

The Pragmatist and the Existentialist: A Comparative Study of Russellian Layman's Philosophy and Sartrean Existential Humanism

Dr. PR Chandra Reddy, Professor of English

Department of Science and Humanities

Mother Theresa Institute of Engineering and Technology (Autonomous)

Palamaner, Chittoor Dt, Andhra Pradesh, India. 517408

E-mail: chandrareddy.pr@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-8250-7463>

Abstract: This comparative review article examines the conceptual and structural intersections between Russellian Layman's Philosophy, understood as a form of common-sense pragmatic rationalism grounded in lived experience, and Existentialism Is a Humanism by Jean-Paul Sartre. While philosophical discourse frequently separates formal existential inquiry from the practical realities of ordinary human life, this study argues that both frameworks converge upon a shared humanistic imperative: the rejection of predetermined meaning in favor of the active construction of significance through human action and choice. By contrasting the layman's dependence on experiential intuition, adaptive resilience, and pragmatic reasoning with Sartre's formulation of radical freedom, anguish (*l'angoisse*), and existential responsibility, the article demonstrates how ordinary lived experience often embodies existentialist principles without explicit theoretical articulation. The study further explores how individuals negotiate the burden of freedom, confront the temptations of 'bad faith' (*mauvaise foi*), and transform existential uncertainty into practical agency. Ultimately, this review argues that Russellian Layman's Philosophy represents a pragmatic and intuitive expression of existential humanism, whereas Sartrean humanism provides the philosophical foundation that validates the moral and existential significance of everyday human choices within an indifferent universe.

Keywords: Sartrean Humanism, Layman's Philosophy, Pragmatism, Existential Anxiety, Freedom and Action, Meaning-Making, Comparative Literature.

Introduction: Academic philosophy has often remained distant from the practical realities of ordinary human life. While formal philosophical traditions frequently emphasize abstract metaphysical inquiry, everyday individuals navigate existence through personal experience, common-sense, reasoning, and pragmatic decision-making. This study refers to this practical mode of thought as 'Russellian Layman's Philosophy,' a form of perceptive pragmatism shaped not by academic theory but by daily struggles, emotional suffering, economic pressures, and the constant need for adaptation. Rather than pursuing theoretical perfection, the layman relies on what works in sustaining resilience and social continuity. Although such practical wisdom has often been dismissed as intellectually unsophisticated, it nevertheless reflects a coherent philosophy grounded in lived human experience.

This apparent division between academic philosophy and ordinary survival becomes significantly narrower when examined alongside the existential humanism of Jean-Paul Sartre. In *Existentialism Is a Humanism*, Sartre argues that human beings possess no predetermined essence or fixed destiny; instead, individuals define themselves through their choices and actions. His assertion that 'existence precedes essence' places responsibility, freedom, and action at the center of human life. In this respect, Sartrean humanism closely parallels Russellian Layman's Philosophy, as both frameworks emphasize the active construction of meaning within an uncertain and indifferent world. This study therefore argues that Layman's Philosophy represents an intuitive and practical expression of existential humanism, while Sartre provides the philosophical foundation that explains the significance of ordinary human choice and action.

Methodology: This study employs a qualitative, comparative textual analysis and conceptual synthesis framework to examine the intersections between everyday human resilience and formal twentieth-century philosophy. Specifically, the methodology is structured around three distinct operational phases: textual boundary explanation, comparative conceptual mapping, and pragmatic-phenomenological synthesis.

The Epistemological Opening: Russell's Analytical Intellect vs. Sartrean Existential Choice: The philosophical worlds of Bertrand Russell and Jean-Paul Sartre reveal a deep intellectual contrast between analytic rationalism and existential humanism. Russell, one of the central figures of analytic philosophy, approached knowledge through logic, scientific reasoning, and empirical skepticism. He believed philosophy should pursue objective truth by eliminating

emotional prejudice, linguistic confusion, and inherited dogma. For Russell, the universe functioned according to natural laws independent of human desires, and philosophical inquiry required intellectual clarity rather than emotional involvement. Although he remained deeply committed to humanitarian and social causes, his philosophical method largely maintained a detached and scientific perspective toward reality. In contrast to this analytical restraint, George Bernard Shaw emphasized the transformative power of active human intervention, famously asserting that ‘the reasonable man adapts himself to the world; the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore all progress depends on the unreasonable man,’ (Shaw, G.B. 1903). This insight anticipates the existential emphasis later developed by Sartre, where human beings are understood not as passive observers of reality, but as active agents responsible for shaping meaning through conscious action and choice.

In contrast, Jean-Paul Sartre rejected this detached understanding of human existence and grounded philosophy in the lived experience of human consciousness. In *Existentialism Is a Humanism*, Sartre argues that human beings are not fixed objects governed by predetermined essences but free individuals who create themselves through choice and action. His famous principle that ‘existence precedes essence’ emphasizes that life possesses no pre-given meaning, divine plan, or inherent human nature. While Bertrand Russell sought certainty through analytical reason, Sartre focused on the burden of freedom and personal responsibility within an indifferent universe. Human beings, according to Sartre, are ‘condemned to be free,’ compelled to construct meaning through their decisions and actions. A similar existential insight appears in the philosophy of Albert Camus, who argued that ‘the struggle itself toward the heights is enough to fill a man’s heart’ (Camus, A. 1991), emphasizing that meaning emerges through conscious human confrontation with an absurd and indifferent world rather than through predetermined truths. This contrast between Russell’s analytical intellect and Sartre’s existential choice forms one of the central philosophical tensions explored in this study.

The Ethical Crucible: Knowledge without Wisdom and Freedom with Responsibility: Despite their major philosophical differences, Bertrand Russell and Jean-Paul Sartre found common ground in their strong opposition to war, oppression, and institutional injustice. Their shared commitment to social activism became historically significant through the establishment of the Russell Tribunal in 1966, which investigated war crimes and violations of human rights. This collaboration revealed a deeper concern present in both thinkers: the growing separation between human power and ethical responsibility in the modern world. Russell repeatedly warned that scientific and technological advancement without moral wisdom could lead humanity toward destruction. For him, knowledge alone was insufficient unless guided by compassion, rational ethics, and concern for human well-being.

A similar anxiety emerged in the reflections of J. Robert Oppenheimer, often called the ‘father of the atomic bomb,’ who famously recalled the words from the Bhagavad Gita after witnessing the first nuclear explosion: ‘Now I am become Death, the destroyer of worlds’ (Oppenheimer, R. J. 2005). This statement symbolized the profound moral crisis created when scientific achievement advances beyond humanity’s ethical preparedness. Together, these perspectives reinforce the argument that intellectual and technological power, without moral responsibility, can threaten the very foundations of human civilization.

Sartre approached the same crisis from an existential perspective. In *Existentialism Is a Humanism*, Jean-Paul Sartre argued that individuals often escape responsibility by hiding behind social roles, institutional authority, or deterministic excuses, a condition he described as ‘bad faith’ (*mauvaise foi*). According to Sartre, authentic human existence requires individuals to fully accept the burden of freedom and responsibility for their actions. Similarly, Bertrand Russell warned that humanity’s greatest danger lay not in the absence of knowledge, but in the absence of wisdom and ethical responsibility, observing that ‘the fundamental cause of trouble is that in the modern world the stupid are cocksure while the intelligent are full of doubt’ (Russell, B. 2009). While Russell emphasized the need for ethical wisdom in directing human knowledge, Sartre stressed the necessity of personal accountability in exercising freedom. Together, their philosophies suggest that neither intellectual reason nor human freedom has meaningful value unless it is consciously directed toward the protection of human dignity and social justice.

The Divide between Thought and Life: Academic philosophy has often remained distant from the practical realities of everyday human survival. While institutional philosophy traditionally emphasizes abstract metaphysical theories and systematic intellectual inquiry, ordinary individuals must navigate life through personal experience, intuition, and common-sense pragmatism. This ‘layman’s philosophy’ is not developed in universities or formal philosophical texts but emerges through daily struggles, economic pressures, emotional suffering, and the practical need for survival. Guided by the simple principle of ‘what works,’ it functions as a philosophy of adaptation and resilience. Yet, because

of its informal and non-technical nature, academic discourse has frequently dismissed this practical wisdom as intellectually insignificant, creating a divide between philosophical theory and lived human experience. Bertrand Russell, in *The Problems of Philosophy*, acknowledged that philosophy often appears detached from practical concerns because its value lies less in definitive answers than in enlarging human thought and deepening contemplative understanding (Russell, B. 2001). However, the contrast between speculative philosophy and lived experience reveals that ordinary people frequently construct their own practical systems of meaning and survival outside formal intellectual traditions.

This divide becomes less rigid when examined alongside the existential humanism of Jean-Paul Sartre. In *Existentialism Is a Humanism*, Sartre rejects detached metaphysical systems and places human action, freedom, and responsibility at the center of philosophy. His famous principle that 'existence precedes essence' argues that human beings are not born with a fixed nature or predetermined purpose; rather, individuals define themselves through their choices and actions. This emphasis on self-creation reflects an intellectual lineage traceable to Nietzsche, who argued that individuals must create values and meaning in a world no longer governed by absolute metaphysical certainties (Nietzsche, F. 1967). By insisting that meaning emerges through lived experience rather than abstract theory, Sartre brings philosophy into the same practical world occupied by the ordinary layman. This comparative review therefore argues that layman's pragmatism and Sartrean humanism share a common emphasis on action, responsibility, and the active construction of meaning. While layman's philosophy represents existentialism in an intuitive and practical form, Sartre provides the philosophical framework that explains why everyday human choices possess genuine existential significance.

Existence, Freedom, and the Layman: In everyday life, ordinary individuals rarely have the luxury of searching for grand metaphysical explanations before responding to personal crises and existential challenges. Russellian Layman's Philosophy functions as a practical rejection of abstract determinism, the belief that human life is completely controlled by fate, history, biology, or divine design. When confronted with situations such as economic hardship, personal loss, or serious illness, most people do not pause to interpret their suffering within a larger cosmic blueprint. Instead, they focus on immediate survival, practical adaptation, and the possibilities still available within their control. This instinctive pragmatism reflects the belief that life must be managed through action rather than passive surrender to predetermined circumstances. A similar rejection of fatalistic passivity appears in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, where Cassius declares, 'The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves' (Shakespeare, W. 2009), emphasizing human agency over destiny and reinforcing the existential importance of individual action in shaping one's life.

This practical attitude closely parallels the existential philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre. In *Existentialism Is a Humanism*, Sartre argues that human beings are not born with a fixed essence or predetermined purpose. His famous principle, 'existence precedes essence,' asserts that individuals define themselves through their choices, actions, and responses to life's uncertainties. Similarly, the layman intuitively understands that identity and meaning are not permanently given but continuously shaped through lived experience and practical decision-making. This emphasis on human agency also echoes Greek Stoic philosophy, particularly Epictetus' argument that individuals should focus on what lies within their control rather than surrendering to external circumstances (Epictetus, 2008). Both frameworks therefore reject passive fatalism and emphasize that human existence is formed through ongoing action, adaptation, and responsibility within an unpredictable world.

The Sartrean Paper-Knife Metaphor and Human Liberty: In *Existentialism Is a Humanism*, Jean-Paul Sartre explains his theory of human freedom through the famous example of a paper-knife (*coupe-papier*). Sartre argues that when an artisan creates a paper-knife, the object is first designed with a specific purpose and function in mind. In this case, the object's essence, its design and intended use, exists before the object itself is physically created. If human beings were similarly created according to a divine plan or fixed human nature, then human life would also possess a predetermined purpose established before existence. Sartre rejects this idea completely. According to his existential philosophy, human beings are not born with a predefined essence, cosmic destiny, or permanent identity. Instead, people first exist and only later define themselves through their choices, actions, and lived experiences. This emphasis on human freedom recalls Rousseau's famous declaration that 'man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains' (Rousseau, J.J. 2002), a statement that similarly critiques the social and ideological structures that limit authentic human freedom and self-determination.

This principle is expressed in Sartre's famous statement that 'existence precedes essence.' Human beings therefore cannot simply blame fate, divine design, or fixed human nature for their actions because no universal blueprint exists. It can also be called a kind of escapism. Individuals are responsible for creating their own identity and meaning through conscious decisions and practical engagement with the world. A similar idea appears in the Greek Dramatist Sophocles' Oedipus Rex, where the tragic revelation 'Thou art the sinner, O king' (Sophocles, trans. 1984) forces Oedipus to confront personal responsibility rather than escape into ignorance or destiny alone. This idea closely parallels Russellian Layman's Philosophy, where ordinary individuals respond to crises and uncertainty not by searching for predetermined answers but by adapting through action and practical judgment. Both Sartrean existentialism and layman's pragmatism ultimately emphasize the same reality: human character is not permanently inherited or fixed in advance but continuously shaped through lived action, responsibility, and personal **choice**.

The Convergence of Action and Utility: Where Existentialism and Pragmatism Meet: A significant point of convergence between pragmatism and the existential philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre lies in their shared emphasis on human action as the source of meaning. Both frameworks reject detached metaphysical speculation and argue that meaning is not a fixed or pre-existing reality waiting to be discovered. Instead, meaning is actively created through lived experience, practical engagement, and human choice. In pragmatic philosophy, ideas are considered valuable only when they produce useful and observable effects in real life. Similarly, in Existentialism Is a Humanism, Sartre insists that "there is no reality except in action." His principle that "existence precedes essence" rejects the belief that human beings possess a predetermined nature or cosmic purpose. Consequently, both pragmatism and Sartrean existentialism place individuals within an uncertain world where meaning must be constructed through continuous action rather than passive contemplation.

Despite this shared focus on action, an important difference separates pragmatic philosophy from Sartrean existentialism. Pragmatism generally approaches uncertainty with optimism, treating problems as opportunities for adaptation, experimentation, and practical improvement. The layman's philosophy therefore relies heavily on common-sense wisdom, cultural traditions, and social roles to maintain psychological stability during difficult situations. Expressions such as "life goes on" or identification with roles like parent, worker, or citizen often help ordinary individuals cope with suffering and uncertainty. These practical habits provide emotional resilience and social continuity in everyday life.

Sartre, however, interprets many of these coping mechanisms with skepticism. He describes the uncritical acceptance of social roles, cultural conventions, or fatalistic excuses as "bad faith" (*mauvaise foi*), a form of self-deception that allows individuals to avoid confronting their absolute freedom and responsibility. For Sartre, human beings are "condemned to be free," meaning that every choice carries deep personal and moral responsibility. While the layman often seeks stability and relief from anxiety through practical adaptation, Sartre demands an authentic confrontation with freedom, uncertainty, and existential responsibility. Thus, although pragmatism and existentialism converge in their emphasis on action and lived experience, they diverge sharply in their psychological understanding of freedom, anxiety, and human self-awareness.

The Burden of Liberty: Anguish versus Everyday Resilience: In Existentialism Is a Humanism, Jean-Paul Sartre argues that human freedom carries immense psychological and moral responsibility. According to Sartre, when individuals make choices, they are not simply deciding for themselves alone; they are also presenting an image of what they believe humanity ought to become. Every action therefore possesses universal significance. This realization creates what Sartre calls anguish (*l'angoisse*)—the deep anxiety that arises from understanding that human beings are entirely responsible for their decisions without the guidance of divine authority or predetermined moral laws. Human beings stand alone in an uncertain universe and must create meaning through their actions while accepting full responsibility for the consequences of their choices.

In contrast, ordinary individuals often cope with life's uncertainties through practical forms of emotional resilience rather than constant existential reflection. Common expressions such as "it is what it is" function as psychological tools that help people manage suffering, loss, disappointment, and uncertainty. Rather than representing intellectual weakness or passive fatalism, these everyday responses allow individuals to preserve emotional stability and continue functioning during difficult circumstances. When faced with crises such as grief, economic hardship, or institutional failure, most people cannot remain trapped in endless metaphysical questioning while still managing the practical demands of life.

This contrast reveals an important difference between Sartrean existentialism and Russellian Layman's Philosophy. Sartre often viewed reliance on social roles, cultural habits, or comforting expressions as forms of "bad faith" (*mauvaise foi*), because they can prevent individuals from fully confronting their freedom and responsibility. However, from a pragmatic perspective, these coping mechanisms possess important psychological value. They protect individuals from emotional exhaustion and help sustain resilience in everyday life. Thus, while Sartrean humanism provides a powerful philosophical defense of human freedom and responsibility, layman's pragmatism offers the practical emotional framework that enables ordinary people to endure and function within the burdens of that freedom.

The Sartrean Café Waiter and the Trap of Institutional Identity: Jean-Paul Sartre illustrates the concept of bad faith (*mauvaise foi*) through his famous example of a café waiter in *Being and Nothingness*. Sartre describes a waiter whose gestures, speech, and movements are excessively formal and mechanical, as though he is striving to embody the role of the 'perfect waiter.' This exaggerated performance, Sartre argues, reveals an attempt to reduce human identity to a fixed social function. By acting as though his professional role wholly defines him, the waiter treats himself as an object determined by institutional expectations rather than as a free and self-creating consciousness. In doing so, he exemplifies bad faith—the denial of human freedom through identification with a socially prescribed role.

For Sartre, this behavior represents a form of self-deception. Human beings are not fixed objects with predetermined identities; they are free individuals capable of choice, change, and self-definition. By fully identifying himself with his occupational role, the waiter attempts to escape the anxiety of freedom and the responsibility of creating his own meaning. In this sense, "bad faith" occurs when individuals hide behind social labels, professional identities, or cultural expectations in order to avoid confronting their existential liberty.

This analysis also connects closely with Russellian Layman's Philosophy. In everyday life, individuals frequently rely on institutional identities such as worker, parent, citizen, or professional to maintain psychological stability and social order. From a pragmatic perspective, these roles can provide structure, resilience, and emotional security. Sartre, however, warns that when people completely surrender themselves to these fixed identities, they risk losing awareness of their deeper human freedom and responsibility. Thus, the café waiter becomes a powerful symbol of the tension between social stability and existential authenticity.

The Layman's Negotiation of Roles as a Pragmatic Anchor: When Sartre's critique of institutional identity is examined within the realities of everyday life, the layman's adoption of social roles appears far more practical than deceptive. For ordinary individuals, identities such as parent, worker, teacher, or civil servant often function as important sources of stability and direction rather than as forms of self-deception. These roles help people organize responsibilities, manage uncertainty, and maintain psychological balance within the pressures of daily survival. From the perspective of Russellian Layman's Philosophy, social roles operate as pragmatic frameworks that guide action and preserve social coherence. Instead of eliminating freedom, they frequently help individuals channel their freedom into meaningful and productive activity.

This creates an important distinction between Sartrean "bad faith" (*mauvaise foi*) and the layman's practical negotiation of identity. In *Being and Nothingness*, Jean-Paul Sartre warns that individuals may lose awareness of their freedom by completely identifying themselves with institutional roles. However, a pragmatic interpretation suggests that human beings cannot live in a permanent state of existential uncertainty without risking emotional exhaustion and social instability. The layman therefore adopts social identities not necessarily to escape freedom, but to create structure, resilience, and continuity in everyday life. Authenticity, in this context, does not require rejecting social roles entirely; rather, it involves recognizing one's freedom while consciously and responsibly inhabiting those roles. In this way, institutional identities become not prisons of self-deception but practical instruments for meaningful human action.

Optimism, Agency, and the Demystification of Quietism: In the years following its emergence, Sartrean existentialism was frequently criticized as a pessimistic and nihilistic philosophy that encouraged despair and passivity. Many critics argued that by rejecting divine authority, predetermined purpose, and absolute moral certainty, existentialism reduced human life to meaninglessness and quietism. Jean-Paul Sartre strongly rejected this interpretation in *Existentialism Is a Humanism*, where he defended existentialism as a philosophy of human freedom, responsibility, and action rather than hopelessness. Sartre argued that existentialism appears frightening only because it removes the comforting belief that human destiny is controlled by fate, God, or fixed human nature.

For Sartre, however, the absence of predetermined meaning does not produce despair; instead, it creates the possibility of genuine human agency. By insisting that individuals are free to define themselves through their choices and actions, existentialism places the future directly in human hands. Human beings are not passive victims of destiny but active creators of meaning and identity. In this sense, Sartrean humanism is fundamentally optimistic because it affirms the individual's power to shape life through conscious action and responsibility.

This perspective closely parallels Russellian Layman's Philosophy, which also emphasizes practical adaptation, resilience, and purposeful action in the face of uncertainty. Ordinary individuals rarely survive difficult circumstances through passive resignation alone; instead, they continue moving forward by making decisions, solving problems, and adjusting to changing realities. Both existentialism and pragmatic layman philosophy therefore reject quietism and affirm that human life gains meaning not through abstract certainty, but through continuous engagement with the challenges of lived experience.

The Core Definition of Hopeful, Continuous Action: The optimism of Sartrean humanism lies in its strong emphasis on action, responsibility, and the possibility of personal transformation. In *Existentialism Is a Humanism*, Jean-Paul Sartre argues that human beings are defined not by hidden potential, abstract intentions, or imagined possibilities, but by the concrete actions they perform in everyday life. According to Sartre, a person becomes the sum of their choices and lived experiences. Simply believing that one could have become successful, moral, or heroic under different circumstances is insufficient if such possibilities are never translated into action. In this sense, existentialism rejects passive excuses and insists that human identity is continuously created through active engagement with the world.

This perspective is ultimately empowering because it places human value within the individual's capacity for action rather than in predetermined destiny or fixed human nature. Sartre's philosophy suggests that people are never completely trapped by their past, since every new decision creates the possibility of change and self-redefinition. Human beings remain works in progress, constantly shaping themselves through their choices. This idea closely aligns with Russellian Layman's Philosophy, where ordinary individuals confront difficulties not through abstract speculation but through practical effort, adaptation, and continuous participation in life. Both frameworks therefore affirm that hope is not a passive expectation of rescue but an active process sustained through everyday action and resilience.

The Everyday Actor and Common-Sense Agency: When Sartrean existentialism is viewed within the context of ordinary life, its emphasis on action closely resembles the practical wisdom of the everyday individual. Most people do not evaluate themselves or others based on abstract potential, hidden talent, or imagined possibilities. Instead, they judge character through concrete behavior and visible action. In daily life—whether managing family responsibilities, handling workplace challenges, or responding to personal crises—the ordinary individual intuitively understands that intentions alone have little value unless they are translated into meaningful deeds. This practical outlook reflects the central existential idea that human beings define themselves through action rather than through predetermined identity or passive expectation.

Russellian Layman's Philosophy therefore shares an important connection with Jean-Paul Sartre's understanding of human agency. Both perspectives reject the belief that character is fixed at birth or hidden within an inner essence waiting to be discovered. Instead, identity is continuously formed through everyday decisions, responsibilities, and responses to life's uncertainties. The layman survives not by waiting for ideal conditions or metaphysical certainty, but through active problem-solving, adaptation, and resilience. In this sense, both existentialism and pragmatic common sense affirm that human life gains meaning through continuous participation in the realities of lived experience.

Synthesis: Character as the Cumulative Sum of Deeds: Ultimately, Sartrean humanism and Russellian Layman's Philosophy converge in their shared belief that human character is formed through lived action rather than predetermined essence. Both frameworks reject passive contemplation, fatalism, and the idea that meaning exists independently of human effort. Instead, they emphasize that individuals continuously create themselves through their decisions, responsibilities, and responses to life's challenges. Human existence is therefore not a fixed condition but an ongoing process of self-construction shaped by everyday choices and practical engagement with the world.

This convergence reveals an important philosophical insight: meaning, dignity, and personal identity emerge through action. In *Existentialism Is a Humanism*, Jean-Paul Sartre argues that human beings define themselves through what they do rather than through abstract potential or predetermined destiny. Similarly, Russellian Layman's Philosophy

recognizes that survival and resilience depend upon continuous participation in life through practical decision-making and adaptation. Despite their different intellectual styles, both existentialism and pragmatic common sense affirm that human beings are not passive spectators in an indifferent universe, but active participants responsible for shaping their own character, meaning, and future through the ongoing momentum of their choices.

Conclusion: This comparative study demonstrates that the construction of human meaning is not limited to academic philosophy but emerges directly from the realities of everyday life. Both Jean-Paul Sartre's existential humanism and Russellian Layman's Philosophy reject the belief that human existence is governed by predetermined destiny, fixed essence, or divine blueprint. Instead, both frameworks affirm that meaning is created through action, responsibility, and lived experience. While Sartre provides the philosophical language to explain human freedom through the principle that "existence precedes essence," the ordinary individual practices this freedom intuitively through practical decision-making, adaptation, and resilience in daily life.

This study also reveals that the apparent tension between Sartre's critique of "bad faith" (*mauvaise foi*) and the layman's reliance on common-sense coping mechanisms is not a contradiction but a difference in psychological emphasis. Sartre demands a direct confrontation with freedom and responsibility, whereas the layman often relies on practical emotional strategies to endure uncertainty, suffering, and social pressure. Expressions such as "it is what it is" function not merely as signs of passivity, but as pragmatic tools that help individuals preserve emotional stability and continue functioning within difficult circumstances. In this sense, layman's pragmatism provides the everyday psychological framework that makes existential freedom livable in ordinary human experience.

Ultimately, the convergence between Sartrean humanism and Russellian Layman's Philosophy offers a powerful understanding of human resilience in an uncertain world. Both perspectives reject passivity and affirm that human dignity, identity, and meaning are formed through continuous action rather than inherited essence. Human beings are not passive victims of fate or spectators in an indifferent universe; they are active participants who shape their lives through choices, responsibilities, and responses to adversity. Meaning therefore becomes an ongoing process of self-creation, built gradually through the cumulative force of lived action.

Acknowledgements: I extend my heartfelt thankfulness to Dr. Rajendra Reddy, the Academic Director; Dr. Lakshmikantha Reddy, the Principal, and Dr.C.S. Dwaraka Visvanath, the Head of the Department of Science and Humanities, for their invaluable cooperation, without which I would not have been able to accomplish my review articles. I am also deeply grateful to Dr. A. Naveen Kumar and Dr. R. Chennakrishna Reddy for their keen interest in my work, despite belonging to a different scientific domain. Finally, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my daughter P.Mounika for her interest in my work.

References:

- Camus, Albert. (1991). *The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays* (J. O'Brien, Trans.). Vintage Books
- Epictetus. (2008). *Enchiridion and Selections from the Discourses* (G. Long, Tran). Dover Publications
- Nietzsche, F. (1967). *On the Genealogy of Morals* (Kaufmann & Hollingdale, Trans.). Vintage Books
- Oppenheimer, J. R. (2005). *The Decision to Drop the Bomb*. In R. Rhodes (Ed.), Simon & Schuster
- Rousseau, J.J. (2002). *The Social Contract-the First and Second Discourses*, Yale University Press
- Russell, B. (2001). *The Layman's Philosophy*. Oxford University Press. The United Kingdom
- Russell, B. (2001). *The Problems of Philosophy*. Oxford University Press
- Russell, B. (2009). *The Triumph of Stupidity*. In *Mortals and others: American essays*, Routledge
- Sartre, J.-P. (2007). *Existentialism is a Humanism*. Yale University Press
- Shakespeare, William. (2009). *Julius Caesar*. Penguin Classics
- Shaw, G. B. (1903). *Man and Superman*. London, England: Archibald Constable
- Sophocles. (1984). *The Oedipus Rex*. Penguin Classics (Originally written 496 BCE)
