ANTHROPOLOGY, IMPERIALISM AND RESISTANCE: THE WORK OF KATHLEEN GOUGH[1]

Richard Lee
University of Toronto
Karen Brodkin Sacks
University of California, Los Angeles

In November 1991 a group of friends and colleagues of Kathleen Gough came together at the meetings of the American Anthropological Association in Chicago at a symposium titled "Anthropology, Imperialism and Resistance: The Work of Kathleen Gough." Six months later a similar group convened at the Canadian Anthropology Society annual meetings in Montreal in May of 1992. This special issue is the result of both symposia.[2]

Although Kathleen Gough was trained in the heyday of British structural-functionalism, her work guided a radical reshaping of anthropology, and the integrity with which she lived has inspired many anthropologists who came of academic age since the 1960s. The long 1960s decade—it stretched well into the 1970s—was a time of infinite possibility when it seemed that global democracy might prevail if we all put our shoulders to the wheel. In the accompanying intellectual ferment progressives called universities to account and challenged knowledge-as-usual to meet criteria of social responsibility. Gough's work was among the first to bring Marxist perspectives to anthropology, to name imperialism and to challenge anthropology's relationship to it. Her individual counsel gave many younger scholars the courage to speak out. However, Kathleen paid a price even in the halcyon days of hope. Today when we see democracy in retreat it is easy to laugh at our optimism, to criticize the intellectual mission along with the particular works it generated. In the academy, scholarly stances of irony and cynicism do just that when they mock progressive ideals along with conventional wisdom, as if they were two varieties of the same intellectual error. Kathleen Gough never abandoned her belief that knowledge can and should serve social justice, however chilly the climate. This volume is a critical appreciation of Kathleen Gough's contributions to that agenda. It constitutes a modest tribute by friends and colleagues

Anthropologica XXXV (1993) 181-193

to a distinguished and visionary Marxist scholar. In these opening pages we would like to offer a perspective on Kathleen Gough's life and work and to introduce the contributions that make up this volume.

* * * * *

Kathleen Gough was born in Hunsingore, Yorkshire, England on August 16, 1925, and died in Vancouver on September 8, 1990. These two dates span a life of extraordinary richness, compassion, and commitment to the cause of social justice. Throughout her life Kathleen Gough struggled for the rights of women, minorities and the oppressed of the Third World. She also made a number of significant contributions to the knowledge, theory and practice of social anthropology.

Educated at Girton College, Cambridge, Gough received her B.A. in 1946 and her Ph.D. in 1950. Her doctoral dissertation, "Changes in Matrilineal Kinship on the Malabar Coast," was written under the supervision of John Hutton and Meyer Fortes. Kathleen maintained a life-long interest in South Asian social formations, their continuities and their transformations under the forces of Imperialism. Her main period of field work in India in 1947-53 was followed by other research trips in the 1970s and 1980s.

Trained during the high-water mark period of structural-functionalism, Kathleen embodied the best of that much-maligned tradition: the discipline of long field work, meticulous data gathering and careful generalizations. But operating during an era of catastophic change, she added to her field work agenda the very unBritish and unfunctionalist focus on transformative change in mode of production. Working at the village level Gough dedicated her ethnographic knowledge to the goal of expanding the options people actually had open to them for empowerment. Just as Engels' studies of Manchester led him to Marx and the cause of the proletariat, Kathleen Gough's ground-level studies of the condition of the peasantry in Tanjore led her in turn to the close investigation of and critical support for revolutionary social movements. Throughout her career Kathleen Gough combined distinguished scholarship with an unswerving commitment to social activism.

Gough's many skirmishes and battles with formal academic hierarchies are legendary. She taught and conducted research at universities in Britain, the U.S.A. and Canada, including Harvard, Manchester, Berkeley, Michigan, Wayne State, Brandeis, Oregon, Simon Fraser, Toronto and the University of British Columbia. Membership in professional organizations included the American Anthropological Association, Royal Anthropological Institute, British Association of Social Anthropologists, Canadian Ethnology Society, Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association and the Canadian Association for Asian Studies. These forums also became arenas of struggle for Kathleen, especially during the Vietnam war era. Gough made major contri-

butions to knowledge in several areas: kinship and marriage theory, sociology of underdevelopment in south Asia, anthropology and imperialism and the anthropology of women.

Kinship and Marriage Theory

In scholarly circles Gough is perhaps best known for her pioneering work among the Nayars, an ethnic grouping in Kerala who practised a form of marriage so unusual that learned authorities questioned whether marriage could even be said to exist among them. In a brilliant series of papers Gough showed that indeed a form of marriage could be discerned among the Nayar, involving a ritual husband as well as many others in polyandrous unions. Her work on the Nayar is justly famous: as one reviewer noted "the most substantial contribution to the sociology of the Nayars is that of Kathleen Gough (J. Ruthenkolan, S.J.)." Additionally the Nayar case and Gough's solution of it has provided a test case for definitions of marriage and family discussed in virtually every text book in social and cultural anthropology. Her work in Kerala is critically assessed in this volume by Joan Mencher's paper.

Systems of matrilineal descent are found world-wide in about one quarter of all the world's societies. Yet the contours and underlying principles of these kinds of societies had never been systematically examined until Gough, in collaboration with David Schneider, published their monumental *Matrilineal Kinship* (1961). Of the two major parts of this large volume, the first contained nine essays of which she wrote four; in the second there were seven essays comparing systems, all authored by Gough. The book, which was essentially hers, documented and achieved much more than it had set out to do: Gough charted the variables affecting all unilineal systems. In her final chapter on the effects of colonialism and industrialization on such systems she delineated a general view of social transformation of primary-group based societies by intrusive centralized bureaucratic systems.

Her building of a historically informed and politically relevant kinship theory is carried forward in Kathleen's well-known critique of Evans-Pritchard's assertions of segmentary egalitarianism among the Nuer in her "Nuer Kinship: A Reinterpretation" (1971a). In a meticulous re-examination of Evans-Pritchard's data, Gough demonstrated the inequalities among lineages in access to water and grazing land and showed how this related to political inequalities among lineages, which in turn produced inequalities among adult men and between women of wealthy lineages and men of poor lineages. Gough showed how all of this was linked to a variety of marriage forms. Probably the major impact of this paper was the way in which Gough reconceptualized the concept of segmentary lineage. Where Evans-Pritchard saw a homogeneous, egalitarian culture and a necessarily self-regulating system, Kathleen revealed sources of variety, inequality, instability and possibilities

of change. Here, as in her work on matrilineal kinship, Gough expanded the field of vision to develop a theoretical framework which addressed questions of change and variation as well as social and cultural continuity. This paper was influenced by Marxism, but, as was characteristic of Gough, the influence lay in broad concerns—with questions of how to understand change processes and the production/destruction of inequality. Influenced also by cultural evolution, Gough's approach differed from it in providing a conceptual apparatus for placing relatively egalitarian societies back into the stream of history.

Underdevelopment in South Asia

Gough carried out intensive field work from 1951-53 on the organization of production and caste and class relations in Tanjore villages with follow-up work in the 1970s. This work produced a series of important papers and culminated in two major monographs: *Rural Society in Southeast India* (1981) and *Rural Change in Southeast India* (1989). In the books Gough weaves a masterful synthesis of three discourses on Indian society which, as Hira Singh notes in his paper, are not often articulated: first, the analysis of caste relations based on an informed understanding of south Indian Hinduism in theory and practice; second, the complex history of British colonialism and its effects on social order and world view; and third, the analysis of political economy, class and power relations of village India.

Most other studies of "village India" are visualized through the lens of the culture and thought of the wealthy and powerful, and, as Singh and Tharamangalam note, take on a rather "Orientalist" character. Gough consciously attempted to break with this pattern and to appreciate the perspective of the subaltern long before it became fashionable to do so. Despite her stated sympathies for the undercastes, the result is a remarkably even-handed account of caste and class relations. Also noteworthy is the accessibility of her text and the richness of ethnographic detail. In a field noted for obscure and abstruse discourse, Gough's writings are a model of clarity. It is important to add that her emphasis on class, political economy and the subalterns earned her no respect from the south Asian academic establisment in the U.S.A.

Anthropology and Colonialism

Her long immersion in post-colonial societies undergoing rapid change gave Kathleen Gough a double insight. First, in a period of rapid upheavals, she saw that the anthropologist's traditional methodological focus on equilibrium in small-scale societies would no longer do. It no longer reflected, if it ever did, the concerns of people whom anthropology had traditionally studied, these being issues of ethnicity/class, nationhood and social change. New methods and new research agendas were necessary if anthropologists were to

remain relevant. But of relevance and of service to whom? From this question flowed her insight that Anthropology was a discipline that emerged historically as a handmaid of colonialism. Its methods, theories and questions were shaped by service to colonial administrations rather than by the needs, perspectives or demands of the colonized. Hence, anthropology itself could be seen as part of the problem of decolonization. Kathleen Gough was among the first to publicly confront the intellectual content of anthropology, to say explicitly that our discipline was neither objective nor neutral, that its establishment in universities was in part to serve and justify politics of domination.

These ideas were first published in 1968 as the lead article in the influential American Marxist journal, *Monthly Review*. That issue, with its title "Anthropology: Child of Imperialism," emblazoned on the front cover made the discipline's politics and the article's point very public and crystal clear; no deconstruction was needed to get the point. Because it was published in a widely read left journal, Gough's article opened up a dialogue on the relationship of the academy to imperialism which went far beyond the discipline of anthropology (1968a). About the same time, "New proposals for Anthropologists" was published in *Current Anthropology*, a germinal paper that launched a wide-ranging self-examination of the roots of the discipline and the historical interests it has served (Gough 1968b). This paper played a key role in animating discussions of anthropology's need to "study up," and in raising issues of exoticization and constructions of "others." Perhaps even more far-reaching, this paper helped legitimate studies which address questions of class, ethnicity, race, revolution and nation. As Gerald Berreman points out in his paper, though controversial at the time, Gough's proposals have come to be widely adopted, and have contributed to a fundamental reorientation of research priorities for a generation of scholars. Thus she can be seen as one of the precursors of the "Anthropology as Cultural Critique" school and of one component (the non-hermeneutic one) of reflexive anthropology generally. As an exemplar of this new direction Gough turned her attention to the study of social movements and the problems and the prospects of revolutionary change. This approach was embodied in articles such as "Indian Peasant Uprisings" (1979a) and "Peasant Resistance and Revolt in South India" (1979b) and in her book (with Hari Sharma) *Imperialism and Revolution in South Asia* (1973). Joseph Tharamangalam takes up some of these issues in his paper.

Anthropology of Women

Although Gough did not see herself primarily as an anthropologist of gender, when the women's movement began, Kathleen embraced the insights and new perspectives feminism offered. In a review of Kate Millett's *Sexual Politics* (1971b) she wrote, "At this date it is both embarrassing and relieving to

admit and savor them [Millett's findings]: embarassing because one wonders how one could ever have allowed oneself to be so brainwashed and so imposed upon; relieving because there is no need to ignore the oppression or to pretend ignorance any more."

Kathleen was among the first to explore feminism's implications for rethinking anthropological analyses of gender and kinship. She wrote several important articles, essays and pamphlets on women's history and evolution. While cast in the evolutionary thinking current in progressive anthropology of the 1960s (including emergent feminist anthropology), Gough's "An Anthropologist Looks at Engels" (1971c) and "The Origin of the Family" (1971d) provided overviews of the anthropology of women to a large audience. In those early days of feminist anthropology many of us searched for past matriarchies and the Marxist-feminists among us sought an original state of sexual egalitarianism to "prove" that patriarchy was not inevitable. Kathleen remained sceptical of these efforts, as Pauline Barber and Belinda Leach point out in their paper, and urged us to think critically about our need to legitimate feminist politics with reference to some construct of pristine/essential form of human social organization. She did so with characteristic honesty and kindness. As the external reviewer for Rayna Rapp's *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, she began her critique of Sacks' "Engels Revisited" with "Karen, this is Kathleen speaking . . . ," and went on to give it a very tough going-over as well as wonderful suggestions for repair.

As the paper by Barber and Leach indicates, Kathleen Gough remained nevertheless insistent that feminist analysis be attentive to differences and inequalities among women. In "Nuer Kinship: A Re-interpretation" (1971a) she dealt with women as political actors. She also analyzed the differences between women of "aristocratic" lineages with access to wealth, and other women. Her classic "The Nayars and the Definition of Marriage" (1959) was among the first and most influential challenges to beliefs in the universality of nuclear families. In some of her last writings on Vietnam, on the situation of women in socialist states, Gough grappled once again with the difficulties of dealing with both class and gender; and in many of her articles and chapters on south Indian social structure she places her analysis of caste, marriage, domestic economy and ritual in an engendered perspective.

Political Concerns and Agendas

All of this scholarship and political writing addresses only half of Kathleen Gough's public and professional life. From the early 1960s on she was a tireless campaigner in anthropological meetings and many other forums for social justice and against the increasingly virulent and destructive strain of American Imperialism, expressed in the war against the Vietnamese people. In his paper in this volume Joe Jorgensen describes how she fought university

administrations and American presidents with equal fervour, and to say her career suffered for it would be a classic understatement.

Kathleen taught at Brandeis from 1961 to 1963 more forcefully than perhaps she wished to about the links between the academy and politics, between intellect and activism, between ideas and their consequences in many ways. No newcomer to American politics, she had been active in multi-racial politics in Detroit during her Michigan years of the late 1950s. At Brandeis, she was active in the fledgling peace movement and in the early civil rights movement on campus.

In October 1962, when the Kennedy administration precipitated the Cuban missile crisis, Kathleen was asked by students at Brandeis to address an all-university forum; untenured Assistant Professor Gough complied, and gave a sharply critical and thoroughly documented speech in support of the Cuban revolution. She expressed the hope that Cuba would defend itself against the United States' flagrant violation of international law. After her talk, Herbert Marcuse, also on the podium, publicly congratulated her, saying prophetically, "you have more courage than I." Kathleen's action electrified the campus.

Kathleen Gough took Brandeis' liberal rhetoric at face value, only to be forced out of the university for it with her husband and colleague, David Aberle, by a hypocritical administration and a cowardly faculty. Their struggle provided a political education for Brandeis students, most of whom, including one of us (Sacks), were very much children of the 1950s. In 1963, Kathleen Gough and David Aberle left Brandeis for the University of Oregon in Eugene. Gough's outspoken stance and unequivocal political sympathies at Brandeis preceded Berkeley's Free Speech movement by over a year and the University of Michigan's Teach-In movement (also initiated by anthropologists) by two years.

By 1964 United States involvement in an increasingly dirty war in southeast Asia had become the most pressing political issue. At Eugene, Kathleen helped organize Students for Democratic Action and the Faculty-Student Committee to Stop the War in Vietnam. At Marshall Sahlins' urging, Kathleen, David, other faculty and students began to organize a major protest movement focussed around an all-day, all-night Teach-In on the war at the University of Oregon. Kathleen avidly studied the history, ethnology and political-economy of Indo-China in order to make a thoroughgoing and well-informed analysis of the social forces resisting U.S. Imperialism, an interest that was to remain with her for the rest of her life.

The results of this creative melding of politics, scholarship and moral principle were exciting and held unforeseen consequences. As Jorgensen writes:

> When Kathleen was invited to teach south Asian ethnology and kinship [at Oregon] in 1966, she advised the department chairman that she would not assign grades. Low grades could be a ticket to conscription, and she would have no part in contributing to an imperialist war in this fashion. The offer to teach was withdrawn.

After three years in Oregon during the Vietnam war, the Aberles became disillusioned with living in the United States and in 1967 they moved to Canada: David to a professorship at the University of British Columbia and Kathleen to one at the relatively new Simon Fraser University. SFU was an exciting place in the late 1960s, a mecca for radical scholars like Tom Bottomore and Andre Gunder Frank and a site of serious and ongoing confrontations among faculty and between faculty and the conservative Board of Governors. Even prior to the firing of the PSA nine, Simon Fraser's Governors had been the object of a Motion of Censure by the Canadian Association of University Teachers.

In 1968 the Political Science, Sociology and Anthropology department (PSA) was formed at SFU as a bold experiment in radical education and against the artificial compartmentalization of knowledge by disciplinary boundaries. The PSA department goals of support for oppressed peoples and critical analysis of society were perhaps not as threatening to the administration as its principle of student/faculty parity in all decision-making, including hiring, promotion and tenure. Although Kathleen saw the dangers of this course of action she supported the department's principled stands, even when it was put into receivership by the administration. Jorgensen's paper offers a detailed account of the famous PSA strike, the subsequent firings of eight faculty and the lengthy censure proceedings by many professional associations that followed, surely one of the most significant episodes in Canadian academic history. The upshot for Kathleen was the decision, despite offers for reinstatement and offers from other universities, to pursue her career as an independent scholar without permanent teaching responsibilities.

Gough's anti-war work kindled her interest and love for the people and country of Vietnam, which she first visited after a return trip to India in 1976 and again in 1982. She wrote *Ten Times More Beautiful: The Rebuilding of Vietnam* (1978) and *Political Economy in Vietnam* (1990a) on the basis of these trips. The second book appeared shortly before her death. Hy Van Luong's paper in this volume critically assesses her work in Vietnam.

Kathleen was about to embark on a major interdisciplinary study of Vietnamese society in the 1990s when illness intervened. The research, a collaboration between the Vietnamese National Centre for Social Sciences, Hanoi, and the Centre for Human Settlements at the University of British Columbia, and funded by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), is a five-year study involving 20 UBC faculty in enhancing research programs at

eight Vietnamese Institutes in the areas of rural development, urbanization, the household economy and social policy. As Peter Boothroyd notes in this volume, the entire project is a testimony to the political sensibilities, compassion and internationalism that was so characteristic a part of Kathleen Gough's identity. It will become part of her enduring legacy.

Teacher and Mentor

It was recognition of that integrity as well as her anthropological achievements that led the rather stuffy Royal Society of Canada to elect Kathleen a Fellow in 1988. However her principled opposition had its price: for the last 20 years of her life Gough did not hold a regular academic appointment. She had none of the institutional supports that usually provide the foundations for academic influence and renown—no graduate students and no academic patronage to dispense. One can only speculate on the lost opportunities to work with students and the ultimate effect on the course of Canadian anthropology to have such an important figure on the proverbial sidelines. Marianne Ainley, an historian of science and Director of the Simone de Beauvoir Institute at Concordia, discusses this aspect of Kathleen Gough's career and places it within the context of the career paths of Canadian women academics and the general issue of the "chilly climate."

By all odds, Kathleen should have joined the ranks of forgotten academic women. That she did not is testimony to the inspiration she brought to several generations, and to her own strength in creating a path for herself as a politically engaged and connected intellectual. She stood with one foot in the academy and the other in a wide variety of activist and revolutionary movements. Kathleen was a bridge. She placed the best the academy has to offer—careful, sustained and deep analysis—in the service of social change and she kept the agenda of engaged scholarship alive in the academic world.

Kathleen fought the good fight at three universities and, though the fights were lost on one level, on a more profound level the experiences at Brandeis, at Oregon and at Simon Fraser had elements of victory: in each she galvanized and mobilized a circle of people around her. Many of those so touched described in later years their contact with Kathleen as critical to their political and intellectual formations.

One of us (Sacks) was also fortunate to have had Kathleen Gough as an undergraduate teacher at Brandeis in the early 1960s. More than anyone, Kathleen was responsible for her becoming an anthropologist and for her early political education. In the classroom, she was a challenging and inspiring teacher, always patient, encouraging of different views and respectful of them. But she demanded a great deal from her students and held herself to the same level of performance and commitment she demanded. Her analyses were decades ahead of their time in the early 1960s. In retrospect, they were

early workings-out of her writings of the 1970s. Her course on India showed the links between caste and class, and how each constructed the other. Long before it became fashionable to talk about multiple subjectivities and the construction of situated knowledge, Kathleen Gough analyzed those processes in her lectures on the political histories of Indian religions. Most of all, she taught her students to think for themselves, to be critical. She had them read Evans-Pritchard on the Nuer and she talked about woman-woman marriage in a way that raised issues of the relationship of status and gender. She did that in 1962, long before the feminist movement surfaced. Karen vividly remembers Kathleen explaining to her, who at the time got all the news she needed from *Time* magazine, why that magazine and the U.S. government might not be reporting the whole truth. While Karen was not fully convinced, she was motivated to the reading that ultimately did lead to activism and political engagement.

Knowing Kathleen was for many a lesson on how one might live a life of principle. At the memorial sessions, Kathleen's students, some who had never been her students and some who had only known her from her writings, rose to give testimony to Kathleen's influence and support. Her Brandeis graduate student, Linda Tobin Pepper, remembers her as a teacher "in the finest sense." She went on:

> She imparted knowledge of subject matter—the history and politics of India and she imparted depth of meaning to that subject matter through respect for the people who were affected by those events.
>
> She also did this when she allowed me to write a major paper (for another course) from her Ph.D. thesis on matrilineal kinship. Although her thesis was thick and dense, due to her guidance I was able to retain a sense of exploring very different kinship patterns among a very real group of people.

To Susheila Raghavan Bhagat, Kathleen was "mentor, friend, confidant, and benefactor." Jerome Handler, from Brandeis' first graduate anthropology class, recalled his pleasure sitting in the Midwest and hearing about Kathleen's stand on Cuba. Bill Derman spoke of writing as an undergraduate at Brooklyn College to support her, and his pleasure of receiving a personal reply. Later, as one of the organizers of a radical anthropology caucus in Michigan in the late 1960s, he treasured Kathleen's support of this graduate student effort and her regular articles and syllabi for the newsletter. Even though Debbie D'Amico Samuels never met Kathleen, she came to testify to the inspiration she and her friends have taken from Kathleen's writings. And Harriet Rosenberg provided a Canadian perspective from sitting in on Kathleen's course in Toronto: "This is what the world would be like if the Queen Mother were a communist."

We pay tribute to Kathleen for her courage, her intellect, her insights, her leadership. And a bit of canonization is not a bad thing, especially in the cur-

rent conjuncture when the left and feminist academy is in a period of soul-searching and needs its heroines and role models more than ever. But let us not take this too far. Let us remember Kathleen's own wry and self-deprecating sense of humour and not take this occasion so seriously that we lose sight of the fact that Kathleen could be stubborn and cranky, and theoretically we all had our differences with her of one kind or another. Everyone will have different memories of Kathleen. Richard's favourite is of visiting her and David and watching her pour the tea into elegant bone china, and in her impeccable Oxbridge accent discussing the varieties of Indian Marxism, class struggle in Bengal or the most recent idiocy of the Reagan or Bush administrations. Karen remembers camping at Crater Lake with Kathleen and two of her British friends. Arriving tired and late at a wet campground, Kathleen suggested building a fire and set off in search of wood. She soon came back, rolling a slice of a redwood tree as big as she was, and directed her friends to gather needles for kindling. While Karen explained why it was impossible to light half a wet tree with a handful of wet pine needles, Kathleen lit a blazing fire that kept us warm for the night.

The closing years of the 1980s and the dawning of the 1990s were not happy ones for those, like Kathleen Gough, who have held steadfastly to a vision of a future socialist humanity. Mordecai Briemberg, a close friend and comrade-in-arms from the Simon Fraser days, has written for the volume a moving memoir of conversations with Kathleen shortly before her death about the fate of that vision.

> "Each time we spoke," writes Briemberg, "the four horseman of counter-revolution had loomed larger on the horizon. . . . In the difficult moment of her too early dying, Kathleen was entitled to project despair or to seek romantic solace. She chose neither. Rather she manifested her loyalty to personal comradeship and to the revolutionary value of egalitarianism. She spoke with the conviction that the communist vision remains the most creative seedbed for emancipation from this inhumane world order. It is a small band that today draws sustenance from a revolutionary vision gained with intelligence and sacrifice in the past 150 years. Kathleen will be missed from among us."

The last article Kathleen Gough wrote (1990b), appearing only weeks before her death, was a thoughtful reappraisal and update of her landmark paper on Anthropology and Imperialism. A sober, even sombre account of the breakup of the Soviet Bloc and the setbacks of the socialist project, it nevertheless struck notes of defiance, and expressed confidence in the ultimate triumph of a more humane and just world order. Originally appearing in the *Economic and Political Weekly* of Bombay it is reprinted below.

* * * * *

Bearing Briemberg's comments in mind, it is Kathleen Gough the brilliant scholar and intellectual that we commemorate today, and also Kathleen Gough the political activist who used her intellectual gifts so effectively in her life-long fight for social justice. But on an even deeper level there is yet another Kathleen Gough to be reckoned with: at the point where the Marxist philosophy of praxis through struggle and the Christian philosophy of redemption through service to humanity intersect, there is another Kathleen Gough: a moral being whose commitment to living the just life transcends mundane political discourse. It is in the tradition of the indigenous English radicalism of Gerard Winstanley, William Blake, Tom Paine and Robert Owen. The moral strength touched all who had the good fortune to know her personally, and many more through her voluminous writings. It is this complex and multifaceted Kathleen Gough whom we will remember in the years to come.

Notes

1. We would like to thank the following colleagues who made substantive contributions to the content of this paper and to the two symposia on which it is based: David Aberle, Stephen Aberle, Dipankar Gupta, Joe Jorgenson, Tom McFeat, Hira Singh, Patricia Uberoi and Hy van Luong.

2. Two papers were originally presented in Chicago (Joan Mencher and Gerald Berreman), two in Montreal (Joe Tharamangalam and Marianne Ainley) and three were presented at both sessions (Joe Jorgenson, Hy Van Luong and Hira Singh). Also included are a number of shorter contributions and tributes from colleagues in the Third and First Worlds.

References Cited

Gough, Kathleen

1959 The Nayars and the Definition of Marriage. Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 89(1):23-34. Reprinted in the Bobbs-Merrill Reprint Series.

1968a Anthropology: Child of Imperialism. Monthly Review 19(11):12-27.

1968b New Proposals for Anthropologists. Social Responsibilities Symposium, *with* G.D. Berreman and G. Gjessing. Includes comments and replies. Current Anthropology 9(5):403-435.

1970 The Struggle at Simon Fraser University. Monthly Review 22(1):2-16.

1971a Nuer Kinship: A Re-examination. *In* The Translation of Culture: Essays Presented to E. E. Evans-Pritchard, edited by Thomas O. Beidelman, pp. 79-121. London: Tavistock Publications. Reprinted in the Bobbs-Merrill Reprint Series.

1971b Sexual Politics. Review of Kate Millett's Sexual Politics. Monthly Review 22(9):47-56.

1971c An Anthropologist Looks at Engels. *In* Women: Social and Economic Position, edited by Nona Malbin, pp. 156-168. Chicago: Rand McNally.

1971d The Origin of the Family. Journal of Marriage and the Family 33:760-771. Reprinted in various anthropological readers.

1978 Ten Times More Beautiful: The Rebuilding of Vietnam. Vancouver: New Star Books; New York: Monthly Review Press.

1979a Indian Peasant Uprisings. *In* Peasant Struggles in India, edited by A.R. Desai, pp. 85-126. Bombay: Oxford University Press.

1979b Peasant Resistance and Revolt in South India. *In* Peasant Struggles in India, edited by A.R. Desai, pp. 719-742. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

1982 Rural Society in Southeast India. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1989 Rural Change in Southeast India, 1950s to 1980s. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

1990a Political Economy in Vietnam. Berkeley, CA: Folklore Institute and Oxford University Press, India.

1990b "Anthropology and Imperialism" Revisited. Economic and Political Weekly 25(31, August 4):1705-1708.

Gough, Kathleen, and Hari P. Sharma, eds.

1973 Imperialism and Revolution in South Asia. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Schneider, David M., and Kathleen Gough, eds.

1961 Matrilineal Kinship. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.