

Albert Camus: From the Silence of the World to Revolt

Fahima Bouhafs

Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities
University of Algiers 2 Abou El Kacem Saadallah – Algeria –

fahima.bouhafs@univ-alger2.dz

Received: 18-02-2026

Accepted: 10-04-2026

Published:15-05-2026

Abstract

This article addresses the problem of man confronting a world that resorts to “silence” and refrains from providing explanations or revealing its meaning. This is the central issue raised by Albert Camus in his philosophical works and manifested in his literary writings. The aim of this article is to demonstrate that, no matter how incomprehensible the world may seem, man must not surrender to nihilism, but rather confront this cosmic “absurdity” through the act of “revolt.” As long as the individual possesses consciousness and will, he can break this existential silence and move from individual revolt to shared human solidarity. Instead of falling into despair, the rebellious human being chooses to embrace life in the heart of “hopelessness,” accepting suffering courageously and building happiness within limits and values that preserve human dignity.

Keywords: silence, absurdity, revolt, revolution, solidarity, limits, moderation.

Introduction

Albert Camus was preoccupied with the absence of answers to the questions confronting man regarding death, injustice, poverty, and war. These concerns took shape within a turbulent historical context, as he witnessed the consequences of wars and lived through the reality of colonialism with its accompanying deprivation and inequality. In his attempt to understand these problems, Camus encountered the “silence of the world,” realizing that absurdity emerges from the gap existing between the silence of existence and man’s longing to find meaning for his questions. However, this silence did not lead Camus to surrender; rather, it pushed him to search for meaning and confront this world through the act of revolt. He summarized this tense relationship between silence, absurdity, and revolt in his work *The Myth of Sisyphus* by stating: “The absurd is born of this confrontation between the human need and the unreasonable silence of the world.”

Based on this statement, the relationship between absurdity and revolt is defined as a conscious transition from the awareness of meaninglessness to confronting it. To understand how Camus approached absurdity and arrived at revolt and its manifestations, we raise the following problem: How does man confront a silent world that does not respond to his longing for clarity? How does revolt break this existential silence? And what are the limits that Camus established to regulate this revolt?

First: Forms of Silence in Albert Camus

Silence in the philosophy of Albert Camus is not understood merely as abstaining from speech, but rather as an existential structure expressing the absence of the answers that man expects

from the world. Nevertheless, a distinction can be made between this existential silence and other forms of human silence, such as silence resulting from the inability to express oneself or from physiological or psychological barriers. However, despite their differences, these forms may intersect in a shared experience represented by the impossibility of producing meaning, without reducing them all to the same existential silence. Hence, multiple forms of silence can be distinguished in Albert Camus.

1- Forms of Existential Silence

1-1 Metaphysical Silence

This silence begins with Meursault's relationship with time (the protagonist of *The Stranger*) when he receives the news of his mother's death, saying: "Mother died today. Or maybe yesterday, I don't know."

Meursault's response reflects the disintegration of the meaning of time for him, as time had lost its significance as a criterion for ordering events and their importance. This state is manifested in his detachment from the emotional meanings associated with the event of death, through his refusal to open the coffin to see his mother, his drinking coffee and smoking a cigarette in front of her corpse, and then his feeling of relief after the funeral because he would be able to return to his daily life. The novel shows that death, according to Meursault, is the common destiny awaiting everyone and carries no symbolic or emotional value; rather, it is for him a neutral event that does not require any special concern.

This detachment is not limited to the moment of death but extends to the nature of the relationship that united him with his mother. Meursault highlights the deep silence that prevailed between them, which led him—despite being her only son—to place her in a nursing home, justifying this by his financial inability and the absence of genuine communication between them. This position reveals the rupture of emotional bonds that give human relationships their socially recognized meaning.

Metaphysical silence reaches its peak in Meursault's confrontation with the priest before the execution of his death sentence, when the priest offers him the idea of faith in salvation in the afterlife. Meursault rejected the advice given to him by the priest, namely seeking God's forgiveness before the execution. For him, death means the complete severance from this life, and he does not believe in the existence of another life. This rejection stems from the certainty of the novel's protagonist that the world provides no guarantees for an unseen afterlife, and therefore there is no point in seeking meaning in a presumed transcendence.

1-2 The Silence of Nature

In the same novel, silence takes on another dimension in the beach scene. When Meursault shot his opponent, he justified the act by the intense heat and the sweat pouring down his forehead, which affected his vision and sensory perception of what was happening. Nature here is a neutral space; the burning sun, the intense heat, and the stillness of the sea are all elements that provide neither explanation nor guidance for human action. Thus, the protagonist's shooting of the Arab finds nothing in the world to justify or condemn it, because the universe is silent and indifferent to man's fate.

1-3 The Silence of Justice and Institutions

The manifestation of silence is not confined to nature alone but extends to legal institutions as well. During the stages of Meursault's trial, justice appears incapable of understanding the

existential motives of human action. The protagonist was not tried for the murder itself as much as he was condemned for his failure to conform to social rituals. The judge condemned Meursault based on his emotional indifference because he did not cry at his mother's funeral and because he displayed indifference toward moral norms. This led Meursault to conclude that justice does not seek the truth but issues judgments lacking knowledge of the real causes, relying instead on moral judgments. Thus, in this context, the judiciary becomes an attempt to impose moral meaning on a world lacking clarity—a meaningless world.

The circle of institutional silence in Camus expands further in his work *Reflections on the Guillotine*, where he criticizes the death penalty as a legal practice that attempts to speak in the name of justice while concealing a profound moral contradiction. Judges acknowledge that execution is regrettable, yet they still apply it. Here appears the silence of society before legitimate violence and the silence of the law before its internal contradiction. Camus expresses this by saying: "Capital punishment stains our society, and its supporters cannot logically justify it."

This existential conception of silence is inseparable from Camus's personal experience, but rather finds its deep roots in the concrete conditions of his existence, which we shall elaborate on in the following section.

2- Silence in Albert Camus's Biographical Experience

2-1 Physiological Silence

Silence for Albert Camus is not limited to its existential dimension, but extends to his daily life experience. Albert Camus's mother was deaf, and his father died before he reached his first year. This made the environment in which he grew up a space dominated by silence: the silence of the absent father through death and the silence of the deaf mother.

2-2 Social Silence

Alongside physiological silence, Albert Camus suffered from social silence represented by the poverty he experienced with his family. After his father's death, his mother moved to Algiers in order to find work to support her family, which was living under difficult material conditions. As a result of the poverty and deprivation that Albert Camus experienced in his childhood, he developed a feeling "that the destiny of the poor is solitude, quiet silence, and resignation."

Thus, Camus lived the experience of physiological, social, and existential silence together, which gave him an early awareness of the paradox of human existence in a world that does not answer. But if the world is silent and offers no meaning, does this lead man to surrender to meaninglessness? Or is this silence what drives him to search for another position through which he may confront this silence?

Second: From the Silence of the World to the Absurd

Albert Camus links existence and meaning through the phenomenon of suicide, by means of which man puts an end to his life, a life dominated by silence and deprived of meaning. In *The Myth of Sisyphus*, Albert Camus بړی that man tries to be logical throughout his life, yet the decision to commit suicide is often an emotional and irrational decision. Reaching the choice of suicide instead of continuing to live expresses the individual's inability to comprehend this life and his inability to endure continuing in this world, generating within him the conviction of the futility of remaining in it. Man's inability to live in this world stems from his inability

to find meaning in the silence that dominates this world, leading him to conclude that this world is irrational—that is, absurd.

Absurdity in Albert Camus arises from the clash between the human mind searching for meaning and the silence and irrationality of the world, meaning that “the absurd is an awareness of the condition and a transformation of consciousness at the same time; it is an awakening, a decision to confront a meaningless world.”

Starting from the concept of absurdity, Albert Camus distinguishes between two types of suicide: physical suicide, which means putting an end to life, and the suicide that means escaping from unbearable conditions because of their absurdity, which Albert Camus calls “philosophical suicide.” Philosophical suicide represents the solution through which man overcomes the problem of the absurdity of life, hoping to eliminate this tension. Through the idea of philosophical suicide, Camus links existence and meaning, believing that the question of suicide is the only philosophical issue worthy of attention, instead of delving into metaphysical issues that search for man’s destiny, origin, proof of God’s existence, and other matters whose investigation is pointless as long as they are not as important as the relationship between existence and meaning that drives man to end his life.

Absurdity, as Jean-Paul Sartre sees it, is manifested in several poles. On the one hand, it expresses the separation that occurs between man and nature and his desire to achieve unity between them; on the other hand, it appears between man’s desire for immortality and the finite nature of his existence limited by death. According to Sartre’s conception, absurdity in Albert Camus represents the inability of reason to understand this reality.

Suicide represents a direct expression of the loss of meaning, as the suicide victim implicitly acknowledges the absurdity of existence, taking the ending of his life as a final solution. However, Camus rejects suicide and rejects sacrificing oneself even for the noblest causes. In this context, he invokes the example of the scientist Galileo Galilei, who renounced affirming a major scientific truth once he faced the danger of death. Camus sees Galileo’s choice as correct, for there is no cause, no matter how great, that justifies sacrificing human existence.

Accordingly, Camus believes that the true confrontation with cosmic silence is not embodied in escaping toward death, but in insisting on continuing to live, which he calls the “metaphysical revolution.” Albert Camus considered this revolution metaphysical because it is “a general revolt against existence, not against one of its conditions.” Therefore, in order for man to live, he must realize the absurdity of the world and confront it.

Absurdity contradicts suicide; for suicide means the abolition of the experience of life, whereas absurdity requires full engagement in it. From this perspective, what matters for Camus is not that a person lives the best life, but that he lives the greatest possible number of experiences before death overtakes him. The absurd man’s certainty of the limited nature of his existence drives him to adopt an attitude characterized by “indifference* toward the future, and the desire to exhaust everything that is given” . This awareness of absurdity makes him conscious of the limits of his freedom and the narrowness of the horizon of his future, which leads him to confine his adventure to this life, while bearing the consequences of his actions. Thus, Albert Camus distinguishes between hopelessness and despair; despite man’s awareness of the indifference of the future (hopelessness), he still possesses an eagerness for life and for undergoing its experiences. Therefore, the despair felt by the absurd man because of the silence of the world

does not mean hopelessness. However, the realization of this hope remains in this life and not in another life.

In his attempt to understand this absurd and irrational world, Albert Camus distinguishes in his work *The Myth of Sisyphus* between the concept of absurdity and the concept of anxiety in Søren Kierkegaard. According to Camus, Kierkegaard sees anxiety as the fundamental truth of human existence, and consequently calls for the search for a metaphysical meaning for this anxiety and for the absurdity prevailing in the world, considering that man is incapable of comprehending it through reason alone. In contrast, Camus rejects reducing absurdity to metaphysical causes for which no proof exists, considering that transcending absurdity through faith constitutes a form of “philosophical suicide,” and he expresses this by saying: “I allow myself here to call the existential attitude a philosophical suicide” . In explaining the difference between anxiety and absurdity according to the existentialists and Albert Camus

To embody the idea of the absurdity of life, Camus presents “The Myth of Sisyphus.” He states in his work that Sisyphus received an eternal punishment consisting of rolling a rock up to the top of a mountain, only for it to fall again to the bottom each time he attempted to raise it to the summit. The narratives concerning the sin of Sisyphus have varied; some indicate that he preferred water for his city over the god of thunder, while others recount his opposition to death and his refusal to return to the underworld. In both cases, Sisyphus was punished because he loved life and hated the gods, and thus his repeated effort became the supreme embodiment of absurd life. Yet Camus does not see Sisyphus merely as a victim, but rather regards him as an absurd hero. When Sisyphus descends from the summit, he becomes aware of his fate, and it is this awareness that drives him to accept his tragedy. The rock no longer represents for him a source of external torment; rather, it has become his alone, for he is the sole one responsible for the choices that led him to that fate. From this, Camus concludes that we must imagine Sisyphus happy.

Here Albert Camus raises the issue of the relationship between happiness and pain and misery, which led some critics such as Abdel Ghafar Mekkawi to attempt to understand the reason behind the happiness of Sisyphus, that miserable man. Mekkawi sees that happiness, according to Albert Camus, does not mean comfort, nor is it incompatible with misery; meaning that happiness may arise alongside pain and exhaustion, and may also appear when man loses hope in life. Therefore, Mekkawi concluded that the happiness of Sisyphus is not connected to the end of pain, but rather that his happiness lies in his awareness of every step he takes now and afterward, remaining faithful to his principles regardless of their consequences. Hence, Mekkawi concluded that: “Sisyphus is an honest and noble man. But we cannot imagine him as a happy man” .

Jean-Paul Sartre sees that Albert Camus combines in his philosophy narrative storytelling with philosophical analysis. Regarding the meaning of absurdity, he distinguishes between the determination of the abstract concept of absurdity in *The Myth of Sisyphus* and the presentation of the feeling of absurdity in the myth of *The Stranger*. According to Sartre, Albert Camus published *The Stranger* in order to make the reader live within the “climate” of absurdity; the novel conveys an image of alienation, separation, and rupture, after which *The Myth of Sisyphus* appears to explain the reason behind that alienation and rupture. Albert Camus—according to Sartre—reveals that contradictory, unclear lived reality which is subject to coincidences, and

then demonstrates how that reality is reoriented by the human mind . This explains—in our view—the precedence of Albert Camus’s composition of *The Stranger* (1940) over *The Myth of Sisyphus* (1941).

But if man’s awareness of the silence of the world ends in the realization of absurdity, does he choose surrender to this absurdity or confrontation with it?

Third: Rebellion and Confronting Silence

3-1 The Nature of Rebellion

Man does not stop at merely realizing the silence of life, nor does he surrender to this silence, nor fall into absolute nihilism. Human awareness of the silence of the world and the absence of meaning (that is, absurdity) is not the final station at which he stops; rather, he rejects this absurdity and confronts it through rebellion. Rebellion in Albert Camus means that man rejects everything that exceeds his limits; through consciousness, the individual puts an end to absurdity through his rebellion against everything that surpasses his limits. This refusal is embodied in saying “no,” and this “no” does not signify absolute rejection, but rejection accompanied by the right to reject; it is a rejection of every exaggeration and تجاوز للحدود. Thus, the rebellious man says “no” to everything that exceeds his limits and “yes” to affirm his right to rejection, “and in this sense the rebellious slave says ‘yes’ and ‘no’ at the same time” . Rebellion is the meaning created by man in confronting the silence of the world, and it is the act through which he breaks this silence in its various manifestations. If absurdity stops at the level of awareness of meaninglessness, rebellion means the realization of absurdity and confronting it; it is the conscious moment in which man says “no.”

Albert Camus compares the transition from absurdity to rebellion to the idea of methodological doubt in René Descartes, who doubted everything until he arrived at the self-evident truth of the “cogito,” which cannot be doubted. Likewise, Camus considered everything in this world absurd, yet he never doubted his rebellion and protest against this silent world that offers no justifications . Camus expresses this by saying: “The only certainty I receive at the heart of the absurd experience is rebellion” . Therefore, rebellion is considered the sole certainty in a world dominated by absurdity.

The rebellious person’s awareness of the silence of the world, its contradictions, irrationality, and absurdity does not lead him toward surrender and despair or what is known as “passive nihilism,” but rather toward adventure and action. Hence, nihilism in Albert Camus is an active nihilism . For absurdity for him is not an abstract concept, but rather a lived feeling, just as rebellion is the launching point toward action.

3-2 From Individual Rebellion to Human Solidarity

Rebellion arises in a world of absurdity and irrationality; it is that feeling which seeks unity in a contradictory reality that carries both the idea and its opposite. Among the qualities of the rebel is that he does not accept everything presented to him, does not abandon his convictions, and bears the consequences of his actions. The rebel rejects everything that exceeds his limits while affirming his fundamental rights. Although the rebel may incline toward silence as an expression of his condition, when he speaks he reveals his desires and judgments in order to confront others. The rebel (the slave) remained silent regarding the abuses issued by his master,

but when he realizes the necessity that the master respect his limits and treat him on the basis of equality, he enters into a state of resistance that compels others to respect him.

Silence itself may transform into a means of rebellion, and this is what Albert Camus embodied in the story “The Silent Men,” where the barrel-making workers rebelled against their employer through a complete strike and their gathering before the factory gate . Silence here means the severing of communication, and it is this stance that led to workers’ solidarity . In this sense, silence is not the opposite of rebellion, but one of its forms, especially if it emerges from awareness or expresses refusal.

If rebellion begins from an individual motive to confront a personal aggression, then when the rebel confronts his oppression, he rejects the oppression committed against others because he feels that the humiliation affecting others affects him as well. Hence rebellion does not remain an individual value, but transforms into a shared value that establishes human solidarity against oppression. Thus rebellion is founded upon the values of solidarity and participation. According to Albert Camus, rebellion passes through two stages: the stage of individual rebellion and the stage of solidaristic rebellion. The first begins as an individual feeling, whereas in the second it transforms into a shared human experience. Therefore, the relationship of the rebel with others resembles the self-evidence of René Descartes, because the rebellious human being becomes aware of his existence through his awareness of the silence surrounding him, attempting to make it speak and to search for answers, and in his rebellion he unites with others like him among the rebels. This shared consciousness is what establishes the Camusian self-evidence stating: “I rebel, therefore we exist” . The rebel realizes the contradictions of life and attempts to transcend them together with others who share with him in rebellion.

As for the extent to which the Cartesian cogito, “I think, therefore I am,” corresponds to Camus’s statement, “I rebel, therefore we exist,” according to Mekkawi, it lies in the fact that Descartes doubted everything until he arrived at a single primary certainty: that he existed as a being who doubts and therefore thinks. In other words, he moved from doubting his existence to affirming his existence as a thinker; doubt and certainty in Descartes are two operations that occurred at the level of the mind. Albert Camus, however, moved from awareness of existential absurdity or existential silence to rebellion and its actual realization in real life. Hence, Mekkawi concludes that Camus moved from thought to reality, and herein lies the essential difference between Albert Camus and Descartes. Regarding the relationship between rebellion and existence in Albert Camus, Mekkawi saw that rebellion in Albert Camus means existence, and if that is the case, then the statement “I rebel, therefore we exist”—which appeared in Camus’s work *The Rebel*—cannot be regarded as a logical syllogism, but rather as a tautology. Likewise, the transition in this statement from the “I” to the “we” is unjustified. Therefore, according to Mekkawi, Albert Camus’s statement cannot be understood except within an existential dialectical framework; for rebellion carries within it the contradiction represented in the negation of everything that harms human dignity, life, and freedom (negation), and the affirmation of limits that cannot be transgressed (affirmation). Thus occurs the dialectical transition from the individual to all people who share in rebellion. To understand Albert Camus’s statement—according to Mekkawi—its dialectical dimension must be understood; otherwise, it would merely be a repetition of words conveying the same meaning as a tautology.

4-1 The Limits of Solidarity

Rebellion unites those in solidarity around commitment to limits that regulate their actions, and this commitment is considered the boundary at which rebels must stop. Regarding the position of the limit in relation to rebellion, Jean-Yves Guérin sees that rebellion, which is based on acceptance and rejection, means that it possesses limits at which it stops; the rebel says “no” when matters exceed their proper bounds, and says “yes” when affirming his right to reject. Thus, the “no” is what confirms the existence of limits that may not be transgressed. This limit represents the foundation of the dignity and solidarity of the rebels . Albert Camus believes that there exists a shared value among human beings, but that at the same time there also exist limits and moderation that establish this value.

But what is the source of the value that makes the individual abandon his selfishness, unite with others, and exert every effort to achieve it, even if this requires self-sacrifice for its sake? Does not the act performed by the rebel arise from his belief in a transcendent absolute? . Abdel Ghafar Mekkawi sees that Albert Camus means by that value “human nature,” which transcends the nature of the individual. This led him to assume that Albert Camus believed in the existence of a transcendent value, although Camus—according to Mekkawi—denies this. The value to which Albert Camus calls, according to Mekkawi, is neither a transcendent value that existed prior to the existence of man nor a value that man will create in the future; rather, this value is life itself, which the rebel lives, defends, and is prepared to sacrifice himself for. This does not constitute a contradiction—according to Mekkawi—because rebellion carries affirmation and negation simultaneously. As for what makes the individual unite with his peers, it is consciousness; consciousness that man can unite with his peers and demand respect for himself and for others, namely consciousness of life. Hence Mekkawi concludes that existence in Albert Camus precedes appearance, contrary to what Albert Camus held in saying that “appearance creates existence”; for through solidarity man becomes conscious of his existence.

4-2 Metaphysical Rebellion

This type of rebellion appears when the individual rejects the ready-made answers provided to him by metaphysical systems, which deprive him of his right to question. The metaphysical rebel differs from the disobedient man; although both reject their condition, the disobedient man revolts against the manner in which his master treats him and demands justice first, eventually ending by seizing power from the master, at which point his rebellion ends. The metaphysical rebel, however, seeks a deeper and more comprehensive goal; he strives to eliminate the radical contradiction existing throughout the entire world through calling for the realization of justice, the elimination of oppression, and the imposition of a new human order in the face of the silence of the universe.

4-3 Historical Rebellion and Its Limits

Albert Camus sees rebellion as the confrontation carried out by the individual against everyone who exceeds his limits. Rebellion is a reaction that occurs here and now, not an application of prior ideas or theories dictating what should be done in response to certain situations. Rebellion therefore proceeds within a historical process in which it attempts each time to overcome the obstacles impeding its course. Thus we notice that rebellion resembles revolution in that the goal of both is to change existing conditions .

However, Albert Camus believes that revolution differs from rebellion; revolution means replacing one authority with another and embodying a preconceived idea in reality, its aim being to close the circle of history through the realization of its absolute idea. Rebellion, meanwhile, is defined as “the movement that leads from individual experience to the idea” , a path that forms without prior theories mapping it out. According to Albert Camus, the slave’s rebellion against his master does not merely mean the killing of one human being by another, because in that case the disobedient slave aspires to become equal to the master and ultimately ends up becoming a new master himself. Revolution therefore is founded upon killing and consecrates “historical nihilism,” because it embodies abstract principles representing absolute truth. Hence it may be said that the revolutions called for by philosophers to liberate man do not represent rebellion but submission, in Camus’s expression.

If the aim of revolution is to make human nature the force driving history, so that man becomes merely a historical agent within it, rebellion is the act that places limits upon history. Albert Camus expresses this by saying: “Revolutionary thought, if it wishes to remain alive, must therefore draw vitality from the sources of rebellion, and thus inspire itself from the sole idea of this origin, namely the idea of limits” . When rebellion draws limits, it establishes a value representing its being, namely “unity,” which differs from the totalitarian universality called for by revolution. The difference between revolution and rebellion, according to Albert Camus, lies in the fact that rebellion is acceptance and rejection at the same time, whereas revolution is founded upon total rejection and future victory that creates slaves. Rebellion is also the act that creates solutions, whereas revolution is a nihilism based upon a promise of liberation that is never fulfilled, because once victorious it seeks enslavement anew. In order for revolution to rid itself of this nihilism, it must adopt rebellion; people must carry a slogan stating: “We must live and make live in order to create our being, instead of killing and dying to generate a being other than our own” .

4-4 Rebellion and the Limits of Justice and Freedom

Albert Camus draws for rebellion limits that the rebel and his companions must stop at and not exceed. Instead of resorting to killing and destruction, rebellion resorts to unity, that is, to life and creation. Absolute nonviolence leads to enslavement, whereas absolute violence annihilates the being of individuals; therefore limits for violence must be sought. In rebellion, violence must remain within its organizational limits, while taking into account its justifications and resulting consequences. Violence is used only in extreme cases where disobedience exists, and is never employed to serve interests of any kind or to realize ideological principles. Rebellion resorts to violence only in order to limit it, through choosing systems founded upon this principle. Thus, the death of the rebel becomes legitimate only if those systems are attacked, and consequently violence becomes temporary rather than absolute. In this case, where the benefit is shared and represented in preserving “human dignity,” sacrificing the lives of individuals becomes permissible; apart from that, the individual sacrifices only himself. It thus becomes clear that revolution which does not draw limits for itself is limitless despotism, and in order to avoid this, revolutionary thought must draw limits for revolution. In his articles entitled “Fear,” Albert Camus explains that violence generates fear, for through it the individual becomes either a victim when he is killed, or an executioner when he kills others, and in both cases the realization of a lofty principle is used as a pretext to justify violence .

According to Albert Camus, rebellious thought is founded upon the common principle in human nature, and the pillar of this nature is the “limit” that unites contradictions in order to attain unity. In this rebellious world, absolute freedom is considered tyranny, and absolute justice oppression and the abolition of the individual, meaning that “absolute freedom mocks justice, and absolute justice denies freedom” . Therefore, a point of balance must be sought in which the limits of both freedom and justice are determined. When the rebel becomes aware of injustice, he seeks to achieve justice while respecting the limits of rebellion. In the pursuit of justice, rebellion does not call for death, but rather for justifying the rejection of death, because it is life that makes individuals happy, not death. Thus, Albert Camus believes that efforts must be made to reduce the circumstances that lead to killing. According to rebellion, freedom is not achieved by killing the other, but through the rebel’s readiness to kill himself for its sake.

However, here Abdel Ghafar Mekkawi raises the following question: does rebellion mean transcending limits or setting limits to rebellion? And can one speak of rebellion without exceeding limits? According to Mekkawi, this apparent contradiction between limit and rebellion disappears when we return to Albert Camus’s definition of rebellion, which he saw as that act which carries both “yes” and “no” at the same time. On the one hand, it affirms his suffering, and on the other hand, it says no to everyone who seeks to oppress him. Thus, the limit aimed at by rebellion—according to Mekkawi—does not contradict rebellion, but rather constitutes the condition of its existence, and rebellion cannot be understood except within a “dialectical movement”; it is that tension between rejection and affirmation. From this tension emerges the concept of moderation, since “moderation is not against rebellion, but rather the opposite: rebellion is moderation” . Moderation can exist only where rebellion exists, insofar as it is the activity undertaken by reason in order to regulate and direct rebellion.

Albert Camus expresses this conception, which places limits upon rebellion, through the “idea of noon” , which is the idea that sets a limit to totalitarian, absolute, and limitless thought. In his analysis of the concept of noon, Michel Onfray sees that “noon” in Albert Camus symbolizes that period of time which divides the day into two parts; it is the moment in which the shadow disappears and the heat intensifies. It is the moment of ultimate clarity in which illusion dissipates, and it is the moment in which the tension arises that obliges thought to commit itself to limit. Michel Onfray believes that Albert Camus’s aim was not the search for beautiful ideas to present at Parisian seminars, nor was he a philosophy professor seeking fame among students; in short, he was not the intellectual of the closed elite, but rather his purpose was to change the lives of ordinary people and oppressed workers. Onfray sees that Albert Camus’s ideas were not purely theoretical notions that astonish those who read them, but rather tools for changing lived reality. Therefore, Albert Camus’s thought—according to Onfray—still retains its relevance.

Conclusion

From the analysis of the preceding ideas, we conclude that despite Albert Camus’s awareness of the silence of the world, he nevertheless decides to confront it and rebel against it. The fact that the world is meaningless, governed by absurdity, and filled with contradictions does not imply surrender to the impossibility of understanding it; rather, it requires understanding this absurdity and confronting it. The absence of hope in Albert Camus does not mean despair;

despite hopelessness, eagerness for life and happiness remain possible and present. Camus did not stop, in his presentation of the concepts of absurdity, rebellion, and silence, at the limits of abstract theorization, but rather sought to embody them in lived experiences so that the recipient might realize their harshness and pain. This explains his hybrid style between philosophical writing and literary fiction. Albert Camus's personal life constitutes a living testimony to the possibility of seeking happiness at the heart of suffering; despite his tuberculosis, which threatened him with death at any moment, he continued his creativity. Likewise, the poverty in which he lived did not prevent him from finding his happiness in the sun and sea of Algeria .

Nevertheless, despite this conception that makes rebellion a human act aimed at preserving dignity and resisting all forms of oppression, Albert Camus in *The Rebel* links rebellion to Western civilization, where he says: "The problem of rebellion acquires meaning only within Western society". However, this proposition raises the following question: if absurdity and the silence of the world are a human experience, can rebellion be confined within a particular civilizational framework? Or does it remain a universal human expression that every person has the right to practice whenever his dignity is violated?

References

- Badawi, A. R. (1980). *Dirāsāt fī al-falsafah al-wujūdiyyah* [Studies in existential philosophy]. Beirut, Lebanon: Arab Foundation for Studies and Publishing.
- Brée, G. (1968). *Albert Camus*. (J. I. Jabra, Trans.). Beirut, Lebanon: Arab Foundation for Studies and Publishing.
- Camus, A. (1973). *Al-insān al-mutamarrid* [The rebel]. (N. رضا, Trans.). Beirut–Paris: منشورات عويدات.
- Camus, A. (1979). *Al-maqṣalah* [Reflections on the guillotine]. (G. Tarabishi, Trans.). Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Maktabat Al-Hayat.
- Camus, A. (1983). *Uṣṭūrāt Sīzif* [The myth of Sisyphus]. (A. Z. Hassan, Trans.). Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Maktabat Al-Hayat.
- Camus, A. (2005). *L'étranger*. Béjaïa, Algeria: Éditions Talantikit.
- Camus, A. (n.d.). "Al-Ṣāmitūn" [The silent men]. In *Al-manfā wa al-malakūt* [Exile and the kingdom] (K. Hammad, Trans., p. 70). Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Maktabat Al-Hayat.
- Comte-Sponville, A. (2013). L'absurde, de la révolte à la sagesse. In *Albert Camus: La pensée révoltée* (p. 14). Paris, France: Philosophie Magazine.
- Gloag, O. (2017). *Albert Camus: Muqaddimah qaṣīrah* [Albert Camus: A very short introduction]. (M. M. R. Ahmad, Trans.). Cairo, Egypt: Hindawi Foundation.
- Guérin, J.-Y. (2008). *Dictionnaire Albert Camus*. Paris, France: Éditions Robert Laffont.
- Ivaldi, J.-P. (1997). Le silence protéiforme. In A.-M. Amiot & J.-F. Mattéi (Eds.), *Albert Camus et la philosophie* (p. 270). Paris, France: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Mekkaoui, A. A. (1964). *Albert Camus: Muḥāwalah li-dirāsāt fikrihi al-falsafī* [Albert Camus: An attempt to study his philosophical thought]. Egypt: Dar Al-Maaref.
- Onfray, M. (2013). La pensée de midi. In *Albert Camus: La pensée révoltée* (p. 125). Paris, France: Philosophie Magazine.
- Sartre, J.-P. (1947). *Situations I*. Paris, France: Gallimard.