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ABSTRACT: These two articles examine whether Sartre’s final interviews, recorded in *L’Espoir maintenant* [Hope Now] indicate a final turn to God and religious belief through an overview of his engagement with the idea of God throughout his career. In Part 1, published in *Sartre Studies International* 19, no 1, we examined Sartre’s early atheism, but noted the pervasive nature of secularised Christian metaphors and concepts in his religion of letters and also the centrality of man’s desire to be God in *L’Etre et le néant* [Being and Nothingness]. His theoretical writings sought to refute the idea of God, but in doing so, God was paradoxically both absent and present.

In Part 2 we consider his antitheism and its implications for his involvement with the idea of God before examining in detail his final encounter with theism as outlined in *L’Espoir maintenant*, arguing that it is part of Sartre’s long-term engagement with the divine, but refuting the idea that he became a theist at the end of his life.
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1. The Promethean Presence of God: An Anti-theistic Attitude?

In the first part of this study we saw that Sartre, despite his youthful atheism and his assertion that he did not think very much about God after his loss of belief, in fact makes
constant reference to Him. Les Mots [Words] through its depiction of his religion of letters, and also his literary works indicate the presence of religious, and specifically Christian symbols, stories and concepts. Moreover in L’Étre et le néant Sartre not only seeks to provide a great atheistic philosophy by demonstrating the impossibility of God, but also places the project of the pour-soi [for-itself] to be the être-en-soi-pour-soi [being-in-itself-for-itself] (in other words to desire to be God), at the heart of his analysis.

The idea of God remains paradoxically central to his thought in L’Existentialisme est un humanisme [Existentialism is a Humanism] and Cahiers pour une morale [Notebooks for an Ethics] where God’s absence is seen as a positive. For Sartre, atheism is where man finds his true liberty. So he both rejects God and incorporates the concept of God into his thinking. God is paradoxically both absent and present.

It is this vigorous championing of the liberty of the individual that explains the presence of significant anti-theistic elements in Sartre’s work. There are texts where he appears to be attacking God directly. This is particularly the case in Les Mouches [The Flies] (1943). Performed during the Occupation, it is, like Bariona (1940), a call to resistance against the occupying enemy, but it goes much further than his prison play. Its religious setting and its metaphysical themes (represented by Oreste’s confrontational attack on Jupiter), are crucial to its impact.

Oreste, after early hesitation in uncommitted liberty, is rebellious and openly anti-theistic, refusing to join with Electre and the people of Argos and succumb to the guilt and remorse that Jupiter and Egisthe want him to feel. He rejects the doctrine of
atonement that accompanies the declarations of guilt he is supposed to utter and the psychological slavery imposed on the people by Jupiter.

Oreste is portrayed as a champion of his own, and of man's freedom, robustly confronting Jupiter: ‘[…] tout ton univers ne suffira pas à me donner tort. Tu es le roi des dieux, Jupiter, le roi des pierres et des étoiles, le roi des vagues de la mer. Mais tu n'es pas le roi des hommes’¹ […] your whole universe is not enough to prove me wrong. You are the King of the Gods, Jupiter, the King of the stones and the stars, the King of the waves of the sea. But you are not the King of men.]

Jupiter is addressed as an equal: 'Je suis ma liberté! A peine m'as-tu créé que j'ai cessé de t'appartenir’² [I am my liberty! You had scarcely finished creating me that I ceased to belong to you.] Oreste displays the familiar Promethean traits, those of the archetypical rebel against the power of the gods in favour of man.³ Jupiter/God is rejected for the evil that he brings on men.

It is as if Oreste is the epitome of original sin, which Jupiter desires to punish, and which the play derides. Oreste is God to himself, free in thought, word, deed and destiny, deserting God because of his newfound enlightenment, leaving behind the subservience of sin, remorse, guilt and repentance, and grasping his own freedom and dignity. Hence his description of his experience of the transforming power of his discovery of individual liberty:

Mais, tout à coup, la liberté a fondu sur moi et m'a transi, la nature a sauté en arrière, et je n'ai plus eu d'âge, et je me suis senti tout seul, au milieu de ton petit monde bénin, comme quelqu'un qui a perdu son
ombre; et il n'y a plus rien eu au ciel, ni Bien ni Mal, ni personne pour
me donner des ordres.  

But suddenly, liberty swept down on me and transfixed me. Nature leapt
back, I no longer had any sense of age, and I felt myself completely
alone, at the heart of your pitiful little world, like someone who has lost
his shadow; and there was nothing in the heavens any more, neither
Good nor Evil, nor anyone to give me orders.]

Conversion, a key feature of religious experience, is important in Sartre’s thought.
Here, Oreste’s conversion takes the form of a rebellion against the evils and illusions of
religious belief. He leaves behind an uncommitted liberal humanist vagueness, surely an
autobiographical reference. Arriving in his home city a disconnected spectator, his killing
of Aegisthe and Clytemnestre represents a step towards engagement [commitment], and
his disappearance at the end can be seen positively, as a Messianic, Christ-like
assumption of the guilt of Argos, an example for his people to follow.

Sartre’s description of Oreste’s freedom may mirror that of the pour-soi [for-itself], but
the play’s emotional power comes from Oreste’s confrontation of Jupiter’s pride and his
challenge to Jupiter’s vain desire for worship. Jupiter may represent the Catholic Church
during the Occupation, but the metaphysical confrontation with and repudiation of
God/the gods adds vigour, energy and authenticity to the drama. God is rejected and
derided, and man’s freedom is celebrated. The dramatic power of this declaration is a far
cry from the merely philosophical refutation of God in L’Etre et le néant.
Le Diable et le Bon Dieu [The Devil and the Good Lord] (1951) approaches the rejection of God differently. Set in 16th century Germany at the time of the Anabaptist peasants’ revolt, Goetz von Berlichingen, the feared General, decides to sack the besieged city of Worms to serve evil and defy God. Heinrich, a Priest, convinces him that it is easy to do evil, but a much more difficult task to do good. In response, Goetz devotes himself to good by attempting to set up a Cité du soleil, but fails utterly, as do his attempts to help the peasants. When Heinrich, now apostate, meets him later in the play, he forces Goetz to admit that his experience has taught him the emptiness of religion, that all religion is man-made: Heinrich: ‘L'homme est néant ... Tu as triché, Catherine t'a vu: tu as forcé ta voix pour couvrir le silence de Dieu. Les ordres que tu prétends recevoir, c'est toi qui te les envoies’5 [Man is nothing … You cheated, and Catherine saw you: you forced your voice to cover up God’s silence. The orders that you are pretending to receive, you are the one who is sending them.] Goetz realises that God does not exist:

Le ciel ignore jusqu'à mon nom. ... Dieu ne me voit pas, Dieu ne m'entend pas, Dieu ne me connaît pas. Tu vois ce vide au-dessus de nos têtes? C'est Dieu. Tu vois cette brèche dans la porte? C'est Dieu. Tu vois ce trou dans la terre? C'est Dieu encore. Le silence, c'est Dieu. L'absence, c'est Dieu. Dieu, c'est la solitude des hommes. Il n'y avait que moi: j'ai décidé seul du Mal; seul j'ai inventé le Bien. … Si Dieu existe, l'homme est néant; si l'homme existe ... Dieu n'existe pas. … Joie, pleurs de joie! Alléluia ! Fou! Ne frappe pas: je nous délivre. Plus de ciel, plus d'enfer: rien que la terre.6
[Heaven doesn’t even know my name. … God doesn’t see me, God doesn’t hear me, God doesn’t know me. You see that emptiness above our heads? That’s God. You see that hole in the door? That’s God. You see that hole in the ground? That’s God too. The silence is God. The absence is God. God is man’s solitude. There was only ever me: I alone decided what was evil; I alone invented the Good … If God exists, man is nothing; if man exists … God doesn’t exist.

Joy, tears of joy! Hallelujah. Madman! Don’t strike me: I’m setting us free. No more heaven, no more hell: nothing but the earth.]

His Pascalian conversion repudiates God and champions the freedom of the individual mind. God’s non-existence is again based on the nature of human consciousness, His existence a creation of the human imagination. Because Goetz can think of God and of moral imperatives and because he can change his mind, God does not exist. His final familiar refrain echoes Nietzsche, ‘Dieu est mort’ [God is dead]⁷, although this is not a message he is prepared to pass on to his troops.

Goetz’s problematic relationship with God parallels Sartre’s own relationship with something in which he says he does not believe, yet continues to repudiate. As Sartre says: ‘La pièce traite entièrement des rapports de l’homme à Dieu, ou, si l’on veut, des rapports de l’homme à l’absolu’⁸ [The play is all about the relations between man and God, or, if you like, about the relations between man and the absolute.] Men and God are in opposition, because men exist: ‘D’abord tout amour est contre Dieu. Dès que deux personnes s’aident, elles s’aident contre Dieu. Tout amour est contre l’absolu puisqu’il est l’absolu lui-même’⁹ [First of all, all love is against God. As soon
as two people love each other, they love each other against God. All love is against the absolute, because love itself is the absolute.]

This statement is anti-theistic rather than atheistic, as is the play. In describing this troubled period of the Reformation, the play attacks the concept of God’s providence and His permissive will, which raises the Promethean problem of evil and focuses our attention on the unbelieving outcome of Goetz’s struggles. Intended as a transposition of Sartre’s doctrine of political engagement, the choice of a theologically driven era is revealing, though the key doctrinal issues of the Reformation are not in question. Sartre is obviously not seeking to disprove God’s existence, but is attacking the idea of God through a completely unconvincing ‘Christian hero’ and asserting God’s non-existence.

The most powerful literary expressions of Sartre’s doctrine of absolute freedom occur in plays where he is in direct opposition to gods or God and where the deity, the moral absolute, is scorned, and vigorously rejected. Though he has always been against belief in God, seeking to develop an atheistic philosophy, the emotional intensity and adversarial spirit of these plays belies unbelief. These parallel strands of atheism and antitheism are paradoxical and part of the complex dialectic of the notion of God in his work.

Our necessarily brief survey of Sartre’s works has shown that his atheism is a choice of liberty, but is accompanied by an ongoing involvement with the concept of God. We have seen the pervasive presence of biblical and Christian concepts, his religious view of literature, his philosophical refutation of God and yet have pointed out, alongside those elements, the centrality of the absence of God in his thinking, his vigorously emotional anti-theistic caricatures and his long-term devotion to atheism.
This radical independence is justified in a range of ways, but Sartre’s doctrine of freedom is always conceived in opposition to, and in interdependence with, an absolute who is God, either absent, powerless or rejected, as well as his interaction with the material world, and these interactions have a significant presence in his thought. We have seen that this influences his desire to do good, and, later, his need for moral absolutes, recognised as having a Christian origin. His rejection of God and assertion of moral freedom forces him to be God to himself, and drives him to seek a morality for all, as evidenced in his social and political engagement.

2. *L’Espoir maintenant*

Our survey of Sartre’s structuring preoccupation with God, absent or present, notably in relation to morality, has prepared us for our analysis of *L’Espoir maintenant*. This text clearly marks a further evolution in his approach to morality, Marxism and metaphysics, but does it show a movement towards belief in God?

The interviews with Benny Lévy recorded in this text were part of a joint project for a book entitled *Pouvoir et liberté* [*Power and Freedom*], which remained incomplete because of Sartre’s death. Sartre’s continued concern for the success of left-wing revolution, given his despair at the current state of the left, is evident. He admires the moral focus of the Jews and sees the hope that is indicated in that perspective as the driver of change that France needs. However he denies that this is a disjunction from his previous work, contending that hope, transcendence, resurrection, and morality were already present in his thinking.
Hope was implicit, not explicit, he concedes, in his concept of liberty through transcendence: ‘[…] c’était une manière de saisir la fin que je me proposais, comme pouvant être réalisée’ […] it was a way of seizing the goal that I set myself, as something achievable] and had been present in his political thinking since 1945.\(^\text{12}\) He had theorised about despair because that was how he saw the human condition,\(^\text{13}\) but despair, he maintains, was a theoretical understanding influenced by his reading of Kierkegaard rather than his personal experience.\(^\text{14}\) As he also states clearly in *Les Mots*, in the face of the absurd he retained a positive view of the world. But he now wishes to contradict the absolute pessimism of his earlier career. While he admits that he stands in the Christian theological tradition, which is the only one he has,\(^\text{15}\) he disassociates his view of morality from Christianity: ‘J-P S: Oui, et je considère que la morale que nous envisageons n’est pas liée à la tradition du christianisme...’\(^\text{16}\) [Yes. I think that the morality we have in mind is not part of the Christian tradition].

He is not seeking to be God, an *être en-soi-pour-soi*, he wants to find a morality, to champion the moral engagement of the free individual and to revive the left. Clearly and explicitly espousing a morality goes beyond his earlier radical freedom, but not beyond the moral concerns that are implicit in his *littérature engagée* [committed literature]. Certain beliefs are needed: ‘[…] il faut croire au progrès’ […] we must believe in progress.]; and a sort of humanism: ‘[…] notre fin c’est d’arriver à un véritable corps constitué où chaque personne serait un homme et où les collectivités seraient également humaines’ […] our goal is to arrive at a genuinely constituent body in which each person would be a human being and collectivities would be equally human.]\(^\text{18}\) However it is a different humanism to the humanism of the Autodidact condemned in *La Nausée*
He also criticises his earlier work for being too individualistic, an uncontroversial point. Now ‘conscience’ [consciousness] has a moral dimension. In this regard he is breaking new ground:

Et c’est cette réalité-là, ce soi-même se considérant comme soi-même pour l’autre, ayant un rapport avec l’autre, que j’appelle la conscience morale. … Je n’avais pas déterminé ce que j’essaie de déterminer aujourd’hui: la dépendance de chaque individu par rapport à tous les individus.

[And it is this reality, this self that considers itself as a self for the other, as having a relationship with the other, that I call moral consciousness. … I hadn’t determined what I am trying to determine today: the dependence of each individual on all other individuals.]

This key development goes beyond his earlier positions, but he still supports the revolutionary left, and seeks what he sees as true democracy. Repudiating Marxism’s emphasis on superstructures, he focuses on fraternity: ‘Il ne s’agit pas d’un mythe; la fraternité, c’est le rapport de l’espèce entre ses membres’ [It is not a question of a myth; fraternity is the relationship which each member of the species has with each other].

Using terms such as humanity, democracy and morality suggests that he is now accepting humanist moral categories, yet they have been implicit in his thinking for a long time, particularly in his concept of engagement and in the moral judgements he has made in his existentialist Marxism.
Sartre has clearly moved towards a focus on ethics. In this respect one can see similarities with Levinas, whose writings had strongly influenced his interlocutor, Benny Lévy. The latter became more and more interested in Judaism, the Kabala and the Talmud as he moved away from his earlier anarchist position. Indeed it is noteworthy that Sartre was introduced to phenomenology in 1933 through reading Levinas’ *Théorie de l’intuition dans la phénoménologie de Husserl* (1930) [*The Theory of Intuition in Husserl’s Phenomenology*] and now at the end of his career he comes under his influence again. Levinas’ focus on ethics, his concentration on the other, on alterity, takes him beyond ontology and the Western philosophical tradition, towards God and theology, towards universalization and a Jewish form of humanism. This trajectory resembles the movement we have been outlining in Sartre, linking the singular and the universal through the ethical by confronting transcendence, no matter how paradoxically.

Judaism and Messianism are discussed towards the end of the interviews in the context of this moral focus. They seem to provide a transcendent structure for such a morality. Sartre, in this exchange, acknowledges a debt to Lévy, and, in doing so, shows an openness towards new and different ideas, hardly, in itself, a matter for criticism, and something which characterised his thought throughout his career.

But it goes further. Sartre acknowledges Lévy’s contribution to his concept of destiny: ‘Le juif se considère comme ayant un destin. Il faudrait que j’explique comment je suis venu à penser ça’ [The Jew considers himself as having a destiny. I will need to explain how I have come to think that.] Sartre has repudiated destiny in the past, but confessed to its influence, as we have seen. Now, as Lévy says, he is acknowledging the role of eschatology in his thought. In coming to understand the Jewish concept of destiny and
of the Jews’ contact with God, he acknowledges the structuring and totalising value of those beliefs:

Ce qui est neuf, c’est ce qui, en ce Dieu-là, se mettait en rapport avec les hommes. Le rapport qui caractérise les juifs, c’est un rapport immédiat avec ce qu’ils appelaient le Nom, c’est-à-dire Dieu. Dieu parle au juif, le juif entend sa parole et, à travers tout cela, ce qu’il y a de réel, c’est une première liaison métaphysique de l’homme juif avec l’infini.

[What is new is the kind of relationship this God entered into with men. It was an immediate relationship that the Jews had with what they used to call the Name, that is to say, God. God speaks to the Jew, the Jew hears his word, and the reality to emerge from all of this was a first metaphysical link of the Jew with the infinite.] 26

This is a further development of the role that his engagement with the concept of God has already had in providing a structure for his moral reflection. Within this Jewish context, the moral character of the relationships engendered by these beliefs impresses him. 27

Si tu veux, c’est le commencement de l’existence des hommes les uns pour les autres. C’est-à-dire une fin morale. Ou, plus exactement, c’est la moralité. Le juif pense que la fin du monde, de ce monde et le surgissement de l’autre, c’est l’apparition de l’existence éthique des hommes les uns pour les autres. 28
[If you like, it’s the beginning of the existence of men living for each other. In other words it is a moral end. Or, to put it more precisely, it is morality. The Jew thinks that the goal of the world, of this world and the coming into being of the other, is the appearance of the ethical existence of men living for each other.]

His goal is to establish the ultimate purpose of morality as the simple way that men relate to one another. This is ‘messianisme’ for him: not a belief in a literal Messiah, of God coming to earth. Indeed it is something ‘[…] qui pourrait être utilisée par des non-juifs pour d’autres buts’30 [ … something which could be used by non-Jews for other purposes]. His admiration for Jewish thinking relates to the moral dimension brought to the idea of revolution in contrast to Marx, who saw political relationships as primarily economic. Underlining the importance of law, he wants: ‘[…] une société dans laquelle les rapports entre les hommes sont moraux. Eh bien, cette idée de l’éthique comme fin dernière de la révolution, c’est par une sorte de messianisme qu’on peut la penser vraiment31 [… a society in which the relationships between men are moral. Indeed, this idea of ethics as the ultimate goal of the revolution can be truly conceived by means of a kind of Messianism]. This Messianism brings hope rather than despair, which is Sartre’s main motivation for welcoming it. As Lévy says: ‘L’impératif est pour Sartre, ordre de l’universalisation: l’Homme est à faire’ [The imperative for Sartre is a question of universalisation: Man is a work in progress],32 an obvious expansion of the message of L’Existentialisme est un humanisme in 1946.

Part of Sartre’s continuing political engagement, a movement towards a moral stance that has always been implicit, these interviews deal with familiar areas: the moral, the
ontological, and the metaphysical, and provide further evidence of Sartre’s intellectual project of totalisation, the desire to theorise the whole of reality. We have already seen that his engagement with the notion of God has been central to his definition of freedom, of the individual project and to the formulation of morality, albeit negatively, for much of the time. His interest in Judaism, stressing ethical concern for the other as the basis on which to fulfil revolutionary goals, represents a development of that preoccupation but without the element of repudiation that we have seen in his earlier anti-theistic stance.33

The metaphysics of hope in mankind have been implicitly present in his work, but it was, and remains, a secular hope.34 There is no suggestion of the establishment of a spiritual relationship with the transcendent God of Judaism. There is rather evidence of a respect for its universal humanistic principles. The individual project of freedom has become communal. It is hope as ultimate failure, given its naturalistic setting, but a call to ‘vivre comme si’ [live as if]. In a Sartrean universe it must also be so.

3. Sartre and God

The effects of Sartre’s long-term engagement with God and the idea of God have become clearer. He has always worked in relation to an absolute, and, inconsistently, retained belief in certain moral absolutes of good and evil. In L’Espoir maintenant the structuring aspect of a belief in God has been more explicitly recognised. But that is as far as it goes. Sartre has changed and developed throughout his career, but let us not exaggerate the position he has reached. His concerns remain the same, and they are obviously not spiritual.
This is not the story of a spiritual odyssey. Significant elements of Christianity and Judaism are absent: the worship of God, a consciousness of sin, religious practice and a belief in the supernatural. Sartre has not become a Christian, a Jew or a theist. However, though his theological knowledge and his spiritual experience may be limited, God has been in his mind throughout his life. As Adrian van den Hoven says:

[…] Sartre ceased believing in God at an early age but his personal struggle to develop a theology on an atheistic basis - … did not free him from the framework of Christianity. Christ’s life and Christian themes remain a guide for his own existence and an inspiration for his writing and especially his theater.³⁵

Sartre has always been concerned with belief, with questions of destiny, purpose and happiness: ‘The world presented by Sartre is the world of the God-haunted man for whom God does not exist. It is not a pleasant world and Sartre does not present it as such’.³⁶ He constantly defines himself against God. While mitigating the despair of the absurd, the paradoxical atheistic and anti-theistic rejections of God function as a totalising structure, an absent absolute giving coherence to his universe, and the existentialist lifestyle he propounds requires the individual to be an inadequate God to himself. Even the creation of morality focuses on God. The move to hope and a shared morality in L’Espoir maintentant merely takes things a stage further.

In this analysis we have not had the scope to evaluate all the examples of Sartre’s engagement with God and religion, but we have indicated a clear pattern. We have seen the structuring influence of Sartre’s Christian cultural upbringing, studied the use of
Christian and religious concepts in his dramas and their persistence in his work, explained the framing of his doctrine of freedom in relation, negatively, to the idea of God and noted his strong anti-theistic rejection of God in favour of individual freedom. Atheism for Sartre is the individual’s choice of liberty. He remains true to this concept of freedom which is now strengthened by his commitment to the other, to morality, particularly in *L’Espoir maintenant*.

Since it is reasonable to propose that *L’Espoir maintenant* outlines Sartre’s own views, we can see that his interaction with Lévy is a further example of his thinking anew in order to meet the challenges of his revolutionary position. It does not indicate a radical change, but the movement from the influence of one group to another, and, after all we do not know the position Sartre would have reached had he lived. The loneliness of the long-distance atheist is maintained to the end. His paradoxical and problematic relationship with the notion of God remains. He has not been abducted into religious belief, but is moving towards a metaphysically based universal morality, developing the normative values implied in his earlier moral and political positions.
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