THE DEVIATION OF CONSCIOUSNESS INTO BAD FAITH IN SARTRE'S *BEING AND NOTHINGNESS*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ÇIĞDEM ÇIRACIOĞLU

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

DECEMBER 2014

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

———————————

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

———————————

Prof. Dr. Halil Ş. Turan

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

———————————

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Barış Parkan

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Halil Ş. Turan   (METU, PHIL) ———————————

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Barış Parkan   (METU, PHIL) ———————————

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ertuğrul R. Turan   (AU, DTCF) ———————————

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Çiğdem Çıracıoğlu

Signature　　　　:

ABSTRACT

THE DEVIATION OF CONSCIOUSNESS INTO BAD FAITH IN SARTRE'S
BEING AND NOTHINGNESS

Çıracıoğlu, Çiğdem

M.A., Department of Philosophy

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Barış Parkan

December 2014, 87 pages

This study aims to understand Sartre's conception of bad faith and how it arises. The study is divided into three main parts. The first part evaluates a general theory of consciousness and themes such as freedom, anguish, lying, and responsibility. It demonstrates that consciousness is both freedom and nothingness. This part explains the responsibility and the hardly bearable feeling of anguish which arise when consciousness comes across its own freedom. The second part shows how consciousness drags itself into bad faith in order to evade the constant feeling of anguish. This part also investigates what bad faith is and its relation to the project of bad faith. The third part investigates the three examples that Sartre uses while explaining bad faith. This investigation reveals that each example has one common weakness. In order to make up for this weakness I introduce a new example of bad faith. By this example, my main concern is to explain the deviation of consciousness into bad faith in a very clear way.

Keywords: consciousness, bad faith, anguish, sincerity, lie

ÖZ

SARTRE'IN *VARLIK VE HİÇLİK* ADLI ESERİNDE BİLİNCİN KENDİNİ ALDATMAYA SÜRÜKLENİŞİ

Çıracıoğlu, Çiğdem

Yüksek Lisans, Felsefe Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Barış Parkan

Aralık 2014, 87 sayfa

Bu çalışma, kendini aldatma kavramının ne olduğu ve nasıl ortaya çıktığını açıklamayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma üç ana bölümde ele alınmıştır. İlk bölümde, bilinç kavramı genel olarak ele alınıp, özgürlük, kaygı, yalan, sorumluluk gibi kavramlara değinilmiştir. Bilincin hem hiçlik hem de özgürlük olduğu ortaya konmuştur. Bilincin, özgürlüğünün farkına vardığı zaman ortaya çıkan, katlanılması zor olan kaygı hissi açıklanmıştır. İkinci bölümde bilincin, yaşadığı sürekli kaygıdan kurtulabilmek için, kendini aldatmaya doğru nasıl sürüklendiği gösterilmiştir. Kendini aldatmanın ne olduğu ve altında yatan motivasyon incelenmiştir. Üçüncü bölümde ise Sartre'ın konuyu açıklarken kullandığı üç önemli örnek ele alınmıştır. Bu örneklerin konuyu açıklamakta bir anlamda yetersiz kaldığı belirtilmiştir. Bu zayıflığı gidermek için yeni bir kendini kandırma örneği tarafımdan yazılmıştır. Buradaki amacım, bahsi geçen örnekten faydalanarak, bilincin kendini aldatmaya doğru nasıl olup da sürüklenebildiği açıkça ortaya konmaya çalışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: bilinç, kendini aldatmak, kaygı, samimiyet, yalan

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Barış Parkan for her encouragements and guidance throughout this study. She is the one who made it possible to write and finalize this thesis.

I would also like to thank to my committee members, Prof. Dr. Şeref Halil Turan and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ertuğrul Rufayi Turan for their suggestions and valuable comments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Bad faith is one of the most discussed and intriguing concepts that Sartre has developed. It can easily be said that bad faith is a very difficult topic to deal with, both because it has a depth that is not so obvious at first sight and thanks to Sartre's style of writing and the examples he uses, neither of which are very clear! Bad faith is a very difficult concept to grasp, which cannot be understood by reading only the one chapter devoted to it, because it harbors within it both a general theory of consciousness and existential themes such as freedom, anxiety, lying and so on that require careful observation and analysis.

If we ask why this subject remains so interesting for so many people and scholars despite the fact that it is so difficult to understand, there is a lot that can be said. Sartre has constructed his concept of bad faith on such a precarious balance that once one hears about it, it becomes impossible to forget about this concept and the question of how it may be possible to be in bad faith: how can a human being play a trick on himself/herself like this, especially when Sartre rejects the unconscious?

Sartre presented the concept of bad faith in such a compelling manner that an ordinary everyday expression that we constantly use—"lying to oneself"—suddenly started seriously troubling me whenever I heard it or thought about it. I realized that I couldn't understand how one could deceive oneself in earnest; a sentence that I used to easily and "unconsciously" (!) use

all the time became alienated from me because of Sartre; every time it occurred to me, it made me wonder "But how is it possible?"

I believe that now I can begin talking about this subject which has begun to make life so difficult for me. Sartre's concept of 'bad faith' is simply "lying to oneself." While this idea initially seems to make sense, Sartre builds his definition on such a substructure that it becomes impossible to either comprehend or discard it! According to Sartre, a consciousness lies to itself, but here, Sartre explains this phenomenon by taking away from us another concept that we have all become so familiar with that we treat it in our everyday lives as if we are as certain of its existence as we are of the existence of our liver: the unconscious. According to Sartre, there can be no part of consciousness that consciousness itself cannot reach. He objects to Freud on this point and makes it clear to us that he will construct his theory of bad consciousness completely on the level of consciousness. So, in this thesis, we are severed from the thought of an unconscious that is the source of all those comforting thoughts that absolve us of the responsibility of the things that we do. From now on, there are no longer things that we did that we were not aware of doing, but only clear decisions in our lives.

Sartre also speaks of the translucency of consciousness. In other words, consciousness can always see itself and is always aware of what is going on inside it.

These two moves exclude the possibility of a human being to easily lie to themselves and to get away with the things that they do by resorting to explanations like "that was my unconscious" or "I was not aware of what I was doing". What we have now is a consciousness that is aware of itself and does not have layers that cannot be reached, on the one hand, and the activity

of "lying to oneself" on the other. The human being who has these two most powerful tools taken away from himself/herself is nevertheless engaged in the activity of lying to himself/herself according to Sartre. It is at this point that the concept of bad faith becomes particularly intriguing. How can a human being believe a self-told lie without these tools? It seems that he/she sould be aware of the fact that he/she is lying.

Another intriguing aspect of the theory is the scary idea that one's consciousness can play tricks oneself when we think that it is our most powerful weapon in life. If a person can become so alien to what is going on in their own consciousness, what can they rely on?

To explore this intriguing phenomenon, I began by presenting a general outline of the structure of consciousness as presented by Sartre *in Being and Nothingness*. Thus, in Chapter 2, I briefly explained the fundamental two-fold structure of being as presented by Sartre in terms of being-in-itself and being-for-itself as well as facticity and transcendence. I presented Sartre's conception of consciousness as nothingness which is radically and fundamentally free and translucent. I also focused on Sartre's explanation of consciousness as involving a negating activity which is what enables consciousness to ask questions to the world, interpret it and transcend it. Finally, chapter 2 closed with a discussion of Sartre's conception of anguish which results from consciousness's confrontation of its radical freedom. We saw that it is this anguish that lies at the root of the phenomenon of bad faith that so intrigued us.

It must be noted that this outline presented in Chapter 2 is not a deeply involved ontological analysis of the above-mentioned concepts, but a mere

survey of them only in so far as it would be necessary for me to carry out my analysis of bad faith in the upcoming chapters.

In Chapter 3, I moved to the main question of my thesis, which was: how is bad faith possible? To make clear why bad faith is such a difficult concept to make sense of, I first explained Sartre's classification of three types of lies. Then I laid bare the problem of bad faith in terms of the impossibility of lying to oneself. An analysis of the relation between faith and bad faith opened a door for us in this investigation. I found a further clarification in Sartre's claim that bad faith originates with 'a project of bad faith' and explained what this may mean. Lastly, I turned to writings of Sartre scholars, mainly Detmer, and made use of Detmer's discussion of various methods that bad faith uses to shed light on the phenomenon of bad faith. The relation between the fact that bad faith is a kind of faith and an ambiguous attitude towards evidence as a common method of faith proved to be particularly enlightening.

Finally, Chapter 4 discussed bad faith through concrete examples. As mentioned above, one aspect of Sartre's discussion of bad faith that makes it so difficult to comprehend this phenomenon is Sartre's manner of writing and the examples he uses. It is not easy to see, in the examples through which Sartre allegedly explains bad faith, exactly where and how the consciousness that is accused to be in bad faith is lying to oneself. In this thesis, I hope to have managed making sense of these examples through a careful analysis of them and with the aid of secondary literature. Further, after a criticism of Sartre's examples, I came up with an example of my own, which I believe overcomes the shortcomings of Sartre's examples.

CHAPTER 2

THE GENERAL STRUCTURE OF CONSCIOUSNESS

The starting point of *Being and Nothingness* is phenomenology of consciousness. While Sartre is examining consciousness, he is also examining the world because there is no separating the world and consciousness. Consciousness is consciousness of the world. Thus, the world and consciousness are two different aspects of a unity.

Consciousness is an ongoing activity; it is not a place or an area. So consciousness does not reflect the world, or represent it or take it inside of itself. Indeed since it is an activity, rather than a thing, it has no inside[1] Consciousness is an awareness that is always directed at itself and the world. Thus, consciousness is a relation to the outside world and itself. It is also an awareness. Consciousness is aware of the external world and itself at the same time.

Consciousness does not create the outside world. It just interprets the world which already exists. In other words, Sartre is not an idealist. While he puts great emphasis on consciousness, he also clearly states that "consciousness is born supported by a being which is not itself"[2]. In Daigle's words, "it is

---

[1] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Intentionality: A Fundamental Idea of Husserl's Phenomenology*, p. 5

[2] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p.23

not consciousness that creates and sustains the world. Consciousness depends on the necessary pre-existence of the world in order to exist"[3].

2.1 Being-in-Itself and Being-for-Itself

In the introduction to his *Being and Nothingness*, which is titled "The Pursuit of Being", Sartre tells us about types of being and their structure. He mainly speaks of two types of being: being-in-itself and being-for-itself[4].

2.1.1 Being-in-Itself

Sartre sometimes uses the terms 'being in itself' and 'being' interchangeably.

We can say that all inanimate beings belong in this category. Things that belong in the category "in-itself" are objects for consciousness. They themselves do not have consciousness; they merely are. We can also simply call them 'unconscious beings'.

According to Sartre, being is simply what it is. It is fixed and has no distance to itself. Sartre states that "being is what it is"[5]. In other words, entities that belong to being-in-itself are completely identical to themselves. Therefore they are not lacking anything; they are completely equal to themselves. There is no *negativity* in them; they are all *positive*.

---

[3] C. Daigle, *Jean-Paul Sartre*, p.21

[4] To be more accurate, Sartre states later on in Being and Nothingness(page 218), that there are three types of being: being-in-itself, being-for-itself, and being- for-others. However, in this section, he discusses only the first two and this is the duality that concerns me for the purpose of my thesis.

[5] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p.29

"The in-itself is full of itself[...]"[6] "There is not the slightest emptiness in being, not the tiniest crack through which nothingness might slip in" [7].

2.1.1.1 Nothingness

Yet Sartre says that" coiled in the heart of being-like a worm" lies nothingness. "if nothingness can be given, it is neither before nor after being, nor in a general way outside of being"[8].

So where does this nothingness come from? We know that the in-itself is completely equal to itself and positive. Then the source of nothingness must be the for-itself.

2.1.2 Being-for-Itself (Consciousness)

Being for-itself is consciousness. Sartre uses the expressions 'for itself', 'consciousness' and 'human reality' interchangeably; "they have the same meaning in Sartre's philosophy"[9].

The structures of being-for-itself and being in itself are the opposite of each other. As we know, the in itself is identical to itself and all positive. In that case, we can say that, as its exact opposite, consciousness for itself is un-identical to itself and negativity. "Indeed it is impossible to define it as coincidence with itself"[10] because consciousness that is for itself can never coincide with itself, it always has a distance to itself. "[B]eing is what it is

---

[6] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p.120.

[7] Ibid, p. 121

[8] Ibid, p. 56

[9] Joseph S. Catalano, *A Commentary on Jean-Paul Sartre's Being and Nothingness*, p. 44

[10] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 121

not, and is not what it is"[11]. To say that 'being-for-itself is not equal to itself' means that consciousness does not have a fixed nature.

Sartre names human being as 'for itself' because the human being can never be identical to itself. As Wider states "because consciousness is self-consciousness, even at the pre-reflective level, that the Law of Identity does not apply to it"[12]. This non-self-identicalness causes consciousness to reach out beyond itself and relate all things to itself for its own purpose.[13]

But why does Sartre choose to use the words 'in-itself' and 'for itself' instead of words like 'man' or 'things'? He does this to point to the relation that the being in question has with itself. For example, an apple, which is a being-in-itself, is an apple…

> [I]t does not have the task of becoming what it should be. The being of an apple is not in question for itself. The being of an apple is in itself and thus has no relation with itself[14]

Consciousness, on the other hand, is in a relation with itself.

2.1.2.1 Consciousness is Self-Conscious

We have seen that consciousness is a relation to things and itself. It is also an awareness. Consciousness is aware of the external world and itself at the same time. Consciousness not only takes itself as an object and reflects on

---

[11] Ibid, p. 113

[12] Kathleen Wider, *The Bodily Nature of Consciousness: Sartre and Contemporary Philosophy of Mind, p.*87

[13] Joseph S. Catalano, *A Commentary on Jean-Paul Sartre's Being and Nothingness*, p.43

[14] Ibid, p.43

itself, but it is also aware that the subject on whom it is acting is itself. That is what is meant by the saying 'consciousness is aware of itself'.

2.1.2.2 Consciousness is Translucent

A fundamental aspect of Sartre's account of consciousness that will be important for our discussion of bad faith in the next chapter is his insistence that consciousness is translucent. As we will see in more detail below, Sartre decribes the structure of consciousness as nothingness (in opposition to being). Given that consciousness is nothing, and given that "the being of consciousness is consiousness of being"[15], it becomes almost tautological to admit that consciousness must be translucent. Indeed, saying that 'consciousness is nothing' and that 'consciousness is translucent' amount to the same thing. Consciousness is nothing because consciousness is always consciousness *of* something acccording to Sartre; in other words, it does not have a content of its own.[16] Further, Sartre points out that a consciousness that is ignorant of itself—an unconscious consciousness—would be a contradiction in terms.

2.2 Facticity and Transcendence

A human being is not merely a consciousness. We also have bodies. We perform with our bodies. Because we're both bodies and minds, we have two sets of attributes. These are facticity and transcendence.

---

[15] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 89

[16] Ibid, p. li

2.2.1 Facticity

Facticity is the totality of the facts that are true about ourselves. My birthplace, who my parents are, the schools I went to are some of the facts about my past. My current location, my certain height and weight, how old I am are all the facts about my present situation. At the same time, the things I do and experience also become unchangeable static facts as soon as I am through with doing or experiencing them. For this reason, my past is also a part of my facticity.

My facticity even extends to and encompasses my future. Although it has not yet occurred, it is a fact that one day I am going to die. It is a fact about the future. So we can say that facticity covers our past, present and future.

2.2.2 Transcendence

"[S]ince I am what I am not and since I am not what I am"[17], being for itself is not limited to the facts about it, but it can transcend them. For example, I have a certain height; it is a fact about me. But my height is not a fact about me in the same way that an apple is an apple. I transcend my height (and other facts about me) because I am aware of it. I do not deny my actual height or claim to be taller or shorter. I am just not my height in the same way as a being in itself would be. "I am not my height because I am conscious of it, and have an attitude toward it, and undertake projects dealing with it"[18].

---

[17] Ibid, p. 348

[18] David Detmer, *Sartre Explained:From Bad Faith to Authenticity*, p.78.

It is important to notice that, facticity and transcendence have a reciprocally antagonistic relationship with each other. Facticity determines the limits of transcendence by keeping it restricted within the limits of reality. On the other hand, transcendence corrupts facticity. It forcefully leads the fixed nature of facticity towards possibilities. And this disturbs the integrity of facticity.

Transcendence is the sense in which I exceed the facts about my life. I have plans and desires to reach beyond the facts of my life. They are simply possibilities, not facts yet.

So transcendence is, in a sense, the possibility of change, "the ability to move beyond one's current situation into a new one, an ability that Sartre considers to involve freedom but which would still be a form of transcendence if it did not"[19].

Transcendence is necessary for the notion of freedom. Freedom can only be meaningful for a being for itself. So, this struggle between facticity and transcendence is only possible for the being for itself.

> Because consciousness is absolutely free, it can transcend its own situation, its facticity, and become what it chooses to be through its actions[20].

There is an intentional relationship between consciousness and being-in-itself. If consciousness did not have an intentional structure, the world would be merely full of heaps of matter. This is not to say that things wouldn't exist if there was no consciousness, but for them to constitute a meaningful whole,

---

[19] Jonathan Webber, *The Existentialism of Jean-Paul Sartre*, p. 76

[20] C. Daigle, *Jean-Paul Sartre*, p. 59

there must be a consciousness. As Barnes explains: "without the for-itself, there would be not a world but only an undifferentiated plenitude of Being"[21]. Because of the intentional structure of consciousness, we see around is not only a pile of objects, sounds and colors but an environment that makes sense to us—that is, a world. Consciousness interprets the world according to its plans, desires etc. In making sense of an already existing world, it unavoidably and ceaselessly interprets it.

So how does consciousness turn these heaps of being, sound,color, smell, etc. into a meaningful whole? Here the main thing consciousness does is to bring some things to the foreground while pushing others into the background.

We can say that neither or facticity nor our transcendence can impose themselves on us with their own ready meanings. Sartre repeatedly makes this point in *Being and Nothingness*.

> No one object, no group of objects is especially designed to be organized as specifically either ground or figure; all depends on the direction of my attention[22].

As we shall see in the next chapter, bad faith is acting as if these things could be imposed on us with their own meanings. For example, in his example of the waiter, Sartre says that the waiter acts as if his job could could limit him and turn him into something completely determinate. But in fact, what it means to be a waiter and how to be a waiter will be determined by that person's own point of view. Of course, there are certain norms about being a waiter at a cafe, but how he will adopt and apply them is up to the waiter's own approach.

---

[21] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 807

[22] Ibid, p. 41

2.3 Negation

The negativity of consciousness enables consciousness to ask questions as well as realizing its possibilities. As being free, consciousness can ask questions to itself and the world outside of it.

We have already noted that consciousness is not identical to itself. Therefore it has a distance to itself. That is why it cannot be absolutely positive. This distance consciousness has with itself causes negation.

Sartre points out that if there was no negation, we could not question certain things; we could not ask questions "We next had to recognize that no question could be asked, in particular not that of being, if negation did not exist"[23]. So there is a relation between our ability to ask questions and negation. Let's elaborate on this negation. To ask a question means to posit the possibility of receiving a negative answer from an object that is completely equal to itself and is just being what it is. Detmer writes as follows:

> [B]eing in itself, which is subject to causal laws, is fully positive, so that the asking of a question, which introduces a multitude of negativities into being, can be accomplished only by wrenching oneself free and clear from the positive realm of deterministic laws of cause and effect.[24]

Each question that consciousness asks is another orientation of it to the world or to its object. During this questioning, consciousness realizes the possibilities it has concerning different stances it can take towards the world. Each question indicates another possibility of orienting oneself towards the

---

[23] Ibid, p. 56

[24] David Detmer, *Sartre Explained:From Bad Faith to Authenticity*, p. 66

world. Further, consciousness answers each question it asks itself with another preference. Until we adopt one of them, those stances and the courses of action they suggest are just possibilities. The moment consciousness realizes all those prospects/possibilities, it also realizes its own freedom. It has decisions to make, too many decisions.

As said before, neither my facticity nor my transcendence blatantly reveal their meaning to me; they do not "dictate" their meaning, so to speak. It is consciousness that needs to show the necessary/required/relevant interest and endow certain meanings on the world.

For example, suppose I have three brothers. What that means is not something that will be put before consciousness on a plate. Consciousness needs to interpret this fact from its own point of view. Further, its point of view will be shaped by the "interests and projects"[25] it already has; consciousness will give meaning to anad shape its life from this point. So, while one person who has three brothers will relate this fact about themselves to a sense of security, another person with three brothers may feel oppressed and clogged in because of this fact. The reason for these two completely different approache has to do with the fact that their consciousnesses look at the same fact with completely different intentions from completely different points of view. Otherwise, the concept of having three brothers does not impose a meaning of any sort in its own.

---

[25] Ibid, p. 80

2.3.1 Destruction

In *Being and Nothingness* Sartre makes the following puzzling claims: "[I]t is man who destroys his cities through the agency of earthquakes[...]"[26]. This does not mean that human beings are the cause of earthquakes. Of course Sartre is aware that there are earthquakes that happen independently of us. But without there being a consciousness that understands and interprets such an incident, there will also not be a "destruction".

There is in fact the same amount of being-in-itself before and after an earthquake or a storm. But the external world that was ordered in a certain way before has completely changed. It is consciousness who is aware of the change that calls this process "a destruction" and claims that there is a process of destruction here. This is because consciousness can surpass what is before and given to it and assess what the situation was before and what it has turned into now. Here, consciousness nihilates the situation before itself. Such nihilation would not be possible if consciousness was not free and did not have the faculty/ability of going beyond what is given to it in facticity.

2.3.2 Absence

Sartre illustrates this point in his famous example of meeting Pierre at a cafe. Sartre has an appointment with a friend of his named Pierre at 4 o'clock. He arrives fifteen minutes late for the appointment, wondering if his friend, who is always very punctual, will have waited for him or left. He looks around

---

[26] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 40

the room which is full of many people, but Pierre is not among them. It seems that Pierre is gone[27].

As Sartre was looking at each individual face while looking for his friend at the cafe, as soon as he understood that the person he was looking at was not Pierre, those faces became blurred and receded into the background. Why did everybody turn into a background? Because the intention of Sartre looking for Pierre was to find his friend. That was the intention with which he had come to the cafe and that was his point of view. When he approached life from the point of finding Pierre, all other people became a surplus, or a mere background.

Going even one step further, Sartre concluded that Pierre was not there and thus introduced nothingness into the world. Even though the cafe was completely full of being, Sartre still managed to experience the absence of Pierre.

In short, how one sees something has to do with one's intention. That's why what was happening in the external world could not determine Sartre's perception, and he was able to surpass the physical experience and experience the absence of Pierre instead. He thus introduced nothingness into the world. This is not a one-time trick that Sartre manages, but something that we inevitably do all the time to be able to experience the world as a meaningful place.

---

[27] Ibid, p. 40

2.4 Anguish

Consciousness is always free and self reflective. With these two important properties, consciousness will be able to take itself as an object and reflect on itself. This is what creates the anguish. "[A]nguish is the reflective apprehension of freedom by itself"[28]. It is the recognition of itself as freedom and seeing, through self-reflection, that this freedom is unstoppable that causes the tremendous anguish. "[I]t is in anguish that man gets the consciousness of its freedom"[29].

Now we can see the consciousness which is looking at its own freedom, realizes all the responsibility that this freedom brings about and is afraid of it. This is the point where anguish arises. "[M]y being provokes anguish to the extent that I distrust myself and my own reactions in that situation"[30].

That "human reality" is "what it is not"[31] does not affect consciousness only momentarily; realizing this peculiarity of consciousness also affects the relationship consciousness has towards its own past and future. The distance that appears between consciousness and itself as a result of consciousness not being identical to itself is conclusive and inescapable of course.

2.4.1 Fear vs. Anguish

Before going any further, it is crucial to state that Sartre clearly distinguishes anguish from fear. Like Kierkegaard before him, Sartre seperates those two feelings. They both are worries but fear is the worry that is caused by an

---

[28] Ibid, p. 78

[29] Ibid, p. 65

[30] Ibid, p. 65

[31] Ibid, p. 100

external danger. Anguish, on the other hand, is a kind of worry that is caused by one's own deficiency. Sartre says, "fear is fear of beings in the world whereas anguish is anguish before myself"[32].

Fear is a feeling that arises as a reaction to a threat from the outside world. All the unpredictable risks of accident that present themselves to consciousness in the outside world can cause fear. While walking down the pavement a car may suddenly crush me, even before I see it. There is almost nothing I can do to avoid such situations which cause fear in me since they do not have anything to do with *my* performance.

In *Being and Nothingness*, Sartre gives the example of a precipice to illustrate fear[33]. Imagine a narrow path one can walk on, but it is by the precipice and there is no guardrail. While walking there, I might feel fear concerning something that might be harmful to me, coming from the outside world, like a sudden strong wind or a wild animal attack, which might be harmful and even deadly to me. Thinking about such possibilities causes fear, according to Sartre.

On the other hand, anguish is a worry about me causing harm to myself through a fault of my own. It is a kind of worry about my own performance. For example, while walking by the precipice, I can worry about what would happen if I lost my attention and slipped into the precipice or if I got tired and distracted after a long walk and did not realize that a rock was falling towards me.

---

[32] Ibid, p. 65

[33] Ibid, p. 65

2.4.2 Appointment

Because of its nature, consciousness is unsteady. Therefore consciousness cannot remain the same as it was in the past. Similarly, in the future it will also have changed. Since consciousness cannot be stable, continuous changes in it are inevitable, and therefore I cannot predict my attitude in the future. If I could predict my attitude in the future, I would not worry about whether I would make mistakes or put myself in worrisome situations. But as it is, it is impossible for me to predict with certainty my upcoming reactions to or performance in life.

Anguish is related to this obscurity. It is the doubt a person has, towards his own future performance, on any occasion. As Sartre states:

> I "make an appointment with myself on the other side of that hour, or that day, or that month." Anguish is the fear of not finding myself at that appointment, of no longer even wishing to bring myself there[34] .

I feel anguish because I cannot predict who I will turn out to be in the future when I arrive at that appointment with myself. I do not know whether the future me will follow through with what I (now) count as important. This lack of knowledge towards my future status causes anguish in the present me. The consciousness that worries about its own performance feels anguish deeply.

2.4.3 Anguish towards the Future

The reason for anguish is that the 'future me' is not going to be like me who is worrying now. If I stand by the precipice and worry about my safety in terms of my own future carefulness, the person who worries and the one

---

[34] Ibid, p. 73

who will discontinue to tend to safety will be different. More precisely, they will not be different people in the literal sense of the word, but the person will have changed. Of course, it will again be me who will be walking by the precipice in a sense; but in another sense, it won't be me. If I could be equal to that future person walking on that path, there would be no need to worry now. But I cannot be sure about my future performance. Sartre states, (anguish) is "precisely my consciousness of being my own future, in the mode of not-being"[35]. If I could rely on the future me, then I would not get worried about the actions I will take when the time comes. I would settle on the way I am supposed to act today and that would settle future as well. The right decisions from yesterday would carry me to the proper judgments (right decisions) of tomorrow. But that is not possible at all. In every distinct moment, one has to decide for himself/herself and be prepared to face and deal with whatever life brings.

2.4.4 Anguish towards the Past

Anguish also arises as a result of the relation between my past and my current being. The decisions I made in the past cannot decide who I am or what I will do now. The consciousness that is anguished by the thought of the future person whom he/she will turn out to be, also has problems with its past settlements. The decisions I made in the past do not determine me totally. Again we are having the same problem which arises because of the fact that consciousness cannot be identical to itself. Consciousness has to re-examine *now* the decisions it has made before. It cannot surrender itself to the decisions made and actions taken by his/her past self and let go of itself

---

[35] Ibid, p. 68

in the present. In other words, consciousness cannot tell itself "I had taken care of that before" and put itself at rest. The decisions should be made over and over again in every other situation and moment. This constant challenge is unavoidable. There is an un-stoppable process of constant decision-making, consciousness of freedom and the obligation to surpass the given life all the time. It is impossible to stop that flux. This causes consciousness to feel anguish.

Sartre gives the example of Gambler in order to illustrate the anguish one can feel towards the past. A gambler decides to quit gambling a while ago. But one day he comes across a game (table). The gambler wants to join this game now but he had decided to quit. At that moment when he wants to join the game, he realizes that his past decision does not have any effect on him currently. Of course he does know his decision not to play anymore and he remembers it. But Sartre calls that only "a memory of a feeling"[36]; in order for that decision to be effective on me, I have to decide all over again, today, to obey the rule I had made for myself a while ago or sometime in the past. Otherwise, a previous decision made by myself can not affect my way of life now. That is hard to bear. While illustrating the example, Sartre states that "I perceive with anguish that nothing prevents me from gambling" [37] except oneself. Whether the gambler will play a game or not will be decided when he sees the table and makes his decision all over again. No previous decision can shape the moment. One has to constantly re-examine, re-evaluate and renew his/her decisions. My past cannot help me today.

---

[36] Ibid, p. 70

[37] Ibid, p. 70

Consciousness wants to see itself as if what it is is already decided, "that [its] intentions are in fact determined by causal series, to consider ourselves as an itself"[38]. But it does not have that option.

2.4.5 The Deviation of Anguish into Bad Faith

To sum up, I feel anguish because I do not know who I will turn out to be. I cannot even be sure about the future me being careful enough to keep me alive while walking down a path. This future me can get depressed or just lose her/his interest on the road and fall into the precipice. On that matter Sartre indicates, "if nothing compels me to save my life, nothing prevents me from precipitating myself into the abyss"[39]. The Future is obscure and terrifying.

In addition to this, as we have seen, consciousness does not have a past it can lean its back against. Consciousness also cannot carry a self or ego with itself to the present moment. If that were possible, this could have eased its pain a little. This suffocating freedom is everywhere no matter how much we look for an easement. And this burden of constant decision- making causes anguish.

This perpetual flux cannot be stopped neither toward the future nor towards the past. It is inexorable. What is noteworthy is that trying (even considering trying) to interrupt this process itself is another decision. Considering escaping the options I face is also an option, just as deciding not to make a decision is itself a decision. In other words, even if consciousness wanted to rid itself of all possibilities in the present moment, it would inevitably find

---

[38] Joseph S. Catalano, *A Commentary on Jean-Paul Sartre's Being and Nothingness*, p. 74

[39] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 69

itself faced with options. Priest calls that "refusing to freely make ourselves what we are, we masquerade as fixed essences by the adoption of hypocritical social roles"[40].

In these circumstances, consciousness wants to escape the unending task of choosing. In order to achieve that escape, it acts as if it can stop that flow... But that is not possible at all. What consciousness is trying to do is "to flee that it cannot flee, to flee what it is"[41]. Consciousness is freedom, it cannot flee that. Consciousness might sometimes (we might even say usually) try to ignore its freedom in order to get rid of the suffocating feeling, but it really has nowhere to go. "[T]o think that I can hide or indeed attempt to hide, my anguish is bad faith"[42].

As we have talked, consciousness is always self reflective. Consciousness cannot prevent itself from reflecting on itself. This causes consciousness to notice its own attempts to hide something from itself. All its attempts to avoiding something will also be seen by itself. The flight from anguish is necessarily "a mode of becoming conscious of anguish"[43].

Now we are looking at a consciousness which is reflecting on itself and its own freedom. The freedom it confronts is a heavy burden. It causes anguish. This anguish usually brings about bad faith. As Heter defines, "Bad faith is

---

[40] Stephen Priest, *Jean-Paul Sartre: Basic Writings*, p. 204

[41] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 115

[42] Ronald E. Santoni, *Bad Faith, Good Faith , and Authenticity in Sartre's Early Philosophy*, p. 4

[43] Ibid, p. 30

a conscious misapprehension of one's freedom"[44]. In the next chapter we will see what this bad faith is and how this consciousness can put itself bad faith.

---

[44] T. Storm Heter, *Sartre's Ethics of Engagement: Authenticity and Civic Virtue,* p. 63

CHAPTER 3

BAD FAITH

3.1 Lie vs. Bad Faith

In the chapter "Bad Faith" in *Being and Nothingness,* Sartre makes a distinction between lying in general and lying to oneself (bad faith).

Sartre splits lies into three main types, which are "ideal lies", "common lies and "bad faith". These three types of lies lie on a spectrum. In this section, we will talk mainly about ideal lies and bad faith, which lie on opposite ends of this spectrum.

3.1.1 Ideal Lies

While explaining ideal lies, Sartre first points out that in an ideal lie, there is a deceiver and a deceived. In other words, for an ideal lie to take place there must be at least two consciousnesses. The deceiver possesses the truth about the issue and lies to the other person on purpose.

In an ideal lie, the deceiver has to be aware of the lie he is telling. If one is spreading an error due to his own ignorance about the issue, we cannot accuse him of being a liar. But in the case of lying, although the deceiver knows the truth, he tells a lie because of some purpose he hopes to attain. The liar deceives the other person on purpose. It is not an honest mistake.

In an ideal lie, since the deceiver knows the truth about the topic one is lying about, that gives the deceiver the advantage of focusing on the argument and the chance to persuade the opponent. The deceiver can make a concerted

effort to achieve the impact s/he desires. In order to achieve that, s/he can get prepared for the lie beforehand, adds details to his/her story; s/he can even swear to persuade the other person. S/he can attempt to persuade the other person by focusing on his/her double speech clearly. S/he can lead the dialogue according to his/her wishes. That means, the deceiver may do what it takes to convince the deceived. These people who know the truth completely inside but tell another thing outwardly are, named, by Sartre, as 'cynical liars'. "The ideal description of the liar would be a cynical consciousness, affirming truth within himself, denying it in his words, and denying that negation as such"[45]. Cynical consciousness lies intentionally and benefits from his opponent's ignorance of the truth on the issue. This type of consciousness has full control over its own behavior. This is what the "ideal lie" is.

3.1.2 Common Lies

Sartre does not give a very detailed or rigorous analysis of common lies, he merely mentions them. He places this kind of lies between ideal lies and bad faith. Common lies, just like ideal lies, occur between at least two different consciousnesses. Sometimes, the liar starts to believe his own lie. Therefore he also becomes a victim of the lie he is telling. Sartre names these lies" common, popular forms of lie"[46] ; they are daily, simple lies. They are neither ideal lies, nor bad faith.

Other than the fact that the liar begins to believe in the lie s/he is telling others, common lies do not have much else in common with bad faith. While

---

[45] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 87

[46] Ibid, p. 88

occupying a place in between ideal lies and bad faith, common lies are significantly closer to ideal lies in this spectrum.

3.1.3 Bad Faith as a Lie

Although Sartre defines 'bad faith' as "a lie to oneself"[47], bad faith is quite different from the ideal lies and common lies. Ideal and common lies are told to another person but bad faith is "a lie to oneself".

While the deceiver is explicitly aware of the lie when they are lying to another person, this awareness is not possible while one is lying to oneself. One cannot focus on the lie s/he is telling himself/herself or s/he cannot plan the details to persuade himself/herself. Thus, if lying to oneself is possible at all, then its structure or dynamics must be different.

Primarily we know that bad faith occurs in "the unity of a single consciousness[48]; so there is no duality of a deceiver and deceived in this case. The deceiver-deceived duality evaporates. There is a consciousness which lies to itself and it (again) believes the lie it was told. It means that both the lying and the believing processes occur in one and the same consciousness. McCulloch asks:

> How can there even be room for deception when the dupe actually knows about the attempt at deceit, not only on reflection, but as part of the attempt? How can you trick yourself at chess?[49]

Therefore, bad faith is pretty hard to grasp because we know that consciousness has properties that will not allow for such an explicit lie.

---

[47] Ibid, p. 89

[48] Ibid, p. 89

[49] Gregory McCulloch, *Using Sartre: An Analytical Introduction to Early Sartrean Themes*, p.54

Consciousness is translucent which means it has no hidden aspects; one can see through it.

Consciousness is aware of itself and the external world all the time. Besides, the act of self reflecting is constant; it never pauses or stops. Sartre says: "the being of consciousness is consciousness of being"[50].

Keeping in mind all those properties of consciousness which would prevent bad faith, there arises the question: how can one still manage to lie to oneself? If this translucent consciousness lies to itself cynically, it cannot believe that lie. "if I deliberately and cynically attempt to lie to myself, I fail completely in this undertaking; the lie falls back and collapses beneath my look"[51]. The consciousness cannot believe something it definitely knows to be a lie. That is the reason why it cannot make obvious plans to convince itself or focus on the speech it is about to give to itself.

So now we can clearly draw a conclusion that, the lie the consciousness is telling to itself is not a cynical lie. If it was a cynical lie, consciousness could never believe it. Instead, while talking about bad faith, we are talking about a situation which takes place surreptitiously, secretly. The decision to deceive cannot be made obviously, visibly, clearly. In short, bad faith cannot be a cynical lie because consciousness cannot expressly lie to itself.

Therefore, in order to achieve its goal of bad faith, consciousness contrives to ignore what is going on right before its eyes and tries to focus on other aspects of life. It achieves doing so by using various methods which will be

---

[50] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 89

[51] Ibid, p. 89

discussed in detail in section 3.5. But before discussing those methods, there are several important characteristics of bad faith that should be clarified first.

As Catalano clearly states it is undeniable that, "One cannot read *Being and Nothingness* without realizing that Sartre does not approve of bad faith; bad faith is, after all, a flight from freedom"[52].

Another important point is that, it is difficult for consciousness to keep itself in a position which we might call one of "ignoring" (even denial). For that reason, Sartre defines bad faith as being "metastable". 'Metastable' is a word Sartre has invented, which Hazel Barnes, in a translator's footnote, defines as "subject to sudden changes or transitions"[53]. Additionally Gary Cox, the writer of *The Sartre Dictionary*, informs us that Sartre uses this word when defining both his concept of bad faith and his concept of authenticity. These states (i.e., bad faith and authenticity) appear to be stable/permanent states, but in fact they are not. Cox explains the meaning of this bizarre word ('*metastable*') as follows:

> [I]n fact they are ongoing projects that must be sustained against the constant threat of collapse. A person cannot simply be in bad faith, or be authentic, he has to be in bad faith or authentic, constantly choosing these modes of being[54].

Thanks to the definition of 'metastable', we grasp that bad faith is not a situation one can settle into and live in comfort in. Conversely bad faith has to live the life of a fugitive which can be collared any moment by

---

[52] Joseph S. Catalano, *Reading Sartre,* p .102

[53] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 90 Fn 2

[54] Gary Cox , *The Sartre Dictionary*, p. 137

consciousness. "A person can *live* in bad faith, which does not mean that he does not have abrupt awakenings to cynicism"[55]. As Sartre states, one can suddenly realize his bad faith and that would terminate bad faith. It's as if bad faith would suddenly vanish if it were observed.

Although bad faith is so fragile, it sometimes can be lasting. Although it can be subject to sudden changes, thanks to the techniques bad faith uses in order to escape, it might turn out to be a permanent situation. Sartre even claims that "It can even be the normal aspect of life for a very great number of people"[56]. This means that it is also a sustainable process.

So where does this resilient phenomenon—which is under constant threat of being caught, but can nevertheless become a permanent aspect of one's life—originate? Sartre's answer to that is clear: "One does not undergo his bad faith; one is not infected with it; it is not a state. But consciousness affects itself with bad faith"[57]. One does not go into bad faith as if he is going through a foggy road or it does not fall into one's hands from the sky. It is the result of a strong motivation. As will be explained in the upcoming pages, Sartre calls this strong motivation 'the project of bad faith'.

In the origin of bad faith lies a strong desire that consciousness has to achieve doing/not doing something. To this strong desire, Sartre gives the name 'project of bad faith': "There must be an original intention and a project of

---

[55] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 90

[56] Ibid, p. 90

[57] Ibid, p. 89

bad faith"[58]. It is this original intention/project that acts of bad faith stem from.

Before going any further, we should come to an accommodation. Although Sartre defines bad faith as a "a lie to oneself" [59], a lie told to oneself cannot be considered in the same way as a lie told to others; as a matter of fact, "telling a lie to oneself" sounds like an oxymoron, a contradiction. The structure of a lie requires explicit scheming in order to manipulate a certain consciousness. However, it is not possible for consciousness which is translucent to explicitly scheme against itself. If so, then it is clear that bad faith can certainly not be a cynical/ideal lie.

In another passage, Sartre explains bad faith as hiding: "the one who practices bad faith is hiding a displeasing truth or presenting as truth a pleasing untruth"[60]. Does it help us to make more sense of bad faith if we think of it as analogous to hiding rather than an explicit lie?

After understanding the impossibility of lying to oneself, hiding also seems slightly problematic. If we understand by 'hiding' something like putting something somewhere where one cannot see it, then the analogy of hiding also would not work to rescue the concept of bad faith. It is clear that consciousness cannot hide something from itself in the sense that Freud talks about it. By insisting on the translucency of consciousness, Sartre has already made explicit his disagreement with Freud's psychoanalytic theory. He points out that by making a distinction between the *id* and the *ego* (the

---

[58] Ibid, p. 89

[59] Ibid, p. 89

[60] Ibid, p. 89

unconscious and the conscious), Freud has rejected the "conscious unity of the psyche"[61]. However, Sartre observes that, for making this distinction between the conscious and unconscious, psychoanalyis needs to make use of the idea of a" censor" which represses or resists the emergence of certain desires and experiences. But this means that "the censor" must know; it must be conscious of itself [62]. Since Sartre has already eliminated the unconscious, and where else could consciousness hide something? Nowhere.

But if what we understand by 'hiding' is "to keep something out of sight"[63] then we can say that bad faith is a kind of 'hiding' in the sense of 'acting as if one is not aware of what is taking place right before one's eyes'. Thus, maybe we should focus more on this version of hiding to understand bad faith.

Hiding something may be achieved by changing the focus of attention away from what is happening before one and channeling one's attention into another direction. In this way consciousness could manage to hide something from itself. We can also call this act 'distraction' or even 'deception'.

To sum up, while Sartre defines bad faith as a "lie to oneself"[64]. Cannon agrees Sartre and defines bad faith as "reflectively lying to oneself about the

---

[61] Ibid, p. 94

[62] Ibid, p. 94.

[63] Hide. (n.d.). In Dictionary.com. Retrieved from http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/hide?s=t

[64] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 89

nature of reality"[65]. After that Sartre explains what a lie is. When he distinguishes lying to others from lying to oneself, we understand why we cannot lie to ourselves in the same way as we lie to others. So now we cannot really speak of "*lying* to ourselves". In light of this clarification, it is important to note Sartre's following characterization of bad faith: "To be sure, the one who practices bad faith is hiding a displeasing truth or presenting as truth a pleasing untruth"[66].

So, in this case, we should understand the word 'hiding' as "deceiving" or "distracting". Otherwise hiding something from oneself on purpose has no difference from lying to oneself in terms of the structure of the consciousness. Yet distracting oneself is completely different, much more innocent and practicable. From now on, when I come across the expression 'bad faith', I will understand by it a kind of self-deception, self-distraction or misleading oneself, and I will use all those words interchangeably.

While distracting oneself, one "steer[s] one's mind away from the truth"[67] which occurs before one's eyes. As we will see below, in section 3.5, the unidentical ("non-self-identical") structure of consciousness is perfectly suited to achieve the goal of distracting oneself.

But before going any further, we should give one final example that depicts the difference between the lie to oneself and distracting oneself.

---

[65] Betty Cannon, *Sartre and Psychoanalysis: An Existentislist Challenge to Clinical Metatheory*, p. 41

[66] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 89

[67] Jonathan Webber , *The Existentialism of Jean-Paul Sartre*, p. 90

While walking on a dark street alone, if one tells oneself that s/he is at a beach watching the waves with pleasure, in order to ease the fear, this is a lie. If one tries to persuade oneself of something which is definitely not true, it is a lie to oneself. On the other hand, if one croons or tries to remember the multiplication table, again in order to ease the fear, this is distraction. This would take his/her attention away from the uncomfortable situation s/he is in.

Once we find out how distraction can occur, it will be clear how this may give rise to bad faith.

3.2 Faith

As we have seen above, bad faith is not an obvious lie, but a distraction of consciousness. By claiming "[t]he true problem of bad faith stems evidently from the fact that bad faith is faith"[68]. Sartre shows us the way to explain this "problem of bad faith". Let's follow his footsteps and find out what that means.

Bad faith is a kind of faith. This means that we have a problem of faith on our hands. Faith is an area concerning things which cannot be known for sure; but are just accepted as they are. In other words, faith is "concerned with the type of evidence that is not perfectly convincing"[69].

Although the evidence for it is not precisely convincing, one can have faith on an issue anyway. This type of faith is quite different from something like believing the truth of a mathematical proposition (such as 1+1=2). Faith is not an area where one can verify the belief s/he has. As an example, love is an

---

[68] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 112

[69] Joseph S. Catalano, *A Commentary on Jean-Paul Sartre's Being and Nothingness*, p. 86

issue that concerns faith. One can only believe that one of his/her friends loves him/her. S/he cannot prove herself to be wrong or right, s/he can merely assume it. The actions of one's friend give a general idea about his/her mood and one, by judging the actions of the friend, reaches a conclusion. This may be positive or negative but can never be definite, explicit. It is always an assumption.

Sartre states that, "the essential problem of bad faith is a problem of belief"[70]. Now the problem of bad faith turns out to be a belief problem instead of a blatant lie told to oneself. Since belief is not an area with clear-cut distinctions, we also cannot talk about an objective way of thinking concerning the matter in hand. Once a consciousness wants/decides to believe in something, it can convince itself with any amount of evidence it accepts. In matters of faith, there is no objective measure of appraisal to decide whether to believe something or not believe it.

As we know, consciousness is reflective; this is its nature. But this characterization puts faith in danger. According to Sartre, once consciousness realizes that what it believes is a belief, it cannot believe it any more.

> To believe is to know that one believes, and to know that one believes is no longer to believe. Thus to believe is not to believe any longer because that is only to believe[71].

This confrontation with its own belief causes the reflective consciousness not to believe any longer. As Katherine J. Morris puts it, "*reflection* transforms

---

[70] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 112

[71] Ibid, p. 114

faith into non-faith"[72]; or even "into opinion"[73]. This recognition of belief as belief turns it into a mere opinion. The object of the belief becomes an area one only has ideas upon but not faith in. This realization may even be devastating.

Since detecting the belief as belief, turns it into non-belief, in order to sustain the belief, consciousness should not recognize it. This is the only solution to keep the faith alive. Consciousness would love to sustain the belief because it is easier to do so.

A belief can be conserved as a belief only if consciousness manages not to notice it as a belief. In order to achieve that, it needs to make itself believe that what it believes is not just a belief but a truth. Consciousness convinces itself (that what it believes is a truth); it finds evidences in order to support its view. While gathering evidence, it does not have to be so picky because in matters of faith there are no objective criteria for viable evidence.

Sartre compares belief with science at this point and says that science escapes from "this self-destruction of belief […] by searching for evidence [...]"[74]. Here Sartre opposes science (which uses viable evidences) to faith. Science has objective criteria while selecting evidence; however, faith, which is a biased operation, does not need that. Since faith does not correspond to a precise field, consciousness that is in bad faith takes advantage of this uncertainty to the full.

---

[72] Katherine J. Morris, *Sartre*, p .85.

[73] Ibid, p. 85

[74] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 115

Now there is a consciousness which needs to believe something and in order to manage it, it benefits from the obscurity of the faith. Besides, it is not aware of the fact that it is just a faith. If it noticed the presence of the faith, the faith would vanish. Consciousness is in a flux but not aware of it exactly.

3.3 Bad Faith

This fact that consciousness is constantly in flux and thus capable of constantly surpassing its present condition is what causes bad faith or makes it possible. If we were identical to what we are, bad faith would not have been possible. To put it more specifically, and in terms of fundamental Sartrean concepts: what makes bad faith possible is the fact that there is an equivocal relation between our transcendence and facticity, which consciousness needs to settle by synthesizing the two aspects of consciousness and bringing them into a balanced relation with each other.

Given that consciousness is what it is not and is not what it is; it is constantly wavering, engaged in the act of trying to balance and synthesize its transcendence with its facticity. As a matter of fact our lives consist of our transcendence and our facticity. Our past, our future, what has taken place, what may happen… The constant flow of these two in interaction is life itself and we are constantly collating them.

As Sartre states, "these two aspects of human reality [facticity and transcendence] are and ought to be capable of a valid coordination"[75]. When we deceive ourselves because we want to flee from the freedom that burdens us, we are messing with the balance between our facticity and transcendence. Any attempt at lying to or deceiving ourselves must take the form of over-

---

[75] Ibid, p. 98

emphasizing either our facticity or transcendence. Even though life looks immensely variegated, all that consciousness works with falls in the realm of either facticity or transcendence. This is why all attempts at bad faith need to take advantage of certain properties of these two realms.

Since it is not exactly determined who or what one is, when one is trying to live their life, they might try to see themselves as something determined even though they are not. One may see oneself as simply defined by facts about themselves such as one's height, one's race, places one has been to or the things one owns, thus limiting oneself to one's facticity.

Conversely, one may emphasize one's transcendence by focusing on what one is not but may one day become, places one may reach, an undefined state one may someday be in and so on.

As we have mentioned before, in the process of self-making, one gives meaning to his/her life in light of one's "projects and interests", and looks at the world from the point of view of those projects and interests.

In this way, depending on my projects and interests, those two aspects of my reality, which could have been balanced, can turn into instruments that work only in one direction. For example, a father in a patriarchal society can say "I am the *paterfamilias*; you shall do as I say", thus using his social position (a fact about him) to accomplish his own projects or serve his interests.

3.4 Project of Bad Faith

At this point, we have a crucial question to ask. Why does consciousness want to convince itself on a certain issue? What is the reason for it? The answer to this question is the original reason/source of bad faith.

Consciousness has a motivation, a position it wants to see itself in. This motivation is the project of bad faith. Because of the project of bad faith consciousness affects itself with bad faith. This project is caused by my motivation to be a certain way (or to be in a certain state of mind) in the world. There is a lot to be said about the motivation in question

As Detmer explains, in cases of bad faith, "I have a prior decision to allow myself to be persuaded by non-persuasive evidence "[76]. This prior decision is what we have been talking about, what Sartre calls "the project of bad faith". The reason for me to believe in evidences which are not even persuasive is my "prior decision". I have already made up my mind, so whatever evidence I face, I will be persuaded. Even insufficient evidence may convince me because I have already settled upon being persuaded. However, it would be misleading to describe this setup as a decision; as Sartre notes "there's no question of a reflective, voluntary decision here"[77]. Cox also clearly states that "people do not deliberately undertake the primitive project of bad faith, they fall into it […]"[78].

Here consciousness is neither aware of the project of bad faith nor the acts of bad faith it has been committing in order to achieve the project.

> [T]hus to be in bad faith, I must deceive myself not only about the issue with which I am directly concerned to deceive myself, but also, about my project of deception itself[79] .

---

[76] David Detmer, *Sartre Explained:From Bad Faith to Authenticity*, p. 55

[77] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 113

[78] Gary Cox, *A Guide for the Perplexed*, p. 123

[79] David Detmer, *Sartre Explained:From Bad Faith to Authenticity*, p. 85

So consciousness is distracting itself in two levels simultaneously. It is most important to underline this twofold ignorance to be convinced of the possibility that consciousness can deceive itself.

It is apparent that consciousness is reflective and translucent. But we have been talking about a project of bad faith which has reached a decision on a certain issue because of its motivations in life. How is it possible for a consciousness to take action on an issue but not realize that it is doing so? Is it even possible? Weber gives an explanation to this question which I hope will be enlightening[80].

Suppose there is a man leaving his house to go to his office. His project is arriving at his office. This is also the motivation of him when leaving the house. "I need not constantly think about the goal of getting to my office or about the procedure of walking in order to be walking to my office"[81]. He is doing something to achieve his project but he is not constantly thinking about the process of going to the office. He is not paying attention to every single step he is taking or each turn he takes. He is aware of his environment and will arrive at his office,"but this awareness need not be precisely and explicitly articulated"[82].

Here the man has done some things for his project while not keeping track of what he was doing. But to better understand how one can be both aware and not so aware of what one is doing, we need to look more closely into

---

[80] Jonathan Webber , *The Existentialism of Jean-Paul Sartre*, p. 92

[81] Ibid, p. 92

[82] Ibid, p. 92

how certain relevant aspects of consciousness are brought into play by the project of bad faith.

3.5 Methods of Bad Faith

3.5.1 Benefiting from the Dualities of Consciousness

In order to analyze the phenomenon of bad faith, many Sartre scholars (such as Detmer, Weber, etc.) make use of dualities of consciousness that Sartre discusses in the *Transcendence of The Ego.* These dualities are mainly, dualities of awareness and dualities of consciousness. Bad faith is a kind of deception, not a lie (as we have seen before); in order to achieve that deception, it makes use of these dualities—namely, the distinction Sartre makes between thetic and non-thetic consciousness and reflective and non-reflective consciousness. While these distinctions are actually made in *The Transcendence of the Ego*, Sartre also occasionally uses this terms in *Being and Nothingness*[83].

3.5.1.1 Thetic vs. Non-thetic Awareness of Consciousness

While one is engaged in an activity, s/he gives his/her attention to something clearly. The focus is on that main activity. This is being thetically aware of it. As an example, while I am ironing my clothes, I am thetically aware of the trousers and the shirts. I focus on the activity and not ironing my hands. On the other hand, without focusing my attention on them, I am also aware of other things as well. I might feel my feet getting cold or I can hear the music playing on the TV of my neighbor's. Non-thetically, I can be aware of many other things simultaneously.

---

[83] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, pp. lii-liv

In other words, in the condition of non-thetic awareness of consciousness, one is aware of something but this is not the main focus of consciousness. While driving a car, one passes by buildings. The driver does not crash into the building; s/he knows that the building stands there, but s/he is not staring at the structure. The driver senses the mass but does not analyze it piece by piece.

In bad faith, while consciousness benefits from this duality, there is an awareness of the situation (about which one is in bad faith), but it is not clear. As Detmer says, "in one kind of bad faith one has a dim, inarticulate awareness of something about which one wants to avoid achieving full, vivid clarity"[84]. I recognize the situation but I gloss over it without paying attention. Bad faith cannot be a developed/mature cynical lie. But when I really wants to deceive myself; I can deceive myself by using this duality of consciousness. As Detmer states: "it relies [instead] on the technique of keeping vague things vague"[85]. I have some feeling about a certain issue but it is obscure, and I don't have the intention of figuring it out straightforwardly. For example, suppose one is looking for a baby-sitter and does not have much time left to keep on searching. One finds a baby-sitter who seems to have all the qualifications one is looking for, but there is something about this prospective baby-sitter that inspires mistrust. Since one doesn't have much time left, one chooses not to focus on this bad feeling of mistrust. Instead of trying to understand what may be causing this feeling, one chooses to ignore it. Once one finds out that this person had a criminal record concerning child-abuse or something like that, one will probably

---

[84] David Detmer, *Sartre Explained:From Bad Faith to Authenticity,* p. 82

[85] Ibid, p. 83

admit to themselves that they had actually known it, but they had chosen not to acknowledge it because of the urgency of finding a baby-sitter.

This is one of the most common methods of bad faith. I don't chase after the subject; I evade asking certain questions which I should be asking; thus the issue remains vague.

While Sartre is describing this point he states, "One puts *oneself* in bad faith as one goes to sleep and one is in bad faith as one dreams"[86]. At this point, if we consider what we have read so far, it will be clear what Sartre meant. While trying to fall asleep, if one focuses on the sleeping or the lack of sleep one has, it would be difficult to fall asleep. Instead if one focused one's attention on other things (anything but the sleep) it makes it much easier to fall asleep.

Similarly, while one is trying to deceive oneself, one does not focus on the exact issue one wants to cover up. But if one, instead of looking at the particular point that needs to be hidden from oneself, distracts one's awareness and becomes thetically aware of other things, one can achieve bad faith.

3.5.1.2 Reflective vs. Pre-reflective Modes of Consciousness

As an addition to the duality in awareness of consciousness, the duality in modes of consciousness is another method used by bad faith. In the pre-reflective mode of consciousness, consciousness is directed out. On the other hand, in the reflective mode of consciousness, it is looking at itself. Now let's see the relationship between bad faith and the modes of consciousness.

---

[86] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 113

When a consciousness is trying to keep itself in bad faith, it may benefit from the duality between pre-reflective and reflective consciousness. When it is in the act of doing something it does not want to acknowledge, there is something it does not want to confront, it may switch to a pre-reflective mode. Conversely, in exactly opposite situations, when it needs to move away from the outside, it can reflect on itself by turning its attention to itself.

Suppose that, one appears at a court because of a dishonorable criminal activity, for instance, molestation of a minor. During the trial, this person may choose not to focus on the discussion going on. Instead, he might retire into himself and give himself to his own thoughts. Or suppose there's a writer who wrote many successful novels. While he is receiving a Nobel Prize, he directs his gaze towards other people's smiling faces, the compliments they are paying him, the proud face of his family. In short, he directs his focus on the outside word and imprints the experience on his mind.

The person on the court and the person receiving an award are both human beings with similar consciousnesses. But because of the different circumstances surrounding them, while one focuses the reflection on himself, the other one is full of the desire to reflect on his surroundings. When we see how these consciousnesses can direct their reflections, we can see that bad faith is not that hard to grasp.

It must be noted that, although one may be tempted to think of these levels of consciousness as if they are successive, in fact they do not occur one after another. They are coeval. In other words, these two levels are not about the temporal order of the reflections.

3.5.2 Evidences

When consciousness is in bad faith, it does not only make use of the dualities that it has owing to its own structure; it also uses another method: misuse of evidence. Concerning the issue about which it wants to deceive itself, it can evaluate the evidence confronting it as it suits its purposes. Since it is bad faith that we are talking about, the amount of evidence required for consciousness to be persuaded is arbitrary. Consciousness does not have definite criteria as in the case of science; it is subject to its own rules.

In *Sartre Explained*[87], Detmer identifies misuse of evidence (though he does not use the expression 'misuse of evidence') as an important method of bad faith. There are two forms of such misuse of evidence which Detmer discusses that are particularly informative:

3.5.2.1 Lowering One's Standards of Evidence[88]

Consciousness already has a project; it already has a belief it wants to hold concerning a certain issue. While it already holds a certain belief concerning this issue, it also looks for some evidence for it. This evidence may be very little or weak. Here, consciousness tries to keep on believing no matter what it confronts.

A consciousness that already believes something is in search of evidence to support its belief. "Because faith is not certainty, the consciousness of bad faith […] decides to be content with an insufficiency of evidence; to determine arbitrarily the amount of evidence by which it will be

---

[87] David Detmer, *Sartre Explained:From Bad Faith to Authenticity*, p. 80

[88] Ibid, p. 85

persuaded"[89]. In this way, consciousness can choose to be convinced by any amount of evidence it wishes to. But this is not in the form of an explicit lie. As Detmer states, "there is no question of a reflective, voluntary decision, but of a spontaneous determination of our being"[90]. In other words, this decision has happened of its accord; consciousness is not aware of it.

3.5.2.2 Using Different Standards of Evidence[91]

Sometimes, besides lowering one's standard of evidences, one may use different standards of evidence. This is also a convenient method bad faith resorts to. Consciousness, again without an intentional decision, makes use of evidence because of its project. Here, instead of lowering its standards, consciousness uses double standards. When confronted with some evidence, it accepts only those which suit its purposes while not accepting evidence that contradicts what it needs to believe for its own purposes. "Although bad faith perceives evidence, it resigns itself in advance to not being fulfilled by the evidence"[92]. Because it already has a goal, it does not have an objective attitude towards the evidence. As an example, assume there is a racist person who believes in the superiority of the white race. In the case of a crime believed to be committed by a person of another race (maybe an African), the racist would not question this incident in great detail; he/she would be very eager to immediately accuse the suspect. If there are some who claim to be eyewitnesses to the incident, then that is enough for him/her to believe that

---

[89] Ronald E. Santoni, *Bad Faith, Good Faith , and Authenticity in Sartre's Early Philosophy*, pp.38-39

[90] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 113

[91] David Detmer, *Sartre Explained:From Bad Faith to Authenticity*, p. 85

[92] Ronald E. Santoni, *Bad Faith, Good Faith , and Authenticity in Sartre's Early Philosophy*, p.38

the suspect is indeed guilty. If the situation were reversed and the suspect was a person of his/her own race in the case of a crime committed, he/she might come up with many arguments to defend the suspect who is of his/her own race. He/she might ask various questions to shed light on the incident and prove the suspect's innocence.

Thus, consciousness keeps itself in a state of belief concerning something it already believes. This attitude is spontaneous; it is not intentional; consciousness is not aware of maintaining it. It's an attitude that is channeled into seeing what it wants to see. This is another common method used by bad faith.

CHAPTER 4

EXAMPLES OF BAD FAITH

4.1 Patterns of Bad Faith in Being and Nothingness

In the second section of the chapter "Bad Faith", Sartre develops his conception of bad faith through a description of 3 cases which, he seems to believe, exemplify bad faith. This section is titled "Patterns of Bad Faith", suggesting that there are 3 distinctive patterns bad faith presents itself in. The pattern has to do with whether the person in bad faith focuses on their transcendence while ignoring their facticity, focuses on their facticity ignoring their transcendence, or does something more complicated. So each case is an illustration of one of these patterns.

In what follows, I will present Sartre's description of these 3 cases while also critically evaluating Sartre's analysis of what is going on within those consciousnesses who are in the act of "deceiving themselves". As my exposition shall make clear, I contend that, on many crucial points Sartre's analyses are not quite satisfactory in light of our main problem: how can a translucent consciousness manage to deceive itself. Therefore, throughout my exposition, I add, making use of the interpretations of other Sartre scholars, my own analyses and interpretation of what is going on within a consciousness that is in bad faith.

4.1.1 Woman on a Date

A woman goes on a date with a man, for the first time. They are at a restaurant. She is aware of the fact that he is attracted to her. She knows that sooner or later she has to make a decision concerning whether she is interested in him or not. But she does not want to be rushed. She wants to have a good time and enjoy the meal they are having. While she enjoys the man's attention, she does not name it as a first date; she considers this as having a meal with another person. When her companion says the words 'you are so attractive', she perceives it as if he is talking about an object such as the roundness of the table and the color of the walls. As Sartre states, "she disarms this phrase of its sexual background; she attaches to the conversation and to the behavior of the speaker, the immediate meanings"[93]. She takes the compliment as if it is a neutral remark about herself, like, 'you have green eyes'. She ignores the sexual implication of his sentences. She overlooks his desires and focuses on the respectful aspect of his behavior.

According to Sartre, in fact she is aware of the passion he has and also his intentions. Although she does not want to consider those intentions of his, she, on the other hand, wants them to remain as they are. A directly expressed desire would humiliating to her, but if her companion did not desire her, it would also be humiliating. She wants him to desire her but not express it boldly[94].

She knows she has to make a decision about this man sooner or later. But she does not want to be in the position of being obliged to decide, so she

---

[93] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 96

[94] Ibid, p. 97

postpones the judgment because the obligation of making a decision causes anguish to her and she wants to have a good time before making a decision.

Eventually, the companion does something that speeds up the process: he reaches and holds her hand[95]. This gesture speeds up the process because if she holds his hand in return that means something; if she pulls her hand back it means something else. She does yet another thing. She keeps her hand still under his hand! "The aim is to postpone the moment of decision as long as possible"[96]. It is as if she did not realize his hand. She is too caught up in whatever she is talking about in the moment; her mind is on her own speech. "She does not notice because it happens by chance that she is at this moment all intellect"[97] . At this moment she disengages herself from her physical characteristics and perceives herself as an intellectual being only. She disowns and separates her own hand from herself. Now the hand on the table, beneath the man's hand, is just a hand. Not her hand but a hand"[98].

The woman in this example is in bad faith, according to Sartre. His analysis of this situation focuses on the relation this woman establishes with her body. As we have seen before, Sartre understands bad faith to have something to do with what he considers to be two basic attributes of a human being: Facticity and trancendence are "the double property of the human being"[99]. Sartre believes that these two aspects of a human being are entwined in a subtle interrelation with each other. "[T]wo aspects of human

---

[95] Ibid, p. 97

[96] Ibid, p. 97

[97] Ibid, p. 97

[98] Ibid, p. 98

[99] Ibid, p. 98

reality are and ought to be capable of a valid coordination"[100]. Because the woman tries to cancel out one of the two basic attributions and focus on only one of them, she is in bad faith.

She uses a diverse array of actions to manage that. Both her attitude toward her companion and towards herself give rise to the bad faith she is in. During the time they are spending together, she is aware of the desire she evokes in her company and the intentions he has. Even so, she only concentrates on the 'respectful' attitude of her companion. And in order to achieve that, she perceives his expressions as they exactly are. She overlooks the message between the lines. In this way she only focuses on the facticity of the man and waives his transcendence. She perceives his attitudes as they are, as if he is an in-itself. But as a conscious being, this man's deeds cannot be reduced to the level of a being-in-itself.

She also takes an inverse but similar approach to herself. She focuses on her transcendence only by canceling out her body thoroughly. When the man reaches and holds her hand, she just leaves her hand there and focuses on their conversation only. That is the intention of separating her facticity from her transcendence.

But Sartre underlines that facticity and transcendence are two indispensable aspects of human reality. The woman tries to split these two inseparable aspects of the human being. Although she wants to be this all intellectual person she admires, she is the one whose hand is captured by her companion. Instead of embracing the facticity and transcendence in a

---

[100] Ibid, p. 98.

harmony, she tries to single out one of her properties. She is in bad faith because of that mindset.

Sartre's account of the woman's behavior in this example goes only this far. However, as it stands, it is not clear to the reader how the woman manages to maintain this attitude of bad faith. I find it hard to understand how someone cannot notice that their hand is held captive in someone else's hand. This may seem like a trivial point, but I believe that it is important to insist on making this point clear to understand exactly how bad faith operates.

A clue to clarifying this question comes from Santoni's analysis of bad faith. As I had emphasized above, to understand bad faith it's important to realize that bad faith always firstly involves a project of bad faith which is its origin. In his analysis of Sartre's example of the woman discussed above, Santoni draws our attention to the layer underlying her behavior. According to him, this woman already has a project which leads her to have a coquettish attitude from the start. Thus Santoni refers to her as a flirt, and points out that her bad faith is firstly about her being in denial about the fact that she is a flirt. In Santoni's words,

> [T]he faith of the coquette, for instance in, deciding in advance not to be fully convinced in order to convince itself that she is not what she is (a flirt) is in bad faith from the start[101]

In other words, the woman, from the start, does not want to acknowledge that this is a male-female relationship. She was already well motivated to

---

[101] Ronald E. Santoni, *Bad Faith, Good Faith , and Authenticity in Sartre's Early Philosophy*, p.40

maintain her status with the man dangling in the air and that's how she managed to maintain her assumed oblivion by ignoring where her hand is.

Having understood that she was very well motivated, we now need to turn to the question of how she was able to ignore her hand. As explained above, one of the methods bad faith employs is the duality between thetic and non-thetic consciousness. So the only plausible account, which can be given of how someone can not realize where their hand is, is that maybe she was thetically aware of the intellectual dialogue and she might have ignored her non-thetical awareness of the body. Only in this way could she have managed not to notice her hand in her companion's hand.

If this explanation seems non-convincing, we can consider another scenario where we would more readily believe that one might not be aware of what is going on with their body. Consider a situation where you are very angry and are having a physical fight with somebody. You realize, as you get ready to punch this person you are fighting with, that you can't lift your arm because some onlooker was already holding your arm to restrain you. It is plausible, in this scenario, that you might not have noticed that there was someone behind you trying to hold you, because you were so thetically focused on the fight itself.

4.1.2 The Waiter

While the woman in the example whom we have just discussed focused on her transcendence and ignored her facticity, a second example Sartre gives us is about a waiter who completely turns himself into an in-itself, ignoring his transcendence:

Let us consider this waiter in the cafe. His movement is quick and forward, a little too precise, a little too rapid. He comes toward the patrons with a step a little too quick. He bends forward a little too eagerly; his voice, his eyes express an interest a little too solicitous for the order of the customer. Finally there he returns, trying to imitate in his walk the inflexible stiffness of some kind of automaton while carrying his tray with the recklessness of a tight-rope-walker by putting it in a perpetually unstable, perpetually broken equilibrium which he perpetually reestablishes by a light movement of the arm and hand. [102]

Through this elaborate portrayal, Sartre is trying to convey the message that this waiter is in bad faith as well because he has turned himself almost completely into a thing. In his description, Sartre continues to observe the mechanical nature of the waiter's movements, and accuses the waiter of "playing at *being* a waiter in a café"[103]. In this way, the waiter is reducing himself to his social function and denying that he is a for-itself that has the possibility of transcending his facticity and the social role that he currently has.

Since all acts of bad faith originate with a *project* of bad faith, we may now question what the waiter's purpose might be. While Sartre does not explicitly mention it, it seems that he is trying to make a more general social critique of people surrendering themselves to the roles that society imposes on them. So, we may speculate that, in Sartre's view, the waiter is trying to avoid the anxiety that acknowledging his possibility of transcending his waiterly situation would cause him. Perhaps he wants to deny that he has other options in life than just being a waiter.

---

[102] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 101

[103] Ibid, p. 102

When he acts as if he is just a waiter, he denies that he has other options such as quitting his job, going back to school, choosing not to work that night, and so on. He acts like he has a '*waiterly essence'*. But he is not just a waiter; he does not have 'waiterly' properties. Nobody can be a waiter in this sense. In Sartre's words, "the waiter in the cafe cannot be immediately a cafe waiter in the sense that this inkwell is an inkwell"[104].

4.1.3 Sincerity

We have already studied first two of the three major examples of bad faith Sartre uses while illustrating bad faith; now let's see the third and last one. In the context of this example, Sartre explains his conception of sincerity. Thus the relationship between consciousness and sincerity will be more visible.

We normally associate sincerity with honesty and being genuine. The honest attitude one adopts toward others and oneself can be defined as being sincere. Sartre defines sincerity as follows: "To be sincere, we said, is to be what one is"[105]. Now let's try to resolve the relationship between sincerity and bad faith.

When discussing sincerity, Sartre leads us in a certain direction by calling "the idea of sincerity" as "the antithesis of bad faith"[106]. By this implication, sincerity seems to be the saver which will rescue us from the hounding shadow of bad faith. We get the impression that it may be the escape we have been looking for, that this notion of 'being what one is' is going to save us

---

[104] Ibid, p. 102

[105] Ibid, p. 105

[106] Ibid, p. 100

from bad faith. In fact, at first glance, it is really plausible. If bad faith is not being honest with oneself, then being sincere to oneself should rescue a person from falling into bad faith. Yet, we should consider all the details before drawing a conclusion.

In order to be sincere to oneself and to others, one has to be 'what he is'. However, recall that 'consciousness is being what it is not and not being what it is'. It is not identical to itself; besides, it has a distance to itself. Keeping that in mind, the structures of sincerity and consciousness seem to be contradicting each other. I wonder how we can think of a conscious being being sincere (being what s/he is) to oneself and to others then? It doesn't seem to be practicable.

Sartre's discussion of the example of the homosexual and his friend whom he names "champion of sincerity" clarifies why sincerity is not really the antithesis of bad faith, but another form of bad faith.

4.1.3.1 Homosexual and the Champion of Sincerity

In this example, there is a homosexual and his friend who is trying to get him to confront his homosexuality. As can be guessed, Sartre accuses both of them of being in bad faith because of two separate reasons.

The one Sartre speaks of as 'the homosexual' is a person who has sexual experiences with men. But the homosexual does not accept being defined as one. While stating the reasons for it, he emphasizes that his experiences do not constitute a confirmed habit that has become part of his nature or are not the "manifestations of a deeply rooted tendency"[107]. Instead, he claims that

---

[107] Ibid, p. 107

they were just explorations with men; they were all kind of a game. He refuses the results of his past deeds.

Think of it this way: we call someone who is constantly bumping into and breaking things 'clumsy'. Suppose that a clumsy person acknowledges that he is constantly bumping into and breaking things, but he objects to being called 'clumsy'. Both the clumsy guy and the homosexual refuse the conclusion which can be reached out of what has happened in the past.

According to Sartre, the homosexual is in bad faith because he refuses the result of his past experiences. He makes up excuses to maintain his condition. His past is his facticity, and he refuses his facticity while emphasizing his transcendence. He is not being sincere; he does not accept a simple fact about his past deeds. The denial of the facticity causes his lack of sincerity.

Note that Sartre would not accuse the homosexual of being in bad faith if this man had refused being called a 'homosexual' by appealing to the following argument. This man could have said that, 'in terms of the experiences I have had with men, I am a homosexual. But I am a conscious being and my past experiences cannot identify me permanently. Therefore I am not a homosexual.' This kind of an explanation would prevent him from being in bad faith. Sartre emphasizes that one's former involvements cannot characterize/mark him forever; this is what 'not being what one is' is about.

The homosexual, as a conscious being, cannot be determined like a thing is. An in-itself (e.g., a chair) is what it is; it is fixed. A human being cannot be what he/she is, therefore s/he cannot be a homosexual the way a chair is a chair. This man would not be in bad faith if he would recognize his for-

itselfness and if he had used the sentence 'I am not a homosexual' to state that.

4.1.3.2 Champion of Sincerity

Sartre names the homosexual's friend 'the champion of sincerity' because he urges his friend to be sincere. His friend (the homosexual) admits his past deeds but does not accept being a homosexual. The champion of sincerity finds that mindset to be hypocritical. This duplicity annoys the champion of sincerity. He demands the sincerity of his friend and wants him to admit "the truth". He wants to hear a confession regardless of whether his friend feels sorry or happy when making that confession, whether he makes that confession in tears or with his head held high up. Sartre presents the champion of sincerity's demand that his friend accept his situation as arising from "the champion"'s desire to see his friend as an in-itself. Because of that stance, Sartre accuses the champion of sincerity of being in bad faith. There are different indications that might lead us to accuse him of being in bad faith, all of which have to do with him trying to see his friend as an in-itself.

Firstly, the champion of sincerity focuses on his homosexual friend's past only. He emphasizes his friend's facticity while ignoring the transcendence. He acts as if the homosexual's past identifies his entire existence and has the audacity to demand from his friend that he accept this as a fact.

Secondly, the champion of sincerity acts as if his friend's freedom can be cancelled by him. He acts almost as if he can take away his friend's freedom and give it back to him. But freedom is not something that can be taken away from the for-itself. As Catalona nicely explains:

> The advocate of sincerity wants temporary custody of the other's freedom in order to give it back to him with his blessings. He wants to treat freedom as a thing[108]

To sum up, the champ focuses only on his friend's facticity and demands his friend to be"stable and fixed"[109] whereas a conscious being cannot be fixed.

4.1.3.3 The Past and Sincerity

If we continue to adhere to the previous example in our discussion, the homosexual did not accept what he had done in the past. He did not accept that he is the person whose past deeds turned him into. He could have said 'I was a homosexual then'; he could have accepted his former experiences. This is why he was in bad faith. On the other hand, his friend was in bad faith because he thought that his friend's past would limit and determine his future.

Even though Sartre has shown us that sincerity is a kind of bad faith, this is not the case in relation to the past. Sincerity is possible only in relation to the past. Sartre states that, "We shall see that if this sincerity is possible, it is because in his fall into the past, the being of man is constituted as a being-in-itself"[110]. Since I constitute myself as an in-itself, I can be really sincere towards my past and define/label/identify myself. This is like making an analysis, looking back and frankly telling what has happened in reality. With respect to the past, the crucial 'not being what one is' attribution disappears.

I can examine my past and say 'I was too lazy then'. Although I am labeling myself as something, it is towards the past and the past is settled already.

---

[108] Joseph S. Catalano, *A Commentary on Jean-Paul Sartre's Being and Nothingness*, p. 86

[109] Ibid, p. 86

[110] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 110

This is just analyzing what has happened so far. If I now analyze myself and say 'honestly, I am a lazy person', this suggests that this is the situation and I have no control over it; this is what I am, and I cannot change it. This kind of a sincerity would imply that I believe that I am fixed and limited. Through this belief I manage to avoid assuming responsibility for my present and future acts. And therefore, such "sincerity" leads to bad faith.

So we can clearly say that, sincerity is only possible towards the past. This is because when being sincere, one constitutes oneself as an in-itself, as a determined being. This is possible when sincerity is directed towards the past. On the other hand, sincerity towards the present and towards the future is not possible. One, as a conscious being, cannot be what one is. One cannot be sincere with regard to his present and future conditions. Because one cannot be identical, equal to oneself.

Until now, we have been trying to set free the human being and make him/her confront his/her freedom and his/her options in life. So far we have said that defining oneself as what one is and thus limiting oneself leads to bad faith. At this point we distinctly can see another approach which may drag us into bad faith. If one does not embrace one's past and rejects one's history, one is in bad faith as well. This means that it is not only trying to present oneself as a definite thing that leads one to bad faith; not embracing a past that can no longer be changed can also lead one to bad faith.

As a result, sincerity seemed to be the antithesis of bad faith at first. When observed, we realized that it did not fit the definition and could not fulfill the task of being the antithesis of bad faith. In fact we clearly saw that sincerity

itself can take us into bad faith. Sartre states that "one can fall into bad faith through being sincere"[111].

In short, Sartre's concept of bad faith turns out to be quite tricky. We see that a conscious being can fall into bad faith by displaying in-itself properties in some cases, while in others, not recognizing one's in-itselfness may put one into bad faith. One's relation to oneself is so troublesome that both being sincere towards oneself in some contexts and not being sincere in others may cause bad faith. By now bad faith has become almost inescapable.

4.2 Criticism of Sartre's Examples:

In section 3.1.3 we saw that bad faith is defined as a "lie to oneself" and discussed the difficulty of making sense of the possibility of deceiving oneself. In this respect, there is an important problem with the examples that Sartre uses: they fail to adequately elucidate how bad faith can be possible because all the examples he gives take place in the context of social interactions and involve at least two consciousnesses. As Anderson states, "bad faith seems to refer primarily to the relationship individuals have to themselves. It is not first and foremost a social notion"[112]. The main difference between an ideal lie and bad faith, on the other hand, is that while an ideal lie requires at least two consciousnesses, bad faith takes place within the unity of a single consciousness. Therefore, when one is examining these examples, and trying to understand through them, how it is possible to deceive oneself, it is difficult for one not to wonder whether this person who

---

[111] Ibid, p. 109

[112] Thomas C Anderson, *Sartre's Two Ethics: From Authenticity to Integral Humanity*, p. 16

is allegedly in bad faith is really not simply lying or deceiving the other consciousness.

For example, in the case of the woman on a date, we do not know whether she really did not notice that her companion took her hand or if she merely acted as if she didn't notice it.

In the case of the waiter, when criticizing the waiter's "playing at being a waiter", Sartre emphasizes that the waiter is in bad faith because he can never really be just a waiter, he can only play at being one just as an actor plays at being Hamlet[113]. But then, how can we ever get from this example that the waiter really convinces himself that he is merely a waiter? Maybe he is indeed just acting before his clients or his employer, just in the same way that an actor plays the role of Hamlet.

Lastly, in the case of the homosexual, there are again two consciousnesses involved, so it is very difficult to draw conclusions from this example about how the homosexual confronts or evades or simply relates to his own sexuality in his own single consciousness. Maybe he is simply annoyed by his friend pressing him on this issue and does not want to admit it to his friend. Maybe he is simply resisting his friend's pretentious power games.

For these reasons, if we are to persuade ourselves that it is possible to deceive oneself, or how one does so, I think it's important to try to examine this phenomenon through an example that is immune from a social context and takes place within a single unitary consciousness.

---

[113] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p. 103

4.3 The Mouse

Last year I was suspicious about there being a mouse at my home. Sometimes I heard noises coming from the kitchen. One night some heavy thing fell off the counter late at night (all the windows were closed; the counter is not pitched). Most probably there was a mouse at home then.

I did not want to come across that filthy animal. This confrontation would force me to take action on this serious problem. If I were willing to confront and deal with the problem, I could use mousetraps or use poison to kill him. I could call people over and pay them to kill the mouse. I could move to another house rather than dealing with the mouse. I had options indeed, but none of those options were preferable. Acknowledging the likely presence of the mouse would make me have to do things that are not pleasant at all.

So what did I do to cope with the situation? Almost nothing. While walking at home, I made loud noises in order to give the mouse that probably was living with me enough time to hide or skip out. While I was in the kitchen doing stuff, if it felt like there was something moving in the corner, instead of quickly taking action and trying to hunt the mouse, I ignored the feeling. I did not look in that particular direction. Sometimes I just left the kitchen in order to avoid the confrontation.

I overlooked the signs for a while and the noises stopped after a while. In this way, my harried days with the mouse were over. This is how I dealt with that process. I never saw a mouse at home, so I did not have to accept the fact that I was living at home with a mouse. Now, after a year, it occurred to me while I was trying to find a good example of my own to describe bad

faith that the mouse and my attitude towards the mouse was the perfect example of bad faith.

It was a good example of bad faith because there was here a project of bad faith involved –it was the decision which is 'not acknowledging that I was living in a home which had a mouse in it'. And the for-itself to which the project belongs could do almost anything to manage that project. The for-itself was so determined that she was making noises and ignoring some parts of the house, we could say that she even restricted some of her activities for the sake of the project. This emphasizes how extreme an attitude a person can develop because of her bad faith.

Besides, she was using the opportunity to manipulate the viability of evidence for her own good. To that end, she put visual evidence over audible evidence. She limited the conditions for acknowledging the presence of the mouse to seeing the mouse. The sounds she heard were not enough to convince her; she made herself believe that she would have seen a mouse if there was one. On the other hand, she was being so cautious that it had become almost impossible for her to bump into the mouse (because of all the commotion she made). All this emphasizes the power of the for-itself and her dual attitude towards the evidence she has in her hands. She interpreted the evidence as it convenienced her.

Because of the aforementioned reasons, I decided to use this example here. Now there is one question our hero (i.e., me!) should ask herself: was she aware of those actions she took? Now in retrospect I can clearly say that I *was* aware in the sense that I was of sound mind. I knew what I was doing; I was not hypnotized or having a mental delusion or a hallucination. But I honestly

do not think that I knew that I was doing all those things just in order not to see a mouse.

The situation here has a structure similar to the example of the woman on a date. In both cases, the person in bad faith is in denial about why they are doing what they are doing—i.e., they are in denial about their project—while it is the project that precisely determines the attitude that underlies all the acts of bad faith. For example, the woman's project was to avoid being cornered into making a decision about her suitor. The attitude she develops to achieve that project is to act as if there is no sexual tension in the air. It is this attitude that determines her individual acts of bad faith such as disowning her hand. Similarly, my project is to deny that there is a mouse in the house. The attitude I develop to achieve this project is to be on guard against running into "the suspect", and it is this attitude that determines my individual acts such as making a noise to give the mouse time to hide.

In short, these examples are similar in that while the project determines what one does, one's thetic awareness of what they're doing and their declared intentions is not on the project.

So, I was thetically not aware that I was trying to scare away the mouse. This is not to say that I couldn't have seen this if I had looked more carefully into my consciousness and pulled the project which was in the background into the foreground of my thetic awareness. But all I was doing at the time was to save the moment. I was just doing what I had to do not to see the mouse at that particular moment. I did not realize it was just a part of a bigger process.

Now I can say, 'my bad faith was the real reason for my behavior then'. Eventually now I can evaluate my past behavior and embrace my bad faith. I am now being sincere towards myself. At that time I was not able to realize that, just as I might be deceiving myself about something now and not recognizing it.

Since my sincerity is toward the past, it is also possible according to Sartre. As explained before, Sartre argued that one can be sincere only about one's past since consciousness can determine its past as an in-itself and can describe and even define it.

Despite the fact that Sartre had already given three famous examples to illustrate bad faith, I found it necessary to give this example since Sartre's own examples had certain important shortcomings which I hoped to have overcome within one example that neatly sums up the concept of bad faith. Firstly, this example illustrates that bad faith originates with a project. Further, it demonstrates the main methods consciousness employs, such as playing with evidence and taking advantage of the dualities in consciousness (e.g., thetic vs. non-thetic awareness). While Sartre's examples could also be used to elucidate these points, they were not explicitly found in Sartre's discussions. Especially the case of the woman required extensive interpretation and analysis for it to be credible. A third strength of the mouse example is that it sheds light on and supports the points Sartre makes concerning sincerity.

Lastly, and most importantly, the mouse example avoids the major flaw that is found in Sartre's example. I have argued that the major flaw of Sartre's examples is that they take place within a social context and thus involve certain social dynamics whereas the mouse example involves a single

consciousness. In Sartre's examples, the possibility that the person who is allegedly in bad faith is indeed simply lying or deceiving the other cannot be dismissed.

One might respond to this objection as follows. In these examples, Sartre considers the consciousness that is in bad faith from within that consciousness. It is clear that he means these examples and the descriptions (of the woman on a date, for example) to be read as if they are being told from the perspective of the person who is in bad faith and whose consciousness is being described.

Granting that this is the case, it still remains a problem that the consciousness brought under close examination is in interaction with another consciousness. Given that the main question this thesis focused on is how deception can be possible within a single consciousness, the fact that the consciousnesses being described were in the state of interacting with one or more other consciousnesses could corrupt and distort the way those consciousnesses function, making it possible for social lies and acting to manifest themselves in them.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This central and sole concern of this thesis was a vexing question: if consciousness is translucent as Sartre claims, how is bad faith possible?

While this question was my main concern, to understand Sartre's conception of bad faith, it was necessary to introduce some other central concepts that Sartre uses in relation to this question.

Therefore I began my thesis by presenting the concepts of being-in-itself and being-for-itself which constitute the two-fold structure of being explained in *Being and Nothingness*, and the concepts of transcendence and facticity which are just as important. I later demonstrated Sartre's claim that consciousness is nothingness by making use of the elements of destruction and absence. In doing so, I tried to show the relation between negation and freedom. While talking about the feeling of anguish that inescapably confronts us in every situation, I explained that anguish is in fact a feeling that we experience when we recognize our freedom.

I identified the harrowing and persistent structure of this feeling of anguish as what causes the deviation of consciousness into bad faith. Consciousness, when faced with a freedom which it does not know how to handle, can feel so desperate as to deny its own freedom and this leads to bad faith. In Sartre's view, the reason why bad faith emerges is the fact that consciousness is "condemned to be free" and this freedom creates a deep feeling of anguish in consciousness. In that sense, bad faith is consciousness trying to flee from

itself and its freedom so that it can act as if it can avoid making at least some of the decisions that it constantly needs to be making in life, as if those decisions are already made for it.

In chapter 3, I searched for an answer to the question of what Sartre understands from bad faith and how bad faith can be possible. After illustrating the concept of a lie, and where bad faith can be located in a spectrum of different types of lies, I argued that it is not possible for bad faith to be a sort of lie. Here we saw that bad faith must be some kind of "hiding" but since consciousness has nowhere to hide, this hiding can at best be in the form of self-distraction. I also explained that bad faith is a type of faith and therefore allows consciousness to believe what it wants to believe. After clarifying that faith in general has a structure that does not hold beliefs on the basis of clearly defined objective criteria, I moved on to the section on the project of bad faith which is the true cause of acts of bad faith. While discussing how the project of bad faith leads to bad faith and how a person's motivations can manipulate a person, I made the transition to the methods of bad faith which Detmer carefully delineates for us. Elaborating on the parts that I found particularly important, I showed that bad faith mainly uses the following two methods: playing with the credibility of evidence and taking advantage of the dualities that consciousness has by virtue of its structure.

Finally, in Chapter 4, I analyzed in detail the examples of bad faith that Sartre gave. The first example was the example of the woman on a date which, in my opinion, was the most difficult example. Sartre accused a woman who was on a first date of being in bad faith for two different reasons, but what he told us was not enough to completely clarify his example. Therefore I had

to make use of secondary literature to interpret this example. After discussing why the waiter who is the next example Sartre uses is in bad faith, I moved on to the homosexual and the champion of sincerity, which is the last of Sartre's own examples. In this example, Sartre did not only show that both of these men are in bad faith by using the concept of sincerity, but he also introduced a new thesis: since consciousness constitutes itself as an in itself retrospectively, not acknowledging what one has done in the past is a sort of bad faith. In other words, by the end of this chapter, I had shown that this concept of self-distraction (bad faith) had besieged us on all sides.

Sartre's own examples all relied on social relations. Therefore these examples that took place between two consciousnesses could all too easily blur the line between bad faith and a simple lie. Since I hoped to clarify this point with a single example, I wrote my own example of the mouse at the end of chapter 4, and with this example we attained an example that could demonstrate all the important aspects of bad faith. I personally believe that this example which I wrote with the hope that it would remove all the difficulties I experienced when trying to understand the concept of bad faith is quite elucidatory.

A consciousness which is in fact free, but tries to deny the existence of that freedom since it does not know how to deal with it usually falls into bad faith. However, Sartre tells us that it is possible to escape bad faith in a trice in a footnote at the end of the chapter "Bad Faith". At this point, I find it fitting to follow his model and I finish my thesis with this words:

> [T]hat does not mean that we can not radically escape bad faith. But this supposes a self-recovery *of* being which was previously

corrupted. This self-recovery we shall call authenticity, the description of which has no place here.[114]

REFERENCES

Catalano, Joseph S, *A Commentary on Jean-Paul Sartre's Being and Nothingness*, Mid-way Reprint, Chicago, 1985.

Catalano, Joseph S, *Reading Sartre*, Cambridge, New York, 2010.

Daigle, C, *Jean-Paul Sartre*, Routledge, New York, 2010.

Detmer, David, *Sartre Explained:From Bad Faith to Authenticity*, Open Court, Chicago, 2008.

McCulloch, Gregory, *Using Sartre: An Analytical Introduction to Early Sartrean Themes*, Routledge, London, 1994.

Morris, Katherine J, *Sartre*, Blackwell, Oxford, 2008.

Webber , J, *The Existentialism of Jean-Paul Sartre*, Routledge, London, 2009.

Santoni, R.E, *Bad Faith, Good Faith , and Authenticity in Sartre's Early Philosophy*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia ,1995.

Cannon, Betty, *Sartre and Psychoanalysis: An Existentislist Challenge to Clinical Metatheory*, University Press of Kansas, Kansas, 1991.

Wider, Kathleen, *The Bodily Nature of Consciousness: Sartre and Contemporary Philosophy of Mind*, Cornell University Press, New York, 1997.

Cox, Gary, *A Guide for the Perplexed*, Continuum, London, 2007.

Cox, Gary, *The Sartre Dictionary*, Continuum, London, 2008.

Priest, Stephen (ed.), *Jean-Paul Sartre: Basic Writings*, Routledge, London, 2001.

Anderson, Thomas C, *Sartre's Two Ethics: From Authenticity to Integral Humanity*, The Regent Press of Kansas, Lawrence, 1993.

Sartre, Jean Paul, *Being and Nothingness: A Phenemenological Essay on Ontology* (trans. by Hazel E. Barnes), Washington Square Press, New York, 1992.

Heter, T. Storm, *Sartre's Ethics of Engagement: Authenticity and Civic Virtue*, Continuum, London, 2006.

Sartre, Jean Paul , *Intentionality: A Fundamental Idea of Husserl Phenomenology*, (trans. Joseph P. Fell), Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology 1, No. 2, 1970, p. 5.

APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY

Mahkûm olduğu özgürlüğünün farkına varan ve bu özgürlüğün beraberinde getirdiği sorumlulukla nasıl başa çıkacağını bilemeyen bilinç kaygılanır. Bu kaygı onu öyle bir sarıp sarmalar ki ne kendi geçmişi ne gelecek güzel günler ona umut veremeyecektir. Kaçacak yeri olmadığını fark eden bilinç bu kaygıdan biraz olsun uzaklaşabilmek için kendini kandırma yoluna girer. Kendisini sanki özgürlüğü yokmuş gibi yaparak aldatacaktır. Elinde idare etmesi gereken bir özgürlük olmazsa, tüm o sorumluluklardan sıyrılacak ve rahatlayacak, biraz olsun sıkıntısından kurtulacaktır. İşte kendini aldatmanın hikâyesi kısaca budur.

Bu çalışma, bilincin özgürlüğünün farkına varmasıyla başlayıp kendini aldatmayla biten bu yorucu süreçte başından geçenleri anlatmaktadır. Çalışma, Sartre'ın *Varlık ve Hiçlik* adlı eseriyle sınırlandırılmıştır. Sartre'ın bilinçaltının varlığını reddetmesi ve bilincin sürekli olarak kendisinin farkında olması iddiaları, kişinin nasıl olup da kendisini aldatmayı başarabildiği sorusunu akla getirir. Bu soruyu yanıtlamak amacıyla yazılmış bu çalışma üç bölümden meydana gelmektedir.

Kendini aldatmanın ne olduğunun anlaşılması için gerekli olan temel bilginin sunulduğu ilk bölüm basit bir giriş yapmayı hedefler. Burada Sartre'ın bilinç kavramı temele oturtularak bilgi verilmeye çalışılmıştır. Bu sırada Sartre'ın kendi-için-varlık ve kendinde-varlık adını verdiği iki varlık kipinden bahsedilmiş ve aralarındaki farklılıklar bizi olgusallık ve aşkınsallık konularına sürüklemiştir. Burada bilincin nasıl bir aktivite

olduğu açıklanmış ve Sartre'ın bilinçaltının olmadığı iddiası da vurgulanmıştır. Bu temel bilgiler paylaşıldıktan sonra Sartre'ın *Varlık ve Hiçlik* eserinde bahsettiği çerçevede hiçlik ve özgürlük kavramları ele alınmıştır. (Bu kıymetli konuları sadece benim araştırmam için gerektiği kadar incelendiğimi burada ısrarla belirtmeliyim.) Kendi özgürlüğünün farkına varan bilincin yaşadığı kaygıyı ve bu kaygının onu ne kadar çaresiz bıraktığını bu genel bilgi verme amacıyla yazdığım ilk bölümün sonuna kadar ayrıntılı olarak anlattım.

İkinci bölümde, Sartre'ın "kendini aldatma" kavramının ne olduğunu açıklamaya çalıştım. Bu kafa karıştırıcı sorunun cevabını ararken bir yandan da kişinin gerçekten kendini aldatıp aldatamayacağı sorusunu sordum sürekli olarak. Bu zorlayıcı soruların cevaplarını bulabilmek için önce, Sartre'ın da izlediği yolu izleyerek, yalan kavramının üzerinde durdum. Sartre'ın ayrıntıyla açıkladığı bu kavramı, en az iki bilinç arasında gerçekleşen bir durum olduğunun altını çizerek özetledim. Ve (genellikle) bir çıkar sağlamak amacıyla kişinin karşısındakine kasten bir konuda doğru olamayan bir şey söylemesi olarak açıkladım. Bu noktada da, elimizdeki bilinç kavramını da göz önüne alarak, yanıtlamamız gereken bir soru daha ortaya çıkmış oldu: tek bir bilinç içinde, kişinin kendisine yalan söylemesi ve de sonra ona inanması mümkün olabilir mi? Mümkün olsa bile yalanın tanımı gereği bu kendi söylediğine inanma haline "yalan" diyebilir miyiz? Bu soruyu ayrıntıyla yanıtladım ve özet olarak su sonuca vardım: Sartre'ın yalan tanımı çok nettir. Ve yalan denebilmesi için gereken bilinçler-arası durum burada yoktur. Bahsi geçen duruma yalan denemeyeceği açıkça ortadadır. Ama hala elimizde bir kendini aldatma sorusu vardır, onun nasıl olup da gerçekleşebildiği ilerleyen sayfalarda araştırılmaya devam edilmiştir.

Bu şekilde "kendini aldatmak" dendiği zaman kişinin kendine kasti olarak yalan söyleyemeyeceğini göstermiş oldum böylece bu noktada kendisini aldatmanın bir yalan olamayacağını anlamış olduk. O zaman da karşımıza cevap verilmesi gereken yeni bir soru çıktı. Kendini aldatmak eğer bir yalan değilse nedir? Uzun uğraşlar ve açıklamalar sonunda tek bir sonuca varabildim. Burada bilincin kendisinden açıkça bir şey saklayamayacağını bildiğimize göre, olsa olsa bilinç kendisini oyalıyor olabilir. Yani kendini aldatmak dediğimizde artık anlayacağımız şey, bilincin kendi önünde olup bitenleri bir şekilde (ilerleyen satırlarda bunun da nasıl olduğu açıklanacaktır) görmezden gelerek kendi istediği şeylere kendisini yönlendirmesidir. Ancak bu şekilde tamamen kendisinin farkında olan bir bilinç kendisini aldatıyor diyebiliriz. Bu noktadan sonra da kendini aldatmak dediğimiz zaman aslında kastedilenin bir çeşit kendini oyalama olduğunun farkına varılması önemlidir. Eğer kendini aldatmayı sadece bir yalan olarak anlamakta diretecek olsaydık, bu Sartre'ın bilinç adını verdiği aktivitenin başına gelebilecek bir durum olamazdı.

Peki, ama bilinç nasıl oluyor da istediği şeylere inanmayı seçebiliyor bu bahsi geçen kendini aldatma halindeyken? Sartre bu sorunun cevabını verirken kendini kandırmanın bir çeşit "inanç" olduğu açıklamasını veriyor bize. ("kendini aldatma" kavramının İngilizce karşılığı "bad faith", inanç kelimesinin karşılığı ise " faith"tir. Yani "bad faith"in bir çeşit "faith" olduğu İngilizcede açıkça ortadadır. Oysa Türkçe karşılıkları kullanıldığı zaman ilk bakışta, bu durumun anlamsız gelmesi olasıdır. İngilizcede apaçık görünen bu ilişki, Türkçe yazıldığında görünemediği için bu açıklamayı yapma ihtiyacı duydum) Kendini aldatma bir çeşit inanç konusu olduğu için de tamamen kendi isteklerine bağlı olarak nelere inanıp nelere inanmayacağına karar verebilir. Bu noktada Sartre, inanç denilen alanı bilim alanından ayırır

ve bu ayrımı da inanılan konularda kanıt aranmamasıyla temellendirir. Yani inandığı şeyde objektif kanıt aranmayan konular inanç alanındayken, kanıtlarla hareket ediliyorsa bilim alanındadır. Sartre, kendini aldatmanın bir inanç konusu olduğunu bize söylediğine göre bahsettiğimiz kavram, objektif kriteri olmayan bir alandadır. Demek ki kendini aldatma tamamen kişisel, keyfi olarak inanacağı konuları belirleyebilmektedir.

Bu noktaya ulaştığımızda artık kendini aldatmanın ne olduğunu açıklamaya başladım. Bilincin durdurulamayan bir akış halinde olduğunu ve sürekli değişim içinde olduğunu zaten belirtmiştik. İşte bu daimi hareket sırasında bilinç olgusallığı ve aşkınlığı arasında salınır. Bu iki özelliği aslında birbiriyle uyum içinde bulunabilecekken, kendini aldatma durumu bilincin bu ikisinden birisinde kendisini sabitlemesidir. Yani aslında bu iki özelliğinden birisinde kendisini sınırlandırır, belirli kılar ve kendini ona eşitler. Böylece aslında olduğu şey olmayan, olmadığı şey olan yapısı bozulur ve kendisini bu dengeli dünyanın dışına atmış olur. Bilinç artık sadece olduğu şey olmuştur, sınırlıdır, belirlidir. Bunu yaparak da kendisi üzerinde yıkıcı bir etkisi olan özgürlüğünü(ve beraberinde getirdiği dayanılmaz endişe duygusunu) bir süreliğine de olsa bir kenara bırakmış ve olduğu şey olarak o sürekli akışı engellemeye çalışmıştır. Burada kendini aldatmak dediğimizde anlamamız gereken şeyin şu olduğunu gördük: Bilincin sahip olduğu kaçınılmaz ikiliği olan olgusallık ve aşkınlıktan istediği birine kendisini eşitleyerek, kendisini adeta belirli bir varlıkmışçasına sunmaya çalışmasıdır. Bu sınırlandırmaya şöyle örnekler verilebilir: kişi aşkınsallığına odaklanarak henüz olmamış ama belki bir gün olabilecek planlar veya hayallere odaklanarak içinde bulunduğu durumu görmezden gelebilir. Veya diğer yönden de düşünebiliriz, kişi olgusallığına odaklanarak kendini sadece hali hazırda içinde bulunduğu durumla değerlendirip tüm

olasılıkları görmezden gelme girişiminde bulunabilir. Bir bilincin, kişinin, kendini bu şekilde sınırlandırmaya çalışmasına kendini aldatmak der Sartre.

Kendini kandırmanın ne olduğunu da açıkladıktan sonra hala açıklanmayı bekleyen, belirsiz noktalar kalmıştı. Örneğin bir bilinç neden ve daha önemlisi nasıl olup da kendisini bu şekilde belirli kılabiliyordu? Bu soruyu da Sartre'ın "kendini aldatma projesi" dediği kavramı açıklayarak cevaplamaya çalıştım. Bu kavram aslında Sartre'a göre kişinin kendini aldatma girişiminde bulunmasının asıl nedeniydi. Yani bu, adından da anlaşılacağı üzere asıl proje, asıl motivasyondu. Bu noktanın ikna edici şekilde açıklanmasının yazma sürecinde beni gerçekten zorladığını da itiraf etmeliyim. Sartre'ın "kendini kandırma projesi" dediği (kendini kandırma süreci belki de başlamadan bile önce) bilinçte yer etmiş bir istek, arzu olarak tanımlanıyordu. Belki de şimdi sizlere bilincin dünyayı bir anlam yükleyerek, anlayarak, şekillendirerek algıladığını hatırlatırsam bu, anlamayı kolaylaştıracaktır. Dünyayı sadece anlamlandırmakla kalmaz bilinç, kendisini de belirler. Kendisini hayatta görmek istediği bir yer, olmak istediği bir kişi vardır. o olabilmek, oraya ulaşmak için bilincin sahip olduğu motivasyon, bu bahsettiğimiz kendini aldatma projesidir.

Bilinç karşılaştığı türlü durumu kendi projesine uygun olup olmadığına bakarak yorumlar. Önüne çıkan verileri bu çerçevede ve aslında pek de objektif olmayarak değerlendirir. Ancak asıl zorluğu çıkartan şudur: Sartre bilincin bu süreçte ne kendini aldatma projesine sahip olduğunu ne de kendini aldattığının farkında olduğunu söyler. Yani bilinç bunları yaptığından bir anlamda habersizdir. Yalnız burada bir çeşit uyurgezerlikten bahsetmediğime dikkat çekmek isterim, Sartre'ın bahsettiği daha çok kişinin bu kararı düşünüp, farkında olarak ve(belki de) bilerek

almamış olduğudur. Yani kişi kendini aldatırken aslında iki kademeli bir inkâr halindedir. Bunların ilki o kişinin kendini aldatma projesi olan asıl motivasyonunun inkârıdır. İkicisi ise kişinin kendini aldatma sürecinde tüm o yapıp ettiklerinin farkında olmaması halidir. Eğer bunların herhangi birinin farkına varacak olursa bilinç, kendini önceden bir şekilde inandırmayı başardığı konuya artık inanmaz olacaktır. Bu farkındalık beraberinde yeni kararlar, yeni zorluklar getireceği için bununla yüzleşmek istemeyen bilinç başarabildiği kadar bu inkâr durumunu sürdürmeyi tercih eder.

Bilincin düşünümsel ve şeffaf olduğunu aklımızda bulundurarak sorduğum şu soruya bir cevap vermeye çalışalım: Peki nasıl olur da bir insan ne yaptığının farkında olmaz onu yaparken? Bunu, evinden çıkıp ofisine giden bir kişinin durumunu tartışarak açıklamaya çalıştım. Diyelim ki bu sabah evden, ofisime gitme amacıyla çıktım. Ofise gitmek benim buradaki asıl motivasyonumdur diyebiliriz bu durumda. Ofise gitmek için arabama bindim, gitmeye alışkın olduğum yollardan belki de hiç düşünmeden geçtim ve sonunda park ederek ofisime girdim diyelim. Nasıl tüm bu süreç boyunca adım adım tüm yaptıklarımın o an farkında değilsem, onları an an algılamıyorsam aynı şekilde kendimi aldatma sürecinde de tüm yaptıklarımın farkında olmama ihtimalim vardır. Sartre'ın 'kendini aldatma projesi' ve' kendini aldattığının farkında olmaz bilinç' derken bize anlatmak istediklerini bu örnekten faydalanarak netleştirmeye çalıştım. Bu örnekte kişinin nasıl yaptıklarından haberdar olmadığını 'kendini kandırma yöntemleri' adlı bir başlık açarak ayrıntıyla inceledim.

Çalışmamın üçüncü bölümünü tamamen Sartre'ın örneklerine ayırdım. Sartre bize kendini kandırmanın ne olduğunu anlatırken günlük hayattan

alınmış farklı farklı örnekler sunar. Bu meşhur örnekleri sırayla ve ayrıntıyla inceleyerek onların ne şekilde kendini aldatmayı bize açıkladığını göstermeye çalıştım. Burada, Sartre'ın örneklerinin kendini aldatmakla ilişkisinin ilk bakışta anlaşılamadığını hatırlatma ihtiyacı duyuyorum. Kendini aldatmayla ilişkilerinin çok da net olmaması ve tüm örneklerin kişiler arası yani sosyal örnekler olması dolayısıyla da kendi örneğimi yazma ihtiyacı duydum. Sartre'ın tüm örneklerinin sosyal örnekler olmasının neden sorun yarattığını düşündüğümü de bölümün ilerleyen kısımlarında açıkladım. Bu temel açıklamadan sonra bu meşhur örnekleri tek tek değerlendirelim.

Sartre'ın kendini aldatma bölümünde faydalandığı örneklerin ilki buluşmaya giden kadın örneğidir. Bu örnek bir kadın ve erkeğin ilk buluşmalarını konu alır. Adam ve kadın bir masada karşılıklı oturuyor, hayattan ve belki de daha entelektüel konulardan bahsediyorlardır. Bu konuşmalar sırasında adam zaman zaman kadına iltifatlar ediyor ve ne kadar da güzel olduğundan da bahsediyordur. Oysa kadın bu buluşmadan ne beklediğine henüz net bir şekilde karar vermemiştir. Bu buluşmada net bir tavır sergilemek istemiyor, aralarındaki ilişkinin durumun muğlak olmasından keyif alıyordur. Bu istek doğrultusunda hareketler sergileyen kadın adamın iltifatlarını adeta duymuyordur. Duyuyorsa bile sanki adam masanın yuvarlak olduğunu veya duvarların mavi olduğunu söylüyormuşçasına duyduğu cümleyi basit bir gerçeklik gibi alıyor ve içerdiği arzu ve beğenme anlamlarını algılamıyordur. Bu şekilde sürüp giden bir konuşmayı keyifle anlatan Sartre bir anda adamın yaptığı ani hareketten bahseder bize. Adam bir anda kadının masanın üzerinde durmakta olan elini elinin içine alır. Artık kadının elini tutuyordur adam ve konuşmaya bu şekilde devam ediyorlardır. Burada kadının ne yaptığı

80

önemli rol oynar; hiçbir şey! Kadın elinin adamın elinin altında olduğunu fark etmemiştir bile! Bu durumu anlamakta çok zorlandığımı itiraf etmeliyim. Sartre'a göre o an kadın o konuşmaya öyle bir odaklanmıştır ki adamın kendi elini tuttuğunu fark etmemiştir bile. Şimdi asıl konumuza dönecek olursak, bu örnekle kendini aldatmanın nasıl bir alakası olabilir acaba? Hatırlarsak kendini aldatma kişinin sahip olduğu olgusallık ve aşkınlık özelliklerinden bir tanesine kendisini mühürleyip diğer tarafı adeta hiç yokmuşçasına bir tavır sergilemesiydi. Bu bilgiyi aklımızda bulundurarak gelelim kadının neden kendini aldattığı konusuna, kadın Sartre'a göre iki ayrı sebepten kendisini kandırıyordur. Bunların ilki karşısındaki kişiyi, karşısındaki özgür bilinci adeta bir kendinde varlık gibi algılamasıdır. Adamın ona söyledikleri, ne kadar güzel olduğu hakkında yaptıkları konuşmayı, kadın sadece duyduğu kadarıyla alır. Yani ima ettiklerini görmezden gelir. Adamı sadece ağzından çıkanlarla sınırlandırır onu dinlerken. Karşısındaki özgür kendi-için-varlık'ı adeta bir kendinde-varlık olarak görmeye çalışır ve yapıp ettiklerini sadece oldukları kadarıyla algılar. Eğer kadın karşısındakinin sadece olgusallığına odaklanmasaydı onun olgusallık ve aşkınlık özelliklerini aynı anda barındırdığını görmezden gelmeye çalışmasaydı kadının kendini aldattığı iddiasında bulunmayacaktık. Sartre'ın bu kadını kendini aldatmakla suçlamasının bir diğer nedeni de kendisine karşı aldığı tavırdır. Kadın masanın üzerinde duran elini öylece bırakmıştır. Yani kendi bedeni adeta yokmuş gibi davranmıştır. Kendisini o konuşma sırasında sadece bir aşkınsallıktan ibaret olarak görerek, olgusallığını görmezden gelmiştir. Oysa bu ikili yapı birbirinden ayrılamaz, sadece tek birine eşitleyemez kendi için varlık, kendisini. Sanki o an yapabileceği bir şey yokmuş da vücudunu terk ederek ortamdan veya sıkıntılı durumundan uzaklaşabilecekmiş gibi davranmıştır.

İşte bu iki sebepten Sartre kişinin kendini aldattığını iddia etmektedir. Önce karşısındakinin sadece olgusallığına odaklanarak aşkınlığını yok sayması, sonra kendisinin sadece aşkınsallığına odaklanması onun kendisini kandırdığını söylememize neden olur.

Sartre'ın buluşmaya giden kadın örneğinden sonra garson örneğini anlattım ve açıklamaya çalıştım. Garson belki de en çok bilinen örnektir bu yazdıklarım arasında ve sanırım bunun nedeni de en kolay anlaşılır olan olmasıdır. Daha doğrusu neden bir kendini aldatma örneği olduğu ilk bakışta en rahat anlaşılan örnektir. Bu nedenle diğerlerine nazaran daha kısa yazmama rağmen en az onlar kadar açıklayıcı olabildiğimi umuyorum. Sartre sürekli ve hemen her yerde yazı yazardı kafelerde, restoranlarda geçen örnekler vermesinin nedeni belki de budur. Bu örnekte de bir kafede çalışan garsonu bize tarif eder. O şahane dil yeteneğini kullanarak adeta metinde adamı gözümüzün önünde canlandırabildiği halde, ben sadece donuk bir portresini çizebileceğim korkarım burada. Bahsi geçen garson bir kafede çalışmaktadır ve adeta sadece bir garsonmuşçasına davranmaktadır. Hareketleri ani ve adeta robotsudur, sanki bir mekanizma onu yönetiyor gibidir. Müşterilerine ve kafenin işleyişiyle aşırı alakadar ve ilgilidir. Adeta hisleri yokmuşçasına çeviktir ve atiktir. Bu adam o kadar mekaniktir ki sanki bir insan değil de mekanizmadır. Sartre bu adamı alaycı bir dille etkili bir şekilde tarif eder ve onu da kendini kandırmakla suçlar. Adam kendisini kandırıyordur çünkü sanki sahip olduğu meslek onun tüm karakterini, hayattaki duruşunu belirlemiştir. Adam sanki sadece garsondur. Ve bu onun mutlak gerçekliğidir. Oysa bir bilincin asla sadece olduğu şeye eşit olamayacağını biliyoruz. O sebepten Sartre bu adamın sadece içinde bulunduğu durumla kendisini belirlemeye çalıştığını, kendisinin

sınırlandırdığını böylece elindeki olasılıklar ve karşı konamaz özgürlüğünü görmezden gelmeye çalıştığını söyler ve onu kendini kandırmakla suçlar.

Garson örneğini de inceledikten sonra, Sartre'ın kendi örneklerinin sonuncusu olan eşcinsel ve arkadaşı 'içtenlik şampiyonu' örneğine geçtim. Burada iki ayrı kişiden bahseden Sartre ikisini de apayrı sebeplerle kendisini aldatmakla suçlamaktadır. Örneğin ilk kısmı eşcinsel bir adamla ilgilidir. Bu kişinin geçmişte hemcinsleriyle pek çok cinsel deneyimleri olmuştur. Ancak kendisi eşcinsel olduğunu reddetmektedir. Burada eşcinsel olmayı ne anlamda reddettiğini şu şekilde açıkladım, faydası olacağını sanıyorum: sürekli etraftaki eşyalara çarpan onları yanlışlıkla kırıp döken birisine sakar denir. O kişi bir şeyleri kırdığı için sakardır aynı şekilde bir kişi eğer hemcinsleriyle cinsel ilişki yaşıyorsa eşcinseldir. Bu anlamda adamın eşcinsel olduğunu reddettiğini anlatır bize Sartre ve onun kendisini aldattığını söyler. Bu noktada samimiyet kavramından bahseden Sartre kişinin kendi geçmişine karşı samimi olması gerektiğini bizlere söyler. Bir insanın sadece geçmişe dönük olarak kendisini kendinde varlık olarak görebileceğini söyler bize. Yani aslında bu noktaya kadar kişinin sadece kendi için varlık özellik gösterdiğinden bahsetmiş de olsa, burada bize yepyeni bir bir bilgi verir Sartre. Bu da şu anlamda önemlidir, kişi kendi geçmişini benimsemiyor ve olanları kabullenmiyorsa yani kendisine karşı samimi, içten bir tutum sergilemiyorsa o kişi de kendini aldatıyordur. Sadece geçmişe yönelik olarak bir bilincin ne ise o olmak özelliği gösterdiğini söyleyebiliriz bu sebepten de sadece geçmişe dönük olarak ne ise o olduğunu reddetmesi kendini reddetmesidir, kendini aldatıyordur. Burada şunu da söylemeden geçmemek gerekir, kişi ne yaptıysa sonsuza kadar onunla tanımlanacak diye bir şey yoktur. Ve hatta bu Sartre'a göre mümkün de değildir. O halde bu eşcinselle ilgili son önemli bilgiyi buraya ekleyelim

ve örneğimizi açıklamaya devam edelim. Sartre bu adamın eğer eşcinsel olmadığını şu anlamda iddia etmiş olsaydı, onun kendini aldattığını söyleyemeyeceğimizi söyler : 'evet bugüne kadar eşcinsel deneyimler yaşamış olduğum doğrudur bu anlamda ben bir eşcinselim. Ancak geçmişimde yaşadığım deneyimler beni sonsuza kadar belirleyemeyeceği için, özgür bir bilinç olarak sürekli bir değişim içinde olduğum için de hayır, eşcinsel değilim. Bazı deneyimlerim yüzünden ben adeta bir kendinde varlık gibi algılanamam o yüzden de eşcinsel değilim" iddiasını eğer bu anlamda savunuyor olsaydı o zaman kendisini aldattığını iddia edemezdik der Sartre.

Gelelim örneğin diğer karakterine. Sartre bu kişiye alaycı bir tutum sergileyerek, içtenlik şampiyonu adını verir. Bu ismi vermesinin nedeni de bu kişinin arkadaşından bir itiraf bekliyor oluşudur. İçtenlik şampiyonu, arkadaşının eşcinsel olduğunu itiraf etmesini ister ve bunun için de onu zorlar. Kim olduğunu kabul etmesini inatla ondan talep eder. İstediği şey arkadaşının kendisine ve ona karşı samimim, ,içten bir tutum sergilemesidir. Sartre burada içtenlik şampiyonunu kendini aldatmakla suçlar. Bunun nedeni de arkadaşını sadece geçmişinden ibaret olarak görmesi, onu sadece olgusallığından ibaret görmesidir. Oysa arkadaşı, bir kendisi için varlıktır ve sadece olgusallığından ibaret olamaz aşkınsallığı görmezden gelinemez. Bu tek taraflı yaklaşımının şu anlamı da vardır, arkadaşını sadece olduğu şey olan haline getirmeye çalışması onun özgürlüğünü elinden alma girişimidir aslında. Yani arkadaşından o itirafı alana kadar onu zorlamaya çalışarak ondan, aslında alamayacağı halde, özgürlüğünü almaya çalışması ve itirafla beraber geri vermesi anlamına gelecektir. Sartre bir insana bu şekilde tek boyutlu yaklaşması dolayısıyla içtenlik şampiyonunu da kendini aldatmakla suçlamaktadır.

Bu bölümde örnekleri elbette burada anlattığımda çok daha detaylı olarak inceledim ve bazı sorunlar olduğunu gösterdim. Bu sorunların ne olduğunu tek tek yazdıktan sonra da o eksiklikleri olmayan, yepyeni bir kendini aldatma örneği yazdım. Kendi örneğime geçmeden önce Sartre'ın kendi örneklerinde gördüğüm eksiği belirteyim. Tüm bu örnekler kişiler arası ilişkilere dayanıyor oysa Sartre bu örneklere gelene kadar sadece tek bir bilinç içinde olup biten bir süreçten bahsetmektedir. Tüm bu özgürlüğün altında tek başına ezilip, endişe içinde kıvranan bir bilinç bu durumdan çıkış yolu olarak kendini aldatma yolunu buluyorsa bence bunu anlatırken verilen örnek de sadece tek bir bilincin başına gelenler hakkında olmalıdır. Kişiler arası ilişkilere dayanan bu örnekler kendini aldatma ve yalan arasındaki çizginin silikleşmesine hatta yer yer yok olmasına neden olmaktadır. Örneğin buluşmaya giden kadın örneğinde, kadının gerçekten elinin orada olduğunu fark etmediğine inanabilir miyiz? Yoksa bu sadece karşısındakine göstermelik olarak alınmış bir tavır da olabilir mi? O kadının kendi elinin nerede olduğunu gerçekten bilmediğini mi düşünmek daha inandırıcıdır yoksa hiç tanımadığı bir adama yalan söylediği düşüncesi mi? Aynı şekilde garsonun kendisini gerçekten sadece garson gibi benimsediği iddia edilebilir mi? Orada rol yapması gereken insanlar veya çok çalışıyormuş gibi görünmek istediği bir patronun orada olması örneğe gölge düşürmekte bence. Son olarak eşcinselin sadece eşcinsel olduğunu arkadaşına itiraf etmek istemediği ama bunu kendisine karşı açıkça söylemediğini nasıl bilebiliriz? Buna da verebilecek bir cevabımız yok. Sartre burada sosyal ilişkiler üzerine kurar örnekleri karmaşıklaştırmıştır.

Bu tip nedenlerle Sartre'ın örneklerine alternatif bir örnek yazdım. Bu örnek kısaca evimde bir süre yaşadığından şüphelendiğim bir fare hakkındadır. Benim o farenin çıkardığı sesleri duyduğum halde o yokmuşçasına bir hayat

sürmeye çalışmam ve varlığını inkar etmeyi sürdürebilmek için yaptıklarım hakkındadır temel olarak. Nasıl bilincin kendini aldatma projesine uygun olmayan uyaranları görmezden gelebildiği ve kişinin ne kadar uzun bir süre kendine itiraf etmeden bir yalanı yaşayabildiğini bize basitçe gösterir bu örnek. Bahsi geçen örneğin Sartre'ın diğer örneklerine kıyasla güçlü olduğu diğer yanları da vardır. Tek bir bilincin başından geçenlerin yine o bilinç tarafından anlatılması, sosyallikten arınmış olması ve kendini aldatma projesi ve samimiyet gibi unsurları da barındırır. Bu sebeplerle kendini aldatma konusunu hem anlamaya çabalarken hem de bir başkasına anlatırken faydalanılacak bir örnek olduğunu düşündüğüm bu örnekle üçüncü ve son bölümü de tamamlamış oldum.

APPENDIX B: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ■

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı : ÇIRACIOĞLU
Adı : ÇİĞDEM
Bölümü : FELSEFE

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : THE DEVIATION OF CONSCIOUSNESS INTO BAD FAITH IN SARTRE'S BEING AND NOTHINGNESS

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans ■ Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐

2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐

3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ■

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: