

Hal Draper, "Marx and Engels on Women's Liberation", copyright 1970, from a work-in-progress on Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution. (Printed in International Socialism) (obviously this is going to be in Vol. III of his work according to the 1977 publication of the first two books, the Foreword to which lists it as a chapter in Vol. III)

This chapter is vs. the less-than-knowledgeable summaries that have seen the light recently.

Although HD's very first sentence begins with revolution -- "Not paradoxically, discussion of the revolution in Man begins with woman" --

he evidently does not mean woman as revolutionary but the revolution is in man.

First, HD talks about the division of labor between the sexes, and that naturally this includes family, forms of marriage, sexual relations, but at once he cannot resist talking against those who point to male chauvinism, saying that instead, the WQ must be seen within

the context, not simply of a psychology and attitude (like male chauvinism'), but of the primordial division of labour.

HD's conclusion is that since "the primordial division of labor" predates capitalism, it will be that much harder to uproot, means nothing more to HD than that we have to wait for ever more.

HD begins the 1st section on Marx's early views before Marx was a Marxist, i.e. 1842. Not only that, but he actually dares assign nothing short of the 1844 Manuscripts to Fourier.

"The influence of Fourier is evident in one of the first lucubrations of this newfledged socialist..." He is talking about Marx and continues with his arrogant references to alleged Fourierism in the 1844 Manuscript, thus reducing Marx's most profound remark about Man/Woman relationship to those "lucubrations":

"He enthusiastically adopts the view that 'man's whole level of development is, in a basic sense, measured by the man-woman relationship...'"

And HD even quotes the entire paragraph from the 1844 Manuscripts.

2ndly, he goes into quotations from the Holy Family, being so anxious to show that Marx quoted Fourier that he never once mentions the fact that his great early work of Marx defended Flora Tristan against

Eugene Sue's The Mysteris of Paris. From there he skips all the way to Anti-Duhring, in order to show that Engels was still paying homage to Fourier and supposedly ten years before Marx did the same, even though

Marx there has no reference to Fourier. Instead, Marx is talking about the American National Labor Union: "Anybody who knows anything of history knows that the great social changes are impossible without the feminine ferment. Social progress can be measured exactly by the social

position of the fair sex (the ugly ones included)". This Dec. 12, 1868 letter of Marx to Kugelmann, which is so full of enthusiasm of the American union which had voted for the 8 hour day and which had granted full equality to women, HD thinks is no more than Marx's 1845 quotation from Fourier, and since he cannot prove this, he says that Marx was echoing it "perhaps without thinking of the ~~source~~ source." HD also refers to Engels 1844 work on the condition of the working class in England, where he takes up the working-class family. The 1962 edition of Engels' work has a beautiful quotation from Engels: "If the reign of the wife over the husband, as inevitably brought about by the factory system is inhuman, the pristine rule of the husband over the wife must have been inhuman, too."

3rd. when HD begins talking of the German Ideology which was recognized as the 1st expression of the materialist conception of history, (he is quoting the 1964 edition, p. 40, which contains all three parts, not only parts 2 and 3) and it is clear from p. 33 on the 1st ~~form~~ form of social relationships "headed by the patriarchal family chieftans" and then continues "the slavery latent in the family only develops gradually". Evidently HD cannot stand this since he writes, "The family is virtually responsible for the rise of private property," quoting then p. 44 from GI "The nucleus, the first form of (property) lies in the family, where wife and children are slaves of the husband. This latent slavery in the family, though still very crude, is the first property..."

(look up also p. 369, where Marx ~~is~~ is speaking against the double standard of sexual behavior, especially as "encoded in France: in French practice where the wife is regarded as the private property of her husband, only the wife can be punished for adultery." What is even more fantastic about HD's trying to make Marx so indebted to Fourier is that HD himself quotes Marx against Fourier (p. 564) "The fantasies by which Fourier tried to give himself a picture of free love are not to be taken seriously." The same thing is true when HD has to show that before GI, in the Theses on Feuerbach, the 4th Thesis already ~~states that the family must be destroyed~~ states "the family must be destroyed" in theory and in practice." (Evidently this was modified in Engels' 1888 version of Marx's Thesis to "criticised" in theory and revolutionized in practice."

* * *

14544

Having mixed up 1842 with 1844, reduced 1844 to Fourierism, and when he can no longer attribute Marx's view to ^{first} lucubrations of this newly fledged socialist" once the references to slavery latent in the family appears in the recognizably materialist conception of history in the GI. HD embarks on his second section "The Sexual Revolution of the Past," 1st the Communist Manifesto and then, in 1850, (review of a book by Daumer, where Marx says the author tries "to console women for their social distress by making them the object of cult...") and then finally gets to Capital, where Marx not only describes the murderous exploitation of women and children, but quotes favorably a factory commission report "against no persons do the children of both sexes so much require protection as against their parents." HD quotes from Capital pp 489-90 (Moscow Edition) and also from the General Council of the First International, Vol 2, pp. 232-233:

"Moreover, it is obvious that the fact of the collective working group being composed of individuals of both sexes and all ages must necessarily, under suitable conditions, become a source of human development." And then, of course, comes The Origin of the Family and what Engels called "The Defeat of Women." Engels ~~phrase~~ phrase is "the world historic defeat of the female sex. The man ~~took~~ took command in the home also; the woman was degraded and reduced to servitude...." (p. 119 of O of F). P. 120 references are to American Indian tribes. p. 129 Leacock, Engels sums up this "defeat of the woman" by using the actual expression of class opposition: "The first class opposition that appears in history coincides with development of the antagonism between men and women in monogamous marriage, and the first class ~~opposition~~ coincides with that of the female sex by the male."

Engels: "In the family he is the bourgeois; the wife represents the proletariat." p. 232 (Clara Zetkin's favorite phrase.) Where upon HD comments "as a strong metaphor, of course." It's clear, and that much HD sees, that "the abolition of the family" is the abolition of the family as the economic unit of society. (p. 232 and 310) But then HD continues: "the road to WL then runs through the same field as saw their 'world historic defeat' -- and cannot be basically changed simply by ideological (including psychiatric) exhortation." THIS IS THOROUGHLY IDIOTIC. FIRST OF ALL IDEOLOGICAL IS NOT EXACTLY LIKE ~~psychiatric~~ AND SECONDLY AND MOST IMPORTANT WL DOES NOT RUN TO THE SAME FIELD AS THE WORLD HISTORIC DEFEAT.

The 3rd section is "Monogamy and/or Love: The Future of the Family" whereupon HD suddenly jumps to what would happen to that under the impact of socialist transformation.

So narrow-minded as well as antagonistic to WL is HD that the nature of the man-woman relationship that has to be revolutionized suddenly gets a parenthetical crack from HD: "(that would be so even without the pill)".

P. 25, Col. 1, paragraph 3

There is a reference to ~~Engels~~ criticism of Kautsky on monogamy. See Engels' Letters to Kautsky Feb. 10 and Mar. 2, 1883 and HD notes, correctly, that Engels wrote the Origin of the Family one year later. Quotes Engels (p. 1957) ftn. p. 25, col. 1, IX.

HD then goes into a short excursus on Marxism and love. From the Holy Family p. 32-44. Then follows the "Revolutionization of Monogamy", which goes into Bebel's work, especially Chapter 28 of Women and Socialism.

The 4th and last section is entitled "Problems of Working Women's Liberation". There he begins with the Paris Commune where the women played a "prominent and militant role" and he quotes from Marx's first draft of the Paris Commune. (Whereas here he quotes the Archives, I have actually seen this first draft in the book he edited on the Paris Commune, about no distinction between women called illegitimate and the wives and widows.) HD then goes back to (1868) and Marx, the mention of Madame Harriet Law as a member of the General Council (Letter to Kugelmann 12/12/68), the formation of working women's branches in the International and the fact that Marx had made the motion at the 1871 Conference as to "the need for forming women's sections in the countries whose industries engage many women." HD then mentions Engels and Bebel's work for an autonomous leadership and a press of its own for women, which had a circulation of 100,000.

In a word, everything we know. It doesn't throw a single light on WL today. He takes up also Eleanor Marx, italicising the word "socialist" before women's movement and working women's rights groups, since without it, it was "a purely bourgeois past-time," which is supposed to be a quote from Engels to Bebel on Oct. 1 1891. The very last column is on "Social Revolution Comes First," with the final sentence being "But in the last analysis the historic form of the division of labor between the sexes could be uprooted for good and all only by a profound an upheaval as it had originally taken

to impose the world historic defeat of the embourgeoisement of which Engels had written

14546

div. as socialist movement