**Review Article**

Open Access

# How does Dussel Help to Understand How Pre-Islamic Arab Tribes See "The Other"

**Faiz Alasmari**

King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

**ABSTRACT**

This paper is to examine the concept of "the other" in the pre-Islamic Arab tribes. To examine this concept, the paper focuses on "the same" as a concept that should be determined according to Dussel's philosophy. Pre-Islamic Arab tribes had different cultures, but the concepts of "the same" and "the other" were not different and popular. The society at that time had several strata, freemen, slaves, released people, and dethroned people. "The same" has only one class, namely, freemen. The other classes are "the other." "The other" does not have a choice to be "the other." And their chance to be "the same" is not huge. The way to transform a self from "the other" into " the same" is difficult and dangerous. "The same" is an ideology, not a person. If "the same" person acts against the ideology, he will find himself "the other."

**Keywords:** The Other, Pre-Islamic Arab Tribes, Communication, Diversity, Cultural Difference, Dussel's the Other

Although ancient civilizations, cultures, and societies disappeared years ago, they still matter today as a guide to understanding how their life works. Primitive societies are one of these ancient cultures. By examining these societies, one can understand what could contribute to preventing a certain society from life perfectly today or being developed. This paper will focus on one of these ancient societies, pre-Islamic Arab tribes. It will look at how these tribes deal with "the other" according to Dussel's concept [1].

"The other," which this paper cares about, is considered another person who does not belong to the society or the culture. Trying to explore how "the same," a certain tribal member, sees or deals with "the other" is strongly related to the communication field, in which "the same" will communicate, directly or indirectly, with "the other" as a human being although "the same" maybe do not see him/her a human being, as this paper would show.

This paper is divided into four sections. The first section is about the pre-Islamic Arabic society. It shows the structures and the strata of the society and the law of the community. Although there were multiple kinds of societies in the pre-Islamic Arabic era, this paper focuses only on the Bedouin tribes, tribes that did not have a specific location, but followed the pasture and always changed their location depending on living factors. The main purpose of this paper is to find out how primitive societies, which does not have an organized government, deals with "the other". The second section is about "the other" according to Dussel's concept in his *Philosophy of Liberation*. The third section displays how the pre-Islamic Arab tribes see "the other" according to Dussel's theory. Finally, what the paper results on is the conclusion section, the final section. The Pre-Islamic Arabian Tribes

Arabic culture is not only various, but it is also old. Arabs existed before 3000 B C [2]. Although their well-known pre-Islamic location is the Arabian Peninsula, according to Dezerah Sgal, their first existence was in Mesopotamia around 2500 B C [3]. Considering this approximated date, Arabs appeared almost 3700 years before the emergence of Islam. In addition, they are originally Semitics, identified as descendants of Ishmael [2, 3]. This deep and long history indicates that there should be several different cultures and societies. Sgal divides Arabs into three main categories which are: extinct Arabs (Bayeeda), original Arabs (Mot'ariba), and Arabist Arabs (Most'ariba) [3]. The extinct Arabs emerged from the beginning of the Arabs' existence, then they disappeared. And their history is not well-known. However, the first existing of original Arabs was in the south of the Arabian Peninsula (Yemen), they are attributed to Y'aroob Ibn Qahtan (a figure in pre-Islamic history) and took the Arabic language from extinct Arabs [3]. The third category was non-Arabs, but they came to the Arabian Peninsula, learned the Arabic language and cultures, and lived according to the tradition of Arab tribes. However, Muhammad Taquoosh divides Arabs only into two categories: extinct Arabs and remaining Arabs [4]. The latter means Arabs whose descendants are well-known today and contributed later to the Islamic civilization.

In addition to these categories, the remaining Arabs are divided into urban Arabs and Bedouin Arabs. Each member in these two categories considered members of the other category an enemy, they were always fighting each other [3]. However, this paper focuses on the remaining Arabs and the Bedouin Arabs due to the available information and the characteristics of the Bedouin society, which is a primitive society.

**Bedouin Arab Society**

Around 150 years before the appearance of Islam, almost the

majority of Arabs lived in tribes. Their families were extended families that "migrated together and held their property in common" [2]. The only thing that bound them is their race and ancestry. Because there was no political system that organized the relationship between these tribes, "the tribes lived a combat life" [5]. The stronger is the one who has the right to live. In addition, because their life depends on fighting others, and the constant wars need fighters, the members of the tribes are the most important part. They protected each member of the tribe by fighting against others [2]. Fighting is the basic rule of relations with the other. According to Jonathan Brown, there is a consensus on the characteristics of these societies are described as societies that suffer from constant blood feuds and inter-tribal wars [6]. The rule is: to protect "the same," one must fight "the other".

This fighting life indicates that living alone is not just a dangerous concept, but is against the tribe's basic principles. According to Sgal, there was no concept of a homeland, rather the tribal members belonged strongly to their relatives not to the land because their life is about constantly moving from one location to another, seeking rain and grass [3]. In other words, "homeland", in the pre-Islamic era, is a concept that pointed to a behavior or even a doctrine more than a place and an idea. In sum, the tribes were independent, they did not undergo external authority although they contacted the outside world [4, 7]. They had their own structures, rules, and traditions that are sacred and non-negotiable.

**The Structure of the Pre-Islamic Arab Tribes**
As mentioned above, members of tribes are an essential part. They are considered the only cause to guarantee their survival. In addition, no one can live alone, everyone, at that time, should belong to a tribe that protects him. Each member understands that, so they follow the instructions of their tribes even though, sometimes, some members do not agree with what their tribe decides. Durayd Ibn Al-Summa (530-630), a pre-Islamic Arabic poet, says: And I am only from Ghazia, if it goes astray, I will go astray, and if it rightly behaves, I will be guided by a Ghaziya [8]. What he believes does not matter, the most important thing is what the tribe sees. What Ibn Al-Summa said shows to what extent a tribal member is loyal to their community. They ignore themselves in order to attain the vision of the tribe. The importance of the members of the tribes does not mean their own opinion is the matter, but means they are the way to implement and follow the collective mind. Members of tribes are parts of bigger categories, such as family.

Although an individual is the most important part of the tribe, he/she is the smallest part. There are other parts such as small family and large family. Alsayeed Bagdadi arranges the social structure of pre-Islamic Arab tribes from the largest group to the smallest, namely *sh'ab* (nation), *qabalah* (tribe), *emara* (building), *baten* (belly), *fakhth* (thigh), and *faseyla* (clique) [9]. In this division, the *sh'ab* consists of some tribes; the tribe is a set of *emaras*; a set of *batens* is called *emara*, and the *baten* is some *faseylas*. By looking at the meaning of the words (nation, tribe, building, belly, thigh, and clique), there is no mention to the individual. In addition, the meaning of the words indicates that they cannot be without a small part. For example, the building is a set of apartments, offices, and rooms. Also, belly and thigh are part of a body. "The basic operating unit of a tribe is the independent local community, which usually small" [7]. But where are the individuals? Individuals do not have the right to decide to live according to what he/she sees or wants, so they are not counted in the structure of the tribe because the concept of an individual does not exist at that time. Again, no one can live alone. He needs

to be within a category. Without these categories, a person in the pre-Islamic era cannot live.

In addition to this division, which is about what the tribes consist of and ignoring the individuals, there is another division which focuses on the individual who is the basic part of the tribe. The tribe's members are divided into three categories, namely freemen (*ahrar*), slaves (*'abeed*), and released people (*mawaley*) [3, 5, 10]. Taqquoosh follows these categories but with different words. For him, the pre-Islamic individuals are divided into a high class, middle class, and low class [4]. However, freemen are members who are connected to the tribe by descent. They are the children of the tribes' founders. The slaves are people who are bought by the freemen to serve them and the tribe. However, released people are people who were slaves and then were released by their masters. But these categories do not include every individual at that time. In fact, there are dethroned people (*Kul'aa*). Some scholars place them in released people (*mawaley*).

In these categories, freemen are considered high-class members, then the released people, then the lowest class are slaves. Each class has its tasks and things to do, and also there are other things that they cannot do. For example, the highest-class members, freemen, can marry from the other classes, but a man from the other classes cannot marry from the highest class. but if a freeman marries a woman from the slave category and she becomes pregnant, he will not admit the son or the daughter as his son or daughter [5]. Rather the born baby would be a slave. His or her full name will not include the freeman's name as a father. In addition, "craftsman … were held in contempt, and to be designed such as a gross insult" [7]. These kinds of occupation are for the middle-class members and lower-class members. But, as mentioned above, these categories are not exemplified all individuals in the pre-Islamic era. There are other different categories, dethroned people and allied people.

Going back to the other two kinds of individuals that are not included in the categories of tribe individuals, namely dethroned people and allied people. Dethroned people are individuals whom their tribes dethrone due to frequent problems that they bring to the tribe, or because they do not follow the tribe's instructions. And there are two kinds of dethroned people depending on what they choose to be after they are dethroned. The first type of them decides to go and live in another tribe [5]. In this case, they would be in the released people category. Another type of dethroned people chooses to live alone and are called wretches (*Sa'aleek*).

Literally, in the Arabic language, *Sa'alook*, the singular form of *Sa'aleek*, means a person who is poor and does not have money [11]. But Kaleyf mentions that the literal meaning is not enough to define *Sa'alook*, so he writes: "*Sa'alook* is a poor who faces the life alone" without anything that can help him to overcome the difficulty of the life [10]. This means that *Sa'alook* indicates to a person who has three things which are lack of money, support, and the basic required equipment that could help him to live.

Although *Sa'aleek* are considered out of the tribes' systems, they have some values and principles that they live according to. They value knighthood, although the meaning of knighthood, for them, is different than the known meaning in the pre-Islamic culture. For them, the knighthood is stealing from others and provides poor people what they steal [5]. For them, money should be equally divided between people. But according to Dayef, they do not steal from people who are known as kind people. That means that they try to redistribute the wealth according to the people

characteristics. In addition, they are brave which is obvious if one closely looks at their life. They live alone in the desert in a time that does not acknowledge the existence of a weak person.

However, there are some Arab tribes which allies with other tribes for several reasons. This alliance has conditions to be constantly active. Arabs value their alliance, which begins by covenant (*'ahd*) which is the holiest principle in their life. According to Sgal, if an Arab tribe allies with another tribe, each tribe has the same obligation of the other tribe [3]. They become one tribe guided and led by the chief. The Chief of the tribe is a position that has complicated rules and duties.

### The Chief of the Tribe
Who does manage this complicated system of the tribe? In the pre-Islamic Society which does not admit individuality, is there an individual who is considered chief of the tribe? the answer would be yes. According to Taqquoosh, Arabs never accept a hereditary ruling system which is reasonable in a society that has equality between individuals of high class of a tribe [4]. However, Goldschmidt mentions that the leaders of tribes are chosen depending on certain characteristics, "except in a few tribes where the leadership was hereditary" [2]. the hereditary ruling system was not accepted in the Bedouin Arab tribes, it is known in urban tribes that have a monarchy ruling system. But in the Bedouin Arab tribes, freemen are equal, their chief can be one of them and is chosen according to specific factors that are built according to their principles and values.

There are conditions for an individual to be a leader of a tribe. Obviously, the leader should be a man. In addition, the leadership style is not only an individual who can lead the tribe. In fact, there is a senate which consists of members from the freemen category. The members should be from each clan of the tribe. Then there is an individual who is considered the leader of the senate [3]. The leader should have six characteristics which are generosity, helping others, forbearing, patience, humility, and eloquence [4, 9]. The meaning of these characteristics indicates that the leader cares about other members of the tribes. All these characteristics depend on how the leaders deal with the other members. However, Sgal mentions that the leader should be one of the elderly members of the tribe, have good manners, and be a respectful person [3]. When a person has these characteristics, he can be one of the candidates to lead the tribe. The characteristics of the leader pose a question about the limit of the power of the chief of a tribe. But what should be mentioned is that the power of the chiefs is limited by principles and traditions.

Does the leader have absolute power? How can he make a decision about a matter that is in the interest of the tribe? The role of the leader is limited. The members of the tribe expect the chief "to give support and set an example, but not compel" [7]. According to this, his role is to provide a set of solutions and ideas, but the final decision is taken by voting, which does not have a clear system. In addition, he is in charge of leading his tribe in battles, welcoming the delegations of other tribes, etc. However, although he has this authority, he could be dethroned or killed, and that is what happens to Kulayeb ibn Rabe'ah, the chief of Tagleep tribe. He was killed due to the oppressive ruling system that he exercised against members of his tribe. The traditions, principles, and values of tribes in the pre-Islamic era are the constitution that guides pre-Islamic people's life.

The Values, Traditions, and Customs of Pre-Islamic Arabic Tribe
Although there was no obvious law that supports certain values and occasions, pre-Islamic Arab tribes have their own values

and principles which are achieved by the strong affiliation of an individual to his or her tribe. Sgal mentions the most popular seven values at that time, which are generosity, hospitality, fulfillment, helping others, forgiveness, bravery, and refusing to insult [3]. "The most important value, for them, is generosity, so at night they make a huge fire for lost people," it is an invitation for others to come to their houses to eat and sleep [5]. And if someone wants to boast, he would show how he is generous. In addition, their neighbors are the most important thing that needs to be taken care of. They boast when they protect and take care of their neighbors. When 'Antra ibn Shaddad, an Arabic poet, describes himself, he says, "I never look at my neighbor's wife, until she goes inside her home. I am a man who has a good manner and does not follow my evil desire" [12]. A good pre-Islamic individual is determined by the extent he or she follows these values mentioned above, and a bad pre-Islamic individual is a person who has a bad manner.

In addition to these values, there were other traditions, which were considered later as bad manners. At that time, adultery, alcoholism, and gambling were popular although pre-Islamic people considered them things that bring the manner of an individual down [5]. Also, revenge was the prevailing law, especially when, as mentioned above, the tribes depended on fighting to prove their power and sovereignty. Sgal writes: "revenge was the greatest law which rules tribes, and it was holier than their religion … some men fasts", and they never eat until they kill who kills their relative. Many of the characteristics mentioned in this section are for men and women [3]. Pre-Islamic women had a complicated situation in this era. There are several categories for them, each category has its values that should follow.

### Women in Pre-Islamic Society
The description of pre-Islamic Arab society shows that it is a masculine society. But before examining the status of women, it is important to mention that the categories of individuals in pre-Islamic society include men and women. In addition to these categories, there are other categories which are only for women. Historian scholars, such as Dayef and Taqquoosh mention that there were two categories of women in pre-Islamic society, namely, freewomen (*Hara'eer*) and slaves (*Emaa'*) [4, 5]. But this division does not indicate released women who were slaves, then their masters released them.

Freewomen status depends on their family wealth and position in the tribe. Although the pre-Islamic culture is masculine, some women play an important role in her society. for example, some Arab tribes are named by their mother's name such as Bano Khundog, Bano Muzayena, and Bano Bujayela [4]. In addition, freewomen play an important role in wars. Freewomen were taken to the battles to encourage the fighters, to treat the wounded, and to weep over their murdered fighters. Also, the freedom for some freewomen was unlimited. they have the right to do what they want without the authority of men. According to Dayef, for example, some freewomen choose their husband which was unusual in other societies at that time [5]. Moreover, they can do some tasks of leaders of tribes. Some of them were able to protect members of other tribes who come to them when they kill others to protect them from the revenge of the family and tribe of the murdered. Therefore, freewomen in pre-Islamic societies were in a position which is equal to men position. But not all women were free in the pre-Islamic era. Female slaves were everywhere. And their status was the worst status for human beings.

Female slaves' status was worse than male slave's status although they could marry freemen. This kind of marriage is

what contributes to their suffering. In this kind of marriage, they used to be a sexual tool, when they become pregnant, their born baby will not be attributed to his or her freeman father. This act reinforces the meaning of slavery in their mind. In addition, the majority of female slaves practice prostitution. Their situation is only to serve the freewomen or to make the freemen enjoy them. So, their life is about being a maid or prostitute.

What can be concluded from this section is that "the same," in the pre-Islamic Arab tribes, is the person who is part of the tribe; and "the other" is a person who does not belong to the tribe. In this point, Dussel's concept of both terminology (the same and the other) comes to deepen our understanding of "the same" and "the other" in the pre-Islamic Arab tribes.

### The Other According to Dussel's Concept

The relationship between "the same" and "the other" is dialectical. Although both indicate human and there are many concepts that they share, "the other" is still considered exteriority, which is different than "the same." In this concept, totality comes to present itself as a concept that coordinates with "the same" in its, as a system, or his, as a human, relationship with the other. According to Enrique Dussel, "[t]otality, the system, tends to totalize itself, to the center on itself, and to attempt -temporarily- to eternalize its present structure. Spatially, it attempts to include within itself all possible exteriority" [1]. That means the existence of the exteriority is unadmitted due to the difference that may contribute to breaking the totality.

In societies and cultures, the relationship between the same and the other is built in an unconscious act. In other words, it is the result of values and principles that a certain society or culture believes in as a basis for its structure. For this, Dussel does not refer this type of relationship to a person's will. Rather this evil or injustice is a result of ignorance. When a system totalizes its system and seeks to merge the exteriority within its structure, the individuals who live according to the concept of that system would be unconsciously part of or merely a tool to do this evil or unjust act. For the system, the other is different. This difference indicates a threat to the unity of "the same," so the same is in charge of proclaiming this danger of "the other" for the whole. According to this, "the other" is not just different, but it is also an enemy. An enemy means it should be aggressively faced and a tool that tends to destroy "the same" and the system as a whole. However, the role of the same is to point out Being and its opposite distinctness, the other. Consequently, heroes appear to fight against the other who would destroy the totality of the same. The same, here, is a reliable man who guides the system and its members' thoughts and ideology. He is considered the cornerstone of the system. As mentioned, "the other," for "the same," is the source of the distinctness which is, as Dussel indicates, exteriority that does not admit the one-dimensionality of the system, but when this exteriority strives to merge into the system, it is welcomed because he will be "Being is."

According to this, the relationship between "the same" and "the other" takes another way. "Insomuch as Being is and non-Being is not, the other is not". And this is the reasonable result of totalizing the system itself. This concept should be reinforced in the system's members as a doctrine or a basic principle. For this, Dussel sees propaganda, communication media, movies, and TV as tools to reach this goal. Despite the great effect of these tools on people's thoughts, there are more frightening factors that manipulate heroes' thoughts toward "the other" as non-Being which are "the certitude the dominating have of representing the gods on the earth and new

democracy, freedom, and civilization". It is the most frightening because heroes get this idea toward "the other" as a doctrine that their construction would be nothing without, so they see death in achieving their goal as the greatest way to strive for the satisfaction of their gods or the rulers. In this concept, Dussel writes: in the name of Being, of the human world, of civilization, it annihilates the alterity of other peoples, other cultures, other erotics, other religions. Thus it incorporates them or, in another way, violently expands the frontiers of its world until it includes other people in its sphere of control.

For "the same," there are only two ways to coexist with "the other," which are annihilating them or merging them into their systems. In these two ways, "the other" as a concept would not be. In this meaning, Dussel mentions that "the same" does not the other to be other", inasmuch as it provides two ways to coexist with "the other," "the other" does not have another option, namely, he or she should be "is" or "not." It is annihilating the other.

But how does "the same" annihilate "the other" and merge him into itself?. The process of annihilating and merging is the role of "the same" as a dominator. However, "to totalize exteriority, to systemize alterity, to deny the other as other, is alienation. To alienate is to sell someone or something, to pass it on to another proprietor". Absolutely, it is alienation because grabbing someone or something from his, her, or its context means they would be something without meaning. In fact, it is a kind of punishment. Alienation was a punishment that is used by previous civilizations to annihilate the punished person. One of the ways to do this alienation is to place "the other at the service of the dominator", so the other's needs would depend on the will of the dominator, whose willingness is to annihilate "the other." The threat of "the other" to the system is measured depending on the time of peace or time of danger. According to Dussel, in the time of danger, "the other" is an enemy. But in the time of peace, "the other" would be a potential danger. That means the relationship between "the other" and the same is based on mistrust and hostility. There is mistrust in peacetime and hostility in the time of danger. This point poses a question which is does "the other" completely transform into "the same"? for Dussel, it is not a transformation, rather it is a mask that "the other" put on instead of completely transforming into "the same." And "the mask is not a face … it is one more piece of furniture in the environment. For this, "the other," for "the same," is a potential danger in peacetime because "the same" knows that the face of "the other" is merely an ugly mask. The chance for "the other" to defend itself is a point of question.

But why does not "the other" try to face "the same" to be just other? In fact, there are implications for trying to liberate. The implications for liberation put "the other" in greater trouble. When "the other" tries to liberate, "the same" transforms the domination into repression because their liberation means the victory of "the other" and the destroying of "the same." To clarify this point, one must look at the war which is, for Dussel, "the ultimate fulfillment of the praxis of the domination". Wars is to keep the same above "the other" or to annihilate their power. In addition to this example, colonization is a praxis of domination, too. The colonized is not fought to only reduce their power, but also to merge their identity to the colonizer's identity. The process of annihilating and merging the other into the same is deeper than bias to an idea or culture; it relates to what is called "ethos."

In addition to the culture and religion or some ideologies (such as democracy and freedom), ethos is considered a guide of "the same's" thought toward "the other." "Ethos is the moral character

of a people or a person: it is the form of whole of attitudes that predetermine action". That means the first kind of education that "the same" or the dominator gets from the beginning of his or her life is the ethos although it is not things that could be taught. It is planted in their mind and heart. And the older "the same" becomes, the harder the ethos would be annihilated from his characteristic. This kind of ethos becomes a law or a constitution.

If the tendency to annihilate or alienate "the other" is ingrained in the system of "the same," the law of the system reinforces this ideology. Dussel writes: "if we accept the principle love your country and fight for it," and we compare the nineteenth-century Englishman with a Nigerian, each will fight for their country … Both acts are legal and moral …". That means that "the same" tries to annihilate "the other" according to the law. And at the same time, "the other" would defend his or her existence according to the law, too, so, according to this, alienating others is not only a legal act, but it is an obligation of "the same."

The Other in Arabic Tribe
As this paper shows in the first section, the image of "the other" in pre-Islamic society is various. There was "the other" in the tribe itself, "the other" tribes, and "the other" nations. In addition, there are two kinds of "the other", namely, systems (tribes) and individuals. According to Mayy Yasein, Arabs did not live in closed societies, rather they interacted with others such as Indians, Ethiopians, Romanians, and Persians [13]. The main reason for interacting with these cultures is trading and economy. Religion was part of the ethos that pre-Islamic tribes cared about. Different religion means different identities and leads to the concept of "the other."

In addition to this interaction with the nations, there were "the others" who lived in The Arabian Peninsula but followed different religions such as Jews and Christians. Yasein mentions that Arabs accepted Christians and there were many Arab Christians at that time. However, they did not accept Jews. Moreover, they scorned Jews [5, 13]. The reason could be because Christianity, which is unlike Judaism, was spread by evangelists who valued their cultures and adequately spoke with them. So, there is no threat to their system. Christians engaged in Arab traditions and language; they did not appear as an exterior component to the pre-Islamic cultures which helped them to be part of the Arab pre-Islamic culture. Language is a cornerstone of identity and culture. Speaking "the same" language helps to cultural convergence.

The Arabic language is the most valuable cultural component for Arabs in the pre-Islamic era. Oratory and poetry were the highest skills required to be a noble. At that time, poets were considered the tongue of the tribes. For this, foreigners who did not speak Arabic were scorned. The only component that unites Arab tribes is the language, "the other," for them, is a person who could not speak their language. He may destroy their identity. Therefore, they see other nations at a lower level than their level. They do not marry them which is obvious when one of the Persian leaders asked Al-Nu'aman, a tribe chief, to marry his daughter, the latter refused although he knew that the Persian leader had the capacity to destroy him and his tribe. The result was that Al-Nu'aman was killed by the Persian leader [14]. He knew he would be killed, and there was a potentiality of destroying the whole tribe, but his ethos was greater than this danger. For him, marrying the leader of Persian does not only mean his identity would be destroyed, but there is a shame which is more painful than his death. The concept of death with honor is better than a humiliating life was his guide. According to Yasien, for the members of Arab tribes, the

loyalty to the tribe's values is above the loyality to their religion [13]. For them, religion is not an important thing that they deal with others depending on although they scorned Jews. But their scorning of Judaism, as mentioned above, is not for the religion itself, but because its followers did not value them and their culture as Christians.

"The other," for Arab tribes, is an evitable concept. Their life, as shown in the first section, is a war life. They invaded "the other," for a trivial reason and expected "the other" to fight them. In addition, in pre-Islamic Arabic poets, "the other" is a part of their speaking about themselves [13]. As much they annihliating "the other," as much they esteem "the same." In this concept, poets speak about their generosity, which they offer "the other," their bravery to defend "the other," their family, as a thing that makes them proud. Taqquoosh mentions that the relation of a tribe with urban tribes, which is "the other," is one of the reasons that contributes in weaken the tribe [4]. In this relationship, tribes would lose their power because urban tribes or nations have different values and principles. As a result, the Bedouin tribes would lose their identity. So, to stay strong is to obtain and defend the values and principles. To do so, Arab tribes maintain their descent which enables them to encourage their members as a part of the tribe to stay and fight according to the tribe interest [9]. In addition, what shows how "the other" is important in pre-Islamic society is that the members of the tribes, especially the high-class members, choose tough and awful names for their children because if "the other" calls them, the meaning of the names indicates wars, killings, death, etc. Bagdadi mentions that a member of the per-Islamic tribe was asked why they name their child tough names and their slaves lovely names, he says: "we name our child for our enemy and our slaves for ourselves". The most popular names at those times are dog (*Kulayeb*), war (*Harb*), Killer (*Mujahid*), etc. "The other" was attacked in several ways to protect "the same." "The same" is not a person, rather it is an ideology. "The same" person is "the same" because he respects and acts according to the concept of "the same." Any act outside "the same" boundaries that is made by "the same" person means transforming "the same" person to "the other" person.

**"The Same" Could be Transformed into "The Other"**
"The same" in Arabic tribe could be transformed to "the other," but it is impossible for "the other" to be "the same," except in a few situations that would be explained later in this paper. Arab tribes tried hard to maintain their unity. "The other" is considered the most dangerous thing that would contribute to destroying this unity, so they always keep a distance between them and the other. In addition, they do not consider slaves and released people as "the same." In fact, tribal custom places barriers between the tribal categories, so slaves can never be freemen, even if they are released [9]. In addition to their effort to maintain their totality, any freeman who acts against the tribe's instructions, he would be transformed into "the other" because his act is a contribution in destroying the unity of the tribe [10]. The person who is transformed into "the other" tries to reduce the negative implications of the transformation by moving to another tribe to be in a new category called the dethroned category.

The procedure of punishing "the same" by transforming him to be "the other" is the cause of the appearance of the dethroned person (Kul'aa). According to Kaleyf, any freeman who acts against the tribe's tradition, values, and/or customs would be dethroned, and the tribe announces that to the other tribes, so if he fights them, steals from them, or kill anyone from them, they would not invade his tribe [10]. Also, if someone kills him or steals him, his tribe

will not help him or take his revenge. In addition, if the dethroned person goes to another tribe, he will not be a freeman as he was in his tribe [4]. For the new tribe, he would be "the other," in which he does not relate to any category of the tribe. Although he could join another tribe as "the other," the joining itself has conditions [10] such as following the tribe's instruction, respecting its values and customs, and fighting for it even against his original tribe. To transform from "the other" to "the same" is not impossible but close to the impossible.

## "The Other" Who Becomes "The Same"

There are two situations in which "the other" would be "the same". First, if a tribe (the same) allies another tribe (the other). The latter would be transformed into "the same." Both would be as one tribe. They share their obligation and tasks [4]. If one tribe invades another tribe its allied tribe should help it. The alliance has more than one form. The first form is that the two allied tribes have the same power, and their military forces are equal. In this case, each tribe transforms another tribe (the other) into "the same." Second, if there is a weak tribe that wants to be strong, it allies to a stronger tribe. and the name of the alliance would be the name of the stronger tribe, and this kind of alliance is called benefit (*intifaa'*) because the weak tribe would benefit from the power of the strong tribe. In this case, "the other," which is the weak tribe, is annihilated by destroying its name and identity although it is still alive. But its existence is seen as nothingness because its life has no meaning due to its conceding its existence, values, customs, and traditions.

The second situation in which "the other" would be transformed into "the same" is rare. As mentioned above, freemen could marry female slaves and their born baby would be a slave. He or she is not attributed to the freemen. The baby is the son or the daughter of the freemen, so he or she should be a freeman or a freewoman. But in this case, he or she is reduced to "the other" due to his mother who is "the other." However, if the born baby is a male and grows up as a slave, he has a chance to be "the same", a freeman. According to Sgal, the son of a slave mother could not be attributed to his father unless he does a great act that is similar to the act of freemen, or he exceeds them in maintaining the values and customs of the tribe [3, 5]. And the most famous example is 'Antra Ibn Shadad who is the son of a chief of a tribe, but his mother is a slave. However, 'Antra Ibn Shadad was "the other" he loved his cousin, but his uncle did not accept his request to marry her due to his status. What happened is that 'Antra is a poet and a great knight; he took advantage of these two characters to become "the same." After showing his father, his uncle, and the whole tribe his ability to defend the tribe's interests, they accept him as a freeman, "the same," although he is black.

## "The Other" Who Lives in "The Same's" Society/Tribe

The pre-Islamic Arab tribes divide their members according to three categories. These categories, as mentioned in the first section of this paper, are freemen, slaves, and released people. To apply Dussel's concept of "the other" to these categories, it is obvious that the freemen category is "the same." They are sons of the tribe's "thigh," which should be considered high-class members. The other categories, which are considered "the other," are born outside the tribe or born in the tribe but their mothers or families do not belong to one of the tribe's "thighs." "Those born outside tribal commonwealth found it hard to obtain the tribal status" although some of them were born in a freemen category in another tribe, which is considered "the other" [10].

In the tribe construction, the slaves and released people categories, which are considered "the other," do not have the rights that the freemen have. The men of these two classes cannot marry from the freemen category. Also, their voice is not heard. That means they cannot contribute to the decision about the tribe's interest and future. In addition, they cannot participate in the tribes' wars. However, the released people category is a higher class than the slaves because the members of released people are not owned by others although the majority of them were slaves [10]. Slaves who were the lowest categories were the servants; they served the freemen. The majority of them are black. For this, the black color is associated, in the pre-Islamic era, with slavery [13]. They are different; and because they are different, they are "the other," whose identity is seen as a threat that would destroy "the same's" system. That means that to maintain the tribes' system is to make the slaves, "the other," live in "the same's" system as slaves which means annihilating them. In addition, the freemen category's members call the female slaves *Agreba* (crows) due to their color and status, in which the crows were a sign of bad luck [10]. The description of the female slave means that they not only transfer them from their own system to "the other" system, but they also make them belong to a type of nonhuman.

## Conclusion

This paper tries to find out how the pre-Islamic Arab tribes dealt with and see "the other," so it is divided into three main sections. The first section is a display of the pre-Islamic Arab tribes and societies. The second section is about the concept of "the other" of Dussel. And the final section shows how the pre-Islamic Arab tribes see and deal with "the other" according to Dussel's concept. What the paper concludes is that the society of pre-Islamic Arab tribe was not a closed society. Rather, it interacts with other nations, tribes, and societies. The relationship between them, as "the same concept, and "the other" was a radical relationship. They tried to annihilate "the other." For them, "the other" is dangerous and tends to destroy their system. In addition, their relationships with the slaves' category and the released people category, they did not try to reduce them to "the same." In fact, they transform them into nothingness, as people who do not have identity. The members of these categories were not allowed neither to be "the other" nor "the same." It is an act to totalize "the other" and his or her system. In sum, "the other" was seen as non-Being.

## References

1. Dussel Enrique (2003) Philosophy of Liberation. Translated by Aquilina Martinez, Eugene, Wipf and Stock.
2. Goldschmidt Arthur A (2002) Concise History of the Middle East. 7th ed., 25th anniversary ed, Westview Press.
3. Sqal Dezerah (1995) Arabs in Pre-Islamic Era. Beirut, Dar Al-Sadaqa Al-Arabia.
4. Taqquoosh Muhammad (2009) History of the Arabs before Islam. Beirut, Dar Al-Nafayes.
5. Dayef Shawgy (1960) Pre-Islamic Era. 11th ed., Cairo, Dar Almareyf.
6. Brown Jonathan AC (2003) The Social Context of Pre-Islamic Poetry: Poetic Imagery and Social Reality in the Mu'allaqat. Arab Studies Quarterly 25: 29-50.
7. Hoyland, Robert G (2001) Arabia and the Arabs: from the Bronze Age to the coming of Islam. London; New York https://courses.edx.org/asset-v1:NotreDameX+TH120.2x+3T2015+type@asset+block/ODL_TH1202x_M02_HoylandChapter9.pdf.
8. Ibn Al-Summah Duraid (1985) Dewan Duraid Ibn Al-Summah [Divan of Duraid Ibn Al-Summah]. Edited by Omar

Abdelrasol, Dar Al-Ma'aref.

9. Bagdadi Alsayeed (1924) Bloque Alarab fi Mārifat Ahwal Al-Arab. 2nd ed., Cairo, Dar Alketab Al Masry https://www.abebooks.com/Bulugh-al-Arab-Marifat-Ahwal-Volume-three/31424879979/bd.

10. Kaleyf Yosof (1978) Al-Showarā Al-Saāleek fi Al-Asr Al-Jahili. Cairo, Dar Al-Maārif.

11. Ibn Mansour, Jamal Al-Deen, Lesan Al-Arab, Beirut, Dar Sader (1883).

12. Ibn Shaddad (1992) Antra. Sharh Dywan 'Antra ibn Shdad. Edited by Mojeed Terad, Beirut, Dar Al-Ketab Al-Arabi.

13. Yasien Mayy (2006) The Other in Pre-Islamic Poetry. An-Najah National University, Master Thesis.

14. Muhanna Ahmad (2017) The Other in the Poetry of Women in the Pre-Islamic and Islamic Eras. The Islamic Universityof Gaza, Ph.D. Dissertation.