

## FREEDOM AND THE PROBLEM OF HUMAN IDENTITY IN FRENCH PHILOSOPHY OF EXISTENTIALISM.

The problem of human identity in philosophical concepts French existentialist thinkers J.-P. Sartre, G. Marcel and A. Kamyu is investigated. J.-P. Sartre and G. Marcel considered the question of identity as the question of the relationship of human subjects are found out. In dealing with others existence we know and discover yourself is established. A person acquires and retains its identity thanks to rebellion is approved.

The problem of identity, of course, belongs to one of the most controversial and urgent problems of modern philosophical thought. The question of human identity are its development as one of the main currents of philosophy of the twentieth century - existentialism. Within the existential philosophy of problem identification is refracted through the prism of finding its essence, the meaning of existence, the search for transcendence. A man is in a situation in left being alone, she does not know either himself or the meaning of life itself. This radical left situation. But existentialism offers a way out of this situation here being: it is absolutely specific output for man, not man-general. It is the meetings. All Existentialist philosophers give the fundamental situation of their colors, but agree that being-with-others is a way of finding existence. In this case the call is fundamental categories; answering, attendance forms them.

Being not created anyone or anything, it just is. It is not active, not passive, not immanent, it is different from itself, it is "rooted to himself". Being is what it is [4, p. 33]. Being is absolute positivity "escapes" with temporariness, devoid of basis. This - the being-in-itself and so is completely random. So, being there is, in itself, is what it is.

Consciousness as being - its specific mode of existence in-itself is the being-for-itself. "Exist for consciousness is to have consciousness of existence. It appears as pure spontaneity to the world of things that are pure inertia" [5, p. 1]. The bearer, unique representative consciousness of being a specifically human being - the only being in the world, able to ask questions of themselves and therefore distinguish himself from himself. However, the question can be put not only the existence but also of oblivion, nothing. This question implies, in turn, the possibility of transcendental existence oblivion at least in its three forms: non-existence of the object; another oblivion subject of certainty than this; nothingness knowledge of the subject.

Nothingness (nothing) there is on par with being. But nothingness is not merely the absence of all being, and being negative. So nothing (nothing) is secondary, derivative of existence. "Nothingness is only on the surface of life" [4, p. 52]. The source of oblivion is man - "man is the being through which nothingness comes into the world" [4, p. 60]. But denial does not generate Nothing. It is based on nothing that has ontological status. A negative statement only reveals the existence of negative life - nothing.

J.-P. Sartre did not try to find the meaning of human existence - the human being ridiculous, it is necessary to understand and reconcile. The lack of meaning in life and interest to it lead to a radical denial of the external world, immersing him completely in nothing. In this case, the world is perceived as totally hostile consciousness as such that causes a person once (nausea).

The production of Nothing by consciousness - a way of seeing the human world and its attitude. The outside world is present, it can not be destroyed, you can only change your attitude to it. This premise was the starting point for the formation of J.-P. Sartre concept of absolute free will (freedom of choice). Freedom, as he believed, is a universal feature of human existence, a way of being of consciousness. Freedom means independence of man from any conditions outside world. Absolute freedom - "a man is not free; it is a slave - it is completely free and always" [4, p. 452]. Even while in prison a person has a choice - humble circumstances, try to escape or commit suicide. Choices of course limited, but the choice is always there.

People surrounding a man (Other) should promote all sorts expand the range of possibilities of choice. However, in reality it is quite the opposite. Therefore, J.-P. Sartre said: "Here it is that, hell! Never would have thought ... .. Remember: sulfur, play pan .... Nonsense is it all. Why pan, hell - the other" [6, p. 536].

The authenticity of human existence, considered as a philosopher, involves understanding and a man of his absolute freedom of choice and personal responsibility. To detect the initial choice of the person who serves as the basis of its states, feelings and actions, J.-P. Sartre proposed a method of existential psychoanalysis. "The initial choice", according to him, is the productive structure, the sole subject and the only logical meaning which consistently reproducible individual in a variety of empirical situations, projects and handling.

J.-P. Sartre's intersubjective problem is associated with being "Other" as a member of my existential experience. But another part is this experience aggressively. The individual is constantly under the gaze of another. Another takes me away from me. He tried to have me and thus transforms me into a static "improvised" obedient, predetermined being, that being quite inhuman. On the other hand, the other (as well as I respect the other, we stand here together) wants to own me so that I still remained sovereign, free being. Only in this case - possession of a pleasure. This structure is love. But this desire controversial. Or ownership, or freedom. Or being-for-itself or being-in-itself. So love fails. She is constantly exposed to the temptation of being-in -self (being inert, static, a identical), but can not deprive a person of the original will. A communication between people is spinning a form of "useless passion".

So, J.-P. Sartre believed that man is free to determine own identity. There is no predefined script of our lives! There is no "essence" that tells us who we are and what we should be. Our freedom and our responsibility lie in the fact that we, collectively and individually, should find a more precise answer to this existential riddle. Jean-Paul Sartre considered the question of identity as the question of the relationship between human subjects. For Jean-Paul Sartre mutual recognition of individuals is a battleground. When two people look at each other, there is always an element of a power struggle over who is going to control who is going to define himself and

others. Even in unequal forms of understanding and identity involved two parties who agree disadvantage. This is - the question of relationships, not just an isolated entity inner vision of themselves and others. We can not have our desired identity without recognition from others. That's why we depend on what everyone else thinks about us, so why fight the inevitable. However, we can assume that this is due to nature, not culture and struggle.

French philosopher Gabriel Marcel called his teaching the Christian existentialism and existentialism after condemnation in the papal encyclical (1950) - Christian socratizm ("neo-socratizm").

Gabriel Marcel distinguish individual spiritual world of human existence (transcendental world) and ontological world that exists independently of man and formed bonds, sensations and feelings of the human body. Accordingly, all reality was seen as split on "real world being" and "seeming world of ownership". The basic contradiction of human life is a contradiction between "being" and "having". Having depth means man in the outside world, burdened with matter, the property, which obstruct it from being true, selects her real freedom, giving instead only the appearance of freedom. No property belongs to us - in fact we belong to it. Arbitrary decisions possession in the world is not real freedom. True freedom and it is becoming itself, to overcome the subordination circumstances.

Be yourself, by G. Marcel, means being able to say "I – is Me" (what I am, is what I would like to be). Can a man do that thousands of threads obligations related to the society? In everyday life, it is in most of their actions are not free and can not say "I – is Me". The confidence to be itself in the modern world, which dominates the alienation of man, dramatically reduced. The material world, according to G. Marcel is dull and soulless, it is deprived of its own harmony and is a place where the tests. The higher material culture, the more it threatens personal dignity and the more obstacles there on the way to its perfection. As Gabriel Marcel, "human world, probably ever had heart, which seems to already beat" [1, p. 418].

In general, in all the existential searches of the above-mentioned French thinkers with their diversity of approaches to identity problems concerning the essence of human existence is spiritual, existential imperatives, including the crucial problems

of choice and personal (individual, personal) responsibility in the relationship with the other. Man finds himself in the primarily spiritual activities reliance on universal (universal) moral values. Although (this is especially clearly seen in Camus) individual has priority in comparison with total and full of revolutionary protect their identity.