

Sartre's Critique of the Concept of Anthropological Structuralism in Strauss

Mohammed Abdullah Jeru¹,

Abstract: Sartre goes in his critique of the structuralism, which sees the human being as a false formulation, because it overcomes the value of the structuralism and is absent from it after the effective practice from the historical person, as is evident in Sartre's critique of structuralism, came different from his language and modest tone addressed it to the Marxists.

Keywords: Sartre, Critique, structuralism, Marxists.

I. INTRODUCTION

We do not need more to demonstrate these deep-rooted relations between existentialism and structuralism to clear the common opinion mistakes that releases the estrangement value between them, and does not understand any weight of the historical and intellectual links between them, where we must now consider Sartre's relationship, after publishing his last book "Criticism of the Dialectic Mind" which has a subtitle (Fundamentals of structural anthropology)

It is interesting to mention that Sartre's criticism of the Structuralism, where Sartre believes that the structuralism is only a new ideology and the last weapon raised by the bourgeoisie against Marx.

It is clear from Sartre's language in his criticism of the structuralism that the contagion of Marxist dogma ideology, and it has moved him a "Neo-Marxist" it is the same spirit that Marxists criticised the existentialism in the 1940s. What is the difference between this criticism, Lukács' critique of existentialism as a "third road" and a weapon in the hands of the bourgeoisie to stop the Marxist-left encroachment, that Strauss adopts the structural approach in view of the cultural structure that man was only one of its many elements?

So we're about two approaches and two projects-a historical project, a cultural project, human of ideas, and human of practice.

How did the battle turn between them? What led the dialogue? And how Sartre's position in front of the real Anthropologists when he claimed that he was in the (foundation of structural anthropology) How did he justify it?

Search Hypothesis

The Search hypothesis is to identify the impact of Sartre's critique of the concept of anthropology of Strauss and the discussion between them on the following points;

First: the meaning of anthropology.

Second: The difference between the analytical mind and the synthetic dialectic mind.

Third: The meaning of history and the historical process.

What should be noted, however, is that both Sartre and Strauss have begun to interpret these points from a particular methodological standpoint, that their differences come from their differing methodological and theoretical perspectives, whereas Sartre is based on the dialectic existential approach in looking at the human and his freedom as a historical collection, that means he is searching for the man of practice and overtaking.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In writing this research, we have adopted a critical approach as well as the comparative historical approach.

The Meaning of Anthropology

A- Critique of Sartre: Sartre paved the way for his work when he talked about the difference between philosophy and anthropology, criticizing the latter for its systemic inadequacy. He pointed out in a comparative perspective between philosophy and anthropology;

"(I see that the philosophical field is human... Every other problem can only be imagined in relation to human being, whether it is metaphysical, anthropological or phenomenological.

Sartre goes on to distinguish between the subject of philosophy and anthropology, noting that philosophy human being is a subject of philosophy, whereas anthropology human being is only subject.

^{1 1} ^aAssist. Prof. / University of Baghdad/College of Arts Department of Philosophy, Email: dr.m.alkhaldil@gmail.com

Although anthropology "Human Science " When studying their subjects examines something in man, but not the universal human being taught by philosophy. Sartre tries to restrain anthropology in its ambition to be the universal teacher of man, saying; (The development of anthropology, even if the integration of science will never abolish philosophy in terms of asking questions on the sane person " and warn of trying to turn everything into a subject (Paul, 1977).

Sartre goes on to criticize the structuralism, which sees the human being as a false construct because, as the value of the structure overcome by missing a dimension of effective practice dimensions of the historical human being in the manufacturing of the structure, the amount of structure made it for human being , as much as the latter makes the structure and exceeds it.

It is clear that Sartre's tone in the critique of structuralism was different from his language and his humble tone , directed in dealing with Marxism, and even the theoretical proofs of distinction between philosophy and anthropology suggest the perception of Sartre and a review of the powerful existential problems described of the mighty Marxism.

When Sartre was demonstrating the legitimacy of his claim to the importance of integrating existentialism into Marxism, he placed his famous distinction between philosophy and creed.

He regarded Marxism be the philosophy of "knowledge" from which marginal doctrines feed such as existentialism, which regarded as a parasitic doctrine, live on the sidelines of the first, but Marxism needs it to renew its vitality and regain its role in increasing the historical human knowledge.

That there is no reason left for existentialism, that he wanted to merge existentialism with Marxism, but here it is different, when Sartre distinguishes between philosophy and structuralism where he sees that the structuralism is false, anthropology is deficient while the philosophy that has now become a revised Marxist is representation and the Structuralism must be integrated into the comprehensive world, even the anthropology has no choice in that, whether or not it is incorporated by surprise without the knowledge of the guardians, in the "Dialectic Mind" by the Existentialist Marxist Sartre. (Strauss. 1987).

B. Levi Strauss's Critique for Sartre

When the French anthropologists , Strauss and his companions got up in the morning of 1960 to read on the back of the book, "Fundamentals of Constructed Anthropology " fly their senses from the surprise and astonishment, but once they woke up from the impact of the shock, they have to read the book, to find a reason to conceal their surprise especially as they are more surprised to write the foundations of anthropology by philosopher known to put Fundamentals of phenomenological ontology in Being and Nothingness, 1943.

We do not need to emphasize that disappointment was their share and that is exactly what I felt and bitterly expressed by Levi Strauss, who wrote, "What I want me to do is to make my points of disagreement with Sartre, which is about the philosophical origins that establish anthropology, I have no intention of going into this field except after numerous readings "dialectical criticism ", I was assigned with several of my colleagues several discussion during the 1960s and he adds with a tone of a sober, confident thinker, who is confident of himself (and may not see Sartre in this controversy and dialogue that has crowned all these efforts and respect).

As for disappointment of anthropologists that they did not find after reading the book about the evidence of constructed anthropology fundamentals, according to their perceptions, Strauss said (the anthropologist is disappointed before this thinker-based on origins far from the his origins of an idea). he adds , is it striking that the positions and events be limited that Sartre inferred from the social facts are formalistic, beating a football match, boxing, or a row waiting the bus... It is a series of occasional events that do not allow the establishment of social life fundamentals and its foundations (Doloz, 1987).

C. Humanities and the Structural Approach

What are the mistakes that our philosopher Sartre faced? Strauss even mentions a full chapter in his book "Wild thought " titled "History and Controversy " which is the ninth chapter of the book.

In the beginning, the difference between Sartre and Strauss is a difference between two projects and two approaches, each with a particular angle and vision for human and human sciences.

While Sartre argues that the goal of philosophy is to represent the human being--in the context of the historical process, Strauss goes on the contrary to emphasize that the ultimate goal of the humanities is not to erect human composition but to melt it , and Strauss borrows Rousseau's phrase, which says: (If we want to study man, we must look at the remote, i.e. realize the differences first in order to discover the characteristics (Strauss,1987).

If Strauss believes that the goal of human sciences is not human synthesis, then Foucault will say later, not to be found like this composition at all (there is never a man and for me always exists even for a short period, and to show

the shape of Man or his features on the strength in the human being linked to a relationship with special forces from outside.

Gilles Deleuze sees in his book, "Knowledge and Power " that the general principle of Foucault's thought is that each form is composed of forces relationships and since the intervention of the forces of man in a relationship with the forces of ascent to infinity, they compose the shape of God, not the shape of man, and this is due to his discovery of Feuerbach who confirmed that God is only a numerator for the human who bend the God and rebending so Deleuze sees with Foucault that Nietzsche was not meant by the death of God except human death, as long as God exists, that is, as long as the form-God is working-the human is not yet found either when the shape-man appears, it is only prior understanding of human death But what does Foucault want to say that nothing calls for grief and tears over human death? Was this form really good? Was he able to see the forces within the human being and preserve them, the power of life, the power of speech and the power of work? Deleuze argues that the forces of man are not necessarily involved in the composition of the human form, but that it remains possible to exploit and accept recruitment in a different way and in a differently differentiated manner. (Strauss 1996).

If the forces of man do not have a shape but to enter into a relationship with the forces of the outside, with any new powers that we run the risk of entering into a relationship now and any new form that will emerge, nor God or man? It is the correct presentation of the form that Nietzsche called the "Supreme Man " (that the supreme man in the perspective of Foucault is far less than the disappearance or the demise of the existing people and much more than a coup in the conception (Strauss ,1977) the human perception that the emergence of a new form other than God, and there is hope that it will not be worse than the previously formed (Adet ,1993).

What is surprising and important, however, is the great similarity between the two viewpoints of the existentialist Sartre and the structuralist Foucault in saying the idea of existence is earlier than the shape, since this problem-identity-is the one discussed by Foucault in the "self-existence" Where Foucault sees: the new patterns of self-generation have established patterns that have no identity, after being seen as identical and cohesive with a specific identity, the contemporary human being faces the problem of identity if he cannot have a guarantee of his identity in the absence of God what can I do? What do I know? What am I?

These questions facing the modern man Jill Deleuze goes on to say the events of 1968 were a repetition of these three questions, what is our vision, what is our language, and what is our reality today?

After all, it is not concurrently to follow the rapprochement between Sartre and the structuralist philosophers, but what I want to know with is the differences and the philosophical dialogue that took place between Sartre and Strauss on the "Mind and history" and that is what we will consider now.

First: Critique of the Mind

Strauss sees that Sartre swings between two senses of mind as he puts the contrast between the analytical mind and the dialectic mind (as if it corresponds to the mistake and the truth, if not between the devil and the God, and sometimes (it seems that these two minds are complementary, as if they were two different ways that lead to the same facts (Abdallah 1988).

The reason for this contradiction and paradox is that, in his view, Sartre makes the dialectical mind a "self-generated" mind, an independent mind of the analytical mind, while Marx, who returns to Strauss and Sartre to think about it, has made the match between the two minds relatively, not absolute. Unlike Sartre, Strauss believes that the dialectic mind in our eyes is a constantly formed mind. It is an ongoing effort that the analytical mind must make to be shaped anew, when he aspires to characterize language, society and thought.

As such, Strauss begins his attack in an attempt to blow up the Sartre's pattern from the roots, and we know that the controversy, the synthetic mind built above him, and the new Sartre place, and when it is refuted, is nothing but a miracle that prevents him from cracking and falling just like the great palace of rationality fell who had built Sartre in young days of words and fiction" in Being and Nothingness" as Sartre admitted himself not sorry for him.

It's different now. How Sartre is allowed this time even to approach and to prejudice this lofty philosophical edifice, which he feels reassured that he had built of solid stones and marbles, if not said by precious stones, building from the history and practice of words and things on the evening rock he tried himself long in settling it –This rock – the historical Marxist of historical controversy "Marxism as a philosophy has become the reality" that we can understand the impatience of Sartre, when he loses control of his anger, and when he was asked about his position on Strauss who says that every thought is analytical?. To come screaming in the face of the person asking the question: (that Levi Strauss does not know what dialectical ideology, and he does not know and cannot know. That by intuition is helpless, and with absolute inability to understand dialectical thinking and adds to explain his view in the meaning of dialectic thought-the dialectic thought is above all and at the same point the scrutiny of what reality and study in terms of this reality is part of the whole, and all of the part... In kinship bonds there is never controversy, from his factual

study in terms of the relationship between the whole and the part. This type of thinking doesn't exist with Strauss.(Fouad, 1988).

However, Sartre's emotion and his screams did not prevent Strauss from going quietly and in a cool spirit towards the goal he had put for him as he directs his speech to Sartre to tell him (How to erect the contrast between analysis and controversy, while all your intellectual activity is based on analysis in the definition of topics and interpretation of the reality and the distinction between them and the corresponding , comparison and the conclusion (Al-Daoui, Abdulrazak,1992).

It is clear that the heavy burden in scientific studies and knowledge is generally on the shoulders of the analytical mind, where Sartre called it "Zombie Mind" while Strauss called this same mind with controversial mind, but when it is partial in advance, a mind that is an active , making an effort to overcome itself and that's why Strauss says we are in the eyes of Sartre " Hubristic Materialists, connoisseurs of beauty" we see in the dialectical mind an excess of the analytical mind, it is the necessary condition for the latter to dare to embark on the transformation of humanity into inhumane.

We do not lack evidence to demonstrate the direction of both Sartre and Strauss are based on a different methodological perspective of the meaning of dialectic and analysis, but it is right to note that Sartre does not have a clear and harmonious view of the dialectical analytical mind, sometimes distinguish between them and sometimes unites them (the analytical mind, it is a lifeless practice, while the dialectic is an energetic composition of practice at, and the analytical mind is dialectic mind making itself lifeless, the analytical mind, is the dialectical mind, in the small degree) so Sartre's floundering, while found Strauss proved more practice and more harmonious in his imagination and perceptions of the relationship of analysis to the dialectic . His proofs however, what must be known is that Strauss's goal of the critique of Sartre's mind, not the mind itself , but the results that lead to it in the field of humanities and history, this is disclosed by Strauss, where Strauss goes to that Sartre who makes all knowledge of man and practice is dialectic knowledge it will definitely end- to generalize this rule that is based on the lethal metering "That all knowledge of the other is dialectic knowledge then all the other is also dialectical " And this measurement is never true in the eyes of Strauss, but is rejected by him because we get the different facts of "Our facts " Specifications return to the method of perception and its becoming ,and added to its properties our argument , that we do not see and interpret the facts and events as they actually are, but as we have read and we perceive, and this is a falsification of the fact(Henry , 1963) .

After Strauss has disproved the originality of the dialectical mind in human anthropological research and shows its contradictions, he tightens the noose on Sartre, who unites man, history, and controversy and wonders: what to do with the peoples of "no history" and how they determine her fate when we determine the human being from controversy and controversy from the " history?

Here, Strauss reveals the authenticity of anthropology and the warm emotion of the direction of the "savage man" and his concern about the primitive peoples that were sacrificed by civilized peoples, declaring a sincere and progressive humanism. (Habib 2001).

As such, anthropology can be considered a philosophy of protest against European colonialism and against the extermination and enslavement of primitive peoples, on the other hand defending the right of these peoples to a free and dignified life and defending the humanity of the primitives who are treated as savages.

What can the philosopher of man and human freedom, say whose philosophy and life revolves around the defence of man? What can Sartre say in front of such a trial and compelling reasoning?

That Strauss tells us, that Sartre has fallen into the trap of distinction between "real controversy authorizes " The civilized historical peoples as a short-term "frequency controversy" to "get rid" of primitive societies that put them along the "biologica(Paul,1977).

In fact, all Sartre's attempts to get out of this impasse go unheeded and not saved by his attempt to distinguish between historical humanity and the dialectic and humanity that has been distorted and atrophy.

It is interesting to note that Strauss in his late works and was caught in the predicament of Sartre when he ended in anthropological search for the distinction between the two types of peoples called "Hot peoples" means civilized Europe and "Cold Peoples " Primitive and Eastern societies in Asia and Africa.

But what should be the reflection of Strauss and Sartre about the dialectic when dialectic was expelled from nature, retained it in the history only, Strauss, for his part, was able to face the controversy of history when he showed its non-authenticity as a method of human knowledge and as a legal process for the development of social and cognitive life ,as such it was controversial to pronounce his last breath.

This is how Strauss ' critique of the Dialectic of the mind was the last nail in the coffin of Marxist Dialectic. It is interesting in that both Sartre and Strauss have refuted the controversy in the name of man for Man, the first refuting the

myth of controversy in nature in the name of the historical man and the future man, while the second Strauss rejected the historical controversy in the name of the savage man, primitive man of the past. (Paul, 1977).

After Strauss clears the account with a dialectical mind, he is heading towards history and man his reality, but now he is taking the stress of his structural anthropological attack on Sartre mercilessly.

In his view, the belief that humanity has been dissolved in one pattern of geography or history is impossible to prevail in our contemporary society without being naïve and selfish, influenced by its nature, because the reality of the human being in Strauss' eyes lies only in the different meetings and their common characteristics, and Sartre is accused with subjectivity and selfishness, pointing out that those who take the self-assumed intuitive are stable and never come out of itself and Strauss goes in his critique (Strauss, 1977).

So that Sartre was a prisoner of Cogito "I'm thinking then I'm there" his own and he did not do according to Strauss in its social character whether to move from one prison to another, that is, he made the group and the age a framework that is not temporal to individual self.

This ... Strauss says that "Descartes has cut to put the rules of human physics from his society," and Sartre, who claims to be the founder of anthropology, has been cut off his community from other societies, and this Cogito, tucked away, and stayed in the pretexts, and has been isolated in individuality and accept of the cruelty and away from discernment of the social psychology (Adet, 1993).

Strauss, the researcher about the ancient man in the pre-history human being, believes that Sartre's insistence on the historical man is selfish, self-projection and inhuman intolerance against the human himself.

However, it is regrettable that every researcher in the Humanities strives to show his findings as a complete vision of the human person and to re-erect the network through his own perceptions, perhaps this will be a sufficient reason to distance the humanities from objectivity and to look to philosophers and human scholars as "transcendent" more than others.

If Strauss believes that the controversy of history is an inescapable dilemma in which Sartre has fallen, the latter believes that the role of structural anthropology in the structure plays a major role.

Where history reduced to unnecessary and external state, the structure is everything and it is composed and formed. If we wonder, how can practice preserving and change these lifeless structures? We meet history again as an anthropological science. The structure is involvement, and it is imperative to find out how to practice in the important practice and how you don't forget its erosion and necrosis.

If the historical controversy involvement for Sartre, the structure would implicate Strauss. When Strauss wants to inject Sartre to prove the inability of the complete historical dialectic mind, he will have a weapon in the structural arsenal, in the face of Sartre it's the bomb that the latter defence can't meet it. It's the language. where Strauss stand joyfully, he says that language is the greatness that Sartre's criticism is incapable of breaking, which is not placed in the analytical mind, nor in the composed dialectic that, it is a mass that is beyond the thinking and the language was the same before realized it, because then she was able to rhetoric and she will remain so tomorrow.

It is a human mind that man cannot come to think of it because her speech has never been and will never be the product of a comprehensive knowledge that realizes the languages and surround it (Abdallah, 1988).

Needless to say, the linguistic model that developed its origins by "De Susur" is the most visible and solid model in the whole structural pattern.

However, the language will not be the "greatness" that divided the back of Sartre fortified with Dialectic and Marxist-solid approach, but his Marxist fortifications enabled him to thwart the attack if we did not say "break the greatness of the language itself.

where Sartre moves to reply (The language model is not understandable, it is the same if we do not returned it to the human being. The true understanding of language is due to practice (Paul, 1977).

Sartre is unlike his predecessor, Heidegger, who asserted in his "humanitarian message," That being the word language, "even criticizes him for that, as Sartre sees this as alienation. (I have nothing behind me, but in my estimation that man is in the middle, or that he internalized things when it is behind him, nothing before man, except the animal, except the man the maker himself by himself there is nothing before or after him (Strauss, 1996).

This one... Foucault will say, "There is nothing" before, or behind, the knowledge, where he criticizes Sartre, because he did not leave the intention, only making "holes" in existence, without reaching the flexion of existence. The knowledge of Foucault is the flexion of the self-existence, the human being retained the things in himself.

In fact Sartre did not say otherwise, but with a different vision insisting on the primacy of knowledge. But there are human beings in a world where the realism of their existence leads them to internalized the depth. Human being is the depth of the world and the world is the depth of human. All this is achieved in a normal way together through a pattern of practice that is to use those open-ended topics called the word. Sartre goes on to respond to Strauss, (1996).

What we often forget is that the word "open" is historically produced and reconstituted by me, so if I speak the word and write and draw these material activities, and material activities have the same meaning in the language. (The denotation is mediated between the man and the subject between the thing to sign and the meaning... and the opposite between the meaning and the thing to sign the meaning mediated between the function and the connotation, between the connotation and all this can only be done with man and with him and for him(Paul, 1977)

It is clear that the difference between the two scenarios is great, and perhaps this discrepancy between Strauss and Sartre is due to the language nature. To their differing viewpoints on the nature of the humanities, while Strauss was aspiring to make the humanities more objective in the natural sciences, relying on what had been achieved by the "non-English" sciences that managed to move to the other bank, which penetrated the barrier separating the natural science from human science by adopting the structural language model.

Sartre strongly objects to such trend who tries to make human science compatible with natural science in terms of objectivity and scientific rigor. That's why he sees such ambition as crazy. Sartre thus refutes anthropology as a strict science, affirming that, in a sense, anthropology is in my estimation, a destructive science of man, as much as he learned on the basis that it is a scientific subject and then not the one who makes science either, and philosophy goes to that which makes science and cannot treat it with scientific, and can treated it with acquired words, that Husserl 's idea of philosophy as a "strict science" seems to me a crazy genius idea but it's a crazy idea, that philosophy as a strictly accurate science is meaningless.(Doloz,1987).

Sartre describes the anthropologists as beauty gourmet when they study people as they study the ants.

In any case, we can discover that scientific and philosophical dimension and the strict physical science on which the structural anthropology of Strauss and his colleagues are based, if we know they move from the principle of considering life as a function of gentlemen and looking at man as a job not as a history.

So Strauss announces when he talks about the differences of characteristics between people, saying (we will reveal one day he comes with him the ability to understand life as a function of the "rigid material " that this material is of very different characteristics than that which it has previously landed(Paul, 1977).

Strauss ' attempt at the secularization of human research will be more clearly manifested when he simplifies his perceptions of the meaning of history and historical knowledge.

Second: Critique of History and Historical Knowledge

Strauss does not see the only Sartre among contemporary philosophers who exaggerate the value of history and his preference for other humanities by looking at him with some unjustified some sanctification. and privilege, whereas-that is, that Strauss does not give historical knowledge any advantage over other human sciences, but sees in history a complementary search for anthropological research the first shows stalling the communities in the second time in place(Paul, 1977).

As such, the gap is increasing in Sartre and Strauss, while Sartre conspires anthropology is a complementary research, should be incorporated into historical research, and Strauss goes quite the opposite considering history as a complement to anthropological research, and Strauss proves the anthropology view, which does not confer the historical knowledge of any mentioned privilege of other science as such is consistent with Heidegger in his view that "There is no way in the knowledge that surpasses others in the study of subjects, but the meaning of this term acquires different connotations for each of them. (Strauss 1996).

Where Strauss wanted to show the contradictions in the historical knowledge, it involves double matching , and that what has happened in the past and the question is where did this thing happen? The historian is the one who is given by abstraction as he escapes from this roundabout and Strauss finds that what applies to the composition of the historical event also applies to its choice.

The historian, history maker must choose and separate , so that he does not face a whole historical resemblance to the mist and that it is some countless individual historical events and small partial facts.

That Strauss, too, concludes that history is not a history of itself, but the history for us. The history of the French Revolution is not as we know in a single moment at the Jacobins, the aristocrat and Al Jabli , to both (Al-Daoui, Abdulrazak, 1992).

After Strauss has suspected in the objectivity of the historical knowledge, he has been able to uncover her self-biased nature , so that each historian chooses facts and makes a history of what his ideological and intellectual interests tend to be. He goes on to refute the objectivity of the same history, where he denies that history is a wholly connected process, considering that a historical existence is a related one, which is only connected rigid case ,nothing but imaginary or contradictory. (what is the meaning that the history begins that symbolized by its realization from ten or one hundred thousand years and then resumes the ladder of thousands, from the third and fourth thousand ,and

then finally on a picture of an old history crowded its events according to the mood of the historian and then ends with an annual history of the centuries ,years , days and hours these histories do not constitute a single sequence but they belong to different types of classes or histories .(27)

This is how Strauss understands history, not as a process of evolution and rigid existence , but rather of separate group composed of historical fields, each with its own frequency, and with distinctive symbols meaning "pre and post.

It is only the history is a statistical record of some of the facts and events that have occurred in the past that Strauss is likely to embark on his perceptions of history from that old understanding of the history theory based on Cleopatra nose but since the 19th century since Hegel, especially Marx of the 20th century, has shown a serious meaning for the word "history" is not only indicative of the time of the event in the past, (but is a sign of the human being in the broadest range of the past, present and future as it relates to the same bond as the fabric of the human adventure as a whole (Strauss 1999).

And if Husserl is in his ambition of secularization the philosophy, and suspended the landmarks and placed it between the brackets, Strauss, in his tinged desire for the secularization of human knowledge, has placed man, history, development and progress between neglected brackets.

It is interesting to note that the young man ,Sartre had rejected the " suspension of the World " And now he strictly stands against the suspension of man, history and progress where Sartre begins to unite between man , history and controversy, history is the activity and intended work of human being, the effective humanitarian practice in which man weaves a process of his development , progress and override it's this frequent process of human effectiveness that develops as a dialectic that Sartre do not separate between the history as a process of becoming and a dialectical knowledge and in light of that the real problem in the structural confrontation that wants to divide the knowledge is that there is no partial truth, and there is no separate field in the human history.

The human truth is comprehensive and there is a possibility to understand history as a continuous process of operation through a continuous process of fragmentation. But Sartre believes that every studied phenomenon, it is not understandable except in the context of the operation of other phenomena of the external world phenomena (I see in each group a certain pattern of the relationship of the part in the whole and it appreciates the fact of the war in Vietnam it is possible to say that the people of Vietnam express us, Sartre concludes that the subject of history witness to itself as itself witness to his own subject) (Henry ,1963).

If Sartre had said, "the scientific tendency of the anthropology will destroy man," Strauss in his talk of dilemma of historical consciousness ends in the assertion, "the historical consciousness may lead to destruction in history and in order to go through history this tragic fate , Strauss suggests the solution in questioning the supposed dealings between the concept of history and man, which imposes on us an unspoken purpose, made history the nominal money not transcendental humanity and makes fun of Sartre saying (as if the emigration of human beings to their selves after emptying from their identities is the only condition for their delusional freedom in the framework of (We).

We do not lose sight of the difference between the existential criticism of history and the historical determinism done by Merleau-Ponty and Sartre, as well as the critique of Camus for the sanctity of history and its interpretation between the anthropological and structural criticism of the presumed ,identical history between man and history, the first criticism came in the name of contemporary man. Critique of historical determinism in order to make room for human freedom, and to assert human ability to transcend necessity to the future ' while Strauss criticizes the historical determinism, and present and future human being in the name of the past human being in order to assert the humanity of the ancient human being before history(Paul,1977).

The motive that explains to us the reason for Strauss to make his criticism against the concept of symmetry between history and the historical man , and that's what he's disclosing now ,as he went on to think that the search for the rationality of things never leads to history as a goal, but that history is only start or beginning of any search for rationality (Strauss 1999).

He adds to his intentions have already mentioned that barbarian thought is not without the historical forms of knowledge in which it finds its roots and we now know why this knowledge has not been opened in the spirit of this thought, "Savage thought", it is characteristic of this thought will not be temporal. (Habib 2001)

III. CONCLUSION

So Strauss went on to his ultimate goal of refuting the dialectical mind and to disprove some of that history and then the historical man ended by refuting the similarity between rationality and history all of this to pave the way to exceed the pseudo-encounter as he says between the "logical mentality " "and the mentality between the logic and finally declares proudly as the victorious warrior for the excess booty he was able to get it and take away after he fought this intense intellectual battle with Sartre, saying, "Just as we think logically, the savage idea is logical too, and thus it seems that the entire human knowledge orbit is self-locked orbit .

That Strauss had missed the high value or that he changed with the terrible loss that the thought had to offer in order to prove such a crazy hypothesis "The logic of savage thought" especially that Sartre does not negate the importance of the structural anthropological research and does not look at the primitive human being as superfluous and it doesn't deserve attention. On the contrary, Sartre believes that the consequences doesn't need for all these highly costs that have led to the sacrifice of man, history and controversy, not for anything but for the recognition of "The savage thought is logical " where Sartre sees that anthropological research can be taken with its important scientific findings within and through historical controversy approach.

On this basis, it is possible to look at the valuable information of anthropological research such as the "bonds of kinship" of Strauss.... and others at this level are collaborating with Strauss as an anthropological scientist, when Strauss wanted to make the "structure and the structuralism the final word in all general human mythological knowledge of science , so exceeds the limits, thus attempting to enter the philosophical realm, but philosophy does not see in man as a subject only as in the private world but philosophy study man as a subject and a self at once that is not found with Strauss.

The structure of the Strauss in itself and for itself makes the structure that resembles Moned Liptens, the only measure of the only event in life and knowledge.

Sartre believes that such disturbing structures are false combinations, because anything in themselves will not be able to give them the structural unit, if not the unified social practice that proves and preserves those structures that the human being exerts a double influence on the structures is not enough to fix and preserve it with its activity, and at the same time, it does not stop destroying, undermining and actively bypassing it.

As Sartre concludes, the whole movement is turning to the filling of history with the structure in which renew its dialectical reasonableness, which would not have left without a reference to the external analytical track, and submits its unity without a unifying act, on it's purely misleading.

Sartre is thus able to expose the flaws in which Strauss and his anthropological and structured colleagues ,who fell under the influence of the magic of the structure, to believe that they could be able to start on the basis of the structure to provide a comprehensive and rigorous scientific philosophy, but which led to the suspension of man, history, controversy and presentation.

REFERENCES

1. Paul S (1977): Defending the Intellectuals, translation of Joe, Tarabishi, Dar al-Adab Beirut, 1st edition.
2. Levi Strauss L.(1987): The Innocent thought, the translation of Nadeer Jahil , the university institution for studies, publishing and distribution Beirut, 2nd edition.
3. Doloz .G.(1987): Knowledge and Power, introduction to read Foucault, translation of Salem Yafoot, Arab cultural Center, Beirut, 1st edition .
4. In Being and Nothingness , a narrow edifice of rationality and that's what ended up, by falling from irrational tendencies.
5. Strauss L.(1996): The Innocent Thought, and more Structuralism and beyond, edited John Stroll, translated by Mohammad Asfour, the World of Knowledge Series, Kuwait,.
6. Strauss L.(1977): Structural anthropology, the translation of Mustafa Saleh, Publications of the Ministry of Culture and National guidance, Damascus, 1st edition.
7. Adet A.(1993) of Structural Era, translated by Jaber Asfour, Dar Suad al-Sabah, Kuwait 1st edition ,.
8. Abdallah A. (1988): Claude Levi Strauss reading in contemporary anthropological thought, House of the Qur'an, Manama.
9. Fouad Z. (1988): Horizons of Philosophy, Dar al-Tanwir, Lebanon, 1st edition.
10. See Al-Daoui, Abdulrazak, Human death, Dar al-Tali'ah, Beirut, 1st , 1992.
11. Henry S.(1963) The Thought of history, translation by Adil , the Hashemite Press, 1st edition , Damascus.
12. Habib C. (2001): Existence and controversy in the philosophy of Sartre, Almasarif Establishment , Alexandria, 1st edition .
13. Strauss L. (1996): The Innocent Thought, P. 183 and more about Structuralism and beyond, edited John Stroll, translated by Mohammad Asfour, the World of Knowledge Series, Kuwait, , P. 22.
14. Abdallah A.(1988): Claude Levi Strauss reading in contemporary anthropological thought, House of the Qur'an, Manama, , P. 51.