



Emir Abdelkader: The Problem Of Identity And Modernity In The Establishment Of The Algerian State – A Philosophical Reading In A Foundational Model

Baghdoud Meriem, University of Mascara (Algeria), drbaghdoudmeriem@gmail.com

Received: 23/08/2024

Accepted: 11/03/2025

Published: 09/05/2025

Abstract:

In the context of re-examining Algerian modernity, Emir Abdelkader emerges as an exceptional philosophical and political figure who succeeded in establishing a modern state entity despite the civilizational fragmentation that loomed over his homeland—a crisis exacerbated by French colonization. The Emir transcended mere military confrontation, crafting a philosophical vision rooted in unifying collective identity through reconciling warring tribes under the umbrella of religious constants and a shared will to resist colonialism.

Emir Abdelkader's state embodied a composite civilizational project, blending Islamic authenticity (through the application of Sharia principles and values of justice) with rational governance based on Shura (consultation) as a mechanism for political dialogue. This was coupled with the creation of deeply rooted national symbolism—a flag, currency, and seal expressing sovereignty. He also established institutional state structures, such as the Consultative Council (Shura), which organized administration through territorial divisions and specialized ministries, hinting at the seeds of a modern state mentality a century before its Arab counterparts.

Keywords: Modernity; Emir Abdelkader; War; Violence; Politics.

Introduction:

The establishment of the state represents an existential issue that has existed for humanity from ancient times to the present day. The state is not merely a political entity, but a civilizational project in which peoples embody their conception of justice, identity, and authority. In the Algerian context, Ottoman rule (before the rise of Emir Abdelkader) represented a paradoxical model between the absence of popular legitimacy and the collapse of the social contract. Algerians lived under the yoke of foreign rule characterized by the duality of tyranny and chaos: fragile security followed by unrest, and exorbitant taxes fueled by tribal conflicts.

By the nineteenth century, cultural fragmentation reached its peak: politically, the ruling elite transformed into an opportunistic clique that prioritized its own interests over those of the nation. Militarily, the prestige of the Algerian fleet collapsed after the Battle of Navarino (1827), opening the door to external threats. Socially, moral collapse (theft, hunger, epidemics) spread as a result of the absence of justice and the disintegration of the social fabric. In light of this existential vacuum embodied in the absence of the state, the disintegration of identity, and the disappearance of the civilizational project, Emir Abdelkader's rationalism emerged as a philosophical form that answers the following question: How does Emir Abdelkader combine the components of identity with the demands of the modern state?

1- The Emir's Construction of the Modern Algerian State: The Philosophy of Governance Between Sharia and Modernity

The conditions of Algerian society when the Emir assumed power were dire, as evidenced by the testimony of the Almoravid clerics to Mahieddine: "The Turkish regime had annihilated and crushed our forces" (Bruno Etienne, 2001: 135)

This assertion confirms that Algeria was experiencing a severe political crisis that had serious repercussions on various aspects of social and economic life. At that time, people lacked the foundations of existential stability, represented by security and internal peace. Algerians had been subjected to Turkish rule for centuries, characterized by "injustice and the serving of the interests of the loyal minority," which led to the erosion of the country's political structure and made it vulnerable to French colonialism. The Turkish withdrawal also left a profound "political vacuum," necessitating the appointment of Mahieddine as the leader of the resistance. However, his advanced age prompted him to nominate his son, Emir Abdelkader, to bear the burden of the historic confrontation. Algerians welcomed Emir Abdelkader with joy and hope, seeing him as the long-awaited leader who would rescue them from tyranny and fragmentation. They expressed to him their suffering under Turkish rule, describing them as "unjust and unable to achieve peace and security," and living a "barbaric life." Despite their affiliation with Islam, "the character, morals, and actions of Muslims are rarely seen in them," reflecting the erosion of moral and institutional values under Turkish rule.

Before Emir Abdelkader's accession, Algeria had been subject to the rule of the Moroccan Sultan, where "the Moroccan ruler took the initiative to act and organize because of the physical protection provided to him by the military structure that Sheikh Muhyiddin's directives had provided the country" (Ashrati Suleiman, 2009: 125). Although the Moroccan sultan did not find the country "completely in chaos," the organizational structure established by Muhyiddin was insufficient to achieve deep political stability. Rather, it provided only "some material aspects," enabling the continuity of "the country's politicians, its management, and the guidance of its people" according to what was available. However, the Moroccan sultan did not continue to govern Algeria; rather, he abdicated, leaving a "political vacuum." Emir Abdelkader took over, devoting his reformist vision to building the state and reshaping the political system. "The imperial mission was a novel event, as generations upon generations of inhabitants of the land of intermediaries had never before practiced the experience of governing themselves" (Ashrati Suleiman, 2009: 128).

2-Political, Economic, and Social Organizations

Emir Abdelkader al-Jazairi was appointed a new ruler of Algerian society. He established a long historical era led by non-local figures—those of non-Algerian nationality. Here, a profound philosophical question arises about the nature of national loyalty versus individual interests. Foreigners, often seeking to achieve their own personal interests, lack a true sense of belonging to that land, while rulers, who are citizens of the country, carry a sense of responsibility and zeal for their country. This reflects the moral and existential dimension of human life in the face of the challenges of belonging and identity. Upon entering the orbit of colonialism, foreigners prepare to return to their homeland, while the local ruler—within the framework of political, economic, and social organizations—pledges to protect their land and advance their people with a philosophical spirit that transcends the mere management of state affairs.

The Emir belongs to the Muhyiddin family, "and the men of the Muhyiddin family were able to travel and learn about the conditions of Islamic countries" (Ashrati Suleiman, 2009: 83). This statement not only reveals his exploratory tendencies, but also confirms that his journeys were not merely a geographical wandering, but rather an intellectual and political journey aimed at deriving civilizational values and philosophical foundations for understanding the politics of nations and the fate of peoples.

His extensive experiences contributed to enriching his intellectual and political background. He stated: "His exposure to political, social, and administrative life during his journey, which formed an important foundation, undoubtedly facilitated his work toward creating administrative, leadership, and organizational structures" (Ishrati Suleiman, 2009: 120). Here, a philosophical aspect emerges in his awareness of the importance of building institutions based on the principles of justice and participation, far removed from methods of tyranny and oppression.

Based on the many negatives he observed in the Turkish government, the prince sought to overcome them and replace them with a better model, leveraging the positives of some of the policies he encountered during his travels, such as Egyptian policy. This embodied a new philosophy that viewed political renewal as a path to achieving the nation's dignity and re-establishing human values. Among the positive aspects of the Emir's government, compared to Turkish rule, was that "he made all important decisions in the life of the nation based on consultation, without tyranny or arbitrariness" (Awni Ahmed et al., 1996: 66). Here, the concept of consultation emerges as a philosophical value based on dialogue and participation, reflecting the spirit of democracy that transcends the limits of absolute power into an intellectual space that combines rationality and humanity.

The Emir did not limit himself to managing state affairs behind scribes; he also conducted awareness-raising campaigns on the ground, "beginning his reign by embarking on field visits, traveling across the country, receiving the popular pledge of allegiance and introducing himself" (Ishrati Suleiman, 2009: 120). His visits to the tribes were both a strategic and philosophical step; through them, he sought to instill the idea of loyalty to the state and service to the nation, emphasizing that national identity transcends personal affiliations to become a humanitarian message aimed at elevating the nation's status. His career was not without challenges, as the prince faced difficulties in building a modern state due to internal conflicts, the multiplicity of tribes, and the absence of a major Algerian ruler capable of unifying the ranks. He stated: "In the province of Oran, Tlemcen was ruled by Ibn Nouna, who recognized only the Sultan of Morocco. The north of the country responded to the tribal chiefs of the Makhzen—Mustafa bin Ismail and Al-Mizri—... and the orders of Abd al-Qadir were not heeded by Ibn Nouna, nor by the heads of the districts and the zamala" (Ashrati Suleiman, 2009: 63). Here, the issue of national unity becomes apparent as a profound philosophical issue, requiring every individual in society to transcend narrow divisions to achieve a state of spiritual and intellectual integration.

In essence, Emir Abdelkader represents a unique model of a ruler whose role is not limited to managing political, economic, and social organizations, but extends beyond this to a philosophical dimension that restores human worth within the context of the nation and existence. He seeks to achieve a balance between historical heritage and the desired future, making his rule a symbol of national renewal and renaissance based on sublime human and spiritual foundations.

One of the primary goals the Emir focused on was uniting the Algerian tribes and incorporating them into his state before the colonizers annexed them. "He saw the spread of influence across the continent as an important condition for consolidating sovereignty, giving the state its status, uniting its regions and people, and repelling the ambitions of occupation" (Ashrati Suleiman, 2009: 132). Here, a philosophical vision was revealed that transcended mere political management to become a call for existential unity, reflecting the struggle of humanity against external forces seeking to dismantle its entity and identity. Among the Emir's initial plans, to gain recognition from the French and others, was to expand Algeria's territory and attempt to annex the tribes that had been isolated from the rest of the country, making them subservient to the Algerian state and subject to its laws. On the other hand, he sought to unify the Algerian people and the warring tribes, creating a unified society—a goal the colonizers

feared but did not desire. The fundamental idea outlined by the Emir was to shift from loyalty to the tribe to loyalty to the state. A society torn apart by tribalism resembles a fragmented individual whose soul is lost in dispersion, while national unity represents the philosophical entity that restores dignity and a sense of belonging. It was clear that the persistence of society as a collection of warring tribes fosters fragmentation and undermines the idea of national unity, which calls for a profound vision that transcends individual interests in favor of a lofty human message. To achieve this, the Emir sought to unify all tribes based on two fundamental ideas:

You all share a common religion, and therefore, your unity is the decisive factor in determining rights and duties. Any problem that arises should be resolved by the Qur'an and the Sunnah. This same religion also calls for brotherhood and unity.

The land of Algeria is your land, all of you, and therefore, all tribes must unite against the enemy.

The Emir addressed the tribes, saying: "If you continue to quarrel among yourselves, you will find this land owned by people different from you in religion and origin." Here, the philosophical dimension is evident in his emphasis that identity is not derived from race or lineage, but rather from a shared value that elevates the spirit toward achieving the supreme interest of the nation.

The colonizer's goal in Algeria was only to achieve his own personal interests, obliterate Algerian identity, and seize wealth. Islam became the prince's method for governing society. He chose it because it was their religion, and the majority of them believed in it. It was not foreign to them, so that some would accept it and others would reject it. "He declared to them from the first moment that his authority would be the Qur'an and the Sunnah, and that his law would be the law of the Qur'an" (Ashrati Suleiman, 2009: 41). Here, it becomes clear that religion was not merely a legislative framework, but rather a comprehensive philosophy of life, carrying within it a call to return to the moral and humane principles that build bridges of communication between members of society.

He also sought to achieve peace and security and to win over dissenters. If a peaceful solution failed, he was forced to deter them by all means to prevent them from betraying him to the colonizer. The ultimate goal, to which he devoted all his material and moral resources, was the establishment of a free and independent Algerian state, a state based on the principles of justice, unity, and humanity, and an embodiment of the philosophy that places the human being and his destiny at the heart of national construction. As part of his personal awareness campaigns, the Emir began his field trip upon assuming power, "beginning his reign by embarking on field visits, during which he traveled throughout the country, receiving the popular pledge of allegiance and introducing himself" (Ishrati Suleiman, 2009: 120). Here, his role was not limited to mere political tours, but rather represented a philosophical journey toward embodying the concepts of responsibility and humanity, expressing his will to unite the nation and awaken a sense of belonging among the nation's citizens. Emir Abdelkader faced numerous challenges in building the modern state as a result of internal conflicts, the multiplicity of tribes, their lack of unity and understanding, and the absence of a central Algerian ruler to organize and guide them, as evidenced by his statement: "In the province of Oran, Tlemcen was ruled by Ibn Nouna, who recognized only the Sultan of Morocco. The north of the country responded to the chiefs of the Makhzen tribes—Mustafa bin Ismail and Al-Mizri—... and Abdelkader's orders were not heeded by Ibn Nouna, nor by the heads of the districts and the zamala" (Ashrati Suleiman, 2009: 63). Here, the existential challenge facing the fragmented nation becomes apparent, as it needs to be unified through a comprehensive philosophical vision based on unity and justice.

Among the Emir's initial plans, so that the French and others would recognize his sovereignty, was to expand the Algerian territory and attempt to annex the tribes that had been

isolated from the rest of the country, making them subservient to the Algerian state and subject to its laws. On the other hand, he sought to unify the Algerian people and the warring tribes and unite them, something the colonizers feared but did not want. The fundamental idea outlined by the Emir was to shift from loyalty to the tribe to loyalty to the state. Maintaining society as a collection of warring tribes fosters fragmentation and undermines the idea of national unity. Here, the philosophy of unity is invoked, transcending individual differences to form a cohesive entity that expresses the spirit of the nation. Thus, from the beginning of the Emir's political career, all Algerians knew that their state was Algerian, Arab, and Islamic. This facilitated his resolution of the problem of tribal and ideological fanaticism to which each tribe adhered. The Emir did not assume responsibility for the nation for political purposes or personal interests, but rather for lofty humanitarian aims. He assumed the responsibility of the country to prevent corruption and chaos among the members of his society in particular and among humanity in general. When Emir Abdelkader was sworn in as Emir of the country, he laid out a plan to follow, seeking to achieve a number of objectives, including the unification of the Muslim community. To unite, a single goal and a common element were necessary. The Emir found this in the need for solidarity to expel the foreign colonizer. This would enable them to push the colonizer to recognize their state and their Emir. There is strength in unity, and all this would benefit the Algerians and terrify the French. This vision was not merely a political strategy; it was a philosophy of life based on the principles of solidarity and unity, which make society an entity capable of confronting all attempts at disintegration and fragmentation.

It should not be noted that the Emir did not limit himself to strengthening internal relations; he also worked to strengthen external relations, particularly with our Moroccan brothers, as well as with the Spanish, the English, and others. He also began to run his state based on the mechanism of descending and ascending debate, meaning that orders and decisions descend from the emir to his deputies and officials, and the escalation of completed tasks and adjudication of cases from his assistants to him. The emir was not dictatorial with his administrative apparatus; rather, he made his decisions only after consulting with them, reflecting a philosophical vision based on dialogue and shared decision-making.

He also sought to achieve peace and security and to win over dissidents. If a peaceful solution failed, he was forced to deter them by all means to prevent them from betraying him to the colonizer. The supreme objective, to which he devoted all his material and moral capabilities, was the establishment of a free and independent Algerian state, a state based on the principles of justice, unity, and human dignity.

The emir did not limit himself to the political aspect alone; he also gave prominence to the social sphere, striving to establish an Islamic society with a national identity embodied in its land and state, Algeria, its language, Arabic, and its religion, Islam. He was also keen to open up the field of agricultural practice using the country's arable lands, thus achieving self-sufficiency and reducing reliance on imports and dependence on other countries. Here, the Emir demonstrates a philosophical dimension based on the idea that development is not merely economic indicators, but rather the realization of identity and human dignity, allowing every individual to contribute to building a bright future for their homeland. In the context of his quest to revive the nation and consolidate the values of civilization, his idea was to establish a true Muslim state, based on the model inherited from the ancients, transcending the boundaries of time and space to become a beacon of knowledge, justice, and brotherhood. He saw the establishment of this state as the foundation that would illuminate the path of the nation in confronting the enemy everywhere. Thus, to ensure that the flame of religion remained alight and capable of confronting every challenge, "his idea was to establish a truly Muslim state according to the model inherited from the ancients... and to kindle the flame of religion, which alone could confront the enemy everywhere... I established schools in which children were

taught the observance of prayer and the most important instructions of the Holy Qur'an, along with reading and writing..." (Bruno Ittienne, 2001: 162)

This educational project was not merely an administrative measure; rather, it embodied a profound humanist philosophy. The Emir understood that knowledge is the gateway through which humanity opens onto the horizon of renewal and progress, and that scholars are symbols of wisdom and advancement. He took a personal interest in the matter, believing that the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) said: "One scholar is higher in degree than a thousand worshippers," which highlights that, in his view, knowledge was the path to achieving social harmony and the advancement of humanity.

The Emir paid special attention to the education sector, making education free and accessible to all, adopting two innovative systems at the time: He introduced the school meal system on a general level, allocated funds to assist students of knowledge and sheikhs of the *zawiya*, sponsored religious and cultural institutions, and extended a helping hand to the corps of scholars, jurists, and teachers (George Al-Rassi, 2008: 41). Within this framework, the philosophical dimension emerged, based on the belief that the role of the educated person is not limited to receiving knowledge, but rather becomes capable of change, transformation, and communicating with others in the spirit of dialogue and constructive criticism, transcending the boundaries of fanaticism that restrict thought.

The Emir's interest was not limited to formal education alone. He also issued educational directives related to the development of religious and educational aspects. He ordered that "those who sought greater progress in their studies be sent free of charge to *zawiyas* and mosques, where they found students capable of training them in history and religious sciences" (Abdelkader Boutaleb, 2009: 104). *Zawiyas* and mosques were considered beacons for gathering scholars and learners, where the foundations of scientific research and critical thinking were laid, confirming that civilization can only be built on solid foundations of knowledge. The Emir sanctified knowledge and scholars, following the teachings of his Islamic faith. Just as the first revelation to the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) from the All-Knowing Creator was "Read," one of his primary goals was to spread knowledge, realizing that civilization is built through intellectuals and that creating a civilized human being is easy when knowledge is present, while building a civilized society is difficult without it. The educated person accepts discussion, criticism, and advice based on arguments and reason, unlike the fanatic who believes that the truth belongs to him alone.

Among the ethics imposed by the prince in his government was not allowing men to adorn themselves with gold and silver, as this was part of his religious and national principles. "Because he was opposed to extravagance, he prohibited the use of gold and silver for adornment, with the exception of women. This stemmed not only from his ascetic nature, but also from his deep belief that the legitimate purpose of these precious metals was the public treasury, in order to achieve the well-being and development of the community" (Muhammad al-Sharif al-Sahli, 2003: 199). He saw this decision as an embodiment of the philosophy that the welfare of the nation is the first priority of the good citizen, and that personal luxuries cannot be given priority in times of war or need.

The prince did not limit his efforts to the educational and social spheres, but also focused on the military and economic aspects. He formed an organized army, wearing uniforms and receiving a monthly salary. At the same time, he encouraged agricultural and industrial activity, focusing on developing the economy, particularly the military industry. This revealed a holistic vision that combined the defense of the homeland with its development, through dialogue with the French as part of attempts to reach peaceful solutions, as illustrated by the following statement: "What we note here is that the dialogue process between Emir Abdelkader and the French continued since the era of armed struggle" (Ashrati Suleiman, n.d.: 19).

The Emir's ability to engage in dialogue and negotiate with various parties, whether from different classes within the country or from external powers, demonstrates the depth of his intellectual knowledge and social upbringing. He was the son of Muhyiddin and the *zawiya*, which was a meeting place for scholars from both within and outside the country. He sent a letter to General Bugeaud, "in which he told him that he desired a relationship based on security, and that your merchants would be in our country as our merchants were in your country, and that he looked forward to his partnership in important projects" (Ahmed Zouzou, 2009: 89). This highlights the philosophical aspect of his view that dialogue and cooperation are the foundation for building human relations based on justice and fairness. One of the characteristics of the political ruler is the sublime humanitarian spirit; he accepted trade exchanges even with the colonizer, thereby reinforcing the idea of mutual benefit between peoples, whether in his quest to obtain deficient products for his people or to expand human relations between nations. In this context, the prince addressed Maréchal Bugeaud, saying: "Your country claims to be the first in the world to love fairness, to use it, to maintain the balance of justice, and to rule by it. This action belies its claim" (Emir Abdelkader Al-Jazairi 1964: 396). The Emir's goal in concluding peace with Demichel was to strengthen national unity and build a modern state. He stated, "The mission entrusted to me by the Arab people is to establish an organized government that reassures the righteous and loyal and terrifies the disloyal." The Emir exploited the period of peace to establish an organized state, believing that there can be no successful resistance without a unified state, and that embodying democracy requires uniting the hearts and voices of Algerians through dialogue and debate.

The peace treaties with the French played an important role in consolidating the Emir's position, as they made clear that "France's appeasement of the Emir would strengthen his standing—as the nation's leader—before other nations, especially its fraternal ones, which would prompt them to reconsider the policy of ignoring or waiting it out that they had followed toward him" (Ashrati Suleiman, 2009: 265). This event represented global recognition of his authority and the importance of his leadership, prompting some rulers to review their policies and consider the necessity of cooperating with this leader who combined wisdom, knowledge, and a patriotic spirit. Clear evidence that his rule was based on the principle of *shura* is that "the advisory council met to consider matters of truce and war... including the meeting held near Miliana to refuse to approve an amendment to the Tafna Treaty according to the new agreement (July 4, 1838), as well as the *shura* meeting held to declare jihad against the enemy after the French army crossed the Iron Gates (November 1839)" (Awni Ahmed et al., 1996: 82). Even when the council refused to amend the agreement, the Emir told the French: "On the one hand, out of my desire to avoid unjustified bloodshed, and on the other hand, I have restrained my people who want nothing but war" (Colonel Ascot, 1981: 207), thus highlighting his concern for preserving human life and avoiding destructive conflicts, within the framework of a profound humane and philosophical vision.

His interests were not limited to the political and military spheres. He also possessed a profound sense of humanity toward women. It is clear that he was extremely reluctant to see female prisoners, considering the thought of women becoming victims of war a constant source of concern. In a funny incident, when the cavalry of one of his successors brought him four girls as valuable spoils, he turned his face in disgust and sarcastically said, "Lions attack strong animals" (Henry Churchill, 2009: 263).

This brilliant embodiment of the dimensions of good governance demonstrates that Emir Abdelkader was not merely a political or military leader. Rather, he possessed a comprehensive philosophical and humane vision that sought to spread knowledge, achieve national unity, and consolidate the principles of *shura* (consultation) and justice. He believed that civilization is built on knowledge and dialogue, not violence and fanaticism.

In the world of politics, the Emir's character stands out as a humane and ethical ruler who combined politics and morality without separating them, a result of his deep understanding of Islamic ethics and religious teachings. He refused to allow women, the elderly, children, and even unarmed young men to be among his captives, all of which are commanded by Islam. Once, his army brought him four female captives, and he was ashamed of this and returned them, while protecting, respecting, and honoring them. Here, we find confirmation of the Islamic principle that men are the protectors and maintainers of women. The prince viewed a captive woman as a symbol of weakness that warranted a man's protection, in stark contrast to many modern men who hide behind women and demand their protection without fulfilling their duties. This contradiction highlights the profound philosophical dimension of the concepts of strength, compassion, and duty, where humanity is, at its core, a field of sacrifice and dignity. The Emir's resistance can be divided into three periods

"The period of power: 1832-1837: During this period, the Emir was able to extend his influence over the various tribes and subjugate them, enabling him to confront the French with a strong front. He established a camp as his capital and seized the port of Arzew" (Ibrahim Mayassi, 2012: 18)

In the first phase of the Emir's jihad and politics, he achieved significant achievements that had a profound impact not only on the ground but also on the national conscience. He contributed to the unification of the Algerian tribes that had been at odds with each other, established a camp as the country's capital, demonstrated excellence in guerrilla warfare, established a military office that contained various military laws, and formed a regular army with various specialties. He also expanded his territory. In light of these achievements, the French offered him the Treaty of De Michel. All these successes were achieved in a period of no more than five years, confirming that true strength is not measured by age or numbers, but rather by lofty principles and an indomitable spirit.

- The Period of Temporary Calm: 1837-1839: Emir Abdelkader exploited the Treaty of Tafna to strengthen his military forces and organize his government through administrative and military reforms (Ibrahim Mayasi, 2012: 19).

The Emir took advantage of this period of calm to form councils, including a ministerial council and a consultative council, and to divide the country into provinces, districts, and tribes—a division that continues to this day. He also diversified budget revenue sources through the zakat and tax systems, investing these resources in jihad. He also established a special flag, a symbol of the state's independence; a state cannot have a flag unless it has true sovereignty. All of these achievements were achieved in a short period of no more than two years, highlighting that internal peace and administrative justice are among the foundations that establish security and stability. Territorial security, market police, and traffic police were so assured that not a single caravan was pursued at night. Women could leave alone without suffering significant harm, and morals improved significantly. This achievement confirms that politics is not merely about conflicts and wars, but rather about building a society where peace, brotherhood, and justice prevail.

- The Difficult Phase of Resistance: 1839-1847: Marshal Vallée violated the Treaty of Tafna by crossing the Emir's territory... and was subsequently abandoned by the King of Morocco" (Ibrahim Mayassi, 2012: 20)

At this stage, the Emir's power declined due to several circumstances, the most important of which was the Sultan of Morocco's cessation of support. Here, the philosophical aspect becomes apparent: victory does not always belong solely to those with physical strength, but rather depends on unity and honesty in fulfilling promises.

3-The Emir's Imprisonment and His Supervision of the Peace Treaty of the 1960:

The Emir suspended his rule in Algeria for several reasons. He "did not surrender and refused to live in France and own palaces" (Princess Badiaa Hasni al-Jazairi, 2002: 10). The Emir, a seasoned politician, did not surrender; rather, he decided to stop the war. This decision reflects his profound political wisdom, as he studied the situation under those circumstances and concluded that French capabilities far exceeded those of Algeria, and that the latter were incapable of confronting and defending themselves. Furthermore, he was exposed to betrayal from within and without the country, the French seized his capital, and the comradeship collapsed. Therefore, the Emir, in consultation with those who remained loyal to him, decided to leave for Damascus. However, the colonialists betrayed him and imprisoned him in Amboise Prison in France. What is noteworthy here is that even in prison, he did not surrender; rather, he continued his struggle with his pen. His book, "Al-Muqaraḍ," is nothing more than a defense of the Islamic faith and the rumors attributed to it. Because he possessed high human values, the Emir rejected the temptations offered to him by the French, such as palaces to live in. The Emir fought French colonialism inside and outside Algeria, with the sword and the pen, emphasizing that true nobility lies in sacrificing one's homeland, not in compromising one's principles. His primary concern was the nation's general interest, not his own; the Emir fulfilled his promise. Had he been solely concerned with his own safety and fate, he could have survived and exploited his political position to portray himself as opposed to the French, when in reality, he was conciliating with them and betraying his country. Instead, he risked his life, fearing neither France nor death on the battlefield. The French offered him gold and property in exchange for ceasing his heinous schemes and the country's sophisticated politicians, but he refused out of love for his country, loyalty to his position, and obedience to his Lord. He even rejected their offer to allow him and his family to leave and live in peace, leaving his fellow citizens behind. This sacrifice reveals the philosophical dimension of heroism: heroism is not measured by personal gain, but by the extent of dedication to serving humanity and loyalty to one's covenant.

Emir Abdelkader lived after his release from Amboise Prison in Damascus, where a sectarian conflict erupted in Syria. The Emir played a major role in stopping the bloodshed and rejecting conflict. He strove to quell the strife and achieve brotherhood between Christians and Muslims. Had he been spiteful, he would have taken revenge on the Christians who had seized Algerian land. They would have tortured, killed, and destroyed, betrayed their promise to him, and imprisoned him. However, his chivalry, manliness, and humane morals compelled him to take the initiative to make peace. Moreover, he championed Deleuze and told Muslims that the land belongs to God, and Christians are God's creation, and they cannot be expelled because they did not come for war. The Emir also spent many sleepless nights, earning him recognition for his humanitarian stance and the pinnacle of manliness and morality. He received numerous letters of thanks and appreciation, and his international fame increased, to the point that a street in the United States was named after him. Humane ethics were clearly evident in his character when he undertook the peace process of the 1960s, "as the prince gathered Moroccan men and sent them to the Christian neighborhoods to repel the attackers and call them to reason, and he opened his house to the fleeing Christians" (Ben Sebaa Abderrazak, d. (s.): 57).

4The State Between Identity and Modernity: Results and Prospects:

Emir Abdelkader represents an existential phenomenon that transcends the duality of identity and modernity. His project was not merely a reaction to colonialism, but rather an attempt to establish a political entity that embodies the dialectical synthesis of the spiritual and the material. He proceeded from an awareness of the necessity of shaping the collective self as a cultural construct that derives its legitimacy from the Islamic and Arab heritage, without being

closed off to the dictates of the times, but rather becoming an active player in formulating the ethics of modernity from within. In governance, he transformed authority into a rational project, establishing a centralized system that embodied harmony between individual and public will, through an advisory council that embodied collective wisdom and a regular army that transformed chaos into established discipline. Economically, he viewed money as nothing more than a tool for achieving existential balance. He coordinated the necessities of material construction (taxes, agriculture) with the needs of the spirit, transforming the economy into an existential equation that reconciled resources and productivity.

In the cultural sphere, his vision manifested itself as a dialectic of preservation and renewal. For him, identity was not a museum of memory, but rather a fertile field for interaction with modern knowledge. He rejected a cultural dichotomy between authenticity and modernity, believing that civilizational requirements required the accommodation of contradictions without dissolution. But his project collided with existential contradictions: the weakness of resources revealed the fragility of internal structures in the face of a colonial power possessing the tools of the era. Nevertheless, his thought remained an open problem, prompting the question: How can the state be the bearer of a cultural project that balances the self and the other?

Today, the prince's experience is transformed into a lively philosophical question about the possibility of building political entities that do not dissolve into globalization or close themselves off. It is a call to reimagine the state as a space for interaction between the absolute (identity) and the relative (modernity), where legitimacy is forged not only from power, but also from the ability to combine historical awareness with future will.

Conclusion:

Emir Abdelkader's founding of the modern Algerian state is a great and unique achievement. This young man, in his early twenties, succeeded in building a state divided into regions, each with a leader to solve its problems. He paid great attention to science; he exempted scientists from punishment, demonstrating his appreciation for scientific research. He also built cities and factories, encouraged national production, united warring tribes, advanced the ranks of the army, confronted the colonizer through negotiations and imposing his terms, and corresponded and negotiated with the rulers of different regions. The Emir was distinguished by his political acumen and military strategies, and he embodied the qualities of humility, Islamic ethics, and a humanitarian spirit; he was even a friend of the French. When we say that the Emir founded the modern Algerian state, it can be said that Emir Abdelkader is the founder of the modern Algerian state and a pioneer of the resistance against the French occupation. He is a global encyclopedic figure worthy of in-depth study and research. His personality embodies the philosophical paradox between strength and compassion, between the struggle for freedom and adherence to the highest human principles.

References:

1. Ben Dah-Ascott, (1981), *Memoirs of Colonel Ascott during his stay in the Fellowship of Emir Abdelkader in 1841*, Algiers: Printing Company.
2. Princess Badiaa Hasni Al-Jazairi, (2002), *And They Didn't Change: Precise Details of Emir Abdelkader's Jihad, Migration, and State*, Damascus: Dar Al-Fikr.
3. Bruno, Etienne, (2001), *Abdelkader Al-Jazairi*, Rouiba: Communication, Publishing, and Advertising Foundation.

4. Ben Sebaa, Abdelrazaq, d. (t.), Emir Abdelkader Al-Jazairi and His Literature, Kuwait: Masoud Al-Batini Foundation for Poetic Creativity.
5. Badiaa Boutaleb, Abdelkader, (2009), Emir Abdelkader and the Building of the Algerian Nation From Emir Abdelkader to Liberation Party, Dahlab Publications, Algiers.
6. Churchill, Henry, (2009), The Life of Emir Abdelkader, Algiers: Dar Al-Ma'rifa.
7. Al-Rassi, George, (2008), Religion and State in Algeria from Emir Abdelkader to Abdelkader, Dar Al-Qasbah Publishing House.
8. Al-Sharif Al-Sahli, Muhammad, (2003), Emir Abdelkader: French Falsehoods and Algerian Realities, trans. Habib Chenini, Algiers: Dar Al-Qasbah Publishing House.
9. Abdelkader Al-Jazairi, (1964), The Visitor's Masterpiece in the History of Algeria and Emir Abdelkader, Beirut: Dar Al-Yaqza Al-Arabiya.
10. Ashrati, Suleiman, (2009), Emir Abdelkader the Thinker, Oran: Dar Al-Gharb.
11. Ashrati, Suleiman, d. (t.), The Memory of the Wise and the Warning of the Heedless: Emir Abdelkader, Dar Al-Gharb, Oran.
12. Aouni, Ahmed, (1996), Emir Abdelkader, Founder of the Modern Algerian State, Algiers: Dahlab Press.
13. Miasi, Ibrahim, (2012), The Spirit of Emir Abdelkader Through the Algerian Resistance, Algiers: Dar Houma.
14. Zouzou, Ahmed, (2009) correspondence with Emir Abdelkader, Algeria: Houma edition.