International Journal of **Human Sciences Research**

SARTRE AND EDUCATION AS A PROJECT OF BEING

Ana Julia Bento

This research aims to investigate a possible conception of a subjectivized education, which aims to respect the individuality of the being, with a theoretical basis in the existentialism of the philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre, specifically in his consecrated ontological work ``*O ser e o nada*``. Following primordial concepts such as consciousness, being-in-itself and being-for-itself, freedom and the Other, the proposal is the possibility of education being the foundation of the subjectivity of being, contrary to the fact that it is only a subjectivity which is mortalized by the gaze of the Other. Based on the analysis of these concepts and interpreting Sartre's phenomenology, although consciousness is interpreted as nothingness, since it is For-itself and sustains only the ontological existence of being, the project-of-being is constituted independently, in the world, where objectivity takes place. The I present in the project-of-being emerges independently of the Other, even though, for Sartre, the Other "steals" consciousness, the I is, first of all, In-itself.

Keywords: existentialism; education; Sartre;

INTRODUCTION

This research intends to analyze what education can become having as a theoretical reference the thought of the French existentialist Jean-Paul Sartre, specifically his analysis and conception of education within a structure that aims at the subjectivity of the phenomenological being.

But would Sartre's philosophy be enough to base a whole new way of thinking about education? To answer this question, it is necessary, first of all, to understand and explain the freedom of the existentialist being in Sartre's philosophy, his ontology and phenomenology. In addition, it is necessary to keep in mind the difficulties and problems of this freedom, and thus be able to offer a progressive pedagogy, whose basis is respect for individual freedom, which is, for Sartre, the raison d'être of all men.

The relationship between Sartre's existentialist philosophy (1905-1980) and education was not perceptible, or not at all. Although there were criticisms of the French educational system in a post-World War II world made in its magazine ``*Les Temps Modernes*`` – founded together with Simone de Beauvoir and Merleau-Ponty – Sartre did not dedicate a conclusive theory on education and its ideal model.

In the same way, it is not very common for the theme of education to be approached by the existentialist line of thought, and precisely for this reason it is necessary to analyze and investigate Sartre's literary and philosophical works in order to understand the fundamental nuances and topics of his philosophy, such as freedom, society, politics, literature and ethics. In the trilogy: ``*Os Caminhos da Liberdade*`, and the protagonist Mathieu, who, we can say, is Sartre's alter ego, history and politics form an elementary background in the plot of the philosophy professor who seeks freedom in its purest form.

Basing his theory on dialectics, Sartre bases his ontological concepts of being-in-itself and being-for-itself, where being-in-itself is the being of the phenomenon as being what it is, being. No assumptions. The subject is In-itself due to the very relationship it has with the gaze of the Other, even if being-In-itself, paradoxically, is unaware of otherness. The For-itself is consciousness, therefore it holds the intention of knowing the facts of the world through contemplation, apprehension.

For that reason, consciousness is something other than itself. By knowing and contemplating the facts of the world, it is not being, it is not In-itself, it is For-itself.

Being and nothingness imply, respectively, the In-itself and the For-itself. As Sartre establishes the meaning of objectivity for

being and subjectivity for nothingness, both concepts complement each other and require the existence of both to make sense. Objectivity, regardless of existing in spite of consciousness, needs a reason for being, which is to be contemplated precisely by consciousness.

The project-of-being arises from this interaction of the two dualistic forces being and nothingness, through Sartre's freedom, in which Sartre's famous phrase "existence precedes essence" arises. The subject first defines himself in the world, in objectivity, to later emerge in a responsible freedom, being able to make free choices. But man is condemned to be free. This implies that even in non-choice, there is a choice.

From this project, the new pedagogy emerges, in which Sartre places a new role for the teacher towards the students: that of mediator. The figure of authority must be forgotten, the teacher must mediate the student towards the path of responsible freedom and free choices, since the student, as a being In-itself, has already established itself in the world, now it is the "duty" of the average teacher. him in this transformation of himself so that it is possible to transform the world – all of this, through education.

In ``*O ser e o nada*`` – Essay on Phenomenological Ontology, Sartre brings his ontological and phenomenological vision paying attention to education, in general in the third part of the work, when talking about the problematic of the Other. In this ontology, the French philosopher points out how the concept of looking is fundamental to the For-itself and its extension of being-For-another.

Comparing the look with a medusa school, an allusion to the Greek myth of the gorgon Medusa, who turned anyone who looked her in the eye into stone, the look establishes a dialogue between Sartre's ontology and the current pedagogy. This research aims, in short, to obtain answers of an educational nature and to go deeper into Sartre's existentialist thought, ontologically and phenomenologically, linking Sartre to the Philosophy of Education and the Philosophy of Education to Sartre.

THE SARTREAN PHENOMENOLOGICAL ONTOLOGY

The Sartrean phenomenon arises after Jean-Paul Sartre's encounter with the existentialism of the Danish philosopher Soren Kierkegaard, which is based on the opposition made to Friedrich Hegel. This, which neglects the "insurmountable opacity of the lived experience" (SARTRE, 2018, page 115), in other abstract terms: the darkness that is living. And who lives more in the shadows than man? Singular, Sartre establishes man as a concrete being in the world. From this, his subjectivity becomes undeniable, as being part of reality, of the world, and mainly as an individual, subject.

Sartre also relies on the historical-dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels to support some of his concepts. This partnership arises, moreover, as a counterargument to the Hegelian dialectic and aims to understand human reality as a historical path: adverse conjunctions are part of it and there would be no history without them, being "good" or "bad". Contradiction is necessary for there to be history, there is no history with appeasement. Thus, man is a product of history, to the same extent that he produces it (Cf. SCHNEIDER, 2012, page 391).

Sartre builds his entire phenomenology of being from fragmented concepts of Edmund Husserl, the German philosopher who brought phenomenology to light as a way of understanding the phenomenon as the things that appear to consciousness. In ``*O ser e o Nada*`` – An essay on Phenomenological Ontology, Sartre bases Husserl's theory on

consciousness and proceeds to an ontological analysis of the In-itself and the For-itself, that is, Being and Nothingness.

The French philosopher seeks to focus on the core of Husserl's theory, which is the phenomenon as it appears to us, to our conscience. Roughly speaking, the phenomenon is the things, that is, the facts that appear to us in consciousness. The apparent fact would be subjected to several variations of images in order to capture its essence. But that would not be necessary, according to Sartre, since the appearance of a table in consciousness, for example, already shows its essence: the essence of the table is its own opinion, being a table. That simple. The phenomenon is absolute, it occurs by itself, without presuppositions.

The subject-object dualism, which Sartre maintains throughout his phenomenological theory, also carries the Cartesian heritage of the cogito[1]. The "I think, therefore I am", the principality of the subjectivity of the subject therefore finds the foundation of the concept of freedom (Cf. LIMA, 2009, page 27). Thus, adding to his history of philosophy among so many philosophical concepts from modern philosophers, Sartre sets out in search of his own phenomenological ontology, leaving traditional metaphysics aside and following the path of what appears to be for being itself. So, at the heart of the ontology of ``*O ser e o nada*``, being-in-itself and being-for-itself arise.

THE HUMAN BEING-IN-SELF AND BEING-FOR-SELF

The Being-in-itself is the being of the phenomenon as it appears to us, the being of appearances would be how facts show themselves to our consciousness: "Being is. Being is in itself. Being is what it is" (SARTRE, 2018, page 40). It would be what Sartre would later call objectivity/world. It constitutes everything that being gives existence to existence itself. It does not have relations with the other, nor with consciousness, for this reason, it does not know alterity, that is, it does not know the other being. A table, for example, is In-itself, it is what it is, a table, without presuppositions.

> But the characteristic of the being of an existent is that it does not reveal itself, in person, to consciousness: an existent cannot be stripped of its being; being is the ever-present ground of the existent, it is in it everywhere and nowhere; there is no being that is not being in some way or captured in that way of being that manifests and conceals it at the same time. However, consciousness can always go beyond the existent, not towards its being, towards the meaning of that being. (SARTRE, 2018, p.35)

Sartre also states that as man tends to act in the face of facts deferred by consciousness, behaving in the face of the In-itself, this implies that man does not appear to be the being that he presents to the world: "We find, therefore, non-being as condition of transcendence for being" (SARTRE, 2018, page 90).

Being-for-itself is the absolute opposite of being-in-itself, as it is consciousness:

---

1. The cogito ergo sum, required by the philosopher René Descartes, through his Metaphysical Meditations, introduces the Cartesian method. This has the primary function of distinguishing true knowledge from false knowledge by the use of reason and Cartesian skepticism, and the denial of the use of the senses - because by itself it is not a source of true knowledge and can constantly deceive us if we do not use reason. With his cogito ergo sum, Descartes places the first principle, together with the method, of his philosophy of thinking. Thought and only its presence is the foundation of the cogito, the presence of the universe and the world is placed in the background, so to speak. In order to consolidate ourselves as men, rational animals, living in the universe, one must think, in the sense of doubting the facts, to place all given knowledge as doubtful and false until proven otherwise. In Sartre's case, even though he constantly honors the cogito in his ontology, the idea would be "I think, therefore I am". Since for the French philosopher, it is not necessary to think for the being to be absolutely sure of its own existence, since the being is In-itself.

"What can properly be called subjectivity is consciousness (of) consciousness" (SARTRE, 2018, page 34). For the person, it implies awareness. It is intentional because it is always focused on the object (or fact) to which it intends to differ and apprehend, and therefore maintains relations with the other, it is alterity.

This definition of consciousness as something other than itself [2]opposes Husserl's concept, which states that consciousness is always consciousness of something. An example is an In-itself object, such as a table, which is a being that differs from the For-itself. The table is present to the consciousness of the For-itself but which, from that consciousness, are separated by an impassable abyss.

> [...] the for-itself must be its own nothingness. The being of consciousness, as consciousness, consists in existing at a distance from itself as a presence to itself, and this null distance that being carries in its being is Nothingness. Therefore, for a self to exist, the unity of being must contain its own nothingness as the nihilation of the identical. For the nothingness that slides into consciousness is its nothingness, the nothingness of belief as belief in itself, blind and full belief [...] same. (SARTRE, 2018, page 127)

Nothingness (néant) is an important notion that arises from the negation[3], of non-being, of the fact that consciousness (For-itself) does not coincide with itself – that is, being something other than itself.

Like, for example, being aware that the table is an object different from the For-itself, or, in other words, the ``I`` experiences the fact of not being that table. It is part of the constitution of consciousness to exist as consciousness of something, and therefore the birth of non-being halfway between In-itself and For-itself is inevitable.

Sartre, complementing the concept of In-itself and making a connection with nothingness, states that: "The In-itself is full of itself, and we could not imagine a more total fullness, a more perfect adequacy of the content to the container: there is no smallest void in being, the smallest fissure through which nothingness could slide" (SARTRE, 2018, page 122). For this reason, the Nothing starts from the For-itself, since this does not represent any fullness.

– it is just the opposite, it is nothing, in other words, it becomes nothing, because consciousness is something other than itself.

It is through negation and contradiction that knowledge is contemplated, according to Sartre. Facts are presented to consciousness and differ from it, and therefore, to know is to recognize that the object is not consciousness and that consciousness is not the object. Therefore, knowledge would essentially constitute a negating activity: "[...] if negation did not exist, no question could be asked, even, in particular, that of being" (SARTRE, 2018, page 64).

---

2. In the book: ``O ser e o nada``, Sartre, in the fifth chapter, separates himself from Husserl's phenomenological concept of consciousness, corroborating: "Consciousness is consciousness of something [...] that is, consciousness is born having as its object a being that it is not. We call this the ontological proof. [...] To say that consciousness is consciousness of something means that there is no being for consciousness outside of this need to be intuition that reveals something, that is, a transcendent being". It continues on the next page: "Consciousness is a being whose existence posits the essence, and, conversely, it is the consciousness of a being whose essence implies existence, that is, whose appearance demands being. Being is everywhere". (SARTRE, 2018, page 34-35)

3. From the negation of being, of non-being, nihilation emerges, another fundamental concept in Sartre's ontology of being. The néantisation was nihilated, as it originates from nothingness, which is nothing, nothingness was. And nothingness was nihilated. As the concept of facts and objects in the world is deferred by consciousness, following Husserl's line of thought, and the being of the Sartrean phenomenon is a being that appears: consciousness becomes nothing, nidifies itself, because it is something that does not herself. The philosopher affirms that only being can be nihilated, because it is necessary to be to assume nothingness: "Nothing can be nihilated except on a background of being: if a nothingness can exist, it is not before or after being., not generally outside of being, but in the bulge of being, in its heart, like a worm." (SARTRE, 2018, page 64).

Sartre postulates his existentialism in the ontology of being-in-itself and being-for-itself, triumphing through Husserl's phenomenology, Kierkegaard's existentialism, honoring the Cartesian cogito throughout the speech of ``*O ser e o nada*``, and the historical-dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels. From this, determined to overcome even more idealisms and metaphysical psychologies of modernity, Sartre creates a concrete dialectic between subjectivity and objectivity, which are the basis of his future ontology of being-as-being.

THE HUMAN BEING AND NOTHING

Sartre, in order to concretize his dialectic, creates his sphere of objectivity, and states that if we are real beings, belonging to the world, being also real, implies a materiality of being, since this being coexists amidst materiality, has a body, that exists independently of us – the world is still here if we die, that's the point – materialism is objective, "true to reality" and opposes human subjectivity.

However, even in opposition, objectivity opens the way for subjectivity represented by consciousness, which is always "awareness of something". Which arises not in relation to itself, to what it is, to being-in-itself, but arises in relation to the other. Consciousness needs transcendence to be-in-itself, to exist (Cf. SCHENEIDER, 2012, page 396, apud BURSTOW, 2000), that is, it can only sustain itself by being in relation to the other, to something that is not she.

Sartre, therefore, maintains that subjectivity is For-itself, because what is subjectivity if not consciousness? Why do we think? Do we judge? We do? Do we create beliefs and values? It is for-itself, but not in-itself because it is defined by non-being, as when we think,

it is always something, someone, never in-itself, never about consciousness itself. "Consciousness is, therefore, what it is not, therefore, it is nothing" (SARTRE, 2018, page 207).

For this reason, objectivity is necessary in Sartre's existentialism to understand reality, because it does not depend on anything to exist, it is real, it is there, it is the world, it does not need consciousness as consciousness needs reality. Objectivity is In-itself, being-In-itself only exists in relation to itself, it does not know otherness, there is no relationship with the other. However, even if there is no otherness, there is no purpose if it is not contemplated by consciousness.

This is Sartre's existentialist ontology, the persistent dialectic between being and nothingness, the In-itself and the For-itself, objectivity and subjectivity. Consciousness is, therefore, the context that establishes a relationship with things. Materiality is independent, but needs consciousness to make sense. Sartre uses both to overcome what he calls "inner life":

> Here we are freed from Proust! Freed at the same time from the interior life: [...] because, after all, everything is outside, everything, even ourselves: outside, in the world, among others. It is not in any refuge that we will discover ourselves: it is on the street, in the city, in the middle of the crowd, thing among things, man among men. (SARTRE, 2005, p.31)

FREEDOM AS MAN'S CONDEMNATION

Freedom originates from this nothingness, which, in a way, forces man to do himself, instead of just being.[4], therefore: "[...] man is made; it is not done beforehand" (SARTRE,

---

4. The problematic of the concepts of doing/being and freedom is the essence of Sartre's literary trilogy: ``*Os Caminhos da Liberdade*``. In ``*A idade da razão*``, written in 1945 at the height of World War II, the individualism of the existentialist protagonist Mathieu is remarkable. He seeks freedom in its purest form, without seeking compromises of any kind. Sursis, also written in the same year, reveals that what we want individually is of no importance, history determines freedom as being lived

2019, page 53). And therefore, existence precedes essence. Man exists first and then defines himself as being, the being of the phenomenon, the being who is educated and transforms the world, according to Sartre, the being of the phenomenon is transphenomenal, it escapes knowledge.

Thus, knowledge is an ontological construction, since it was created after the existence of man, it is not innate, it is a posteriori. It appears to us after we emerge and define ourselves in the world as beings, which happens through the relationship of consciousness with things and our relationship with the world (CF. DA SILVA, 2005, p.182).

> [...] there is no determinism, man is free, man is freedom; [...] we will have neither behind us nor in front of us, in the luminous realm of values, no justification and no excuse. We are alone, no excuses. This is what I can express by saying that man is condemned to be free. Condemned, because he did not create himself, and since, however, he is free, once he has been released into the world, he is responsible for everything he does. (SARTRE, 2019, page 33)

Sartre, therefore, postulates a condition to be a subject: the one who first exists, defines himself according to the world and his conscience and the relationship of both with things, starts to obtain knowledge and from that, becomes a subject who plays a leading role. the individual and human history itself (Cf. SCHNEIDER, 2012, page 397). There is no human nature, the existence of being is a priori and its essence is a posteriori. The existence of being gives before being, long before it singularizes itself as a person.

The human condition that nevertheless exists is the existence that precedes essence.

This human condition must be clarified: man has a body, which is material, and is reality, therefore, it is in-itself; consciousness is for itself; man has a body and conscience, which would be the being-in-itself-for-itself. This aggregation occurs continuously, without a period. While man finds himself unable to be a simple body, In-itself, for being consciousness, and also unable to be simple consciousness, For-itself, for being body and consciousness at the same time, this defines the constant totalization in man (Cf. SCHNEIDER, 2012, page 395).

While man faces his impossibilities, the subject gives new meaning to temporality[5] because it is not reduced to being its past In-itself, because, as a subject in time, it is always facing its becoming – which is nothing because it has not yet happened and if it has not happened, nothing is, is not. Sartre thus manages to totalize the past, present and future of the subject being (Cf. BURSTOW, 2000, page 108).

This presupposes an existence that transcends being, that exists beyond its essence, what Sartre calls freedom. "Man is free because he is not himself, but the presence of himself" (SARTRE, 2018, page 545). Therefore, what is fundamental in man is what he decides to do when he defines himself and places himself in the world, what he aspires to be. And freedom is what he wants to be as a subject, free, there is no way to choose – even

in the moment, not how we want to live freedom: what we do together determines our existence to an individual degree, therefore. Finishing the trilogy ``Com a Morte na Alma`` (1949), philosophy professor Mathieu manages to represent in a practical way the theory put forward in Sursis by risking his own life to delay the attack of the Nazi troops.

5. About time, Sartre comments: "Temporality is evidently an organized structure, and these three alleged "elements" of time, past, present, future, must not be seen as a collection of "data" ("data") whose sum must be realized - like, for example, an infinite series of "present moments" in which some are not yet, others are no longer -, but as structured moments of an original synthesis. Otherwise, we are going to come across this paradox first of all: the past is no more, the future is not yet; as for the instantaneous present, everyone knows that it does not exist: it is the limit of an infinite division, like the dimensionless point. Thus, the entire series annihilates itself, and doubly so, since the future "now", for example, is nothing as far as the future is concerned and will be realized in nothing when it passes into the present "now" state" (SARTRE, 2018, page 158).

not choosing is already a choice and that is why man is condemned to be free.

It implies, here, the notion of responsibility, which seems to go hand in hand with freedom, even if they are antagonistic, since the subject becomes completely responsible for his being from the moment he chooses and defines his own actions[6]. Being the subject responsible for his actions, he is not totally free – the choice must occur within a "choice framework" (SARTRE, 2018, page 72). That is, it depends on the context, situation, and therefore, we cannot choose to do what we want and when we want. It is necessary to use freedom with caution.

EDUCATION AS A PHENOMENON

Education is a phenomenon, which implies that it is apprehended by consciousness as a fact of the world, capable of transforming and undergoing transformations in itself. And so, together with the being of the phenomenon, whose purpose is the act of educating, the reason for education becomes educating to transform oneself, the human being and the world, starting from itself. Transforming man, transforms the world.

Education is indeed transformative, but it also transforms and is defined by social, cultural and historical factors, which ends up resulting in different types of educational models. It is as if it were a mediator of the historical process of humanity, to the point that transmitting knowledge to the human being in order to transform it in order to transform the world, is essential in the act of its process as a human being, individual, and as a sociocultural being., part of a collectivity (Cf. SCHNEIDER, 2012, page 398).

As phenomenology, education would support the world as it really is, in its purest becoming. We live, well, in what and from what we really are, there is no vision for a life beyond this one, only this one. Sartre's phenomenology navigates through this reality and returns to itself, to its phenomena, it does not assume anything beyond what is, what is given, how things really are – education would therefore be a phenomenon in itself.

THE PROJECT OF BEING OF A SPECIFIC WAY

> [...] man is nothing but what he makes himself. This is the first principle of existentialism. This is also what is called subjectivity, and this is the term by which we are criticized. But what do we really mean by this, if not that man has more dignity than a stone or a table? For we mean that man exists above all, that which he projects to become, and that which he is conscious of projecting to become. Man is, initially, a project that lives as a subject, and not like a moss, a fungus or a cauliflower; nothing exists prior to that design; there is nothing intelligible under the sky and man will be, first of all, what he has designed to be. Not what he will want to be. For what we ordinarily understand by wanting is a conscious decision which, for most of us, comes after what we have actually made of ourselves. I may want to join a party, write a book, get married, all this is just a manifestation of a more original, more spontaneous choice than what is called will. But if existence really precedes essence, man is responsible for what he is. Thus, the first result of existentialism is to place every man in possession of what he is, and to place the full responsibility for his existence on him. (SARTRE, 2019, page 25-26)

The project to which Sartre refers is the project-of-being, it is to choose oneself, as

---

6. When the subject realizes that being is something placed in the world, that it exists by itself, alone, where even non-choice is a choice, and then begins to define itself as being In-itself through being-for-itself, anxiety arises. linked to the Sartrean concept of bad faith – which means "lying to oneself", in a form of self-deception when the subject refuses to believe that self-consciousness is something that only she made herself. Sartre says: "He who is affected in bad faith must be aware (of) his bad faith, for the being of consciousness is consciousness of being" (SARTRE, 2018, page 95).

a unification of all postulations of man: The In-itself-For-itself of body and consciousness, the past and the present of man toward becoming (Cf. SCHNEIDER, 2012, page 400). The project-of-being consists of man existing, emerging in the world, and from his relations with the world and reality his essence is defined, and only after that, man chooses what to be and what to do. It is the primacy of the phrase "existence precedes essence", and, therefore, the project-of-being is strongly linked with the concept of freedom.

My choices, however, primarily affect others, not me. Sartre uses the term being-For-itself-For-the-Other in this structural part of human reality. Since, the being who has conscience, who is For-himself, who as previously said, exists for-the-Other, must pay attention to his choices in the same way for-the-Other. If I choose, for example, to hate people because of the color of their skin, I am also giving other people the option of doing the same, because, following the logic of the For-the-Other: if I can, so can the other.

> So, when we say that man is responsible for himself, we do not mean that man is only responsible for his strict individuality, but that he is responsible for all men. [...] When we say that man chooses himself, we mean that each one of us chooses himself, but we also mean that, by choosing himself, he chooses all men. In fact, there is not a single one of our acts that, creating the man we want to be, is not simultaneously creating an image of man as we believe he must be. Choosing to be this or that is to affirm, at the same time, the value of what we are choosing, because we can never choose evil; what we choose is always good and nothing can be good for us without being good for everyone. If, on the other hand, existence precedes essence, and if we want to exist at the same time as we shape our image, this image is valid for everyone and for our entire time. Therefore, our responsibility is much greater than we might suppose, as it involves the whole of humanity. (SARTRE, 2019, page 26-27)

The subjectivity of the subject takes place as objectified subjectivity, as there is materiality, history, social facts, concrete existences and it is in the process of appropriating these factors that subjectivity is constructed and actions, thoughts and emotions make it objective (SARTRE, 2018). Above all, man is involved in a process of relationships: with material reality, with the body, with the other, with time.

This subjectivity is concretely shown in the sociocultural relations that prevail and materialize as groups are formed in society, where a group implies the union of people who form a whole, "a weaving of people in the light of a common project, intertwining of socially, culturally, affectively and psychologically implicated personalities" (SCHNEIDER, 2012, page 398). With the groups, which we can call the subject's existential supports, which transmit a certain type of knowledge and build knowledge, of different types, form the basis of the educational act.

NEW PEDAGOGY

Sartre, in the third part of ``O ser e o nada ``, criticizes the educational model that has the teacher as an authority figure, or any authority, and sole holder of knowledge, while the student is just a passive figure in the process educational. Sartre's new pedagogy focuses on the student and his potential, and the teacher is the mediator of the learning process that will help the student to reach his potential.

This search for the potential reach of the student is what characterizes the becoming of the subject, the notion of the project-of-being – the student, in the school environment, which already exists, has already placed himself in the world, defined himself, now seeks to reach his potential. with the educational act through the teacher, so that he can use his freedom

with caution. And so, the teacher is the Other who mediates the transcendence of the Self and the Self, which is the student, in order to reach his potential, achieve his freedom and transform himself and the world.

Learning must occur through interaction and through social relationships with others, which is not very detailed in the hierarchical teacher > student model. It is a relationship of process and development of both. Being-with-the-Other also fulfills the role of social mediator between the cultural groups on which it bases the educational process as a dialectic between the production and transmission of knowledge by material subjects and society.

Freedom as part of the phenomenological process of education conceives knowledge as part of the subject's material reality, which recognizes its historical-dialectic character, and therefore transforming (Cf. SCHNEIDER, 2012, page 401). Doing education in Sartre is liberating in the sense that man is his subjectivity, it is necessary to be free and bear the actions of one's own responsibility.

THE LOOK OF THE OTHER

The subject's greatest responsibility is to deal with existing alongside the Other at the same time that the Self is under the gaze of that Other. It is, in Burstow's words: "the Other that makes me a human being" (BURSTOW, 2000, page 109) and it is this same Other that objectifies our being, in other words, it is the Other that makes us what we are. Just as facts are captured by consciousness, the In-itself that encounters the For-itself, and thus consciousness differentiates facts to acquire knowledge through negation, when the ``I``, it becomes the object of apprehension of the Other, it finds a sense, meaning – becomes the object of the gaze of the Other.

It is a human condition, in addition to freedom, to be an individual, from birth, and to be in the world living with other individuals, since without this condition of alterity with the other, there is no humanity and if there is no humanity, there is no human nature:

> This way, I, who, while I am my possibilities, am what I am not and am not what I am, from now on I am someone. And what I am - and escapes me on principle - I am in the middle of the world, insofar as it escapes me. Therefore, my relationship with the object, or potentiality of the object, decomposes under the gaze of the Other and appears to me in the world as my possibility of using the object, insofar as this possibility escapes me on principle [...] (SARTRE, 2018, page 339)

Sartre states: "Thus, the Other is for me, first of all, the being for which I am an object, that is, the being through which I acquire my objectivity. If I can conceive of only one of my properties objectively, it is because the Other is already given. And it is given, not as a being of my universe, but as a pure subject." (SARTRE, 2018, page 347). Then he adds that: "[...] the Other is always present to me insofar as I am always For-another". (SARTRE, 2019, page 359)

It is through the look of the other, in this relationship of subject-object, subjectivity-objectivity, that makes me like the very object of apprehension of consciousness, like the very fact to be deferred by the For-itself. The ``I,`` it is In-itself:

> The proof of my condition as a man, an object for all other living men, thrown into the arena under millions of gazes and escaping myself millions of times, I realize it concretely on the occasion of the appearance of an object in my universe, whether this object indicates to me that it is probably an object, in the present, by way of this differentiated for a consciousness. It is the set of the phenomenon that we call looking. (SARTRE, 2018, page 360)

Sartre considers the Other, therefore, "indispensable" to the existence of the subject. The knowledge we think we have about our

Self is the knowledge that the Other reflects on us, as if the gaze of the Other were the primordial element in the creation of the knowledge we have about ourselves. In the third part of Being and Nothingness, Sartre reiterates that: "Consciousness does not know its character – except by reflexively determining itself from the point of view of the Other. [...] This character, therefore, only exists at the level of the For-other". (SARTRE, 2018, page 438-439)

Therefore, the ``I``, it is the Other, insofar as the gaze of the Other possesses, in a certain way, the being of the subject-object; the Other has primary knowledge about the Self. What makes me? Awareness. And who can know it, since the For-itself of consciousness knows everything but itself? The other:

> [...] the Other is for me the one who stole my being and, at the same time, the one who makes "there" a being, which is mine. So I have the understanding of this ontological structure; I am responsible for my being-For-another, but not its foundation; my being-For-another appears to me, therefore, in the form of something given and contingent, for which, however, I am responsible, and the Other grounds my being insofar as this being is in the form of "there is"; but the Other is not responsible for it, although it grounds it in complete freedom, in and by its free transcendence. Therefore, to the extent that I reveal myself as responsible for my being, I claim this being that I am; that is, I want to recover it, or, in more exact terms, I am a project to recover my being. (SARTRE, 2018, page 455)

The Other who "stole my being", as Sartre points out, does so because he enjoys freedom. It has already been made in the world, alterity has been established with the Other, it has been defined, in short, life has been given as a project-of-being, so the Other is free to choose, its look is free. It is worth remembering that Sartre's freedom is ontological, therefore, there is no way not to make choices: not

choosing is a choice in itself. It is intrinsic in human nature.

> This being that I am retains a certain indeterminacy, a certain unpredictability. And these new characteristics do not result only from the fact that I cannot know the other, but also, and above all, from the fact that the other is free; [...] the freedom of the other reveals itself to me through the disturbing indeterminacy of being that I am for him. Thus, this being is not my possibility, it is not always in question at the heart of my freedom: on the contrary, it is the limit of my freedom, its "reverse", in the sense in which we refer to the "reverse of the coin"; such a being is given to me like a burden that I carry without ever being able to turn my face to know him, without even being able to feel his weight; if we can compare it to my shadow, it is a shadow that would be projected onto a mobile and unpredictable matter [...]. However, this is effectively my being and not an image of my being. It is about my being as it is written in and by the freedom of the other. (SARTRE, 2018, page 337)

The object and its meaning vary and are distinguished according to the consciousness of the Other, by the factor of freedom, of choices. People are individuals, subjects, they don't think in alike ways, they don't differ in alike ways. The consciousness of the Other when apprehending a subject-object can capture and differ different senses and meanings than I would capture (being the Other) about the same subject-object. Being seen through the eyes of the Other causes a feeling of discomfort, according to Sartre.

The gaze of the Other crosses us, enslaves the freedom of the Self, since we constitute an image of ourselves, a social mask before society and the environment in which we are. We are never or reveal the true I, because the Other holds my being, my conscience. The freedom of the Other "models" my subject-object being and makes it to be, so the freedom of the ``I``, it does not bring any security to the being of

the phenomenon (SARTRE, 2018).

Phenomenologically speaking, alterity is conflicting not only because the gaze of the Other "steals" the identity of the Self, but coexisting is at odds with the subject-object who perceives that the image he has of himself differs from the image created and differed by consciousness from the other. The subject-object and the relationship with the look open an important discussion about education, and the school space and the role of the teacher as an authority within the project-of-being.

THE JELLYFISH SCHOOL

COERCIVE MYTHOLOGY THROUGH THE GAZE

Mythologies of the ocean, the gorgons were counted since antiquity as waves of the high seas, women with sharp teeth, claws made of bronze and hair of a serpent. The best known is Medusa, surrounded by the petrified figures of the men who dared to look her straight in the eye. Before proceeding with the term "medusa-school" and understanding why this structure causes fear, it is necessary to briefly understand the myth of the gorgon Medusa.

The most common narrative is that of the Roman poet Ovid, where Medusa, unlike her Gorgon sisters Euryale and Stheno[7], she was a mortal priestess of Athena – who emerged from the head of her father, Zeus, valuing, so to speak, rationality – who ended up enchanting Poseidon, god of the seas. Poseidon, god who cannot contain her will, violently in the temple of Athens, awakening the fury of the virgin goddess, who decides to punish the priestess for having seduced Poseidon with her beauty.

Transformed into a gorgon, just like the sisters were, Medusa was punished by Athena with the intention that she would

not be seductive to any man or god again (Cf. OLIVEIRA, 2017, page 87). Medusa's punishment persists until the arrival of Perseus, when she is manipulated and has her head torn off as a gift from marriage to Polydect, king of the island of Seriphus.

With that, Medusa, in a look where fear and hatred meet, faces her fateful end.

In the shield painted in 1598 (Image 1), Caravaggio accurately captures the moment between the life and death of Medusa and her serpents, to the point that her look is one of astonishment and fear, but there is also a certain resentment for the betrayal suffered by Perseus. The Italian painter alludes to the shield of the goddess Athena, used in battles, on which there was an engraving of a gorgon, astutely associated with the fact of the petrification of Medusa's gaze to frighten her opponents.

Picture 1 – *Meduse*

SOURCE: Image 1 – Meduse. Caravaggio Merisi. 1595-1598. Oil on canvas on wood (shield).

Etymologically, Medusa has its origin in the Greek verb medon, which means command, who reigns, in a proper sense of measure,

7. Gaia, the Earth, spawned his son ``Points``, the ``Sea``, and together they had Phorcys and Ceto – both deities said to be sea monsters – who gave rise to the three gorgons: Medusa, Stheno and Euryale. In one version of the myth, Stheno and Euryale were beautiful and seductive like their sister, Medusa, and were disfigured after arousing envy in other gods – including Athena – who would have transformed them (WILK, 2000).

moderation, to assume with authority. We can interpret Medusa's petrifying gaze (Image 2) as a look of command, of control. The petrifying look that crosses our soul, which ends up highlighting the fragility of human existence. What Sartre calls - look-At-self, which runs through the look of the Other, because there is a certain violence in that look: it is the look of Medusa staring at the man that petrifies him, paralyzes him, and not the look of the man at himself.

Imagem 2 – *Gorgoneion*

SOURCE: Image 2 – Work signed by Ergotimos as a potter and Kleitias as a painter. Support with Gorgon. Greek, archaic art produced with black-figure pottery. 570 BC, Terracotta. Height: 5.7 cm, diameter: 9 cm. Fletcher Fund, 1931.

The Medusa of the archaic period is often represented as in Ovid's narratives, a monstrous creature, possessing claws and fangs, in addition to the presence of snakes that replace her hair - all because she was punished. The Gorgoneion is currently found in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, in New York, whose caption is: "The three Gorgons were so horrible to behold that whoever looked at them turned to stone" (HEDREEN, 2017).

However, the gaze is penetrating and paralyzes, it pierces the soul of the being in any representation of the figure of the gorgon, whether on a shield or a vase. The look that goes beyond centuries and versions of narratives, continues to carry the essence of his look: the look of hate, resentment, ferocity. Thus, following this idea, the medusa school teaches, according to Sartre, by authority and is intimidated by the gaze. It is a simple reflection that starts from Greek mythology, but above all, from the notion that we constitute ourselves as human beings from the perspective of the other.

The ``I`` constitutes itself as a being in front of another being. In this perspective of the gaze of the Other, it is thought that: we exist because we have the gaze of the other to reaffirm our existence, in a way, the same happens to reality/world as previously said, which despite being independent, it only makes sense when contemplated by consciousness. In this sense, the school has the function of looking at the Other, putting itself in the Other's place, a way of understanding the reality of students and teachers.

Sartre believes, therefore, that the school, due to its entire process of construction and transmission of knowledge through the educational act, - which is a way of relationship and socialization between student and teacher - is the perfect meeting of the Self and the Other and the relationship that both play in being-For-another. This implies that both the student and the teacher occupy the roles of I and Other as there are interlooks, several glances, several perspectives, several I and several Others.

CONCLUSION

Developing his ontology from the line of thought of his master and creator of the very concept of Phenomenology, Edmund Husserl, Sartre concretizes his own phenomenological ontology, even though he still maintains the

habit of conceptualizing philosophers of modernity, as well as every contemporary, in order to honor its existentialist origin. Jean-Paul Sartre fulfills the promise of having his ontology as an overcoming of the idealist metaphysics of the 19th century.

As modern philosophy developed in a more naturalistic way, with man being a "rational animal", in the following century, the advance of philosophical theories passes through the position of man as a subject being, putting in check the function of Philosophy – in a sense to define being a man who must have the being as a subject and not as an object of scientific research.

It is this objectification and subjectivation of being that Sartre postulated in Being and Nothingness. Seeking to bring a new meaning to the being of being a subject, the French philosopher elaborates on dialectics, as in the concepts that define his ontology: being-in-itself and being-for-itself. Fullness and consciousness, ego and otherness. Since the In-itself is given and does not depend on anything else to exist, the For-itself depends on alterity and on relations with the Other, which occur in the world of objectivity.

The For-itself, therefore, already depends on the objectivity of the In-itself to exist, since this is the being of the phenomenon, which is the I and which is also the Other. However, the In-itself is not free from dependencies. As we have seen, to give meaning to the existence of the In-itself/world, something is needed that contemplates it, that makes it be In-itself: consciousness, which apprehends everything but itself. Thus, although the For-itself implies the non-being of consciousness, according to Sartre, being is a combination between being-In-itself and being-For-itself.

Sartre's ontological freedom is the possibility of transiting between the Self and the Other, since it is a primordial condition of being to do. Being is made when it is In-itself, because it is born alone, in the world, in the midst of objectivity. As the individual establishes himself in the midst of this world, he develops relationships with the Other, with otherness from consciousness, from the For-itself. Freedom as condemnation has always been there, so not choosing is already a choice. And how can we use this freedom being an ontological entity of being? Through the project-of-being.

Would it be possible, therefore, to subjectify education as based on the individuality of the being? Undoubtedly. The problem in education criticized by Sartre in the chapter on the Look, and also the problem that persists in current societies, is education that coerces through the look, with the teacher as the Other who uses the freedom to look with the purpose of intimidating, placing fear, and not exactly to teach or transform themselves and the world.

The new pedagogy based on the project-of-being proposes an education that aims at first respecting the subjectivity of being. The being that constituted itself in the world and was transformed along with the teacher's mediation, in order to transform the world through freedom. Precisely for this reason, even with the otherness immanent in the ontology of being, the existence of the Self is emancipated from the Other, as the Self also transits as the Other. This does not mean that my existence is totally independent of the existence of the Other, as Sartre vehemently asserted.

REFERENCES

BURSTOW, Bonnie. A filosofia sartreana como fundamento da educação. In: **Educação e Sociedade (Cedes).** Campinas, SPAGE n. 70. page 103 –126, abril de 2000. Publicado Originalmente no Journal of Philosophy of Education, nº 2, vol. 17, 1983, pg. 171-185. Tradução: Newton Ramos-de-Oliveira. UNESPAGE Disponível em: https://www.scielo.br/j/es/a/8RR8rfDWmRH XVHn7TT3zZdC/?lang=pt. Acesso em: 20 jun. 2021.

DANELON, Márcio. **Educação e subjetividade: uma interpretação à luz de Sartre.** Tese (Doutorado em Filosofia) – UNICAMP, Campinas, 2003.

DA SILVA, Luciano Donizzeti. **A Filosofia de Sartre: entre a liberdade e a história**. São Carlos: Claraluz, 2010.

———. Existencialismo e educação – a filosofia sartriana da liberdade como fundamento pedagógico. **Aprender – Caderno de Filosofia e Psicologia da Educação**. Vitória da Conquista, Ano III, No. 4: 175-200, 2005. Disponível em: https://periodicos2. uesb.br/index.php/aprender/article/view/3175/2657. Acesso em: 25 jun. 2021

HEDREEN, Guy. **The Frontal Face in Athenian Vase-Painting – The Frame in Classical Art.** A Cultural History, Verity Platt and Michael Squire, eds. ppage 177–78, fig. 3.11, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

LIMA, Walter Matias. **Lições sobre Sartre.** Maceió: Edufal, 2009.

OLIVEIRA, Kamilla Mesquita. **Medusa ao Reverso: uma jornada entre mitos, pedras e danças.** Arte da Cena, Goiânia, v. 3, n. 1, page 85-107, Jan-jun/2017. Disponível em: http://www.revistas.ufg.br/index.php/artce.

SARTRE, Jean-Paul. **Crítica da Razão Dialética: precedido por questões de método**. Tradução: Guilherme J. F. Teixeira. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2002. 135 p.

———. O **existencialismo é um humanismo**. Tradução: João Batista Kreuch.
4. Ed – Petrópolis: Vozes, 2019. 191 p.

———. **O ser e o nada: Ensaio de Ontologia Fenomenológica**. Tradução: Paulo Perdigão. 24. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2018. 782 p.

———. **Os Caminhos da Liberdade**. Tradução: Sérgio Millet. 9. Ed. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 2017.

———. **Os Pensadores**. Comentários: Marilena Chauí. Ed: Abril, 1978.

———. **Une idée fondamentale de la phénoménologie de Husserl: L'intentionnalité**. Tradução: Ricardo Leon Lopes. VEREDAS FAVIP, Caruaru, Vol. 2, n. 01, ppage 102–107, jan./jun. 2005.

SCHNEIDER, Daniela Ribeiro. Sartre, existencialismo e educação. In: OLIVEIRA, PAGE E (org.) **Filosofia e Educação: aproximações e convergências**. Curitiba: Círculo de estudos bandeirantes, 2012. page 389-404.

WILK, Stephen. **Medusa: Solving the mystery of the Gorgon**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.