Sartre on Three Waves of Ethics: A Philosophical Reflection

Tulika Sutradhar

Abstract

In this research paper, an attempt has been made to analyze Sartre's consideration of morality by following his philosophical approach to human existence. Many thinkers have disdained to regard Sartre's existentialism as a moral philosophy because of his negative analysis of human existence. Sartre himself promised in his Being and Nothingness that he would further work on morality and indeed he developed his moral thought gradually in his later writings. However, in various ways, Sartre has been criticized for his moral thought, particularly for his doctrine of the key concept of freedom. It is noticed from Sartre's philosophical works that he has shifted his morality from one phase to another. His moral philosophy is divided into three major sections which are interrelated with each other. However, the subsequent versions are far more enriched than the previous ones. This article aims to explore the underlying insight of the transition from one ethical wave to another ethical wave with a critical outlook.

Keywords: *Authenticity, Being-in-itself, Being-for-itself, Ethics, Freedom, Need, Recognition, obligation*

Prelude:

> ***"Give someone who is thirsty something to drink not in order to give him something or in order to bring good but in order to overcome his thirst"***
>
> ***Notebooks for an Ethics, p.3***

It is well known that Jean-Paul-Sartre (1905-1980) is the most prominent figure of the twentieth century in the field of existentialism. His intellectual field covers a vast area of knowledge. His literary works carry deep philosophical significance. However, this paper will discuss about three noticeable phases of ethics emphasized by Sartre. Sartre's ethical concepts are too vague but highly thought-provoking. His moral ideology seems problematic because he has not set up any specific and fixed moral ideology while doing ethics. Having said that there remains considerable confusion and controversies regarding his moral ideologies. Most interestingly there are also controversies regarding the issue of whether he has any fixed moral ideology or not. Naturally, the question arises- which seems to be pertinent that if Sartre did not set any specific moral ideology, then how can we identify him as a

moral philosopher? The problem with Sartre is that he developed three waves of ethics without giving or specifying any rigid moral maxim based on which one can justify the moral right and wrongness of human action.

Sartre's ethical doctrine imprints its great influence on several traditional moral theories. However, the central problem is that traditional moral theories appeared as just a theory that lost their practical significance due to their ideological fixation. Human existence is not something fixed, it always shows us the lights of our possibilities that are waiting for their actualization. As there are infinite possibilities within us, our existence is full of ambiguity. Every situation in our life is new with lots of moral demands those are needed to be satisfied. Sartre, being an existential philosopher, profoundly thought about every aspect of human existence. It seems that he not only gave us a descriptive scenario of our existence rather he was also concerned about how human existence will connect with morality. His prime ontological work on human existence is *Being and Nothingness (1943)* where in the chapter entitled "The Ethical Implication", he promised to provide a work on ethics. For Sartre, though ontology is intriguingly connected with ethics as it helps to understand the ethical elements, such as consciousness and reality of value but it cannot able to provide us any universal moral guideline. In his *Being and Nothingness, Sartre says:*

> "*Ontology itself cannot formulate ethical percepts. It is concerned solely with what is and we cannot possibly derive imperatives from ontology's indicative. It does, however, allow us to catch a glimpse of what sort of ethics will assume its responsibilities when confronted with a human reality in a situation."*[1]

Therefore, Sartre's magnum opus, *Being and Nothingness* is purely an ontological work on human existence that deals with several proclivities of human life, such as – *freedom, facticity, abandonment, anxiety, bad faith, authenticity, etc.* His motive is to understand the nature of human existence by examining these dispositions of human beings before developing any ethical doctrine. For Sartre, a human being is ontologically a moral agent. The question then is if men are

[1] Sartre, Jean-Paul, (1956): *Being and Nothingness,* New York: Philosophical Library, *p. 626*

ontologically moral, why are they searching for ethics? Why are we prompted to experience immoral activities? Who will mark the standard of morality? What is the goal of morality? How does the Sartrean moral concept differ from traditional morality? Does Sartre make any wholesale rejection of traditional morality? These are the crucial issues that have been covered in this article from the perspective of Sartrean ethics. This article is divided into four specific sections. The first three sections meditate on Sartre's three enriched insights into ethics and aim to discover the reason for his transition from one phase of morality to another. After analyzing Sartre's three waves of ethics, the concluding remarks have addressed the nature and relevance of Sartrean morality. Now let us proceed to the first ethics-

Insight of First Ethics:

It is well acknowledged that existential philosophers including Sartre, are deeply concerned about the concept of authenticity and the inauthenticity of human existence. The idea that existentialism is solely concerned with the ontological description of human existence and ignores morality is a misconception, as Sartre has addressed the ethical concept of authenticity. His ontological description of human reality provides a strong sense of what constitutes ethics and how moral conundrums ought to be handled. Sartre's first wave of ethics is marked by his magnum opus *Being and Nothingness*. Here his ontological examination of the human condition stimulates our conscience and exhorts us to think beyond any situated framework of existence. The key elements of human existence as Sartre presented in his book *Being and Nothingness* is the theory of consciousness and freedom. These are the crucial elements of his philosophy, providing shelter to his morality.

Despite ideological differences in interpretation, the concept of consciousness plays a vital role in every field of philosophy. Here consciousness does not refer to the straightforward experience of pain and pleasure rather Sartre characterized consciousness as like a blowing wind and the source of all knowledge. It is important to note that Sartre's theory of self and consciousness can best be the foundation of every theory of knowledge whether it is empiricism, rationalism, or something else. This is because Sartre defines consciousness with

the act of intentionality which is the starting point of all knowledge. The act of consciousness is defined by cogitation, where consciousness is always directed towards an object. This object-directed status of consciousness is called intentionality of consciousness. It encompasses all conscious actions, like thinking, loving, perceiving, rejecting, comprehending, analyzing, and all other activities. These objects of our consciousness were termed *cogitatum* in the field of phenomenology. For this reason, consciousness in existentialism denotes something active. There is no room for a sleeping consciousness. Temporality and transcendence are the key characteristics of consciousness. It is temporal because at every moment it is in a moving position. In this regard, one may relate Sartre's theory of consciousness with the Buddhist understanding of self which is temporal by nature, and always remain in flux. It does not stop at a particular time as a static thing. It is in a position to transcend toward new possibilities from its present situation which is also called transcendence. On this matter, Sartre in his book *Being and Nothingness,* says that *the structure of consciousness is itself a lack.* Here, Sartre identifies consciousness with nothingness.

Nothingness is the mark of our living existence. So long as we are alive or exist, we are nothing. Sartre in his *Imagination* and *Being and Nothingness,* says that this world is constituted of two realities; consciousness and non-conscious things which are technically termed as *being-for-itself and being-in-itself* respectively. Therefore, human reality has its meaning through the continuous dialectical process of these two realities. The concept of nothingness can best be explained by the existential freedom introduced by Sartre. Sartrean concept of freedom is the sole source of his ethics. The inner sense of a lack of something is the instinct of all human action, without which man cannot identify themselves as alive. The existence of a human being implies that he is nothing and totally free to be something. In this regard Sartre in his book *Existentialism is a Humanism (1946),* says "Existence Precedes its Essence". Therefore, it can be said that being an existential philosopher Sartre has rejected all kinds of rigidity in his philosophical thought. According to him, our existence is not determined by any universal pre-established principle. Sartre does not admit any superpower over human beings who can determine them, rather for him men are the architects of

their lives. In this sense, Sartre in his *Existentialism is a Humanism,* also says that "*Man first exists, encounters himself, surges up in this world, and defines himself afterward*"[2]. Man is the maker of his history. He says that man is totally free and condemned to be free. It is because being existing and being free is the same thing. For him, man is a free-thinking agent. Existence without free action is not possible. The man suddenly finds himself in a particular situation where he faces infinite options, and only he can choose any option for himself. That is why Sartre remarks "*It is senseless to think of complaining since nothing foreign has decided what we feel, love, or are".*[3] Here, one may raise a question- is it an arbitrary choice? In this context, Sartre's understanding of human reality suggests that human choice is not arbitrary as it is always grounded in a specific situation and constrained by a deep sense of responsibility. For Sartre, man cannot fly in the sky if he wants to do so. In this sense, Sartre admits that the limitations of our lives make our freedom meaningful. Man is absolutely free to choose amid the challenges of our lives.

Therefore, Sartre's ethics falls under the principle of transcendence. He purely rejects any ethical absolutism. Here, does it mean that Sartre is a moral relativist? My understanding in this context is that Sartre may not be regarded as a moral relativist because of his deep concern for individual freedom. He suggests something can be regarded as moral or authentic when it promotes the primary value of the freedom of others. On the other hand, moral relativists maintain that moral decisions vary from culture to culture. Therefore, they admit some determinate values in respect of cultures while making moral decisions but Sartre does not acknowledge any determinacy in ethical judgment.

Sartre also says in his *Being and Nothingness* that "*Man is condemned to be free and carries the whole world's weight on his shoulders; he is responsible for the world and himself as a way of being"*[4]. Here, men are condemned to be free because they do not have any choice to not choose any option. Man is always bound to choose something. In this context, Sartre says that freedom is the unique foundation of value. When one chooses something for him, choose for all men. Our life is the

[2] Sartre, Jean-Paul, (1946): *Existentialism is a Humanism*, London, Yale University Press, p.22
[3] Sartre, Jean-Paul, (1956): *Being and Nothingness,* New York: Philosophical Library, p.554
[4] Ibid, p.553

synthesis of all our free choices, and our choices influence other's lives. Thus, man is responsible not only for his individuality but for the whole world.

The fundamental human experience of radical freedom and the irresistible responsibility gives birth to the feeling of anguish. A human being becomes anxious about the fact that he is strongly responsible for his deeds. Sartre in his book *Existentialism is a Humanism,* beautifully explains this concept of anguish which plays a significant role in understanding the requirement of morality. Generally, we try to escape from our feelings of anguish which causes us to fall into the darkness of bad faith. Bad faith is the natural human disposition of telling lies to one's self. It is normally called self-deception, which is required to be overcome to live a worthy life. Bad faith is the primary cause of the unworthy ideologies of our life, like- lack of self-confidence, lack of self-respect, lack of self-knowledge, absence of patience, dedication, lack of the power to take responsibility, etc. every misguiding characteristic one has for entertaining this sense of self-deception. As a result, human beings commit several undesirable and heinous acts without considering their consequences. The worst thing is that the person acting in bad faith will continue to create excuses and refuse to accept responsibility for their deeds. An Individual in bad faith does not accept their existential freedom and ignores that he has two dimensions of his existence, freedom and facticity. The man disregards his freedom and responsibility, believing himself to be a situated being based on his facticity. Therefore, in order to transcend the darkness of bad faith, a person needs to acknowledge the two dimensions of our existence and be aware of our existential freedom.

Freedom is the hallmark of human existence and it is the foundation of all doctrines of morality. We know that all ethicists can't ignore the relevance of freedom while discussing ethics. Here, the point of departure from the other ethicist with that of Sartre is that he takes freedom radically, his concept of freedom is something different from that of others. Like another ethicist, Sartre not only finds freedom as a postulate of morality rather he equates freedom with human existence. For him, existence and freedom go together. It gives meaning to our existence. Here it can be said that there is no fixed meaning of our existence. From Sartre's perspective existence is meaningless, or in other words ambiguous. The

philosophers before the existential movement primarily retained an essentialist and deterministic ideology about human reality and their ethical decisions were also deterministic. Sartre and the other existential thinkers possess another attitude about human reality and ethics. They find the uniqueness of morality in moral invention. For them, as our existence is ambiguous, ethics is also ambiguous. Sartre thought that in an indeterminate ambiguous life how can we make ethical decisions based on a particular determinate moral principle? Here Sartre opposes any moral absolutism or moral determinism that promotes a particular moral principle as a justification of ought and makes it universalized. Human beings have to invent moral judgments based on the demands of a particular situation. Every situation man encounters in life has a unique meaning. It is impossible to resolve our different ethical dilemmas by following a rigid moral principle. In this regard Sartre in his book *Existentialism is a Humanism,* differentiates his ethical conception from that of Kant and other absolutist moral standpoints by referring to a moral dilemma of his student. He claims, that one of his students is suffering from the moral dilemma of whether he should join the war or stay with his lonely and ailing mother. Moral absolutists can't resolve the dilemma due to their rigid moral principles. For example, Kantian moral principle instructs us to treat man as an end, not a means. Here the problem is to whom the person takes as an end, his mother or the soldiers of the war who are fighting in place of him. If he joins the war, it implies that he treats the soldier as an end but his mother as a means and vice-versa. Here Sartre suggests that the individual should choose what his situation demands to him relying on his *freedom of choice*. Each moral dilemma is like a personal question to an individual which can be solved by the person himself. In this regard, Sartre states that no one can help an individual in adopting this or that particular value. It is the individual himself who will justify what is right and wrong for him. Therefore, individual freedom is the *foundation of value*. Thus, Sartre says in his *Existentialism is a Humanism*, "Ethics is like a work of art that has to be invented.*"*

There are a number of objections raised against Sartre's position to admit freedom as a foundation of value. Philosophers like Wilfried Desan, and Maurice-Merleau-Ponty raised objections such as the following: if freedom is the foundation of ethics, then it will lose its meaning and convert into an arbitrary morality.

Though Sartre positively does not take a stand in defense of his value theory, one can find its answer in his other two moralities. Now let us understand the nature of his second morality and the rationale behind this transition.

A Transition to Second Ethics:

From the above discussion about the insight of Sartrean first ethics, it is clear that his first ethical approach plays an extensive role in his entire ethical ground. It explores mostly all the means that are required to light up our inner ethical discretion. Having said this, Sartre himself realizes that his first ethics is very individualistic and abstract due to not incorporating any concrete ethical practice to deal with the socio-ethical dilemma. That means, he believed, his first ethics failed to overcome the socio-ethical dilemma which is essential in ethics. Further, he inclined to say that his moral philosophy was idealistic and insufficient to address the oppressive, conflicting social reality. Then Sartre's ethical thought was modified by the touch of his political thinking in the age of 1960s. At that time, he developed a societal ontological work *The Critique of Dialectical Reason (*1960*)* which was influenced by the political ideology of Karl Marks. Many thinkers and scholars thought that Sartre in this book tried to reconcile existentialism with Marxism. However, it seems that here Sarte attempts to fill the blanks of his early ethics by partially adopting the Marxist socialistic vision rather than making a real attempt to reconcile these two philosophies. He realizes that ethical discussion will be meaningless if it fails to serve the purpose of society. Sartre was influenced by the Marxist dialectical process but he rejects his dialectical materialism due to the lack of subjectivity. Marxism only talks about the material phenomena, the dialectics between two classes of society. However, Sartre's account of dialectics is between praxis and things of the world which may alternatively be termed as *dialectical realism*. His dialectical realism helps us to understand human history. He analyses the molecular element of society part by part and then synthesizes the parts into a totalized reality. Here Sartre talks about the synthesis between praxis and the *practico-inert*. Praxis and practico-inert indicate the conscious transformative action of human beings and the determinate structures of the world resulting from individual praxis respectively. Thus, for a proper understanding of

human history, Sartre talks about the formation of four kinds of groups, such as series, the group-in-fusion, the organization, and the institution.

Sartrean concept of series may be conceived as a *pseudo totalization* which appeared as a unified collectivity. It is the plurality of isolation, which *is an ensemble whose members are determined in alterity by others*[5]. For example, Sartre talks about the queue, which is a collection of persons waiting at a station or bus stop for their train or bus respectively. Nobody is concerned about anyone here. Each of the members of the series has their own goal. As a result, no one can find any commonality among them. It is a perplexing exteriority of society. Sartre also gives an example of a radio broadcast to make this point more explicit. A large number of people can listen to the message and participate in a conversation with it serially and also can communicate with each other. In the series, the listeners are passive about their relationship with others. Hence there is no sense of sincere reciprocity with the other. Thus, realistically each person maintains a negative relationship with each other. Due to insufficient resources and scarcity, every person looks towards others as an enemy. Significantly, Sartre's later philosophy concretizes his earlier understanding of abstract human relations by examining the concept of series.

It can be understood by historical analysis that to overcome any anarchism of society, or any unsurpassable oppression of the political leaders or the oppression led by the aristocratic class, series eventually turned into groups to achieve a common goal. It is a fact that any kind of revolution is not possible without group action. Individuals alone cannot make a revolution. Therefore, one has to transcend the phenomena of seriality towards the world of reciprocity, because groups are governed by the sense of reciprocity. Therefore, for the prevention of any explicit exterior threat, the members of a series form a group which Sartre called *group-in-fusion*.

Group-in-fusion or fused groups are formed to achieve some common goal. It is already mentioned that generally to overcome the unsurmountable oppression

[5] Singh. Mithilesh Kumar, (2020): *Jean-Paul-Sartre on Man, Society and Freedom*, India, New Delhi, Rajat Publications, p.86

or to gain a democratic right, this kind of group is formed. For example, during the French Revolution, people were victimized by political anarchism. Scarcity, heavy taxation, and lack of equal democratic rights strongly infuriated the common people of France. At that time to achieve their democratic demand they created a group which we can call *group-in-fusion*. The mutual reciprocal recognition of all individuals binds people of all classes. As a result, the individual praxis is turned into a common praxis. The fused group is created at the cost of individual freedom. The individual submits his or her freedom for the sake of group praxis. In this case, we should not think that the individual becomes the slave of the group as he submits his freedom for the constituted praxis of the group. Importantly, this fused group can be regarded as a "Quasi Totalization"[6] due to its contingency on the existence of the external obstacle. Sometimes it happens that an external threat suddenly may become implicit. In this case, it would be very tricky to navigate the threat. Therefore, in order to navigate the implicit external threat, the members of the fused group take a pledge to take care of each other and affirm the other's freedom as a primary value.

Again, the fused group turned into an organized group. However, the organization is more reciprocal than the fused group. Here each member takes an oath to stand for each other and protect each other from explicit external threats. They also take a pledge not to betray the group in any circumstance. As a matter of fact, when a group becomes highly organized then it gives main concern to the structures and functions of the organization and it turns into an institution. It gradually constrains the practical freedom of an individual. For this, Sartre vehemently criticizes the institution as a *degraded group.* Sartre admits, the organization is the best group as there is a fraternal relationship among the members of the group. However, the sense of fraternity that Sartre here talks about is developed to combat external threats, hence it is called by Sartre a fraternity-terror that is not a true sense of fraternity. Sartre advocates fraternity without terror where there is no possibility of violence.

[6] Ibid, p. 86

Of course, one may be curious about the significance of explaining these constituents of society. The pertinent question is: how can one relate these conceptions of groups and series with morality? The discussion about the constituents of the society points out several elements that play a significant role in the sphere of morality. While discussing the group, Sartre talks about several elements which will cause a healthy social relationship. The concepts of fraternity, solidarity, submission of individual freedom, and equal respect for the freedom of the members are genuine ethical ideologies, the proper exercise of which will establish a humanitarian society.

However, the main reason for the formation of these several kinds of groups is *the lack of fulfillment of human needs.* For Sartre the need is the root of morality through which he inclines to say "Everything is to be explained by need; the need is the first totalizing relation between the material being, man, and the material ensemble of which he is a part, this relation is univocal and of interiority."[7] It is evident that Sartre in his early philosophy considers the human being as an embodied consciousness but in his later philosophy he examines the human being as a material organism that can be explained only in terms of need. Men are born in a particular world and make it a human world out of the push of their needs. Sartre in this sense says, "Need is the original praxis by which man produces and reproduces life." [8]

Sartre here states that man is defined by the material conditions of his existence and the nature of his work- that is, his struggle against things and men. The concept of need is not merely the need for any material inert object. Rather, they are *felt exigencies*. Sartre talks about the need for love, self-valuation, dignity, respect, freedom, etc. He eloquently illustrates this second concept of ethics and humanity in his *Rome Lecture*, where he depicts the inhuman scenario of colonialism and the capitalist society, in which people are treated not as humans but as a means of production. They exploit and oppress the masses. Sartre argues that the ethical problem is to learn how a revolutionary counter system can attain

[7] Catalano, Joseph S., (1986): *A Commentary on Jean-Paul-Sartre's Critique of Dialectical Reason*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, p.96
[8] Ibid, 90

its goal of humanity while surviving within those systems. Regarding the ethics of these systems, Sartre goes on to remark "Ethics here goes for vacation." [9] By observing this scenario, it appears that Sartre engaged in developing socialist ethics, the goal of which is *integral humanity*. The objective of this socialistic ethics is to go beyond all systems. For Sartre, socialism is rooted in need and aims at humanity. Humanity is an option, not a necessary outcome or even a probability. Humanity is not there in the realm of being, so it is needed to bring into the realm of being by our active reciprocal participation in society. Therefore, the goal of this ethics is to form a fraternal humanitarian society. Sartre in his "*1964 Rome Lecture*", states-

"Humanity entails satisfaction of need instead of scarcity; novelty instead of repetition; group instead of serial action and praxis guiding instead of being guided by the practico-inert".[10]

Thus, this article attempts to show how human beings could satisfy their needs so that the whole human race will meet with integral humanity. In this way, Sartre's second ethical approach specifies the goal of ethics but cannot properly explain in which path human beings can attain their goal. So, the question needs to be answered what is the seed of experiencing a mutually, reciprocal relationship with others, for the purpose of realizing man's historical goal: integral humanity?

Emergence of the Third Ethics:

After developing these two waves of ethics, Sartre in the mid-seventies engages to develop a new moral insight in a very unified and profound way. Sartre's sketch of the third wave of ethics is not entirely a new concept rather it is the prolongation of the earlier two waves of ethics. One can find here a richer understanding of an integrally humanized society. However, it is important to point out that Sartre has worked on this new orientation of ethics at the very final stage of his life. In 1974, he was affected by a blinding stroke which left him unable to read and write. Despite this fact, he never gave up. In an interview with his assistant Mr. Benny Levy, he shares his thinking about his third morality. Sartre also

[9] Anderson, Thomas C., (1993): *Sartre's Two Ethics*, Chicago and LA Salle, IL: Open Court, p.113
[10] Bowman, Elezabeth A. and Robert V. Stone, "Socialist Morality" *In Sartre's Unpublished 1964 Rome Lecture: A Summery and Commentary*, University of Hartford, p.175

participated in another three interviews between 1976 and 1980. So, it becomes very difficult to have any conception of his third wave of ethics due to not having any strong written source for it. Then, just a few months ago of Sartre's last breath Mr. Levy published this tap-recorded interview from which we can come to know about Sartre's third wave of ethics. The series of interviews was partly published as a book entitled *Hope Now*, in 1980, which is the main sourcebook of Sartre's third wave of ethics. In this context, I want to say that there is a serious controversy regarding the validity of Mr. Levy's interpretation of Sartre's third ethics. It has been argued against Levy's interpretation that he dilutes Sartre's third ethics by incorporating his personal thoughts on it. However, I have taken Levy as a genuine interpreter of Sartre's third ethics. Let us turn to the key ground of his third moral attempt with the question – how did he explain his new concept of ethics?

It has been already stated that his third ethics is not something entirely new concept rather it is the deepest amplified version of the earlier two moralities. Sartre while answering Mr. Benny Levy, of the question, "What do you mean today by 'Ethics'?", remarks the following quote:

> "By 'ethics' I mean that every consciousness, no matter whose, has a dimension of obligation. By 'obligation' I mean that at every moment that I am conscious of anything or do anything, there exists a kind of requisition that goes beyond the real and results in the fact that the action I want to perform includes a kind of inner constraint. Every consciousness must do what it does, not because what it does is necessarily what is worthwhile, but, quite to the contrary, because any objective that consciousness has presents itself as something like requisition, and for me, that is the beginning of ethics"[11].

This quotation led us to assume that his third wave of ethics is the *ethics of obligation.* Sartrean sense of obligation has its deep philosophical significance. He meant an *inner constraint* by the term obligation. It seems, in this context he connects his earlier concept of ethics where he demands to treat human freedom as

[11] Sartre, Jean-Paul. and Benny Levy, (1980): *Hope Now*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, p.70

a primary value. In his first wave of ethics by acknowledging freedom as a primary value he creates the ground for his third ethics. To understand the unique sense of obligation Sartre expresses a deep philosophical concept of "requisition". It may suggest that the world is a perplexing open question to an individual who constantly claims an ethic. Human beings exist in a shared world where the presence of the other is always constrained and obliged us. In this context, Sartre says "Morality is a matter of one person's relationship to another"[12]. It is a generous relationship that every consciousness should maintain with each other. The reality of abstract conflictual human relationships as presented in *Being and Nothingness* and the concrete alienated reality of human relationships presented in *Critique of Dialectical Reason* can be overcome by this sense of obligation. Thomas. C Anderson in his book *Sartre's Two Ethics (1993)* states that by introducing the deep sense of moral obligation Sartre tries to establish the "Morality of the We" where everyone relates with each other through a bond of fraternity. By introducing this unique aspect of ethics, Sartre wants to sketch a world that will be filled with mutual care and affection. As a result, men can fulfill their needs mutually and establish integral humanity.

Concluding Remarks:

Based on the above discussion, it can be said that one may grasp a systematic and more enriched development of Sartre's moral thought in three waves of ethics. It is sparklingly clear that Sartre's ethics aims to establish integral humanity, which is presented as a form of possibility in his first wave of ethics. It has been discussed that Sartre acknowledges freedom as a foundation of value and this is the ground where he implants the seed of integral humanity. However, people may argue that if man regards freedom as a foundation of value, would there not be a clash of values between individual freedom and others? People may also criticize his concept of integral humanity as a seemingly impossible and abstract goal amidst the challenges of concrete human reality. In this context, it can be said that the clash of values or the conflict between individual freedom and society is always there. This conflict can be mitigated by prioritizing the individual freedom of other

[12] Anderson, Thomas C., (1993): *Sartre's Two Ethics*, Chicago and LA Salle, IL: Open Court, p.170

people. Therefore, his first ethics is devoted to searching for a way to establish an authentic human relationship in the midst of the original hostility of life. With this, it can be stated that Sartre's early philosophy is the mirror of the unconverted and narrow phenomenon of human existence, overserving which one could understand in which way he is required to develop his ethical conscience. However, after being severely criticized by others and observing the inhuman scenario of the post-war period he thought to enrich his position of ethics by synthesizing individual virtue of authenticity with the society.

It is right that without our genuine effort or without our eagerness to become an authentic person no one can make us or our life authentic. It is a fact that most of the time it happens that our genuine efforts to be a moral or authentic person are hampered by society. So, there is always a gap, and conflict remains between individuals and society. It has been discovered that scarcity is the root cause of social conflict. Sartre suggests that to overcome this social conflict and create integral humanity man has to develop a sense of fraternity and mutual recognition with each other. The point is, in this serious hostility of human existence, how could one develop a sense of fraternity and mutual recognition? Therefore, the goal of attaining integral humanity seems overly impossible and abstract.

One could find a possible solution to this problem in Sartre's third wave of ethics where he attempts to establish the sense of reciprocal recognition in the form of a "Morality of the We". He introduces here three important elements of ethics: *obligation*, *requisition*, and *inner-constraint*. Though Sartre focuses on the autonomy of human existence, this autonomy entails a state of self-constraint within human beings. The progressive development of the self-constraint state of man is the main theme of Sartre's three waves of ethics. In this regard, it appears to me that the enhancement of human conscience or the sense of self-constrained status of human beings will light up all the moral elements like authenticity, humanity, and obligation within us. It will also help us to develop a mutually recognized society where everyone is concerned about the interests of everyone. Man can constrain himself or limit his freedom for the sake of establishing a humanitarian world when he will feel oneness with the other. Here one may say that the realization of oneness with others is the true meaning of the "Morality of

the we". Still, it is difficult to understand the term "we". Does it embrace the realm of being where the difference between 'I' and 'you' is completely overcome? In the sphere of existentialism, it is quite troublesome to see his concept of "we" in this unified way. However, I interpret Sartre's concept of the "Morality of the We" as exploring the collective responsibility and fraternal bond among human beings within the context of existentialism.

References:

Anderson, Thomas. C., (1993): *Sartre's Two Ethics*, Chicago and LA Salle, IL: Open Court.

Barnes, Hazel, (1971): *An Existentialist Ethics*, New York: Vintage.

Catalano, Joseph S., (1986): *A Commentary on Jean-Paul-Sartre's Critique of Dialectical Reason*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

De Beauvoir, Simone, (1947): *The Ethics of Ambiguity*, translated by B. Freshman, New York: Citadel Press.

Detmer, David, (1988): *Freedom as a Value*, LA Salle, IL: Open Court.

Sartre, Jean-Paul, (1992): *Notebooks For An Ethics*, translated by D. Pellauer, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sartre, Jean-Paul, (1948): *Existentialism Is a Humanism*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Sartre, Jean-Paul, (1956): *Being and Nothingness*, translated by Hazel E, Barnes, New York: Philosophical Library.

Sartre, Jean-Paul, (1980): *Hope Now*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Singh, Mithilesh Kumar, (2020): *Jean-Paul-Sartre on Man, Society and Freedom*, India, New Delhi, Rajat Publications.