

The Ethnological Notebooks of KM were also reviewed by Cyril Levitt in Catalyst #12, 1978, which in fact did not appear until March 1979, and is a sort of continuation of Krader himself. In fact it was from a Krader seminar at the Institute of Ethnology at the Free University, Berlin, summer semester 1973. He notes that the notebooks of KM were at the Institute for Social History in Amsterdam in manuscripts B 146 and B 150; the Morgan notes occupying 93 manuscript pages; Phear, Maine, 26 and Lubbock, 27, 37 and 8 respectively; Marx completing the ms. B 146 in 1881 and the B 150 in 1882, just 4 months before his death.

Page 88 CL finally begins with the debates in Marx contrasting 1844 to Capital, and the EN do show both continuity and discontinuity with the early works: "In an important sense he had come full circle; he began his development with the study of philosophical anthropology and ended his theoretical career immersed in the study of empirical anthropology." Then the author makes his own divisions by saying that since we have dealt with the young and the mature, let's now deal with the elderly. He at least makes clear without any peradventure of a doubt that the "elderly" KM gives further and final proof of KM's use of the dialectic, in support of which he quotes KM on the concept of caste (EN, p. 15-16), showing that where the dialectical passage from gens to caste harkens back to 1844, "although he had no knowledge then of the gens and its importance. It can no longer be seriously doubted that KM remained a dialectical thinker, even in the very last writings." (p. 89)

14570

2.

What is interesting about the next paragraph is that obviously KM had studied philosophical and empirical anthropology in the 1840s before he did the 1844 MS., and that that early by considering man a social being he opposed not only the Left Hegelians but also took issue with the Social Contract theorists, the philosophers of natural law, the physiocrats and the defenders of individualist doctrine.

And he further shows (referring to the KM Chronik edited by Adoratsky) that you see KM had read an 1806 work on the origins of religions and reread it in 1852 in a

German translation of Du Culte des Dieux Fétils by DeBrosses.

(rd: which must have made Krader very happy because DeBrosses was the head of the school Krader was chairman in Germany.)

(rd: evidently the point that he brings out on p. 89 about the different sources KM studied which include the Journals of Merchants and Travellers to the Orient was the very one that Hal Draper uses to play down KM's new development on the Orient, article in the Tribune. But there is no doubt that all these plus the theorists and so forth, did become part of his theory of the Asiatic mode of production.)

p. 90 contrasts the views of Morgan on the family and the systems of consanguinity to Marx's (EN p. 112) which led naturally to stress on the economic factors in history and thus the relationship of base to superstructure. Pointing to double mediation: one via tools and technology; and two via social relations; "In class divided society the social totality remains only a potentiality to be realized, for society is divided within itself. To take 14571

3.

society as a whole is take up an abstraction. This is the starting-point of Marx's critique of Hegelian social theory. If the publication of the Notebooks establishes nothing else, it confirms once and for all the differences in the theoretical works of Marx and Engels.

1st, Engels dealt only with Morgan and not with the [redacted] that Marx had covered, and it's that Morgan book which [redacted] led to "The Origin of the Family." p. 91: "With the Marx original readily available we can compare 'The Origin' against the excerpts."

2nd, Engels had a much higher opinion of Morgan than [redacted] who did Marx, and he certainly didn't embrace him as a fellow "historical materialist" as did Engels. Indeed Marx cast suspicion upon Morgan's materialism, [redacted] Morgan's statement about "earliest ideas" at which point KM put an exclamation point before concluding with the phrase "of property" (KM p. 127)

3rd, when Engels as Morgan reconstructs the whole from the part, KM explicitly criticized this in the Grundrisse and in Capital: In the anatomy of man is [redacted] key to the anatomy of the age. This is at once a rejection of the speculative method and support for systematic, empirical analysis.

4th, KM is less willing to generalize on the basis of Morgan than Engels is. This is especially true where Engels speaks of the Athenian model whereas Marx ^(shows it) did not play such a typical role, that it was merely a [redacted] 'sort of military democracy' (KM p. 207; LK p. 149-150)

5th, I have to look up the fact that he says that the evolution of the state in Engels and Marx differ on the question of commodity form appearing in primitive society. 14572

4.

I doubt this, because the exchange between village commune was certainly not in the commodity form, even though it is true that KM held that economics plays a determining role not only in capitalist society, and anyone who said otherwise KM rejected. The one thing CL says that is correct is that in Engels, though ~~both~~ both the objective and subjective sides of development of the state are taken up, they just seem to lie there side by side. whereas KM of course has them clash all the time.

(b) Morgan outlined a multi-lineal process of human development but separating Old and New ^{Worlds}. Engels conceived a lineal progress of development with fixed stages and substages, and considered the development of the family from matriarchy to patriarchy without dealing with exceptional nature of the Graeco-Roman pattern.

In that KM certainly agreed more with Morgan than with Engels.

Whereas both KM and Engels accepted Morgan's view that ~~that~~ the matrilineal society was first and that the existence of patrilineal from ~~newest~~ Greece and Rome amongst the ancient Hebrews did ~~not~~ contradict Morgan, as against Maine who insisted that the original form was the patriarchal joint family. But the real question was the question of women, their role, and there was no doubt that the condition of women was considerably better among the savages than among the civilized. What to me is exciting is Marx's analysis there of mythology: "But the condition of the Goddesses on Olympus shows a reminiscence of an earlier, freer, and more influential position of women. The tyrannical Juno, the Goddess of wisdom, springs out of the head of Zeus and so on." In this contrast between mythology and reality, it is clear that Marx considers mythology a reminiscence of past reality, taken up as hypostatization.

14573

5.

Next CL calls attention to a reversal in form
that KM introduced into Morgan by pulling out part 2 and
placing it after

part 4, so that there is no lapse between what
is said of the ~~gens~~ and what is said of the state,
i.e. the discussion of property is ~~displaced~~ immediately
after government, so that the part on the family (3)
is not permitted to intervene. "This ordering bespeaks
Marx's rejection of Morgan's biologism." (p. 93)

(8) The most interesting and critical parts of the
notes concern the other books, Fheare, Maine and Lubbock,
and in those the whole question of Oriental society, the
Oriental commune, and the whole question of the Asiatic
mode of production, were related by ~~him~~ the imperialist
type of bourgeois writer, from which Marx got some good
facts for his position, and certainly exposed their
prejudices, criticizing their ethnocentrism, calling them
"English rogues and asses" (EN p. 263), hitting out against
both their racism and their position--he doesn't use the
word male chauvinism, but that clearly is what he criticizes
when he sharply attacks their position on women. He even
showed that the utopian way ~~for~~ for betterment ~~was~~ was
itself a position of ~~class~~ interest which lay in the
maintenance of the system. His sharpest criticism therefore
is against Maine, even "defending" Bachofen's teaching of
Mutterrecht, saying: "Mr. Maine is a block-headed Englishman
does not start with the gens, but with the Patriarch who
later become Chief etc. Silliness. The same goes
for the older form of the gens, this Patriarch--e.g. Morgan's
Irquois (with the gens in female descent)." (EN p. 292)

EN p. 263, 292
+ the note + male chauvinism

14574

6.

And to prove his point of the bourgeois ethnocentric prejudices which colored everything, KM says: "The entire false presentation of Maine's, ~~who~~ considers the private family as the basis..." [He quotes Maine] 'It is part of the ~~perogative~~ (archaic expression for the gens and tribe relationship) belonging to the representative of the pure blood and the joint family... the thing is just the opposite. For Maine, he cannot knock the English private family out of his head, this entire natural function of the Chief of the gens, natural precisely because he is its Chief (and theoretically always elected), appears as 'artificial' and 'near-administrative authority', while the arbitrariness of the modern paterfamilias is itself artificial, as the private family is itself, from the archaic standpoint." (EN-p. 309)

(rd) The important thing to me has seemed KM's great emphasis on the fact the British, in occupying Ireland and supposedly teaching them civilization, had moved backward on the role of women, eliminating the Irish laws which had given women considerable freedom.)

The last of the books by Lubbock Marx again criticizes his ethnocentric treatment of primitive marriage, matriarchy and descent.

The most exciting passage to me occurs in the EN p. 34 where he describes ~~in~~ a section of Lubbock on the aborigines of Australia, which deals with a Reverend trying to teach religion to the ~~aborigines~~, so when Lubbock writes that ~~the~~ the reverend found it very difficult "to make the Australian understand," Marx writes in parenthesis, "should read make him believe" in his existence without a body. Marx also makes a parenthetical remark in relationship to the aborigine, calling him "the intelligent black," and remarking that the one Lubbock calls the gentleman is "the Cleric Lang a silly friend," and having called the cleric silly and the aborigine the intelligent black, KM concludes, "Indeed the savage who worships an animal or a tree would see no absurdity in worshipping a man (as if the civilized Englishman did not 'worship' the Queen or Mr. Gladstone)"

14575