P. Skalník

Authentic Marx and anthropology: the dialectic of Lawrence Krader

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 136 (1980), no: 1, Leiden, 136-147

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

PETER SKALNÍK

AUTHENTIC MARX AND ANTHROPOLOGY: THE DIALECTIC OF LAWRENCE KRADER

The aim of the present review article is to offer an evaluation of Professor Lawrence Krader's three books on the theory of society and history. At the outset I must say that the books under review¹ have been written by a man of exceptional learning and erudition. L. Krader undoubtedly has contributed toward a better understanding of the principles of human development. He attempts to set up a landmark with his constructive criticism of both Marx' work and the distortions committed in Marx' name by his followers, who have self-appointedly called themselves Marxists. Moreover, Krader seems to claim that his theoretical work fits into the context of the praxis of revolutionary change in the world of today and tomorrow.

Before presenting the problems taken up by Krader, I shall try to characterize the background to his study of the Marxian and Marxist stream in social history. L. Krader is a well-known figure among anthropologists. For many years he was the Secretary-General of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. Born in New York on December 8, 1919, he studied first under Alfred Tarski at the City College of New York and later at Yale University. He specialized in the history and anthropology of Central Asia and received his doctorate from Harvard University in the early 1950's. He did fieldwork in Mongolia and his interests first turned toward the questions of social organization among the pastoral nomads of Central Asia² and the peasantry of Eastern Europe.³ Early in his career he began to deal with the problems of feudalism and the state among Central Asia nomads.⁴ His interests in Central Asia, Marxism and especially the Asiatic mode of production, can be traced as far back as 1947 when he met Karl A. Wittfogel. As Wittfogel's assistant L. Krader worked on the translation of some Russian and other writings for a planned volume of readings that was conceived of as a companion for Wittfogel's *Oriental Despotism*. L. Krader broke with Wittfogel, how-

ever, after the latter testified before the McCarran Committee in 1951.⁵

Another impetus for his orientation towards Marx was Krader's acquaintance with Karl Korsch (1886-1961), a leading German Marxist of the 1920's and a contemporary of Geörgy Lukács, whose interpretation of Marx' legacy has recently become increasingly appreciated by radical scholars.⁶ Since the latter half of the 1960's Krader has published theoretical and often epistemologically tuned studies on the dialectic of human history as it underlies the more specific queries of western empirical anthropology.⁷ His main concern in these studies has gradually become a new evaluation of the significance of Marx' work. So far this concentrated effort has given birth to the three books under review, another book and a number of articles.⁸ Other publications are either in preparation or in press.⁹ Krader's works are received with interest in many countries; they are continually being translated and reviewed.

L. Krader's trilogy was intended to be a unity of analysis and synthesis. The publication and analysis of original, and practically unknown, texts of Marx was not the task *per se* but an indispensable precondition for the building of a theory of one crucial epoch in human history, that described in *The Asiatic Mode of Production*. This in turn, together with Marx' ethnological notebooks and the critical use of many other works, gave Krader the opportunity to propose a dialectical treatment for the problematic kernel, that of *civil society*. The main theme of the trilogy is the transition from a pre-class to a class society. In order to analyse it, Krader tries to develop a sophisticated dialectical method. In all of his own texts he consequently employs dialectic, or "the tendency of a notion to pass over into its own negation as the result of conflict between its inherent contradictory aspects",¹⁰ so that sometimes the reader is unable to follow the argument because the author attempts to reveal all the possible contradictions in every subject discussed. L. Krader stresses dialectic in his analysis as well as Hegel's influence on Marx.

It appears that with the publication of the ethnological notebooks of Karl Marx, L. Krader intended to establish the fundamentals for a truly Marxist anthropology. The latter should be the first step towards an anthropology that will be a unified science in which "natural science will subsume the science of man, just as the science of man will subsume natural science in itself" (Marx 1844).¹¹ This anthropology will be a negation of ethnology or empirical social and/or cultural anthropology as one of the atomized social sciences in civil society.

L. Krader faithfully and scrupulously transcribed and edited Marx' excerpts from several books written by ethnologists of his time.¹² Marx produced this work during the last period of his life, from 1880 to 1882, when he formed a plan to write a synthetic work on human history. This work, which he never accomplished, would probably have included a treatment of all "epochs of the economic formation of society", *from the point of view of the critique of contemporary bourgeois society*, as well as the primitive condition in the history of humanity. Krader's theoretical introduction (pp. 1-85, notes pp. 354-397) relates Marx' commentaries on the writings of Morgan, Maine, Phear and Lubbock to a wider framework of his materialist conception of history and its relation to the socialist doctrine. Excerpts show, in various ways and degrees of intensity, Marx' opposition to evolutionism and his critical standpoint with regard to its protagonists. *The Ethnological Notebooks* not only concern themselves with primaeval (primitive) communities but also deal with the first steps of the society which eventually became divided into social classes. Together with an English translation of parts of Marx' excerpts from Maksim Kovalevskii's book *Obshchinnoe zemlevladienie* (1879),¹³ they are an essential source for the study of the epoch of primary class formation.

What Marx only began when he proposed a study of the nature of the *transition* from what he called the primaeval (primitive, archaic) social formation to the secondary or civil formation,¹⁴ Krader wishes to accomplish as fully as possible. This would also include the underlying logic of research on the past principles of collectivism in the archaic social formation as a theoretical preparation for the main (Marxist) aim, i.e. the abolition (*Aufhebung*) of the modern civil (class) society and the establishment of a higher social formation based on principles of collectivism.

According to Krader, Marx appreciated Morgan's evidence for the collective being of humanity in the pre-civil social order. In fact, he used this to argue strongly against individualism in the economy, philosophy and sociology of the nineteenth century. On the other hand Marx, in contrast to his friend Engels,¹⁵ was not so enthusiastic about Morgan's theory of *gens* as a general and all-comprehensive unit of primitive "society". With his emphasis on organicism and evolutionary teleology (savagery, barbarism, civilization), Morgan (like other writers from whom Marx took notes) expounded a theory of evolution in which human inventions, the dissolution of gentile organization, the growth of property, and the emergence of territorial organization are steps on

the ladder of the organic progress of the human race. Though he criticized the world in which he lived, Morgan, according to Krader,

"proposed an act of faith in progress and optimism in man's capacity for development beyond present limitation . . . Morgan was critical of modern civilization in a utopian, that is, ambiguous because non-particularized way; for him as for the other ethnologists mentioned the comparison with the savage was taken as an index of how far civilized man had come from his rude past, hence was a ground for self-praise" (1974: 3).

Krader points out that Marx was alien to that interpretation of progress. He explains step by step at which points Morgan was wrong and shows that most of his faults were grasped by Marx. Krader observes that Engels, who was enthusiastic about Morgan, was also more positive towards Bachofen and Maine (1974: 77-78).

Marx implicitly criticized Morgan for his *gens* theory. He found, after taking excerpts from other ethnologists' books (including that of Kovalevskii), that it was community and not the *gens* which formed the basis of primaeval social formation. Community was the "natural" (*naturwüchsig*) unit of human organization. Krader appears to believe that community relations are a synonym for social relations in the divided society. Community relations are social relations uncontaminated by exploitation and alienated meta-social relations. The latter are characteristic of what Krader (following Hegel) calls *civil society*, which is divided into social classes. The state is an overarching organizational principle in civil society; it is perhaps its most important external, apparent feature, its *excrecence* (1974: 329). The essence of civil society lies in the formation of social and political economies through the process of social labour. The whole of Krader's theoretical presentation revolves around the transition from the archaic to the civil social formation, and the concepts which are developed throughout all three books, though quite numerous, all derive from his analysis of labour.

Krader contends that Marx' ethnology is the key to the critique of the capitalist mode of production. According to him, European capitalism and colonialism are incomprehensible without an understanding of the Asiatic mode of production. He also emphasizes the lasting importance of Hegel's work for Marx. Unlike, e.g. Althusser, Krader sees Marx' work as a continuing process which began with his 1843 manuscript entitled *Critique of Hegel's "Philosophy of Right"*.¹⁸

The Asiatic Mode of Production is a monographic treatise. Here

Krader first follows the genesis of the concept of oriental society and then turns to a discussion of the development of Marx' ideas on the East-West dichotomy as a historical category. Like Vitkin (1972, see note 14), he arrives at the conclusion that Marx gradually developed a fairly clear understanding of the differences between historical processes in Europe and in non-European areas. Unlike Vitkin (see Skalník 1975, note 13), Krader concludes that the Asiatic mode of production (AMP) was the first among the exploitative modes of production, and the society of the AMP, according to him, was the *first form of civil society*. Krader even asserts that the AMP was in fact a simplified form of the modern bourgeois mode of production. This somewhat contrasts with his thesis that it was the world-wide confrontation between the societies of the capitalist mode of production and those of the AMP which has determined the dialectic of history, at least for the last five centuries (the colonial and post-colonial eras). Krader reminds the reader that one can understand the AMP only via the understanding of our modern economic substructure and civil society and that therefore Marx' analysis in *Capital* is methodologically crucial.

The history of the AMP is based on production in agrarian communities and the extraction of the social surplus by the agencies of the state. The latter extends its power over the communities as a result of various factors, out of which the complexities of the exchange of commodities have probably played an essential role. Labour, which was free in primaeval communities, becomes unfree and exploited in the society of the Asiatic mode of production. The history of civil society can be summarized, according to Krader, as a development from social bondage in the AMP to a formal freedom of labour in the modern mode of production.

Krader sees the concept of community as very important for the understanding of class and state formation processes. In the primitive condition the community, a unit of simultaneous production and consumption, gradually turns into a producer of commodities for exchange. It is at the same time socialized and de-socialized by commodity production and the alienation of the social product from its immediate producers. Communal essence turns into mere form in the AMP because only the husk remains: the community becomes subordinated to the state and is obliged to supply surplus products for the sovereign and other agencies of the state. In abstract terms, communal economy turns into social economy, which gradually becomes political economy. What was originally produced only for the value of its use¹⁷ gradually

acquired an exchange value. This exchange value brought about a surplus value. The laws of exchange value and surplus value, originally discovered by Marx, are the forces which destroy the community and bring about the emergence of the first individuals torn loose (*losgerissen*) from the community.

In the third book under review, *Dialectic of Civil Society*, Krader also pays a great deal of attention to the problem of community in early class society. He takes up the question of agrarian communism as a controversy. Having sharply distinguished the *primaeval* from the agrarian community, Krader shows that the latter was too closely connected with the question of property relations. The theme of agrarian communism is, however, connected with other, and more important, problems such as the contents of the economic interpretation of history and the opposition of collectivism and individualism. Thus a reconstruction of social relations in agrarian communities, both those that are classless and those in the process of class formation, is essential for the understanding of the rise of civil society. It may be important both for the anthropologist interested in universal forms of productive and social units, and the practitioner involved in the application of collectivist principles in the development of policies and movements.

In *The Asiatic Mode of Production*, after presenting a large amount of evidence in support of the thesis that the AMP concept played an important role in Marx' work, Krader puts forward a number of theoretical principles and critical points concerning the AMP of his own. Perhaps it should be pointed out here that, while many authors have tried to develop some of Marx' views on the AMP and/or present their own ideas recently, this is the first attempt at a comprehensive elaboration of Marx' conceptualization. Krader studied the sources Marx consulted while he was working on the pre-capitalist parts of *Grundrisse* and *Capital*, and then added the fruits of his own erudition in the field of social history.

Regrettably he does not comment on the numerous discussions on the AMP which have occurred since the 1920's in the Soviet Union, Japan and, after the appearance of K. A. Wittfogel's *Oriental Despotism* (1957), in many other countries. Krader is content to look at the AMP problem as if he had completed the task that Marx was not able to finish. It is obvious that he was familiar with Wittfogel's work and with most of the other writings on the AMP, and he must moreover have concerned himself, consciously or otherwise, with the impressive bulk of studies that has been produced since Marx' time. The only

visible evidence for this, however, is provided by footnote 53 on pp. 114-117, where Krader criticizes Tökei and Thorner, and attacks Wittfogel's analysis of the state as forming a part of the substructure of society (or production) through its role in water control. An implicit criticism of Wittfogel is present in several places in the book where Krader views despotism not as an omnipresent framework of power and class, but as a superstructural phenomenon, which cannot be considered as determining the character of the societies of the AMP. According to Krader it was mainly the members of the ruling stratum or class within the state hierarchy who were subjected to the despotism of the sovereign or other high officials. This was not true of the agrarian communities, which could easily ignore the movements of courts, intrigues, wars between dynasties, etc. Furthermore, Krader denies that irrigation was universally present in the AMP or that it automatically led towards centralization, social inequality and the state.

Krader believes the relationship between the complex of arable land, water, seed and the labour force of peasants on the one hand, and the state organization with its different agencies on the other, to be essential for the existence of the AMP. This relation is marked by laws of exchange value and surplus value. Perhaps because of this, Krader returns to the theory of value twice in *Dialectic of Civil Society* (pp. 161-210). The contradictions between urban and rural ways of life and between manual and intellectual labour are also the result of this relation.

Krader claims that social inequality, the division of society into social classes and other opposed groups, is the result of a very long process. For the Inca society of Peru, for example, he notes,

"an early form of political economy, civil society and the state in which the community does not exist apart from the state; at the same time, community and society in form are one. Civil society is not as yet fully formed . . . In the Inca system, as in the early form of the Asiatic mode of production, community and the state are not distinguished and the land is held by the community as the state" (*Dialectic of Civil Society*, p. 147).

In more developed forms of the AMP the state and the community were no longer identical and civil society was separated from the state.¹⁸ The development of the complementary opposition of the public and private spheres of civil society exterminated the collective principles of the community. However, in the AMP the public and the private are still amalgamated and do not stand in opposition in the way they

do in more developed forms of civil society. This is also evident from an analysis of the methods of extraction (or appropriation) of the surplus, i.e. the mode of exploitation, from communities. These methods usually supply the state agencies with the social surplus (= unearned appropriated product) in the form of regular tribute or even irregular tributary gifts. Tribute can be viewed analytically as a syncretic unity of tax and rent.¹⁹ According to Krader the public sphere in the AMP certainly has predominance over the private sphere. At the same time, as far as production is concerned, the third, or communal, sphere was originally the most widespread, but lost social force in favour of the state organization of ex-communal individuals.

In this connection Krader discusses another serious problem, namely the question of private property, which some authors have considered to be the crucial criterion for class and state formation. Tökei, for example, and allegedly also Wittfogel, consider property and the mode of production to be the same (p. 114). For Krader, however, private property, like the state, is a superstructural phenomenon:

"The form of property in land is the civil announcement of the separation. [of state and civil society]. The agency of the state in the latter period of the Asiatic mode of production is now opposed to that of the community and of the individual... The opposition between the communal and the private sectors is at no stage fully expressed in the history of the Asiatic mode of production, for the community retains its right as landowner down to the nineteenth century, while individual private property in land is but poorly developed... The fact of property determines nothing... where landownership is in question, it is the formal side of the relation to the soil" (*Dialectic of Civil Society*, pp. 147 and 149).

Dialectic of Civil Society on the one hand summarizes Krader's interpretation of Marx in *The Ethnological Notebooks* and *The Asiatic Mode of Production*. On the other hand, Krader offers in this work his own critique of civil society, which is based on the analysis of value and the entire edifice of political economy. He believes modern civil society to be of two types: modern bourgeois and modern socialist. The modern socialist society in the U.S.S.R. and other countries

"no less than the bourgeois is the society of exchange value, wage labour, the society of the production of surplus value, of class division and the state. It is opposed to the modern capitalist society in its ideology, a difference in the superstructure of the societies. The modern bourgeois and socialist societies are alike those in which the production and expansion (valorization) of capital predominates" (1976: 95).

Krader tries with his anthropology to argue for both the internal critique of anthropology and the transcendence (*Aufhebung*) of modern society with its state, capital, etc. Having followed Marx and attempted to bring his conceptualization to a more complete level, he arrives anew at the idea that anthropology, with the analysis of communal life — “the common root of human society” —, can contribute to the transition from theory to “practical criticism” of society, thus renouncing its positivistic background. At the same time he sees no real possibility for a “Marxist anthropology”. According to Krader, we can have either anthropology in its sense of a positive (bourgeois) science of culture and society, or a *genuine dialectical science of nature and man at once*, a materialist teaching of history and the praxis of changing society. If we return to the introduction to *Dialectic of Civil Society*, we see that Krader views the problems discussed by him in his three books as being directly related to their practical resolution “by the dialectic of social evolution and history”. Only practical application will show whether Krader really brought the projected new anthropology, based on the radical tradition of the work of Karl Marx and his followers, such as Korsch and Lukács, to the professed level from which it may become a reality. Whether this will or will not happen should, in my opinion, be a subject for study by both empirical and theoretical anthropologists.

NOTES

- ¹ *The Ethnological Notebooks of Karl Marx (Studies of Morgan, Phear, Maine, Lubbock)*, transcribed and edited, with an introduction by Lawrence Krader, Assen: Van Gorcum, 1972, 2nd edition 1974, X + 545 pp.
The Asiatic Mode of Production; Sources, Development and Critique in the Writings of Karl Marx, Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975, XIV + 454 pp.
Dialectic of Civil Society, Assen-Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1976, X + 279 pp.
- ² ‘The Cultural and Historical Position of the Mongols’, *Asia Major*, n.s., 1952, III-2: 169-183.
Social Organization of the Mongol-Turkic Pastoral Nomads, The Hague: Mouton, 1963.
Peoples of Central Asia, 3rd edition, The Hague-Bloomington: Mouton, 1971.
- ³ ‘Recent Studies of the Russian Peasant’, *American Anthropologist* 1956, 58: 716-720.
‘A Nativistic Movement in Western Siberia’, *American Anthropologist* 1956, 58: 282-292.
‘The Transition from Serf to Peasant in Eastern Europe’, *Anthropological Quarterly* 1960, 33.
- ⁴ ‘Qan-Qagan and the Beginnings of Mongol Kingship’, *Central Asian Journal* 1955, I: 17-35.

- 'Feudalism and the Tatar Polity of the Middle Ages', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 1958, I-1: 76-99.
- 'Mongols; The Governed and the Governors', *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin* 1969, 22: 512-526.
- 'The Origin of the State among the Nomads of Asia', in: H. J. M. Claessen and P. Skalnik (eds.), *The Early State*, The Hague-Paris-New York: Mouton, 1978, pp. 93-107.
- ⁵ G. L. Ulmen, *The Science of Society; Toward an Understanding of the Life and Work of Karl August Wittfogel*, The Hague-Paris-New York: Mouton, 1978, pp. 433-434. Cf. K. W. Wittfogel, *Oriental Despotism*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- ⁶ 'Persona et culture', *Les Etudes philosophiques* 1967, 22-3: 289-300.
- L. Krader (ed.), *Anthropology and Early Law*, New York and London, 1966.
- Formation of the State*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- 'Person and Collectivity; A Problem in the Dialectic of Anthropology', *Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1968, 30-6: 856-862.
- 'Critique dialectique de la nature de la nature humaine', *L'Homme et la Société*, 1968, 10: 21-38. English translation in *Critique of Anthropology* 1976, 2-2: 4-22.
- 'The Anthropology of T. Hobbes', *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* 1973.
- 'Beyond Structuralism: the Dialectics of the Diachronic and Synchronic Methods in the Human Sciences', in: Ino Rossi (ed.), *The Unconscious in Culture*, New York: Dutton, 1974, pp. 336-362.
- ⁷ *Ethnologie und Anthropologie bei Marx*, München: Hanser, 1973.
- 'Karl Marx as Ethnologist', *Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1973, 35: 304-313.
- 'The Works of Marx and Engels in Ethnology Compared', *International Review of Social History* 1973, 18: 223-275.
- 'Marxist Anthropology: Principles and Contradictions; New Perspectives in the Science of Man', *International Review of Social History* 1975, 20, 2-3: 236-272, 424-449. Reprinted as 'On the Dialectic of Anthropology' in: *Dialectic of Civil Society*, part V, pp. 211-273.
- 'Social Evolution and Social Revolution', *Dialectical Anthropology* 1976, 1-2: 109-120.
- 'The Ethnological Notebooks of Karl Marx; A Commentary', in: S. Diamond (ed.), *Toward a Marxist Anthropology*, The Hague-Paris-New York: Mouton, 1979, pp. 153-171.
- ⁸ Among Krader's most recent publications a large synthetical work, *The Treatise of Social Labour* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1979), stands apart.
- ⁹ Korsch left Germany in 1933 for the U.S.A. In Germany he published several books, of which the most important for theoretical thinking are *Marxismus und Philosophie* (1923), which was translated in 1970 (New Left Books), and *Die materialistische Geschichtsauffassung* (1929), which was reprinted by Frankfurt-Köln: Europäisches Verlag Anstalt (EVA) in 1971. *Karl Marx*, in which Korsch evaluates Marx as an economist, sociologist and historian, was first published in English in 1938 and was reprinted in 1963. Only one German edition (1967) has been published by EVA. Korsch contrasted philosophy and Marx' teaching. The latter was for him a scientific negation of the former.
- ¹⁰ Of course, this characteristic of dialectic is taken over from Hegel. Krader goes even further and denies the existence of "pure dialectic". "Pure dialectic is the fantasy of a pure idealism which takes whole sciences for its province ... The dialectic is one with human history, connected to it alone, ... there is no universal dialectic, ... the history of the human kind is discontinuous with the

history of nature. The dialectic is not an emanation of the spirit or mind; it is embodied in human history. It is the relation that the human kind bears to its history, or the relation in human society" (*Dialectic of Civil Society*: 1).

- ¹¹ Karl Marx, 'Ökonomisch-Philosophische Manuskripte', *Werke*, Berlin: Dietz, Supl. I, or *MEGA I*, vol. 3, pp. 122-123, Frankfurt 1928-9. Quoted from Krader's *Dialectic of Civil Society*, p. 214.

- ¹² These four books are: Lewis Henry Morgan, *Ancient Society*, London, 1877; John Budd Phear, *The Aryan Village*, London, 1880; Henry Summer Maine, *Lectures on the Early History of Institutions*, London, 1875; and Sir John Lubbock, *The Origin of Civilisation and the Primitive Condition of Man*, London, 1870.

Earlier, and for other purposes, Marx had studied and made excerpts from several ethnological works. These studies influenced Marx' use of the term "fetishism" in his economic and sociological writings. I have published in Slovak the only complete edition of these excerpts: 'Marxove bonnské výpisky z roku 1842', in: K. Marx, F. Engels, *O ateizme, náboženstve a cirkvi*, Bratislava: Pravda, 1976, pp. 394-413.

In 1868 Marx also carefully studied the works of E. L. von Maurer, A. Haxthausen and Chicherin on the German Mark and the Russian Mir, which were types of communities that still existed in the 19th century or shortly before.

- ¹³ Kovalevskii was an intellectual friend of Marx. They met quite regularly while Kovalevskii lived in London. The full title of the book is *Obshchinnoe zemlevladienie. Prichiny, khod i posledstviia ego razlozhenia*, Moscow, 1879. Krader published in English translation only those parts which were concerned with colonies, i.e. with the Asiatic mode of production. See pp. 343-412 of *The Asiatic Mode of Production* and Chapter IV of the same book, which analyzes Marx' excerpts from Kovalevskii on this subject. For a full publication of the original German excerpts see P. Harstick, *Vergleichende Studien zur Geschichte des Grundeigentums im Nachlass von Karl Marx. Excerpte aus M. M. Kovalevskii. Obščinnoe zemlevladienie (1879)*, Münster, 1974.

- ¹⁴ Marx' hypothesis on the primary (archaic) and secondary (civil-ized) social formation can be found in Marx' drafts of letters to the Russian populist Vera Zasulich, viz. 'Vera Zasulich und Karl Marx', in: David Riazanov (ed.), *Marx-Engels Archiv*, Frankfurt, 1926, vol. 1, pp. 309-342. This hypothesis was taken up by M. A. Vitkin. See his article, 'Problema perekhoda ot pervichnoi format-sii ko vtorichnoi' (The Problem of Transition from the Primary to Secondary Formation), in: L. V. Danilova (ed.), *Problemy istorii dokapitalisticheskikh obshchestv*, Moscow: Nauka, 1968, pp. 425-454. See also Chapter IV of his monograph *Vostok v filosofsko-istoricheskoi kontseptsii K. Marksa i F. Engel'sa* (The Orient in the Philosophico-historical Conception of K. Marx and F. Engels), Moscow: Nauka, 1972. Cf. my review of this book in *Political Anthropology* 1975, I-1: 88-90. See also Vitkin's article on 'Karl Marx and the "Asiatic mode of production"', *Asian Thought & Society*, 1978, VIII-7: 1-13.

- ¹⁵ Krader is critical of Engels' interpretation of Marx' materialist dialectic of history in several places in all three books. See especially the Introduction to *The Ethnological Notebooks*, pp. 76-85; Chapter IV in *The Asiatic Mode of Production*, pp. 271-280; and the Introduction to *Dialectic of Civil Society*, pp. 10-12. In the last of these books Krader criticizes the preoccupation with periodization and the stages of human history. He classifies Engels as a social evolutionist, along with E. B. Tylor and L. H. Morgan. Krader is, at the same time, against the exaggeration of this critique. He wrote elsewhere that: "Now Frederick Engels is the target of a campaign to put him down, to separate him from Marx, a coin thrown into play first by Georg Lukács, then by Jean-

Paul Sartre. Engels is to remain only as Marx's shadow, sent to oblivion as a thinker ...” ('Social Evolution and Social Revolution', *Dialectical Anthropology* 1976, 1-2: 117). This does not, however, detract from the fact that, as Krader put it, “Engels did not overcome the objections to the utopianism and teleology of Morgan, nor did he overcome Morgan's utopianism and teleology within his *Origin of the Family*” (*The Ethnological Notebooks*, p. 80). Cf. J. R. Llobera, ‘Techno-economic Determinism and the Work of Marx on Pre-capitalist Societies’, *Man*, n.s., 1979, 14: 249-270.

- 16 In addition to the 1974 article mentioned in note 6 above, Krader criticizes Louis Althusser at length in *The Dialectic of Civil Society*, pp. 104-112; especially on pp. 107-108, he deals with Hegel's term “civil society” and opposes its use by Marx and Althusser. For an excellent English edition of Marx' *Kritik des Hegelschen Staatsrechts* (1843) see Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's "Philosophy of Right"*, edited with an introduction by Joseph O'Malley, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- 17 Krader points out that in the communal system one can even say that no production of use value occurred because there was no measurement of working time. Products were used, i.e. consumed, by their immediate producers, who did not evaluate them at all. Of course, people in primaevial communities produced mainly things which they used. In addition to the direct use of products there was, obviously, a distribution of products to those who were in need of them and did not directly produce them. Food brought in by male hunters was distributed to women and children, and conversely, food gathered by women and children was distributed to males. Use value is relevant only when products are going to be exchanged as commodities. There are no useless commodities; all of them have to have use value: “The use value of the thing is that which it itself provides by having been socially produced, and which it bears unto the social transaction of exchange” (*Dialectic of Civil Society*, p. 198).
- 18 Krader pays a great deal of attention to the relations between civil society and the state. See the chapters entitled ‘Civil society and the state’ and ‘Civil and political society’ in *Dialectic of Civil Society*, pp. 32-50. Concerning their separation he wrote the following: “... state and civil society are separated [in the later period of the AMP]. This ... separation [is] measured by the introduction of the distinction between public property in land, communal property, and private property. It would be untenable to consider this distinction as the motor of history; it is but a formal consummation of a separation whose incentive lies elsewhere. The form of property in land is the civil announcement of the separation” (*Dialectic of Civil Society*, p. 147). On the question of separation as a historical development after the establishment of civil society, see Marx' *Critique of Hegel's "Philosophy of Right"* (see note 15, 1970: passim).
- 19 The term “tribute” is rather vague. For details see my contribution, ‘Some Additional Thoughts on the Concept of the Early State’, to the collection *The Study of the State*, ed. by H. J. M. Claessen and P. Skalník, The Hague: Mouton, forthcoming.