

Level 4+ Exemplar of Analysis

Claim 1: Human beings live in anguish because they always have freedom even if they don't want it.

Supporting Details:

- Humans will have to be responsible for their every actions even if they don't want to be responsible for it
- They will have to make choices, and even not making a choice is also a choice
- Objects have to have an "essence" to it to make it what it is
- However, humans don't have this "essence," there is nothing that makes one what they are, no human nature that fixes what humans are
- What humans choose as their purpose in life is their own choice, making everyone unique and nothing is fixed

My Judgement

I agree with Jean-Paul Satre in some ways and also disagree in others. It is true that humans will sometimes be responsible for their actions, since they are forced to be free. However, humans don't always have freedom; there are slaves everywhere in this world, how people are wanting freedom but not getting it, opposite of what some other people are, having the freedom but not wanting it. True, one may argue that the people are thinking they are not free which leads to them not being free. Nevertheless, it is still reaching the point of slavery even if it takes a while to. There is still slavery going on and nobody always has freedom. On the other hand, Satre's other points on having an "essence" are some that agree on. Humans do get to make choices and choose what their purpose in life is. Say, even if someone commits suicide or has no purpose, they still have one because they chose to do that, creating a purpose for them.

Claim 2: Existentialism is a humanism (existence precedes essence)

Supporting Details:

- One does something that creates themselves; doing something that one does creates their own characteristics and person
- It makes one itself
- What people do is what they think the world should do
- For example, if a person wears Nike, according to Satre, that person thinks everyone should wear Nike

My Judgement

One doing something that creates itself is something that I can understand and agree on. However, someone doing something means they think that the world should do this is a point I disagree on. What if one only did that to satisfy what the world thinks they should do,

but actually hating to do it. Take for instance: during the 19th and 20th century, women couldn't have short hair; it is what the society thinks they should do. A woman has long hair but doesn't think the world should have it debunks how Satre thinks about a person. Sometimes people are doing things they don't like to just be part of society.

Claim 3: Life doesn't have any meaning at all until we give it meaning by making choices, and then before too long death comes and removes all the meaning that we can give it.

Supporting details:

- Satre describes people as a useless passion that there is no point in people's existence
- Only the meaning people create through their choices gives us some purpose in life
- Sometimes people do stuff that doesn't really explain any answers, but they don't commit suicide or anything
- It is because that gives them something to do, a meaning in life, a purpose in life

My Judgement

I guess I agree in this although I have to say that Satre kind of contradicted himself to say that everyone makes choices to have their purpose in life but in this claim he sort of said that people don't really have purpose. Although he did say that people's choices gives them a meaning in life, he still contradicted himself by trying to debunk his own statement.