

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Theoretical Framework

This chapter aims to explain the theory that is going to be applied for the research in analyzing Albert Camus' *The Outsider*, A novel that brought him into achieving Nobel Prize for literary in 1957 as it is quoted from *Camus: A Bibliography* and put it in the introduction of the novel (Dunwoodie xxv). The writer has decided to use theory of Existentialism which the writer takes three concepts (the first three stages of Sartre's theory). Those are concept of being, value and authenticity/avoiding bad faith by Jean-Paul Sartre as part of his existentialism theory in describing the depiction of life of Meursault, the hero in the Novel.

Furthermore, this chapter will discuss about Sartre's theory of existentialism that supports the analysis. The theory, which is applied in the analysis, is based on Sartre's three stages of existentialism: the emergence of consciousness, the chosen value and the authenticity. The first stage will consist of concepts of *Being-in-itself* and *Being-for-itself* as the emergence of consciousness, secondly the process of taking or creating value as the significance of the concept of value in meaning Meursault's self-existence and thirdly the act of Meursault's value as the ultimate existentialism virtue that is the avoidance of *bad faith*/the authenticity itself. The

three stages has been included with what Sartre calls as *facticity*. That is a condition as Spade quotes it from *Existentialism is Humanism*,

While I am free to choose this or that, I am not free not to choose. I didn't ask to exist, no one consulted me. But I do exist anyway, and so have to choose. Even if I choose to commit suicide, so that I will not have to choose any more, that is still a choice. (Spade 83)

The term, will help the writer finds whether setting (place) has any influence or not toward Meursault's existence.

2.1.1. Existentialism Theory

2.1.1.1. Concept of Being and Consciousness (The Emergence of Consciousness)

The Theory of Being, according to Sartre, is decided by *the others* and *the look* (Wibowo 24-27). *The other* term means people's being is often constructed by others. And *the look* is the tool that is used by *the other* to construct one's existential being. In that sense, the goal of Sartrean theory of being is to nihilate *the other* and *the look*. As a consequence, one's being is tried to be reconstructed by the one itself through denying *the look of the other* (Wibowo 24-27).

From those points, Sartre then continues to divide the term of being into two; being-in-itself and being-for-itself. The two have explanations on how they nihilate *the look of the other* which resulting to the emergence of consciousness.

2.1.1.1.1. Being-in-itself

As an explanation to *Being-in-itself*, it is better to describe it from its characteristics. There are three characteristics of *Being-in-itself* they are first, "Being is in itself." That is, *being-in-itself* is in itself (Spade 80-83). The point here is basically a metaphysical claim. Sartre is in effect saying that *being-in-itself* has no cause. If it did have a cause, it would not be "in itself" but "in its cause" (Spade 80). So the term "in itself" is meant to suggest something like "self-contained."

Sartre gives a simple analogy: the analogy of the letter-opener. The letter-opener is an artifact. It is designed by someone, and manufactured in accordance with that design. The design — a kind of blueprint or plan — in effect sets the limits to what the letter-opener is and what it can do. This plan or blueprint gives us the essence of the letter-opener. It could be said that the essence is the "principle of the series" of phenomena. This essence exists in a sense in the mind of the designer or artisan of the letter-opener before the actual object is produced or manufactured. And in that sense, for the letteropener: "*Essence precedes existence.*" (Spade 81).

Second, the characteristic of *Being-in-itself* is "Being is what it is" this means *being-in itself* is what it is. Sometimes Sartre puts it by saying that *being-in-itself* is *opaque*, it is *solid*. Roughly, the point of all these metaphors is to say that *being-in-itself* is through and through positive. There is nothing *negative* about its (Spade 82).

Third, "Being is." (That is, *being-in-itself* is.) Sartre often puts the point here by saying that *being-in-itself* is "too much," it is "superfluous." That is, there is no good reason why it should be there, rather than not being there. This is closely related

to the previous characteristic: "Being is in-itself." That first characteristic amounted to saying that being-in-itself has no *cause*. This third claim amounts to saying that being-in-itself has no explanation. Whereas the former is a metaphysical claim, this one is more *epistemological*. An "explanation" is an account that satisfies the mind. It may be a *causal* explanation, or it may be some other kind of explanation. But in any case, this third claim says that being-in-itself has no explanation. (Spade83).

2.1.1.1.2 Being-for-itself

As it is stated before that *Being-for-itself* means by rejecting *Being-in-itself*, so it is *not* being *what it is* or *is what it is not*. Sartre identifies human beings with consciousness. Consciousness is not something human beings have, but it is what they *are*. Consciousness is also our fears, hopes, wishes, desires, emotions, memories — *even our bodies* (Spade 81). So that it could be said that *Being-for-itself* has the opposite characteristics of the three characteristics of *Being-in-itself*.

First, *Being-for-itself* is *not* in-itself. In the case of being-in- itself, this meant it was not metaphysically *caused* by anything, it did not depend causally on anything else. Thus, to say that being-for-itself is *not* in-itself means that it *is* caused, it does depend on something else. And what does it depend on? Well, what else is there? It depends on the *in-itself* (Spade81). Sartre describes the for-itself as "arising" out of the in-itself, it "surges up" (Sartre 209). In short, consciousness depends on matter. Without matter, there would be no consciousness. This doesn't mean that

consciousness is *itself* a material process, or that it can in any way be reduced to matter, but it remains the case that without matter there would be no consciousness.

The second characteristic of being-in-itself is that the in-itself *is what it is*, and *is not what it isn't*. By contrast, the for-itself, Sartre says, *is not what it is*, and *is what it is not*. The claim is of course deliberately paradoxical.

Third, it is different from the two previous characteristics, this last characteristic of *Being-for-itself* is the same with the third characteristic of *Being-in-itself* that is *Being* is just *is*. There is no ultimate "sufficient reason" for the existence of consciousness any more than there is for the existence of being-in-itself. Consciousness too is "absurd" for Sartre. Since consciousness arises out of the in-itself somehow, it is not altogether without any reason or grounding. It is not totally contingent (Spade 83). There is a certain limited kind of necessity forced on consciousness from the outside (Sartre 209).

This kind of "limited necessity" is what Sartre calls "*facticity*" as quoted by Spade from *Existentialism Is A Humanism*. In part, the basic idea behind "facticity" is that,

While I am *free* to choose this or that, I am *not free not to choose*. I didn't ask to exist, no one consulted me. But I do exist anyway, and so have to choose. Even if I choose to commit suicide, so that I will not have to choose any more, that is still a choice. "*Man is condemned to be free*" (Spade 83).

With those two explanations on two concepts of being, Sartre then put the emergence of consciousness is the emergence of *being-for-itself* by annihilating *being-in-itself*. (Sartre)

2.1.1.2. Concept of Value (The Chosen Value)

Every individual person is a particular *project*, a particular attempt to transcend a particular facticity and become one with himself or herself, to become the foundation of this particular being. We frequently tend to think that values are found ready-made in the world, that ethical and moral standards are absolutes, that certain things just are good and others just are bad, just in themselves. Certain standards or codes of ethics just are authoritative, and it is up to us to find out which ones they are and to conform to them. (Spade 177-179).

It is different from Sartre's doctrine; this would be true if all our projects were necessarily the same — and the same in detail. In that case, the same standards of right and wrong would apply to everyone, and would not be subject to negotiation. But in fact, of course, we do not all have the same projects in mind — much less necessarily having the same projects. (If we did all have the same projects, then since a human being just *is* such a project, there would be only one human being!)

This notion that values are ready-made *absolutes* found in the world is what Sartre calls the "*Spirit of Seriousness*." He accuses the bourgeois of having this attitude. They regard their norms and values as eternal truths. One does this; one does

not do that — and that is the end of the matter. Everything in its place — a place that is carved out by the very nature of things.

A world like this, with objective values, is comfortable. It is a world in which it is possible to fit in, to belong. Sartre thinks this “Spirit of Seriousness” is in bad faith as quoted by Spade from *The Transcendence of Ego*. To be sure, values do appear in the world. In a famous phrase, he says values “spring up like partridges.” But that doesn’t mean they are there ready-made. No — they are projected there. We find them there because we read the world in terms of our own project to be God in our own unique way. In the end, consciousness is the source of value.

2.1.1.3 Concept of Authenticity/Avoiding Bad Faith (Act of Responsibility toward The Chosen Value)

The situation of value is the same as what have been already seen with emotions. A person’s anger first appears in the world — as a particularly outrageous deed, for example. But of course He is the one who made it outrageous. As far as ready-made, absolute values are concerned, there are none. The Ten Commandments have no ultimate authority. If he accept them, if he *feel* their weight, it is because he *choose* to. In the end, he is the final authority (Spade 239).

It is fairly clear what Sartre wants. He wants there to be *one* absolute value after all, one ultimate existentialist virtue: namely, authenticity. Authenticity has to be earned (Sartre 312). When people are *authentic*, they reject the “Spirit of Seriousness.” They avoid *bad faith* (accepting “spirit of seriousness), they recognize

that they determine their own values, and that they are utterly without guidelines in picking their values.

If they pick a certain set of guidelines — for example, the Ten Commandments — why did they pick those instead of others? Isn't it because they find them especially worthy — that is, haven't they *already* chosen their values before they can *see* the Ten Commandments as good ones, as ones that deserve to be followed? There is no avoiding it: they are ethically on their own (Spade 179).

To avoid *bad faith*/to be *authentic* means to realize this fact (value) — *and then to act*. It makes little difference in the end how we act. Just do! Take a stand! *Create* your values. And be fully aware of what you are doing. Realize your freedom in this respect, and *act* anyway. Act in *anguish*. The point is, you are *going* to “create” your own values anyway, whether you admit it or not. What Sartre wants us to do is to realize this, to know what is going on (Spade 179).

2.1.1.3. Setting (Based on Sartre's Facticity)

The second part of intrinsic element is setting. Setting of the story has crucial meaning or explanation on the decisions that the hero will take. The setting itself would be divided into place setting.

In this part, the setting (place) will have to deal with the concept of facticity which has been described above that is as Sartre stated,

while people are free to choose this or that, they are not free not to choose. Due to the fact that, people didn't ask to exist (in a certain

place and time). No one consulted them, but they do exist anyway (in a certain place and time), and so have to choose. Even if they choose to commit suicide, so that they will not have to choose any more, that is still a choice. (Spade 83).

By dealing with facticity, the writer will find if there is any influences occur to the existence of Meursault.

2.2. Review of Related Studies

There are some studies that concern about some issues or themes in *The Outsider*. Those studies concern about alienation and absurdity in Albert Camus' *The Outsider*. One of those is Hatice Bay's thesis which is related study as comparison with this research. The title of the thesis is *The Outsiders As Reflected In The Novels Of Albert Camus, John Wain And Yusuf Atilgan*. In the thesis, Bay pointed out about absurdity issue appeared in the novel. Meursault is detached from society because he is an absurd man. Namely, in Camus's universe, which is empty, absurd and meaningless, Meursault is an indifferent individual, who lacks commitment, positive moral ethics and intimacy with his fellowmen. Then, it examines Charles Lumley, who decides to become an outsider since he disapproves of the inhibiting social structure of his society. He opposes the mannerisms of the middle class milieu, the class stratification and educational system in post-war England.

The second study is a thesis from Rassoul Djamoukhanov which is entitled *A Critical Analysis of Albert Camus's The Stranger and The Myth of Sisyphus From*

Post-Colonial and Religious Perspectives. The study tells that by depersonalizing the Arabs and reducing them to featureless creatures, Camus's literary technique incapacitates or blocks readers' emotional response to the act of killing. The death of the Arab does not evoke the feelings of pity and sympathy simply because the readers cannot feel sorry for someone who is pictured as a stuffed dummy rather than a human being. One may wonder why Camus picked an Arab for the role of a sacrificial lamb and not a French-Algerian. The answer lies, at least partly, in the fact that Camus uses the Arabs as "a convenient backdrop to a series of wholly European preoccupations.

The third study which is taken by the writer as related study is a thesis by Maria K. Genovese which is entitled *Meaningful Meaninglessness: Albert Camus' Presentation of Absurdism as a Foundation for Goodness*. The study describes on how Camus thoughts on The Absurd. It tells that The Absurd is the result of the dissonance between human and non-human beings and workings in the world. Humans can never succeed in their efforts to understand the non-human, nor can they reject the unknown or non-human. However, that dissonance serves to connect the human and non-human (Camus uses the word "world" as opposed to "man" to refer to the nonhuman) in the single possible way, for "the Absurd is not in man...nor in the world, but in their presence together...it is the only bond uniting them."

The difference of the three studies with this study is that all of the three studies do not use or study directly any existentialism theory including Sartrean

theory of existentialism. Otherwise, in this study, the writer explores more about Meursault's consciousness and honesty which leads him being Sartrean Existentialist.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS