

REVIEW OF THE BOOK “*FAMILIY AND CAPITALISM. A LINGUISTIC AND POLITICAL STUDY*”, Carlos Allones Pérez, USC (2019)

By prof. Luis Arribas¹

Carlos Allones performs a theoretical investigation on the origin of the family and its relationship with the emergence of capitalism, by means of elements of the methodology of the Social Sciences, used with originality and imagination, reason why it is worth commenting its characteristics:

First, the implicit use of an inductive system, more typical of physical science research than the deductive system, which consists of enunciating in a general way the 'law' to verify how it is fulfilled in the case we are studying.

In any case, this involves a difficult theoretical construction; the one that consists strictly in the relation of abstract arguments that consistently explain the social phenomena that are analysed.

And finally we must bear in mind the basic question of theorization and validation, which is not so different in the field of Natural and Social Sciences; remember that many of the mathematical, astronomical and / or physical theories did not have an immediate confirmation; like the theory of relativity, or the theories of fractality; a theoretical-inductive approach initiated in the Military Drill Instruction of the courtyard of the barracks does not have to be considered in a different way.

Carlos Allones takes us - through a structuralist and linguistic approach - to explain the configuration of the family and capitalism in today's society. And if the previous consideration on epistemological parameters could surprise us, this approach also does so because of the difficulty of the theorization that it entails.

At the same time that a theory is being constructed, the notation and the formulation that synthesizes it are being constructed, and this allows carrying out the necessary logical operations -taking into account the inherent difficulty of finding an intelligible sequence for its application to the understanding and explanation of our immediate reality.

However, that is what he intends to do for us; using linguistic mechanisms, he tries to offer us a symbolic formulation that picks up the regularities of the existing relationships between the individuals that make up the social group, and that determine both the family and capitalism.

¹ Luis Arribas (1945-2005), a mathematician and sociologist, was professor of Sociology at the University of Santiago de Compostela. He published this review in the Journal of Political and Sociological Research (RIPS), 1999, Vol. 1, n° 2, pp . 129-130.

The use of such a complex framework is not accidental, since the fundamental element that configures the human group is the linguistic brain, which allows storing experiences -even the feelings- on a regular basis. Rationality, tradition and affection, i.e.: the pillars of human personality, of the socialization process.

We are talking about the sociality of the Erectus group, of basic and traditional socialization, communication, maintenance of the survival strategy; of domination and conquest; of the specialization of the social fabric.

Is the specialization of gender the *sine qua non* condition of the development and survival of the group? Thus it seems to be detached from the theory constructed by Carlos Allones; an emergence of the linguistic gender classes that occurs in the process of socialization.

Step by step, one could argue:

1. A human being needs a linguistic brain to perform the basic function of communication and relationship (a computer machine needs a basic language to order and hierarchize its accounting and storage operations, that is: an operating system).
2. The complexity of the language, simultaneous to that of the social group, facilitates new relationships and prevents some of the old ones (the substitution of an operating system for a new version facilitates the execution of new programs and can prevent the execution of others).

Let's enter into the sociological theory itself. Professor Allones tells us that every human society is configured under the condition of maternal-filial care of male infants, and so under the ultimate control of the male adults themselves; and that there is no alternative, there is no other possible mode of natural stable development.

A second issue is the emergence of capitalism and its relation to the shaping of the family in this context; that the use of labour-power can be explained with a formulation similar to that of maternal-filial upbringing is deeper than it seems.

The formulations, as we said before, collect regularities, so we must accept that the proposed theory explains that the implantation of the linguistic brain, of the process of socialization, of the sexual division of labour, necessarily imply the division of social work.

The accumulation of capital and the exploitation of the labour-power by each other is what breaks with the previous sequence; the maternal-filial upbringing and the correct maturation of the linguistic brain are prevented; in short, the correct development of the species.

Let's make a reflection; Is it possible in the Natural Sciences the existence of a similar phenomenon, such that its acceleration causes alterations that affect the total structure of the system? Nuclear fusion and computer viruses are sufficient evidence.

The question is, then, if a social process can generate a sub-process or loop that alters its initial structures so much that society ends up being unrecognizable. Yes; this seems to be the definitive conclusion of the work, collected directly from the text, in the rigorously classic form of a syllogism:

“The maternal-filial infant-rearing is a necessary and sufficient condition for the maturity of organic linguistic forms and organic linguistic contents amongst male and female *sapiens*.

In statistical terms, infant-rearing ceases to be maternal-filial when production becomes capitalist.

Subsequently, and in statistical terms, capitalist production impedes the maturity of *sapiens* in accordance with nature.” (p. 143)

I appreciate the utopian component that can be included in the classic texts of Sociology, such as the proposed solution to the previous dilemma by Carlos Allones, with which he concludes his work:

“Men and women, in highly capitalised industrialised countries, should of course study whatever industrial techniques they are interested in, be it cybernetics, biochemistry, tennis, theology, horticulture, particle physics, whatever takes their fancy. And, as there is no other choice, they should work in capitalist companies that today control the means of production.

However, they should renounce, from the start and for always, any profit or personal accumulation of capital!

They should *educate* their children in this renouncement, generation after generation, for as long as it takes to politically impose industrial relations, but just *not* capitalist... let's say, a sort of craftsmanship, but now produced with industrial technologies...

Only then will sexual and infant-rearing relations be able to express themselves in freedom, without having family based political content forced on them by the prohibition of incest, as was the case before, nor statistically hindered, as now, by the buying and selling of labour-power.

Only then will we see if a *certain* statistical predominance of the Family nucleus is natural or not...” (p. 145)

In short, a very interesting work for his imagination and intellectual rigor, which shows a deep analysis of the sociological foundations of the social group, using with skill the methodological resources that the sociological theory offers.