

## **RESPONSIBILITY PRODUCE OF GUILT: A DIALOGUE BETWEEN HANNAH ARENDT AND KARL JASPERS**

*A RESPONSABILIDADE FRUTO DA CULPA: UM DIÁLOGO ENTRE  
HANNAH ARENDT E KARL JASPERS*

Antonio Justino de Arruda NETO  
PhD student in Law at the  
Faculdade de Direito do Recife/UFPE  
Professor at Faculdade Conceito Educacional/FACCON.  
E-mail: [arruda.neto@ufpe.br](mailto:arruda.neto@ufpe.br)  
Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5188-3198>

### **ABSTRACT**

This text presents the relationship of responsibility as a consequence of guilt. The theme is problematized from a political-legal responsibility due to the State of exception. In order to understand, use as a theoretical foundation, the thoughts of Hannah Arendt and Karl Jaspers. For this reason, the research problem is: To what extent does the concept of guilt in Karl Jaspers influence Hannah Arendt's thinking about political responsibility – the legal result of a government of exception? Regarding the objectives, there is: the general understanding of a problem. Meanwhile, the specific objectives: (1) Identify the concept of state of exception; (2) Analyze the concept of guilt in Karl Jaspers and (3) Discuss the relationship of political-legal responsibility resulting from guilt. Thus, a review is constituted as a bibliographic literature, these articulated with the main books of the authors of the theoretical reference: by Jaspers “The Question of Guilt” (1945), while by Hannah Arendt: “The Origins of Totalitarianism” (1961) and “Responsibility and Judgment” (2003). It is expected as a result in both concepts are characters of political responsibility as a way of provoking a social-political-legal unrest, to avoid totalitarian policies. For, both concepts in their guarantee the capacity of freedom and freedom to the public space.

**Keywords:** Political Responsibility. Purification. Hannah Arendt. Karl Jaspers.

### **RESUMO**

O presente texto apresenta a relação da responsabilidade como consequência da culpa. O tema é problematizado a partir do pressuposto da responsabilidade político-jurídico em razão do Estado de exceção. No intuito de compreender, utilizou-se como fundamentação teórica, os pensamentos de Hannah Arendt e Karl Jaspers. Por essa razão, tem-se como problema de pesquisa: Em que medida o conceito de culpa em Karl Jaspers influencia o pensamento de Hannah Arendt sobre uma responsabilidade política – jurídico fruto de um governo de exceção? Em relação aos objetivos, tem-se: o geral em compreender a problemática. Enquanto, os objetivos específicos: (1) Identificar o conceito estado de exceção; (2) Analisar o conceito de culpa em Karl Jaspers e (3) Discutir a relação da responsabilidade político-jurídico fruto da culpa. Sendo assim, a pesquisa, constitui-se como uma revisão bibliográfica, estes articulados com os principais livros dos autores do referencial teórico: de Jaspers, “A

Questão da Culpa” (1945), enquanto de Hannah Arendt: “As Origens do Totalitarismo” (1961) e “Responsabilidade e Julgamento”(2003). Espera-se como resultado que ambos os conceitos sejam caracteres de responsabilidade política como forma de provocar uma inquietação social-política-jurídica, para evitar as políticas totalitárias. Pois, ambos os conceitos em sua convergência garantem a capacidade de aparecimento dos indivíduos ao espaço público e a condição de liberdade política.

**Palavras-chave:** Responsabilidade Política. Purificação. Hannah Arendt. Karl Jaspers.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Guilt and responsibility, both concepts have parallel and convergent characteristics. For the moral sphere is the result of an action taken by an individual, which belongs to a community. This action is considered disapproved of by the customs and traditions of this. In relation to the political and legal context is the result of this reproach, in this case, we are talking about guilt. In relation to responsibility, this is the consequence of actions taken contrary to the social process of the community.

Thus, for the understanding of the theme, there is the research problem to be answered in the course of writing the text: to what extent does the consequence of the (Es)state of exception correspond to a political responsibility in the light of the thoughts of Arendt and Jaspers? The theoretical framework for the writing of the text is the result of the reflections and debates of the classes of the discipline 'Democracy and Human Rights' by Professor Antonella Galindo. Although, they were not mandatory references of the discipline. The debate of the theme of this, was the premise for the writing of this text.

The general objective is to understand the research problem and related to the three specific objectives: (1) Identify the concept of crisis of the 'nation-state', from the thought of Arendt; (2) analyze the concept of guilt in Karl Jaspers and (3) discuss the concept of responsibility/purification in the thought of Arendt and Jaspers. In the first section of the text, there is Arendt's theoretical reference in discussing the term crisis as a process of rupture. The crisis of the nation-state is presupposed for the understanding of totalitarian policies and the politics of the field of exception.

In relation to the second section of the text, there is in the thought of Karls Jaspers the analysis of the concepts of guilt as a result of the actions developed in totalitarian Germany. The third section of the text discusses political responsibility in Arendt and purification in Jaspers. That said, the theoretical framework stems from Hannah Arendt: "The Origins of Totalitarianism" (1961) and "Responsibility and Judgment" (2003) and "The Question of Guilt" (1946) by Jaspers. Finally, the understanding of the

concepts mentioned in this text is: political responsibility and purification, both aim at the ability of individuals to appear in the public space and the exercise of their freedom.

## 2 BETWEEN THE CRISIS OF THE NATION-STATE AND THE BIRTH OF THE EXCEPTION

The word crisis provokes a sense of concern and uncertainty in political institutions, individuals and the community as a whole. For this reason, the main conceptual characteristic of the term is: the disruption of a social-political-biological stability. For, its meaning derives from the latter word, which for the Greeks would be the disruption of the individual's health. This consequence would be the emergence of a disease for the individual. Thus, the State went through its crises, which resulted in the disease of totalitarian States, that is, political diseases against the sense of participation in the public space.

In this section, we have two discursive objectives, the first on the premise of the 'Crisis of the Nation-State', while the second is about the birth of the exception. About the first part, we will identify in the last section of the second part of the work: "The Origins of 'Totalitarianism'" (1961). In relation to the second part, the discursive elements will be taken from the third part of the mentioned book. Both discursive elements cited are from Hannah Arendt's thought.

"Nothing that was being done, however incredible and however numerous the men who knew and foresaw the consequences, could be undone or avoided" (Arendt, 2012, p. 369).<sup>1</sup> From this quote, the statement made by Hannah Arendt about the context of the First World War is inferred. For the winds of 1914 were the indicators of 1939. On the words presented by Arendt, as a consequence are the instruments of domination, those that were present in Imperialism: bureaucracy and racism (Rensmann, 2020). These acted as a way of reducing the human condition to the process of thing (object).

"Each event was definitive as a final judgment, a judgment that was passed neither by God nor the Devil, but which seemed the expression of some hopelessly absurd fatality" (Arendt, 2012, p. 370).<sup>2</sup> The diversity of events converged to indicate 'objective enemies', who should be expelled and held

---

<sup>1</sup> "Nada do que estava sendo feito, por mais incrível que fosse e por mais numerosos que fossem os homens que conheciam e previam as consequências, podia ser desfeito ou evitado" (Arendt, 2012, p. 369, Edição brasileira).

<sup>2</sup> "Cada evento era definitivo como um julgamento final, um julgamento que não era passado nem por Deus nem pelo Diabo, mas que parecia a expressão de alguma fatalidade irremediavelmente absurda" (Arendt, 2012, p. 370, Edição brasileira).

responsible for their condition of life. The event aimed to eliminate social relations in the public space, the act of elimination would be the definitive sentence (Rensmann, 2020). With this, the withdrawal of rights hastened the condition of the human to stop being a human of rights.

The right has interchanged with hatred, the latter as the new policy for the disregard of the life of the citizen. With the beginning of the withdrawal of rights, the citizen was also prevented from having a home or a community. This action, with its unpredictability, did not build bonds for the emergence of public spaces. Rather, it was a denial of these, through the acts of disintegration of states and rights. However, the process that hastened the crisis and the breakup of the nation-state was denationalization. This, Arendt (2012, p. 372), presents to us:

Denationalization became a powerful weapon of totalitarian politics, and the constitutional incapacity of European nation-states to protect the human rights of those who had lost their national rights allowed the oppressor governments to impose their scale of values and even on opposing countries. Those whom they had singled out as the refuse of the earth - Jews, Trotskyists etc. - were welcomed as the refuse of the earth everywhere; those whom persecution had called undesirables became de facto the *indésirables* of Europe.<sup>3</sup>

The word undesirable represents the strong tone and sentence of the men and women, who lost their social and nationality rights. The war thus hastened and confirmed this condition of men and women. This process culminated in the expression: displaced persons (that is, in a literal translation they would be displaced persons). Arendt (2012) indicated that the use of this term by European states was to solve the issue of statelessness. Both terminological uses are to converge, to the condition of men and women, who have no rights (Gündoğdu, 2020).

"The expression displaced persons was invented during the war for the sole purpose of liquidating the problem of statelessness once and for all by means of the simple expedient of ignoring its existence" (Arendt, 2012, p. 383).<sup>4</sup> They represented 'two shocks', i.e. two problems for the States, which began to receive them. For political communities, they chose the path of ease, that is, of political utility: not to dispose of or recognize rights. As a result, it follows: "the legal dimension of the problem consists in the

---

<sup>3</sup> A desnacionalização tornou-se uma poderosa arma da política totalitária, e a incapacidade constitucional dos Estados-nações europeus de proteger os direitos humanos dos que haviam perdido seus direitos nacionais permitiu aos governos opressores impor sua escala de valores e até mesmo sobre os países oponentes. Aqueles a quem haviam escolhido como refúgio da terra – judeus, trotskistas etc. – eram recebidos como o refúgio da terra em toda parte; aqueles a quem a perseguição havia chamado de indesejáveis tornavam-se de fato os *indésirables* da Europa (Arendt, 2012, p. 372, Edição Brasileira).

<sup>4</sup> "A expressão *displaced persons* [pessoas deslocadas] foi inventada durante a guerra com a finalidade única de liquidar o problema dos apátridas de uma vez por todas, por meio do simplório expediente de ignorar a sua existência" (Arendt, 2012, p. 383, Edição Brasileira).

loss of personality: unable to incorporate themselves into the legal community of the nation-states that receive them and deprived of rights by international law [...]" (Gündoğdu, 2020, p. 149).<sup>5</sup>

With this process of denial of rights, the nation-state lost its functionality of protecting the rights of its own and foreigners. The culmination of this devastation was the transformation of the nation-state into an arbitrary one and hastened the loss of rights by men and women. For this reason, Arendt (2012) identifies two major losses: (1) the home and (2) protection. These consequences were the result of imperialist practices, in which nation-states appropriated the experience of their overseas colonies into the heart of their communities.

On the theme of loss, for Arendt the fatal culmination would be for men and women to be totally expelled from the community. In addition to not being able to exercise the condition of acting and appearing for her. Therefore, "man can lose all the so-called Rights of Man without losing his essential quality as man, his human dignity. It is only the loss of his own community that expels him from humanity" (Arendt, 2012, p. 405).<sup>6</sup> From the quote, the process of expulsion indicates the ontological essence (not being part of living), however, it is the political aspect, which the author wants to present to us this condition of expulsion.

Thus, men and women, as non-parties to the process of acting, not only lose their rights. But they lose the condition to be called citizens, to have a profession and to be recognized as members of the community. That said, the initial process took place during the First World War and its aftermath. The problem of undesirables was the argument used to elect an objective enemy, as well as to create salvific discourses, for the reconstruction process. In fact, what was reconstructed was the hatred of rights and communities. Therefore, the second part of this section will present that the elements and instruments of domination were improved, for the formation of the political novelty: totalitarianism.

To understand this political movement of denial and domination of life and community. We need to rescue three personal questions of Arendt, which are questions for today: "What had happened? Why did it happen? How could it have happened?" (Arendt, 2012, p. 415).<sup>7</sup> In writing the preface to the third

---

<sup>5</sup> "a dimensão legal do problema consiste na perda de personalidade: impossibilitados de incorpora-se à comunidade legal dos Estados-nações que os recebem e privados dos direitos pela lei internacional [...]" (Gündoğdu, 2020, p. 149, Edição brasileira).

<sup>6</sup> "O homem pode perder todos os chamados Direitos dos Homem sem perder a sua qualidade essencial de homem, sua dignidade humana. Só a perda da própria comunidade é que o expulsa da humanidade" (Arendt, 2012, p. 405, Edição brasileira).

<sup>7</sup> "O que havia acontecido? Por que havia acontecido? Como pôde ter acontecido?" (Arendt, 2012, p. 415, Edição brasileira).

part on totalitarianism, Arendt in 1966, indicated the assumptions for understanding the totalitarian phenomenon.

On the theme it is necessary to understand that totalitarianism has a division: the movement and the government. The first, Arendt presents a paradigm: "nothing better characterizes totalitarian movements in general - and especially the fame enjoyed by their leaders - than the surprising ease with which they are replaced" (Arendt, 2012, p. 434).<sup>8</sup> While the second, "only where there are large superfluous masses that can be sacrificed without disastrous results of depopulation does totalitarian government, as distinct from the totalitarian movement, become viable" (Arendt, 2012, p. 438).<sup>9</sup> The separation that the author performs is to present in both situations, the mass is the main element in the constitution of totalitarianism. Therefore, the emergence of the mass is the result of the collapse of class societies. According to Arendt (2012, p. 442):

The masses have in common with the rabble only one characteristic, namely that both are outside any formal social ramification and political representation. The masses do not inherit, as the rabble do, the standards and attitudes of the ruling class, but reflect, and to some extent pervert, the standards and attitudes of all classes towards public affairs. The standards of the mass man are determined not only by the particular class to which he once belonged, but above all by general influences and convictions which are tacitly and silently shared by all classes of society.

These elements presented by Arendt, to situate us in the discussion and indicate the individuals, who would confirm and exercise totalitarianism. However, there is an addition that the author makes in the course of presenting the 'mass'. According to Arendt (2012, p. 446): "the main characteristic of the mass man is neither brutality nor coarseness, but his isolation and his lack of normal social relations".<sup>10</sup> The main characteristic of the mass man is inferred from the quote: solitude. This was considered as an ideal instrument for vague ideas to be planted. The aim was to awaken the lonely masses and the rabble to political activism (which was a paradox, because it was not an action, but a tacit acceptance of totalitarian policies).

"The pronounced activism of totalitarian movements, their preference for terrorism over any other form of political activity, attracted the elite of intellectuals and the rabble alike [...]" (Arendt, 2012,

---

<sup>8</sup> "Nada caracteriza melhor os movimentos totalitários em geral – e principalmente a fama que desfrutam os seus líderes – do que a surpreendente facilidade com que são substituídos" (Arendt, 2012, p. 434, Edição brasileira).

<sup>9</sup> "Somente onde há grandes massas supérfluas que podem ser sacrificadas sem resultados desastrosos de despovoamento é que se torna viável o governo totalitário, diferente do movimento totalitário" (Arendt, 2012, p. 438, Edição brasileira)

<sup>10</sup> "A principal característica do homem da massa não é a brutalidade nem a rudeza, mas o seu isolamento e a sua falta de relações sociais normais" (Arendt, 2012, p. 446, Edição brasileira).

p. 463).<sup>11</sup> It is recalled that the loneliness of the masses is the result of their inability to think, that is, to exercise judgment (Assy, 2015) in distinguishing the danger of totalitarian policies. By not exercising the question is that the mass is enchanted with an instrument, which will be of extreme importance for the dissemination of the initial and main ideas of the totalitarian movement: propaganda.

This, according to Arendt, expresses a force, so that the inner mass of the movements and the outer layers are touched. So that they exercise confirmation and become members of political activism. That said, individuals are enchanted and dominated by empty discourses, that is, falsehoods become oases for lonely political individuals. For this reason, Arendt (2012) presents propaganda as elements of a 'psychological warfare' and techniques of 'prophetic affirmations'. The consequence of these methods was the seizure of power and the confirmation of a leader, this with the intention of promoting his infallibility (that is, he would not err and his words would be considered indoctrination, for his subjects).

However, totalitarian propaganda acted on the core of the masses: their utilitarian and political needs. Propaganda was instrumental in knowing what the masses wanted to hear or consume. In this case, the first standardizations of products to be sold to the masses occurred. With this, the product was to deny political life (bios) and consequently, biological life (zoé). But to arouse a possible need, the masses had to validate the process: "what convinces the masses are not the facts, even if they are invented, but only the coherence with the system of which these facts are part" (Arendt, 2012, p. 485).<sup>12</sup> As a means of capturing attention, totalitarian propaganda used the system itself (the German defeat in the First World War and the social-political crisis that the German state was going through).

The premise of the standardization of totalitarian propaganda was to rescue medieval and modern antisemitism. Thus, "totalitarian propaganda was ingenious enough to transform antisemitism into a principle of self-definition, thus freeing it from the inconstancy of a mere opinion" (Arendt, 2012, p. 492).<sup>13</sup> This was possible due to the creation of slogans, i.e. catchphrases, which arouse the confirmation

---

<sup>11</sup> "O pronunciado ativismo dos movimentos totalitários, sua preferência pelo terrorismo em relação a qualquer outra forma de atividade política, atraíram da mesma forma a elite de intelectuais e a ralé [...]" (Arendt, 2012, p. 463, Edição brasileira).

<sup>12</sup> "O que convence as massas não são os fatos, mesmo que sejam inventados, mas apenas a coerência com o sistema do qual esses fatos fazem parte" (Arendt, 2012, p. 485, Edição brasileira).

<sup>13</sup> "a propaganda totalitária foi suficientemente engenhosa para transformar o antisemitismo em princípio de autodefinição, libertando-o assim da inconstância de uma mera opinião" (Arendt 2012, p. 492, Edição brasileira).

and acceptance of the masses by sight and hearing. Therefore, the main objective of propaganda was: "the real goal of totalitarian propaganda is not persuasion but organization" (Arendt, 2012, p. 496).<sup>14</sup>

Slogans are essential parts of the totalitarian organization. This depends on the figure of the leader, that is, "the totalitarian character of the leadership principle comes solely from the position in which the totalitarian movement, thanks to its peculiar organization, places the leader, that is, the functional importance of the leader for the movement" (Arendt, 2012, p. 500).<sup>15</sup> Regarding the organization, for success it depends on bureaucratizing the function of each member of the movement. With this, there would be a division between who was the sympathizer and who would be the active. Therefore, the creation of the state police (configures the protection of the totalitarian state).

The fight to dominate the whole was the goal of totalitarianism. When it gains power, it installs the so-called totalitarian state. The intrinsic character is the novelty and the political movement, which awakens the sense of revolution. Therefore, the concern of the figure of the leader, whose function is to be a machine to move the false ideology, to keep the mass enchanted (Arendt, 2012). The totalitarian leader had the duty to avoid the normalization of acts and perhaps of a 'way of life', which created by fallacies and lies would exchange the movement for another (Arendt, 2012).

The mode of life then created was the apparent one (i.e. it represented the falsification of political and legal normality). This is configured in the non-extinguishment of the Weimar Constitution by the new occupants of power. In this case, the totalitarian state was formalized by the constitutional guidelines of the period. For the international community, the German state machine was functioning within constitutional parameters. However, the hermeneutic turning point occurred with the enactment of the "Nuremberg Laws": which elected an enemy of the State, which were the Jews and their banishment from the spaces of social-political-legal life (Arendt, 2012).

The year 1939, especially September 1, was the landmark of the radicalization of totalitarianism. With this, slogans became increasingly used in order to confirm that the enemy should be fought. This used the secret police as the right arm of the totalitarian leader, her duty would be to increase the control of the leader as a way to expand dominance over the members of society. The secret character of the

---

<sup>14</sup> "o verdadeiro objetivo da propaganda totalitária não é a persuasão mas a organização" (Arendt, 2012, p. 496, Edição brasileira).

<sup>15</sup> "o caráter totalitário do princípio de liderança advém unicamente da posição em que o movimento totalitário, graças à sua peculiar organização, coloca o líder, ou seja, da importância funcional do líder para o movimento" (Arendt, 2012, p. 500, Edição brasileira).



actions of the regime's secret police was to constitute a protection network for the regime. In addition to hiding the experiments, which the regime was using: the concentration camp.

The concentration camp was the confirmation of the exception of the totalitarian regime. For it represented the maximum reprisal of the lives of those opposed to the regime. The regime was not concerned with maintaining life but with extinguishing it as a form of domination and indicating its power over life. For this reason, "the concentration and extermination camps of totalitarian regimes serve as laboratories where the fundamental belief of totalitarianism that everything is possible is demonstrated" (Arendt, 2012, p. 581). That said, the camp became the symbol of degrading human life, that is, the encounter of the human with its non-human condition (Agamben, 2017). Therefore, the camp was the confirmation of the element of exception, that is, total domination by reason of the life of the other.

### 3 THE GUILT

In this section, the discursive objective is about guilt. The word in question is associated with an act performed. It appears in various areas of the social sciences indicating that a social disruption has occurred. In this case, someone caused an action, which destabilized the social and political order. Therefore, for the law, guilt is the result of an action that has caused harm to a person, community or institution belonging to the community. For this reason, this section has as its theoretical reference Karl Jaspers, who discussed guilt in the German context of the post-totalitarian regime.

In the introduction to the book "The Question of Guilt" (1945), by Karl Jaspers, the author makes some reflections/statements. These are the assumptions for the classes of his course, which led to the writing of the book cited. Thus, we inform these reflections: "we want to learn to talk to each other" and "we want to try to put ourselves in the perspective of the other" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 09). The author's feeling about these reflections is about the consequence of totalitarianism and how much of German society accepted the Totalitarian State. Being the main reflection of how the other denied the condition of empathy of the other, the consequence was the delivery of the neighbor; the work friend and those who maintained social relations. These were delivered to the state police and to the concentration camp.

In these two quotes, the characteristic of understanding guilt in Jaspers is inferred: the denial of empathy for the other in the subjective and collective sphere. The main consequence: denying the condition of forming a collective living space. This is a place of harmony and social interrelationships, for the development of social bonds. For this reason, what was done in Nazi Germany was to list the possibility that each member of the Nazi ideology was a judge. These established the final penalties, for

the other, this action demonstrated the denial of life and the abandonment of the executioner by his community.

Therefore, before starting to discuss the referential elements of guilt in Jaspers, it is necessary to indicate two elements: (1) the restoration of reasoning and (2) the encounter with each other (Jaspers, 2018). These elements are present in the introduction of the book cited. The first element is the provocation that the author makes, for German society to awaken reasoning as an element of thinking, to exercise the capacity of judgment. It is like removing the inertia of thought, to avoid the illusion of salvific speeches. The second element corresponds to the rescue by the empathy of the community. With this, the re-establishment of bonds of a community that avoids the exception by the other.

On the aspect of the issue of guilt, this term as said gives rise to the feeling of acting that generates a consequence. In this case, motive, act, omission are terms that generate guilt and elect the guilty. Jaspers, then indicates that the post-World War II, for the surviving Germans was the paradigm of punishment and retraction (Jaspers, 2018). For the survivors, they were already being punished for the condition of misery. As for retraction, this was exchanged for silence as a result of shame. Thus, there is a warning from the author on these two issues:

Guilt, before being a question imposed by others on us, is a question of us to ourselves. The way in which we respond to it in our innermost being is what underlies our current existential awareness and our self-awareness. It is a vital question for the German soul. It is only through it that a turning point can occur that will lead us to renewal from the source of our essence (Jaspers, 2018, p. 18).<sup>16</sup>

Because it is a vital issue, the author highlights the challenge, which the surviving German society has in recognizing self-blame. Another point in the quote, which is implicit, is about the two sides of the coin: the winner and the loser. The former argued that they had used every means to protect themselves against their tormentors. Therefore, they would not have the duty to recognize themselves guilty. Whereas, the loser (the guilty), he would not have the duty to incriminate himself. In this case, using guilt as an element of 'ourselves' is a challenge, which Jaspers provokes his audience. To this end, the author will schematize and differentiate the types of guilt.

Continuing his course on 'the question of guilt', Karl Jaspers introduces to his audience four types of guilt: (1) criminal guilt; (2) political guilt; (3) moral guilt and (4) metaphysical guilt (Jaspers, 2018). For

---

<sup>16</sup> A culpa antes de ser uma questão imposta pelos outros a nós, é uma questão de nós para nós mesmos. A forma pela qual respondemos a ela em nosso íntimo é o que fundamenta a nossa atual consciência existencial e nossa autoconsciência. É uma questão vital para a alma alemã. É só por meio dela que poderá acontecer uma virada que nos levará à renovação a partir da origem de nossa essência (Jaspers, 2018, p. 18, Edição brasileira).

our discussion, the meanings presented are important, however, we will not be able to epistemically scrutinize all of them. However, as a research cutout, we will discuss political guilt. Although, we will analyze the others as an introductory form. In the explanation about the four types the author warns about the difference between them and their specificities. Therefore:

The differentiations between the concepts of guilt should protect us from the superficiality of guilt talk, in which everything is brought down to a single level, without gradations, and then evaluated with crude rudeness in the manner of a bad judge. But in the end, the differentiations should lead us back to that single origin, to which it is almost impossible to refer simply as our guilt (Jaspers, 2018, p. 25).<sup>17</sup>

The discursive continuum of the quote refers to the self-understanding of the acts carried out during the totalitarian period (Soares, 2021). Although, the alert takes place in non-totalitarian or exception periods. In this case, to understand the concept of guilt in Jaspers, it is necessary not to have a single look. But a hermeneutic about the situation: in the first moment, the discussion is for German society in the post-totalitarianism and in the second moment, due to the pre-constitutive periods of formation of a state of exception in a society.

Thus, the differentiation of concepts and moments of guilt is the methodology used by Karl Jaspers, to indicate those responsible at their levels of actions. Therefore, "Its cause is negligence, convenience, participation in the creation of a public sphere that disseminates lack of clarity" (Soares, 2021, p. 05).<sup>18</sup> That said, these elements corroborate the sense of the cause of harm, for society and the community: guilt.

For this reason, the four types of guilt that will be cited have a characteristic in common: the damage. Thus, we cite the types of guilt, the first due to the "criminal guilt", this stems from the transgression of the positivist law. While, the "political guilt" stems from the effects due to the political acts of the State. About the third type, "moral guilt" its characteristic is interconnected to the actions of individuals, who develop a social and political activity. However, these individuals break with the original action of their activities. Finally, "metaphysical guilt" is related to the individual's deviance and the impossibility of redeeming himself before his community (Jaspers, 2018).

<sup>17</sup>As diferenciações entre os conceitos de culpa devem nos proteger da superficialidade do falatório de culpa, em que tudo é levado para um único nível, sem gradações, para depois ser avaliado com rudeza bruta à moda de um juiz ruim. Mas no fim, as diferenciações deverão nos levar de volta àquela única origem, à qual é quase impossível referir-se simplesmente como sendo nossa culpa (Jaspers, 2018, p. 25, Edição brasileira).

<sup>18</sup> "Sua causa é a negligência, a conveniência, a participação na criação de uma esfera pública que dissemina falta de clareza" (Soares, 2021, p. 05, Edição brasileira).

Thus, in the mentioned types of guilt, the central figure is in the individual. The individual is at the center of discussions about guilt, as it is he who generates the damage due to others and a community. In this case, the individual becomes the disseminator of denying the sense of action in community. For, "it is fatal for every human being to become entangled in power relations through which he lives" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 26).<sup>19</sup> On power relations there is the constituent of an ethos or even a political egoism of these individuals who relate totally by power and deny the condition of sharing.

"This is the inevitable guilt of all, the guilt of the human being" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 26).<sup>20</sup> The sentence written by Jaspers is similar to a Pauline quote written to the Romans: "sin entered the world through one man, and his sin brought death" (Bible, Romans, chapter 05, 12-19).<sup>21</sup> Both quotations indicate a condition inherent in man's conduct acting because of transgression. Therefore, in the first quotation, there is the element of confirmation of guilt. While, in the second quote, guilt or sin came to the world (to the public space), this as a place of coexistence of men, by their intrusion and stubbornness.

About these two quotes there is a common question, for their understanding: "who judges and who is judged?" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 30).<sup>22</sup> From the quote, there are two meanings: the first about the concern to indicate those involved in the process of transgression and those who have a duty to repair the situation. In relation to the second sense, it stems from the personification of these, that is, responsibility as a consequence of acts. For this reason, the general objective of the questioning is about the sense of judging as a response in delimiting whose responsibility it is.

Therefore, Jaspers (2018) informs that an accusation as the initial element of a trial process only makes sense when the object is delimited. In addition to emphasizing that the subject/accused must be indicated with clarity and certainty. For, "the guilt of the other cannot refer to any intention, but only to certain actions and forms of behavior" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 31).<sup>23</sup> In summary, the author indicates that there are no conditions for outsourcing guilt. For, in the course of these acts, there are consequences as the Philosopher situated in the indication of the four types of guilt.

<sup>19</sup> "é fatal para todo o ser humano enredar-se em relações de poder por meio das quais ele vive" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 26, Edição brasileira).

<sup>20</sup> "É esta a inevitável culpa de todos, a culpa do ser humano" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 26, Edição brasileira).

<sup>21</sup> "o pecado entrou no mundo por meio de um só homem, e o seu pecado trouxe consigo a morte" (Bíblia, Romanos, cap. 05, 12-19, Edição brasileira).

<sup>22</sup> "quem julga e quem é julgado?" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 30, Edição brasileira).

<sup>23</sup> "a culpa do outro não pode se referir a qualquer intenção, mas apenas a determinadas ações e formas de comportamento" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 31, Edição brasileira).

These consequences for the author represent four situations. These are located in the external environment, that is, the result of the acts practiced. Therefore, "guilt has external consequences for existence, regardless of whether the affected person understands it or not, and has internal consequences for self-confidence, when, when I become aware of guilt, I see myself transparently" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 27).<sup>24</sup> From the quote, the external and internal sphere correspond, the first due to the process of carrying out an action of the individual against another or due to his political community. The second meaning corresponds to the sense of responsibility, which the individual has due to the consequences of the act practiced.

Regarding the four meanings, Jaspers indicates the first, due to a crime committed, there is "punishment" as reparation. Due to the second type, in the political aspect there is "responsibility". In the third type of guilt, the consequence is related to "penance" and "renewal". Finally, "metaphysical guilt" corresponds to "a transformation of human self-confidence before God" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 28-29). Finally, both consequences correspond to the sense of responsibility, which has the duty to indicate to individuals the ability to rescue and form the World as a place of political action.

#### 4 RESPONSIBILITY IN ARENDT AND PURIFICATION IN JASPERS

The theme of responsibility stems from an obligation. This as a result of subjective or collective consequences. The first is due to the individual's own acts towards another. In relation to the second sense, it refers to the actions carried out by the selfish collectivity in view of the external public, that is, the victims are those who do not participate in this 'collectivity'. Therefore, in this section, the discursive objective will be on responsibility in Arendt and Jaspers. For both, the discursive context will be about the totalitarian period in Germany and the aftermath.

The metaphor of the first decades of the 20th century was: the crisis would not be permanent. I explain that there was the crisis of the First World War, the crash of the New York Stock Exchange and the novelty of Totalitarianisms. Thus, one wonders: is crisis the general principle of the democratic process or perhaps of Democracy? The text will not be able to answer this question, but it serves us to understand the presupposition of this section: responsibility. For the crisis as a process generates a

---

<sup>24</sup> "a culpa tem conseqüências externas para a existência, não importando se o atingindo entende isso ou não, e tem conseqüências internas para a autoconfiança, quando, ao tomar consciência da culpa, eu me vejo de forma transparente" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 27, Edição brasileira).

responsibility, however, assuming it is the challenge. Another is to remove the sense of permanence and perennality of the crisis in democratic environments and give way to responsibility for the community.

This becomes a crisis, a temptation to facilitate possible change quickly. Those who think and act in this way do not worry about the consequences. They want to become 'Pilate', because they can 'wash their hands'. Therefore, responsibility is a preventive and reparatory action, because it focuses on a pre-constitutive situation. But, in the situations realized. For, in the context of the post-fall of German totalitarianism, high and low-level officials used the argument of 'order-takers'. In this case, the function was to absolve themselves of responsibility.

Thus, Eichmann in his judgment used this argument. To explain the 'triggered' controversy, Hannah Arendt indicates some arguments to remove their responsibility from the executioners. Thus, Arendt indicates (2008, p. 80): "finally, and very surprisingly, since it was a trial whose outcome invariably was the production of a judgment, I learned that judging itself is wrong: one cannot judge who was not present".<sup>25</sup> The language and tone used by Arendt was to explain that it was possible to exercise the ability to judge. That is, the author uses irony to indicate to her critics that Eichmann's judgment was possible.

This is the discursive context in Arendt on the relationship between judging and responsibility: the Eichmann case. In this sense, in the follow-up of this trial, Arendt (2004, p. 81) asked herself: "Who am I to judge?".<sup>26</sup> Although the quote conveys a possessive and subjective element. The interpretation is extensive, for the collective sphere, for its reader and participant in the public space. The paraphrase of the questioning is: 'Who are we to judge?'. Thus, it follows:

There are several reasons why the discussion of the right or ability to judge touches on the most important moral issue. Two things are implied in this: first, how can I distinguish right from wrong if most or all of my environment has prejudged the issue? Who am I to judge? And second, to what extent, if any, can we judge events or occurrences in the past at which we were not present? (Arendt, 2004, p. 81).<sup>27</sup>

There are three discursive elements in this quote: (1) about witnesses, (2) the methodological relationship of judging and (3) the arrogance of judging. On the first, the last part of the quote reveals

<sup>25</sup> "finalmente, e de modo muito surpreendente, já que se tratava um julgamento cujo resultado invariavelmente, era a produção de um juízo, fiquei sabendo que o próprio julgar é errado: não pode julgar quem não estava presente" (Arendt, 2008, p. 80, Edição brasileira).

<sup>26</sup> "Quem sou eu para julgar?" (Arendt, 2004, p. 81, Edição brasileira).

<sup>27</sup> Há várias razões pelas quais a discussão do direito ou da capacidade de julgar incide na mais importante questão moral. Duas coisas estão implicadas nesse ponto: primeiro, como posso distinguir o certo do errado, se a maioria ou a totalidade do meu ambiente prejudicou a questão? *Quem sou eu para julgar?* E, segundo, em que medida, se é que alguma medida, podemos julgar acontecimentos ou ocorrências do passado em que não estávamos presentes? (Arendt, 2004, p. 81, Edição brasileira).

the important role of 'witnesses' on their ability to report and confirm events. Regarding the second element, there is a methodological concern of Arendt in disposing about the ability to judge. Finally, the witness reports situations of third parties, that is, not experiencing the events, for Arendt (2004) she can judge by 'arrogance'.

However, about the above quote, the main objective is to highlight: the testimony and the witness. This will have as antagonist the 'confrontation', what kind? As an answer, the relationship he/she obtained with the facts and the form of their narrative. Therefore, Agamben, as a reader of Arendt, presents in the book: "What remains of Auschwitz" (2008), highlights, "a perfect type of witness is Primo Levi. When he returns home, among men, he tells everyone without stopping what he had to live" (Agamben, 2008, p. 26).<sup>28</sup> Another point is about the distinction that the Latin language makes in relation to the term 'witness'.

For the Latins, there are two words and meanings. The first is *testis* and the second is *superstes*. Therefore, the first term is conceptualized as: "the first, *testis*, from which our term witness derives, etymologically means the one who stands as a third party (*\*terstis*) in a process or in a dispute between two contenders" and the second term, "the second, *superstes*, indicates the one who lived something, went through an event to the end and can therefore bear witness to it" (Agamben, 2008, p. 27).<sup>29</sup> Thus, the first type refers to what Arendt indicated the witness, who judges by 'arrogance'. While the second represents the witness's sense of responsibility for the testimony.

"The result of this spontaneous admission of collective guilt was, of course, a very effective, though involuntary, falling away of those who had done something: as we have seen, when everyone is guilty, no one is" (Arendt, 2004, p. 91).<sup>30</sup> Arendt's critical tone for this 'fall' is noticeable. In this case, there is a refusal of 'collective guilt' by the author (Assy, 2015). In this sense, "Arendt describes political responsibility as one of the few possible forms of collective responsibility in which we take responsibility

<sup>28</sup> "um tipo perfeito de testemunha é Primo Levi. Quando volta para casa, entre os homens, conta sem parar a todos o que coube viver" (Agamben, 2008, p. 26).

<sup>29</sup> "o primeiro, *testis*, de que deriva o nosso termo testemunha, significa etimologicamente aquele que se põe como terceiro (*\*terstis*) em um processo ou em um litígio entre dois contendores" e "o segundo, *superstes*, indica aquele que viveu algo, atravessou até o final um evento e pode, portanto, dar testemunho disso" (Agamben, 2008, p. 27, Edição brasileira).

<sup>30</sup> "O resultado dessa admissão espontânea de culpa coletiva foi, claro, uma caiação muito eficaz, embora involuntária, daqueles que *tinham* feito alguma coisa: como já vimos, quando todos são culpados, ninguém o é" (Arendt, 2004, p. 91, Edição brasileira).

for actions we do not practice" (Assy, 2015, p. 22).<sup>31</sup> With this, the term responsibility emerges as a witness of duty, which is exercised by the individual who is part of the community.

For Arendt, indicated to us that collective guilt is to demonstrate the washing of the hands of the members of the German community. The whole would be a veil of appearance, that is, made to deceive and hide the negative deeds of German citizens, who accepted the Nazi ideology of the concentration camp. This is the bureaucratic machine of the banality of evil, that is, the function of exercising totalitarianism because of the lives of those considered guilty. With this, "at the time the horror itself, in its naked monstrosity, seemed, not only to me, but to many others, to transcend all moral categories and explode all standards of jurisdiction; it was something that men could neither adequately punish nor forgive" (Arendt, 2004, p. 85).<sup>32</sup> From this quote, Arendt then conditions that collective guilt would not be ideal, as this would reduce the situation of 'monstrosity' to a non-verdict of the facts.

From the social and political context analyzed and experienced by Arendt. The author's concern was to indicate and defend the responsibility of acts carried out due to totalitarianism. Therefore, "totalitarianism brought to light the exceptionality of borderline situations, forcing the partition that separates political from personal responsibility" (Assy, 2015, p. 23).<sup>33</sup> By this extreme act, Arendt indicated to us that political responsibility removes the notion of collective guilt. For, political responsibility generates conditions, so that political individuals assume collective responsibility (Assy, 2015).

As said, Arendt's thought is to avoid collective guilt, this can be considered as a social and political conformism. That is, it does not provide the activity of thinking as something that guarantees the birth of a political community, which has responsibility. Or even, it does not carry out judging as an activity resulting from thinking, to question what actually happened and avoid conformism. For this reason, Arendt indicates, in the text: 'Some questions of moral philosophy' (1965), thinking as close to politics and political responsibility as that of indicating our responsibilities for the acts practiced. Therefore,

---

<sup>31</sup> "Arendt descreve a responsabilidade política como uma das poucas formas possíveis de responsabilidade coletiva na qual assumimos responsabilidades por ações que não praticamos" (Assy, 2015, p. 22, Edição brasileira).

<sup>32</sup> "na época o próprio horror, na sua nua monstruosidade, parecia, não apenas para mim, mas para muitos outros, transcender todas as categorias morais e explodir todos os padrões de jurisdição; era algo que os homens não podiam punir adequadamente, nem perdoar" (Arendt, 2004, p. 85, Edição brasileira).

<sup>33</sup> "o totalitarismo trouxe à luz a excepcionalidade das situações limítrofes, forçando a divisória que separa a responsabilidade política da pessoal" (Assy, 2015, p. 23, Edição brasileira).



political responsibility is the ability to rescue and create actions, for the formation of communities and the appearance of individuals in the world.

In this second part of the section, we will discuss Jaspers' thinking on the question of responsibility as a question of purification. This word represents an act of making water pure or clean, or a chemical substance, or a food. In religions, purification is the result of a ritual, that is, the act of purifying oneself is the permission to participate in the religious or political acts of the community. To enter the Temple, Jews had to be purified. For the consubstantiation of bread into body and wine into blood, the priest needs to wash his hands, which is ablution. In this sense, how is purification a presupposition of responsibility in Jaspers' thought?

For this reason, purification is an act of making the individual fit to perform religious or political activities. That is, it is an act of transformation, which a situation considered impure is acceptable. The act described reveals a process of communication, that is, as a discourse to be passed between members of the community. That said, "what individuals realize together in communication can, if true, become the consciousness spread among many, and then become valid as the self-consciousness of a people" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 93).<sup>34</sup> This was the purpose of the act of communicating with each other: to perform an action as a condition of transformation.

Transformation is an action, which in the political question is an act of change, for individuals to present themselves to the world. Therefore, "the world becomes, so to speak, our home, as if, although originating elsewhere, we found shelter in it" and "when we become - the world in its reality and we in our eternal origin - strangers and misfits, we feel sacrificed, deprived of reality and faith, with a freedom that is devoid of meaning" (Jaspers, 2011, p. 125).<sup>35</sup> The first quote, the author highlights the world as our site of action and while, the second quote would be the relations of tensions when living in the world and these can lead to turning the world into an antagonist of action.

Totalitarianism turned the world as the site of the German community's political exercise into an antagonistic site. For, the politics of exception found the enemy of the reich and categorized him as the exclusive culprit. Therefore, to look at this issue is to understand the deviation of the German community, which accepted the political misery in denying the other. This action deviated from the sense of justice, so that German citizens lived in an apparent action, that is, in the powerlessness to realize the

---

<sup>34</sup> "aquilo que os indivíduos realizam em conjunto na comunicação pode, se for verdade, se transformar na consciência difundida entre muitos, passando então a valer como autoconsciência de um povo" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 93, Edição brasileira).

<sup>35</sup> "quando nos tornamos – o mundo em sua realidade e nós em nossa origem eterna – estranhos e desajustados, sentimo-nos sacrificados, privados de realidade e fé, com uma liberdade que se despe de sentido" (Jaspers, 2011, p. 125, Edição brasileira).

appearance of community. The opposite occurred, the community transformed into social misery. Beyond the human, it was transformed into sacrifice and numbers, into the concentration camps. Therefore, Jaspers' thought is to awaken, that the assumption of guilt, this cannot be a pattern, for the survivors (among the victims and the party participants).

In addition to preventing the assumption of guilt by the participants of the reich from being a simple atonement and an element of forgetfulness. This is a way of erasing the real reasons present in the state of exception by the community and the state of exception for political institutions. In this case, Jaspers (2018) is concerned not to reduce guilt as a fallacious element. But as a possibility of creating political responsibility. That said, Jaspers (2018, p. 98) states: "only when this decision as an original act is clear, can the deviations of abdication of the self and proud renitence be avoided. Purification leads to the clarity of its consequences".<sup>36</sup> Therefore, purification conditioned the creation of 'we' as a political category to transform our community.

The purification process, as we can cite the example of water, requires the charcoal crystals for the process of absorbing impurities. In this case, for example, there is the metaphor of 'the political clay filter'. In the process of filtering/purification of water, the first step is the content: the set of H<sub>2</sub>O molecules, which forms the quantity. In the second step, there is the decantation, the heavy elements at the bottom of the container and finally, the filter as the final process. In politics, the set or content are the actions, which form the communities and the decantation, arise from social situations. The filter is the element of judgment on the acts.

That said, the praxis on 'the path of purification' is: "in practice, purification means first of all reparation" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 106).<sup>37</sup> The meaning extracted from the quote and that draws attention is the term 'reparation', which has in its essence the legal question. However, in Jaspers' thinking, this will have the ethical sense, that is, in the sense of the term ethos, it means assuming something as a possible responsibility. Thus, "reparation will only be a serious intention and will only fulfill its ethical sense if it is a consequence of our purifying reFOUNDATION" (JASPERS, 2018, p. 106).<sup>38</sup> Therefore, for reparation to occur, it is necessary to have completed the path of purification. Its assumptions being these according to the author:

<sup>36</sup> "apenas quando essa decisão como ato original estiver clara, podem-se evitar os desvios da abdicação do eu e da renitência orgulhosa. A purificação leva à clareza de suas consequências"(Jaspers, 2018, p. 98, Edição brasileira).

<sup>37</sup> "na prática, purificação significa primeiramente reparação" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 106, Edição brasileira).

<sup>38</sup> "a reparação somente será intenção séria e somente preencherá seu sentido ético se for uma consequência de nossa refundição purificadora" (JASPERS, 2018, p. 106, Edição brasileira).

Presuppositions for this work, in addition to the legal form, which brings about a fair distribution of the burden, are life, capacity and the possibility of work. It is unavoidable that the political will for reparation is exhausted when political acts of the victors destroy these presuppositions. For then it would not be peace implying reparation, but a continued war implying a new destruction (Jaspers, 2018, p. 106).

From the quote, some discursive elements are inferred, two stand out: (1) the explicit, which are the constitutive elements of a community: life, capacity as action and possibility of work as modification of the world/community. The (2) implicit, the tension, which we will dispose of a political paradox: peace and war. From this relationship, one has the legal-political consequences of conflict. In our context, the question of the politics of exception. From this relationship, there is the formation of the concept of purification according to Jaspers (2018, p. 106): "politically, this means carrying out acts which, departing from what is said inwardly, put into juridical form and abdicating one's own needs, restore a part of what was destroyed to the peoples attacked by Hitlerist Germany".<sup>39</sup>

The concept lists the meaning of purification: as a legal relationship. However, there is the aporia of the path of purification: how can the individual as author and participant of the state of exception recognize his guilt in an inner way and demonstrate it? The author indicates as an answer the capacity of 'consciousness of guilt', that: "when the consciousness of guilt has been incorporated, we will endure false and unjust accusations as tranquility. For, our pride and our reticence have been fused" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 109).<sup>40</sup> Thus, the author continues that 'guilt consciousness' is the result of a "clarification of guilt is also the clarification of our new life and its possibilities. It is from it that seriousness and decision spring" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 107).<sup>41</sup> As an interpretation, this question removes the sense of guilt as something selfish and passive to the political individual in not being responsible for the individual and collective acts carried out by the state of exception.

In this question, the author indicates as a discursive element, to corroborate the sense of responsibility: "purification is not the same for everyone. Each one follows his personal path" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 107).<sup>42</sup> In this case, this path is interpreted as the condition and capacity of the individual to act,

<sup>39</sup> "politicamente, isso significa realizar atos que, partido do dizer interiormente, colocados em forma jurídica e abdicando das próprias necessidades, restabeleçam uma parte do que foi destruído aos povos atacados pela Alemanha hitlerista" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 106, Edição brasileira).

<sup>40</sup> "quando a consciência de culpa tiver sido incorporada, suportaremos acusações falsas e injustas como tranquilidade. Pois, o nosso orgulho e a nossa reticência foram fundidos" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 109, Edição brasileira).

<sup>41</sup> "esclarecimento da culpa é também o esclarecimento da nossa nova vida e suas possibilidades. É dela que brota a seriedade e a decisão" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 107, Edição brasileira).

<sup>42</sup> "a purificação não é a mesma para todos. Cada um segue seu caminho pessoal" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 107, Edição brasileira).

as a way of appearing to the world and being able to transform it, through his 'consciousness of guilt'. Therefore, as a conclusive element of this path of purification, Jaspers points out the condition of freedom as an element to be conquered and maintained by the legal condition. This is a consequence of purification. Thus, "purification is also the condition of our political freedom" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 108).<sup>43</sup> For the author, it is not any kind of freedom, but a political freedom, which is:

Political freedom begins with the fact that, in the majority of people, the individual feels co-responsible for the politics of the common good - which he not only desires and criticizes, but rather demands of himself to see reality, and not an action based on the belief in an earthly paradise, wrongly used in politics, which only fails to materialize due to the bad will and stupidity of others. He knows much more: politics seeks paths that can be followed in the concrete world, led by the ideal of the human being: freedom (Jaspers, 2018, p. 108).<sup>44</sup>

Purification, therefore, is liberating and provides the condition for individuals to establish themselves and be part of the world. This process results in the response of the metaphor of the political clay filter: freedom as a result of filtration/purification. Thus, freedom provokes a responsibility, for man to act for the sake of the common as a condition of forming the political community. Therefore, from the wreckage of the German exception, it was possible to reconstruct freedom as an indication of not forgetting the acts of totalitarianism.

## CONCLUSIONS

The discursive theme of this text was to discuss the relationship of political responsibility due to the consequences of two moments: (1) the state of exception and the state of exception. Both themes were experienced by Hannah Arendt and Karl Jaspers, our theoretical references. For the author, she used political responsibility as an argument for understanding what had happened in Germany. While, the author presented the concept of guilt and the path of purification.

Therefore, to resume the research problem of the text: to what extent does the consequence of the (Es)state of exception correspond to a political responsibility in the light of the thoughts of Arendt and Jaspers? We sought to answer this problem from the concept of 'crisis'. This is an intrinsic and

---

<sup>43</sup> "a purificação também é a condição de nossa liberdade política" (Jaspers, 2018, p. 108, Edição brasileira).

<sup>44</sup> A liberdade política começa de fato de que, na maior parte do povo, o indivíduo sente-se corresponsável pela política do bem comum – que ele não apenas deseja e crítica, mas antes exige de si mesmo ver a realidade, e não uma ação a partir da crença de um paraíso terrestre, utilizada erroneamente na política, que só não se concretiza pela má vontade e pela estupidez dos outros. Ele sabe muito mais: a política busca caminhos trilhável no mundo concreto, conduzida pelo ideal do ser humano: a liberdade (Jaspers, 2018, p. 108, Edição brasileira).

explicit element of the research question. In this case, Arendt presented us with the question of the 'crisis of the nation-state', this as a presupposition of totalitarian events. While Jaspers presented in his writings the concepts of 'guilt'.

Thus, the arguments used by the authors, aims to demonstrate not the institutions used as instruments of domination. But the individuals, that is, those who accepted the totalitarian ideals. In this case, the community, which corroborated the policy of the field of exception. Arendt's first analysis corresponds to her second assumption on the question of responsibility: Eichmann. This was a mass man, who was enchanted by the ideology of propaganda. Jaspers also analyzes the people of the community and its members, when he reflects on the actions developed in the period before and after the state of exception.

For this reason, when Arendt presents political responsibility as the condition to exercise recognition of the acts done in the totalitarian period. She wants to awaken and defend thinking as an activity of questioning, that is, that of judgment as a way to avoid the massification of acts. In addition to the condition of not forgetting the acts performed, because of individual or collective guilt, these can become a condition of dodging the acts performed. Jaspers in the 'path of purification', demonstrates a metaphor, to reach the political responsibility of German society. However, both concepts are characters of political responsibility as a way to provoke social-political-legal unrest, to avoid totalitarian policies. For, both concepts in their convergence guarantee the ability of individuals to appear in the public space and the condition of political freedom.

## REFERENCES

AGAMBEN, Giorgio. **Meios Sem Fim**: Notas Sobre a Política. Tradução de Davi Pessoa. 1. ed. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2017.

AGAMBEN, Giorgio. **O Que Resta de Auschwitz**. Tradução de Selvino J. Assmann. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2008.

ARENDT, Hannah. **As Origens do Totalitarismo**. Tradução de Roberto Raposo. São Paulo: Companhia de Bolso, 2012.

ARENDT, Hannah. **Responsabilidade e Julgamento**. Tradução de Rosaura Eichenberg. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2004.

ASSY, Bethania. **Ética, Responsabilidade e Juízo em Hannah Arendt**. 1. ed. São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva; São Paulo: Instituto Norberto Bobbio, 2015.

BÍBLIA. Romanos. *In: Bíblia Sagrada*. Tradução dos Monges Beneditinos de Maredsous (Bélgica). São Paulo: Editora Ave-Maria, 2013.

GÜNDOĞDU, Ayden. A Apatridia e o Direito de Ter Direitos. *In: RAYDEN, Patrick; (org.). Hannah Arendt: Conceitos Fundamentais*. Tradução de José Maria Gomes de Souza Neto. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes, 2020.

JASPERS, Karl. **A Questão da Culpa: A Alemanha e o Nazismo**. Tradução de Claudia Dornbusch. São Paulo: Todavia, 2018.

JASPERS, Karl. **Introdução ao Pensamento Filosófico**. Tradução de Leonidas Hegenberg e Octanny Silveira da Mota. São Paulo: Cultrix, 2011.

RENSMANN, Lars. O Totalitarismo e o Mal. *In: RAYDEN, Patrick; (org.). Hannah Arendt: Conceitos Fundamentais*. Tradução de José Maria Gomes de Souza Neto. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes, 2020.

SOARES, Daniel Benevides. A Culpa e Responsabilidade: Um Diálogo entre Karl Jaspers & Eric Weil. **Filosofia Unisinos**, São Leopoldo, v. 22, n.2, p. 1-13, 2021.



NETO, Antonio Justino de Arruda . RESPONSIBILITY PRODUCE OF GUILT: A DIALOGUE BETWEEN HANNAH ARENDT AND KARL JASPERS. *Kalagatos*, Fortaleza, vol. 20, n. 3, 2023, eK23061, p. 01-21.

Recebido: 07/2023  
Aprovado: 08/2023