Chapter - II

The Existential Philosophers

Soren Kierkegaard (1813-1855): In the hierarchy of existential philosophers, Soren Kierkegaard, a Danish philosopher, laid the foundation of existential philosophy. He is also regarded the father of existentialism. He was the person, who broke the tempo of traditional philosophy and reorganized it into a new format. He meticulously observes the society and found that modern man has become rational, moreover has forgotten “how to live”. He criticizes the intellectuals of his time for their tasteless, passionless and belief in the Absolute truth that is indeed beyond the glimpse of devotion. Hegel’s philosophy often mentions the concept of individual realization but it has merely the conception of collective ideas rather than spirit. Kierkegaard attacks the Hegelian facets of systematic philosophy as well as the entire tradition of the Western philosophy. His objective in philosophy is to free us from illusions by reflecting the understanding of the certain problems and anxiety. However, he does not believe in history as an objective process revealing God’s image while he himself assures that in the contemporary world, modern men have lost their imagination, feeling, intuition and passion. His writings attack the system of modern outlook. In this reference Narain. Tripathi quotes Kierkegaard’s point of view, “... by turning in worldly man discovers freedom, and for his bliss, not freedom to do this or that, to become king or emperor, or the exponent of ‘public opinion; but freedom to know of himself that he is freedom” (Tripathi 147). The concept of dread is conspicuous in the writing of existentialists which Kierkegaard associates with religion that in fact has
very close to the idea of sin. Tripathi again cites Kierkegaard’s definition on dread as a, “sympathetic antipathy and an antipathetic sympathy” (Tripathi 161).

Kierkegaard published numerous philosophical and theological works under various pseudonyms, such as: *Either /Or, Fear and Trembling, The Concept of Anxiety, Concluding Postscript* and etc. However, he was true Christian yet believed that “to be Christian is to suffer before God” (Tripathi 147). He utters in a very special sense about “individual existence”, a sense in which man is not a biological, psychological, or social animal, but a man who is merely a human being. For him, human existence lies in its constant and conscious inner striving which is very akin to the fundamental notion of ‘Conatus’ in Spinoza and the ‘will’ in Schopenhauer. Kierkegaard’s idea of human existence is based on the doctrine of the three spheres of human existence. First ‘Aesthetic stage’ that embraces the sensuous moment of life, the ‘Ethical stage’ that tries to legitimate absolute moral standards based on societal more on rationality and the final one is ‘Religious stage’ in which he puts forward the sufferings of human existence. The above-mentioned stages of the individual’s life through which a man has to pass in his life. Thomas R. Flynn directly cites Kierkegaard’s opinion of all the three notion of human existence in which he writes in a letter *Stages on Life’s Way*:

There are three existence-spheres, the aesthetic, the ethical, the religious. . . . The ethical sphere is only a transition sphere and therefore its highest expression is repentance as a negative action. The aesthetic sphere is the sphere of immediacy, the ethical the sphere of requirement (and this requirement is so infinite that the individual
always goes bankrupt), the religious the sphere of fulfilment, but please note, not a fulfilment such as when one fills an alms box or a sake with gold, for repentance has specially created a boundless space and as a consequence the religious contradiction: simultaneously to be out on 70,000 fathom of water and yet be joyful. (Flynn 27)

The aesthetic existence of man represents a life without principle that leads him toward the enjoyable life where nothing is good or bad for him on the contrary, ethical stage adopts satisfaction or dissatisfaction, fulfilment and frustration, ecstasy and despair. Mrinal Kanti Bhadra quotes Kierkegaard’s point of view, “The ethical stage is universal and as the universal it applies to everyone, which may be expressed from another point of view by saying that it applies every instant.” (Bhadra181) Kierkegaard accepts Socrates as a model for ethical stage, Don Juan for aesthetic stage, and Abraham for religious stage. He considers that an aesthetic person always merely focuses on the present and remains indifferent to the past. As a model of Kierkegaard’s aesthetic spheres Don Juan lives only for the sensual satisfaction of the present moment. His *Diary of a Seducer* is one of the most remarkable tales of life in which he delineates the character of ‘Johannes the Seducer’, which is parody of the rakish progress of Don Juan in his first aesthetic stage of life. There is nothing like repentance, obligation, commitment in the aesthetic sphere, these things have an inevitable place and remain relevant only in the ethical stage. They come into play after a ‘leap’ or ‘conversion’, experience and exercise of a free choice of individual acts.
Kierkegaard considers that, often, the ideology of people leads them toward the aesthetic sphere because in ethical sphere, man is confined in certain rules and norms that he has to follow. In fact, Socrates emerged the model of the ethical sphere beyond the laws of Athens on the other hand Abraham, Kierkegaard’s tragic hero remains within religious sphere. In the further step, he believes that the highest sphere of man’s life is religious sphere. He says that ‘leap of faith’ is a way of entrance into this sphere. He talks about the story of ‘Abraham and Isaac’ that he derives from the Genesis. It is a story of the absurd belief of Abraham in God for which he was ready to sacrifice his son in obedience to God’s command. At the last moment of the sacrifice of his son, Isaac on the altar, God Himself sends an angel to stop him for doing that. Thus, Abraham shows his blind belief of not adhering any reason and condition but devotes unconditional faith in God.

Kierkegaard coined a term ‘leap’ for the faith of Abraham in God that probably refers person’s belief in God without reason. The Existential ‘leap of faith’ has been perceptible in the opening chapter of the Bhagavad-Gita; when Arjun’s soul is caught in the net of worldly gloom, bewilderment and illusion then Lord Krishna intertwines and purifies his soul by reciting the lesson of the Geeta to Arjun. Similarly, Lord Buddha also realizes his ‘self’ by enlightening his soul. Kierkegaard writes, “Doubt is conquered by faith just as it is faith which has brought doubt into the world” (WEB). Thomas R. Flynn quotes Kierkegaard’s view on the integration of all the three spheres in his book:

If you cannot reach the point of seeing the aesthetical, the ethical, the religious as three great allies, if you do not know how to converse the
unity of the diverse appearances which everything assumes in this diverse spheres, then life is devoid of meaning, then one must grant that you are justified in maintaining your pet theory that one can say of everything, “Do it or don’t do it- you will regret both. (Flynn 36)

Kierkegaard assumes that religious stage is the actual existence in which an individual is supposed to be connected to God and tries to arise the religious sphere of life by correlating it with human mind. In this regard Thomas Flynn writes, “The religious individual is above the universal and from that religious viewpoint the ‘temptation’ now is to reverse this relationship, namely to make the ethical/ universal absolute to do the ‘moral’ thing and disobey the Divine command. This is truly a ‘leap’ of faith” (Flynn 34).

Kierkegaard further refers that an existing individual has two open paths to follow: objectivity and subjectivity. For an objective person God is merely an object while the subjective personality approaches Him in the inwardness of subjectivity that Kierkegaard actually supports which has a boundless passion that eternally remains true in its subjective response. As far as Christianity is concerned, it even protests every form of objectivity, which has no mean to individual support. Patrick Gardiner points out, “It is subjectivity that Christianity is concerned with, and it is only in subjectivity that its truth exists, if it exists at all; objectivity, Christianity has no existence” (Gardiner 93). In fact, the idea of subjectivity and conception of truth lead to the pivot on Kierkegaard’s account of religious belief in the Postscript. The existential thinkers revolve around the realm of imagination, feeling and passion with its subjective connotation. In its true sense, subjectivity is the confrontation of the
individual with God, since only before God an individual really ascertains himself ultimately and irretrievably alone. He, meticulously, observes the distinction between the truth of objectivity and subjectivity. While unfolding the truth of subjectivity and objectivity, he describes that the truth of Christianity exists only in subjectivity, as no more than a way of expressing this point. His analysis of the concrete existential patterns of individual objectivity is associated with all of heaviest despairs that generate melancholy, guilt, sin, worries and grief.

Kierkegaard utters that the development of self depends upon individual freedom since he believes that freedom is the initial effort to understand the self-consciousness. In general, for knowing the self and freedom anyone first goes to acquaint with Hegel’s concept of self and consciousness. His argument on consciousness appears to the lowest level of awareness. Kierkegaard’s comprehension on consciousness is not the relation of ideality and reality. In fact, it is an intermediate activity as he thinks that an individual cannot exist in this complex and illusive world without freedom, adding that his concept of freedom is never conceived without a reference to man’s inner relationship to God’s individuality. Therefore, the existential freedom is a constitution of inwardness. In his book *The Concept of Dread*, he points out that the opposite of freedom is guilt the paramount glory of it. ‘Who is I’ merely stands at the centre of the Kierkegaardian universe? His writings *The Concept and Anxiety* and *The Sickness unto Death* have been psychologically interpretations of ‘I’. His psychological writings delineate the structure of human personality in dynamic and volitional terms since human body is an amalgamation of psychical and physical entities. Freedom cannot be placed within the area of the systematic things since human existence and action have the necessity of freedom as well as thought. Thus,
Kierkegaard maintains that the mode of human existence grows up from the life of spirit that needs to be understood as consciousness and freedom. N. Tripathi cites Hugh Machintosh’s opinion on existentialism:

Existential thinking as a mode of thought which concerns not the intellect merely but the whole personality of man who awakes to it and adopts it. To think existentially, therefore, is to think not as a spectator of the ultimate issues of life and death, but as one who is committed to a decision upon them . . . Kierkegaard would have said that the chief defect in Hegel’s philosophy is the definite lack of such thought.

(Tripathi 157)

Therefore, Kierkegaard’s views on human value, individual freedom, and self-realization take an account in the realization of human values and its real importance with his complete identity of inward looking. In the case of objective uncertainty, subjective truth made the way for faith in relation to passion. Being the theistic existential philosopher, he follows the spirit of human existence on religious sphere and believes that without all-round struggle human being cannot exist in this vast universe. Socrates’ slogan ‘know thyself’ highly influenced to Kierkegaard consequently he added subjectivity of truth in his philosophy.

**Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900):** In the club of existential philosophers, the German existential philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche, vehemently and consistently comes as the first European atheistic existential thinker. Speculating the inner and outer feelings, Nietzsche is almost different from Kierkegaard as he dogmatically affirms the importance of body and of what is ostensibly ‘outer’. Kierkegaard had
belief in Christianity only because of to escape from ‘absurd’ and ‘meaningless’ world but Nietzsche disdained Christianity and had no belief in it. Unlike Kierkegaard, he repeats Ludwig Feuerbach’s proclamation of ‘God is dead’ and denounces Christianity for encouraging a form of what he calls “slave morality”. Even he denigrates Socrates while Kierkegaard casts himself as a latter-day version of Socrates. Nietzsche casts his supreme attention upon the finite world, which Kierkegaard rejected and resigned. Both of them are akin on decrying Kant, Hegel, and other traditional philosophers but Kierkegaard was champion of Socrates’ system because he was concerned with individual identity while Nietzsche did not completely reject him, since he only accepted the truth. He says that system only provides us ‘subjective truth’ not truth. Both of them stand in the favour of individual identity that comes out from the mass or social structure. Indeed, Kierkegaard is a philosopher of human existence while Nietzsche is a philosopher of the world. In contrast to Kierkegaard, Nietzsche considers that there is nothing like God in this world; human being must understand himself God. Hence, he proposes the idea of ‘Superman’ in which he mentions the name of Buddha and Zarathustra who realize their ‘self’. In the queue of self-realization of these super being, Nietzsche coined a phrase “Will to Power” (Tripathi 284) and recommends that ‘will to power’ is the only way through which man seeks the path of self-realization.

Nietzsche was precocious student whose first book *The Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of Music* (1872) at the age of twenty-seven in which he holds that tragedy is an art that has long captivated philosophical imagination. He assumes that it tells us the deepest and horrifying truth, and offers us a paradoxical form of redemption. In *Birth of Tragedy*, he remarks the division between Dionysian Frenzy and Apollonian
forms of life and meticulously depicts the greatness of the Greek art that lies in the control of the Dionysian Frenzy by the Apollonian reason. During writing he found the difference between ‘self’ and ‘true self’, between ‘natural’ and ‘man’s nature’. He expresses the short-lived transition of the individual personality who is himself an orientation of the passionate ideas. Michael Tanner quotes Nietzsche’s ideas in his book *Nietzsche: A Very Short Introduction*, “Man is no longer an artist (as he had been in creating Gods), he has become a work of art; the artistic power of whole nature reveals itself to the supreme gratification of the primal oneness amidst the paroxysms of intoxication” (Tanner 12-13). Throughout his life, he had been obsessed with the question of human salvation while he himself continued living atheistic life to explore the basic instinct for redemption in the world without God. Gile Fraser postulates that Nietzsche’s work is a series of experiments in redemption and salvation. His first work *The Birth of Tragedy* is an attempt to articulate, as art, “Life is only justified as an aesthetic phenomena, it is the best known summary of this position” (Fraser 02). Nietzsche’s ideas swim beyond the good and evil for which he himself interprets Jesus’ toward good and evil. Gile Fraser in his book *Redeeming Nietzsche: On The Piety of Unbelief* cites Nietzsche’s opinion, “Jesus said to his Jews: The law was made for servants, love God as I love him, as his son! What do we sons of God have to do with morality!” (Fraser 05). Indeed his articulation is an outcome of Bonhoeffer’s Nietzscheanism. For Bonhoeffer freedom is not possible without the capacity of the ‘Ubermensch’ that operates beyond the dictates of morality. He spells out in believing that freedom is the very essence of salvation and it is only possible beyond good and evil. Notwithstanding, he believes that knowledge of good and evil
takes humanity further from our original unity with God. Both Nietzsche and Bonheoffer conceive that salvation is a sort of reversal of the original ‘moral’ fall.

On the psychological ground, Nietzsche’s life was inevitably full of contradictory since he broke the chain of the tradition and norms of the society through his philosophical ideas. Being an atheist, he writes in a letter that all Gods are dead, since man is courageous animal; therefore, he put forward his idea to survive even with the death of God. The principle of atheism of non-existence of God with intellectual argument is later on borrowed by Sartre where he argues that in this world in absence of God, man must be absurd, unjustified and without reason, the being itself. As Mrinal Kanti Bhadra enumerates Nietzsche opinion, “The man who sees the death of God, significantly enough, is a mad man and he cries out his vision to the unheeding populace by the market place, asking the question: Do we not now wonder through an endless nothingness?” (Bhadra 225). Barret says that Nietzsche, in its actual sense, was not sure of God since at the age of twenty-four, he wrote a poem “To the Unknown God”, in which he speaks about himself as a God-possessed man that Bhadra mentions in his book:

I must know thee, Unknown one,

Thou who searched out the depth of my soul,

And blowest like a storm through my life.

Thou art inconceivable and yet my kinsman!

I must know thee and serve thee. (Bhadra 225)
The existence of God can never be proved therefore he thinks that God is merely a superstitious belief and ascribes that indeed God is concrete and his autonomous presence can be hold in men. Nietzsche adroitly writes in his book *Joyful Wisdom* that N. Tripathi mentions in his book, “Seek god! I seek God! God is gone because he and the spectators there in the market-place have killed Him” (Tripathi 293).

Nietzsche’s nature is even less of irrational than Kierkegaard, both of them think that it is reason that brings us to the conclusion where morality has no rational basis. For Nietzsche, morality and religion are interdependent, stand and fall together at the same stage. On the basis of morality he decries Christianity and gives slogan the ‘God is Dead’ which is not simply an assertion but with the death of God an age of absurdism begins where people find themselves in the state of madness. His death of God, in actual sense refers the question of His existence in this universe. Since he believes, that ‘fear of God’ has no longer been the part of Christianity. At this juncture, Nietzsche and Kierkegaard stand at one place that to be a Christian does not mean to accept a doctrine that there is no God, but it is to feel oneself in the presence and fear of God. The fundamental concern of Nietzsche’s life was to plot the relationship between suffering and culture. He decries Christian view of morality for the construction on moral basis since his judgment on morality is based on ‘will to power’. He claims that morality is a self-supporting system, based on nothing outside itself. It is built on reason, the basis of morality, in other way, is proved by its utility. He does not repudiate the existence of value. However, the rejection of value is somewhat he calls ‘nihilism’. Sometimes, he thinks himself as a prophet of nihilism such as Jeremiah was the prophet of destruction of Jerusalem. He postulates that Christianity has always been in a state of moral identity crisis. He discerns the
nineteenth century an event of nihilism, the radical rejection of value, meaning and desirability. His proposition on morality is more obeyed by a weak man rather than by a strong one because the idealistic morality makes man weak from his instinctive sense. N. Tripathi excerpts Nietzsche’s ideas in his book, “The European disguise himself in morality, because he has become sickly crippled animal who has good reasons for being ‘tame’, because he is almost an abortion, an imperfect, weak, and clumsy think” (Tripathi 289).

On the religious stand, he says that Christianity has crushed and broken man’s conscience and submerged him as in a slew of mind. He supports that morality should not be compulsion for humanity and criticizes by saying that it is a construction of passion and faith which is the prohibition against human instinct and impulses. However, in it reason is supposed superior to passion. Like the traditional philosophers, he also believes that morality is the consequence of reason. Further, he writes against the Christian morality and faith in his last book *Twilight of the Idols* that Michael Tanner reproduces in his book:

> When one gives up the Christian faith, one pulls the right of Christian morality from under one’s feet. This morality by no means self-evident: this point has to be exhibited again and again, despite the English flatheads. Christianity is the system, a whole view of the things thought out together. By breaking one main concept out of it, the faith in God, one breaks the whole: nothing necessary remains in one’s hands. Christianity presupposes that man does not know, cannot know, what is good for him, what evil: he believes in God, who alone
knows it. Christianity is a command; its origin is transcendent; it is beyond all criticism, all right to criticism; it has truth only if God is the truth it stands and fall with faith in God. (Tanner 38)

*Zarathustra*, one of the Nietzsche’s finest books begins with the symbol of rebirth and resurrection in which he denies the notion of free will with moral choice. He projects the human beings free from the earthly illusions that transcends him toward the biological dimension of human existence and its irrational instincts that derives him what he called ‘Will to Power’. In its cosmic sense, will to power is a force that can move the universe. It is indeed tempted moment of life that derives the biosphere. Psychologically, it is a drive to dominate and control the mind of individual. Self-control is the highest expression of the free spirit. Thomas R. Flynn observes Michal Haar’s opinion in his book, “Nature as a whole is will-to -power and it maintains every dimension of existence” (Flynn 38). Nietzsche’s ‘will to power’ does not mean a kind of desiring rather than happiness and pleasure. He calls it an ‘effect’. For him it is the primitive form of effect while all other impacts are merely a configuration. Manifesting the idea of ‘will to power’, he correlates it with metaphysical or better an ontological concept that Narain Tripathi cites his views in relation to Danto’s view in his book, “. . . he often has in mind only a philosophy that speaks of a reality which higher and purer that one we are seemingly acquainted with through the senses” (Tripathi 284). His notion of the ‘will to power’ manifests two phrases: the first one Nihilism and the second one is sublimated into the will to create the higher man. His higher man is also known a ‘super being’. He has written some doctrines for his goal in his book *Zarathustra*, in which he is to serve, “Look. Teach you the superman: The Superman is the meaning of the earth” (Tripathi 301). He
considers Zarathustra a religious prophet who is intended not having disciples but a desire that he is keen to stress. In his teaching to his disciples he says joy is deeper than suffering that can be observed in forth part of “The Drunken Song” in which he says:

The world is deep

Deeper than day had been aware. Deep is its woe;

Joy-deeper yet than agony:

Woe implores: Go!

But all joy wills eternity-

Will deep, will deep eternity. (Tanner 57)

Thus, Nietzsche’s philosophy on existence is irrationally a sense of believing. His atheistic point of view is fundamentally based on his faith, choice, morality, prophesies, disillusionment, tragedy and will to power. His concept of religion is probably based on Buddha where there is no name of God.

**Martin Heidegger (1889-1976):** German philosopher, Heidegger’s relationship with existentialism has been a subject of some controversies only due to some sustentative philosophical dissimilarity between his projection of ideas and other French contemporaries. His most influential book *Being and Time* (1927) is compared to Hegel’s *Phenomenology of Spirit* and Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason*. Heidegger’s book left a demarcation on theologians, psychologists, sociologists, and philosophers of his time. Husserl, Hegel, Kant, and Kierkegaard mostly influence his
philosophy of life. Like Kierkegaard, he also complains against particular concern with essence. He conceives that Husserl’s phenomenology neglects individual existence. His conception of philosophy is nothing but a verbal expression of certain pre-verbal or ontical structures and essentially a rejection of platitudes of the commonsense of the times. N. Tripathi writes Heidegger’s view in his book:

“Existence must always be grasped as a standing out from its being. The word ‘existence’ comes from the Latin term ‘existere’ which means “to stand forth”, “to arise”. By using the term ‘existence’ in the etymological sense instead of with the sense of “being”. Heidegger is characterizing the Person as that which can transcend itself. (Tripathi 198)

Heidegger’s concept of being in the world surrenders the three obvious components: the world, the being in the world, and the relation of being-in-itself. The problem of Being arises as soon as Heidegger starts contemplating with Brentano on the meaning of the word ‘being’ for Aristotle. His idea of ‘Being’ refers the entities than that on our knowledge of entities or on the sciences. For Heidegger, ‘Being’ contrasts not only with knowledge but also with ‘beings’ or ‘entities’. His argument about being is not the thin, unappetizing subject that has come to be seen. In fact, Being can be understood as the ground, in which metaphysics, as the root of the tree of philosophy is held fast and nourished. The glory of man is his openness to Being that Heidegger calls ’Dasein’, refers the human way of being. He calls man/Dasein ‘the shepherd of Being’ and advocates that we should learn to ‘dwell poetically’ rather than to behave mere pragmatically. Aristotle understands the verb ‘to be’ as an
ambiguous prospects in several dimensions. In the medieval period, Being procured the accumulation and refinements and exhibited the distinction between being as an essence and being as an existence. The question of meaning requires man’s authentic engagement into the act of questioning and thinking. Even Being is not something that lies upon the surface of everyday existence. It has rather a ground or depth in itself. He surmises that the pre-Socratic philosophers might not have been aware of the ontological difference between Beings and Being. They might have thought of Being as an outcome that embraces all manner and types of beings as: heaven and earth, gods and men. Hence, Being is an emerging-into-light, a shining forth and an appearance. He discusses ‘being-in-the-world in his book Being and Time and analyses the way that Dasein relates to other entities. It is also concerned with ‘dwelling’ rather than any more objective description of location.

Heidegger’s remarks on Being, is to analyze in each cases of traditional and modern thinking. Indeed Dasein has a preliminary understanding of being. As cities, theories, questions, and tools, all of which are depend upon their mode of being similarly Dasein itself is independent, it depends upon other Dasein. Machael Inwood writes in his book Heidegger: A Very Short Introduction:

Dasein is essentially in the world, not simply in the sense that it occupies a place in the world together with other things, but in the sense that it continually interprets and engages with other entities and the context in which they lie ‘environment’ or the ‘world around us’. . . Dasein is not just one thing among others; it is at the centre of the world, drawing together its threads. (Inwood 22)
Heidegger refers Dasein both to the human being and to the type of being that humans possess. It emerges from the verb ‘Dasein’ that means ‘to exist’ or ‘to be here, to be there’. He considers that the being of humans is different from that of other entities of the world and writes that ‘Dasein is an entity while Being is an issue’. Michael Inwood writes in reference to Dasein:

The essence of Dasein lies in its existence. Accordingly those characteristics which can be exhibited in this entity are not ‘properties’ present-at-hand of some entity which ‘looks’ so and so and is itself present-at -the-hand; they are in case possible ways for it to be and no more than that . . . so when we designate this entity with the term ‘Dasein’, we are expressing not its ‘what’ (as if it were a table, house, or tree) but it’s Being. (Inwood 23)

Thus, Dasein’s being is an issue of the dependence on the fact of being as in case of His. Dasein contravenes Aristotle’s ontology in two respects: the first one is not a substance with an essential nature and with properties or ‘accidents’ but in other one, its potentiality is prior to its actuality. Ontologically, Heidegger’s ‘Being-present-at-hand’ is an outcome of his view over its objective point of existence. He considers that Dasein crosses the ambit of subject and object that is why he is defined as ‘being-in-the-world.

Heidegger introduced the term ‘authenticity’ that Sartre later on adopts in his existential evolving. He also mentions two modes of existing of Dasein: authenticity and inauthenticity in reference to man’s relationship to himself. In a broader sense, an authentic life is one based upon an accurate appraisal of human condition. Jack
Reynolds observes Heidegger’s view over authenticity and in authenticity in his book *Understanding Existentialism*, “Authenticity involves an individualizing sense of ‘mineness’ eg. My decision- as well as a recognition of wholeness (BT), because it assumes, rather than flees from, the finitude and groundlessness of Dasein’s existence” (Reynolds 37). An authentic existence predominantly based on the probability whereas inauthentic existence is grounded predominantly in actuality. Heidegger’s argument over authenticity propounds the meaningful life adding because of that, which might be, and what might have been. He explicitly contends Dasein’s fall from three main authentic existences that Jack Reynolds further writes in his book, “. . . reliance on various kinds of psychological determinism (the insistence that all behaviour is causally determined by the past); a conception of a particular future as inevitable; and a conception of ourselves as having an essence or nature” (Reynolds 37). The authentic man has an adequate understanding of himself of ‘who he is’, whereas the inauthentic man does not focus on the canvas of ‘I’ who acts blindly thus both the modes are the Dasein’s possibilities. Of course, authenticity depend on an adequate ontological identification of one’s ‘existing’, facticity and fallenness while inauthenticity rejects Existenz and lives in fallenness. So far as the inauthentic mode is concerned, it is man’s forgotten Being while in authentic existence Dasein is supposed to recognize and act in accordance with the notion of its self. In the case of authentic existence, Being makes up his own mind and prepares himself for true to its own self.

One of Heidegger’s most important and striking doctrines is his rejection of truth that he himself considers it as an uncovered or uncovering. The most striking point is his formulation of our ‘primitive’ or ‘natural’ viewpoint of the world, which
is an essential structure of Dasein. There has been close relationship between the world and Dasein. Traditional philosophers understood this relationship as one of knowing and entities known as an object. The prominence of knowing concealed us from primitive or natural viewpoint. He points out that although we do not make contact with things yet entities inspire to find out the notion of things. The next idea of Heidegger develops with anxiety and angst that has tremendous significance in *Being and Time*, and largely on account of individualizing role Heidegger argues it. He envisages that anxiety individualizes us because we no longer feel at home in the world of ready-to-hand.

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger introduces an account of the career of assertion that essentially communicable to others. Generally, it passes on from one person to other and is accepted by everyone, but ambiguity and duplicity infect our relations to one another. Michael Inwood iterates Heidegger’s opinion in his book:

> Dasein is proximally and for the most part alongside the ‘world’ of its concern. This absorption in . . .’ has mostly the character of Being-lost in the publicness of the ‘they’. Dasein has, in the first instance, always already fallen away from itself as an authentic ability to be its ‘Self’ and has fallen into the ‘world’. ‘Fallenness’ into the ‘world’ means another absorption in Being-with-one-another, in so far as the latter is guided by idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity. (Inwood 52-53)

Heidegger’s account of Dasein’s feeling is a vivid and compelling, but it elevates several illusions. He assures by telling that our condition in this world has become fallenness and inauthentic. He raises a question in his book *Being and Time* discussing
whether the external world is real or not, in this reference Michael Inwood writes in his book:

. . . . between and the world, then with my body counted as something external to me rather than intrinsic to me? Then I am conceived as a pure, ‘worldless subject’. And this must be a knowing subject, rather than acting subject, a subject whose only access to the world is by way of internal state of itself impressions, ideas, or whatever. But this not what I am like. My being is care; I potter around doing things in a familiar environment. I am essentially in the world my access to the world and to the things in it is not mediated by ideas or anything of that sort; I hear the ‘cracking wagon’, not ‘pure sound’. (Inwood, 60)

The Greek philosophers had link with temporal presence of Being. Plato ascribed Being only to unchanged, eternal forms or ideas which had nothing to do with arise, fade and die away. He differentiates the temporal entities such as men, plants, utterances, and propositions are the outcome of supernatural being such as God. Heidegger rejects the above-mentioned classification of entities and says that there is something like a supernatural God in this world. It refers that there would be eternal truth of the independent of Dasein. There are no temporal theories, meanings or propositions. Nevertheless, there are all ways of Dasein’s temporal, historical and being as Dasein is. Heidegger thinks that death is not simply something that happens at the end of one’s life. Dasein’s awareness of death shows an attitude of ‘being-toward-death’. Life without the prospect of death would be a life of perpetual postponement. Death is non-rational. It severs all one’s relationships to others. His
conception regarding ‘life after death’ has been perhaps wide spread. Further Michael Inwood observes the ontological account in his book:

If death is defined as the end of Dasein that is to say, of Being-in-the-world, this does not imply any ontical decision whether ‘after death’ still another Being is possible, either higher or lower’ or whether Dasein ‘lives on’ or even ‘outcasts’ itself and is ‘immortal’. (Inwood 74)

Thus, his notion of freedom is something of a burden, not least because it deprives us of our habitual comfort zones. His ideas over ‘conscience’ have a long and complicated theological and socio-cultural history but his understanding is distinct from these moral perspectives. The phenomenon of conscience gives us something to do understand while it cannot be explained away by biology and psychology. His experience of conscience and guilt create the “I” in concrete form with existential significance.

Jean-Paul Charles Aymond Sartre (1905-1980): French writer, Sartre, is renowned for being as a philosopher, novelist, political activist, literary critic, and biographer. He was a leading and key figure in the field of phenomenology and twentieth century existential philosophy and Marxism. His immortalized works such as Being and Nothingness, Nausea, No Exit, The Devil and Good Lord. Apart from above mentioned works his lecture “Existentialism Is a Humanism” has influenced sociology, critical theory, Post-colonial theory and literary studies. He left behind immemorial thoughts in the field of literature therefore he was awarded the Noble Prize in the field of literature in1964 that he rejected by saying, “A writer should not
allow himself to be turned into an institution.” (WEB) He believes that our ideas are the product of experiences of the real-life situations, that novels and plays very well depict, and these ideas later transform into theory. In the beginning, his conscience is inspired by the phenomenologist epistemology. Andre Franz explains in his book *The Social Thought of Jean-Paul Sartre*, “Man chooses and makes himself by acting. Any action implies the judgment that he is right under the circumstances not only for the actor, but also for everybody else in similar circumstances.” (WEB) Practically, his life revolves around the notion of human freedom. He considers existentialism, a doctrine that makes human life possible and assures that every truth and every action insulate both an environment and a human subjectivity. In the lecture, “Existentialism Is a Humanism” delivered in 1946, he defines existentialism in these words, “I have lately been told of lady, whenever she lets slip a vulgar expression in a moment of nervousness, excuses herself by exclaiming, I believe I am becoming an existentialist” (Sartre 02). Further, in the same lecture he considers himself as an atheist in dividing two groups of existentialists:

There are two kinds of existentialists. There are, on the one hand, the Christian whom I shall name Jaspers and Marcel, both professed Catholics; and on the other hand the existential atheists, among who we must place Heidegger as well as the French existentialists and myself. What they have in common is simply the fact they believe that ‘existence comes before essence’ or if you will that we must begin from the subjective. What exactly do we mean by that? (Sartre 03)
Sartre’s work *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenology Ontology* (1943) took a revolutionary image in modern notion of psychology and people’s way of understanding. However, it stands as an iconic and defining work of tradition. Heidegger, Hegel, and Husserl mostly influenced him during penning the present book *Being and Nothingness*. As a representative of atheistic existentialism, he pronounced an idea for particular being that human existence comes first before its essence, therefore he gives a slogan regarding the present concept in his lecture: “existence precedes essence.”(Sartre 04) Further, in his lecture he says that there is something like human nature, and there is no God to have conception on it. He points out in his lecture, “Man is nothing else but that which he makes of himself. There is first principle of existentialism. And that is what people call it ‘subjectivity’.” (Sartre 04) His conception of ‘existence precedes essence’ refers that human beings first exists and thereafter define his essence by the way in which he lives. He distinguishes the two modes of consciousness- the pre-reflective cogito that is related to present the experiences of life which does not have any kind of ego or self and the second one is the ‘reflective cogito’, it postulates a self in order to reflect on the past experiences.

Sartre considers that there are fundamental categories that human existence involves: Bing-in-itself, Being-for-itself, and Being-for-others. The first one Being-in-itself, as Sartre thinks, is an unconscious state of man in which there does not have any creativity or development in other words it is an inactive state of a being but it is the nature of “Isness” means there is something exists in it. It is an initial state of a particular being, Sartre calls absurd to this state of being. In his book *Understanding Existentialism*, Jack Reynolds observes Sartre’s view on being-in-itself, “It is a “pure plentitude” and we cannot properly speak of it. To refine our earlier definition, our
facticity is the relationship between the for-itself (transcendence) and the in-itself (brute object)” (Reynold 59). Being-for-itself, for Sartre, is a unique, developed, creative, active and wonderful state. Here in it, man starts making planes and finds some potentiality to create something new. In this state, he realizes his real mental states and its importance. Jack Reynold again writes in his book, “Being-for-itself, as the term suggests, refers to creatures that are something for themselves; that are self reflective but it cannot be restricted merely to reflective consciousness” (Reynold 58). Sartre says that being-for-itself is a freedom, and its function is by negating the in-itself. In fact, it rejects facticity and objects. Facticity designates the relationship between being for-itself and being in-itself that incorporate our social situation. Being-for-other is a mode of human existence that is irreducible to being-in-itself and being-for-itself. Simply, he considers there is something outside of the world, there must also be other people. He prefers that one encounters the existence of others, on three ways that Jack Reynolds writes in his book, “. . . the other can be an object that I appreciate and use it as an instrument; ‘the other can be that which takes a perspective on objects that I am looking at’ and ‘the other can appear as he or she who looks at me, who can judge me, and I hence experience my own objectness” (Reynold 92). Thus, being-for-other purports the relationship between subject and object. Sartre proposes that for Being, other is an object. Sometimes Being might be object for others (subject) even other may be object for someone else (subject). Thus, the chain of relationship between subject and object always run. His Being-for-other clearly exposes the notion of original one that he called “the look” that refers we are ourselves an object in the eyes of another person or the object of another’s judgment.
Sartre gives the idea of the existence of others by giving the examples that Jack Reynolds quotes in his book:

In his park example, it is still only probable that the other person is actually in fact a person. The other is still an object of some kind within my perceptual field, albeit a particular kind of object that we cannot treat as just another object that can be manipulated. So, we are still after the proof of the existence of the other that Sartre is seeking.

(Reynolds 93)

In his lecture “Existentialism Is a Humanism”, Sartre considers that man is a project who possesses a subjective life as well as responsible for what he is. He points out in his lecture:

When we say that man is responsible for himself, we do not mean that he is responsible only for his own individuality, but that he is responsible for all men. The word “subjectivism” is to be understood in two senses, and our adversaries play upon only one of them. Subjectivity means, on the one hand the freedom of the individual subject and on the other hand, that man cannot pass beyond human subjectivity. (Sartre 04)

Sartre’s conception of freedom is an ontological dimension of consciousness. He spells out many times that human being is “condemned to be free”, which manifests that our freedom is not something, that can either be gained or lost, but it is a necessary aspect for being human. He understands freedom by analyzing the nature of consciousness and further assimilates responsibility with freedom and purports that
one cannot leave or escape from one’s responsibility by using one’s freedom. In other words, responsibility itself becomes hindrance in the line of freedom. Advocating the absolute freedom, he says that there are five elements that stand as an obstacle for it: place, past time, environment, other human being and death. All of them may stand against human freedom to certain extent nevertheless; they have also capability to construct a new situation. In Being and Nothingness, he says that freedom is the condition of human existence, “... a being which is what it is not and is not what it is” (Reynolds 57). Sartre discusses, concrete example of human existence, asserting that freedom is the first condition of action that requires a situation. He keeps himself away from the traditional argument for the freedom of the will on the ground level. Discussing over freedom, he proclaims that it cannot be restricted to the mere exercise of the will, or of rational, calculative judgment. The term ‘will’ is itself the result of a prior freedom and choice. Sartre himself writes that we entirely bear the responsibility that befallen upon us and in a particular situation; we have to choose what way we have to follow.

The existentialist’s propagation of existence of human beings embodies man in a particular situation. Sartre calls this the present situation, an amalgam of our ‘facticity’ and our ‘transcendence’. Facticity denotes the givens of our situation such as our talent limitations, our race and nationality, and the other with whom we deal our previous choices. ‘Transcendence’ refers the tendency beyond our consciousness that functions somewhat like the intentionality of consciousness. Thus, Sartre admits the situation in an ambiguous sense. His conception of nothingness condemns the freedom and assures that consciousness always remains conscious of itself. His important argument is ‘anguish’, which is different from fear. He suggests “... fear is
fear of beings in the world whereas anguish is anguish before me” (Reynold 70). Actually, anguish needs to be distinguished from fear, it involves a reflective apprehension of the self and our freedom is a respond to an external situation in any number of different ways. In his book Being and Nothingness, he distinguishes anguish into two main senses: anguish in the face of the future and anguish in the face of the past. Both anguish and fear come in the mind of a person when he realizes about his complete destruction of existence. Further, he says that man has to endure the burden of the anxiety by suppressing his freedom however; he tries to escape from his responsibility. Later on, he calls this attitude of man bad faith in which he find himself not to be authentic.

Sartre’s idea of existentialism is better known for its term “bad faith”. He considers that it is our usual inclination to deny the responsibility for our situation. Bad faith or self-deception is an understanding of a character or individual in the guise who defines himself through the social categorization of his formal identity. It refers one must believe the social role is an equivalent to the human existence. As far as ‘bad faith’ is concerned, it denotes man’s social, economic, and racial occupation. Sartre considers ‘bad faith’ merely a social position, which is related to human experience and compares it with lying. As in a lie, we find three elements: first, one must believe that something is true, second, one must express to another the opposite of what is believed and the third, if a lie is succeeded then other must believe in the statement expressed. He calls the “faith” of bad faith because it reveals high standard of evidence and provides the key to bad faith as a choice to be satisfied with non-persuasive evidence. Thomas R. Flynn cites Sartre’s view in his book Existentialism: A Very Short Introduction, “One puts oneself in bad faith as one goes to sleep and one
is in bad faith as one dreams” (Flynn 72). The duality of the facticity and
transcendence in human life makes ‘bad faith’ possible that is in fact an attempt to
escape from tension. The Marxist economic to Freudian psychological variety provide
theoretical versions of bad faith. Sartre’s conception of faith assumes two forms: good
and bad. Both of them come out from the same disintegration of consciousness. In
good form, one gets freedom and understands that one can exist only by trying to
become what he is actually. It is also considered that ‘bad faith’ is the abolition of the
traditional ethics. Thus, bad faith is the result of a person’s creation of life on the past
events by negating the current self and following past self that is longer in existence.

The French existentialists find that there is nothing like God in this world.
Sartre in his lecture speaks Dostoevsky’s view on it, “If God did not exist, and
everything would be permitted” (Sartre 07). He himself supports Nietzsche for his
giving the concept of the ‘Death of God’. He says that we all are alone in this huge
world therefore in his lecture, “Our aim is precisely to establish the human kingdom
as a pattern of values in distinction from the material world” (Sartre 13).

Man’s freedom in the society has to take its account in relation to other human
beings since man has to work in relation to others. Sartre gives the phenomenological
description of man’s relation with others and reaches at a point that man becomes
aware of his existence in a moment of shame, discomfort, and agony in the presence
of others. He again mentions that both Marxism and Existentialism are philosophy of
freedom, as well as projection of a theory and commitment. In this regard,
existentialism is a humanistic philosophy of action, of effort, of combat and of
solidarity. The communists call Sartre’s philosophy, ‘a philosophy of graveyard’ and
accuse him of double idealism. He explicitly speaks in his lecture that it is a philosophy of despair, however it makes man courageous to face every critical situation and able to decide alone or without any support of social custom and tradition. He says that responsibility gives man a dignity and relates it with freedom. He supports the thinking of Marxism and points out that now society has become capitalist and it has divided man and woman into the bourgeois and the proletarian classes that has exposed the long drench among people.

Sartre opinion on death is worth considering that is the last barrier of human life. Indeed, it is an empirical fact that is the last aspect of life. Narain Tripathi observes Sartre’s view in his book, “death is my possibility . . . but the always possible nullification (neantisation) of what is possible for me, which is outside my possibilities” (Tripathi 275-76). He postulates that death has never given any meaning to life despite it actually deprived life from its all significance. Thus, N. Tripathi again cites Sartre view on the clear-cut distinction between life and death:

Life decides about its own meaning, because it is always in ‘abeyance’. It possesses the power of auto-criticism and of auto-metamorphosis, which allows it to be defined as a ‘not-yet’. The dead life also does not stop changing, but it is ‘done’. This signifies that for it, the game is over and it will undergo these changes without being anymore responsible for them. Nothing can happen to enter it from the ‘inside’, it is completely closed and nothing can enter it anymore, but its meaning does not cease being modified, albeit from the outside. (Tripathi 276)
Other Existential Philosophers: In the queue of existential thinkers Karl Jaspers, Gabriel Marcel, Albert Camus, Simone de Beauvoir, Franz Kafka, Dostoevsky are also regarded influential figures. Theodor Jaspers (1883-1969), a German psychiatrist, theologian, and philosopher, is mostly known for the ingredient contribution in the existential philosophy. He draws the root of his philosophy from Kierkegaard’s “leap of faith” and “transcendence”. He says that in selecting the choice an individual sinks into despair and resignation where he has to confront with his limitless freedom, that Jaspers termed ‘Existenz’. He was monist who tried to recognize the validity of the concepts of both the subjectivity and objectivity. With his philosophy of transcendence, he influenced the contemporary theology and explicitly refused the notion of religious doctrine including the personal God. Apart from the Western, he was also influenced by the Eastern philosophy, particularly Buddhism, whose positive result developed a theory of “Axial Age” that refers to the period of religious and philosophical development. His book *Philosophy of Existence* (1938) explores the history of the philosophy as well as philosophical system. Generally, he believes that life welcomes reason and through it, existence becomes lucid and simple. However his conception of ‘existenz’ leads ‘being’ toward the self-ascertainment which is in fact neither conceivable nor objectively valid. Jaspers thinks that true being cannot be found because it has place in its transcendence that is akin to ‘existenz’. For him existence is temporal while ‘existenz’ being in time is more than time. Its being has relation with other ‘existenz’ and transcendence. Transcendence is the being that is beyond the existence and consciousness as well as ‘existenz’. It transcends all of them and opposes the finite, relative, inclusive objects and subjects of consciousness. Another new conception that Jaspers introduces is ‘Encompassing’
which may support to understand ‘existenz’ and transcendence. As one always thinks and lives within a horizon while encompassing is something that assimilates horizon within itself. It cannot be called an object but it is an explicit theme of thinking in which one may know his empirical existence, consciousness and spirit. Thus, Jaspers conception of ‘existenz’ is the encompassing that has actually its fundamental origin. Existenz contains every mode of the encompassing that scientifically can become investigable realities. However, Jaspers considers that ‘existenz’ is an object of science; it is the possibility of decision, which is derived from no universal validity. Without transcendence, ‘existenz’ becomes a sterile, loveless, and demonic defiance. Despite it, he gives the importance to reason by saying that ‘existenz’ and reason are two opposed power struggling for victory because without reason ‘existenz’ becomes inactive, and sleeping motion. Thus, Jaspers was a theist philosopher who’s thought run around ‘existenz’, a new term in existential philosophy.

Gabriel Marcel (1889-1973), a French philosopher and playwright, also comes in the trend of Christian existentialists. He was the first thinker who applied existentialism to Sartre and Camus. His philosophical works Mystery of Being and Man Against Mass Society preferred the level for ‘neo-Socratic’. Like Socrates, Marcel is an outspoken critic of the contemporary society. He defended his ‘will-to-truth’ against Nietzsche’s ‘will-to-power’. His philosophical enquiry begins with a person’s ‘being-in-the-world’. In Tragic Wisdom and Beyond, he discusses the concept of ‘being’ and designates ‘being’ as an ‘absolute super-being’ and later calls him most ‘genuine being’. He points out a very subtle distinction between having and being and later gives the preference to being. For him, Being means free from all burden and impediments while conception of this new idea leads him to a new
dimension where one crosses the entire burden till the death and enters into eternal life. He had rather optimistic approach to death who believes that death does not mean sinking into a void rather a step toward eternity. In his philosophical doctrine, he further moves towards analyzing the concept of love and hope that he observes them in concrete forms. Generally, it is considered that fidelity can be for one-self, to other or to God that Marcel himself supports. He says it is one of the most important ways in which ‘I’ and You’ belong to an ontological permanence and perpetuation. Hope, expectation and despair are related to one another; hope has been recurring dimension in the works of Marcel that meet the challenge to death. Narain Tripathi writes in his book, “The Christian has hope of eternal life, a hope founded on a premise” (Tripathi 229). Therefore, hope is connected to new light and new way for living the tranquil life while despair is only connected with isolation. By interpreting love, Marcel connects himself with Christianity and owes much to the New Testament in following the bond of love. He considers love as a ‘real knowledge’ that contains transcendental explanation. Love and suffering are integrated to each other. Marcel was the first one who dissociated himself from the figure of Sartre’s ideology and discusses about the ‘philosophy of existence’ in his works. He uses a term ‘incarnation’ in respect to the relationship between body and self, self and God, and person and universe. He widely analyses these relationships in his preface to “Man Against Humanity” that Narain Tripathi cites in his book, “The dynamic element in my philosophy, taken as a whole, can be seen as an obstinate and untiring battle against the spirit of abstraction” (Tripathi 239).

Another influential figure in the list of existential philosophy was German philosopher Franz Kafka (1883-1924), whose novels and short stories such as The
Metamorphosis, The Trial, and The Castle left an immemorial landmark on the society. His works are filled with the theme of archetypes of alienation, physical and psychological brutality, and parent child conflict, individual on a terrifying quest, mythical transformation and labyrinth of bureaucracy. He also comes in the hierarchy of Sartre and Nietzsche for being ‘an atheist’. His philosophy is not based on monitoring of the world but on that of the ‘self’ he calls the present world ‘mouse-trap’. He witnessed the destruction of the First World War in which he lost his three brother-in-laws. It changed his mentality. He became very keen in analyzing hatred, malicious spite, and vindictiveness. In his Diary, he writes the conception of evil in severe form that Narain Tripathi cites in his book, “... evil knows of good, but good does not know of evil” (Tripathi 348). It denotes that evil is constant awareness of everything while good is not. He critically analyses evil, good, sin, guilt, life, hope, and certainty in his works in philosophical terms. In his work Aphorism, he points out in the very beginning of the book that we are guilty of not having eaten the Tree of Knowledge but because of we have not tested ‘Tree of Life’. He goes to the root of genesis in judging the mentality of modern human beings. His most renowned work The Metamorphosis contains the idea of powerlessness, loneliness of the individual who faces the hypocrisy of the existence. In his book The Burrow, he assesses man’s intrinsic loneliness in the face of an empty heaven. For him each individual tries to make a wall around him to be secure but he forgets by the time about the isolation and loneliness that makes him sometimes weak from his inner heart. His outlook for suffering is positive in a sense as he himself says that through suffering man gets relief and contentment. Further, he says that the first sign of enlightenment begins when someone wishes to die. It shows life is unbearable and unattainable that is full
of uncertainty. Kafka conceives basically, that the world is full of turmoil and irrationality. He holds that we are responsible not only for what we have willed and for what we have done but also for our indiscretions, our very misfortune and our secret desire. His book *The Trial* deals with the theme of crime and ignorance of the hero K. who feels emptiness, sterility and realizes guilt without knowing the reason. In fact, it shows the tendency of the modern man who is sad and has feeling of meaninglessness but he remains ignorant about the cause. Kafka says that all the time our soul is preoccupied with the power of evil even he accepts that life is itself the incarnation of evil. He assumes that the world is filled with absurdity where human intelligence is groping. Kafka touches the only darker side by ignoring the brighter side of the life in his philosophical ideas. Human predicament and the experience of emptiness is one of the control themes of Kafka’s philosophy.

In the club of existential philosophers, Albert Camus (1913-60) possesses griping position of the French existential philosophers. His most significant contribution to the philosophy has been ‘idea of absurd’. He was very close friend of Sartre by whom he accepts the term of not being an existential philosopher, therefore, in 1945, in an interview, he rejects the ideological association, “I am not an existentialist. Sartre and I are always surprised to see our name linked with existentialism . . . .”(WEB) However, he incorporates the features of existentialism with absurd things in his works. He applies the characteristics of absurdist notions in his works *The Myth of Sisyphus, The Stranger*, and *The plague*. He considers that the idea of absurd arises in relation between man and the world, and between his rational demand and the world’s rationality. In other words, in the absurd situation man’s outlook toward life becomes pessimistic. In actual sense, he himself saw the absurd
situation of man. The Second World War laid the seeds of absurdity in European literature. Camus offers the existential solace in his interpretation of the Greek myth of Sisyphus who is condemned by God for denouncing the death and supporting people against God. Therefore, he is punished by God to push a heavy stone up to the mountain only to see it roll down repeatedly for all eternity. The task that God gave him as a punishment was useless and without hope. Camus applies the result of punishment with the modern man’s lives, which is without hope and meaning. In the eyes of Camus, Sisyphus is the hero of absurd who had great hate for death and passion for life for which he condemned God. Thus, he condemns the modern men for the embellishment of life. He agrees with Dostoevsky’s view that love of life is more important than that of the meaning of life that Camus shows in his *Myth of Sisyphus*. He surmises that the notion of absurd is an outcome of man’s extreme dependence on the world. His idea also assimilates the problem of suicide that is the result of meaninglessness, rootlessness and pessimistic outlook. He anticipates that suicide is a philosophical problem that takes its root in the critical condition of a person’s mind. His interpretation of freedom depends upon physical and mental rebel, and upon justice. He fundamentally makes clear distinction between rebellion and revolution. He thinks that rebellion is a very limited and a reaction against a specific injustice while revolution is an outcome of idea and aims at totality and unity. N. Tripathi writes Camus’ view in his book, “Man’s solidarity is founded upon rebellion and rebellion can only be justified by this solidarity . . . I rebel therefore I exist” (Tripathi 335-36). Both Camus and Sartre meticulously examined the notions and awareness of the twentieth century. Camus believes that the best way comes out from absurd to
rebel. The notion of rebel germinates in man’s mind when he comes in the state of consciousness and starts thinking about his existence in this complex world.

Simon de Beauvoir (1908-86), a first feminist- existential philosopher gave a new dimension to feminist movement, had been life-long partner of Sartre. She comes in the row of the most of the French leading intellectuals whose *The Second Sex* (1949) was her revolutionary work that changed the phase of feminism in her time. In her book *Ethics of Ambiguity*, she has anticipated Sartre in elaborating the social dimension of the individual’s situation. Like Sartre, she, too, writes many novels and fought against the oppression of its various guises, most notably against imperialism, racism and sexism. Her projection of existentialism is based on the interpretation of Sartrian existentialism. She associates Sartre’s Being-for-others with the women. She supposes women as being of others or who are treated as a puppet in the hand of men. They also try to search out their existence and identity in this sophisticated society. As the title of the book *The Second Sex* already refers the ‘Second’ for woman which has their identity in the world as a projection of ‘others’, they and sub-marginalized, who are second to men. Explicitly interpreting the point, she says that man thinks himself as a subject while for him woman is merely an object. She shows the contest of both biological and metaphysical arguments to establish a feminine essence. *The Ethic of Ambiguity* is a remarkable attempt of Simon de Beauvoir, explaining existentialism she says that freedom of a particular person is a realization in its external and internal outlook. Jack Reynolds observes de Beauvoir’s point of view that she writes in her book, “We are as free in the cage as if we are not in the cage” (Reynolds 146). She asserts in her book the condition of human situation with its spontaneous urge for freedom that is suppressed of the external weight of the world. She argues on an
individual’s transcendence and freedom and develops the idea of the requirement of freedom and transcendence for others. She puts the transcendental idea of inventions, discoveries, culture, painting, industries and book for the individual person. For her human life is involved with two things-perpetuation and transcendence. Transcendence is a moral justification of the society while perpetuation surpasses every hindrance and remains permanent at every step even its subject assigns himself in it. She describes many times the adventurer, the passionate man, the demonic man in her *The Ethics of Ambiguity*, which she calls “the attitude of seriousness”, the same phrase occurs in Sartre’s *Being and Nothingness*. The term “serious man” is closely related to Kierkegaard’s conception of ‘ethical stage’. Sartre and de Beauvoir discovered society on the basis of individual’s action without dissolving it in some impersonal collective this is why the meaning of de Beauvoir’s text is as a call of action.

Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1908-61), a classmate of de Beauvoir, founded the avant-garde journal *Les Temps Moderns*, is famous for his major work the *Phenomenology of Perception* (1945). He does not talk about death, freedom, anguished responsibility and conflictual relations with others but argues about the phenomenology, which is the essential factor of existential philosophy. His general perception in this field is, too emphasized the body as a subject. He does not deny the cognitive relationship between the subjects and object and postulates that our lived experience of body denies the detachment to the subject from object, mind from body and even both empiricism and rationalism endorse in different ways. He says that body is a fusion of subject and object, although it always remains in ambiguous condition, decision or perception yet it can be traced back to the subject. His
conception of freedom varies from Sartre and spells out that the past is the atmosphere of the present while Sartre gives the idea of separation between past present and present-future. Ponty gives his idea of argument in relation to ‘being-with-others’ against Sartre’s ‘being-for-other’ has been more primordial mode of contemporary world.

In the chain of existential philosopher, the Russian novelist, essayist and philosopher Fyodor Dostoevsky (1821-1881), explores the human psyche of the troubled political and spiritual atmosphere of the nineteenth century Russia. His most notable works Crime and Punishment (1866), The Idiot (1869), and The Brother Karamazov (1880) are based on man’s lawless freedom, his suffering in irrationality and tragic duality. In his book Crime and Punishment, Dostoevsky records the struggle for the survival of human freedom. The protagonist of the novel Raskolniko indulges himself committing the crime for his freedom and individual identity. He primarily not only raises the question of socialism and shows the problem of the labours or forth class but also they are more concerned with atheism. He holds the ‘principle of socialism’ in relation to ‘disbelief in God’, immorality and freedom of human spirit which is concerned with man and his destiny. He was an idealist, humanist and a socialist. His philosophical doctrine develops an experience of terror, surprise and despair. The term ‘prisoner’ denotes a man without a will or loss of freedom. In his work Notes from Underground, he shows the negative phenomena of consciousness and points out that consciousness kills feelings, corrupts the will and paralyses actions. Inertia develops from consciousness and from Inertia, there develops boredom that fills man’s life with pessimistic mood. He considers that the existence of human life lies in the self-assertion of the irrational will. His Notes from
Underground is the greatest attempt at the philosophy of tragedy in literary field. Hence, the modern existential philosophy of Kierkegaard attains its zenith after the Second World War with Sartre and other existential philosophers.
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