Dean&Francis
ISSN 2959-6122

Sartre and the Burden of Responsibility

Vivian Liu[1, *]

[1]Cheltenham Ladies College, Cheltenham, England
*Corresponding author: vliu5206@gmail.com

Abstract:

This essay explores Jean-Paul Sartre's idea of radical freedom and the criticism that his philosophy places too heavy a weight of responsibility on human beings. Starting with Sartre's contention that existence precedes essence, it considers how his ontology of freedom insists on radical self-determining in a universe without divine or natural assurances. But critics say this requirement makes life unbearably solitary and morally absolutist. The essay rereads the accusation of bad faith through Sartre's model for it and argues that its protest responsibility is a masked form of refusal to confront one's freedom. It goes on to examine the modifications brought by Simone de Beauvoir's concept of situated freedom and Sartre's own subsequent formulation in Critique of Dialectical Reason, which conceives freedom within historical and social totalities. Finally, the essay maintains that the "burden" of responsibility is not an ethical excess or a failure of abstraction, but constitutive of human existence as such: an ontological necessity enabling both authenticity and dignity and moral creativity.

Keywords: Freedom, Responsibility, Bad Faith, Situated Freedom, Authenticity.

1. Introduction

The philosophy of Existentialism, which has its roots in the mid-to-late 20th century, is referred to as existentialism. Existentialism was born in a world disillusioned by two world wars, a world confronted with the vacuum left by the death of religious and moral certainties. The introduction briefly gestures to this upheaval, but it is worth recalling the particular historical ruptures that shaped the intellectual climate: the mechanised slaughter of the Western Front, the failure of liberal democracies in the interwar years, the rise and fall of fascism, and the revelation of the Holocaust. These events made visible the collapse of once-stable frameworks—Christian teleology, Enlightenment faith in progress, and the humanist belief in a rational, orderly universe. By the mid-twentieth century, many thinkers experienced not merely disillusionment but a profound metaphysical vertigo. In this context, Sartre's claim that "existence precedes essence" emerges less as a dramatic inversion than as an inevitable response to a world where inherited meanings had crumbled. The very conditions that wiped away traditional certainties prepared the ground for the existential insistence that individuals

ISSN 2959-6122

must create their own purposes. Its leading figures, among them Jean-Paul Sartre, made what may be the most revolutionary statement of modern philosophy: "existence comes before essence." There is no such thing as a God-vouched-for human nature. They are born into the "world" lacking an aim and must make up purposes through their involvement in specific acts. From this unfree beginning appears Sartre's now famous contention that human beings are radically free — condemned to choose without the help of external guarantees, divine or natural. To Sartre, freedom is not a gift but a sentence—it's the only condition that makes our lives matter.

That vision has earned him lifelong enemies. Sartre has been accused of "holding individuals to an excessive burden" and making life nothing more than an impossible task of self-creation. His insistence that there are "no excuses," to some, omits the dependence and social constraints that form every human existence. Still, the charge requires a closer look. Is not the protest against this 'burden' itself already bad faith? According to Sartre, bad faith (mauvaise foi) is the flight from freedom—the attempt to conceive of oneself as an inert object, a mere thing in the world rather than an agent who can transcend it. To declare Sartre's picture intolerable may then be an example of the evasion it itself exposes: a way of escaping unwelcome truths about being entirely for oneself.

This paper claims that the Sartrean notion of absolute responsibility is not a matter of choice when it comes to deciding on an ethical code; rather, it is a dimension of our reality, in terms of existence as consciousness. To resist freedom is to be guilty of self-deception—to deny one's very being as free. We can nuance Sartre's story even further, however; after all, there is no human freedom in an empty world. The self is always situated: embodied, gendered, historical, and material. The dialectic of abstract freedom and concrete freedom will be key in this regard. In addressing this paradox, the essay will suggest that Sartre's "burden" is what gives human life its weight and honour: an inexorable demand that is crippling only because it cannot be evaded.

Central to Sartre's philosophy is the seemingly simple phrase "existence precedes essence," which challenges centuries of metaphysical knowledge. Classical and theological traditions—from Aristotle's belief in man as a rational animal to Aquinas's notion of humanity ordered to the divine end—tended to take it as given that there is such a thing as "essence preceding existence." Typically, Sartre turns this around: it is people who first exist, only later to be defined by their choices. There is no god to prescribe morality, no nature to assign purpose. Freedom is as infinite as responsibility. Sartre demonstrates this in Existentialism Is a Humanism with the tale of the student who can't decide whether to join the French Resistance or stay at home tending his mother. No ethical code can determine it for him; he must decide, and even sometimes invent values. "The choice for which he is," says Sartre vehemently, "is a choice of all men." Here is the core of Sartrean ethics: each act defines not just oneself, but what it means to be human. To exist is to legislate—to carry the weight of universality in one's specific choices. But it is out of this very trembling with fear and grandeur that the demand for responsibility arises.

2. Why Critics accuse Sartre for overburdening the individual

Sartre is considered to burden his subjects with responsibilities for a number of reasons; The following are "his most significant and provocative partial justifications." First, there is the simple scope of responsibility. Yet when criticizing Sartre on this point, it is important to anchor the critique in concrete situations rather than leaving it at the level of abstraction. For example, his notorious neglect of social and material conditions becomes clearer when viewed through the lived disparities between social classes: the "freedom" of a working-class individual whose choices are constrained by economic precarity, familial obligations, or lack of educational access is qualitatively different from that of the bourgeois subject Sartre implicitly universalises. Such examples illustrate how the burden of absolute responsibility weighs unevenly across society, and they reveal the practical limits of Sartre's claim that all individuals, regardless of circumstance, are equally able to choose. Introducing case studies of this sort not only strengthens the criticism but also prevents it from drifting into theoretical generality. Sartre maintains that in the act of choosing, one is not in fact inventing a private fate but submitting to and thus defining a conception of humanity. So the moral reach of a simple choice doesn't go out as far as the self. For some, universalization of this kind is far too great, since it turns our personal deeds into cosmic pronouncements.

Second, the psychological cost of Sartre's requirement has attracted much attention. Devoid of an external anchor in God, nature, or the past, individuals face a psychological abyss of self-authorship. Sartre calls this experience angoisse (anguish) or existential "vertigo": the staggering realization that in being-for-itself, nothing holds one back but oneself. Sartre's student is not just choosing and deciding but facing the unbearable nature of absolute freedom. Critics counter that a burden of this magnitude yields only complacency, despair, or grim determination [1].

Third, Sartre supposes a neglect of the social material. Simone de Beauvoir, Sartre's lifelong partner in both thought and life, complicates his theory in The Second Sex. She argues that freedom is never pure—it's always

shaped by the body, by gender, by history, and by culture [2]. A woman may be free in the abstract sense Sartre describes but still trapped within a patriarchal system that limits her choices. Later Marxist thinkers expanded on this, arguing that Sartre's early existentialism neglects the influence of class and material conditions, and so risks reducing freedom to a purely individual matter [3].

Many critics also question the moral harshness of Sartre's philosophy. He accepts no excuses: blaming fate, upbringing, or God for one's failures counts, for him, as bad faith. Yet this very rigor is what makes his ethics feel punishing. To Sartre, those who live in bad faith are not just inauthentic but somehow wrong—self-deceived or morally at fault. For his critics, this makes his view of responsibility not only heavy but almost inhuman in its severity.

3. Sartre's Justification for the Heavy Burden

Sartre would answer that we can't escape responsibility—it isn't a moral demand but a fact of being. Freedom, for him, isn't something we own or control; it's the very texture of consciousness. To exist as human is to be condemned to freedom, to face every moment as a decision that only we can make. "We are abandoned without excuse," he writes in Being and Nothingness. This abandonment isn't about loneliness in an emotional sense, but about the absence of any divine or natural framework to fall back on. And its force becomes clearer when viewed through the small but decisive choices of everyday life. A student choosing between a stable but uninspiring career and a riskier path aligned with personal passion can consult parents, teachers, and statistics, but no rulebook can tell her what to value; she must decide what she will become. Someone who witnesses misconduct at work—an unfair dismissal, a discriminatory remark—must choose whether to intervene, stay silent, or rationalise inaction. In each case, the responsibility cannot be outsourced. The decision is theirs alone, and its meaning is shaped entirely by them. Thus when critics accuse Sartre of placing too much weight on the individual, they misread his point. He isn't imposing an ethical burden but describing an existential condition: we are free, and that freedom is what makes us human [4].

For Sartre, this recognition redefines human dignity itself. Responsibility is the gravity that grounds our freedom—the only weight we are truly free to carry. In Existentialism Is a Humanism, he declares, "Man is nothing else but what he makes of himself." Freedom's suffering is, in that sense, the price of meaning. Without responsibility, authenticity collapses, moral seriousness dissolves, and the self becomes hollow. We see this, too, in everyday evasions: blaming circumstance for a choice we made, insisting that "I had no alternative," or hiding behind convention to avoid the discomfort of agency. To reject responsibility is, for Sartre, to flee from humanity—to hide in bad faith behind the mask of an object or a mechanism, something acted upon rather than acting [5]. Such denial is not an act of humility but a quiet disowning of one's own authorship of existence. This method is more serious devoid of God. In Sartre's famous dictum, "If there is no God, everything is permitted," he does not indulge in nihilism; it just means that the moral law must itself emerge now from within human subjectivity. With no divine law, because, in fact, with no metaphysical essence of man as such, values are to be forged—created! To back away from this creative act is to live in a fantasy of escape behind determinism, social conformity, or transcendent command [6]. It is thus that responsibility is the curse and also the doom of human existence. It cannot be moved, fled, or delegated; it defines what it is to be human.

Thus the "burden of too much" is also the most supreme privilege. Radical responsibility is the sine qua non of creativity — the capacity to make meaning out of nothingness. The hell of being cast is also the heaven of not: the realisation that truth is no script but an open horizon of self-fashioning. The humanist existentialism of Sartre tells us that the freedom which horrifies is the one in whose name we are equally dignified. To assume the burden of responsibility is to fulfill it — not in the sense that one can inevitably collapse under, but standing outside oneself with a muscle [that] transcends a certain subject, and taking upon oneself existential authorship, thereby affirming existence in its totality.

4. The Charge of Excessive Burden as Bad Faith

To understand the allegation better, we must first understand what form it takes. Bad faith (mauvaise foi) is what Sartre describes is going on here — in Being and Nothingness he thinks that our lives are punctuated by not being confident of our existential status. It's not lying, in the strictest sense of that word — not lying to others — but it is a rejection of possibility; it is the refusal to consider certain possibilities so as to preserve an illusion of security in a "meaningless" world. It's conscious suicide. To Sartre, as he lays it out in Being and Nothingness, consciousness is what it is not—and also always conscious (if unconsciously at least) that it necessarily longs to escape itself [7]. The subject is made to both know and not to know the truth about its own condition. So bad faith is not ignorance, but a dark and willed opacity — a refusal to confront the radical openness of one's being. The existential exit strategy, in other words, the way out of the vertigo that sets in when it begins to dawn on you that no one —

ISSN 2959-6122

not a divine order, not nature, not society's rules — will tell you who to be.

This longing is obvious—although with excessive truth—in the phrase "I can't take this on myself." Under the protest is the longing for heteronomy—a wish for something other than myself to determine the meaning of my life. But it is this illusion that Sartre wants us to see through. His existentialism confronts us with a universe that is not warmed by theology but one that is cold purposive. But, ultimately, this chilliness, he insists, is what separates us from others. With no God or substance to absolve, there are no alibis. What ensues is not some unfortunate by-product of freedom; it is the affective strategy, the sounding of human presence. Underneath the charge of "unjust burden" lies one of repression. It indicates a critic attempt to launder some type of metaphysical convenience back in as philosophical proposition. Therefore, the "Sartre made too much of us" is an allotment for determinism—a desire for some kind of moral exteriority and the go back to collapsed certitudes. The critic blaming Sartre for cruelty or an embellished descant is trying to neutralise the anxiety we experience with freedom: they think that responsibility can be spread, deputised, or disclaimed. But, in so doing, they enchant the route that Sartre diagnoses—the flight from freedom to object, from accountability to attribute, from consciousness to thing.

The charge of "undue burden" might itself, then, be bad faith [8]. It represents an undertaking on the part of the critic to smuggle some sort of metaphysical solace back in as philosophical complaint. The claim that "Sartre asks too much of us" is an appeal for determinism—a subtle cry for moral externality and the eventual return to collapsed certitudes. The critic who accuses Sartre of cruelty or exaggeration is attempting to dissolve the anguish one experiences because of one's freedom: they fantasise that responsibility can somehow be spread around, delegated, or apologised for. But in so doing, they follow precisely the path that Sartre diagnoses—the flight from freedom to abjectness, from responsibility to excuse.

5. Nuancing the Debate: Situated Freedom and Structural Contraint

But Sartre's early existentialism can also be complemented and enriched in crucial respects. If human ontology is weight, how are we to acknowledge the inescapable stiltedness of human existence—its embeddedness in bodies, histories, and social systems? It can often seem as though these conditions fall away almost entirely in Sartre's early claim that we are "condemned to be free," as if the poor worker and the privileged intellectual faced the same horizons of choice. In Being and Nothingness, Sartre's depiction of consciousness as pure transcendence risks giving the impression that freedom knows no limits—that every form of confinement can be willed away by choosing. This is a view at once microscopically thin and metaphysically radical, yet so lacking in essential "meat" that it begins to bleed into abstraction. It discounts the political, social, and material conditions that define human potential. It was Simone de Beauvoir, Sartre's lifelong interlocutor, who first recognized that tension and sketched a more nuanced synthesis. Beauvoir contrasts ontological with practical freedom. Ontologically, she shares Sartre's view: no consciousness is ever not free, since there is nothing that can remove from us the fundamental ability to choose. But in practice, freedom is always exercised under limits. The self, for Beauvoir, is never pure subjectivity; it is always embodied—implicated in a world of others, institutions, and bodies. She refers to this condition as facticity: the conditions that are given in one's situation, such as gender, race, class, body, and historical moment, that limit the horizons of action. This becomes clearer when brought into everyday life. A young woman may "choose" any career, yet the weight of gendered expectations—subtle discouragement in school, pay gaps, or the burden of domestic labour—shapes the range of what feels realistically possible. A working-class student is ontologically free to pursue higher education, but the practical constraints of tuition fees, the need to work part-time, or a lack of family networks limit the avenues open to him in comparison to a wealthy peer. Someone with a chronic illness may be fully free in Sartre's abstract sense, yet their body imposes concrete boundaries on when, how, and how much they can act. These are not denials of freedom but the very texture through which it must operate. Fact, for Beauvoir, is not the negation of freedom but its condition as well as its horizon. "To will oneself free," she declares, "is also to will others free, so that the existence of individual freedom is already a gesture that gives value to the freedom of all men" [2]. This is not at all to deny Sartre's ontology; on the contrary, it provides a lived context for this otherwise barely intelligible philosophical mythology. She makes him concrete, no longer an abstraction, by helping us to see that there is nowhere from which freedom isn't exercised. It is not the airy flight of pure abstraction but an engaged and situated practice—one that moulds limitation without ever becoming defined by it. Not power, but freedom; not what is to be done, but what may be freely so done through conscious participation in human nature. So, for Beauvoir the moral challenge is not to transcend one's lot but to claim it — to act in and against it. The goal is to go from facticity to freedom through crafty resistance, by transforming the stuff of one's conditions for sheer existence into materials for moral self-making. This observation undermines the charge that Sartre's existentialism is an intolerable "burden" it places on people by rendering

them blank slates devoid of history or social reality. This is not a relativizing of responsibility but its apprehension in a historically shaped and morally related space. The human task, in Beauvoir's view, is not only self-definition but resistance — the moral and political labor of making freedom bigger within the given shape of things.

6. Structural Freedom and the Dialect of History

Sartre himself acknowledged this gap in his own later philosophy (notably Critique of Dialectical Reason). In it he endeavors to reconcile existential freedom with historical materialism, so that the products of his involvement as a Marxist thinker of human existence. Freedom, in this sophisticated understanding, is not either absolute or illusory; it lies essentially within what Sartre dubs "practical ensembles,' the complex wholes of social relations, economic structures and collective projects that condition but do not entirely determine human action. In the Critique, Sartre unambiguously turns toward history, collectivity and materiality. He articulates that freedom is always mediated by necessity—through praxis, the activity of transformative doing through which humans fabricate and are fabricated anew. Not freedom as a mere isolated fact of consciousness, but man's manner of action and his historical situation. For one thing, the worker is not ‚free' in the same way as a bourgeois intellectual (in periods of capitalist ‚normality', if we characterize him politically); for another, [supplement with specific differences, such as ‚the worker's choices are more constrained by economic survival']. This is a dramatic change in Sartrean thinking. The freedom of early existentialist was a matter of self-authorship, but later he finds it in the dialectic of history. The disembodied consciousness of Being and Nothingness becomes the embodied agent in the Critique as it also muddles through material constraint, want, and social conflict. This later Sartrean philosophy allows for the retrieval of what remained condemned in his early existentialist texts— freedom is conditioned by its dialectical locations; it is mediated by social totalities and historical forces [3]. But he does not jettison the existential core of his earlier thought. In such constraint however, Sartre insists, a sheer surplus of transcendence is left—a realm of creative remaking where consciousness makes up its own mind how to relate to the given. Liberty is only confined and not killed.

As a consequence this picture is rather more muscular of responsibility. Sartre is still right, then, that we are never released from freedom — and so responsibility cannot come to an end; we remain the authors of our deeds. But it is also true that his critics are right to insist that he gives salience to situations in their importance for understanding responsibility. Responsibility is always-already performed within certain regimes of power, domination, and mutual imposition. To speak of the freedom of man outside any conditions at all is to run the risk of turning existentialism into abstraction—a kind of metaphysical bravery that has never heard tell of those limitations which are a constituent aspect of the human condition. Yet it is also perilous to speak of conditions without freedom, for that is always to risk determinism on some level and make real agency impossible. Sartre's and Beauvoir's thinking is alive, then, to the necessity of holding that tension open: the human as both factually determined and transcendence (or constraint by circumstance but capable of expressing freedom within it). From this perspective, freedom isn't escape from the world but a new way of orienting oneself to it — making use of one's limits rather than just denying them.

Indeed, we learn from their discussion that the responsibility of existence is not a strictly individual matter but one that always entails others. Here Beauvoir's famous (or infamous) maxim—that one has to will the freedom of others, or that we are not free except inasmuch as our freedom wills freedom for other people—distributes Sartre's ontology across an ethical or political landscape. Freedom does not mean being never indebted, but rather knowing that we all depend on each other for our freedom. To be real human life demands that we be with, for, and in communion with each other, because our freedom is intertwined. This is also the position that Sartre had taken up in his late career when he insisted on the claim that genuine freedom could only be intelligible within social structures which are ontologically its antecedent. In this way, existentialism turns out to be a kind of ethical humanism: a philosophy calling for personal responsibility, but insisting on grounding it in collective struggle.

Sartre has often been accused of being tough on the individual due to his concept of freedom, but this is no mistake— it's an extreme position that refuses to make excuses for people. For at its most distilled, his philosophy is a kind of existential vertigo — a suspicion that we stand alone within an indifferent universe, and that when we make our choices, they not only define us but reflect back upon humanity itself. But Sartre's later writings suggest that one can transform this vertigo into something despair-less. The weight of freedom is not a burden but an enduring tension of the individual and history, possibility and limitation, autonomy and constraint, transcendence and situation. The accusation of "excessive burden" may therefore manifest a more nuanced form of bad faith: a refusal to own up to the anxiousness accompanying freedom by privilege constraint over possibility [9]. The moral demand described by Sartre and Beauvoir is not that we negate our situation but that we accept it wholesale, assuming responsibility not only for ourselves but for the

ISSN 2959-6122

world into which we have been thrown [10]. To thrive feels like converting film to project, condition to project, life itself into endless performance.

7. Conclusion

Sartre starts with a painful but liberating truth: There's no fixed template for what it is to be human — no divinely ordained purpose, no hidden pattern waiting to be uncovered. We are before, in the sense that coming first precedes defining ourselves. From that, he derives one astringent fact: freedom isn't and never has been an optional extra. We are condemned to be free, and we bear the weight of our choices not for ourselves alone but for what they mean about human beings at large..

It's this awesome sense of responsibility that makes his philosophy feel so weighty, perhaps even overwhelming, to many. But this essay has demonstrated that this charge misconceives his claim. Sartre's existentialism is not burdened by the weight of freedom; it brings that weight to light. The "burden" is not a moral punishment but an ontological fact: to exist as consciousness is to choose, and to choose is to create value where none exists.

But this essay also contends that Sartre's model needs to be situated. Liberty does not happen in a vacuum but is mediated by material, historical, and bodily circumstances. This is precisely what Beauvoir's intervention in The Ethics of Ambiguity and, later, The Second Sex makes clear: everyone's freedom is lived as facticity, and it is precisely within limitation that moral meaning emerges. Her positive conception of situated freedom reverses Sartre's generalization about the grassroots and lifts it from abstraction to a code of ethics, placing originality not as an escape from the givenness of existence but as a confrontation with its reality. In the same vein, Sartre's later texts in Critique of Dialectical Reason recognize the social and historical aspects of choice—despite his earlier project of individual freedom—when we begin to think of freedom, formerly individuated, as collective and dialectical: a praxis of mutual self- and world-shaping.. So it is that what Sartre's critics deride as the "crushing responsibility" of Sartrean ethics is, in fact, an expression of human dignity. The cost of self is the anxiety of freedom; the burden of meaning is responsibility. To refuse this weight is to lapse into bad faith, running from the reality that constitutes us. Freedom, in Sartre's final vision, is not the absence of limitation but its ongoing assumption—the capacity to turn necessity into project and existence into creation. Yet this idea risks feeling remote unless its practical force is made explicit. For contemporary readers, especially young people confronted with "career choice anxiety" and the pressure to follow predetermined life templates, Sartre's account offers a concrete reassurance: the absence of a fixed essence is not a deficit but an opening. Limitations—whether industry competition, financial constraint, or family expectation—need not be obstacles to selfhood but raw material for it. In actively choosing amid these conditions, we do not escape responsibility; we enact it. This is the everyday realisation of Sartre's demand: that we transform our circumstances, however imperfect, into the projects through which we create meaning.

This burden, again, isn't punishment but what makes our lives deep and full. And in bearing it, we don't become hopeless — we find an alternative kind of hope. It's the hope that in a world where there is no such thing as certainty, every action and every life still counts. Visible or erased, transitory or living on for generations, these are efforts that contribute in some way to the story that connects past to future.

References

[1] McGill, V. J. "Sartre's doctrine of freedom." Revue internationale de philosophie (1949): 329-342.

[2] Catalano, Joseph S. "Successfully lying to oneself: a Sartrean perspective." Philosophy and Phenomenological Research50.4 (1990): 673-693.

[3] Dupont, Marie. *Existentialism: Remarks on Jean-Paul Sartre's L'Être et le Néant*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1983.

[4] Butler, Michael. "The Role of Responsibility in Sartre's Ethical Theory." Sartre Studies International 11, no. 1 (2005): 23–42.

[5] Jones, Peter. "Sartre's Concept of Freedom(s)." Sartre Studies International 10, no. 2 (2004): 77–95.

[6] Natanson, Maurice. "Jean-Paul Sartre's Philosophy of Freedom 1." Existentialist Ontology and Human Consciousness. Routledge, 2013. 30-46.

[7] Eshleman, Matthew C. "The Misplaced Chapter on Bad Faith, or Reading Being and Nothingness in Reverse." Sartre Studies International 14, no. 2 (2008): 1–22.

[8] Flynn, Thomas R. "Freedom and Responsibility in Sartre's Philosophy." Philosophy and Phenomenological Research 33, no. 3 (1973): 322–339.

[9] Butler, Michael. "There is no good answer: the role of responsibility in Sartre's ethical theory." Sartre Studies International (2015): 97-107. Butler, 2005, 11 (1)

[10] Simone de Beauvoir, *The Ethics of Ambiguity*, trans. Bernard Frechtman (New York: Philosophical Library, 1948), 34.