



Historical and Regional Variability in Navajo Women's Roles

Author(s): Louise Lamphere

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Journal of Anthropological Research*, Vol. 45, No. 4, Navajo Ethnology (Winter, 1989), pp. 431-456

Published by: [University of New Mexico](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3630518>

Accessed: 16/03/2012 20:29

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of New Mexico is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Anthropological Research*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

HISTORICAL AND REGIONAL VARIABILITY IN NAVAJO WOMEN'S ROLES

Louise Lamphere

Department of Anthropology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131

Data from Navajo community studies over the last fifty years allow us to go beyond global statements about the status of Navajo women to a more historically nuanced analysis of variability in women's roles. Focusing on the gender division of labor and female exchange networks, this paper documents community variation within and between areas studied during this time period. Variation has increased dramatically with the incorporation of Navajo women into a capitalist wage economy. Depending on the viability of a livestock economy, residence choice, and the size of female sibling sets, women in rural areas might forge strong female-dominated networks or be relatively isolated. In urban areas, some women have professional jobs, large networks, and substantial ties to the reservation, while others have low-wage jobs and are more dependent on husbands, isolated from kin, or supporting children as single parents. The overall outcome of Navajo incorporation into the larger economy has been to create more diversity in women's situations and a tendency towards polarization along class lines.

INFLUENCED BY FEMINIST anthropology of the 1970s, a number of recent articles on Navajo women have focused on the issue of women's status. Frisbie has argued that a complementary balanced division of labor existed in the *domestic* sphere between 1870 and 1940 and that Navajo women were self-reliant and self-sufficient. In contrast, she contends that the *political* involvement of women has been minimal since Fort Sumner times (Frisbie 1982:13–14). I have suggested that the domestic and political spheres were relatively undifferentiated in Navajo culture during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and that most crucial decisions were taken within the domestic group rather than in a wider political arena. Authority within domestic groups was egalitarian, and Navajo women had a great deal of control over their lives. They did not need to wrest power from others in positions of authority and did not need to influence the decisions of others; instead, they could make important decisions on their own (Lamphere 1974:102). Taking account of economic changes since the 1930s, Mary Shepardson (1982:149) has suggested that “traditionally, Navajo women held high status, a position lost with stock reduction. High status has been regained with education and wage work.” These views complement rather than contradict each other, but they either utilize the dichotomy between the domestic and public spheres as a framework or focus on “women's status” as a unidimensional issue, similar for all Navajo women.

A continued focus on “the status of Navajo women” will not lead us much further, in part because of the difficulty of using notions of domestic and political spheres. Such a framework leaves us with the problem of weighing the importance of each sphere. We are pressed into asking such questions as: Is or

was Navajo women's status "high" or "low"? Was it equal or unequal to that of men? Or, Has women's status declined or increased over the last fifty years? These global assessments get us away from understanding the variability of women's roles and factors important in change.

Since Frisbie, Shepardson, and I published our articles, feminist anthropologists have moved from constructing universalist frameworks for interpreting women's position to conducting more historically embedded analyses of gender relations. The focus has gone from an emphasis on universal gender asymmetry to an attempt to understand variability, both among women in different cultural and historical contexts and between women within the same culture or society. In new analyses of women and production, women and reproduction, and women and the state, human agency has become a salient feature, as researchers have focused on women's resistance to various structures and their strategies within particular cultural contexts (see Lamphere 1987, 1989 for an overview of this new feminist literature).

In this paper I begin a more historically sensitive analysis of Navajo women's roles by focusing on two topics: the sexual division of labor in the household and residence group and the structure and function of female exchange networks. I have chosen these topics as a vehicle for examining women's agency and activity since there is general agreement that Navajo women are active participants in domestic life, while their participation in political and ritual activities has been the subject of some controversy (Frisbie 1982:23, 19). I have used material from community studies rather than life histories or historical documents since they provide data on more women and give us material on men as well and since authors often provide community-wide data on economic, social, and political factors which shape women's behavior. In attempting to assess both regional variation and historical change, I use material collected from five different Navajo communities during different periods since 1938. First, I examine the division of labor in Ramah, drawing on the work of Dorothy Leighton and Clyde Kluckhohn, particularly Leighton's fieldwork in 1940 and 1942 (Leighton and Leighton 1944, 1949; Leighton and Kluckhohn 1947; Leighton field notes). Then I move to Navajo Mountain, using Malcolm Carr Collier's 1938 study (Collier 1966). Data from the 1950s come from Fruitland and Laila Shukry Hamamsy's study of Navajo women (Shukry 1954, field notes; Hamamsy 1957; see also Sasaki 1960). I next draw on my own fieldwork in "Copper Canyon" between 1965 and 1966 (Lamphere 1977) and finally utilize Christine Conte's dissertation based on research in Kitsili and Flagstaff in 1981 (Conte 1982, 1984).¹

Both topics—the gender division of labor and women's exchange networks—seem well suited to an exploration that is sensitive to historical change and to the impact of an evolving political economy on women's agency. Data on the gender division of labor tell us the activities women (and men) actually engage in and the distribution of productive and reproductive labor among household and residence-group members. These activities have been extensively shaped

by the penetration of capitalism into Navajo life—in terms of both the transformation of a pastoral economy dependent on mercantile capital and the expansion of wage labor or welfare payments as pastoralism and craft production have declined. Material on women's exchange networks, in contrast, allows us to focus on women's strategies—their active attempts to utilize kin networks to deal with the economic constraints of their situation. Thus an exploration of both topics in each community gives us a sense of how women's activities are shaped and how women in turn construct and act on their environment. Because of the impact of recent economic and demographic shifts on women's lives, historical changes in women's position loom larger than regional variation in this analysis.

THE IMPACT OF ECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES ON NAVAJO WOMEN

The last fifty years have seen tremendous economic changes on the Navajo Reservation. Stock reduction during the early 1930s brought an end to a Navajo subsistence economy based on mixed pastoral and agricultural activities. Wage labor, which began to penetrate the reservation in the post-Fort Sumner days (Weiss 1984:68–70), increased in the 1930s, though not nearly enough to replace declining pastoral activities. Most of the early wage jobs were for men, who were recruited on the basis of Anglo definitions of male versus female jobs. These included shepherding for ranchers, laboring jobs at local Indian agencies, and work on railroad construction and repair gangs. Ramah, Klagetoh, and Navajo Mountain, all studied between 1938 and 1940, were thus partially dependent on wages, but pastoralism, agriculture, and craft production still made up over 50 percent of community income (Landgraf 1954; Collier 1966).

Women were recruited to work in war-related industries in border towns (Gallup and Flagstaff) during World War II, while men were inducted into the armed forces. However, in the early postwar period, wage labor continued to be male dominated, with the exception of women's participation in agricultural labor off the reservation, where women accompanied their husbands and children to pick oranges, harvest potatoes, and labor in the sugar beet fields. The recent rise of female labor force participation has come with the creation of clerical and service jobs in expanding tribal, Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), and Indian Health Service offices and at educational institutions. In 1980, 35.4 percent of Navajo women were in the paid labor force, and of these, 45.5 percent had children under six years of age (Navajo Nation 1988:13). Shepardson (1982:159), using 1980 data, reports that out of 5,789 Indian BIA employees on the Navajo Reservation, 2,699 (46.6 percent) were female and that 957 (69.7 percent) of the 1,373 Indian Health Service employees who were Indian were female. Women's ability to take advantage of clerical jobs and the growing number of semiprofessional and professional positions on the reservation is due to their commitment to education. For example, Shepardson

(1982:155) notes that 65 percent of the tribal scholarships awarded in 1978–79 went to female students.

Navajo women's roles have also changed because of changing fertility and mortality rates which have affected the timing and number of children Navajo women have borne. The Navajo population has steadily grown between 1870 and 1960, increasing its annual growth rate from between 1.5 and 2.0 percent in the 1870–1900 period to 4.2 percent in 1965–67 (Broudy and May 1983:3). The population expanded from 10,000–12,000 in 1868 to around 175,000 in 1983. Kunitz (1974) argues that the early enlargement of the reservation allowed pastoralism to persist and the expansion of medical care led to a decline in infant mortality, both factors supporting population growth. In addition, "the relative lack of involvement of Navajos in the wage economy and educational system has meant a persistence of high birth rates and many features similar to those found in developing nations all over the world" (Kunitz 1974:14).

Recently, however, the Navajo fertility rate has begun to decline, decreasing between 1965 and 1978 from 55.4 to 33.1 births per thousand (Broudy and May 1983:3). During the 1970s increased access to birth control and abortion on the reservation probably contributed to this decline. Temkin-Greener et al. (1981:406) present evidence that fertility was declining for women over age thirty-five during the 1970s, but the proportion of deliveries among teenagers increased. While Navajo fertility remains high, especially relative to their Hopi neighbors and the U.S. as a whole, women are having fewer children over their life span. While their mothers may have raised five to ten children, women in their twenties and thirties are now having three to five children (McCloskey 1988). These changes in women's role as mother are in turn related to increased labor force participation and education, a reversal of the patterns Kunitz noted as supporting high fertility. In examining the community data below, I begin with studies of late 1930s populations in which pastoralism was still important in the growing context of male wage work and women combined their reproductive roles as mothers of large families with their productive roles in pastoral, agricultural, and craft activities.

RAMAH

In their general works of the mid-1940s, Clyde Kluckhohn and Dorothea Leighton show a tendency to mold Navajo reality to the Anglo model of gender roles, which in that period emphasized male authority and an allocation of men's household labor to "outside" work and women's to "inside" work. Although their comments are presumably about the Navajo as a whole, they are based on extensive fieldwork at Ramah during the late thirties and early forties. Their initial statement suggests a clear division of Navajo labor into female and male tasks:

The husband takes the primary responsibility for building dwellings, corals, and fences, although his wife and other women folk assist in plastering and chinking the hogan. The wife airs the bedding and keeps the

dwelling and cooking utensils clean and orderly. She cooks, butchers mutton, gathers those crops from the field which are to be used for immediate consumption, and looks after the children, although the man will assist in all these tasks if the woman is ill, or under other special circumstances. The man is expected to cut most of the firewood, unless there are boys old enough to do this. All assist in bringing wood to the fire, although this is a special chore for children. (Kluckhohn and Leighton 1946:50)

Outside, men also did most of the agriculture, looked after horses, wagons, saddles, and cattle, and hauled wood and water. The major exception to the divided nature of work, according to Kluckhohn and Leighton (1946:50), was in the care of the sheep herd, where "at times of heightened activity in the care of the sheep, as when the lambs are being born, every able-bodied family member assists. At other seasons responsibilities are distributed according to the availability of personnel and to arrangements within the extended family, but herding tends to be the duty of youngsters and of the old." In contrast to the gender and age integration of pastoral activities, crafts (whether practiced indoors or outdoors) were primarily assigned by gender. Women wove and made baskets or pots, while men made moccasins and were silversmiths, although women were beginning to participate in the latter craft (Kluckhohn and Leighton 1946:50).

In discussing authority patterns, Leighton and Kluckhohn clearly take the position that men dominate, though women have some decision-making ability, particularly in the household:

The man is unquestionably the official head of the family. In most families there are pretty well distinguished "spheres of influence." The husband's decisions are generally final in all matters pertaining to farming, horses, and cattle, and sometimes to sheep and goats. But often the wife or the group of women claim—and exercise—the right to use their own judgment as far as the sheep and goats are concerned. They are more likely to be influenced by the opinions of their brothers or uncles than by those of husbands or fathers. . . . Within the hogan and in the area immediately surrounding it, woman's authority is seldom challenged. (Leighton and Kluckhohn 1947:83)

To be fair, Kluckhohn and Leighton do note the flexibility of the Navajo division of labor, stating that many Navajo men can cook and often assume responsibility for child care. "Exactly who does what depends upon all sorts of accidents of the situation," they maintain (Kluckhohn and Leighton 1946:51). More concrete data from Ramah reinforce this pattern of flexibility. The Leightons' field notes and the life histories they collected in Ramah when they lived with Bill and Ellen and recorded Gregorio's life history (Leighton and Leighton 1949) indicate that men often did women's work and vice versa. They note, for example, that their interpreter's son ground some corn for a hogan blessing,

“laughing as if he shouldn’t be doing it” (Leighton field notes: Jan. 25, 1940); his sister then was called in to finish the job. Gregorio learned to cook during his youth while herding for a Mexican and then taught his first wife, who had apparently not learned how to make bread and cook meat. Dorothea’s interpreter, Evelyn, was learning to be a silversmith from her husband.²

John Roberts (1951) confirms this pattern of flexibility in his minute descriptions of daily activities in three Ramah households related to Mr. Moustache, one of Kluckhohn’s major informants and the community *naat’áani* (leader, or one who talks well). Two of the women (Mothers A and C) engaged in hunting, either trapping prairie dogs and rabbits or shooting birds with a rifle. Women and children did the cooking, but “men helped in a casual way” (Roberts 1951:38). For example, Mr. Moustache could cook when the occasion arose. Men ordinarily built fences, but one wife (Mother B) helped build a fence in the canyon while her husband cared for their baby. Men were supposed to haul wood, but Niece A was observed more than once bringing in a wagonload of wood (Roberts 1951:52).

The breadth of women’s roles was emphasized by one of the Leightons’ female informants:

The mother of the family don’t do one thing. In summer she has to help her [family] some, carry wool or spin it while herding. When they [the women] get that ready, then they put it up and weave a blanket. We help each other, some weaving, some herding, some spinning. When the weeds gets up we has to hoe. All hoe at one time, any one who is big enough to hoe. The littler girl stays home and does the cooking. (Leighton field notes: Jan. 20, 1940)

Though some aspects of the Navajo division of labor, including its flexibility, may have evolved in the much earlier transition of Navajo economy from a hunter-gatherer adaptation to a mixture of pastoralism and agriculture, external economic factors in the late 1930s certainly supported the maintenance of flexibility and women’s continued participation in both herding and agriculture, as well as in “inside” reproductive chores. In the early 1940s, 40 percent of Ramah’s community income derived from pastoralism, more than 14 percent from agriculture, and a substantial, but unestimated, amount from wage work (Landgraf 1954:62, 60, 70–71).³

Wage labor had begun to penetrate the Ramah community in important ways. Men, rather than women, were employed for wages as herders for local Hispanics and Mormons. Gregorio, the Hand-Trembler whose life history was extensively analyzed by the Leightons, had worked a great deal for a Hispanic living in the southern part of the Ramah area. His expenses for 1940–41 make it clear that his family could not have survived without wages (Leighton field notes). Roberts’s monograph (1951:51) indicates that the husbands in each of the three households and even Mr. Moustache himself had been engaged in wage labor. Wage labor often took men away from home for short periods of

time, and Roberts (1951:52) notes that "mothers were self-reliant and could manage very well when their husbands were absent working for white employers, attending ceremonies, visiting, or for other reasons." In Ramah, after stock reduction severely limited herds, male involvement in wage labor may have allowed the women in less affluent families, such as those studied by Roberts and the Leightons, to continue their dominant role in shepherding and the care of animals and their supplemental role in agriculture. As we shall see, male involvement in the cash economy in other communities at later times has had different consequences for women's roles.

Women's networks in Ramah were forged to facilitate exchanges that supported their herding activities and craft production. Cooperative labor with husbands in the same households, with women in an extended-family residence group, and with a wider network of kin was important. In the extended-family residence groups studied by Roberts and the Leightons, virilocal residence was common, and several women had married into the Ramah community. Thus networks were not forged out of ties with mothers and sisters and did not have a matrilineal composition. This may relate to the kinds of ecological and economic factors outlined by Levy, Henderson, and Andrews (this issue).

The three examples of kin networks that I have reconstructed using Dorothea Leighton's field notes, life histories collected by the Leightons, and published material on Ramah indicate this importance of husbands and in-laws rather than matrilineal kin. The first network, that of Gregorio's wife, Nazba, and her sister Ellen, is documented in the life histories collected by the Leightons (Leighton and Leighton 1949:171-77; Leighton field notes). The network was centered on these two sisters but included their husbands and in-laws since both women had a difficult relationship with their mother, exacerbated by her several marriages and "mean" character. Both sisters' life histories indicate that they were cared for by relatives when they were young, thus impairing lasting solidarity and resource exchange between the "old woman" and her daughters. The second network can be reconstructed from life histories collected from several residence groups near Gregorio and Nazba's residence group. The main participants were Carlos's wife, her sister, her clan brother Sam, and her half siblings Carmen and Juanito. Although three sisters were at the center of the network, the men were as important to it as the women. This network was also truncated by death and remarriage. The third case is that of Evelyn, who married into the Ramah community. She depended on her husband's relatives but, more important, rose to political eminence not on the basis of kin relationships but because of her skills, including the ability to speak English and her knowledge of the community, partly gained through her long association with anthropologists.

None of these women was part of a strong female-centered resource network (Conte 1982). Instead of networks of a mother and several sisters, these were smaller networks in which husbands and male siblings or half siblings played the most important roles vis à vis the women. Data from the Leightons' life histories and field notes suggest that in the period between 1900 and 1940, a

great deal of residential movement occurred among the Ramah Navajo, particularly among those families living in the southern part of the community, and virilocal affiliations were as important as uxorilocal ones.

NAVAJO MOUNTAIN

Malcolm Carr Collier's early study of Navajo Mountain (based on data collected between September and December 1938) dates from a period about a year before the Leightons' stay in Ramah and is contemporaneous with some of Kluckhohn's early Ramah work. On Rainbow Plateau in the Navajo Mountain area, Collier found nine camps or residence groups with a total population of 135.⁴ All nine camps were composed primarily of women and men descended from Whiteman Killer (also known as Chách'osh), his wife, their three daughters, and his sister's daughter.

Data on the sexual division of labor is sparse, but Collier's descriptions allow us to make some comparisons to the Ramah material. Collier says that cooking was done by the women. "Beyond this, the heavier tasks of hauling wood and water, lassoing a grazing horse, cutting wood, etc. are usually done by the men, although the women all can and often do perform these tasks" (Collier 1966:27). Children of both sexes seem to have done most of the sheep herding, and grandchildren often herded the sheep belonging to a grandparent in another household in the camp. (Three of the camps had two herds; one had three herds.)

Camps cultivated fields, most camps having a larger field in Paiute Canyon and smaller fields (often cultivated by separate households within a camp) on the plateau. Collier says that use-rights to fields were transmitted from mothers to daughters, though sometimes sons inherited them.

At planting time all the men living at Navajo Mountain work together, moving from field to field. The fields on the plateau are planted individually. . . . In general, both the men and women do the planting, whether on the plateau or in the canyon. Weeding, especially in the canyon, is done mostly by the men. The women sometimes help work in the smaller plateau fields. Harvesting is done by both men and women. (Collier 1966:29-30)

She also says that a man "usually helps his neighbors" and that brothers and brothers-in-law cooperated even though their fields were not adjacent (Collier 1966:31). These remarks suggest that agricultural work was primarily done by men, though the earlier comments suggest a more even division of labor. During ceremonies, older boys or younger men hauled wood and water, and food preparation was done by women.

Data on networks are even more difficult to obtain from the Collier monograph. However, some information can be gleaned from an analysis of camp composition. Of the nine camps at Navajo Mountain, six were extended-family

camps. Among them were seven cases of matrilineal postmarital residence and six cases of patrilineal residence.⁵ Camps 2 and 6 contained a matrilineal core comprised of a mother and daughters or granddaughters; Camps 1, 3, and 4 included a mother, married son, and one or more married daughters; Camp 9 was based on a brother-sister tie; and Camps 7 and 8 were connected by a mother-daughter tie. These data suggest that the majority of adult women lived in camps with their mothers and sisters, though some were related as daughters-in-law or sisters-in-law to other women in the camp. Given these camp compositions and the close kin connections among all camps, we can project that many women could have used their ties with other women both within and outside their camps as important sources of goods and services, though a woman's ties with her brothers and sons might also have loomed large, as would have her tie with her husband.

Collier's comments suggest that women's networks were important in the organization of the larger ceremonies. Food donated from outside the camp came from sisters of the woman at whose place the ceremonial was being held and was cooked by her sisters, daughters, and mother. Other help was directed towards a variety of relatives (both male and female), but Collier does not specify the sex of the donor: "Out of twelve people who helped outside their camps, four helped their brothers-in-law, three helped their sisters, and one each helped a brother, mother's sister, father's sister, sister's son and sister's daughter" (Collier 1966:33). She also notes that there was a great deal of mutual aid between camps for farming, though not for herding. Those who helped were given a "token payment" of corn.

In sum, the Navajo Mountain data, sparse as they are on the sexual division of labor and resource networks, support an argument for considerable intra-community diversity. Exceptions to the general Navajo division of labor outlined by Kluckhohn and Leighton were found at both Ramah and Navajo Mountain: women sometimes did men's jobs and men sometimes did women's jobs. More important, many activities which were part of the care of the sheep herd and the agricultural cycle were done by both men and women, though at Navajo Mountain, as in Ramah, it seems possible that women did more to care for the sheep and males were more involved in farming. Compared to the cases I selected from Ramah, women's networks at Navajo Mountain may have been more focused on female kin since so many women there were relatives and were genealogical descendants of Whiteman Killer's daughters and sister's daughter. Nevertheless, given the high proportion of virilocality at the residence-group level, women may have leaned on husbands, brothers, and sons for help with farming, ceremonies, and transportation. Navajo Mountain, like Ramah, was not an area of Navajo settlement which was conducive to the growth of predominantly matrilineal and matrilineal local organization (see Levy, Henderson, and Andrews, this issue).

Collier does not mention wage labor, and it is possible that it had not penetrated the Navajo Mountain community as extensively as it had the Ramah population. In 1937, 34 percent of the total Navajo Mountain income came

from livestock and 20 percent from farming; Collier does not state whence the other 46 percent derived (Collier 1966:85).⁶ Figures for traditional economic activities were higher for Navajo Mountain at this time than for other parts of the reservation.

FRUITLAND

By the 1950s, the increasing wage and welfare dependency of the reservation economy began to have an important impact on women's roles. The best ethnographic material on Navajo women of the 1950s comes from Laila Shukry Hamamsy's study of Fruitland (Shukry 1954; Hamamsy 1957). Fruitland was an unusual community because it was established on a government-administered irrigation project where ten-acre plots were allotted to male heads of households. Two types of families received allotments: those who migrated to the project from other parts of the reservation and those who had long resided in the area.⁷ Since the ten-acre allotments were not large enough to support a nuclear family solely by farming, many husbands and even wives had wage jobs in Farmington, Shiprock, or more distant communities. The extent of wage work in Fruitland was impressive: virtually all the males in the thirty-six families that Shukry interviewed had had wage experience, while eleven of the forty-three able-bodied women had worked for wages.

In Fruitland the major factors that undermined women's traditional position of economic influence were the allotment of land to males as heads of households, the prevalence of patrilocal or independent nuclear-family residence, which separated women from their kin, and the heavy involvement of men in wage jobs. The combination of all three of these factors was very unusual for the period. In other parts of the reservation, wage labor (especially on the railroad or in seasonal agricultural work) drew males away from the community, thereby leaving women with their kin and supporting uxorial, rather than virilocal, residence choices. Even in Ramah and Shonto (Adams and Ruffing 1977), where virilocal residence was prevalent, women were still heavily involved in pastoral and agricultural activities, as well as in rug weaving. These activities provided economic resources which women could control through sale, procurement of credit, or use for subsistence. The assignment of farm plots to husbands placed women at a particular disadvantage in Fruitland, a disadvantage not experienced elsewhere on the reservation, where fields were cultivated on the basis of use-rights.

As the "ideal" Fruitland division of labor, Shukry reiterated the Kluckhohn and Leighton formula: Women take care of all the work inside and right around the hogan; outside the hogan they herd the sheep and help with shearing and dipping. In agriculture, they perform the less arduous tasks of hoeing, shucking the corn, and gathering the crops, while men perform all the heavier activities. But she also emphasized the flexibility of the Fruitland division of labor, citing, for example, cases of women herding at distant sheep camps (though few

women still had sheep herds) or men caring for children while a wife worked for wages or was in the hospital having a baby.

The creation of the irrigation project and the increased availability of wage work in the area between Shiprock and Farmington also meant that the "reality" of the Fruitland division of labor as expressed in Shukry's and Sasaki's field notes exhibited a more complex kind of flexibility than that associated with the Ramah or Navajo Mountain data. The significant changes in the division of labor had two contradictory sides: the overburdening and "underburdening" of women. On the one hand, male wage work meant that many women were taking over the "heavy" farm work that might normally have been done by husbands, older sons, or brothers-in-law:

She (Mrs. Diswood) mentioned she had a lot of work to do. She takes care of everything around the farm, since her husband works with the agency (government). She even uses the tractor to do some of the farm work. The one thing that annoys her most is to have to chase the horses out of her field. (Shukry field notes: Oct. 24, 1951; quoted in Shukry 1954:129)

Other women relied on their husbands' weekend help or hired male labor to fill in for an absent male:

Elsie has a farm from her husband who died a year ago. (Who works it for her?) She does. She's a real hard worker. She works a lot. She got six children. (Does she hire people to help her?) Sometimes when the work is hard, to help her cut the alfalfa. (Shukry field notes: Jan. 5, 1952; quoted in Shukry 1954:134)

Finally, some older widows found it difficult to take care of their farms without a man's help and consequently gave up their land assignments. As one consultant described the situation of a widow, "After her husband's death, she found that she could not take care of the farm, so she gave it to her son and moved next to her daughter" (Shukry field notes: Oct. 25, 1951; quoted in Shukry 1954:134).

On the other hand, Shukry describes those women who had less to do in the home as restless and bored. Some of these women visited her, spent their time looking at magazines, and wanted to go to town to movies. She implies that without sheep to care for and with increasing dependence on a husband's wages, they were bored with their fewer household tasks yet were burdened with children that needed a mother at home. These may have been younger women, such as Elizabeth, who had already had some experience in wage jobs and were living in nuclear families: "Before getting married, Elizabeth worked in a cafe in town. She had stopped 'to have a rest.' She is bored with home, however, and would like to go back to work again, 'I hate to stay at home. There isn't much to do'" (Shukry field notes: Oct. 1, 1951; quoted in Shukry

1954:141). Women may also have complained about boredom because they were responding to new ideas that child care and housework were not really "work."

Along with isolation and boredom, Shukry emphasizes women's new financial dependence on males. Some husbands turned much of their pay over to their wives; but others spent paychecks themselves, and their wives had little access to their husbands' money (Shukry 1954:161-70). As one woman said, "You know, when we had lots of sheep, we don't care when the husband go away and don't send no money. We butcher sheep and sell lamb. We make rugs and have money that way. We don't have no sheeps now" (Shukry field notes: Dec. 12, 1951). Shukry describes four cases of women who had applied for welfare aid after their attempts to support themselves and their kin had failed. In contrast to these cases, Shukry (1954:151-54) also gives examples of women who maintained some independence in financial decisions through wage work or a sheep herd. Some women had considerable personal influence over decisions within the family and particularly over a husband's behavior; for example, educated women dominated less-educated husbands. In reexamining Shukry's notes and dissertation, I feel she only emphasizes one side of her research, the creation of isolation and dependence, while her data also suggest that some women were able to retain a measure of independence through traditional activities or to gain some leverage in households through their own wage labor. However, the overall picture demonstrates the ways in which the larger political economy, the incorporation of Navajos into wage work, and the government policy to encourage male-dominated agriculture shaped the gender division of labor to the disadvantage of Fruitland women.

Data on resource networks are scanty in Shukry's dissertation. Some women evidently had important ties with their mothers and sisters, though the dominant pattern was for women to be in close proximity to their husbands and husbands' relatives. Shukry stresses that women's isolation from matrilineal kin was caused by patrilocality and neolocality. Of the thirty-six households she studied, she argues that only six couples, all original residents of the area, were in an uxorilocal situation or near supportive female kin (Shukry 1954:122). Shukry also notes that the daughter-in-law/mother-in-law relationship in extended-family camps was often filled with tension and conflict. She describes the case of Alice Curly, who married a man from Fruitland but lived matrilocally at Sheep Springs until her mother died. She then went to live with her in-laws in Fruitland. Alice was isolated from her own kin except during the years when her sister was married to one of Alice's husband's brothers and joined the residence group in Fruitland. Alice resented doing farm work for her mother-in-law, and after her sister died, she felt she should have inherited some of her sister's belongings (e.g., a sewing machine) and more of her sheep herd (Shukry 1954:242).

There is some evidence that virilocality produced female-centered networks based on relations between sisters-in-law. In one of the few additional cases she cites in detail, Shukry describes a female work group shelling corn while

all the men were away at work. The group appeared to be made up of two sisters, two sisters-in-law, and the mother of one of the sisters-in-law (Shukry 1954:130).⁸ In general, then, the Fruitland situation mitigated against women using ties with mothers and sisters for either productive exchanges (labor) or consumption exchanges (goods and services).

COPPER CANYON

By the mid-1960s the traditional livestock and agricultural economy had declined across the reservation as the wage and welfare economy grew. Furthermore, with the BIA's program of relocation, many males and families had moved to larger urban areas like Los Angeles, Phoenix, Dallas, and Denver. Almost all school-age Navajo children were attending school, and most had to attend boarding schools for some of junior high and all of high school. Railroad work and agricultural labor had declined, but not entirely disappeared, while federal and tribal programs were beginning to provide some local jobs to both men and women. All of these trends can be seen in the situation I observed in "Copper Canyon" (a pseudonym) in 1965-66.

The Copper Canyon population of 1,000 included 750 residents and 250 nonresidents who had relocated in distant cities and border-town communities (Lamphere 1977:75).⁹ In contrast to Ramah and Navajo Mountain in the late 1930s and early 1940s, Copper Canyon was a community dependent on wages and welfare, not on the traditional sources of Navajo livelihood. Pastoral activities and weaving accounted for only 14.2 percent of the community income, for stock reduction had reduced the number of sheep from 3,972 in 1938 to 2,228 in 1966. In contrast, 61.6 percent of community income came from wages and 24.2 percent from welfare, social security, and other government payments (Lamphere 1977:24). Railroad work was still important and accounted for 19 percent of community income, or almost one-third of wage income.

Yet wage work had a different impact on Navajo women in Copper Canyon than it did in Fruitland. Railroad work was pulling men away from their nuclear families, but women were not left to tend ten-acre farms. Seasonal agricultural labor was important, but nuclear families or sections of a camp migrated together. The 25 percent of the population that had moved to urban areas moved as nuclear families, either on their own or through the Relocation Program. All of these forces took wage earners out of the community, but not in a context where the remaining women were overburdened, for sheep herds and agricultural fields were small and older members of residence groups, often women, could substantially handle herding and agricultural activities, thus releasing some married children and their spouses for wage labor in urban centers. However, in the 1960s more wage work was becoming available within the community. War-on-Poverty programs provided for a community development worker and aides at the new Headstart Program. The Tribal Works Project funded ten-day work projects which hired local chapter members (both men and women) to weave rugs, build houses, and haul wood, thereby accounting

for 18 percent of the wage income. Although men may have derived more income from wages, women were not entirely shut out of wage work, since they were hired on tribal work projects and as Headstart aides. Finally, older women received social security, and younger women received AFDC payments that gave them a certain amount of financial independence.

My 1966 data show more overlap in the gender division of labor within the household than did Kluckhohn and Leighton's in the 1940s. Although I acknowledged that women performed the cooking, housecleaning, weaving, washing and ironing, and primary care of children and that men usually carried out the heavier tasks, such as water hauling and wood chopping, I also emphasized flexibility. Many household tasks were shared, and on numerous occasions, especially if the spouse were absent, one partner took over a task usually delegated to the opposite sex. Almost every man knew how to cook, and some women drove pickup trucks, hauled water, and chopped wood (Lamphere 1977:83).

Pastoral activities at Copper Canyon also illustrate the overlap in the sexual division of labor. In contrast to the Ramah and Navajo Mountain sheep herds in 1940, Copper Canyon herds were small enough to be handled by two to four adults (Lamphere 1977:115). Since virtually all children (previously used as herders) were in school, older men and women (of the grandparental and parental generations) managed the sheep. Men seemed as involved as women, in contrast to earlier accounts in Ramah and Navajo Mountain where almost solely women were associated with the family's herd. For example, in one nuclear-family camp, the husband, Thomas, owned most of the sheep, but both he and his wife, Stella, shared the herding. In another case, Nancy, an older woman who lived in an extended-family camp with two married sons and one married daughter, managed the herding, but she requested help from her daughter and son-in-law as well as from her young husband and some of her grandchildren. Her two sons and their wives were not involved in herding (Lamphere 1977:113-14). Shearing was also a mixed-sex activity, and the women who helped were typically cross-cousins and clan relatives, not siblings, of herd owners. During the community sheep dipping, the one example where two herds were combined involved communication between female kin and the use of women as herders during the dip (Lamphere 1977:117-20).

Women were also involved in agricultural work, though men took the lead, especially in clearing fields, irrigating, and plowing. Fields were plowed by men who owned tractors and were hired by members of residence groups. If a couple in a nuclear-family camp cultivated a field, the woman helped her husband in planting, weeding, and harvesting. In a multihousehold residence group, one couple (usually of the grandparental generation) handled these activities (Lamphere 1977:123).

It is difficult to say whether the greater participation of men in livestock activities and of women in farming is an old Copper Canyon pattern that differs from the Ramah and Navajo Mountain cases or if gender integration is a result of recent change. Gender integration of tasks is congruent, however, with a

situation where traditional resources are dwindling and wage work is increasing, especially for younger people.

In this context of economic change, women's networks showed a great deal of variability in Copper Canyon, as three examples illustrate. The networks of Edna, Stella, and Lucy show the importance of residence and of the gender composition of a sibling set in shaping networks. Edna lived uxorilocally in a camp with her mother and divorced brother, who lived in separate one-room cabins; she had only one sister and a sister-in-law, who lived in residence groups across the road. Stella resided in an independent nuclear-family camp but had a few, distant maternal relatives nearby; her sister lived several miles away. Lucy was living in an independent camp, yet she was not far from her mother's residence group and her siblings, including one sister.

Edna was very close to her mother, but she was estranged from her divorced brother, a chronic drinker who was rarely allowed in Edna's house. Edna cared for an old lady who was a member of her father's clan, as well as for her husband, Mike, and five children. Edna's kin network was centered on women—not all matrilineal relatives, but predominantly so. The important individuals were her mother, her teenage daughter Susie, her sister across the road, and her sister-in-law, who lived in a separate residence group next to the sister. Edna's divorced brother and two male clan relatives who live in Navajo, Arizona, were important males. Other important women in the network were her clan sister Ruby, two other women in her clan, and her neighbor Lucy (the same clan as Mike). Mike was an important network participant in 1965–66, often providing rides for network members (Lamphere 1977:133–36). However, Edna and Mike were separated a year or two later, and the network assumed an even more female character. The importance of Edna's ties with her sister and sister-in-law was demonstrated by the central role that they played in helping her with the cooking and support work for ceremonies (including a Peyote meeting and Enemyway) (Lamphere 1977:156, 121). Edna's network in 1989 remains dominantly female; at its core are her daughter Susie and Susie's children, who can be relied on for everyday household chores and transportation. (Edna's mother died in 1986.) Her sister, sister-in-law, and a married daughter of the sister-in-law assist occasionally, especially for an important occasion like a granddaughter's *kimaaldá* (girl's puberty ceremony). Edna's married sons have replaced her husband and brother as significant males. However, the sons cannot be relied on for consistent help since they do not always live at Edna's residence. They do fix cars, participate in agriculture, take care of the small goat herd when Edna is absent, assist in building ceremonial hogans, and attend ceremonies and Peyote meetings.

Stella, in contrast to Edna, had a relatively impoverished network since her parents were both deceased, her sister lived virilocally in another part of the community, and her only brother lived over fifty miles away. Stella's mother's sister and grandmother were the closest matrilineal relatives who lived in a nearby camp. Thomas, her husband, had a small kin network as well. Stella and Thomas handled herding, dipping, and shearing by themselves but helped

cross-cousins in shearing and gave rides to Stella's mother's brother and wife (Lamphere 1977:113, 133–34). Since Stella was a Pentacostal, she did not participate in traditional Navajo ceremonies; so fewer occasions in her life required kin connections for the exchange of goods and services.

Lucy, who also lived in an independent camp, nevertheless had close relations with her mother, sister, and brothers, all of whom resided in a residence group two miles away. Like Stella, she had a close working relationship with her husband, Kevin, in 1965–66. (They separated two years later.) Kevin and Lucy had no sheep but cultivated their field jointly. Kevin also plowed the fields of several nearby camps (Lamphere 1977:123). Both provided transportation for a wide range of Navajos (Lamphere 1977:131), although Lucy was often heavily involved in helping her mother and siblings. Lucy belonged to a large clan in Copper Canyon, but she cooperated with other clan relatives only rarely. Less truncated than Stella's but not as extensive as Edna's, Lucy's network centered on her mother and sister, with her husband and three brothers as important participants.

In each of these networks, the woman's closest associations were with her husband¹⁰ and female relatives, primarily her mother, sister, or mother's sister if they lived nearby. Residence and the gender composition of the sibling set were important factors in shaping the structure of these networks. Their structure complements the picture developed for Ramah and Fruitland, where virilocal residence and a small number of sisters meant that women focused their networks on husbands and in-laws, including women. In contrast, the examples I chose from Copper Canyon were ones where uxorilocal or independent residence, even with a small sibling set, meant that women who did not leave the area for wage work could forge networks with their own mothers and sisters. These networks cooperated in both traditional activities (like sheep shearing and ceremonies) and contemporary tasks (such as getting rides to the hospital, providing transportation to boarding school for their children, or enlisting help for a Peyote meeting). Yet none of the Copper Canyon women had more than one sister, so they were unable to form the kinds of large, sister-based resource networks that Christine Conte has described at Kitsili (see below).

KITSILI

Christine Conte's fieldwork on women's resource networks in Kitsili and Flagstaff gives us the most recent material on rural and urban Navajo women in the 1980s. In Kitsili, a community of 350 residents in thirty-nine households on Black Mesa, 51.2 percent of total income came from wages, 33.8 percent from welfare and other redistributive income, 6.5 percent from crafts, and 8.5 percent from livestock (Conte 1984:89).¹¹ Between 1970 and 1981, migrant railroad and agricultural employment was replaced by jobs in Kitsili and other parts of the reservation (Adams and Ruffing 1977:76). Kitsili women were

increasingly engaged in wage labor over this period, working at female-dominated service occupations such as kitchen helpers, teachers or teachers' aides, and secretaries (Conte 1984:101). Women's jobs tended to be more stable and localized than those of men, but they paid much lower wages. Men earned an average of \$5,594 and women \$2,974 during 1981 (Conte 1984:81, 91, 99). But jobs remained scarce in Kitsili, and only a small elite minority received the majority of the community's annual wage-labor earnings (Conte 1984:104). A substantial number of young adults, including daughters, had migrated in search of employment.

Women dominated the livestock and crafts sectors of the economy. Among twenty-nine couples, 86.5 percent of the sheep and goats and 70.4 percent of the cattle were owned by women. Since men have often been associated with cattle and horses in accounts of Navajo animal husbandry, it is interesting that women in this community inherited and purchased cattle so extensively. All but four of the thirty-nine households owned some sheep and goats; but herds were small, and only four households brought in 63 percent of the total cash income from livestock. Ten women made income from weaving and one from making cradleboards.

Conte's description of the division of labor echoes those from other communities. In general, child care, house care, and food preparation were carried out by women, while men often hauled wood and water and chopped wood. "Men may occasionally babysit, feed, diaper, or otherwise tend to the needs of their own children or those of close kin (usually older sisters), but this normally occurs only when there is no kinswoman available" (Conte 1984:179).

Among twenty-five married couples, two different patterns of handling income were evident. In the first and most prevalent pattern, each adult handled his or her cash separately, and there was no central fund or individual responsible for the consumption of cash resources for the entire household. In the second and minority case, households derived most of their income from male wages. Where husbands handed over their pay to wives, women controlled expenditures; but women whose husbands failed to remit a paycheck voluntarily were forced to use more devious means of extracting cash from their spouses (Conte 1984:174-75). This second pattern is reminiscent of the female dependence emphasized by Shukry in the 1950s in Fruitland.

Conte's material on female networks emphasizes the role of women in the livestock economy and the variability in women's opportunities to build networks of female kin depending on their residential situations. Of twenty-three married couples in Kitsili, thirteen were living uxorilocally, nine were in independent camps, and only one was living virilocally. The low rate of virilocality suggests that women in Kitsili were in closer proximity to their maternal kin than were women in Copper Canyon and Fruitland. Conte contrasts the strong female-based uxorilocal network of Grace Begay and her two sisters with those of Ruby James, who lived virilocally, and Baah Yazzie, who moved to Kitsili after marriage.

Grace (an older married woman with ten children), her divorced sister Betty, and her married sister Jane lived in three separate residence groups. Each sister owned most of the livestock in her herd and had purchased cattle as well, and each received only minimal help with the livestock from her husband and sons. Grace and Betty took turns herding their joint flock, while Jane herded separately with infrequent help from her children. Every spring the three sisters cooperated to shear the sheep and goats; they also recruited their daughters, some of whom were called home from town to help.

All three women had gardens of corn, squash, and potatoes. Grace, who had the largest garden, received help from her husband, her resident sons and daughters, a son-in-law, grandchildren, and, occasionally, her mother's sister's son. Several of Grace's grown children were called back for the potato harvest, and more distant maternal and paternal kin also came to help (Conte 1984:164). Betty's three daughters bought seeds and fertilizer and paid for a local male to plow Betty's field. A daughter and son-in-law did most of the planting, and Betty did all the weeding herself. Jane had a less productive garden, which she tended herself with little help from her nonresident children. In farming, Conte maintains there was no gender-based division of labor, in contrast to the situation in Ramah in 1947 (Roberts 1951).

Grace Begay's female resource network included her two sisters, five daughters, Betty's two daughters, one mother's sister, and one maternal clan relative. Conte's description of actual activities indicates that the roles of husbands and sons were also important. In 1981, Grace's two married sons planned to return to Kitsili with their wives, fence their end of the valley, and develop a "ranch." Her younger brother played an important role in establishing legal claims to the land. With the increased participation of resident sons, rather than daughters, the female-centered character of this network could shift as Grace, Betty, and Jane get older (Conte 1984:151-55, 159-68, 183-87).

Ruby James resided virilocally in the next clan cluster down the valley from Grace Begay. Although she lived near her husband's kin, she was not far from her own maternal relatives. Her husband and four oldest sons had been employed in wage jobs and had invested capital in livestock. With increasing wealth, tensions were created with her affines, especially her mother-in-law and husband's sister, which caused Ruby and her family to found a new camp, apart from her husband's family. Ruby planned to relocate to her own family's use-area (thus residing uxorilocally), but since this land was in the former Joint Use Area, she was unable to build a house there. Conte suggests that Ruby has had to depend mainly on her husband and adult sons, though detailed descriptions of herding, farming, and piñon-picking activities are lacking, as is mention of any cooperative relationship Ruby may have had with her mother and sisters (Conte 1984:155-58). In sum, this was a smaller, more male-oriented network, where tensions with in-laws meant that cooperation was focused on members of the household rather than on the extended family.

Baah Yazzie was even more isolated. She married into Kitsili and in 1976

lived with her husband, their children, and, in a separate dwelling, her unmarried brother-in-law. Baah relied only on her husband and children for their livestock and garden activities and was never included in the piñon-gathering expeditions of other women. She was rumored to have engaged in bootlegging and prostitution and in 1980 was accused of the murder (involving witchcraft) of her husband; neighbors attempted to drive her off her land. Shortly afterward, Baah remarried and brought her new husband to live with her. Her former brother-in-law left because of the harassment, but Baah remained, a community pariah and outsider (Conte 1984:169).

Grace Begay and Baah Yazzie are probably at two extremes of a continuum, Grace having a "vital" network centered around women and Baah having a very small network focused on her husband and children. The networks I described for Copper Canyon were between these extremes and show a balance between the importance of female kin and cooperation with a husband, though Lucy and Edna came to depend more on their own kin after separating from their husbands. Both the Kitsili and Copper Canyon analyses show how the number of female siblings, the continued longevity of a mother, and postmarital residence choices all shape the kinds of networks women forge.

FLAGSTAFF

While Kitsili networks were still embedded in a productive livestock economy, the gender division of labor and resource networks of Flagstaff women are congruent with an almost complete dependence on wages. Among the forty-six couples Conte interviewed in 1981, wages accounted for 81.2 percent of family income, welfare for 10.2 percent, crafts for 6.5 percent, and livestock for 2.1 percent (Conte 1984:89). One-third of Conte's sample were professional women—teachers, administrators, or social workers in government-funded programs. Others worked in the service sector as motel maids, kitchen helpers, and beauticians. About 22 percent of the women also received income from craft production (including beadwork, jewelry, and weaving). Others were homemakers. Some women and/or their husbands still participated in the livestock economy of their parental community on the reservation. They owned livestock, often selling sheep and reinvesting revenues in cattle on the land-use area of their kin (Conte 1984:130–32). In Conte's sample, men on the whole contributed more wages to household income than women did.

The female labor market was polarized between professional women earning relatively high wages and service sector and craft-producing women with low cash incomes.¹² This diversity of women's incomes created a wide variety of wage control patterns. In some households, husband and wife pooled their incomes into one checking account; in others, individualized decision making was the norm. In five households, the senior male held "unequivocal authority" over the spending of cash. In another five, "male authority appears to dominate, but is less absolute" (Conte 1984:201).

Most women in the Flagstaff sample (thirty-three, or 71.7 percent) were living in nuclear families. Three (6.5 percent) were in matrifocal, or "remnant," households, and ten (21.7 percent) were in multiple households (seven in joint households with siblings or cousins and three in extended households with a parental couple and one married offspring). Sisters, cousins, or collateral affines were often recruited from the reservation to help with child care and house-keeping in exchange for room and board, a little spending money, and an opportunity to experience town life (Conte 1984:215-17).

Male wage earning had a negative impact on the gender division of labor. Women in nuclear families were far from female kin who could help with child care or cooking, and some were in situations where it was difficult to persuade men to take on more tasks:

Whether they worked outside of the home or not, most Navajo women in Flagstaff, like their Reservation counterparts, retain primary responsibility for childcare and housework. Very few received any substantial assistance from their husbands or other male household members with these duties. The double day for women is prescribed not only by gender role stereotypes, but by the frequent, and sometimes prolonged absences of male household members who work on construction or highway maintenance crews throughout the state. (Conte 1985:4)

Kin-based networks were important for Flagstaff women, though they centered on consumption and redistribution and had little to do with the production so significant in Kitsili. Women were important members of these networks, but they also included close paternal relatives, affines, and non-kin, as well as matrilineal relatives. "Non-kin, who play a minor role in Kit Silee [Kitsili] women's cooperative networks, represent the second largest group of aid givers after female kin, surpassing affines and close paternal consanguines" (Conte 1984:195). Conte gives three examples of female exchange networks in Flagstaff: the "vital resource network" of Margaret Tsosie, a professional; the network of Sally Nez, a self-employed beadworker and seamstress who worked at home; and the relatively isolated situation of Doris Littlesinger, a divorced single mother.

Margaret Tsosie was the director of a Navajo-staffed social service program in Flagstaff. She had a large network of work friends as well as strong ties with her parents, who had moved back to her mother's land-use area on the reservation. Margaret and her younger siblings were part of a "corporation" established with their parents to provide cash resources for the family livestock operation. The extent of her network is indicated by the pattern of loans and exchanges Margaret engaged in. She loaned cash to and exchanged transportation with a maternal aunt and several cousins in Flagstaff. In addition, she made small cash loans to coworkers and other Navajo friends. In sum, from among coworkers and kin, Margaret created a large female-based network that bridged her urban and rural connections.

In contrast, Sally Nez, beginning with her ties to a clan relative from her home community who worked at the Flagstaff "Indian Center," developed a network through customers of her craft business. Sally's husband was an important participant since he provided domestic labor while he was laid off and thus allowed her time to work at home making her wares for the Christmas and tourist seasons. The two eldest children also provided some child care for younger siblings. As an example of the way her craft business intersected with the creation of ties to other Navajo women, Conte mentions that Sally provided a ride from Flagstaff to Tuba City for a non-kin Navajo neighbor partly to take advantage of a chance to market her wares. Sally's network was as wide ranging as Margaret's but was forged less from kin links and more out of her nuclear family and relations with customers and friends.

Doris Littlesinger, a single mother of four teenagers, lived in a mobile home and worked as a teacher's aide at a Catholic school. Unlike Margaret, Doris was the only Navajo at her place of employment; hence her workplace did not provide a "springboard" for constructing a network of work-based friends. Since her divorce, she cut off cash remittances to her sisters, who in turn appropriated her small herd of sheep for their own use. Doris's social network was limited to an Anglo woman from her church and a Navajo instructor at the Indian Center's continuing education program. These women sometimes provided her with transportation, small cash loans, and emotional support (Conte 1984:232).

In Flagstaff, we see that a woman's place in the political economy based on wage income has a dramatic impact on the division of labor, control over economic resources, and the creation of resource networks. Highly paid professionals can use their workplace relationships to build a network of friends and coworkers and can use cash resources to solidify relations with parents and siblings on the reservation (where contributing to the pastoral economy is still important). In contrast, women in craft and service occupations are less able to build strong female networks from customer or coworker relationships. These women have less income to invest in reservation enterprises or in the maintenance of good relations with parents and siblings. Finally, some women are in dependent circumstances where males are the major breadwinners and they are primarily homemakers with little access to independent sources of income.

CONCLUSIONS

As Navajo families have been incorporated into a capitalist wage economy over the last fifty years, enormous changes have occurred in women's position in Navajo society. The unevenness of this incorporation at different times and places has caused varying developments in the domestic division of labor, the composition of women's resource networks, and the importance of male versus female wage labor. Some of the evident intercommunity variability in the gender division of labor may be related to patterns of wage labor already prevalent in the late 1930s. The composition of women's resource networks has been

determined, in part, by postmarital residence choices (which, in turn, may be attuned to the sorts of microenvironmental factors outlined by Levy, Henderson, and Andrews) and by the number of females or males in one's sibling set. Certainly, not all women were in situations where they could forge strong female-centered networks from among sisters, mothers, and female children.

We already see some slight differences between Ramah and Navajo Mountain in 1938, when both communities were still dependent on agricultural and pastoral resources but when sporadic, seasonal male wage labor was increasing. In Ramah, women did more of the sheepherding and men more of the agricultural labor, while in Navajo Mountain both sexes participated more equally in these activities, though men dominated the heavier agricultural tasks. Some Ramah women's networks were small, based on ties with husbands and affines and not dominated by strong relations with female kin. In contrast, at Navajo Mountain, residence groups were connected by many matrilineal ties, and the potential for forging networks among female kin was greater.

Fruitland in the 1950s represents a unique conjunction of factors which combined to create female economic dependence and both an overburdening and underburdening of women in terms of productive and reproductive labor. Allotments to male heads of households and extensive male labor away from home made some women dependent on male wages and isolated in nuclear families. But many women replaced their husbands' labor with their own on farms, while others worked for wages. The high incidence of virilocality and neolocality, particularly among women who had immigrated to the Fruitland area, meant that many networks were small and made up of affines rather than sisters and mothers.

By the 1960s communities throughout the reservation were dependent on wages and welfare rather than pastoral and agricultural resources. In Copper Canyon and Kitsili, the older generation of women was committed to preserving the pastoral economy, while younger women were incorporated into wage work or received some form of government support. In the 1960s young couples migrated from Copper Canyon to distant cities; but by the 1980s some local female jobs were available in Kitsili, even though other daughters still moved to border towns or larger cities in Arizona for wage jobs. These circumstances supported increased flexibility in the division of labor for those who remained in rural areas. Herding and agricultural activities seem more equally divided between men and women in Copper Canyon than in Ramah in the 1940s, while at Kitsili, Grace Begay and her sisters dominated the livestock economy and shared gardening with a variety of male and female kin. We see some polarization in women's resource networks here, depending on residence choices and the size of women's female sibling sets. Networks were based on productive activities and ranged from strong female-dominated networks like Grace Begay's to isolated ones like the pariah Baah Yazzie's.

Data from Flagstaff afford us a glimpse of the division of labor and female networks in an area where wage labor predominates. Here it is important to emphasize that male wage labor is still dominant and that men, on the whole,

earn more than women. However, well-educated Navajo women are able to obtain professional jobs (a consequence of our society's occupational segregation system that classifies relatively high-paying jobs such as teaching and social work as female). Other women are relegated to low-paying female service work or are forging an income for themselves through craft production. This bifurcation of women's employment situations, in combination with extensive male wage work, has created a wide range of patterns in women's domestic labor, control over cash income, and the ability to build a resource network for exchanges of goods and services. Some women have large networks, substantial ties with the reservation, and access to good incomes. Others are more dependent on husbands, isolated from kin, or supporting children as single parents.

Shepardson's overview provided an initial statement that Navajo women's "status" traditionally was relatively high, had declined with stock reduction and male migrant wage labor, but has again risen as women have gained access to wage jobs and, through education, to relatively high-paying professional jobs. However, this examination of the incorporation of Navajo families into a capitalist wage economy over the past fifty years indicates that the situation is more complex. The impact of wage work has not been the same across time, between communities, or even within communities. The overall outcome of incorporation has been the creation of more diversity in women's situation and even a tendency towards polarization along class lines. Women have responded by using a variety of tactics and practices to gain cash income, to ally themselves with other women in resource networks, and to cope with husbands or sons on whom they may have to depend for cash or productive help. The experience of Navajo women in the past and in the contemporary period is certainly not "one thing." Further attention to the determinants of variability, both on the reservation and in border communities, is important if we are to isolate those factors that have shaped Navajo women's lives.

NOTES

1. These data are perhaps skewed towards communities on the peripheries of the Navajo Reservation (e.g., Ramah, Fruitland, and Navajo Mountain), but data on women's roles are less available from some of the communities at the center of the reservation. My choice was primarily determined by the richness of the material from these five communities, which in turn reflects anthropologists' decisions concerning where to conduct research in the 1940s and 1950s.

2. Where possible, I have used the pseudonyms used by Roberts, the Leightons, and Kluckhohn.

3. Kluckhohn (1966:347-49) estimated that in 1951 the community income in Ramah was derived from the following sources: 51 percent pastoral activities, 3.6 percent agriculture, 25.4 percent wage work, 16.7 percent welfare and government benefits, 1.1 percent handicrafts, and 3.6 percent miscellaneous sources.

4. In 1962 Mary Shepardson and Blodwen Hammond (1970:23-24) counted twenty-one camps and 323 individuals in the same area—only one of the four areas that they included in the Navajo Mountain community, which then had a population of 600.

5. Of the three "independent cases," Camp 8 was made up of Whiteman Killer's sister's daughter who was living with a married son and daughter-in-law from Camp 4, Camp 7 was composed of a married daughter of Whiteman Killer's niece and her husband, and Camp 5 consisted of a son from Camp 4 and a daughter from Camp 3. It is difficult to place the "locality" of these camps in relationship to kin.

6. In 1961, livestock, agriculture, and weaving accounted for 38.4 percent of Navajo Mountain income, wages were 22.6 percent, and welfare, free services, and social security amounted to 40 percent (Shepardson and Hammond 1970:116).

7. The political character in each of the three units of the project differed, as described in Sasaki (1960:Chapter 4).

8. The group included Custer Sim's wife, Custer Begay's wife, Allan Sim's wife and her mother, and Hosteen Yazzie's wife. Custer Sim and Allen Sim undoubtedly were brothers. Custer Begay and Hosteen Yazzie may have been married to sisters.

9. The 750 residents lived in 142 households in 78 residence groups. Of 106 couples, 39 (36.8 percent) were living uxorilocally, 22 (20.8 percent) were living virilocally, and the rest had established independent camps or were heads of camps. If we examine both the residence of younger couples within camps and the location of older couples with regard to relatives within a neighborhood, two-thirds of the adult married women were close to female kin, while one-third were near the husband's kin (either in the same camp or same neighborhood) (Lamphere 1977:74-83).

10. Since both Thomas and Kevin had small kin networks, they focused their activities on their own nuclear families. Only Edna's husband, Mike, had a strong and competing network of parents and siblings. After Edna and Mike separated, in-laws were not important in any of the three women's lives.

11. These figures are not too different from those at Copper Canyon fifteen years earlier, although Copper Canyon was slightly more wage dependent and slightly less welfare dependent. This is somewhat surprising, given the greater isolation and rural nature of Kitsili and the role of livestock and farming in the lives of the women Conte studied.

12. Annual household income ranged from \$2,000 to over \$30,000, with a median of about \$10,000.

REFERENCES CITED

Adams, W., and L. T. Ruffing, 1977, Shonto Revisited: Measures of Social and Economic Change in a Navajo Community, 1955-1971. *American Anthropologist* 79(1):58-83.

Broudy, D. W., and P. A. May, 1983, Demographic and Epidemiologic Transition among the Navajo Indians. *Social Biology* 30:1-16.

Collier, M. C., 1966, Local Organization among the Navaho. New Haven, Conn.: Human Relations Area Files.

Conte, C., 1982, Ladies, Livestock, Land and Lucre: Women's Networks and Social Status on the Western Navajo Reservation. *American Indian Quarterly* 6(1-2):105-24.

Conte, C., 1984, The Navajo Sex-Gender System. Ph.D. diss., New School for Social Research, New York.

Frisbie, C. J., 1982, Traditional Navajo Women: Ethnographic and Life History Portrayals. *American Indian Quarterly* 6(1-2):11-33.

Hamamsy, L.S., 1957, The Role of Women in a Changing Navaho Society. *American Anthropologist* 59(1):101-11.

Kluckhohn, C., 1966, The Ramah Navaho. *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 196:327-470. Washington, D.C.

Kluckhohn, C., and D. Leighton, 1946, *The Navaho*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Kunitz, S.J., 1974, Factors Influencing Recent Navajo and Hopi Population Changes. *Human Organization* 33(1):7-16.

Lamphere, L., 1974, Strategies, Cooperation, and Conflict among Women in Domestic Groups. Pp. 97-112 in *Woman, Culture and Society* (ed. by M.Z. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere). Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Lamphere, L., 1977, *To Run After Them: The Cultural and Social Bases of Cooperation in a Navajo Community*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Lamphere, L., 1987, Feminism and Anthropology: The Struggle to Reshape Our Thinking about Gender. Pp. 11-33 in *The Impact of Feminist Research in the Academy* (ed. by C. Farnham). Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.

Lamphere, L., 1989, Feminist Anthropology: The Legacy of Elsie Clews Parsons. *American Ethnologist* 16(3):518-33.

Landgraf, J.L., 1954, Land-Use in the Ramah Area of New Mexico. *Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University* 42(1). Cambridge, Mass.

Leighton, D., [1940, 1942], *Field Notes and Life Histories*. Unpub. ms., Special Collections Library, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff.

Leighton, D., and C. Kluckhohn, 1947, *Children of the People: The Navaho Individual and His Development*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Leighton, A.H., and D.C. Leighton, 1944, *The Navaho Door*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Leighton, A.H., and D.C. Leighton, 1949, Gregorio, the Hand-Trembler. *Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University* 40(1). Cambridge, Mass.

Levy, J.E., E.B. Henderson, and T.J. Andrews, 1989, The Effects of Regional Variation and Temporal Change on Matrilineal Elements of Navajo Social Organization. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 45(4):351-77.

McCloskey, J., 1988, *Navajo Women's Fertility and Labor Force Participation*. Unpub. Dissertation Research Proposal, Department of Anthropology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

Navajo Nation, 1988, *Navajo Nation FAX 88*. Window Rock, Ariz.: Technical Support Department, Commission for Accelerating Navajo Development Opportunities.

Roberts, J.M., 1951, *Three Navaho Households: A Comparative Study in Small Group Culture*. *Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University* 40(3). Cambridge, Mass.

Sasaki, T.T., 1960, *Fruitland, New Mexico: A Navaho Community in Transition*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Shepardson, M., 1982, The Status of Navajo Women. *American Indian Quarterly* 6(1-2):149-69.

Shepardson, M., and B. Hammond, 1970, *The Navajo Mountain Community: Social Organization and Kinship Terminology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Shukry, L.S., 1954, *The Role of Women in a Changing Navaho Society*. Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Shukry, L.S., [1951-54], *Field Notes*. Unpub. ms., Special Collections Library, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff.

Temkin-Greener, H., S.J. Kunitz, D. Broudy, and M. Haffner, 1981, Surgical Fertility Regulation among Women on the Navajo Indian Reservation, 1972-78. *American Journal of Public Health* 71(4):403-7.

Weiss, L.D., 1984, *The Development of Capitalism in the Navajo Nation: A Political-Economic History*. Minneapolis, Minn.: MEP Press.