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CONCLUSION

BEYOND SARTRE - THE POSITION OF A WRITER

We have seen that while mocking at a life full and complete the existentialists most often try to expose the negative aspects in life, such as the irreparable loss, alienation, uprootedness, absurdity, lack of freedom, bad faith and so on. But focussing on these negative sides does not mean that it is a negative trend of thought. Their positive intention is evident from their interest in man's future possibilities. They encourage people to face the negative aspects squarely to make life worth living. By emphasizing the tragedy inherent in human condition, by enabling man to live the fears and frustrations of everyday life and by intensely attempting to tackle all existential problems, existentialism in fact emerges as a living philosophy.

Jean-Paul Sartre did not wish to build a system of philosophy of man but rather to unveil the very intimate and
the most mysterious aspects of human existence. Man is the only one that exists in his view. In *Saint Genet* he writes: "Whatever mistakes I may make about him I am sure that I know him better than he knows himself because I have a passion for understanding men."¹

Without providing any firm answers to any problems and without establishing any standards for human existence, existentialistic thought in general and that of Sartre in particular influenced the entire thought of the 20th century to a great extent because it deals with the basic existential problems of man. It must be kept in mind that though Sartre rejects the basic human nature, he accepts the basic human condition -- that everybody is born, labour and die. This is a universal condition for all human beings.

Man enters into a world, makes it habitable though his consciousness, confers meaning to it through his free choices. He is overawed by the dreadful freedom which makes him responsible for his existential situations of his life. Anguish that results from freedom from his attitudes to the other, from his search for social justice -- these are all pervasive themes discussed in Sartre's works.
Even so many decades after the Second World War, existentialistic attitudes can still be considered as the spirit of the present age. This attitude begins with an individual facing a confused world that he cannot accept. This confused world is a consequence of Renaissance, the Reformation, the growth of science, the decline of church authority, Enlightenment movement, French Revolution and the growth of mass militarism and technocracy. And, in the present day life individual's disorientation and confusion result from the decline of morality, degeneration of culture, degradation of a stable family and weakening of interpersonal relationship, over crowded population, lack of secure professional opportunities, lack of freedom (individual as well as professional) under the strict impositions of the government and religious institutions.

The existential attitude is first of all an attitude of self-consciousness. There appears a possible threat latent in this attitude. Man's interests and preoccupations centre on in an increasing measure on his individual predicaments and uncertainties. Such a self-centered state of mind is prone to become oblivious to the social components and needs of human condition. This will
result in burrowing deeply into the mysterious grounds of one's own self. The Sartrean existentialism can be misinterpreted in certain aspects, for succumbing to such kind of narcissitic self-centrism. But Sartre's intentions were genuine, honest and most importantly utilitarian.

When we consider Sartre's predecessors who influenced his ontology, the common ground on which both Hegel and Sartre stand is to accept the primacy of consciousness and the fact that mind cannot be detached from reality. In a way during his initial years of philosophizing Sartre has been very much influenced by the Hegelian idealism. Apart from this, Hegel's language of conflict and alienation finds a place in Sartre's elucidation of the other. It serves as a progenitor of Sartre's theory of conflictual intersubjectivity.

Kierkegaard's maxim that "subjectivity is truth" and his conviction that the subject is an ethically existing subject have been revered by Sartre resulting in the existentialist maxim that "existence precedes essence," or in other words, subjectivity must be the starting point of philosophizing. Sartre also declares that the being-for-
itself, the human reality, is a moral being who makes himself, chooses (for) himself and thus becomes a responsible being. Kierkegaard warns against crazy modes of civilization, institutionalized sects of authority all of which snatch the individual away from the truth as subjectivity. Sartre's literary and philosophical works explicitly show the aftermath of those man-made catastrophe.

With regard to the Nietzschean influence on Sartre, I would like to say that Nietzsche's apparent nihilism and Sartre's apparent pessimism are linked to each other with an indirect demand to make man moral. Their atheistic tendencies compel man to make himself by opting for the right choices and by being responsible for himself. Nietzsche's understanding of individual's integrity, passion and its mastery, freedom from conventions are all put into detailed examination and application in Sartre's literary works.

As far as the Husserlian influence on Sartre is concerned, his notions of consciousness and intentionality and consciousness as the consciousness of something have been adapted by Sartre. But Sartre rejects the Husserlian transcendental ego and substitutes it with the transcendent
ego. He also denies Husserl's bracketing of the world. Inspired by Husserl, Sartre applies his descriptive phenomenology to the region of phenomena of Being (which leads to the region of pour-soi and also in the region of Being of phenomena (which leads to the region of objects, en-soi). Sartre argues that the world in which man exists cannot be bracketed and the ego of man is a transcendent one.

The Sartrean views on ontology can be said to be carved out of the Heideggerian ontology. Both commences their philosophy with the problem of Being. Their approach to the problem is ontological in nature. Both insist that the term existence is reserved only for humans. Sartre effectively uses the notion of 'authenticity' — a theme proposed by Heidegger — in many of his literary works in which one can make out the character's transition from a less authentic level to a higher one as the events unfold themselves.

The notions of death separates these two thinkers poles apart. To put it briefly, Heidegger remarks that an intense awareness of death confers individuality (vide:1.6)
to *Dasein*. But to Sartre an awareness of death removes all meaning from life. When Heidegger remarks that we can run ahead of ourselves towards death to adopt a point of view upon ourselves, Sartre assumes that death remains always a nihilation of one's future possibilities. In spite of such differences, both accept that man is finite and he exists in this world. Their ontology is meant for man who faces existential problems of breaking away from the threshold of convention.

After considering these influences when one looks into Sartre's ontological treatise *Being and Nothingness* it is regarded as a model of existentialistic thought for two reasons: (a) for its unique treatment of the concretely existing conscious, particular, individual human being, (b) for its treatment of the key concept of human freedom. It remains a fact that one cannot understand the extent of human freedom unless one can understand the being who is free: the being-for-itself.

By rejecting the existence of God and thereby rejecting a pre-given human nature, Sartre coins the maxim - "existence precedes essence." Man first of all exists, confronts himself, emerges into the world, comes to face to
face with others and thus he defines himself. Man makes himself. Sartre attempts to define human reality as "it is not what it is, it is what it is not," (vide: 2.2), thus linking man to his past, present and also to future possibilities. Sartre rules out the possibility of man being perfect since he exists always as a lack due to the spontaneity and scatteredness of consciousness.

According to Sartre man is freedom. Freedom is the freedom to choose a goal from various alternatives, and thus man makes himself. Success is not important to freedom, but rather freedom consists in choosing a goal. But the for-itself is condemned to freedom, for the for-itself cannot free itself from its freedom. This freedom of the for-itself is always in confrontation with that of the other ending up in conflictual intersubjectivity leading to reciprocal relation of mutual negation. In No Exit Sartre boldly declares "The other is hell," (vide: 4.2).

In fact Sartre went wrong in generalizing a partial experience. Conflict is an irrefutable fact in interpersonal relations. But as long as man remains a member of a family and a society he has innumerable positive
relations too, such as love, affection, solicitude, faith, hope, etc. (*vide*: 2.6).

Through bad faith Sartre tries to justify his assertion on intersubjective conflict. Bad faith is lying to one-self — a kind of self-imposed, fake personalization to win over a particular moment. It results from the spontaneity of consciousness which fails to establish an apt relationship between its facticity and transcendence (*vide*: 2.7). In reality the existence of the for-itself is encapsulated by both these modes of existence.

Numerous problems arise here: Rejection of God and denial of a pre-given human nature seem to be inconsistent with Sartre's understanding of bad faith (*vide*: 2.7). By interpreting bad faith as a normal indulgence in the worldly affairs of man Sartre, in fact, shakes his bottom-line statement, "existence precedes essence." If bad faith is a commonly found attitude of the for-itself, is it not a generality founded on the for-itself akin to the Aristotelian contentions on universality of human nature?

This question of generality or universality arises even when Sartre attempts to define the-for-itself as "it is
not what it is, it is what it is not." If there is no pre-
given human nature, how can Sartre deliberately bundle human
reality under this definition? [vide: 2.2 & vide: 2.7]. So
the validity of this attempted definition stands in
question.

I would like to add here that for this lying to
oneself, i.e. bad faith, the for-itself alone cannot be held
responsible. To some extent it is a victim of social norms.
In such cases it takes refuge in bad faith for the fear of
the kind of response it may receive from the society and the
fellowman, if it decides to make a choice of its liking
especially if that choice happens to be of a radical type.
Sartre himself considers environment and the fellowman as,
coefficients of adversity which obstruct human freedom. As
long as man remains a social being bad faith should be
considered only as a tactful attitude to overcome a
difficult situation.

Another difficulty arises when Sartre speaks of
death as the coefficient of adversity. By rejecting the
notion of possibility attached to death, Sartre seems to
prefer a never ending life which will ever remain an utopia
(vide: 2.8.5). As long as the for-itself is existence and
freedom is applicable to both the being-for-itself and the being-of-the-other, death also affects both. Again, if death remains far from the possibility of the being-for-itself, there is no point in blaming death for removing all meaning from the life of the for-itself.

I would like to say that one should cultivate an intense, persistent awareness of one's impending death which always remains a personal possibility. Choices one makes in the future become meaningful, if it is chosen foreseeing death. As long as man exists he should face the reality of death in a bold manner since all are "condemned" to die as in the same way as all are condemned to be free. I seem to agree with Heidegger in this context.

One of the most applausable notions of the Sartrean ontology is his insistence on responsibility of the for-itself as an ontological requirement arising out of its freedom. By so affirming Sartre in fact provided the foothold for the process of making man all by himself.

Sartre considers literature to be the most suitable medium to articulate the freedom of the for-itself. It is freedom from preconceived ideas and freedom to
innovate novel ideas. Writing provides enormous freedom to the author. It liberates both the author and reader from various kinds of alienations that confront them.

Sartre's contention is that an aesthetic product, a product of aesthetic talent and imagination is unreal. This contention of Sartre raises a question: if an aesthetic work is unreal why does one create art? Sartre replies that an artist does so because all creative activities derive their impetus from others. This statement is an assertion of the ontological foundation of Sartre's theory of art. It necessitates the need to communicate, thus making art a medium of communication.

Sartre's commitment to descriptive phenomenology compels him to choose prose rather than poetry. But his under-estimation of poetry needs to be reconsidered (vide: 3.4). It is true that poetry uses words that are obscure and vague to some extent. But this need not mean that it is an end in itself. It can indicate events of historical importance, socially relevant themes, romantic aspirations and so on. A committed writer should feel free to write everything that is related to human life through his art of
writing. Here lies his commitment.

Sartre believes that an insane pride is necessary to write freely, (vide: 3.5). I would say that this pride should not be taken in a narrow sense. It is the pride of owning an aesthetic datum. Once it gets exposed in the form of meaningful words the writer experiences the fortunate feeling of emptiness — a satisfaction derived out of accomplishing what he wanted. Then the author too becomes an ordinary person.

Here arises the legitimacy of another question: how can a writer inspite of being the proud owner of an aesthetic ability become an ordinary person? I prefer to say that he lives amidst the ordinary persons portraying mostly their existential situations. The author too is a social being. What makes him different from others is his aesthetic sensibility. Once he releases his imaginative energy in literary form, his pride sublates itself and he becomes a common man though his talented consciousness awaits another source of inspiration.

By recognizing the fact that there is no art except for and by others, (vide: 3.7), Sartre highlights the
mutual recognition of freedom of both the author and the reader. All literary work is an appeal to the reading community to collaborate with the author in the production of the work of art. Thus it means that the writer considers the reader as a part of his pure freedom (vide: 3.8).

Here another difficulty arises. It goes against Sartre's earlier assertion of confrontation of the freedom of the for-itself and that of the other which results in the objectification of the being-for-itself nullifying all its future possibilities, (vide: 2.6). Even though writing a literary script is conceived as an expression of writer's freedom and creativity, one thing should be kept in mind that the reader has the freedom to evaluate the author's credibility. Here the confrontation of these two opposing freedoms is a certain event. Even in the field of literature, there is a possibility to develop conflictual intersubjectivity. It shows the risk of coefficients of adversity in literature. The differences of the cultural, moral and educational background of these two existential beings, viz. the author and the reader, itself suffice to build up a tension. The possibility of this conflict is already contained in their freedom.
Many of Sartre's ontological notions especially the freedom of the for-itself are explicated in detail in his literary works. His autobiography, *Words*, elucidates his commitment to writing over living. Its major theme is the birth of a literary vocation. Though his elucidation of freedom is not exposed in the *Words* very prominently, the significance of this work is that the child, Sartre himself, chooses to become a writer. In his later years, he defined freedom as choosing a goal from various alternatives overcoming many obstructions. The child makes use of his freedom here though at that time, preconsciously.

In *Nausea* Roquentin in choosing himself to exist in the midst of the in-itself, runs away from his freedom. He denies any companionship and seeks refuge in solitude. This step away from his existential situation in fact marks the first sign of Roquentin's liberation. But instead of accepting that he is a free individual, he freezes his freedom, regarding it as an inert, opaque useless object. I would like to comment that the freedom to which we are all condemned will appear only as a form of determinism if we do not make it our freedom, if we do not try to appropriate it, if we do not strive to make ourselves free.
In *The Wall*, though Sartre advocates absolute freedom of the for-itself, he presents that freedom with various limitations. To put it briefly, here the fellow beings and the fear of death limit the freedom of the convicted characters. Here, towards the end of the short-fiction, the Sartrean notion of freedom as the freedom to choose (by the lead character Pablo) has been turned upside down by the stroke of fate.

In *No Exit*, each character is condemned to be in the disturbing presence of the other which leads to the controversial assertion of Sartre: the hell that is the other, *(vide: 4.2)*. This hell symbolizes the limitation of freedom. In fact freedom ceases to be there. All the five coefficients of adversity play a role in this play.

There is an indirect warning of Sartre which I wish to interpret. He is asking the reader to guard his freedom in the presence of the other.

In *The Flies*, it is Orestes' freedom that compels him to challenge Aegistheus and God, the Zeus. The power of human freedom is expressed in an absorbing manner in the
play when Orestes declares that God blundered in making man free (vide: 4.3). Even God admits that gods are powerless against a free man, (vide: 4.3).

Even though Orestes' freedom is a precarious freedom of an exile, he decides to take over its burdens and responsibilities together with its privileges, i.e. he wants to appropriate or possess his freedom. Here Sartre's words echo his conviction: "I am my freedom," (vide: 4.3 quote 22). Adorning himself with his subjects' crimes and atonements, he sets them free from guilt. His option to abandon the kingdom, the crown and his people serves only as a means to assure him that he is free. This turns out to be an act of selfishness.

Sartre's trilogy Roads to Freedom elucidates the existential absurdities in the life of the protagonist, Mathieu, in three successive fictions: The Age of Reason, The Reprieve, and Iron in the Soul.

In The Age of Reason Mathieu fails to acknowledge that he has attained the age of reason. Different interpretations of freedom by his dear and near ones confuse
him, though all through his life he longed to be free. This tragic hero of Sartre is ignorant of the fact that he himself is freedom. Instead, he remains a dissatisfied person who complains that life offered to him nothing except confusion.

Here Sartre tries to warn his readers not to ignore freedom and the consequent responsibilities. If one does so, his life will end up in nothing. Throughout the fiction, the readers could hear the author's message: search nowhere for freedom except in thyself. The for-itself is freedom. Sartre also reminds man that he has already attained the age of reason and that he has to accept this irrefutable fact to avoid ill-fated eventualities in his existential situations.

In the second fiction The Reprieve which followed the The Age of Reason, all characters face an uncertain future. Everybody's freedom is at stake because of the ensuing, inevitable war. Mathieu feels that his freedom is exile (vide:4.4) and that he is free for nothing. He was confronted with many alternatives: to go against the war or to stay back to fight in the war or to run away from the
war. He finally chooses to stay back and fight. It was an authentic free choice since he realizes that this free choice will end up in the fatal consequence — his death.

In the final fiction of the trilogy, *Iron in the Soul*, in the face of humiliating defeat and German occupation, Mathieu in a way consoles himself saying that neither the war nor the defeat was his choice. He decides to "choose a rifle," or in other words he chooses to die in order to demonstrate the impossibility of living. The fiction serves as an illustration of the tragic consequences of ignoring or under-estimating the power of human freedom and responsibility to modify an absurd situation irrespective of the limitations to human freedom.

In the thesis, I have considered two popular Malayalam novels since I think I can do justice to my study on Sartre's ontology by elucidating and evaluating these ontological themes of Sartre in an area which is familiar to me. By area, I mean the place (Maiyyazhi, as in the case of Mukundan's work) and the language (Malayalam) with respect to both works.
Both their narrative style and application of these ontological themes to the lives of the characters are so genuine that the readers may feel that they happen to be a witness to all events in the lives of the characters — feeling of pain, fear, frustration and hopes. While studying both works, I tried to concentrate on four aspects: to listen to each author's underlying message, and while doing so I was keen to look out for the Sartrean ontological themes, to study how the vernacular authors implement them in their respective works and finally to access how successful they are. Here is the result.

Anand's Deserts are Born portrays human beings wander around in pursuit of individual freedom to avoid existential absurdities as in the case of Mathieu in Roads to Freedom. Both works reveal the basic attitudes of dejections and depressions of human beings. Both authors accept literature as the medium to articulate and reflect on everything connected with existence. Their themes are powerful enough to liberate the author and the reader from all kinds of alienations which occur during one's life — alienation here becomes a process of sharing everything —
feelings of pain, frustrations, anxiety, lack of freedom and the final decision to make a choice. It is clear that Anand and Sartre share the view that a work of art serves as a bridge to link various cultures since the influence of the Sartrean - French existential themes' impact on this Malayalam author is enormous (so also is the case with Mukundan).

Both the authors indirectly invoke the need to encapture and enhance the moral and cultural values which are degrading in an alarming pace. Anand's Deserts are Born discusses a major theme of Sartre — the lack of individual freedom and the evil consequences of it.

Anand's linguistic command is powerful enough to drag the reader's soul through all the pathetic moments of the lead character Kundan as if it is his shadow.

The role of the other in obstructing the freedom of the for-itself is portrayed exquisitely. As in No Exit, the other becomes the hell to Kundan, interfering into his personal and professional freedom transfixing all his future possibilities. To add to the dismay, from Sartre's
perspective, the other also plays a role to make the existence of oneself very troublesome — with the creeping of desert like barren attitudes into the mind of man.

Everywhere Anand depicts a lack — a lack of individual freedom, an absence of boundaries, a want of basic resources and minimum comforts, a need for proper livelihood, a desire for stable human relationships, etc. (vide: 5.3). Presence of negation is prominent in his work. The theme negates not only the possibility of freedom but also the knowledge of freedom. Fighting against all odds, like Mathieu of Roads to Freedom, Kundan realizes his freedom to choose and he chooses to take refuge in Delhi. Anand's message, (vide: 5.3) compels man to reflect over the matter and encourages him to realize his freedom and take over the consequent responsibilities.

When we shift our attention to Mukundan, the nostalgic author, he depicts the protagonist, Dasan, trying to reaffirm his freedom and self-identity, always sticking on to his life principles resulting in costing his own life. Nostalgic tendencies are too dominant in Mukundan's theme as it discusses Maiyyazhi, the native land of the author. It
exceeds in style, form, novelty and originality irrespective of the Sartrean influence.

Dasan, the protagonist, confronts two kinds of freedom: the freedom of Maiyyazhi from the colonial rulers and his individual freedom. He personally conceives them both as one and the same. The Sartrean assertion of freedom to choose a goal is beautifully depicted in the life of Dasan. The French philosopher's conviction that man is not only responsible for himself but also for all mankind echoes in Mukundan's theme when Dasan clarifies that the liberation of Maiyyazhi is beneficial to the future generations to come and his individual effort is meant for that purpose. Sartre's leftist inclination is also clearly expressed when Dasan comments that communism is humanism.

Maiyyazhi attains liberation in Dasan's absence. (His initial efforts to liberate Maiyyazhi fails and he ends up in prison.) After getting released, wishing nowhere to go and nobody to rely on, Dasan chooses to commit suicide. As the master of his own principles, he chooses to die instead of becoming a burden to others. As Sartre insists, Dasan shows that he is a self-made man, never aiming for
success but never failing to choose his goal and retain his freedom (as Sartre said, while choosing a goal, success is not important).

All the three writers, Sartre, Anand and Mukundan illustrate how they make the common people realize the importance of freedom and responsibility in the simplest words possible through a media liked by all bringing the characters to such impressive situation capable of arresting the attention of readers.

The crisis of today's writer is that he is too preoccupied with competition for self exposure and recognition, making room for interpersonal conflict in the world of words. The Sartrean convictions which include: (a) all creative activity derives its impetus from others - the aesthetic appreciators (vide:3.3), (b) the author and the reader are mutually dependent on each other (vide:3.3), (c) there is no art except for and by others (vide:3.7), (d) literature in a way accepts the mutual recognition of each other's freedom (vide:3.7), (e) the literary work is an appeal by the author to the freedom of the reader (vide:3.8), etc. stand in question, because Sartre forgets
or in a way ignores that the relation between the author and the reader is also an intersubjective relation. It can accommodate the possibility of conflictual relations, though Sartre accepts it while discussing exclusively the ontological relations between the for-itself and the other. Sartre should have taken a middle path with regard to this theme in his ontology as well as in his literary convictions.

In the present age man always exists face to face with different kinds of existences as in the case of Roquentin in *Nausea*. Though Sartre and Heidegger insisted on and reserved the term 'existence' exclusively for 'humans,' I would say here that in the prevailing life-situations we are confronted with existence of both human as well as non-human.

The frequency of the feeling of absurdity of existence in our consciousness is increasing day by day because of the difficulties we experience in the course of our life. The relevant question is how can man save himself from being a useless passion especially when subjectivity is
considered to be the starting point of existence or to put it in the Sartrean dictum - when existence precedes essence?

The remedy against the feeling of absurdity consists in making man realize his freedom which is primordial. It is his weapon, it is a blessing, a blessing in disguise to use against all odds. Then how can he be made conscious of this blessing of which he is often ignorant or unaware of in the moments of crisis?

I would say that one way is to make him aware of it is through the medium of literature. Then another question may arise here: what will happen if the concerned individual is not gifted with the art of writing or reading? The answer is that the majority gets involved in socializing or that majority engages itself in communication with the literate sections of the society. This enables the individual to know of his freedom, his future possibilities and, of course, his limitations and most importantly the ways and means to overcome those limitations by making use of his freedom.

I would like to add that Sartre's atheism gives room to allow man to exist first and make himself later.
However, they are not successive in character. The Sartrean atheism displaces God and provides room for man. Men are powerless only when they admit they are so. Man is totally free to make his life the way he wants to be made. This is a responsible freedom. In this manner his existence too turns out to be responsible.

This message could effectively be carried through the literature, a medium accessible to the majority of the people irrespective of their cultural, social, economic and educational disparities. It should be utilitarian, aiming at the entire population.

A writer who is aware of himself as a free individual can write or engage in a good literary work in which he can choose the subject matter for a good cause. A good literary work must be quite marvellous and must be an exemplification of simplicity. It should be not only engaging and significant but also should expose relevant themes. Images portrayed through literature should not be superficial and artificial.

A writer can write about the world only if he has the ability to connect himself with it. When he writes
about relationships, he should be immersed in such lives and
fulfil a vital need within him. He should not attempt to
write about an area or subject which is unfamiliar to him.
He should rather concentrate on what he knows and what he
has appropriated. It may be limited, but that would be an
honest venture.

The literary medium should never destroy the
message that the writer intends to convey. It should have
thoroughness and dedication. It should be impressive enough
to attract attention with warm, balanced, informative
language free of blemish which should be exceedingly well-
annotated. Such a literary work written by a free,
individual should offer encouragement and support to all
making them realize that they are also free to express
themselves. In short, it should help in better
understanding of oneself, of the community and of others. It
should erase the feeling of being 'left out' in the midst of
others.

The function and purpose of literature to evoke
aesthetic pleasure has now only a secondary status. In
these days it has got a wider range of scope and purpose.
Literature should reveal to man his world and life-situations and of his fellowman as well in order to modify his living standards. It should make man feel responsible for his choices in life, for his life as a whole. Here I would prefer to accommodate the Sartrean assertion - when an individual becomes responsible for the choices of his life as a whole he is finding room for others too, because man is not an isolated being. He exists amidst others. In this way he becomes responsible for others too.

A writer is better placed to link people to people. He is a mediator of people, of cultures and his commitment lies in establishing mediation. It also indicates his basic need to communicate. Communication is an expression of freedom. Freedom of writing induces the need of the feeling that we have an essential relationship to the world and to others. Man becomes helpless due to the lack of proper communication and its result is alienation. Communication is not merely man to man talk. It stands for effective use of words in many other ways too. Its impact will be all the more effective through literature.
The author's need to write is fundamentally a quest for self-purification. Sartre also said that the function of literature is to offer man a critical image of himself. But there is no scope for selfishness in writing.

If a person writes for himself, that would be the worst thing. Sartre aptly remarked that the art of literature is a collaboration between the author and the reader. The writer is committed to a conscious affirmation of certain values as a free agent. He should not merely portray the life-situations, but should also try to change the social set-up if a situation demands it for a good cause. He should appeal to the reader's critical ability and to stimulate his talented, free individuality. I agree with Sartre that all literary work is an appeal to the freedom of the reader to collaborate in the production of the author's work, thus accepting each other's freedom.

The success of the Sartrean ontology consists in its ability to discuss those themes which are very much relevant to the existence of human beings in the world. But as discussed in the previous chapters, I may add here, once again, his existential philosophy defaulted with respect to:
(a) avoiding the possibility of conflictual intersubjectivity in the field of literature, (b) in his presentation of the objectifying look of the other which results in the freezing of all future possibilities of the for-itself and (c) in his universalization of a partial experience. But while studying Sartre, his ontology and literary works, one should always keep in mind that the nature of intersubjectivity, man's freedom and responsibility, the consequences of the lack of them, even bad faith and anxiety — all these are inevitable in the process of making of man all by himself. All these themes may be taken for granted or may go unnoticed if they are not articulated through the medium of literature. Here lies the significance of Sartre's ontology and the positive contribution of his literature.

The role of individual freedom in all these areas of individual existence is immense. Once the individual realizes that he is born free, many of these problems need not even arise in human existence. So Sartre's ontological themes provide a full scope for a meaningful existence if understood in a proper way discarding all the weak points which may emerge in certain crucial moments.