lebanon against Israeli invasion, I'm probably thinking of a much different off in expecting that.

"I can't imagine it's going to be much of a problem, but it could be, couldn't it?" was related to how much I should worry about restating my position.

=====

## Re:So this

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 07-07-2008 11:05

---

TonTon wrote:

I'm certainly very unlikely to be making any appeal to "Enlightenment values".

Every Marxist makes such an appeal, even if only implicitly.

(Discuss.)

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by TonTon - 07-07-2008 11:17

---

If you mean that you have decided that Marxism makes appeals to what you consider to be "Enlightenment values", it would seem that the answer is "yes".

(That is, it surely depends on what you mean by "Marxist" and "Enlightenment values". Which is not necessarily the same as enlightenment values. Should such a category be accepted at all)

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 07-07-2008 15:08

---

I don't really follow that. I just mean that Marx was very much in the swim of the European Enlightenment, and that this includes his "values", tacit and implicit. More so than some of his more agrarian-utopian Socialist contemporaries, indeed.

I'm on about what gets called "modernity", I guess.

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by TonTon - 07-07-2008 15:29

---

Ok, I appreciate I've not been too helpful there. I don't have the impression that nefertiti means the same as you might do, WE. But either way, I think that, particularly given the abuse of such a concept which seems to be rife at the moment, I'm not happy to assume that we all have a shared understanding, and I'd be happier if people were more explicit before asking me to agree with them, or assuming that I do. Or don't. Or, well, you know, whatever, really.

Why on earth I might think that jumble might be any more helpful, I couldn't tell you.

=====

---

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by Hofzinsler - 07-07-2008 16:23

---

Tonton, I may have got the wrong end of the stick but are you saying that either (a) there is no such thing as "Enlightenment values" or (b) that you don't believe in "Enlightenment values" per se?

If you're saying neither then apologies.

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by TonTon - 07-07-2008 22:45

---

Well, I might say one of those, I might even say the other, it really depends what you're talking about. I'm saying that just saying "Enlightenment values" isn't enough for me to know whether I agree with you or not.

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by Spence Cascaval Pane - 07-07-2008 23:01

---

It's the difference between "Enlightenment values" and, y'know, Enlightenment values, innit.

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by TonTon - 07-07-2008 23:07

---

It could well be, yeah.

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by Hofzinsler - 08-07-2008 09:32

---

I'm not asking whether you agree with my interpretation of the term so what I might mean by it isn't relevant to my question.

What I'm asking is if there's an interpretation of the term that you recognise as meaningful and, if so, whether you think these values are a good thing. (And "if not, why not?" for both too, I suppose.)

For what it's worth, I'd define "enlightenment values" (and I don't think it's an especially idiosyncratic definition) as, primarily, valuing reason and rationality as ways to find truth over appeals to authority or revelation, and a questioning and scepticism of authority. That sort of thing.

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by TonTon - 08-07-2008 09:54

---

That might have been what you meant previously, but it's not what you said.

It's not a term I'd use, no. It strikes me that its current usage is primarily in support of projects which I find neither enlightened nor valuable.

On another thread, I linked to this John Molyneux piece which seems relevant here:

---

To put the matter as starkly as possible: from the standpoint of Marxism and international socialism an illiterate, conservative, superstitious Muslim Palestinian peasant who supports Hamas is more progressive than an educated liberal atheist Israeli who supports Zionism (even critically).

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by E10 Rifle - 08-07-2008 11:15

---

I'm not sure I'd go as far as TonTon - you can't just ignore reactionary social policies - but there's certainly a debate to be had about the extent to which resistance to imperialism is itself an Enlightenment value, which might back up his position.

I'm big on Enlightenment Values meself, like, though increasingly the invocation of them, like the invocation of Orwell, have become the last refuge of the disingenuous liberal warmonger.

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by nefertiti - 08-07-2008 13:05

---

It's a good thing that said illiterate peasant is unlikely to venture onto these pages since he'd get a pretty rough time, especially if he supports a big red club as well as the one and only God, creator and sustainer of the universe.

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by Antonio Gramsci - 08-07-2008 16:12

---

To put the matter as starkly as possible: from the standpoint of Marxism and international socialism an illiterate, conservative, superstitious Muslim Palestinian peasant who supports Hamas is more progressive than an educated liberal atheist Israeli who supports Zionism (even critically).

I'm sorry, this doesn't follow at all. Even if you accept the article's contention that Marx was not anti-religious (which seems wrong to me, but let's leave it aside), it does not follow from this that one needs to support a movement which is religious and quasi-medieval in outlook against a country that is secular, modern and capitalist in outlook. My understanding of the Marxist view of these things is that "objectively" one has to be on the side of the group that is closest to the higher (and "final") stage of capitalism. At least, I can't think of another case in history where Marxists behaved otherwise (and why even among anti-Soviet marxists, there was not a lot of hand-wringing over the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan because the Afghan opposition, like Hizbullah, were just a bunch of "backwards" religious types).

Reasons for supporting one side or the other in Arab-Israeli conflicts may be based on some conception of socialism (although frankly, I think that's a lot harder in the case of Hizbullah than it is for the Palestinians), but I can't see how you can base it on Marxism.

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by Donald Potts - 08-07-2008 19:46

---

It seems clear to me that the article is talking about anti-imperialism. And whether or not Israel is all the things you mention it is also a wealthy and heavily armed power illegally occupying another country and oppressing its people. I can see where there can be disagreement with Molyneux's point, but his reasoning seems clear.

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by Antonio Gramsci - 08-07-2008 20:55

---

Yes, but Marx was sort of mixed on the subject of imperialism precisely because it was "objectively" brings people under

---

"oriental despotisms" closer to socialism (via capitalism). (See Marx on The British Rule in India)

Anti-imperialism is all well and good; my point is just that it's not self-evidently Marxist in inspiration.

=====

**Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance**

Posted by TonTon - 08-07-2008 21:47

---

Does the article argue "that Marx wasn't anti-religious"? Strikes me as a bit of a missing of the point, as it goes.

Marx wouldn't necessarily be my marxist reading of choice on imperialism.

=====

**Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance**

Posted by Antonio Gramsci - 08-07-2008 23:38

---

Well, it makes a number of points, most of which seem to be riffs on a theme recently picked up by Obama, which is that crappy material conditions will make people turn to religion. As a result, one shouldn't be anti-religious, one should work to eliminate the material conditions which allow religions to prosper. Or something like that.

Marx wouldn't necessarily be my marxist reading of choice on imperialism.

This made me smile.

=====

**Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance**

Posted by TonTon - 09-07-2008 06:46

---

I should bloody hope so. Though I was being serious too, in a way.

I'm not sure that "Marx said it's the material conditions that count, innit" is a mahoosive revelation, is it?

=====

**Re:So this**

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 09-07-2008 11:22

---

E10 Rifle wrote:

I'm big on Enlightenment Values meself, like, though increasingly the invocation of them, like the invocation of Orwell, have become the last refuge of the disingenuous liberal warmonger.

That's nailed it, I think, right there.

Though actually, the fact that (a) TonTon shares almost no opinions on deep questions with the Muslim world, yet (b) he doesn't see this as any kind of reason to take sides against them--that, in itself, is as Enlightenment as fuck, in a way.

=====

**Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance**

Posted by TonTon - 09-07-2008 11:28

---

"TonTon - as Enlightenment as fuck!"

=====

---

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 09-07-2008 11:33

---

Heh.

It's a very paradoxical thing, the way the Enlightenment habit of self-criticism so readily morphs into self-congratulation. Kind of "Aren't we all great, with our self-critical ways, and isn't the rest of the world, by comparison, a bunch of dangerous fanatics that we (who love liberty) need to sit on?"

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by ursus arctos - 09-07-2008 11:36

---

1789 and all that, innit?

=====

## Re:So this \"ban\" on the Lebanese resistance

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 09-07-2008 11:37

---

Ooooh, now that's a can of worms.

=====