ETHICS AND RESPONSIBILITY: THEMES IN THE LIFE AND WORK OF KATHLEEN GOUGH

Gerald D. Berreman
University of California, Berkeley

Kathleen Gough epitomized the best anthropology has to offer: important and impeccable scholarship combined with courageous commitment to social justice. Her India research accompanied her admiration for India's freedom fighters; her Vietnam work grew from empathy for the Vietnamese people in their struggle for independence and her informed outrage at the United States' war upon them. Always Gough's actions spoke as loudly as her words. Her scholarship was unquestioned but for her conscience she paid the price of recurrent harassment and lost employment while earning the respect of colleagues, of students, of those about whom she wrote and among whom she struggled.

Before we had met, I knew about and admired Kathleen as a result of our shared research interest in India. I became acquainted with her personally through our shared commitment to social responsibility in anthropology, and especially through our participation in the anti-Vietnam War movement. We each organized (she with husband David Aberle) anti-war teach-ins on our respective campuses in Berkeley and Eugene—as did colleagues nationwide—on March 23, 1965, simultaneously with the prototype teach-in organized by Marshall Sahlins in Ann Arbor.[1]

Two years later, on March 24, 1967, we both delivered papers on the issue of social responsibility at the joint meetings in San Francisco of the Southwestern Anthropological Association and the American Ethnological Society.[2] We met frequently during the years that she, David Aberle and their son Stephen Aberle lived in Eugene directly across the street from my parents' home. There is no scholar whose intellect, courage and social conscience I have admired more, whose friendship I valued more.

In identifying ethics and responsibility as themes in her life and work I want to focus on the positive, assertive responsibility she shouldered to *act* on the understandings and insights she obtained as a research anthropologist and

***Anthropologica* XXXV (1993) 249-262**

on the values she embraced as an empathetic, humane being. The Principles of Professional Responsibility, to which our professional association was committed during the last 20 years of her lifetime (i.e., from their adoption in May 1971 until their revision and dilution in 1991 [Newsletter 1970; 1989; cf. Berreman 1991]), included this paragraph under its second principle, "Responsibility to the Public":

> As people who devote their professional lives to understanding people, anthropologists bear a positive responsibility to speak out publicly, both individually and collectively, on what they know and what they believe as a result of their professional expertise gained in the study of human beings. That is, they bear a professional responsibility to contribute to an "adequate definition of reality" upon which public opinion and public policy may be based. (Newsletter 1970; American Anthropological Association 1983:1-2)

This principle, and the responsibility to act upon it, are what I mean by the "positive responsibility" which Kathleen Gough advocated and lived by. She was political in the truest sense, even as she was scholarly in the truest sense. Her values remind me most closely of those of my other hero, the great sociologist C. Wright Mills, whose commitment to the "politics of truth" she shared. As he put it:

> The very enterprise of social science, as it determines fact, takes on political meaning. In a world of widely communicated nonsense, any statement of fact is of political and moral significance. All social scientists by the fact of their existence, are involved in the struggle between enlightenment and obscurantism. In such a world as ours, to practice social science is, first of all, to practice the politics of truth. (Mills 1959:178)

And again:

> The intellectual does not have any one political direction, but the work of any [person] of knowledge . . . does have a distinct kind of political relevance: his [*sic*] politics, in the first instance, are the politics of truth, for his job is the maintenance of an adequate definition of reality. (Mills 1963b:611)

> The political [person] does not need to wait upon more knowledge in order to act responsibly now. To blame . . . inaction upon insufficient knowledge serves as a cheap escape from the taking of a political stand and acting upon it as best [one] can. (Mills 1963a:301-302)

In this essay I will briefly characterize Gough's ethical, positively and proactively responsible, research and writing, bearing in mind that it was consistently, inextricably and uncompromisingly bound to direct social and political action in pursuit of peace and social justice; that is, she sought indefatigably to enhance the quality of human life. I will demonstrate this by quoting from the source: herself. By way of introduction, I want to quote a paragraph

written by her husband and colleague, David Aberle, together with their son Stephen. That will be followed by a few lines from a eulogy by Ronald Frankenberg. These quotations will lead us directly to the words, the work and the life of Kathleen Gough:

> [She] struggled valiantly for the rights of women, minorities, and the oppressed of the third world. She was active in the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, the Civil Rights movement, and the struggle to end the war in Vietnam. Passionate in her commitment to social justice, she fought oppression wherever she encountered it, often at risk and cost to her academic career. Her vocal opposition to U.S. policies during the Cuban missile crisis led to her departure from Brandeis University. At the University of Oregon, together with her husband, she participated in and helped to organize marches, rallies, and an all-night Teach-In to stop the war in Vietnam. Their opposition to the war was a major factor in their decision to come to Canada in 1967, where they offered aid to American draft resistors. She and seven of her colleagues lost their positions at Simon Fraser University in British Columbia as a result of their attempts to organize faculty, staff and students in their department along democratic lines. (Aberle and Aberle 1990)

> Kathleen never joined any political party, although in India she had sympathized with the aims and policies first of the CPI [Communist Party of India] and then the CPI(M) [Communist Party of India (Marxist)]. While at Wayne State [University, 1960-61] . . . she met, and debated major political and humanizing issues with, black and other radicals in Detroit and she . . . came to understand and empathize with the problems of the powerless in the United States and, as [a] logical extension of her lifelong feminist consciousness and hatred of oppression, to embrace Black liberation and women's liberation. (Frankenberg 1991:24)

I turn now to Kathleen Gough's own words, beginning with excerpts from a paper entitled "New Proposals for Anthropologists," which she delivered before the plenary "Symposium on Social Responsibility" at the 1967 meeting in San Francisco of the Southwestern Anthropological Association (Gough 1968a). Thereafter I will quote at some length but still only fragmentarily from another, much longer, article (Gough 1968b) in order that the reader may achieve further appreciation of the power of her ideas and her prose:

> In this revolutionary and proto-revolutionary world, anthropologists are beginning to be in difficulties. From the beginning, we have inhabited a triple environment, involving obligations first to the peoples we studied, second to our colleagues and our science, and third to the powers who employed us in univesities or who funded our research. In many cases we seem now to be in danger of being torn apart by the conflicts between the first and third set of obligations, while the second set of loyalties, to our subject as an objective and humane endeavor, are being severely tested and jeopardized. (Ibid.:405)

> The question tends to become: what does an anthropologist do who is dependent on a counter-revolutionary government in an increasingly revolutionary world? (Ibid.)

> With all these demands many anthropologists bury themselves in their specialties or, if they *must* go abroad, seek out the remotest, least unstable tribe or village they can find. As Peter Worsley (1966) has recently pointed out, however, in a paper called "The End of Anthropology?" we shall eventually have to choose either to remain, or become specialists who confine themselves to the cultures of small-scale pre-industrial societies, or else, bringing to bear all our knowledge of cultural evolution and of primitive social institutions, embark fully on the study of modern societies, including modern revolutions. If we take the former path, as our subject matter disappears, we shall become historians and retreat from the substantial work we have already done in contemporary societies. If we take the latter path—which is the one some of us must inevitably follow—we shall have to admit that our subject matter is increasingly the same as that of political scientists, economists and sociologists. . . . Unfortunately, we have I think a serious drawback in our own history which makes it very difficult for us to approach modern society as a single, interdependent world social system. This is that although we have worked for over 100 years in conquered societies, and although for at least 50 of them we have emphasized the interconnectedness of parts of social systems, we have virtually failed to study Western imperialism as a social system. (Ibid.)

> Why have anthropologists not studied world imperialism as a unitary phenomenon? To begin to answer this question would take another article. I will merely suggest some possible lines of enquiry, namely: (1) the very process of specialization within anthropology and between anthropology and related disciplines, especially political science, sociology, and economics; (2) the tradition of individual fieldwork in small-scale societies, which at first produced a rich harvest of ethnography, but later placed constraints on our methods and theories; (3) our unwillingness to offend, by choosing controversial subjects, the governments that funded us; and (4) the bureaucratic counter-revolutionary setting in which anthropologists have increasingly worked in their universities, which may have contributed to a sense of impotence and to the development of machine-like models. (Ibid.:406)

Gough then goes on to say that if we are to do applied research, as she certainly thinks we should, let it be on real issues affecting real people in the real circumstances of their lives:

> We might compare revolutionary and proto-revolutionary movements for what they can teach us about social change. . . . We need to know . . . whether there is a common set of circumstances under which left-wing and nationalist revolutions have occurred or have been attempted in recent years [in a wide variety of nations]. . . . What are the types of peasantry and urban workers most likely to be involved in these revolutions? Are there typologies of leadership and organization? Why have some revolutions failed and others succeeded? How did it happen, for example, that some 1,000,000 Communists and their families and

> supporters were killed in 1966 in Indonesia with almost no indigenous resistance, and how does this affect the self-assessment and prospects of, say, the Left Communist Party in India?
>
> . . . I am asking that we should do these studies in *our* way, as we would study a cargo cult or kula ring, without the built-in biases of tainted financing, without the assumption that counter-revolution, and not revolution, is the best answer, and with the ultimate economic and spiritual welfare of our informants and of the international community, rather than the short run military or industrial profits of the Western nations, before us. I would ask that these studies be attempted by individuals or self-selected teams, rather than as part of the grand artifice of some externally stimulated master plan. Perhaps what I am asking is not possible any more in America. I am concerned that it may not be, that Americans are already too compromised, too constrained by their own imperial government. If that is so, the question really is how anthropologists can get back their freedom of enquiry and of action, and I suggest that, individually and collectively, we should place this first on the list. (Ibid.:407)

In another part of the same discussion, published as a separate paper in Theodore Roszak's *The Dissenting Academy* (1968), she explicitly addresses the issue of ethics in anthropology. She begins by referring to the resolution condemning the war in Vietnam which she and David Aberle had introduced at the business meeting of the American Anthropological Association's 65th annual meeting, November 1966. That resolution, as amended and adopted, was as follows:

> Reaffirming our 1961 resolution, we condemn the use of napalm, chemical defoliants, harmful gases, bombing, the torture and killing of prisoners of war and political prisoners, and the intentional or deliberate policies of genocide or forced transportation of populations for the purpose of terminating their cultural and/or genetic heritages by anyone anywhere.
>
> These methods of warfare deeply offend human nature. We ask that all governments put an end to their use at once and proceed as rapidly as possible to a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam. (American Anthropological Association Newsletter 1966:2)

Gough comments on the response elicited by the resolution's introduction to the Association's Council (i.e., the membership):

> The Vietnam resolution had . . . a history that illustrates some of the conflicts and strained loyalties among anthropologists. . . . Its introduction [at the business meeting of the American Anthropolgical Association's annual meeting] was opposed by the President-elect [of the Association, Frederica De Laguna] and by a majority of the executive board. The chairman [President-elect De Laguna] felt obliged to judge the resolution "political," and hence out of order, since the Association's stated purpose is "to advance the science of anthropology and to further the professional interests of American anthropologists." A hubbub ensued at the conference in which the resolution was salvaged when one member [Michael J. Harner] suddenly proclaimed, "Genocide is not in the

> professional interests of anthropologists!'' . . . A motion to overrule the chair then passed by a narrow margin. Amendments were next introduced [and approved] that removed an allegation that the United States was infringing international law by using forbidden weapons, and transferred responsibility for the war from the United States government to ''all governments.'' . . . The proceedings showed that under pressure, most anthropologists are willing to put their profession on record as opposed to mass slaughter. But most are evidently unwilling to condemn their own government. (Gough 1968b:136-137)

On the next page she makes what I consider to be her *core* statement on the positive ethical responsibility of anthropologists—a statement which should be enshrined in the collective memory of our discipline. Having commented that much anthropological research, while legitimate and interesting, is irrelevant to issues confronting people in the world today, she goes on to say:

> [It bypasses] the most crucial problems of world society. Cumulatively [it] also evade[s] a central question: *Who is to evaluate and suggest guidelines for human society, if not those who study it?* It is as though the more we study the world's cultures, the less capable we feel of making judgments as citizens; certainly, the less able to speak or act collectively on the basis of our knowledge.
>
> This partial paralysis results, I think, from the way in which, over time, the social settings of anthropologists have affected their research problems, theories, and conceptions of social responsibility. (Ibid.:138, emphasis added)

She proceeds from there to a keen and extensive analysis of the history of the relationship between anthropology and imperialism, whereupon she concludes with a return to the broad ethical implications:

> It must be acknowledged that anthropology has not been and cannot be ethically neutral. Rather, what seems to have happened is that in circumstances of increasing specialization, bureaucratization, and management of research by governments, anthropologists have virtually ceased to ask explicitly what the human goals of our science are. More and more reduced to the status of hired functionaries, they have tended to make productivity of facts and of mutually unrelated hypotheses their goal. The fear of being speculative and ''unempirical'' (a fear that may bear some relation to the less conscious fear of producing politically or socially ''subversive'' theories) has made current anthropological work fragmented and dull. In abdicating the search for beneficent goals for our science, we have ceased to be its masters and have turned into its slaves.
>
> For a speculative and questioning anthropologist in America, the networks of research and teaching within which he must work are increasingly repressive. . . . While professors need not always actively support current policies, they may be handsomely rewarded if they do so and they are discouraged from effectively opposing them. The fact that constraints are usually unofficial and vaguely formulated, and that they operate within a rhetoric of democratic and academic freedoms, only adds to the bafflement and frustration of unconventional scholars. (Ibid.:149-150)

This last paragraph makes a point upon which Gough was writing from the authority of bitter experience. Nevertheless, she concluded the article, as she had the talk upon which it was based, on a hopeful note—a note of "optimism of the will" which always characterized her work despite the "pessimism of the intellect" which informed it:

> In the universities of the West, the anthropologist's best hope may be his students. These, far outnumbering their elders, are forcing us to reexamine our subject matter, theories, and aims. As they insist on creating a space in which to think freely and to grow in dignity, they will shake the foundations of our academic institutions. With them, we may be able to help in reshaping our own society, and in so doing to find new goals for the science of man. (Ibid.:156)

I will turn now to some words chosen from four more among Kathleen Gough's scores of published works—words which further exemplify her contributions to socially relevant scholarship: the breadth of her interests, the depth of her knowledge and understanding, the pervasiveness of her courage and social conscience.

In the Preface to *Imperialism and Revolution in South Asia*, co-edited with Hari P. Sharma (1973), we read:

> American social science research on South Asia is remarkably lacking in studies dealing with the dynamics of imperialism as well as with the revolutionary movements that have arisen to destroy this system. This book is a modest attempt toward meeting that lack. (Ibid.:vii)

That book contains two essays by Gough, the first of which comprises the initial chapter, "Imperialism and Revolutionary Potential in South Asia" (Gough 1973a).[3] I will characterize it by means of two quotations:

> It is noteworthy that in India the Communist movement has received strongest electoral support in states which have the poorest food supply and the highest proportions of landless laborers, and in which both these conditions have been exacerbated in the past twenty years: Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, and West Bengal, where between 45 and 89 percent of the people are estimated to lack the food *calories* (let alone the food content) necessary for adequate subsistence and where between 34 and 37 percent of the agricultural population were landless or near-landless laborers in 1963-64. By contrast, the right-wing Jan Sangh and Swatantra parties are strongest in Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh, and Punjab—states where much lower percentages (between 13 and 26) of the people are estimated to receive inadequate food calories and where the percentage of landless or near-landless laborers is as low as 12-23 percent of the agricultural work force. It is not argued that absolute poverty or landlessness directly "cause" support for communism, but it is suggested that revolutionary ideology will be stronger and more widely accepted in states where the largest proportions of the people have suffered relative deprivation in food supply, living standards, and landholding over a period of years. Where smaller proportions have suffered deprivation, right-wing parties may

gain support from people of middle rank who are afraid of losing their security or being attacked by the poor.

Again, it is not argued that revolutionary movements will necessarily *start* among the poorest peasants and landless laborers. . . . Nevertheless it is argued that once an armed revolutionary movement has gained strength, it has large potential support in areas with masses of poor peasants and landless laborers, and that regions experiencing an increase in the proportions of these classes are ones in which revolutionary ideologies are most likely to take hold. (Ibid.: 12-14)

She concludes the essay with this paragraph:

Flexibility, a break with past South Asian Marxist groups, new alignments which crosscut some of these groups and some ancient enmities within the Marxist fold, and independence of external socialist mentors seem to be required of the South Asian revolutionaries in the immediate future, as do efforts toward unity with each other. During the resistance struggle in Bangladesh in the spring of 1971, a militant of the National Awami Party put the matter crisply to a reporter: "We don't worry whether China openly supports us or not, whether Russia tries to mediate, or America tries to replace Yahya Khan [General and head of state, Pakistan, from 1969]. We have to wage our own battle, and we are sure to win." (Ibid.:33)

From Gough's classic study in two rural villages of Tamil Nadu, *Rural Society in Southeast India* (1981), I will quote two paragraphs from the Preface, followed by three excerpts from the Conclusion:

Preface:
This book is about changes in the political and economic structures of two villages in Thanjavur district of Tamil Nadu State in southeast India. It is an attempt to view the villagers' changing internal class relations in the context of change in the larger structures of the district, state, and nation, in which some members of each village participate and which affect all of them. (Gough 1982:vii)

I hope that this work . . . may have practical value for labour organizers in south India. Thus, I explore the conditions in which villages retain traditional hierarchies of authority through caste assemblies, and those in which such hierarchies disappear. I discuss conditions favourable to the rise of unions among agricultural labourers and the effects of such unions on the political consciousness of workers. I also consider obstacles to union formation, especially among tenant cultivators and smallholders. Finally, I note reasons why many village people, despite their poverty, support extremely conservative political groups. These and similar questions relate, of course, to the revolutionary potential of various classes of villagers, a potential yet to be realized in India. (Ibid.:viii)

> Conclusion:
> When I first worked there in the late 1940s I thought that India would soon become a socialist country because of world trends coupled with the misery of the people. The outcome was otherwise; India today is a major, if dependent, capitalist power with a large industrial establishment. But it is not a prosperous country, and especially in the present crisis of world capitalism, the conditions of the majority are deteriorating year by year.
>
> Unfortunately, class struggle is at present often obscured or derailed by inter-ethnic conflict, which is usually engineered by the more prosperous and is often the direct outcome of conflicts among the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie.
>
> Class struggle, however, continues, especially on the part of agricultural labourers, dispossessed tribal minorities, and the most exploited industrial workers. At present, there is no nationwide revolutionary leadership capable of coordinating and directing such struggles in the country as a whole, but the need for it is widely felt. Whether or how India will proceed to socialism cannot now be predicted. That it will eventually do so still seems probable. (Ibid.:527-528)

Here, again, we see the optimism of Gough's will combined with her courage of her convictions. Eight years later she produced a follow-up book, *Rural Change in Southeast India: 1950s to 1980s* (1989). In the words of her Introduction:

> This book analyzes economic and political change in Thanjavur District, and especially in two villages, between the early 1950s and the early 1980s. It forms a sequel to *Rural Society in Southeast India*, which dealt briefly with the colonial period in Thanjavur and then focussed on the results of my first fieldwork of 1951-53. (1989:ix)

And in her Conclusion:

> The green revolution dovetailed with the actual operation of the land acts to promote capitalist farming. . . . In general, as has been noted for other areas of the capitalist periphery, green revolution farming had widened the income gaps both regionally and between large and small owners. (Ibid.:518)

> Whereas the big owners hoarded paddy until the scarce seasons and then sold it on the blackmarket, the poor had to sell theirs at low statutory prices in the harvest seasons and then buy paddy at blackmarket rates in times of scarcity. . . .
>
> Similarly, credit arrangements favoured the rich and mulcted the poor. Rich farmers had the benefits of institutional credit at relatively low rates of interest, whereas poor farmers and workers had to borrow mainly from private moneylenders. (Ibid.:519)

> Inequality had increased not only among the villagers as a whole, but also among the landowners. In both villages, the top 25 per cent of the owners owned more of the land in 1952 than in 1897, and still more in 1976. . . . Land ownership had thus become more centralized as well as more concentrated in the course of capitalist development. (Ibid.:524)

Gough's most recent project was a continuation of her 20-year concern with and for Vietnam and its people. From its beginning the concern for Vietnam had constituted a major additional focus for the anthropological scholarship and social concern which had previously been devoted primarily to India. She relinquished none of her devotion to India, but added a similar devotion to Vietnam, applying her energies to both in her characteristic scholar-activist mode. Her last book, entitled *Political Economy in Vietnam* (1990), she dedicated "to the struggling people of Vietnam, with gratitude and love." It is grounded in extensive library research as well as visits to Vietnam in 1976 and 1982.[4] It covers history and ethnography, an evaluation of contemporary social and economic programs and a thoughtful (and not surprisingly controversial) analysis of Vietnam's internal and international political evolution from 1946 until the present, followed by her projections regarding its future. It is a passionate and compassionate work, one which required courage matched by few, together with creative energy and physical stamina more commonly associated with youth.

As yet another indication of Kathleen Gough's breadth of expertise, interest and moral concern I must mention her "Irawati Karve Memorial Lecture" (named for the late, great Indian anthropologist), delivered in New Delhi before the Tenth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences in 1978. The lecture was titled "Dravidian Kinship and Modes of Production," a fitting subject in view of Dr. Karve's work on Indian kinship and her expertise in Dravidian kinship in particular. When published by its sponsors, the Indian Council of Social Science Research, the lecture was received with high scholarly praise (K.G. Aberle 1978). I will not attempt to summarize her argument in that lecture, but I cannot resist characterizing and quoting from her final remarks therein.

After having discussed the implications of changing modes of production for traditional and changing features of Dravidian kinship and having noted that overall "changes in the position of women under the peripheral capitalist mode of production are too complicated for me to mention more than one or two points of interest," she proceeded to make those points and then to close her lecture with these socially and politically incisive and provocative comments:

> The opening up of wage and salary work for some women, and of female school education, appear to have brought a general disappearance of both taboos and formal privileges in relation to kinswomen, involving both a decline in the sexual connotations of womanhood and an increase in feminine freedom. . . .
>
> The changing position of women is not one of simple emancipation, however. . . . While more and more women are thrown on their own resources in small matrifocal or nuclear family households, unemployment makes the lives of millions wretched or insecure. . . . On the other hand, when women do en-

> gage in wage work outside the home, they are likely to have a heavier double burden of external and domestic work than was traditionally required of them.
>
> For the full emancipation of women, and for the end of unemployment and poverty, we shall have to wait upon a new mode of production. (Ibid.:18)

The Karve Memorial Lecture was a manifestation of the work which has doubtless been most responsible for the respect and lasting fame which Gough has achieved in the worlds of anthropological and Indic scholarship: her research and publication on social organization among the Nayar and other matrilineal castes of Kerala. These writings are to be found in a variety of places, but nowhere as sharply focussed nor as widely read and quoted as in her co-edited book, *Matrilineal Kinship* (Schneider and Gough 1961). Her essays not only comprise the bulk of that book (11 of the 17 chapters; 354 of the 727 pages), but are recognized as classics in the anthropology of kinship, of matriliny and of social organization in India. Four of those chapters are ethnographic accounts, two on the aristocratic Nayar castes, one on the low caste Tiyyar (or Irava) and one on the Muslim trading group, Mappillas. Her remaining seven chapters are incisive and broadly analytic comparative treatments of variation and change in matrilineal societies worldwide.

Gough concludes the final chapter, "The Modern Disintegration of Matrilineal Descent Groups" (ibid.: 631-652), in her familiar manner, with a paragraph which characterizes extremely briefly a very detailed, convincingly documented and persuasively argued analysis of the complex and important process described in the previous 20 pages. With characteristic attention to social relevance, and not a little understatement, she also suggests the practical significance of that process and her analysis of it:

> Although . . . absorption into the capitalist market system eventually appears to bring about the disintegration of both patrilineal and matrilineal descent groups as organized units, one may perhaps expect decay to become earlier apparent in the matrilineal system. There are also more intermediate steps in the process of change, and the end result shows greater discontinuity with traditional forms than appears to be the case in a patrilineal society. (Gough, *in* Schneider and Gough 1961:652)

A Concluding Tribute

In this brief essay I have quoted Kathleen Gough's own words at length because I think only they can adequately convey the tenor of her work; only they can demonstrate the magnitude and variety of her contributions to anthropological thought, to our collective social conscience and our individual political courage. We are privileged indeed—*graced* may be a more fitting word—to have had among us a colleague and role model of such profound compassion, courage, intellect and insight. Those who were her friends are doubly graced.

Having made my solemn tribute to Kathleen as a paragon of ethical, socially responsible, activist anthropology I will conclude on a lighter note, for she had her lighter moments as well and a warm sense of humour. I think she would appreciate my favourite personal memory of her, for it reveals something essential about her that is missing in what I have written above—something that those who knew her will immediately recognize.

That memory is of a fine spring day in the early 1970s when Kathleen was visiting Berkeley. It was also a day—one of too many such days—when tensions and conflict over the war in Vietnam were running high and riot police from a number of Bay Area cities were everywhere, patrolling the campus and the town. I was acting as her host-for-the day and, knowing her, I was not surprised when she suggested that we take a stroll down Telegraph Avenue, "To see what's going on." Neither was I very surprised when, a few blocks down the avenue, we encountered a police barricade and were told by an armed and helmeted Oakland cop, baton in hand, that the street was closed.

I was about to turn back when Kathleen, all matronly innocence with her British accent and flowered spring dress, stepped up to him and asked, "Whatever for?"[5]

"Security! You can't go. It's our orders," the cop announced.

To which she replied, "I don't see why not, it's a public thoroughfare," whereupon she firmly shouldered her way past the astounded officer, who shrugged uncertainly as I followed, equally uncertainly, and we proceeded to have our look at the nearly deserted avenue, the only souls to have crossed the police picket.

Notes

1. Sahlins, anthropologist then at the University of Michigan, was the inventor of teach-ins which were to become the hallmark of the anti-war movement on campuses nationwide.
2. Subsequently published in *Current Anthropology* as part of the "Social Responsibility Symposium" (Berreman 1968; Gough 1968).
3. Her other essay in the volume is a vivid account, based on her own field work, of the oppression of untouchables in rural south India and the resentment and resistance with which they respond. That essay, comprising chapter 2 of part 2, is entitled "Harijans in Thanjavur" (Gough 1973b).
4. See also her first book on Vietnam, *Ten Times More Beautiful: The Rebuilding of Viet Nam* (1978).
5. The public impression Kathleen conveyed was vividly suggested by Harriet Rosenberg when she spoke briefly at the memorial session from which the papers in this volume are drawn. She remarked that upon first meeting Kathleen she thought to herself, "This is how it would be if the Queen Mother were a communist!"

References Cited

American Anthropological Association
1966 Resolution Against War. Newsletter 7(10):2.
1970 Annual Report of the Committee on Ethics, September 1970. Newsletter 11(9):10-16.
1983 Professional Ethics: Statements and Procedures of the American Anthropological Association. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
1989 Proposed draft revision of the Principles of Professional Responsibility. Newsletter 30(8):22-23.

Aberle, David F., and Stephen D. Aberle
1990 Obituary notice for Kathleen Gough Aberle. Vancouver, BC: Photocopy distributed but unpublished.

Aberle, Kathleen Gough (see also: Gough, Kathleen)
1978 Dravidian Kinship and Modes of Production. Irawati Karve Memorial Lecture. New Delhi: Publication No. 115 of the Indian Council of Social Science Research.

Berreman, Gerald D.
1968 Is Anthropology Alive? Social Responsibility in Social Anthropology. Current Anthropology 9(5):391-396.
1991 Ethics versus "Realism" in Anthropology. *In* Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology: Dialogue for a New Era, edited by Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, pp. 38-71. Philadephia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Frankenberg, Ronald
1991 Obituary: Kathleen Gough Aberle. Anthropology Today 7(2):23-25.

Gough, Kathleen (see also: Aberle, Kathleen Gough)
1968a New Proposals for Anthropologists. Current Anthropology 9(5):403-407.
1968b World Revolution and the Science of Man. *In* The Dissenting Academy, edited by Theodore Roszak, pp. 135-158. New York: Random House (Vintage Books edition).
1973a Imperialism and Revolutionary Potential in South Asia. *In* Imperialism and Revolution in South Asia, edited by Kathleen Gough and H.P. Sharma, pp. 3-42. New York: Monthly Review Press.
1973b Harijans in Thanjavur. *In* Imperialism and Revolution in South Asia, edited by K. Gough and H.P. Sharma, pp. 222-245. New York: Monthly Review Press.
1978 Ten Times More Beautiful: The Rebuilding of Vietnam. New York: Monthly Review Press.
1981 Rural Society in Southeast India. New York: Cambridge University Press.
1989 Rural Change in Southeast India, 1950s to 1980s. New York: Oxford University Press.
1990 Political Economy in Vietnam. Berkeley: Folklore Institute.

Gough, Kathleen, and Hari P. Sharma, eds.
1973 Imperialism and Revolution in South Asia. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Mills, C. Wright
1959 The Sociological Imagination. London: Oxford University Press.
1963a The Social Role of the Intellectual [1944]. *In* Power, Politics and People: The Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills, edited by Irving Louis Horowitz, pp. 292-304. New York: Ballantine Books.
1963b On Knowledge and Power [1955]. *In* Power, Politics and People: The Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills, edited by Irving Louis Horowitz, pp. 599-613. New York: Ballantine Books.
Roszak, Theodore, ed.
1968 The Dissenting Academy. New York: Random House (Vintage edition).
Schneider, David, and Kathleen Gough, eds.
1961 Matrilineal Kinship. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Worsley, Peter
1966 The End of Anthropology? Paper prepared for the Sociology and Anthropology Working Group of the Sixth World Congress of Sociology (cited in Gough 1968a:405).