Eleanor Burke Leacock's Introd. to Engels' ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY
PVT. PROP.&THE STATE, IP.ed/.3rd
printing, 1975 (1st.1972)

Aparcient Soc. by Le wis Henry Moragn, 1877; Engels' 1884. E. focused

on 3 topics: (1)developmental stages of mankind's his.,(2)neture of primitive society with regard to prop., rank, family forms & descent systems, &(3)emergence of commodity prod., economically based obasses &the state.

p.9, Morgan wkd. without through to a theory of sequential stages in marriage p.10 Mirgan had remained dubious about the hypothesis of human evolution until he met &talked with Darwin....

p.12:"It used to be commonplace in Am.anthropology, follow the anti-evolutionary empiricism with the name of Franz Boas, ques. Morgan's sequence of stages... However, Morgan knew tre limits of his schemW.

That's where League ck is good, she brings up the latest anthropological finds and relates both Morgan's study & Engels interpretation, and shows where the bacis truth or concept remains where it doesn't

p.15: "Engels sharpened the implication of the comparison Morgan drew bet. primitive communal &class society, using it as an argument for socialism. Therefore both Morgan's & Engels work have had checked careers... "Begun to take up serieusly by Russian scholars, Soviet Studies in His. (1966)

Historical" (Boas). "functionalism" (Eng.) & synchronic" Archeological studies threw still newer light, made explicit by British scholar, V/Gordon Childe. Darbarism. savagery (hunters) &civilization. Ancient East. p.17.fth. 6. W. (hunters) &civilization. Ancient East. p.17.fth. 6. W. (hunters) "Contemporary terminologists generally refer instead to major product ive techniches, such as "food gathering" ("savagery") & "food producing" (barbarism...."

Primitive Communism section is pp.20 18-25 but where late data does allow Leacock both to bring in new and not be very original begins.pp.29-43 THE EMERGENCE OF MONGAMY

p.35:"It soon became clear that matriarchyth the sense of power held by women over men comparable to that later held by men over women, has NEVER existed. However, questions about the significance that matrilean descent held for the status of women in primitive societies remained." Cf.p37 re THE MOTHERS by Briffault &women's high role, "however the data are lifted out of context..." men comparable to that

Need for study BEPORE DEV. OF MALE DOMINANCE THAT ACCOMPANIED EUROPEAN ECONOMIAT EXPLOITATION, p.39 <u>c.40</u>

Re low status of women not due either to childbearing or decline of importance of food prod. when moved into agric., etc. "However what was basic was that these transitions occurred in the context of developing exploitative relations."

of developing exploitative relations whereby communal ownership was being undermined, the communal kin group broken of & THE INDIV. The spring of the reconomically of the rearing of the

14548

-2-

earlier section in Engels where he speaks of the formation of the family as eco.unity affirmed by the overthrow of mother right which Engels emphasizes is "world historical defeat of the female sex" (p.120)

But does not q the par. byMARX which preceded it. Man's

innate casuistry! (custom of giving name of father's gens to child athus have him inherit,rd) To change things by changing their names! And to find loopholes for violating tradition while maintaining tradition, when direct interest supplied sufficient impulse."

&after Morgan's description of new social organism whose head ruled over wife &children &no.of slaves with rt.of life & death over them arriving with ironclad family system of Latin tribes. Marx adds:

tribes, Marx adds:

"THE MODERN FAMILY CONTAIN IN GERM NOT ONLY
SLAVERY (servitus) but also serfdom since from the beginning it is
related to agric.services. It contains in miniature all the contradictions which later extend throught society & its state."

No lun. . My In depressing though he enger the To performen.

where she shows more empiric data is needed than Engels gives& points to the fact that he jumps from Medieval to cap. society too fast, but instead of filling it out author goes to p.43-

but in fact what Leacock is doing is that in criticism of those women's groups "radicals" who think subjugation is all due to childbearing & playing up against that, (not a total phil), but just that ordinary women asking for different schools, hsg., welfare as being "more rev.," calls "middle class radical women's groups" "confusing &diversionary." (p.45) Indeed, she practically comes up with some variation of "4 class bloc"

Pol.Ramifications of Engels'

The final section (Problems of Theory & Method, "pp. 57-67 hardly lives up to its title. She asks questions of women's special oppression but doesn't answer, though she does try to answer critics of Marx as anthropologist. & pmp. 59, ftn. 28 ex'tr parkage Yale U.1930s project on Human Relations we dealt with in the 1940s. And when it comes to abstract answers, she does know how to answer the materialist anti-dialectician Harris: p. 62. Apparently Harris is addressing himself to the casual or conversational usages of the terms of contradiction negation... "listing Harris decryig "Marx)'s Hegelian infatuation with contradiction. " & off to landing a man on the moon!

p.129:FE: "The lst kixx class opp. that appears in his coincides with the dev. of the antagnosm bet. man&woman in monogemous marriage the lst class oppression coincides with that of the femal sea by the mark whom FE quotes, both in preceding an following

Ant Sough Chi

Marine Contraction of the Contra

JAN9. 8

stresses individual self dev. thus in CAP: "Those ancient social org ganisms of prod. are, compared with bourgeois society, extremely simple and transparent. But they are founded either on the immature dev. of man INDIVIDUALLY, who has not yet severed the umbilical cord that unites him with his fellow men in a primitive tribal community, OR UPON DIRECT RELATIONS OF OF DOMINATION AND SUBJECTION." (p.79, IP ed.)