

The Concept of Violence in political philosophy

By Hannah Arendt (1906 - 1975)

مفهوم العنف في الفلسفة السياسية

عند حنة أرندت (1906-1975)

D. Meddahi Amel - ¹, P. Ramdani Hocine ²

¹ amelmeddahi26@gmail.com

² HOCINE.RAMDANI@univ-tiaret.dz

ملخص:

يشكل موضوع العنف في الفكر الفلسفي مساحةً أساسيةً، وخاصة في الفلسفة السياسية، حيث يمثل العنف والسلطة علاقة جدلية متأصلة في تاريخ الحياة البشرية. ومن ثم، فإن قضية العنف تعد مسألة فلسفية شغلت الفكر لدى المثقفين والفلاسفة على مختلف العصور، القديمة والحديثة والمعاصرة، وهي تثير العديد من التساؤلات حول موضوعاتها وعلاقاتها مع مجالات أخرى متعددة، كارتباط العنف بالسياسة والسلطة وغيره. وبما أن الحديث عن إشكالية العنف - كما تراها حنة أرندت - يثير تساؤلات حول الثورة والعنف والسياسة، فإن هذا ما يدفعنا في هذه الدراسة إلى محاولة تسليط الضوء على رؤية الفيلسوفة حنة أرندت وأفكارها الجديدة حول العلاقات العنيفة، وهو ما يكتسي أهمية كبيرة في تحليل ونقد الفكر الفلسفي بعامة والفكر الفلسفي المعاصر بخاصة

Abstract:

The subject of violence in philosophical thinking constitutes a fundamental space, especially in political philosophy, because violence and power constitute a contentious relationship based on the history of human life. And therefore, the issue of violence is a philosophical issue that has preoccupied intellectuals and philosophers in the various times, both old and recent and now, He has many questions about his subjects and his relations with many other subjects, as we have mentioned violence with politics, power and others. And since talking about the problem or dilemma of violence, as Hannah Arendt sees it, which raises questions about revolution, and violence as well as politics, this is what prompted us in this study. To try to reach out to highlight the view of the philosopher Hannah Arndt on violent relationships s views and new ideas, which is important for

placing the analysis and criticism of philosophical thinking in general and contemporary philosophical thinking in particular

Keywords: (revolution), (philosophy), (violence), (power), (politics)

1. INTRODUCTION

The subject of violence has been an intellectual struggle and political debate, as discussed in the books and ideas of philosophers and intellectuals in both the cognitive and the political sphere. The issue of violence has been linked to political as well as social problems. This is due to the importance and status of the subject. And so the subject of violence is not the object of the hour or the day because it is one of the themes that has endured in human history since time immemorial, especially during periods of human war in this world, Violence is one of the issues that began with the emergence and beginning of human life, as evidenced by the Abel and Qabil brothers, and the phenomenon of violence has not persisted throughout the various periods. Violence is an expression of the power of all kinds that comes against man in order to control and dominate, what made it related to politics and other areas in various periods in Greek philosophy that addressed issues of politics and regulations and the subject of violence was linked to power. In modern philosophy, philosophers also addressed the issue of violence and its relationship to politics and power. They have addressed the topic of the polemics of violence and tolerance, but in contemporary philosophy, because of the political events of this period, major political problems have arisen, which involve many problems, whether about power, violence, revolution, systems or other problems.

With regard to Hannah Arndt's philosophy, new philosophical ideas have been introduced in the political sphere. These new stereotypical ideas led Hannah to present a philosophical analysis of various issues as she started her canvases by asking a number of questions about violence, politics, power and revolution and was able to present a new perspective because she combines philosophy and politics through a great personal and historical experience that

formed the general theoretical framework of her philosophy. Through this, in this study we address the problem of violence in Hanna's philosophy of seeing that the problem of violence is the fledgling of contemporary rather than ancient societies, so we found ourselves in front of the following main problem: how did Hanna address the problem of violence? Has she been able to reach the results of her questions on the issues? Through this problem there are many sub-questions: What is the concept of violence? What does politics have to do with violence? Is authority a face of violence?

2. Conceptual approach:

2.1 Language:

The word "violence" in Arabic means the use of force and disbelief. The act of violence means violation and encroachment. We say the violence of any violation is unaccompanied. It is violent if it is not a companion and the most violent thing is taken with force and cruelty. Violence in Latin goes back to violence, which means harm or violation, and in English, violence is vital. (Ibrahim al-Haidari, 2015, p. 6) The violence is a two-section vi term that is taken from the same route from which the word vitality is taken, that is vital, and there is a relationship. In Greek, between the bios of any life bi ai violence, and Nietzsche connects violence to life in that life in essence expresses violence as going beyond itself, and this bypass means rejecting the old with creativity. (Murad Wahba, 2007, p. 441)

2.2 Terminology:

The linguistic definition may be unanimous and agreed that violence is cruelty and force of all kinds, whether material or moral, but the terminological definition of violence has many meanings and connotations. This is due to the diversity of views and opinions of many philosophers and intellectuals. "Anti-gentle, synonymous with severity and cruelty," violent "is characterized by violence: Every act of intensity is contrary to the nature of the thing, and it is imposed on and outside of it. Violence is the force that is intensifying by increasing the obstacles to its obstacles. and violence from the tendencies and intense vibes

of the will, and its image increases to dominate all aspects of the soul. And the violence of men is the one who is not treated with kindness, and does not know the mercy of the way to his heart. Violence is the unlawful or unlawful use of force "(Gamil Saliba, 1982, p. 112). Thus, violence in its meaning is met with harm and cruelty, whether material or moral, and violence in the political sphere is controlled and punished and defined by "Ahmed Khalil Ahmed" in his book "Basic Concepts in Sociology" as harm by hand, by tongue, or indeed, or by some word in the confrontational field with the other "(Khalil Ahmad Khalil, 1984). 101.

3. Violence in Hannah Arndt's philosophy:

Hannah's violence is linked to the political sphere, because her place of interest in politics is known, and Hannah has not practised and contemplated politics except on the basis of the circumstances and the pain she has experienced as a result of exile and exclusion. Because she was born in a Jewish family, we coincided with the political system that was rejecting and not receptive to Jews, but drawing images of hostility and disagreement with them, Because Judaism in the Nazi State of Hitler is a dilemma if we don't say a crime punishable by law. This problem that Hannah experienced was a cruel experience for her as a citizen of her country prompted her ideas and writing her books in politics. She was one of the most prominent activists in German student organizations, and we see that Arendt's interest in the subject of violence is natural, especially since she has lived it so many times. Once in her homeland as an undesirable Jew, again as a student living in contention with her and her teachers, and once as a fighter trying to build a nation that will put an end to the loss of Jews in the world. In the event on the subject of violence, we must mention that there are many modern thinkers who also cared about violence, such as John Paul Sartre, Sorrell and Fannon. Perhaps Marx is the soul of every policy that the revolts he denounced and his socialist philosophy against capitalist exploitation, this thought made Marx a source of philosophers in the 20th century. Arndt's writing about violence has backgrounds of thinkers who have also raised the problem of violence in their books. In presenting their thoughts on violence, we find that views are similar, because both see violence as a phenomenon primarily human being. This means that this problem exists from

the very age, here we find Hannah disagreeing with them in this proposition, Being among those who see violence as a contemporary phenomenon Because the contemporary period has witnessed the emergence of various political systems, the political sphere has become one of the most prominent problems of such violence. Questions have been raised about it and its relationship with politics, power, necessity and other questions that emphasize attention to this problem.

3.1 Definition of violence:

Hannah Arndt was able to make violence a special approach that distinguished it from others in the philosophical field in general and political form in particular. This is because she has been able to put violence in the field of mental connotation, and Hannah focuses on the idea of terms and concepts that are problems that stand in front of the human mind. This is because much falls into the blending and synthesis of each other's concepts: for example, the concept of authority and the concept of power; Also, capability, Hannah believes that these concepts are an obstacle to the political sphere and in this case it is more difficult to dismantle and understand them in their specific formulation. Hannah believes that the optimal and appropriate use of these concepts is not solely on the linguistic side. And the basis for that is a return to old perceptions, that is, a return to the historical path, This is what comes out of the maze of concepts and definitions, because the reason is clear and it is not related to the weakness of the linguistic aspect. The main reason is the complexity and interconnectedness of these definitions. And since politics focuses on dominance between the controller and the convict, Which means that these concepts of power, power and influence are just the names of dominance. The latter, which human beings work to use to dominate each other, so Arndt believes that the concept of violence is distinct from other concepts and its instrumental nature.

That is to say, the violence that is my instrument in nature seems realistic, given that it is effective in reaching the purpose that it would justify. Arendt's violence is a tweet concept and a special expression, or to say that violence is the individual against the group more precisely is the one versus all, In her view, violence is visibly the closest to

ability. And if we look at the tools of violence, they are similar to other tools that are used to multiply the nature of the ability so that they can reach their place at the last stage of their development. "Since violence is in a distinction from power and power or capability - a constant need for tools, and the essence of violence itself is driven by the saying of purpose and the means whose main advantage if applied to humanitarian affairs" (Hannah Arendt, 2015, p. 6) Arendt has identified violence in three types: the first type, military violence, in addition to internal repression, and violence resulting from technological development and advancement, and stresses that this last type of violence: It is the most dangerous and threatening of human freedom, because it confines freedom in general, and intellectual freedom in particular, which leads to attention to military services without shaming them. Here, I see violence as most necessary in the twentieth century, yet it is not a product of this century. "This generation that has not known anything other than the diversification of theories in the social and political spheres, and which has taught us a great lesson about the principle of manipulation... this manipulation can be exercised on human beings through physical pressure, torture and deprivation. "(Hannah Arndt, *ibid.*, p. 27) It means that the violence that this generation has found is made by previous generations. In Hannah's view, this generation has the impulse and enthusiasm to build on so many actions. We find Arndt to be "that violence results from anger, a matter that everyone agrees on, and anger would be irrational and satisfactory. It is possible to create conditions that deprive man of his humanity, but that never means that man will turn into an animal-like, and in such conditions, it is sure to be a clear indication of the dehumanization of man is the absence of anger and violence, not their presence, not anger, in any way an automatic reaction to misery and pain. ". This is because, by its nature, instrumental violence seems realistic since it is effective in reaching targets that would justify such violence and because violence is a reaction to a reaction. Arendt has pointed out that violence is often regarded as a means of reform and even a weapon used to remedy the situation, far from being a weapon of revolt. "Indeed, violence, contrary to what its prophecy prevents them from telling us, can be regarded as more of a weapon of reform than a weapon of revolution. France has never had the most radical law, since Napoleon, to allow it to change its violent education system. " (Hannah Arndt, *ibid.*, p. 72)

What means is that violence in this case resorts to oppressive tools, and we find that in everyday life force is used to synonymous with such violence, because violence is of an instrumental nature, and it is considered the first basis of power, and war is also a kind of violence, and it is worth noting that every use of force to suppress and subjugate unwillingly. This is considered violence against him, and that violence has aspects whether it is physical violence using physical means, or moral violence, which is used for psychological pressure as well as in social and other relations for the purpose of exploitation and domination. Therefore, violence has two aspects: violence in everyday social life, violence in the political sphere, the first directly directed at the victim, and the second victim is not directly required, as it belongs to a political system, or refers to the creation of a terrorist climate that creates a crisis for the political system. It must be mentioned that Arendt's violence is not synonymous with power, as some see violence and power as two sides of a single currency. It considers that the authority is different from that of the source, as well as to the end. Violence itself involves its own mortality. Violence always needs a special justification in its path towards achieving the goal, and the loss of power becomes a solution for the use of violence.

3.2 Violence and politics:

As for Tunisia, it considers that politics is the primary source of the sources of communication and association with which we find different relationships, whether social relations and others, and that this communication reflects the difference that exists between them. And it does not lead to disintegration, but to complementarity and interaction among all like those who think that difference is an obstacle that tears apart relationships. It is one of the reasons for the policy's transition to violence, but it has shown us that the issue of violence is linked to non-political acts. violence in its view is an apolitical act and requires many justifications that would justify the cause of violence, Anti-policy violence exists in the absence of freedom to do. In Arndt's view, violence is inseparable from and closely linked to politics and power, and there is no policy violence at the theoretical level that is greater and more dangerous than invoking a classic biological perception of violence, which is Arndt's finding in her analysis and thinking about violence. Hannah emphasizes that

power on its scientific side is governance, and therefore the Government exercises only the power of compulsion and subordination motivated and under the name of interest. This expresses the democratic system. On the other hand, the autocrat expresses in the totalitarian regimes that the idea of politics was inevitably something to do with freedom. "Politics and freedom are identical, and everywhere where where this type of freedom is imperfect, there is absolutely no political space in the special sense, on the other hand, the means that can establish a political space and establish its existence are not always and not necessarily political means." (Hannah Arndt, 2014, p. 50) which makes politics include violence.

4. Violence and authority:

The issue of the relationship between power and violence is one of controversy, and they were once seen as one thing, but not as conceivable power without violence or violence without authority. The instrument's perception of policy makes violence a means of achieving different political goals and objectives. In other words, violence justifies a lack of capacity for human capabilities. In this case, it reflects this kind of thinking within the military system and the actual use of power to subordinate the other. But violence does not lie in this substance. Violence is inherently an instrument. As a whole, it always needs direction and justification on its way to the goal that it follows and needs justification from another party that can never be at the core of the thing. " (Hannah Arendt, in Violence, p. 45) which means that Arendt excludes from the political sphere violence because he opposes political power, But because the relationship between violence and power is one of absence and presence, they cannot be combined. Arendt criticizes in some way the confusion of the concept and its inappropriate wording, but rather the falsification of meaning. Concepts must therefore be clearly defined, especially with regard to philosophical concepts in general and political concepts in particular where similarity occurs and it is difficult to distinguish these concepts: power, power, power, bullying and violence. Between power and violence, there is confusion and divergence, and this is what Hannah has focused on in more than one field, and perhaps even those differences have extended to all the political theories considered by the political philosophy from the Greek

period to the modern period, especially the contemporary period that has focused more on political issues and problems. "Sadly, as it seems to me, our current level of political science does not allow terminology to distinguish between key words, such as " power ", " ability ", " power ", " control "and, finally, " violence ", which refers to phenomena that differentiate and differ from each other, and it is difficult for them to find, if not such differentiation, what they use on the basis of being synonyms, not only reveals a loss of sensitivity to their linguistic connotation, which seems to us to be quite dangerous." (Hannah, *ibid.*, p. 38)

Let us consider, to that end, Arendt's differences in these concepts, and let us record her feathers' plans to do so in such a way as to enable us to fulfil our request. "Power means man's ability not only to act, but to act harmoniously. Power is not an individual characteristic, it belongs to a group and that makes it a prerequisite, and therefore individuals' practices and actions become outcomes, or changes to things. As such, they possess the characteristic of introducing the new and changing attitudes and positions without their effectiveness being a condition for transforming others from human beings into a disability or blockade of action. In other words, the Authority's work is to harmonize and harmonize actions. Hence, it is not an individual characteristic, but a collective characteristic belonging to the community, and "it exists as long as the group remains with each other" (Hannah, *ibid.*, p. 39) The authority as such, then, means the most ambiguous of these phenomena, making them persistently vulnerable to linguistic abuse and can be applied to people. There is something like personal bullying, such as in the relationship between parents and children and between teacher and pupil. "(Hannah Arendt, *ibid.*, p. 40) They are contemplated outside the notion of control, and therefore do not make any distinction between predominant or superfluous, or to exert coercion on one another. When "we say about somebody who is" in power ", we actually point out that he has been bullied by a number of people. Violence, in its entirety, is based on all the means and techniques used by an individual to control others and achieve their goals. "Violence is by its very nature an instrument. As a whole, it always needs to guide and justify its way to the goal it is trying to reach. It" needs to be justified by another party, which can never be in something substantive. " (Hannah Arndt, *ibid.*, p. 45) Here we find Hannah Arndt here do not hesitate

to take from contemporary political events her testament in the subject and the total non-violent resistance of the Czechoslovak people was a classic case of confrontation between violence and power. Violence is not dependent on number or public opinion, but on techniques, tools and means.

5. Conclusion:

Finally, through this study, in which we addressed the problem of violence, we have reached the following conclusions: The subject of violence has become a topic of controversy in various fields, especially in the political and social spheres. "Hannah Arndt" was able with her thoughts in most of her books, especially in her book "In violence" and focusing on this topic, which is very important on the one hand, and in the knowledge and methodological power on the other, all the events that the world has witnessed have been understood but in ideas "Arendt" critical of all achievements of political modernity "Violence and totalitarianism" In doing so, with her vision and self-experience in politics, she was able to lay solid ground for her political philosophy. Not only did she stand at this point, but she had to spread the culture of co-living and the culture of peace in the worlds, especially since she was interested in the cause of freedom, peace and happiness. Arendt refuses to gather power with violence. Violence was related to the absence and termination of power, and violence took place at the time of the de facto collapse of power. Thus, violence cannot defend power from collapse. It considers that security and political stability have to do with the absence of violence.

6. Referrals and margins:

1. Ibrahim al-Haidari, Sociology of Violence and Terrorism (Beirut, Dar al-Saqi, 2015), i 1.
2. Murad Wahba, Philosophical Dictionary, (Egypt, Dar Quba, 2007), i 5.
3. Jamil Saliba, Philosophical Lexicon (Beirut: Lebanese Book House, 1982). S2.
4. Khalil Ahmed Khalil, Basic Concepts in Sociology, (Beirut: Dar al-Haddatha, 1984) i 1.

5.Hannah Arendt, in Violence, TR: Ibrahim Al-Arais, (Lebanon, Dar Al-Saqi, 2015) 2 TR

6.Hannah Arendt, What Politics, TR: Zouhair Al Khawildi, (Algeria, Publications Difference, 2014), p 1