1. Falsehood
   a. Consciousness is a “no;” its being = negating its being
   b. If we would be what we are (in-itself), then bad faith, inauthenticity, and self-deception would not be possible (101)
   c. Irony (87)
      i. I say the opposite of what I mean
      ii. The others know that I am ironic (truth)
   d. Lying (87-89)
      i. No problem: always related to others
      ii. The lying person actually knows the truth; you try to deceive the other, but you are not deceived
   e. Can you “lie” to yourself? (89-90)
      i. Note: this is difficult for Sartre since he rejects psychoanalytic theory and since he argued in chapter one that consciousness is transparent in itself (so, ultimately that’s the reason why in section 3 of this chapter he starts talking about faith/knowledge)
      ii. Problem: you lie to yourself, but how is this possible?
      iii. The deceiver and the deceived are the same person
      iv. The deceiver knows the truth, the deceived does not know the truth; so, how can this be possible in one person?
      v. “Better yet I must know the truth very exactly in order to conceal it more carefully” (89)
      vi. Important look forward: what S calls on p.90 “metastable”: people can “live in bad faith” (90), i.e., he already indicates that bad faith and self-deception about one’s freedom and being takes places on the level of pre-reflective living through consciousness
2. Critique of Freud (90-96; we jump over this passage)
3. Patterns (96)
   a. Example: seduction
      i. “We can see the use which bad faith can make of these judgements which all aim at establishing that I am not what I am. If I were only what I am, I could, for example, seriously consider an adverse criticism which someone makes of me, question myself scrupulously, and perhaps be compelled to recognize the truth in it” (99)
      ii. Basic structure: transcendence-facticity (i.e., in bad faith I try to be a thing, like the woman’s hand in the seduction example); I deny that I am transcendence, i.e., that I am always in distance to what I am (99); I try to be a passive object (100)
      iii. The woman in the seduction example tries to deny that she is a for-itself, a subject, she denies her freedom (of actually rejecting or affirming the seducer)
   b. Example: waiter (101)
      i. S observes something weird about the waiter
ii. The waiter plays *being* a waiter; he follows an “obligation” (102) to *be* waiter
iii. Sure, he *is* a waiter, but, wait, he is *playing* waiter (because the waiter is not just a waiter, but many other things); he is playing a role
iv. He tries to give himself an *essence* (that’s what I am!)
v. He wants to be secure; he somehow negates that he was not always a waiter, that there are many other things going on and that he will not always only be a waiter; accordingly, his *essence is not fixed*
vi. We deny our freedom and try to be “just this or that” (facticity)
vii. Of course, S is talking about all of us: we are all like the waiter
viii. He surpasses his “being” a waiter $\rightarrow$ transcendence

4. Consciousness
   a. S goes back to what he was telling us in the preceding chapter
   b. Consciousness “is not what it is” (111)

5. Sincerity
   a. Upshot: S argues that sincerity is basically the same as bad faith, for in the moment in which the sincere admits that he is evil (107) or a pederast (107), he already *denies* its being a pederast or evil, insofar as it is impossible to be only *this*.

6. Bad Faith
   a. It works! We all feel less anxious and more secure and “fixed” because we make ourselves a thing; we *believe* (that) are what we are
   b. Bad faith is really S’s attempt to present a notion of inauthenticity
   c. Here is the upshot of section 3 (you can get lost in what he says there...):
      i. Remember: we are non-positionally/pre-reflectively conscious (of) what we are doing
      ii. So, pre-reflective consciousness is *not* a form of knowledge (i.e., it is not reflective and it is not conceptual)
      iii. Remember: knowledge emerges with a reflective act
      iv. If consciousness is conscious (of) itself, then this “while” we are doing what we are doing, we do not know that we are doing it, i.e., we are in a mode of what might be called “faith” or “belief”
      v. Accordingly, on the pre-reflective level we are always inauthentic because we do not know, i.e. *deny*, that we are doing it
      vi. Now: apply this to the waiter: the waiter is pre-reflectively doing the waiter game. While the waiter *is* a waiter, he does not know that *he is not* a waiter (transcendence, role, etc.); so, here we go: while we are in our acts we necessarily *deny* our freedom because we try to be “just” one thing, namely, the current actualization of ourselves
      vii. Similarly, I cannot *know* that I am courageous when I try to be courageous; so, I am *believing* it on the level of the act
      viii. However, the *belief* (of) being courageous is *negated* by the translucency of consciousness itself, insofar as we are pre-reflectively conscious of our own believing; so, we cannot hide that we are only *believing* it, i.e., we do not know it!
ix. We (the philosophers) and others always know about the bad faith/inauthenticity and can make at any time someone aware of it

7. Conclusion
   a. Though S starts out with lying and knowledge, this should really be read as an entry point since in the end he argues that bad faith/self-deception/inauthenticity (we are not what we are) is a necessary structure of the “not” of consciousness itself, and this is precisely intuitive [Anschauung] (instead of being propositional such as “I know that ‘x’”)
   b. Good faith, sincerity, authenticity, is – as being – impossible, but it can be a “demand” (100), an “obligation” (101) and a “task” (105); so, does Sartre even rule out that we can have “authentic” moments? Check what he says on the impossibility of “full” sincerity on p.106
   c. Again, the point is that bad faith takes place on the level of non-reflective acts and acting
   d. Put differently, with every decision to do X or to be X you are inauthentic because you deny in this moment that this is only one possibility of many