

THE ETHNOLOGICAL NOTEBOOKS OF KARL MARX (Studies of Morgan, Phear, Maine, Lubbock, transcribed and edited, with an Introduction by LAWRENCE KRADER (Van Gorcum, Assen, Netherlands, 1972.)

The ethnological writings that Marx summarizes and critically reviews were done in the period of 1880-1881-1882. "Marx left his notes in the state in which they are published here, his work cut short by his death in 1883."

Ryazanov gave a brief account of them on 11/20/23, published in Vestnik Sotsialisticheskoi Akademii and it was brought out by Carl Grünberg in the Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus in 1925. The Russian version of the Morgan manuscripts alone "with significant changes" (I will quote the paragraph later) was published in the Archiv in 1941 on the basis of the photocopy of the original made by Ryazanov. It is these which were surveyed by E. Lucas in 1964.

(rd: I now skip to the Addenda, pp 86-90)

The chronology of the materials at the Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis, Amsterdam: Notebook B 146 contains Morgan, Phear and Maine excerpts; Notebook B 150 contains Lubbock. (A further note by Krader lists the fact that besides these, Marx had in 1879 studied [redacted] and that excerpts are contained in B 146 and dated [redacted] and that was published in 1958 in Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie, and in 1959 Problemy Vostokovedenia, and in 1960 another part was published. (This note starts from pp 360 to half of 363. And I might as well skip here to fn. 25, the part that is on p. 367 since that is where the incorrectness of the Russian translation and thus the section on which Lucas wrongly depended is shown): Marx's excerpt reads "When field culture bewiesen hatte... the new property career of mankind..." The Russian edition renders this "When the pursuit of agriculture... mankind entered a new, hallowed path... private property exercised a powerful influence on the human mind..." (Archiv Vol. 9 p. 52)

At that point Krader shows that the Russian version "has here changed Marx's excerpt in 3 particulars. It has rendered 'property' as 'private property' twice and it has introduced the word 'hallowed' where neither Morgan nor Marx applied it. The linking of the adjective 'private' to the substantive 'property' was perhaps influenced by the reading of Engels and the reading of Marx in the light of Engels' book, bearing its title in mind. And since they did not indicate that they were making such a change Lucas took it as Marx's expression.

Returning to the Addenda, Krader then refers to the Zaslitch Letter Feb. 16, 1881, which Marx sent on March 8, 1881 and he further quotes part of the draft that Marx did not send, and shows that the reference about archaic communal property, which 'the American author' described, was a reference to Morgan.

Krader further quotes Hyndman "The Record of an Adventurous Life" p. 256 where Hyndman reports his discussion with Marx on Morgan. There is a part on the difference between the dates quoted in Karl Marx, Chronik seines Lebens which shows that Marx worked on these Notebooks Dec. 1880 to March 1881, and some others who then showed him to be working on it until June 1881.

14555

und 9x 15 (2nd family) und 13 decomp 11 pik Ralke 17 15
Social Sci

In any case, Marx returned to ethnology late in 1882, at which point, the excerpts from Lubbock were published. (The fn. 16 on the Chronik also cites Rubel, who quoted Ryazanov. The Moscow dating of Engels' discovery of Marx's manuscripts on Morgan is the first half of February 1884, but Krader thinks it was before. Krader also appends the fact (p. 90) that Marx was in close touch in 1880 with E. Rav Lancaster in 1880. The final reference is a letter of Engels to Marx 12/8/1882 about Hubert Howe Bancroft, The Native Races of the Pacific States in order to "clear up the matter of the parallel between Tacitus' Germans and American Redskins".

(fn. 374, in the Notes to his Introduction, Krader goes hammer and tongs against Ryazanov's claim that supposedly Marx's creativity was diminished in the last years of his life, both referring to the actual notebooks and the people who saw him and reported their conversations -- Kautsky, Kovalevsky, Hyndman -- reporting the exact opposite.)

fn. 142, p. 386. Krader shows that the fn. Engels inserted on p. 396 of Capital, Vol. 1, was evidently dated (over 7, 1883): "Hence it is an indication that the stage of thinking which Engels had reached in formulating his own ideas about primitive social economy, brought out in the following year." Krader: "Marx had instead developed a two-fold basis on the question of the division of labor in primitive society: (1) physiological, and (2) by inter-tribal conflict. (3) the social division of labor based on exchange between communities. Marx here asserted that the division of labor within the family is further developed in that of the tribe; he took no position that the family is further developed into the tribe." "Marx's conclusions in 1881 had gone beyond the view attributed to him by Engels in the fn. of 1883. We infer therefore that Engels studied Marx's manuscripts on Morgan only after this date."

fn. 146, p. 387. Krader brings in another difference between Engels and Marx. When Engels in the origin refers to the brilliant criticism of civilization by Fourier he promises to develop that further but doesn't. Krader then shows that Marx's movement from that was complex, 1st the question family and society, and its state has to be separated from the relationship of family to society without the state. 2nd the antagonisms of society and the state develop further and besides which there are 2 kinds of antagonisms and they have to be separated in time and quantity. 3rd, "the family that contains a relation to services for agriculture is an economic unit both of production & consumption. The single family of civilization includes the family in industrial society WHICH IS A UNIT OF CONSUMPTION, BUT SCARCELY A UNIT OF PRODUCTION. Engels' reference to the single families as economic units should be understood within this framework." Krader also is good in pointing to the limitation of Fourier's view that Marx had:

The following fn. 147, and in fact the whole of the next 2 pages (388 and 389) lists all of the letters about Engels reading to Bernstein from Marx's Notebook and from Engels own synopsis". The citation is to Bernstein's My Years of Exile p. 168. The date given is the beginning of March 1884. Then there is a letter to Kautsky on Feb. 16, and again on March 24, and letters to Bebel, Lafargue, with the one Bebel on June 6, which lists

his whole new work and the various chapters which shows that Engels was devoting fully 1/3 of the entire work to the family.

Handwritten notes on the left margin, including "13 du", "15 du", "17 du", "18 du", "19 du", "20 du", "21 du", "22 du", "23 du", "24 du", "25 du", "26 du", "27 du", "28 du", "29 du", "30 du", "31 du", "1^{er} jan", "2^e jan", "3^e jan", "4^e jan", "5^e jan", "6^e jan", "7^e jan", "8^e jan", "9^e jan", "10^e jan", "11^e jan", "12^e jan", "13^e jan", "14^e jan", "15^e jan", "16^e jan", "17^e jan", "18^e jan", "19^e jan", "20^e jan", "21^e jan", "22^e jan", "23^e jan", "24^e jan", "25^e jan", "26^e jan", "27^e jan", "28^e jan", "29^e jan", "30^e jan", "31^e jan", "1^{er} fev", "2^e fev", "3^e fev", "4^e fev", "5^e fev", "6^e fev", "7^e fev", "8^e fev", "9^e fev", "10^e fev", "11^e fev", "12^e fev", "13^e fev", "14^e fev", "15^e fev", "16^e fev", "17^e fev", "18^e fev", "19^e fev", "20^e fev", "21^e fev", "22^e fev", "23^e fev", "24^e fev", "25^e fev", "26^e fev", "27^e fev", "28^e fev", "29^e fev", "30^e fev", "31^e fev", "1^{er} mar", "2^e mar", "3^e mar", "4^e mar", "5^e mar", "6^e mar", "7^e mar", "8^e mar", "9^e mar", "10^e mar", "11^e mar", "12^e mar", "13^e mar", "14^e mar", "15^e mar", "16^e mar", "17^e mar", "18^e mar", "19^e mar", "20^e mar", "21^e mar", "22^e mar", "23^e mar", "24^e mar", "25^e mar", "26^e mar", "27^e mar", "28^e mar", "29^e mar", "30^e mar", "31^e mar", "1^{er} avr", "2^e avr", "3^e avr", "4^e avr", "5^e avr", "6^e avr", "7^e avr", "8^e avr", "9^e avr", "10^e avr", "11^e avr", "12^e avr", "13^e avr", "14^e avr", "15^e avr", "16^e avr", "17^e avr", "18^e avr", "19^e avr", "20^e avr", "21^e avr", "22^e avr", "23^e avr", "24^e avr", "25^e avr", "26^e avr", "27^e avr", "28^e avr", "29^e avr", "30^e avr", "31^e avr", "1^{er} mai", "2^e mai", "3^e mai", "4^e mai", "5^e mai", "6^e mai", "7^e mai", "8^e mai", "9^e mai", "10^e mai", "11^e mai", "12^e mai", "13^e mai", "14^e mai", "15^e mai", "16^e mai", "17^e mai", "18^e mai", "19^e mai", "20^e mai", "21^e mai", "22^e mai", "23^e mai", "24^e mai", "25^e mai", "26^e mai", "27^e mai", "28^e mai", "29^e mai", "30^e mai", "31^e mai", "1^{er} juin", "2^e juin", "3^e juin", "4^e juin", "5^e juin", "6^e juin", "7^e juin", "8^e juin", "9^e juin", "10^e juin", "11^e juin", "12^e juin", "13^e juin", "14^e juin", "15^e juin", "16^e juin", "17^e juin", "18^e juin", "19^e juin", "20^e juin", "21^e juin", "22^e juin", "23^e juin", "24^e juin", "25^e juin", "26^e juin", "27^e juin", "28^e juin", "29^e juin", "30^e juin", "31^e juin", "1^{er} juil", "2^e juil", "3^e juil", "4^e juil", "5^e juil", "6^e juil", "7^e juil", "8^e juil", "9^e juil", "10^e juil", "11^e juil", "12^e juil", "13^e juil", "14^e juil", "15^e juil", "16^e juil", "17^e juil", "18^e juil", "19^e juil", "20^e juil", "21^e juil", "22^e juil", "23^e juil", "24^e juil", "25^e juil", "26^e juil", "27^e juil", "28^e juil", "29^e juil", "30^e juil", "31^e juil", "1^{er} aout", "2^e aout", "3^e aout", "4^e aout", "5^e aout", "6^e aout", "7^e aout", "8^e aout", "9^e aout", "10^e aout", "11^e aout", "12^e aout", "13^e aout", "14^e aout", "15^e aout", "16^e aout", "17^e aout", "18^e aout", "19^e aout", "20^e aout", "21^e aout", "22^e aout", "23^e aout", "24^e aout", "25^e aout", "26^e aout", "27^e aout", "28^e aout", "29^e aout", "30^e aout", "31^e aout", "1^{er} sept", "2^e sept", "3^e sept", "4^e sept", "5^e sept", "6^e sept", "7^e sept", "8^e sept", "9^e sept", "10^e sept", "11^e sept", "12^e sept", "13^e sept", "14^e sept", "15^e sept", "16^e sept", "17^e sept", "18^e sept", "19^e sept", "20^e sept", "21^e sept", "22^e sept", "23^e sept", "24^e sept", "25^e sept", "26^e sept", "27^e sept", "28^e sept", "29^e sept", "30^e sept", "31^e sept", "1^{er} oct", "2^e oct", "3^e oct", "4^e oct", "5^e oct", "6^e oct", "7^e oct", "8^e oct", "9^e oct", "10^e oct", "11^e oct", "12^e oct", "13^e oct", "14^e oct", "15^e oct", "16^e oct", "17^e oct", "18^e oct", "19^e oct", "20^e oct", "21^e oct", "22^e oct", "23^e oct", "24^e oct", "25^e oct", "26^e oct", "27^e oct", "28^e oct", "29^e oct", "30^e oct", "31^e oct", "1^{er} nov", "2^e nov", "3^e nov", "4^e nov", "5^e nov", "6^e nov", "7^e nov", "8^e nov", "9^e nov", "10^e nov", "11^e nov", "12^e nov", "13^e nov", "14^e nov", "15^e nov", "16^e nov", "17^e nov", "18^e nov", "19^e nov", "20^e nov", "21^e nov", "22^e nov", "23^e nov", "24^e nov", "25^e nov", "26^e nov", "27^e nov", "28^e nov", "29^e nov", "30^e nov", "1^{er} dec", "2^e dec", "3^e dec", "4^e dec", "5^e dec", "6^e dec", "7^e dec", "8^e dec", "9^e dec", "10^e dec", "11^e dec", "12^e dec", "13^e dec", "14^e dec", "15^e dec", "16^e dec", "17^e dec", "18^e dec", "19^e dec", "20^e dec", "21^e dec", "22^e dec", "23^e dec", "24^e dec", "25^e dec", "26^e dec", "27^e dec", "28^e dec", "29^e dec", "30^e dec", "31^e dec".

Handwritten notes on the right margin, including "13 decomp", "14 decomp", "15 decomp", "16 decomp", "17 decomp", "18 decomp", "19 decomp", "20 decomp", "21 decomp", "22 decomp", "23 decomp", "24 decomp", "25 decomp", "26 decomp", "27 decomp", "28 decomp", "29 decomp", "30 decomp", "31 decomp", "1^{er} jan", "2^e jan", "3^e jan", "4^e jan", "5^e jan", "6^e jan", "7^e jan", "8^e jan", "9^e jan", "10^e jan", "11^e jan", "12^e jan", "13^e jan", "14^e jan", "15^e jan", "16^e jan", "17^e jan", "18^e jan", "19^e jan", "20^e jan", "21^e jan", "22^e jan", "23^e jan", "24^e jan", "25^e jan", "26^e jan", "27^e jan", "28^e jan", "29^e jan", "30^e jan", "31^e jan", "1^{er} fev", "2^e fev", "3^e fev", "4^e fev", "5^e fev", "6^e fev", "7^e fev", "8^e fev", "9^e fev", "10^e fev", "11^e fev", "12^e fev", "13^e fev", "14^e fev", "15^e fev", "16^e fev", "17^e fev", "18^e fev", "19^e fev", "20^e fev", "21^e fev", "22^e fev", "23^e fev", "24^e fev", "25^e fev", "26^e fev", "27^e fev", "28^e fev", "29^e fev", "30^e fev", "31^e fev", "1^{er} mar", "2^e mar", "3^e mar", "4^e mar", "5^e mar", "6^e mar", "7^e mar", "8^e mar", "9^e mar", "10^e mar", "11^e mar", "12^e mar", "13^e mar", "14^e mar", "15^e mar", "16^e mar", "17^e mar", "18^e mar", "19^e mar", "20^e mar", "21^e mar", "22^e mar", "23^e mar", "24^e mar", "25^e mar", "26^e mar", "27^e mar", "28^e mar", "29^e mar", "30^e mar", "31^e mar", "1^{er} avr", "2^e avr", "3^e avr", "4^e avr", "5^e avr", "6^e avr", "7^e avr", "8^e avr", "9^e avr", "10^e avr", "11^e avr", "12^e avr", "13^e avr", "14^e avr", "15^e avr", "16^e avr", "17^e avr", "18^e avr", "19^e avr", "20^e avr", "21^e avr", "22^e avr", "23^e avr", "24^e avr", "25^e avr", "26^e avr", "27^e avr", "28^e avr", "29^e avr", "30^e avr", "31^e avr", "1^{er} mai", "2^e mai", "3^e mai", "4^e mai", "5^e mai", "6^e mai", "7^e mai", "8^e mai", "9^e mai", "10^e mai", "11^e mai", "12^e mai", "13^e mai", "14^e mai", "15^e mai", "16^e mai", "17^e mai", "18^e mai", "19^e mai", "20^e mai", "21^e mai", "22^e mai", "23^e mai", "24^e mai", "25^e mai", "26^e mai", "27^e mai", "28^e mai", "29^e mai", "30^e mai", "31^e mai", "1^{er} juin", "2^e juin", "3^e juin", "4^e juin", "5^e juin", "6^e juin", "7^e juin", "8^e juin", "9^e juin", "10^e juin", "11^e juin", "12^e juin", "13^e juin", "14^e juin", "15^e juin", "16^e juin", "17^e juin", "18^e juin", "19^e juin", "20^e juin", "21^e juin", "22^e juin", "23^e juin", "24^e juin", "25^e juin", "26^e juin", "27^e juin", "28^e juin", "29^e juin", "30^e juin", "31^e juin", "1^{er} juil", "2^e juil", "3^e juil", "4^e juil", "5^e juil", "6^e juil", "7^e juil", "8^e juil", "9^e juil", "10^e juil", "11^e juil", "12^e juil", "13^e juil", "14^e juil", "15^e juil", "16^e juil", "17^e juil", "18^e juil", "19^e juil", "20^e juil", "21^e juil", "22^e juil", "23^e juil", "24^e juil", "25^e juil", "26^e juil", "27^e juil", "28^e juil", "29^e juil", "30^e juil", "31^e juil", "1^{er} aout", "2^e aout", "3^e aout", "4^e aout", "5^e aout", "6^e aout", "7^e aout", "8^e aout", "9^e aout", "10^e aout", "11^e aout", "12^e aout", "13^e aout", "14^e aout", "15^e aout", "16^e aout", "17^e aout", "18^e aout", "19^e aout", "20^e aout", "21^e aout", "22^e aout", "23^e aout", "24^e aout", "25^e aout", "26^e aout", "27^e aout", "28^e aout", "29^e aout", "30^e aout", "31^e aout", "1^{er} sept", "2^e sept", "3^e sept", "4^e sept", "5^e sept", "6^e sept", "7^e sept", "8^e sept", "9^e sept", "10^e sept", "11^e sept", "12^e sept", "13^e sept", "14^e sept", "15^e sept", "16^e sept", "17^e sept", "18^e sept", "19^e sept", "20^e sept", "21^e sept", "22^e sept", "23^e sept", "24^e sept", "25^e sept", "26^e sept", "27^e sept", "28^e sept", "29^e sept", "30^e sept", "31^e sept", "1^{er} oct", "2^e oct", "3^e oct", "4^e oct", "5^e oct", "6^e oct", "7^e oct", "8^e oct", "9^e oct", "10^e oct", "11^e oct", "12^e oct", "13^e oct", "14^e oct", "15^e oct", "16^e oct", "17^e oct", "18^e oct", "19^e oct", "20^e oct", "21^e oct", "22^e oct", "23^e oct", "24^e oct", "25^e oct", "26^e oct", "27^e oct", "28^e oct", "29^e oct", "30^e oct", "31^e oct", "1^{er} nov", "2^e nov", "3^e nov", "4^e nov", "5^e nov", "6^e nov", "7^e nov", "8^e nov", "9^e nov", "10^e nov", "11^e nov", "12^e nov", "13^e nov", "14^e nov", "15^e nov", "16^e nov", "17^e nov", "18^e nov", "19^e nov", "20^e nov", "21^e nov", "22^e nov", "23^e nov", "24^e nov", "25^e nov", "26^e nov", "27^e nov", "28^e nov", "29^e nov", "30^e nov", "1^{er} dec", "2^e dec", "3^e dec", "4^e dec", "5^e dec", "6^e dec", "7^e dec", "8^e dec", "9^e dec", "10^e dec", "11^e dec", "12^e dec", "13^e dec", "14^e dec", "15^e dec", "16^e dec", "17^e dec", "18^e dec", "19^e dec", "20^e dec", "21^e dec", "22^e dec", "23^e dec", "24^e dec", "25^e dec", "26^e dec", "27^e dec", "28^e dec", "29^e dec", "30^e dec", "31^e dec".

On p. 4 K seems to start with a total view, showing that the positions of phil. anthrop., from the start (and the start with him is even before 44, 1841) to the very end are one continuous dev. To prove the interest in all of these on the ? of the family, civil society and the state -- Cr. of Hegl. Phil. of Right (1842) -- the alienation of man in society and nature (1844), the labor of man (1845) and Holy Fam., opposition of the concrete to the abstract (Theses on F.) led to the rev. of 48, and by then he had decided that Pol. Econ. was the ~~subject~~ ^{anatomy} of society, so that ~~he moved~~ ^{he moved} from phil. anthrop. to empirical subject went back again to emp. study in the very last period of his life 1879-1882.

This type of total view and rel. of study to activity shows in Grundrisse, i.e. (the interest in primitive people at the very time of economic crisis) And he also points to the fact that the primitive vs. capitalist prod. goes right into the chapter on the social div. of labor in Capital (incidentally, at this early point, he also has ft. 6, p. 355, where he gives the 1st reference to Ryazanov, as well as Marxists who were ~~in~~ continuity vs. discontinuity in Mx: Auguste C. Cornu, Georg Lukats, Jean Hyppolite, and Karl Korsch, and this extends into making some very good cracks against Althusser, but admiration for Pasdolsky.) He ~~ends~~ on Zasulich.

The first subheading then, is on the section of Mx's excerpts from Morgan. And he too ~~is~~ still continues to stress the juxtaposition of materials not just on anthropology but on the colonial quest, on tech. and agriculture, on the jurisprudence, so that for example we have here both the ref. to ft. 15 (p. 359) which lists the Notebooks as they exist in the IISG, plus the readings that he did on Kovalovsky and quotes from Mx's excerpts of p. 14. "The propensity to pair, now so powerful in the civilized races also might be normal to mankind, but a growth through experience, like all the great passions and powers of the mind." K. continues to develop his own views in ft. 16 to where it is also related to the difference between what Hegel considered culture and Marx's rejection of Hegel's Absolutes as well as his criticism of Feuerbach's abstract man.

Therefore, as K continues in the context of his Introduction (p.7), he is right in saying that the Notebooks are not to be regarded as gratuitous, agglomerations. They stand as nodal points in which ideas are related." And he rightly concludes "the rel. to one phil. problems and to problems of praxis" (p.8).

origin of (in Asia)

The question of common/mankind in Morgan, and on p. 9 K shows that even when he doesn't directly take issue with Morgan, for example on the question that in primitive societies, gov't is founded on relations that are personal, Mx. can be seen to ~~contravert~~ ^{emphasize} that in his Maine mss. (see Maine excerpt 164, ft. 15).

On p. 11 is the first show of difference between M and E when he says that though Mx was favorable to Morgan, he did not reach Engels' verdict that it was ~~an~~ ^{an} epochal work. Q Engels that "Morgan's rediscovery of the precedence of the matriarchal over the patriarchal gens has the same significance for pre-history that Darwin's Th. of evolution has for biology and Mx's Th of surplus value has for pol. economy" (Origin, preface to 4th edition, at which point K says: "Mx emphasized the Th of the gens, not the precedence of matriarchy over patriarchy."

Handwritten notes on the left margin: "APRILS", "gens", "folk", "HERE".

Handwritten notes on the right margin: "this is", "the ref.", "Tech", "Morgan", "Engels", "nodal", "Th of evolution", "Th of the gens", "Emphasis in Morgan's", "Engels' instead of".

In tracing the origin of civilization and the state in the ^(dissolution) primitive group there is the emphasis, once the talk of liberty and equality of ancient society is discussed, on the role of women. Which Morgan considers as proof of the progress in the family and of freedom. It's at this point, where Mx wrote: ^(the quotation being sent to Mike)

The greatest freedom that K displays is on p. 15, where he stressed the "most explicitly dialectical of all of Mx's formulations" as he works out the transitions from the abstraction of the clan to the concrete caste; that furthermore these are in turn a ^(dualism) since the movement from concrete to the next concrete stage takes place ^{at the same time} as abstract to concrete: "Caste is opposed to a further formation ^{arising out of} the dissolution of gentile society, the aristocracy; ... here a social relation external to the gens principle ^{is} introduced: IT IS ~~NOT~~ CASTE AS SUCH, NOR CONQUEST AS SUCH, NOR DIFFERENTIATION IN GENS, THAT DESTROYS THE BOND OF KINSHIP AND OF FRATERNITY; THE GENS AND GENTILE PRINCIPLE PASS INTO CIVILIZATION, ~~CASTE~~ DOMESTIC SOCIETY, AND THEN ~~ARISTOCRACY~~, SUBJECT TO ANOTHER OPPOSITION THAN THAT WHICH IS DELINEATED HERE: ^{equality} ~~the gens, conquest,~~ the bond of kinship and ~~caste~~ ^{equality} ~~EXIST TOGETHER WHILE PROPERTY IS NOT UNEVENLY ACCUMULATED...~~ ^{but for equality in rel. to property to come about there must have been a quantitative increase in the amount of social property ..."}

On p. 16 he then does try to relate it to Mx in Capital ^{stop Mx} excerpts from Morgan note 160 ^{at note, which appears on p. 403.} K refers to the concept of caste in Mx beginning with his letter to Annenkov of 12/28/1846 = the Appendix to Poverty of Phil. (on Proudhon). In the context, i.e. back to p. 16, K also has a great crack at Sartre on the ~~Q~~ Q of cyclical instead of ~~dialectical~~ dialectical revolutions as "recurrence in history of the ~~perpetual~~ factors of the human condition as scarcity.

The next sub section is on "The State and civilized society" and here he returns to Mx's Capital: "Aristotle's definition is actually that man is by nature a town-citizen. This definition is as ~~characteristic~~ characteristic for classical antiquity as Franklin's definition that man is by nature a tool-making animal is for Yankeeedom." (V.I pp 200, 358). For that matter, K continues showing also Mx's opposition to "Cartesian determination of man as determination of mind." (p. 20) He also takes up commodity fetishism, (p. 22). And makes what I consider a profound remark when he writes: "the religious field was then subjected to dialectical critique, ~~NOT~~ because it afforded the occasion for performance of virtuosity, wherein the converted spirit was reconverted into matter, ^{(BUT) RATHER BECAUSE, BY THE MYSTICAL FORMULATION A RELATION BETWEEN (Mx) HAS BEEN REPLACED BY A RELATION BETWEEN THINGS...}"

K then shows that in the Ethnological Notebooks, ~~Mx~~ Mx wasn't only working with both empirical and philosophical terms, but with practical aspects and political action by the very choice of books and themes and methods of excerpting and notes and comments.

The next sub-heading is on the Excerpts and Mx's marginalia.

On p. 31 begins the Excerpts from Phear, The Aryan Village, Phear's work, which interested Mx directly was the Q of the Oriental commune. The biggest subsection, however, is on Mx's excerpts on Maine, Lectures on the Early History of Institutions (I SHOULD NOT HAVE JUMPED THIS SOON TO THAT PART BECAUSE IT'S ON FIN. 25 THAT WE HAVE THE INFAMOUS TRANSLATION FROM THE RUSSIAN.)

He is extremely good in bringing out "Mx's systematic and uncompromising rejection of race, racism and biologism..." (Maine excerpts pp 162 actually appears on p. 289-90; pp 164 appears on p. 292; 187 is p. 323.) On the Maine p. 164 excerpt is where Mx writes: "Herrn Maine als block-headed Englishman ~~geht nicht von gens aus, sondern von Rassen aus~~" and on Maine's p. 137 he repeats even more strongly about "English block-headed" ~~had declared that the ancient Irish law which recognized women the same power of dealing with their own property without the consent of their husbands "to be illegal at the beginning of the 17th century."~~

* * * * *

I'll skip here though I would like especially to see p. 54 where ~~because he used Engels Dialectic of Nature as starting point, whereas Mx had raised the Q of both the subjective and objective aspects of man in society.~~ But I want to go to the last part (section 7) because that is where K deals with "Relation of Engels to Marx and Morgan" (pp 76-85)

He begins with Engels writing first together with Mx in the 1840s -- The Holy Family and then shows that in AntiDunring it was Mx who suggested excerpting Bancroft and writing Appendix II, "The Marx". Then he goes to Engels' finding Mx's posthumous papers, i.e. the excerpts from Morgan (in the Fin. there is a list of all the letters between Engels and Bernstein and Kautsky and Bebel on this discovery.)

Whether K refers to Mx's strictures upon Morgan that E. passed over or E's more positive attitude to Bancroft and Maine than was Marx's or even when he shows that what E' had added to Capital in 1883, which was considerably below what Mx had developed in 1881, K suddenly becomes quite mild. (p. 78)

Lawrence KRADER, THE WORKS OF MARX & ENGELS IN ETHNOLOGY COMPARED

FROM: Int. Review of Social History, Vol. 18, 1973, Part 2/, Van Gorku, Assen, Netherland

I - Marx & Engels in their General Relations -- deals with various estimates from-Mehring, -Mayer, Ryazanov, -Cornu, Lukacs, Korsch Jordan, Schumpeter, etc. pp.223-9

II. M & E in their relations to the DIALECTICS OF NATURAL & HUMAN HISTORY pp.229-238

re one science for nature & history--in future.--1844-46 in opp to primitive man even at beginning if culture & exchange of product

in den Anfangen der Kultur. In CAP. I, pp.336-7 (Ger. 7th ed.) KM likewise says "Their mode of prod., mode of life & products are therefore different." And K. continued (p.231) Here there is firm ground for rejection of any notion that Marx separated

absolutely primitive from civilized man. p.231 K. seems to say that where KM

in Ch. very 1st sentence, called attention to class struggle, E. in ftn.

about written history seems to withdraw from that emphasis as if it were a debate "negotiation about the nature & forms of historiography;" E sees man not in his unity but duality "a non-dialectical separation, an anti-dial position."

BOTH IN CAP. & IN MORGAN MAIN EXCERPTS MARX HAS MOVED TO UNITY OF HUMAN NATURE & OF HISTORICAL PROCESSES WITHIN IT. p.232

III. THE WORKS OF M & E IN ETHNOLOGY

pp.243 Marx didn't ques. ethnology (Morgan's) on Am. Indians & Oceania "BUT ADDED MUCH DATA OF HIS OWN IN THE ETHNOLOGY OF THE ANCIENT & MEDIEVAL TIMES."

pp.246-7 "the distinction which Engels drew bet. the soc. factors in the primitive & civilized life of man did NOT CORRESPOND TO MARX'S OWN CONCLUSIONS which he expressed in his comments on Morgan (this opp. to Maine. Marx noted of the Kuchin of the Yukon River region of Canada that they had '3 grades or classes of society'... & later added "that as soon as a DIFFERENCE IN RANK

BET. CONSANGUINEI OF THE GENTES arises this enter into CONFLICT with the gentile god & the gens can patriify into its opposite, caste."

Moreover, it is not successive to gens "BUT SUCCESSIONS OF OPP? hence no div. bet. primitive & civilized."

pp.250 "The origin of the family is no doubt the weak side of E's book. Cunow was among the 1st to attack it on the ground of the weakness of presentation of the evolution of the family"...

followed that line... "E adopted a simple system of the evolution of the family which proceeded from the matrilineal to the patriarchal without ref. to to the Hebrew & Roma variant (rd which M'rgan considered exceptional as strictly patriarchal) On 4th ed. E took over Kovalevsky's evidence (which differed from Morgan) BUT FITTED IT INTO HIS SYSTEM WITHOUT ALTERATION he did not bring together the opposed systems of Morgan & Kovalevsky."

Lukacs agreed with evolution of family but criticized E's evolution of state as if Athenian state was a patriarchal typical model of state formation in general -force they "state"

p.252 "The ch. headings direct the reader's attention to the institutions of the FAMILY, gens & state, which alone are mentioned as such. The stages of cultural dev. & th' peoples dealt with are to be found likewise singled out, but the institution of PROPERTY are to be found neither in ch. headings nor

SUB HEADINGS; ASIDE FROM THE REF. TO (PVT.) PROP. IN THE TITLE OF THE BOOK
it is mentioned passively in the text. On the other hand, Morgan devoted
Part IV (& Marx moved it to Part II & enlarged it) Yet Engels made the
topic of property central. Social recognition of PATERNITY, he wrote, "is
demanded because these children are to come into the father's property eventu-
ally as legitimate heirs.", p.55"

State (See also STATE 5541)
pp 417-8
pp 292-4

Morgan developed this after which Marx developed, 1st by citing Plutarch
which Morgan had not, ditto Aristotle, & then opposed Morgan

the expression by Plutarch, that the lowly poor readily followed the bidding
of Theseus & the statement from Aristotle cited by him, that Theseus was
inclined toward the people, appear however, despite Morgan, to indicate
the chiefs of the gentes, etc. ALREADY ENTERED INTO CONFLICT of interest with
the mass of the gentes which is inevitably connected with the monogamous
family through private prop. in houses, lands, herds."

then K continues: "Engels omitted these consideration from his presentation
of the matter, following the dev. by Morgan at this point in a straightforward
way."

aside from connection bet. monogamy & pvt. prop., what is central
in Marx is RELATION OF CHIEFS & MASS of the gentes. 2nd. both obj. & public
& interest as CONFLICT bet. chief & mass."

Census in Marx (See also CAP. VOL. III, Part 2)
both obj. & sub. are related.

IV. From Phil Anthropology to Empirical Ethnology
K. begin with 6th Thesis on Feuerbach on human essence not an abstraction
of one, but ensemble of social relations. K adding: "too much can be made
of this."

"The theory of the decline
of primordial equality, fraternity and communism thru action of internal factors
is to be taken in conjunction with the factor of ex. bet. communities whereas
commodities & commodity ex. begin their historical career. This is a dialectical
moment opposite to the 1st, for it involves the internalization by the
given communities, internal commu."

the internal rel. of commodity prod. is thereby est'd/ In the (1st) theory,
on the contrary, explanation of the rise of the inequities rests on the
externalization of internal relations & their (re)internalization by im-
migration, return to the collateral kin, etc. The internal & external factors
were not brought together by Marx, for his studies were cut short by death."

Finally, the sub-section Asiatic Society & M. of p.

p. 267 Marx distinguished sharply bet. the Oriental & European historical courses
Engels, Origin, pp. 158ff: "AT ALL EARLIER STAGES & R PROD was essentially
collective..... & distribution communistic." K: THE SOCIAL DIV. OF LABOR
UNDERMINES THE COLLECTIVITY OF PROD.

re Wittfogel, critique of.

...Mit Loslösung der Individualität von d. ursprünglich nicht despotischen
Regeln (wie blockhead Maine es versteht), sondern befriedigend u. gesundheitlichen
Bedürfnissen der Gruppe, der primitiven Gemeinschaften, -- damit d. einseitige Heranbildung
der Individualität. Was aber die wahre Natur der letzteren zeigt sich erst wenn
wir d. Inhalt -- d. Interessen dieser "letzteren" analysieren. Wir finden dann,
dass diese Interessen selbst wieder gewissen gesellschaftlichen Gruppen gemeinsam u.
als charakterisierende Interessen, Klasseninteressen etc sind, also diese
Individualität selbst Klassen -- ihre Individualität ist u. diese in letzter Instanz
haben alle ökonomische Bedingungen zur Basis...

ETHNOLOGICAL NOTEBOOK

p. 52