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As modern men, we proudly proclaim that we have been freed from the bonds of superstition that have plagued man since antiquity. This is a fallacy, however, due to the aesthetic refinement of our worship. For just as the ancient Jews, Egyptians, and Romans worshiped idols made with human hands, so we worship idols made with human minds. Truly our culture prizes above all others before it the freedom from metaphysical tutelage; but, sadly, we have not freed ourselves from any forms of superstition, but merely have become partakers in them all. We no longer have a basis to believe anything, so instead we believe nothing, which is simply a backwards way of believing anything, only we don't know it. And when a man does not know that he believes something, this does not prevent him from doing so, nor allow him to stop doing so. He becomes a slave to his nothingness. He becomes a slave to himself.
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CHAPTER 1

ADDICTION: DEFINITIONS AND ONTOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS

Introduction

A wise man once told me that I should write about only that which has got me by the throat. Without a doubt, the phenomenon of addiction and Sartre's notion of love are just such topics. So I am writing, so to speak, my way out of a stranglehold. Writing under such conditions, you may be sure, involves both pain and a sense of exigency, with a searing telos of truth. What I write about has been and is a matter of existence for me, and it is for this pressing and weighty reason that I could do none other than employ phenomenological/existential methodology.

Before giving a general overview of my methodological commitments operative within this dissertation, I feel it necessary to give a broad overview of what I seek to accomplish during the course of this work. In the present chapter, my aim is twofold: (1) To introduce the reader to the subject matter of the dissertation, and (2) To introduce the reader to the methodological underpinnings employed throughout the course of the dissertation. In chapter two, I explicate and analyze Sartre's philosophy of love. Drawing from the vast
gamut of his works, I show that he develops two distinct theories of love, and I raise the question concerning the compatibility of these two theories. I conclude that, given Sartre's ontology, no synthesis of the two is possible. Furthermore, I conclude that one of Sartre's theories of love is, within his own ontological framework, an unrealizable ideal.

In chapter three, I wish to lay out a comprehensive theory of addiction. I shall draw upon numerous phenomenological/existential texts to accomplish this aim. Primarily, I will utilize the writings of Soren Kierkegaard and Jean-Paul Sartre, but I will also employ in a tangential role the thoughts of Simone de Beauvoir, Albert Camus, the Marquis de Sade, Ortega y Gasset, and Friedrich Nietzsche. None of the latter five thinkers are necessary for the coherence and legitimation of my theory of addiction, but serve as additional voices of wisdom, hopefully serving to further illuminate the recesses of the hidden caverns of a dark problem. The voices of de Beauvoir, Camus, Sade, Ortega, and Nietzsche shall be contained in the footnotes of the theory of addiction. These voices embody various intra and inter-paradigmatic perspectives on the text, and proffer a meta-level of discourse. Since none of the seven thinkers represented focused on the phenomenon of addiction or offered an analysis of the issue, I must develop my own theory, utilizing the ontological tools they have provided. I have as of yet not
seen any thinker offer a philosophical theory of addiction, and it is for this reason as well as those stated in the opening paragraph that I have set before myself this task. Or, possibly better said, I have attended to the task that has been set before me.

In chapter four, I show that Sartre's remaining theory of love, given the phenomenological/existential theory of addiction developed in chapter three, is in fact a theory of addiction. I wish to do this by way of addressing and critiquing Sartre's notions of "conversion," "authenticity," and the "phenomenological reduction." In the Sartrean world, I demonstrate, all love is but a species of covert addiction. The Sartrean cosmos, peopled with naught but bad dreams, is found to be a loveless one indeed.

Part One
Section A

A "Subjective" "Definition" of Addiction

---

1The following "subjective" "definition" of addiction is written in the first person and therefore may require patience and vigilance on the part of the reader. This "definition" is necessary to balance the subsequently appearing "objective" "definition" of addiction, which may appear as a wholly different phenomenon. Nevertheless, so as not to minimize the terrible suffering of the addict, the "subjective" "definition" of addiction must of necessity be contained herein. Therefore, I ask of the reader a magnanimous spirit in the reading of the text. A "subjective" "definition" of addiction is necessary to describe the addict's phenomenological field, therefore the essential appearance of this section in the text.
This slimy feeling is always with me, I can't shake it. Like sweating to the bone on a hot day, feeling the salt dry on your pasty body, and being unable to take a shower. And the feeling never goes away. Except maybe a little, when I'm drowned in a sea of unremitting unreality, choking on the venom of my own imagination. Oh, believe me, it's lonely in here.

I don't look like a sick man. But that's part of the sickness. Tan, toned flesh can disguise countless lethal diseases, and one can die from a coronary on the day that he feels the best. I'm choking alright, and my spirit is bent. I'd cry forever if I ever really felt anything real. So falsehood is the order of the day. I even seek to discharge my trumped up emotions into obviously false scenarios. So I frequent the movies and imbibe almost any form of art whenever I can. Sure I'm screwed, but what can you do? Who to blame? A cosmic rape scene? Twentieth century Promethianism?

I shake a lot. But it's mostly inside. Actually, almost always, and always inside. But I do make a lot of stupid mistakes - you know, where I almost hit pedestrians when I'm driving and crap like that. It's the anxiety that does it. I just can't lay it down. I hurt people all the time, but I never think I really want to.

Sometimes I like to be really tired, to the bone, because then, sometimes, I don't feel the pain. I reflect on the pain during these times, so it never really leaves me. It just
stands back enough so that I can see it.

I get this rage inside. Like, when am I going to stop getting screwed? It's metaphysical, this rage. I scream at the cosmos. I can't really look anybody in the eye. It's just not right to be seen this way.

I eat standing up a lot. The food kind of sticks in my throat. It never tastes good. I tend towards lighter foods. Heavier foods make me feel like I'm simply sinking further into the abyss. I'm sure that life means something because I couldn't feel this bad if it didn't. But the only real belief I have is in the pain. The rest is just fancy metaphor, skillfully constructed poison. Oh, I know there's a hell. I've been living there for years.

How can one escape from a metaphysical prison? What would even constitute escape? Maybe if I went deeper into it I wouldn't care enough to feel the pain anymore. But the pain doesn't lead to answers, only questions. More and more questions. And I have no more time for questions. Because of the pain. It's a son of a bitch dog's world.

I don't get no kick from anything no more, unless you mean kick in the ass. Pleasure for me now is not an illusion; it simply is not. Through the valley of the shadow of death I walk, but, unfortunately, I do not die. I do not know what death is, and I fear that suicide would be insufficient to bring it about. I eat cereal with milk, but only a little cereal, and only a little milk. Too much existence, too much
existence. I long to take up less space. Space itself haunts me as the distance between what I am and what I am. But I don't feel like anything. I really used to have hopes and dreams. Stuff that sounded nice, that had body. Now I exemplify the very negation of that disgusting positivity.

I concoct my own universe, a playground of dissimilitude. The bitter draught of reality has already been swallowed; now is but the time to minimize its effects. Me and my illusions have become inseparable. I can no longer tell them apart, thank God! But I know too much to give them up and so be tossed upon the rocks of real reflectivity. I hate existence. But I am beyond cynicism, so I hate that too. The pain has systematically stripped me of my humanity, as a fisherman flays a walleyed, cold fish. Reality must be accepted - even if it involves for its acceptance a necessary injection of illusion. Confusion is my friend, for in it I wallow in the slimy pool of inactivity. I feel a kinship with all humankind because I know and understand the lowest of their wretched deeds. The pain has made brothers of us all.

Don't question my motives, for motives are a thing that only make sense to you. Or, alas, perhaps they no longer make sense to you either. Fine. Don't expect consistency or understanding here. You're lucky if you can get a cheap motel.

Believe me, these addictions no longer make me feel guilty. I felt guilty before any of this. It's more like the
guilt drives me to it. The crevice in my being - the fault, if you will - I didn't bring about. I just noticed it at some point and that was it. I don't fault myself - my self faulted me. I sleep on a bed of knotty pine. But I haven't got a mattress.

All buildings are too enclosed for me. I just can't seem to breathe in them. I never can breathe right. It's this tightness in my chest. It never leaves me. I know I'll have to crack soon. But I don't see how it can be any worse than this.

I tried counseling. Quite a lot of it. But it all skirts the issue. When you're drowning you don't want to know the composition of water. You don't really want to know anything. Knowledge itself has become a matter of suspicion for me. Knowledge is but a kind of power, and I have no more power, so I have ceased to know anything. But I have seen it all slip away, so I am privileged to know that I am deprived.

Counselors all work from a cognitive or affective base anyhow, and since I have nothing more to know and nothing more to feel, it all passes me by. Besides, how does one accept the unacceptable? Believe the unbelievable? Desire what one does not desire?

Love is foreign to me, lost in a Portuguese nun of futile passion. One should not call me hopeless. It is descriptive enough to say that I have ceased to hope. All my strength bleeds from me in a vain attempt to expel existence from me,
and love is simply an immersion therein. Besides, why bury two heads in a pillow of blood, when you can sweat and stifle more silently on your own? Real communication seems to imply truth and a modicum of self, and since I am in possession of neither I have nothing to say.

Drugs don't cover the sickness up, be they legal or not. Just one more thing to pay for, and one more thing to choke on. And believe me, I've paid in more ways than I care to remember. Drugs don't cause the problem, and they sure as hell don't cure it. At best, they're a grimy mirage in a sea of blackness. But who would turn away from a light of falsehood, if all around there appeared only the dark? Men have been known to drink urine from time to time.

Nothing feels right anymore. There are only degrees of less-wrongness. And since nothing feels right, I don't know what I want. Or is it that I don't want anything? Or if I knew what I wanted, something would feel right? Ambi-valence is the pathos-de-jour, the insufferable suffering. I don't know what I want. I don't know who I am. All that I know is that this isn't me. I'm in the grip of an alien power, the life force, if you will, dashing itself upon the rocks of Gehenna.

If I really faced my own pain, I think it would kill me. So my life is a carefully constructed series of ruses designed to deflect away from myself the pain that I know I have. To dam the river of tears. I never cry for anything except
myself. Or, better put, the loss of myself. Don't mess with me, because I truly have nothing to lose. Even I don't know what I might do. Generally, all I ever manage to do is to attempt to resist the irresistible - a dismal failure. I end up trying to anchor myself in something I can get a hold on - a little firewater, a dame, speed on the highway. It doesn't really matter what it is - it's what it does. Or what I pretend it's going to do. But it never does any of this and ends up pounding like a flashing neon on the underbelly of a wrecked Edsel. I don't have time for your questions; I'm bored enough already. Don't get me wrong. I'd love to love you. But it's all a joke to me, I can't get into it. Detachment is the order of the day, and I observe even the spectators. I doubt that it would be beyond me to witness my own funeral. Actually, it wasn't.

If I could actually make a choice, I'd be free. But this piss ant twilight dragged down crapper of a life feels no such freedom. Choice appears vacuous if there ain't a damn thing that looks good. It ain't nothin' free, but a smorgasbord of inedible vermin. The griffon vulture or the rock badger? I'll have two of each! There's no choice when the voluminous spread sports only fare that sickens the palate. Don't talk to me about a change of taste. I'd probably have to move to a different table. And I'm frail from all these years of struggle, and my eyesight is poor. Besides, even the Eskimos shiver in winter.
I don't feel any gray area here. Either you're screwed or you're not. I mean, do you have to wait till it's over to know what happened? Amidst the sweat and the stench, do you really question if it's a rape? I didn't consent to this, and it's nailed me to the tree. Can't you take one look at me and know I'm just a pawn? Don't babble to me about love for my attacker, acceptance, and the meaningless like. I'm still trying to get this bastard off me. Can I help it if I bludgeon myself in the process?

I don't see what I see anymore. That's the point. I don't know what I know anymore. That's the point. I don't feel what I feel anymore. That's the point. I don't live what I live anymore. That's the point. I don't do what I do anymore. That's the point. I don't say what I say anymore. There is no point.

I see the clock but I don't feel the time. It's a never ending nursery rhyme. Clickety-clack, up and back, there ain't no way to get off the track. Though dreams are gone and night has come, the train will take another run. Up yours.

When I get scared I go back to the stake. It rescues me from the toss of the flow, and I have nowhere else to go. Twixt anxious thought and deep depression, through the stake my tensions lessen. Never fear if light is dark, back again I know I'll hark.

The hell with emotions. Lies, damn lies. Positivity? Yeah, right. Yank my heart out and eat it for dinner. Throw
it up and make stew. Feed me the leftovers. And don't forget the croissants. Blow me with a lead pipe. I'd definitely rather never feel again than feel this bad. No contest.

I'm a trinitarian. I believe in pain, death, and the stake. You couldn't fit a pipe cleaner through my window of opportunity, unless you consider the chance for self-dismemberment a gift. My calling is to curdle blood. I do it with a pitchfork and a touch of lime. They say the stake's delusional, but that's only when it works. The rest of the time it's bloodletting as usual. Peace be unto you. And also to you. Bastards. How can you have peace if you don't even believe in peace? As for me, I believe in the stake. Sometimes. When I'm at my best. Or my worst. You tell me.

Okay, if you swallow paint thinner, what do you do? Induce vomiting? Right. Well, it's the same damn nasty business if you've swallowed too much unpalatable reality. You need to vomit it up. You need the stake. After expulsion, you feel lighter, freer. You think different thoughts, feel different feelings. Know the truth. Sing songs. You no longer feel like yourself. And it's a good thing too.

Why do I believe these lies I tell myself? Why, I ask you? Because I like them. I like them better than what I avoid knowing when I employ them. Not to say they're pleasant. I like them in the same way I like going to the dentist. The moron. My teeth'll be fine when the mercury finally seeps into my brain and kills me. And to think I paid
for this. Yes, I paid for this.

How the hell can I come to believe the feces I feed myself as truth? Well, I had reasons for doing so. How do these reasons override what I heretofore believed to be true? Simple, really. Before, I believed what seemed to me to be true. Now, I've got reasons to believe otherwise, and these reasons - be they bogus or no - always seem somehow to override the previous beliefs, you know, the ones that were believable simply because they seemed to be true. But now I am the king of seeming, and in particular, seeming to be true. I mean, who can fight with reasons? I have no problem gathering them by the score! How can one's experience hold up in the face of reasons perpetuated expressly for its denial? Cognition jettisons experience once again. Or should I say, the experience of cognition I find more serviceable than flat experience itself, that naive stuff predicated on who knows what. With the mind I can definitely step back from life. Now everything revolves around the metaphysics of the stake. Luckily.

Am I afraid of existence? Damn right, insofar as I ever actually experience it. You would be too if your ass got roasted on the coals of life day after day after day. The hell with it. Give me liberty or give me death? Right. Liberty's blown a gasket somewhere along the Jersey turnpike, got ramrodded by a couple of semis. Make no mistake, death scares the crap out of me too. But it's got that strange
allure. I've seen the sun rise and fall on this side, and the stars vanish with the moon in the blackness of the night. I await another sphere, where, just maybe (who the hell knows?), crying would be no more. But don't ask me questions. I don't know anything. Here in my world I'm God and the Devil in my own heaven and hell (for I have left the earth!) - and only the stake exists. And I (blessed be he!) am the author of the stake.

Section B

An "Objective" "Definition" of Addiction

Addiction is a pathological (suffering) condition of the human being which transpires when the project of the human being is nonsynchronous/incompatible with the being of that human being. Addiction can be characterized as a form of as well as a result of self-betrayal. The addicted self's attempt to "fuse" with being is the result of its inability to fuse with itself, that is, become itself, process itself, live itself. Addiction involves the experience of alienation from oneself and the seeming inability to in any way rectify this situation. Addiction, then, develops and is anchored in the dolorous experience of missing oneself.

Addiction involves a sacrifice of the real in that the addicted "self" seeks to construct for itself an imaginary self so as to disguise from itself the ongoing loss of itself.
The imaginary self (universal) is chosen in lieu of the real self (particular). Since the self can only become a particular self - its self - the self is lost in the project to become its imaginary self. In this way, the addict achieves a respite from self-knowledge.

Addiction involves freedom's self-entanglement. This occurs as a result of the attempt to avoid one's own anxiety, a feat accomplished only at the cost of self-avoidance. Anxiety is the thread by which, if followed, the self could come to constitute itself. Thus the refusal to face one's own anxiety casts one in the morass of the addictive process.

Addiction involves not only the loss of self, but the experience of guilt, both of which are experienced as a loss of freedom. Freedom negation is the origin of ontological guilt. The addict experiences both bondage and culpability, the feeling of being shackled to and by oneself. Or, better said, by the self that is not. Addiction is a nonreflective project in opposition to the "weaker" reflective will, the latter being merely a tributary of the former.

The addicted self seeks to constitute itself through the "object" of addiction. Since the self is infinite in nature (since freedom is infinite and the self is freedom), it cannot be constituted through that which is finite (the object of addiction). Therefore, addiction is expressed in the contradictory effort of a self seeking self-constitution through the not-self (object of addiction). The Creator-
Ground of the self is the only legitimate object of the self's infinitude (freedom), because only the Creator-Ground itself exhibits the essential infinitude necessary to function as an object of the self's infinitude. Even though I am freedom, it is possible for me to be less than myself - if I chose to attempt to constitute myself through that which is incommensurate with my being (the finite). Addiction involves a disrelationship in one's inmost being, and this disrelationship expresses a self-relation of despair. A self despairs because it lacks necessary, free being as a constitutive ground for selfhood. Addiction is expunged from that self that dispenses with its own despair as a result of developing a relation with its own ground.

The addict's lebenswelt becomes magical as a result of impure reflectivity, which seeks for the self an essence or substantial being. Since the self has no essence or substantial being, the deceptive gaze of impure reflection sets the self (addict) up for a pathological relation to its environment. In this warped condition, addiction is seen as a function of the essence of the self, rather than a project of

---

2"Pure reflection", for Sartre, is the result of a katharsis consciousness effects on itself, which allows for the presence of the reflective consciousness to the consciousness reflected on. "Impure" or "accessory" reflection occurs whenever consciousness focuses itself on its own "psychic states". Since consciousness is never comprised of a state or states, impure reflection always involves some measure of self-deception. See Jean-Paul Sartre, Being and Nothingness, trans. Hazel Barnes (New York: Philosophical Library, n.d.), 633.
the self. Addiction is an impotent attempt to circumvent the essential nonessence of the self.

Addiction is an habitual way of being emotional. It is the process of "objectifying" one's own affectivity in the object of addiction. Consciousness itself is symbolized in the object of addiction and its relation to the addict. The object of addiction is thus imbued with certain magical powers (as a function of impure reflectivity) that are in fact nothing other than rejected and split off facets of the addict's self. These facets of the self gain a degree of mastery and power over the addict they could in no way possess if they were acknowledged and psychically reintegrated via purifying reflectivity. This the addict seeks to prevent, for the self would then be faced with the very absence of itself.

Addiction is a phenomenon of belief in that the addict believes (through the emotional consciousness of impure reflectivity) that his or her freedom has in fact been circumscribed through its relation to the object of addiction. Being-addicted is a species of impure reflection taking itself as pure reflection, an error possible only subsequent to the addict's project to-be-addicted, a self-evasive maneuver. The addict, then, believes that he or she is engaging in pure reflection when in fact he or she is engaging in impure reflection. The self becomes handmaiden to its own project and, swept up in the current, is finally drowned. The omega of consciousness is the project to-be-addicted.
Addiction is a function of the imagination through the utilization of self-induced hypnagogic imagery. It is an intentional (nonthetic, at one with consciousness) project contrary to the (thetic, conscious) will. Hynagogic images are a way of being conscious, and they involve all the modifications of attention heretofore detailed - impure reflectivity, emotional consciousness, and belief. The dream of hypnagogic consciousness is created by consciousness itself. Consciousness can no longer take a point of view on itself - it believes its own dream - and the representation of the (addictive) object is conflated with the object itself. The addict relates to himself or herself in an imaginary way, by way of imaginary constructions.

Addiction is the attempted suppression of the nausea of being through self-derealization, focusing on the imaginary (hypnagogic) object which is transcendent but not external to consciousness. Why nausea? Because being "appears" meaningless, superfluous. Addiction, then, is an attempt to avoid the experience of the meaninglessness of existence, or an attempt to surmount it by becoming essential being, being with an essence, necessary being.

Addiction is a sedimented and successful pattern of flight from freedom. To flee freedom is to flee the self, thus addiction involves one in self-derealization, but this derealization is a project of the real self (freedom). Thus, in the addictive process the self is bent on its own self-
Addiction, furthermore, is a phenomenon of bad faith (mauvaise foi, self-deception). It is an attempt to evade one's own being and substitute for that being another being. But one can either be addicted or be oneself, since both involve the other's negation. Addiction is the project of the (self-) extinguishment of one's own freedom (self), and so is not compatible with a lucid attempt at self-constitution. Since the will (reflectivity) is an epiphenomenon of the project (nonreflectivity, that which is at one with consciousness), the addict remains as such unless a reflective katharsis reveals to the addict his or her project. But the self in bad faith evades such a reflective revelation, since untruth about the self (through imaginary consciousness, emotional consciousness, and the subsequent faulty belief) is a necessary prerequisite for the project to-be-addicted.

The flight from oneself operative in the addictive phenomenon exhibits a basic fear of the human condition. Since human life is grounded in freedom (is being-free), the freedom negation of addiction is a denial of life and a project towards one's own death (global freedom negation). Angst (ontological anxiety, dis-ease) propels the addict away from him or herself into the addictive object that helps the addict prepare for his or her own death (negate his/her self).

Freedom is the source of value for human being and thus must be preserved. In the project of addiction, freedom is
engulfed in the goal of self-extinguishment. Therefore, the project of addiction is not a valid, free project, since all projects are valid only insofar as they are a movement toward freedom. Freedom-denying projects must be denied, therefore, addiction is seen as an illegitimate and self-destructive project of the human being. This is revealed through a deconstruction of the epistemology of self-consciousness.

Section C

Addiction and Love

This dissertation seeks to illuminate Sartre's theory of love and show that it is actually a theory of addiction, given the phenomenological theory of addiction found herein. Since this is the case, the dissertation in no way seeks to or claims to deal with a theory of love proper, but instead restricts itself to the topic of addiction. After delineating a theory of addiction, I seek to show that Sartre's theory of love is actually a theory of addiction. Therefore, either (A) All love is addictive, or (B) Sartre's use of the term "love" is unwarranted.

What I would like to suggest is that there are two fundamental approaches or projects to being human: (1) A movement toward freedom, toward more fully appropriating one's freedom, and (2) A movement away from freedom, toward being, in which one's freedom is squandered, evaded, and discharged
fruitlessly in endeavors that trap one and make one less human. Furthermore, I would like to suggest that (1) is being in love, for one must be free to love and one must love to be free - the relation is reflexive, and mastery of one's being and its relation to the world can only come through love and in love. Contrariwise, situation (2) is a situation of addiction, a living process in which human being seeks to grip its own freedom in a self-mutilating attempt to divest itself of its own transcendence.

My final claim is simply that loving and addiction as modes of being are mutually exclusive. One cannot be in love with oneself, with another, with anything, and at the same time seek to sever one's own freedom, for love involves, indeed is a projection into freedom. The continuum of love and addiction is wholly straight: as one move towards one, one moves away from the other. For both are possessions in which one's being reaches out to embrace the object of its encapsulation, with either a wave of joy or derision, as the case may be.

It could be that Sartre never meant to confuse love and addiction. It could be that he knew that his theory of "love" was just another trick of the light, another coy subterfuge, another hopeless hoping, another birthday party of one. It is my contention that Sartre knew full well the loveless world he painted, the dimly lit cavern of existence that he so painstakingly and starkly portrayed. What this all amounts to
saying is that Sartre knew his use of the term "love" was unwarranted, and that, finally, his world was a world without love. Who would want to be "in love" in Sartre's world? One more searing pain to the psyche, one more potent blow to the frame.

The larger question that yet remains, one that is well beyond the scope of this work, is that concerning whether or not love exists in any world, or is all "love," finally, nothing more than a covert form of addiction? The answer, it seems to me, hinges in the main on the ontological question concerning whether we ever really can move toward freedom, whether we ever really can dance freely among the beings of life. This question, I believe, is not beyond the scope of any adequate theory of addiction, but in fact lies within its very core. For if we cannot dance, then we cannot love. We are the addict, for the addict is the danceless soul. Many questions we could raise, but these would serve only to raise still more. The question is coming to know oneself. And this task cannot be surmounted through the reading or writing of any philosophical work. This task, on the contrary, involves flight from philosophical obstruction to the close self that is often so far, far away. It is here alone that we will find the secret key.

Part Two

Ontological Underpinnings Operative in the Theory of
Addiction

At the outset, I shall lay bare the major ontological underpinnings operative in the theory of addiction. I feel somewhat uneasy, I must admit, utilizing the term "assumptions," since all that follows is thought by Sartre or Kierkegaard (or both) to be philosophically grounded through the employment of existential/phenomenological methodology. Certainly, one could debate what constitutes "legitimate" philosophical grounding. I am only pointing out the fact that these men have in fact done copious amounts of philosophical footwork with a view to grounding the following ontological claims, footwork far beyond the scope of this present work. The reader is encouraged to consult any number of the voluminous primary sources which follow in both the footnotes and bibliography for an extensive defense of these claims. These claims, certainly, can in no way be grounded in "reason" alone, for existential/phenomenological methodology employs a far wider scope of possible ways of knowing than does traditional Cartesian and Post-Cartesian rationalism. With these considerations in mind, I proceed to utilize the terms "assumption" or "presupposition" with quotation marks.

The first ontological "presupposition" operative within the phenomenological theory of addiction is the notion of a "self" - in particular, the notion of a "real self." This self is "comprised" of freedom and is infinite in nature,
since freedom is infinite (another ontological "presupposition" to which we shall attend shortly). We see the notion of "self" operative throughout the theory because one can choose not to be a self, and we see the notion of a "real self" operative in the phenomenon of one choosing to be other than himself or herself.

The second ontological "presupposition," one already referred to in our mention of the first, is the notion of "freedom." The self is said to be free, in fact, the self is said to be comprised solely of freedom, as previously mentioned. The nature of freedom is such that it can become tangled in itself, and, so to speak, abort itself. The nature of freedom is such that it can do no other than project itself toward some transcendent goal. In fact it is nothing other than this projection, even if this project entails the attempted suppression of freedom itself. Freedom cannot be anything, because it has no essence. This is the same thing as saying that it is in constant flux, or that it is always a project.

The third ontological "presupposition" at work in the theory of addiction is the notion of anxiety, coupled with its closely related concept, guilt. Anxiety is a function of the apprehension or experience of one's own freedom and so can in no way be expunged from the self. It is an aspect of the "essential nature" of the self. Anxiety speaks to the self about its self and so is a meaningful ontological event.
Guilt is experienced concomitant with the suppression of one's freedom, usually a result of the project to evade one's own anxiety. Guilt is an ontological recrimination, so to speak, for the refusal to discharge one's own freedom in a legitimate project. A project is legitimate only if it is a movement toward freedom.

The fourth ontological "presupposition" is the notion of "despair." Despair is a "disrelationship" in the self, meaning that the self is related to itself and the Creator/Ground in an improper fashion. Despair is expunged from the self through proper self-constitution. Despair has no specific relationship to consciousness, since not all persons in despair are aware that this is the case. Nevertheless, conscious despair is a meaningful existential experience.

The fifth ontological "presupposition" concerns the nature of consciousness itself. Consciousness is seen as tripartite in nature, being comprised of (1) Pure reflectivity, (2) Impure reflectivity, and (3) Nonrelectivity. Two types of impure reflectivity which are necessary for the theory of addiction are emotional consciousness and imaginary consciousness. Emotional and imaginary consciousnesses, being impure, are "degraded" forms of consciousness in which consciousness tries to create for itself an essence and then attempts to believe in the mythical products of its own construction. This scenario provides fertile ground for the experience of addiction.
The sixth and closely related ontological "presupposition" is the notion of self-deception (mauvaise foi or bad faith in Sartre). The nature of consciousness is such that it can deceive itself about itself and its own relation to what it believes to be true. This being the case, consciousness has the capacity to partition itself, so to speak, and simultaneously believe in two contradictory states of affairs. The possibility of self-deception is essential for the construction of my theory of addiction.

The seventh and final ontological "presupposition" operative in the theory of addiction is one which piggybacks upon many of the preceding presuppositions, and this is the dyadic notion of the "will" and the "project." The "will" is the reflective discharge of one's freedom, that at which consciousness ostensibly aims. The "project," in contradistinction, is "at one" with consciousness and so involves a nonreflective discharge of freedom. It is the vector or direction in which the self thrusts its being in the world. The will is no more than a tributary of the project, since the former must always negotiate within the originary thrust of the latter. This dyadic scheme, balanced within the notions of the nature of freedom, the self, and consciousness, is yet another necessary component in the construction of a viable existential theory of addiction.

Concerning questions surrounding the metaphysics of the existence and role of a "God" in the theory of addiction, I
would like to point out that: (A) A "God-concept" is not necessary for the theory of addiction, and (B) A "God-concept" is necessary for the theory about the nonaddicted self. Otto Rank has stated that "For only by living in close union with a god-ideal that has been erected outside of one's own ego is one able to live at all." If we define living as a movement toward freedom, and the ego as the existential self, then Rank's view encapsulates quite well the ontological position of a "God-concept" within the present work.

---

CHAPTER 2
SARTREAN THEORIES OF LOVE

Introduction

In Sartre's autobiography, *The Words*, (written in 1963), he states that "for the last ten years or so I've been a man who's been waking up."¹ What can Sartre mean by this? Is it to be taken seriously? I think Sartre invests it with very specific meaning, and that he was quite serious when he made the claim. The whole tenor of the work is quite serious, and seems to reflect a certain sense of loss and deep sadness associated with his pre-waking state.

---

¹Jean-Paul Sartre, *The Words*, trans. Bernard Frechtman (Greenwich, CT: Fawcett, 1964), 158. R. D. Laing picked up on this in his 1969 work entitled *The Politics of the Family* (New York: Vintage, 1972). Laing's notion of a "transpersonal system of collusion" is very certainly influenced by Sartre, and exhibits an elucidation of the social dimensions of bad faith (*mauvaise foi*). That is, Laing's transpersonal system of collusion is operative in a case where persons in bad faith agree in bad faith to a certain interpretation of "reality" which is based on self-deception "forgotten" as such. This conceptual nomenclature is of import when elucidating both the psychological and sociological dimensions of addiction as well as love in Sartre.
In Sartre's work on ethics, *Cahiers pour une morale*, published only after his death in 1983, he made a number of comments which bear directly on the question of concrete relations with others. Early in that work, he stated that *Being and Nothingness* was an "ontology before conversion." The vast majority of commentators on Sartre view *Being and Nothingness* as the text in which Sartre treats concrete relations with others, including that of love. Does Sartre hold a consistent position throughout his works on the question of love? Or does he alter his position irremediably such that his ontology as presented in *Being and Nothingness* is no longer viable and must somehow be reconstructed? Should we accept the ontology posed in *Being and Nothingness* as necessary or as contingent? What is the nature of this so-called "conversion" that Sartre did no more than hint at in his works published during his lifetime?

In stating that *Being and Nothingness* is "ontology before conversion," is Sartre indicating to us some other, superior ontology, or really, is he indicating any alternative ontology whatsoever? Certainly to speak about an alternative ontology is not necessarily to develop one. Saying that you wish you could work out another ontology is just that - a wish, rather than a worked out philosophical position. Sartre also tells

---


3*Cahiers*, 13.
us in Cahiers that the "pursuit of Being is hell." If this pursuit is necessarily connected with the ontology of Being and Nothingness, the question then becomes "Can one get out of hell?" Put differently: Within a Sartrean perspective, can we come up with a different ontology such that persons could dispense with the pursuit of Being, or is this pursuit forever indelibly impressed upon the being of Sartrean man?

In a late interview, Sartre states that "...beginning with Saint Genet I changed my position a bit, and now see more positivity in love." Does this "shift in position" necessitate a change in ontology? If Sartre has merely changed his position "a bit," is the "conversion" nevertheless somehow necessary? Or is there simply one coherent Sartrean theory of love that cuts across ontological distinctions? These questions - as well as many others - crowded my mind as I sought to carefully distill and delineate a "Sartrean" theory of love. I have concluded that there is not one, but two distinct Sartrean theories of love. I have also concluded that these two theories are mutually exclusive. In chapter four the reader will be presented with an exhaustive analysis and critique of Sartrean texts in support of this claim. The theories in no way intersect, but are necessarily antithetical

---

4 Cahiers, 42.

to one another. The pivot between the two is the "radical conversion" (or simply "conversion") that Sartre refers to sporadically in his works.

In *Being and Nothingness* (1943), Sartre writes a haunting footnote after detailing the necessary failure of all human relationships: "These considerations do not exclude the possibility of an ethics of deliverance and salvation. But this can be achieved only after a radical conversion which we cannot discuss here." Why couldn't Sartre discuss the "radical conversion" here? How have we any way of knowing? Am I making an illicit linkage between ontology, ethics, and concrete human relations - in particular, love? Only if Sartre himself makes the connection as illicit. For this footnote clearly indicates their necessary interconnection in Sartre's mind.

Some commentators, for example Thomas Busch, hold that *Being and Nothingness* is a partial ontology, and that Sartre

---


7 The discussion, possibly, would have been out of place if *Being and Nothingness* was deliberately relegated to the discussion of accessory rather than pure reflection, the former being the level at which, for Sartre, "psychic objects" are constituted. See Sartre's *The Transcendence of the Ego*, trans. Forrest Williams and Robert Kirkpatrick (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, n.d.), in particular, 64ff.

8 Sartre never supplied the ontological groundwork necessary for the possibility of other modes of human self-consciousness. Therefore, for Sartre, all existing modes entail the same aforementioned result: the "failure" of all human relationships.
"reserves his treatment of authentic human relations for separate study." If this is in fact the case, to relegate Sartre's theory of love to Being and Nothingness would be - even in Sartre's mind - to deal with love relations between inauthentic human beings. Of course, one possibility is that, for Sartre, this is all there are, or can be. But this is only one possibility, and I intend to treat it as such. Therefore, because of the aforementioned difficulties in culling a single theory of love from Sartre's multifarious writings, I have decided to break this chapter into three separate parts, as follows: (1) The view of love found in Being and Nothingness and supporting writings: the generally accepted view. (2) Conversion and authenticity: An alternative view of love, and (3) The synthesis: Commonalities between the first and second positions. Central to this chapter will be the question concerning whether such a fusion is possible, or whether, given the commonalities, we find them too few to support a coherent synthesis.

At the crux of the alternative notion of love in Sartre is his notion of "conversion." What, for Sartre, is the conversion? I believe it includes the following:

---

9Thomas W. Busch, "Sartre's Use of the Reduction: Being and Nothingness Reconsidered," found in Jean-Paul Sartre: Contemporary Approaches to His Philosophy, 26.

10Again, since I conclude in the present chapter that the relation between the two views of love cannot be one of synthesis, I shall explicate the alternate relations in chapter four.
(1) The process by which consciousness moves from the level of impure or accessory reflection to the level of pure reflection. In accessory or impure reflection, consciousness attempts to objectify or reify itself so as to be able to apprehend itself as some "thing." In this type of reflection, consciousness is clouded and misled by its erroneous apprehension of the "substantive" nature of its self, conflating free being (pour-soi) with nonfree being (en-soi). As long as consciousness apprehends itself as something other than free being, it has still not left the plane of accessory or impure reflection and therefore has not experienced the conversion. Reflective consciousness, contrariwise, experiences itself as a power and not as a substance.¹¹

¹¹Sartrean ontology seems in no way to rule out the possibility of an "inverse conversion" wherein consciousness moves from pure to impure reflection. But Sartre does not deal with this possibility as a kind of conversion, but rather as a degradation of consciousness that consciousness effects on itself [See Jean-Paul Sartre, The Emotions: Outline of a Theory, trans. Bernard Frechtman (New York: Philosophical Library, 1948), 77-91]. The reason that pure reflective consciousness is "better" than impure reflective consciousness is that in the move from the latter to the former, psychic objects, products of consciousness itself, are expelled from consciousness. This process of expulsion allows consciousness to more fully realize its being-in-the-world, rather than remain mired in a world generated, at least in part, by itself. As consciousness becomes purified during conversion, it at the same time realizes more fully the extent of its own freedom. The question concerning how consciousness moves from one "form" to another (pure to impure or vice versa) is a difficult one. Sartre maintains only that the movement either way must necessarily be a free project of the for-itself. But if one remains on the pure/impure reflective planes and one's project is at one with consciousness (nonreflective), the shift in projects remains inexplicable.
(2) The process by which consciousness becomes aware of the extent of its own freedom. This comes subsequent to the turn to reflective consciousness and is a function of the expulsion of psychic objects (constituted through impure or accessory reflection, the "substantification" of consciousness) from consciousness.

(3) The process by which consciousness flushes itself of its own bad faith. Reflective consciousness is in good faith to the extent that it is aware of its own bad faith, but this is not synonymous with the expurgation of bad faith from the entirety of consciousness, a process realized only in the conversion.\(^{12}\)

(4) The process by which consciousness realizes its own ontological reality, viz. that it is the project to be "God" (legitimated being, necessary being, the fusion of free and essential being). The question of import at this point involves whether this project recognized as such allows the for-itself a wider swath of freedom than it had prior to this realization of its "essential" nature. This question is of concern also for our analysis of Sartre's theory of love as well as for a phenomenological theory of addiction.

Conversion is the ontological process whereby the for-itself repudiates its own God-project. That is to say, the

\(^{12}\)Since consciousness in bad faith contains both the truth and the lie (thus, bad faith), such consciousness is always aware on the reflective and/or nonreflective level(s) of its own dissimilitude.
converted for-itself no longer pursues being, it no longer seeks to necessitate its own existence. Conversion, if it is possible in a Sartrean world, involves a shift in consciousness, volition, and praxis for the for-itself. In terms of consciousness, a reflective katharsis in which consciousness is purged of all self-deceptive residue resultant from impure and nonreflective consciousness must occur. The for-itself must "know" itself for what it is. In terms of volition, the converted for-itself must be willing to cease from engaging itself as a project to ground its own being, in whatever form this project may take. In terms of praxis, the for-itself, in fact, must cease from engaging itself in this same cooptive effort to "acquire" being. The converted individual is one who can hang in the balance between being and nothingness, one who can navigate the narrow strait between seeking an essence and negating the freedom that one is.  

What is the connection between the notions of conversion and love in Sartre? This is a question that must be broached as I proceed to explicate and critique Sartre's notions of love. If the conversion is a necessary precondition for authenticity in Sartre, how, in fact, does one bring about this seemingly elusive ontological phenomenon? Authentic human being has reflectively faced its freedom, has eradicated its own bad faith, and has dispensed with the project to be

\[\text{\textsuperscript{13}}\]

Sartre's notion of "conversion" will be addressed at greater length in chapter four.
God. In a characteristically Sartrean way, that is to say, with connections that are far from clear, Sartre seems to link his notions of conversion, authenticity, and play. To play means to create, to seek freedom rather than being as an end. One either seeks freedom or one seeks being. One either plays or one does not. The playing for-itself utilizes the freedom that it is to be free, rather than seeking to be in any other mode.

Could the conversion involve "play?" What would this mean? Even in the pages of Being and Nothingness we find Sartre stating that "The first principle of play is man himself; through it he escapes his natural nature." What is this "natural nature" to which Sartre refers? Isn't it the case for Sartre that the for-itself has no nature but to be free, to be a project, to be a point of view on being, a nothingness gliding over the surface of being? What could this "escape" entail? I would like to submit that this escape, if it is possible, allows for authentic woman to be born from the very ashes of her inauthenticity. This authenticity would involve some type of pure reflection rather than merely accessory reflection. But this would most likely be only the beginning. In explaining this "escape" through play, Sartre continues, saying that "This particular type of project, which has freedom for its foundation and its goal, deserves special study. It is radically different from all

14 Being and Nothingness, 581.
others in that it aims at a radically different type of being."

Don't all Sartrean projects have freedom as their foundation? If so, the issue must lie with freedom as the goal of the project. The "escape" involves freedom as its goal, whereas the "natural nature" somehow does otherwise. The escape involves play. Sartre makes clear here that this radically different type of being - the aim of play - is not dealt with in Being and Nothingness. Indeed, play releases another kind of human being not found within the pages of Being and Nothingness. The most pressing of questions, I believe, is whether such a different type of being is actually possible in a Sartrean world, in addition to the question

15 Being and Nothingness, 581.

16 This "otherwise" could be merely the pursuit of being.

17 Why shouldn't just any type of being be possible in a Sartrean world, since the self is wholly freedom? If human beings have no "essence" other than freedom, isn't it reasonable to suppose that all conceivable types of being will be tried? These are two distinct questions. The for-itself does try to become what it cannot become, therefore in at least some cases, it projects itself toward what it can conceive but not realize. The for-itself cannot become in-itself or in-itself-for-itself, since the move to the former would involve the cessation of selfhood, freedom, and consciousness, and the move to the latter, for Sartre, is an unrealizable ideal. Why? Because it would entail the process whereby a contingent being created its own necessity (a failure in theory and fact), and would involve the fusion of two forever distinct modes of being (a Sartrean supposition upon which rests his "proof" for the nonexistence of a necessary being, i.e. "God"). All conceivable modes of being are not possible even in a Sartrean world. Ontological parameters invariably obtain.
concerning whether such a being is theoretically possible. It is to these questions that we shall eventually turn. At present, we shall tackle section one: The view in Being and Nothingness and supporting writings: the generally accepted view.

Part One

Being and Nothingness and Related Writings:
The Generally Accepted View, or Sartrean Love Type One

The generally accepted view, which is in the main predicated on Being and Nothingness, is that Sartre views love as a rotten, insipid, necessary failure, the life of which is "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" due to its "triple destructability." In Sartre's autobiography, he

18If such a different type of being is not possible in the Sartrean world, if human reality is condemned to repeat, reflectively or nonreflectively, the quest for the unrealizable goal of being-in-itself, in what sense can it be said that the Sartrean human being has no nature, especially given the fact that Sartre tell us that the for-itself has no essence but to be free? If this revamped being is not possible, so much for freedom. The Sartrean self comes conceived in its own metaphysical straightjacket, from which one can ne'er extract himself. In this case, the death of the for-itself is the beginning of freedom. If freedom, that is, is to have any beginning at all. To be freed from the necessity of a specific project is in no way to be freed from the necessity of having a project.

19Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan, found in Classics of Western Philosophy, ed. by Steven Cahn (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 1979), 365. I borrowed this phrase from Hobbes because it seemed too good to pass up when describing the Sartrean love relation. Sartrean love does, in fact, seem to occur in the (a) "state of nature."
recounts that while a youth, he "found the human heart insipid and hollow, except in books." This was, of course, by his own accounting, before Sartre began to "wake up." In *Intimacy*, one of Sartre's short stories, Lulu exclaims "God how rotten love is..." Lola, in Sartre's novel *The Age of Reason*, is tormented in her relationship with Boris "simply because she loved him." In the same novel, Sartre tells us of the love that Mathieu has for Ivich: "He realized that he loved Ivich, and was not surprised. Love was not something to be felt, not a particular emotion, nor yet a particular shade of feeling, it was much more like a lowering curse on the horizon, a precursor of disaster." In Sartre's 1951 play entitled *The Devil and the Good Lord*, the main character, Goetz, says simply, "Good night, we must kill the thing we love." It seems, on this model, that it would be best to greet love with howls of execration.

---

20 *The Words*, 35.


23 *The Age of Reason*, 330.


25 Here I borrow the last five words from Albert Camus' *The Stranger*, trans. Stuart Gilbert (New York: Vintage, 1954), 154. The stranger welcomed such execration, and viewed love as a mythic illusion. The parallels with the Sartrean for-itself are only too striking.
Finally, in *Kean*, another of Sartre's plays, we witness another prototype of Sartrean loving. Kean speaks of his love for Elena: "I love her and I want to destroy her. That is how we actors behave [which is equivalent to every Sartrean for-itself]. Do you not think I have dreamed of heaping honors on the woman I love? But since that is denied me, I accept the risk of dishonor for her. If I must destroy myself, and her with me, I accept; at least, I shall have marked her for life."\(^2^6\) Love, in reality, involves the pain and derogation of branding\(^2^7\), although forever unrealized hopes may be otherwise. And unrealized hopes are the universal story of this version of Sartrean love.

Why is this the case? To address this question, we shall turn to some Sartrean ontology. Sartre tells us in his early work, *The Transcendence of the Ego*, that "consciousness cannot conceive of a consciousness other than itself."\(^2^8\) This is due to the very conditions under which the for-itself comes to be, for the first ekstasis of the for-itself involves a fissure which is precisely the negation of everything.\(^2^9\) It is nothing except this negation; without this negation it is nothing - not even the for-itself.

---

\(^2^6\)The Devil and the Good Lord and Two Other Plays, 190.

\(^2^7\)An attempt at ontological mutilation or cooptation, which, in certain cases, may well amount to the same thing.

\(^2^8\)The Transcendence of the Ego, 96.

\(^2^9\)Being and Nothingness, 298, 299.
Being-for-others, the third ekstasis of the for-itself, is a contingent reality and not an ontological structure of the for-itself. In Being and Nothingness, Sartre tells us that only through my being objectified by the Other can I come to be aware of his or her subjectivity. Since this is the case, there can be no true intersubjectivity, because one is always an object before the Other's subjectivity - or one objectifies the Other while becoming a subject for oneself. Either way, for Sartre, Mitsein can be only psychological and not ontological, as two subjects cannot be in relation with one another.

---

30 Being and Nothingness, 282.
31 Being and Nothingness, 256.
32 Being and Nothingness, 424. Why doesn't Sartre believe in the possibility of intersubjectivity? This is a good question, and one with no clear cut answer. Sartre's disallowance of mitsein seems to stem wholly from his ontological commitments laid down in Being and Nothingness, namely, that I only become aware of the subjectivity of the Other as the Other objectifies me. Sartre apparently thinks it makes no sense to say that I become aware of the subjectivity of the Other when he apprehends me as a subject. Such an experience must have been beyond Sartre's phenomenological purview. Sartre has already admitted that I can "know" the subjectivity of the Other as such, and that I can "know" my own subjectivity, but I can't know both at the same time. For Sartre, the question becomes one of temporality rather than logic - both my subjectivity and the subjectivity of the Other are available to me, but only sequentially. Sartre disallows Mitsein based on a kind of ontological/perceptual ruling out, but does this ground hold? Isn't it akin to Hume's argument in his The Treatise of Human Nature concerning the nature of the self as a bundle of sense perceptions? [David Hume, The Treatise of Human Nature, ed. T.H. Green and T.H. Grose (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1886), 533-543]). Hume could only make this claim regarding the "perception" of his own "self," and was in no position to safely and legitimately universalize the claim. (continued...)
The original relation of the for-itself to the Other is an "internal negation" - that is to say, originally, I am constituted as not being the Other. The Other, then, is defined as the self which is not myself. Negation, then, is seen as the "constitutive structure of the being-of-others." Because this is the case, the for-itself, as such, cannot be known by the Other. That is to say that my consciousness, that is, my freedom, can never be experienced by the Other; it will always be the Other which is not-me. Nevertheless, even though contingently, my being-for-others is a structure of my being-for-myself. (Therefore, the possibility of shame before oneself).

The Other, then, is for Sartre reduced to a "regulative concept": "[S]ince a relation between consciousnesses is by nature unthinkable, [and] the concept of the Other cannot

Sartre claims that I "know" the subjectivity of the Other only when he objectifies me, but how is it that an object knows a subject? What sense does it make to say that an "object" knows anything? Wouldn't it make more sense to say that only a subject can know a subject as such? In terms of epistemology, Sartre does seem far too Cartesian here, without sufficient warrant.

32(...continued)
33 Being and Nothingness, 232.
34 Being and Nothingness, 232.
35 Being and Nothingness, 238.
36 Being and Nothingness, 238.
constitute our experience.\textsuperscript{37} The Other appears to me as a subject, but only at the expense of my subjectivity for me. Because this is the case, there are only two alternatives in interpersonal relationships: either I transcend the Other, or I allow myself to be transcended by her. In the former case, I apprehend myself as subject and the Other as object. In the latter case, I am objectified before the presence of a subject. Since these are the only possibilities, Sartre concludes that all relations between consciousnesses are rooted in conflict.\textsuperscript{38}

"My original fall is the existence of the Other," says Sartre, because it is only in the presence of a subject, a freedom, that I can become objectified and experience limits on my universe (freedom).\textsuperscript{39} When the Other looks at me - that is, when I apprehend the Other as a subject, I perceive myself in a situation in which my transcendence is transcended.\textsuperscript{40} This inherent limitation in the presence of the Other is the ground of the conflict noted in all concrete relations. Finally, Sartre concludes, concerning my knowledge of my

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{37} \textit{Being and Nothingness}, 227. Granted, the Other as for-itself in its totality does not and cannot constitute my experience, but is a relation between consciousnesses, even within a Sartrean paradigm, really "unthinkable?" An unwarranted thesis? How does the latter necessarily follow from the former?
  \item \textsuperscript{38} \textit{Being and Nothingness}, 429.
  \item \textsuperscript{39} cf. \textit{Being and Nothingness}, 263.
  \item \textsuperscript{40} \textit{Being and Nothingness}, 263.
\end{itemize}
being-for-others, that is, how I appear to the consciousness of the Other, with the following: "Total opacity, ignorance: this is nothing but a description of our being-in-the-midst-of-the-world-for-Others." When I am perceived by the Other, my consciousness of this perception is a "fall," an "alienation," and involves a necessary limitation of my freedom.

Confronting the consciousness of the Other gives birth to what Sartre calls "the circle." This circle is comprised of the "two primitive attitudes" available when I confront the consciousness of the Other, both mentioned previously. Put differently, these attitudes entail that I either (A) transcend the Other's transcendence, or (B) incorporate the Other's transcendence as transcendence within myself. Since these are the only two possibilities, Sartre says that "I am - at the very root of my being - the project of assimilating and making an object of the Other." The circle is forever closed. To curtail one approach is necessarily to engage in the other. Either/or - but not in the Kierkegaardian sense. Since I am either a transcendence-transcending or a transcendence-transcended in relation to the Other, unity with that Other is unrealizable in fact and theory, for the fusion of

---

41 Being and Nothingness, 267.
42 Being and Nothingness, 275.
43 Being and Nothingness, 363.
44 Being and Nothingness, 263.
transcendences would eradicate the otherness (not-me-ness) of the Other. Therefore such a fusion is absolutely impossible. The attempt at such a fusion is precisely the unrealizable ideal of love. I am guilty before the Other, says Sartre; my original sin is the fact that I am de trop before him or her. Such guilt is inexpungable because the circle cannot be broken and is the ground for such guilt. I am superfluous before the Other, and my freedom constitutes for the Other a threat. Thus I am forever guilty, indicted and condemned without recourse.

Why do I seek to assimilate the Other? That is, what is the goal of the project? Sartre says that the goal is to take the Other's point of view on myself, and thereby make myself be. Thus all concrete relations with others can be seen as variations on the theme of the quest for being. The melody may change, the chord progression may be altered with fantastic virtuosity; nevertheless, the ground bass remains forever a reverberating quest for being. If I could somehow take the Other's point of view on myself, and be, I would be in-itself-for-itself, freely grounded being, being with an essence, a

45 Being and Nothingness, 365, 366.
46 Being and Nothingness, 366. The impossibility of the realization of the ideal of love is a manifestation of the impossibility of the unity of the for-itself and the in-itself.
47 Being and Nothingness, 410.
48 Being and Nothingness, 365.
nature. I would be God (noncontingent). All concrete relations, for Sartre, are "haunted" by this "absolute being" which is [an absent] God. 49

Since conflict is the basis of being-for-others, both the for-itself and the Other (another for-itself) are in constant struggle to enslave one another. It is a simultaneous, symbiotic attempt on the part of both parties to free themselves, while capturing the Other. 50 And since "I am the project of the recovery of my being," 51 the struggle is perpetual and perennial, "ceasing" only under a bad faith illusion. The unrealizable ideal of love, as noted previously, is the fusion of freedoms that are the selves of the two lovers. But Sartre says that love is a "contradictory effort to surmount the factual negation while preserving the internal one." 52 That is, I seek ontological union with the Other, when such a union would mean precisely my death - since my original birth meant my not-being the Other. Underlying love, then, would be the project of the death of the self qua self.

Love, for Sartre, is inherently deceptive because the lover necessarily deceives the beloved. This is because the beloved perceives the lover as a subject (and not as the object he pretended to be) as soon as the lover's love is

48 Being and Nothingness, 365.
50 Being and Nothingness, 364.
51 Being and Nothingness, 364. Underlining mine.
52 Being and Nothingness, 376.
reciprocated. I recognize the lover as being different than he or she appeared to be as soon as I myself love. Thus the birth of love is the death (of the very possibility) of love. Thus the birth of consciousness is the death of love. Sartre says that "...to love is to want to be loved." Yet the production of this very love is the demise of the same, for it is in the same movement that the beloved becomes the lover that he or she subjectifies the Other. The lover, every time, objectifies herself in the process of subjectifying the Other. This is the movement of love in Sartre. The problem of the destruction of love inherent in the roots of love itself is

53 Being and Nothingness, 376. Sartre seems to propose this as a kind of partial definition. It seems, at first glance, to be a thoroughly passive characterization of love, especially for such a philosopher of action as Sartre, until one accounts for the praxis involved in the project of attempting to lure the Other into the snare of one's own "objectivity" that is a necessary aspect of "making" oneself be loved. No passivity is evidenced on either the part of the lover or the beloved, for each must actively deceive himself and the Other in order to produce and perpetuate the precarious illusion that constitutes the Sartrean love relation. Sartre never proposes a scenario in which the lover and the beloved could/would actively work together to produce a relation that might in some sense evade the insecurity and weakness of individual contingency. This refers us back to Sartre's fundamental arguments against Mitsein. For in the Sartrean world, "being-with" is always "merely" psychological or illusory. It is never a real ontological phenomenon. "Being-against" is the only "real" ontological relation. Why couldn't lovers attempt to build a relationship upon the psychological experience of Mitsein alone? This they try to do, but the metastable project nevertheless disguises(temporarily) its own underlying ontological unreality and impossibility. If consciousness were always reflectively aware of its own ontological reality and limits, the project of love would become nothing more than anachronous. Full lucidity does not enhance but instead diffuse and destroys the very basis for the Sisyphean struggle.
without solution, says Sartre. Sartre claims that I alone cannot ever succeed in taking the Other's point of view on myself, which is to say that I can never successfully objectify myself. If I could, there would be no need to coopt the being of the Other for this very purpose. In attempting to become an object for myself, I attempt a reflective dissociation from myself, which is the same as saying that I try to take the Other's point of view on myself. Such reflectivity comprises for Sartre the "second ekstasis." Why is such an attempt surely to fail? Because, as Sartre says, "... simply because I am my own mediator between Me and Me, all objectivity disappears." That is, I cannot dissociate myself from myself. The me reflected on is not the same as the me reflecting, nevertheless, the former is what I consider to be "myself," as constituted through impure reflection.

Later, in Sartre's Critique of Dialectical Reason, in Book I, Chapter III, Part I ("Scarcity and the Mode of Production"), Sartre states that the freedom of the Other is an "alien force," "de trop." The goal of such a relation is to suppress the freedom of the Other - or, better said, control/utilize it for one's own purposes (not necessarily a reflective endeavor). This is quite akin to concrete

54 Being and Nothingness, 298, 299.

55 Being and Nothingness, 274.

56 Jean-Paul Sartre, Critique of Dialectical Reason, trans. Alan Sheridan-Smith (London: Verso, 1982), 122-152. Original-
relations with others as exemplified in *Being and Nothingness*, including the love relation. In the same work, in Book II, chapters I and II, Sartre speaks of group dynamics. If we consider the dyad to be a group, or even if we consider Sartre's comments to have broader extension, this work may also show parallels to Sartre's view on love as developed in this section of the present work. Sartre says in this portion of the *Critique* that all internal conduct of individuals in pledged groups (and possibly, equally true of love relations) are powered by *terror itself*. Is this, possibly, the ground of the terrible pursuit of being, that unceasing self-flagellating endeavor that may be here said to be the central and primordial bane of humankind?

For Sartrean love of this type, deception and self-deception are essential. A number of writers on Sartre have pointed this out. I shall mention but a few. Sander Lee, in his article entitled "The Failure of Love and Desire in the Philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre" states that "...both love and sexual desire are doomed to failure because they are, for Sartre, analogous to emotional realms *necessarily* entered in 'bad faith.'"  

56(...continued)

ly published as *Critique de la raison dialectique* (Paris: Gallimard, 1960). Hereafter referred to as the *Critique*.

57*Critique*, 345-444.

faith and the failure of love. Bad faith (mauvaise foi) has been translated by some, among them, Walter Kaufmann, as "self-deception," and it is important to highlight the self-deceptive essence of bad faith. Nevertheless, the "faith" of bad faith should also be kept securely in mind. Linda Bell, in her recent book entitled Sartre's Ethics of Authenticity, maintains that love and desire, for Sartre, are both projects in bad faith and remain as such unless a "radical conversion" from such bad faith obtains. Iris Murdoch, in her work entitled Sartre, Romantic Rationalist, states that Sartrean love is "a battle between two hypnotists in a closed room." Here, the telically deceptive aspect of love is highlighted, that is, deception as a goal.

Sartre himself also speaks directly to the question of deception and self-deception. If love, for Sartre, is reducible to the project of making oneself be loved, what does this entail? The beloved becomes the lover, says Sartre, when the beloved "projects being loved." What does this mean? For one, it means that the beloved experiences the lover as a subject, for how is it possible to experience the love of an

---

59 For Kaufmann's rendering of mauvaise foi, see Walter Kaufmann, Existentialism From Dostoevsky to Sartre (New York: New American, 1975), 299-328.

60 Linda Bell, Sartre's Ethics of Authenticity (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1989), 81, 83.


62 Being and Nothingness, 374.
object? When this occurs, the beloved experiences himself as object. I become an object for myself only when I experience my being-for-others. My self as being-for-others, as object, cannot love because it (I) is (am) a transcendence-transcended. Thus my "fall" is the existence of the Other, even if that Other is the lover, apprehended as such. To project being loved, and therefore, for Sartre, to give birth to my own love is the same as to announce the death of my own subjectivity for myself. Therefore, in becoming the lover through experiencing the Other as subject and myself as object, I engage in the same deceptive practice as that of the Other when he initiated the project of making himself be loved. At least, this is the way Sartre tells the story in Being and Nothingness. Sartre states in Being and Nothingness that love is an "illusion," a "game of mirrors." To awake from this illusion is to apprehend the evanescent nature of love as it dissipates before one's reflective gaze. Sartre concludes that love is in essence a deception which is relativized by others outside the love dyad, and that love contains its own internal instability in that either partner can "wake up" to the reality of the illusion at any time. As this is the case, I would ascribe to Sartrean love the category of "metastability" - which is precisely Sartre's

---

63 cf. Being and Nothingness, 376.

64 Being and Nothingness, 377.
description of the ontological structure of bad faith consciousness.  

Sartre concludes that the project of love is useless because one can ultimately never lose himself in his own objectivity, or his being-for-others. This is the case because if one apprehends oneself in one's objectivity, this very apprehension is nothing other than the apprehension of (by) a subject, i.e. oneself. Thus the only absolute loss of subjectivity would involve the death of the for-itself. This could be said to be the implicit ideal of this type of Sartrean love.

In Literature and Existentialism (1947), Sartre writes that "To speak is to act; anything which one names is no longer quite the same; it has lost its innocence." In relating this passage to love, I would like to turn it on its head: to act is to speak, since for Sartre, the body is language. The body that seeks to become a fascinating object for the Other so as to freely capture her freedom veils

65 In what sense is the Sartrean type one love relation metastable? It is less stable than some modes of being - which means it is more precarious - because it depends not only on deception but self-deception. This is not true of all Sartrean relations, at least according to Sartre, and if it is true, then all relations are necessarily in bad faith.

66 cf. Being and Nothingness, 377. A successful attempt at one's own "objectification," in this sense, would entail the witnessing of the cessation of one's own subjectivity, an obvious impossibility.

unsuccessfully the fact that this project of self-objectification is the project of a subject. For Sartre, my original upsurge in a world where there are others is my originary loss of innocence. Innocence is the ideal of being-in-itself-for-itself, essential being, yet free being. Innocence is unrealizable in such a Sartrean world. As is non-illusive love.

In another passage in Literature and Existentialism, Sartre says that "Once you enter the universe of significations, there is nothing you can do to get out of it." This, to me, is reminiscent of the circle in all concrete relations with others. We are born in the circle in which everything is signification, and we cannot opt out of this circle. We can merely be the project of assimilating or transcending the freedom of the Other. Ontologically, we are trapped within the universe of significations because we have given birth to this universe ourselves, as well as being born into it. Indeed, we are this universe of significations. Our ontology is a cage, for we are language. Linguistically, we

---

68 This loss of "innocence" could be the result of the fact that deception (the "lie", "sin") entered the world concurrently with the Other, as did the realization of one's own self-deception (the lie that one has no "outside," that one is infinite). More aptly said, when the Other comes to be before me, I realize that I am not innocent. This realization then allows for the idealization of innocence, as well as a possible quest for its recovery.

69 Literature and Existentialism, 24.

70 At least, not without conversion.
can exist for the Other as a subject or as an object. But since, as Sartre says, a look cannot be looked at, we cannot relate as a subject to a subject.\textsuperscript{71} Deception is inherent in our project to capture the subjectivity of the Other as subjectivity, given that this project is the free project of a subject attempting to appear as an object. All attempts at (self-)objectification are necessarily deceptive. Love is but one variation on these attempts.

In *The Devil and the Good Lord*, Goetz becomes the revered and loved leader of the people within the "City of the Sun." Nevertheless, Goetz expresses his sadness ruefully: "The more they love me the more I feel alone."\textsuperscript{72} The loneliness stemmed from the fact that Goetz elicited the love of his constituents through deception, in fact, it appears that he could do so in no other way. Of course, this is but one character in a Sartre play. Yet he appears as the main character, and it appears that Sartre is using him as a foil to make a strong philosophical point in a poignant way. In the same play the following dialogue takes place:

Goetz: "Hilda, I need to be put on trial. Every day, every hour, I condemn myself, but I can never convince myself because I know myself too well to trust myself...I need someone to lend me his eyes."

\textsuperscript{71}See pp. 252-302 of *Being and Nothingness* for a complete characterization of this "look." Intersubjectivity as "myth" may seem unsatisfactory, yet this is a basic ontological tenet of *Being and Nothingness*. The question, of course, is whether this tenet holds throughout the remainder of Sartre's works.

\textsuperscript{72}*The Devil and the Good Lord and Two Other Plays*, 111.
Evidenced here again is the concept of love based on illusion, lack of knowledge. The lover must necessarily be deceived about the nature of her beloved. Only those who don't love us have the possibility of knowing us. Therefore, in this Sartrean world, to be surrounded by those who love us is to be abjectly lonely, known and knowable by no one. For love and knowledge of the Other are mutually exclusive, while love and deception are forever coupled, the former based upon and rooted in the latter. Truth is not only not an ideal of Sartrean love, but is quite certainly excluded from such a loving world.

In another of Sartre's plays, The Condemned of Altona (1959), Leni proclaims the following: "The right of love? How insipid you are! I would give my body and soul to the man I loved, but I would lie to him all my life if it were necessary." And this is precisely what she does in her incestuous love relationship with her brother Franz. Indeed, the relationship is rooted in falsehood and unreality. It is very difficult to ascertain who loves whom in Sartre's fiction, because it is always a matter of capturing someone before they "wake up" to the reality of the Other. Such Sartrean love relationships are, to say the least, precarious, quite

73 The Devil and the Good Lord and Two Other Plays, 136.

metastable. In a Sartrean love relation, one must subject herself to the freedom of the Other, and, for Sartre, this seems to be the most harrowing position of all, albeit unavoidable. A very stark example of a Sartrean love relation is evidenced in the same play at a much later juncture in the dialogue. I would like to replicate here this much revealing passage:

Franz: "Is it still possible to love me?"
Johanna: "Unfortunately, yes."
Franz: "I shall never be alone again... I beg your pardon, Johanna; it's a little too soon to corrupt the judge whom I have appointed over myself."
Johanna: "I'm not your judge. One doesn't judge those whom one loves."
Franz: "And suppose you stop loving me? Won't that be a judgement? The final judgement?"
Johanna: "How could I?"
Franz: "BY LEARNING WHO I AM."
Johanna: "I already know."
Franz: "Oh, no! Not at all! A day will come just like any other day. I shall talk about myself and you will listen. Then, SUDDENLY, love will be shattered. You will look at me with horror, and I shall again become... a crab."

Possibly, Sartre has some type of fascination with crustaceans, as evidenced here and even more strikingly in *Nausea*. But this is an aside. Love, again, is seen to be excruciatingly fragile because it is based on illusion - deception and ignorance. In this particular case, Franz was a closet Nazi who had previously engaged in the systematic torture and extermination of the Jews. In spite of this (or, 

maybe, because of it), I believe Sartre wants to universalize the scenario and say that Franz's/Johanna's love is no more fragile or based on illusion than anyone else's. Such fragility goes with the territory. The lover, whether he be a torturer or otherwise, is a person who has not faced himself fully and reflectively, hence he is engaged in the pursuit of being through the conduit of the Other. If he loves in a fashion other than that which involves the pursuit of being, he is not a Sartrean lover (at least not in the sense of Sartrean type one love). Love of a different stripe is not evidenced in this Sartrean world.\footnote{This illustration from a dramatic work of Sartre's alone is insufficient to warrant a universal claim regarding the nature of Sartrean love. Nevertheless, coupled with Sartre's philosophical works as well as other dramatic writings, we may come to note a conspicuous absence of other forms of love relations in the Sartrean world.}

As underscored previously, love for Sartre involves the "pursuit of being," the attempt to legitimate oneself, ground oneself, make oneself necessary, give oneself an essence, become God. At the beginning of this chapter, we quoted Sartre from Cahiers saying that the "pursuit of being is hell."\footnote{Cahiers, 42.} Love as a concrete formulation of this pursuit of being would therefore be hell. Love as hell. Hell as the perpetual pursuit of the unrealizable ideal. Ideality as unreality. In the love relation, we pursue being by trying to
appropriate the Other as a subject. What we seek to capture is the freedom of the Other, or "alienated freedom." But the lover alienates her own freedom in the enterprise of becoming an object for the Other. So, the lover alienates her own freedom through the attempt to incorporate the alienated freedom of the Other. Thus, this self-contradictory attempt is deemed "hell" by Sartre.

In Sartre's early and extremely interesting work, The Psychology of Imagination, he writes the following lines which I find applicable for an analysis of love: "Thus we can recognize two distinct selves in us: the imaginary self with its tendencies and desires and the real self." If the human being is defined as freedom, if the for-itself has no essence, what do we mean when we delineate a "real" from an "imaginary" self?

To begin with, if such a distinction is possible, we can say that the imaginary self must be the project of the real self, but not vice versa. That is, the imaginary self must be a free project of the for-itself. This imaginary self, if taken to be the self, would be the for-itself in love. The illusion of love is the illusion of the imaginary self, which

78 Being and Nothingness, 375.
79 Being and Nothingness, 375.
is a project of the real self aimed at ontological alteration. The alterity of the imaginary self seeks to realize this altered ontological condition. Nevertheless, this imaginary self is metastable in that it could always "wake up" (via purifying reflection) to the freedom of the real self that has projected the imaginary self. Without the imaginary self, Sartre's type one conception of love would not be possible because the necessary condition of self-deception would not be realized by the for-itself. With the notion of the imaginary self we can make sense out of the deceptive/self-deceptive nature of love in this sense, yet also understand its ongoing allure.

In The Age of Reason, Sartre details Mathieu's love for Ivich: "'But I love you, Ivich...' He eyed her dubiously, he felt his desire revive. That sad and resigned desire was a desire for nothing."\(^{81}\) This nothing is the freedom of the Other - the unrealizable goal of love. What is "loved" is the freedom of the Other qua freedom. What is loved is nothing. I desire what I cannot have (and what is in essence nothing), and I "realize" this in the failed enterprise of love. If one desires something other than the freedom of the Other, then this is not a love relation in the type one sense. The nothing of alienated freedom is the goal of love.

Why does the lover seek to objectify herself in the love relation? How does this function in the interest of the

\(^{81}\)The Age of Reason, 373, 374. Underlining mine.
lover? If the lover becomes an object for the beloved, says Sartre, the lover becomes "unsurpassable," the lover becomes "the whole world" for the beloved. So what? Of what benefit is this to the lover? To this, Sartre says that if I become an object, I become "the absolute limit of freedom... the absolute source of all values... the absolute value."\(^{82}\) This means that I function as the ground of being for the Other. I, as an object, have an essence from which value can be derived. Thus I serve as an irrefutable guide to the Other, an oracle, a functional limit to her freedom. I create a world for the Other because I am in my very being the parameters of that world. This occurs only as long as I am an object, and collapses simultaneous with the collapse of my objectness for the Other.

Therefore, obviously, I as the lover have a vested interest in maintaining my objectivity for the Other. This, of course, collapses as soon as the beloved projects being loved and apprehends me as subject. Thus if I realize my goal, i.e. loving the Other, I destroy that very realization in the Other's realization of my realization of that goal. If one could control the freedom of the Other, one could possibly succeed in maintaining for quite a long time this metastable illusion. But in any Sartrean world there is certainly one thing that no one can do - be she the lover or otherwise, and

\(^{82}\)Being and Nothingness, 367, 369.
that is control the freedom of the Other. Therefore, love is perpetually precarious.

The lover wants to be perceived by the beloved as an "absolute choice," casting a light of "fatalism" upon the relationship as it is perceived by the beloved. This is because, as Sartre says, "the beloved cannot will to love." Why is this? Simply because if the beloved wills to love - as the lover has already done - the beloved would in this very willing seek to make an object of himself for the lover. In so doing, the beloved would "wake up" immediately to the subjectivity of the Other. And this, above all, the lover seeks to prevent. Therefore, the lover seeks to prevent the beloved from willfully engaging in the project of loving the lover. Thus, for love to be "successful," the beloved cannot will to love. The only way the lover can "produce" love in the beloved is by "seducing" him, by inducing within his phenomenological purview the experience of "fatalism" in relation to the lover. Thus the "fatedness" of "falling in love" - beyond choice, beyond reason. Love demands "freedom's self-enslavement" says Sartre. Only free beings can love, but free beings only partially recognized as such. For the

---

83 cf. Being and Nothingness, 370.

84 Being and Nothingness, 371.

85 Being and Nothingness, 403.
full realization of such beingness would crush forever the endeavor.\textsuperscript{86}

The idea of love as "fatalism" can be seen vividly in Mathieu's relationship with Ivich in The Age Of Reason: "He smiled and was conscious of a timid but refreshing sense of regret, he looked affectionately at that passionate, frail body on which his freedom was aground. 'Beloved Ivich, beloved freedom.'\textsuperscript{87} In this novel, love is most certainly evidenced experientially as the loss of freedom, the mooring of a ship, the ending of incessant drifting upon the vast ocean of freedom, the horrifying clank of the anchor, the inability to set sail again.

This theme of "loss of freedom" is again noted in Sartre's Critique. In Book II, Part II of this work Sartre holds that the group, which is the product of men and not a given "essence of men," implies a progressive alienation of freedom to necessity.\textsuperscript{88} What does this mean? If the group dynamic can be transposed upon the love dyad, we may say that as the lover exercises her freedom to seduce the beloved, she discovers the necessity of the alienation of her own freedom through her objectness in being-for-others. The realization of this necessity and its attendant "constriction" of freedom

---

\textsuperscript{86}The context of these comments must be kept firmly in mind. In this section, I am discussing Sartrean type one love and no other.

\textsuperscript{87}The Age of Reason, 245. Underlining mine.

\textsuperscript{88}Critique, Book II, Part II, 405-444.
lead to the realization of the failure of the project. Thus the attempt at group fusion (love fusion) ferrets out for the lover the necessity that is inherent in the project, the (self-)alienation of one's freedom even as one seeks the (self-)enslavement of the Other's freedom. One must utilize one's freedom to realize its limits; one must utilize one's freedom to run up against its necessity, beheld in the freedom of the Other. Both the group and the love-dyad characterize this process.

The type one love relation, for Sartre, has as its goal "salvation." "Salvation," as Sartre utilizes the term, comprises the justification of my existence, the founding of myself as subject-object, or the creation for me of an essence. It entails the infusation of meaning within my being: since I am the "whole world" for the beloved, my existence is necessary and no longer contingent. The love relation, as every other concrete relation with others in Sartre, is an exemplification of the attempt to overcome the contingency of one's being. To overcome such contingency would be to be; to be would be to be necessary. Thus I become "saved" through the Other in the love relation. Once again, it is important to note that "salvation" (at least telling the Sartrean story in the manner in which we have been telling it) is an unrealizable ideal of the for-itself. In The Age of Reason, Sartre narrates Mathieu's potential salvation, to be found in the love of Ivich alone: "Fear shook him and he
turned towards Ivich. Malicious and aloof as she was, in her lay his sole salvation."\(^{89}\)

In this Sartrean world, there can be no mutual recognition of freedoms in the love relation. Therefore, there can never be equality between lovers. Inequality in this and all other concrete relations with others is necessarily part of the ontological framework of the for-itself (at least, before conversion). Any *prima facie* equality between oneself and the Other in the love relation is merely another facet of the deception and self-deception inherent in love.\(^{90}\) The experience of equality or intersubjectivity can be only a psychological apparition, since it can never correspond to ontological reality.\(^{91}\) Concerning the impossibility of ontological fusion, Sartre has some things of value in his *Critique*.\(^{92}\) Sartre speaks in this work of the "double failure" of being-in-the-group. These two kinds of failure may be described as akin to the failure inherent in the two primitive attitudes toward the Other as delineated in *Being and Nothingness*: I fail to be able to dissolve the group in myself (or, incorporate the Other's transcendence, or transcend the Other's transcendence) and I fail to be able to be dissolved in the group (or, lose myself in my objectivity or my being-for-

\(^{89}\)The Age of Reason, 218. Underlining mine.

\(^{90}\)Being and Nothingness, 408.

\(^{91}\)Being and Nothingness, 424.

\(^{92}\)Critique, Book II, Part III, 445-504.
others). This double failure, according to Sartre, which manifests the contradiction of ontological unity, is the basis of practical unity. Practical unity is *seeming* but not *being*, since it is based on praxis and psychological concerns alone, masking the hollowness of its diasporatic (fragmented, perpetually elsewhere, pursued-pursuing, transcendent) ontology. In this same section, Sartre goes on to say that the fact of this discrepancy between being and praxis is the basis of *terror*. It is the praxis of a nonexistent totality, precisely as the playing at love in this Sartrean world is a game of mirrors played by this nonexistent totality.

In the *Critique* we also find other concepts and nomenclature readily transferable to the love relation - the "group in fusion" is based upon "freedom-terror": the love relationship is a project of freedom to overcome the terror of contingency. "Allegiance-terror" can be seen as the struggle against seriality: the devotion seen in the love relation is the struggle against the very superfluity of one's existence outside this allegiance-fusion. Within such a "fusion," one is "saved" from seriality. In either case, the allegiance-terror stems from the fact that my being-ness (as necessity)

---


can only be granted (surreptitiously) within the confines of the relation. ⁹⁵

Love, for Sartre, is forever a failure because the factual negation cannot be negated while at the same time maintaining the two internal negations which comprise the for-itselves (sic) in love. For each individual can ek-sist only as ontologically isolated, forever. Love, for Sartre, is forever a failure because any attempt to relate to the Other as object (as the beloved does in the love relation) refers one to the subjectivity of the Other, inexorably. For we could at any time apprehend the look of the Other, and so glimpse his subjectivity. All our relations with others are inconsistent because they are partializations of reality. The only fully accurate characterization of the Other would be a characterization of her as subject and object. This would mean, says Sartre, that we would have to experience her freedom in two ways: as transcended by mine, and as transcending mine. Put differently, I would have to experience her as a freedom both capturing mine and captured by mine. For Sartre, this is impossible. ⁹⁶ Therefore, I can never really know the Other, and I can never experience her as she really is. All experience is a partialization, a finite experience of the Other's freedom, which is infinite. Any finite perspective on the infinite is a partialization, a distortion,

⁹⁵See the Critique, Book II, Chapters I and II.
⁹⁶Being and Nothingness, 408.
a falsification.\textsuperscript{97} This is precisely the situation of my love relation with the Other.

To conclude section one, I would like to gloss two passages in Sartre's fiction, both taken from \textit{The Devil and the Good Lord}. In this play, Heinrich states simply that "If God does not exist, there is no way of escaping men."\textsuperscript{98} As with most fiction, this can be read in a number of ways. Given the Sartrean world portrayed in the preceding pages, I would like to offer an interpretation that intersects with our discussion of love. God is absolute A. Man is absolute B. Since there can be only one absolute, both A and B cannot exist. Nevertheless, an absolute must exist or we must create one. Otherwise, all being is \textit{de trop}. Therefore, either A or B.

For Sartre, since A does not exist, B is the absolute. Nevertheless, since B is \textit{de trop} it is not really the absolute, but only seeks to be such. It is the-project-to-be-the-absolute. This is the pursuit of being seen in Sartrean love type one. But "man" as such is an abstraction. Only individual men and women exist. Therefore, each individual is

\textsuperscript{97}Here follows an interesting Nietzschean gloss on this sentence: "There is only a perspective seeing, only a perspective 'knowing'; and the more affects we allow to speak about one thing, the more eyes, different eyes, we can use to observe one thing, the more complete will our 'concept' of this thing, our 'objectivity,' be." Friedrich Nietzsche, \textit{On The Genealogy of Morals}, trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage, 1969), 119.

\textsuperscript{98}\textit{The Devil and the Good Lord}, 142.
a project-to-be-the-absolute. Love, as the project to be the absolute, negates God in its very telos. And my love, in attempting to become the absolute, negates the very love of the Other, since there can be only one absolute and there can be no ontological union. This is why the birth of love in the beloved is the death of my love - there can be only one absolute, and two absolutes cannot join to become one. The birth of one entails the death of the other. Thus love is the phoenix of the death of love; love is the reincarnation of the death of the project of love. "If God doesn't exist, there is no way of escaping men": If there is no uncontestable absolute, each for-itself is the project of becoming the absolute.

There is no escape from men because for men there is no escape from the project. This is because the history of men is the history of eternal return: from being to being, separated temporarily by (being) consciousness of being. All consciousness is the project-of-becoming-being once again, albeit with the modification of the addition of consciousness. Such a project, realized, would be the absolute, if it were attended by consciousness. The cessation of consciousness within being is again to reveal the superfluity of being; consciousness unable to be is also revealed to itself as nonessential, de trop. If God doesn't exist, there is no way of escaping men because each one is the project of the recovery of his being. Love, of course, is but one variation on this project. The pursuit of being is hell. Love is the
pursuit of being. Therefore, love is hell. If God doesn't exist, the pursuit of being is necessary because it is necessary that there be an absolute, and such an absolute can only exist if free-and-necessary-being exists. Therefore, the indelible pursuit.

The second passage is a conversation between Hilda and Goetz. It exemplifies quite well the gloss on the above passage.

Hilda: "We shall not go to heaven, Goetz...Here you are: a little flesh, worn-out, rough, miserable - a life, a wretched life. It is this flesh and this life I love. We can only love on earth, and against God's will.

Goetz: "I love only God, and I am no longer on earth".

Hilda: "Then you don't love me"?
Goetz: "No. Nor do you, Hilda, love me either. What you believe to be love is hate."

We can only love on earth and against God's will because if God exists, there is no need to pursue being - and love is the pursuit of being. Either God or love. Both would coexist unnecessarily because the goal of love has already been realized by God. Thus, in this Sartrean world, love is forever a desperate and clandestine affair. "What you believe to be love is hate" because you can only love at my expense, through the spilling of my blood, through the sacrifice of my life (freedom). In this Sartrean world, there is no other way to love. Or is there? It is to this question that we now turn in section two.

99 The Devil and the Good Lord, 125, 126. Underlining mine.
Part Two

Conversion and Authenticity: An Alternative View of Love in Sartre, or Sartrean Love Type Two

As mentioned in the initial pages of Chapter Two, Sartre stated that he saw more positivity in love from the time of Saint Genet onward. He sets the stage for another type of love relation as early as 1943 with the footnote in Being and Nothingness that we noted earlier: "These considerations do not exclude the possibility of an ethics of deliverance and salvation. But this can be achieved only after a radical conversion which we cannot discuss here."\(^{100}\) We also noted that Sartre wrote in Cahiers that Being and Nothingness was an ontology "before conversion."\(^{101}\)

Some commentators on Sartre equate pure reflection with radical conversion,\(^{102}\) whereas others do not.\(^{103}\) Just what is this [radical] conversion that Sartre speaks of? In Cahiers Sartre spells this out fairly clearly, at least not in the manner of an aside (as it appeared in Being and Nothingness): "...[T]he conversion consists of renouncing the

\(^{100}\) Being and Nothingness, 412. Underlining mine.

\(^{101}\) Cahiers, 13.

\(^{102}\) For example, see Bell, Sartre's Ethics of Authenticity, 118ff.

\(^{103}\) For example, see Kerry S. Walters, "A Recovery of Innocence: The Dynamics of Sartrean Radical Conversion", Auslegung XI, no. 1 (Fall 1984): 358-377.
category of appropriation...Sincerity is therefore excluded because it bears on that which I am. Authenticity bears on what I will...Pure and authentic reflection is a will for that which I will...."\(^{104}\) Some writers hold that the conversion involves a necessary social dimension, that one "cannot make the conversion alone."\(^{105}\) This is because, in the words of Sartre, "Morality isn't possible unless all the world is moral."\(^{106}\) We can glean from the longer excerpt from Cahiers that Sartre links conversion and authenticity, and that the pursuit of being is not linked with authenticity. A converted individual is an authentic individual; an inauthentic individual is not converted. What then is authenticity for Sartre? This has been a thorny issue for Sartre scholars for quite a long time, and it is no wonder. I shall recount but two instances of Sartre's explication of the concept.

First, in Cahiers we note a passage that seems to be in direct opposition to the above passage, that the "authentic individual cannot through conversion suppress his pursuit of Being because there would be nothing else [car il n'y aurait plus rein].\(^{107}\) How, then, is the authentic individual different from anyone else? In an interview with Benny Levy at the very twilight of Sartre's life, Sartre tells us that

\[^{104}\text{Cahiers, 495, 496.}\]
\[^{105}\text{Bell, Sartre's Ethics of Authenticity, 178.}\]
\[^{106}\text{Cahiers, 16.}\]
\[^{107}\text{Cahiers, 42.}\]
authentic individuals "no longer want to be God... no longer want to be causa sui." Is this incompatible with the preceding claim, or is it just the case that authentic persons no longer want what they nevertheless must pursue inexorably? In this case, the claims would not be incompatible, but would simply express in a poignant way the nausea, anguish, and failure of the Sartrean world. The question is certainly far from resolved.

One noteworthy difference between the authentic and the inauthentic individual is that the latter is reflectively unaware of her causa sui project, whereas the former, in not wanting to be causa sui, must be at least reflectively aware of such a project. Thus the latter is in bad faith, whereas the former is not. The type one Sartrean love relation

---


109 This seems to echo quite well the "lucidity" of Camus' Sisyphean hero as he "surmounts" his fate through this very lucidity. Existential conditions have not been altered, they have merely been consciously rejected: "There is no fate that cannot be surmounted by scorn." [Albert Camus, The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays (New York: Vintage, 1955), especially 88-91.] This attitude of conscious rejection (or, "metaphysical rebellion" as it is labeled in The Rebel [Albert Camus, The Rebel, trans. Anthony Bower (New York: Vintage, 1956)]) is the very antithesis of the Nietzschean cry of amor fati, found throughout Nietzsche's works. See, in particular, Nietzsche's 1888 work entitled Ecce Homo [ trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage, 1969)].

110 Nevertheless, such a resolution is necessary to give a fair reckoning of Sartre's philosophy as a whole. No other issue may harbor more import for a fair rendering of the Sartrean corpus. I will focus on this specifically in chapter four.
exhibits such "unawareness" (otherwise, "waking up" would not be an issue), but a causa sui project recognized as such would not fit within the parameters of the Sartrean type one love relation. Why is this? Because if the lover engaged in the project of making herself be loved with a reflective awareness of the pursuit of being (and its necessary failure), then the illusion of love would be shattered at the very initiation of the project. Even if the praxis were the same, the telos would invariably be different, since the lover can no longer "believe" in (the project of) love. Love, like bad faith, is a phenomenon of belief. To love is to believe that one loves. To not-believe that one loves is not-to-love. The love relation is a "game of mirrors" because it is a phenomenon of belief (not ontology), just as, for Sartre, if emotion is a joke, it is a joke we believe in.  

111 Reflective awareness of one's project is a necessary but insufficient condition to make one authentic, since authenticity must include a volitional component. Even if one could never, finally, succeed in "being" authentic (since one can never be anything), the project to flee one's own inauthenticity toward the unrealizable ideal of authenticity would then constitute authenticity. That is, if one is to speak of authenticity at all in a Sartrean world. What I want to get away from is reducing the notion of authenticity to merely a matter of reflective awareness. If authenticity were merely a matter of reflective awareness, then the person with the most self-knowledge would be the most authentic. Knowledge is a kind of being, but being is not reducible to knowledge. Authenticity, therefore, is not simply a kind of consciousness.

Sincerity is ontological and impossible. Authenticity is volitional and involves reflectivity. Sincerity is unrealizable in the Sartrean world, because human being can never simply be what it is; it always transcends itself. Sincerity implies a state of being - and states of being are unrealizable for the for-itself. Authenticity involves a relationship to one's own praxis, one from which deception, self-deception, and claims of sincerity are expunged. Therefore, the

---

113 I argue in chapters two and (particularly) four that authenticity, in fact, involves more than this, that ontology, reflectivity, and volition are involved.

114 Take, for example, two cynical people who have an affair, each telling the other that s/he is loved, each knowing that s/he is lying, and each knowing that the other is also lying. Three questions crop up: (1) Would this be a praxis of love from which deception, self-deception, and claims of sincerity are expunged? (2) In which case, would this be an example of authenticity? (3) How is this form of self-consciousness "better" than bad faith?

In response to the first question:

(A) Cynicism is ruled out by definition in Sartrean type one love, since this form of love is a phenomenon of belief and necessarily involves deception and self-deception for its precarious existence.

(B) Sartrean type two love is based upon honesty and therefore rules out cynicism.

Therefore, two people who lie about the existence of their love relation are in fact not lovers at all, but merely actors. How is this different from any other Sartrean relation? It is different simply because it is a matter of the actor's relation to his own consciousness and the consciousness of the other: All concrete relations with others in Sartre are phenomena of belief because they are based upon emotional and imaginary consciousness. The cynical "lovers" have eliminated the component of belief (based upon emotional/imaginary consciousness) in their relation, and with it the risk. It is no longer a "real" love relation, but an "imaginary" one. Sartre has stood the love relation on its head: The imaginary "love" relation is based upon full lucidity, whereas the "true" "love" relation is based upon deception and self-deception.

(continued...
sincere individual is necessarily she who is inauthentic, and the authentic individual makes no claim to sincerity.

What are some of the characteristics of Sartrean love which are based upon authentic human being? Sartre gives us far from a full blown view, but he has given us some important guidelines. It is to these that we shall now turn.

In Cahiers Sartre states simply "That which will define its [the for-itself's] love is the concrete sacrifice that it makes today and not what it intends or what it feels." Here we can see a volitional notion of love focusing on sacrifice as the essence of love. But active willing is seen as insufficient (if not converted into praxis), and execution is necessary. Therefore, we can see here a conception of love

\[114\] (...continued)

In response to the second question: I am sure that Sartre would wish to say that authenticity involves honesty to all individuals concerned, and since the cynical "lovers" lie to others concerning the nature of their relationship, they are not authentic. But it is not clear to me why these lovers could not be authentic (at least in some sense) within the Sartrean paradigm, since Sartre seems to relegate authenticity to the self's relation to itself. At this point, I will leave this an open question.

In response to the third question: Given the fact that there are no pre-existent values in the Sartrean world, the only way we can judge concerning whether cynical self-consciousness is "better" than bad faith is to know the project(s) of the cynics. There seems to me to be no clear cut sense in which we can say, a priori and in a universal sense, that cynicism is a "worse" or "better" mode of consciousness than bad faith. Cynicism and bad faith may, respectively, have their own brands of positivity - at least on the Sartrean playground.

\[115\] Cahiers, 494.
as praxis (in particular, "sacrificial" praxis). Elsewhere, it has been said that Sartre sees respect also as essential to the love relation.

In Cahiers, Sartre describes what he would consider to be "Utopia": "[W]here each treats the other as an end, that is to say, takes the enterprise of the Other as an end." This, of course, would be a mutual recognition of freedoms, precisely that which Sartre said was in principle unrealizable under the earlier description of love. Therefore, if such a "utopian" existence is realizable, we could say that this would involve the negation of the unrealizability of love. Love - if the above scenario were realizable - would be realizable and manifested in the very description of the "utopia" noted above. Love would be the mutual recognition

How do these feature guarantee authenticity? If one reduces the notion of love to praxis, as Sartre does here, there is no guarantee of authenticity. A person engaging in such "loving" sacrificial praxis could still exist at the same time in bad faith and could be, knowingly or unknowingly, deceiving others. To reduce love to praxis is to say nothing of the consciousness with which it is attended. Since authenticity bespeaks of a certain kind of consciousness, no claims can be made concerning the relation between authenticity and Sartre's notion of love as "sacrificial praxis."

See Bell, 156. Bell mentions the relation between Hilda and Goetz in The Devil and the Good Lord which I have relegated to type one love. She also focuses in Hoederer in Dirty Hands. She may be right in saying that Hoederer exemplifies a love laced with respect if one can swallow the notion that this type of "respectful" love sees murder as legitimate and necessary. See Jean-Paul Sartre, Dirty Hands, found in No Exit and Three Other Plays, trans. Stuart Gilbert (New York: Vintage, 1955). I happen to think Bell is mistaken.

Cahiers, 54.
among persons that persons are to be regarded categorically as ends and not as means. Of course, the question as to whether such a scenario is possible is still at issue.

In *The Age of Reason*, Daniel thinks to himself that "One could only damage oneself through the harm one did to others."\(^{119}\) If we could say that deceiving the beloved in the type one love relation is injurious to the beloved, then the above thought would bring the self-damaging aspect of this type of love to the fore (as well as call it into question). Conversely, we might be able to say that the only way to insure the absence of such self-damage is to refrain from deceiving the Other (attempting to coopt his freedom) and treat the freedom of the Other as an end. If my fate is so inextricably intertwined with that of the Other, then I must treat his freedom as I treat mine. But this could only be possible after conversion, since, ontologically, it is not possible in the type one relation (because I am the project of the recovery of my being). So whether such a possibility is a possibility hinges on whether or not the conversion is possible.

In *The Family Idiot*, Sartre states tersely that "...[M]aternal love is a relation and not a feeling."\(^{120}\) Again, we can see the sentiment expressed by Sartre that love is (should

---

\(^{119}\)The Age of Reason, 111. Underlining mine.

be? normative? descriptive?) a matter of volition, a matter of praxis. Why even call such a relation a love relation, unless due to the fact that one treats the Other as an end, has respect for his freedom, "loves" him? If love is reducible merely to a social relation, then love is only a special kind of praxis, nothing more and nothing less. At least nothing more that we can here reflectively delineate. This praxiological notion of love, with its inclusion of respect for the freedom of the Other, can be based only upon authentic human being.

In "Self-Portrait at Seventy," Sartre relates to us his belief that transparency, honesty, and truth are essential for "social harmony." Such a view gives us further basis for our construction of a type two Sartrean love relation: "A man's existence must be entirely visible to his neighbor, whose own existence must be entirely visible in turn, before true social harmony can be established."121 This type of social harmony cannot rest on love relations which are "in essence" deceptive and "in principle" a failure. A new type of love relation is called for, a new type of ontology, a conversion in human being.

The necessity of honesty in the love relation is exemplified in the relation between Marcelle and Mathieu in The Age of Reason: "When Mathieu had pledged himself to Marcelle...He

---

could not love Marcelle save in complete lucidity... 'If I lied to myself,' said he, 'I should have the feeling I was lying to you as well.' ¹²² Love here, in the eyes of Mathieu, is based upon transparency, honesty, and truth, and is undergirded with the notion of treating the Other as an end. This is not type one Sartrean love. A new, revamped notion is called for. For my freedom is not imperiled before yours, but is contained within yours. This is exactly what Sartre says in Cahiers: "He discovers it [the Other's freedom] at the heart of his freedom as a free movement accompanying [him] toward his ends... [Each] freedom is totally in the other." ¹²³

Before conversion, my freedom is in the Other in the sense that I can attempt to "ground" my being through the utilization of her freedom. It is in this sense and in this sense only that my freedom is in the Other (although psychological aberrations may indicate otherwise). This is in no way treating the Other as an end, but as a means to the end of my own "justification" of being. But this "being-justified" (as a project) does not recognize the freedom of the Other as an end in itself. It is merely a tool utilized to enhance the end of my freedom. Therefore, if my freedom is going to be "in the Other" in any other way, an ontological alteration is necessary. This, if such a thing is possible, would be conversion.

¹²² The Age of Reason, 113.
¹²³ Cahiers, 299. Underlining mine.
The *Age of Reason* is noteworthy in that it was written prior to Sartre's transitional period (the novel appeared in 1945) in which he began to see "more positivity" in love. I believe that Sartre characterizes both type one and type two love in this work. First, the following passage:

And He [Mathieu] was suddenly seized with the desire to talk to Marcelle about it: it was to her alone that he could talk about his life, his fears, his hopes. But he remembered that he would never see her again, and his desire, not yet actual or defined, slowly dissolved into a kind of anguish. He was alone... 'The truth is that I gave up Marcelle for nothing.'

In the last section, we noted that Mathieu loved Ivich and believed that in her lay his only possible salvation. This love relation, that between Mathieu and Ivich, exemplifies the type one Sartrean love relation. Mathieu gave up Marcelle for nothing, save the freedom of the Other (Ivich), the freedom that is nothing, the illusive freedom that would be his salvation if he could capture and incorporate it within himself qua freedom. The relationship between Mathieu and Marcelle is based upon "honesty" (at least as an ideal), transparency, sacrifice, and freedom. It is this relation that is the type two relation. The relations are mutually exclusive. Either/or. The truth is that Mathieu gave up Marcelle for nothing.\(^{125}\)

\(^{124}\) *The Age of Reason*, 394, 395.

\(^{125}\) In fact, the ideals presented by Mathieu and Marcelle are just that, for both had been engaged in long term self-deception in terms of their relation to each other. Their "hatred" for one another and wallowing inability to chose (continued...)
The preceding points indicate clearly that for a type two love relation to be possible, an ontological shift/alteration is necessary in the for-itself. Such a possibility is opened up in the very pages of Being and Nothingness. This type of being would have freedom rather than being as its goal.\footnote{continued...}

\footnote{...continued} themselves reduced them to effectual muteness before one another. They both failed to recognize and accept the implications of their freedom(s) in the face of the relationship, and it was upon this refusal of recognition that the relationship endured. Honesty would have led to its rapid and sordid demise, which was exactly what happened as they both began to progressively face themselves before the backdrop of the behavior of the other. I think Sartre makes it clear with this relation that a love based on honesty, transparency, sacrifice, and freedom was not possible for either Mathieu or Marcelle. Any such relation was absent throughout the course of the novel. Mathieu is seen as free only to engage in either the covertly self-deceptive/deceptive relation with Marcelle or the more expressly overtly self-deceptive/deceptive relation with Ivich. Either way, both relations fail to exhibit the "positivity" Sartre is beginning to accord to the love relation. Here we find the Sartrean world, once again, loveless and peopled with naught but bad dreams.

\footnote{How is having freedom for a goal different from having nothing for a goal, especially since Sartre uses the terms "freedom" and "nothing" interchangeably? If freedom is something different from nothing, Sartre does not explicitly clarify this. But he certainly implies a difference between the two throughout the corpus of his work. This difference, it may seem, is to imply that freedom, no longer nothing, in fact has an "essence," that to which we are called to account, for we are freedom. The way Sartre painstakingly details how we can be untrue to our own freedom sounds as if we are being untrue to our own "essence," our own self.} If having freedom for a goal is the same as having nothing for a goal, how is this different from having no goal? Since, according to Sartre, we are not free not to have a project. This project, which is the ontological "goal" of the for-itself, signifies that "nothing" cannot be the project of the for-itself, that freedom cannot be aimless, that freedom cannot aim at nothing, and that freedom is not reducible to nothing. Although Sartre uses "freedom" and "nothing" interchangeably, they do not amount to the same thing within
This type of being is the being of play: "The first principle of play is man himself; through it he escapes his natural nature."\(^{127}\) Man's "natural nature" is the pursuit of being; the shackles chaining man to this pursuit are opened through play. Such play can only occur after the for-itself moves from accessory to pure reflection.

We must again remember the distinction Sartre makes between accessory and pure reflection. In accessory reflection, the for-itself seeks to become a "psychic object" for itself. In pure reflection, the for-itself abandons this quest for self-objectivity, as it recognizes that it has no essence other than to be free. It is the self still caught in accessory reflection that seeks internal "reasons" for its own behavior (as a function of a substantive "self"). The self engaged in pure reflection realizes instead that it is responsible for who it is and what it does, therefore taking responsibility for its own being and praxis. The self caught in its own gaze of accessory reflection has not yet expelled all "contents" from consciousness, but still seeks at least some motivation for its own praxis in something other than its...

\(^{126}\)(...continued)

the body of his philosophy. Therefore, having freedom for a goal is not the same as having nothing for a goal. Furthermore, having freedom for a goal is not synonymous with having no goal. Freedom is the uncoiling of being in the face of itself, a process enhanced or impeded by the complicit for-itself.

\(^{127}\) *Being and Nothingness*, 581. Any reading of *Being and Nothingness* which ascribes to Sartre an ontology which excludes this possibility is a misreading of the text.
own freedom. Therefore, those engaged in accessory reflection have not fully exited the realm of bad faith consciousness, whereas those engaged in pure reflection have.

Sartre makes clear that the essay in phenomenological ontology which is Being and Nothingness does NOT deal with the type of being that is the being of play: "This particular type of project, which has FREEDOM FOR ITS FOUNDATION AND ITS GOAL, DESERVES A SPECIAL STUDY. It is RADICALLY DIFFERENT from ALL others in that it aims at a RADICALLY DIFFERENT type of being." I find this entire passage highly illuminating, and recommend that the reader go directly to Sartre's text for a fuller understanding. I submit that this radically different type of being is that which is aimed at through play, and that play is only possible through conversion. Conversion necessitates authenticity, a volitional and praxiological shift in being. The goal of this project is a radically different kind of being - it IS being in love. This is not possible for the unconverted Sartrean woman, for love in such a world, as we have shown, remains merely an illusive game of mirrors. Can love be any other way in a Sartrean world? It is to this question that we turn in Section Three.

Part Three

\[128\text{ Being and Nothingness, 581. Caps mine.}\]

\[129\text{ But certainly not in the Sartrean type one sense of the term.}\]
Are type one and type two love mutually contradictory or can there be a synthesis of the two? Are there salient commonalities? What does Sartre have to say about these issues, if anything?\footnote{Sartrean type one and type two loves seem to represent two distinct modes of being-in-the-world, and the purpose of this short section is to illuminate this appearance. It may be said that, because both types of love represent distinct modes of being in the world, they are therefore mutually exclusive \emph{a priori}. But this does not seem to follow as a self-evident truth, since it is theoretically possible that these "two" "modes" of being are such based only upon a conceptual confusion, and that they can be reduced to one another following a more thoroughgoing analysis. It is the aim of this section to show that they cannot be reduced to one another, that these two modes of being are, so to speak, incommensurable. Why is it of such great import to demonstrate this? Because it has far-reaching implications for the theory of addiction, in particular, whether for Sartre a nonaddicted mode of being is realizable. What I go on to show in chapter 4, after a more lengthy analysis, is that both types of love are not alternative human possibilities, but that type two love in a Sartrean world is an unrealizable ideal. Both types of love are not grounded in a basic human reality. In fact, Sartre must positively negate his conception of basic human reality in order to posit his conception of type two love. Sartre is very tricky on these issues, and it seems wise at this point to step carefully.}

In \emph{Being and Nothingness}, Sartre states forcefully and succinctly that "I am the project of the recovery of my being."\footnote{\textit{Being and Nothingness}, 364. How can this passage be reconciled with the passage on page 531 of \textit{Being and Nothingness}, which I cited at the end of part two of the present chapter? We have (A) The being of play, and (B) The being who seeks to be God. If we read the above passage as a necessary truth about the for-itself, then (A) is negated, since the for-itself cannot simultaneously aim at freedom and being.} If this is necessarily and not contingently true...
(like the vast majority of Sartre scholars seem to believe), then changes in volition or changes in praxis will have no effect on the basic project. Therefore, one would not be free to be being, but also would not be free to dispense with the attempt at being being. Since, for Sartre, the "law" of identity is only contingently true (since it does not apply to the being of the for-itself), it may well be that the "law" of the pursuit of being may likewise be only contingently true. As long as I continue the project of attempting to make myself be, I continue to attempt to take the Other's point of view on myself, which means I continue to attempt to be a fascinating object for the Other so as to capture his subjectivity qua subjectivity. As long as my being-for-others is haunted by the absolute being ("God"), do I have to seek to be this being? Can I refuse to be that being which perpetually haunts my being? In *Being and Nothingness*, unity with the Other, as we noted, is unrealizable in fact as well as theory, yet this remains the unrealizable ideal of love. Is the

These two positions are irreconcilable, unless each is only contingently true. In chapter 4, I argue that the conversion is not possible. Therefore, the radically different type of being achieved through play is unrealizable, since play is possible only after conversion. Finally, then, only (B) remains possible in a Sartrean world. Sartre was unable, after all, to reconcile the possibilities of freedom and being as ends, given his limited ontological understanding of the for-itself.

nature of this triple ekstasis which is the for-itself such that it is free being, but free only to pursue God?¹³³

At this point we turn back to Cahiers and observe once again that according to Sartre, the "authentic individual cannot through conversion suppress his pursuit of being because there would be nothing else."¹³⁴ From Sartre's interviews, it appears as if he wishes there were something else, but this something else fails to appear in the Sartrean world. Again, is this fact necessarily so? It is certainly not the only conceivable state of affairs, and Sartre himself does not view present reality as ideal (witness Nausea!), yet conception in mente falls far short of existence in re. Despite the fact that my being is perpetually haunted by the absolute being of God, there is no God and I cannot ever become God, says Sartre. In Sartre's popular essay, "Existentialism," he explicitly states that "Existentialism is nothing else than an attempt to draw all the consequences of a coherent atheistic position."¹³⁵ God is functionally indelible in the Sartrean system, but also nonexistent.

¹³³ cf. Being and Nothingness, 298, 299.
¹³⁴ Cahiers, 42. Underlining mine.
¹³⁵ Found in Jean-Paul Sartre, Existentialism and Human Emotions, trans. Hazel Barnes and Bernard Frechtman (New York: Philosophical Library, 1957), 51. Also, note Sartre's relevant and interesting discussion of Heidegger's notion of "forlornness" on pp. 21ff. of this same work.
Since authenticity bears on what I will and what I do (volition and praxis), authenticity is a category which overlaps the sphere of ethics. Is authenticity possible? Possibly, we could take the approach of asking whether or not a Sartrean ethic is possible. In Saint Genet, Sartre writes tersely that "...any ethic is both impossible and necessary."\(^{136}\) Is this the case with authenticity? Is this the case with the Sartrean conversion? How can this be? Self-contradictory, this can only occur in the Sartrean world where contradiction is not an argument against existence, but is, in some circumstances, a condition for existence. How else could it be said that the for-itself is not the opposite of being, but is its contradiction?\(^{137}\)

In Sartre's discussion of The Devil and the Good Lord, he states that "First, every love is in opposition to God...Every love is in opposition to the absolute because it is itself absolute...If God exists, man does not exist; and if man exists, God does not exist."\(^{138}\) Harkening back to the earlier discussion of a passage from this play (see section one),

\(^{136}\)Jean-Paul Sartre, Saint Genet, trans. Bernard Frechtman (New York: New American Library, 1964), 247. This statement is a prime example of why Sartre is often so difficult to decipher.

\(^{137}\)Being and Nothingness, 14.

we remember that, for Sartre, there can be only one absolute. If more than one exists, one must take precedence and functionally negate the other(s). For Sartre, God does not exist, and man exists as freedom. As freedom, man tries to create (become) the absolute through love (or other concrete relations with others). This attempt to create the absolute through love functions as the absolute because it is exclusionary. The love relation in Sartre is the absolute because it seeks to do what the absolute would do if the absolute did in fact exist - ground being, make being necessary, provide meaning. Sartre made these comments about the time that he began to see "more positivity" in love, indicating the overlapping of the type one and type two love projects insofar as they are both projects toward absolutization - and absolution. For my being-guilty will cease if my being is "justified" through being-in-love. For I shall execrate my own being unless it can be "justified" from within or without, or unless I can give up the project with impunity.

The following dialogue between Goetz and Hilda is the final excerpt taken from The Devil and the Good Lord. In it we can find type one and type two love exemplified, by Goetz and Hilda, respectively.

Goetz: "Sleep with you under the eye of God? No, I don't care for coupling in public. Oh, for a night deep enough to hide us from his regard...."

Hilda: "Love is that deep night; when people love each other, they become invisible to God...I still love you. If you die, I will lie down beside you and stay there to the very end,
without eating or drinking; you will rot away in my embrace, and I will love your carrion flesh; for you do not love at all, if you do not love everything."

Goetz: "Whip me." 139

We can note here again the opposition between love and God. Both potentially serve the same function. Hilda is trying to hide from God through love, whereas Goetz is trying to expunge his own guilt through the love relation. Hilda's ideal is unrealizable in that (A) If God exists, love would be insufficient to "hide" her from His gaze, and (B) Since God does not exist, one becomes invisible before nothing, that is, the attempt is superfluous. Goetz's ideal is unrealizable in that, since all being is contingent (in love or otherwise), it is forever unjustified and unjustifiable, and, therefore, "guilty" (de trop). 140

In "Existentialism," Sartre delineates the parameters of legitimate choice: "One may choose anything if it is on the grounds of free involvement." 141 Type one love involves belief in its own reality - hence the illusion. The belief is a tributary from the stream of bad faith consciousness. Bad faith always involves a limited recognition of one's own freedom. Therefore, the project of type one love can only be chosen through a necessarily limited perspective on one's own

139 The Devil and the Good Lord, 133.

140 Guilt and superfluity are not strictly synonymous, nevertheless, phenomenologically, they may be experienced as overlapping or equivalent.

141 Existentialism and Human Emotions, 48.
freedom, and cannot be chosen on the grounds of free involvement. Type one love is therefore necessarily ruled out. Type one love is therefore necessarily ruled out. ¹⁴²

We never relate on a plane of equality because I never recognize the freedom of the Other as freedom for the Other, nor does the Other recognize my freedom as such.

Type two Sartrean love is based on transparency, honesty, truth, sacrifice, freedom, and play. In such love, the Other is treated as an end. We have said that such a love is possible only if the conversion is possible. If the conversion, for Sartre, is the equivalent of authenticity, then type two love is not possible because even the authentic individual cannot opt out of the pursuit of Being. ¹⁴³ But in this very passage, located in Cahiers, Sartre states that the authentic individual is the converted individual. ¹⁴⁴ What this means, quite simply, is that type two love is not possible in a Sartrean world, because even authentic, "converted" individuals are not free not to engage in the pursuit of Being. Therefore, Sartre gives us two clearly different views of love throughout the body of his works. The first is possible but

¹⁴² This is independent of the deception inherent in love, as the lover tries to appear only as an object for the beloved, granting a limited perspective which brings forth a limited range of consciousness of freedom-possibilities for the beloved - precisely what the lover intends. Type one love is also ruled out as a legitimate choice on these grounds.

¹⁴³ In chapter four I shall attempt a new rendition of Sartrean "authenticity." For now, we shall adhere closely to Sartre's own proclamation.

¹⁴⁴ Cahiers, 42.
a failure in principle, since the possibility rests on the possibility of an illusion. The second is an impossible love, but one that would not be a failure if it were to exist. So Sartre has conceptualized quite clearly what non-illusive love would be like. He is also quite aware of the ontological impossibility of such love. Type one love, then, is that actually occurring in the Sartrean world. It is descriptive. Type two love is Sartre's ideal. It is normative. Nevertheless, the norm is unrealizable, just as descriptive love aims at the unrealizable.

Illusive/delusive love is Sartrean love. It is in essence a deception. One may do well to question whether Sartre has a theory of love at all. To conclude this section, as well as chapter three, I would like to replicate a passage from The Family Idiot in which Sartre shows clearly and eloquently the deceptive, illusive nature of love.

Let the word love be pronounced...the change is radical. The emotion, the tenderness, even the sexual excitement were their own end...A shift in view: Love becomes the

---

145 That is, assuming the validity of his presuppositions.

146 The full grounding of this conclusion will have to await the lengthier analysis of Sartre's phenomenological apparatus in chapter four. In that chapter, I explicate and analyze in more detail Sartre's notions of the phenomenological reduction, conversion, and authenticity. Following upon the additional insight gained through the analysis appearing there, it will be all the more evident that Sartrean love can be only of type one.

147 One may be reminded of Stendhal's famous "theory of crystallization" in which love is regarded as, in essence, a deception. See Jose Ortega y Gasset, On Love, trans. Toby Talbot (New York: World, 1968), 19-78.
end. The tender emotion, the desire are means to maintain it in being; that is, to remain faithful to the vow. They are proofs...nourishments for that abstract flame of love...For love is nothing but a vow extracted by society from each member of the couple with the complicity of the other...One will therefore nourish the vampire.\textsuperscript{148}

The vow: certainly it is a shackle, a rusty chain for the being who is only freedom. For freedom is faithless except to itself, it has no continuity except to be infinite, to be freedom. Love's flame is only as abstract as that of freedom. But freedom's burns brighter and extinguishes that of love since the ultimate goal is freedom, always freedom.\textsuperscript{148} When the bell tolls I will no longer nourish the vampire of love, instead I will feed that of freedom. When the bell tolls I will be free, for that is all that I am. The rest is sheer trickery, mere subterfuge. I am free, but not in love. I am free, but not in love. I am free. For freedom and love are both absolutes, and the one must be sacrificed on the altar of the other. I am the forever recurring avatar of freedom. I am ethereal, haunted even by myself. I live on the blood of love. Freedom. Yes, I will be free. For that is all I am, for I am nothing.

At this juncture, we shall plunge into chapter three, wherein I develop an existential theory of addiction. It is

\textsuperscript{148}The Family Idiot, vol. 1, 783, 784.

\textsuperscript{148}That is to say, freedom is the only legitimate grounding or meta-value in the Sartrean paradigm. Freedom is the source of all value, and, as such, must be preserved. The origin of "anti-value" is the suppression of freedom.
to this central task that I now turn. Later, in chapter four, I shall demonstrate that based upon the existential theory of addiction advanced in chapter three, Sartre's theory of love is in fact not a theory of love at all, but a theory of addiction.
CHAPTER 3
AN EXISTENTIAL THEORY OF ADDICTION

Introduction
The Culling of a Theory

Chapter three is divided into two main parts: (I) Kierkegaard on addiction, and (II) Sartre on addiction. Both parts will be laced with insights from other thinkers, where appropriate, the majority of these insights to be contained in footnotes to the text.¹ The texts of both Kierkegaard and Sartre shall be, generally speaking, dealt with in a chronological manner. I make no claim to present a comprehensive account of their works in relation with developing a theory of addiction. I merely claim to have begun such an arduous project, plowing the ground, so to speak. The bulk of Being and Nothingness is relegated to chapter four, wherein I seek to view love and addiction conjointly. The views of both Kierkegaard and Sartre on addiction I find to be compatible

¹As specified in the introduction to chapter one, the footnotes in this chapter offer another voice - or, other voices - in the development of an existential theory of addiction. These voices often raise issues outside the scope of this dissertation - issues which are nevertheless worthy of mention. It is with this understanding and in this spirit that the following footnotes are presented.
and complementary. Connections between the two shall be noted in both parts one and two.

One major difficulty in extracting a theory of addiction from the works of Kierkegaard and Sartre is that neither of them dealt with the issue specifically. Furthermore, the concept of "addiction" itself is mentioned quite infrequently. Since it is the case that both leave the region of addiction ostensibly untouched, I am left to construct a theory from their texts in philosophical anthropology and phenomenological psychology. I believe the seeds for such a theory are numerous in the writings of both thinkers. The time has come to lay the groundwork for such a philosophical theory. The format and style I employ may appear unorthodox. Nevertheless, there is to be found here a clear and consistent full-blown theory of addiction. Every effort and therefore every possible writing style and characterization of addiction are utilized to foster the reader's understanding of the tragedy that is addiction.²

²"Belief in freedom of the will is a primary error committed by everything organic." [Friedrich Nietzsche, Human, All Too Human, trans. R.J. Hollingdale (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 22.] Belief in the phenomenon of addiction, under this description, would be a twofold error, involving: (1) The belief that the "will" is "free," and (2) The belief that somehow this "free will" has become entangled, disjointed, or in some sense ruptured. "....[A] brazen wall of fate: we are in prison, we can only dream ourselves free, not make ourselves free." [Human, All Too Human, p. 223.] Also: "The theory of free will - the hundred times refuted theory." [Friedrich Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil, trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage, 1966), 25.]

(continued...)
The notions of "addiction" and "the addict" operative throughout this dissertation shall be clarified contextually, that is, their meanings shall be slowly unraveled as we proceed through the various aspects of the phenomenon of addiction. As Ortega said well in his Meditations on Quixote and with which I thoroughly concur, the way to "tell" what something is is to show what it is, to bring the reader on a journey. Therefore, I ask the reader to have patience as the

Finally: "The creed of man's free will was only invented to forge that of grace." [The Marquis de Sade, "Dialogue Between a Priest and a Dying Man (1782)," trans. by Paul Dinnage, found in The Existential Imagination, ed. by Frederick Karl and Leo Hamalian (Greenwich, CT: Fawcett, 1963), 52.]

It must be remembered that I am attempting to construct a theory of addiction within a Kierkegaardian-Sartrean paradigm. Certainly, there are other paradigms antithetical to this project. However, I do believe it is possible to make sense of the notion of "addiction" even within the Nietzschean paradigm, albeit in a different manner. I shall attempt to clarify what I mean by this in subsequent references to and explications of Nietzsche. Certainly, it would be nothing short of chimerical to attempt to "legitimate" a theory of addiction suitable to all paradigms of thought, or to develop such a theory "free" from all paradigms. I merely seek to develop a theory within the strictures of an existential/phenomenological ontological framework, knowing full well that this approach has limitations when viewed from other perspectives (I, too, embody some of these perspectives). Nevertheless, I must choose (or, be) a perspective; I cannot help but do so, and this is precisely what I have tried to do, adhering to this choice as closely as possible. Given this fact, I cannot hope to "show" that the theory of addiction contained herein is "true" in some universal sense, or even that it is a theory of "addiction," also in that same sense. From a Nietzschean-Spinozistic-Sadean deterministic paradigm, the very belief in the reality of addiction would be, as I have outlined earlier in this footnote, delusional.

See Jose Ortega y Gasset, Meditations On Quixote, trans. Evelyn Rugg and Diego Marin (New York: W. W. Norton, 1963), 31-52. See also Julian Marias' introduction, 13-26. Existential-
various conceptual components coalesce into the subsequent amalgamatic theory of addiction.

Part One

(...)continued)

tial "methodology," is, to be sure, non-methodological, meaning (A) That existential "methodology" is not reducible to a process of conceptual clarification (although it involves this), and is certainly not reducible to a rational-empirical justificatory schemata. Emotions and the imagination are necessary components of the existential method of "demonstration"/knowing, the footwork in reference to which must be performed by the reader herself. Concepts alone are insufficient to drive a point home, and therefore the imagination and the emotions must infuse the conceptual apparatus with existential truth, truth which goes beyond "reason" and "sense perception," per se, and strikes at eidetic reality. (B) That existential "methodology" is in fact an ontological frame of reference from which "reality" is described. Existential "methodology" recognizes that all method presupposes an ontology, but that all ontology does not necessarily presuppose a method. Therefore, ontology is a more primordial and basic "reality." It is that upon which the process of truth disclosure (method) is legitimated. (C) Truth is, therefore, not strictly speaking discursive, but rather, "incursive," meaning, namely, that one must circle it from various perspectives in order to strike at its core - a notion well stated by Ortega in What Is Philosophy? [Jose Ortega y Gasset, What Is Philosophy?, trans. Mildred Adams (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1964), 17-111]. Kierkegaard also has much to say in terms of the necessary indirect communication of truth in the entire corpus of his philosophical works. (D) That from an existential perspective, the notion of "truth" itself is thrown into confusion. If "truth" is "conceptual," it fails to encompass the whole of reality - witness the slippage of the notion "tree" in Sartre's Nausea [Jean-Paul Sartre, Nausea, trans. Lloyd Alexander (New York: New Directions, 1964), 126-135]. If "truth" is nonconceptual, problems of ineffability inevitably crop up. Unless nonconceptual truth can be represented linguistically (symbolically). And, again, this issue is a problem in itself. Is all language conceptual? Or only discursive language? The problem here has two loci: (1) The notion of "truth" itself, and (2) The conveyance of "truth" - the question of language and concepts. From an existential perspective, the very notion of laying out "truth" in the form of a dissertation - at least truth of any philosophical import - is immediately suspect.
Section A

Addiction is a Function of Missing One's Self

In *Either/Or*, vol. 1, Kierkegaard includes a section entitled "The Immediate Stages of the Erotic or the Musical Erotic." In this section he explains three kinds of desiring, comprised of three stages. The sensuous merely awakens in stage one, it is a dolorous desire without a specific object. Desire is melancholy because it is not specified as the desiring of a particular object. In stage two, desire becomes specified, it seeks the object of desire without, Kierkegaard says, "desiring" it. Stage three desire is exemplified by desiring the particular absolutely. The addict fallaciously desires the object of addiction, while her actual desire

---


5The addict "fallaciously desires" in the sense that she fallaciously believes that the ostensible object of her desire is in fact that which she desires, which it is not. The ostensible object of desire is nothing other than a reflective symbol or sensate manifestation of an unknown (nonreflective) object of desire. The addict seeks to circumvent the process whereby she would come to recognize the three stages of desire in herself and instead deems by fiat the object of addiction as her stage three desire. This object is fallacious in the sense that it is misleading and deceptive, impeding progress toward the realization of a genuine stage three desire, since the object functions surreptitiously as the same. This confusion about the object of desire is not inherent in desire itself, but is a self-delusion belonging to the aesthetic mode of consciousness. This is the case because the aesthetic desirer has, as previously mentioned, circumvented the process whereby she would come to recognize the three stages of desire in herself. That is, she has impeded the process whereby she

(continued...)
remains unknown to her. Desire for the object of addiction expresses a stage three desire, which is operative in lieu of the real object of desire, which is merely dreamt about (stage one). Thus the addict settles for the object of addiction, hoping to thereby create a stage three desire, when in fact the addict has not succeeded in leaving the plane of stage one desire. The addict's consciousness, as such, is still asleep to itself. The addict wants to think herself awake - thus the object of addiction. But the object is fallacious, since

would come to realize the meaning of her own desire. Because this is the case, her desire is "fallacious," meaning that it fails to realize (cognize) its own end, but instead stops short and latches upon something unworthy of itself, that which becomes the transient object of addiction. But it is not specifically the object that creates the addictive relation, but the way in which the object is desired.

Another way to state this would be to say that the addict wishes to fully constitute her selfhood without meeting the necessary preconditions for the possibility of selfhood, i.e. consistently and systematically utilizing her freedom to become a self. Addiction is seen (nonreflectively, in the manner of a dreamer) as a short cut to becoming a self. The object of addiction, a "thing," is therefore necessary for the "constitution" of the self, since the addict treats herself as if she were a thing, attempting to construct herself thusly (after the manner of a thing). Since the self cannot be apprehended or constituted as a thing, the entire project of the addict to constitute herself after the manner of a thing is, therefore, a failure in principle. The "thingness" of the object of addiction is important here, for the attempted internalization of the same gives rise to the dynamic of attempted self-constitution I am outlining. This is true even of addictions involving forms of praxis (e.g. sports, war, music, love, sex, thinking), since all involve attempts at activity based selfconstitution and the bleeding of the self into the praxis-de-jour.

This form of desiring (aesthetic) is not addictive because it lacks self-consciousness, but because it is predicated upon self-deception (Self-consciousness alone lacks
the desirer is still only at stage one. Thus the lugubrious-
ness - since the addict is nonreflectively aware of her
condition. This affective condition may or may not be
manifested empirically.

Desire, as Sartre says, is a lack of being. It is also
a choice of being, here (in the case of addiction) unrecog-
nized as such. That is, without desire, choice would appear
superfluous. Desire is the impulsion to choice, the latter
being a function of the former. For Sartre, the desire and
its object may equally well be a function of choice. That is,
inasmuch as the object of desire is a choice, so is the desire
itself, at least in the sense that one chooses to be at all.

For Kierkegaard, however, desires and their objects can
in no sense be merely a function of choice, as the self is not
fully self-constituted, but is co-constituted along with the

6(...continued)
the efficacy to deliver us from addiction). In the case of
aesthetic desire, it is not merely a question of being
mistaken in taking a particular object of desire as what is
desired, but a case of misinterpreting the meaning of one's
own desire, and therefore seeking a "fallacious" object.
Although the aesthetic desirer does progress beyond stage one
(dreaming), through stage two (seeking) and stage three
(desiring the particular absolutely), aesthetic desire remains
forever encapsulated in the dream, and it is within the
context of the dream that the aesthete operates. The meaning
of the desire itself has completely escaped the aesthete
because she has failed to face the structure of her own
consciousness, but instead remains trapped in its mesmerizing
surface. The aesthete dreams when she believes that through
self-deception she can arrive at the truth of her self.

7It is "true" only in the sense of being a subterfuge.

8Jean-Paul Sartre, Being and Nothingness, trans. Hazel E.
Barnes (New York: Philosophical Library, 1956), 87ff.
Power or Ground (God). This distinction in Sartre and Kierkegaard concerning the concepts of desire and choice brings with it ramifications concerning the genesis, exodus, and revelation of addiction. The basic underlying question in play in the dialogue between the two thinkers concerns the nature and extent of human freedom. Stated simply, this is: "How free are we, really?" This underlying question will be in play throughout the course of our discussion of the phenomenon of addiction.

The third stage of desire is the synthesis of the first (dreaming) and the second (seeking): The particular object is specified and desired absolutely. All three levels of desire detailed by Kierkegaard in Either/Or, vol. 1 are levels of aesthetic desire. Aesthetic desire, put simply, is the desire of an aesthete. The aesthete, for Kierkegaard, is any individual (not properly called a "self") that does not exist in ethical and/or religious categories, but instead relegates "good" and "bad" to a personal calculus of the pleasant/unpleasant or the desirable/undesirable. The aesthete cannot properly be called a self, says Kierkegaard, because the aesthete lacks the necessary preconditions for becoming a self. Such preconditions involve the voluntary placing of ethical/religious obligations upon oneself so as to allow for

---


10Either/Or, vol. 1, 83.
the infinitization and constitution of the self through its originary Creator (Power, God). The aesthete lacks such self-constituting grounding.\textsuperscript{11}

Aesthetic desire, as such, creates the condition of addiction. The culmination of aesthetic desire (desiring the particular absolutely) is addiction.\textsuperscript{12} To be a certain kind

\textsuperscript{11}In order to hold at bay the copious amount of metaphysical baggage entailed by Soren Kierkegaard's notion of the self, we could reformulate his conception of the Ground (Power, Creator, God) and its relation to the self, stating that:

(A) The "Ground" is a psychological construct erected by the culture/self with a view to producing an integrated/coherent version of the self, i.e. a self that can narrate its own existence, and can place such a narration within the framework of a metanarrative. [cf. Alasdair MacIntyre's After Virtue (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981)]. With this reformulation, we restrict our "metaphysical" claims to the nature of the self itself.

(B) As a result of (A), the self places "ethical-religious" obligations upon itself, allowing for the processes of infinitization and constitution within itself. These processes occur via the self's relation to itself, not via the self's relation to the nonself. An "ethico-religious" obligation would be that which lifts the self beyond a random succession of moments into a sphere where reflectivity and the imputation of meaning can transpire.

It seems clear that no "philosophical" "justification" for Kierkegaard's theological commitments is possible. Nevertheless, given a shift in the ontological status of the commitments, we can reformulate his position to interface our own phenomenological reality.

\textsuperscript{12}If desiring the particular absolutely is addiction, is it then the case that desiring the nonparticular absolutely is not addiction? This is possibly but not necessarily the case. This would entail the notion that the object itself is of import in determining the addictiveness/nonaddictiveness of the relation. The answer to this question depends upon (A) If in fact a nonparticular exists, and (B) The nature of that nonparticular. Is it conceivable to have an addictive relation with a (the) nonparticular? Certainly? Why is this? Because it depends upon the nature of the desirer - not what is desired. Therefore, if a (the) nonparticular exists, the (continued...)}
of desirer is *eo ipso* to be(come) an addict. A non-grounded desirer (i.e. an individual with a truncated relation to the Ground) can do none other than desire the particular absolutely, since there is no absolute object of (aesthetic) desire. This creates the metastable condition of being noted by Sartre in relation to bad faith. Don Juan, says Kierkegaard, represents the power of sensuousness incarnate. Such desire cannot be expressed in words, but only in music. The desire is reflectively inexpressible. Because the desire (project) is at one with consciousness, it can only

(...continued)

relation of desire to this being could be either addictive or nonaddictive. It is the constitution of the self itself which has decisive bearing upon the addictive/nonaddictive nature of the relationship.

"In the end one loves one's desire and not what is desired." [Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil, 93.]

Addicts desire the object of addiction infinitely because they "love" the desire rather than its object. Thus addiction is a failure in principle because the infinite desire cannot be discharged qua infinite desire. Note that such an ontological condition would obtain regardless of object, since addiction involves the how rather than the what. Whatness and the consequent nonaddictive relation only comes into view subsequent to the conversion. We could, of course, deny the possibility of "infinite" desire on the grounds of impossibility or incoherence. This Kierkegaard does not do. I shall address this issue specifically at a later point in my argument.

*Either/Or*, vol. 1, 87. Don Juan represents the perfection of aesthetic desire, or, the achievement of wholly aesthetic desire. For the aesthete, such a scenario is an unrealizable ideal. Therefore, one must be careful not to draw parallels in too tight a fashion between Don Juan and the addict. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to note that both the former and the latter are unrealizable ideals.

*Either/Or*, vol. 1, 100.
be nontheoretically aware of itself, and therefore cannot be consciously aborted as a project.

Don Juan's energy is represented by dread.\textsuperscript{16} This is a psychological condition indicative of a substantial (ontological) condition (despair). As with Don Juan, the addict becomes one with the object of addiction through dread, and through dread cannot separate himself from it.\textsuperscript{17} The dread must be dealt with as dread, that is, in terms of the subject's relation to himself and the Power, as a precondition for the possibility of a decathexis (release, unbonding) from the object of addiction. Dread (psychological dis-ease) reveals despair (ontological/psychological dis-ease); it is not itself despair.\textsuperscript{18} Yet ongoing dread precipitates despair, just as faced dread allows for the possibility of nondespair. Despair, unabrogated, precipitates the cognizance and continuance of addiction. Dread is the thread that can lead to the

\textsuperscript{16}Either/Or, vol. 1, 128, 129.

\textsuperscript{17}Given the backdrop of The Concept of Anxiety (angst is translated alternately as "dread" by Walter Lowrie [The Concept of Dread (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957) and "anxiety" by Thomte and Anderson; see below) and The Sickness Unto Death, this dread certainly need not be reflective, but such dread is, of course, not ruled out. See Vigilius Haufniensis [Soren Kierkegaard], The Concept of Anxiety, trans. Reidar Thomte and Albert B. Anderson (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980), and Anti-Climacus [Soren Kierkegaard], The Sickness Unto Death, trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983).

\textsuperscript{18}cf. The Concept of Anxiety, 73-80.
experience of one's own despair and the cognizance of the ontological dis-ease that is addiction.  

"Don Juan is ideality [imagination] over against actuality [sensation, perception]..." Likewise, what the addict gets out of the object of addiction is not contained in the object itself, but rather is a function of the imagination. The same goes for what the addict thinks she gets out of the object, also a function of the imagination. As Don Juan is ideality over against actuality, so is addiction.

---

This passage is in no way meant to suggest that dread (anxiety) is a function of the aesthetic outlook alone. Dread signals the experience of the possibility of one's own freedom, and, as such, is an indelible aspect of the human being. Since this is the case, dread is, to varying degrees, present in all spheres of human existence - aesthetic, ethical, religious, or other (if such exists). Anxiety and freedom are co-original. Given that the human being is freedom, the psychological manifestation of this realization - anxiety - is an ever present possibility.

To say this is also to say that all anxiety is not indicative of the ontological condition of despair. Only the self that probes the meaning of its own anxiety can come to understand whether its anxiety originates from despair, or whether it does not. The aesthete, rather than seeking this knowledge, flees her own anxiety, and in this flight loses the possibility of grasping the meaning of this anxiety.

Furthermore, to say that all persons experience anxiety is not to say that addiction is inevitable. That individual who faces her own anxiety with a view to "knowing" its meaning is not engaged in a self-deceptive flight from self, but rather, utilizes her own anxiety to grapple with her own self-constitution. The nonaddicted self, like the addicted self, is an unrealizable, the teloi of which are, respectively, either a flight toward freedom, or a flight from freedom.

Either/Or, vol. 1, 133.
"An individual does not become happy until he has had the tragic."¹¹ We, as human beings, are ontologically being-as-addicted, or addicted-being. That is to say, we are not ethically/religiously embodied unless we make the choice(s) to be so. Our selfconstitution is a function of choice and involves ethical/religious categories, lest the self fail in the task of infinitizing itself and thus fail to discharge its own infinite passion in its relation to the Infinite (God). Aesthetic self-constitution is circular and nonsubstantive in that the self seeks to be-come (come to be) via drawing into itself (introjecting) the necessary constituents of self-ness, among them nonsuperfluity, justification. But in so doing, the aesthetic self, as such, experiences a surfeit of existence, which it must disgustedly spew forth in a contrary (to that of self-constitution as detailed heretofore) effort to mitigate the experience of becoming engulfed in being.

This seesawing between introjection and spewing forth is an ontological dynamic the aesthetic self cannot help but participate in, as its "self" is naught but nothingness gliding over the surface of being. The ideality of total freedom involves the negation of the possibility of selfhood, linked with the ceaseless ontological current of introjection/extrojection. Being-addicted (that ceaseless and ambivalent malaise of introjection/extrojection) is a necessary ontological structure, just as are the original fissure

²¹Either/or, vol.1, 143.
with being (the birth of the for-itself) and the reflective ekstasis (the birth of reflective thought and the "objectivity" of the "self"). When we become conscious of this condition and its tragedy, we have acquired the necessary but insufficient conditions for "happiness." Sufficient conditions would necessitate the conversion.

"The bitterest pain is manifestly remorse, but remorse has ethical, not aesthetic reality." Realization of one's condition as being-addicted, with the subsequent perpetuation of this condition, leads one to an ethical pronouncement regarding oneself, i.e. "I should not be this way." In this way, the is-ought gap is bridged. We move from ontology to ethics, within the unity of a single consciousness. One describes this perpetuated condition to oneself as a condition of guilt. Once the stage of reflective grief is reached, consciousness "ethicizes" itself. Thus ensues the struggle of the will (reflective) against the project to-be-addicted (nonreflective).

Reflective grief, says Kierkegaard, can become "permanent" and thus provide a "sense of numb relief." In reflective grief, sorrow constantly and unsuccessfully seeks

---

22"Happiness" as "self-alignment." More on "conversion" in chapter four.

23Either/Or, vol. 1, 146.


its object. This is certainly true of the addict, who experiences this "object" as necessarily external to herself. The reflective grief which creates and sustains addiction is a function of missing one's self. There is no external way of rectifying this ontological condition.

Kierkegaard's aesthete expatiates on the character of Donna Elvira (from the opera "Don Juan") in *Either/Or*, vol. 1. He states regarding Elvira's love for Don Juan that "Her love is even from the beginning a kind of despair; nothing has any significance for her, either in heaven or on earth, except Don Juan." Don Juan functions as the object of addiction for Donna Elvira. Were she to lose Don Juan, she would lose "herself." Thus her relation to the object is rooted in despair; the despair of seeking the "self" in the object (other) and the fear of the possibility of the loss of that object ("self"). Her "self" is not consciously grounded in her own freedom, consequently, she is in an ontological condition of despair. She is not the locus of her own selfhood; she seeks this selfhood (despairingly) in the object (other).

Such "selfhood" is always open to collapse before the freedom of the other, or before the reflective apprehension of one's project in relation to the object (other). Thus incessant, necessary despair, at least at the nonreflective level. When reflectivity is involved, consciousness "ethici-
zes" itself. Thus Donna Elvira experiences her own being as "damned" as a result of her inability to separate herself from the object of her passion, Don Juan. She cannot effect the disunion (praxiological); for her, this is because she is damned (ontological).

Returning to the aesthete, we come upon Kierkegaard's notion of the "unhappiest man." The unhappiest man, writes Kierkegaard, cannot love because he is always absent, never present to himself. "He cannot love, for love is in the present, and he has no present, no future, and no past... he

Donna Elvira desires Don Juan alone. It may be said, therefore, that she has "purity of heart," due to the fact that she desires one thing, and one thing alone. Again, it must be stated that it is not the what of the desire that makes the relation addictive, but the how of the desire. It is clear that Donna Elvira was willing to sacrifice even her "true self" for Don Juan - precisely a drive operative in the addicted relation. She sought herself through Don Juan, thus attempting to utilize him as a conduit for her own self-constitution. This dynamic, which is a component of the Sartrean love relation, shall be discussed at length in chapter 4.

Could Donna Elvira be subsumed under Kierkegaard's aesthetic type? If one can shoulder the position that nothing in heaven or earth has any significance for Donna Elvira except Don Juan, and that this could be an ethical/religious type of existence, then the answer is no. Can she "love" Don Juan in an apparently ethical/religious way and still not be ethical or religious? How is it that her relation to her soul object of desire is ethical or religious? How can we know the answer to this question, in any case? This question points to the need for a phenomenology of desire, that which can ferret out the essential characteristics of each kind of desire.

In any case, it seems to me that the (aesthetic) addiction which characterizes Don Juan is categorically different from the addiction of Donna Elvira, be the latter aesthetic or no. Don Juan is addicted to an experience which he produces via many objects, whereas Donna Elvira is addicted to an experience which she believes can be produced only through a single object, Don Juan.
has no passion, not because he is destitute of it, but because simultaneously he has the opposite passion." The unhappiest man is the aesthete, says Kierkegaard. The aesthete as addict is he who attempts to anchor his conflictual passional nature in the object of addiction. He becomes "present" to the object to the degree in which he "loses" himself in it, and such "losing" vitiates his conscious need for the construction of his own selfhood. He only recognizes himself as the unhappiest man when the project of addiction breaks down, that is, becomes reflective. The unhappiest man attempts to give himself a nature (essence) through the object of addiction, which would be the same thing as freedom attempting to freely truncate itself (short of death, which in fact would be the success of this very project).

"There is a sadness in the autumn which entirely corresponds to the emotion evoked by the thought of the fulfillment of one's desires." So spoke the seducer in Kierkegaard's

---


29 Addiction as the "unselfing" of man. "Unegoistic" morality, for Nietzsche, involves the unselfing of man, it involves resistance to "natural instincts." The addict unselfs himself in discharging the "will to power" (instinct for freedom) vicariously (surreptitiously) into the surrogate object (the object of addiction). Power (freedom) is in fact not discharged but is instead introjected into one's own being - freedom turned back upon itself, trying to tie its own hands - making oneself sick. Thus, the "unhappiest" man. Cf. Friedrich Nietzsche, Ecce Homo, trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage, 1969), 292.

30 Either/Or, vol.1, 434.
"Diary of the Seducer." The addict desires to perpetuate his desire so as to be (surreptitiously) something. One seeks in this case to suppress consciousness of one's own freedom so as to be something (in bad faith). Addiction, then, as the project of forever unsatiated desire, would grant the addict a continuity which would function in lieu of the (real desiring) self. Addiction here is seen as the (nonreflective) perpetual desire to desire perpetually, the desire to immure oneself within one's own incessant desiring, to desire irresistably so as to have a stage three project. This is a necessary failure, as freedom is used to constrict rather than expand the self. The self (as addict) is nonreflectively aware of this.

The seducer concludes his diary by telling us that in aesthetic drugging, aesthetic self-narcosis "Everything is

---

31"Incessant desiring" issuing in a result that is a necessary failure involves self-constriction because the "incessant desire" is the result of a false self that is constructed by the "real" self to mask the self's ambiguity and ambivalence. It is a project in bad faith to give oneself an essence which constricts the self, not the "incessant desiring" or the "necessary failure," per se, were they able to come about in other ways. The project to desire incessantly is a project to rein one's own freedom, a project to forever captivate (capture) the self via the object of desire. It is, again, not incessant desire itself which constricts the self, but the project to desire incessantly.

32On the distinction between "knowledge of" and "consciousness of" see Jean-Paul Sartre, Being and Nothingness, trans. Hazel E. Barnes (New York: Philosophical Library, n.d.), 1-lvi. Knowledge contains a reflective component that "awareness" or "consciousness of" lacks. "Nonreflective awareness of" is thus a consciousness of but not a knowledge of the phenomenon in question.
symbol; I myself am a myth about myself."\textsuperscript{33} Exactly. The object of addiction functions as a symbol for the self-that-is-not; this myth is grounded in and perpetuated by the self that in its freedom chooses not to be a self, but rather an addict (mythic self-construct). \textit{Addiction is the project of symbol-izing the self, rather than creating the self by being the self.}\textsuperscript{34} The object of addiction is the surrogate symbolic self functioning in place of the self I refuse to be. When the addict sees this mythology as pathology, the is-ought gap is bridged and the addict is at a crossroad which signals two

\textsuperscript{33}\textit{Either/Or}, vol. 1, 439.

\textsuperscript{34}Symbol-izing the self is different from creating the self in that

(A) "Symbol-izing the self" refers to the project whereby I seek to become a self that I am not, a false self, the addict. Since I chose not to utilize my freedom to become my self, I symbol-ize the absent self so as to give the illusion of selfhood. The telos of self-symbol-ization is a false self/false consciousness. The process of self-symbol-ization is a flight from freedom. Self-symbol-ization is addictive because it is a process of masking/entangling one's own freedom.

(B) Creating the self is the process whereby I utilize my freedom, within the given parameters of my existence, to become my self. The telos of self-creation is the self/lucid consciousness. The process of self-creation is a utilization of and movement toward freedom. Self-creation is not an addictive process, because it involves this utilization of/flight toward freedom.

Because I am freedom, a movement away from freedom is a movement away from my self, and a movement toward freedom is a movement toward myself. My freedom is the only power I have with which to constitute myself, and, therefore, insofar as I move away from my freedom, I drain from myself the power necessary for self-constitution.
disparate ontological dimensions. In the stage of (nonreflective) denial, of course, the mythology is functional reality. Therefore, I am an addict. I no longer have to grope for an essence.

The aesthete, for Kierkegaard, lacks selfhood: "He [the aesthete] does not possess himself; only when the world trembles before him is he tranquilized." To not-be oneself is to-be-addicted. One can either discharge freedom to become a self, or to become an addict. The polarities of discharge are oppositional; one cannot simultaneously achieve the status of addict and self. The constitution of selfhood involves sustained reflective ekstatic facing of the self (freedom). The constitution of addiction as a mode of being involves sustained aversion to the imagined fruits of this very reflective ekstasis. Self-constitution involves a necessary journey into self-understanding and awareness. The journey into addiction involves the necessary obscuring and blotting out of the truth about the self. The journey into addiction

---

The addict, as such, is ashamed in front of herself, exhibiting the fact that she has not attained freedom [liberation]; nonaddiction appears to her as a necessary prerequisite for this liberation, the floating of detachment among the "objects" which people her existence.

is built upon this very blotting out. Self-constitution is a journey into truth; addiction is a journey into falsehood. One cannot move simultaneously into truth and into falsehood. The addict makes a bold epistemological claim in the staking of her ontological condition: "I do not want to know myself." In fact, when the addict realizes (reflectively) that she would rather destroy herself than know herself, consciousness has reached the level of ethical pronouncement regarding itself. Consciousness here recognizes the abysmal and destructive nature of its own project. It can in no sense call the project "free" or "good," but only the choice of a coward who refuse to know and be herself. In summary: addiction involves a movement away from the freedom that one is, whereas self-constitution involves a utilization of and movement toward or with this very freedom.

The addict: only when she trembles before the world is she tranquilized. Tranquilization is the goal, and it is only achievable through the narcotic art of addiction. Thereby,

37Perhaps we should pity rather than judge the addict who flees herself because she either knows or fears the poverty of herself. Could such an addict's "cure" be some decisive action on her part? Only if she can overcome the fear of the nature of herself to the degree that she can cease to flee herself. The question thus becomes one concerning how the addict overcomes her own "self"-fear. I would like to suggest that self-love is essential for this to transpire, and that such self-love can be achieved only subsequent to (or concurrent with) the experience of being loved. The attempt to demonstrate these contentions is beyond the scope of this work. Nevertheless, I believe that they are of major import and cannot be easily sidestepped when focusing on the issue of the movement from an addicted to a nonaddicted mode of being.
the anguish of freedom is made nonreflective while the anguish of addiction is reflectively apprehended. The addict thus focuses on the reality of her addiction, rather than on the fact that she has no self.

Would such an addicted "self" have reason to be melancholic? How could it be otherwise? Melancholy, for Kierkegaard, is a meaningful experience. Melancholy signals the presence of hysteria of spirit. Why hysteria? It is due to the damming up of the spirit (freedom) within oneself, and the consequent damming of the self. Addiction is an attempt to regain control of this spirit out of control, without allowing freedom to take itself as an end. Hysteria is preferred to the anguish entailed by the apprehension of nothingness. The disabusing of the self would necessarily involve peering over this abyss.

---


39 And the consequent necessity of freedom.

40 cf.: "Ah, mon cher, for anyone who is alone, without God and without a master, the weight of days is dreadful. Hence one must choose a master, God being out of style." [Albert Camus, The Fall, trans. Justin O'Brien (New York: Vintage, 1956), 133.]

Freedom is too great a burden to bear. Slavery is preferable. Since the human person, for Kierkegaard, is a relation, he can relate to himself in a slavish manner. But since he is the relation, there remains only a fear-induced relation of slavery to oneself, a scenario devoid of a master. Freedom is not truncated, but only unrealized, and since being is a function of doing, the addict is not free in fact. He has abnegated his own freedom by means of that very freedom, one of the dizzying possibilities of the infinitude that is freedom. One can therefore destroy one's own being [freedom] by means of that very freedom. This is a form of auto-cannibalism, and, as Sartre says is true of all vice, involves
The Judge in *Either/Or*, vol. 2, states that "Every aesthetic view of life is despair...." The despairing being is capable only of relating to "objects" in an addictive way - he cannot maintain a proper distance to them, viz. he cannot even maintain the distance to them that he wants to maintain. Here Kierkegaard equates despair with being constantly "beyond yourself." This is the definition of transcendence for Sartre, which is the self. The self as necessarily in despair. This, again, would be the natural, unconverted self, as opposed to the converted self. The transcendence that is freedom cannot get beyond itself, yet also it cannot be contained within the self, it cannot be self-possessed. The slippage of the self; the self runs away from itself in freedom.

"Doubt is a despair of thought, despair is a doubt of the personality." Despair is ontological, not psychological.

---

This paradox is expressed in *The Fall* hinges on the horns of freedom and guilt. Jean-Baptiste Clamence finds himself guilty (by his own reckoning) in a world devoid of any pre-established moral values. Since there is no God to expiate this guilt, freedom is seen as the culprit: If one is not free, she cannot become guilty. Therefore, Clamence preaches universal guilt and the "salvation" of collective slavery. The slave can only say yes or no. The freedom of the rebel as addict. cf. chapter two, part two of the present work.

41 *Either/Or*, vol. 2, 197.
42 *Either/Or*, vol. 2, 199.
43 I will develop this claim further in chapter four.
cal. It is indicative of something other than itself; it is a meaningful experience, it is a sign. "...[T]he true point of departure for finding the absolute is not doubt but despair" because despair is ontological, and knowledge (for Kierkegaard and Sartre) is not psychological, but rather, a mode of being. Despair is the starting point for choosing oneself, choosing oneself is the starting point for knowing. The addict is in despair whether she knows this or not, just like the self that has an improper relation to itself and the Ground, since the addict is this self.

"Every finite despair is a choice of finiteness." In addiction, one chooses the finite with infinite passion - a necessary failure. One cannot choose finiteness infinitely without choosing failure. Why infinite passion? Because freedom is infinite and thus must be directed to an object commensurate with itself. In psychological terms, the infinite passion is directed toward the object of "ultimate

---

45 See The Sickness Unto Death, 25.
47 cf. The Sickness Unto Death, 15.
49 Addiction is an attempt to finitize the object of infinite passion in order to control it (a circuitous attempt at self-control). It is an attempt to (re)capture selfhood, to become a self by becoming unified with(in) the object of addiction.
concern." Such an object allows for the gathering together of the fragments of the would-be personality. But the fragmentation remains if the object is incommensurate with the passion with which it is attended.

Addiction, as can be seen from an analysis of Kierkegaard's *Either/Or*, vols. 1 and 2, is a function of missing one's self. Addiction involves a flight from self towards the object of addiction, the object of addiction functioning as a surrogate for the self the addict has failed to be. Furthermore, the aesthetic desirer is the addict because she does not meet the necessary preconditions for the possibility of self-constitution. The tools necessary for the acquisition of selfhood have been bartered away for the experience of "unity" with the object of addiction - an ephemeral, illusory experience. It is for this reason that I contend that addiction

---


51 "...[L]ife is not a product of morality: it wants deception, it lives on deception." [Friedrich Nietzsche, *Human, All Too Human*, 6.]

The addict self-deceptively seeks to ground her being (overcome her contingency) via finitely infinitizing herself, without being infinitized by the Infinite. For Kierkegaard (and I believe him to be correct), this is an impossibility.

52 Addictive "self"-creation is a movement toward being; real self-creation is a movement toward freedom. At times, only an acute observer can ascertain the difference. This is, of course, because the reality of the situation isn't always reflectively evident even to the addict herself. In nonaddictive self-creation, will and intention move together in union toward possibilities of freedom, whereas in addictive "self"-creation, will may or may not be synchronous with intention. Intention, in the latter case, however, remains directed toward being.
involves the sacrifice of the real. It is to this topic that we need to turn next, and it shall in fact be the focus of our inquiry in the next section.

Section B

Addiction Involves the Sacrifice of the Real

Addiction and erotic (aesthetic) love are alike in that they both have as an ideal the legitimation of being and the synchronous negation of the real. Regarding love, Kierkegaard says it like this: "The idea is the life principle in erotic love and, if necessary, one must sacrifice life for it and even erotic love itself." Thus, the project based on the (nonthetic) idea shall decimate the real even beyond the failure of the project, even beyond the death of love itself. This destructive and self-destructive behavior is addiction. Notice that one sacrifices the real for the ideal, yet only the real does and can exist. Herein lies the destructive/self-destructive dimension. It is the equivocation of two noninterchangeable, forever separate realms. The real fuels the fire of ideality. The burning of one's being.

Addiction, as a flight from the real, involves the addict in behavior aimed at self-narcosis. Since the pain of existence is too great to bear, the addict engages in self-anaesthetizing behavior, behavior once sedimented she cannot

---

53 Repetition, 140. Underlining mine.
dispense with, for fear of facing her own pain (that is, herself). "A person can achieve a sameness [of behavior]," says Kierkegaard, "that has a far more anaesthetic power than the most whimsical amusements, and becomes more and more powerful."\(^5^4\) This inflexibility of behavior is precisely the empirical manifestation of the nonthetic project to-be-addicted, a project of the weak. "The weak" is a category that comprises any individual who "cannot" be herself or himself, any individual who "cannot" face his or her own pain. This pain is, at least in part, the consequence of failing to face oneself. And, the failure to face oneself itself creates this pain. Therefore, the self-effacement (non-self-facement) operative in addiction compounds the pain the addict feels as a consequence of not facing and becoming herself. Yes, as the

\(^5^4\)Repetition, 179. cf. also Nietzsche's Genealogy of Morals, 2nd essay, section 17: 86, 87: "The instinct for freedom, forcibly made latent and vented upon itself is the beginning of the bad conscience." Addiction can be seen, utilizing Nietzsche's nomenclature, as the weak man's entertainment: cruelty turned inward, coupled with narcoticization. Once one accepts (nonreflectively) the premise that one's instinct for freedom should be made latent, she is complicit in creating in herself her own bad conscience. The addict sees the object of addiction as a way to exercise her "latent" freedom in an "innocuous" way, but ends up by projecting the "addiction" as the source (cause) of her bad conscience. If the addict breaks with the object of addiction, she continues to experience the bad conscience as a result of her (still) latent freedom and so seeks a new object for her latent freedom - which then becomes the new object of addiction - in order to attempt to truncate the bad conscience and exercise her freedom. This circular exercise perpetually results in failure. The instinct for freedom, for Nietzsche, equals the "will to power." The "will to power" may be utilized as an alternate conceptualization when discussing the freedom/addiction paradox.
pain increases, the likelihood that one will achieve a nonaddicted mode of being decreases.

Following this line of reasoning, one may say that the addict had no pain prior to the time she refused to face herself. The question as to the motivation for addiction then comes to the fore. But, for Kierkegaard, all individuals are born in "untruth" ("sin")^55, meaning that they have not yet thematically (reflectively) faced themselves. Therefore, the refusal to face oneself must be a reflective endeavor, following upon the heels of the realization of the possibility of thematic self-knowledge. The self, therefore, is born into untruth about itself, meaning that it has no understanding of its own nature. Pain is an unavoidable response to the realization that one has heretofore had no understanding of one's own nature (and the recognition of the consequent poor choices this must have entailed). Conclusion: Pain is inevitable in the process of waking up to oneself. Addiction is a "way out" of this pain by an attempted reversal of this waking process - a self-induced somnambulism.

"I am completely convinced that he does not know the girl at all...she is the girl - period."^56 So said Constantin Constantius, the "writer" of Kierkegaard's Repetition, of a

---


^56 Repetition, 185.
young man once smitten with erotic love in the pages of the same work. The girl is a category, a representation-object, a symbol. That is to say, the girl functions for the lover as the object of addiction functions for the addict. This is the case because the relations are identical - they are both cases of addiction. The girl is symbol-ized by the young lover and thus made valuable as a conduit for the potential recovery of his being. Thus the idealizing project that is erotic love is impelled by the same metaproject as that underlying addiction.

Repetition (renewal) in Kierkegaard is the possibility of freedom, and involves a transcendent religious movement "by virtue of the absurd." The possibility of freedom becomes a (reflective) possibility only after the (reflective) experience of bondage. This experience of bondage is

---

Repetition, 305. In addition to this explication on page 305 (draft), Kierkegaard advances and seeks to legitimate these claims throughout the entirety of this short volume. Since it is beyond the scope of this work to replicate Kierkegaard's arguments here, I suggest that the curious reader consult Kierkegaard's text (as well as Sartre's texts on conversion. See the section in this present work on the conversion in Sartre) for a more full-bodied comparison.

What is the origin of the experience of bondage? Some of its origins may be delineated as follows:
(A) The fact and realization that one is born into "untruth," meaning, effectively, that one's knowledge about oneself is, to some degree, obscured. Since this is necessarily the case before one wakes up to the nature of her self - through sustained reflectivity (reflective ekstasis), insofar as it is the case, the self is in bondage to its own ignorance of it's self. One misinterprets one's own thoughts/wishes/intentions/behaviors - necessarily. (B) The fact that the nonconverted for-itself seeks being as its end. Having the project of the recovery of being as an underlying intentional telos circumscribes the freedom of the for-itself, preventing it from unleashing itself to the
precisely the experience of addiction. Without the experience of bondage, repetition would not even become an issue; it would appear superfluous.

The notion of repetition in Kierkegaard has striking similarities to the notion of conversion in Sartre. First, both involve a reflective awareness of one's personal ontological condition and one's ontological condition vis-a-vis existence in toto. Secondly, both repetition and conversion become issues following the experience of bondage to a metaproject that was heretofore outside the realm of one's reflective awareness. Thirdly, both repetition and conversion involve ontological reconstitution. Finally, both are likewise valuable and necessary when deciphering Kierkegaardian and Sartrean texts on love and addiction.

Addiction is at-one-ment (with the object of addiction) without atonement (ontological reconstitution). Repetition is the true atonement, and is absent from the addictive experience. This means that the addict has sought ontological reconstitution (restructuring) by means of the object of realization of the full scope of its freedom. The for-itself is in bondage to the degree that it fails to achieve reflective awareness of its own intentional project to be. (C) The dread (anxiety) and guilt that surround the perception of one's own finitude and mortality, as well as the realization that one's self has no substantive essence, is "nothing." Dread may also arise from the perception of one's own superfluity or contingency, especially as one perceives these in the face of the Other. (D) The experience of bondage may also result from engaging in behavior that one considers to be unethical.

— cf. Repetition, 311, 312.
addiction in lieu of reconstitution within the self itself in relation to the Power. The object of addiction merely functions as a subterfuge to prevent ontological reconstitution proper, which could occur via the transcendent movement that is repetition. Repetition is the process by which the self is born unto itself, the very process addiction vitiates.

The at-one-ment of addiction, as "nonwilled" union, is accompanied by experiential negativity. Kierkegaard tells us that "If freedom here [in repetition] now discovers an obstacle, then it must lie in freedom itself."\(^{60}\) This means that "nonwilled" union is precisely this obstacle - a function of freedom itself! Addiction, then, is a project of freedom.

In a draft of the Concept of Anxiety, Kierkegaard views habit as including "the disappearance of self-awareness."\(^{61}\) When habit becomes addiction, it involves a painfully acute, heightened sense of self-awareness, albeit unwelcomed. It is habit that has become malignant.\(^{62}\) Such heightened self-

\(^{60}\)Repetition, 320 (Deleted from margin).

\(^{61}\)Repetition, 327.

\(^{62}\)How is habit different from addiction? Are some habits addictions? Addictions are different from habits in that (A) Addiction, in contrast to habit, involves painful self-awareness, that from which the addict seeks to flee. Habit, contrariwise, involves the loss of self-awareness. Habit is thoroughly nonreflective, whereas addiction is not. (B) Addiction involves the project to be, whereas habit does not. This means, simply, that one cannot tell through behavior and its frequency alone whether or not addiction is present. It is the intention and the will of the for-itself that determine whether habit or addiction (or neither) are present. Habit is addiction if and only if they are teleologically synonymous, and, if this is the case, the habit is no
awareness the addict tries to extinguish. Addiction, again, is seen as the project of the self to extinguish itself (a failure in principle, short of suicide, if this is not in fact also a failure on the same or different grounds). Indeed, it is the project to extinguish that very self-awareness that would lead to the possibility of ontological reconstitution through the transcendent movement that is repetition.

Section C
Addiction Involves Freedom's Auto-entanglement and the Refusal to Face One's Own Anxiety

Anxiety is the trembling of human being as it beholds its own possibility, as it recognizes its unavoidable and inexorable task of becoming a self, its self. Lucid awareness of ourselves and our existential condition brings with it the experience of anxiety, which the addict tries to circumvent through her object of addiction.

Addiction is "entangled freedom" where "freedom is not free in itself but is entangled, not by necessity, but by

longer habit, but is reducible to an addiction.
(C) Is the experience of bondage present? If not, the case in question is a case of habit alone. The difficulty, it may be noted, arises when we ask whether bondage must be a reflective experience. Bondage may be experienced as a systemic and amorphous dis-ease, and may not be consciously linked in any way to the object of addiction. Therefore, if such a case transpires, bondage is not reflective.
Anxiety is entangled freedom, which is neither a category of necessity nor of freedom. Nothing gives birth to anxiety, that is, the apprehension of the nothing (freedom) that we are. Addiction is the flight from this nothing, toward being. Anxiety involves both a "sympathetic antipathy" and an "antipathetic sympathy" - as does addiction. The ambivalence inherent in the addictive relation: desire and repulsion, yet all the while being in the grip of an "alien power." Addiction is an attempt to mask this nothing which we are - which we have to be - by a "necessary freedom," which is, in fact, freedom entangled in itself but unrecognized as such. Spirit relates to itself and its possibility via anxiety. Addiction is the attempt in bad faith to suppress

---

63 cf. The Concept of Anxiety, 49.
64 The Concept of Anxiety, 49.
65 See The Concept of Anxiety, 42.
66 The Concept of Anxiety, 235 (from Kierkegaard's Journals). For an illuminating post-Freudian discussion of ambivalence within the context of family systems, see Alice Miller, The Drama of the Gifted Child: The Search for the True Self, trans. Ruth Ward (New York: Basic Books, 1990), 23-34. [Originally published as Das Drama des begabten Kindes (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag Frankfurt am Main, 1979).] Miller underscores her belief that "True liberation can only be found beyond the deep ambivalence of infantile dependence." [pp. 23, 24.] The addict as such has not as yet proceeded beyond her fundamental infantile ambivalence in terms of her object relations with the world. Therefore, she can in no way experience liberation, it being the case that she lives in a world filled only with alluring webs of entrapment.
the anxiety of this conditionality, to parry our anxiety over the nothing that is our being.

"Anxiety is the dizziness of freedom." Addiction is a project to overcome (suppress) this dizziness. Dizziness is indicative of one's ontological condition, blotted out (relegated to the nonreflective) from the addict's subjectivity. The process is a failure, as fear transplants anxiety with the object-relation fear the addict experiences in relation to the object of addiction. The particular, specific object-relation fear is transposed upon the universal (nonspecific) experience of anxiety. Even if the former is experienced as preferential, the latter cannot be wholly suppressed.

---

67 cf. The Concept of Anxiety, 44.

68 "Man would rather will nothingness than not will." [Nietzsche, The Genealogy of Morals, 3rd essay, section 28: 162, 163.] As a result of the existential vacuum that he is [the nothingness of freedom, the valuelessness of being prior to free determination], man experienced no meaning in life [that is, he experienced the inherent meaninglessness of existence], and thus acted so as to create meaning and thereby overcome this lack. Addiction is an attempt to create meaning by the repeated process of willing the same thing. The addict persists in this behavior, fearfully believing that it is better to have a "negative" [self-indicting, "evil"] meaning, than to risk the possibility of having none at all (or, that it is preferable to the risk involved in the attempt to go outside oneself to another, or to the Ground). Such "quantification" of willing in no way affects the existential qualification of the will, which is always tertiary to (a tributary of) the project. The will to power as the will to quantification.

68 The Concept of Anxiety, 61.
Thus the counterpoint of fear-anxiety which harrows the being of the addict.  

Fear is in relation to guilt because guilt is the only source of the loss of freedom. The relation of freedom to guilt is that of a continuum: I am responsible for the diminution of my self (loss of freedom), and I am responsible for the expansion of the self (utilization of freedom). Guilt involves the loss of freedom. The loss of freedom involves the loss of self. The loss of self involves one in addictive relations with one's world in order to recoup this self (a necessary failure). The task of the self, according to Kierkegaard, is to become itself. Failing this, the self accrues guilt and the loss of freedom. As one is responsible

70 This passage is not meant in any way to suggest that all attempts to escape from the anxiety of freedom are addictions. One can seek escape through taking two Xanax, a couple of Valium, watching a Woody Allen film, eating two boxes of Pop Tarts and washing them down with two liters of Coca Cola. One could ride 120 miles on a bicycle, call fourteen people in succession on the telephone, or watch MTV for three hours. One could play an album of Roxy Music, followed by albums of Hank Williams, Stan Kenton, and Frankie Widder. Or, one could get married. In all of these ways, anxiety may be terminated, lessened, or masked. Does this make the behavior addictive? I am not prepared to say so. Behavior alone is always insufficient to determine the existence of addiction. The marks of addiction are specified throughout this chapter, and the above behaviors may or may not in fact be addictions. It depends, again, on the object of the behavior in question, the telos of the actor.

71 The origin of guilt is the suppression of the self. It is also a function of the decision of the self not to be certain possible selves, these possible selves being negated by the self in the very act of choosing a self. That is to say, the destruction of possibility creates guilt within the self. To live is to choose, and to choose is to destroy possibility. Therefore, to live is to incur guilt.
for becoming oneself, one is responsible for the consequences of the failure to become oneself, i.e. guilt and loss of freedom.

Freedom and guilt are antithetical: "...the opposite of freedom is guilt." Fear, loss of freedom, and guilt are always intertwined, but always in an ambiguous, ever-changing way. Addiction, as the experience of the loss of freedom, is also the concomitant realization (recognition) of one's own guilt. Guilt, as utilized here, does not have to be defined ethically (at least not initially), but ontologically. Guilt is the ontological recognition of the discrepancy between the way things are and the way things ought to be. Existence itself is seen as an imperfection. The recognition of addiction per se involves the simultaneous recognition of "bondage" or "limited" freedom. The recognition of guilt involves the simultaneous recognition of one's own freedom and culpability. Addiction is thus the absurd, the unthinkable,

---

72 The Concept of Anxiety, 107, 108.

73 cf. Cervantes' Man of La Mancha: "True insanity is to accept the world as it is and not as it should be." If this were the case, the truly guiltless would be she who is thoroughly insane.

74 cf. Jean-Paul Sartre's Nausea, trans. Lloyd Alexander (New York: New Directions, 1964), 101ff. Also note the following, taken from the same work: "...I find the same desire again: to drive existence out of me..." [p. 175]
"...the sin of existing." [p. 177]
"...I was In the way for eternity." [p. 129]
the paradox. The place where reason does not penetrate. Addiction as hell. To think the paradox that is addiction would be to eradicate the mythical belief that the locus of bondage is outside the self.

"The good is freedom." This is true for both Kierkegaard and Sartre. Addiction, as the experience of the loss of freedom ("unfreedom") is negated as good by this standard. Good and evil, for Kierkegaard, are always in concreto and never in abstracto, therefore, freedom cannot be thought. The object of addiction becomes an object for thought, "masking" freedom, which cannot become an object for thought, cannot become abstract, but must be real-ized (not thought) concretely. Thus the object is intended to "block" the vision (experience) of the nothingness of freedom. The object functions as a device for surrogate self-objectification via projection. Addiction is thus an attempt to circumvent the impossibility of self-objectification.

"Absurd" and "paradox" as here utilized are meant in no way to designate that specific "object" which Kierkegaard often denoted by them, namely, the Incarnation of the son of God. I am using "absurd" and "paradox" here to suggest a situation of apparent irrationality, contradiction, senselessness. For it is, in part, precisely because the addict can make "no sense" of her predicament that she remains trapped within it.

The Concept of Anxiety, 110.

It is also true for de Beauvoir. See Simone de Beauvoir, The Ethics of Ambiguity, trans. Bernard Frechtman (Secaucus, NJ: Citadel Press, 1980), 70-80, 156.

cf. chapter one on the impossibility of becoming an object for oneself.
"Freedom is infinite and arises out of nothing." Sartre's view exactly. The end of all legitimate action is freedom itself, for Sartre, showing clearly that freedom functions as the infinite within the Sartrean paradigm. Freedom functions as an infinite within the Kierkegaardian paradigm. Freedom, for both Kierkegaard and Sartre, is viewed as the only legitimate and appropriate object of infinite passion (freedom). The kosher (legitimate) circuit of freedom: infinity to infinity.

Kierkegaard delineates a concept he calls "inclosing reserve" in The Concept of Anxiety. As the term suggests, an individual of inclosing reserve remains tacit regarding some aspect of herself before both herself and others. Such an individual refuses to fully face herself, or even to acknowledge that this is the case. This individual seeks to avoid even the knowledge that she seeks to avoid certain knowledge about herself, and thus she lives in a world of falsehood brought on by her own self-deception. Inclosing reserve, then, signifies a lie or untruth: "But untruth is precisely unfreedom." The bondage of unfreedom is addiction. The addict is the individual of inclosing reserve, the solitary

---

79 The Concept of Anxiety, 111.
80 To this we shall turn more extensively in chapter four.
81 The importance of this paragraph for any viable theory of addiction cannot be overestimated.
82 The Concept of Anxiety, 128.
one, even amidst the multitude. The reserve signifies that "there is something that freedom is unwilling to per-vade." Such a person has "two wills": the stronger, which wills inclosing reserve, and the weaker, which wills revelation. Addiction is promulgated by this intrapsychic polemic. Precisely, addiction is a nonreflective project ("strong" will) in opposition to the weaker reflective will. Therefore, the ontologically "irremediable" nature of addiction.

"Whoever is educated by anxiety is educated by possibility [freedom], and only he who is educated by possibility is educated according to his infinitude." Addiction is the failure to be educated by anxiety, and the corresponding experience of the loss of possibility (freedom). "Whoever does not wish to sink into the wretchedness of the finite is

The person of inclosing reserve is the addict because such a person exists in untruth, and untruth is unfreedom. This person is bound to her own untruth about herself, and experiences the unfreedom of the lie. This person may have, in fact, no "external" object of addiction. Instead, she is addicted to her own psychic constructs, produced via impure reflection. The person of inclosing reserve is addicted to her own self-concept. Such an addiction is insidious and extremely difficult to treat. Inclosing reserve, then, is a special case of inauthenticity.

The Concept of Anxiety, 130, 131.

The Concept of Anxiety, 129.

"Irremediable," that is, from within the fundamentally deceptive/self-deceptive framework of the individual of inclosing reserve, because inclosing reserve is itself a choice.

The Concept of Anxiety, 156.
constrained in the most profound way to struggle with the infinite." The infinite, here, is freedom itself, and the Ground of that freedom. Struggling with freedom alone never allows one to get outside of the circuit of freedom, but necessitates one's remaining within the circuit, since the circuit lacks a Ground.

Put differently, freedom per se is unable to fully penetrate itself in order to appear to itself in its full lucidity. Freedom must be referenced in terms of something other than itself in order to embody and grasp (not understand) its own infinitude. This is because one is what one wishes to apprehend, and this apprehension can occur only subsequent to the coupling of the self into a circuit of infinitude that draws one outside of the self (metaphysical ekstasis). Thus the infinite struggle with addiction must be fought on two fronts. One must run the gauntlet on both the "Eastern" (self) and the "Western" (Power) fronts, always, and at once. Put differently, to struggle fruitfully with one's own infinitude necessarily involves one also in a struggle with the Ground of this infinitude.

88 The Concept of Anxiety, 160.

89 The reader is encouraged to review part one, section A of the present chapter for an elucidation of the metaphysical/theological overtones contained in this paragraph. In addition, it will be helpful to again quote Otto Rank: "For only by living in close union with a god-ideal that has been erected outside one's own ego is one able to live at all." [Modern Education: A Critique of Its Fundamental Ideas (Agathon Press, 1968), 142.] See chapter 1, part two of this dissertation for the earlier discussion surrounding Rank's
Section D

Addiction Involves One in the Contradictory Effort of Attempting to Absolutely Will the Finite

"It is a contradiction to will something finite absolutely, since the finite must have an end. But to will absolutely is to will the infinite, because this is an end which can be willed at every moment." The addict engages in the strictly contradictory behavior of taking her object of addiction as an absolute telos, although it is but contingent and not necessary. An "absolute telos," as utilized here, is anything (person, object, activity, cognitive construct) a person feels they cannot live without. To "live without," such a person feels, would necessitate a radical change in selfhood, self-definition, human being. And this is precisely contention. I am interpreting this quote in such a way that no "metaphysical"/"theological" claims need be posited. That is, the god-ideal set up by the self need only be transcendent to consciousness, but not external to it.

If the god-ideal and the object of addiction are equally the products of imaginary consciousness, how is it that the former is the answer to the problem of addiction? Some imaginary constructs are imprisoning, whereas others are liberating?

90 Concluding Unscientific Postscript, 353.
91 "Infinite passion" as directed toward the "absolute telos" could be rendered, alternately, as simply that which is the preeminent value or source of value in any given person's Weltanschauung.
the case, due to the psychic function the object of addiction plays in the life of the addict.

Addiction is the incommensurability between the object and the passion with which it is attended. "It would be irrational to yield absolute devotion to a relative [contingent] end." The only legitimate ends for infinite passion are God and freedom qua freedom, because only these are commensurate with that passion. All other ends convolute that freedom and turn it inward upon itself. Addiction is the pathology (suffering) of this turning inward, the suffering of introjected freedom/inclosing reserve.

Can freedom take itself as an end? What would be the structure of such praxis? How is freedom "known" as an end? Is "freedom" a "self-evident" end? What could this mean? Can the knowledge of what it means to be free be universal? How do I know that what you mean by "being free" is what I mean by "being free?" Must conceptions (perceptions) be held in common or at least overlap? Why? If the human being does not have freedom but is freedom, how can he or she do otherwise than be free? Thus, the prima facie legitimacy of all action. Nevertheless, the phenomenological experience of bondage. Therefore, even though I am freedom, it is possible for me to be less than myself.\footnote{Concluding Unscientific Postscript, 355.}

\footnote{This lessening of the self being a function of aesthetic desire, hysteria of spirit, inclosing reserve, and bad faith.}
Section E
The Mutual Exclusivity of Addicted and Nonaddicted Modes of Being

The addict is in despair because she relates herself with infinite passion (ultimate concern, or, even, "seriousness") to the addiction-object, but with infinite passion one can relate oneself - if one is not in despair - only to the Eternal. The ontology of the addict is necessarily an ontology of despair. Despair is a disrelationship in one's inmost being, precisely that condition that obtains when a human being seeks to discharge her infinitude solely in that which is finite. A man despairs because he lacks the Eternal, which is equivalent to Sartre's in-itself-for-itself, the necessary, free being. Despair precedes and yet is

---

94 This is an obvious revamping of Soren Kierkegaard's *Works of Love*, trans. Howard and Edna Hong (New York, Harper and Row, 1964), 54.

95 See *The Sickness Unto Death*, 13ff.

96 Can one be in bondage to her own idea of "God?" Definitely. Not every case in which an individual erects a god-ideal outside of her ego is clearly not a case of addiction. The god-ideal functions as an object of addiction insofar as it constricts the freedom of the self. A nonaddictive god-ideal must be a function of imaginary/emotional consciousness, since a conceptual ideal precludes the possibility of infinitization. To attempt to conceptualize the god-ideal is to attempt to contain the ideal; to attempt to contain the ideal is, simultaneously, to hem in the self. To hem in the self through the god-ideal is to produce for oneself an addictive god-ideal. To seek to conceptually delineate a nonaddictive god-ideal would effectively erase both the ideal and its nonaddictive nature. In order to
addiction, despair promulgates addiction, and despair perpetuates addiction. The woman who has no disrelationship in her inmost being is not in despair, this acquired equilibrium being the result of discharging her freedom (infinitude) in relation to an object with which it is commensurate, that is, Freedom itself. Therefore, addicted and nonaddicted being are ontologically mutually exclusive.

Section F

Addiction is a Function of Despair, Which is a Disrelationship in One's Inmost Being

"Necessity's despair is to lack possibility." The despair of addiction is the experience of the "necessity" of the object of addiction - and the lack of the possibility of the cessation of the addiction - short of death. This is a description of the addict's phenomenological field. "It is indeed freedom which despairs." The "self-accusation" of despair is freedom freely despairing over freedom. This ontological contradiction is experienced phenomenologically

prevent a disrelation in one's inmost being, the nature of the god-ideal must be such that it is a function of imaginary/emotional consciousness, an ideal infinitude to correspond with the infinite nature of the self.

97 This exclusivity will be addressed in chapter four.

98 The Sickness Unto Death, 38.

99 The Sickness Unto Death, 145 (draft).

100 The Sickness Unto Death, 146 (draft).
but not known, as it cannot ever become an object for consciousness. Thus the addict "knows" (experiences) what she cannot know, and it is this "knowledge" which brings torment.

Addiction: despair over something earthly. This is "pure immediacy" (and, as such, is subject only to aesthetic categories), it has an "external" motivation. Despair here is experienced as a submitting (to the object of addiction, upon which the addict bestows magical powers). Consciousness progresses dialectically from despair over something earthly (the particular object of addiction) to despair over the earthly (in toto, as a category of totality). The latter is experienced as despair over one's total existential condition, including one's own ontology, which appears irremediable. The object of addiction makes the despair "bearable" for some period of time by focusing and particularizing it. Better to despair over one's relation to the object (externality) than over oneself (internality). The internalized threat is seen as more horrifying; therefore, projection onto the external object of addiction.102

101 See The Sickness Unto Death, 50-60 for a discussion of despair over the earthly (the particular).

102 "I first guessed how an activity [selfhood] chosen in defiance of one's instincts...is related to the need for deadening the feeling of desolation by means of a narcotic art [addiction]..." [Ecce Homo, 286, 287. Underlining mine.] The concept of "defying one's instincts" in Nietzsche's works certainly overlaps with Kierkegaard's concept of "refusing to be oneself" as explicated in The Sickness Unto Death. Both can be interpreted to show the "necessity" of addiction to anaesthetize oneself against the pain of failing to be oneself. Nietzsche speaks of "my task" repeatedly in Ecce
"Not until a self as this specific individual is conscious of existing before God, not until then is it the infinite self...."\(^{103}\) The addict seeks the expansion of the self, seeks the infinite self, but is crushed beneath the finite (the addiction-object) in its finitude - unless he seeks the Ground. The infinite self can only be realized through such a relation. For how can finitude spawn infinity? Infinitude is "spiritual" reality (nonmaterial), as is freedom. Each species gives birth only to its own kind. "The wind blows where it will, you hear the sound of it, but you do not know where it is coming from or where it is going. So with everyone who is born of spirit."\(^{104}\) Such birth allows freedom (spirit) to be free.

\[\text{Homo (e.g. pp. 286, 288, 289ff.), signaling the need to become oneself while performing it and in order to perform it, a sentiment likewise expressed in The Sickness Unto Death (Of course, for Nietzsche, the "self" is certainly not the unfolding of the creative Spirit of God. Nietzsche's unfolding would have more to do with allowing oneself to acquiesce within the inexorable nature of the Eternal recurrence). Failure to become oneself (perform one's task) brings about the "need" for "idealism" (meaning producing belief) and the concomitant (necessitated) rituals by which these meaning producing beliefs are maintained. This cycle of flight from oneself into ritualized meaning producing praxis-belief involves the necessity of perpetuating these rituals to sustain the web of belief and consequent continued flight from the self. This cycle is the addictive behavior pattern, which results from a flight from self and produces a flight from self. cf. "Fundamentalism" as addictive meaning producing praxis-belief.}\]

\(^{103}\) The Sickness Unto Death, 80.

\(^{104}\) John 3:8 (New English Translation).
"The human being as spirit simply cannot have equilibrium in himself."\textsuperscript{105} Since most persons are in despair,\textsuperscript{106} non-equilibrium is the normal "state" for most persons. This metastable condition is the self in bad faith, that self which fails to recognize and draw implications from the fact that it is spirit. The thread that can be followed from the heart of the self will make this evident if one has but ears to hear.\textsuperscript{107}

From the thought of Kierkegaard I have culled part of my theory of addiction. Kierkegaard, believing that the fundamental ontological nature of the human person is spiritual, has focused on the self's (freedom's) relation to its own Ground (God). Kierkegaard has operated within categories of truth/untruth, inclosing reserve, repetition (renewal), anxiety, and despair. These concepts already broached in Kierkegaard, in addition to others found in Sartre's philosophy, have given me the necessary tools for the groundwork of an existential theory of addiction. It is to Sartre's conceptual contribution to the theory that I now turn.

\textsuperscript{105}The Sickness Unto Death, 146 (draft).

\textsuperscript{106}cf. "The Universality of the Sickness (Despair)" in The Sickness Unto Death, 22-28.

\textsuperscript{107}See Matt. 11:15, 13:9, 43, Mark 4:9, 23, 7:16, 8:18, Luke 8:8, 14:35.
CHAPTER 3

Part Two

Sartre's nomenclature as well as his atheistic viewpoint are both radically different from the thought of Kierkegaard. Nevertheless, through the utilization of Sartre's ontology in connection with that of Kierkegaard, I am able to flesh out and complete an existential theory of addiction. In particular, I wish to focus on Sartre's notion of the imagination and his notion of self-deception, both being indispensable for the construction of my theory. The coupling of these two Sartrean concepts with the fundamental ontological nature of the for-itself in Sartre results in the existential possibility of being-addicted. It is this very being-addicted that I wish to describe in Sartrean terms in part two of the present chapter.

Section A

Addiction as a Phenomenon "Undergone"
By an "Imprisoned" Consciousness:
The Addict Experiences the Spontaneity That is Consciousness as "Beyond Freedom"

Impure reflection exists, for Sartre, whenever the self seeks to apprehend itself through self-objectification. In impure reflection, the self seeks within itself a substantial nature, an essence, a being from which its thoughts, feelings,
and indeed its very actions emanate.\(^1\) Impure reflection, then, does not and cannot ascertain the true nature of the self, which is to be free, to have no essence or substantial being. Insofar as the self seeks and "apprehends" such a substantial self, it is self deceived. All objectifications of the for-itself are blockages created by the for-itself to allow for the nonapprehension of its own nonessence (freedom). In pure reflection, contrariwise, the self achieves a lucid apprehension of itself as free being, having no substantive essence.

In impure reflection, consciousness "imprisons" itself in the world in order to flee from itself (this is only too true of the addict); consciousnesses are "given" as "emanating" from states, and states are apprehended as a function of the ego. Thus the substantive ego, phenomenologically, appears to have primacy. But, in actuality, the order is reversed: consciousnesses are first. Through consciousnesses, states come about, and, through states, the ego is "produced."\(^2\) The \textit{lebenswelt} of the imprisoned consciousness is made up of

\(^1\)This is not to deny that the self must act, must engage in praxis. What is at issue is the \textit{nature} of this self, and the \textit{locus} of the action. Freedom, being primordial, acts to create the self. The self has no \textit{essence} from which freedom is derived; the self, instead, is \textit{reducible} to freedom. The goal, here, for Sartre, is to get away from the positing of a (substantive) "metaphysical" entity known as the "self." Impersonal freedom is sufficient, in lieu of "self."

"magical objects" which are simultaneously objects of the world, and through memory, spontaneous artifices of consciousness: "...[M]an is always a sorcerer for man."3

Consciousness of addiction, then, for the addict, is given as emanating from the "state" of being addicted, rather than the "state" of being addicted being recognized as a project of (a) consciousness attempting to imprison itself in the world. The magical object of addiction retains, as it were, a memory of the spontaneity of consciousness while remaining an object in the world. Addiction experienced as a "state" or a function of the "ego" is merely the secondary description of a more primary phenomenon, which can only be a free project of the for-itself. 4

"The [addict's] 'me' [or, ego, which is a construct

3The Transcendence of the Ego, 82.

4The claim here presented concerning addiction based on the state/fluidity (impure/pure) dichotomy is phenomenological to the degree that Sartre's dichotomy is phenomenological. Phenomenology, as the descriptive study of the nature of consciousness and its contents (noesis) and the surrounding "world" (noema), allows procedural/ontological room within its parameters for the advancing of the above claim. Phenomenological description is not reducible to conceptual analysis and "cognitive" epistemology, being instead an intuitive existential process (see Being and Nothingness on knowledge, pp. 216-218). The intuitive apprehension of truth is not always amenable to non-intuitive "justification" (nor is such "justification" warranted or appropriate within such an epistemology). Is the previous statement open to non-intuitive "justification?" Intuitive "justification?" These questions, of course, leave aside the question concerning what would count as a "justification" to begin with. And - why "justification" at all? Is the question of "justification" an appropriate one after all? Or is it the case that we've got it all wrong? What would this even mean? And - how would we know?
produced through impure reflection] can do nothing to this spontaneity [(of) consciousness], for will is an object which constitutes itself for and by [is consequent to] this spontaneity." This spontaneity frightens consciousness, as it is "beyond freedom." This spontaneity is perceived as "beyond freedom" because it is experienced by the for-itself as the source of its freedom, that is, its very being. Whence cometh the being of the for-itself? Insofar as the for-itself has no easily accessible answer to this question, since it is beyond the for-itself's phenomenological purview, this spontaneity (source of being) is a source of fear to the for-itself because it is shrouded in mystery.

The addict, too, experiences her own spontaneity that is consciousness as "fixating" (cathecting, obsessing, being spontaneously "unfree") on one "thing," a state of affairs experienced as being beyond freedom. The addict feels "free" only in her response to this (spontaneous) consciousness, but not free to determine this consciousness as a matter of will. The spontaneity, as such, is outside the scope of the will. "It is an essential necessity that one not be able to distinguish between voluntary spontaneity and involuntary spontaneity." The Sartrean "category" of "involuntary spontaneity" as noted in The Transcendence of the Ego is precisely the

---

5 The Transcendence of the Ego, 99.
6 The Transcendence of the Ego, 100.
7 The Transcendence of the Ego, 101. Underlining mine.
category of addiction - from the addict's phenomenological vantage point.

Involuntary spontaneity is beyond freedom, but this is not really the realm in which addiction originates, it merely "appears" there so as to mask the underlying nonreflective project of voluntary spontaneity. Regardless of this fact, Sartrean consciousness cannot distinguish the two (at least not prior to the reduction or reduction/conversion), thus addiction is a phenomenon "undergone" by an "imprisoned" consciousness. Absolute and irremediable dread is the result of pure consciousness apprehending this "fatality of its spontaneity." Consciousness degrades itself to the level of

---

8Addiction: Freedom (voluntary spontaneity) being discharged predictably in an "unfree" manner (involuntary spontaneity). This can be a result of the addict's nostalgia for her lost childhood, a period when she did not know the exigencies of freedom, these being concealed from her by pre-angusted childhood subjectivity. The addict's world, in terms of freedom, is the child's make believe world of dolls and trucks and trains, a controllable system of "finite freedoms" (freedom discharged in an "unfree" - i.e. controlled or controllable - manner). This of course is contradictory in theory and in fact and is a necessary failure. It is freedom freely recognizing not to realize its own essence and the demands of that essence. One cannot become free by circumscribing (via prescience) the boundaries of one's own freedom. This is not within the jurisdiction of freedom itself, but rather that of involuntary spontaneity. The attempt at such circumscription is self-manipulative and repressive, it is an attempt to rise above oneself (get "outside" of one's own freedom), take an external point of view on oneself, meet oneself ahead of oneself and so coincide with oneself. It is an attempt to turn freedom into a thing. See Simone de Beauvoir, The Ethics of Ambiguity, trans. Bernard Frechtman (Secaucus, NJ: Citadel Press, 1980), 35-42 for the child's relation to her own freedom.

9The Transcendence of the Ego, 102.
impure reflection (which entails the absence of this spontaneity) to submerge this anguish: this is precisely what the addict does with his "state" of being addicted. In consciousness' frenetic "escape" from itself, it seeks refuge and dissolution in the "me" (a psychic object, a bid for "thingness"). The addict attempts this very projection of consciousness into the me. The resultant consciousness is particularly precarious in that it can "wake up" to itself via purifying reflection at any time. Thus the addict is perpetually insecure.

Section B

Addiction is a Habitual Way of Being Emotional and a Phenomenon of Belief

Addiction is "incantatory behavior" carried out with seriousness (as is the case with Sartrean emotional consciousness): it is an attempt to alter (reperceive) a world that we cannot control, it is a reversion to the level of magic when the "instrumental" approach is seen to be a failure. Being addicted is a habitual way of being emotional, unrecognized by the addict as such, as the project of emotional consciousness is only nonthetically conscious of itself as such, and
theoretically conscious of the object of addiction.\textsuperscript{11} We set up the "magical" world by using the body as a means of incantation - and the physiological manifestations subsequently appear. Consciousness simply has "reversed" (reperceived, interpreted inversely) the order of causation. Consciousness believes, theoretically, that it is the result of physiological/deterministic factors, rather than the physiological/"deterministic" factors being the result of the project of emotional consciousness (addiction). "The image [of imaginary, that is, addicted consciousness] is a sort of ideal for feeling."\textsuperscript{12} Emotions are thus experienced and "known" through the circuit that is comprised of the addict and her addiction-object.\textsuperscript{13} Addiction, then, is the process of

\textsuperscript{11}For Sartre's views on emotional consciousness which I utilize in my description of addictive consciousness, see Jean-Paul Sartre, The Emotions: Outline of a Theory, trans. Bernard Frechtman (New York: Philosophical Library, 1948), 52-70. Hereafter referred to as The Emotions.


\textsuperscript{13}Granted, the claims made here may seem odd, para-doxa. They may not seem to reflect the addict's own self-consciousness. Maybe all this Sartrean talk about freedom is a kind of existentialist mythology. But then, maybe we need mythology in order to live, be human, be "free." What is the function of the mythical within the human psyche? Can any cultural anthropologist seriously claim that at any time throughout human history there were mythology-free civilizations? So we aspire to be such? What would this mean?

Then again, maybe all this Sartrean talk about freedom is not a kind of existentialist mythology. Maybe the "biological/"genetic" theories of addiction are truly mythical. Or, maybe the existential as well as the "biological/"genetic" theories are all "true" under some commensurable description yet to be developed. How did the true world finally become a fable?
objectifying one's own affectivity (in the object of addiction), allowing it to be "known" (as an object for knowledge). The final progression of this calculus of affectivity results when the addict can no longer feel unless she is "under the influence of" her object (person, experience, cognitive construct) of addiction.

"...[B]ehavior pure and simple is not emotion [nor is it addiction], and pure and simple consciousness of this behavior is not emotion either....true emotion [addiction]....is accompanied by belief. Addiction is a phenomenon of belief: The seeds of belief (the psychic objects created via impure reflection which blossom into a "substantive" self [ego]) are necessarily antecedents to the clinging vines that are the phenomenological experience of bondage. For one is in bondage to oneself, but one feels as if in the grip of an alien power. These psychic objects could in no way take root in the soil of the consciousness of the for-itself were it not for the project of impure reflection vying to ground itself through seeking for itself an essence. It is this very (created, fictitious) essence which subsequently throttles the consciousness of the for-itself with the death grip of addiction. How is it that consciousness engages in the project of addiction (emotional consciousness) and subsequently believes in the project, i.e. that its being is being-addicted, an "immutable" ontological reality not open to being

\[1] The Emotions, 71, 73.\]
freely amended, altered or truncated? Addiction is a phenomenon of belief in that the addict believes that (at least) a portion of her freedom - heretofore experienced as such - has been circumscribed by some reality other than herself. "The origin of emotion [addiction] is a spontaneous and lived degradation of consciousness in the face of the world."¹⁵ Degraded consciousness (impure reflective consciousness) does not experience itself as being-free (having no essence), but as being-addicted (having an essence), its actual inversion.¹⁶

Being-addicted is the inversion of consciousness which does not recognize its own inversion, lacking any perspective on this perspective,¹⁷ save the recognition of the previous experience of freedom. This being-free of consciousness in the past is separated from present consciousness by a nothingness which it must be and so cannot effect the alteration of the inverted consciousness by recourse to this past. Being-addicted is a species of impure reflection taking itself as pure reflection. That is to say, the for-itself believes that it is engaging in the project of pure reflection when in fact it is engaging in the project of impure reflection.

How is it that consciousness can produce for itself

¹⁵The Emotions, 77.
¹⁶Note carefully the phrase "does not experience itself as being." This is merely a note to carefully delineate ontological reality from perceptions of the same.
¹⁷That is, lacking a metaperspective.
believable belief? (The addict as mythologizer). Consciousness has confused itself regarding its own reflective status, and, in so doing, has opened itself up to a wasteland of nebulous and noxious fabrications. In this existential condition, the for-itself is in grave and ever-present danger, yet this is the condition in which the addict perpetually exists and maintains herself. The lie (consciousness degraded to the level of impure reflection) has become the truth (ersatz pure reflection) and the true world has finally become a fable.\(^{18}\) Ah! Free at last!\(^{19}\)

What happens when consciousness "wakes up" through a purifying reflection (the dispensation with impure reflection, that is, impure reflection's erasure) to the recognition that the "state" of "being-addicted" is an ever-threatening reality as long as the reflective apprehension of oneself as freedom (in pure reflection) is necessarily accompanied by anguish, pure dread? Consciousness perpetually seeks to elude its own dread as part of the project of attempting to ground (found, 


\(^{19}\)Freedom being too much of a burden for the addict to bear, she finally "realizes" this (free-being) in her own mythological construct - if she realizes it at all. (She would, then, only experience "freedom" when under the influence of her object of addiction). Freedom, in this case, coincides with the dispensing of the real. One becomes more "free" as one becomes less "real." But I caution the reader to allow that some addicts become \textit{less} "free" as they become less \textit{real}." It all depends upon the mythological constructs employed. Not all phenomenological attributes of the experience of addiction are universal.
legitimate, necessitate) its own being. As freedom always appears contingent and therefore unaccounted for (unnecessary, superfluous), consciousness invariably seeks suppression of consciousness of this freedom. Once pure reflection is realized in the face of being-addicted, consciousness is free to abandon this particular project of being-addicted (emotional consciousness). It will succumb nonthetically to the next project of addiction unless through conversion it can relate itself thetically to the Ground.\textsuperscript{20}

"Freedom [for the captive consciousness caught in its own trap] has to come from a purifying reflection or a total disappearance of the affecting situation."\textsuperscript{21} In addiction, the addict denies her addiction (at least at times) because of its phenomenological (experiential, existential) discontinuity, which is the result of periodic purifying reflections, during which time the addict is "free" of her object of "addiction." The addict here experiences a break in freedom in relation to the object, but not its total temporal demise. The addict is "free" during the reflection only because she

\textsuperscript{20}Does it follow, then, that we should seek a theological rather than a clinical "cure" for addiction? This does not necessarily follow, since "theology" can be addictive in itself. The "cure" will be "metaphysical" in nature, being comprised of clinical, philosophical, and "theological" (god-ideal) elements. The focus throughout the healing process remains the existential condition of the self. Since addiction involves an inadequacy in the self, and the self is itself a "metaphysical" construct (although nonsubstantive; it is freedom alone), the "cure" will be, necessarily, "metaphysical."

\textsuperscript{21}The Emotions, 78, 79.
recognizes herself as the author of the project to-be-addicted. Nevertheless, such consciousness does not necessitate the abandonment of the project (praxis), but may in fact merely alter the project so that it appears in different forms or guises. The realization that one is free in relation to a given project does not mean that the project is a project to be free, a project which aims at freedom as an end. The recognition that one has freely engaged in a project is not synonymous with the ability to freely abandon that very project. The ontological/axiological reality hidden behind the original (free) choice must be addressed.

"Emotion is a revelation of the meaning of the world."  
Addiction, too, is a revelation of the meaning of the "world." The addict "realizes" that freedom was the illusion, and that she is in fact unfree. Her question to herself now becomes "Can I become free?" She then sets about attempting to detail the necessary and sufficient conditions for her own liberation - always within brackets - realizing all the while (based on the "deception" of her "pre-addicted" phenomenological condition) that the struggle against her own "unfreedom" could be merely a facet of the unfreedom itself.  

22 The Emotions, 81.

23 "The qualities which the emotion confers upon the object and the world it confers upon them ad aeternum [forever]." [The Emotions, 80.]

24 That is, the description of the illness is itself part of the illness.
unfree being become free? Can such a thing ever transpire?²⁵ Can such a being free himself? The addict as philosopher.

"Consciousness can be a transcendent [psychic] object only by undergoing the modification of passivity."²⁶ Consciousness is symbolized (made symbolic, reified, solidified, coagulated, objectified) by the addict by being projected onto the object of addiction. Thus the addict looks at his own consciousness when beholding the object of addiction, a vision masked as such by the addict. Addiction is yet another attempt on the part of woman to flee her own consciousness (or, put differently, for consciousness to flee itself), the perennial, tragic saga of humankind. Consciousness here obstructs itself (its vision of itself) through the utilization of the object of addiction. This "works" (functions

²⁵Note Sartre's discussion of freedom in Jean-Paul Sartre, Being and Nothingness, trans. Hazel E. Barnes (New York: Philosophical Library, n.d.), 433-481. Sartre, of course, would say that the addict's "realization" is fallacious, since an unfree being cannot even contemplate the idea of freedom. Such an idea for an unfree being would be counterfactual. The contemplation of such a counterfactual would involve the negation of being (current reality) via imaginative construction. Such negation based on the imagination would never be possible for an unfree being, for such a being could only operate on the level of what is (the factual) and never on the level of what is not (the counterfactual). Therefore, for Sartre, to ask oneself "Can I become free?" is a contradiction. One is either wholly and forever free, or not free at all. If the question of freedom were not an issue, if it were not a question at all, this would not necessarily mean that man was not free. But since the question of freedom is an issue, man is free. Interrogation involves a distance or distancing from what is, which shows, for Sartre, that freedom lies at its root. Every question belies the freedom of the interrogator, that is, her very being.

²⁶The Emotions, 84.
effectively) as long as the object of addiction is seen as such ("nonfreely" beheld). Should this guise of "nonfreedom" break down, consciousness will effect a purifying reflection upon itself and simultaneously recognize its own previous bad faith (self-deception). Or, we may be able to say that this breakdown is an integral aspect of this purifying reflection.

It is evident, then, why the addict has "good reason" to maintain her addiction as such. Recognition of one's bad faith throws one at the feet of good faith, the realization of the real possibility of an alternate project, and this realization's attendant necessary conditions - anguish and dread. Freedom and anguish are forever intertwined. This reality the addict rejects as she seeks evasion and alteration of the same. She realizes a phenomenological separation of the two once she becomes the addict: she is in a condition of dread while experiencing herself as "unfree." What she sought, of course, was the inverse, freedom without dread. The project of addiction delivers only the contrary. Nevertheless, this is a result of the addict's skewed phenomenological vantage point, since freedom and dread are forever intertwined. The addict has succeeded only in embezzling her own experience of freedom, while in no sense successfully

27 All recognition of bad faith is, in fact, an exercise in good faith. That is, it is consciousness waking up to itself, realizing itself, being itself. In this sense, all movement toward good faith is a movement away from addiction.

28 cf. Being and Nothingness, 70.
negating her experience of dread. Even if dread were ephemerally negated, the addict would simply find herself experiencing a second level dis-ease: the dread of dread. This disease was the originary impetus for the project to-be-addicted. The steel jaw trap of addiction closes once again.

Section C

Addiction is a Function of the Imagination
By Way of Self-induced Hypnagogic Imagery:
The Quest for Simultaneous and Symbiotic Self-real-ization and Self-dereal-ization, or How Consciousness Creates for Itself Believable Belief

"What defines the imaginary world and also the world of the real is an attitude of consciousness." Addiction, as stated in the previous section, is a phenomenon of belief. The object of addiction becomes such based on the confusion of voluntary spontaneity with involuntary spontaneity. Voluntary spontaneity is a matter of will; involuntary spontaneity is a matter of intention. This the addict is conscious of but

29 The Psychology of Imagination, 27. Underlining mine.

30 Addiction is a phenomenon of belief because impure consciousness bestows upon the object of addiction magical powers, and it is the resulting consciousness' belief in these powers that fuels the phenomenon of addiction. These powers are in no way contained in the object itself, and without these powers, the phenomenon of addiction would dissipate as such. Belief is voluntary to the degree that consciousness refuses to face the nature of itself. For Sartre, voluntary spontaneity is a matter of will (the scope of our freedom, our possibilities, a reflective sphere), and involuntary spontaneity is a matter of intention (the conscious but nonreflective project that is at-one with consciousness). [See Being and (continued...)]
chooses not to know.\textsuperscript{31}

Consciousness, as such, is intentional.\textsuperscript{32} Thus only the cessation of consciousness qua consciousness can extinguish intentionality (involuntary spontaneity).\textsuperscript{33} The imaginative image produced by the addict is beheld quasi-observationally, thus it can be infused with "magical" ("addictive") powers. When quasi-observation "becomes" observation (involuntary spontaneity), the observer becomes the addict. This is a function of the addict confusing pure reflection with impure reflection, and voluntary spontaneity with involuntary spontaneity. The reversal of this procedure is much more difficult for consciousness, since we now have a \textit{bona fide} phenomenon of belief, whereas the initiation of the imaginative construct did not involve such. Man truly is a "wizard" to man\textsuperscript{34} - for himself, and for others in that "...every human being is...equally unfree, that is, we...create out of

\textsuperscript{30}(...continued)
\textit{Nothingness, 407, 433-481.}

In \textit{The Psychology of Imagination}, Sartre defines "belief" as "fascination without existential position." [p. 245] Once consciousness is fascinated, it can in no way be said that belief is wholly "voluntary." All belief, for Sartre, seems to involve elements both of the voluntary and the involuntary.

\textsuperscript{31}Knowledge of this confusion would necessarily involve an antecedent reflective katharsis so as to purge consciousness of impure reflectivity and open it up to a perception of the distinction between voluntary and involuntary spontaneity.

\textsuperscript{32}That is, it is always consciousness of something.

\textsuperscript{33}cf. \textit{The Psychology of Imagination}, 24.

\textsuperscript{34}\textit{The Emotions}, 84.
freedom a prison." We imagine the walls quasi-observationally, they then appear as a pristine bucolic scene; then, in the aftermath and carnage, we observe the walls.

"We must under no circumstances confuse intention with will. To say that there can be an image without will implies in no way that there can be an image without intention." Addiction is an intentional (nonthetic, at one with consciousness) project contrary to the (thetic, conscious) will. This is an ontological subversion, an ontological mutilation, a splitting of one's being. A schizophrenia. Ambivalence. Since addiction is a project unrecognized as such, the schizophrenia does not appear phenomenologically (for the addict) to be self-induced. The addict experiences herself as "victim." The addict's own Shadow masks the sun.

The addict's consciousness permits itself to be "charmed," she thinks in a new way, her consciousness is "imprisoned." "In normal and pathological cases, the constitutive basis of the hypnagogic consciousness is a

---


38 The Psychology of Imagination, 59.
This modification of attention is precisely the situation that obtains in addiction (and love): it is a situation of mania - "an abnormal state of attention in a normal person." Consciousness puts itself to sleep through the utilization of such hypnagogic imagery. Self-hypnosis is induced by consciousness and "forgotten" as such by that very consciousness. Hypnagogic images are a way of being conscious, rather than being contemplated by consciousness; this fascinated consciousness is in bondage to itself, paralyzed by its own constructions. Such is the addict's consciousness: not distracted, but fascinated. This consciousness is of course not in bondage to objects (hypnagogic images) but to itself, since consciousness creates for itself its own hypnagogic imagery. Since it is not reflectively aware of this, it posits an "external" source of bondage.

---

39 The Psychology of Imagination, 60. Underlining mine. "Hypnagogic consciousness", as here utilized, is impure reflective consciousness creating for itself a nonexistent world peopled with psychic objects, a function of the imagination.


41 An "image" is defined by Sartre as "an act that envisions as an actual body an absent or non-existent object by means of a physical or mental content, but which appears only through an 'analogical representative' of the envisioned object." [The Psychology of Imagination, 75.]

42 The Psychology of Imagination, 62.

43 As is the consciousness of the Sartrean lover.
Hypnagogic images appear with a certain nervousness, because the hypnagogic "state" is unstable (metastable) and artificial (constructed of quasi-observational material), coupled with the fact that consciousness has allowed itself to be charmed and hence is complicit in instigating and perpetuating the "dream". This allowance is the process of consciousness taking nothing (freedom) for something (the hypnagogic image) so as to surmount being as the negation of being. This charmed consciousness is self-infused with fatality, the negation of freedom. Consciousness does not seem to be able to imagine itself otherwise, it fails to be able to take a point of view on itself, to "suspend judgement;" it seems fated to believe in itself (as the hypnagogic negation of freedom). The representation of the object is conflated with the object.

The addict is constantly haunted by the presence of the imaginary image as an absence. Thus, the harrowing torture of desire for the "object," even in its absence (no, precisely in its absence). The addict truly is haunted by the image rather than the object. The addict goes on the rack before

---

44 cf. The Psychology of Imagination, 64, and The Concept of Anxiety, 41-51.
46 cf. The Psychology of Imagination, 104.
the image. The image is the essence of the addiction. The image is the self haunting itself as its own absence of being. The image is not (reality), and yet the addict is pursued by what is not, and she falls down in terror before that which she cannot evade. "...[F]or lo, I am with you always, even to the end of time." The beckoning of the Nothing (image) to one in Gehenna. "Reason" balks at these abhorrent absent presences. The absent presence that comprises the quasi-observational object of addiction is repugnant to far more than the reason of the addict. It is both her salvation and her damnation. Certainly, this is repugnant to her reason. Yet the pain of the ontological circumcision is far greater to bear, and it is upon this gibbet that the addict hangs. The mirage of addiction as leading to the oasis of truth.

The object that is the imaginary image does not "obey" the "laws" of individuation or identity, says Sartre. Hence the addict's belief that she may be able to transcend

---

47 Ergo, without the "faculty" (power) of the imagination, the phenomenon of addiction would not occur, as addiction is a function of the imagination.

48 Cannot from her own perspective, that is.

49 Matthew 28:20.

50 cf. The Psychology of Imagination, 126. God's "absent" presence, by this standard, would likewise be repugnant to my reason. This is equally the case for Kierkegaard as well as Sartre. A possible case for the meaningfulness, via indirect proof, of a subcategory in relation to reason designated "repugnant."

51 The Psychology of Imagination, 130, 131.
herself into the object of addiction, thus achieving at-one-ment. Addiction, as a project based on imaginary consciousness, is a variation on the Sartrean "Jonah complex."\(^{52}\) I become external to myself while simultaneously internalizing the object of addiction.\(^{53}\) This genre of thought, the imaginary, negates the very possibility of perception, since the image is not perceptible, even in principle.\(^{54}\) "Sensation" without perception. "Contamination"\(^{55}\) is an essential structure of the addictive image, meaning that it has an impoverished quality which makes it such that it is not perceivable, even in principle. Contamination is essential to introduce the magical aspect into the object, which is in turn essential to bestow upon it its addictive qualities.

\(^{52}\)Being and Nothingness, 631. Hazel Barnes here defines this complex as the "Irrational desire to assimilate and to identify with oneself either the object of knowledge or a beloved person - without in any way impairing that object's character as an external object." In the case of addiction, the "object of knowledge" is beheld quasi-observationally (via imaginary consciousness), thus making the Jonah complex doubly irrational, since one seeks to assimilate not an external object but an imaginative construct of one's own creation (the object of addiction as object of addiction, rather than merely as object). Here we evidence a desperate bid for connectedness in which the addict fails even to get outside of her own head. Thus the hypnagogically induced internal circuit that is the project to-be-addicted is the ultimate in metaphysical impotence.

\(^{53}\)The addict may seek to appropriate the addiction-object, become at-one with this object, or both at once, showing forth the impossible and contradictory nature of addiction. cf. de Beauvoir, The Ethics of Ambiguity, 47.

\(^{54}\)The Psychology of Imagination, 133.

\(^{55}\)The Psychology of Imagination, 132.
The image is neither concept nor percept, nor can it be either. The image is contaminated by an impure imaginary consciousness which prevents it from being witnessed clearly by consciousness as either a percept or as a concept. Such clear comprehension can only be the result of pure reflection, which necessarily involves the erasure of impure imaginary consciousness. That is to say, impure imaginary consciousness and pure reflective consciousness are mutually exclusive: one cannot reflect purely and impurely at the same time, and one cannot perceive/conceive and imagine at the same time.

Addiction is a phenomenon originating necessarily in the imagination, then emanating from the imagination and flowing, surreptitiously, into the "conceptual"/"perceptual" realms. The imagination truly is the capacity instar omnium, including the capacity for the project to-be-

56 See The Psychology of Imagination, 133.

57 Since (A) One cannot simultaneously reflect purely and impurely (pure reflection destroys the psychic constructs of impure reflection) and (B) One cannot imagine at the same time that one perceives or conceives, and (C) Because I am arguing that the addictive object becomes such based on the powers with which it is infused through the imagination (resulting in hypnagogic imagery), any perception/conception of the experience of addiction is subsequent to the bondage produced via imaginatively produced hypnagogic imagery (see earlier footnotes in the present section on "hypnagogic consciousness" and "imagery"). This in no way means that the addict does not experience real bondage.

My usage of "perceive," "conceive," and "imagine" follows Sartre's usage in The Psychology of Imagination. [See pp. 8-27] For further clarification, please see the remainder of the present section.

58 cf. The Sickness Unto Death, 30, 31.
addicted.

"An image has no persuasive power but we persuade ourselves by the very act by which we construct the image." To be (self)-persuaded regarding a certain state of affairs in one's relation to the object is to be an addict. For the persuasion is at-one with the addiction. Bondage is the result of attempting to dissuade oneself (reflectively) of that which is the nonreflective project to-be-addicted. The image does in fact have persuasive power, but not qua image. "Pure knowledge can become debased into imaginative knowledge by losing its pre-reflective character [its capacity for being readily reflectively accessible] in order to become wholly non-reflective."

In the "interest of understanding," (a self-deceptive artifice of impure reflection) the addict moves away from clarity and reflectivity. What passes itself off for thought is in fact nothing other than that resultant from the attempt of consciousness to prevent thought, to induce a somnambulism, to create a magical world in which the purifying reflection can no longer be a threat because it can no longer take place. Consciousness has become a hedge against itself. The threat of being-in-the-world is circumvented and mutilated via the imaginary object of addiction, such that the addict identifies

59 The Psychology of Imagination, 137. Underlining mine.
60 The Psychology of Imagination, 150.
with the object as a being-in-the-midst-of-the-world.\textsuperscript{61} If bad faith were not possible, addiction would not be possible.\textsuperscript{62}

Imaginative consciousness necessarily confuses transcendence and externality.\textsuperscript{63} The addict's consciousness, in trying to transcend itself (or, in trying to \textit{real-ize} its own transcendence, or \textit{be} its own transcendence) "realizes" that its intention is toward an externality which could serve to ground its being.\textsuperscript{64} The object of addiction is in fact external to the transcending consciousness. But the object of addiction as object of addiction is an (imaginary) image and thus can be only transcendent but never external to the addict's own consciousness. The addict, without the purifying reflection, is left to flounder within the confines of his own subjectivity.\textsuperscript{65} The object of addiction as object is always

\textsuperscript{61}cf. \textit{Being and Nothingness}, 58.

\textsuperscript{62}That is, the project of consciousness, by way of the imagination, to prevent access to the perceptual/conceptual realms.

\textsuperscript{63}See \textit{The Psychology of Imagination}, 151.

\textsuperscript{64}This belief, of course, is already a fiction.

\textsuperscript{65}cf. Addiction as Joseph Chilton Pearce's "Eureka" (metanoia) experience. This could be characterized as the "transcending" of one's transcendence, which is illusory. This may be seen as an attempt to be Other for oneself, while bypassing the need for concrete relations with others and/or the Ground, in an effort to ground ourselves or wholly unify our experience (become at-one with "reality", the cosmos, etc.). We can experience the Other as a transcendence transcended. In addiction, we experience ourselves as a transcendence transcended (the metanoia experience) under the (continued...)
conflated with the object of addiction as image. It is this object/image (external/transcendent) synthetic structure that allows for the faulty bifurcation of the same, displacing the object by the image.  

"...[T]he image is like an incarnation of non-reflective thought," that is, an incarnation of the God-project (the project to "legitimate" one's own existence) in the object of addiction. The image is the stage for the reification of thought. The ability to dispense with the object of addiction (image) would be coextensive with the ability to abandon the God-project, since the project to-be-addicted is a subset and concrete manifestation of the metaproject that is the God project.

---

65(...continued)

illusory guise that we can get "outside" of our own transcendence (experience, subjectivity). Just as the Other can "wake up" to us in her subjectivity, so the addict can "wake up" to himself and the fact that his experience of "transcending his own transcendence" was in fact self-deceptive and the result of transcendence entangled within itself (introjected, self-introjected). What the addict seeks, he can only find via externality, yet the object of addiction as such remains forever transcendent but not external. For more on the "Eureka" (metanoia) experience, see Joseph Chilton Pearce, The Crack in the Cosmic Egg: Challenging Constructs of Mind and Reality (New York: Washington Square Press, 1973), 63-83, 110, 111, 143, 173.

66Of course, the addict is always aware of this, but she does not know it. To make the imaginatively constructed image an object for reflective consciousness would destroy that very image. Its evanescent nature would immediately give way to the nothingness of consciousness. This the addict has a stake in preventing.

67The Psychology of Imagination, 160.
"Non-reflective thought is a possession." 68 This is the case because the non-reflective pursuit of being can be, for Sartre, totally independent of reflectivity, that is, it has no need of reflectivity for its existence. Ideas on the non-reflective level are always images, and there is no path to travel from thought as image to thought as thought. This colorized world retains the colorization described quite eloquently by Sartre in chapter three of The Emotions. 69 A veritable exorcism is needed to purge woman of her own hypnagogic imagery, which she believes to be ideas (conceptualizations) as such while she is in her self-induced somnambulist state. The image is thought to be an adequate representation of the thought. 70 Addiction is the experience of not being able to get out: Plato's cave once again. 71 "Oh, sir, it's not just that I'm no good, but you lose track of the light." 72 Yes, consciousness as image has lost track of the light, it has itself sought to extinguish that light which

68 The Psychology of Imagination, 165.

69 The Emotions, 50-94.

70 "There follows a warping of the further course of consciousness." [The Psychology of Imagination, 166]

71 With the major difference being that the addict has seen the sun but nevertheless gone back to chain herself into the cave. See Plato, The Republic (Bk. VII), trans. Paul Shorey, in Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns, eds., The Collected Dialogues of Plato (Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press, 1973), 747-772.

would illumine the meaning of being. For the meaning of being is the last thing that the addict wants to apprehend, and yet in her frenzied attempt to flee herself she shows that she knows all too well just what it is that she flees.

All unreal (imaginatively produced) objects can be apprehended only quasi-observationally. The addictive object, as shown above, is and must be such an imaginatively produced unreal object, although the original impetus for such an imaginative production is always rooted in the real. Addiction, therefore, is a quasi-existential phenomenon, based on the quasi-observation of its unreal object. Nothing here is real except the project to-be-unreal. I must derealize (or, unrealize) myself to enter the world of imagery, since there is absolutely no other way in which to enter. To realize oneself (the state of faith in Kierkegaard) is the converse of the addicted condition of being, a project which necessitates self-derealization. Self-derealization is the process whereby through analogical thought, utilizing the object of addiction, we evade the responsibility of having to be our own nothingness of being: "The images offer us an escape, they present themselves as a negation of the condition of being-in-the-world [in-der-Welt-sein of Heidegger] as an anti-world."

---

73 The Psychology of Imagination, 174.
74 The Psychology of Imagination, 188.
75 The Psychology of Imagination, 194.
The original impetus for the imaginative production of addictive imagery, then, being always rooted in the real, involves the inability/unwillingness to accept the existential conditions of life. It is a sign of nihilism or idealism, coupled with the inability/unwillingness to advance (positive) viable alternative projects. Addiction is the attempted suppression of the nausea of being. Why the nausea? Because being is seen as superfluous, de trop, forever unjustified. How then could any attempt at "rectification" be anything other than spurious? The addict, too, (in spite of her addiction) experiences existence as such as unjustifiable. "Why is there something rather than nothing?" resounds hopelessly before the nothing with untrammeled hollowness. The human person beckons for meaning, and the universe fails to respond. Yet, for the addict, the experience of addiction is likewise absurd. It becomes one more necessity in a world of facticity in which all things are given and nothing is justified. The illegitimacy of fate. The illegitimacy of fate. The illegitimacy of fate.

---

76 cf. Nietzsche's *Genealogy of Morals*, especially the third essay, sections 13-28 (pp. 120-163).


78 This is not to say that she doesn't believe existence as such is justified or justifiable.

79 For Camus, the origin of the experience of the Absurd. The "odd trinity" is comprised of man (the interrogator), the world (which remains silent), and the juxtaposition of the two, which brings forth the Absurd. See Albert Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays*, trans. Justin O'Brien (New York: Vintage, 1955), 2-48.
imacy of freedom. No way out. Addiction as folly to the Greeks and a stumbling block to the Jews. The task for the addict is to think being - her own being - yet the scissiparity between being and thought makes this forever impossible.

"The affective state, being consciousness, could not exist without a transcendent correlate." The object of addiction performs the service of posing as this transcendent correlate (it is transcendent as object, but merely immanent as object of addiction), so that the addict may engage in emotional consciousness with "impunity" (the only "punishment" being the loss of the real. But this the addict no longer "knows."). The object of addiction, that is, thus exists as an excuse for the choice of a chronic affective "state." Emotion would otherwise return to its origin to be fed there, and so realize the nothing (freedom) of its original construction. The object of addiction allows the emotion to transcend into the object and be "absorbed" there, without remainder. Addiction, then, allows for sedimented and successful patterns of flight (from freedom).

---

80 cf. I Cor. 1:23. That is, addiction involves both conceptual (Greeks) and praxiological (Jews) bafflement. It is that which one goes out of one's way to preserve and engage in and is, nevertheless, a contre coeur. A contre coeur, ne a contre meta-coeur pas.

81 The Psychology of Imagination, 199. This follows clearly from the Husserlian-Sartrean phenomenological dictum that "All consciousness is consciousness of something."

82 Put differently, addiction is a sedimented and successful pattern of flight, a pattern of flight being the process (continued...)
"Feeling...behaves in the face of the unreal as in that of the real...[the unreal] is only the simple reflection of the feeling."\(^{83}\) The (real) object of addiction is utilized in an attempt to real-ize the imaginary image at the same time as oneself while simultaneously derealizing oneself in order to create the (imaginary) object of addiction which is then surreptitiously substituted for the real object. Hence, the inevitable failure of the project of addiction: it is attempted simultaneous and symbiotic self-real-ization and self-de-real-ization.\(^{84}\)

The attempt at simultaneous and symbiotic self-real-ization and self-de-real-ization (the structure of the project to-be-addicted) is a failure in principle on two counts:

1. One cannot at the same time move toward and away from her own freedom. Freedom is spent either in discharging itself or obstructing itself, since it is a contradiction in principle to act so as to effect both at once.

2. One cannot, as detailed previously, engage in imaginary consciousness (a function of impure reflection) and pure reflection simultaneously. To engage in pure reflection is to

\(^{82}\)(...continued)

within which the for-itself attempts to move away from/negate/vitiate/deny its own freedom (self). See Being and Nothingness, p. 40, on patterns of flight.

\(^{83}\)The Psychology of Imagination, 200.

\(^{84}\)Only the unreal self can real-ize the (imaginary) object of addiction as object of addiction. But since there is no unreal self, this has to be a project of the real self, which cannot real-ize the imaginary object.
effect upon one's own consciousness the katharsis that necessarily eradicates all vestiges of the imaginary constructs of impure reflection. Were consciousness able to effect the katharsis upon itself and still be duped by imaginary contents therein, the for-itself would have no way of delineating the real from the unreal, and all purported truth claims would be forever suspect. The imaginary may take itself (as a function of nonreflective and impure reflective consciousnesses) as the real, but reflective consciousness dare not be forever confused concerning its own veracity, lest one find herself forever adrift upon the sea of not only pseudo-objectivity, but pseudo-subjectivity. For if the reflective for-itself has no certitude even regarding its own consciousness, then it has no certitude even regarding its own subjectivity, to say nothing of the problematic task of escaping its own intentional beam to something outside of it. Conclusion, as stated previously: Either pure reflective consciousness or impure reflective consciousness, but not both, unless the consciousnesses are not simultaneous but sequential.

The phenomenological experience of "emptiness"\textsuperscript{85} can be seen as an impetus for the adoption of imaginary consciousness and the construction of the image. The abysmal nature of this experience can be such that imaginative consciousness is seen

\textsuperscript{85}See The Psychology of Imagination, 206.
as preferential. Once consciousness is "degraded" to the level of imaginary consciousness and thinking becomes analogical, consciousness experiences the same objects as somehow binding (fantastic), as freedom bleeds toward and into them. The price of admission, as it were, into this fantastic universe of imaginary consciousness is precisely the acceptance of fatality over freedom. I watch my dreams unfold as I sleep; at times, I am shocked by what I see. Yet I can only think of acting within the dream, rather than thinking of shattering its fictitious (self-induced) parameters. I am no longer empty because I no longer behold the panorama before me in a voluntary fashion. I am condemned to be unfree. I am the addict. 87

"There is no passage between real and imaginary feelings, the real is always accompanied by the ruin of the imaginary." 88 The addict, we have said, has an ongoing experience of the "object of addiction" which she has imaginatively constructed as such. This (imaginary) image is the focus of her emotion (imaginary feelings), yet the image is the work of her real feelings. As long as consciousness remains self-

86The Emotions, 76.

87The addict may be viewed as the woman pretending to fall asleep who has in fact fallen asleep. Can such a woman wake herself up? The addict is a victim of metaphysical carpal tunnels: through engaging in repetitious forms of (addictive) praxis, the self is finally crippled and finds itself ontologically self-mutilated.

88The Psychology of Imagination, 209.
enchanted by the image (that is, as long as the project to-be-addicted remains), consciousness only has access to imaginary feelings, not real feelings, the latter of which would begin to serve to indicate the meaning of the construction of the imaginary object (as image). Therefore, the meaning of the addict's own consciousness is veiled from her. 89

The real and the imaginary selves are two distinct selves which, by their very natures, cannot coexist. 90 The imaginary self, as I have indicated, is a project of the real self. The addict rejects her real self in favor of the project-to-be-her-imaginary-self. The addict becomes "bound" by her imaginary self: her imaginary self becomes her "real self." 91 Her imaginary self transcends (overcomes, dispenses with) itself utilizing the "purifying reflection" (in this case, also a function of the imagination), to collapse at the feet of her "real self" (a subset of the imaginary self). She begins the project (to-be-addicted) again, only to collapse again before her "real self." 92 Repeated indefinitely.93

89 And yet only the addict can be conscious of this meaning.


91 The contrary would be that the imaginary self would know itself as such. This, of course, could not take place in the phenomenon of addiction, and from a Sartrean perspective, could not occur regardless of circumstance. Once the imaginary self becomes an object for itself, it collapses before its own freedom that is the real self.

92 From a Kierkegaardian perspective, "real self," as engaged here, should always appear within quotations (Sartre (continued...)}
Consciousness is spontaneity. But in the "syndrome of influence" which occurs with imaginary consciousness, says Sartre, consciousness recognizes in itself its own "counter-spontaneity." Such counter-spontaneity has run wild in the imaginary consciousness of the addict, and the addict experiences a "loss of control," even in regards to her own consciousness. If I am defined as freedom, why can't I think what I want to think? The existence of the notion of counter-spontaneity, at least in part, addresses this issue. Consciousness is a "victim" of itself, it experiences its own otherness. But if I am not free, then I am not responsible: the makeshift ontology of the addict, crafted to suspend (ethical) obligation.

"There is no imaginary world. In fact, it is but a

---

92(...)continued

does not follow this practice), because the self that refuses to be itself is not a self at all. Hence, "real self." See The Sickness Unto Death, 42-74.

93Or, until reduction/conversion.

94The Psychology of Imagination, 225.

95The Psychology of Imagination, 222.

96The addict makes the illicit move from not finding herself responsible for her own intentionality that is her consciousness to not finding herself responsible for her own praxis. It is true that she is not the source of her own consciousness. But it is false to say that she is not responsible for the praxiological choices she makes based upon this consciousness - provided she is responsible for anything at all. In addition, she is responsible not for consciousness itself, but for its mode of being, in this case, being-addicted. Response-ability is entailed by the choice of a project, provided one is responsible for anything at all; if one's project is not chosen, then one is not free.
matter of belief." ° The experience of the imaginary world is an experience not of freedom or determinism, but of fatalism. This is precisely the experience of the phenomenon of addiction in that consciousness fatal-izes itself and subsequently unreal-izes this fatal-ization. Fatalism transpires when consciousness degrades itself to the impure, imaginary level, and then "forgets" (suppresses) the process whereby it effected this degradation upon itself.

As argued previously, either the unreal/aesthetic or the real/perceived: "Esthetic contemplation...a sort of recoil in relation to the object contemplated which slips into nothing-ness so that, from this moment on, it is no longer perceived; it functions as an analogue of itself, that is, that an unreal image of what it is appears to us through its actual pres-

---

° The Psychology of Imagination, 242. For Sartre, "belief" is defined as "...fascination without existential position." [The Psychology of Imagination, 245.] Described thusly, it seems to be an "involuntary" version and subset of Husserlian bracketing, if such a thing is possible.

°° The Psychology of Imagination, 246.
Either the unreal/addictive or the real/perceived. (Actual) presence effaces imaginative consciousness. Therefore, actual presence effaces addiction. Actual presence is accompanied by absurdity and contingency. The function of imaginative consciousness in addiction is an attempt to negate both the former and the latter.

Section D

Addiction is a Phenomenon of Bad Faith

Bad faith (self-deception) is an effort to evade one's own being and in this sense it is a confession. Addiction is likewise a confession in that one prefers being-addicted to being-one-self. One can either be addicted or be oneself.

The failure to achieve "wholeness," "oneness," "unification," or "ontological integration" leads one to the project of addiction, in whatever form this project may veil itself. The experience of ontological integration can occur only when the for-itself has concretely faced its own desires and its

---

99 The Psychology of Imagination, 281.

100 This, of course, is a failure in principle, since any project of the unjustified and unjustifiable for-itself is equally unjustifiable.

101 Being and Nothingness, 261.

102 Please see part one, section A of this chapter for the Kierkegaardian perspective on this same dynamic. The full-throttled theory of addiction, of course, involves the union of both Kierkegaardian and Sartrean perspectives.
own freedom. Both sadism and masochism, says Sartre, are "two reefs on which desire may founder." The nonrealization of the desire for "wholeness" leads to the sado-masochistic self-relation of addiction, an alternate approach to unification.

Addiction is an attempt to effectuate one's own salvation via the rejection of one's own freedom. "Thus the refusal of freedom can be conceived only as an attempt to apprehend oneself as being-in-itself." The addict attempts to become at-one with the object of addiction by projecting her freedom into the object (which is a totem for herself), and, collapsing at its feet, pays it obeisance in hopes of becoming like it (in-itself). Addiction is the project of the (self)-extinguishment of one's own freedom - an Eastern conception of "salvation." Simply to seek to become one with the object of addiction while preserving one's own consciousness would be a Western conception of "salvation." Both

---

103 Being and Nothingness, 404.

104 For more on this, see part two, section E of this chapter.

105 Being and Nothingness, 440.

106 This is equally true of addictive interpersonal relations, since one can never experience for oneself the freedom of the Other, that is, one can never experience the Other's subjectivity, which is in essence the experience of freedom. See Being and Nothingness, p. 611, for the description of "anti-value", which is the attempt to utilize one's freedom to become in-itself. The addict does not flee this anti-value (even if she fears it), but instead welcomes it. Nevertheless, she welcomes it only as addict.
"conceptions" of "salvation" are necessary failures (since being-in-itself and being-for-itself are nonnegotiable realms of being), and the addict has a (nonreflective) awareness of this.

"The will can reach only details and structures and will never modify the original project from which it has issued."\(^\text{107}\) The will is an epiphenomenon of the project: in relation to the project to-be-addicted, the will can provide only temporary reflective respite from (the effects of) this project. One chooses reflectively ("will") to circumvent the nonreflective choice which one is - thus one "chooses" against oneself (the freedom that is being itself against the being of freedom itself in the for-itself) - although reflectively in favor of oneself.

Therefore, a reflective "abandonment" of addiction is a necessary failure unless a nonreflective abandonment can be coupled with it.\(^\text{108}\) This would be the attempt to integrate thetic and nonthetic projects. How does one make the nonreflective reflective, or how does one make imaginary consciousness/emotional consciousness reflective consciousness? The ability to shift and focus awareness from the one to the other is consciously and deliberately impaired by the addict. How can one abandon a project (of addiction) if one cannot

\(^{107}\) Being and Nothingness, 476. Underlining mine.

\(^{108}\) In fact, if the latter is realized, the former will appear superfluous.
reflectively or nonreflectively choose to engage in a new project?\textsuperscript{109}

When one does not have a reflective awareness of the project to-be-addicted, addiction is experienced as the "fall" (psychological and ontological) into facticity.\textsuperscript{110}

Addiction is surrogate intimacy, an attempt to ground one's being without the necessity of relations with other freedoms as such. The ontological flue vent of the Other is voided in favor of the pseudofreedom proffered by the imaginatively constructed object of addiction. This is the case even in interpersonal addictions, since the addict fails to relate to the freedom of the Other as freedom, but rather seeks to acquire (imbibe) it in the manner of an object - the imaginatively constructed object of addiction.

\textbf{Section E}

\textbf{Addiction is a Basic Fear of the Human Condition: The Addict Prepares Her Own Death}

The "inverted liberty" of Sartre's anti-Semite\textsuperscript{111} is precisely what the addict has apparently obtained.\textsuperscript{112} Perhaps she experiences it rather as an inversion of this

\textsuperscript{109}That is, be a new project.

\textsuperscript{110}viz. addiction is the nonreflective telos.

\textsuperscript{111}That is, liberty without responsibility.

inverted liberty: as responsibility without liberty. She feels responsible for her addiction without feeling free to abandon it. The experience of being-towards-death. The social psychology, i.e. group psychology, of the anti-Semite is the individual psychology of the addict. The latter operates intrapsychically; the former, interpsychically. Nevertheless, the imagination and construction of the imaginary object remains identical in both cases: its purpose is to vitiate and mask freedom and its corollary, responsibility.

The relationship that the anti-Semite has with the Jew is the relationship the addict has with himself: the addict discerns in himself a "metaphysical principle that drives him to do evil under all circumstances [that is, perpetuate the addiction], even though he thereby destroy himself,"

---

113 The addict feels that this "nonevadeable" addiction is leading her towards death, towards unhope, inexorably, even if this death is not ostensibly "physical" or corporeal.

114 The "sub-man" in de Beauvoir's *The Ethics of Ambiguity* (pp. 42-45) is afraid of engaging himself as a project, is afraid of a "positive" use of freedom. It is this "sub-man" who turns to addiction as a project-unrecognized-as-such. In this way, his freedom is discharged "without" responsibility, the very conditions the "sub-man" sought to attain. The "positive" use of freedom entails the movement toward becoming a self. The "negative" use of freedom entails anything that involves self-negation. A person becomes a slave to any end (project) not posited as such. "The sub-man makes his way across a world deprived of meaning toward a death which merely confirms his long negation of himself." [p. 45] Quite the saga of the addict.

115 Based on the principle that consciousness " ethicizes" itself. See part one of the present chapter.
a principle that the anti-Semite likewise "finds" in the Jew. This principle is "magical": the addict relates to herself in an imaginary way, by way of imaginary constructions.\footnote{117} "Strange liberty, which instead of preceding and constituting the essence, remains subordinate to it."\footnote{118} The addict's experience of being condemned to be unfree, that is, unfree to become free of her object of addiction.\footnote{119} She has utilized her freedom in an attempt to essential-ize herself (give himself an "essence"), which she now experiences as fatal-izing her. One either seeks to become a self - which is to be free and have no essence - or one seeks an essence in lieu of the missing self. The latter attempt, as previously de-scribed, involves freedom's self-entanglement, the process to-be-addicted.

\footnote{116} (...continued)
\footnote{116} Anti-Semite and Jew, 39.

\footnote{117} cf. The self that lacks finitude or necessity in The Sickness Unto Death, 30-33.

\footnote{118} Anti-Semite and Jew, 39.

\footnote{118} The addict is de Beauvoir's "serious man" in that the addict claims the addiction (object of addiction) as the "involuntary" absolute end, an end which is posited and then repudiated, or posited and repudiated at once. The origin is posited as external to one's own freedom and seen as negative, thus one considers oneself to be in the grip of a world that reveals itself as "evil." [cf. The Ethics of Ambiguity, pp. 45-52]

Note page 51: "It is in a state of fear that the serious man feels this dependence upon the object..." de Beauvoir makes no reference to addiction throughout the course of this volume, but the connections are clear: the addict is the "serious" "sub-man."
Anti-Semitism represents a basic sadism; once the anti-Semite and "the Jew" are within the domain of a single human consciousness (that of the addict), sadism becomes masochism. The addict as sado-masochist. The addict is the sado-masochist in that she has introjected the anti-Semite's belief in the metaphysical principle that drives the Jew to do evil, and then has undertaken the process of trying to dispel this principle from her own psyche. The addict thus seeks a psychic incision to induce the expulsion of this heinous evil. Addiction is thus the creation of ontological guilt (freedom-negation) and also a bid for ontological expiation (i.e. rectification of the previous psychic surgery or ontological mutilation resultant from this freedom-negation).

As the anti-Semite prepares the death of the Jew, the addict prepares her own death because she finds herself to be

120 Anti-Semite and Jew, 46.


122 Addiction, as a species of self-mutilation, is a kind of masochism. This is not to say that all masochists are addicts. Insofar as the addict utilizes her addiction to manipulate the Other, the addict is a sadist. This is not to say that all sadists are addicts. Unless it is the case that masochism, sadism, and sado-masochism are themselves kinds of addictions. To support this claim, I would be required to provide a detailed description/analysis of these practices, something clearly beyond the scope of this work. These practices appear to be addictions to the degree in which they exhibit teleology synonymous with other addictions, coupled with imaginatively produced hypnagogic imagery.
the embodied "principle of evil" that she seeks to stamp out. The addict's only recourse lay in eradicating this very "evil" thing - her own freedom - (for how can there be evil without freedom and responsibility? she "thinks"), thus the in-itself becomes the goal of the project of addiction. And the in-itself is precisely the death of the for-itself. The addict prepares her own death.\(^\text{123}\)

\(^{123}\)This description of addiction calls to mind Camus' brilliant history of "metaphysical rebellion" as expounded in his 1951 work, *The Rebel*. I feel that it would be difficult to overrate this amazing and often misunderstood book. The publication of this volume led to the definitive split between Sartre and Camus. In it, Camus attacks Marxism and Christian­ity directly, but implicitly attacks existentialism as well as all other forms of what he called "idealism." ["To abandon oneself to principles is really to die - and to die for an impossible love which is the contrary of love." (pp. 129, 130)]

I view addiction as a form of introverted or introjected metaphysical rebellion. In delineating this rebellion, Camus makes the following claims (these few excerpts are by no means meant to be exhaustive):

"Rebellion cannot exist without the feeling that, somewhere and somehow, someone is right." (p. 13).

"The transition from facts to rights is manifest...in rebellion." (p. 15).

"...[R]ebellion puts total freedom up for trial." (p. 284).

The addict is the rebel, she recognizes herself as calling the metaphysics of existence into question, yet she fails to engage in interpersonal (social/political, etc.) rebellion, but instead remains yoked through fear of freedom and its implications to a fully introjected (internalized) form of rebellion. She recognizes the legitimacy of rebellion while recognizing the illegitimacy of her form of (introjected) rebellion, which is no more than legitimated freedom negated as legitimate praxis. The being of the rebel (as addict) becomes sour, becomes rancid, as she tries to force­fully expel her (self-introjected) freedom. The rebel may utilize her freedom in two conflicting ways: introjection and expulsion. The dominance of one of these forms over the other will determine rebellion as praxis or as addiction.
Anti-Semitism is a basic fear of the human condition, \(^{124}\) precisely as is the case of the addict. "His life [the anti-Semite's] is nothing but a long flight from others and from himself," \(^{125}\) the addictive flight from the being of freedom. \(^{126}\) Universal existential anxiety (angst) is introjected; the addict particularizes the anxiety, turning it into fear, centering it on repercussions/machinations/ruminations surrounding the object of addiction. Death (global freedom-negation) is less an object of fear than the pain of addiction, which is, for the addict, a specific and ever present phenomenological reality. The absence of this flight (freedom-negation) in the for-itself would be authenticity.

To broach the topic of authenticity, for Sartre, is to broach the topic of morality: "Thus the choice of authenticity appears to be a moral decision." \(^{127}\) Sartre states on page

\(^{124}\) *Anti-Semite and Jew*, 54.

\(^{125}\) *Anti-Semite and Jew*, 135.

\(^{126}\) Under a certain description, we could in fact conceptualize the anti-Semite as an addict with her imaginatively constructed/nuanced external object, the Jew. In this case, the anti-Semite could no more do without the Jew than any other addict could do without her object of addiction. The "loss" of the Jew (as an object of execration) would thus involve the anti-Semite in withdrawal. Therefore, the anti-Semite has a stake in preventing the death of the Jew, that very class of people she may conceptually and even praxiologically seek to exterminate. Withdrawal: Existential pain experienced over the loss/prospective loss of the object of addiction.

\(^{127}\) *Anti-Semite and Jew*, 141. I ask the reader kindly to recall the bridging of the is-ought gap in the phenomenon of addiction, as delineated in part one of this chapter.
ninety-three of the same volume that the term "inauthentic" implies "no moral blame." Here we see clearly the strange relation, for Sartre, between the authentic and the inauthentic human being. Authenticity appears in the moral sphere, but inauthenticity somehow does not. Can these viewpoints be reconciled? I certainly shall not even feign to solve the problem here, but shall leave the reader with one thought: If the anti-Semite is "inauthentic," and inauthenticity implies no moral blame, on what grounds can Sartre condemn the anti-Semite? It seems that if the anti-Semite is inconsistent in her position, then Sartre is too.\(^{128}\) If addiction is merely an ontological phenomenon (as, supposedly, is anti-Semitism), stemming from the improper utilization of one's freedom, freedom itself cannot be seen as a legitimate aim and ground (meta-value) for a morality.\(^{129}\) The categorization of addiction (and anti-Semitism) as moral phenomena is essential for the possibility of any Sartrean ethical theory. If freedom can be truncated by the for-itself (as in the case of addiction) without ethical ramifications, then the for-itself can have no legitimate value at which it can project itself.

\(^{128}\)If inconsistency is no indictment, then on what Sartrean grounds can we ever impute "moral blame," since Sartre wants so much to censor anti-Semitism? How does Sartre fail to be caught in his own trap?

\(^{129}\)Sartre attempts the latter repeatedly, in *Anti-Semite and Jew*, in *Existentialism and Human Emotions*, in *Cahiers*, and, I believe one could argue, in *The Psychology of Imagination and Being and Nothingness*, the latter volume, of course, merely by implication, since the text remains on an ontological level.
Which may well be the case. "Thus it amounts to the same thing whether one gets drunk alone or is a leader of nations." 

Section F
Addiction: The Illicit Illusion

To conclude this work's Sartrean section on addiction, I wish to note but a few ethical implications of the phenomenon of addiction. These observations are not essential for the theory, but are certainly important tangential considerations when dealing with this phenomenon within the context of Sartre's philosophy.

"The ultimate meaning of the acts of honest men is the

\[\text{\textsuperscript{130}Being and Nothingness, 627. This is found at the very end of this volume, under the section entitled "Ethical Implications." Interestingly, Sartre says in the same short section the following: "Thus existential psychoanalysis is moral description for it releases to us the ethical meaning of various human projects...Thus we are already on the moral plane but concurrently on that of bad faith...existential psychoanalysis is going to reveal to man the real goal of his pursuit...as a means of deliverance and salvation...In particular is it possible for freedom to take itself for a value as the source of all value, or must it necessarily be defined in relation to a transcendent value which haunts it?" [pp. 626, 627] The latter scenario, as Sartre repeatedly points out, is a failure in principle. The former, which would require the "conversion," delivers us over to an "ethical plane." [p. 628] Of course, if it really does amount to the "same thing" if one gets drunk or is a leader of nations, then it makes no difference if one loves or hates her neighbor, for one would have no "neighbors" at all. All talk concerning the value and sanctity of freedom as such would be strictly rubbish.}\]
quest for freedom as such." Given the preceding section, one could certainly ask "Why be honest?" Choosing freedom, for Sartre, is an ethical rather than an aesthetic choice. Why is this? How so? Sartre tells us that coherence is the proper ground for ethical decision making. Why is this? What does coherence have to do with morality? Is coherence an unquestionable ideal? Why is this? Why is freedom an unquestionable ideal? Is it? Other statements regarding this issue from the same work include the following:

"We want freedom for freedom's sake and in every particular circumstance."  

"Therefore, in the name of the will for freedom, which freedom itself implies [the inexorable dythrambic ontology of individuation? cf. The Birth of Tragedy], I may pass judgement [moral judgement] on those who seek to hide from themselves the complete arbitrariness and the complete freedom of their existence."  

"One may choose anything if it is on the grounds of free involvement." 

If my description of addiction is correct, then addiction, for Sartre, is illegitimate. It cannot be the free project of a free, honest being (engaging in pure reflective conscious-


132 Existentialism and Human Emotions, 42.

133 Existentialism and Human Emotions, 45.

134 Existentialism and Human Emotions, 46.

135 Existentialism and Human Emotions, 46. Underlining mine.

136 Existentialism and Human Emotions, 48.
ness), and it is therefore "immoral," given the statements above.

In terms of addiction, the addict's phenomenological loss/restriction of freedom is:

1. An illusion (voodoo metaphysics). In fact, (A) the project of addiction is involved in the quest for freedom, or (B) the project of addiction is involved in masking one's freedom from oneself, but one is in fact not less free, or (C) the project of addiction is an unsuccessful project to become less free. All projects are projects to-be-free, but one does not become free through all projects. One seeks to become "less free" because this is perceived as a "freeing" experience. Movement relative to freedom is a function of the for-itself and must be ascertained/evaluated only through each for-itself's phenomenal field.

2. A process consciousness effects on itself. Therefore, the addict is necessarily dishonest with herself, i.e. she is in bad faith, and

3. The addict thinks (1) nonreflectively, while thinking she is "less" free (reflectively). Consciousness thus thinks A (I am equally free) and not-A (I am "less" free) at the same time (bad faith), violating Aristotle's "law" of noncontradiction.

The addict thinks A and not-A simultaneously (this she must do in her role as addict); addiction is inherently
paradoxical, unthinkable, absurd. The goal of addiction is the cessation (or discharge) of freedom as such, hence the end is not valid. Freedom is engulfed in the goal of extinguishing itself. Therefore, it is not a valid free project. "The constructive activities of man take on a valid meaning only when they are assumed as a movement toward freedom."

Now either addiction is a movement toward freedom which involves the experience of "unfreedom" or "loss of freedom" as a movement toward freedom, or addiction is a movement away from freedom, in which case it would lack a valid meaning. I have argued throughout this chapter for the latter. The project to-be-addicted is one of attempting to hide one's freedom from oneself, and to do so in the dynamic surrounding the "object of addiction." Addiction is a "negative" action in that transcendence is "condemned to fall uselessly back upon itself because it is cut off from its real goals." This defines a situation of (self) "oppression." Addiction is illegitimate as a project because "A freedom which is inter-

137 "An end is valid only by a return to the freedom which established it and which willed itself through this end. But this implies that freedom is not to be engulfed in any goal; neither is it to dissipate itself vainly without aiming at a goal." [The Ethics of Ambiguity, 70]

138 This is equally true for Kierkegaard, Sartre, and de Beauvoir.

139 The Ethics of Ambiguity, 80.

140 The Ethics of Ambiguity, 81.
ested only in denying freedom must be denied...[F]reedom will never be given; it always has to be won..."141 This reality the addict consistently fails to recognize. The flaying of being upon the stake of truth.

Yet the reflective slat of opportunity waits quietly for the addict as an eye in a dim cavern, as a lantern on a hill, as a voice in the wind, if the addict will but turn a weary gaze upon the halcioni illumination. Fail not, O wayward one, to heed the beckoning beam that is within you! The light of freedom dances deftly upon the razor's edge of reflection, singing brightly of another being, yet the same being, of another land, yet the same land. The horn pipe plays to your gossamer-like figure sweet tales of moon beams playing upon your destiny the hope of an eternity. Your being cries out! Do not mute its wistful voice of pining.

Rise up, my love, my fair one, and come away.142

In the next chapter I shall address the necessary preconditions for the possibility of a nonaddictive relationship. I shall also demonstrate that Sartre advances not a theory of love, but a theory of addiction.

REED'S THEORY OF ADDICTION: A SUMMATION

Addiction is the self (A) seeking to be other than it is, (B) seeking to mask the project to be other than it is from

141 The Ethics of Ambiguity, 91, 119.
142 Song of Songs 2:10b
itself, and (C) seeking to mask its "true nature" from itself. Truth about the self and freedom are inseparable; untruth (the lie) and bondage are likewise linked.

The experience of the contingent and unaccounted for (unnecessary, superfluous) nature of freedom is such that consciousness fears freedom and the dread/anguish that is an integral part of the experience of freedom. Therefore, consciousness fears itself and the truth of itself, since consciousness is freedom.

Since consciousness fears freedom (the truth of itself), it seeks to elude its own self-knowledge by way of an addictive encounter with being. By means of such an encounter, consciousness (A) effectively (self-deceptively) obscures its knowledge of itself, (B) gives itself a "nature" or an "essence" (the "locus" of the addiction), and therefore, (C) "OVERCOMES" THE INSOLUBLE PROBLEM OF THE CONTINGENCY OR SUPERFLUITY OF ITS OWN FREEDOM (BEING). It achieves this through the "realization" that it cannot dispense with the "object" of addiction, thus legitimating, due to its experiential inexorable exigency, the praxiological link between the addict and the object of addiction. The addiction "results from" the essential nature of the self and is therefore "irremediable" and consequently justified, since it can no longer fall within the realm of free being. Put differently, if one's project is not chosen, then one is not free. Ergo, the self is determined as addict. Addiction, then, is the
contradictory effort of the self seeking self-constitution through the not-self (object of addiction).

But being is either free or determined, but not freely determined. The addict seeks to freely determine being, therefore engaging in the project of denying his or her own freedom. If freedom is denied, there is no hope of constituting oneself as a valid project, since freedom is the only possible source of validity (validity = meaning). Indeterminate free being equals nonself, so the task of consciousness is to become a self without recourse to freedom-denying self-determinative projects.

Consciousness of and knowledge about the self allow one to seek to be free rather than to be. Addiction is a project in which the self seeks being as an end. The self desires to think its own being, but the necessary difference between being and thought makes this impossible in principle. So the self as addict seeks to be what it cannot think: its own being.

In order for addiction to be possible, emotional and imaginative consciousnesses must be possible, since emotion and imagination are necessary for addiction to transpire. Both types of consciousness operate on a sub-reflective level, a level at which consciousness is not clear to itself, a level at which consciousness is not fully aware of its own "nature." On this sub-reflective level, consciousness imaginatively produces an addictive image which functions as an analogue of
the existential object in question. The addict bestows upon this object-as-image "magical" powers, most importantly, the "power" to coopt a degree of the freedom that is the self. Unless the addict can dispense with this mode of consciousness, he or she can only think of acting within the sub-reflective "dream." The unreal (addicted) self is mesmerized by the image produced via emotional/imaginative consciousness, and remains trapped within the imaginary feelings/thoughts produced thereby. The unreal self is produced by the real self simultaneous with the production of the (unreal) object of addiction (image). The addict cannot return to his or her real (free) self unless imaginary consciousness and its attendant image is eradicated, as perception and imagination are antithetical (both being wholly consciousness), and cannot occur together. This is because the image, being imaginatively constructed, is not perceivable, even in theory.

Addiction is possible because the self is both voluntary and involuntary spontaneity. Voluntary spontaneity is reflective or sub-reflective freedom, whereas involuntary spontaneity is nonreflective (yet intentional), at one with consciousness. How does one become conscious of one's own consciousness? How can one know consciousness as such, when consciousness is not knowledge? One cannot know consciousness qua consciousness, and therefore the project that one is escapes reflective comprehension.

The will, being voluntary spontaneity, being reflective
consciousness, cannot comprehend and therefore cannot alter the fundamental project or being that one is. The only solution, therefore, to the problem of addiction would be to redirect the project-to-be, for as long as one seeks being as an end, one is the addict: one seeks to imbibe being and make one's own existence necessary.

If one cannot renounce the nonreflective project to be, one is forever the addict. This is because one believes (nonreflectively) that one needs to ingest the nonself in order to be a self. The necessary and sufficient condition for the possibility of a nonaddicted mode of being would be the possibility of the project of freedom as an end, the being of play. Therefore, we could ask the question concerning the possibility of a nonaddicted mode of being in a different but equally accurate way: Is it possible for human being to play? For the possibility of play is the possibility of freedom. And the possibility of freedom is the possibility of the nonaddicted self. Any unacknowledged project of the self creates in the self a condition of bondage, a condition of slavery. Addiction is the self slavishly but nonreflectively seeking to justify its own unjustified and unjustifiable freedom that it is, a freedom that is indelibly precarious, a freedom that cannot exist as anything but praxis. For freedom cannot be reified or collected, but must be utilized as the flow that it is. Anything less is self-mutilation.
CHAPTER 4

SARTRE'S THEORY OF LOVE: A THEORY OF ADDICTION

Introduction

In the present chapter, I will do a closer analysis of Sartre's phenomenological apparatus as it impinges upon the topics of love and addiction. Of particular import for this project will be the following well-trod Sartrean notions: pre-reflective (nonreflective), impure reflective and reflective consciousnesses, bad faith in both the weak and strong senses of this term (to be elucidated below), the purifying reflection (katharsis), the phenomenological reduction, deliverance, salvation, conversion, and authenticity. Among the contentions I wish to make in this chapter are the following:

1. That pre-reflective consciousness = "immediacy".
2. That impure reflection = bad faith consciousness.
3. That the purifying reflection is not equivalent to conversion.

The purifying reflection allows for consciousness of bad faith. Consciousness of bad faith is good faith but not authenticity. Good faith is a certain point of view on one's bad faith, but not a (radical) escape\(^1\) from it. Existential psychoanalysis, via the purifying reflection, allows the human

\(^1\)i.e. as would be necessary for conversion.
person to "see" the project that he is (the project of the recovery of being), but this alone does not constitute the abandonment of the project. This is why it is possible to glean from Sartre's writings weak and strong notions of bad faith.  

Strong bad faith exists in the for-itself that sees its project for what it is, and yet still engages itself as this very project (a scenario possible only subsequent to the purifying reflection).

Weak bad faith would constitute engagement in the same project prior to the purifying reflection, through impure reflection. "Deliverance and salvation," possible only subsequent to the purifying reflection, are made possible through existential psychoanalysis.  

A condition of deliverance (conversion, salvation) would be authenticity. The addict can exist in weak or strong bad faith; in fact, the for-itself in weak or strong bad faith is the addict (non-being inexorably seeking to be through that which is other than itself). Authenticity dispenses with the conditionality of addiction in the for-itself. That is, the authentic self does not need to seek to imbibe the non-self in order to be

---


its self. "Self"-ingestion is not a constitutive ground for selfhood for either the addict or the authentic self. The authentic self recognizes this and operates knowing that it is the case, whereas the addict continues his flight toward the ingestion of freedom/being. The purifying reflection alone is not enough to spawn authenticity, because awareness (impure reflection) and knowledge (or quasi-knowledge, through pure reflection) are not equivalent to authentic being, but merely are preconditions for its possibility. Authentic being, if such is possible, would arise simultaneous with a choice based upon this awareness and knowledge, but would not be reducible merely to this awareness and knowledge. Good faith, then, is not equivalent to authenticity, but is, again, a necessary prerequisite for the possibility of the same.

There are thus four levels of being, not three:
(I) Pre-reflective consciousness. Innocence? No, since being still seeks to be other than itself.
(II) Impure reflection. This is the realm of weak bad faith.
(III) Pure reflection. This is the realm of strong bad faith when coupled with the refusal of (IV). This could also be the realm of good faith, depending upon one's own relation to one's own self-knowledge.
(IV) Conversion. This is authentic human being.

For Sartre, level (IV) is unattainable. I shall demonstrate this below. Being and Nothingness is written from the point of view of pure reflection (III), about persons engaged
in impure reflectivity (II). "Reasons are always from above downward," and the explication and analysis of any paradigm is always extrapoladigmatical. Those who engage in the purifying reflection and subsequently suppress the evidence derived therefrom are in bad faith in the strong sense. Those of pre-reflective consciousness cannot be in bad faith in the strong sense because they have not yet taken a point of view on their own being as such, rather, being it, they are absolutely taken in. Those who engage in impure reflection are "captivated" by the psychic objects which their own consciousness has spun, and, due to the element of captivity, are in bad faith in the weak sense. Such a consciousness has become drunk through the consumption of its own pharmacological elixir (the pharmacon), imbibing to the dregs the draught of its own serum of falsehood. Truth is temporally suspended in the balance of unknowing, as consciousness has eclipsed the vision of its own sun. Many of these contentions may appear to run counter to much of accepted scholarship on Sartre and therefore appear untenable, but seeming is not always being, and sometimes, at least, the crowd is untruth.  

The aim of part one of this chapter is to show that the Sartrean conversion is not possible. If conversion is not

---


possible, for Sartre, then the only possible type of Sartrean human being is the addicted being. This is another angle of attack, a flank, if you will, on Sartrean type two love, showing the impossibility of its existence in any Sartrean world. In chapter two I demonstrated that the conversion was a necessary precondition for the possibility of Sartrean type two love. I also showed in that chapter that Sartrean type one and type two love were incompatible. In addition, I sought to show the impossibility of Sartrean type two love against the backdrop of Sartrean ontology. Here, I wish to argue that the conversion is not possible. Since the conversion was previously shown to be a necessary prerequisite for type two love, type two love, then, is likewise excluded from any possible Sartrean world. This being the case, Sartre is left with only type one love. Type one love, as I shall argue in this chapter, is nothing but a form of addiction in light of the phenomenological theory of addiction proffered in chapter three. Therefore, Sartre's theory of love is actually a theory of addiction. This I shall conclusively demonstrate in part two of the present chapter. The Sartrean world thus remains, many "critical" empyrean accolades to the contrary, loveless.

Part One

Section A

The Phenomenological Reduction in Sartre
What is the phenomenological reduction in Sartre? This question may be premature, as there is no consensus as to whether the reduction even exists in Sartre's philosophy. If the reduction in fact exists in Sartre (a question we shall attend to momentarily), what would it involve? It could involve one or more of the following:

(1) The process whereby consciousness suspends judgement concerning the existential condition or truth value of the phenomenon (experiential reality) in question. "Experience" is the operative word here, rather than "reality," the "real," etc. What is at issue, once the reduction has taken place, is not the existence or nonexistence of the datum before consciousness, but the specific nature of the data and the conditions for its appearing/possibility of its appearing. In this way, no existential truth claims need be made about the "object" pole of consciousness, and consciousness is free to focus on the appearing itself.

(2) The process whereby consciousness seeks to go beyond the phenomenon and its series of appearances in order to grasp its essence. The essence could be said to be the meaning of the phenomenon.

(3) The process whereby consciousness purges itself of bad faith, viz. a reflective katharsis in which consciousness faces itself, unfettered by duplicity. The nature of the
project that is the for-itself will come to light under this description.

The above three descriptions of the phenomenological reduction are by no means mutually exclusive. It is my contention that they are in fact compatible, a claim that will be developed coincident with the development of a number of other claims relevant to the topic at hand. But before this can take place, we need to address squarely the possibility of the phenomenological reduction in Sartre.

The translators of Sartre's early work, The Transcendence of the Ego, state that

...the rejection of the transcendental ego and the return to the phenomenological doctrine of intentionality in its original significance had a radical consequence - seemingly not fully evident to Sartre himself at the time of the following essay [1936-37] - which led directly to existentialism, that is, to a philosophy of human existence. The radical consequence is that the important Husserlian technique of "reduction" or "epoche" is impossible.

Much of the debate surrounding the necessity/possibility/impossibility of the reduction in Sartre revolves around what is meant by the reduction, and can be resolved at this level. Sartre himself spoke of the necessary use of the phenomenological reduction in his brilliant 1940 work entitled The Psychology of Imagination. Hazel Barnes

---


writes in her "Key to Special Terminology" in her translation of *Being and Nothingness* that Sartre approves of the "eidetic reduction" but rejects the *epoche*. In *The Transcendence of the Ego*, Sartre writes that "...the *epoche* is no longer a miracle, an intellectual method, an erudite procedure: it is an anxiety which is imposed on us and which we cannot avoid: it is both a pure event of transcendental origin and an ever possible accident of our daily life."  

Many other notable thinkers have maintained that Sartre rejects the reduction(s). Wilfred Desan states that "Heidegger and Sartre have abolished the reductions." Maurice Natanson maintains that "no *epoche* or reduction has been performed" in Sartre's philosophy. Joseph Catalano writes in his commentary on *Being and Nothingness* that Sartre "rejects Husserl's phenomenological reduction." Robert Solomon claims that "Sartre and Heidegger explicitly reject the reduction in all its forms." A. G. Pleydell-Pearce claims that "Sartre found no role in his philosophical method

---

8 *Being and Nothingness*, 630.

9 *The Transcendence of the Ego*, 103. Underlining mine.


for that central feature of Husserlian phenomenology - the epoche.¹⁴

Contrary to this view is that espoused by Kerry Walters, Linda Bell, and Thomas Busch.¹⁵ Busch holds that "Being and Nothingness ... can be understood only within the context of Sartre's use of the phenomenological reduction."¹⁶ He also states that Sartre's philosophy can be seen as an "extension of Husserl's programmatic."¹⁷ My own view is that there is in fact a necessary place for the reduction in Sartre's philosophy. I also feel that it is necessary to deal with this issue in order to adequately address the topics of love and addiction. The possibility/impossibility of the reduction has extensive ramifications vis-a-vis Sartre's notion of love, and also for the construction of a phenomenological theory of addiction.


¹⁶Thomas Busch, "Sartre's Use of the Reduction": 18.

¹⁷Ibid., 18.
What is the phenomenological reduction in Sartre? It is certainly true that some critics deny that such a reduction exists, but I wish to focus on the line of interpretation that maintains that the writings of Sartre can only be understood within the context of the phenomenological reduction. This, most certainly, is my view. Thomas Busch, in his article entitled "Sartre: The Phenomenological Reduction and Human Relationships" maintains, simply, that impure reflection constitutes the "natural attitude" and that pure reflection (effected by way of the purifying reflection) constitutes the "phenomenological viewpoint," or the "reduced" attitude. The natural attitude, he says, is marked by indelible bad faith. Busch maintains that "If Being and Nothingness is read within the context of Sartre's presentation of the reduction in The Transcendence of the Ego, it is evident that a purifying reflection can be effected which delivers a consciousness from bad faith." This reduction is the move from the

---


20 Ibid., 61.
natural attitude characterized by bad faith to the phenomenological attitude in which bad faith is rooted out. Busch also maintains that subsequent to the reduction, "the stage is set for the refusal by phenomenological consciousness of the project to be God..."\textsuperscript{21} I can follow Busch this far, as long as this stage-setting is not confused with the conversion itself. The order is therefore (1) The natural attitude, (2) The reduced attitude, and (3) The converted attitude. The question both in play and at bay at this point concerns whether or not (3) is possible. In another article on Being and Nothingness, Busch claims that Sartre "... reserves his treatment of authentic human relations for separate study," because Being and Nothingness is only meant to be a condition- al, partialized ontology.\textsuperscript{22} Linda Bell, in Sartre's Ethics of Authenticity, equates pure reflection (the phenomenological reduction) with (radical) conversion.\textsuperscript{23} Kerry Walters seeks to clearly delineate the reduction from the conversion.\textsuperscript{24} In

\textsuperscript{21}Ibid., 57.

\textsuperscript{22}Thomas W. Busch, "Sartre's Use of the Reduction: Being and Nothingness Reconsidered": 26, 18. Note that Sartre in fact does not reserve his treatment of authentic human relationships for separate study, as he does not study them at all.

\textsuperscript{23}Linda Bell, Sartre's Ethics of Authenticity, 118. Others also seem to equate the reduction with the conversion. See, e.g. de Beauvoir, The Ethics of Ambiguity, 14; Francis Jeanson, Sartre and the Problem of Morality, 28; and Thomas C. Anderson, The Foundation and Structure of Sartrean Ethics (Lawrence, KS: The Regents Press of Kansas, 1979), 41.

\textsuperscript{24}Kerry Walters, "A Recovery of Innocence: The Dynamics of Sartrean Radical Conversion": 358-377.
Cahiers, we may remember, Sartre tells us that the "pursuit of being is hell," and that *Being and Nothingness* was an "ontology before conversion."²⁵

What is the relationship between reduction and conversion in Sartre? Sartre tells us in *Being and Nothingness* that the work is written as a description of accessory or impure reflection rather than a description of pure reflection.²⁶ Therefore, all consciousness described in *Being and Nothingness* would be immersed in bad faith, unable to imbibe the breath of pure reflective consciousness unless the reduction was effected. As a result of the reduction, consciousness comes to realize (know) the project that it is. Consciousness recognizes that it is the project of "assimilating and making an object of the Other,"²⁷ that it is the project of the recovery of its being.²⁸ Prior to this reflective katharsis, the for-itself is not aware that it seeks to be being: "There is no consciousness of this being [the unrealizable ideal] since it haunts non-thetic [pre-reflective] self-consciousness."²⁹ Note here that Sartre says "no consciousness of," not "no knowledge of." This means, precisely, that at no time


²⁶*Being and Nothingness*, 581.

²⁷*Being and Nothingness*, 363.

²⁸*Being and Nothingness*, 364.

²⁹*Being and Nothingness*, 90.
could consciousness have knowledge of the unrealizable ideal of the recovery of being, since knowledge is the result only of a reflective focusing upon that which consciousness was heretofore nonpositionally aware of. One cannot become positionally (reflectively) aware of (know) that of which one was not previously nonpositionally aware (conscious of): reflectivity (knowledge) is a tributary of the river of nonreflectivity (awareness, consciousness). Awareness (consciousness) circumscribes knowing, therefore, awareness circumscribes potential modes of being.

The reduction brings this nonthetic unrealizable before the gaze of consciousness (or does it?) so that consciousness may therefore realize the project that is its own being. It is a revelation of self, for I am my project. This unrealizable ideal haunts my being as that which I must be, and is in no sense "imaginary." For I am my unrealizable ideal in the mode of not being it or I am not it at all, since I cannot be anything other than the attempt to be. The unrealizable ideal appears as an imperative, since it appears to me as "to be realized." I recognize this previously pre-reflective imperative for what it is after my consciousness is purged, so to speak, by the phenomenological reduction. It is at this point that I acquire a "bad conscience," which is synonymous with consciousness of bad faith, the ideal of which is

\footnote{cf. \textit{Being and Nothingness}, 527.}

\footnote{\textit{Being and Nothingness}, 528.}
...taking toward oneself the point of view of the Other [a self-judgement]."  

This, of course, is also the goal of impure reflection, and it is for this reason that impure reflection exhibits bad faith in the weak sense. I have a "bad conscience" (bad faith) because I realize that I have been attempting to objectify myself, deny my own freedom, and surreptitiously and inexorably pursue an unrealistic ideal. The ideal of a "good conscience" (good faith) as it presents itself to me at this time would entail the cessation of the project that involves the fusion of this triad.

In the Psychology of Imagination, Sartre makes clear that "After the phenomenological reduction...consciousness ...unveils itself to our reflective descriptions." The reduction and pure reflectivity thus amount to the same thing, and by this means we purge consciousness of bad faith (if we squarely face the task of becoming authentic, rather than retreating into the nebulous nether world of the pre-reflective/impure reflective). In Being and Nothingness, the reduction is that which is indispensable for the practice of existential psychoanalysis. Sartre makes many claims regarding this psychoanalysis, his own non-Freudian type of psychoanalysis, among them that

---

32 Being and Nothingness, 527.
33 The Psychology of Imagination, 259.
Thus existential psychoanalysis is moral description, for it releases to us the ethical meaning of various human projects.\textsuperscript{34}

The principle result of existential psychoanalysis must be to make us repudiate the spirit of seriousness.\textsuperscript{35}

Existential psychoanalysis is going to reveal to man the real goal of his pursuit...this psychoanalysis may function as a means of deliverance and salvation.

Notice the following about these passages:

(A) The normative standard invoked, i.e. the necessary repudiation of the God-project (deliverance from the spirit of seriousness).

(B) The tentative nature of deliverance and salvation. That is, in spite of the fact that existential psychoanalysis DOES reveal to us (reflectively) our own bad faith (via moral description), DOES acquaint us with our passion (the God-project), it MAY OR MAY NOT operate as a means of deliverance and salvation. This is the same thing as saying the reduction is possible, and that the conversion may or may not be possible. Therefore, we can conclude that the two notions are separate ones in Sartre's mind, and that the second may not even be possible, that is, that it may be another Sartrean unrealizable ideal, albeit one that would allow one to get out of hell, since one would no longer pursue being but free-

\textsuperscript{34}Being and Nothingness, 626. Underlining mine.

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid. Underlining mine.

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., 626, 627. Underlining mine.
dom. Once consciousness makes the reflective turn upon itself which comprises the phenomenological reduction, it opens itself to anguish, to fear. For it then recognizes the inexorable nature of its freedom while concomitantly recognizing that it is not the author of this very freedom. One can extinguish but not create freedom. It is present as the negation of facticity, as the beckoning of responsibility, as the genesis of the ethical. The consciousness that realizes this becomes afraid: "Consciousness is frightened by its own spontaneity because it senses this spontaneity as beyond freedom." The response to this fear is at least in part determinative of the possibility of conversion. Consciousness may once again flee its own spontaneity, retreating once again into the bad faith of impure reflectivity which characterized it prior to the reduction, or it can choose to respond to the realization of itself as the pursuit of the impossible. What would be constitutive of the latter response? Is the for-itself forever immured in the pursuit of the in-itself-for-itself, all attempts to the contrary being somewhat less than feckless? Is this the nadir of the Sartrean corpus, its horrible achilles heel?

---

37. Again, this too is only possibly the case.

38. That is, in death.

39. The Transcendence of the Ego, 100.
In section B of part one, I shall utilize Kerry Walter's aforementioned article to a great extent. I find it to be the most inclusive and accurate rendition of the Sartrean processes of reduction and conversion. Walters tells us that "The progression [from the reduction to the conversion] is not an inevitable one, in the sense that anyone who acquires pure reflection will automatically undergo a conversion, nor even that anyone who undergoes the conversion will sustain it in her future actions." Now, the notion of "undergoing" either the reduction or the conversion indicates passivity. For Sartre, consciousness is all activity, all spontaneity, having no inertia. Furthermore, nothing can act upon consciousness save consciousness itself. Therefore, all connotations of passivity must be expunged in relation to consciousness itself, and in particular in relation to the notions of reduction and conversion. Assuming that the phenomenological reduction has been effected upon consciousness by itself, what then can be said of the conversion? This is the very question I shall delve into in section B.

Section B

Conversion and Authenticity in Sartre

40"A Recovery of Innocence: The Dynamics of Sartrean Radical Conversion."

41With a major flaw, to which we shall attend momentarily.

42Ibid., 359. Underlining mine.
The authentic individual, for Sartre, is the converted individual. The authentic individual knows of the god-project which he is, and no longer wishes to pursue this unrealizable. The authentic, converted individual no longer seeks to appropriate being, but seeks instead freedom as an end. Phyllis Sutton Morris equates authenticity with lack of self-deception. This is not enough, since one could most certainly recognize his pursuit of being and therefore not be in bad faith, yet still engage in such a pursuit. This is why a clear distinction between the reduction and the conversion must be made. The reduced individual recognizes that he is the pursuit of being (awareness); the converted, authentic individual abandons this very project (praxis). The abyss between the two is enormous, comparable to that between Lazarus and the rich man. Carole Haynes-Curtis has likened the "radical conversion" to the Kierkegaardian "leap of faith," but she has not attempted to produce a strict argument.

---

43 Cahiers, 42.


45 Cahiers, 495, 496.


for the comparison. This comparison I find interesting, and I believe it shows promise. The connection, however, certainly cannot be made from within the Sartrean paradigm, but only from within that of Kierkegaard. To say this is to say that there is no conversion in Sartre because the possibility is delimited by his ontology.

Simone de Beauvoir does an interesting gloss of Sartre's notion of the conversion in her celebrated The Ethics of Ambiguity. She tells us that the converted individual puts his "will to be 'in parentheses." First he recognizes his will to be (the reduction), then he denies it as a basis for action (the conversion). But how can I put what I AM in parentheses? For Sartre makes it only too clear that human being is this very project. Is this a simple act of the will? Does volition allow for the alteration of ontology? de Beauvoir goes on to say that in the conversion "[Man] rejoins himself only to the extent that he agrees to remain at a distance from himself and ambiguous." But how does this appropriate and moral distantiation come about? Through

---


49 This, as it turns out, is in fact my view. But Haynes-Curtis says none of this and my spelling it out shall have to await a later section of this work.

50 The Ethics of Ambiguity, 14.

51 "I am the project of the recovery of my being." [Being and Nothingness, 364]

52 The Ethics of Ambiguity, 13.
volitional recognition alone? Does this turn the Sartrean world of "failure"\textsuperscript{53} into a world of "successful," "moral" men? Was it all a matter of the will, unrecognized as such? de Beauvoir follows Sartre in saying that to will oneself free and to will oneself moral are identical.\textsuperscript{54} Morality, then, is born with the conversion.\textsuperscript{55}

de Beauvoir continues: "To will oneself free is to effect the transition from nature to morality by establishing a genuine freedom on the original upsurge of our existence."\textsuperscript{56} Nature, as Busch told us earlier,\textsuperscript{57} is the nonreduced attitude of bad faith consciousness. The move to morality, then, is effected by the reduction and conversion. If freedom is "total and infinite," how can I will myself free?\textsuperscript{58} Isn't freedom prior to will? How could it be otherwise? "Willing oneself free" involves precisely the hypostasization of self (the psychic) that Sartre has repeatedly repudiated and

\textsuperscript{53}"The history of a life, whatever it may be, is the history of a failure." [\textit{Being and Nothingness}, 481]

\textsuperscript{54}\textit{The Ethics of Ambiguity}, 24.

\textsuperscript{55}But - why be moral? Maybe this amounts to asking why the pursuit of being is hell. Here I think Sartre is mistaken. The pursuit of being recognized as such is hell. This means that man is born into hell through the phenomenological reduction. The conversion? Only a matter of will? No symmetry here? The end of the "allegory?"

\textsuperscript{56}\textit{The Ethics of Ambiguity}, 25.


\textsuperscript{58}\textit{Being and Nothingness}, 531.
scourged. And if I can will myself free, in what sense was I heretofore not free? If freedom is total and infinite, in what sense was I "less free" before? Again, how can I "become" (will myself) free? In Sartrean ontology, where there are only two kinds of being, such an occurrence is foreign. For I am either free (pour-soi) or not free (en-soi). What is this mythological hybrid that can will itself free? The whole point of the Sartrean corpus is to show that we do not and cannot have an essence, that we cannot achieve in-itself-for-itselfness, that the very idea of such is a contradiction in terms.

---

59 cf. John A. Schumacher, "The Existential Sociology of Jean-Paul Sartre." Unpublished manuscript, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, NY, 1985. Schumacher states that "[For Sartre] there are no totalities whatsoever (ontologically, separation and the individual reign), though human beings can act as if there were...Indeed, the challenge posed by the non-classical conception of materiality is to find a non-classical conception of freedom (and an associated conception of social sciences), a conception based on fusion rather than separation. Moreover, Sartre's disputants do not consider a non-classical materiality any more than he does, and if the classical materiality is to remain - as it may very well do - then there is no way, I have argued, to escape Sartre's conclusions about human sociality, that is, if human freedom is to remain as well." (pp. 10, 16). Sartre's (contemporary) disputants may well have failed to directly challenge the "classical" (Cartesian) conception of materiality. But this does not mean that certain of Sartre's precursors did not do this very thing. I have in mind Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, to say nothing of Pavel Florensky.

60 And, therefore, according to Sartre, God cannot exist. The parallels to Kierkegaard and Nietzsche at this point are almost uncanny. I am not trying to legitimate Sartre's bifurcated, simplistic ontology here. I am merely attempting to shed at least a bit of light on the issue. Could it be that "...the negation of everything [which is equivalent to the original upsurge of the for-itself] is in itself a form of (continued...)
Let us at this time take a closer look at Walters' claims concerning the reduction and the conversion. In delineating the difference, Walters says that

In short, the phenomenological reduction, by illuminating the essential structure of the for-itself, reveals the futility of the god-project. It does not, however, represent the abandonment of the project. That act of the will, clearly not a part of the dispassionately neutral reduction's mandate, just as clearly belongs to the domain of the radical conversion.61

I would like to make two fundamental points here:

1) The will (freedom) cannot alter fundamental ontology since this would be an attempt to volitionally alter the spontaneity that we are. Freedom is the ground of the possibility of the will. Freedom's primordial nature is such that it cannot be induced or impeded by the will, but only reflectively acknowledged and utilized. Otherwise, it is merely utilized nonreflectively. Whatever the case, it is utilized as a function of existence itself, rather than willing, for freedom is the very "stuff" of our being. If Sartre believed it was in fact


60 (...continued) servitude and [that] real freedom is an inner submission to a value which defies history and its successes."[?] [Albert Camus, The Rebel, trans. Anthony Bower (New York: Vintage, 1951), 186.] Of course, with these words, the "good friendship" between Sartre and Camus came to an end (1951). "He who has ears to hear, let him hear." [Matthew 13:9] Camus goes on to say in the same work that "Atheist existentialism at least wishes to create a morality...But the real difficulty lies in creating it without reintroducing into historical existence a value foreign to history." [p. 249] Camus translated "difficulty" as "impossibility" and in one fell swoop "realized" the necessity of dispensing with (at least) this form of "existentialism."

61 "A Recovery of Innocence: The Dynamics of Sartrean Radical Conversion": 368.
possible for the for-itself to will itself free, he never made a case for it, and based on the Sartrean corpus we do have, we can positively exclude such a possibility. It simply makes no sense for a being that is freedom to "will itself free," as if an additional measure of freedom could be superadded to a being that is nothing other than freedom.

(2) The reduction is not "dispassionately neutral." If it were, there would be no motivation to effect or sustain it. "Why the reduction at all?" has no answer, especially in the light of the accompanying anguish. Such a naive belief (that the reduction is "dispassionately neutral") is relegated to the playroom of mythology along with such ideas as "I am no more than a thing which thinks." 62

Walters claims that the conversion is "a direct volitional act of the for-itself arising from reflection upon the reduction's revelation of the for-itself's true nature." 63 If this is so, how does the "volitional act" change the "true nature" of the for-itself, if this nature is such that will (reflective) is merely a tributary of the more primordial (nonreflective) project which it is? The reflective scissiparity of the will is only a secondary phenomenon, and in no way can alter the fundamental structure of the for-itself,

62Rene Descartes, Meditations on First Philosophy, as found in James Ogilvy, ed., Self and World, 2nd ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, Inc.), 22.

which is wholly responsible for the form and content of volitional activity.\(^{64}\)

Furthermore, Walters claims that

This explicit acceptance of its non-being [as a result of the conversion] does not mean that the for-itself suppresses its desire to be god; that hunger is a result of its ontological structure. It does mean, however, that the for-itself is no longer a slave to that desire, that its fundamental project

---

\(^{64}\)To say that the will alone can effect the conversion seems to me to be Sartrean in only one way: the desperate, futile attempt seeks to perpetuate the moral solipsism inherent in the desolate Sartrean world. Certainly, Sartre made "optimistic" statements to the contrary, but optimistic statements are not equivalent to a revamped ontology. Witness the following: "In order to get any truth about myself, I must have contact with another person. The Other is indispensible to my own existence, as well as to my knowledge about myself...Hence let us at once announce the discovery of a world which we shall call intersubjectivity." [Jean-Paul Sartre, Existentialism and Human Emotions, trans. Hazel Barnes and Bernard Frechtman (New York: Philosophical Library, 1957), 38. Underlining mine. Hereafter referred to as Existentialism.] Sartre says this after he states in Being and Nothingness that being-for-others is a contingent mode of being for the for-itself: "Being-for-others is not an ontological structure of the for-itself...it is a fact...not an essential necessity." [282-283] Furthermore, note that "My original fall is the existence of the Other." [263] See also pp. 362-412 on the impossibility of intersubjectivity. Philosophically, Existentialism and Human Emotions is probably the worst document Sartre ever published (as well as the most popular). It is also the most "optimistic." I do not think this is a coincidence. On page 476 of Being and Nothingness, Sartre writes that "The will can reach only details of structures and will never modify the original project from which it has issued." (underlining mine). This being the case, I do not see how any type of call for a willful repudiation of the god-project can do anything other than serve to drive this project to the nonreflective level once again (if one ever left this plane to begin with). Even after the phenomenological reduction, the realization of the project that I am does not alter the scenario, for I am this project.
is no longer the god-project, but is instead freedom itself.\textsuperscript{65} Now, the "hunger" is not merely a result of the for-itself's ontological structure, it is its ontological structure. There is a coextension here, rather than a causal connection. This is a world of difference. To say that one can act (will) counter to what one is is like saying that there is a "neutral substratum" (the "will") within the for-itself that can choose or not choose to be what the for-itself is. This is just another attempt at a reflective ekstasis, a bifurcation between the reflecting and reflected self, and in no sense will lead to a second "innocence" in which man no longer pursues being.\textsuperscript{66} To take a point of view on one's desire (being) is simply no longer to be that desire in the mode of being it, but is, rather, to be that desire in the mode of not being it. Otherwise, there would be no such desire. One cannot consistently take freedom for an end, cannot sustain the conversion (cannot not-be what one is) unless the desire (being) to be god is somehow obviated, vitiated, negated, expunged, eradicated, quelled from the heart of being. For the desire to be god coupled with the horrifying fear of freedom (the yawning abyss of the infinite) is too great, too

\textsuperscript{65}"A Recovery of Innocence: The Dynamics of Sartrean Radical Conversion,": 369.

\textsuperscript{66}The attempt is akin to the weak asking the strong not to be strong. See Friedrich Nietzsche, \textit{On the Genealogy of Morals}, trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage, 1969), 24-56 (First essay).
monstrous, too boundless to be surmounted by the "will" of the for-itself. The conversion simply cannot be a matter of simple reflective katharsis and subsequent volition. Even for Sartre, this was only too clear.

To quote Walters again: "In short, there is no necessary connection between reduction and conversion." Precisely. "Satan" is "reduced" but not "converted": "He" "knows" that which he fails to embody. Put differently, "he" embodies it as negation or refusal. The will, again, is always an epiphenomenon of the project. Without the project, the idea of willing would make no sense and lack impetus. While one deliberates concerning the making of the conversion, one deliberates from within the structures of an already existent project. The spontaneity that is consciousness thrusts us toward both God and the god-project. The will is but a log in the everflowing stream of consciousness that is the for-itself. No, the conversion cannot be effected via purifying reflection and volition alone. Man is freedom, but freedom does not extend to the alleviation/truncation of his own spontaneity that is the god-project. For the for-itself cannot get "outside" the project that it is - this attempt at dissociation - like the dissociative attempt of impure reflection - necessarily results in failure. How does one get "outside" the project that one is - and one is nothing other

---

Walters states triumphantly that the "Post-conversion" attitude is marked by "innocence," that it is "natural," "naive," and ideally, "unsullied by ulterior motives." It is said to be akin to pre-reflective immediacy. In this context, what could constitute an "ulterior motive?" How could this be determined? Indeed, what would constitute a "motive" at all? In what sense is this seamier for-itself "innocent?" Is "innocence" a moral term? If so, why? How? Whence cometh the moral sphere? If not, what is its import? Why should one deem it desirable enough to pursue it? If it is merely ontological, why call it "innocence?" If it really is a return to pre-reflective immediacy, does this mean our reflective capacities have been eradicated (a seeming condition for true "innocence"), or do we now simply have the capacity to temporarily suspend reflectivity? If so, wouldn't we necessarily be aware of such a suspension, and in this sense no longer "innocent?" Isn't the possibility of reflectivity the possibility of philosophy? Is this the end of philosophy? What? The possibility of philosophy based on the "fall" into reflectivity? Philosophy the result of the originary "loss" of "innocence?" Are we "responsible" in some

68 Note the parallel between this problem and that of how "objective" truth can be available to a "subject."

sense for this loss? No? The reflective dissociation "forced" upon us? The reflective dissociation and loss of innocence a victimization, a process undergone but not assented to? Yes? The reflective dissociation and loss of innocence somehow our "fault?" But what can ontological (rather than moral) fault mean if not precisely a crevice in being, that is, the reflective dissociation? But why attempt to induce such a "fault" and subsequently remediate the same - unless the crevice that is cloying reflectivity seemed somehow like a "mistake?" But what? The ground for the possibility of the acknowledgement of selfhood is a mistake, is the fundamental loss of "innocence?"

How can this "return" to "innocence" be merely an act of the will after the katharsis? It cannot be, if the will is an epiphenomenon of the project, as I have been arguing. The will cannot modify the original project which I am, for it is constituted by that project. Conversion is ontological. I am freedom, and freedom is the equivalent of choice. Therefore my ontology, in toto, is freedom/choice. But the freedom/choice that constitutes my ontology cannot be utilized to alter that very freedom/choice in its very being. I can utilize my freedom to change my original relationship to my freedom (as evidenced in the move from pure to impure reflection - if I can choose this. It is possible that the reduction itself is not a choice, for if the for-itself "naturally" flees freedom, why would it ever effect upon itself the
reduction?), yet I cannot utilize my freedom to change my freedom's original relationship to me, for I am it.

Walters wishes to have us believe that the Sartrean conversion is a "a return of sorts to the original pre-reflective celebration of freedom which was characteristic of original immediacy. It is in this sense that we may call it a recovery of innocence." In response, (A) The pre-reflective for-itself did not celebrate freedom because it did not know itself as free. Therefore, conversion is not the equivalent of pre-reflective immediacy. (B) There was no originary "innocence" in the Sartrean world, because there was never unadulterated, pure immediacy. Such an idyllic state of innocence could be postulated only upon the assumption of a Sartrean "Garden of Eden." The mythic Sartrean cosmology grows to monstrous proportions. But no such Garden could ever have existed, since the original upsurge of the for-itself was and is an upsurge of negation: "I am not X" (Let "X" be anything whatever). This, being the universal property of consciousness (the only such universal in the Sartrean description of consciousness), negates pure immediacy or being on any level. Sartrean philosophy is a philosophy of

70 Ibid.

71 It is true that in the state of pre-reflectivity I am not reflectively aware of myself as the negation of being. Nevertheless, I am aware of this nonreflectively, and have access to it reflectively if I choose to effect the reflective dissociation. I am also nonreflectively aware of this latter possibility but have simply not as yet made it an object for (continued...)
hypervigilance: "I am never that which I apprehend." Fear. 

In "Consciousness of Self and Knowledge of Self" Sartre tells us that "...[We] place ourselves...on the level of morality...starting from the moment when we reject being, since being has rejected us, the moment when we no longer want values, in the sense in which want is taken as a simple coincidence with self." Kierkegaard certainly could have said this, in the sense that for Kierkegaard, value could never be a simple coincidence with self, for freedom gives birth to value, and freedom negates the possibility of coincidence. The above passage seems to imply that if we do not reject being (do not dispense with the project to be in-itself-for-itself), we are for that very reason premoral or nonmoral. What does this mean? What are its implications? Does this suggest that none of our actions under these conditions can be brought into question, having no basis from

71(...continued)
consciousness. For Sartre, pre-reflective consciousness always entails non-positional self-consciousness. There is, therefore, no such thing as originary or recovered innocence in Sartre.

72Hypervigilance: Being seen, if not by the Other (this is contingent), then by the self. The latter is forever impure and forever existent: no innocence.

which to interrogate in a moral sense?\textsuperscript{74} Regardless, Sartre certainly would reject the idea that none of our actions could be brought into question, for how then could freedom remain the ultimate value?\textsuperscript{75} It too, would be relative to my valuation. Certainly freedom is the basis for any valuation and is in this sense ultimate, but why valuation at all?

The conversion, then, for Sartre, is subsumed under a well-known Sartrean category: that of the unrealizable ideal. Once again, we must refrain from confusing the unrealizable with the imaginary,\textsuperscript{76} and wonder why it is that the conversion is an ideal at all.

\textsuperscript{74}Possibly, actions could be condemned on the grounds of logic alone, as Sartre tries to do in \textit{Existentialism}. But in this work he seems to assume that both the reduction and the conversion are realizable, otherwise he would not speak of the world of "intersubjectivity," and one could not respect the freedom (project) of the Other. What kind of indictment could it be, to be incriminated on logical grounds? The essence of the for-itself is contradiction - a being that is not what it is, and is what it is not [\textit{Being and Nothingness}, 58], in addition to the fact that the for-itself is the contradiction of being! Therefore, noncontradiction seems at best to be a tenuous ground for a moral theory, at worst, positively mistaken.

\textsuperscript{75}Mustn't an ultimate value be valuable \textit{in terms of} something? What is the basis for the designation of an ultimate value within the Sartrean paradigm, if all other values are designated as such only with reference to this ultimate value? Mustn't such an ultimate value be somehow justified? If we say that freedom is the ultimate value because we are freedom, how does this legitimate freedom \textit{in any sense}, especially if it is the case that our existence is \textit{de trop}? Insofar as a "thing" exists (and freedom is a "nothing") it is "good," and "evil" really is a privation? Ontology is destiny? What?

\textsuperscript{76}\textit{Being and Nothingness}, 527.
In *Either/Or*, vol. 2, Kierkegaard tells us through the Judge that "I do not create myself, I choose myself," and the self, as in Sartre, *is* freedom. He goes on to inform us that choosing oneself is equivalent to repenting oneself, a religious category in the presence of God. There is quite a gulf between the notions of choice and creation, all the more so since they are both on the grounds of a freedom that is total and infinite. The difference between these two notions will be unfolded as we progress. Maybe it is the case that Sartre is right in maintaining that the for-itself must "repudiate the spirit of seriousness." Sartre beckoned from the prison of seriousness in *Being and Nothingness*, faintly sensing an Elysian field of play. For Sartre, it is Kierkegaard who is the serious one, it is Kierkegaard who is both a "coward" and a "stinker." Could it be precisely the contrary? Could it be that Sartre is the serious one and that Kierkegaard is not? Could not Kierkegaard truly be the humorist (as he often was pseudonymously), and this be the final twist of existential irony? Can one be playful (humor-

---


79*Being and Nothingness*, 626.

80cf. *Existentialism*, 46, 47.
claims) can be made apart from a specific and deliberate grounding in nondemonstrable truth claims.83

To continue with my line of reasoning, I am arguing that Kierkegaard's notion of love and Sartrean type two love overlap significantly, meaning that Kierkegaard in fact espouses a viable existential theory of love, whereas Sartre does not. Sartre presents us with a theory of addiction, whereas Kierkegaard presents us with a theory of love. Yet

83 In the weakest rendition of this claim, I would be maintaining that (A) One cannot legitimate presuppositional truth claims from within the paradigm in question, because the claims themselves serve to legitimate the paradigmatical structure. In addition, to assume a metaparadigmatical approach to the epistemological legitimation of presuppositional truth claims is to announce implicitly the advent of other such truth claims outside of any paradigm thus far scrutinized, and (B) All truth, therefore, is perspectival. These claims do not deny "objective" or (at least) nonrelativistic truth, they merely make statements about how the "subject" can "get to" this truth. These claims, I realize, are complicated and sweeping. To do them any type of justice would require at least another dissertation. Kierkegaard's Johannes Climacus [trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985)] and Concluding Unscientific Postscript [trans. David F. Swenson and Walter Lowrie (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968] as well as Nietzsche's corpus more forcefully argue such a position than I could ever hope to do. I urge the curious reader to consult one or more of these outstanding works. Phenomenological truth can be sufficient or even apodictic without an attendant so-called "demonstration."

Furthermore, since the topic proper of this dissertation is addiction, I do not need to advance any specific truth claims regarding the specific substantive nature of love. I merely need to show that Sartre's theory of "love" is in fact a theory of addiction. It is theoretically possible that the scope of addiction as a phenomenological reality is so broad as to encompass all "types" of "love," and that not only the Sartrean, but in fact all, worlds are loveless. It is also possible that the reduction and conversion are unrealizable not only for Sartrean human being, but for all human being. If this is the case, being-addicted is coextensive with being-human.
Sartre knows, as previously indicated, that type two love, if it in fact existed, would in fact constitute love, and that type one love is hell in the sense that addiction is hell because it involves the grievous, heinous pursuit of being. That is to say, Kierkegaard and Sartre agree in the main on the ideal of love, yet only the former has uncovered sufficient groundwork for its theoretical realization. Love as well as addiction can exist in the Kierkegaardian world, but only the latter can appear in the Sartrean world. Existence, for Sartre, is an imperfection, yet Sartre can well envision another scenario, where one would lay down his pursuit of being and be "completely visible" before his neighbor, who would be in turn completely visible to him.

At this point I wish to move to a more complete analysis of Sartrean love, with a view to showing that Sartrean love, of whatever variety, is in fact addiction.

Part Two

Sartrean Love as an Addiction

In the twilight of his life, in "Self-Portrait at Seventy," Sartre tells us that "visibility" (truth, nondupli-

---


85 Keep in mind that Sartrean type two love has been eliminated. All appearances of love in the Sartrean world must be of type one, regardless of their particular guise.
city, openness) is essential for concrete relations with others, including the relation of love. Yet, in spite of this ideal, deception and self-deception are essential for Sartrean love type one (as shown in chapter two), the only existent Sartrean love (hereafter referred to simply as Sartrean love). The lover must "seduce" the beloved because the lover cannot make the true intentions of her project known to the beloved, lest the entire edifice collapse. Deception is necessary: I must appear partialized, that is, as an object, not a subject attempting to appear as an object. Leni's love relation with Franz is predicated upon deception, as is Franz's love relation with Johanna. Bad faith is "intended to fill up the nothingness which I am in relation to myself," and this is precisely what I attempt to do in becoming the object-limit (absolute value) for the subjectivity of the Other in the love relation.

Another salient characteristic of the bad faith that is in play in the Sartrean love relation is that it "affirms facticity [essence] as being transcendence [freedom] and


87 See *Being and Nothingness*, 371.


89 *Being and Nothingness*, 43.
transcendence as being facticity."\(^90\) The project that is Sartrean love does precisely this in that it does not seek freedom as an end, but rather being (the unrealizable ideal of love). Yet the lover does not recognize the illusive and unrealizable nature of this project, for the very reflective ignorance of this fact allows for the possibility of the project. A necessary failure recognized as such would cease to appear attractive in the eyes of the for-itself. The Judge in Either/Or, vol. 2 foresaw such a scenario in his insightful comment that "If you know love is an illusion, you have lost everything [the possibility of being], unless you struggle again to fall into the same illusion, which is a self-contradiction.\(^91\)

Love, being for Sartre a phenomenon of belief, necessitates perpetual deception and self-deception. The Aesthete tells us that "In illusion, the individual is hidden from himself [no reflective cognizance of the desire to be]; in mystification, he is hidden from others [the Other does not know that the lover seeks to incorporate into himself the beloved's very freedom]."\(^92\) "Love" as an addiction involves both illusion and mystification. A full recognition on the part of the Other concerning the lover's project would reveal a self seeking to become itself through the conduit of the

\(^{90}\) *Being and Nothingness*, 56.

\(^{91}\) *Either/Or*, vol. 2, 129.

\(^{92}\) *Either/Or*, vol. 1, 248.
Other, the latter being merely a part of the circle of selfness. The beloved could do nothing other than vituperate against the seductive project in which the lover has engaged to bleed the Other's freedom (enslavement) from him toward the lover who utilizes it to fulfill himself.\textsuperscript{93} The illusion and mystification noted in addictive "love" is a function of a certain kind of lover, the aesthetic lover.\textsuperscript{94}

"Generally, I can assure any girl who entrusts herself to me a perfect \textit{aesthetic} conduct: only it ends with her being deceived; but this is consistent with my aesthetics, for either the girl deceives the man, or the man deceives the girl."\textsuperscript{95} Certainly this is the intransigent rule for Sartrean love relations, for love is in essence deceptive.\textsuperscript{96} The "triple destructibility" of Sartrean love is ever present because all patterns of conduct toward the "Other-as-object include within themselves an implicit and veiled reference to the Other-as-subject, and this reference is their death..."\textsuperscript{97} Sartrean love, as is the case with all addiction, must be

\textsuperscript{93} On love as seduction, see \textit{Being and Nothingness}, 371ff.

\textsuperscript{94} The same could be said for the ethical lover, as there is no inherent kinetic power within the self sufficient to offset the centripetal force of the love relation. The reader is encouraged to consult chapter two of the present work for a fuller rendition and analysis of Sartrean love.

\textsuperscript{95} \textit{Either/Or}, vol. 1, 375.

\textsuperscript{96} On the inherent deception of love, see \textit{Being and Nothingness}, 374-377.

\textsuperscript{97} \textit{Being and Nothingness}, 408.
based on the metastability of deception/self-deception, but has as its underlying (ideal) unrealizable ideal (telos) nondeceptive love, which would move us into the ethical sphere and the reality of ethical love. Sartrean aesthetic (addictive) love leads inexorably either to its own demise or to ethical love.

"He who cannot reveal himself cannot love, and he who cannot love is the most unhappy man of all." Love, for Sartre, demands that one conceal, not reveal, himself. Thus,

98 This is of course true only subsequent to the necessary phenomenological reduction and conversion, the latter of which, in the previous section, has been shown to be, for Sartre, an unrealizable ideal.

99 Note the metalevel in play in this argument, a level which Sartre never explicitly deals with: The unrealizable ideal of Sartrean love is being. The ideal unrealizable ideal of Sartrean love is freedom. The real and the ideal unrealizable ideals are incompatible, and Sartre knows this, yet continues to espouse the ideal as if somehow the conflict might be volitionally resolved. I certainly do not accuse Sartre of bad faith here (as does Richard Bernstein [in Praxis and Action (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971).] I believe he was well aware of the sleight of hand he attempted to effect. Yet just as freedom is the contradiction of being in Sartrean ontology, so the real is the contradiction of the ideal in Sartrean love theory. I would say that Sartre lacked the heart to draw the logical conclusions from his fundamental ontology which remained unaltered throughout his lifetime, which is certainly not to say that he lacked the insight. "In the middle of the winter I at last discovered that there was in me an invincible summer." [Albert Camus, The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays, trans. Justin O'Brien (New York: Vintage, 1955), 144.] Even Sartre -even Sartre - remained hopeful against reason - against his own reason. I would say again in an analysis of this issue that, for Sartre, both the real and the ideal unrealizable ideals were not to be confused with the imaginary, but were instead experienced as imperatives [see Being and Nothingness, 529.] It is a mistake to confuse the true with the beautiful.

100 Either/Or, vol. 2, 164.
for Sartre, all consciousness is inevitably "unhappy" consciousness. Love based on concealment is not love, but rather addiction. A clandestine and sordid attempt at ontological fusion.  

"Only when one knows what one loves does one truly love." For Sartre, love is in principle deceptive/self-deceptive. The lover engages in a series of ruses to "prevent" the lover from "waking up." Sartre is the inverse of the Judge, the ethical lover in Either/Or, vol. 2, just as addiction is the inverse of love. The incompatibility of the two manifests the either/or nature of the relation. Kierkegaard tells us through the mouthpiece of Climacus in the Concluding Unscientific Postscript that "All love is affected by illusion, but when love is interpenetrated with a God-relationship this imperfection of illusion disappears." Kierkegaard recognizes the illusion inherent in all love, and does not discount this existential phenomenon. In fact, noting the above, he tells us that this illusion is so powerful that human being in its own subjectivity cannot be freed of it - without recourse to the Ground.  

101"Fusion" as the interfacing of the for-itself and the in-itself in "God."


103Concluding Unscientific Postscript, 52.

104This argument is similar to that of Descartes in his Meditations. Here Descartes says that the only way one can be (continued...
"This perpetual act by which the in-itself degenerates into presence to itself we shall call an ontological act. Nothingness is the putting into question of being by being."\textsuperscript{105} In Sartrean love, the lover seeks to become the "absolute value" for the beloved and thereby become the limit of his freedom. Absolute value suppresses freedom since the origin of value is freedom. But absolute value would be coincident with being (which represents the object state the lover seeks to "become" for the beloved), and being is the absence of freedom.\textsuperscript{106} Sartrean love, which we construe as

\textsuperscript{104}(...continued)

sure that one is not deceived is through belief in an all powerful and benevolent (i.e. Judeo-Christian) God who would not suffer His creatures to be involuntarily deluded - at least not for an extensive period of time - concerning the nature of reality. Does this form of argument "work" for Kierkegaard? By means of an indirect proof we can say (A) All love involves illusion; (B) Sartre's ontology precludes eradication of this illusion, and, in fact, predicates "love" upon its perpetual reality; (C) The resultant love is unpalatable for Sartre ("hell"); (D) Therefore, if one rejects Sartrean love, the world is loveless unless one adopts Kierkegaardian love. If Sartre is right, we are thrust either upon a Kierkegaardian conception of love, or left with the loveless world of Sartre. The third alternative, of course, would be to reject this indirect type proof and make a paradigm shift. But these thinkers do not entertain this possibility, and this would be another story altogether. Either love or addiction. Or, merely addiction. How does one accept the unacceptable? Impossible. We "reject being, since being has rejected us..." [Sartre, "Consciousness of Self and Knowledge of Self." : 134.] Rejection is the essence of the affirmation of the for-itself. When explicating the above claims, it is important to keep in mind Otto Rank's aforementioned concept of the "god-ideal." See chapter one and chapter three, part one. In no sense in a transcendent "god-ideal" necessarily external to consciousness.

\textsuperscript{105}Being and Nothingness, 79.

\textsuperscript{106}Except in the case of the unrealizable ideal, God.
a functional addiction, is the (implicit) utilization ("interrogation") of being attempting to prevent the interrogation of being by suppressing the possibility of valuation through the attempted absolutization of value. Being is thus not put into question and therefore the realization of contingency remains pre-reflective. For Sartre, "Bad faith is also a confession, since it is an effort to flee the being which I am."\textsuperscript{107} This is precisely the avoidance of the interrogation of being. In love, the lover seeks to be himself before God,\textsuperscript{108} in addiction, as in bad faith, one seeks to flee oneself. For Kierkegaard, the God-relationship negates illusion/self-deception.\textsuperscript{109} Such a relationship is grounded in conscience, which possibilizes love based on truth.\textsuperscript{110} Love demands not ontological fusion, but telic fusion, which involves a recognition and respect for the freedom of the Other, and at the same time a mutual enhancement of both projects toward freedom. Sartrean love, the antithesis of love, involves "two hypnotists in a closed room" who each seek to bleed the freedom and the project of the Other into one's own.\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{107}Being and Nothingness, 261. Addiction (Sartrean love) is also a confession that one prefers being-addicted to being oneself. One can either be addicted or be oneself. cf. Kierkegaard's The Sickness Unto Death, 42-74.

\textsuperscript{108}Works of Love, 251-253.

\textsuperscript{109}Works of Love, 129.

\textsuperscript{110}Works of Love, 137.

\textsuperscript{111}With Sartrean love as with any addiction, an ever present danger is the confusion of narcoticization with peace.
Regarding selfhood, Sartre tells us that

The self therefore represents an ideal distance within the immanence of the subject in relation to himself, a way of not being his own coincidence, of escaping identity while positing it as a unity.  

What the for-itself lacks is the self - or itself as in-itself.

...the ontological mirage of the Self.

The Kierkegaardian self, on the other hand, does not lack itself in the Sartrean sense because it is a triple synthesis of freedom/necessity, finitude/infinitude, and temporality/eternity which is grounded in the in-itself-for-itself (self) of God. The Kierkegaardian self as in-itself is that which overlaps in the nexus of the God-relation. Such Kierkegaardian selfhood is not grounded in human being, lest this self also disintegrate into an ontological mirage. The possibilities of nondeception and selfhood, for both Sartre and Kierkegaard, are not found within one's own ontology. For Kierkegaard, they are found in the relation to the Ground. For Sartre, if such a relation were possible, it would be found in this Ground-relation, i.e. in whatever would function ontologically as Ground (the god-ideal). Therefore, the being of the for-itself, in addition to being for-itself and for-others, has as a contingent ontological structure being-for-
addiction or being-addicted. The very structure of the for-itself as pursued ("by" being)-pursuing (being)\textsuperscript{116} is the ontological structure of addiction. Only by an ekstatic relation to a being that would constitute (ground) its own freedom could the transcendence of being-addicted transpire.

Regarding selfhood, Heidegger claims that "as 'human reality' is essentially its own possibility, this existent can 'choose' [Note the word "choose" here rather than "create."] itself in its being; it can win itself and it can lose itself."\textsuperscript{117} How can the Sartrean self "lose" itself if this self is an ontological mirage? How can the for-itself "lose" the self if the for-itself lacks the self? This is precisely what happens in addiction (the Sartrean love relation), since the lover in objectifying himself (the equivalent of failing to choose himself) alienates his own freedom.\textsuperscript{118} Addiction is a function of having no self. That is, one must "harness" one's own freedom, so to speak, through the reflective projection of oneself. Otherwise, one is indeterminate free being, that is, non-self. Sartre tells us in The Psychology of Imagination that in obsession, consciousness is a captivated victim of itself, yet "...Not for a moment does he [the obsessive person] mistake imaginary objects for real

\textsuperscript{116}\textit{Being and Nothingness}, 362.

\textsuperscript{117}\textit{Martin Heidegger, Sein und Zeit}, 41, as quoted in Jean-Paul Sartre, \textit{The Emotions}, 12.

\textsuperscript{118}See \textit{Being and Nothingness}, 375.
ones...Nevertheless, something has disappeared: the feeling of belonging to oneself..."  

This is a function of the fact that the addict has to mask from himself the project to-be-addicted, that is, the project to alienate his freedom from himself. This is also the effect of the love project. The Sartrean lover/addict cannot give himself away and so suffers from the loss of self and the loss of the possibility of giving that self away. Both projects (love/addiction) in the Sartrean world demand that one's freedom be alienated, otherwise the true nature of the projects would be reflectively conscious and signal (be at one with) the collapse of the project. Sartrean love beyond the metastable illusion is just as much a kind of bondage as is any other addiction, for both are rooted in the same ontological structure.

Love is not possible in the Sartrean world because love must be between two individual beings. Selfhood is an unrealizable ideal, therefore lovers pretend to give to one another a self that they do not have. I cannot possess myself, for I am not a self. I cannot possess the Other,
for the Other is not a self.\(^{122}\) Therefore, we must "pretend," and we can only pretend seriously as long as we tell ourselves that pretending is the only thing we can do. As long as we believe our own narration/metanarration, pretense is functional reality, the being of the phenomenon is appearance.\(^{123}\)

"A person who does not know himself cannot promise love out of a sincere faith."\(^{124}\) Exactly. The Sartrean lover promises love out of faith - but this faith is bad faith. The Sartrean lover knows that he is a lack, and he engages in the project of love to vitiate/"justify" this lack of being. He does not know himself as a positivity, but as a negativity (i.e. negation), his "self" having no content but the interrogative, the absence of being. The Sartrean pursuit of love intended to fill the cavity that is the ("self's") lack of being is the frenzy of addiction. Sincere faith is excluded.

\(^{122}\)I could not possess the Other even if the Other were a self. The goal of Sartrean love is therefore multiply unrealizable.

\(^{123}\)The being of the human phenomenon is nevertheless irreducible to the phenomenon of being, due to the transphenomenality of being. That is, all being exceeds any and all of its manifestations. [See Being and Nothingness, xlvii-li for Sartre's elucidation of his ontological position on this.] But being free and the pretense of being free are not synonymous, therefore the possibility of the conflation of the two necessary for the possibility of the deceptive/self-deceptive Sartrean love relation. The absence of selfhood may be discerned through a series of significations, one of which may be an experience of entrapment in the addictive love relation.

\(^{124}\)Works of Love, 150.
One does not focus on the seamier side: one is the seamier side. For Kierkegaard, selfhood is constituted through the Ground. For Sartre, selfhood is simply not constituted. This bleeding (free) cavity that is the Sartrean self can relate to being in no other way than by way of addiction. The Sartrean for-itself, be it the lover or no, is the addictive leech on being, that being which attempts to inject being into itself.  

"One must know oneself before knowing anything else."  

Sartrean type one love is necessarily a function of impure reflection. Since this is the case, the Sartrean lover has no self-knowledge in the sense of knowing his being as free being. Rather, he considers himself to be "determined" to be free as a function of the psychic objects which appear to his accessorially reflective gaze. The Sartrean project of love is predicated upon a lack of self-knowledge and is perpetuated as such on the same grounds, as is the project to-be-addicted.  

Love and addiction in the Sartrean world are predicated upon pre-occupation, a process of deflection whereby

---

125 An interesting conception of the intravenous addict's relationship to the needle whereby he "comes into being" (or, "comes alive").


127 Which, as I have been arguing, is the same thing. The project to-be-addicted simply has broader scope, as the project of love is a single mode of the project to-be-addicted.
consciousness induces in itself and the Other a somnambulistic stupor via hypnagogic imagery. As the possibility of a sleeper awaking is an ever present danger, the love/addiction relation is exceedingly precarious and generally involves desperate attempts directed toward its maintenance.\textsuperscript{128}

Kierkegaard maintains that the self is not a creation of itself but a choice of itself. He informs us that after God, the self is that which is most eternal.\textsuperscript{129} Kierkegaard also states that "Not until a self as this specific single individual is conscious of existing before God, not until then is it the infinite self."\textsuperscript{130} What this indicates, for Kierkegaard, is that the self is a synthesis of finitude/infinitude but that the self cannot tap into the infinitude of itself unless it relates itself to the Infinite. The Infinite allows the self to release and fully utilize that which is infinite in

\textsuperscript{128}Ortega y Gasset speaks of obsession in his fine series of lectures compiled in \textit{What is Philosophy?}, stating that obsession is evidenced in those individuals who try "to substitute for their own being another one." [Jose Ortega y Gasset, \textit{What is Philosophy?}, trans. Mildred Adams (New York: W.W. Norton, 1960), 252.] This overlaps Kierkegaard's notions of the desparer under the categories both of despair in weakness and despair in strength (the defiant desparer). See \textit{The Sickness Unto Death}, 49-74.

\textsuperscript{129}\textit{The Sickness Unto Death}, 53. This is a problematic claim, possibly analogous to that of "levels" of infinity. Yet the essence of the claim, that the self is eternal, remains unscathed and may be advanced (given the Kierkegaardian paradigm), sidestepping the issue of the genus of the eternality specified. An investigation into this issue would most likely prove quite fruitless and certainly would not be in keeping with the spirit of Kierkegaardian existentialism.

\textsuperscript{130}\textit{The Sickness Unto Death}, 80.
itself, that is, its freedom. The free release of freedom (infinitude) is contingent upon the substantiation/instantiation of the self in Freedom (Infinitude). Otherwise freedom, entangled, turns back upon itself, having no aim other than itself, and the self is being-addicted. In a draft of *The Sickness Unto Death*, Kierkegaard states that "To be a human being is to be a relation... a relation which is [reflectively and responsibly] for itself [for sig]."\(^{131}\) The way I read this is that the self becomes reflectively for itself subsequent to the phenomenological reduction, and responsibly for itself following the conversion. The self outside of the reduction/conversion is the addicted self, a self that cannot know itself because it cannot be a self, a self that necessarily thwarts its own freedom (infinitude) because it is ontologically nonsynchronous with its source.\(^{132}\) A proper relation to the Ground is essen-

\(^{131}\) *The Sickness Unto Death*, 143, 144.

\(^{132}\) Related to this is the notion of "reflective grief," which Kierkegaard deals with at length in *Either/Or*, vol. 2, 165-187. The sorrow that is reflective grief, says Kierkegaard, constantly and unsuccessfully seeks its "object." This is a function, as I see it, of missing one's self, and is the essence of addiction and Sartrean love. Another example of the absence of self is found in Kierkegaard's *Repetition*, p. 221: "I belong to the idea. When the idea calls, I abandon everything, or, more correctly, I have nothing to abandon." The speaker here is a young lover. The sentiment expressed could perhaps be more accurately rendered "I have no self to abandon, therefore, I abandon everything [all existential considerations] and lose 'myself' in the idea [hypnagogic image]." The subjectivity of the nonself is necessarily self-deceptive (love and addiction) and deceptive (love).
tial for the nonaddictive love relation. All nonaddictive love is grounded in the Eternal, says Kierkegaard, and therefore can never be coopted into a nonreflective project to-be-addicted. The relationship to the Ground is primary and must be the substratum for all other love relations, for only love itself can teach one what love is. Love involves hope because "Hope is the relationship to the eternal." Addictive love necessarily involves the absence of hope, as one is paralyzed in the face of love's imminent demise. The project of love (addiction) is the flight toward the Sartrean anti-value, a process whereby one strips oneself of one's own humanity, and flays one's freedom upon the stake of being. The ramifications of the perversion of freedom and value in addictive love (under the guise of love) course through one's being as a nauseating emetic. The introjected love project must be projected (vomited) into the world to disguise the anti-value in the form of value. Hence, the advent of the Sartrean love relation.

For Kierkegaard, one achieves a faith relation (relation of nondespair) with the Infinite through repetition. "Repeti-

---

133 See Works of Love, 27.


135 Works of Love, 122.

136 Works of Love, 118.

137 Works of Love, 237.

138 cf. Being and Nothingness, 611.
tion's love is the only happy love."¹³⁹ Such love would be Kierkegaardian or Sartrean type two love. Sartre envisages this type of love as the ideal unrealizable ideal, as noted previously. This type of love would be the result of reduction/conversion, a null set in the Sartrean world. The Sartrean reduction/conversion is equivalent to repetition for Kierkegaard, an existential condition in which bad faith is rooted out and the for-itself is free to pursue freedom as an end in itself. It "takes courage to will repetition"¹⁴⁰ because it is equivalent to the dispensing with the project to be one's own project. Both the Sartrean conversion and the Kierkegaardian notion of repetition involve acceptance of the limitations upon one's own freedom in the face of being, the difference being that in the Sartrean world the totality of being, as compared to the Kierkegaardian, is more circumscribed. Sartre realized that the conversion, within the confines of such a circumscription, was not possible, yet even in his last interview with Benny Levy he still sought the conversion as an ideal. For Kierkegaard, the self connects with the Eternal through repetition in such a way that the self itself becomes eternal. This claim, of course, is para-

¹³⁹Kierkegaard, Repetition, 131.
¹⁴⁰Repetition, 132.
doxa: "The proposition inaccessible to thought is: that one can become eternal although one was not such."\textsuperscript{141}

Sartre makes two claims in \textit{Being and Nothingness} that serve to forever impose certain strictures upon his ontology and disallow him from shifting toward Kierkegaard:

- Being is uncreated.\textsuperscript{142}
- Being is superfluous (\textit{de trop})...for eternity.\textsuperscript{143}

I wish to make but one observation here. If Sartre's major work is "an essay in phenomenological ontology," neither of the above claims can be advanced.\textsuperscript{144} For \textit{Being and Nothingness} must remain on the level of pure description, it must remain an elucidation of the contents of the experiential reality of the for-itself. Phenomenology is an essential description of being. Therefore, truth claims outside of the descriptive scope of the for-itself are a fundamental violation of the procedure expounded by Sartre himself. Both of the above ontological claims, then, are extramethodological and therefore cannot be legitimately advanced. Sartre wishes to make definitive truth claims here regarding both the past and

\textsuperscript{141}Concluding \textit{Unscientific Postscript}, 508. From a philosophical standpoint, I am not even going to begin to argue for this claim. It is simply a piece of Kierkegaardian dogma.

\textsuperscript{142}\textit{Being and Nothingness}, lxv.

\textsuperscript{143}\textit{Being and Nothingness}, lxvi.

\textsuperscript{144}This is in fact Barnes' translation of the subtitle of this very work, \textit{essai d'ontologie phenomenologique}. See \textit{L'être et le néant} (Paris: Gallimard, 1943).
the future. This seems clearly to be a fundamental violation of his own methodological protocol.

If Sartre were to refrain from describing what is in essence nondescriptive, he may find himself open to a wider range of ontological possibilities, possibilities which he himself would find admittedly more palatable. Sartre can envision such possibilities, but he fails to be able to explore them given his preexistent ontological mythology. The issue is central for the possibility of a nonaddictive love relation in the Sartrean world, and for the possibility of a nonaddicted for-itself. The experiences of anguish, nausea, revulsion, bondage, etc. Sartre describes well throughout the body of his works. These phenomenological findings serve as backward indicators to illuminate the preexistent ontological presuppositions laid down in the introduction of Being and Nothingness.

Put differently, cognitive presuppositions necessarily color the nature of one's perceived phenomenological reality.

---

145 Hence, the possible superfluity of nausea?

146 "Mythology": Methodologically nondemonstrable/extraparadigmatic. A myth may be true or false, or, possibly, have no truth value at all. It is simply the case that with mythology, knowledge of the truth value of the myth is outside the knower's epistemological scope.

147 These findings do not, however, demonstrate the fallaciousness of Sartre's presuppositions, that is, they in no way show (demonstrate, prove) that Kierkegaard is right. Sartre's findings are merely suggestive of other possibly valid ontological frameworks, and the urgency of the need to explore the same.
Phenomenology, then, cannot be a science based on primordial experience. It becomes, rather, a description of cognitively infested/presented/interpreted/discounted experiential data. Back to things in themselves? A retreat to the tree of life within the Garden? If and only if "reason" has its own immutable and distillable essence, separate from originary being-in-the-world. God was in his heaven no longer. Stalin was in the Soviet Union. Mussolini was in Italy. Hitler was in Germany - and in Poland. And in France. And the people needed to believe. Something.

Sartre sets love in opposition to God in his explication of his play "The Devil and the Good Lord: "[E]very love is in opposition to God..." Finally, Sartrean ontology denies both God and love in favor of another absolute - freedom. Yet Sartre sees freedom without love as de trop, and life becomes not only meaningless but nauseating. Why is Sartrean love in opposition to God? Because it sets itself up as the absolute, because, if God existed, as Kierkegaard has said,

---


149 This is in stark contrast with the view Camus' espouses in The Myth of Sisyphus, The Plague, The Rebel, A Happy Death, etc., that life is meaningless while also being invigorating, affirming, joyful. Camus has no conception of a reduction or a conversion because he sees no need of them. Sartre, however, forever cried out concerning their absolute necessity (and simultaneous impossibility).
absolutized love would be a form of "idolatry." Both Sartrean love and addiction are idolatrous because they seek to perform the ontological task of God and thus exist only as God-surrogates. The Sartrean lover seeks to be "the whole world" for the beloved, he seeks to become the absolute limit of the beloved's freedom and therefore "unsurpassable": "As the absolute limit of freedom, i.e. as the absolute source of all values, I am the absolute value." I am the absolute value. I am the absolute. I am. The project of the lover is the God project, the project to-be-addicted, the project to freely create an essence. The lover seeks to become the absolute value for the beloved: such is the unrealizable telos of Sartrean love and addiction. The object of addiction (love) becomes the absolute limit of freedom, hence one cannot get "outside" of it.

---

150 cf. Works of Love, 70. In Either/Or, vol. 1, Kierkegaard also notes that aesthetic love, as the object of ultimate concern, is equivalent to idolatry.

151 Being and Nothingness, 367.

152 Being and Nothingness, 369.

153 Echoing Yahweh to Moses; an unrealizable telos.

154 Note the obvious parallel to omnipresence and omnipotence, the classical attributes said to be a part of the essential nature of God. These would also be said by the addict to pertain to the object of addiction. The fork in the road comes when we toss in omnipotence, said to be an attribute of God but certainly not the addictive object.
In Sartrean love, I attempt to become the object of addiction for the Other.  

"I [as the lover] try to constitute myself as the necessary intermediary between the beloved and the world." I try to constitute myself as the addictive object, the necessary object, the indispensable object, that which is necessary for ontological fusion. Nevertheless, "essence is what has been." In Sartrean love and addiction, I try to be in the manner of an essence, trying, therefore, to be what I have been but am not. Thus, the successful project to-be-addicted (to-be-in-love) would be the death of the for-itself. Yet I seek life through the contradictory and self-disintegrating conduit of death, forging backward, as I am unable to meet my freedom ahead of me and so coincide with my being. "Reflective consciousness can be called a moral consciousness since it cannot arise without at the same moment disclosing values." Reflective awareness of the project of the self in both love and addiction, for Sartre, would entail the recognition of the anti-value

---

155 cf. Being and Nothingness, 369.
156 Being and Nothingness, 372.
157 "Fusion" in the sense of "overcoming" the fragmented diasporatic nature of the for-itself by reference to an "essence" (the lover).
158 Being and Nothingness, 35.
159 Being and Nothingness, 95. Underlining mine.
implicitly espoused as the telos of both projects.\textsuperscript{160} deBeauvoir has this to say concerning the issue:

By virtue of the fact that he refuses to recognize that he is freely establishing the value of the end he sets up, the serious man [as lover, addict, or both] makes himself the slave of that end.\textsuperscript{161}

For the lover (addict), the "object" of love (addiction) appears as the object of ultimate concern (absolute limit), and thus as a "necessary" choice (absolute choice; "fatalism"). In Sartrean love, as in addiction, one does not become more free in relation to the "object," but "less free."\textsuperscript{162}

Imagination is the mode of communication between Sartrean (addictive) lovers as well as the mode of communication the addict has with himself. Both addiction and love are projects of the imaginary rather than the real self.\textsuperscript{163} Since we cannot perceive and imagine simultaneously, our experience must flow from either the former (real self) or the latter (imaginary self).\textsuperscript{164} Love is a project of the real self,

\textsuperscript{160} cf. \textit{Being and Nothingness}, 611.

\textsuperscript{161} \textit{The Ethics of Ambiguity}, 48.

\textsuperscript{162} Phenomenologically speaking. I am arguing against this notion in any ontological sense. Like Sartre's description of the experience of \textit{mitsein} in \textit{Being and Nothingness}, the experience of "loss of freedom" is psychological in nature. I make the psychological/ontological distinction as Sartre does in \textit{Being and Nothingness}, and as Kierkegaard does in \textit{The Sickness Unto Death}, the latter when explaining the relationship between consciousness and despair. The distinction is both crucial and problematic.


\textsuperscript{164} cf. \textit{Being and Nothingness}, 257, 258, 600.
addiction (Sartrean love) is a project of the imaginary self. Just as imagination and perception are mutually exclusive, so are love and addiction. Sartrean consciousness is constructed such that the dynamics of both love and addiction cannot coexist, therefore love and addiction necessarily exclude each other, as do perception and imagination. "So the structure of an affective consciousness of desire is already that of imaginary consciousness."\(^{165}\) The desire for being that (through the green fuse)\(^ {166}\) drives the flower of Sartrean love and addiction is an affective consciousness of desire for the object of addiction (love), thereby negating perception, encapsulating consciousness in its own hermetically sealed hypnagogic vacuum. "But if we form a second consciousness, or a reflective consciousness, on top of this imaginary consciousness, a second kind of belief appears: the belief in the existence of the image."\(^ {167}\) This means that the "reflective katharsis" operative in imaginary consciousness is effected only within the confines of imaginary consciousness itself. Hence, a captivated consciousness (as in the case of imaginary consciousness), effects the katharsis (reduction) as a matter of fallacious belief rather than as an effectual purifying

\(^{165}\)The Psychology of Imagination, 102.


\(^{167}\)The Psychology of Imagination, 125.
reflection. This game of mirrors operative in Sartrean love and addiction allows for imaginary reflectivity, which is simply another cul-de-sac in Sartrean self-consciousness. This being the case, the problematic of self-deception in Sartre is closely aligned with that of Descartes in his Meditations. Cognition becomes the handmaiden of affectivity. This means that in Sartrean love as in all addictions, the "truth" of imaginary consciousness (as is also the case with emotional consciousness) is a function of affect, not reflective intentional perception of the world. Affect is a necessary distortion of reflective phenomenological relations with the world. "Everything is symbol; I myself am a myth about myself;" a poignant statement of the relation the Sartrean lover has with his being-in-love or the addict has with his being-addicted. For if I were not a myth about myself, I would be nothing at all.

The mythology imaginary consciousness proffers itself in bad faith is intended to fill the nothingness it is in relation to itself and so suppress its own anguish. Yet how can I suppress that which I am? I become (am) an imaginary

**168** That is, how does one know if one is (self) deceived? Due to the insular structure of Sartrean imaginary consciousness (exclusionary of perception) and the attendant "warping" of thought, this question becomes of utmost importance.

**169** cf. The Psychology of Imagination, 129.

**170** See The Emotions: Outline of a Theory, 58ff.

**171** Either/Or, vol. 1, 439.
self; I become (am) an addict (Sartrean lover). "The idea [a function of imaginary consciousness] is the life principle in erotic [in this case, Sartrean] love and, if necessary, one must sacrifice life [freedom, consciousness] for it [the hypnagogic lie] and even erotic love itself."\(^{172}\) Camus has said that an idealist is one who will kill for an idea.\(^{173}\) The Sartrean lover is an idealist (forever forging toward the mythic noncontingent being) who will kill his own love (self) for the sake of the idea of the meaning of that love. The addict is the idealist who will kill his self for the nonreflective ideal addiction represents. The addict (re)presents this ideal to himself (imagination), and believes in his own representation (faith).

In *Either/Or*, vol. 1, we see that imagination is the real mode of communication between Cordelia and Johannes, the two "lovers" chronologized in *The Diary of the Seducer*.\(^{174}\) This is quite consistent with any analysis of aesthetic erotic love, and is in accord with Sartre's description of imaginary consciousness in *The Psychology of Imagination*: the object of love (addiction) is the hypnagogic image, which negates perception by its very existence. It could not be otherwise, for love (addiction) here is a fiction based on the project of

\(^{172}\) *Repetition*, 140. Thus, the metastability, triple destructibility, and perpetual insecurity of Sartrean love.


\(^{174}\) *Either/Or*, 297-440.
the false self. Given analysis, the similarity should not be unexpected at all, as the Sartrean lover induces in himself imaginary consciousness (autohypnosis) which gives rise to the mysticism of hypnagogic imagery, merely a subset of the parallel case of the broader spectrum of other addictive relations.

Sartrean love is a despairing love, a love that is perpetually insecure and forever precarious. Despairing love is addiction. Such despairing love is evidenced in Donna Elvira's relation to Don Juan: nothing earthly or heavenly has any significance for her except Don Juan, and from the very beginning she is in despair. Such is the case in Sartrean love, as the lover "becomes" the "whole world" for the beloved, and there is nothing beyond the world; the loss of the lover is the loss of the world, i.e. affective and effective death. The lover seeks to induce despair in the beloved, that is, being-addicted. In this way, the beloved is bonded to the lover through an act of affective treason.

Kierkegaard tells us in Works of Love that "Spontaneous love is in despair because the lover relates himself with infinite passion to a single individual, but with infinite passion one can relate onself - if one is not in despair -

---


176See Either/Or, vol. 1, 189.
only to the Eternal." Spontaneous love is despairing love; such despair is the equivalent of the ontology of the addict. Despair, we may recall, is an ontological disrelation in one's inmost being. For Kierkegaard, a man despairs because he lacks the Eternal. The "Eternal" in Kierkegaard is the functional equivalent of Sartre's in-itself-for-itself, which is the unrealizable telos of Sartrean love. Therefore, the unrealizable telos of addictive, despairing Sartrean love is nonaddictive nondespairing love, which is contingent upon the "creation" of the in-itself-for-itself. Why does one relate with infinite passion and thus induce disrelation/despair? Because freedom is infinite. The "stuff" of my project that is me is my freedom and only my freedom.

For Kierkegaard, love must be consciously grounded in the Eternal to eradicate despair, but love cannot be grounded in an unrealizable and so disintegrates into addiction. Put

---

177 Works of Love, 56.

178 Why is the unrealizable telos of Sartrean love the Kierkegaardian Eternal? Because Sartre fully recognizes the necessary and sufficient conditions for the possibility of a nondespairing self. The nondespairing self is the nonaddicted self, that is, the self that is capable of loving. For even the addicted lover has as her unrealizable goal nonaddicted love. Despair is the discrepancy between the former and the latter; cognizance of the discrepancy generates a new level of despair in which a certain level of translucency is operative with regard to one's being.

179 Project-ion cannot be partialized short of ontological schizophrenia, which is the Sartrean lover/addict attempting to derealize via imaginary consciousness his own despair.
differently, the Sartrean project of love is a disintegrative project of addiction.\(^{180}\)

"Doubt is a despair of thought, despair is a doubt of the personality."\(^{181}\) Despair is ontological, not psychological. It has significance in that it is indicative of something other than itself (being-addicted). The Absolute is apprehended not through doubt, but despair, because despair is ontological, as is knowledge. Despair is the starting point for choosing oneself; choosing oneself is the starting point for knowing.\(^{182}\) The Sartrean lover (addict) seeks to hide from his own anguish and so suppress the despair that he is. Sartrean love and addiction function as the anti-value, leading one away from the truth of the self (despair) which could lead to the proper (nontruncated) utilization of one's own freedom - the condition of the nondespairing self. "Every man who has not tasted the bitterness of despair has missed the significance of life."\(^{183}\) Without despair, the for-itself lacks the impetus to effect the purifying reflection (katharsis) upon itself, to say nothing of conversion, for which the former is requisite. Life truly does begin on the

\(^{180}\)See Works of Love, 46.


\(^{182}\)Echoing Paracelsus: "He who knows nothing, loves nothing...The more knowledge is inherent in a thing, the greater the love...." Found in Erich Fromm's The Art of Loving, xxiii.

\(^{183}\)Either/Or, vol. 2, 212.
other side of despair. Yet the flight that is the Sartrean project of love/addiction is a flight from self that disallows sufficient knowledge of oneself for the cognizance of one's own despair, thus precluding the possibility of the realization of this "other side." "The Jordan river is chilly and cold/It chills the body but not the soul." Love/addiction: the amulet worn in flight to ward off the "evil" of despair. Soon, Draconian measures are necessary due to the habituation (developed tolerance) of the addicted for-itself.


Jordan river: the promised land, conversion, the ideal unrealizable ideal.

Even if I kill the Other, says Sartre, there is no way that I can get away from my being-for-others, which still exists as a result of the fact that the Other existed, and exists now (as a nothingness). My suggestion is that, in the for-itself's codependent attempt to utilize the being of the Other (or the object of addiction) to flee his own despair, he becomes inextricably intertwined with that other being. Sartre is well aware of this, as is Sade: "I am alone here, I am at the world's end, withheld from every gaze [the Sartrean look, whereby I am objectified by the Other and realize my being-for-others], here no one can reach me; no limits, hence no barriers, I AM FREE." [Marquis de Sade, The 120 Days of Sodom and Other Writings, trans. Austryn Wainhouse and Richard Seaver (New York: Grove Press, 1987), 412.] Better yet might be Austryn's Wainhouse's superb gloss on the philosophy of Sade, which could quite directly also be said of Being and Nothingness: "'The supreme good consists in living independent of others' [thus, no drain hole, no crack, no bleeding of the world toward the Other, no guilt following my original upsurge in a world where there are others, no invisible flight, no fixed sliding of the whole universe, no decentralization of the world, no internal hemorrhaging. See Being and Nothingness, 255-257]; that being out of the question, one had to be clever [deceptive], supple [able to appear as subject or (continued...)}
"What the lover is demanding he expresses by the awkward and vitiated phrases of 'fatalism.'"\(^{187}\) The Sartrean lover seeks to induce in the beloved the fatalism of imaginary consciousness, the nonreflective dream state of the addict. The beloved's being-in-the-world must be a "being-as-loving" - an ontologically "determined" (nonfree) condition. This must be a free determination of being that subsequently ceases to be within the realm of freely determined being - an impossibility. It would be being that has (been) chosen to be determined "forever", irrevocably (thus, security).\(^{188}\) The lover seeks to induce dependency in the Other in order to... continue

\(^{186}\)(...)continued) object, depending upon the particular ruse de jour] in order to live with them." [Writers in Revolt, ed. by Terry Southern, Richard Seaver, and Alexander Trocchi (New York: Berkley, 1963), 58.] For Sade, "Solitude is power" - just as is the case for Sartre [See Albert Camus, The Rebel, 248], a power (freedom) without warrant, without justification, and without purpose. Within the Sartrean paradigm, the conclusion, therefore, is as follows: "I AM FREE, THEREFORE, I VOMIT." This may appear absurd, but it is not humorous. Incongruity can be just as much a source of pain as pleasure. Erotic love thus degenerates into "the mute nausea of my passion." [Kierkegaard, Repetition, 204.] Passion becomes engulfed in the juxtaposition of its necessity (for man is the passion to be God) and its own superfluity. The aim is not lacking, as Nietzsche says in The Genealogy of Morals. What is lacking is the reason for the aim (operative, of course, in Sartrean love and addiction). Again, a question for philosophers. Or is it? What do philosophers know about themselves? Or anything else, for that matter? Despair expropriates the purview of the pusillanimous.

\(^{187}\)Being and Nothingness, 370.

\(^{188}\)The necessity of deception and self-deception in this process is readily evident, for how could one freely determine one's being? Being is either free or determined but not freely determined.
create the lover's own necessity. This ontological dependency on the love-object is the addictive relation. The telos of love and addiction is "freedom's self-enslavement." The beloved's freedom runs aground upon the ubiquitous shore of the lover, the endless shore from which one never again shall set sail.

The induced/self-induced hypnagogic imagery at the center of the addictive relation can be characterized in the following ways: imprisoned consciousness, modification of attention, bondage, fascination, condition of paralysis, enchantment, nervousness, willing bondage, captive, possession. All these are terms Sartre utilizes in *The Psychology of Imagination*, all the while making no reference to addiction. Sartre tells us that "these are forms that possess the power to deceive consciousness endlessly," strikingly indicating the escape from freedom at the root of the project of such self-induced hypnagogic imagery operative in Sartrean love and in all addictions. The Sartrean lover seeks the "alienated freedom" of the Other, a desperate attempt which leads only to

---

189 See *Being and Nothingness*, 403.

190 That is, until the deception (love) is over. Ontological lucidity is a necessary but insufficient condition for the possibility of a nonaddictive love relation, as delineated previously in part one, section B of the present chapter.

191 These terms are introduced in the text between pages 59-101.

the lover's own self-alienation of his freedom.\textsuperscript{193} The only possible way the lover can hope to recapture his alienated freedom is through the ontological flue vent of the Other, since it is the Other that "possesses" this alienated freedom, and it is the Other that makes this "possession" evident (in the look).\textsuperscript{194}

The dependency experienced in Sartrean love and addiction is an ontological mirage: "There is no situation in which the for-itself would be more free than in others."\textsuperscript{195} Of course, for the addict to know this would be for the addict to "wake up" to the project. Therefore, the addict as addict never experiences this reality, but is left to struggle in the realm of imaginary consciousness. Kierkegaard does not eschew dependence, but relegates it to one's relation with the

\textsuperscript{193}This occurs as the lover seeks objectivity before the look of the beloved. See \textit{Being and Nothingness}, 375.

\textsuperscript{194}This is why addictive love is only a degeneration on the first level, since the "bartering" ("exchange") is still in kind (freedom for freedom - as an ideal). Addictions which do not involve two freedoms - noninterpersonal addictions such as alcoholism, nicotine addiction, food addiction, cocaine addiction, etc. - are degenerative addictions of the second level, because they do not even seek in the object of addiction freedom as an unrealizable ideal. Sartrean addictive love is a failure in principle; noninterpersonal addictions are double failures in principle, for, in the latter, addicts have even given up hope of coopting free being, but instead have directly sought the in-itself qua in-itself.

\textsuperscript{195}\textit{Being and Nothingness}, 549.
Such dependence, for Kierkegaard, is true independence. Independence, then, is only through the conduit of another, but this other must be ontologically categorically different from oneself.

de Beauvoir's ideal of love, working from within a Sartrean ontological framework, maintains that love should not involve the expropriation of the Other: "Love is the renunciation of all possession, of all confusion." de Beauvoir's ideal is in accord with those of Kierkegaard and Sartre, but remains unrealizable within the Sartrean paradigm. Love based on the telos of possession is rooted in confusion and is addiction. Either possession/confusion and addiction, or love based on the absence of both possession and confusion. An attempt to imbibe/ingest freedom/being is ipso facto addiction and precludes the possibility of love due to its inherent constellation of metastability/deception/self-deception/expropriation.

In *The Second Sex* Simone de Beauvoir says that

Genuine love *ought* to be founded on mutual recognition of two liberties; the lovers *would then* experience themselves both as self and as other; nei-

---


197 *viz.*, independence, for Kierkegaard, can *never* be achieved through a temporal love relation with another, or through a lack thereof.

198 At least, according to her reckoning.

199 *The Ethics of Ambiguity*, 67.
ther would give up transcendence, neither would be mutilated; together they would manifest values and aims in the world. For the one and the other, love would be a revelation of self by the gift of self and enrichment of the world.⁰²⁰

Note the imperative/hypothetical/subjunctive voice. For the Sartrean addictive lover, love is not and cannot be founded on the recognition of two liberties. Therefore, the lovers do not experience themselves both as self and as other, but rather experience a partialization and denial of self and other. The lover and beloved feign the giving up of transcendence even before the gaze of the self. If they could manifest values and aims in the world, there would be telic (not ontological) fusion. Sartrean addictive love is predicated upon ontological fusion. It is neither a revelation of self by the gift of self or an enrichment of the world, but an ongoing impoverishment of the world through self-denial and the attempted enslavement of the Other. Since type two love is made impossible by Sartrean ontology, these conditions obtain in every expression of Sartrean love. What both Sartre and de Beauvoir want, obviously, is the realization of type two love. Can one desire what one cannot have? Most assuredly. Can one be mistaken about that which is unrealizable? This amounts to asking and answering the Kantian question "What can one know?" in a specific manner. Regardless, the

---

possibility of an affirmative answer exists, since it is ruled out neither in fact or in theory.

At this point, it becomes necessary to look briefly at the issue of the meaning and value of freedom in Sartre, since Sartrean love and addiction both involve a flight from the same. It is commonly held by commentators that Sartre takes freedom as the ultimate value, since he designates it as the source of all value. There is ample textual support for such a view of Sartre's writings. Love as an addiction runs counter to this very ideal, and, therefore, is open to excoriolation by Sartre himself. From the plethora of references as to the meaning and value of freedom in Sartre, I wish to replicate but a few, in concert with congruous references on the same topic from the works of de Beauvoir (all underlining mine):

One may choose anything if it is on the grounds of free involvement.  

I can take freedom as a goal only if I take that of others as goal as well [not the case with Sartrean love]. As soon as there is involvement [concrete relations with others], I am obliged [why is this?] to want others to have freedom at the same time that I want my own freedom [I am obliged to want the ideal unrealizable ideal?].

---

201 Jean-Paul Sartre, Existentialism and Human Emotions, trans. by Hazel Barnes and Bernard Frechtman (New York: Philosophical Library, 1956), 48. On this ground, Sartrean love and addiction are excluded from the set of legitimate ends.

202 Existentialism and Human Emotions, 46.
The one thing that counts in ethics is knowing whether the inventing was done in the name of freedom [contra addiction and Sartrean love].

...human freedom is the ultimate, the unique end to which man should destine himself [therefore, Sartrean addictive love is negated].

An end is valid only by a return to the freedom which established it and which willed itself through this end...freedom is not to be engulfed in any goal [freedom, however, is engulfed in the Sartrean projects of love and addiction].

To will oneself free is also to will others free [Sartrean love and addiction are therefore jettisoned].

We have to respect freedom only when it is intended for freedom. A freedom which is interested only in denying freedom must be denied [On such grounds, Sartrean love and addiction must again be denied].

The supreme end at which man must aim is his freedom, which alone is capable of establishing the value of every end [love/addiction are illegitimate ends].

Man is free but he finds his law in his very freedom.

---

203 Existentialism and Human Emotions, 47.
204 The Ethics of Ambiguity, 48, 49.
205 The Ethics of Ambiguity, 70.
206 The Ethics of Ambiguity, 73.
207 The Ethics of Ambiguity, 90, 91.
208 The Ethics of Ambiguity, 113.
209 The Ethics of Ambiguity, 156.
The unrealizable goal of both Sartrean love and addiction, as readily seen by this time, is "freedom's self enslavement."\textsuperscript{210} Since it has already been shown that addiction and Sartrean love both involve a flight from freedom - in fact, that they are this flight, we can utilize the above passages to see clearly that even within the Sartrean ontological framework,\textsuperscript{211} addictive love is still illegitimate.\textsuperscript{212} For if freedom is denied within the Sartrean framework, there is no hope of constituting oneself as a valid project, since freedom is the only possible source of validity.\textsuperscript{213} Thus the preservation and sanctification of freedom is crucial in the Sartrean world. This is also, of course, true for Kierkegaard (but in a different sense), for without freedom, there would be no self and no God. Freedom, for Kierkegaard, is an essential ideal and value, yet not the only ideal or value, nor the only potential source of value.\textsuperscript{214} Kierkegaard values freedom so highly that for him "Every human being's essential destiny is to become free, independent, to become

\textsuperscript{210}\textit{Being and Nothingness}, 404. See also \textit{The Concept of Anxiety} and \textit{The Sickness Unto Death} on this dynamic.

\textsuperscript{211}Not to mention that of Kierkegaard, who censors such freedom negation in an even more categorical and forceful way.

\textsuperscript{212}Yet, as we have seen, it is the only ontologically possible love-fare for Sartre.

\textsuperscript{213}validity = meaning, value, self-constitution, nonaddic tedness.

\textsuperscript{214}What one means by this depends on what one means by freedom.
himself."\(^{215}\) Yet all is not decided within a vacuum of freedom for "If the eternal is not, there is neither truth nor freedom."\(^{216}\) This is the same as saying that without the eternal there is no nonaddictive love. For Kierkegaard, as well as for Sartre and de Beauvoir, the in-itself-for-itself is the necessary precondition for the possibility of a nonaddictive love relation,\(^{217}\) but for the latter two thinkers, the in-itself-for-itself is an ideal unrealizable ideal.

Love and addiction, we have noted, are both for Sartre unrealizable ideals.\(^{218}\) The unrealizable ideal of love must be separated from the concrete praxis of love, says Sartre: "This unrealizable ideal which haunts my project of myself in the presence of the Other is not to be identified with love

---

\(^{215}\) Works of Love, 259.

\(^{216}\) The Concept of Anxiety (draft), 206. See also p. 207.

\(^{217}\) Jean Grenier succinctly expresses what I take to be the Kierkegaardian view: "...absolute freedom is the destruction of all value [the Sartrean framework], absolute value suppresses all freedom [the Hegelian framework]." The quote is found in Camus' The Rebel, 288. Kierkegaard's own position is represented between the two (Sartrean-Hegelian) poles. Nietzsche provides us with an interesting gloss of the issue, quite applicable to the discussion: "...Hence a philosopher should claim the right to include willing within the sphere of morals [axiology, values]...the desire for 'freedom of the will' INVOLVES NOTHING LESS THAN TO BE PRECISELY CAUSA SUI. [Beyond Good and Evil, 27-28.] But from Nietzsche's perspective, Sartre is dead wrong. For Nietzsche, "freedom as the ultimate value" is a ridiculous perversion of the eternal recurrence wherein freedom is an ephemeral illusion engulfed in the necessity of all things. Kierkegaard would again fall in between the two thinkers on this second, Sartrean-Nietzschean spectrum.

\(^{218}\) See Being and Nothingness, 365-366.
insofar as love is an enterprise... But it is the ideal of
love." The enterprise of Sartrean love and addiction,
ostensibly, is exclusive of the god project, viz. its meta-
physical underpinnings are not nonreflectively apprehensible
(visible). Sartre's statement merely highlights the irremedi-
able gulf between what I do in the love (addiction) relation
and what I think I do (on a number of levels, dependent upon
the depth of bad faith). His statement serves to underscore
the necessity of deception/self-deception in any Sartrean love
relation. The concrete enterprise differs from the ideal
enterprise because in the former there is no (reflective)
consciousness of the unrealizable ideal.220

Kierkegaard tells us that

All idealizing passion (Earthly passion tends to
prevent existence by transforming it into something
merely momentary) is anticipation of the Eternal in
existence, functioning so as to help the individual
to exist.221

In saying this, Kierkegaard sets up a passion dichotomy that
could be linked to Sartre's conception of love. Kierkegaard
delineates two kinds of passion: (A) The real ("earthly") and
(B) The ideal ("idealizing"). (A) could be said to be the

---

219 Being and Nothingness, 366.

220 cf. Being and Nothingness, 90. There is no conscious-
ness of the unrealizable ideal prior to reduction/conversion,
which would entail the death of Sartrean type two love.
Therefore, for the Sartrean lover engaging in the enterprise
of loving, there is no consciousness of the unrealizable
ideal.

221 Concluding Unscientific Postscript, 277.
concrete enterprise of love in Sartre, with its attendant passion, whereas (B) would then be the unrealizable ideal of the love project. The Sartrean unrealizable ideal functions as a constant ontological substratum, in relation to which the concrete manifestation of love is only fleeting and contingent. Such is likewise the case with the project to-be-addicted, which is identical in form to the Sartrean love project but may or may not be identical in content. Idealizing passion, says Kierkegaard, helps the individual to exist; idealizing passion in Sartre simply helps the individual (addict) to flee existence toward being. Idealizing passion linked to the Ideal does not volatize existence but rather makes it possible. The passionate Sartrean is relegated to cynicism and the abortion of passion as an ideal. The passionate Kierkegaardian creates within the boundaries of a formally but not materially constituted universe. The passionate Sartrean creates with a backdrop of naught but the abyss of freedom.  

"The one thing that it is impossible to become is to become necessary, because the necessary is always presupposed

222 Camus made a point quite relevant in this regard in The Rebel: "Artistic creation is a demand for unity and a rejection of the world...rebellion can be observed here in its pure state." [p. 253.] The artist as the addict; the addict as the rebel. An attempt to create a universe in which there is subject-object unity on some level. The inexorable and insatiable desire in the heart of the artist/rebel/addict for this unity, experienced as an ontological necessity. (Hence the "necessary" tone of the contingent ontology espoused in Being and Nothingness.)
as being." On this point, Kierkegaard and Sartre are forever in agreement. Yet, for Sartre, love is an enterprise of becoming necessary for the Other, an enterprise of becoming the Other's addictive object, the goal of such impossible necessity being "salvation." As Constantin Constantius said of the young lover in Repetition, so we can say of the Sartrean lover: "I am completely convinced that he does not know the girl at all...she is the girl, - period." For the Sartrean lover, the beloved is merely of value as a symbol (conduit, conductor, circuit, transformer) for the potential recovery of being. Therefore, "necessity," "salvation." The love object is the object of addiction for the lover, as the lover seeks to become the object of addiction for the beloved. "Salvation" predicated upon addiction is a necessary failure. Since Sartre was tacitly well aware of this, his thought contains another, positive notion of salvation which negates addiction and type one love. This conception of salvation is already employed in Being and Nothingness when Sartre makes clear that existential psychoanalysis, as he delineates it, "may function as a means of deliverance and salvation." This type of salvation would entail the dispensing with

---

223 Concluding Unscientific Postscript, 90. Underlining mine.
224 cf. Being and Nothingness, 371.
225 Repetition, 185.
226 Being and Nothingness, 627.
addictive love relations and would allow for type two love. As de Beauvoir says:

An authentic love should assume the contingence of the other; that is to say his lacks, his limitations, and his basic gratuitousness. It would not pretend to be a mode of salvation [as type one love does], but a basic human interaction.227

This type of love relation is not available to the unconverted for-itself, and conversion is not possible in the Sartrean world. All love in the Sartrean world is a variation on the basic theme of addiction, a bid for salvation, a bid for necessity, a bid for cosmic significance, nonsuperfluous. de Beauvoir writes of salvation in The Ethics of Ambiguity:

Existentialist ethics [made possible after the reduction and conversion] appears [appears, yes, and is, finally, only mere appearance] as the only proposition of salvation which one can address to men [viz. the only proposition of salvation is the refusal of salvation]...If it came to be that each man did what he must [that is, give up the perfidious quest for salvation, made possible only after reduction/conversion. Each man must give this up in order to be a man], existence would be saved [but certainly not from contingency, or from the possibly mistaken belief that existence could be anything other than contingent] in each one without there being any need of dreaming of a paradise where all would be reconciled in death [a good thing too, since the assumption of basic superfluousness is a condition for this type of salvation].228

Sartre and de Beauvoir both want "salvation." The ideal unrealizable ideal would be salvation-as-ontological-justification. Since this is not possible short of reduc-

---

227 The Second Sex, 654. Underlining mine.

228 The Ethics of Ambiguity, 159.
tion/conversion and reduction/conversion, for them, is not possible, they chose an "inferior" (even by their own reckoning) form of salvation: salvation-as-the-repudiation-of-the-attempt-at-ontological-justification, an inverse notion of the preceding account of salvation. This, of course, isn't salvation at all in any traditional sense of the word, but an acquiescence in the face of a superfluous, meaningless existence.\(^{229}\) The problem is that even this inferior notion of salvation cannot be possibilized in the Sartrean world because the reduction/conversion is not possible. Because the reduction/conversion is impossible, the for-itself's pursuit of being is inexorable, inexpungable. Therefore, salvation in both senses is excluded from the Sartrean world. One cannot be an authentic lover in the Sartrean world, and one is either a lover or an addict. The Sartrean for-itself, as such, is the addict. The Sartrean for-itself will always be the addict as long as, according to Sartre, "being is superfluous (de trop) for eternity,"\(^{230}\) and, ontologically, the for-itself balks and chafes at this. And this is all the for-itself can do, for the for-itself is this balking and chafing at the superfluity of being. The essence of the for-itself is either to-be-nauseated or to-be-(self)deceived (or both). In the latter as in the former, the for-itself is being-addicted.

\(^{229}\)Thus, the greater the degree of acquiescence, the greater the degree of "salvation."

\(^{230}\)Being and Nothingness, lxvi.
There is no love in the Sartrean world, but only variations on the theme of addiction. In fact, it is the reality of the absence of the former that is the genesis of the reality of the latter. This is descriptive, phenomenological analysis. Either love or addiction. For Kierkegaard, both are ontological possibilities. For Sartre, addiction alone is the grievous alpha and omega of ontological possibility.
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