

## Prologue: Rereading and Remembering Michelle Rosaldo

*Louise Lamphere*

In the past ten years feminist anthropologists have done a great deal to reclaim our early foremothers. Beginning with *Women Anthropologists: A Biographical Dictionary* (Gies et al. 1988), we have discovered more about the lives of women anthropologists including those who studied women even during the nineteenth century. We now have biographies (in some cases more than one) and articles on many of the most important female anthropologists – Alice Fletcher, Elsie Clews Parsons, Ruth Benedict, Margaret Mead – as well as a sense of how minority women, archaeologists, and women who worked in museums and laboratories contributed to the discipline (Parezo 1993; Bolles 1997). The importance of women to the writing of ethnography has been explored, and the contributions of women who began to write in the 1950s and 1960s have been analyzed (Behar and Gordon 1995). With this volume we begin to look at the anthropology of feminists in my own generation, those who came of age professionally in the 1970s. Michelle Rosaldo, perhaps because she died so young, but also because she was one of anthropology's most important feminist theorists, is a particularly appropriate focus for our attention at the end of the 1990s. The twenty-five years since the beginnings of what was to become *Woman, Culture and Society* give us sufficient distance to appraise her work and to value her legacy. A generation of anthropologists has been trained in the intervening time. Those now entering graduate school and the profession were likely to have been only babies when Shelly and I worked on this collection. Our children were not yet born, and mothering was a somewhat abstract possibility.<sup>1</sup> Our training in social anthropology, ethnohistory, and the works of Durkheim, Weber, Geertz, and Lévi-Strauss is much different than the blend of Marxism, interpretive anthropology, history, and postmodernism that informs much of the discipline today.

Time brings changes in anthropological theory, a shift in the topics that seem important to study, and even a transformation of the gender, class, and racial/ethnic characteristics of anthropologists. Thus, as Kamala Visweswaran points out, “different historical moments engender different strategies of reading” (1997:597). We have seen this in Barbara Babcock’s reinterpretation of Ruth Benedict’s work. Feminists of my generation were taught to critique Benedict’s approach to the study of culture and personality, seeing her descriptions of the Zuni Apollonian, Plains Dionysian, and Kwakiutl Megalomaniac patterns as simplified caricatures or “psychological types” writ large. Instead, Babcock has emphasized Benedict as a precursor of interpretive anthropological practice and even postmodernism (Babcock 1995:105, 123). With her training in literary criticism and her sensibilities as a poet, Benedict read cultures as “texts” organized around “tropes” long before terms like *root metaphors*, *key symbols*, and *master tropes* became common terms in anthropological analysis. As Babcock says, she taught us “not only to read cultures as texts but also to read texts as cultural documents” (119). Likewise, Elsie Clews Parsons was rarely read outside of those interested in southwestern religion and folktales. She was known as a folklorist and eclectic. Her early feminist writing was erased from the anthropological canon. More recently, the insights she provided on her own upper-class institutions have been emphasized (Deacon 1997), the dialogic nature of her prose has been noted (Lamphere 1995; Babcock 1991), and her continued interest in gender and women’s roles in her research in the Southwest and Mexico has come to the fore. Such new interpretations of feminist anthropological work stem from the recent emphasis in cultural anthropology on historical context, examining anthropological theories as emerging in particular historical periods and reflecting the class, race, and gender positions of theorists.

This leads me to place Shelly’s research and writing in the context of her background, her training at Harvard, her involvement with the feminist movement, and her years at Stanford. In many ways Shelly’s and my experiences in the 1960s and 1970s were parallel, especially in terms of the intertwining of feminism and anthropology, our efforts to transform the academy, and our desire to put a personal politics into practice through constructing a dual-career family, participating in a communal household, and sharing parenting and housework by integrating men into the domestic sphere.

Shelly Zimbalist was raised in a Jewish upper-middle-class family in a Long Island suburb, where she attended Great Neck South high school.

She entered Harvard as a freshman in 1962, the same year I came as a graduate student. I first met her in a small seminar on economic anthropology taught by Frank Cancian during the spring of 1964. Karen Brodtkin (Sacks), Pam Lambert, Shelly, and I were the only four students I can remember who met in a small informal seminar room at 9 Bow Street, the three-story house that was the home of the Social Anthropology Program before William James Hall was opened in 1965 to house all four segments of the Social Relations Department. Shelly was only a sophomore, but she had taken a freshman seminar from Evon Z. Vogt ("Vogtie") and conducted fieldwork during the summer of 1963 on the Chiapas project. She returned to Chiapas in the summer of 1964 and also conducted field research in Spain during the summer of 1965. She majored in history and literature at Harvard, writing her honors thesis on the poetry of W. B. Yeats. Her major gave her a grounding in literary criticism and a sense of how to write prose that was much more nuanced and layered than my own.

Shelly and Renato began dating in the fall of 1964, when Renato became a newly enrolled graduate student in social anthropology in the Department of Social Relations and a tutor in Leverett House. They were married in June 1966, when Shelly also graduated from Radcliffe. In the fall Shelly entered the social anthropology graduate program at the same time that Renato was beginning his third year of study. She and Renato decided to do field research in the Philippines, choosing to study the Ilongots, an "exotic" and remote culture in northern Luzon, Philippines, rather than continuing to work in Chiapas. Like many young graduate students, it seemed important to conduct research in a faraway place among "primitive" peoples, in their case examining the lives of swidden agriculturalists who also practiced head-hunting.

Shelly and Renato were in the Philippines between the summer of 1967 and the summer of 1969. During this period I had finished my dissertation on Navajo kinship and cooperation, had taken a year's job at the University of Rochester, and then had been hired as an assistant professor at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island. By the fall of 1969, when I saw Renato and Shelly in Cambridge, the world had changed. Both Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy had been assassinated, the antiwar movement had grown, and the Harvard Strike the previous spring had brought radical politics to campus. In 1966 the antiwar and civil rights movements had engaged only a few white students on northeastern campuses. Within the next three years there was a radical shift that politicized

students and brought them into a mass movement against the war in Vietnam.

Beginning in 1967 and 1968, women's groups emerged from various New Left organizations, primarily in large cities like Chicago and New York, many in reaction to what was viewed as male domination in these organizations. In Boston, Bread and Roses, a socialist feminist organization, issued a position paper in June 1969 (Hole and Levine 1971:411) and formed over twenty-five small groups in which women participated in discussions and "consciousness-raising." This term originated with the New York Redstockings group to express the importance of sharing personal experiences in small groups in order to understand the political nature of women's oppression. "The personal is political" became an early motto of the movement. In October 1969 Shelly joined a Bread and Roses group that included a number of Radcliffe graduates and friends (including Judy Herman, Susan Carey, and Gail Parker). This set of close friends became her way into politics. Nancy Chodorow, another friend of Shelly's from undergraduate days, was a member of a different Bread and Roses group. From this early beginning in an activist socialist feminist organization, Shelly and Nancy developed their feminist ideas in tandem over the next several years, often through correspondence. Nancy's participation in 1971-72 in a small group that discussed mother-daughter relationships, her training in the sociology doctoral program at Brandeis, and her exposure to object relations theory not only shaped Nancy's approach to a theory of gender personality development but also had an important impact on Shelly's own conceptualization of sexual asymmetry.

In August 1970 Shelly and Renato moved to Palo Alto, where Renato had accepted a position as an assistant professor in the Department of Anthropology. There they joined George and Jane Collier, who had also been Harvard students, although Jane was completing her Ph.D. degree at Tulane and parenting (with George's help) two young children. Renato and George held the tenure-track positions, while Jane and Shelly, both finishing their degrees, were "faculty wives."

During this year Shelly participated in a consciousness-raising group and also began, with Jane and a number of graduate students, to articulate ways in which feminism might reform how anthropologists thought about women and men in other cultures. The most concrete result of this was a course during the spring quarter 1971 on "Women in Cross-Cultural Perspective" (taught by Jane Collier, Julia Howell, Kim Kramer, Janet Shepherd Fjellman, Ellen Lewin, and Shelly).

### Embracing Feminism

The early 1970s were a time when those of us who participated in the broader women's movement through consciousness-raising groups, testifying at hearings on abortion rights, participating in rallies and marches, attending conferences or other movement activities, began to integrate our feminism into the academic fields in which we had been trained. For Shelly this first meant participating in the 1971 course and then helping to organize a symposium at the American Anthropological Association (AAA) meeting in November 1971 in New York City. This was an association meeting full of controversy. The discipline had been rocked by the revelation that anthropologists had participated in counterinsurgency activities in Thailand. I still remember a packed ballroom where, at the AAA Council of Fellows meeting, a report of a committee to investigate these alleged activities (chaired by Margaret Mead) was resoundingly turned down for not condemning clandestine research (Wakin 1992:211–13).

It was in this atmosphere that feminist papers were first appearing on the program in significant numbers. Shelly had mailed me a copy of the lectures from the spring 1971 class, and we were already talking about a book, so I attended the Stanford session at the November American Anthropological Association meeting with anticipation and was impressed with the quality of the material. Before I returned to London, where I was spending a year's leave, Shelly and I decided to put together a collection of essays on the new cross-cultural research on women. We wrote to thirty-five women who had given talks on women at the anthropology meetings or who had participated in the Stanford course. By February we had received enough replies to draft an outline of a collection with over twenty contributions to submit to presses. Looking back over our correspondence, both of us seemed uncertain about how to proceed, nervous about turning contributors down and yet increasingly aware that the book was unfocused and too long. As Shelly wrote on February 1, 1972: "Wow! My desk is a mess, and things feel incredibly complicated. At the same time, I feel very excited by the kinds of responses we've had."

We were both extremely naive about how to handle contacts with presses and how to shape what was soon becoming an unwieldy volume. In turning our book prospectus down, an editor from Harper and Row wrote to Shelly, in January 1972, that "the outline is excellent but that a book based on papers given at a symposium has a limited appeal in the paperback market." Shelly voiced a series of worries, "One is the sheer

number of our contributors . . . And, related to that—some of our contributors seem to be of ‘uncertain’ quality; does that mean that we’ll edit like hell, or reserve the right to decide on seeing the papers that some people won’t be included . . . Have you thought about when and how we’ll be ‘hard-nosed’; it really scares me, but I think we may well want to have some freedom in accepting papers, and I think we should get together on how we’ll proceed.”

Shelly turned for advice to Monica Wilson, a senior female anthropologist, who was at the Center for Advanced Study at Stanford that year. During a conversation with Shelly at a party Wilson suggested paring the book down drastically and eliminating papers on “‘big societies,” that is, complex societies such as the United States and Taiwan. In writing to me about this exchange, Shelly suggested we might have to cut some of the papers: “When I get confused I get mainly very very anxious, so I would really appreciate knowing what you think as soon as possible . . . Again, I’m sorry to be flashing an SOS with the request that YOU make some difficult decisions. But when local feedback is all of the kind that says, ‘God girl, you’ve sure taken on a mouthful’ and stops there—I don’t know where else to turn.”

I was much less willing to make such hard decisions. In a letter to Shelly I said: “I can see that matters concerning the book are getting a bit more complex. I know that 22 people is really too many, but I also don’t see how we can cut anyone out at this point. I’d say the thing to do is (1) to be nasty about the September 1st deadline . . . and (2) ask people to rewrite if the paper is poor and perhaps in that way we cut the number of articles down.” Eventually, we had to “bite the bullet.” Although some authors eliminated themselves, we had to tell others that their pieces would not fit in the book or that the outside reader recommended against inclusion. I suspect Shelly was more comfortable about this than I was—a commentary on our different personalities and approaches to scholarship. Shelly was always highly critical and demanding of herself and others when it came to judging the quality of an argument or the use of theory. While I tend to dislike conflict and wish to “patch things over,” Shelly was less tolerant of insufficiently worked out analyses. For her (and here I think she was correct), as painful as eliminating several articles was, it made for a better and more coherent book.

For six months we had been trying to find an established press that would consider publishing the collection. The breakthrough came when Shelly talked to Jess Bell and Bill Carver at Stanford University Press in

May 1972. They were interested but wanted us to cut several authors and have the remaining ones submit longer abstracts. Shelly quickly wrote most of those on our list (several had dropped out by this time), assembled the abstracts, and returned a packet to the press in July. Then began a long year of working with authors, who turned in drafts by the end of the summer. I traveled to Palo Alto in August 1972; I remember sharing Renato and Shelly's small house for several days as Shelly and I pored over drafts. We discussed the essays together and then divided them up, each of us working individually with authors, usually writing a long letter with comments and suggestions (in the days before computers and e-mail, a time-consuming task). I traveled to California again in January 1973 (for another long working session in the dreary winter rainy season). By this time we were close to assembling the whole manuscript, which was submitted to the press during the spring and sent to an outside reader. In those days there were hardly any senior women who had published on women or gender, and so our outside reader was male. The reader and our editors at Stanford urged us to drop several essays. We agreed in three cases but went on to push for continued revisions for three others. In at least one case our extensive rewriting was met with serious objections by the author, and she eventually produced her own set of revisions, which were acceptable to the Stanford editor. In a second case both the Stanford editor and I "cut and pasted" until we had something with which all three of us were satisfied. During this period Shelly drafted the introduction from notes she had made, and I added suggestions, rewording, and revisions. At last, at the end of the summer in 1973, the book went into production, with the last two or three essays straggling in. By the time it appeared in April 1974, Shelly was already in the Philippines on her second field trip there.

It was not until a year or two later that we both realized that the book was making an important impact on both anthropology and feminism as practiced in other disciplines. We began conversations with our coauthors about what to do with the profits over the years. We shared our ideas over the phone and sometimes sent checks to the volume's participants and at other times contributed to a fund for Guatemalan children in memory of Lois Paul (one of our contributors, who had died in 1976) and to a variety of feminist organizations.

During the years between 1970 and 1974 Renato and Shelly were attempting to forge a dual-career marriage, a difficult proposition when couples were rarely hired in the same program. At Harvard, in the generation preceding us, Bea Whiting, Florence Kluckhohn, and others had only

held lectureships and research associate positions, while their husbands enjoyed full professor status. At Stanford Louise Spindler was a lecturer while her husband, George, was a full professor, and Margery Wolf and Lois Paul both conducted joint research with their husbands in Taiwan and Guatemala, respectively, but remained in the status of faculty wives. There was not much precedent for “dual-career equal partnerships” in academe.

In 1970–71 Shelly completed her dissertation, and during the following year she was a member of the Committee on Linguistics, teaching courses but still not a full-time faculty member. Other jobs in the Bay area had not materialized, and she started thinking seriously of applying for a position on the East Coast. Even looking for a job three thousand miles away from one’s husband or partner was an unusual occurrence in the early 1970s. In addition, a woman had to rely on a personal network of patrons and their close colleagues. In the days before advertisements and affirmative action jobs were found by word of mouth, usually through full professors (male) recommending their students to department chairs who called on the phone. In December 1971, just after the AAA meetings (and an interview in New York), Shelly received a job offer from Columbia. She wrote in a hasty letter:

[Robert] Murphy called on Tuesday to offer me (you’re wonderful, your work is excellent, just what we want . . . an incredible high!) a job at Columbia. [Ben] Paul [chair of the Stanford Anthropology Department] now speaks (ironically, admitted) of ‘if we can convince you to stay’ and [Charles] Frake says he promises to buy a big sailboat and let us use it if I turn down Columbia. So, things look like they’ll work at Stanford; and after a year of self-doubt, anxiety, and feeling that THEY are all against me, I feel reasonably relaxed, confident, and pleasantly alive.

By December 30, 1971, the Stanford Department had voted half-time appointments for both Shelly and Jane Collier. Renato asked the university if they could split the one and a half positions into two three-quarters positions, and they agreed. Eventually, Shelly came to feel that the arrangement was exploitative: “Both Renato and I put in full-time labor for three quarters pay . . . instead of four full-catalogue courses a year we do three apiece. Apart from that we work a full load. That extra course is a bonus. It gives me flexibility that I like . . . I don’t know if I’ll continue to



feel that way. I might sell an extra quarter time to someone else so as to feel less exploited." In working out a stance as a partner (rather than wife) in a dual-career couple, Shelly pushed for a vision of her life in which she was not confined to a domestic sphere nor a subordinate to her husband in the public sphere. As Lugo and Maurer point out in their introduction, these are interventions that embodied the notion of gender as performativity. They were part of her feminist theorizing and also part of the way she thought about her partnership with Renato: "We have very separate intellectual styles. Given the same data and similar theoretical orientations, we would still write very different papers. Our colleagues see us as two and a half people, not as one and a half. We are both strong individuals and our 'togetherness' seems to add to our presence" (Stanford University *Campus Report*, May 25, 1977).

From January to December 1974 Shelly and Renato returned to the Philippines for a second field trip to the Ilongot, one that was to shape Shelly's book *Knowledge and Passion* (1980a). Over the next seven years Shelly's personal and intellectual effort went into building a collective household (in which her children could be an integral part) and changing the university through increasing the presence of academic feminism. In 1974 Renato and Shelly purchased a collective house with two other Stanford couples. Their year at Princeton at the Institute for Advanced Studies in 1975-76 provided Shelly with time to get started on the book and to solidify important intellectual relationships with Clifford Geertz and Ellen and William Sewell.

Shelly wrote to me in March 1976 from Princeton that she was pregnant: "Starting to get fat with baby is making that seem realer." After much soul-searching and negotiating, they turned down two job offers from the new department at Johns Hopkins, since Stanford had offered Renato tenure in order to keep them. "We decided that if Stanford could give Renato tenure we'd just as soon have our baby in good weather with the company of good friends."

After the Princeton year the house on Embarcadero became their home, and a number of young Stanford faculty shared their collective lives over the years in which Sam (born September 21, 1976) was an infant and toddler and Manuel (born July 28, 1980) came into the world. By 1978 Shelly and Renato were able to negotiate full-time appointments, adding one-quarter time to each position. Shelly received tenure in 1979. Over the Christmas / New Year's break in 1980-81 Shelly mockingly described herself as "the Kompleat Mother—I'm breast feeding Manny on the floor of

Gymnastics West where Sam is having a gymnastics lesson.” At the same time she was dashing off a note to me about what to do with the 1980 book royalties.

In the late 1970s Shelly put a great deal of effort into teaching feminist anthropology. She and Jane Collier continued to teach the course that had been offered collectively in 1971 under the same title, “Women in Cross-Cultural Perspective.” They also cotaught several graduate seminars (one on gender relations among Australian Aborigines, another on women in chiefdoms) in which they jointly worked through some of their important theoretical ideas. Much of Shelly’s *Signs* article on “The Use and Abuse of Anthropology” (1980b) and her joint article with Jane (Collier and Rosaldo 1981), were a result of this collaboration.

Shelly was also involved in the creation of a program in Feminist Studies at Stanford. She began meeting with a group of Stanford faculty, including Nan Keohane, Barbara Gelpi, Myra Strober, and Estelle Friedman, at the newly formed Center for Research on Women (now the Institute for Research on Women and Gender). Estelle and Shelly cochaired the committee, and Estelle remembers that Shelly did much of the administrative work to get the undergraduate major approved. The name of the program, Feminist Studies (rather than Women’s Studies), is a tribute to Shelly’s insistence that the undergraduate major take this much more controversial name since it focused on a critical analysis of gender and its intersections with other forms of hierarchy. Estelle remembers how much Shelly’s appreciation for complexity enriched the field of feminist scholarship. She was able to go deeper and further into an analysis than others around her and find the language that articulated the intricate relationships between gender and other social categories.

#### Michelle Rosaldo as Theorist

Although Shelly drew a great deal from anthropological theory in formulating her ideas about gender asymmetry and the dichotomy between public and private spheres, her own experience in the women’s liberation movement and her attempts to integrate her personal and professional life (rather than to be pushed into a domestic sphere) undoubtedly played a role in how she thought about women’s position theoretically. For most of us in the early 1970s there was no separation between our discipline (anthropology), our participation in the women’s movement, and our personal choices about partnerships (with males or females) and raising chil-

dren. Rather, we attempted to bring the same principles that integrated social critique, a commitment to egalitarianism, and the struggle for change to bear in all areas of our lives.

Shelly was a subtle and brilliant thinker. Although critics have often labeled her work as fitting into a neat category—structuralist, interpretivist, symbolic—her arguments are actually less easy to characterize. It was during our collaboration in 1972–73 that I began to see how different Shelly’s intellectual style was from mine. I would often write “plain Jane” straightforward sentences, which Shelly would reword, adding clauses, qualifying, and making the meaning more nuanced. It is her prose that makes it possible to see connections that Alejandro Lugo and Bill Maurer make to Foucault’s work on power, to recent analyses of the imposition of Enlightenment categories on colonized peoples, to current interest in the anthropology of the self, and even to the reflexivity emphasized in so much contemporary ethnographic writing. One of the important contributions of several authors in this collection is their interest in going beyond the early critiques of Rosaldo’s use of the public/domestic dichotomy as too simple, rigid, and circular to be useful in our understanding of gender relations. Instead, these authors argue, Rosaldo’s analysis helps us see the particular force of these categories in many societies, including our own, and to emphasize a performative perspective.

A few examples from Shelly’s texts will suggest how nonreductive and complex her arguments were. In discussing domestic and public orientations in the “Woman, Culture and Society: A Theoretical Overview,” Shelly says she is providing “the basis of a structural framework necessary to identify and explore the place of male and female in psychological, culture, social and economic aspects of human life.” This is a framework for exploring and thinking about a complex set of relations—not a rigid set of categories. Shelly goes on to argue that “the opposition does not *determine* cultural stereotypes or asymmetries in the evaluations of the sexes, but rather underlies them.” Again, as Lugo and Maurer point out in their introduction, Shelly is here rejecting a simplistic causal model and instead positing a cultural logic that has a kind of performative force (indicated by Shelly’s use of the term *evaluation*) that seems very similar to Judith Butler’s analysis of gender relations (1990, 1997).

In her 1980 *Signs* article Shelly staked out a position that clarified how she saw sexual asymmetry and the usefulness of the domestic/public dichotomy. Then she went on to break new ground in understanding the historical lineage from which the domestic/public concepts emerged and to

call for a new approach rooted in practice or performance, in which cultural meaning (or what would today be called discourse) still had an important role. “It now appears to me that woman’s place in human social life is not in any direct sense a product of the things she does (or even less a function of what, biologically, she is) but of the meaning her activities acquire through concrete social interactions. And the significances women assign to the activities of their lives are things that we can only grasp through an analysis of the relationships that women forge, the social contexts they (along with men) create—and within which they are defined” (1980b:400).

In her book *Knowledge and Passion* we see the working out of this performative perspective. Throughout her analysis Shelly attempts to explicate Ilongot concepts—in an almost Benedict-like fashion—through contrasts with her own thoughts and perceptions of incidents in the field. She talks of “following the Ilongot,” explaining, first, words for feelings and then the social and practical situations to which emotional idioms were applied (Rosaldo 1980a:223). In rereading the book, I was struck by the postmodern-like stance Shelly took even in the late 1970s. Her sentences were always qualified, placing herself as well as her consultants in a dialogue. Her prose was shifting and contextual, giving us a sense of multiplicity rather than unity and always pointing up the contrast between the anthropologist and her subjects. For example, she discusses how Ilongot children reacted to a tape of Joan Baez “singing in a tremolo that for Ilongots recalled the quivering tension of such songs as stir men’s hearts to kill—about a soldier going off to war.” But, rather than see the similarities in our reaction and those of the Ilongot to the song, Shelly emphasized the differences: “Baez’s song protested against war and invoked mourning, whereas for Ilongots her quivering voice was like a fluttering bangle or a twisting heart” (222).

#### Feminist Anthropology since 1974 and Michelle Rosaldo’s Legacy

Since 1981 anthropology and feminist theory have been transformed in a number of ways that seem to veer away from Shelly’s contributions. First, postmodernist theorists (using the work of Derrida, Lacan, and Foucault) attacked the validity of Enlightenment concepts and emphasized the importance of discourse (deconstructing the fundamental categories used by social science). Anthropologists, however, have drawn much more on Foucault than on Derrida or Lacan, partly because of their firm commit-

ment to an analysis of power and the grounding of discourses in concrete practices. Second, the analysis of texts and ethnographic writing has led to a critique of objectivist description and forced feminist anthropologists and others to position themselves within their texts, to take reflexivity seriously, and to invent new ways of writing more dialogically. Third, and perhaps most important, the critiques of anthropology as a colonial discipline and of feminism as a white woman's movement have shifted the focus of feminist work so that it includes the voices of U.S. women of color and women throughout the Third World.

It might seem that feminist anthropology of the 1990s is all about situated knowledges, dialogic texts, "women's voices," and "performativity." Yet there is another strain that has developed through socialist feminist analysis, the study of gender and colonialism, and the continued importance of concepts of class and power in gender relationships. There is a continuity here that is rooted in the analysis of materiality and meaning, which were issues that very much occupied Shelly's interest. Many of the essays in this volume draw on socialist feminist and Marxist traditions that, unlike Christine Gray's reading of the literature, have found much to gain through an analysis of the impact of colonialism and the new global economy.

The mark of a great scholar is his or her impact on the thinking of others. Since Shelly died when she was only thirty-seven years old, her potential influence over students in the 1980s and 1990s was lost. We can only surmise that she would have taken the insights of postmodernism, the writings of women of color, and the attention to textuality and turned them from fresh insights into feminist predicaments. That her work can be reread in the 1990s and remains an inspiration to younger scholars is a testament to her skill as a thinker and her insights as a feminist anthropologist.

#### NOTE

1. Several of the contributors to *Woman, Culture and Society*, however, were mothers and may have brought that experience to their analyses.

#### REFERENCES

Babcock, Barbara

- 1995 "‘Not in the Absolute Singular’: Rereading Ruth Benedict." In *Women Writing Culture*, ed. Ruth Behar and Deborah A. Gordon, 104–30. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Behar, Ruth, and Deborah A. Gordon  
 1995 *Women Writing Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.  
 1996 *The Vulnerable Observer: Anthropology That Breaks Your Heart*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Bolles, Lynn  
 1997 "Women Ancestors: A History of Black Feminist Anthropology." Paper presented in a session on "The Poetics and Politics of Black Feminist Anthropology," American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C., November 19–23.
- Butler, Judith  
 1990 *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.  
 1997 "Critically Queer." In *Playing with Fire: Queer Politics, Queer Theories*, ed. Shane Phelan, 11–29. New York: Routledge.
- Collier, Jane F., and Michelle Z. Rosaldo  
 1981 "Politics and Gender in 'Simple' Societies." In *Sexual Meanings*, ed. Sherry Ortner and Harriet Whitehead, 275–329. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Deacon, Desley  
 1997 *Elsie Clews Parsons: Inventing Modern Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gacs, Ute, Aisha Khan, Jerrie McIntyre, and Ruth Weinberg  
 1988 *Women Anthropologists: A Biographical Dictionary*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Hole, Judith, and Ellen Levine  
 1971 *The Rebirth of Feminism*. New York: Quadrangle Books.
- Lamphere, Louise  
 1995 "Feminist Anthropology: The Legacy of Elsie Clews Parsons." In *Women Writing Culture*, ed. Ruth Behar and Deborah A. Gordon, 85–103. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Parezo, Nancy J.  
 1993 *Hidden Scholars: Women Anthropologists and the Native American Southwest*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Rosaldo, Michelle  
 1974 "Woman, Culture and Society: A Theoretical Overview." In *Woman, Culture and Society*, ed. Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere, 17–42. Stanford: Stanford University Press.  
 1980a *Knowledge and Passion: Ilongot Notions of Self and Social Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
 1980b "The Use and Abuse of Anthropology: Reflections on Feminist and Cross-Cultural Understanding." *Signs* 5 (3): 389–416.
- Visweswaran, Kamala  
 1997 "Histories of Feminist Ethnography." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26:591–621. Palo Alto: Annual Review Press.

Wakin, Eric

1992 *Anthropology Goes to War: Professional Ethics and Counterinsurgency in Thailand*. Madison University of Wisconsin Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Monograph no. 9.