

## PHILOSOPHY AND THE PRESENT ACTUALITY: COEXISTENCE ACCORDING TO HANNAH ARENDT AS A MODEL

**Hamida HERBADJI**

Faculty of Humanities, Algiers 2 University - Abu al-Qasim Saad Allah (Algeria)

ORCID iD: 0009-0002-0881-7384

[herbadjiamida4@gmail.com](mailto:herbadjiamida4@gmail.com)

**Abstract :** In this article titled Philosophy and the Present Actuality– Coexistence in the Thought of Hannah Arendt, we attempt to address one of the most important contemporary philosophical issues frequently discussed in political, social, and intellectual circles: the concept of coexistence. The goal of this article is twofold: firstly, to correct the common notion that philosophy is merely a transcendent metaphysical inquiry or an analysis of existence from an ivory tower, and secondly, to demonstrate that philosophy is closely connected to reality, addressing current issues, including coexistence, which is also the main objective of this research. We focused on one of the philosophers who emphasized the role of philosophy in addressing various existential issues, the German philosopher and political theorist (who later emigrated to America) Hannah Arendt (1906-1975). By examining Arendt as a model of the relationship between philosophy and contemporary issues, we find that she explored the topic of coexistence and linked it to various concepts such as freedom, politics, and action. She concluded that freedom has a political nature, and practicing it is the only path to living together.

**Keywords:** Hannah Arendt, coexistence, political freedom, philosophy, Present actuality.

### PHILOSOPHIE ET ACTUALITÉ PRÉSENTE: LA COEXISTENCE SELON HANNAH ARENDT COMME MODÈLE

**Résumé :** Dans cet article intitulé La philosophie et L'actualité actuelle( présente) de la coexistence dans la pensée de Hannah Arendt, nous tentons d'aborder l'une des questions philosophiques contemporaines les plus importantes fréquemment débattues dans les cercles politiques, sociaux et intellectuels: le concept de Coexistence. L'objectif de cet article est double: premièrement: corriger l'idée courante selon laquelle la philosophie n'est qu'une enquête métaphysique transcendante ou une analyse de l'existence depuis une tour d'ivoire . Et deuxièmement, démontrer que la philosophie est étroitement liée à la réalité en abordant des questions actuelles , y compris la coexistence qui est également l'objectif principal de cette recherche. Nous nous sommes concentrés sur l'un des philosophes qui ont souligné le rôle de la philosophie dans le traitement de diverses questions existentielles, la philosophe allemande et théoricienne politique (qui a ensuite émigré en Amérique): Hannah Arendt(1906- 1975). En examinant Arendt comme un modèle de la relation entre la philosophie et les questions contemporaines, nous constatons qu'elle a exploré le thème de la coexistence et l'a lié à divers concepts tels que la liberté, la politique et l'action. Elle a conclu que la liberté a une nature politique et que sa pratique est le seul chemin vers le vivre ensemble.

**Mots-clés :** Hannah Arendt, coexistence, liberté politique, philosophie, actualité présente.

## Introduction

Philosophy has long been viewed as a field that deals with transcendent metaphysical topics. However, in reality, philosophy is closely tied to the present, directing its attention to the concerns of individuals and the difficulties faced in real life. Through its tools, history, and methods, philosophy seeks solutions to the challenges individuals and society face, embodying the spirit of the age. In short, it addresses existential questions. Philosophy studies various contemporary issues, including those in scientific, social, and political domains, such as knowledge, language, ethics, bioethics, citizenship, justice, religion, gender, environment, identity, human rights, and coexistence. Philosophers have emphasized coexistence as a central intellectual and philosophical issue that is the subject of ongoing debate worldwide, focusing on the connection between philosophy, the problem of otherness, dialogue with the other, and coexistence within harmony and agreement. One of the notable thinkers on this topic is the German philosopher Hannah Arendt (1906-1975), who connected the idea of coexistence with the concept of political freedom. Thus, we can pose these questions: How does Hannah Arendt mean by coexistence?, how did she view it? How did she view the relationship between coexistence and political freedom? And what role does philosophy play in learning to live together?

### *0.1 Cadre théorique*

This article focuses on the views of the German philosopher (who later emigrated to America): Hannah Arendt on some current philosophical and political issues. In this research we have chosen Arendt's treatment of the topic of coexistence and its connection to various concepts such as politics, action and freedom. Arendt focused on the role of political freedom in achieving coexistence. If we view freedom as a common right shared by people, this presupposes the availability of a political system and laws that regulate this freedom and define the scope of freedoms. Human life is linked to its existence with others, and isolation from them means death.

### *0.2 Cadre méthodologique*

This study used several approaches to address the issue of coexistence, including the historical approach, in which Hannah Arendt returned to the concept of coexistence throughout history, beginning with ancient Greek thought and extending to contemporary Western thought. In other words, she followed a historical context. This study also used the analytical deductive approach to analyze and explain a set of concepts in Arendt's view such as freedom, politics and living together. The methodology followed consisted of starting from defining the concept of Philosophy and the concept of the Present and the relationship between them, then presenting coexistence as a current issue in Arendt's thought, then defining the conditions for living together, so, that the study concludes with the impossibility of life continuing except through coexistence.

## 1. Philosophy and the Present Actuality

### *1.1 Defining the Present contemporary Issues-actualities*

By "present," we mean the new topics that have recently asserted themselves in human thought, such as the relationship between ethics and politics and the significance of the growing discourse on democracy and human rights. Philosophy, as a mode of thinking, does not aim to replace the dominant ideas but rather to critique them. The Role of

Philosophy as a Critical Mission Toward the Present is a critical role of philosophy, which seeks to understand the self to understand the present, allows us to interpret the global changes we experience today with a historical sense, broadly rather than strictly eschatological (Friedrich Nietzsche, w. y, p. 39). Contemporary philosophy is faced with several pressing questions, including scientific inquiries such as the purpose of science: These are some of the questions philosophy aims to address in our current era, focusing on contemporary issues. Questions are raised about the nature of the present when examining its concept, its differences and its intersections with the present which is constantly linked to the human quest to achieve the desire to transcend it. Therefore, a search is underway to explore how to elevate it from the level of the verbal and the everyday to the level of the philosophical concept. Questions are raised about philosophy in its relationship with the present in order to reaffirm its connection to emerging events and distance it from thinking only about the metaphysical.

## ***2.2. The Relationship Between Philosophy and the Present Actuality***

Philosophy has always been closely tied to historical reality and societal events, with philosophers—whether ancient, medieval, modern, or contemporary—engaging with their era and specific national contexts. Their philosophies were often responses to the challenges of their time. In European culture, the term "present" describes something genuinely occurring that captures attention. Émile Bréhier (1876–1952) noted that despite the criticisms of philosophy as an abstract and obscure thought process, philosophy is continually reborn. When we speak of a “contemporary” subject, we are attributing a specific meaning to it, tied to its tangible reality within a defined region and connected to temporal significance embodied by the present. Philosophy’s affinity for the contemporary underscores a strong bond between the two, as philosophy remains closely linked to human life and its complexities, addressing societal crises and challenges. In light of the transformations of the contemporary world, especially at the start of the third millennium, there is a renewed need for philosophy to address new issues. This gives philosophical thought new significance. Philosophy is increasingly inclined to understand the significant shifts within human thought. (Omar Mehibel, 2007, p. 191). This transition is natural, as philosophy seeks to stay relevant by adapting to social, economic, cultural, and political developments. As a critical mode of thinking, philosophy doesn’t replace what is established but instead critiques and guides it. Philosophy engages with the present critically, serving as a vital intellectual tool for human thought, offering rational arguments to help people understand the world and grasp reality. Philosophy is considered the key to existence, revealing the essence of consciousness and truth, distinguished by its comprehensive vision and its relentless questioning and concept creation. The essence and truth of philosophy lie more in questions than in answers, with new concepts aligning with the progress of the times. Contemporary philosophical choice is thus defined by the question of the present — the ontology of our shared existence and the ontology of our present reality, irrespective of the question of truth. Today, we urgently need philosophy as an inquiry into the present. Philosophy is not only enlightenment but also a questioning of the present; if it serves as enlightenment, it does so through the effects of enlightenment — as the ontology of the present. Philosophy, above all, is an endless inquiry into the present we experience and live, in all its existence and differences. It is an interrogation of both being and existence, of the text and daily life. This ceaseless questioning opens new horizons for being, carving out new paths in existence and expanding the realms of our

thought. Current philosophy focuses on the human subject, which makes it an ideal tool for dialogue, whether among individuals or societies. German philosopher Jürgen Habermas (b. 1929) emphasizes the communicative role that philosophy must play to confront the challenges of its time. To prepare for these challenges, philosophy must address two essential experiences tied to the human condition:

- A. The experience of existence in the world, as an interpretation of its symbols and understanding of its events.
- B. The experience of relating to the other, with their distinctness, and a respect for their particularity (Zouhair Khouildi, 2013:298).

Philosophy's return to confront present challenges must be rooted in the idea of ethical communication with the other, especially as we face a current state of disconnection and continuous conflicts and wars among different nations. Philosophy opens itself to new topics pressing upon human thought today, most notably human rights, citizenship, coexistence, and tolerance. Many philosophers have analyzed, studied, and critiqued these subjects, including Hannah Arendt, a philosopher and political theorist who made a significant impact on contemporary Western philosophical thought.

### **3. Coexistence as a Current Issue in the Thought of Hannah Arendt**

#### ***3.1. Coexistence in the History of Western Philosophical Thought***

The concept of coexistence has passed through various epochs, receiving different definitions and expressions, starting with ancient Greek thought and continuing into contemporary Western thought. Concepts of biological superiority began with Hellenic culture, which regarded others as barbarians. This classification continued in ancient Roman and Greek civilizations, where the white color was associated with positive values, while black was linked to death, the underworld, and all things negative. Romans reserved sovereignty and honor for the Roman race, viewing others as barbarians unworthy even of Roman law (Mohamed Amara, 2003:11). In this way, ancient times labeled all who did not share Greek or Roman culture as barbaric, with the term “savage” later used similarly in Western civilization (Claude Lévi-Strauss, 2008, p. 13). The Middle Ages were shaped by the idea that the human world moved within the boundaries of Christianity, recognizing Jews and especially Muslims, while relegating all other ethnicities to the animal kingdom (Jean Poirier, 1974:12). In this era, the term "ethnicity" was applied to denote an uncivilized individual, while in the plural, it referred to marginalized groups — specifically those who were neither Jewish nor Christian, mainly targeting Muslims, who were vilified and symbolized by the black devil. During the Renaissance, Western expansion across the seas through exploration opened the way for contact with the non-European others. Discoveries and journeys led to a blending of societies that were once questioned in terms of authenticity and ethnicity. These accepted ideas were shaken, as the integration of new peoples within the classical structure became increasingly challenging, especially against the backdrop of European economic dominance, where ethnocentrism gained a more aggressive form, viewing other races as inherently inferior. This use of “ethnicity” became a means of differentiation between primitive non-European, non-Christian peoples and civilized Europeans, particularly with the onset of the colonial era, where ethnicity, race, and racism were increasingly linked. Scenes of racism and discrimination experienced by Black Americans at the start of the 20th century reflect the reservation of concepts of

power, honor, and social status for Whites, associating Blackness with servitude (Ian Low, 2015:153-154). This perspective evolved to view ethnic groups through a racial lens, especially before World War II with the ideology of Adolf Hitler (1889-1945) and his followers, who considered the Aryan race the origin of humanity. This era witnessed shameful events of genocide among tribes and communities, supported and financed by powerful forces, as we find in Rwanda during the 1990s. (Ian Low, 2015:12)

As for the twenty-first century: David Callahan (1965) says that ethnic efforts toward self-determination worldwide may be the most important factors in the following decades. This phenomenon should not be seen as separate from other global issues, such as terrorism, failed states, and competition among major powers... (Anthony Oberschall, 2007:10) In the pursuit of the desire for coexistence, Jagdish Chandra (1920-2010) remarks that the current century has left us a legacy of intolerance and hatred, but the dominant voice of the new millennium should relate to systems of equity in reconciliation and the promotion of the civil sphere. (Suzanne Mayhanovich, 2009:2) Levi Strauss (1908-2009) affirms this by saying that we know the concept of humanity that includes all forms of the human species, without discrimination in race or civilization, only emerged very late and has achieved only limited spread. Where it appears to have reached stages of development, it is by no means certain—recent history proves this—that it has become entrenched free from ambiguity and regression. Yet, for vast sectors of humankind and for tens of thousands of years, this concept was entirely absent. (Claude Levi Strauss, 2008, p. 168 )

### **3.2 Conditions for Coexistence According to Hannah Arendt:**

#### *-Freedom*

The philosophical tradition views freedom as merely an internal feeling, as previously defined by René Descartes (1596-1650), who described freedom as a state of feeling and psychology. The feeling of freedom alone suffices as proof of its existence through the experience we have of it. Consequently, the concept of freedom remained tied to the metaphysical realm, which attributed it to the freedom of thought through a set of categories such as will, choice, and causality... However, Hannah Arendt's concept of freedom transcends the boundaries of the philosophical domain and the aforementioned categories, replacing them with concepts related to action, discussion, and practice. Freedom is an ancient and modern issue, a subject of inquiry still debated today, with differing perspectives and various answers to the questions it raises. The hardest part of freedom lies in the contradiction posed by discussing freedom as restricted to the freedom of will or its absence. However, according to Arendt, this contradiction can disappear if we view freedom in the fields of action. She says on this matter: "In all practical matters, especially political ones, human freedom is an axiomatic truth. According to this axiom, legislatures Laws in human societies have been established, decisions made, and judgments issued. (Hannah Arendt, 1974:151) Hannah Arendt connects freedom with coexistence, starting from the principle that everything has a cause. Freedom is the reason why people exist together, and it is the main reason for the existence of politics. To resolve the initial contradiction and clarify freedom, Arendt first seeks to separate freedom from will. In her view, philosophy went astray when it focused solely on metaphysical questions that lack answers: Is humanity predetermined or free? Freedom, in this sense, turned inward to become an individual, internal experience that represents the relationship between the self and itself. This shift occurred because of humanity's inability to act, thus

diminishing the role of politics, as Arendt sees freedom as a political concept. Arendt ties freedom to politics, as freedom is the reason people live under any political system; without it, political life is meaningless. The justification for this is freedom, and its instrument is action. (Hannah Arendt, 1974:154) Freedom is the foundation of politics, opening spaces for communication, dialogue, and the creation of mutual human relationships. A person cannot live in isolation from others, as they are, by nature, a social being.

The individual's desire to excel over others is a virtue of freedom, while the flaw of a tyrant is their lack of desire for excellence. This absence isolates them from the company of others, as tyranny is the absence of companionship and the desire for excellence, tending instead toward controlling and eliminating others. In contrast, Arendt argues that the essence of political life is existence with others, as the desire for excellence makes people appreciate the world and enjoy the company of their peers, driving them to engage in public affairs. (Hannah Arendt, 2008:117) This text highlights an important concept in Arendt's philosophy: freedom is not realized merely by a group of people being together. Instead, they must be motivated by the desire for excellence, a drive that leads them to seek ways to manifest this freedom. The only way to do so is by creating it together, thus requiring companionship. This type of freedom requires equality, which, as Arendt states, is only possible among peers, defined by the ability to speak and act.

The second condition for freedom is difference, which refers to differences in opinion, the foundation of political practice. Relying on diverse opinions distinguishes political action from other forms. Hence, freedom, according to Arendt, requires coexistence with others, meaning plurality, characterized by equality and difference. This equality can only be achieved when people transcend poverty and are free from fear—two conditions that enable them to speak. Thus, we previously stated that speech is the basis of action. In short, freedom is the equality in the right to speak. We notice a similarity between Arendt's ideas and the stance of Jean-Paul Sartre (1905–1980), who argues that freedom is an active relationship linking a person to their lived world. This view aligns with Arendt's, as freedom is essential for any action. Sartre states that freedom is the identity of the human being. One is only truly human through their freedom, and if we strive to embody our freedom, we also strive to realize the freedom of others. We practice freedom for the sake of freedom, and by pursuing it we reveal that it depends on the freedom of others, and that the freedom of others depends on our freedom. (Jean-Paul Sartre, 1964:58) In summary, we can say that Arendt only understood freedom within the framework of politics, which represents the presence of others. She wanted to make freedom the meaning and reason for the existence of politics. "The reason for the existence of politics is freedom, and its domain in experience is action."

Political freedom provides societies with the boundaries of law and respect for others, enabling peaceful coexistence and the formation of a state of rights and justice. Freedom gives humanity the opportunity to come together as equals, capable of both action and speech while holding differing opinions. This space between individuals, which Arendt calls the public sphere, is based on awareness and the ability to reason without violence. This is what creates freedom. Thus, understanding and practicing the meaning of freedom is the only way to live together.

### *-The Public Sphere*

The concept of the public sphere is one of the fundamental elements of political thought. It is a space that includes all citizens, where public opinion is formed around

values, opinions, goals, and objectives in a unified manner. For Arendt, the public refers to what is visible or audible to everyone. It also represents the world itself as a common place for all, linked to what humans have created and made with their hands. The public also embodies the relationships among the inhabitants of the human-made world. In Arendt's view, this means the world is a space of freedom and equality, not a field for violence and tyranny. It is a space for publicly sharing ideas and discussions, which can only be established with an audience and freedom.

#### *-Action Brings People Together*

Arendt presents a different concept of people's existence together, their desire for freedom, and how to practice it. This only becomes clear by understanding the term "action," as freedom and the public realm cannot be fully understood without it. Arendt addresses three activities that have been confused throughout the ages, making the concepts of freedom and the public sphere ambiguous, particularly the coexistence of people and the possibility of a common world that brings together diverse individuals who make up societies. The question Arendt posed was: What exists after society is formed? To answer this, she proposed the concept of the active or practical life to distinguish three activities humans engage in that represent the essential conditions of life.

#### Labor

This is the first human activity, involving labor driven by necessity in direct response to it, meaning biological needs that sustain life. It does not require the presence of others.

#### Work

This creates an artificial world of things, with the worker or maker building this world without the need for others, as the task lies in making and constructing. This is an individual task, preparing the ground for newcomers to this world.

#### Action

This is the only activity that places people directly in a relationship without the mediation of objects and corresponds to the human condition of plurality, which is essential to any political life. (Hannah Arendt, year, p. 27) Therefore, in ancient Roman heritage, phrases like "to live" and "to be among others" were used. This language indicates that living together is deeply connected to an understanding of the meaning of politics. The first step in creating this space between people is distinguishing between what is biological and what is made, as well as the existence with others, which requires a plurality of people who are similar yet distinct different, with no one resembling another—in other words, it is the transition from individuality to the construction of a shared world between oneself and others, a relationship that arises when people come together, made possible through action alone. From this, we conclude that action is the true political activity, representing the real meaning of human existence: the ability to act, to enter the public sphere, which connects individuals, where there are no boundaries or barriers to communication, and where language is the foundation. Arendt emphasizes that humans communicate through what is uniquely theirs—speech. Without this quality, communication would cease. Therefore, living together requires genuine political action practiced through language, free of violence. She says, "There is a unity that connects human existence and political action on

one hand, and the recognition of the importance of language in achieving political action on the other. This means that the essence of humanity is only realized when it steps into the public sphere, that is, into the domain of managing the city with full freedom." (Hannah Arendt, 1961:97)

The essential meaning of living together is the ability to come together, which is the task of the public sphere as a shared world that unites us while preventing us from collapsing onto one another, as the saying goes. What divides people is not their numbers but rather the fact that the world that unites them has lost its ability to bring them together, to connect and bind them. This, as we mentioned before, is due to the confusion around concepts of freedom, the disappearance of action from human life, the dominance of work and production, and the rise of consumer society—all of which have contributed to the inability to see one another genuinely, without barriers, as one sees oneself. This is the true image of living together and the mode of existence within a political organization that goes beyond mere economic interest as the basis of social cohesion. Arendt's political goals aim to establish a presence in the public sphere while respecting human dignity, embodying freedoms, and adhering to the principle of equality. Hannah Arendt faced some criticisms, as does any philosopher who focuses on one aspect while neglecting others. Jürgen Habermas observed that Arendt's concept of the public sphere was limited to the political dimension, whereas he generalizes it to apply to all aspects of life. He also disagrees with her basis for the public sphere concept, as she relies on the Greek model, drawing from Aristotelian political thought and tracing social structure transformations. Habermas objects to Arendt's attribution of the public sphere's origin to the Greek city-state, arguing that she claimed the Greek public realm was the realm of speech and action in contrast to the private realm. The comparison between Arendt and Habermas reveals a difference in their views on the public sphere. Habermas does not reduce it to a single aspect; instead, he bases it on multiple dimensions—political, social, cultural, and more.

## Conclusion

Hannah Arendt addressed one of the most significant topics in contemporary intellectual and philosophical discourse: the subject of living together. She linked this concept with several ideas such as political freedom, plurality, and action. She regarded freedom not as a theoretical or metaphysical issue like existence, nonexistence, or the soul, but as something fundamentally tied to the political realm rather than the realm of thought. If we view freedom as a shared right among people, this implies the presence of a political system and laws that organize this freedom and define the framework for coexisting freedoms. Freedom is only truly practiced when an individual interacts with others. Arendt also emphasized that politics requires plurality, as it arises when a common space emerges among people. The essence of politics is not the existence of the individual, but rather the existence of people. There is no politics in a single position; rather, it is the diversity of positions. It is the unique activity that places people directly side by side. Therefore, the subject of politics is not the individual alone but their existence in the world. The world is the appropriate place where political action is born, a public sphere where people share their interests, concerns, and aspirations as long as they live on Earth and inhabit the planet. People exist only if there is a world, and a world exists only if there is plurality; plurality is indeed the law of the Earth. To live means to exist with others within the embrace of civilization, and to be cut off from people means to die. Thus, Arendt

approached the issue of living together from a political and social perspective, viewing politics as not based on the individual alone but on a community governed by common relationships and interests, despite differences in views, interests, and other factors. Therefore, concepts of freedom, authority, and the public sphere, or living together, intertwine to create a political existence where individuals recognize their ability to express their opinions and to establish relationships based on dialogue, discussion, and openness to others' judgments and perspectives. This prevents political action from becoming absolute and linked to violence and power. Arendt understood it in its political context—as free action practiced only with others in a public space, constructed through language and collective exchange concerning shared existence. Based on this, we can say that the relevance of returning to Hannah Arendt's philosophy lies in the significant role her philosophy plays in moving beyond classical political thought and in her attempt to establish a new global political system characterized by freedom, shared living, and respect for human rights.

### Bibliography

- Al-Ayeb, H. From the Contemporary Philosophy to the Philosophy of the Present, Main Page, Daily Specializing in Culture and Arts. [Online], URL: <https://errahen.symiaconseil.dz/>
- Arendt, Hannah. (1964). *The Condition of Modern Man*. Trans. Georges Fradier. Paris: Ed Calmann-Lévy.
- Arendt, Hannah. (1974). *Between Past and Future*. Trans. Abdel Rahman Bashnaq. (1st ed.). Cairo: Dar Nahdet Misr.
- Arendt, Hannah. (2008). *On Revolution*. Trans. Ata Abd Al-Wahab. (1st ed.). Beirut: Arab Organization for Translation.
- Arendt, Hannah (2016). *The Human Condition*. Trans. Hadiya Al-'Arqi. Jadawel & Believers Without Borders.
- Amara, Mohamed. (2003). *Islam and Minorities: Past, Present, and Future*. (1st ed.). Cairo: Shorouk International Library.
- Bouari, Jean. (1974). *History of Ethnicity*. Trans. Nassim Nasr. (1st ed.). Country: Awadid Publications.
- Derrida, J. (2003). *What Happened on September 11? A Conversation on October 22, 2001, with Giovanna Borradori*. Trans. Safa Fathi. Revised by Bashir Al-Sibai. (1st ed.). Cairo: Supreme Council of Culture.
- Khouildi, Z. (2013). *Anatomy 1st of Western Mind, Philosophical Comparisons in Theory and Practice*. (ed.). Algeria: Ibn Al-Nadim Publishing and
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. (2008). *Race and History*. Trans. Salim Haddad. Beirut: University Institution for Studies, Publishing, and Distribution
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. (2008). *Articles on Humanity*. Translated into Arabic by Hassan Qubaisi. Dar Al-Tanweer for Printing, Publishing and Distribution.
- Low, Ian. (2015). *Racism and Ethnic Intolerance from Discrimination to Genocide*. Trans. Atef Moatamad, Karam Abbas, Adel Abdel Hamid. (1st ed.). Cairo: National Center for Translation
- Mayhanovich, Suzanne. (2009). *Living Together*. USA: Education and Intercultural Dialogue.
- Mehibel, Omar. (2007). *From System to Self: Readings in Contemporary Western Thought*. (1st ed.). Algeria: Arab Scientific Publishers, Al-Ikhtilaf Publications.

- Nietzsche, Friedrich. (1983). *Philosophy in the Tragic Age of the Greeks*. Trans. Souhail Al-Qash. Country: Beirut- Lebanon. University Institution for Studies and Publishing.
- Oberschall, Anthon. (2007). *Conflict and Peacebuilding in Responses to Ethnic Violence*. (First published). New York: Taylor & Francis Library.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. (1964). *Existentialism is a Humanism*. Trans. Abdel Moneim Al-Hafni,. (1st ed.). Cairo. Egyptian House Press.