

SARTRE'S ANALYSIS OF BAD FAITH

RUPON NAG

Introduction:

Jean Paul Sartre is an Existentialist Philosopher. He is one of the best-known philosophers of the twentieth century. He had a very assiduous pursuit of philosophical view, scholar creativeness, sincerity and resourcefulness. Not only that, he was an internationally reputed and recognised political person. He has a renowned personality and known as the father of existentialist philosophy. His philosophical and rational repercussions can be constructed into five grades, namely, psychology, ontology, ethics, political responsibility and the relationship between the fine arts and philosophy, especially concerning literature. Sartre develops his philosophical position in his great work *Being and Nothingness*, published in 1943. According to him, Existentialism is nothing but an attempt to draw all the consequences from a consistent atheistic position. Bad faith is one of the most enduring of Sartre's concept. The concept of bad faith stems directly from Sartre's description of the basic structures of consciousness; human experience consists of a tension between being-in-itself and being-for-itself. The man constitutes of consciousness and the first description of man always goes in terms of consciousness as it is the base of life in a man. This life does not mean the biological but the whole life circumstances which make him a human being and not just living organism. According to Sartre, consciousness is fundamental and inner structure of human being as pre-reflective cogito and the being of the percipere. This account of consciousness is connected to reflection, Cartesian Cogito and intentional consciousness of Husserl, in some way or another. But one thing is clear in Sartre's theory of consciousness that it is not subject to laws of appearance, as the other domain of being is dependent on phenomena. Consciousness creates itself, occurs through nausea, boredom, and it itself is just a being or simply a being to be intuited. In his statement of knowledge, he describes being as a knowing subject which is conscious. This consciousness is not particular mode of knowledge, it is self-knowledge or transphenomenal being in the subject.

Account of Consciousness: Sartre accepts the intentionality theory of Husserl. According to this theory, consciousness is always directed towards an object. But he rejects that part of theory where Husserl says that 'all consciousness is consciousness

of something'. Husserl meant by this that there is no consciousness which is not positing of a transcendent object and it means there is no self-conscious or consciousness has no 'content' in itself. Sartre says that to equal the consciousness to things is to deny the cogito because it should be the first principle of philosophy to expel things from the consciousness and to establish consciousness to be the true connection with the world. According to Sartre, consciousnesses as well as objects of the world, such as, stones, trees, buildings, are real existent things. So, Sartre does not support the view of Husserl that noema is unreal. Sartre says that not all consciousness is knowledge, but all-knowing consciousness mean knowledge of its object only and it is necessary at the same time that it be consciousness of itself as being that knows itself. We arrive into contact with consciousness as a fundamental existence which makes man a man but not an object in the world. Only through consciousness our knowledge is possible as knowledge of me and of the world. Now the question is what is the basic nature of this consciousness? The ontological form of this consciousness can be stretched from different examples taken from the life of a human being. Sartre describes that the human being is separated by the world by a 'not', i.e., I am not a tree, she is not like me etc. Sartre says that these negations adore as a instrument to contact to myself. Being a human, in the depth of my being I know myself. It is not the case that I know myself from the outside world but this consciousness belongs to my subjective realm. This is consciousness, an immediate relation of self to itself. I am the knower and the remaining world is known. This subject-object relation has been a problem in philosophy. So, Sartre uses the third term, self-consciousness between the knower-known to reduce infinite regress and subject-object dualism. He introduces two kinds of consciousness as such:

1. Pre-reflective consciousness is also known as non-thetic consciousness or non-positional consciousness. Here, there is no knowledge but an inherent consciousness of being.
2. Reflective consciousness also known as thetic consciousness or positional self-consciousness. In the sense that transcends itself in order to contact an object.

In case of consciousness reflection does not play the prime role that has been reflected on. Consciousness is something that cannot be revealed by reflection that reflected on to itself but its non-reflective consciousness put forward the reflection possible.

Cartesian cogito which says, "cogito ergo sum" is not supported by Sartre. Because he places pre-reflective cogito prior to Cartesian cogito and he explains that pre-reflective and Cartesian cogito both are in relation in terms of condition which means pre-reflective cogito is the condition for Cartesian cogito. First of all, consciousness of existing belongs in every person. This first consciousness is not positional at all. It is determined by itself as both perception and consciousness of perception. This first self-consciousness is called non-positional consciousness of self. This self-consciousness of something can be considered as a mode of existence. An intention, or a piece of pleasure, or a grief is as an immediate self-consciousness that can only exist.

Being always comes before consciousness, but conscious being is the source and conditions of all possibility. Its existence expounds its essence. In this transcendence of ego, Sartre recites relation of the ego to the consciousness. He says that "a pure consciousness" is an ultimate because it is its own consciousness. It remains a "phenomenon" in very special in where "to be" and "to appear" are one. Consciousness performs the cogito which oriented towards a consciousness and by which consciousness is taken as an object. According to Sartre, if consciousness which constituted the ego by representing itself as false, then consciousness is hypnotised by itself with this ego which has been constituted by it. Distinction between possible and the real, between appearance and being, between the wild and the undergo is possible by the help of ego. Consciousness is produced by itself on the pure reflective level which can be happened. Ego is escaped by consciousness on all sides and creates ego continuously to dominate and maintain it as if the ego is there. On the level distinction is not happened between possible and real which exists as appearance that is absolute. There are no longer any barriers, nothing which can cover up consciousness from itself is said by Sartre. Then consciousness recognizes the thing that could be called the mortality of its spontaneity and is suddenly anguished. It is that anguish which is absolute and without slave, fear of itself which can relate constitutive of pure consciousness. We can't avoid this anguish which imposed upon us. It is at one and pure event of transcendent origin and ever possible accident of our daily life at the same time. That consciousness work as link between me and the remaining world and this was framed by Sartre.

Bad Faith: To be in anguish means to be conscious of one's freedom and to be connected merely with one's future. Thus, to undergo anguish in the being is not simple and human being always likes to choose easier way out. To live in anguish means to connect every work of life in freedom and choosing a correct way. It also inhales adoption of failures, depressions with responsibility and without excuse. But it is tough to go with such a heavy responsibility so that human being chooses excuse that is called flight. One is starting to believe in determinism. We do not go for seeing at all the chances but confide on the one chosen. Because it has been assigned on us from without. We start in ourselves with the chance of itself. We refuse to agree that we have chosen but we ourselves presume that it was the only way out chosen for us. Thus, we run away from anguish by trying to catch ourselves from without as another or as a thing. Anguish and flight both of them exist in some consciousness. And it is not possible to run away from something without being aware of it. This is the cause of flight. According to Sartre, anguish gives path to two modes of conducts. One is freedom and another is 'bad-faith'. The right way of action chosen by human being is not the relation of bad-faith to anguish, but most of the times, human being is found engaged in bad-faith. For Sartre, one definite and essential attitude of mankind in which consciousness instead of directing its negation outward turns it toward itself, is called Bad- Faith (*mauvaise-foi*).

Bad faith is often thought to be identical with falsehood. We speak of an ordinary person who sings of bad-faith or who lies to himself. We will willingly accept that bad-faith lies to oneself on the condition that we distinguish between lying to ourselves and lying in general. We will agree that lying is a negative attitude. But this negation does not affect the consciousness, the goal is towards the transcendent. The characteristic of a lie is that the liar knows the whole truth but he hides it. A person lies about what he does not know; when he preaches about a delusion; when he is mistaken, he does not lie. The ideal description of a liar is a kind of cynical consciousness that admits the truth to itself, denies it in its words and so negative. This dual negative view depends on the transcendent. The facts that are revealed are transcendent because they do not exist. The first negative depends on a truth, that is, on a particular kind of transcendence. Incidentally the heart I do negatively with which I have a prey for truth depends on the world. Moreover, the internal situation

of the liar is positive and can be the object of an affirmative presumption. The liar wants to deceive and he does not hide that intention from himself nor does he want to disguise it beyond consciousness. Conversely, he is supposed to fix secondary behaviour when he accepts it. It publicly imposes an instructive control over attitudes. The flaunted intention to tell the truth, everything from ('I'd never want to deceive you', 'This is the true I swear it') to it is the object of an innermost negation, but the liar does not consider it to be his intention. It is played, imitated, it is the character in whose role he plays the questioner that the specific reason is that this character does not exist, is a transcendent. So, lies do not provide the current inner character of consciousness in the game. So, all the negatives that form him, affect the object that stays away from consciousness for this event. Therefore, falsehood does not need any subjective basis and all the explanations that need to be negative are valid in the case of deception without any change. Of course, we have described the ideal lie. Undoubtedly, it often happens that the liar is a victim of his lies and he thinks about himself. But this common popular form of lying is its dead look. These lies are intermediaries between falsehood and bad-faith. The lie is behaviour of transcendence.

The situation cannot be the same if bad-faith is called indeed a lie to oneself. It is true that bad-faith hides an unpleasant truth or presents an unpleasant half-truth as truth. Bad-faith then has a seemingly false form, which changes everything, so that in bad-faith I hide the truth from myself. So, there is no duality between the deceiver and deceived. Rather there is a unity of a single consciousness in bad-faith. This does not mean that it cannot be affected by the condition of group commitment, as is the case with many other human phenomena. But group commitment can evoke bad-faith only when it establishes itself as a situation that leads to the departure of bad-faith. Bad-faith does not come to man from outside, no one goes through bad-faith or no one is infected by it, it is not a condition. But consciousness itself is struck by bad-faith. There is an original or primitive project and there is also a project of bad-faith. The project indicates the perception of bad-faith and is accompanied by a pre-reflective consciousness that affects itself through bad-faith. It is followed that the one who told a lie and one who tells a lie both are same person. This means that, I, as a deceiver need to know the truth which is hidden from me in my capacity as the one

deceived. Better yet, if I know the truth but I can hide it more carefully, not at two times, which can re-establish a sense of duality together. Rather it will be in the form of a project.

Sartre gave so many examples of bad faith. A young lady has gone for a date with her friend. The lady knows the motives of her friend but when her friend puts his hand on hers, she pretends that the hand is not hers. But she has to make a decision now that he does not have the courage to make. Leaving the hand as it is, it means that she agrees to move forward in love and if she withdraw the hand, it will mean, to ruin the sweet moment that has developed. So, as soon as possible, she wants to postpone this moment. She now rises to the level of complete reasoning and becomes emotionless as she speaks of the ideals of life and even greater things. In this way her body and mind became separated. The hand is but like an unconscious object in fist of a warm hand all the time. Sartre wants to say, the young lady is in bad faith.

Many more examples of bad faith are found in Sartre's plays and novels. Lulu, the protagonist of the 'intimacy' story, decides to return to her husband, under the bad faith that her husband needs her. In 'The Room', Eve also takes her husband's unnatural world for his bad faith. In this context Sartre said, man tries to be what he is not, in the case of bad faith, but can he be what he really is? That is, can he gain sincerity or good faith? Sartre gave the example of café attendant who trying to become an ideal servant in runs, saying. He comes to the guest on foot a little faster, leaning towards them with interest, his eyes seemed to be praying when he ordered food for the guests. Then he comes back to mimic the firm rope steps of an automatic machine and he keeps the hand tray in a state of perpetual motion, like a man steeping on a stretcher and he tries to do something at work by fixing it with the gentleness of his hand every moment. But a café attendant cannot be a café attendant in the sense that an inkwell is an inkwell. He wants to be a café attendant, but he is not just a café attendant. He is a conscious person and so he cannot be one with the ideal café attendant like an unconscious object. He is not a café attendant; in this sense he can be a café attendant. The significance of the ideal of sincerity in this regard is that it is an ideal that cannot be mastered. This ideology means self-contradiction in the formation of consciousness. To be sincere means to be what one is. The pre-condition for this is that I am not what I am in the first place. But if I don't get what I want in

the first place, I'm going to lose everything. And this impossible phenomenon is not hidden from consciousness, but is the element of consciousness. It is inability to accept what we are and the inability to form ourselves as we are. From this point of view, there is no difference between bad faith and good faith or the essential element of sincerity, because sincere people want to build themselves in the way that they are not. Sartre wants to say that even trying to be sincere is afraid of falling into bad faith. In the case of bad faith, it is said that man sometimes fail to control his emotions, so he chooses to flee. Sincerity is what makes a person want to do something that makes him immobile. So, he is becoming what he is not. Even in bad faith, people are turning themselves into what they are not. Since the sincerity with which man seeks to himself with the ideal, he cannot do so, the time remains unaffected. As a result, man has to mechanize himself, which, according to Sartre, is the epitome of bad faith. The first act of bad faith is to flee from something that is human. It is this escape that discovers a broken state in the heart of humanity, a bad faith that wants to remain in a broken state. But he wants to deny this broken state and turn himself into an object. Sincerity is also broken -trying to find the ideal of the consciousness object to protect oneself from the state even though it is not. Sartre thinks that bad faith is possible, because the nature of consciousness is that it is not what it is and that it is not what it is.

Conclusion:

Bad faith is the psychological phenomenon whereby individuals act inauthentically. Sartre suggests that by acting in bad faith the waiter and the woman are denying their own freedom. But they are denying freedom here by using their freedom to do so. They manifestly know they are free, but are actively choosing not to acknowledge it. Bad faith is paradoxical in this regard: when acting in bad faith, a person is actively denying their own freedom, while relying on it to perform the denial. We know politically, our freedom is not unlimited and people are confined within his world and in this sphere, he is not allowed to choose his own freedom. But this is a kind of narrative that the present paper offers regarding the issue of bad faith. Sartre explains how we can achieve authenticity when he says that both in bad faith and good faith or sincerity one is aiming to in-itself. I consider Sartre's concept of bad faith as one of the relieving styles of living. Bad faith makes us more conscious

of our nothingness and insignificance. So, we are more aware of our habit to slip into bad faith and try to be in good faith.

References:

1. Sartre, J.P., 1969, *Being and Nothingness*. Trans, By H.E. Barner, London Methuen & Co. Ltd.
2. Catalano, J.S., 1985. *A Commentary on Jean-Paul Sartre's Being and Nothingness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
3. LaCapra, D.1978. *A Preface to Sartre*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
4. Sartre, J.P., 1997. *Foucault and Historical Reason, Toward an Existentialist Theory of History*.Chicago: University of Chicago Press,U SA
5. Van den Hoven, Jonathan.,2011. *Reading Sartre: On Phenomenology and Existentialism*.London, Routledge.