

Discussions of "Horizon" because topic conceived as
"what about existentialism?" rather than "what is existentialism?"

Existentialism is an attempt, carried out in a variety of
manners, to do justice to the facts of human living (freedom,
responsibility, commitment, interpersonal relations, communication,
death, God)

without breaking through the frontiers of knowledge set
by Kant, namely, that
sense alone is not constitutive of human knowing and that
true judgment can be the medium in quo the real is known
only if the real is already known prior to true judgment.

Heidegger, preliminaries to a solution that in thirty
years has not been reached

Sartre, a premature ontology that is sheer negation though
its coherence and penetration light up the insufficiencies of
existentialist thinkers

Jaspers, a full and brilliantly technical exploitation of
the resources at his disposal

Marcel, detached from theoretical issues, reaches true
concrete conclusions about being through the "good"

can't do justice to details of these efforts in time at
our disposal

no great point in attempting to do so, since the brilliance
of the efforts is matched by the failure to break out of the
closed circle

On the other hand, there is a notable point in attending
to significance of existentialism for scholasticism

Scholasticism is a philosophy of being, but it suffers
from a multiplicity of schools, it rests upon a bog of disputed
questions, it is not marked by any conspicuous desire and labor
to eliminate QQ DD,

because of half-hearted acceptance that truth is medium
in quo real is known -- not denied -- but very commonly it is
not really believed

with result of enormously weakened capacity to influence ground
unify the sciences and to be useful to theology

Existentialism invites scholasticism
to move from per se (subject, principles) to actual order
to move from being a philosophy among philosophies to being
a philosophy of philosophies, from non-historical to historical