

①

DIALECTICS AND THE A M P (re both Lukacs' Critique of FE; *
Lawrence Krader's AMP; Lichtheim's Marx and the AMP; and
Eleanor Leacock's Intro. to FE's O of Family)

This outline of notes which is mainly on AMP actually shows
that none, con or pro, were considering dialectics as related
to any ^{possible} differences between KM and FE. All the greater, there-
fore, -- and indeed because Lukacs has nothing to say on
AMP and speaks strictly on dialectics as method and as
revolution -- is Lukacs' critique of the dialectic method
in FE's Anti-Duhring. The 2nd page of What is Orthodox
Marxism? at once states its revolutionary nature: "Materialist
dialectic is a revolutionary dialectic" and then quotes
from Marx's ^{first} critique of Hegel that "theory becomes a material
force when it grips the masses." On the next page he says
the very critical key question not just on Anti-Duhring
but ^{in his criticism in Anti-D} how that "decisively influenced the later life of
the theory." In fact, let me repeat the whole ~~paragraph~~
paragraph:

14576

(p.3, Lukacs: What is Orthodox Marxism?) -2

To be clear about the function of theory is also to understand its own basis, i.e. dialectical method. This point is absolutely crucial, and because it has been overlooked, much confusion has been introduced into discussions of dialectics. Engels' arguments in the Anti-Duhring decisively influenced the later life of the theory. ~~However we regard them,~~ However we regard them, whether we grant them classical status or whether we criticise them, deem them to be incomplete or even flawed, we must still agree that this aspect is nowhere treated in them. That is to say, he contrasts the ways in which concepts are formed in dialectics as opposed to 'metaphysics'; he stresses the fact that in dialectics the definite contours of concepts (and the objects they represent) are dissolved. Dialectics, he argues, is a continuous process of transition from one definition into the other. In consequence a one-sided and rigid causality must be replaced by interaction. But he does not even mention the most vital interaction, namely, the dialectical relation between subject and object in the historical process, let alone give it the prominence it deserves. Yet without this factor dialectics ceases to be revolutionary, despite attempts (illusory in the last analysis) to retain 'fluid' concepts. For it implies a failure to recognise that in all metaphysics the object remains untouched and unaltered so that thought remains contemplative and fails to become practical, while for the dialectical method the central problem is to change reality.

All the more remarkable is it that there is not a word in that period when none -- and this time none includes revolutionaries and GL himself -- challenged either anything in FE's Origins or knew of the EN or tried to separate KM from FE. In a word, that absolutely key question of dialectics as the "dialectical relation between subject and object in the historical process" is exactly what came to life in a very different historical epoch, ^{cuts} in life, and this time relating both to WL and AMP, climaxed in the ^{needed} separation of Marx from Engels. For that matter GL in the very next ~~paragraph~~ paragraph does mention KM ~~and FE~~ and FE as one. Nevertheless, precisely perhaps because the critique is on "pure" dialectics and abstractly stated and yet so comprehensive as to include the very heart and soul of Anti-Duhring, its central 3 chapters on dialectics, and the fact that it's not that part in which FE solicited KM's collaboration when he asked Marx for a contribution to Anti-Duhring on political economy. What I'm trying to say is that when it came to strict dialectics GL knew Hegel most profoundly, saw the revolutionary nature of the dialectic in Hegel himself. NO OTHER ~~MARKSIST~~ MARXIST CAUGHT IT ANYWHERE NEARLY THAT COGENTLY AND PROFOUNDLY, as witness Korsch in that very same period raising the revolutionary nature of dialectics without a word of criticism of FE's Anti-Duhring. Since our age has nothing to compare to either of them, and that after they do know both EN and the revelations of KM and FE not being one, and the whole question of the Third World, it will be imperative to use that para. from GL even though he has nothing to say on AMP.

Now AMP in and for itself. None have done as much on
as Lawrence Krader
AMP/-- and that not only in ~~his~~ what his own studies are,
but in taking a whole decade for the transcription of Marx's
EN -- AND ~~his~~ ^{let} FAILS TO DRAW ANY CONCLUSION
THAT IN ANY WAY MATCHES HIS FACTS.

One feature characterizes all these failures -- and that
is that not a single man has any conception whatever of WL.
And the one woman who knows the present WLM, Leacock, is
worse than all of them because she combines their male chau-
vinism, even though she also knows AMP, in a Stalinist, non-
dialectical manner. So how let us limit ourselves to the
one para. in Origin and see how 2 such opposite views as
LK and herself can nevertheless reach the same false conclusion.
Here is what EL says (pp. 49-50):

"It has been puzzling to scholars that Engels made no
mention of the 'Asian' or 'Oriental' mode of production...
FE refers to this form of relations in Anti-Duhring though
unfortunately not in Origins."

Here is what LK, who acts as if it is mentioned in
Origins ^{and} ~~not~~ claims that whereas in the 1853 articles on AMP
and in 1857-8 Anti-Duhring, the expression of AMP is the same,
in Origin he has totally shifted his ground: "... the
contrast between these positions and those concerning the
Orient in his later book, the Ursprung der Familie."

Again on p. 275, ftn. 8, LK says: "The question of the chronology of the development of the family from matriarchy to patriarchy was an important one in Engels' Origin of the Family but not in Anti-Duhring."

This ftn. also includes a reference to himself, pp. ^{EN} 76-85 of his Intro. to the EN, where Engels added a ftn. to Marx's expression in Capital, which says: "Subsequent very searching studies of the primitive condition of man led the author of Capital to the conclusion that it was not the family that originally developed into the tribe but that, on the contrary, the the tribe was the primitive and spontaneously developed form of human association, on the basis of blood relationship, and that out of the first incipient loosening of the tribal bonds, the ~~many~~ ^{and various} forms of the family were afterwards developed." This ftn. by FE was dated Nov. 7, 1883.

LK then goes into 2 full tables on words used by Engels based on Morgan and those based on Marx, saying (p. 78): "Marx's strictures upon Morgan were generally passed over by Engels; alone Engels determined that Morgan went too far in regarding group marriage and the punaluan family as a necessary stage before the pairing family in the light of later evidence. Engels was also disposed more positively toward Bachofen and Maine than was Marx." It is clear that there is a big difference even in the short period between Nov. 1883 and 1884 when he writes his own Origin, and yet, ~~Marx's~~ he seems to be unable to draw a conclusion that FE and KM are not one, withough on p. 80 he says: "Engels did not overcome the objections to the utopianism and

integration; and definitely dislikes the Origin and its over-estimation of primitive communism, suddenly choosing only that over-estimation to criticize.

P. 101, fn. 46: "In passing it may be observed that Marx's sketch of 1845-6 supplies a very realistic hint at the emergence of slavery from within the tribal organization. Compare this with Engels' account of how and why 'the old classless gentile society' with its 'simple moral grandeur' succumbs to 'civilized' pressure from outside."

In the end it turns out that though he considers Grundrisse "among the most brilliant and incisive of Marx's writings," and credits him also with anticipating "a good deal of what Weber had to say about Oriental society."

P. 106 -- GL shows correctly how Marx views "Oriental society (is) historically closer to man's primitive origins, having conserved some elements of primitive communism 'IN THE MIDST OF ORIENTAL DESPOTISM' ... The forcible disruption of the Indian or Chinese village community by European capital completes the process by rendering it truly global."

P. 107 -- Lichtheim continues on Marx's philosophic con-
 ceptions as they always relate to "the unfolding of man's
 dormant powers" and thus ~~seeking~~ seeking new starting points
 i.e. "new potentialities of growth and human development;
 in Hegel's terminology, it represents 'a new principle',...
 but ~~but~~ exactly how does it relate to the more strictly
 theoretical concept formulated by Marx and Engels (cf.
 anti-Duhring p.165, 1954 edition: "Where the ancient
 communes have continued to exist, they have for thousands
 of years ~~been~~ ^{formed} the basis of the most barbarous form of
 state, Oriental despotism from India to China.")

[Handwritten scribble]

*(RD) connect -
 ok "new principle"
 after M.P. is pr. & grounds*

*Revolution
 Dialectics
 - Marx/Woman 11/1824
 M. 1870
 (RD) 1871
 both through
 120 Int - 6-25*