

Key:
Blockheaded
John Bull

"Maine als blockheaded
Englishman"

class at
Maine's origin
"Aryan race"
not
only place
part of
class

EN, p. 36 begins LK's Introduction on Maine and the following sentence: "A recurrent theme is KM's systematic and uncompromising rejection of ^{vs.} race, racism, and biologism generally as a determinant without further qualification of social affairs." (Where he justifies by KM's reference on Maine, he mentions pp. 162, 164, 187, but actually it is pp. 289-291) - KM's Q: "The severance of land from the common territory appears most complete in the case of chiefs, many of whom have large, private estates held under ordinary tenure in addition to demesne specially attached to their signatory." And p. 292, KM: "Herr Maine als blockheaded Englishman ... which arose out of an original patriarchal cell ... an institution of the Aryan race (1). And in another parenthesis Marx asks "Who?". pp. 323-324. "After the ancient Irish laws women had some power of dealing with their own property without the consent of their husbands, and this was one of the institutions expressly declared by the English blockheaded judges to be illegal at the beginning of the 20th century."

Chiefs

Q

pp 289-291
pp 323-324

Q In the text
Maine als
blockheaded
Englishman
John Bull
family
despotism
pet dog
blockheaded
John Bull

P. 324 KM Q: "Maine transports his 'patriarchal' Roman family into the very beginning of things... the married woman had among the Hindus her property altogether enfranchised from her husband's control ... it is not easy to give a reason why the obligation of the family despotism (a principle pet-doctrine of blockheaded John Bull to read in original 'despotism') were relaxed in this one particular."

LK correctly shows that Marx posited the unfreedom in the primitive condition, in contradistinction to Rousseau's notion of the chains of civilization as opposed to the primitive state of freedom ~~was~~ conceived by Marx as the chains of primitive bondage which were, rather, satisfying and comforting. Despotic, dissatisfying, discomfoting are the bonds of civilization." NB

Have note of p324 ANP by LK + Q relate it to Rele's cond = "JKM leaves very concept Oriental Despotism to the ideology of ..."

Go to Mike or Peter w/ p3
2/4/83
June 24, 1983

Dear Raya:

The envelope I am sending you contains a number of things that I hope will be helpful to the paper you are writing for Diamond's conference: 1) the reference by Marx to the Iroquois and Western conceptions of "natural man", from 1842; 2) some ideas for the section on mythology and women, which includes a translation of the paragraph from the EN on the goddesses on Olympus; 3) my view of Peter's interpretation of the passage from Marx's notes on Kovalevsky which you questioned, plus two xeroxes that might be relevant to that question-- i.e., the pages from Marx on Kovalevsky directly; and Vitkin's 1981 article on Marx's concept of the Asiatic Mode of Production (especially his attack on Marx before the 1870s as "monistic" vs. Darwin); 4) my review of The Hidden Half for N&L, from which you might find something of interest on American Indian women for the paper (as per p.6 of your draft).

In this letter I want to concentrate on the other points you requested: 1) references directly to anthropology which could be included in the paper; 2) elements in the paper that will hit the audience the "wrong way"; and 3) what I think Krader, Diamond, etc. will want to know.

A) Let me begin with anthropology. I think that the main point is the one you make on pp. 13-14 of your draft, throwing down the challenge to work out Marx's vision of the last decade. That can be contrasted with what anthropology has done to avoid the EN in the ten years since it was transcribed and published, even when both

15724

page 2

the world objective events which many radical/dialectical anthropologists are interested in, and new theoretical directions, have suggested that Marx's Notebooks be seriously studied.

The contrast between the fact that so many of today's generation of anthropologists ^{either} did their fieldwork in lands where actual revolutions broke out, and thus experienced them first-hand, or were involved in a re-examination of anthropological work from a feminist perspective, and the lack of discussion of the new points of departure in Marx's last decade, is so striking that it calls for a deeper look. Why, for example, did the American Anthropologist never review ^{the EM?}

What is additionally complicating is the fact that the last 10-15 years have seen the beginning of a revolt within anthropology against the anti-Marxist tradition that had dominated it since the beginning of the 20th century. Especially in the USA, but certainly also in Britain (and to some extent in France and Germany), anthropology kept far away from Marx, and even (except for a few) from Engels. This includes the "fathers" of US anthropology-- Boaz, Kroeber and especially Lowie. All cherished empiricism. Lowie's 1937 work History of Ethnological Theory was explicitly anti-Marx. If Marx was viewed at all in this long period, it was in relation to Morgan and through Engels' Origin. Those who followed this path (notably Leslie White) considered themselves "Morganists", and elevated a scheme of unilinear evolution for humanity as the key to anthropology. Marx was said by both enemies and friends to have supported this scheme, and to be (with minor exceptions) an endorser of Morgan.

15725

Bay In 1968 Marvin Harris' The Rise of Anthropological Theory have been correctly said that "it would ~~be~~ closer to the truth had it been stated that cultural anthropology developed entirely in reaction to, instead of independently of, Marxism". Yet Harris himself immediately moved to demand that Marxism be purified of "the Hegelian monkey on Marx's back" for use in anthropology. (His own methodology after that is vulgar in the extreme.) What he, and other US scholars meant was evidently simply to divide base/superstructure in their analysis and quote the CCPE (1859). No study of EN here.

France offers a very different tradition, as seen in Godelier, Terray, etc., the so-called "structuralist-Marxists. Godelier doesn't comment on the EN either, but he is interested in Marx's concept of the AMP (All of them are much more interested in that, Krader's book. But when you actually read the reviews and discussion -- much more numerous than the ones on the EN-- you see that they are on Krader, not on Marx's Notebooks on Kovalevsky.) In the letter I wrote to you 3/11/83, there is a long extract from Godelier on Marx's concept of AMP which does catch that there was a development in Marx in the 1870s. But what is most important, and proves no study of Marx's notes is that he groups Marx together with Maine saying they "may be regarded as the first to have drawn Asia into the forefront of historical consideration". Further, he so identifies Marx and Engels that Marx doesn't even get credit as the one who found Morgan: "In 1883-84 the discovery of Morgan's work changed this scheme of primitive history again". Godelier does defend Marx

against those who say he puts all "primitive communism" into one category, citing the letter to Mikhailovsky. But this brings up a lack in Krader. When Krader translated the Kovalevsky notebooks, he excluded all those writings that dealt with non-Asian societies, especially in the New World. Thus, Marx's notes on "hunting and fishing cultures of the New World", and on "Spanish land practices in the conquered parts of the Americas" remain unpublished to this day.

Nor has Leacock been any better on this, of course. In her book (don't have the reference in front of me), she finally mentions the EN to say, in one sentence, that Krader did a great job, and that she can't imagine why some people (unnamed--RD?) are trying to make it appear that Marx and Engels differed when it is clear that Origin is, in the main, the culmination of their efforts.

In the main, anthropologists either think that they have "gone beyond Marx in scientific terms" (Godelier), or treat Engels as the one of interest to them, since he wrote a "finished" work, whereas Marx wrote "fragments" (Harris). What you explode in both the book and the draft of this talk is the distortion of Marx as a Morgan-ite unilinear evolutionist who viewed the Third World as an earlier stage of the general law of human evolution-- this is the Marx commonly depicted in anthropology.

In other words, what you present on Marx's view of the Third World, from the early perspectives through the Grundrisse to the 1870s-80s writings, is new, especially so when it connects

page 5

both to Man/Woman and to "revolution in permanence". Naturally, no one in anthropology (or anywhere else) is speaking on the latter in relation to Marx's last decade. But what is intriguing to me is the fact that where there is interest in that period of Marx, it is much more on Marx and the Third World, as though Engels had said all there was to say on Man/Woman. Thus the divergence between your view of the EN on this subject and Krader's is enormous, and the tracing of Man/Woman in Marx, centering on the last decade will be quite exciting, and new to them.

B.) Man/Woman and anthropology is therefore the second point.

I hope that you can use some of the material in my book review of The Hidden Half. Part of the reason I found it so relevant is that I couldn't help but see how Marx's EN, as you presented it would have been of such help to ~~the~~ anthropology, if they would just

Man/Woman
→ C. 1973
inf...

By Charles
S. ...

3. I thought on first thinking about it, that they would be opposed to the way you bring in the CGP, that they would say it is too political. But now I don't think so at all. If the way the paper is organized is to present Marx's vision of new human forces, new Subjects, especially women and the Third World ~~and~~ and contrast that to the de-humanization of life represented by bureaucracy as Marx saw it (separating Marx from the state-capitalists), then the CGP comes in so naturally. After all, isn't this the exact place that Marx's projection of the end to the division of mental/manual labor is put forth in opposition to the Lassallean capitulation to the state bureaucracy? The more ^{the struggle,} I considered the tension, ~~between the state and the workers~~ ~~in~~ as you trace Marx on bureaucracy (1843; 1867; 1875...) vs. Marx on new human dimensions of women and the Third World, the more I think that this will be ^{not be} not only considered "out of school", but as the kind of contribution no one else will be making.

4. The above is I guess my answer to what I think they will want to know. If there is an area where they will be plain lousy academics (instead of Marxist academics) it is in insisting that the paper have a specific (read "limited") focus. They will want to ~~complain~~ complain that you were too broad and not "in depth" on any one point. But I don't think this will work for them here, since the theme that you wish to develop is quite directly Marx's answer to the problem that they pose as the theme of the conference--
the problem of bureaucracy.

If I can make any of the above more clear, please let me know.

Yours, Mike

15729

Ref. to Iroquois/Papagenos by Marx-- for page 6 of mss.

Marx, in the 1842 essay, "The Philosophical Manifesto of the Historical School of Law", drew very sharply the distinction between actual understanding of non-Western peoples and the imposition of European images of "primitive man" passing for science. This is also his first reference to the Iroquois, and to Native Americans generally:

" According to a fiction current in the eighteenth century, the natural state was considered the true state of human nature. People wanted to see the idea of man through the eyes of the body and created men of nature, Papagenos, the naivety of which idea extended even to covering the skin with feathers. During the last decades of the eighteenth century, it was supposed that peoples in a state of nature possessed primeval wisdom, and everywhere one could hear bird-catchers imitating the twittering method of singing of the Iroquois, the Indians, etc., in the belief that by these arts the birds themselves could be enticed into a trap. All these eccentricities were based on the correct idea that the primitive state was a naive Dutch painting of the true state... For just as every century has its own peculiar nature, so too it gives birth to its own peculiar natural men."

From Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Collected Works,
Vol. 1, pp. 203-204. Int'l Pubs, 1975.

Iroquois + Papagenos
1842
1842
of the Iroquois

15730

On mythology 11111

1) First, here is the passage you wanted from the EN,
p. 121 on the Goddesses on Mt. Olympus.

Marx paraphrases Morgan (p. 482 of Ancient Society) as follows: "From first to last among the Greeks a principle of studied selfishness among the males, tending to lessen the appreciation of women, scarcely found among savages. (Emphasis added by Marx.) The usages of centuries stamped upon the minds of Grecian women a sense of their inferiority."

Now Marx interjects his own comment: "But the proportion of Goddesses on Olympus shows a recollection of an earlier freer and more influential position of women. Juno reigns, the goddess of wisdom springs from the head of Zeus, etc." (Emphasis added by Marx.)

Marx goes on to paraphrase Morgan that "Greeks remained barbarians in their treatment of the female sex at the height of their civilization; their education superficial, intercourse with the opposite sex denied them..."

The point here seems to be a dual one: that the importance of the Goddesses hearkens back to an earlier day when the mythology was created, a day when women's position was genuinely more influential, and secondly, that the mythology is sustained in the classical period in part by the women, who look to it in the hope of a freer future.

2) You had said (p. B-1 of your draft) that you wanted to tie Marx's reference on Goddesses to Luxemburg on Penthesilea. In the Introduction to a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, Marx comments that "The peoples of

15731

mythology 22222

antiquity lived their pre-history in imagination, in mythology".] I couldn't help but think that it is not only a fact that Marx used mythology as a source of understanding the pre-capitalist world, but that for him, too, the characters of mythology spoke not only to the past, but to the future. This is why Prometheus makes such an impact in the freedom struggle of Marx's time vs. the Prussian rulers^{and} that it becomes then the sub-titles of Ch. 9, "Prometheus Bound, Prometheus Unbound".

Isn't this also the case for Luxemburg? I mean isn't her recollection of Penthesilea a less conscious form of Marx and Prometheus? In any case, there are more connections between the queens of the Amazons and Marx than I knew of. You know the figure Theseus of Attica, who Marx was excited to find out was a real, historic person, about whom you quote the ~~the~~ sentence by Marx in the EN? Well, Suzanne tells me that Fuller, in Woman in the Nineteenth Century, makes the point that Theseus married a queen of the Amazons (obviously not Penthesilea).

3) For a point far, far away on mythology, I wanted to point out that the whole question of "warrior women", as taken up in the Hidden Half, only comes into being when sanctioned by mythology. That is, in order to break out of the female role pattern, a Lakota (Sioux) woman had to dream incessantly of Winyan Nunpapika (Double Woman). Only then was she freed to seek her own vision of life. The institutionalization of such a mythological character suggests that "warrior women" were far from being oddities among Plains women. (The Blackfoot had a nearly identical character.)

15732

on mythology 33333

Naturally, when you take up mythology you will get the anthropologists in the audience to pick up their ears, since that is precisely the area that Levi-Strauss made his name in (Tristes Tropiques) by supposedly re-creating the dialectic of Hegel for mythology of Native American peoples (mainly Brazilian Indians). Yet he did so without reference to Marx, saying that this subject was not of interest to KM.

15733

On Peter's interpretation of Marx's comments in the Notebooks on Kovalevsky that Marx there links the "very concept of Oriental despotism to the ideology of European imperialism" (AMP, p. 370; Peter's draft, p. 10).

I am enclosing xeroxes of pp. 368-374, so that you can judge for yourself the meaning of the text in its context. There is no doubt that Marx is here attacking the poor level of scholarship of the "Orientalists", and in particular their understanding of the extent to which conquered land became "domainal property". Furthermore, it strongly suggests a direct change in his view of the subject from the way he had expressed it in the 1850s, especially in his June 2, 1853 letter to Engels on Francois Bernier's book on India and Kashmir and the Moslem rule there. In that letter he had noted approvingly and underlined Bernier's description of conquered lands as the reason for the presence of enormous army encampments, saying that one must "understand the particular condition and government of a country, where the king is the one and only proprietor of all the land in the kingdom"... This is the letter that concludes, "Bernier rightly regards the fact that there is no private property in land as the basis of all phenomena in the East, he refers to Turkey, Persia and Hindustan. This is the real key, even to the Oriental heaven"...

In the Notebooks on Kovalevsky, ^(pp. 370, 391-395) and in Marx's notes on Phear and Maine in the EN, ^(pp. 324-331) Marx regards communal property in land as predominantly local, that is, not connected to the state directly. In India even the public works, canals, etc. were not the work of the state

15734

on Peter on Oriental despotism 22222

bureaucracy, as Marx now sees it. Thus a great many of the original points from his 1853 conception of Oriental Despotism, as expressed in the Tribune articles, are in the process of re-thinking. Even the "solid foundation" of it, the self-governing village of "undifferentiated unity" is now seen to have quite a bit of "differentiation", and the quality of the commune is stressed.

Nevertheless, Marx does nowhere that I can find specifically reject the concept of "Oriental Despotism", or say that the whole idea is from European ideology. On the contrary, the village communalism is presented as in opposition, not only to Western imperialism, but to the autocratic rule from the centralized state, a state that is natively-developed. What can be said is that he no longer uses the term at all; that the concern with bureaucracy he had throughout his writings is not centered on Asia in the last decade, but on bureaucracy in Western capitalism; and ~~that~~ several important elements in the definition of Oriental Despotism as put forth in 1853 were now greatly modified.

From the notes as you dictated them in Wallaceburg, it seemed to me that you intended to place this question, if used at all, in the section (to be written) on bureaucracy. Why I think it is relevant now is in the sense of its relation to 1853 which might be one of the points of that section, as indicated on the top of page "B-1" of ~~your~~ draft.

The other comment I wanted to make after re-reading Peter's essay is that there seems to me to be a not quite

15735

On Peter on Oriental despotism 33333

correct view of Marx's writings in the period of the 1850s on the East, ~~At~~ least it is a different view than I got from your concept of Grundrisse as mediation. The two pages I am referring to are pp. 4 and 5. What I am most concerned with is the assertion on p.5 that the "Third World's social development would progress through definite stages. Marx assumed that the development of capitalism in the East would follow, and mirror, the rise of capitalism in the West". It just seems far too much like Vitkin's view of Marx as "Euro-centered" in methodology as well as in data, and I don't see that either the Tribune articles or the Grundrisse offer any evidence of Marx as a unilinear evolutionist in this period. (I am enclosing Vitkin's article from Philosophy and Social Criticism where he takes up Marx's relation to Darwin on evolution.)

If I may go back to the topic of Marx on bureaucracy as a whole for a moment, I wanted to say that I think this will stand out in the sharpest contrast to Marx's concept of the new human forces ~~you~~ you are following-- women and the Third World. And the last of the three periods you propose to bring it up in is the most fascinating because it is a new view of Marx on labor (if that is possible), and because it is connected to the work on the 49-50 miners strike. The idea that you would counterpose the hierarchy in the factory/mine (vastly heightened under automation) as you described in in M&F, p. 92-94, and as the miners told it to you, to not only the "freely-associated labor" of the Paris Commune, but to the fact that Engels appended the phrase "dictatorship of the proletariat" to that ex-

*Merachy
M. F. 1/2
p. 92-94*

On Peter on Oriental despotism 4444

perience on his own, after Marx died, is entirely new to me. After all, isn't "dictatorship of the proletariat" assumed by all to be Marx's expression, out of the Commune, and isn't that what is remembered, and not "freely-associated labor"?

Hidden Half 11111

19 1/2 pages / 19 pt.

ifal.

The Hidden Half: Studies of Plains Indian Women,
by Patricia Albers and Beatrice Medicine. University
Press of America, 1983.

see no ifal.

Ever
Since the late 1960s both the women's liberation
movement worldwide and the movement of Native peoples
in North and South America have shaken long-ingrained
ideas and stereotypes. A small, but growing, open fem-
inist voice has appeared directly within the Native American
struggle, as exemplified by Shainape Shcapwe's
articles
in the pages of N&L. Nevertheless, for most Americans,
and even for many social scientists writing on Indian society
and history, men are still presented as the only actors
in the drama, with Indian women remaining the "hidden
half", relegated to the twin images of "Princess" or
"her darker, negatively viewed sister, the Squaw".

asterisk for footnote

This collection of essays, edited by Patricia Albers and Beatrice
Medicine, is an important step toward replacing that stunted
view of Indian women as makers of history.
Concentrating on the nations of the North Plains, and focusing
on the period from the late 18th century to today, the
study poses such a fundamental critique of much of the an-
thropological literature that it "deals with problems that
are applicable to the study of all native women" Albers'
introductory essay hits out at the depiction of Plains
Indian women as "chattel, enslaved as beasts of burden",
victims whose work was ignored as "menial and monotonous".

"These views", she charges, "tell us more about the atti-
tudes of the Euro-Americans who studied Plains Indians than

- more -

15738

about the actual conditions under which these people lived."

A re-examination of such reports, ~~and~~ under the impact of the feminist and American Indian movements not only reveals ~~so~~ much about both Indian history and Indian women today, but underlines ~~emphasizes~~ in a new way the need to seriously study Marx's writings on pre-capitalist societies, especially his Ethnological Notebooks. Thus, when ~~an~~ Alan Klein's ~~essay~~ examines the "impact of colonialism (in the guise of trade) upon women", his focus on the Plains mode of production contrasts women's position in the late 18th century, before the introduction of the horse and the hide trade, with that of the 19th century. Far from endorsing what was supposedly Marx's view (as expressed in Engels' Origin of the Family) that treated the loss of women's position in egalitarian society as a single issue, Klein ties it tightly to all the changes wrought by the the new mode of production.

In tracing the buffalo hunt from its collective nature involving both men and women, to the methods used after the introduction of the horse, ~~he~~ emphasizes that the horse "came into nomadic society as the private property of men" along with the ever-greater demand for hides by white traders, came establishment of the ~~private~~ individual ownership of the kill, the absence of women from the hunt, the rise of male soldier societies, and, above all, vastly increased disparities of wealth and power. By then, among the Teton Sioux, the use of a challenge stick arose, thrown into the tent of a rich man by the poor, reminding him that it was his duty to share with others. The very presence

- more -

Hidden Half 33333

of such a practice reveals the widening gulf between chiefs and ranks.

Yet even in this period, ~~when polygyny~~ ^{when polygyny} too, became common, "warrior women" made their ~~appearance~~ ^{appearance}, "not as a form of deviant behavior", Medicine insists, "but as a healthy and self-actualized role". Among the Piegan, "manly-hearted women" took the names of great warriors, seized the economic roles of men, and determined their own sexuality. So ignored was this countervailing tradition by nearly all writers that we have only a few tales-- like that of the Crow woman warrior who sat on the council and ranked as the third leading warrior in a band of 160 lodges-- to hint at the history.

The studies in this volume ~~include~~ ^{include} three important contributions on the nature of "women's work", from ceremonial objects to agriculture and gathering; as well as ~~efforts to deepen a~~ ^{efforts to deepen a} critique of bias in ~~the~~ anthropology-- "the shackles of tradition". Most ~~significant~~ ^{significant} for ~~current~~ ^{current} activity by Native American women is Patricia Albers' essay "Sioux Women in Transition", which takes up ~~one~~ ^{one} North Dakota reservation from its establishment in 1867 to today, looking at "the changing status of women the process of under colonial domination". In asking why, in a period of tremendous economic hardship, women are increasingly active in tribal politics and movements, Albers exposes not only the government's infamous policy of leasing Indian land

-more-

15740

Hidden Half 4444

to whites at bargain rates, but raises questions about the future of a people confined to the "margins" of society. The Hidden Half makes clear that the creativity and struggle of Indian women, in history and today, is central to that future.

Today's Indian women, whether ~~living~~ ^{struggling against} the poverty of the reservation economy or challenging stereotypes in the universities, are ~~opening up new horizons~~ ^{opening up new horizons} as "warriors" for human liberation.

-- Michael Connolly

BF
FE

6 pt.
*Rayna Green, "The Pocahontas Perplex: the Image of Indian Women in American Culture", Massachusetts Review 16: 698-714 (1975). See also her review essay in Signs 6: 248-267 ⁽¹⁹⁸⁰⁾ on "Native American Women".

The hidden dimension: Indian women

The Hidden Half: Studies of Plains Indian Women, by Patricia Albers and Beatrice Medicine. University Press of America, 1983

Ever since the late 1960s both the Women's Liberation Movement worldwide and the movement of Native peoples in North and South America have shaken long-ingrained ideas and stereotypes. A small, but growing, openly feminist voice has appeared directly within the Native American struggle, as exemplified by Shainape Shapwpe's articles in the pages of N&L. Nevertheless, for most Americans, and even for many social scientists writing on Indian society and history, men are still presented as the only actors in the drama, with Indian women remaining the "hidden half," relegated to the twin images of "Princess" or "her darker, negatively viewed sister, the Squaw."

shackles of tradition." Most significant for current activity by Native American women is Patricia Albers' essay, "Sioux Women in Transition," which takes up one North Dakota reservation from its establishment in 1867 to today, looking at "the changing status of women under colonial domination." In the process of asking why, in a period of tremendous economic hardship, women are increasingly active in tribal politics and movements, Albers exposes not only the government's infamous policy of leasing Indian land to whites at bargain rates, but raises questions about the future of a people confined to the "margins" of society. The Hidden Half makes clear that the creativity and struggle of Indian women, in history and today, is central to that future.

— Michael Connolly

Bar
This collection of essays, edited by Patricia Albers and Beatrice Medicine, is an important step toward replacing that stunted view with one of the Indian women as makers of history. Concentrating on the nations of the North Plains, the study poses such a fundamental critique of much of the anthropological literature that it "deals with problems that are applicable to the study of all native women." Albers' introductory essay hits out at the depiction of Plains Indian women as "chattel, enslaved as beasts of burden," victims whose work was ignored as "menial and monotonous." "These views," she charges, "tell us more about the attitudes of the Euro-Americans who studied Plains Indians than about the actual conditions under which these people lived."

INDIAN WOMEN YESTERDAY AND TODAY

MS
A re-examination of such reports, under the impact of the feminist and American Indian movements not only reveals much about both Indian history and Indian women today, but underlines in a new way the need to seriously study Marx's writings on pre-capitalist societies, especially his Ethnological Notebooks. Thus, when Alan Klein's essay examines the "impact of colonialism in the guise of trade upon women," his focus on the Plains mode of production contrasts women's position in the late 18th century, before the introduction of the horse and the hide trade, with that of the 19th century. Far from endorsing what was supposedly Marx's view (as expressed in Engels' Origin of the Family) that treated the loss of women's position in egalitarian society as a single issue, Klein ties it tightly to all the changes brought by the new mode of production.

MS
In tracing the buffalo hunt from its collective nature involving both men and women, to the methods used after the introduction of the horse, he emphasizes that the horse "came into nomadic society as the private property of men." And along with the ever-greater demand for hides by white traders, came establishment of individual ownership of the kill, the absence of women from the hunt, the rise of male soldier societies, and, above all, vastly increased disparities of wealth and power. By then, among the Teton Sioux, the use of a carved "challenge stick" arose, thrown into the tent of a rich man by the poor, reminding him that it was his duty to share with others. The very presence of such a practice reveals the widening gulf between chiefs and ranks.

Yet even in this period, when polygyny, too, became common, "warrior women" made their appearance, "not as a form of deviant behavior," Medicine insists, "but as a healthy and self-actualized role." Among the Piegan, "manly-hearted women" took the names of great warriors, seized the economic roles of men, and determined their own sexuality. So ignored was this countervailing tradition by nearly all writers that we have only a few tales — like that of the Crow woman warrior, who sat on the council and ranked as the third leading warrior, in a band of 160 lodges — to hint at the history.

"SIOUX WOMEN IN TRANSITION"

The studies in this volume include three important contributions on the nature of "women's work," from ceremonial objects to agriculture and gathering, as well as efforts to deepen a critique of bias in anthropology — "the

*Rayna Green, "The Peckham's Burden: the Image of Indian Women in American Culture", Massachusetts Review 14: 688-714 (1973). See also her review essay in Signs 8: 26-57 (1983) on "Native American Women".