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CHAPTER III

LITERATURE AS THE MEDIUM TO EXPRESS FREEDOM
THE SARTREAN CONVICTION

3.1. Literature: The Aesthetic Medium

An artist whether he is a writer or a painter or a sculptor creates an artifact for the sake of people regardless of their cultural, social or national milieu. In creating a work of art these differences can in no way impose any restrictions on the creative talent of the artist. An outstanding work of art should vividly reflect the aspirations and turmoils of life. It is not necessary that the artist should belong to a particular tradition. A work of art becomes perfect when labelled as timeless and magnificent.

I wish to indicate that the relationship between the artist and the work of art is that of an intimate involvement. An aesthetic creation results from the smooth aesthetic flow of talent from the artist. Though the inspiration for an artist to engage in creative work may emerge from many a positive source, it can also arise from
ironical, satirical or unpleasant situations wherein he has been involved personally. In course of time, he learns to respect them and understand the significance of them for his literary pursuits. And, that is the only way they can help the artist to express himself.

It can be said that the world of literature is one of the most popular and influential aesthetic media. Literature has the enormous capacity to take over the world of aesthetics by storm. Literature is the art of collaboration between the writer and the reader. I think it will serve as a unique project leaping out of an active alliance between them. To create and to appreciate literature one has to make use of his talent, intellect, creative imagination, and emotion. It demands his intimacy and involvement with that aesthetic product.

An author's search is for spontaneity of his creativity. In his works there is always scope for accommodating what he chooses to expose. In the case of a painting, for example Michael Angelo's *Last Supper*, various colours merge gracefully with one another to give a unity to the painting. The strength of these colours or in the case
of literature, the characters in a particular literary work, are impressive enough to arrest the attention of an aesthetic audience.

In addition I would like to point out that an author should be close to nature and his surroundings to be spontaneous in creating his work. If that spontaneity is lost one begins to emphasize diverse rules to assert himself. That would be the beginning of vulgar art. So it is for the writer to discover his spontaneity by observing nature and his surroundings. He should turn to nature and grasp his surroundings to understand and to appreciate the innate beauty which is inherent in aesthetic spontaneity.

The motive of the artist/writer is to establish the unity between his own spontaneity and nature which encompass the universal. I do firmly believe that an artistic creation originates from sensual act and attains consummation after a prolonged intellectual endeavour. This, I consider, as freedom in the field of art, freedom from preconceived ideas, freedom to innovate afresh novel ideas. Writing provides enormous freedom to the author. It is a freedom which gets sedimented itself in the mode of
intentional structures (of using words). The purpose of my general exposition is that all these aspects can very well be exemplified in the writings of Jean-Paul Sartre.

3.2. Jean-Paul Sartre: The Literary Legend

Twentieth century has witnessed various revolutionary ventures in the field of literature. It is the century where people began to depend more on the power of written words than on the pleasantness of myths. World witnessed the glory and fall of many writers who revolutionized the thoughts of millions. Their words became the slogans of life. Among them Jean-Paul Sartre has an important position. His literary and philosophical masterpieces have been breathed-in by millions around the globe. His invaluable contribution to the world of letters still appeal immensely among the reading public. This chapter is an attempt to highlight his understanding of literature as such and how he accepts it as the proper medium of expressing human freedom.

Sartre's unique style of literary creativity is born of deep introspection, irrepressible passion combined with masterly craftmanship in the use of words. Many years
after his death, Sartre still remains a legend as he was during his life time. He consciously assimilated everything that captured his imagination and intellectual curiosity. It all helped him to evolve a work which bore his personal stamp. Through his literary works, he introduced the element of pause, a literary technique which compels us to stop for a moment to reflect over the theme repeatedly, as a major feature of his style of writing.

As a prolific writer, he wrote to startle and stagger the reading public by vigorous use of language aptly adapted from his personal experiences. 'Striving to exist' is central to all his themes (for instance works like The Wall, The Age of Reason, etc. portrays characters of this nature). Sartre's works depict the revolutionary (radical) attitude of the youth who rebel against the conformist world. Most of Sartre's works highlight existential absurdities like uselessness of life, self-deception, confrontation with others, etc. As the doyan of the literary medium, his works form a theatre where the characters form the setting of their own lives, as the spider spins its own web, enclosing themselves within it.
It is an act from which they draw sustenance, but in which they finally become prisoners.

Many of his works depict the middle class life and its existential absurdities. His depiction not only reveals the desolation of the personal, human relationships but also the social class whose vanity and uselessness cause its own doom. His literary philosophy is satiric and sardonically humorous. He is recognized for his use of unique masterly style and expression of relevant themes of the life during a period when cultural and moral attitudes faced a head on decline. During this period Sartre felt that the responsibility of the literary persons is to upgrade the dooming cultural and moral attitudes. Sartre's own contributions in this respect, resulted in writing many meritorious literary works including a work on literature, *What is Literature?*

3.3. Sartre's Interpretation of Art

The field of literature is regarded as a form of art. So before commencing the discussion on literature, it would be helpful to elucidate Sartre's understanding of art as such. While considering the notion of imagination,
Sartre remarks that consciousness is the primary datum of human existence. With its ability to imagine, consciousness has the capacity to create an aesthetic object from the world of imagination. An act of imagination from this perspective, becomes the reverse side of reality. It is at once a constituting, isolating and annihilating act.

To form an image, consciousness has to escape from the world of reality. Being absolutely free, it must withdraw from the world. It must negate the world. It follows then that negation is an essential condition for consciousness to conceive the unreal, i.e. to produce an image. But this negation is not purely and simply the world negated, rather, it is the world negated from a 'certain point of view' which implies that it must be situated in the world (being-in-the-world). This fact of being situated in the world is that which motivates the artist to create an aesthetic object.

This ontological magnitude of consciousness, on account of its imaginative dimension, leads Sartre to assume that all authentic works of art are unreal (in the sense in which objects of the world are real). It implies that the
object of our aesthetic appreciation is only an impression carved out of imagination.

To substantiate his point Sartre speaks of the beauty of an aesthetic object as: "What is beautiful is something that cannot be experienced as a perception and which by its very nature is out of the world."\(^1\) What it means is this. The object of beauty serves as an incentive to aesthetic appreciation. This experience of aesthetic enjoyment is not really an empirical experience but it is purely a personal or subjective experience of the aesthetic mind. It is an analogue, a result of the spontaneity of aesthetic consciousness.

Sartre warns his aesthetic audience not to confuse sensuous enjoyment with aesthetic enjoyment. If a certain colour in a painting has different shades of red as in the case of Matisse, it produces a sensuous enjoyment in us which is not an aesthetic enjoyment as such. Sartre maintains:

But when the red of the painting is grasped it is grasped inspite of everything, as a part of an unreal whole and it is this whole that is beautiful.\(^2\)
This means that in the perception of an artifact sensuous pleasure is involved. For instance an impressive colour or a shade in a painting provides the onlooker a certain kind of pleasure. But aesthetic pleasure or enjoyment results after apprehending the whole painting as having an aesthetic value in the beholder's mind.

Moreover, a work of art as maintained by Sartre forms its own space and time in the sense that it should be enjoyed and evaluated with reference to the space and time in which it was developed in the aesthetic mind of the artist. His cultural background, his aesthetic and imaginative talent, etc. are also be taken into account while evaluating a work of art. An artifact exists not merely on the day it gets appreciated; its existence depends on other factors such as the cultural and aesthetic background of the artist as well as his imaginative input. For instance, Pablo Picasso's Guernica or Beethoven's symphonies have certain temporal and spatial dimensions. The spectators and the audience are overwhelmed by these works of art that they are taken away to that period of creation. With regard to Beethoven's symphony, Sartre
writes: "It is not here ... nor is it in the past ... This is the work of art that matured in the mind of Beethoven on such a date."³ We are unable to change a single note of it. It therefore follows that the performance of symphony is only an analogue of Beethoven's aesthetic spontaneity. It can manifest itself only through analogues which are dated but which unroll in our time.

Applying these principles to various literary expressions, viz. fictions, dramas, short stories, etc. Sartre maintains that the novelist or the dramatist constructs the 'unreal' work of art by means of verbal analogue. For example, an actor, in a drama, presents himself as an analogue of an imaginary person. He gives expression to his feelings, his gestures, his strength as an analogue of the feelings and conduct of the character which he is enacting in the drama. In this manner, he lives completely in an unreal world. Even if the actor sheds true tears or if he feels joy while performing faithfully his part, these feelings are mistaken as pretended for the sake of the character enacted in the play. Sartre insists: "It is not the character who becomes unreal in the actor, it is the actor who becomes unreal in his character."⁴
The actor who performs the role of Hamlet transforms himself into the character of the Prince of Denmark and makes himself unreal. And what holds true in the case of the actor is also true of the audience. They transcend the perceptual consciousness and visualizes the image of Hamlet represented by the actor as real.

After considering all these instances from painting, symphonies, play, etc. one may ask the question: if the work of art is an unreality then why does one create a work of art at all? Sartre's answer is that we create art because all creative activity derives its impetus from others, viz. the aesthetic appreciators. This statement is a clear assertion of the ontological foundations of Sartre's theory of art. It necessitates the need to communicate, a communication from one consciousness to another. Art in this sense is purely a form of communication.

An artist feels himself essential in relation to his product, to his world and also to his fellow beings. The very structure of his consciousness enables him to feel so. The feeling of this relationship is beautifully
depicted by Sartre in his *Nausea*, where its main character, Antoine Roquentin, writes about Monsieur de Rollebon:

Monsieur Rellebon was my parter, he needed me in order to be and I needed him in order to feel my being ... He stood in front of me and had taken possession of my life in order to perform his life for me ... I was only a means of making him alive, he was my reason of existence. He had freed me from myself.

This quote shows how significant and dependent the humans are on one another. Each one's existence depends on the other. The other has become an indispensible part of one's existence. The same is true of literature; the author and the reader are mutually dependent on each other.

The status of literature and the influence exerted by it has occupied a prominent position in the aesthetic arena of Sartre. It gets admirable exposure in the work, *What is Literature?* in which he discusses the scope of prose.

3.4. The Sartrean Favouritism of Prose

In *What is Literature?* Sartre chooses to discuss prose. His main convictions of prose-literature can be clubbed into the following assertions: (a) prose is capable
of a purposeful reflection of the world, (b) in prose words are significative of the subject matter and is devoid of abstraction (c) it represents more reality than imagination, (d) prose in essence is utilitarian, i.e. the prose writer makes use of the words in various life-situations, and (e) the art of prose is employed in discourse.

After upholding the status of prose Sartre expresses his displeasure with poetry asserting that: (a) poetry is an end in itself, (b) poetry uses words in order to obtain obscure, harmonic effects and vague, evocative meanings, (c) poetry does not use words in the way a prose uses words, (d) words serve poetry as its aesthetic constituents, (d) poets are men who refuse to utilize language in the strict sense of the word utilize, and (f) the poet is outside language.

Although Sartre has his reasons to downgrade poetry, I have no reason to deny that both prose and poetry are characterized by a sophisticated poetic quality which the ordinary day to day language does not possess. Sartre's personal preference is for languages tailored to express with urgency the most immediate issues of the time. It
occurs to me that Sartre's commitment to descriptive phenomenology compels him to choose prose rather than poetry. It can be said, however, that, although poetry has harmonious effects and evocative meanings, one can say that it is often obscure and vague compared to prose.

But it may not be correct on the part of Sartre to label poetry as an end in itself. To a certain extent poetry does not use and need not use words the way prose uses words. As Sartre says words serve as its aesthetic constituent. Apart from that poetry can also lead the reader to a historic by-gone era, to a socially relevant subject, say for example, racism, decline of morality, sexual oppression, etc. It can also indicate to the scenic views of a hamlet life or to the innocence of childhood and even to the privilege of motherhood and so on.

Hence as against Sartre, I prefer to say that poets also make use of words. They are not outsiders to the use of language. Instead, they too, like prose-writers, indulge in meaningful use of language. Apart from serving as aesthetic constituents of poetry, the poetic words possess signification to a certain extent. When Sartre
speaks of literature mainly due to his descriptive (phenomenological) methodology, he means only descriptive form of it, viz. the prose.

3.5. Literature: Sartre's Convictions

Sartre's activities as a philosopher, a novelist, a playwright, a literary critic and a journalist are interlocking. Whatever be his chosen form of expression, he always expresses it and develops a related and original world view. Sartre believes that philosophy as well as literature should be concerned with man who at once is an agent and an actor. Man enacts his roles while he lives amidst the absurdities of his existential situations. A play according to Sartre is an appropriate vehicle to show the man in action. This may be the reason for his remark that the theatre is philosophical and philosophy is dramatic.

In Sartre's opinion pure literature is a dream. If literature is to be committed, it should contain everything. In other words, if literature is not everything, it is worth nothing. What this means is that if a written sentence does not reverberate at every level of
man and society, then it makes no sense. It should reflect man's existence, the existential situations, absurdities of life and the nature of intersubjective relations. It should also reveal his personal traumas and future possibilities. This is what Sartre means by 'commitment' in literature.

The beauty of literature lies in its desire to be everything and not in a sterile quest for beauty. An insane pride is necessary to write. The writer can only afford to be modest only after his intoxicating pride has been dissipated in his work. Dissipating his pride consists in concretizing his aims in words, i.e. conveying through the aesthetic medium of words what he really wanted to convey. Every writer dreams to write something that is everything to him, everything that he believed to be the sum and substance of his existence.

Writers should begin by renouncing illusions. They should express frankly what they aspire for through their writing. In the field of writing and inquiry experiences are valuable. Literature finds its initial impulse in silence. Similarly Sartre tells Madeleine Chapsal in an interview entitled "The Purpose of Writing,"
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that the writer's feeling of emptiness after the completion of the work is a fortunate experience. A writer's aim is to express to the best of his ability what he feels as an ordinary person.

Then one may ask, why does the writer, in spite of his pride behave like an ordinary person? This I presume is because the writer, a social being, lives amidst ordinary people. What makes him different from the common folk is his imaginative, aesthetic talent. He has his sense of pride because hewithholds what is to be said. To put it in other words, his aesthetic mind is impregnated with aesthetic datum. Then his pride gets transformed into a literary work. The resultant effect is his self-satisfaction for what he has done. Having completed a literary work, he, the author, becomes an ordinary person until some other inspiration originates in him.

Sartre claims that the function of literature is to offer man a critical image of himself. It serves as a critical mirror. If literature is to be engaged, it must reveal, demonstrate and represent the themes which the author really wants to emphasize for the public. Once the
author has done it, the public can freely interfere and interpret his work.

The adventure of writing undertaken by each writer challenges the whole mankind, both those who read the work and those who do not. Whatever be the style of writing, if the writer has talent, the theme written by him appeals to the public and captures their attention. Sartre comments that every book bought by the public becomes a vote in favour of its author. In reality people read literary works because they expect worthy writings from the authors. In a way reading is a sort of rewriting. From this point of view, it could be said that people discover or re-discover themselves in what they read and thus they express themselves in their reading. Similar is the case with the writer. The writer wants to write because he has a need to be meaningful and also to demonstrate the fullness of meaning he experience in life. Unless he writes it down, it slips away from him and later on he finds nothing to write.

Writing indicates the basic need to communicate. It becomes effective only when it is preserved in other people's memories. In Sartre's opinion philosophy and
literature are interdependent in the sense that philosophy is intended to serve as the foundation of literature. Both result from one's own experience. Literature can be effectively supplemented from philosophical foundations and in this respect, Sartre's literary works stand out as solid illustrations since they are rooted in his philosophy. However, I must admit that all literary works need not have a philosophic foundation. There are well acclaimed fictions, plays, short stories, and the like which do not have a philosophical basis and which remain classics on account of the powerful expression of language.

Sartre considers language as our shell and antenna. He makes his point clear when he writes:

It protects us against others and informs us about them. It is a prolongation of our senses, a third eye which is going to look into our neighbour's heart... There is a word which is lived and the word which is met... The word is a particular moment of action and has no meaning outside it.

Expressed otherwise, to speak is to act. Anything one names is already no longer quite the same. For it has been assigned a meaning, it has been burdened with a sense. While discussing language, Sartre considers language not merely in its spoken mode but also in its written form.
3.6. The Process and Purpose of Writing

By writing, the writer depicts a situation. And, by doing so, he reveals it to others with an intention to change it. He strikes at its very foundation, he transfixes it and he displays it in full view. In the process of writing, he articulates the situation with every word he writes. He involves himself a little more in the world by his writing, and, by the same token, he, the writer emerges a little more from it since he goes beyond it towards the future.  

Thus, the writer is a man who has chosen a certain method of action which may be called action by disclosure. Sartre indicates that the committed writer knows that his words are a kind of action. He knows that to write about the unjustifiable is meant to change it. A committed writer is the one who has given up the impossible dream of giving an impartial picture of the society and the human condition. He knows that the words are loaded pistols. And, for him to speak is to fire.
It must be added that the writer not only exhibits the world but also reveals man to the other to enable him to assume full responsibility for his life.

The writer is obligated to act in such a way that he leaves nobody ignorant of the world and that nobody may say that he is innocent of the consequences of what it is to be in the world. Since the writer has once committed himself to the universe of language, he can no longer pretend that he cannot speak. Once you enter into the universe of language and meanings, there is nothing you can do to get out of it.

What Sartre intends to say here is that if the words organize themselves freely into sentences then they will arrange themselves into meaningful wholes. They will refer, then, to the existential situations of human beings. Ironically, Sartre declares that even silence is a moment of language. Being silent is not being dumb. Sometimes, it may be a refusal to speak, but need not always be so.

Another significant part of the process of writing is the manner in which one writes. One cannot be called a
writer for having chosen to say certain things but for having chosen to say the same in a certain way. The style makes the value of prose. But it should pass unnoticed. This reveals Sartre concern for and insistence upon how — which is essential to phenomenology. In prose aesthetic pleasure is pure only if it echoes the response of the reader. Nothing can be said in advance about the form or style. It forms naturally in the course of time. Everyone invents his own style and judges it afterwards. It is true that the readers suggest the style, but they do not demand it. There are no styles a priori, existing outside the literary work.

Sartre invites our attention also to the writer's right to establish an enterprise of communication for the well being of the society and the individual. Each person choosing to write has his own reason. For some people art is a flight from reality. For some others it is a means to conquer an idea. But for somebody else it is a matter of self-satisfaction. Behind the various aims of the authors, there is a deep and immediate choice which is common to all of them — a choice of committing oneself to the art of
writing. However, it needs to be said that one of the chief motives of artistic creation especially of writing is certainly the need of feeling that we are essential to the world.

What Sartre wants to convey is that if we ourselves formulate the rules of production, the measures, or the criterion, and if our creative drive arises from the very depths of our heart, then we never find anything but ourselves in our work. To make writing an act of wide indulgence, reading is necessary. Reading is the other side of writing. Reading invites a truce with the process of writing.

3.7. Literature: A Truce Between Writing and Reading

Sartre is of the opinion that the writer cannot read what he writes in the strict sense of the term 'read'. For the art of writing involves an implicit quasi-reading which makes the real reading impossible. In reading one foresees and waits, one foresees the end of the sentence, the following sentences and the next page. Reading is composed of a host of hypotheses, dreams and the like followed by awakenings of hopes, aspirations and even
deceptions. Sartre makes the following remark in this connection:

Readers are always ahead of the sentence they are reading in a merely probable future which partly collapses and partly comes together in proportion as they progress, which withdraws from one page to the next and forms the moving horizon of the literary object. Without waiting, without future, without ignorance, there is no objectivity.

It means that there is an element of expectancy in the process of reading. The reader while reading is aware of the fact that there is something yet to be read. Here lies the element of expectancy. Moreover the reader develops different kinds of attitudes to the material that he reads: sometimes new, sometimes modifications of the earlier ones.

But writing is purely a regulating mission which the writer projects primarily. It often happens that he waits for inspiration. If he hesitates to initiate the work, he knows that the 'future' of the work is not already made, but rather he himself is going to make it. The future, for the writer (author) with regard to his work which he plans to create, is in the form of some blank pages. However, the future of the reader is, say, two
hundred pages filled with words which separate him from the end of the work.

The writer meets everywhere only his knowledge, his will, his plans, his past, in short, himself. The objects of his creation, viz. the literary works, are out of his reach in the sense that it is meant for the readers, i.e. he does not create it for himself. The sentence will never be quite the same in his eyes. He appreciates the effects of his creation. But these are in fact the effects produced on the readers. The author can judge their effectiveness although he cannot himself feel it.

The creative act is only an incomplete and abstract moment in the production of a work. The operation of writing implies that of reading as its dialectical correlative, and these two connected acts necessitate two distinct agents. The joint effort of these two agents bring upon the scene the aesthetic object within the mind. Hence the Sartrean assertion, "there is no art except for and by others" stands valid. It also points to the mutual recognition among the writers and readers and acceptance of each other's individual freedom.
3.8. Literature: A Pact of Freedom and Generosity

For Sartre human freedom exist, but it is nevertheless a mode of life and consciousness which has to be seized and not avoided. It is a process of becoming. In What is Literature? Sartre lays immense stress on the becoming, for it is the active side of freedom. It was his firm conviction that one's freedom invariably depended on that of the other. Sartre urges writers to use their personal, i.e. ontological, freedom for the service of the society. This is because he points out that one cannot realize one's freedom without the others. In What is Literature? Sartre demands that the writer should in each work propose a concrete liberation from the shackles of life depending on a particular situation.

Literature, if properly used or employed, can be a powerful means to liberate the reader from the kinds of alienation which enchains him in different situations. By making use of his own literary work, the writer also frees himself and overcomes his alienation. Sartre argues that literature is alienated from the masses when it forgets or ignores its autonomy and places itself at the service of the
temporal power, dogma or mysticism. It is the writer's mission to dispel inertia, ignorance, prejudice and false emotion of the masses.

Sartre's elucidation of freedom entails for the writer the necessity of commitment and engagement. He asserts that the writer is inevitably committed to his own time. This commitment indicates a conscious affirmation of certain values. He urges the writer, who according to him is an agent of freedom, to embrace the human condition in its totality.

Sartre deplores literature in general and novels and plays in particular which aim at reconciling man with his environment or which encourages him to escape from the vicissitude of life. Literature should not be a sedative, but a catalyst provoking man to change the world in which he lives and in doing so changing himself as well. By adopting this role, the writer ensures that the content of his work will avoid sterile dogmatism. By anticipating the point of view of the potentially free reader, he frees himself from himself. The process is dialectical and reciprocal.
Literature as presented by Sartre is a form of social action, an action by disclosure. He demands a literature of praxis which is capable of becoming an essential condition for action in a moment of reflective consciousness. It is therefore futile to write for any time but for one's own. No book possesses a finished, inherent, eternal meaning. When a novel is written, its meaning changes as the world changes.

The literary creation can find its fulfilment only when it is read. The author should entrust the reader the job of carrying out what he has begun in his writing. It is only through the consciousness of the reader that he can regard himself as essential to his work. Hence all literary work is an appeal, the author appeals to the freedom of the reader to collaborate with him in the production of his work. This establishes the fact that the writer considers the reader as pure freedom.

In any way, the writer should not seek to overwhelm the reader with any emotions because a literary work is not a mere means for enkindling any kind of emotions. The reader's feelings are never dominated by the
literary work. As no reality can condition them, they have their permanent source in freedom.\(^2\) That is to say they are all generous, for an author can call a feeling generous when it has its origin and end in freedom. Thus reading is an exercise in generosity.

What the writer requires of the reader is not the application of an abstract freedom but the gift of his whole person with his passions, presuppositions, sympathies, sexual temperament and his capacity to assess and to evaluate values. Only such a person can give himself generously. Thus the author writes in order to address himself to the freedom of readers, and he requires it in order to make his works exist.\(^3\) He also demands that they return this confidence which he has given them, that they recognize his creative freedom, and that in turn solicit it by a symmetrical and universal appeal. Here appears a dialectical paradox of reading: the more the readers experience their freedom, the more they recognize the freedom of the author as well. The more the readers demand of his freedom, the more he demands of the freedom of the readers.
Thus reading is a pact of generosity between the author and reader. This generosity consists in the mutual recognition of each other's freedom. Each one limits the other. Each one counts on the other, demands of the other as much as he demands of himself. In this way, there develops a stable intersubjective relation between the author and the reader. This confidence is itself an act of generosity. Nothing can force the author to believe that his reader will use his freedom. Likewise, nothing can force the reader to believe that the author has used his freedom. Both of them make a free decision. There thus establishes a dialectical movement. The aesthetic pleasure and consciousness induced by the work cause a sense of appreciation and belonging in the mind of the reader towards the product and also towards its creator. The work of art, from whichever side we approach is an act of confidence in the freedom men, i.e. both the author and the reader.

The unique point of view from which the author can present to the world those freedoms whose concurrence he wishes to bring about is that of a world to be impregnated always with freedom. Writing is a certain way of wanting to
be free. Once you have begun to write, you are committed. Thus whether the writer is an essayist, a pamphleteer, a satirist, or a novelist, whether he speaks only of individual passions or whether he attacks the social order, the writer, a free man, addresses free men, and he has only one underlying message, viz. freedom.

Both writing and reading win themselves in an historical situation. In each book there is an implicit recourse to institutions, certain forms of oppression and conflict. It appeals to the wisdom or folly of the day, to the lasting passions, and passing stubbornness. It also appeals to superstitions, evidences, ignorance, and also to particular modes of reasoning. It calls attention to hopes, inhibitions, fears, habits, sensibility, imagination, perception and finally to customs and values which have been handed down to the whole world which the author and reader share in common.

It is this familiar world which the writer animates and penetrates with his freedom. It is on the basis of this world that the reader must bring about his concrete freedom. And it is the very same world which the
author should change or preserve for himself and for others. Since the freedom of the author and the reader seek and affect each other's through a world, it is a fact that the author's choice of a certain aspect of the world determines the reader's and vice versa. What it means is that it is by choosing his reader that the author decides upon his subject. Thus all works in the mind of the author contain within themselves the image of the reader for whom they are intended. Literature should serve as the medium to expose the freedom of expression and the freedom of action. One should be used to demand the other. Literature should aim at an appeal to the freedom of men so that they may realize and maintain the reign of human freedom.

In the forthcoming chapter, there is an attempt to show how Sartre through some of his literary works, exposes and implements the project of human freedom in an existential situation.