



Undergraduate assignment feedback form
(to be completed by marker)

Student Name: <u>Jo (Pei-shin cheung.)</u>	
Module title: <u>PTE</u>	Student number:
For completion by marker:	
Comments: In this essay there are a lot of grammatical inaccuracies which, overall, result in a lack of clarity and precision. This point about precision is also related to the fact that the actual detail of Sartre's arguments is avoided. Thus there is very little evidence that the primary work has been engaged with sufficiently. Further, a close consideration of the work of secondary scholars is needed. That said, there is some evidence that you have gained knowledge (albeit limited) of relevant concepts & arguments.	
Marker's signature: <u>[Signature]</u>	Date: <u>27/11/19</u>
Provisional mark: <u>46</u>	
NB. All marks are provisional until confirmed by the final examination board.	

50

What is Bad Faith

Bad faith, in French: *mauvaise foi*, is a concept put forward by Jean-Paul Sartre. He pointed out that man is a being whose existence precedes his essence." (Jean-Paul Sartre, 1948, p52) ^{This} means that there is no more advanced existence to give human survival purposes. So, you create who you will become, choose your way of life, and must give yourself full autonomy.

Reword

We don't have ^{pa} function or ^{pa} essence as humans. We have to make our own, unlike the inkwell and the tree. The inkwell cannot decide to be anything else but an inkwell. A human being is different, we can create what we are, therefore finding our essence.

Intro-
duce
Sartre's
examples
before

Freedom lies in how you choose to respond to what happens to you and we have no excuse for our own decisions. We have to take the responsibility for what we do, as it is our responsibility what we decide to do." I am thus responsible for myself and for all men." (Sartre, 1948) suggests the freedom which all humans have, regardless of whether they like it or not. However, many times we think we are limited because of the vision held by others, or by external structures and ideas, and are not free to make choices. Sartre sees the idea as "bad faith". 'Bad Faith consists in pretending that we are not free'. (Warnock, 1967. p30) Some, or many people have the habit of tricking themselves into thinking they don't have the freedom to make choices because they are afraid of the consequences of their choices. When a person is immersed in a safe, simple and innocuous choice and does not think about a series of other options, the person puts himself at the mercy of the environment. And in it, he happens to find himself. In this case, the person is more of an object than a person who is conscious and aware of his existence. In Sartre's terms, it is the concept of "a being in itself. "Pragmatic considerations, roles in society, and accepted value systems are all excuses that people make for behaving as they do. And this is bad faith.

you
say
this.

Gr/
puncha-
tion.

Explain
how

Sartre
arrives
at this
point.

Sartre gives an example of a waiter in a café who holds a tray and delivers the customer's orders very carefully, and his every movement appears too standard. The waiter is playing the role of waiter ^{he is acting as if} accepting his essence ^{that of being a} as a waiter. It seems he is born to be a waiter. However, he is a free man, and disguising himself as a waiter is a form of bad faith. Sartre's idea is that we are free, but we try to pretend we are not, but because of various "essence", such as the essence of a waiter is to deliver meals, collect orders, listen to the views of customers, and so on, when the waiter thinks that his essence is all of the above, he is living in a bad faith. But his essence is

Re-
word.

Reword.

Opening
first
paragraph
needed.

clarity
needed.

freedom, he can say no, he can leave and go forth to seek employment at his dream job and obtain freedom. Of course, he needs to take full responsibility for this complete freedom.

"Human reality is what it is not, and it is not what it is." (Jean-Paul Sartre, 1969)

This can be applied in this situation; he has consciousness of being not only a waiter, but he has also his own personal identity. At the same time, you are basically a free person, but when you are constantly telling yourself that you are happy with your life conditions, full of positive energy, however, you may also be deceiving oneself, and that could be called bad faith.

Anxiety, according to the Sartre^{an} argument is about consciousness of freedom, and the object of anxiety is freedom. We are in fear of our freedom. In order to ease or cover up our anguish, we try to deny our freedom, the existence of the possibility of choosing other options, and forget the countless possibilities that belong to us. We are able to create our own function and purpose by recognized consciousness.

Re word

We see ourselves as the only option, obscuring our other possibilities, denying freedom and escaping anxiety. We fall into 'bad faith'.

In the midst of anxiety, all the definite reasons and meanings have lost their foundation.

One finds himself in a state of absurdity: my existence is inevitable, but I am accidental. "My existence" being- in- itself existence, the world's physical, social, historical and other factors, the laws have determined my existence, but where is the "I" in this situation?

} clarity needed.

~~The~~ ^{Our} existence precedes ~~before~~ ^{now} essence. Because freedom does not float in the air; if one wants to act meaningfully, it is actually in a situation, in reality.

You could still choose how to face and respond to your situation in your mind and action, which is where true freedom lies, therefore you have to be responsible for yourself, no excuses. Anguish is anxiety about "me": more precisely, anxiety about the possibility I created. When I stand on the edge of a cliff, it is not the visual heights that cause anxiety, but the possibility of jumping off myself. At this point the possibility, the cause and effect law are all in our own hands. We are outside the chain of cause and effect. We have the ability to create or change it.

Reb

Sartre believed that we should look directly at "self-deception" and acknowledge how the conditions for self-deception ^{are} is formed. When we are overly partial or completely obsessed with a certain orientation, we fall into bad faith.

A person may feel completely in isolation and desperate, and yet know that they must bear absolute responsibility, which makes them anxious and causes anguish. In order to shirk responsibility and get rid of anxiety, people presuppose deterministic thinking that they are not free to choose their own way but can only act in a certain way. This kind of behavior, which seeks to get rid of anxiety at the expense of personality and freedom, is called bad faith. This can involve people ignoring their anguish by being immersed in daily routines. There are many manifestations of self-deception. Such like, when one should make a choice, one does not. A person may actively ignore an obvious innuendo and choose instead to believe in the so-called objective truth. Example, A woman dating someone, she clearly knows what the other person's intentions are. The result is accepting the flirtation of others and committing herself to the other party in a way that neither accepts nor rejects. She deceives herself into believing that she is being commented on as a conscious part of this, while refusing to grasp the potential possibilities. Sartre explains that when the courter takes her hand, she neither holds his hand tightly nor pulls her hand back. She merely puts her hands there indifferently to delay the decision (accept or reject). Whether or not she decided to interpret his compliments as a deeper hint. In short, she did not understand her hand as part of a subject, but merely an object as part of the body. In order to, she was able to extend her decision-making time to freely choose her next action by procrastinating.

Refer to
Sartre's
Work/
provide
References

Another example, like the café waiter, denying one's own freedom, he is doing his duties diligently, trying hard to behave like a waiter, over playing his role. Sartre believes that this is negative, passively giving up freedom, and also losing human subjectivity.

Explain.

There is no duality. Sartre argued that the world has an infinite series of finite appearances. This kind of perspective taking eliminates some of dualisms, notably the duality that contrasts the inside and outside of an object.

Such like, in me and others. Now that duality has been abolished, how can lies continue to exist? One way is to use the subconscious theory of psychoanalysis. How does the subconscious suppress a particular consciousness? It begins with the distinction between that repressed consciousness. In other words, the subconscious is informed, but at the same time negate that repressed consciousness. In this way, does the subconscious also have a self-deception structure internally?

We deceive ourselves because we refuse to face the realities of our own existence. Like a cafe waiter. In fact, we can never be just a waiter in a café. We all also have a

variety of roles to play, such as of a friend, partner, son, father. Aside from a waiter, most people also have social expectations and social roles to follow and play which in turn become shackles to human nature. Sartre's sees that as we cannot be a waiter by itself, we cannot be completely authentic. He denied that he was practical and totally engaged in transcendence. But what's the difference between this and self-deception?

During the Second World War, Sartre lived in Paris, which was occupied by the Germans. He met Albert Camus, who co-edited a copy of an underground anti-German newspaper.

There is a story about how a man could change his view and his thinking, even though his external conditions remained the same. In the story of Sisyphus, Camus shows a kind of "absurdness" in which Sisyphus is punished by the gods. He is unable to resist, nor can he die, and instead must push a stone up a mountain repeatedly. Every time Sisyphus approaches the top, he must watch the stone roll back down the hill and push it up again. The absurdness lies in the fact that although his sentence is unfair, and the time of punishment is endless, Camus still sees Sisyphus as an absurd hero who lives life to the fullest, hates death, and is condemned to a meaningless goal. Sisyphus's task represents the mundane repetition of pointless work as a metaphor for modern lives spent working in futile jobs in factories and offices. However, when Sisyphus accepts his punishment and began pushing the stone to enjoy the reward of reaching the top of the hill, he overcomes the endless pain. Sisyphus was free to be aware of the absurdity of his situation and to reach a state of contented acceptance. When he accepts the truth, he could get over it. Camus concludes that "all is well," indeed, that "one must imagine Sisyphus happy." (Albert Camus, 1975) Camus pointed out that we could see Sisyphus might be happy from having awareness (consciousness) of the condition despite his absurd life. But he seems to be able to reach a state and face acceptance. This may be one method to resolve/ease the anguish, anxiety for man's life condition. Sartre viewed that we have anguish because we know deep down, we could be better and do better, but this means taking responsibility, which risks failure and also hard work. So, we lie to ourselves that we should just continue doing what we are doing, rather than try to change the current situation. Camus is suggesting that humans could emulate Sisyphus in accepting themselves, being self-aware, as is the view of Kierkegaard's subjective truth. Sartre believed that anyone could better themselves and were free to make all decisions, using low paid job workers in his examples and stories.

But -
He is
immortal.

Make the link
explicit

Use secondary
sources to
critique.

Will you
critique this
in relation to
the essay question?

Why 'objective'?

As, we can see from the example of Sisyphus, one can transcend Bad Faith by changing one's perspective without changing any external factors.

If we could turn what society thinks of us (objective) to our own understanding of us (subjective), would it make a difference to our meaning of life?

Kanhan point.

As Sartre states, ~~that~~ we are responsible for ourselves and for all men. "All men" suggests the concept that different types of men/workers make up society. We could say that society needs every level of person to work all kind of jobs to be able to run. Regardless of one's conditions in life, whether waiter or prince, it cannot be proven that man can escape from the condition of anguish. (Jean- Paul Sartre ,1968 P.30)

Ref.

Nietzsche had great influence in modern philosophy. It could be said that he had a successful life and lived well. However, at the age of 44, he suffered from mental issues. His mother and his sister had to take care of him, until he passed away.

From this case we could guess that Nietzsche was in anguish in Sartre's bad faith. But Nietzsche had reached the top as an objective condition, how could he have become even better and exceed himself? (R. J. Hollingdale, 1965)

What do you mean here?

There is possibly a way out of this dilemma using a Buddhist concept. In the Satiparrhana Sutra, a classic about meditation. It mentions the person who is practicing meditation needs to live in the present. This means to try to keep the mind in mindfulness at every moment in our life. When inhaling, the practitioner is focused only on the action that he is inhaling, calming the whole body. This exercise can be integrated into everyday life. This topic of how mindfulness meditation can affect people's minds has been under research by various universities, including Harvard. A report from NHIS (National Health Interview Survey) found that in the U.S. the number of people practicing meditation has increased to triple between 2012 and 2017. (Satya Narayan Goenka, 2015)

explain the relevance.

It is possible that anguish is from the fear of the present and the future. For example, a waiter may fear quitting his job for another job, worried that if something was to go wrong, he may not be able to take his old job back.

Sometimes changing the outside condition(objective) cannot always solve the inner problem(subjective). If one was to change one's thought or their perception in how they see certain issues, like Sisyphus, the world may change for the better.

People could play the role of the waiter serving the customer, or like Sisyphus repeating meaningless hard labor by having consciousness of the situation, then accepting it, changing the view of itself, then being itself. As living in the present is keeping one's mind in mindfulness or the breath, it can keep the mind in a positive state. This could be used by those, such as the waiter or as Sisyphus, to help gain a better view or feeling about their duty roles. Even at the end of life where whatever we do may amount to nothing, we could still elevate our existence by contributing our effort to benefitting the world. As Sartre stated, "I am thus responsible for myself and for all men." (Jean- Paul Sartre, 1968, p30)

Bibliography:

Jean- Paul Sartre, Existentialism and Humanism. tr. Philip Mairet. [1948] (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1968).

Jean- Paul Sartre, Being and Nothingness. tr. Hazel E. Branes. (Northampton: John Dickens & Co. Ltd, 1969)

Mary Warnock, Existentialist Ethics. (New York: Macmillan, 1967).

Albert Camus, The Myth of Sisyphus [1942], tr. Justin O'Brien (London: Penguin Books, 1975).

R. J. Hollingdale, Nietzsche The Man and His Philosophy, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965)

Satya Narayan Goenka, Satipatthana Sutta Discourses, (USA: Pariyatti Press, 2015)

Harvard psychologist:

<https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2018/04/harvard-researchers-study-how-mindfulness-may-change-the-brain-in-depressed-patients/>

report from NHIS

<https://nccih.nih.gov/health/meditation/overview.htm>

