

Review of: "A Dispositional Account of Self-Deception: A Critical Analysis of Sartre's Theory of Bad Faith"

Bahia Alhabib Zemni¹

¹ Princess Nora Bint Abdulrahman University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article is a tentative attempt to advance a hypothesis about self-deception that goes beyond Sigmund Freud's and Jean Paul Sartre's respective conceptualizations of the issue. The hypothesis relies on a redefinition of the self that stresses its "fluidity" and complexity, as well as its capacity to "expand or contract" itself. It furnishes a good starting point for a quality research. However, as the article stands, it's far from fulfilling its ambitious objective.

Four sections compose the article:

- Sartre's theory of mind
- Bad faith
- Critique of bad faith
- A dispositional account of self-deception

The sections are balanced in length and written in a plain style, sometimes too simple to render the complexity of the philosophical ideas tackled in the discussion. In addition to the plain style, many passages still require a careful editing because of minor language errors and inconsistencies. Section one needs to curtail the string of long quotations by the means of good paraphrase.

The critique of Sartre's bad faith is central to this research. Bad faith is understood as being the lie of a consciousness to itself. Sartre took it from Freud's theory of mind and revised it within his existentialist philosophy of freedom developed in his *Being and Nothingness*.

The author of the article is right in advancing arguments which counter Sartre's revision of Freud's tripartite division of the mind into: the ego, the alter-ego and the id. However, he/she does not justice to depth-psychology by removing the concept from the context in which the French philosopher advanced it. The context was the French capitulation to Nazi Germany during WWII, and Sartre developed his philosophy as a form of resistance to the German invasion. Was he using bad faith against itself? Perhaps yes; nonetheless, it is left to the author of the article to explore this alternative explanation.

Nor does the author of the article show convincingly how "bad faith" connects to the other Sartrean concepts of "good faith", "being" and "being-for-itself". To discuss a philosopher's ideas is certainly a good academic endeavor, but to curtail the philosopher's ideas is unfair.

More importantly, Sartre's revision of Freud's self-deception is a widely discussed subject in the literature. The author of the article could have reviewed this literature to tell us more about what distinguishes his/her work. Literature review is indeed completely missing from the article.

The most important section of the article is the last one, which favors Freud's ideas over Sartre's, and by advancing the disposition of the self-system to deceive itself in specific contexts. The author supports his/her claim by invoking McConnell's Multiple Self-Aspects Framework (2011, 3) and Linville's Self-Complexity Theory (1985). This section, however, is not developed enough to give consistency to the author's claim. Perhaps it requires an article in itself, with a comprehensive and exhaustive literature review.

Miscellaneous remarks:

The article title does not really reflect the core contribution of the article and limits it to Sartre's ideas.

The abstract does not conform to the norms of good abstracts The conclusion is too short to achieve any meaning.