



A STATE AND THE CONDITION OF LIFE PHENOMENA

Daro Pin¹, Dieu Thach²

Nikrothawan Temple, Kohkrabei Village Preakthmay Subdistrict, Chabaampov
District, Phnom Penh,¹
Cambodia¹
Wat Arunraingsey (Chak Ñkrong) Mongoli, Travinh Province²
Vietnam²

Email: dpin25593@gmail.com, thachdieu98@gmail.com²

Received: January 31, 2023; **Revised:** April 30, 2023; **Accepted:** May 31, 2023

Abstract

This article aimed to study “A state and Condition of Life Phenomena” and found that humans were living beings that existed and existed in the world. There was a constant flow, which was the result of inherent nature, namely liberty, consciousness, intuition, and intellect, living within the framework of culture, society and law without any misrepresentation. At the level of thought and action was called responsibility. With courage and honesty so that human beings could create value and live on their own by facing nature with consciousness, intelligence and freedom to accept or to reject things as they really were by their own existence and well-being until able to live independently in the midst of a society and environment full of conflict and uncertainty by believing in yourself and responsibility for what they did as part of the human ideal of recognizing the inherent human freedom.

Keywords: Existentialism; a condition or condition; Life phenomenon

Introduction

The condition or condition of life phenomena that human beings sought for the truth of life to eliminate the hassle and noted that "State" emphasized the description of man, i.e., “human existence” in describing man rather than



"essence" in the history of Western philosophy such as Greek and medieval philosophy. Explaining human beings through their essence (substance) according to the truth became difficult for us to deny. Just as existentialist philosophers put the human being before the essence, like Sartre, the existentialist philosopher, saw existentialism as a human philosophy. By humans and for humans, this meant that existentialism and humanity were the same thing. Existential was equal to realizing humanity where existentialism was the starting point of philosophy that emphasized "existence precedes essence" (Jean-Paul Sartre, 2007, pp.18-20) because the existence was considered the beginning of human beings when human beings became aware of their own existence (self-consciousness) and being here did not mean just being alive, it meant living with awareness of the condition or condition of human beings that were different from plants and animals, which were also living beings, but were not as conscious as human beings. By reasons plants like objects were unconscious, i.e., all material things only existed but mankind existed for itself (being for itself) because human existence was different from material existence" (Jostein Gorder, 2010, p. 463).

Because human beings existed, they could realize their identity. Human beings were not only objects that existed but human beings could realize it by themselves. It was also what he intended for himself to be only after having existed being human. We were not human just because we thought we were or were told we were. But because we existed with self-awareness and had acted according to our intentions, we existed as human beings.

The condition or condition as existentialism was likened to humanism that valued the living conditions of human beings. Whether it was valuable or worthless, it was depended on the action arising from the freedom of self-determination in seeking the truth that was a phenomenon of life. We would find that the truth that we could find through sensory experience to reach the highest truth, such as the truth with a universal character (universality) was objective (objectivity) or even a state of urgency (transcendence) that was the beginning of the search for truth in metaphysics before moving on to controversies such as ethics and politics. As part of learning the phenomenon of life tried to find the truth but in fact, "The world in front of me" (immanence) had not transcended experience to the world of forms or even gods which was the highest truth that confirmed the world appearing in anyway. The search for

truth rested on “experience”, in this sense phenomenology. Phenomenology focused on finding truth in phenomena (phenomena), a philosophical approach aimed at studying the inner structure of consciousness and essence of animals. The study of phenomenology in a way allowed us to understand philosophy on a continuous and significant basis.

Therefore, this article aimed to study “Life Phenomenon” existed at a state or an existential state or a phenomenological life state. Man as a living being and analytical synopsis reasonably that humans had brought emptiness to themselves and the world and could create themselves which placed importance on the ability to realize oneself and the surroundings that enabled humans to have complete freedom.

The State and Condition as an Existential Concept

Fundamentals of Existential Knowledge: Existentialism was based on external knowledge or knowledge of philosophical concepts as we must learn ourselves before knowing anything else. To know something from the outside of one's own life but without knowing one's life first, everything else had no meaning for us and for others. If learning yourself, knowing who you are, then that was your true existential self; we would also understand the existential nature of things outside of ourselves contemplating knowledge in a real environment, i.e., knowledge that deserved true existential research inevitably happened to the person of each person but there must be a good relationship with each other (Sarutanon Raisaeng, 2018, page 49).

Existentialism is the Foundation of Theology: The theological basis existentialism was the beginning of the historical life of Christ in the existential sense. He hypothesized that we must look back and look at ourselves. Have we followed the teachings of Christ? If not, then align yourself with Christ. If we kept doing, this we would get deeper and broader ideas would be truly meaningful to us. The reality of our existence was made complete according to the condition of each of us according to his position. But real existentialism had the same difficulties associated with the teachings of Christianity. In terms of doctrine and actual practice, they were inconsistent and difficult to perform. This was a philosophical problem. But some people practiced and tried to live in



the right way according to religious principles. “Therefore, his activities, he showed his nature to people to understand. Christ's relationship with God Man and nature were in accordance with the conditions of his activity. Everything else could therefore be regarded as just a prologue” (Kamut Deepawatana, 1987), page 105).

Existentialism is the Foundation of Ethics: Existentialism was the basis of ethics appeared in “Christianity is the current of life” about Christian ethics. It was not just the implementation of a fixed plan but it was something that every Christian must examine from the existentialism of Christ, which he had faith and accepted as an example in living according to the real situation not based on written rules but must be treated with love because the situation of the Lord Jesus and the present day were very different, i.e., his condition and the human condition. This was because in our present life we must imitate him. He acted appropriately according to his circumstances in the present situation. How should we behave in that situation in order to be appropriate? “Trusting in the divine insight, Jesus was not concerned about accumulating wealth. Even though he didn't care until the next day, he still had to eat. Flowers did not care jewelry was also beautiful he didn't even have a stone to support his head as his personal possessions, because he acted appropriately for his situation. If we wanted to imitate him, we must not rely on His direct treatment but must choose the right action for the situation. He was in a situation that was destined for him. He could not be in every situation to be an example for us. From what Kierkegaard has given us would be a parable for us. It was impossible for us to imitate Jesus. Trusting in God's eyewitnesses did not mean that we did nothing but we had to exert even more in our current state of life. What Kierkegaard said was correct. In his humanity we could imitate but in the divine nature it was amazing to us. But it was this wonder that gave us strength to fight against the obstacles in our lives, which bore witness for us. This kind of existential living was the basis of true ethics.

Existentialism as the Goal of Creating the World: Existentialism as the goal of the creation of the world; if, to say, "Individualism was the true macroscopic in the development of creation; the "five macros" meant "the end," thus comparable to the destination itself for the existence of this world was all created. Each of these creations, was something unique and was truly individual for all living beings in the world were the same, and one day it would come to

an end. The end of life was death; the stage of life which was the powerful origin that drove all existential movements into a force of resistance. The "Popular Philosophy" for the benefit of the "material man" created the creation, correction, improvement and reformation of new ideas in human society that enabled human beings to break free from the framework of the network and fixed rules that were universal measures and values that dominated society. Life that made human beings knew how to question the values which were accepted in their contemporary society whether they were the most complete or not, could still be improved and corrected in any way or not. The Masters, such as the Buddha and Jesus Christ, all took an entirely existential attitude, with the Buddha reacted to the fixed provisions of the castes and sacrificial system in Brahmanism. While Jesus Christ also reacted to Judaism's rigid doctrine, the disadvantage of this attitude, like ideological philosophy holding to the expectation that manned existentialism was fully automatic which was unlikely to be realistic as long as humans had passion and selfishness (Søren Kierkegaard, 1983), p. 33-37).

Condition and Condition of Life Phenomena

According to the views of the condition of the phenomenon of life was the condition (being) of a metaphysical phenomenon known as "Phenomenal Ontology (Phenomenological Ontology)" in the following order:

Basic Conditions and Conditions of Life Phenomena: The word "state" referred to a condition corresponding to the English word existence, which was a derivative of the Latin word existential (ex = from + stare = to stand) meaning existence, the basis or true content of metaphysics. There were 2 types of traditional concepts related to the world and life, called being, which were analyzed as follows:

1) Being in itself meant a state without consciousness, i.e., non consciousness, a state of pure existence, such as existence. It could not be the whole of things nor was it hidden behind things as a noumenon, but it was the pure existence of phenomena. Existing referred to all the objects that existed in the world itself. It was dense, shallow, fixed, just a state (being is). The word state was what it was (being is what it is) and was a state in itself. It was just



something that existed. But the unconscious was true of the material parts of the world, including the physical body of each human being had these conditions.

2) Being for itself meant a state in which it was not and not what it was because it denied the condition in itself which what it was the self-awareness represented the opposite of the self-awareness. In such a way that “If the state of the self were the fullness of itself. There was a lack or lack of self-conditions, called “emptiness.” What the self lacked was self-self. The emptiness of self-self was the absence of self-self. It was therefore hollow in the existence at the heart of the state for self, meaning consciousness was part of abstract reality. Here it was the part of the human mind but not an ego mind or the immortal soul that resided behind the stream of primitive idealism of human consciousness that used to trust. It was simply a condition that existed which it could not be. And not what it was (a being which is what it is not and is not what it is). It was the consciousness (mind), which was the reality of human beings in free choice. This was a condition for oneself and also known as the stream of consciousness.

Relationship: Condition of life Phenomena

The relationship between self and for self, both of these facts showed the difference between matter and consciousness. The characteristics of two kinds of truth were “mind and material”. These two states were different: (1) the mind was bare and (2) the object was neutral (neutral). Both referred to the body of human but these two conditions did not show any difference (were undifferentiated).

For example, “screen” and “light beams”, “rays” projected onto the screen. The screen had no reaction, it was inert, it had no driving force, it was just dead; it did not care, not featured, no special characteristics (featureless) a thing should have. Part of the ray of light instead, it appeared flickering, cheerful, alive (live), flickering (flickering) around lively (lively), that was consciousness (consciousness) realized as “the ray of light” and called the “self-condition”.

From this example, Sartre, who saw that the self was comparable to any objects. The condition for oneself was like a mirror, which was an object reflecting itself in a mirror but a mirror was nothing of its own but merely a

reflection of the object within it. Mirrors were separate and never joined with objects” (Norman N, Greene, 1960), p.17). Though Sartre was influenced by Kant's concept of self (material) self, Sartre and Kant were different because Kant's idea was that the manifestation of a phenomenon lied between the self and the self (material), the phenomenon concealed the self and kept it as something mysterious which some scholars said, was wearing a mask obscured by the phenomenon. For Kant, the fact that everything we received directly of consciousness was merely a phenomenon. Therefore, this ensured us that we were unable to truly reach the state of ourselves. But Sartre viewed that phenomenon was nothing like a bad guy wearing a balaclava (closed fitting hood) to hide his face. In terms of form, what Kant called “Selfie” was not a movie on our screens but it was something hidden behind the scenes. For Kant, the screen played the role of raw data while the feeling was caused by the condition within itself.

Sartre contradicted Kant about the phenomenon was not hidden or masked. It was a condition in itself, which it revealed itself as directly as it appeared because Sartre split the description into two parts to distinguish between human beings and objects which could exist by themselves. There was a completeness in itself, such as that rock, chair and tree. Humans were not like objects but only existed absolutely not what it was still having the ability to be something that it could not be, which meant a state of mind that could think about the future. Human beings were not objects those were designed to be finished. As Sartre embodied the following two conditions: (1) the material thing, a condition in itself stiff character, full of self, was just what it was. It was never anything other than what it was like either a stone or a table or a chair; and (2) non-material things. These two conditions could be divided into two parts. In fact, its state was never separated from each other though self-consciousness existed in itself, and it was meaningless without consciousness. But it also seemed to have the power to constantly draw the attention of the consciousness or state to oneself towards it. As for consciousness or self-consciousness, it seemed to have a nature that tried to harmonize itself with the self-interested state because the conditions for oneself were empty therefore it was never able to live alone. Being alone would mean nothing but to try to be unified with the intrinsic state. To make it meaningful but it was never sufficient or satiating with what it sought to be material and nonmaterial because it existed in the world. Sartre conveyed the most important human existence. When referring to



humanity, there were two components, i.e. the body part, which was the unconscious thing, and the mind part, which was the conscious thing, which meant the non-material thing that has a condition for itself.

The Condition and Condition of the Life Phenomenon for Others

The condition or condition of the phenomena of life that existed independently as the condition for oneself and the condition for oneself. Rather, it was a situation in which more than one ego met. This meeting placed one ego under the “looking” of the ego, as Sartre analyzed in phenomenological metaphysics in order to examine the nature of our being in direct experience and in relation to the senses. Sartre divided the state into two categories (1) External, that was, our consciousness with external objects or emotions. (2) The second type was to understand the phenomenon of self-consciousness of the state for ourselves as always related with something outside ourselves. It could be seen that these two types of relationships were also present in the other person because of ourselves. (Jean-Paul Sartre, 1957), p. 341). On the issue that he just **did something clumsy and rude and that action stuck with him; he did not judge** his actions and even blame it. Sartre viewed it as an ordinary form of material for himself. But suddenly he raised his head said someone was there and saw him. Immediately, he realized his clumsiness he was embarrassed. Embarrassedness, of course, was not to look at himself but because someone else was present. He was ashamed as long as he appeared to others” (Sartre, Paris: Gallimard. 1943, pp. 259-260).

The Condition and Condition of Life Phenomena in the World

The phenomena or conditions of life in the world, Sartre said when you start analyzing what appeared to you, was that you would find two forms of existence or a kind of life in the world. Living things in the world here meant human beings because human beings were living beings in the world and therefore had a relationship with the world. Until Sartre could not imagine that if there were no world how would humans live and vice versa. If there were no human beings, would the world still exist? Sartre thus distinguished the in-self and the in-self in a correlation way because Sartre wanted to distinguish between humans and objects. Logically, objects could exist and be possible in

themselves, called "self-conditions" relying on self-conditions, i.e., objects or emotions. Human beings were never satisfied with who they were. Sometimes when he was a kid, he wanted to be an adult. As an adult, he still wanted to go back to being a child or being young. Some people were still dissatisfied with their appearance. Therefore, he underwent surgery to modify the appearance, to make the appearance satisfying for himself and others, because human beings were nothing short of perfect that was, they were not essential but handsome, beautiful. When human beings knew that they were in the world, they began to define themselves as they wanted to be because human beings could choose to be, which was called "self-for-self" since it did not exist, it was not in itself that was ready-made like an object but existed in order to define oneself as meaningful according what one would. Therefore, the condition for oneself was consciousness, and thus was something that one was not and not what he himself was as he imagined. All freedom led to being by emptiness or non-existence (Sartre, Jean-Paul, *Being and Nothingness*, translated by Hazel E. Branes. 1957, p. 12).

Because Sartre emphasized the condition for himself, attached to the body its history and its surroundings, which he called "its facticity": its essence. It was all human. Its true nature was what was born with it and defined itself such a belief seemed close to accepting determinism or the doctrine of determination. However, Sartre explicitly denied that it was not true that the body was the product of the arbitrary decision of the creator of the world (Demiurge), or that the union of body and mind was accidental on the contrary the co-creation of two completely were different substances. Many natures of the condition for themselves called it the body" (Jean-Paul Sartre, (Translator: Walter Kaufman, 1957, p. 309).

Sartre considered it to be an 'abstract' of a single reality was "man in the world" because Sartre primarily focused on the condition for himself though there were so many Self-Sufficiencies in the world. But if there were no condition for oneself, it was meaningless.



Fundamentals of Human Beings a Living Being

Fundamentals of Human Beings as Living Beings: The basis of human beings as living beings, because human beings were the things that were conscious of themselves and able to imagine themselves in the future (Jintana Damronglert, 2005, p. 1093), only (Sartre, Paris: Gallimard. 1943, p, 46). It was an activity or action in living and in relation to other people and the world because they owned empty consciousness. Therefore, it was necessary to hold on to something in order to make itself meaningful but the feeling would be meaningful only if it were expressed through meaningful activities, hence the name “Man makes himself”, since “man is nothing but the sum of his own deeds,” man is the only creature that is deliberately self-conscious. By reasons, human beings were not only self-conscious beings but something he deliberately gave himself to be. A living human being was not just a body but a part of the mind which was very different because a living human being was more than it was even what it had not yet been. For example, Mr. “A” had been a chef (cook) in a restaurant for many years, he thus was tired of wanting to promote himself to be an executive himself. Therefore, intending that one day he would be able to become an executive so he aimed to work and earn enough money. One day he decided to quit being a chef because he had a converted address in a community area. So, he decided to open a restaurant because it was his favorite job and recruit many waiters to help. He himself became an executive at will. Therefore, human beings were called what was possible, even if it were not yet real but could be in consciousness and still had the opportunity to make it came true, so it could be called more than what he was. Because human beings were different from normal objects in that human beings had minds that were very important to human beings, which were its feature (its characteristic) as Sartre Jean-Paul Charles Aymard Sartre, French philosopher; 21 June 1905 – 15 April 1980) asserted the human condition. It was something that existed and was something that existed before defining what it was. As Sartre said, “Man is nothing more than his own product. He exists only in the extent to which he is self-aware, therefore he is nothing more than the sum of his actions and beings” (Ibid. p. 37.).

Characteristics of Man as a Living Being

Man as a living being, for man was the destination, man's loftiness was not regarded as the end result. But man had to create himself all the time. The greatness of man lied in creation not in success stay at the present not in the past or the future because man came into the world surrounded by objects of significance or meaning. So, they believed man, like all matter in the universe, had the same status as an existence. But this condition alone did not make human beings valuable. The value of human beings lied in a condition known as "Knowing yourself." This was the potential to develop in different ways. Man was the future of man, i.e., nothing could replace him, which was possible and confirmed for every truth and every action characterized the environment and subjectivity of man, for example.

Existence preceded essence" (Sartre, 1943). The term essence was the "idea" from the original concept called "existentialism". A retorted statement by Sartre was, "Because I exist so I thought." Many scholars like Descartes concluded that Sartre began his own philosophy with 'Sartre' meant 'karma' or actions or behaviors of people manifested by human liberty. God existed when there was no God at least he had to admit that there had to be something that existed before the essence and what existed before it was defined by thought. Heidegger called "human reality" in "pre-substantial existence," according to existential philosophers, the state of being that a thing existed and could indicate where it was or where it was the existential nature (existence) of something was conspicuous (concrete) of that thing and determined the specificity of that thing because people had freedom to choose as he wanted human beings try to make themselves into something according to their freedom. As such Sartre wanted to reject the creator or the cause behind things. The one who determined things in a fixed way meant denying the belief that God existed and created all things on earth, which was like a mechanic who designed various products. For example, a mechanic who made a chair must know that the essence of the chair was for sitting in the first place. How would it look? It was something that the craftsman would plan to design later on what kind of chair would look like but the essence of it was for it to sit on its own.



Sartre himself emphasized between “A thing with its essence and meaning.” For an existing thing, if there were no human beings at that place or anywhere, it would have its existence, such as the moon, the sun, or the stars, for example. Mars that scientists had explored that there was no life at all. There may have been but only assumptions based on atmospheric conditions or even other planets that had not yet been discovered, it probably existed like that. Therefore, Sartre would like to ask again that then what was the essence or meaning of its existence, unless human beings discovered it and gave it substance or meaning, then they were proud of their own intelligence that they were capable and still dreamed of taking it as a human possession again, for example, scientists who explored Mars in the hope of bringing humans up to live in it could answer that if humans did not exist or there were no humanity at all, their essences or their meanings could not exist, or even if they existed, they were devoid of meaning. By reasons, the meaning or material value was possible since their existence, human beings gave this meaning to it. Sartre wanted to assert the importance of human existence above any other value. Sartre contrasted the belief that God created (the world according to the beliefs of the Divine) and the craftsman who designed the knife to cut the paper. Mr. Chang was more real because the skilled master would know the knife existed before making it. So objectively there was a way to make it into a knife. Having a plan in mind was knowing it in advance. According to the Christian point of view, humans were like paper cutters. God was like a skilled craftsman with purpose, had a method and a plan, and knew in advance what to do. In fact, there were no such nature before for human beings. We defined ourselves after being born on earth; we could choose to be and what we wanted to be. We were nothing more than what we did ourselves. Human beings existed before and casted themselves into the world. When we found or felt ourselves, we could only define ourselves. Sartre also used the term “Man makes himself” because man did not come to this world perfectly. Man had then to choose what was appropriate for himself called moral values (Jean-Paul Sartre, (Translator: Walter Kaufman, 1957, p. 46).

Emptiness was a state of the human mind in which there was a permanent lack or emptiness. Because it was human nature to be empty (Emptiness) (Prayoon Dhammacitto, 2008, page 19) because the state or existence was the root of emptiness. The word “state” here meant a state for oneself that was the “mind” with self-denial nature because the mind was

completely empty, the mind was nothing but just an idea. Humans struggled to be something because they did not want to live in their own emptiness. The mind rejected its own emptiness, it sought to be something that had an object-like meaning because the mind wanted to be like an object, but emptiness was a human condition, so it was difficult for humans to strive to fill it and by this emptiness, humans tried to make themselves as meaningful as they wanted to be. The mind was hollow or empty and human beings could not be completely anything. When it was like this, human still wanted to be like that because the deficit of the human mind was different from the non-mind object. Thus, it was full of itself but humans had infinite desires. Sartre saw, “Man is a useless passion and lack of success.”

It could be seen that emptiness was the state of being human because Sartre believed every human being was born with a state of emptiness. It was considered a deficiency that made humans wanted to be something to make himself meaningful which was in line with the existing situation before it was anything. Where did we find our deficiencies in our own state? Sartre explained that “Man is the animal that is creating his non-existent state (the nothing makes animal). It existed outside the world (events) but was the state of the world as well as the ego of others because Sartre did not believe man was born with an essence or a permanent ego but born with nothingness. (Annihilations = Nothingness) in itself, thus enabling man to continue its pursuit (Jean-Paul Sartre, (Translator: Walter Kaufman, 1957, p. 31).

What was destined to be free existentialist? Philosophers held that human beings were not predetermined because human beings were mere beings. Humans were therefore free, that was free to make decisions at all times because “Man is condemned to be free” (UKessay, 2021). Human beings could not refuse or choose not to have freedom at all because freedom was humanity or man himself was liberty since liberty could not be denied by man, liberty was then like a curse. To accept that human beings were created would be acceptable in the sense that they were created to be free. This word was like an irony of the belief in the Creator according to the belief in theism. The truth when human beings came into the world; man was responsible for everything he did. Humans were afraid to take responsibility, human beings would therefore allow themselves to fall into their beings rather than to be held accountable for their



own actions. Nevertheless, if there were someone responsible for it, so there would have been a ceremony of confession or atonement.

Because freedom was ideal for human life, it should return to itself, that was, the realization of the true nature of freedom. In Sartre's Theory of Freedom, it was absolute freedom, so humans always had a choice. This constant freedom of choice led Sartre to believe that if human suffering existed; there were too much freedom. Therefore, it was hard to make a choice. For example: when we were standing on a steep cliff; we would feel afraid, because we were not sure whether we might decide to jump off the cliff or not and man was free to find a way for himself.

Something important was wrong. The truth was that human beings had complete freedom. But to avoid their own liberties and responsibilities; humans deceived themselves that they didn't have a choice or they couldn't choose because the situation forced them. But the truth was that they still had choices all the time; because freedom was a disguise or concealment of the complete freedom given to human beings. It was believed when man realized freedom it had led man to anxiety and acts of illusion. Sartre cited the example of a young woman who decided to go out with a man knowing what the man thought about her but she still deceived herself that nothing would happen until she was harassed, and she deceived herself that she had no choice. In fact, she didn't choose to deny more because she also had feelings for him as well. Therefore, allowing herself to go after it by acting like an object so as not to be responsible for anything. When human beings lived in a society with rules and customs; human beings suffered because blending himself into society and uncomfortably feeling unfree through understanding that he was under societal influence. The rules that others had determined to do that and could not deny this, which was against the principles of humanity with freedom. According to Sartre, no matter what situation humans were in human freedom. It always meant the freedom to choose, i.e., being able to choose to follow the rules or refused to follow them. Therefore, liberty did not mean the fulfillment of deciding that we had chosen to do this and had to do it. Freedom lied in the ability to make a choice. Freedom was a choice, which had always come with responsibility. Freedom of choice was therefore complete freedom but because man was cowardly and not sure he could take responsibility or maybe he did not want to take responsibility. He therefore chose to allow society to have power or influence over himself and

understood that he had no freedom that was a misunderstanding (Bad faith). Sartre considered it to be self-deception because the truth was that freedom always existed when humans made choices. The freedom here was freedom of choice even not choosing at all. Therefore, human beings could not deny freedom at all but human beings mistakenly think that they were not free (Jeremy Harwood, 2010), p. 152).

Conclusions

Each human being has the responsibility to define his own role and take responsibility for himself and perform their duties fully. In order to respond to new things on his own; oddly enough, Sartre's ethics does not have any fixed rules because Sartre has rejected the normative ethical system of the theist religion with any advices, most importantly, let human decide on his own freely for human beings with values that would help humans realize their own freedom and give humans the opportunity to develop themselves according to the goals they want to be. That is, it allows humans to know the purpose of life and the dignity of human beings who are free in the midst of many situations in which no one could degrade human dignity. Let man understand that he himself represents all freedom. Human beings have no external limitations. There is no significant power. There is no more fixed pattern for human existence. Humans are the creators of their own connection with the world, e.g. freedom and responsibility. Therefore, it is very important goal of human existence as part of learning. Human beings have the freedom to live their lives and able to develop themselves further than they are. It frees mankind from the theist belief that everything is predetermined but it depends on the courage of human beings to choose to accept or reject those beliefs and believes in themselves and takes responsibility for what they do or not. Thus, existentialism, as part of the learning of the two life phenomena, is the self-self, i.e., all the objects that exist in the world. Being an existence is what it is and not what it is having a solid, stiff, shallow nature of itself, such as rocks, tables, chairs, and other objects; being an existence not what it is and is what it is not; there is a sense of emptiness that is independent of both of these things in a relationship exists for others. It is what exists in the world of humanity itself.



References

- Adisak Thongboon (1990). **Handbook of Metaphysics**. 2nd edition (1990) and 4th edition (2003). Bangkok: Royal Institute.
- Admin. UKessays. **Discussion on the Phrase 'Man is Condemned to be Free'**. UKESSAYS.COM Online: (November 2018). Retrieved from <https://www.ukessays.com/essays/philosophy/man-is-condemned-to-be-free-philosophy-essay.php?vref=1> [published 23 September 2021].
- Albert Camus (1955). *The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays* by Albert Camus. Translated by Justin O'Brien. UK: Alfred A. Knopf. Inc. Renewed. **Institute Journal**, Vol. 30, Issue 4, October-December 1995. Bangkok: Common People.
- Keerati Boonchuea (1979). **Existential philosophy**. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.
- Komut Teepawatana (1987). **Existential Philosophy**. Bangkok: Smith. Macombre. Edited by John Kulka. London: Yale University Press
- Phra Thammakosajarn (Prayoon Dhammacitto) (2008). **Comparison of Buddhadasa and Sartre concepts**. 6th edition. Bangkok: Healthy mind.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul (1943) "Being and Nothingness" in Jack Maden. **"Existence Precedes Essence: What Sartre Really Meant."** Philosophy Break Online, retrieved 27 October 2023, from: <https://philosophybreak.com/articles/existence-precedes-essence-what-sartre-really-meant/> [August 2023]
- Sartre, Jean-Paul (1947). **Existentialism is a Humanism**. Translated by Carol Macomber, Yale University Press / New Haven & London
- Sartre, Jean-Paul (1957). **Being and Nothingness**. Translated by Hazel E. Branes. USA: University of Colorado.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul (1959). **The Transcendence of the Ego**. Original and annotated with an introduction by Forrest and Robert Kirkpatrick. New York: Noonday Press.
- Sarutanon Raisaeng (2018). **"Existentialist phenomena in the songs of Body slam artists"**. *Buddhamak Journal Dharma Studies Research Center Wat Awut Wiksitaram School*, Year 3, Issue 2, July-December, 2018.
- Somporn Phromta (1995). **Human beings and the pursuit of truth and the Sophie's World: An Imaginary Path to the History of Philosophy**. 11th edition. Bangkok: Kobfai Printing Project.

Wittaya Setthawong. (1993). **Sartre's Concept of Responsibility**. Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Arts. Department of Philosophy. Graduate School, Chulalongkorn University.