

Sartre's "radical conversion" to historicism has not made the Critique a more dialectical work. ^{here's} ~~the Critique~~ jumps all over vast fields of thought -- from philosophy to science, from literature to anthropology, from economics to psychoanalysis, from analyses of revolutions to those of the Proletariat (the capital P is Sartre's), and from history to the time of day. ^{is highly distinguishable from Stalin's forced labor camps & it lands workers.} And the reason is actually the same for both works, for different as the content, the methodology, or, if I may dare say so to a master of the dialectic in language, in the novel, in drama, ~~and in philosophy~~ the lack of dialectic methodology ^{let me explain.} The impasse in Being and Nothingness was arrived at, in part, in a fundamental part, but only in part nevertheless, from failure to see the social individual, what Marx called "history and its process", ^{is a great deal more than individual vs. social & it's a social subject.}

Sky

1st

Why is this master of language so ambivalent, ~~contradictory~~, so rootless in the warp and woof of Hegelian and Marxian philosophy -- the theory of alienation -- and on the Marxian concept of the actual, the historic, the new praxis where he should, as "a philosopher of existence" get along so swimmingly? The Humanism of Marxism is grounded on this theory. Here Marxism transcended Hegelian ~~ideology~~ ^{ideology} Hegel "right side up", ^{but} ~~separated~~ ^{separated} itself from what Marx called "quite vulgar and unthinking communism" which was "only the logical expression of private property" and "completely negated the personality of man." Clearly the "infusion of Marxism" into Existentialism did not lead the latter to abandon its concept of Other as enemy. On the contrary. Sartre is presently identifying Other ^{with Alienation and} ~~not~~ ^{only} in Class societies but also in "socialist (sic) societies." Indeed, "the new reality" hardly differs from the Old, and the old as the Sartre of Being and Nothingness perceived it. The substitution of the Proletariat with a capital P for the individual, and History of man defining themselves by the project rather than the past seem not to have resulted in any change whatsoever in methodology.