Draft para. on p. 190 <u>RLWLKM</u> in the 3rd para. <u>after</u> "To Mark the development of the relationship of the individual to society and to the state was crucial"

TO ENGLES. Secause oriental despotism meant despotic property only to which the communal form was totally subordinant, he failed to see the duality in each. Thus Morgan's description of the communal form of the American Indian appeared a totally different world. Indeed, though he had written of the asiatic mode of production in inti-Buhring in 1878 it is not so much as mentioned in the Origin of the Family In a word, it was no accident.

(perhaps as finte.)

Where Eleanor Leacock tried to explain away the failure of Engels AMP not being mentioned in Origin by pointing to the fact that it was mentioned in A-D, as if that explains Lawrence Krader claims that Origin does indeed reflect a total shift away from his former position, not, unfortunately, because there is no mention of AMP but because FE totally changed his position.

but because FE totally changed his position.

Alk is a perfect illustration of howHow a simple listing of facts does more to befuddle thought
where its not dislectical especially so on thedislectics of revolution. Here is the sequence:

sudden ftnte.

- 1. The first time LK calls attention to Engels' KEMERK

 (Kerr edition, Vol. 1, p. 386, ftnte. 1) is dated Nov. 7, 1883 and definitely shows that Marx's thinking ont the subject of family way beyond in 1881 and reflects only Engels position on primitive society i.e. Marx in speaking there of the division of labor within the family, taking no position on the question of whether or not the family is further developed into a tribe. (Whereupon LK writes: "We infer therefore that Engels studied Marx's mss. notes on Morgan only after this date" i.e., after Nov. 7, 1883, yet he wrote the Origin in a few months in 1884).
- 2. The next issue that is involved is that of the gens in relationship to the tribe and to the family and this differs considerably from what Marx developed in the Grundrisse as well as in Capital. Where in the Grundrisse Marx was concerned with the community in relationship to land ownership Marx takes this up in the drafts to Zasulich:

 1.4584

Part III

KM, pp.116,EN, from M rggn; ,Ch.IV The Syndygsmian & the Patriarchal Families

"The women were the great power among the clans.
as everywhere clas. They did not hesitate when occasion required,
to knock off the horns, as it was technically called, from the head of a chief, &send him back to the ranks of the ximitsewarriers. The griging nomination of the chiefs also always rested with thhem:

Cf. Rachofen: "Das Mutterrecht". wo gynecrocracy discussed. Unter d.
Iroquois, barbarians in Lower Status of berbarism, BUT OF HIGH
MENTAL GRADE, & among the equally advanced Indians tribes generally.

verlangten d. Manner under severe penalties Keuschheit v.d. Weibern,

abor night reciprocal relations."