

## **THE UNFORGIVING JEW VLADIMIR JANKELEVITCH NO FORGIVING**

D. Djaouida Ghanem

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences ,department Philosophy, University Bouira, Algeria.

DOI: 10.46609/IJSSER.2021.v06i10.019 URL: <https://doi.org/10.46609/IJSSER.2021.v06i10.019>

### **ABSTRACT**

(Vladimir Jankelevitch) is one of the prominent figures who refused to forgive those who participated in the extermination and burning of the Jews at Auschwitz, and according to this position Jacques Derrida asserted the following: Isolate the topic of the Holocaust in an impromptu conversation in Jerusalem, when conscious or unconscious memory of this event is everywhere in our culture and everywhere in my life Crimes against humanity committed during the so-called Holocaust or the Holocaust cannot precisely be forgiven, because they go beyond the measure of any kind of human judgment, they are incompatible with any law, any human judgment, and any human punishment, and it was solemnly declared that forgiveness She died in the death camps, that forgiveness no longer made any sense. According to this context, Jankelevitch: \_ Shall we forgive those who displaced the Palestinian people for thousands of years, even though the Palestinian did not suffer from a single holocaust, but rather from more severe holocausts?

**Keywords:** forgiveness, tolerance, Auschwitz, Jankelevitch, Jewish philosophy.

### **1. Introduction**

The human values of a culture are determined by the nature of the intellectual elements expressed by certain ideological positions, which have been drawn through religious initiations and fanatical positions in favor of this religion. What he notes in this research, is that the policy of double standards may hide many clues and hidden meanings behind every discourse claiming rationality.

This type of analysis leads us to deconstructing the narrative structures of Vladimir Jankélévitch's texts and knowing the implicit conditions in his cultural systems that embraced philosophical references What proves that this philosophy, which claims to be enlightenment,

was unable to confront the implicit and explicit aggression in its terminology and stances in terms of recommending everything that is racist Jew and linking the concepts of confession, forgiveness, repentance, apology and tolerance and against it the problematic of the tragedy of the Jew in Auschwitz at the expense of the endless tragedy And suffering for the Palestinian and Arab people.

In this case, it becomes clear that the method of forgiveness in the Vladimir consciousness does not achieve results with others except in the light of blatant expediency that he returns with the reverse proof that requires that the dead of Auschwitz be alive and their demand to forgive the German people from the era of Nazism until today, and this opens the talk about the malevolent nature of the desired tolerance In Jewish culture, and that (the Jew does not forgive) despite making a lot of concessions that were explained by great historical narratives, especially in Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*, and the tyranny of Shiloh's hatred over revenge and bloodshed, and this is the essence of forgiveness and tolerance.

Jankélévitch expressed the position of intolerance in Judaism with a more contemptuous and pessimistic attitude, and linked it to the place of memory that will continue to review the Nazi prison camps and constantly criticize any Zionist victim on the grounds that the Jewish self is above all human values and what is below this self goes to Dante Alighieri's hell, because Auschwitz's position does not It can be forgotten that forgiveness is the official and historical forgetting of the suffering of the Jew in Auschwitz between the victim and the executioner.

### **1. no forgiveness according to Jankelevitch :**

**(Do not do what you wish to be done to you)** <sup>1</sup>With this saying, Voltaire began his talk about tolerance, and let us ask about Vladimir's position in this saying? Tolerance in Jankélévitch's writings (\*) constituted an endless framework of blame and admonition for the victims of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Voltaire: *A Treatise on Tolerance*, translated by Henriette Aboudi, 1, , Petra Publishing and Distribution House, Damascus, Syria, 2009 , p. 47

(\*)Born to Russian Jewish immigrants, he was a student of Henri Bergson for whom one of the most influential studies was written in French, and was also a member of the French Resistance during World War II. After the war and the discovery of the Nazi extermination camps, Jankélévitch systematically removed from his work any reference to German art, philosophy, or music that favored the war and sang the glory of the Nazi exterminations, as nothing remains of the culture's nothing unless compared to the scale and quality of the genocide. University of Sour Bonn, in addition to his participation in many other theses and conferences.

*Consider :*

Holocaust, whose imposition of rehabilitation was not fulfilled for them in the light of not allowing to erase the offense, no matter the degree of concession and apology from the offending party, and it paints precisely the true picture that remains the Jew. In it, the offender bargains for a sustainable benefit that cannot be ended by simply offering an apology, but it remains eternal in the eternity of memory that is not beatified by forgetting, because sin requires pure repentance and more severe remorse or infinite punishment, especially since the likes of the victims of Auschwitz had become with God one body, and therefore The Germans must be punished at all times, because their transgression against the Lord and his chosen people will ensure that the punishment will remain with them until the end of their existence.

In Jewish philosophy forgiveness does not appear clearly through the Bible, and since Jewish scriptures do not discuss personal forgiveness as much as Jewish philosophy, which has much broader limits in its concept of forgiveness, Jewish and Christian traditions regard interpersonal forgiveness as analogous to the forgiveness of God and Jewish thought Concerning God's forgiveness of mankind, because of this

Similar Concepts and Common Origin So, Jewish and Christian tolerance tend to be similar in their conception of forgiveness as a matter of justice and emotional and spiritual healing. Unlike Christianity, Judaism does not have any examples of forgiveness without apology. The following are stated in the books: In Jeremiah 31, 34, "For I will forgive their sins, and I will remember their fortunes no more." A devout Jew can think of the Christian practice of unrepentant forgiveness as hated, and Judaism does not require forgiveness through the principle of repentance at all, since it arose as a Christian phenomenon based on the teachings of Jesus that stated in its Gospels that the individual who offended him must always be appeased, In the Gospel of Matthew the following came: "If you forgive people their trespasses, then your heavenly Father will forgive you your trespasses, and if you do not forgive people their trespasses, then your heavenly Father will not forgive you.

Jankélévitch has stated that no one can have a reason for that forgiveness if it is in his place to forgive only for the benefit of the other and his actions were the greatest cause of intolerance, this belief leaves the nature of when we forgive a cause that is more secular for Jewish

---

Isabelle de Montmollin, La philosophie de Vladimir Jankélévitch. Sources, sens, Presses Universitaires de France ,Paris,2000 , p. 362-365

philosophy, can require the laws of forgiveness The criminal atones for a crime without resorting to it as a religion, and similarly Jews do not need to appeal to their religion to demand justice.<sup>2</sup>

Most great philosophies tend to forgive without relying on strong arguments, and so the Stoics have always been keen to refuse forgiveness. The hatred . But sorrow, mercy, and pity are many concessions to emotion and setbacks of reason, Epictetus adds, if we cannot help but have a feeling, it is better to have pity rather than hatred that triumphs today in reality, the remission of punishment is due given according to the offender's good faith (judge or the emir), disrupts the legal system or even contradicts it, because the rule of law will not be the same for all. However, the stoic attitude, by Seneca's voice.

For example, he recommends harshness but excludes cruelty, refuses to forgive, but calls for indulgence and restraint when one has the power to punish, demands justice but does not want revenge, enforces law but considers mitigating circumstances, punishes but knows how to transform The sentences are partly to allow a fresh start for some of the defendants.<sup>3</sup>

The issue of forgiveness is due to the increasing recognition of the importance of his moral philosophy to such figures as Paul Ricœur, E. Levinas, and Jacques Derrida, for example, that Emmanuel Levinas acknowledged that Jankélévitch was the source of his concept in "The Otherness". With the same harsh critical quality that Jankélévitch put forth, unforgivable, he says to Levinas: "I can only want to kill a completely independent being, that is, a being that exceeds my capabilities, and that paralyzes the possibility of my capabilities, the other is the only one I can want to kill."<sup>4</sup>

So long as the unjustifiable is not expiated, pardon can only be amnesia, and forgiveness can only be indulgence or a blatant excuse, which degrades complicity with treason, as long as aversion is not expiated.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> James Wilberding Dietz II, *Choosing Forgiveness After Genocide*, May, 2019,P.24

<sup>3</sup>Jacques Ricot *Le pardon, notion philosophique ou notion religieuse*, *Horizons philosophiques*, Volume 13, numéro2 ,2003 ,P .132

<sup>4</sup> Emmanuel Levinas, *The Time and the Last*, translated by: Jalal Badla, Ma'aber Publishing and Distribution, Damascus, Syria, p. 22

<sup>5</sup> Vladimir Jankélévitch ,“Pardoner?” in *L’imprescriptible*. translated :Ann Hobart ,as in *Critical Inquiry* vol. 22, N3, (Spring 1996) 49-52

And since memory confronts and resists forgetting, we will not forget that Germans are an unrepentant people, so why should we forgive those who regret their crimes so little and so rarely? <sup>6</sup>

To claim a pardon, one has to admit guilt without reservations or extenuating circumstances.” Ricoeur agrees with Jankélévitch when he asserts that, "Putting forgiveness simply in a circular motion of giving, the model no longer permits a distinction between forgiveness and reparation, with the radical love of enemies unrequited, this impossible commandment seems to be alone on the level of the lofty spirit of forgiveness."<sup>7</sup>

Thus, the religious value that drew forgiveness is in conflict with the other in the search for revenge and non :

\_forgiveness declared by the Western consciousness, the footholds of the Jewish Holocaust. The discussion opens to more sensitive issues, namely: The Holocaust cannot be forgiven for any other human being unless it is an official concession by acknowledging its historical and mnemonic truth.

\_ The Genocide’s absolution from the commandments of the Bible, and this is what confirmed that it is not recognized at all, and that the narrative of the genocide is more important than its narrative, although it derives its contradictory concepts from the book itself.

\_ Linking forgiveness to the memory project that transcended forgetfulness and made the suffering of the Jews present, and it cannot be bet on losing or transcending it, but rather it is the basis of the deep Jewish history.

Effectively, this kind of forgiveness seems to be an event in his relationship with the person for whom he is to be fully forgiven, and in this respect it is on the same level as the sin, as an emergency.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Vladimir Jankélévitch : Dans l’Honneur et la Dignité, (1948), p .103

<sup>7</sup> Paul Ricoeur, Memory, History and Oblivion, translated by: George Zenati, United New Book House, edition 1, 2009, Beirut, Lebanon, p. 694

<sup>8</sup> V. Jankélévitch ,Le pardon, p.148.

No rational excuse can occur regarding the repentance of the offender, especially his remorse alone, which gives a sense of forgiveness, just as despair alone gives meaning to grace, before there is any question of forgiveness, and the offender must first achieve the following :

\_ To confess himself under extenuating circumstances, and above all without accusing his victims.

\_ Before it comes to a question of forgiveness, it will be necessary first for the guilty to perceive themselves as guilty, rather than to contest their character, and to look for extenuating circumstances in order to achieve forgiveness, especially without accusing their victims.<sup>9</sup>

Janclevich's understanding of human freedom continues through the principle of intolerance and through what **Thomas Martiez** wrote: One of the reasons for tolerance in our contemporary lives is that it requires, in a fundamental degree, an acknowledgment of moral uncertainty and a well-documented skepticism about our values and viewpoints. We believe that what we believe can be wrong if we really want to tolerate opinions that contradict ours or hurt us.<sup>10</sup>

Vladimir forgives others only by emphasizing the unconditionality imposed by different and complex tensions, for this we find Derrida disassociating himself from the strong perspective developed by Vladimir Jankélévitch on the subject of tolerance, and presenting a series of arguments that allow him to assert the impossibility of tolerance in certain contexts, and to address these Arguments, Derrida highlights many of the presuppositions that make up the approach to knowing Vladimir's intolerant system through his "acknowledgment of the uniqueness of the Holocaust, which amounted to the exclusion of the unrepentant, and that no forgiveness is possible." Jankélévitch considered this acknowledgment of an irreversible position as the basis of his historical philosophy, which witnessed most of the events, and these positions were not separated from the racist framework of his vengeful stance, which he must avenge for what happened to the Jews in Auschwitz.<sup>11</sup>

## **2. Absolution died at Auschwitz:**

---

<sup>9</sup> V. Jankélévitch :Le pardon , p .148

<sup>10</sup> Muhammad bin Ahmed Al-Mufti, Criticism of Liberal Tolerance, Al-Bayan Magazine, Fahd National Library, 1431 AH, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, p. 37

<sup>11</sup> Jacques Derrida, Forgiveness is the unforgivable and the imprescriptible, Translation: Mustafa Al-Arif, Abdul Rahim Nour Al-Din, Al-Mostahed Publications, p. 36

Vladimir linked any moral indulgence to placing terrible historical questions about Auschwitz, where the Jewish extermination was carried out by the Nazi regime, and considered Auschwitz one of the Jewish holy places around which all moral values revolve, as it is the only event that defines values and defines the conditions for forgiveness with a more vengeful tendency, he emphasized this. The matter, through his dialogue with Jacques Derrida, said: "The Holocaust is not compatible with human peace, it goes beyond the limits of what is humane and the limits of evil to affect the humanity of man because it enters what he calls what he calls not accepting atonement."<sup>12</sup>

**Vladimir has set a scale of forgiveness for the limits of his forgiveness as follows:**

\_ Forgiveness is conditional upon the request and grant of pardon. It must first be sought in the horrific context of the Holocaust, which Jankélévitch is examining, by declaring the German people their unfortunate remorse and waiving all considerations and granting all compensation in favor of the victims of the Holocaust, which the German people did not show in Vladimir's eyes, so that forgiveness remains in This case is impossible.

\_ Forgiveness is conditional on the human ability to forgive, and for the conditions of pardon to be available, the crime must not be brutal and the possibility of forgiveness cannot exceed the human limit. human and transcend every moral limitation.

\_ Forgiveness is conditional on the possibility of a punishment commensurate with the act committed, in order for forgiveness to be possible, the punishment must be the first possible for the other who caused and participated in the crime so that the possibility of forgiveness can be reconsidered or not.

Jankélévitch addressed forgiveness as a retaliatory compensatory argument, where the link between judgment and potential punishment and potential atonement is still explosive. If we take the Holocaust as an example, it is clear that no punishment commensurate with the crimes committed makes forgiveness then impossible, and the German people have sarcastically criticized the reason for not asking for an apology To the Holocaust and its victims, because the German people have been comforted by economic life, there is no room for them to think of offering their apologies and describing the German people in a despicable and bad manner :

\_ When the offender is fat, well-fed, prosperous, and enriched by an economic miracle, forgiveness is just an evil joke. From before?

---

<sup>12</sup> Jacques Derrida , Forgiveness is the unforgivable and the imprescriptible,p.08

\_Why should we forgive those who so little and so rarely repent of their horrific crimes? From the very day after the massacre, an indulgence of the crime appeared modestly in silence and oblivion, where forgiveness and tolerance became absurd. The gravity of the crimes committed in the death camps, the brutality of the criminal act is not subject to statute of limitations or replacement. Since they are the only ones who can offer forgiveness.<sup>13</sup>

\_If the Accused could pity us, with the death of absolution in the death camps, our terror of what is true is to speak of an unimaginable understanding, that would stifle pity from birth if the Accused might actually make us feel pity.<sup>14</sup>

According to Jankélévitch, their disappearance destroys the possibility of forgiveness, and that forgiveness is conditioned by the reciprocal economy between supply and demand, between the perpetrator and the perpetrator, and by calculating the proportion between the possibility of forgiveness and the possibility of punishment, and between the brutality of crime and its human limits, all this seems to make forgiveness impossible. Forgiveness means, then, to give to the other something sacred, that is, to erase his sin without weakness or cowardice, without malice or a spirit of revenge, since forgiveness removes hatred and not error.<sup>15</sup>

The verb performed will remain true forever, but its value may change over time. Forgiveness does not mean erasing it or leaving it, and forgiveness does not mean weakness or acceptance, so that we say that forgiveness is not forgiveness, and **John Locke** said, "It is not strange for people to be blind except to the degree that they do not see the necessity of forgiveness and its advantages in a bright light."<sup>16</sup>

Within the reasonableness of Jankélévitch's vengeful vengeance that transcends the bounds of evil, we cannot forgive anyone who stood against the transgression of the Jew, for the victims are dead, and tolerance is tested face to face without mediation. 1945 in the sense of (crime against humanity), the resulting lack of statute of limitations is unforgivable. With all the calls for repentance that have been raised around the world, this duality in the landscape of tolerance will

---

<sup>13</sup> V. Jankélévitch, *Le pardon*, p. 158

<sup>14</sup> Jacques Derrida, *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, Routledge, London and New York, 2001, p.50-51

<sup>15</sup> Nibras Chehayed, *À l'épreuve de l'impossible Le pardon selon Jacques Derrida La Maison islamo-chrétienne*, Cahier n° 38, 2017, p.03

<sup>16</sup> John Locke, *A Treatise on Tolerance*, translated by: Mona Abu Sunna, revised and presented by: Murad Wahba, The Supreme Council of Culture, Cairo, edition 1, 1977, p. 23



seem meaningless because all these public declarations of repentance, from the community of an institution or company or a church or a group of unknown victims for whom most of those on their behalf died<sup>17</sup>

Vladimir also believes that it is possible to forgive when the crime crosses the line of extreme evil and human borders, to break up human society, which is the only possible framework for tolerance, as the Nazis believed that they could cross the human line and committed these unjustifiable crimes against humanity, and there is no longer any question About forgiveness because forgiveness no longer makes sense, I created the Holocaust that is not commensurate with human nature, despair and a feeling of helplessness in the face of what cannot be repaired, forgotten, cannot be eliminated, and cannot be justified. The Jew's Inexcusable Sin of Existence Jankélévitch then rediscovers the dialects of Shylock, Shakespeare's hero of *The Merchant of Venice*, to tell us "that it is not clear that a Jew ought to exist because a Jew must always justify himself, and apologise, and live and breathe; his claim is to struggle to live. Survival is in itself an incomprehensible scandal and an extravagant thing about it, a Jew has no right to exist and his sin exists. Therefore, the existence of a Jew in this contradiction cannot be explained."<sup>18</sup>

## **Conclusion**

\_ thought constituted a distinct foundation for the philosophy of tolerance, which he combined with a positive moral philosophy, which did not depart from the pragmatic, vengeful formula that Vladimir considered throughout his philosophical experience and his rational claims represented by many philosophical investigations from his study of Plato and Bergson and his study of the church fathers, above all this cognitive system.

\_ Janclevich declared his true intention hidden behind the walls of rationality and his phenomenological books that (the Jewish Holocaust) is the basis of all tolerance and every rationality from which the mind begins and to which it returns, and the center around it is history and memory, considering that Auschwitz is the eternal memory of the mind and the path of historical care for the Jews from their exodus in the era of Moses until their exodus from Europe towards Palestine and the search for a place for their.

\_ His talk about forgiveness and tolerance did not separate from forgiveness and intolerance, and that the obligation to seek forgiveness from the Jews requires harsh and impossible conditions,

---

<sup>17</sup> Jean-Marie André , De la haine au pardon ,Hegel Vol. 3 N° 1 – 2013 , P.49

<sup>18</sup> Jean-Marie André : De la haine au pardon, p.49

which are that the opponent, repentance, apology, begging and remorse be with the living so that he may be forgiven, and as long as the matter is difficult with the victims of the Holocaust because they are dead, the order of apology is completely unacceptable. Tolerance between those who invented Auschwitz and those who fought it

\_ Jankélévitch 's philosophy of tolerance and forgiveness, presented the Jewish mentality as vengeful through the ages, and that Auschwitz is the center of the mind, history and Jewish memory, and there is no room for forgetting to be achieved in it, and that any dialogue and negotiations outside the recognition of the Holocaust are of no use.

### **Sources and References**

#### **Sources**

1. Vladimir Jankélévitch ,“Pardoner?” in L’imprescriptible. translated :Ann Hobart ,as in Critical Inquiry vol. 22, N3, (Spring , 1996) .
2. Vladimir Jankélévitch : Dans l’Honneur et la Dignité, 1948.

#### **References**

1. Emmanuel Levinas, The Time and the Last, translated by: Jalal Badla, Ma'aber Publishing and Distribution, Damascus, Syria.
2. James Wilber ding Dietz II, Choosing Forgiveness After Genocide , May, 2019,P.24
3. Isabelle de Montmollin, La philosophie de Vladimir Jankélévitch. Sources, sens, Presses Universitaires de France ,Paris,2000 .
4. Jacques Derrida ,On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness ,Routledge, London and New York , 2001.
5. Jacques Derrida,Forgiveness is the unforgivable and the imprescriptible, Translation: Mustafa Al-Arif, Abdul Rahim Nour Al-Din, Al-Mostahed Publications.
6. Jacques Ricot Le pardon, notion philosophique ou notion religieuse, Horizons philosophiques, Volume 13, numéro2 ,2003 .
7. John Locke,A Treatise on Tolerance, translated by: Mona Abu Sunna, revised and presented by: Murad Wahba, The Supreme Council of Culture, Cairo, edition 1, 1977, p. 23

8. Jean-Marie André , De la haine au pardon ,Hegel Vol. 3 N° 1 – 2013 .
9. Muhammad bin Ahmed Al-Mufti, Criticism of Liberal Tolerance, Al-Bayan Magazine, Fahd National Library, 1431 AH, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.
10. Nibras Chehayed ,À l'épreuve de l'impossible Le pardon selon Jacques Derrida La Maison islamo-chrétienne, Cahier n° 38, 2017 .
11. Paul Ricoeur, Memory, History and Oblivion, translated by: George Zenati, United New Book House, edition 1, 2009, Beirut, Lebanon, p. 694
12. Voltaire: A Treatise on Tolerance, translated by Henriette Aboudi, edition 1, Petra Publishing and Distribution House, Damascus, Syria, 2009 , p. 47