Japan Bilingual Publishing Co.

Philosophy and Realistic Reflection

https://ojs.bilpub.com/index.php/prr

ARTICLE

Sartre's 'Freedom' and Society: Existentialist's Dilemma in Naturalistic View

Anirban Ghosh [1], ***Malabika Chakrabarti*** [2*]

[1]*Department of Zoology, School of Sciences, Netaji Subhas Open University, Kolkata 700064, India*

[2]*Department of Philosophy, Ananda Mohan College, Kolkata 700009, India*

ABSTRACT

Existentialism dealt with the essence of human existence and established its priority over others where freedom of act for a conscious mind was the prime factor. Jean-Paul Sartre emphasized on such individual freedom with imposition of some liabilities over it for humanity. Sartre and other philosophers furnished different causes for such restrictions. However, the general concept of natural and evolutionary science is also competent and capable to explain this reservation of freedom. Present article will discuss the background of why such an interruption was required in Sartre's concept of complete freedom. At the same time the article will analyse whether and how far Sartre's concept of complete freedom of a conscious mind was relevant from the historical, social and evolutionary biological perspective with an analysis of consciousness from scientific perspective. Examining Sartre's dilemma on freedom and its relevance with a naturalistic angle, authors tried to answer whether negotiation for freedom was a humanitarian attribute or an obvious natural compulsion for the sustainability of the naturally evolving human association and community. Finally, importance of Sartre in the context of the socio-political scenario of that time has been clarified to justify his views. Simultaneously, the act of a conscious mind in a natural community of human association has been explained to show why it is actually compelling to make a trade-off for freedom in a society.

Keywords: Existentialism; Sartre; Humanism; Freedom; Communism; Consciousness; Survival

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Malabika Chakrabarti, Department of Philosophy, Ananda Mohan College, Kolkata 700009, India; Email: malabikakwc@rediffmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 25 June 2024 | Revised: 28 September 2024 | Accepted: 3 October 2024 | Published Online: 12 October 2024

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55121/prr.v1i1.203

CITATION

Ghosh, A., Chakrabarti, M., 2024. Sartre's 'Freedom' and Society: Existentialist's Dilemma in Naturalistic View. Philosophy and Realistic Reflection. 1(1): 13–25. DOI: https://doi.org/10.55121/prr.v1i1.203

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2024 by the author(s). Published by Japan Bilingual Publishing Co. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0).

1. Introduction

With the inception of 19th Century, a new school began to develop in the arena of human thinking. The world of philosophy found a new terminology 'existentialism' which flourished in the next century and gained popularity through Jean-Paul Sartre's writings. Though Søren Kierkegaard, the Danish philosopher of 19th Century has been widely regarded as the proponent of existentialist philosophy, such thinking may arise even earlier, but definitely gained maturity through the writings of Fredrick Nietzsche, Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus. In this development, the principal question was about the meaning and significance of existence of human. This does not mean only for the physical existence, but have tried to find meaning of our thoughtful existence and consciousness in this world and deduce the exact nature and act of it.

2. Sartre and 'Freedom' Centric Existentialism

In the issue of defining 'existence', almost all existentialist philosophers principally agree with the fundamental notion proposed by Kierkegaard. Rationalist philosopher Rene Descartes told 'I think, therefore I am'. But existentialists opposed the idea and they proposed for the opposite. Kierkegaard supposed that life is not a mere combination or compilation of reasoning, it is much wider where experience plays a key role, and driven by that, human action takes its shape for life. Human existence is nothing but a manifestation of his combined works and actions in life derived from his decisions taken throughout the journey of life. "The goal of an existing individual is to arrive at a decision and renew it....." [1] . Sartre explained existence in the term of freedom, which was a refined projection of that earlier thought. According to him the spirit of 'existence' can only be sensed with the realization of freedom. Sartre described existence as the exploration of potential of a human being to its fullest extent independent of any external interference. Existing within this material world, a human being must have to realize that his essence is unmatched with any other. Thus, individual essence of uniqueness actually lies in the freedom of taking decisions with his own will.

Existentialist philosophers fundamentally admit the proposition that 'existence precedes essence' coined by Sartre in mid-twentieth century which reversed the more commonly accepted and age-old view of importance of essence or nature of any existing objects [2]. The atheist and rationalist philosophical views accept that God provides the essence at the beginning of life which manifest throughout our life and determine the shape and nature of our existence. Accepting the notion that 'essence precedes existence' we are basically surrendering our freedom. In that case human being will be driven by some external energy or agency like any other material objects. "If essence preceded existence in the case of man this would mean that man was not free, that his existence was predetermined." [3]. But we experience that human are free living creature who can build up his own life and existentialist philosophy is firmly rooted in this believe. So, this is a paradigm shift from traditional rationalist concept of 'Essence preceded Existence' to the 'Existence preceded Essence', and in this evolving thinking Jean-Paul Sartre emerged as one of the most prominent and influential flag-bearer of recent times.

Sartre believed that freedom is our fundamental right which we fail to utilize in our life or deny it to escape from its liabilities. Rather we always allow the external forces, agencies or systems to mould our life into different prototypes. Sartre's personal life, his troubled childhood, physical limitations including short height and poor eyesight, upbringing, education and cultural environment influenced his thought process. His psychological analysis about the facts of life, which were the basis of expansion of his philosophical thoughts, emerged from such background. In explaining his theory Sartre put an example of a waiter in a restaurant in 'Being and Nothingness' who always followed some specific gesture or behavioural pattern to serve his customers [4]. He described these patterns and stated how such behaviours had become generalized for all waiters. Sartre put such instance to explain how we are typifying our role and surrender to the fixity of a particular pattern for some specific job. He picked such example from his real-life experience in the café in Paris during his leisure time of argumentive discussions with his colleagues. Sartre's waiter become a universal example of how we are losing our individual freedom to the systems and processes.

Existentialists argued that human existence is con-

fined either of the two forms. In one of its form they have to lead their life fitted within a system, or in other way, have to perform some work where they can never feel their individual existence and freedom. Kierkegaard proposed the other form of work which is integrated to someone's own existence and individuality. When someone faces a crisis and is bound to take any decision of his own, he can feel the spirit of this next type. In such a real crisis situation, the person may confront some serious dilemma and know that the decision may produce uncertainty in his life. Despite all these risks when someone takes his own decision, at that moment he feels that he exists and his existence manifests through his free action towards life and surroundings. Basically, existentialist thoughts work on human psychology. It is someone's thinking about his surroundings including his individual entity and society, and it is about doing action with freedom. Sartre wrote on that 'freedom', which is principally freedom of thought, freedom of taking decision and in its execution. We can compare it with Nietzsche's 'free will' or 'will force'. He never prioritizes any surroundings against the will force of his conceptual superman who possesses the ability to master over the conventional social values and structures. In his "Genealogy of Morals", Nietzsche tried to inspire man to convert from 'slave' morality to 'master' morality using such strong will-force denying others [5]. This denial generates an empty outlook and emphasizes on the baselessness of conventional social and religious structure as depicted in 'Thus Spake Zarathustra', the magnum opus of Nietzsche published in the latter half of 19th Century [6]. Such essential denial to the existing structure reached to its height and gained popularity in a different literary form through the classic work of Sartre in 'Being and Nothingness' where through phenomenological ontology he explained the nature of human consciousness [4]. These works developed a crisis of emptiness and valueless perception towards the existing socio-religious structures and believe to implement self-freedom in life. For such mode of renunciation of pre-existing thoughts, some of the critics designated existentialism as anti-historical and cynical. Some of the socialist thinkers accused such thoughts as fatal to the human existence and social development.

Sartre completely negated such allegation and affirmed that 'existentialism' is such a philosophy which makes human life possible with its humanity. This provides human the freedom as well as responsibility to decide and select, thus closing the means to avoid the consequences of his own decision. Such freedom with responsibility actually enhances anxiety and apprehension which incrementally rolled on to generate a feel of anguish or worry replacing the feeling of happiness. Therefore, the critics are frightened to accept the existentialism. To get rid of such anxiety and stress, we try to project that human is not a conscious independent entity. But Sartre believed that man can construct his life and future through his acts. Each one is free, but when they try to escape from that truth and bypass the option of taking decision admitting any external situation or agent to get into the path of that decision, they have fallen into 'bad faith' [4]. The 'bad faith' may exist in the form of god, religion and rituals, protocols or systems, or even as believe or ideology or anything fixing or limiting the decisions and actions of a 'free' human being. Therefore, to Sartre, even death is limiting the human 'freedom'. Not only we try to use bad faith to find escape routes from our responsibilities, but we are also the victim of such faith in every aspects of our societal life. Sartre's waiter is such an example of bad faith who always believed that his gesture and behavioural pattern in that specific framework would only be acceptable for his clients or customers, and therefore, he always maintained that postures, movements and attitude for days, months and years. Sartre comprehended that our material society and system is working in such a fashion which disregards our individual freedom and entity, and framed our individual psyche, choice and acts so that we are becoming a mere outcome of the systems. Therefore, proving the emptiness in this framework and establishing the prominence of our freedom and to exert it in our life were the primary goal of the existentialist like Sartre.

Consciousness, abandonment and freedom are the propositions which are inseparable of Sartre's philosophy. In his phenomenal work 'Being and Nothingness' Sartre showed that the human consciousness always structured a man through internal contradictions. Thus, the progress of a man is propelled by such inner conflicts resulted from the thoughts of a free conscious mind. Sartre believed that consciousness has an inherent unrest which proceeds through continuously destructing the existing stand. The

vacuum created in such an action bolster the feeling of abandonment, hence drags the state of mind into a new mental state. So, the feeling of nothingness can act as the progressive force, which is only possible when there exists the freedom of mind. As Sartre believed that freedom is inseparable from man, and he also possesses some emptiness in mind so man can think negative. Freedom is that milieu which use negativity to dissociate the past and make the life possible from present to future. Sartre explained anxiety as the experience through which this freedom has been expressed. Man cannot hide that worry and to get rid of it he clings on 'bad faith' as an escape route from anxiety of being responsible. Therefore, he pretends to be something else which he is not actually. "Man does not exist first in order to be free subsequently; there is no difference the being of man and his being free" [4]. So being free and executing that freedom of consciousness is 'existentialism' where abandonment comes as the driving force.

3. Freedom and Social Dilemma

We are taking another famous example of Sartre to understand the nature of freedom for our individual life. Sartre described the crisis of one of his students. That student loved his mother too much. His mother was ill and completely dependent on him. At the same time his nation was going through a crisis and socio-political turmoil. In this crisis phase of nation, the students of the country were taking the leading role in the protest against ruling doctrine, and he was actively involved in that students' movement. Now the movement intensified and students required to participate in the agitating protest rallies where even they might have to sacrifice their lives. So, the moment of taking decision arrived for the student. If he joined the movement his dependent mother would fall alone and might not be able to survive in his absence. On the other hand, when the whole nation requiring such sacrifice and other comrades were moving for the same, how could he withdraw himself from the situation. So his consciousness was in a serious dilemma and at that moment the student came to Sartre to seek his suggestion. Sartre knew that the student was independent for his 'freedom', but from conventional practice the student thought that in such crisis situation he required advice from someone who he believed was more experienced than himself. In this case, the student got victimised in 'bad faith' in his teacher or advisor and failed to implement his 'freedom', hence avoiding to feel the essence of his own 'existence'. Sartre advised him that as he is free to take decision, so he has to decide his own choice. Sartre emphasized that, by doing so, the student would feel the real existence of his consciousness [2]. Such a situation is common in our socio-political life. Any conscious and sensitive mind may face such crisis in any progressive people's movement irrespective of geographic boundary of historic timescale.

Therefore, 'existentialism' always establishes that man is free. He can build his life through his own acts. "To say that existence precedes essence then is to affirm that there is no prior definition of man. Man defines himself by his acts." [3]. Man will decide which act to play and which not. And in doing so he will be 'abundant', he will feel a void in front of him, which again reminds us about 'nothingness'. When there is no God, no master, no agent or system, and no event to make an excuse for any indecision, the man feels anguish, abandonment and despair. Thus, in Sartre's words "we are left alone, without excuse…… man is condemned to be free" [4]. He explained that, 'condemned' because he has none for legitimization of his action and he is now responsible for everything he does in his life, with himself and with others. Sartre also expressed that essence of existence and responsibility with the phrase "You are what you live" [4]. So, such enormity of freedom makes people alone.. However, the anguish experienced by a solitary individual does not necessarily imply inertia or quiescence. Instead, it is through the very act of bearing such profound distress that an individual with the fortitude to assume responsibility and establish their existence by making their decisive choices.

Now such a philosophy reached to the society as an unconventional, person-cantered and to some extent anti-establishment way of thinking. That was the time of post-World War II when the writings of Sartre are gaining its readers. The world was already shaken in WWII and Nazi brutality followed by a collapse of humanity and economic turmoil worldwide immediate after the war. People were dejected ideologically with loosen believe on traditional values and systems and looking for some newer ideologies for their individual and social life and political outlook. Soon after that world had seen a capitalist expansion to

follow in the next decade in one side, and in the other side, the rise of nascent communist countries in Asia and Latin America and consolidation of Soviet communism. Decades after, students' movement and civil right movement and various anti-establishment movements catalysed by the Vietnam War rocked both sides of the Atlantic. That was the time of ideological expansion of leftist thoughts under a capitalist state system in the Western Europe and America which resulted in an obvious conflict in the socio-political contour of the world. The concept of existentialism and its person-centric unconventionality and appeal of freedom attracted the mass and waved through the intellectual minds and youths of any socio-political ideology and belief. Sartre's concepts of nothingness, abandonment and anguish, his appeal to deny tradition and execute freedom acted like an underlying influence in that whole atmosphere. During 1960s and 70s, Jean-Paul Sartre had become the face of 'existentialist' philosophy who ideologically provided support to the people from various sects and categories to express them in the society, be it in the political arena or in the cultural domain. One of such examples was the Woodstock music festival in 1969 in America where Ravi Shankar rocked the world with Jimi Hendrix and many others to an open-air audience of diversified ethnicity and culture in an unconventionally organized event. One of the major influences of existentialism were to express, admit and accept freedom and diversity.

Sartre, as one of the best philosophers and flag bearers of the 'existentialism', who apparently shows his person-centric, individualistic intentions in the philosophical expression, was personally interested in Marxism, which in contrary, divides the society into few broad classes and speaks for the group or class struggle. Sartre was not only interested in Marxist philosophy, he had connections with French Communist Party for a while and established himself as one of the advocates of communism and Soviet policies during 1950s. He also had contacts with the Cuban communist leaders and was under the surveillance of Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) for a long time as one of the intellectual supports of communism. During WWII, where Sartre also had to participate for a short phase and had to become a war prisoner, he experienced the fascist imperialist aggression and brutality. It was during that time when his admiration to communism developed and like many other contemporary intellectuals, he also found a hope to resist the fascism and expansionism through a communist way of thinking. But he found dejected when he observed same expansionism of fascist or capitalist imperialism in the act of Moscow through their invasion in Hungary in November, 1956. He wrote "I condemn the Soviet invasion wholeheartedly and without any reservation....." [7]. He might say the same words today in response to Russian invasion in Ukraine, the burning crisis to the world now created between two of the former soviet lands and ethnicities. His strong criticism to Soviet rulers and activities of French Communist Party intensified with different suppressive actions by soviet in Eastern Europe and Sartre gradually departed from his position to behold his 'existentialist' philosophy alive. His refusal of the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1964 was a strong demonstration of his existentialist stand when he stated that a writer "should refuse to allow himself to be transformed into an institution" [8]. He was always against any types of regimentation or typecasting of individual existence in small or large scales and against any forceful suppression of individual freedom. There lies the basic contradiction between Sartre and ruling communist regimes of his time. Though he did not lose his interest in Marxist philosophy and tried to explain a new form of socialism in the essay 'Search for a Method' in 1957, which was elaborated in his book 'Critique of Dialectical Reason' in 1960 [9,10]. In this attempt Sartre's effort was to combine his existentialist view with Marxist philosophy to develop a free, cooperative and progressive social structure and prosperous humanity. Though Marxian materialism and determinism contradicts with existentialist freedom, he tried to complementing both ends to an amicable form. Basically, the historic timeframe witnessed a worldwide intellectual and socio-political quest for a modality of human existence transcending the parameters of capitalist expansionism and its deleterious ramifications. In contrary, deliberate moves of soviet communism in Europe, Maoist communism in China and events of leftist insurgency in Latin America developed another front in this world with a different ideological, cultural and political motivations. In this backdrop, Sartre's projection of 'Existentialism' as 'Humanism' with his later works became an important attempt to find the way for the entire humanity.

4. Limiting Factors for Sartre's Freedom

According to Sartre, one cannot fix his goal for his individual freedom, if others freedom is not included in that goal. This was Sartre's 'Existentialist Humanism'. Existentialism can never be nihilistic as here every human being has the right to develop own future with their free will. Existentialism advocates that without bounded by any causality one can choose the way of life and that is the freedom. Sartre could never admit that individual will loss his existence amongst many. Therefore, Sartre's philosophy denied suppression of individual in any form, whether it is by group activity or be it the state. There is no universal standard of good or bad, ethics or evil. Man has to decide it on his consciousness. Thus, the consciousness for social responsibility will be entirely a choice of human. As in existentialist way man is solely liable for all his acts and no one can reduce or share that, he will always be responsible for his societal impact or imprint. As the choice is personal and man has to carry his responsibility, if he does not reciprocate others none will be there. ".....as soon as there is a commitment, I am obliged to will the liability of others at the same time as mine" [2]. To select for himself, he selects for others and in doing so, he admits his accountability for others, for the nation. And being stressed in his role for many, the man feels 'abandoned', an obvious feature of existentialism. Sartre gradually admitted that man as social animal has some relationships with others and unavoidable restrictions for himself. So, Sartre wrote "For the moment I feel that my freedom is indissolubly linked with that of all other men, it cannot be demanded of me that I use it to approve the enslavement of a part of these men." [11].

Sartre used the concept of 'reality' similar to Heidegger to explain the freedom in totality and in relation to the exterior. But his reality does not mean for any inert object, but it indicates a surrounding where a conscious mind find himself. This is the situation found in the workspace of a man. Sartre designated death and oath as the inherent restriction of freedom. Death limits the life and freedom, and restrictions to act according to oath ceases the freedom of will. So Sartre admitted some restrictions in the way of executing absolute freedom. Merlo Ponty criticized the essence of Sartre's freedom in 'Phenomenology of Perception' [12]. Ponty opined that Sartre's freedom is not relevant and practicable in daily life and society. According to him, action of man is not independent of extrinsic factors and we can never deny our past, legacy, cultural heritage, surrounding environment and people with our education and perception. They contribute decisively in our action. These are several obstacles to implement freedom of a conscious mind. These obstacles are like 'limiting factors' in ecology which limit the distribution and abundance of a biological species in an area over the earth. Such concept of 'limiting factors' emphasized by E.P. Odum is one of the key concepts in ecology which has the primary capacity to determine whether any organism can live and sustain naturally in some habitat on the earth or whether any of the population from a species can grow or decline in a given area [13]. There may be many other factors including dispersal and evolutionary history of the species for being there in a particular space, but not the consciousness and will of the organism that has the power to principally determine it, rather which may have minor role to set its position in this earth ecosphere. Critics may raise the point that human consciousness is far advanced from the level of animals or men only possess the true consciousness to execute there will or freedom. To the present scientific stand that idea is vague and the concept of consciousness has been reconstructed.

Karl W. Jaspers also criticized the concept of complete freedom and demonstrated that individual freedom has always been compromised for the surrounding milieu and inherent limitations. A truly free consciousness or individual always fight to express freedom, but become limited in his expression. Evolutionary biologists S.J. Gould and R.C. Lewontin wrote a classic paper as a critique of 'adaptationist programme' in evolutionary biology which is apt to explain the situation [14]. As per adaptationist programme each trait of an organism were separable entity and natural selection works on each to evolve them for perfection. Disapproving this individualistic trait-centric view they "attempt to reassert a competing notion.....that organisms must be analysed as integrated wholes, with baupläne so constrained by phyletic heritage, pathways of development, and general architecture....." [14]. Their argument was that no traits in an animal body are separable from the

whole and can be adapted independently without affecting other related traits in the body. Not even so, such changes in demand of better survival can grow within the limit of basic body plan, within their past phylogenetic architectural and developmental history or 'space left over'. As per this logic, a fish can never be adapted in a jelly fish like form or an octopus into a whale, instead of what so ever adaptive force and natural selection pressure may work on it. To explain the issue Gould and Lewontin produced the architectural metaphor of 'spandrel' of St. Mark's Basilica in Venice, Italy to show that the graffiti or sculptures of best of the artistic forms with maximum quality may only be shaped within the left-over triangular spaces between the arches supporting the round domes of the cathedral. Such an architectural metaphor to explain evolutionary constraints is also showing us the importance of background socio-cultural 'space left over' to execute freedom and act accordingly. Therefore, the dilemma arise whether the concept of complete freedom is none but a utopian overrating of freedom that is non-existent in real world over the initial prejudice of 'existentialism'.

Similar example had been placed by Sartre himself in his writings where he produced example of prisoner. A prisoner has no freedom to cross the boundary of the prison or the cell where he is confined, and has no control over his clothing or foods provided by the jail authority. But he has the freedom to refuse the food or fast. Also, from our daily life situation, if we have a room to decorate its interior, we may use our choice of furnishing it within the space provided or 'left over space'. Sartre in his 'Being and Nothingness' mentioned that one cannot decide about his place of birth, his past, surrounding environment and fellowmen and about death. Such admissions were the quantum shift from his initial proposition about freedom. Arguments may continue to accept or deny his factors of limitation for freedom, the shift was prominent. Thus, negotiation of freedom has become pertinent and that was clearly admitted by Sartre with his specific dimension of explanation where he emphasized on the humanitarian ground behind such acceptance. Now we are trying to explore that whether such negotiation for freedom is from humanitarian consciousness and empathy or from the natural compulsion of surviving in a better world for present and future.

5. Freedom is Naturally Absurd

Sartre and other supporters of existentialism had to work on diluting and moderating the general notion that existentialism does not accept anything other than individualistic perception. Sartre's interest on Marxist philosophy and socialism also made him think in broader perspective which we find in his writings as evolved with time. Blackham in his 'Sin Existentialist Thinkers' wrote in defence of existentialism that "The being-in-the-world which constitutes human being is the being of a self in its inseperable relation with not a self—the world of things and other persons in which the self always and necessarily finds itself instead." [15]. Conflict between person and society appeared many a times in the writings of Sartre. Ultimately, he also accepted some limit of freedom imposing a negative in respect to collective or additive entity. He fastened the knot of responsibility over complete freedom from societal perspective. He put the liability of humanity on individual freedom and obligate it to many. So, men have to decide the act not for self and not in free will, but to take care of the fact that the chosen act does never restrict others freedom to act or live. Obviously, this is a critical situation, both ideologically as well as practically. This may ultimately emerge as a vicious cycle which gradually impose limitations over the freedom for one and many. Influenced by Marx, Sartre believed that poverty and scarcity produce disbelief and conflict in a society, admitted to an extent that the society is grossly divided into proletariat and bourgeoisie. Capitalism is a system of producing properties in expanse of human labour and make a society rolled on demand-production cycle where other faculties of individuals are being severely compromised, hence produce a cast-typed civilization according to its need. Such a believe influenced him to establish existentialism to break the system, but his attempt became gradually delicate to balance one with many. Principally, existentialism is person-centric and it may not have any apparent contradiction with communism until the later infringes into personal freedom. Existentialists always spoke for personal freedom at any cost and at any situation, how disastrous it might be. In this regard, communism put the interest of community first bypassing or restricting individual freedom for the common. Marx in his 'Thesis of Feuerbach' wrote, "… the

human essence is no abstruction inherent in each single individual… [but] is the ensemble of the social relations." [16]. Marx's renunciation of individuality for the commons may, in other way, lead to the way of personal 'bad faith' in the name of nation, society or system or in some other way which might produce a leader like Stalin or an event of Tienanmen Square. There Sartre tried to remove any means to escape individuals, but never been able to avoid the interest of common or of greater order, instead, he ultimately restricted the freedom by confining the essence of existentialism. So, in a more gracious way he articulated "I cannot make my own freedom my aim unless I make the freedom of others equally my aim" [2].

The human existence, which Sartre explained on the consciousness of man and as the main tool to execute freedom, possesses a long history of socialization. Such socialization with a primitive communication skill is promptly visible in the primates and very prominent in apes, where they are mostly adapted in group living. One of the fundamental reasons of success of us, namely, Homo sapience over the Neanderthal man are thought to be behavioural rather than anatomical, who expertized in group living, division of labour in their group and developing advanced communication skills and social networking [17]. Also, we are now considered as 'generalist specialist' owing a vast and diverse ecological space on earth which was more likely became possible for group efforts [18]. Development of language through grooming and gossiping and retention of knowledge made our skills incrementally advanced forming the 'tree of knowledge' to rule over this earth [19,20]. Steven Pinker in his essay 'The Big Bang' (metaphor taken from the cosmological theory of creation and expansion of Universe popularized by American TV Series and scientists like Stephen Hawkins and others) showed how language can evolve as a result of complex adaptation, and natural selection can only be the possible explanation of the process [21]. As per Pinker, language probably evolved in small stages where each of the new stage was building on the previous stages and gradually developed to an incremental stage of explosive expansion and maturity. In explaining that, he argued in the same way as Oxford evolutionary biologist and philosopher Richard Dawkins argued to explain 'complex design' through Darwinian natural selection by defying Paley's 'teleological argument' [22]. Such development of complex system or language or advanced level of consciousness as we possess can only be possible with a continuous legacy or evolutionary history and group communication. Pinker argued that "There is a fantastic payoff in trading hard-own knowledge with kin and friends, and language is obviously a major means of doing so.....people always depend on co-operative efforts for survival, forming alliances by exchanging information and commitments" [21]. Thus, socializing for exchanging information and keeping commitments are breaching some major conditions of Sartre's concept of complete 'freedom'. This is undoubtedly a success of grouping together more prominently than individuality which gradually transformed the primitive hunter-gatherer groups to achieve agricultural skills, followed by developing civilization and treading. Such early consolidation of human society had then reached out to industrialization and next level of treading as capitalism. At this long trail Sartre appeared with 'existentialism' in a specific socio-political context worldwide which has already explained. Advocating for freedom might be the timely need of Sartre's era, but the structured society, nation and administrative organization had already evolved through a long historical past from the primordial social assemblage of early human. Therefore, Sartre himself as a trivial component of a huge social structure attempted to uphold the importance of personal freedom and individuality in a time when men and their lives were becoming the by-products of the socio-political machinery or a victim of the process of institutionalization.

Such conflict of one vs. many exists from the inception of life. Natural science and history always remain the major frontier of such conflict. Evolutionary biologists have long been divided into several schools to find the effective unit of evolutionary process and involved in establishing either of their choice in the Darwinian evolutionary process through natural selection. They are divided into different level of organization and claiming each as the 'unit of natural selection' starting from gene and proceed to cell, organism and group. Evolutionary biologist Richard Dawkins of Oxford University and Edward O. Wilson of Harvard University were two who approached from extremely opposite pole to find the solution. When Dawkins approached from his reductionist gene centric version to explain the evolution by natural selection in his best-seller book 'The

Selfish Gene' [23], Wilson approached completely from the opposite direction by his seminal epic 'Sociobiology' [24]. Later Wilson and Hölldobler showed that how a large numbered ant colony system worked in synergy with their division of labour for their own interest and for the interest of a colony as a whole to achieve a maximum survival and sustenance possibility in this hostile world. They termed that system as 'superorganism' where no individual has the freedom to act but assigned for specific work as well as respond in specific synergistic manner to external cues and threats as if all individuals are tuned and well-connected [25]. All these transformed the course of evolutionary and behavioural biology where biologists started to explore the genetic basis of social behaviour and how social acts or group acts are keeping the interest of a gene to thrive and progress with individual survival. This is a vast area of discussion which is beyond the scope of this article, but it appeared that there is no conflict between individual interest and group interest if fitted and used appropriately and that lead to the ultimate success in survival and evolution through natural selection. So, individual freedom and group living in a vast societal structure has no apparent contradiction and may be complementary, if that personal freedom does not harm the greater process of societal survival and progress in the course of time. Therefore, for a society and system, individual 'complete' freedom may be compromised which in turn help to thrive the social structure and a sustained society in turn help in keeping individual interest. Evolutionary biologists explained that how altruistic behaviour actually benefits own survival and ensures transmission of 'self' gene through generations [26,27]. Therefore, thinking for others and apparent sacrifice for self may have a great social and survival benefit for individual. Sociobiology proves that restricting own interest and freedom increases possibility of self-existence. Above discussion is for providing a glimpse of vastness of the problem between one and many in the living world on this earth where man is a mere subject with extraordinary intelligence and consciousness and with superb skill of communication which has established our success over others and made us think 'philosophically' about the individual freedom in the canvas of human civilization.

6. The Genesis of Freedom and Human Society

Most of the critique may argue that the work of Sartre and his existentialist thoughts built upon the human consciousness and how such consciousness perceives the surrounding including society and nation. So, there might be no use of fetching examples of conflicts of freedom and establishment of a particular order from different 'levels of organization' of life. We admit the objection and narrowing our view to consciousness now. At this point we have to admit that 'consciousness' is a complete biological thing and psychologists and neuroscientists are now joined together to find the essence of consciousness. But before entering that course we may think philosophically for a while. If we think that consciousness is only a human think and it had no existence in our past and in other animals including apes, then we are admitting that consciousness emerged 'de novo' for men. Thereby, we are actually denying the fundamental postulate of existentialism, that is 'existence precedes essence' and we are admitting that from a certain point of time an ape anatomically similar to human became conscious and transformed to human. This is becoming analogous to the concept of Christianity where they believe that in a moment God created our Universe and all of the creatures on earth and of them, human as the best creation in the form of Adam and Eve. With this, the whole lot of atheist existentialist's effort of denying God have gone into vain. So, this is self-contradictory and we cannot think this way to continue our argument on existentialism.

The term 'consciousness' has a vast range of meaning, like whether someone is awakened or not, alert or asleep or in coma. But for us this is of phenomenal kind and a product of brain. Consciousness and cognitive neuroscience are now working with both animal and human subjects and recognizes the development of brain in different animals, apes and man as a continuous evolutionary process and hence, the 'consciousness' is now explained as the outcome of that evolutionary process [28]. Scientists using different visual and verbal stimuli identified various regions of response using functional MRI and other

techniques and most of such stimulus works in the brain of other mammals and monkeys and apes. LeDoux, a famous neuroscientist of New York University showed the similarities of our brain and the phenomenon what we call our consciousness with our ancestors in deep time-scale. He told "nervous system if fundamentally a device that gathers sensory information about the world for the purpose of guiding behaviour in the quest to survive. As a result, awareness of the external world is perhaps the most basic level of conscious experience" [28]. Neuroscientists identified different orders of increasing complexity of cognitive theories where primary order information have been processed in higher order to extract features and interpret them to consciousness. They reported the processing hierarchy where conscious experiences use the scheme of memory or experience and concept to develop response. Evolutionary psychology is now explaining the development of higher-level consciousness in a modular approach where basic modules of brain functions are added with different top-up modules to enhance the performance in communication, play and use of tools with time to adapt the external environment more aptly for more successful survival. Present visions of consciousness either regard it as a kind of information processing or as a kind of behaviour which are both purely natural (biological) phenomena [29,30,31]. All these biological phenomena require a complex neuronal network involving pre-frontal and frontal neurocortex, temporal-occipital-parietal lobes, hippocampal region, dentity gyrus, thalamus and other regions of brain for information processing, memory consolidation and conscious thinking [32]. Present neuroscience research is intended to decipher all these complex network interplay to develop conscious behaviour. Kotchoubey explained the emergence of consciousness at behavioural level ".....as a product of a phylogenetic interaction of three particular forms of animal behavior: play, tool use, and communication. When the three components meet in humans, they strengthen and mutually reinforce each other producing positive feedback loop. Therefore, although all three elements of human consciousness are present in many animal species (not necessarily human predecessors), there is no other species that plays, communicates and uses tools as much as humans do" [31].

Consciousness is a state where we find a complex interplay within reflex functions, learning and memory (experience) and thinking. Following epigraph is showing the instance as mentioned by Ludwig Wittgenstein "We think about actions before we perform them. We make representations of them, but why? We expect and act according the expectancy; ..... Expectancy [is] a preparatory action. It outstretches its arms like a ball player, directs its hands to catch the ball. And the expectancy of a ball player is just that he prepares arms and hands and looks at the ball" [33]. The next level produce intuition, apprehension and design human response upon prediction of others reaction. The 'Theory of Mind' (ToM) is a state of cognition where one has a thought about others thought or it is mind reading which is a very important evolutionary development for social interaction or group behaviour [34]. This is not entirely of human domain, but animals including different birds and primates as experimental proxy have passed the behavioural tests of mind reading. Such 'metacognitive' thinking ability and behaviour probably emerged as an adaptive response to the complex social interaction in primates and reached to an intense level within us where language has played an instrumental role [21,34]. All the cumulative evidences demonstrated that consciousness is not a human thing. It has an evolutionary lineage of development and different other forms of brain also possess different levels of consciousness. Therefore, our consciousness also has an evolutionary background and history, the legacy of ascending from our ancestors. Hence, it also has to act in the 'left over space' through its evolutionary path and can never be freed completely. It implies that individual consciousness can never be free in biological sense. So the question of freedom and individuality versus group living, society formation and the conflict there in, are the evolutionary questions to be answered, where freedom of consciousness is also a subject of mere selectivity in the natural world and also within the constraints of our present anthropocentric world.

Sartre defined "Consciousness is a being such that in its being, its being is in question insofar as this being implies a being other than itself" [35]. This is a very indefinite definition which may actually want to say that consciousness is a different state of affair beyond its facticity, which is actually indicating to higher order cognitive processing as per present neuroscientific understanding.

We showed that such higher order cognitive processing or consciousness and 'mind', to a certain level, is existing in higher mammals and possessing an evolutionary history over time. The 'mind game' as explained in ToM is developed for gaining the survival success in group living and such higher order thinking ability claimed a heavy toll in the form of psychiatric disorders like autistic spectrum disorder, bipolar disorders etc [34]. Also 'Sociobiology' and its connection with genetic level have been shown pertinent, where individualistic interest and freedom of action of lower level can be selected only when such have been proved consistent with the interest and survival benefit of the greater sum. Thus, the freedom has become 'conditioned' and has its range within the 'left-over space' of evolutionary lineage, hierarchical levels of cognitive functions as well as for societal benefit from a humanitarian perspective of progress. In this whole process, the 'yin-yang' of freedom has to be determined from a perspective of natural social development rooted deep into the time-scale of human social evolution. The old notion handed down from Descartes that human has conscious mind and animals have reflective automation or instinct, has now been discarded. As Merlo Ponty pointed out that Sartre's freedom was not only restricted by death and oath, as originally pointed out by Sartre himself, but also restricted by the past and present in different forms—has no space to defend by the existentialists. While present findings of cognitive neuroscience showed the developmental trail of consciousness and its connection with group-living, 'sociobiology' showed that trimming own freedom for others is actually a compulsion for better survival in the process of natural selection as per Darwinian evolutionary thinking. This is nothing but a 'trade-off' between individual interest and group interest as well as prediction of others thinking and reaction for a particular act. The existentialist's dilemma is that sense of responsibility to negotiate between self and group, and the essence of which is rooted within the Darwinian concept of survival benefit in group living. As perception of others or group matters much for own wellness in a social structure, man has to appear with falsified image in a socially acceptable fashion. Such gap between external imagery and internal subjectivity may create a feeling of emptiness in complex processing of consciousness. The perception of nothingness, anguish or abandonment are of that evolutionary trace of thinking where higher order mental processing is deciding better survival options for individual and group. Even sociobiology explained that how altruistic behaviour actually benefits the survival of own gene or individual interest. Therefore, being humanitarian by thinking for others in expanse of own freedom is a compulsion for group living. However, such realization in Sartre's existentialist thought came from the socialist perception derived from Marx, though the biological implication of it is much deeper, far reaching and explaining the reason as natural. Influence of Marxism and critique of complete existentialist freedom catalysed Sartre's humanitarian negotiation which was actually obvious to accept and adapt for making 'existentialism' acceptable to human society from the evolutionary biological perspective.

Also, the deep history of our species, development of us as 'Sapiens'—the most dominant and influential species on earth, lies in our formation and evolution as a highly social species with high level of communicating skills and languages and cultural bondage. Such an order of social cooperation, sharing of knowledge and incrementing its magnitude into an incredible height—all these have made us human today. In our world of conflict and competitors we majorly sought cooperation and empathy with some secondarily derived disciplines for group living to form such a large social structure where individual's role was typified to a large extent. In our present-day society also, we are to choose among different professions which are already predetermined or we have to offer some new service acceptable to the society. That, therefore, means restrictions over freedom or in other words, thus individual freedom is being 'conditioned'.

7. Conclusions

So, Sartre's freedom or existentialist freedom always have to negotiate in our societal world which is an established fact from evolutionary and historical background of mankind. Still Sartre is very relevant for us for his advocacy on individual existence which was missing at a time-point in a socio-political context of our near past. We have to remind that none of the above explanations denied the importance of individual and it is also to emphasize that all group activities are for the sake of existence of individual

with a better atmosphere of survival.

Sartre was important in popularizing 'existentialism' in a particular socio-political context of contemporary phase in our history. Sartre put forward his concept of existence to prioritize over anything where freedom had been used as the most important instrument in establishing existence. The time was immediately after the World War II, where a deep socio-political and ideological crisis prevailed over the world which had been briefly described earlier. The most damaging consequences of that was the devaluation of human existence to the system. That devaluation of individual existence maximized with fascism, observed a complete wreckage in the war and was in a very low state in the post-war days. The humanity was sandwiched between capitalism and communism and was hopelessly finding a way to regain the esteem. Sartre was also a victim of that time who persuaded his way with his sharp intellect and deep thinking by projecting the 'existentialism' in his own way. His philosophy helped to gain human existence into a high with confidence to exert personal freedom in the societal structure which was at its minimum in that time. The immediate effect of Sartre's philosophy was in accepting personal freedom and difference of opinion and pluralism. Many of the civic and social movements of 1960s and 70s worldwide had an underlying influence of Sartre's writings and existentialism had become instrumental to achieve civil liberty in different countries and legislations of the world. Sartre never recognized any artificial confinement of individual soul under any circumstances under any system or institution and never accepted any contempt of human existence by any wing, whether it was left or right. So he was the time's need to pull the human existence back to a position where each one's voice should be paid importance and each one's act should be recognised empathically. Any artificial socio-political curbing was condemned by Sartre.

The impact of Sartre and his philosophy produced a qualitative change of thinking and perceiving individual world and society in the second half of twentieth century which was aptly summarized in a report in 'The New York Times' on October 23, 1964 as "Sartre mirrors an authentic modern mood—a sense of life's absurdity but unlike other atheists he has rejected nihilism as uncongenial to his optimistic view of man. Believing in man's freedom to choose what he is to be, he has evolved a new type of moral hero who straddles the worlds of saint and sinner." This concept of individual independence of thinking and acting ignited many scholars of that time, influenced different citizens' and students' movement ignoring the state-owned mechanisms, as well as extended respect to fellowmen and country for their identity. His thoughts are still very active in this present-day world where state or group born aggression, invasion, suppression and oppression are happening in different nooks and corners of this world in different forms. As long as we continue to remain ignorant to think, live and act freely and restrict others for the same within our social or global landscape, Sartre's concept of freedom remains alive. Therefore, Sartre is still very relevant to us in the present time with all his limitations of absolute freedom of existence. And, we again utter Sartre, "I cannot make my own freedom my aim unless I make the freedom of others equally my aim" in this world today to ensure the long-live of human society and also importantly for others living in this green planet as our colleagues in the 'circle of life'.

Author Contributions

A.G. and M.C. both jointly conceptualize and written the original draft version where M.C. contributed on the philosophical aspects of Sartre and A.G. connected different naturalistic and evolutionary and neuropsychological ideas with socio-political thoughts. M.C. reviewed and finalized the manuscript and both authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

The work received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not Applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not Applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Not Applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Kierkegaard, S., 1941. Concluding Unscientific Postscript, 1st ed. Princeton University Press: New Jersy, USA. pp. 1–328.

[2] Sartre, J.P., 1956. Existentialism and Humanism. World Publishing Co.: London, UK. pp. 1–124.

[3] Chatterjee, M., 1973. The Existential Outlook. Orient Longman Ltd: Delhi, India. pp. 1–176.

[4] Sartre, J.P., 1956. Being and Nothingness. Philosophical Library: New York, USA. pp. 21–134.

[5] Nietzsche, F., 1996. On the Genealogy of Morals. Oxford World's Classics: Oxford, UK. pp. 1–208.

[6] Nietzsche, F., 1997. Thus Spake Zarathustra. Wordsworth Classics of World Literature: London, UK. pp. 1–352.

[7] Amanda, O., Missy, S., Matt, M., et al., 2010. Jean-Paul Sartre denounces communism. Available from: https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/november-9/sartre-renounces-communists (cited 12 November 2024)

[8] Sartre, J.P., 1964. The Nobel Prize. Available from: https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/literature/1964/press-release/ (cited 12 November 2024)

[9] Sartre, J.P., 1991. Critique of Dialectical Reason Volume 1: Theory of Practical Ensembles. Verso: London, UK. pp. 674–745.

[10] Sartre, J.P., 1991. Critique of Dialectical Reason Volume 2: The Intelligibility of History. Verso: London, UK. pp. 354–428.

[11] Sartre, J.P., 1950. What is Literature. Methuen & Co. Ltd: London, UK. pp. 1–288.

[12] Ponty, M.M., 1962. Phenomenology of Perception. Routledge and Kegan Paul: London, UK. pp. 1–696.

[13] Odum, E.P., 1963. Ecology. Holt, Rinehart & Winston: New York, USA. pp. 25–134.

[14] Gould, S.J., Lewontin, R.C., 1979. The Spandrels of San Marco and The Panglossian Paradigm: A Critique of the Adaptationist Programme. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B, 205(1161), pp. 581–598.

[15] Blackham, H.J., 1965. Six Existentialist Thinkers. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd: London, UK. pp. 110–165.

[16] Marx, K., 1986. Thesis of Feuerbach. In: Marx-Engels Selected Works Volume I. Progress Publishers: Moscow, Russia. pp.13–15.

[17] Banks, W.E. et al., 2008. Neanderthal extinction by competitive exclusions. PLoS ONE. 3(12), e3972.

[18] Roberts, P., Stewart, B.A., 2018. Defining the 'generalist specialist' niche for Pleistocene Homo sapiens. Nature Human Behavior. 2(8), 542–550. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0394-4

[19] Dunbar, R., 1998. Grooming, Gossip and the Evolution of Language. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. pp. 1–242.

[20] Harari, Y.N., 2011. Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind. Penguin Random House: London, UK. pp. 22–44.

[21] Pinker, S. 1994. The Language Instinct. William Morrow Inc: New York, USA. pp. 332–369.

[22] Dawkins, R., 1986. The Blind Watchmaker. Penguin Books: London, UK. pp. 22–47.

[23] Dawkins, R., 1976. The Selfish Gene. Oxford University Press Inc: New York, USA. pp. 166–266.

[24] Wilson, E.O., 2000. Sociobiology–The New Synthesis, 25th Anniversary ed. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press: Cambridge, USA. pp.378–382.

[25] Hölldobler, B., Wilson, E.O., 2009. The Superorganism: The Beauty, Elegance, and Strangeness of Insect Societies, 1st ed. W.W. Norton & Co. Ltd: New York, USA. pp. 4–13.

[26] Hamilton, W.D., 1964. The genetical evolution of social behaviour. Journal of Theoretical Biology. 7(1), 1–52.

[27] Wilkinson, G.S., 1988. Reciprocal altruism in bats and other mammals. Ethology and Sociobiology. 9(2–4), 85–100.

[28] LeDoux, J., 2019. The Deep History of Ourselves: The Four-Billion-Year Story of How We Got Conscious Brains. Penguin Books: New York, USA. pp. 326–334.

[29] Dennett, D., 1991. Consciousness Explained. Little Brown and Co.: London, UK. pp. 428–510.

[30] Koch, C., 2004. The Quest for Consciousness: A Neurobiological Approach, 1st ed. Roberts & Co: Englewood, USA. pp. 391–403.

[31] Kotchoubey, B., 2018. Human Consciousness: Where Is It From and What Is It for. Frontiers in Psychology. 9, 567. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00567

[32] Nani, A., Manuello, J., Mancuso, L., et al., 2019. The Neural Correlates of Consciousness and Attention: Two Sister Processes of the Brain. Frontiers in Neuroscience. 13, 1169. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2019.01169

[33] Wittgenstein, L., 1996. Philosophische Grammatik. Springer: Wien, Austria. pp. 1–195.

[34] Brüne, M., Brüne-Cohrs, U., 2006. Theory of mind-evolution, ontogeny, brain mechanisms and psychopathology. Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews. 30(4), 437–455.

[35] Sartre, J.P., 2003. Being and Nothingness. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 649–656.