Philosophy 177B
Historical Studies in Existentialism
Lecture Notes

RZ

Sept 2022

Brief History of Existentialism Sept 27 2022

Modernity

Philosophy has been more or less cosmology up until Descartes, while Christianity dominates through Aquinas and Aristotle. Modernity is defined as an epistemological term.

Following by the Renaissance, creates an opportunity and a problem: there are so many new texts which had no historical interpretation. It became a crisis for interpretation and the tradition itself, combined with the printing press and the educated & wealthier middle class - a much bigger problem for the church. A scientific and political revolution was underway...

Copernican Revolution: began the heliocentrism. All combined says that the church with the Aristotelian philosophy is wrong!

so...the reformation in the Holy Roman Empire!

Back to modernity: in the background we have Bacon, Newton, and their scientific methods. This brings new questions to knowledge, freewill, God, and morality. So modernity's focus in developing metaphysics divides into two sides: **Rationalism** (Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz) and **Empiricism** (Locke, Berkeley, Hume). On the rationalist side we have contribution towards mathematics, geometry, deductive logic, a priori knowledge, etc; while the empiricists have emphasis on sense experience, empirical evidence, a posteriori knowledge, relationship between reasoning and knowledge.

Let's get to Hume as he destroyed causation, along with self & external world and other minds. He claims that we cannot lay out the properties for cause (billiard balls clashing). He brings in his own empiricism, atomism, representationalism/phenomenalism - the perception is the ideas in our minds. Anyways, all goes to Skepticism - we cannot prove there is an outside world.

Saviour Kant came along - this is all scandal! There is definitely human knowledge and we gotta do justice to Newton. Kant thinks both approaches have done something right: on the one hand, the rationalist contributes to the a priori; we also have sense experience from the empiricist side. To account for this, we could think of a priori as categories of our understanding, sense exp being intuition/impressions organized by the category of understanding. However, what condition must be here for experience to take place? There follows the Kantian move: A priori seems to concern about the mind that the empiricist kinda forgot, meanwhile there should be something feeding into the mind from sense exp. Both are necessary for experience. Following the antinomies: we have the distinction between Noumenal (things in itself) or phenomenal (things as perceived). Then to categorical imperative...Ought implies can! Kant thinks he preserved human knowledge.

Phenomenology Sept 29 2022

Key figure is Husserl, Ponty, Heidegger (under Husserl) with Sartre coming along afterwards. It is the science/study of phenomenon, with the motto "to the things themselves." Phenomenology focuses on human consciousness & how things are presented to us & how it shows up.

Objects show up in certain conditions/perspective/mood(atlunedness)/model of apprehension/context - they change how objects show up for us. Therefore much of this has to do with the meaning of the object. Ex. if I hold up a water bottle, we each only see one aspect at a time, but given to me as a whole. There are always other perspectives available to other people, but the same perspective with me, at least not at the same time. To see other perspectives, we can either move the object, or change the context (move ourselves, etc). Space and time are both involved.

This way, when we focus on an object, we also have the meaningful background/context that makes the very object stands out, the context also affects how the object shows.

How phenomenologists deal with skepticism: contrast between appearance (phenomenal) and reality (noumenal, things in itself, no perspective at all) - these two are built into two worlds. We are constantly looking at representations: picture of a person, etc. There has to be something else doing the job.

There also is the relation between parts and whole, absence/presence to describe the manifold of the object.

Central to all this is intentionality - the directedness. To say a consciousness is directional, it is always the consciousness of some objects. All consciousness have an intentional object.

Contrary to the public object that everyone could in principle see, the representationalism (perception) is essentially private. We have a dualism container model between the inner (ideas + mind) and the outer world (world +objects). It is the problem how we can go from inside to the outside. For consciousness, Heidegger says it is **already and always** in the world and amidst inter-worldly objects in the world already discovered. In Sartre's word, beings in itself is already outside there in the world already discovered.

Key move for Sartre: if the consciousness of something relates to some mental state, Sartre proposes the **pre-reflective cogito**. Descartes focuses on reflective cogito; while Sartre thinks it's

going to lead into the same cartesian problem always (infinite regress, etc). His theory of consciousness includes the **pre-reflective cogito as the consciousness of consciousness**. Ex. we could be really confused by the thing we look at, but we never doubt who is looking at it - it has to be ourselves. Sartre uses the example of counting cigarettes - you never know exactly how you count them. There is already a "self" within the consciousness directed at something before reflective cogito. Reflective consciousness then takes anything as object of investigation.

The problem with the current representationalism is that it doesn't take in account of absence (nothingness), or a picture of a painting that represent something else. If Kant and everyone else is right, our experience would be different...

Existentialism is Humanism Oct 4 2022

This was first transcribed as a public lecture in Paris. The comtemporary period, intellectual activities are everywhere. Here he looks at the charges and criticism brought on his by some Christians & moralists & communist party (Marxism) & popular misconception. Sartre himself is a Marxist, but had trouble with communist party and their attitude towards philosophy.

Some main points against existentialism lies in

- Quietism and Despair
  connected to his offer of no ethical solutions, too bourgeois

- Subjectivity
  comes back to the Cartesian cogito. Ex. manufactured objects: establishes the difference between for itself and in itself. Stuff get built with an idea/concept/means of production/formula. **Essence precedes existence; Concept precedes its production.** But with a human-being in traditional times, god (his ideas) created everything. Since we have our essence according to god, we therefore have a Imago dei (image of god), then telos (purpose) to relate to god or flourishing/happiness/eudaemonia.

  Sartre thinks it's incorrect, no imago dei! It's only accurate to say that **existence precedes essence** - we exist first before being anything, we decide who we are through choice and actions. We are never fully who we are until we die. **So we are beings "for itself", everything else is being "in itself."** We don't have a thing where we are , we have a thing we "have to be."

- Caprice
  No eternal values: a doctrine of pessimism

Sartre claims that consciousness is nothingness, since consciousness is intentional, it is always relative to some object which is not myself. Our consciousness has nothing fixed to it except for the awareness of self, which is the nature of for itself. Other animals don't have the Cartesian nothing to self reflection, they also have a certain kind and do certain things.

Sartre also claims that individual is responsible for all humanity - kinda categorical imperative? First, **categorical imperative** is an unconditional moral obligation which is binding in all circumstances and is not dependent on a person's inclination or purpose. Sartre here does resemble

the Kantian design, however, Sartre thinks Kant granted human-being freedom for them to be moral, but Sartre starts with human-being being free to begin with.

Let's talk about responsibility. Choice is unavoidable, even not choosing is a choice. We are responsible for who we are, and for all humanity as this is a shared world of meaning. This gets to the point of intersubjectivity. If we realize that all humanity is constantly examining our choices of being a nice human, it generates the anguish proposed by Sartre. If we invoke Heidegger, we are in the world of being-in-the-world-amidst-interworldly-entities-ready-to-hand, OR Dasein. We could day Dasein is also Existentiales or ontological structures (ways-we-have-to-be). Wherever there is a Dasein, there is a world and a world structure, we bring the world with us. Ex. there is never one piece of equipment - there is no hammer without nails, etc. Kinda assignment relations that a hammer is assigned to a nail. The world is an arrangement of all these hammer-nail-wall-house-extendsfurther relation. Similar way existentialism is a structure of meaning. The anguish comes from being thrown in the world.

Office Hour: Motivation for Eliminating Dualism

Heidegger's mission with phenomenology is to get to the Greek stuff, where "there has to be a being, which is something other that's not me." Consciousness is to realize something that's not me. built into that fact we cannot see whole is that object is public, has a public meaning - intersubjectivity - a shared world where meaning is constructed.

do we get rid of the dualism? Phenomonolgists (Descartes, Hume, etc): the things we perceive is the idea in our own mind. The idea is of the object out there - the problem: how do I know there's a object? All points into representation problem.

Causal account: you cannot account for absent stories with causal description.

if we always have a chain of representations (pic of representation etc), then why not just say the object is its appearance?

With Nietzche and all relevant skepticism around trying to find the smallest consitutent part of the world (atomism & reductionism), which is an account based on dualism, we should come back to how we perceive the world as human, ex. appearance. To save all the trouble, Sartre eliminates the dualism between appearance and being...

Continued Existentialism is a humanism Oct 6 2022

Sartre introduced subjectivity in opposed to Hume, who reduced everything down to sense data and perception, no role of subject/mind – BUT Kant got it right.

Subjectivism means, in *Existentialism is a humanism*

1. The individual chooses + makes themselves

2. impossible for a human to transcend human subjectivity

with the second being the essential meaning. By the word "essential" or essence is to find something fixed and in-itself. Sartre thinks we need to connect to a transcend form – Plato's form, tao, etc. Improving from Kantian theory, we wont be able to see anything beyond humanity, not that there's anything or any perspective beyond that. We always look through the human subjectivity.

Anguish & Abandonment & Despair

As we are all condemned into freedom, choices are inevitable. These terms all tie into the idea of absolute freedom and "legislation", latter in a the sense for choosing and responsible for all. Sartre in WWII: you're all responsible for war! If individual chooses no war, there would be no war. Everyone contributes to it. In Sartre's student story, CI won't exactly save this since if human is the end, stay with your mom, but now you rely on everyone else to fight the war. There is no right or wrong before the fact - nothing is absolutely (or established a priori) right or wrong.

Sartre's claim that you can't do bad things traces back to Plato's Guise and the Good Thesis - we cannot choose evil. This implies that whatever that choice is, is taken as good. Thereby you declare this is a good way to be human - by taking a stand on some way of being human-reality. Meanwhile, there also exists others for-itself just like me. The other could contribute to our consciousness of itself (ourselves), then my freedom contribute back to the other in the eternal cycle. We are always intersubjective and being-with-others. Heidegger: Dasein is being-in-the-world and this is its only way. In the structured world with meaning, there are other being-with-others and other Dasein (Dasman).

We are facticity since we have experience, etc, and it doesn't determine others. It is through a reality we have to confront. Meanwhile, we are not limited to factivity, but always transcend to it and going beyond it. We are thrown into factual situation to deal with this and make choice for everyone, hence the anguish.

Intro Being & Nothingness Oct 11 2022

We focus on the ontology given in the introduction - around the **phenomenon**.

The goal of the phenomelogist tradition is by focusing on phenomenon, erase a list of dualisms (being vs. appearance, potentiality vs. actuality, etc) They claim that a series is unified by a principle - and that is the essence, which is connection between appearances. After erasing a bunch of dualism, we are left with the infinite-finite distinction, is this going to be a problem?

We have the distinction between

- The phenomenon of being
  how we experience being, we know an object is not just its properties, we transcend and see there's something more called being - ontico-ontological understanding NOT knowledge, say being a prof is a way of being.

- The being of phenomenon
  when we look at phenomenon: number, dogs, presidents, etc. What is the being of the phenomena that manifests itself. We know there are different modes, but what gives this

modes? There's not so much we can say!

Sartre first justifies the trans-phenomenality of being, that being is not behind appearance, it goes through different ways of appearing and gets to us directly through appearance. The being is to be thought as the condition of all appearing. Therefore, saying modes or ways of being is more accurate. Erasing the subject-predicate form eliminate the scientific form of describing things.

Heidegger on being vs existence. Existence only plays to human-being, is being-for-itself; to exist is to have a certain relationship with being.

- Being-for-itself
  Human reality
  Requires consciousness of X, but is not just consciousness, as consciousness is always interpretive, so create meaning, therefore the world. Only within the horizon of the world, we have the objects manifest to us phenomenally.

- Being-in-itself
  We don't have experience for being-in-itself
  Not equated with matter, nor any kind of substance
  Not a bare substratum
  Sartre: all we can say about being-in-itself is that "being-in-itself is AND is in itself AND it what it is." It is beyond our experience to fit into category of concepts
  No reason or justification for it
  supports this world, but beyond phenomenal experience

What on earth is this dude talking about...? Being-in-itself has a tendency of generating consciousness and being-for-itself. The consciousness then introduces nothingness into being. With nothingness we have determinate existents (objects). Therefore it is a **plenum of being**, which is the fullness and completeness of being, no "needs" used in theology to describe god. Being-in-itself has no meaning, no room for human conception.

Being therefore is a metaphysical ground of building a determinate world.

A quick summary:

- If we have consciousness + being-in-itself, we get Sartre's basic ontology.

- If we have the structures of the for itself + differentiated world and objects, we get Sartre's full ontology.

- Pre-reflective consciousness is always of self. Normal consciousness is of the object in-itself.

Fundamental project of human-being: everyone wants to be in-itself-for-itself. However, in-itself is fullness while for-itself requires consciousness and nothingness, which can never be the case. Heidegger: human has useless passion!

Now we get to Being-for-itself. Sartre says that for-itself is "what it is not and is no what it is"...he means that we always throw projection of possibilities into the world into the future. Taking classes for diploma, but not yet! Meanwhile, for-itself is its very lack of being (which is the nothingness before itself). Gives us opportunity to step back and choose.

Being & Nothingness Chapter 1 Oct 13 2022

Recall BFI includes human reality and consciousness, therefore nothingness. We arrive at that human reality is a lack of being. Notice consciousness is always intentional, that it is always of something, or positional and reflexive (I am conscious of something I'm not, etc)

Consciousness is initially empty, a void, only filled by a "conscious of X." Nothingness is brought into the world by our mind, we therefore get negation and nihilation. Absence shows up as an element of reality.

For Sartre, **saying the world always means the meaningful structures**. The world terminates through human projects, as we have the freedom to decide our possibilities. Through the possibilities, negation raises - one choice means all other choice negated.

We could break reality up in the following: Reality contains being-as-such, then split into

1. Being-for-itself (determinate objects: coffee mug, iPad, etc)
   Contingent as it is not self-founded.
   has an upsurge that gives rise to for-itself (consciousness).
   We don't encoutner being-as-such through BFI

2. Being-in-itself

Recall we have absolute freedom, no a priori meanings, but dumped into being and have to be responsible for our situation, hence the nausea. **The fundamental project** (which is impossible) is to be a mode of being-in-itself as being-for-itself. A mug doesnt have to worry about being a mug:) OR say it's an attempt to freely escape freedom.

Absence and nothingness is part of reality, nothingness doesn't have a being, but it's real. Absence is a flickering of nothingness. So two types of existence is [exist is] and [exist is not] (which doesn't have a being, but REAL)

All we get from a phenomenon of being is the phenomena, we can sense being but not being itself.

Summary: Negation is ontologically real! Consciousness is nothingness!

Roadmap for the idea of negation

Start by thinking about the concept of question - if you lack the knowledge to an inquiry, then nothingness exists here within the ignorance by saying "no." Even if a positive reply implies some kind of "no that." We can have various "no" as possibilities to questions. It's both theoretical (answer question with possibility "no") and practical (in our dealing with the world).

Therefore, nihilation is the power to introduce nothingness. By introducing nothingness, we produce a "negated." Nothingness is also the underpinning of the negated. Being is primary, therefore the negated is not self-sufficient. Pierre's absence is not an intuition of nothing, it is rather a negated state of affairs.

Something about Hegel & Heidegger: Heidegger starts with Dasein + being in the world makes a work world. Also agree nothingness is transcends that it's inside the human consciousness, which is a secondary derivative. what is primary is Dasein's transcendence into the world, which produces nothingness. Sartre is saying only because of nothingness can something be transcendental. Consciousness is nothingness. Sartre's worry is in principle Dasein (primary) can overcome its alienation (lack of being due to nothingness, which is secondary) and could find a home in the world. Sartre thinks due to nothingness, human-being will never find a home. All efforts are doomed.

The Basics of Bad Faith Oct 18 2022

The background is for-itself/Dasein. The basic idea is that in the self, a dialectical relationship between transcendence and facticity. Kierkegaard uses the world infinite/"eternal"/possibility as opposed to finite/"temporal"/necessity. The human being is both of these aspects (Transcendence and Facticity) in relation to each other.

Transcendence	Facticity
infinite	finite (death)
"eternal"	"temporal"
possibility	necessity

The relation relates to itself as a synthesis to transcendence and facticity. Sartre says that we are 100% transcendence and facticity OR mind and body, no Cartesian dualism. By "dialectical", Sartre thinks you cannot know one part without knowing the other.

Couple terms:

- Surpassing
  I am only seeing an image of water bottle, but the being of water bottle jumps out.

- Self
  should be an activity, continuous choice and change, project, task, but not a thing or a substance. The self is to decide what/how/whether to be, which is the **Fundamental Project** - relating to the meaning of it.

- human vs. self
  human is more given and have to be what we are; while self is normative and authenticity. Ex. the waiter example: he is not a very good version of his self.

- Opacity
  bad faith involves it since we try to hide it from ourselves

The basic formula for bad faith: either affirming transcendence in expense of facticity, or affirming facticity in expense of transcendence. The fundamental project is to make the choice, but we can make a project authentic or in bad faith.

Eventually connect to nothingness. For-itself is a freedom, so consciousness can only motivated by consciousness itself. Bad faith can be expressed in self when we choose not to choose in s situation, that is, a being-in-situation.

Sartre's Café Waiter Example

Instead of self-deception, bad faith is more like self-evasion and self-distraction, maybe both! It is trying to evade one's freedom therefore the responsibility.

How do we characterize the waiter? He is too precise, perfect, serious, solicitous, and playing at being a waiter to become a waiter. The problem is that he is trying to be a waiter thing, or merely a waiter - essentially a being-for-itself mimicking being-in-itself (like a table). the waiter is therefore avoiding a choice of choosing his own being.

What is also going on is that our being with being-with-others. The being-with part refers to Heidegger's "Mitsein." From the point of view of the other, there is a recognition from others of this person as transcendence. This person now becomes transcended in others' mind. The waiter is a transcendence transcended, transcended by others. This is kinda an attempt to **thingifying** others - I've transcended them so that they are in a certain category.

The waiter is trying to do this transcendence process originally performed by others by himself. The waiter tries to represent to himself as how he is seen by others.

Waiter	Customer
Transcendence as fact	Transcendence as fact
Freedom	Freedom

When the waiters sees the customer, he sees a transcendence of freedom. The customer transcends waiter's transcendence of freedom - haha a waiter thing! Here is the objectification. If it's not my project, I transcend it.

Continued Bad Faith Oct 20 2022

Recall consciousness is always of something X, the X has the being-in-itself. Consciousness therefore is not X, is "me", which is the pre-reflective consciousness. Therefore also I am not in-itself, not a being-in-itself. Consciousness is a lack of Being-in-itself, it's something else - a primitive awareness for-itself.

Later we encounter others - the encounter between the me for-itself and others for-itself. These others for-itself, as transcendence, freedom, and consciousness of, therefore a point of view OR a world including others. I could walk around with me centered in my world (here exists the gaze/look of the others), but on others' world I am just another object. The for-itself cannot be understood by being with others. The look of others give me affirmation for for-itself-ness, also since it's transcendence, so transcends my transcendence. When others see the waiter, others transcend their transcendence (see himself as a waiter), not as total freedom, kinda like objectification. So **transcended transcendence is basically objectification**, we become this thing-like thing in others eyes.

Ontologically, we necessarily transcend everything that's not ourselves. However, how one customer relates to his transcendence of others depends on him.

Therefore authenticity comes up in the way/manner in which one relates to it. Authenticity

affirms freedom of myself and others; bad faith is an attempt to flee from freedom. In-authenticity also denies the freedom of others, which is the entry to Existentialist ethics. When we become a being-in-situation, we always have the freedom to act and the issue is how we relate to the situation. Authenticity is not related to any emotion or status, just how we relate to our own metaphysical project - how we do what we do rather than what we do.

More on the waiter & the customer:

Waiter (Pierre)	Customer
Transcendence as fact	Transcendence as fact
Freedom	Freedom

The waiter sees the customer as freedom and for-itself, and vice versa. The customer transcends and objectifies him to be a "in-itself" waiter object. Let's get the messy stuff in...

Being in itself could be used interchangably with facticity, but being for itself also has facticity. Transcendence doesn't make sense without facticity - we transcend our facticity.

The waiter recognizes the customer, which is another for-itself that's not me. This is an affirmation of transcendence to the waiter - "I'm a for-itself." It is a threat to freedom since object does not have freedom - to reject, the waiter's freedom objectifies this guy he sees as the customer. They re-assert the freedom by transcending the other - the customer is now an object too. However, object/in-itself cannot transcend. Both sides needs affirmation from each other's for-itself but not in-itself. So again we grant each other for-itself. When two for-itself come together, this is the necessarily happening dynamic.

This whole thing is just inevitable to part of our ontology as for-itself. If the question in each person's case is how we relate to this situation + the other person. Sartre's idea is the customer has an idea/representation of the waiter's transcendence transcended. The waiter wants to adopt for himself just as the customer's way of seeing a waiter. He wants to be a robot waiter, not anxiety of choice whatsoever. However, this is unfulfillable, he can represent the waiter in customer's eyes as his transcendence, but not themselves that way. This is the bad faith - persuading ourselves into something that we are not.

More Bad Faith Oct 25 2022

The Smoker

We use a new example - the smoker. The smoker is a for-itself, located between **transcendence and facticity**. For-itself in the end is fully conscious and fully body (enbodied consciousness), not dualism or monism. We find ourselves "thrown" in a specific situation. We need to take the "ontic possibilities" (being a smoker, caterer, etc) to the facticity - make decision on how to exist, etc.

Imagine one person to persuade this smoker off smoking. If the smoker don't change, it makes the smoker's own facticity and way to take off anxiety. OR he can be "ok I'm done! Non-smoker now!" See the smoker always transcends this smoke-or-non-smoke. You cannot transcend your choices by getting to facticity. What if you try-and-fail? We judge by how we relate to the matter to see if

it's good or bad faith.

Jump back to the waiter and customer, both are transcendence, under the gaze of each other. Each recognizes each others transcendence, freedom, for-itself, ultimately a center of the world. For-itself is a disclosure of the world. Each reduce to an object (or a function of the world, a waiter-thing or a customer-thing) in the other's world - transcendence transcended. Not even getting into bad faith yet. When we encounter another total freedom, we feel threatened by this absolute freedom and its objectifying ability, BUT also affirming since it affirms our for-itself.

The Waiter & Customer

Remember from the first pre-reflective cogito we read the being in itself. But WHEN from the first pre-reflective cogito encountering others, we recognize other for-itself. From other for-itself we get the gaze and recognition for my for-itself. Heidegger's being-with-others, a Dasein. We both need each other's gaze and recognition to bring together a for-itself world. The dynamic though is always of transcendence transcended by each other - a constant **dialectic**.

The waiter then took the representation of the waiter-thing and tries to become that, since being a waiter-thing does not involve making decision and takes away the anxiety. BUT he's not actually a waiter-thing, he's a transcendence, unless you get a project of bad faith...

The Woman on the Date

Again we have two subjects - the woman and man. She's undecided about the man and his sexual/romantic intentions. She leaves her hand in his, also doesn't want to put it back, just leaving it inert. SO she's not consenting or resisting. Her hand is kinda a passive object that doesn't belong to her, so the hand doesn't have possibilities.

Additionally, the guy was also talking, compliments, etc (romantic). Sartre indicates that she is translating them to a general comment/face value from romantic comment. She disarms the romantic stuff, but she has to know the romantic content in order to do the disarmament.

The woman treats herself as being the situation, completely transcended and no attention on facticity, fleeing to future possibilities. Two parallel moves: one is the inert hand, one is treating herself to be completely transcended. An attempt to achieve for-itself, beyond the requirement to choose.

If being human is being condemned to freedom, there's two ways you can fail freedom. Bad faith is one way of fleeing from freedom. The other way is ethical wrongdoing - wronging the other and their freedom.

Office hours: for-itself needs facticity that we are thrown into, which does not interfere with the freedom, but the outcome is contingent. The women is trying to oscillate between both transcendence and facticity at the same time.

More Bad Faith Examples Oct 27 2022

Example for not being bad faith - in good faith! Trying to be in-itself is obviously bad faith. God could be an example: free to create but not have to create, etc. Having a choice but not having to choose is kinda a ultimate good faith. Bad faith is in first instance what we are about: Sartre would say it's almost like we cant live without it.

Simple version of good faith/authenticity would be to involve fully transcendence in "spirit"/geist (fully consciounsess) AND facticity in body (fully body). Being authentic is having good relationship between Transcendence and facticity, not leaning into either one - "equilibrium."

Revisit Woman on the Date

The key thing is the woman is undecided, but the guy has clear intention of being interested in the woman. The women faces the inevitability of choice, kinda pressing (any choice involves anxiety), but she's not sure. There is an avoiding of the choosing, not being honest about being undecided.

Then, he took her hand romantically. She objectifies her hand as it is not mine! It doesn't invite or request any kind of behaviour, no meaning whatsoever. She distances herself from the situation by transforming herself to facticity. If it's just a thing, then anything happening to it has no meaning. But the holding has romantic meaning, so the woman is avoiding that meaning. Meanwhile, he's also giving compliments to her, also meaningful. She gets it, but wants to avoid choosing by treating herself as completely transcending her body (hand) and the romantic situation of meaning. She interprets the compliment into a general notion, stripping off its romantic meaning. She's treating herself as an object in this situation to avoid the choice. It's about her relation to herself and her bad faith.

Homosexual and The Champion of Sincerity

We have the Champion of sincerity and homosexual guy, both people engaging both in bad faith. The background is that he presumes the homosexual feels shameful but keeps to have affairs, OR if he's married and having those secret stuff. Whatever way, the homosexual guys feels shame. The champion comes along, says what the homosexual needs to do is to <u>admit or own</u> that he's homosexual, cannot keep calling this an accident.

They are BOTH in bad faith. The "own it" is not authenticity! But the champion is asking him two things:

1. admit to facticity AND objectify himself - that's what the homosexual is a psycho-sexual identity.

2. do this as a means of transcendence

The champion seems to be suggesting that if the homosexual admits/takes responsibility, then the champion grants/recognizes his transcendence.

The obvious inconsistency is that admitting the homosexuality grants you transcendence. The champion is in bad faith by treating the homosexual as a certain type of thing. This is done from

his own anxiety (that he doesn't know if it's a psycho disease) to the homosexual's freedom (that the champion cannot control). The champion wants to force the homosexual to admit that it is a psycho-sexual thing, but the homosexual has the right to freely deny. The free choice bug the champion - after categorizing them, it becomes natural for "these people just do it."

Homosexual's bad faith: keep treating everything that happened as accidents. However, the champion is right in the sense is that it is wrong in the given culture, just as certain behaviour is called theft, etc regardless of the individual's thoughts. In this case, the homosexual is denying that he is recognized as being wrong in the given culture - he's denying facticity and treating himself as a pure transcendence as he thinks his choice has no public meaning.

In both cases, they are fooling themselves about each other (as bad faith). The champion is trying to be the judge of transcendence...hiding from himself that it is the homosexual's freedom affirming his own for-itself. He's hiding from himself the other person's role and transcendence, and recognizing himself as self-grounded transcendence, which does not exist as transcendence is recognized when interacting with others.

Both made projects of bad faith previously in their lives. Believing implies undermining a proposition from knowledge. To confirm it, we can go chase after evidence. If no basis, the belief is gone. But some is more re-assuring than others: "I'm not a coward." Have you ever been in a situation? The champion has an anxiety over that the homosexual says he won't accept taking responsibility in a psycho sense, the champion sees the homosexual is wrong, although it is he who puts this psycho category onto him. They both pick the stand they want to be in and neglect the other person.

Still Bad Faith Examples Nov 1 2022

Sincerity

For sincerity, the admission is to have a nature that has no freedom in order to transcend.

For the fundamental project of the homosexual, we want to be for-itself-in-itself, where for-itself is the freedom, while the in-itself is being homosexual.

The train of thought from for-itself: it is the origin of transcendence and freedom, derives from the consciousness of nothingness (from a lack of being that's not me), therefore the nihilation power. The nihilation power then again transcends and have us free. We also nihilate the connection between present and the past - we always have free choice from the past. All these is totally abstract unless we involve facticity/situation inside. All human reality is thrown into the factual word into a situation. You won't be any kind of self without expressing the expression of freedom into facticity: specific choices, context, content, etc.

BFI and BII is a misinterpretation of the dialectical synthesis of facticity and transcendence. We have our for-itself as (transcendence + facticity) to be. It is not state or disposition, we just have to be them. However, to be we need to be for-itself-in-itself, so impossible!

Faith of Bad Faith

The human being is a non-self-identical for-itself. We are never identical to what we are - starting point for bad faith. Sartre also denies that belief is a psychological fact, it is an activity. He thinks bad faith starts out early stages coming out of naive and simplistic view of the world. It carries on through the person's life, it comes with self-consciousness and we fall into it.

In Dasein, there exists a call of conscience in terms of guilty. but we are still responsible for the situation since nobody else chose it.

Faith of bad faith: involves a simplistic and naive nature of belief. It affects subsequent belief formation. It is a decision about the nature/criteria of belief. The primitive part of the project of bad faith is the faith of bad faith.

From a primitive project to distinguish belief, we take on project of bad faith and decide on how we manifest the bad faith (transcend this or objectify that, etc). Sartre says that belief itself has a self-destructive teleology - the goal. The teleology of belief is you keep looking for evidence/confirmation: if I find it, we call it knowledge; if not, doubt kicks in and becomes a mere belief.

If there is awareness on belief self-destruct and goes one way or another, then the person (before bad faith) has to arrive at The Basic Belief about beliefs in general, which is to not question them too much. Forming a belief about how counts as belief allows us to base our project of bad faith on these particular beliefs. If one thinks himself brave and not cowardly

Summary Faith of Bad Faith Nov 3 2022

It is a early-on decision: what would be belief, what would be evidence for belief, etc. Since he presents it as a self-perpetuating project, it has to involve pre-reflective awareness in the faith of bad faith. Kinda a defensive mechanism. It allows you to retain certain belief, and from gaining other beliefs that might undermine the current beliefs.

For beliefs, there is counter-beliefs. The decision is already made to not believe the latter. Don't question whatever is in favour, it is evidence, do not introduce any doubts. It only involves a level of pre-reflective awareness, can't be reflective. If so, the belief ceases to exist either way.

The person has to have some sense of what to avoid, as a strategy - confirmation bias. The belief links to the project eventually.

Being-for-others

The for-others constitutes being-for-itself. We are never being-for-itself without being-with-others. The theory of the other is not an issue for epistemology - ontological one. Attempt to articulate the metaphysical relations for inter-subjectivity. Not that we infer after we observe these beings for long enough.

Example Sartre uses: shame and looking through the keyhole. Doesn't matter what he thinks,

he is caught in the act. It's a intentional pre-reflective self-consciousness, that pre-supposes the existence of others. Shame primordially is being seen by the other, consciousness of one's own self as given to the consciousness of others. I am given something that's not immediate, it mediates myself. OR the look of the other makes me into an object for the other, and the other has a representation of me.

Pre-reflective consciousness confirms something that's not me, but the look of others is a confirmation from a being like me, meanwhile making me into an object - an aspect of the for-itself constituted through intersubjectivity. The other's representation of you is part of your for-itself.

Back to keyhole example, the act of shame is mine, but my shame is for the other. No reflection intervenes in this process, doesn't involve self-reflection. We take ourselves to be the shameful object. The for-itself/Dasein is always being-in-the-world, as the world is constituted by human reality. Being-in-the-world include being-with-others. World is constructed by a shared and public structures of significance, which is always some ways of being Dasein. For-itself is never separable from the world.

Next example: the man in the park. First, a non-inferential that this person is for-itself, given as immediate subject. The world is transformed once I encounter this subject, things now orient around this one, which I'm not identical. I am not not the centre of the world after this encountering - decentralization. The response is that we need to contain the other, done through empirical representation of the other, with determinacy to it. We could fix this for-itself into "man on the bench" etc that we can control and determine, a part of the structure of my world, or an object.

The issue here is the subject-subject relation - an ontological transformation. They occur in my consciousness, affects the formation of the something like being-in-itself. other representation of one's self into categories, it fixes me and alienates me from my possibilities.

Continued Being-for-others Nov 8 2022

We first see an important difference between Sartre and Heidegger. Heidegger: Das man (the one, the they, the anyone, anonymous and generic) and being-with. Sartre objects the anonymous, generic part. Sartre wants to do justice to our concrete relation with others - it's ontologically constitutive of us as individuals, since we have social roles, norms, and social expectations.

Sartre treats genuine/authentic person as a normative category: an achievement, not a random collection of experiences. Through self-conscious, we are aware of things, self, and other for-itselfs. We find ourselves distinct from other for-itselfs. Any for-itself always includes a for-others. Shame/pride etc needs more shared/public meaning from being-for-others.

Hence Sartre's term of the look and the gaze of the other. Being fixed in others' gaze is quintessential to human existence, the other is given immediately (not something we infer through reasoning). It dissolve the problem of other minds through eliminating dualisms. The gaze individuates us from others, and reifies (categorizes) by the others. It ultimately makes us into an object-for-the-other, closer to an in-itself, a fixed identity of some kind. The gaze fixes our free + spontaneous self, could turn us into a in-itself, also could feel interrupted about this gaze since we don't want it.

The interaction between for-itselfs leads to the idea of self-estrangement. Since the other becomes predominant in this relationship, we are taken hold of by others. Self takes the ego from public identity, and turn that into how we view ourselves.

Recall for-itself recognizes itself as a lack of being-in-itself, so the impossible fundamental project is to be a fir-itself-in-itself. From the other, we receive the categories and role - in-itself. Therefore, the for-itself sees in other this whole process. BUT there's something kinda attractive as it fills the in-itself part in for-itself, for the project. What if I can be whatever i am for them (representation) for myself?If I can be in the right relationship wit the other, the other can be the thing that articulates my lack for in-itself. If I can be in-itself for me from others, then I can complete my fundamental project. When others see me as in-itself, there are possibilities for the in-itself too. So when we take the in-itself as seen by others to be our in-itself, we take these possibilties by others to be our possibilities.

This is the basis of existentialist ethics.

More concern on concrete relation with others: can we fairly recognize each others' being?

Concrete Relationship with the Other Nov 10 2022

The Basics

The dilemma we face is either treat other as subject, OR other as object, relates to the fundamental project to become for-itself-in-itself by relating to others. Why is this important for self-hood? Being-for-others presents me with another self that is refused (I'm not that self) I am another self, refused by the other - the double negation. We need this reciprocal refusing to have self-affirmation.

We have the basic idea that self-definition through rejection of the other. That is to say we all have a self-destructive dynamic. We are not disinterested to the other - cannot look away from others since they have what I need: what I am as a self. All of this is "internal" and ontological feature of the for-itself. Since being-for-others is being-for-itself, I am not totally under my own control.

Circle of relational projects: the attitudes that are in these projects are present in all of our relations, with no beginning or no end. Can we do a collective project and form a we-self where we are both object? Sartre: no - it would just be a complex transcendence transcended relation. We as object is us - you can always imagine a third party that transcends us. We as subject is: you can find yourself aimed at by others/the subway signs, etc. We are aimed as generic and anonymous self.

There's never a harmonious relationship based on mutual recognition. Human shows an attempt to remove the alienation we feel from our own self, the alienation is brought about most vividly in the original upsurge of the other. The upsurge of others as freedom produces the alienation.

Two classes of attitudes:

- Love, masochism

- indifference, sexual desire, sadism, hatred

The relation we form with others are governed by our attitude towards our being-with-others.

Love

Love is in the mode of trying to assimilate the freedom of the other. Through seduction and fascination, we try to put a spell on the others' freedom. BUT the problem is that in the lover and beloved situation, the lover tries to take the other's freedom, but needs to aim at the freedom of the beloved. However, not as an object, the lover needs the freedom of the beloved's consciousness to affirm the lover's freedom, we are trying to possess the beloved subjectivity, ultimately contradictory.

The lover aims at the beloved's subjectivity, and wants them to "play at being subdued." The lover has to present himself as the limit of the beloved's freedom. The lover seduces her way into submitting her own freedom, and with her freedom does not transgress my project and my needs. Therefore the lover gets the security/stability of their in-itself and also keeping their freedom in a certain parameter, lessen anxiety. The lover wants to be safe and secure in the consciousness of the beloved.

The world is to be re-made to the other through me/in my terms. The love with others saves my facticity and my alienation. The choice for me for love provides justification for my existence.

How do you get the other person to love you? The lover has to become a fascination for the beloved, but seduction is bound to fail - cannot control how other sees you as an object of fascination, along with my language and body, etc. Seduction of the other is not the other's love.

Love + being loved is the ultimate goal. If it works out, the lover is willing himself as a body to the outside, imitating a flight toward the other - a freedom acting out on its own alienation. You have no control how the body is for other. Th ideal of love is an alienation of freedom, each want to be an object for the other to alienate himself (flying towards me and limit own freedom).

Desire

The sexual desire is the foundation of all out attitudes. Sexuality is fundamental to the upsurge for the for-itself - we exist sexually for each other.

Hatred

The freedom and action of other can arouse hatred - serious attitude towards the other, so much closer to love than indifference. Either way we can't ignore the others. Cruelty, kindness, whatever can be just for grabbing attention. Haters don't want others to transcend them - prefer having others never existed. Every consciousness pursue the death of the other - attempt to construct a world free of others. Hatred turns the other into an hate-object, but also haunted by transcendence (hater prefers not to think about). Death does not resolve the problem since the hatred is now fix in my past - no changing that now, will forever be like that in the eyes of the other (continued to be alienated from the grave:).

Indifference

Willful blindness to others' transcendence - but also a project of bad faith since also blind on our own being-for-others. The other can be used as an instrument as an obstacle - depends on the function of this person. A form of extreme isolation of deep insecurity by self-alienation.

Masochism

When the project of seduction fails, we have masochism. If love wants the freedom of the other, then failure in that results in the masochist in seeing freedom as the obstacle. They identify completely to the other, give up freedom, denies transcendence. The true aim is to become an object for themselves. See how objective oneself can be for the other - so self-aimed. Transcendence always stands in the way.

Sadism

Failure of desire too - refuse to be incarnated, and try to dominate the other.

de Beauvoir and *The Ethics of Ambiguity* Nov 15 2022

Ambiguity : human has a participant stance and a observer/spectator stance that we can be like "oh our life doesn't matter, etc" but animals cannot.

Starting from ambiguity and freedom - if you are born into death, then there is a theme of tragic ambivalence that human being feel towards. This tragic ambivalence in existence is connected to being-towards-death (part of our consciousness). We sit there and acknowledge that there will be a time that we die. This death stands as a limit to all possibilities.

de Beauvoir claims that philosophers are trying to escape this ambivalence. The Aristotelian "rational animal" is such an attempt by connecting human to nature, but we are never free from this. We are still consciousness no matter how much we think ourselves as rational animal - almost a form of bad faith - we exert ourselves as pure consciousness where no other beings can take hold of.

We also see ourselves as both sovereign individual, but live in a world among others who are other sovereign individuals. We are absolutely unique, yeah so does everybody. We are also dependent on others as part of human condition.

Every philosophical view has a metaphysics, out of this we get an ethics. Other philosophers tend to remove the human ambiguity of existence from their ethics, to resist the fact that we need to realize this ambiguity.

Human beings are also the source of ends - all actions subordinate to the ends. It should be Kant's Kingdom of ends where we recognize each other as ends, but we treat each other as instruments or obstacles. We cannot escape the ambiguity, so we must face it - existentialism.

We have Sartre going on and on about the fundamental project - a useless passion to be a for-

itself-in-itself - stuck with something impossible. Why wouldn't this lead to despair? There's also no principle of choice, there's nothing that could guide us.

On Existentialist Ethics

First, de Beauvoir points out that existentialist ethics is all the same with other philosophy. But this is normal as ethics begins with failure. Moral perfectionalism to achieve the fundamental project is bad faith! Ethics can only exit with a being that with failure, a being with distance with itself.

Drawing from Sartre, she points out that the for-itself makes itself a lack of being **in order to be + there might be being**. This connects to the nihilation/nullification and it is through this that we have any disclosure of being. Human being is a disclosure of being. As a self-inflicted passion (make oneself lack of a being), this is much more like a choice than we suffered through this. Now, is this choice a useless choice? Nothing is useless until you have a for-itself: **for-itself is what establishes values and meaning!** For-itself decides on if things are useful - before human we don't have ends. This passion has no criterion at all: no external standard, no reason to exist.

We don't have the ultimate reason for explanation or for our purpose, but we can still provide justification through reason.

The disclosure of being is part of our primordial attachment, it is a pre-ontological understanding of being. Almost a coping ability.

Nihilation creates the lack of being and the gap, hence the distance from the world. This is also the only way that the world can be before me to contemplate and experience, etc.

Sartre would say that the fundamental project is to be for-itself-in-itself (god). This is impossible. The aim of the project is that Human takes their telos to be god. however, the striving towards the god-aspect makes us human-being. **Human being is the constant striving-to-be.** This striving to attain the impossible telos brings about human existence/for-itself.

What if we change the concept to that's something we can never complete? We are end-setters as for-itself, so could there be an end that could be consistently with human existence and the ambiguity? This can be a basis for developing an existentialist ethics.

Continued de Beauvoir Nov 17 2022

Again, we need failure to establish an ethics. Instead of thinking the lack of being as failures, it is a fact that we are at a distance with ourselves - a good thing. We accept the distance can bring up anxiety and alienation (we are not like everything else). The distance is also the only thing that prompts genuine relationship - experiencing the world.

The existentialist approach is to embrace the human ambiguity to our existence - the thing that makes up who we are. The for-itself makes a lack of being in order to disclose being - the for-itself succeed in disclosing its being. Being authentic is to embrace the ambiguity, accept we are tran-

scendence/freedom, set (factical) ends, and complete project, and only in the end we have what is useful and what is not. Here we have the source of values.

Several things: there is no value without the for-itself and with the ends set. If we are the source of value and we are ambiguous, an authentic person doesn't set up absolutes or unconditionals of any kind. Also wouldn't set up the external standards of value.

A person's choice in adulthood is formed by all the choice and experience of the childhood. We express responsibility by making it "yours to deal with, since no one else can."

Similar to Nietzsche's Death of Christian God, we also have a existentialist crisis that we fail all the time. de Beauvoir looks for an ideal that it teleological without a final telos. We need to look for an **ideal** that's rational to pursue but also cannot be fully achieved. Here we need an ethics to provide motivation and reasons for action.

As consciousness, we are always in a situation and are not passive. We always are actively interpreting the situation "seeing-as" and that discloses meaning. We want to choose the useful, and choosing one is to reject one option that's not satisfactory.

What would we look for in this ethics?
It has to be consistent with the freedom and the consciousness of the freedom. Something that cannot be conflicted with freedom: **freedom itself**. It also remains open-ended. Rooting in freedom is to root in the ontology of humane existence. the freedom is also the source of all ends and all values. Freedom is the source and condition for all justification. Therefore it should be promoted first and foremost, but it is always going to be manifested in concrete and finite project and ends.

Now we have freedom as an ontological claim, but what about ethical claim?

Deal with Others Authentically

Dealing with pluarility of freedom and ends of others. Q: How do we do this? A: Don't deny that we can arrive at "rules" valid for everyone