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This study provides a description and analysis of the Kasini, a small group of northern Athapaskan Indians. Though it presents a considerable body of ethnographic material from a previously unstudied area, its main concern is to elucidate a form of organization that prevailed, between 1900-1950, in the southeastern Yukon. Kasini social relations were subject to change and the general character of social organization was not predicated on a fixed normative order. Accordingly, I have focused on individual experience and emphasized the emergent quality of social relations in particular contexts instead of assuming a fixed institutional framework and attempting to understand the order of Kasini social life in its terms.

This study seeks to discover the reasons for changes in Kasini relations, the means they had for recognizing changed relations, and the methods used to portray different kinds of relationship.

Social relations are examined from the perspective of activities and ideas. Chapters three and four describe resources used by Kasini and outline the annual sequence of activity resulting from their exploitation. This provides the single most demanding framework governing Kasini behavior and the description reveals that Kasini were subject to frequent
group realignment, and that relative ability in the food quest
was a critical consideration in the formation of all domestic
groups. Chapters five and six discuss certain fundamental
Kasini ideas and show how these pervade Kasini culture and
provide a base-line for Kasini recognition of relationship in
different contexts.

The remainder of the study is an attempt to understand
certain aspects of Kasini social life in the light of the
frameworks of resources and ideas. Chapters seven and eight
examine kinship and the social categories used by people who
were in frequent contact. Differences in individual ability
relate to and determine preferred combinations of people which
constitute domestic groups. Evidence is presented to show how
behavior influenced the use of social categories and perception
of relationships. For individuals in frequent contact, there
was a tendency to employ social categories according to certain
rules, which are described. These constitute a sub-class of a
broader set of categories including those used between people
in infrequent contact. This larger set is described and the
institution of marriage is shown to be a pivotal structure,
creating crucial bonds within Kasini society at large.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyze some aspects of the social organization of an Athapaskan speaking people in southeastern Yukon between 1900-1950. The study has been conceived within a broader framework of social and cultural change and constitutes an oblique prelude to the contemporary scene in which field work was intermittently carried out between 1967-71. The study is a reconstruction of a way of life that is now over. It is based on reminiscent material gathered from a cultural community which, despite existing ethnographic units, we have chosen to refer to as Kasini. This is a word from the dialect of the people in question and refers to a predominant feature of the area: the Pelly river.¹

The Kasini, along with others who previously lived in adjacent areas, now live more or less permanently in the town of Ross River which is situated at the confluence of the Ross and Pelly rivers (see Map 1). Ross River began as a trading post in 1900 and is one of the few remaining settlements in the region that has survived the decline of the fur trade. In 1970 the population of Ross River consisted of about 300 people of which 200 were Indians. Almost all of the White (largely Euro-Canadian) population has come to Ross River since 1966 and they

¹. Our decision to isolate the Kasini in this way is discussed in Appendix B.
are engaged in either permanent wage-employment or in small business of their own. The Indian population has been associated with Ross River since its inception and it consists of three general aggregates of people distinguishable in terms of four, socially significant criteria: territory habitually used for hunting, territory inhabited prior to the decline of the fur trade, dialect, and certain customs and social arrangements. The Kasini constitute the largest of the three aggregates and total 153 individuals.

The contemporary circumstances of Kasini life are quite different from those we describe in the present study. However, they do constitute the empirical base line and stimulus for pursuing particular lines of enquiry. Therefore, before discussing the main problem to which this study is addressed we would like to outline some of the recent historical events which preceded our experiences with the Kasini and briefly describe the conditions of research.

Recent History: 1945-1974

Like most other Indian people of the Canadian subarctic the Kasini have undergone two major changes in their mode of subsistence since their initial contact with the "Whiteman". The first of these involved a shift from hunting and gathering to hunting and trapping with a gradual economic commitment to various tools and manufactured items acquired in exchange for furs. This phase, which properly began for the Kasini around 1900, involved an internal and largely voluntary redefinition of resources and reorganization of activities. The second phase,
which has been called the "government-commercial era", began with the decline of the fur trade after 1945 and involved an increased dependence on wage employment and the direct intervention by administrators in such things as education, cash subsidies, the provision of housing in village settlements, and law enforcement (Helm, 1971).

The construction of the Alaska highway during the second world war has dwarfed in significance and fame most other events in the recent history of the Yukon. However, another less well known project undertaken at the time was an oil pipeline and servicing road that traversed the Pelly river region and extended from the Mackenzie river in the north to Johnson Crossing on the Alaska highway to the south. Although used only briefly for the purpose for which it was constructed, the Canol road, as it is called, passed directly through the town of Ross River and its construction marked the beginning of a vastly increased rate of influence exerted from outside the region. An official of the Department of Indian Affairs visited Ross River in 1949, a Catholic mission was established in 1950, and by 1952 a few children were being flown out to attend residential schools at Whitehorse and Carcross. In addition the fur market began to decline sharply, and eventually, in 1957-58, the combination of a depleted moose population, increased freighting costs, and rising store prices resulted in most of the Ross River population leaving for Watson Lake, Upper Liard, Teslin, Carmacks or Whitehorse in search of wage employment and more direct access to government assistance. By the early 1960's,
however, rumours of summer employment opportunities with big game hunters and mineral exploration companies attracted many of these emigrants back to Ross River again.

Between 1960-65 there was no particular inducement beyond the attractions and distractions of sociability that encouraged the Kasini to adopt a sedentary existence around the Ross River post. Summer wages, government pensions and cash allowances did little more than pay off debts in the store and make a person's credit good in the following months. They were insufficient to allow everyone to live entirely from store bought goods during the winter. Consequently most Kasini lived in the bush throughout the winter and attempted to supplement their food supplies by hunting.

Thus the Kasini mode of production became one of winter hunting and summer wage employment. In addition there were government subsidies for children, elderly, the disabled and unmarried mothers. Trapping was no longer the most significant means whereby food and clothing could be obtained from the store; it became a source of supplementary income whereby a person's supply of tobacco, dried fruits, etc., could be ensured throughout the winter months.

To accommodate the growing interest in the mineral potential of the area a public road was constructed in 1964 which linked Ross River to Watson Lake. This road coincided with the excitement created by the discovery of a rich ore deposit about 40 miles down river from Ross River. By 1966 it was known that a mine was to be built there and construction
workers, some with their families and mobile homes, began to move into the area and a few of these have since become permanent residents of the town. Eventually the road that began in Watson Lake was pushed through to Carmacks and by doing so placed Ross River and the new mining town of Faro on a continuous all-season thoroughfare.

Attendant to this sudden accessibility Ross River experienced a small "boom" and in fairly quick order a garage, motel, beer parlour, cafe, trailer court, police station, school, health clinic and road maintenance station were established and a number of houses were constructed for the newly arrived White residents. In addition the trapping post was rebuilt and became known as a "department store".

This rapid growth of Ross River through the influx of White entrepreneurs and government agencies did little to widen the sources of income for Indians. What it did do was provide new diversions upon which the Indians could spend what cash they were able to acquire in the summer months. Much money which was previously spent on food staples and necessary equipment now went into the purchase of beer, stylish clothes, gadgets, and food in fancy packages. This tendency was encouraged by teenagers recently back from residential school whose interest in clothes fashions, cameras, tape recorders and transistor radios, etc., was as great as their counterparts in Whitehorse. In addition, by establishing a local school in Ross River, the government removed what had been a quite indirect and unintentional form of economic support. This involved taking children
from their parents and educating them in the large residential schools at Carcross and Whitehorse. For better or worse, this reduced the number of mouths to feed and allowed every domestic group to remain mobile throughout the winter. Consequently for many, the establishment of a local school in Ross River further fractured the seasonally fluctuating economic rhythm for it meant that somebody had to stay in town to look after the children who were being schooled. And since the school year lasted from September to June, it also meant that some had great difficulty in supplementing their summer income by winter hunting.

Ultimately these changes did not result in any serious deprivation, for the government stepped in with welfare money and winter works projects. These changes, however, did not influence everyone in the same way and between 1966-71 a partial split developed in the Indian population. Those who were responsible for school aged children were obliged to adapt directly to a sustained sedentary life in town with its attendant seasonal employment, inactivity, boredom, drinking and the schooling of children. Those without such responsibilities could still camp in the bush for much of the year and participate in the familiar, intimate and frequently vigorous existence that characterized life in small domestic hunting groups. For some, especially young couples, there were recognized advantages and disadvantages to both life styles, and frequently the winter was spent moving back and forth between a bush camp and Ross River. For this reason the land around Ross River was assessed primarily in terms
of its accessibility and this involved domestic hunting groups being generally situated within the vicinity of the existing network of rivers and roads.

Gradually, as the children of young couples began to reach school age, fewer and fewer people spent the winter or even part of the winter out of Ross River. This is clearly reflected in Table 1.1, which shows that during September – December of 1967 there were 13 of 29 households living out of Ross River in various domestic hunting groups, whereas during the same period in 1974 only three out of thirty three households were doing so and all were living in Ross River by mid-December.

**Table 1.1**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indian Houses in Ross River</th>
<th>Transportation Mode per House</th>
<th>Households spending Sept.-Dec. in bush</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tents: 11</td>
<td>Dogs: 21*</td>
<td>Bush Camp: 13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses: 18</td>
<td>Cars: --</td>
<td>Town: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Snowmobile: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tents: 1</td>
<td>Dogs: 5</td>
<td>Bush Camp: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses: 32***</td>
<td>Cars: 10</td>
<td>Town: 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A Household credited with "dog transportation" means that it used and cared for one or two dog teams. A "team" being three to five dogs.

**What is indicated by "bush camp" is not the number of camps that were formed in the bush but the number of Ross River households whose occupants were living in the bush for three out of the four months in question. In 1967-68 some Ross River homes were empty for nine months of the year; whereas nobody seems to have spent more than three to four months in the bush during 1973-74.

***Four of these houses are a result of a low cost housing project in 1972-73. Their construction and supervision has had nothing to do with Indians or the Department of Indian Affairs.
The first column does not adequately reflect the amount of construction that has recently occurred. Some older houses have been torn down, and in fact only nine of those standing in 1967 still exist; all the rest have been built since this time. In itself this has required considerable administration, and in 1967 this was completely in the hands of officials from the Department of Indian Affairs (DIA). A Chief and Council had been created as a potential administrative unit by these officials in 1966 but initially those involved did not have the slightest idea what were supposed to be their duties. This was partly a result of not having any idea of accounting, ordering materials and properly administering a payroll. Additionally, they had not grasped the implications of their vastly changed domestic circumstances and simply assumed that the provision of shelter and warmth, for instance, would be provided by individual effort. And indeed some people purchased material and constructed their own houses. However, housing, wood cutting contracts for winter fuel, disposal of garbage and the provision of a domestic water supply remained almost completely in the hands of DIA officials in 1969. At this time the Yukon Native Brotherhood (YNB) was formed and virtually overnight courses were developed to train people from Indian communities such as Ross River to manage these affairs. In addition substantial salaries were provided to those willing to take the training and assume the responsibilities involved.

The general opinion in Ross River was that those who had had some schooling and formal instruction were best suited for the
training and performance of these administrative tasks. Prior to 1969 those who had assumed these administrative positions averaged 40 years of age and some of these people, all of whom were men, were entirely illiterate. Between 1969-72 the selective pressures of training programs and more precisely defined responsibilities resulted in members of the first fully literate generation seeking and gaining office; some of these were women. This lowered the average age of those in positions of Chief, Councilor and Band Manager to 25 years of age. Since 1974 these new incumbents, aside from their official duties, have been largely responsible for the construction of a village hall, development of a co-operative store and successfully bidding for a public contract to clear some land — the last providing work for about six men during winter.

"Modes of transportation" and "Sept.-Dec. spent in bush" are directly related but also reflect different kinds of things. The transition to a mechanized form of transportation is, among other things, indicative of a substantially increased purchasing power. In December 1967 there were sixteen Indian people in Ross River with incomes of $120-$250 per month. These people were distributed in only twelve of the twenty-nine households. Only five of them were gainfully employed, the rest were receiving various kinds of cash subsidies from government agencies.² In

² We are not including here government allowances for children. The subsidies we do take into account involve one unemployment insurance beneficiary and cash allowances to the indigent, disabled and elderly, the last constituting more than half of the total.
December 1974 there were thirty-four with incomes of $120-$600 per month. These people were distributed in thirty of the thirty-three households and out of these, thirteen were working and six receiving unemployment insurance benefits.

The increase in winter income and employment opportunities has developed largely since 1970 and it has allowed most people to avoid the debilitating debts they formerly accrued in the store and which they attempted to pay off in the short season of summer employment. But to the extent that this has resulted in purchase of automobiles and abandonment of dogs for transportation it also reflects the growing commitment and adaptation to a sedentary life in Ross River. This is indicated in column three of Table 1.1. Cars are obviously restricted in their use to the existing system of roads, and without dogs to assist in transporting necessary equipment off the road the Indian people too are now obliged to restrict their movements. Most of the winter hunting now takes place on the week-ends by cruising up and down the road in cars in hopes of intercepting some moose or caribou—the hunters usually returning to Ross River in the evening. By contrast in 1967-68 domestic hunting groups were camped twenty miles away from any road and in different directions out of Ross River there existed continuous toboggan trails of thirty, forty and sixty miles in length.

Development of winter employment opportunities, building a local school and construction of adequate accommodation are only some of the conditions which have brought about a decrease in mobility and growing involvement in town life. The years 1967
and 1974 represent only the extremes of a fitful and uneven process of adaptation that has involved various kinds of influences. There has been, for example, a change in the diet and a decrease in the amount of physical exercise taken. This seems to have resulted in an increasing inability to withstand comfortably the extreme cold and frequently vigorous and sustained activity required in a winter camp. In addition attitudes, sensitivities and social mechanisms are developing to accommodate a cash based economy and the sustained sedentary life in Ross River. These developments are partly a result of the administrative procedures initially employed by DIA officials and since taken up and used by those managing community affairs at the local level. Very briefly these procedures involve construction of houses for specific individuals with a preference given to couples with large numbers of children. Implicit in this procedure there exists a rough equation between household group and family group although in the lexicon of social categories in the various Athapaskan dialects involved there exists nothing which corresponds to the category "family" and no evidence to suggest that a "family" group previously functioned as a unit of organization. In addition certain government allowances are distributed on the basis of reckoning the natural or legal children of a woman or couple without regard to the actual structure of economic dependencies that might exist. Consequently, even within a single household a family unit is isolated or defined for some administrative purposes.

3. We speak here only of the Slave, Tutchone and Kaska speakers now living in Ross River.
In a very loose sense there is, therefore, some need for the Indian people to recognize the economic and spatial correlates of the non-Athapaskan idea of a "family group" simply because it has been imposed. However, the new ambience itself provides reason to recognize non-traditional social boundaries, and in this respect the "family", both as category and group, has come to function as a means of rationalizing and signifying new boundaries of inclusion and exclusion. These are also reflected in other ways.

In 1967 most people still found it extremely difficult to turn down requests for material assistance from their acquaintances, whether or not they shared the same household, and heavy demands were placed on those few who had money from any source. It was partly in an effort to conserve these minimal resources that some people began developing techniques of insulating themselves from the incessant requests for assistance from acquaintances in town. Among these techniques is the use to which the house was put. Unlike the tent or brush shelter of a camp in the bush, a house in town constitutes a physical barrier. Even in 1968-69 it was not customary for a person to request permission to enter a house in which he did not usually reside. He simply tapped on the door and stepped inside in much the same way that he would let out a shout just before arriving at a camp in the bush. However, the house now functions as a socially recognized boundary in which the visitor requests permission for inclusion. In the event that his inclusion is not wanted the knock on the frequently locked door simply receives no response.
from within and the would be hosts remain silent inside until the unwanted visitor goes away.

This new kind of social insularity is also reflected in the current tendency to offer to pay for meat that people from other households have been fortunate enough to acquire in their hunting expeditions. Very often such offers are refused outright in an effort to nullify the implied existence of social separateness. Nevertheless, the offer itself reflects the recognition of new criteria in the interpretation of social boundaries.

None of these influences and interests has jelled to the extent that there now exists a commonly recognized way of establishing social boundaries of inclusion and exclusion in the ambience of town life. Only tendencies exist and these have not, at least not yet, received general recognition or acceptance. Nevertheless, these tendencies all point to the emergence of household groups as units of organization, and an awareness and more precise recognition of what the internal composition of these groups should entail. As we have tried to indicate very briefly above and as the present study shows, these developments are unprecedented and they cannot, at least not entirely, be viewed as derivative of a previous way of thinking about and interpreting social relations. Nor can the past be ignored for it still intrudes, albeit in fragments, in the understanding and organization of current affairs. It is for this reason that we have chosen, in this study of Kasini life, to focus on the past and attempt to give to a few of these fragments some of their former coherence.
Conditions of Research and Character of Data

The foregoing gives a thin but accurate indication of the major shifts in economic orientation and social interests that were in process as fieldwork was being carried out during 1967-69 and 1970-71. It does not, however, reflect the creative mix of idioms nor the general and, in the face of innumerable failures, the rather frantic inventiveness that was, and is still occurring in the semi-urban setting of Ross River. Nor does it reflect the despair and sense of futility that periodically seems to envelop everyone in the contemporary situation.

The initial impression given by the current state of affairs is that of a vast, eclectic clutter in which material concerns, symbolic idioms, ideas, appreciations of relevance and motivational orientations all seem profoundly jumbled. This impression is not simply a result of the observer being exposed to new circumstances since there exists a curious familiarity to much that is going on and it has proven extremely difficult to determine in what way and to what extent this is or is not an illusion.

On the most pragmatic level this jumble is evident in the juxtaposition of two quite different technologies and motivational orientations. On the one hand we have the familiar mixture of disparate technological traditions as manifest in such things as a sled dog chained to the remnants of a Honda motor-bike, bellbottomed trousers and moose hide mocassins, handmade snowshoe frames filled with nylon cord, beaver meat and corn flakes for breakfast, and a bush camp with a transistor radio and a hundred
feet of wire aerial strung through the trees. On the other hand, we have the stated preference of living in the bush attended by an awareness that it is necessary to obtain money in order to live. Today, going into the bush involves the spending of money but not its production. It is largely a subsidized venture in which an individual seldom comes even close to covering expenses through trapping. Consequently, to go or not to go into the bush often presupposes that a person or group can or cannot afford such an excursion. In the summer months especially this frequently results in separations since many of the jobs for mineral exploration companies and big game outfitters require working in remote places well away from Ross River. Those who remain set up camps in the bush and make periodic trips to Ross River to pick up the money that has been sent to them by the individual who is currently employed.

These objects and activities are enveloped in a wide range of ideas and interests derived from Athapaskan and non-Athapaskan traditions. There is Christianity of sorts and Red Power of sorts just as there is the rhetoric of white oppression and the notion of freedom. There is also a notion of individual "power", occasional consultations with shamans, talk of sorcery and collective and individual food avoidances. Steel and machinery are appreciated on the practical level as "tools" and also, by virtue of a traditional kind of interpretation, associated with a capacity called "God power" thought to be possessed by the White-man. "Wage employment" also is appreciated as a means of acquiring money but it is, or can be, other things. Being employed and
getting a bonus, or being employed while others are unable to find jobs not only reflects observable differences within a structure of opportunities it also reflects fundamental differences inherent to the individuals involved. And neither the nature of these differences nor their sociological implications are encompassed or even introduced by categorizing such activities and things as "wage employment" and "tools". This of course does not nullify the utility of such descriptive categories but it does give one reason to pause and reflect on the apparent familiarity of many things and activities in the contemporary scene: What, after all, could an association between a snowmobile and "God power" possibly mean? Furthermore, what is the status of such an interpretation when some would seriously employ it as a means of comprehending the object and their relationship to it and others would lightly dismiss such an interpretation as "Indian bullshit".

The point to be made here, is not that two cultural streams have combined in chaos, for certainly the Kasini comprehend a good deal of the contemporary scene. However, what is familiar to Euro-Canadian outsiders -- snowmobile, salary, God, cousin, etc., must not be understood as familiar things if one desires to comprehend Kasini experience. The modern technical items in Kasini use and English words in their speech, are all the more deceptive for their familiarity. Understanding of Kasini social life, in our experience, is made more difficult by their intermixing of cultural idioms and if one is going to display multiplicity by conjecturing deep structure our examples should indicate just how difficult it is to achieve a proper focus. The phrase
"God power", for instance, is a mix of words derived from both Christianity and Athapaskan notions. In terms of Levi-Strauss's famous bricoleur such a phrase constitutes a bricolage and is similar to the assortment of items one young man had collected to ensure success while hunting. These items were contained in a small canvas bag and involved a shell for a small calibre rifle, two feathers, the ears of a small mammal and a tiny brass cross. In both of these cases, it is true, it was only the idioms (objects and words) that were mixed; the semantic framework in which they were embedded was entirely Athapaskan in nature. Thus the word "God" was a signifier, which had no particular relationship to Christianity, and the phrase "God power" may be translated as something like "non-Athapaskan power" or "a non-traditional kind of power". However, "power" is a distinctly Athapaskan concept which may be translated as ability or capacity derived from contact with a transcendental domain. Similarly the brass cross may be properly described as a religious symbol of some kind but it is only in a very guarded manner that we could categorize it as a crucifix since the only thing it had retained when extracted from the edifice of Christian ideas and symbolic relations was its physical form and apparent centrality to and association with "God power".

In these two examples we can see that the framework for creating relationship has remained Athapaskan but the idiom in which relationship is being expressed is changing. However, the reverse is also true as illustrated in the current usage of the social category _es'dena_ which literally translates as "my people".
Formerly "my people" was used by an individual in reference to all those with whom he was in close association and with whom he frequently interacted. Separately he both referred to and addressed these people with kin terms. Currently, however, those in Ross River are all in more or less close association although they do not all interact with the same frequency. In order to signify degrees of social distance within this new ambience the category $\text{es'dena}$, which is still often used, has obtained a discriminat­ing component which it did not previously possess. This involves an emphasis on genealogical connectedness and a finer differentiation between collateral relatives in signifying degrees of social distance. Thus the term $\text{es'dena}$ has been retained but has come to mean, at least for some, something quite different than it did formerly since the criterion of physical proximity is being supplanted by genealogical proximity. The sweeping classifica­tory distinction of cross-cousin/parallel-cousin (including siblings) implicit to the indigenous system of social categories is being replaced by a three fold distinction involving cousin (in reference to cross-cousin), sibling, cousin-sibling (in reference to parallel cousin). This change has been facilitated by what socio-linguists refer to as code-switching. The indigenous system of categories subsumed by $\text{es'dena}$ has not been tampered with or modified. It has simply been replaced by a new system using English words, e.g. cousin, brother, cousin-brother, which, by recognizing different criteria, partially accommodates what is socially significant in the new situation without directly challenging or contradicting semantic and syntactical features inherent to the traditional system of social categories.
As entangled as this mix between Athapaskan and non-Athapaskan content may be it does not, in itself, pose any special problems for investigation if in fact there exists a clear correspondence between content and form. In other words if we can see the content as being a cultural corpus capable of expressing certain kinds of relationship it should, in the description of social organization, make no difference what, for example, the category es'déné formerly meant if it now, unequivocally means something else. This, however, is not the case for not only has the content in some instances changed while the relationships implied have remained the same, and in other instances the relationships changed while the content has been retained, but insofar as any direct correspondence might be described between content and form these changes are still in a state of flux. As a result, there currently exists quite different meanings attributable to social categories such as es'déné and they are all still in use. Some are derived from the past and are functionally located in a nomadic life style and others are emerging in apparent response to the sedentary conditions of contemporary life in Ross River.

In our attempts to comprehend the symbolic organization of activity our difficulties were further increased by a lack of any clear understanding of a cultural past (which was still passing), and by our failure to achieve fluency in any of the Athapaskan dialects spoken. And for these reasons we were often led astray as we tried to follow up the implications of new relationships embedded in old idioms and vice-versa.
But for precisely the same reasons, although to a much lesser degree, the Indian people were often going astray themselves and they frequently failed to communicate effectively or to draw relevant inferences from each others' behavior. The Kaska words *nusit* and *nutsit*, for example, which may be translated as "physical strength" and "ability (or power) derived from contact with a transcendental domain" respectively, were, in the English vernacular of Kaska speakers, considered roughly equivalent to the words "strength" and "power". The word "strength", however, is often used interchangeably with "power" and this produces a potential source of ambiguity that does not exist in Kaska. Consequently a statement like "When he gets older he will be really strong" can mean two quite different things which may or may not be elucidated by the context in which they are spoken. This statement was in fact made as a commentary on the drunken and violent antics of a young man who had for some years periodically disrupted and at times terrorized the Ross River Indian community with unpredictable and dangerous behavior. The remark was made in reference not to the young man's physical "strength", as was evident in the destruction he wrought, but to his apparent contact with a transcendental domain, as evident in his unpredictable behavior, which was a sign of future ability and "power". Nevertheless, although one person nodded in understanding and agreement when hearing the above remark, another objected by pointing out that the young fellow in question was physically small and skinny and would never be very strong. Furthermore, the second listener, although fully aware of the first kind of interpretation and its implications, was inclined
to attribute the violent young man's behavior solely to the mundane influence of alcohol rather than to contact with the transcendental. For this reason he was also in favour of having the police brought in whenever the young man got out of hand rather than adopting the "traditional" response to such behavior which would have been to avoid entirely all contact or interference with him.

Our purpose in providing these few examples has been to indicate the bifarious character of much of the material we collected and to show reason for adopting the field procedures we did. During 1967-69 we spent 11 months (out of a total of 16) in Ross River and with a notable lack of success we attempted to set up formal interviews and systematically collect information of both an historical and contemporary nature. Apart from being unable to distinguish between Athapaskan as opposed to non-Athapaskan (or neo-Athapaskan) interpretations of fact, whether historical or contemporary, our interviews, such as they were, inevitably foundered whenever we began to focus sharply on a particular topic or too obviously direct the line of enquiry. The reasons for this were many and since they are not at issue here it will suffice to say that most of our information was acquired in general conversation and that we usually advanced on any particular topic in a very oblique and erratic fashion. For instance, the event described above concerning the words "strength" and "power" led, in later discussion, to questions concerning their Kaska equivalents which led, still later, to discussion with the various participants to the interchange. In
this manner we backed in, as it were, to an appreciation of a Kaska distinction which we were then able to read forward as a partial interpretation of the events described.

The remaining five months during our first stay in the field were spent with various domestic groups camped in tents in the vicinity of Ross River. In this setting we learned some of the rudiments of hunting, snaring and fishing, and the techniques of travelling and camping in the bush at all seasons of the year. The opportunity for systematic enquiry was no greater here but since the setting was so clearly redolent of a former way of life it did encourage a more consistent expression of a "traditional" Athapaskan perspective. It was primarily for this reason that during our second stay in the field we chose to spend most of the time (11 of 16 months) living with small domestic groups camped in the bush. This provided us with the opportunity to appreciate a relatively uncluttered Athapaskan view of things, and it is largely upon our enquiries and observations in this setting that we have based the present reconstruction of the social organization of the Kasini as it existed between 1900-1950.

The Plan of the Study

The notion of "organizational flexibility" is now considered characteristic of many hunting peoples (Lee and Devore, 1968) and in various ways this feature has been emphasized for a number of Athapaskan speaking people including Kutchin (Slobodin, 1960), Hare (Savishinsky, 1970), Dogrib (Helm, 1965, 1971; Helm and Iurie, 1961), Bear Lakers (Osgood, 1932), Slave (Honigmann, 1946; Helm, 1961), Chipewyan (Vanstone, 1965), Kaska (Honigmann, 1949).
and for the hunting people of subarctic (Helm and Leacock, 1971) and arctic (Valentine and Vallee, 1968) Canada generally. Flexibility is a quality or condition which can be ascribed to some structures or relationship and requires the notion of a standard or norm. It thus follows that its utility can only be assessed with respect to the relevance of a chosen standard to the people being studied. In Athapaskan studies flexibility has been ascribed to social groups. Almost without exception, some reference has been made to flexibility of group composition, recruitment and attitudes towards residence. However, it is extremely unclear whether this emphasis on groups is shared by the people being studied. The necessary task of describing the groupings that are formed and the activities engaged in by individuals in these groupings assumes pre-eminence and presents a sociological perspective in which the peoples' views of their own relationships are judged. That these views or interpretations do not appear consistent with actual articulation of groups has led to the conclusion that flexibility exists. In many instances this has resulted in clear and intelligent descriptions of limiting ecological conditions and external constraints but it has resulted in a reduced emphasis on how, within such a framework, the organization of activity is culturally constituted. It is hoped that the premises employed and the questions asked in the present study will show how a deeper analysis of culture may be reintroduced to strengthen our general understanding of Athapaskan social organization.

The notion of social organization usefully straddles
the analytical distinction between content and form in the investigation of how and to what extent human action in culturally defined surroundings may be seen as structured and articulate (cf. Firth, 1964: 60-63, 80-84). Form is induced from content and is derivative of two perspectives which result in what, for our purposes, may be called the instrumental logic of activity and the cultural logic of interaction. However, to the extent that the advantages of the notion of organization are evident in investigations which have extensive reference to observed or well documented activities we, of necessity, must employ a rather abbreviated understanding of it in handling the reminiscent material we have on hand. Nevertheless, following Firth we accept that social organization is framed within the superordinate categories of process and change and that in various ways the overall intent of an investigation of this kind is to grasp a relationship between instrumental and cultural forms which, to paraphrase Darendorf, at any point in time either are no longer or not yet what they will become.

Instrumental forms, as we use the term here, involves collation of the narrow horizons and fragmented needs of individuals producing the material necessary for existence. In a certain sense there is something acultural about the generalized framework which results from these considerations; for it is not enough that individuals simply construct and acquire things that, for instance, they label as shelter and food; these things must actually provide protection and be nutritious in a substantial way. In other words all intentionality must respond within the autonomous parameters of specified physical conditions if the ensuing action is to be tolerated. This much is a stock
truisms in anthropology and underlies the entire rationale for describing limiting conditions in social organization. It is, however, important to remember that although any people must recognize such conditions in their efforts to cope effectively it is not necessary (and in fact most uncommon) that they conceptualize or create a general formulation of them. One does not, after all, require a theory of gravity in order to recognize its manifestations and respond accordingly. On the other hand, it is necessary for us to make such a formulation if we are to appreciate the extent to which a culturally distinct body of attitudes and ideas influence the order of human activity. As Leach has pointed out, this appreciation can only be achieved if we first exhaust the possibility of seeing order in these same activities as an adaptive response to particular conditions (Leach, 1961:306).

In the next three chapters we provide such a formulation and show how, in combination, the resource base and the methods used in its exploitation must result in certain kinds of activities and groups. In brief we show that: (a) the resources of the area could only support a small population, (b) this population had to be mobile in pursuit of these resources, (c) this mobility influenced the size of groups that were formed, (d) certainly individual capacities were required for exploiting these resources, and that (e) every economically viable group that formed had to contain an individual with these capacities. From these considerations we cannot show what was normally the case by providing a statistical profile of activities and groupings
since we have no way of knowing what these might have been for any particular time during the historical period in question. To the extent that our description of resources and technology is adequate, however, we can induce a logic of practical reasoning in terms of which we characterize certain regularities in activity and group composition. We only illustrate these regularities with specific cases from our Kasini material but it is our contention that under the conditions described these regularities would necessarily emerge regardless of other cultural considerations.

Our analysis results in a sequential and cyclical outline of activities and a modular appreciation of group composition — it provides the single most demanding framework in which all Kasini must operate. This framework tells us when certain activities are performed and what class of individuals must be on hand to perform them. In the fall, for instance, we learn that Kasini hunt for big game in high country; we also know that this task requires commensurate knowledge and physical ability. Consequently, during the fall we have a particular kind of functional equation from which we may conclude something about the groupings that are formed. This may be diagramed as follows:

```
Activity        Group

Fall Hunting ← Others
       Hunter
```

The hunter in this case is not just somebody who may be called a "hunter" but somebody who is actually capable of hunting. It
does not include the sick, the lame or elderly who may have the knowledge to hunt but who are physically incapable. Nor does it include children (or visiting anthropologists) who may be physically capable but who are ignorant.

This assertion could be judged obvious to the point of triviality were it not for the fact that it is so tempting to view the self-sufficient Kasini domestic group in terms of more familiar considerations. In the small Kasini population many domestic groups that formed involved people of close genealogical connection and the classificatory kin terms that were employed necessarily entailed finite combinations. As a result, with respect to genealogy and kin terms, we very often recorded domestic groups that could be diagramed as variants of the following:

\[ \Delta = \bigcirc \]

The temptation, of course, is to see the above as a "family group" of some sort and to jump from here to the erroneous conclusion that the "family" is a basic productive unit. This, however, would play down the necessary instrumental character of such a group and could result in an emphasis on a familial theme in the recognition of variance rather than on the logic of practical reasoning. In the fall, for instance, the above grouping would not emerge at all if there were not some on hand who could hunt -- this would have been the preeminent consideration in the formation of such a group and it is in terms of this standard of instrumentation that a great many variations in Kasini group personnel may be
understood. Other considerations must be a matter of demonstrated cultural significance and one cannot presume to know what these are until such demonstrations have been made.

Like the bat on a Rorschach card, or the stars of the zodiac and a clock face, the resemblance between the above diagram and something we recognize as a "family" is obvious — but it may not be in the least bit relevant and, in point of fact it was not for the Kasini. The acid test of all domestic groups was their viability as productive units and other than this Kasini possessed no idealization concerning their internal composition. Domestic groups were not perceived as discrete, normative units or entities and there existed no segmentary system of identification centred on group membership. Through time all individuals belonged to numerous domestic groups and Kasini were constantly moving in and out of each other's ambience as they responded to fluctuations in the resource base and shifting individual capabilities.

Kasini were extremely sensitive to changes in relative capability and frequency of contact and these factors influenced their experience of social relationship. Broadly speaking the relationship between any two people was not fixed — the identification of others in terms of oneself and oneself in terms of others was a continuous dialectical process centered on the different inferences that could be drawn from activities on the one hand and social categories on the other. The main body of this study examines this aspect of Kasini social life in detail.

In anthropology the interest in interaction and social relationship largely centers on the paired foci social category
and behavior. The notions of interaction and relationship are derived from inference not observation -- strictly speaking all one can observe are sequences of activity and spatial arrangements of people on the ground (Watslawick, 1967: 54-57). These are transformed into interaction and relationship by understanding how the participants attribute significance both to each other and to the activity in which they engage. In other words interaction and relationship are grasped in terms of how the participants view the situation and this they do in two main ways. Either they recognize significance in their respective activities and thus see behavior as reflecting relationship, or they see significance in properties they ascribe to each other and thus see social categories as reflecting relationship. All people seem to use both methods interchangeably and as a result our general understanding of the postulated relationship between category and behavior has remained rather anfractuous and oblique. Take for instance two individuals who might be from our own society -- individual X gives advice, individual Y solicits advice. In time this sequence may prompt X to address Y with the term "son". The social category "son" and its implicit reciprocal "father" thus portray a relationship -- the relationship itself is derived from how X and Y attach significance to the activity in which they are engaged. In this case it results in X being viewed as superordinate vis-a-vis Y. The activity and the categories employed therefore have a communicative aspect and for this reason we may speak of the semantics of interaction and social relationship. Social categories, however, may also be viewed as a
systematically coherent vocabulary of labels which are employed by applying certain rules -- for this reason we may speak of the relationship between people as syntactical or rule-based. Individuals X and Y, for instance, may employ the reciprocal categories "father" and "son" because X is the legal guardian and assumed genitor of Y. In this case "father" and "son" are applied not because of the activities which X and Y are engaged in, but because of the rules which in certain contexts govern their use. Nevertheless, the categories employed would still possess the semantic quality mentioned above and the relationship between X and Y could not be properly understood, in our opinion, unless this was also brought into the description and analysis of their interaction. The need for this semantic appreciation would be evident if, for example, Y referred to his genitor and legal guardian as "son". If Y was three years old X would likely dismiss the event as a mistake and assume that little Y had simply not properly grasped the syntax of applying such categories as "father" and "son". If Y was a teenager, however, X might object to such a practise and view it as an impertinence -- i.e., X would object to what Y was trying to signify and what this implied about their relationship.

The remainder of this study is an attempt to grasp certain aspects of Kasini interaction and social relationship. We consider both the syntax and semantics of social categories and center on the inferences Kasini drew from physical separation, differences between individuals and changes that occurred in individual capabilities. We begin, in Chapter five, by introducing certain ideas Kasini had about themselves and the reality in
which they lived. This entrance to Kasini culture is a bit arbitrary but lays the foundation for understanding a number of important issues we discuss later. Chapter six attempts two things. In the context of illustrating the prevalence of a particular kind of relationship we provide a broad formula or axis in terms of which relationships of many kinds — social and otherwise — were recognized. This axis, or what Geertz might call a template, was not so much a reflection of any specific situation or event as it was a means of recognizing significant aspects of many events. It functioned as a method of interpreting or giving a particular cast to events and thus served Kasini as a framework for experiencing what went on around them. In no demonstrable sense is this axis derivative of either social arrangements, practical concerns or indeed any particular consideration at all, it is simply there, a given in Kasini culture.

In Chapters seven and eight we examine the Kasini logic of interaction and consider the social categories used by people who were in sustained contact along with the inferences that were drawn from differences in individual ability. Chapter eight is an attempt to understand Kasini domestic groups as a structure of preferred combinations of people interacting. It is individual preference, not the group itself, that constitutes the point of departure in this analysis. In both chapters we provide evidence that behavior influenced how social categories were employed and relationship perceived. There were, however, certain limitations to this process and the application of categories was not, for the most part, derivative of the activity of people in frequent
contact. In other words there was a tendency to employ social categories in terms of certain rules governing their application and to some extent it is fruitful to appreciate relationship and understand Kasini behavior as following from the application of social categories. We cannot, however, develop a one sided thesis along these lines although in this regard it is of interest to consider the broad implications of someone who thinks he can.

In a densely argued work Fortes has recently written,

"Kinship predicates the axiom of amity ... What (this) rule posits is that 'kinsfolk' have irresistible claims on one another's support and consideration in contradistinction to 'non-kinsmen' simply by reason of the fact that they are kin" (Fortes 1969:237-8).

The methodological drift of Fortes' position is to begin with the structure of social categories and then attempt to understand social behavior in terms of this framework. Amicable behavior, as he says, follows from a knowledge of who are kinsfolk. This knowledge and the means of establishing it are, it would seem, necessarily invariant -- a person cannot be categorized as a "kinsman" at one time and a "non-kinsman" at another if amity is

4. Since this narrow synopsis of Fortes' position does not include jural considerations, i.e., systems of rights and obligations, it should not be taken too literally. In passing, however, it is worth pointing out how confounding his position can become. The so-called axiom of amity is, of course, a taxonomic class which implies that amicable behavior is intrinsically identifiable -- in this regard one need only reflect on how various are the interpretations of the muscle contractions of the face which result in an upward curve of the lips. Depending on culturally defined context this behavior may be interpreted as, for instance, a smile or leer. As stated, however, Fortes' behavioral class is entirely devoid of criteria for inclusion in it and for this reason his attempt at generalization cannot be applied simply because we have no means of identifying amity in its specific manifestations. In this rather ungenerous light what began as generality ends as absurdity i.e. "Kinship predicates ... (what??)".
to be predicated on kinship. The structural shape of people in relationship therefore depends on how they appear to each other as members of discrete segments. The analytical emphasis consequently must fall on these segments, e.g. kin/non-kin, and from this knowledge certain kinds of behavior may be expected.

In many ethnographic studies, kinship terms are considered as an autonomous corpus and perhaps for many societies this kind of closure is justified. In Chapter nine, however, we show how Kasini kin terms constitute a sub-class of categories and are encompassed in a much broader framework. The coherence of this larger framework is achieved, furthermore, by inverting the emphasis between category and behavior that Fortes advocates. Social categories are dealt with in terms of a description of behavior and their application is understood as following from certain kinds of behavior. In other words behavior itself possesses a structural eloquence which promotes the use of certain social categories -- activity establishes relationship that social categories simply portray. For the Kasini, as a result, there existed no invariant form of discrete social segments, since a person could be categorized as, for instance, kin or non-kin at different times depending on whether amity or enmity was thought to prevail. The structural shape of Kasini in relationship therefore depended on how they interpreted their respective activity. Consequently the emphasis falls on how they recognized meaningful behavior when they saw it and what sorts of inference they drew from it in particular contexts. Strictly speaking we are not dealing here with a class of behavior but the
event of separation and what significance varying frequency of contact had for Kasini. There were social reasons for separation which we discuss in Chapter eight, although the event seems to have resulted largely from practical considerations centering on the food quest.

In Chapter ten we discuss the Kasini institution of marriage as a pivotal structure in their society and examine how it functioned as a mechanism for drawing together those who were separated.

We can see in the two approaches outlined above that it is not a question of the presence or absence of structure, for both achieve this quite adequately. Rather, it is a question of the immutable or relative nature of properties ascribed to people. Each encourage quite different appreciations of the cultural form of social life. On the one hand we have what may be called the segmentary technique in identifying the sociological other. Here the application of social categories stems from a consideration of specific rules and they provide an unequivocal and timeless definition of people. On the other hand we have what may be called the orientational technique in identifying the sociological other. In this case the application of social categories is derived from the meaning that obtains in prevailing activity. The social life of every people would probably admit to analysis from both these approaches, although it seems the encompassing framework in most societies is segmentary in nature. In this regard Kasini appear remarkable, since, for them, the encompassing framework was orientational.
CHAPTER II
SETTING: GEOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL

Topography and Climate

The Pelly River drainage basin covers a large area in the southeastern sector of the Yukon Territory. From its source close to the Yukon-Northwest Territory border deep in the Selwyn mountain range the river flows in a southwesterly direction towards the plateau between the Selwyn range to the east and the Pelly range to the west. On reaching the southeastern extremities of this 2,000 foot high plateau the Pelly flows through it to the northwest until its 300 mile course terminates in a junction with the Yukon river near the present site of Pelly Crossing.

The two major tributaries of the Pelly, the Ross and Macmillan rivers, also have their headwaters in the Selwyn mountain range and join the Pelly at about 100 mile intervals from the source of the mainstream.

West of the Pelly are other rivers which also flow into the Yukon, the most important being the Big and Little Salmon rivers.

South and southeast of the Pelly drainage the rivers are part of the Arctic watershed and flow into the Mackenzie river. Immediately to the south is the Liard and one of its main tributaries, the Frances river. This system flows south and then northeast for some hundreds of miles before joining the Mackenzie at Fort Simpson.

East of the Pelly drainage and close to the two main tributaries of the Pelly river is the Keele river, which flows
northeast and then east into the Mackenzie about 50 miles upstream from Fort Norman.

These river systems constitute the likely routes by which various peoples who live on the upper Pelly river gained access to the region.

The topography of the area is rough, mountainous and dissected by numerous streams and rivers. The Pelly range, which is between 4,000 and 6,000 feet high and west of the Pelly river, is more or less parallel to the Selwyn range to the east which is between 5,000 and 7,000 feet. These mountains are fairly evenly covered by conifers, mostly Spruce and Pine, up to about 3,500 feet; however, only infrequently do individual trees have a diameter greater than ten inches. Poplar, birch and red willow are very common in ravines and old alluvial terraces of the moist lowlands. In some areas, especially the plateau region along the Pelly river, vegetation is sparse and one finds only bunch grasses, low shrubs and ground plants -- a micro-climate which might almost be described as arid.

The stunted and sparse quality of most of the vegetation is characteristic of the Yukon region, which is well inland, shadowed from the moisture laden air of the Pacific and also subject to long, severe winters. October usually marks the beginning of winter, and May the time of break-up on the largest rivers. Sustained winter temperatures of -20°F are common and not infrequently the thermometer will plummet to -75°F or even colder, especially during January and February. Precipitation is especially light in the inter-mountain plateau through which the Pelly flows and only infrequently does more than two or three feet of
snow fall during the eight month winter. Precipitation in the mountains is somewhat heavier. Another characteristic feature of the climate is the seasonal extremes in exposure to sunlight. During winter months there is little more than four or five hours sunlight per day, whereas in the summer months precisely the opposite occurs. This feature is conducive to rapid matura-
tion of small plants and shrubs which grow quickly and go to seed within the short growing season. However, it does not encourage rapid development of larger plants and consequently restricts forest growth.

Early Contact

The late 18th and early 19th Centuries saw the first contact by Whitemen with areas peripheral to the upper Pelly river region. First came the Russians on the Pacific coast, and not long after the North West Company began exploring and establishing trading posts on the Mackenzie river and its tributaries. By the early 1800's the Indians of the Pelly river were almost surrounded by those who had direct contact with the Whiteman and access to his trade goods (McClellan, 1964:3-6).

Actual White penetration of the region did not take place until the summer of 1840 when Robert Campbell discovered the Pelly river while carrying out explorations for the Hudson's Bay Company. In 1842 Campbell constructed Glenlyon House at Frances Lake and in 1846 the post of Pelly Banks was constructed on the Pelly river near the mouth of the Campbell river. However, in 1849 Pelly Banks burnt down and the following year Glenlyon House was abandoned for the more successful operation at Fort Selkirk, built in 1848 at the mouth of the Pelly river.
But this too was abandoned in 1852, due in part to discovery of easier access routes to the richer fur areas to the north and also the hostile competition of Tlingit traders on the upper Yukon river. Thus Indian-White trade was terminated in the upper Pelly river region, and none was organized for the next fifty years (Campbell, 1958).

The detailed results of the sustained trade on the peripheries of the region and Campbell's brief occupation of the area, are difficult to determine but a few things are quite clear. Trade between Indians, at least on the lower Pelly, had taken place prior to Campbell's arrival; for the Indians he met near the confluence of the Pelly and Yukon already possessed a few items which were of both Russian and Hudson's Bay Company origin (Wilson, 1970: 77-78). Thus, although Campbell makes no similar observations about the Indians of the upper Pelly, trade goods were entering the region prior to White contact. Also, if Campbell's unspecified descriptions of internecine conflict is any indication, the concentric attraction of the trading posts at both Frances Lake and Pelly Banks drew people together who previously had very little to do with one another and very probably any correspondence that might have existed between territories, social relations and linguistic aggregates was becoming rearranged. Certainly events following closure of Fort Pelly Banks suggest that they were becoming rearranged rather quickly, for 35 years later, in 1887, the "Pelly Indians", as Calbreath describes them, were trading at Dease Lake -- 200 miles from the nearest point on the Pelly river (Calbreath, 1888).
But apart from these temporary trading ventures out of the area, it is clear from accounts of informants, early records (Field, 1913; Pike, 1896) and more recent ethnographic surveys (Denniston, 1966) that the period immediately following Campbell's occupation of the upper Pelly was characterized by conflict and immigration of small groups from the south and northeast. Why these groups moved into the area is not certain but perhaps they themselves were being pushed out of other regions or were searching for richer fur country. Whatever the case, in stories now told about this period it is generally held that immigrating groups had had recent contact with White traders and did possess guns. These gave the immigrants a decided advantage in imposing their will and making good their claim to territory inhabited by Kasini who were living northwest of Frances lake and along the Pelly river. Certain sites are still well known for the fighting and killing that went on during this period.

These immigrant groups, however, were neither large in size nor possessed of a common social background or language and they presented no unified front. The result has been a gradual blending with the Kasini and the question of origins dating back to these times has come to bear little sociological weight.

Trapping Posts and the Fur Trade

In the next phase of contact, establishing trapping posts and the wanderings of individuals prospectors following the Klondike gold rush, brought direct and sustained contact to the Kasini. By 1900 numerous posts had been built along the
Yukon river and its eastern tributaries, notably by the company of Taylor and Drury which began operations in 1899. At about the same time an independent fur buyer established Nahanie House at the confluence of the Ross and Pelly rivers and within two years the Hudson's Bay Company reopened a small post near their old site of Pelly Banks (Sheldon, 1911: 190-3). In 1905 Taylor and Drury bought out the operations at both Nahanie House and Pelly Banks. The former they renamed Ross River and it became the main supply depot for it was the farthest point on the Pelly river which could be successfully navigated by steamers transporting freight.

As it turned out Ross River was strategically located for not only was it able to serve people who habitually lived in the area but it was also accessible to those who lived in the region to the north. They trapped in the Macmillan river area and were composed of an intermarried mixture of people who had traded out of Selkirk and Port Norman. In addition those who trapped on the borders of the hinterland of posts to the west such as Big Salmon, Carmacks and Little Salmon, also began to trade at Ross River. Soon after it opened therefore, Ross River was frequented by people who inhabited quite different territories, were socially peripheral to one another and who were quite distinct in dialect and custom. Furthermore, there was at this time a fairly stable arrangement of land use amongst these people. Trapping had just begun and the land was still rich in fur, hence there was little reason for people to move into territories that were both unfamiliar and inhabited by strangers. As a result these linguistic and territorial
clusters remained culturally and economically distinct entities whose interchange appears to have been restricted to ritual competitions in singing and gambling during the few weeks they met each year while patronizing the Ross River post.

Throughout the next 35 years these separate clusters became increasingly discrete -- not because they were political or land holding units as some early observers have suggested (Keele, 1910), but because: 1) they recognized each other as being culturally different and therefore unpredictable and probably dangerous, 2) they occupied different territories that were sufficient to their respective needs, 3) they appear to have been able to find within their own ranks sufficient numbers of marriageable people to perpetuate themselves, and 4) the social distance that existed between these three clusters was further accentuated by the developments of the fur trade that took place in the 1920's and 1930's. During this period at least six other trapping posts were established in the area (see Map 2). To the north independent fur buyers constructed three posts on the Macmillan river and another at Sheldon Lake. To the south a post was operated at Frances Lake and Taylor and Drury established a post at Pelly Lakes. And to the west Taylor and Drury also operated a small outpost at Rose Point. Consequently, apart from decreasing the need to come to Ross River at all, the emergence of these new commercial centers further separated, in terms of geographical distance, these different trapping communities.

The Commitment to Trapping

After his initial exploration of the Frances Lake and
upper Pelly river areas Robert Campbell apparently made the observation that it would be very difficult to estimate the true fur potential of a country so interrupted by mountains and valleys. From his own experience such topography was characterized by small but rich pockets of fur bearing animals that afforded profitable exploitation for only short periods of time. Thus, quite apart from the larger populations on the lower Pelly, it may have been the suspicion of an uneven fur potential on the upper Pelly which led the Hudson's Bay Company investment to be concentrated on the lower Pelly at Fort Selkirk.

In many ways Campbell's earlier assessment was reflected in subsequent events. Amongst the Kasini there is no indication of an "atomistic" form of organization such as emerged with other northern Athapaskan (Jenness, 1937) and Algonkian (Hickerson, 1967) peoples after the establishment of the fur trade and the development of exclusive corporate rights over specific plots of land for trapping purposes. Within the Kasini region, it appears that no particular area could ensure, for even a few years, a sustained fur yield. Kasini found it necessary to move frequently from one area to another in search of fur. There were, of course, limits to their meanderings and these we will discuss presently. However, it is important to bear in mind that neither before nor after the introduction of the trapping business does there appear to have been any system of tenure whereby specific plots of land were allocated to discrete groups or to individuals.

The unevenly distributed and quickly exhausted fur resources of the area are further reflected in the total number of
trapping posts that were established in the region. The Pelly Banks, Pelly Lakes and Frances Lake posts were all closed and opened a number of times before their final closure in the 1950's. In part this was in response to cyclical depletion and resurgence of fur bearing animals being trapped in areas adjacent to each post.

Dependence on trapping, however, was never total for up until the mid 1920's virtually all food the Kasini consumed was obtained through their own efforts from the land. Trade goods, which were restricted primarily to fabrics, condiments, tobacco and hardware items, were appreciated primarily for their novelty and obvious convenience. Even until 1955 the dependence on the trapping post for food involved relatively small, although perhaps critical amounts of flour, rice and sugar.

We can therefore characterize Kasini production with the frequently used rubric "hunting and trapping". However, in doing so we must bear in mind that trapping became functionally related to hunting in a way that did not correspond to any of the previous gathering activities. Indeed, there is reason to suspect that after introduction of trapping the Kasini became more committed to hunting than they had ever been before.

This is based on three considerations. First, prior to trapping the Kasini possessed no working dogs. There is some evidence they had small hunting watch dogs, but from all accounts in this and surrounding areas it is clear that mobility was primarily pedestrian and goods were moved by back-packing or on hand-pulled skin toboggans. The introduction of trapping, however,
increased the need for a more efficient transportation. This was necessary not so much for trapping itself as it was for the movement of both goods and people between a particular trapping area and the post. Such trips were usually made in mid-winter and early spring and, for the Kasini, frequently involved total distances per trip of 80 - 150 miles. In the short run the acquisition of large, strong work dogs to pull loaded toboggans proved an efficient answer.

Secondly, there has been extensive recent discussion of factors which limit the population of hunting and gathering societies (Lee and DeVore.1968: 221-48), and although nothing conclusive has come of this, there has been considerable emphasis on treating hunters within the context of a "predator-prey" relationship. This emphasis has in turn been placed within the interpretive framework of what has come to be known as Liébig's "law of the minimum". This is a "statement about biological evolution which calls attention to the fact that selection and adaptation respond to minimum rather than maximum features of the environment" (Fried.1967:63).

In the case of predator populations which prey on small animals there is often a rapid fluctuation in their population size if the prey species is on a short population cycle which is controlled by means other than predation. Such is the case with lynx and rabbits in the boreal forest region. However, in the case of "man the hunter", who does not have the same recovery rate as the lynx, the population frequently appears to level out at or near the food capacity of the land which is available
during the leanest periods. This can be gauged either in terms of the leanest time of the year and/or the extreme nadir of the animal population which might occur only once per decade or less.

Thirdly, if the "law of the minimum" argument is even roughly correct we can be sure that certain consequences would inevitably attend the introduction of dogs to the Kasini economy. Quite apart from their mobility value dogs would also constitute an additional load on the same food resources available to the Kasini for in this region meat from big game animals constituted by far the largest source of nutrition. Consequently if the population of big game animals was unable to increase its rate of reproduction to accommodate the necessary increase in predation, the inevitable result would be an ever-declining quantity of food for both men and dogs. This situation, if allowed to continue for a sufficiently long period of time, would gradually sharpen the alternatives open to any hunting and trapping peoples: a) they could give up their dogs in order to have sufficient food for themselves; in which case they would probably have to give up trapping, b) they could spend more time hunting for an ever decreasing food supply, in which case they would have to decrease the time spent at trapping, c) they could migrate to a new area in the hopes that it was plentiful in both food and furs, or d) they could rely increasingly on the trapping post to supply them with critical amounts of food. This final alternative does not appear to have been available to the Kasini until the late 1930's and early 1940's.

It is therefore possible that Kasini trapping activities, over a sufficiently long period of time and in some areas, could
have been an unstable adaptive response. In the following chapters we describe a way of life that is characterized by frequent group realignment and rapid movement and it is difficult to say what these owe to the influences considered above. It is likely, however, that they became much more developed after trapping began.
CHAPTER III

NATURAL RESOURCES: LOCAL DIVERSITIES AND SEASONAL VARIATIONS

After 1900 the Kasini remained dependent on hunting, fishing and gathering, which required mobility and a variety of exploitative techniques. Amongst hunters in general, accumulation of goods is constrained by their mobility: "...needs are limited, avarice inhibited and — portability (becomes) a main value in the economic scheme of things" (Sahlins, 1968:86). Kasini therefore placed great emphasis on being able to manufacture both tools and equipment from the materials at hand — rafts and skin, watercraft, bark or dug-out canoes, a variety of bone and stone tools, snowshoes, rawhide snares for both small and big game, fish nets made from sinews, leather containers and clothing, dried food, and brush shelters set to an open fire.

We have already argued that it was not so much trapping but the distances involved in trading that stimulated a need for an increasingly efficient mode of transportation. And this resulted in the acquisition of work dogs. In many respects the use of dogs relaxed the restrictions previously imposed by pedestrian travel, on the quantity of non-subsistence goods that could be acquired at one time. These included fabrics and various items of hardware which frequently decreased effort needed

1. In focus and even in format the following description has followed the lead of others. Some of these individuals and their works are considered in this chapter and the next. However, there are some notable studies which have been consulted but not mentioned; among these are the works of Suttles (1960, 1962) for the Northwest Coast, Spencer (1959), and Damas (1966, 1969) for the Eskimo, Lee (1972) and Marshall (1959, 1960) for the Bushman, and Helm (1965, 1968) for the Athapaskan speakers of the Arctic drainage.
to satisfy the requirements for goods (guns, traps, snare wire, knives and cooking utensils), warmth (axes, files, saws, matches, log cabins, stoves and stove pipes, cloth for tents, bedding and clothing) and transportation (axes, saws and wood planes for making sledges, toboggans and by the 1930's plank boats, the latter requiring in their turn outboard motors, oil and gasoline).

Inherent in this pattern is an overall conflict: on the one hand a sustained need for mobility in the food quest, and on the other dependence on a growing number of cumbersome, and even immovable, material possessions.

To some extent this contradiction was mediated by dogs and the more efficient transportation they provided. However, dogs were an obvious advantage only when used with toboggans during winter months. At other times of the year, especially during late spring, the dog became not only less useful but an additional pressure on the temporarily marginal food resources.

Generally speaking there were seasons in which accoutrements obtained through and for trapping were most useful. Trapping was carried out from November to March when pelts possessed their best market value. During this period most domestic groups lived in widely dispersed log cabins or semi-permanent tent camps, and adjacent to these the adult males engaged in trapping. For the rest of the year hunting and gathering was the main activity and consequently the cabin, stoves, extra clothing and bedding, traps, tools and even extra guns were left behind -- not to be used again until the following season. By the end of April toboggans, sledges and showshoes
were also cached until the following winter. In the spring, summer and fall seasons travel was primarily on foot and goods were packed by both man and dog from one food supply to the next.

This rather simple seasonal pattern depended on acquisition, by the domestic group, of sufficient food in the fall months (September - October) in order that trapping could be engaged in full-time during the winter. This requirement, however, was seldom if ever fully met and hunting frequently had to be given priority even during the trapping season.

In a recent study it has been estimated that humans are capable of living on two pounds of moose meat per day, and that the average moose will provide 400 pounds of food (Ridington 1968). Let us consider one case involving a Kasini man who allegedly was able to cache three moose, five caribou and 500 fish in preparation for the winter of 1946-47. Now if we assume out of hand that the nutritional value of moose, fish and caribou is equivalent and accord an arbitrary average weight of 200 edible pounds per caribou and 3 edible pounds per fish (both of which are probably over estimates) there would have been a total of 3700 pounds of food on hand. However, if we also assume that dogs are capable of working effectively during the winter on two pounds of food per day (which from our experience is an underestimate), we can very roughly gauge the food requirements of the group for the five month trapping season. In doing so we should keep in mind that we have probably over-estimated the available quantity of food and under-estimated the needs of the group. In any case, the group in question involved ten
people and five dogs, which would require, according to our estimates, 4500 pounds of food — 800 pounds more than had been acquired in the fall months.

In the particular case in question the five caribou and three moose were considered to be an average to an above average fall catch. However, the 500 fish catch was considered remarkable by all who knew about it and most claimed never to have been able to cache in excess of 60-80 fish for winter. Thus we may conclude that 2,000 pounds of meat and fish would have had to be procurred during the trapping season by most domestic groups.

These competing orientations did not necessarily influence activities of most individuals in a domestic group. In many cases the trapper was able to intercept game while travelling along his line of traps. Frequently, however, good hunting and trapping areas were not coincident and certain times had therefore to be devoted exclusively to hunting.

Permanent movement out of an area was a result of two things — either fur was depleted or food unavailable. It appears that this occurred every three to five years and by the time any individual had reached maturity he or she had lived in at least four different areas and was familiar, in varying degrees, with a large tract of land. Movement was also initiated by closure or reopening of trapping posts, although this does not appear to have had a major impact before 1930.

Thus the general situation seems to be characterized by both seasonal movements within a given area, and periodic movements into new or at least different areas. As a result
particular clusters of people exploited a "home" territory for only a few years before they found it necessary to fragment and become spatially realigned in adjacent areas. For any cluster of people, however, this phenomenon did not occur simultaneously nor did it necessarily take place at a particular time of the year. Domestic groups or their segments would move off into a new area simply when material considerations suggested that they should and this might be in the early summer, or fall, or even mid-winter.

Very often when a move was required heavier and more cumbersome items had to be left behind with no guarantee that anyone would be able to return to pick them up. As a result material possessions, especially the more durable such as traps and stoves, were duplicated and cached in widely scattered locations. Over a period of time most individuals would acquire knowledge of a number of such caches, both those made themselves and by others. In the event that they or their close relatives returned to the area, which frequently happened, much saving could be effected by the knowledge of equipment already in the locale.

By degrees the region became dotted with small depots of equipment and often, when a choice was open these governed decisions on group movement. Choices, however, were always contingent on where and when the natural resources of the land would be available and it is these primary resources we must now consider. It should be kept in mind though, that the periodic but necessary abandonment of hardware acquired a sustained utilization of many techniques of tool making and technical
knowledge that might otherwise have been forgotten. In varying
degrees this knowledge is still retained and has been observed
first hand as recently as 1970.

Types and Varieties of Resources

a) Food:

Vegetable foods included six species of berries, the
root of one plant, young leaves of several plants, and cambium
layers of at least two species of tree. All available species
of fish were eaten. These included the Longnose sucker, two
species of whitefish, Northern pike, Burbot, Inconnu, Lake trout,
Arctic grayling and all five species of Pacific salmon. At least
five species of upland birds were also eaten, as well as numerous
species of migratory birds including Mallard duck, Canada goose,
and Sandhill crane. The amphibious beaver and muskrat were often
eaten, the former occasionally attaining a weight of 40 pounds.
Numerous small land mammals were important to the Kasini diet
and these included ground squirrels, squirrels, marmots, porcupine
and rabbits. The Lynx was also considered a source of food and,
in addition, the Mountain goat and two species of sheep were
hunted when available. However, even in combination the heaviest
of above sources did not begin to equal in volume the food which
was obtained from moose and the two species of caribou common
to the area.

b) Furbearers:

Trapping produced both edible animals and those
considered inedible. Lynx, squirrel, beaver and muskrat, valued
for their fur, were also eaten. Other animals were valued for
their fur alone. These were wolverine, fox, martin, weasel, mink, fisher and otter. Towards the end of the trapping era the pelts of wolves, Black and Grizzly bear also attained some value on the fur market but the animals were not considered edible by the Kasini.

c) Material for Technology:

Many tools and pieces of equipment were manufactured from by-products of the food quest. These included sinew thread, rawhide cord or "babiche", and leather goods used for packs, containers, various items of clothing, notably mitts, mocassins, jackets, headgear, and bedding. The last item was made from the skins of either ground squirrels or marmots. Other items were almost invariably derived from either moose or caribou, as were the bone tools used in the cleaning and scraping of hides. Stone tools were used when manufacturing leather and these involved almost any pre-formed or easily worked rock, usually some type of slate. All varieties of wood were used for fuel, spruce and willow were used in the construction of fish weirs. The hardest and most resilient wood, usually birch, but sometimes tamarack or black spruce, were used for toboggans, sledges and snowshoes. An indeterminate number of seeds, leaves, fungi, barks and animal parts were used for "medicinal" purposes.

Spatial Diversity, Seasonal Availability and Suitability

a) Plant Life:

The abundance of plant life varies greatly from place to place and is contingent on such general factors as precipitation,
altitude, exposure to the sun, available ground water, soil type and the existence of permafrost. Berries, according to the species, occur either in the lowlands along the banks of streams and rivers, above the tree line, or on sparsely wooded mountain slopes. In any case they are available only in late August and early September. Berries were either consumed immediately, preserved by drying or by being set in lard for use later in the winter.

The one species of edible root is typically found in sandy soil along the banks of rivers and streams. It may be eaten at any time of year but is only available when the ground is not frozen and it seldom occurs in large quantities in any one place.

Young leaves from most deciduous trees were eaten in early spring. At the same time of year, when the sap is flowing most freely, the bark of young poplar was removed and the soft, juicy cambium layer was scraped clean from the wood and eaten. This activity only occurred for the few weeks before the sap turned bitter. It was never collected and always eaten on the spot. Nevertheless, it was construed as a very welcome variation in the diet and may have constituted a seasonally important source of vitamins.

The two types of wood used most frequently in the construction of snowshoes and toboggans were spruce and birch. The former is plentiful and found almost everywhere, whereas the latter occurs only in small and widely scattered stands in areas with abundant ground water. Birch is, therefore, much less ready to hand than spruce. In either case these two species were cut
only after the trees had become dormant in the early winter. No frames were used in shaping the wood and hence it was considered necessary to use dormant trees in which there was just enough moisture to allow for pliability but not enough to make the wood warp or split while drying.

All kinds of wood were used as fuel for fires. However, even here some discrimination was used depending on the time of year and the nature of the abode. When the fire was outside any wood was used and the size of the fire would simply correspond to the prevailing temperature. The same lack of concern with wood type was exercised during the warmer months even when using a small stove inside a tent or cabin. In the winter time, however, it was necessary to situate a tent or cabin near a wood supply that would, with the use of a small stove, provide sufficient heat at extremely cold temperatures. Whenever possible, the site of a cabin would be adjacent to a stand of burnt spruce. Other types would not burn with sufficient intensity to provide adequate heat. Indeed, one of the great inconveniences of any trapping post was that the available wood supply was depleted in a very few years. Even those who had built cabins around a post often had to live in a tent some distance away if they were planning to stay around for more than a few days. Frequently this resulted in tent villages being set up a mile or so away from the trapping post.

The availability and relative importance of mammals and fish to the Kasini diet was contingent on the different habits and seasonally fluctuating activities of individual species.
In terms of their exploitation by the Kasini all animals fall roughly within four categories, based on the criteria of movement and social habits.

The criteria we use rest on whether the animals are found in clusters or in solitary, and whether they are mobile or sedentary. Any subdivision or qualification of these categories and the four combinations they produce will be considered only with respect to individual species. For instance, with the category "clustering" we may be dealing with a species of fish which simply happen to be together, or we may be concerned with the truly gregarious ground squirrel which lives in colonies.

b) Fish

Salmon are restricted to the Pacific watershed and were thus found only in that half of the Kasini territory which is drained by the Pelly river and its tributaries. Other species of fish are found, in combination, in all parts of the region although certain lakes, creeks and places on the larger rivers were known to be particularly productive. Salmon prefer to move upstream along the eddies close to shore and away from the main current. Suckers frequent slow moving waters in the sloughs alongside the main rivers. Northern pike consistently search for food just off submarine shelves in many lakes and are frequently found close to shore. Arctic grayling and whitefish move en masse in their respective spawning seasons and in both cases certain places in lakes and streams are known for the relative ease with which these two species can be intercepted.

Salmon did not occur on the upper Pelly in anything like the numbers that appeared in the Yukon river. Indeed there
seems to have been little, if any, economic advantage to co-operatively exploiting the salmon when they arrived in mid-July and early August. In addition most of the salmon caught were near the end of their spawning run and in an advanced state of degeneration. As a result many... were eaten during the few weeks they were available, and only a few were in sufficiently firm condition to warrant proper drying for use later in the year. Most accounts involve estimates that a domestic group only preserved 20 - 30 salmon for winter consumption. Nevertheless, salmon could be relied upon to arrive in fair quantity at a specific time of year. As such they did provide the means whereby groups of people could pre-arrange to meet and live together for short periods of time.

Prior to the fur trade the Kasini did not manufacture any fish net other than that used for salmon, and since this involved a relatively large gauge mesh it was not used for any other kind of fishing. These nets were small (4 ft. x 10 ft.) and most domestic groups possessed only one since both their production and the accumulation of the 2$\frac{1}{4}$ ft. strands of caribou sinew used in their construction was time consuming. The preferred technique of catching salmon involved a number of domestic groups engaging in co-operative fishing by stringing together a number of these short nets. However, from the point of view of production other sites could be and were used just as effectively by one domestic group with a single net. The function that the collective mode of co-operation served was, it appears, primarily social in nature and although the sites were still used as late as the 1920's their sociological significance was largely superseded by the existence of the trapping posts.
The introduction of hooks as well as fish nets with a range in mesh size and of longer lengths enables greater quantities of different species of fish to be caught. Prior to obtaining these items from the trapping post the fishing which took place after the summer salmon run occurred in the winter months and was accomplished with a spear and "jigging" through a hole in the ice. Winter fishing with nets mainly took place in December when the Humpback whitefish has its spawning run. However, only a few large lakes have runs of sufficient size to warrant the effort of setting a net under the ice, and even so the individual had to have a detailed knowledge of the movements and whereabouts of the fish in a lake in order to intercept them in any numbers.

Arctic grayling was the one other species that was taken in any numbers and which was at all significant to the Kasini diet. These fish have their spawning run in the spring time and move from the lakes down to the larger rivers. It was in the small connecting streams that they were most readily caught. The fishing technique involved building a small weir across the stream and this resulted in the grayling milling about behind the weir in some numbers. The fish were then snared out with a slip noose made of wire, sinew or rawhide.

The other species of fish mentioned were usually caught by hook or in nets but only the three mentioned above were exploited regularly. The fact that all three occurred in relatively large numbers at particular times and places facilitated harvest and distinguished them from other kinds of fish in the area.
c) Birds

The various species of grouse and ptarmigan are usually found in spruce forests or at high altitudes above the tree line. Only one species, the Blue grouse, was actually hunted. The rest were taken only when an individual intercepted them while pursuing other activities. "Blue grouse" are available in relatively large flocks of 15 - 20 on south facing and lightly wooded slopes during their mating season in the early spring. All species of ptarmigan move in flocks of 10 - 30 and, in response to temperature changes and available food, may be found almost anywhere throughout the year.

Occasionally, in the fall, a number of domestic groups would string their salmon nets together on a flat, willow covered bench next to a river or near a lake. They would then drive what small game and birds were in the area into their nets. This technique, which was responsible for the acquisition of a few grouse, was abandoned after the introduction of the small calibre rifle.

All waterfowl in the area are migratory and hence they occur in large concentrations only as they move through the region in the spring and fall. Certain lakes and sloughs are known to be habitual stopping places for large flocks and, since the introduction of the shotgun and rifle, a few geese, ducks and cranes are killed at these places. Otherwise the acquisition of waterfowl was restricted to those birds which actually nested in the area. In either case, no large quantities were ever obtained.
d) Fur Bearing Animals

Animals valued simply for their fur were exploited only during the winter months between mid-November and mid-April. With the exception of the beaver, muskrat and squirrel all fur bearing animals were solitary and mobile and rather extensive trap lines were needed for their successful exploitation. However, after the fur business had been in operation for a decade the presence or absence of any of these animals in a particular area became a function of how recently and how intensively the area had already been trapped. Thus an individual could not deduce that fur bearing animals would be in a certain area simply from his knowledge of natural history, and of topography, flora and fauna; he had also to know how extensively the area had been exploited by humans in the recent past.

Beaver is the one fur bearing species that could be said to have a migratory pattern of some significance. These animals are, of course, gregarious for they live in communal lodges and thus occur, during the winter, in groups of 8 - 10 animals. However, trapping beaver through the ice was never as popular as hunting them in the spring time in open water. At this time the beaver become increasingly active and spend many hours away from their lodges in search of fresh food. When there are only small patches of open water and beaver have to stay in the vicinity of their lodges, the Kasini frequently snared them by setting rawhide nets at the entrance to the lodge. This technique, however, required constant vigilance and usually yielded only a few beaver per lodge. Later in the spring, after
the ice has broken up on the streams and larger rivers, the beaver population becomes dispersed as the mature animals leave their wintering areas and head for larger rivers and lakes. They do not return until later in the summer. The Kasini saw this activity as a result of the males’ wish to travel and the females’ desire for seclusion and isolation while giving birth. In any case, because these animals move downstream on their way to the larger rivers there are strategic spots, e.g. the confluence of two large streams, by which many of them will pass in a relatively short time. Thus an individual with a boat or retrieving dog was sometimes able to shoot large numbers of beaver as they passed by a given vantage point.

e) Small Mammals

Squirrel and lynx were considered edible but never pursued as food except in the case of extreme shortage in winter. Whenever the meat from these two species was obtained during the trapping season it was used primarily for dog food.

The lynx is a hunter and its prey consists of small rodents and the snowshoe hare. The latter is its chief source of food and the lynx population fluctuates more or less in concert with the available number of hares in a given region.

For the most part lynx spend their winters alone and, although there may be a fairly large number in a region, they do not seem to hunt in groups. The technique used to trap lynx was based on the belief that these animals frequently returned from the hunt, which might last a few days, on the same trail they went out on. Thus, in an area where there was a sufficient number of tracks to indicate a lynx was living in the area,
a search would be made for a single set of tracks. Somewhere on this trail a trap would be set in the hope that the returning lynx would be caught. The usual method of luring lynx was to place some visually obvious ribbon or piece of paper in the tree behind the trap. It was hoped that the animal would see the strangely shaped or oddly moving object and be curious enough to investigate. Since the early 1940's one of the most successful visual attractants used for this purpose was a coloured page from a mail-order catalogue.

The presence of lynx in a given region is not exclusively contingent on availability of food, for lynx also respond quickly to temperature changes. During the very cold months of mid-winter they frequently disappear from a region even when there has been no sudden shift in the availability of food. They are then usually found at higher elevations and often 20-30 miles away from their original hunting territory. Thus, within a particular area, the relative abundance of these animals may change rather abruptly throughout a single trapping season.

In contrast to lynx, the squirrel is a clustering and relatively sedentary animal. During the winter they create well packed trails within the spruce forests in which they are found. In the coldest months, when the temperature exceeds -40 degrees F., squirrels are usually unavailable for they stay in their winter nests and travel about only in tunnels they have formed under the snow. In warmer weather they move about on top of the snow and, because they habitually use the same trails from tree to tree, they are easily caught. The most frequent technique the Kasini
used was to tie a series of snares onto a small stick which they would then lean against a tree with the lower end situated on the squirrel trail. Instead of going to the base of the tree, the squirrel would run up the stick and into a snare. Often two squirrels would be caught on one stick by this method.

Occurring in groups, and remaining in one area and having predictable patterns of behavior, squirrels are easy to catch. However, with only a few ounces of what Kasini considered to be unappetizing meat, these small animals were not prized for food.

Porcupine were taken for food at almost any time of the year, but being solitary and sedentary they were never hunted for their own sake. When a Kasini came across some fresh porcupine tracks he would search around in the immediate vicinity until he found the animal, otherwise there was no way he could determine where or when they could be found. Thus it was only in the course of other activities that porcupine were obtained.

Neither muskrat nor beaver were eaten during summer months for the former was considered to have an unpleasant taste then and the meat of the latter, to be too lean. Both were eaten during the winter and very early spring -- beaver being especially prized during this period when its body was heavy with fat.

The Arctic ground squirrel is found in well drained and lightly wooded or open, south facing slopes at almost any altitude. Most frequently they form colonies and to catch any quantity one must know where these are located.

Hibernating and living in burrows, the ground squirrel is only
available during spring, summer and very early fall. It is valued as a source of food primarily in the early spring when just emerged from hibernation. For a period of about six weeks, they retain a good deal of fat on their bodies and are considered very good eating.

Occasionally these animals are shot with small calibre rifles, however, during the spring when they constitute an important source of rich and fresh protein they are usually snared at the mouth of their burrows. A single colony would be saturated with snares at this time and, depending on its size could yield for two to three days most of the food consumed by a domestic group.

The marmot or "mountain whistler" is simply a larger version of the ground squirrel both in general appearance and taste. But whereas the ground squirrel might weigh at the most one pound the marmot frequently weighs 6 - 12 pounds. Like its smaller counterpart, marmots live in burrow colonies, although these are almost invariably at altitudes above the tree line. Thus, quite apart from the fact that they hibernate throughout winter they were less available to the Kasini who considered travelling in high altitudes to be very treacherous in spring and early summer months. Consequently the marmot was only hunted or trapped in the fall. At this time its meat was very rich in fat and, although some were eaten when caught, there was an attempt to smoke-dry as many as possible for use later.

As we have already mentioned, pelts of both ground squirrels and marmots were used in the manufacture of blankets and since the skins of both were fairly small this suggests
that both species were originally caught in large numbers. However, the usefulness of these pelts quickly declined after trapping began and duffel blankets became available.

Finally we must consider the Snowshoe rabbit which, of all mammals, was taken in greatest number by the Kasini. Rabbits usually occur in relatively sedentary and concentrated populations in willow or alder groves and burnt-over areas; they are found less frequently in mature spruce forests.

When an area showed signs of a large rabbit population the most common trapping technique was setting numerous snares along their trails in the snow or the grass and dry leaves. This method was sure to produce some rabbits. Success was contingent on numbers which were subject to wide variation. Population fluctuation among mammals has been the focus of lengthy investigations and, with respect to the Snowshoe rabbit, there has been extensive discussion on the regular or cyclical nature of the changes that occur. The Kasini themselves had a keen interest in anything that affected their food supply and recognized two important aspects of population changes amongst the rabbits. First, the time lapse between the peak and nadir of the population density of these animals varied from five to ten years in any one area (Keith 1963:37-41). And secondly, these variations were area-specific and did not take place simultaneously throughout the region. Thus, in a given area there might be virtually no rabbits available whereas 30-60 miles away the cycle might be just approaching its peak.

Important as they were, Snowshoe rabbit constituted
only a supplementary food supply for the Kasini, but the wide variation in availability made the food quest in certain years much easier than in others. In a peak year a single domestic group might set 200 snares within a mile radius of their winter camp. Each day a third of these would be checked with an expected success of 10-20%, about 13 rabbits or approximately 8-9 pounds of meat per day. In the same area during the nadir of a cycle the Kasini would not bother to set snares at all.

f) Large Mammals

We are concerned here only with those large mammals which were consistently hunted for food, consequently both species of bear will not be considered. Mountain goats and the various species of sheep which inhabit higher altitudes in Kasini territory were all hunted for their meat and skins, but none constituted an important source of protein. Usually a domestic group would take no more than 1-2 sheep in any given year, and goats, because they live in very inaccessible places, were seldom killed at all. Thus our concern is with the moose and caribou, both of which were hunted in substantial numbers every year and constituted the Kasini food staple.

Throughout most of the year caribou range in small herds of less than 25 animals. These begin to form in early September during the rutting season when a lot of movement takes place as different bulls compete for access to cows. Single bulls roam widely at all altitudes in search of a herd, and the herds themselves move back and forth across the vallies as one bull after another achieves dominance.
By the end of October the rutting season is virtually over and herds, usually with a number of bulls present, begin to move towards their wintering grounds. These are in areas of light winter snow-fall with an abundance of white spongy ground lichen on which caribou feed. In some places these wintering grounds may be several hundred square miles in extent and capable of supporting several herds. The caribou are firmly established in such areas by December and have taken up a regular grazing pattern. Their movements are affected by the general topography and may centre on moving up and down a narrow valley or on a more or less circular migratory route in open valleys. Some of these areas are used year after year, whereas others are used intermittently or only for brief periods of time during any one winter.

By April herd movements become much more erratic, due, according to the Kasini to excessive pursuit by wolves. At this time of year wolves can travel on the hard crust which forms on the snow during evening and early morning. Thus wolves have an advantage over ungulates which are much too heavy to be supported by the crust. Towards the end of April, for some reason, caribou frequently form herds of a 100 or more on large lakes, but these congregations last only a few days and their annual occurrence is not predictable.

Cows, followed by yearlings, begin to move off towards calving grounds in May, while the bulls gradually move into the high country to settle into a solitary vigil while their antlers are growing during summer. After calving, the cows with their calves and the yearlings wander in the mountains in the small herds which the bulls eventually pick up in the fall.
Moose, in contrast to caribou, are not a herding animal and seldom are found during any time of the year in groups of more than two or three. Aside from the September and October rutting season in the fall a group typically consist of cows and calves. Groups of moose larger than this usually just happen to be together while grazing in a rich pasture and show little inclination to stay together for more than a day or so, and no desire to move together as a herd.

In fall bull moose in rut move around the country in search of cows. In most cases the cows themselves like to separate from each other at this time of year and are thus usually found alone or in the company of a yearling. Occasionally, during this season, a mature bull will travel in the company of a two year old bull; however, this relationship terminates when a cow is found. The cow usually relies on being able to call a bull to her, although she will also begin to roam quite extensively herself the longer she remains unmated.

By the end of October or early November the rutting season is over and moose move into their early wintering areas in high country. Here they stay feeding on willows until the heavy snows come in December and January. At this time, although temperatures drop in the lowlands, many moose move to lower altitudes and feed on the willows around the banks of frozen lakes and rivers. Here their movements, especially those of calves, are less inhibited by the depth of snow.

By April the moose begin gradually to move back into higher country as the snow melts. However, in May the pregnant
cows move again to the lowlands and seek out patches of open water along the banks of rivers. Barren cows and bulls continue on in the higher altitudes. The Kasini explanation for this also involves the activity of wolves. Cows which are about to give birth in early June are searching out a place which has sufficient food for a prolonged stay and which is also easily defended. A willow patch next to the river or on an island adjacent to an open stretch of water is uniquely suited to her purpose for, in case of attack by wolves, she can always move herself and calf into a few feet of water and there, easily defend herself. The moose which continue on into the high country are looking for south facing slopes and ridges which are bare of snow. During this time of year they travel quickly, eating on the move. Again the reason given for this behavior is pursuit by wolves.

Wolves, it should be mentioned, are on the verge of whelping during the spring, and the hunting packs which operate during the winter are temporarily broken up. In many cases this results in a brief period of starvation for not only is larger game much less accessible but smaller animals, the mainstay during summer, have not yet begun to appear in quantity. Thus wolves go through a brief period (3-6 weeks) when food of any kind is hard to come by. It was only at this time the Kasini themselves had any fear of wolves. They could, it was said, "go crazy with hunger" and even attack man. And certainly from our own experience travelling in this country it was during the spring that wolves showed a temerity towards man not to be witnessed at any other time of year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1. Kasini Subsistence Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Primary Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. → Nov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUNTING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(moose, caribou)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERMITTENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting (moose, caribou)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAPPING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lynx, beaver, muskrat, martin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otter, squirrel, weasel, wolverine,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mink, fisher, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GATHERING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(grouse, ground sqrl, fish, beaver,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUNTING and GATHERING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(moose at salt licks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(salmon fishing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Secondary Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. → Nov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering (berries, birds,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marmot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting (occasional fishing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snaring Snowshoe rabbit when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Mode of Transport</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. → Nov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot Dog with pack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoe Toboggan and Dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**D. Number of Main Camps During</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. → Nov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Type of Abode</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. → Nov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvas tent or lean-to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log cabin, tent with frame, or tent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOG CABIN, TENT WITH FRAME, OR TENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Visit to Trapping Post (T.P.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. → Nov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From calving time in June into mid-August, moose center their feeding and movements around "salt-licks"—places often adjacent to a stagnant slough, and usually consisting of mud or dry clay which the moose relish. Licks can be found almost anywhere below the tree line. Frequently two or more moose will use a single "lick" simultaneously and, if undisturbed, may stay in the general vicinity for three to five weeks before moving on. Generally, however, there is not a great deal of movement during this time and even when a moose leaves a lick it is usually only to go to the next one a few miles away.

In August bull moose move into high alpine meadows and wait out the month feeding and letting their antlers mature. The end of August is also the only time of the year when it is possible to find four or five of these animals in prime condition feeding together on the open slopes of a single small valley or meadow. This period is abruptly terminated when rutting begins.

What has been described above is a general outline of seasonal activities of moose and caribou and it is one upon which many Kasini movements and group activities were based. We can briefly outline these activities in terms of the seasonal availability and suitability of these animals.

In the late summer the Kasini moved away from the rivers, lowland lakes and "salt licks" and into the high country. The main purpose was to hunt moose just as they were going into rut. The bulls get very fat at this time and were highly prized, although it was essential to hunt them before rutting was well advanced for they lost weight quickly once it began. For this reason hunting emphasis shifted to cows after the third week in September.
Before rutting the most common hunting technique was to track a moose until its grazing area was determined. Then the hunter would attempt to draw the animal into the open or encourage it to raise its neck and head above surrounding foliage by scraping a dry scapula of a moose or caribou across the branches of a tree. This activity emits a hollow rattling noise which sounds similar to a bull moose polishing his antlers and will arouse the curiosity of any moose in the vicinity.

During the rut hunting techniques varied from attracting the bull by imitating the mating call of the cow, to simply climbing to a high vantage point and scanning for game. The latter method was frequently used because both moose and caribou may move rapidly during this season and fresh tracks do not necessarily indicate that an animal is still in an area. Consequently if the hunters could actually sight an animal they could then plan how to approach it or where best to call it. In addition, by climbing near the tree line hunters were also in a good position to intercept a herd of caribou or, less frequently, Mountain sheep.

Towards the end of the rutting season, emphasis in hunting was focused on cow moose and caribou. As we have already mentioned the bulls of both species stop eating during this period and towards the end of the rut they get extremely lean. In addition the meat of the bull caribou acquires, for the Kasini, an unappetizing taste and they considered it to be inedible.

The leanness of bulls was a factor in hunting up until mid-winter and therefore emphasis continued to be on cows. Barren
cows of both species were especially prized in winter for they almost always provided meat that was richer in fat than any other. Thus, whenever a choice was available, a hunter would try and kill a barren cow before any other in a group of moose or herd of caribou. Frequently the existence of such an animal could be determined from an examination of tracks in the snow, hours before the animals were actually sighted.

Throughout winter moose hunting continued to be largely the task of individual hunters and, since the acquisition of the rifle, so in fact did the caribou. In earlier days, however, both caribou and moose were frequently snared and in the case of the former this could be accomplished much more efficiently by collective rather than individual activity. Certain areas were well known as habitual winter grazing routes for caribou and particular sites were returned to year after year because of their strategic exploitative value with snares.

The economic advantages of collective caribou snaring appear to have been largely nullified by introduction of the rifle for with this it was not uncommon for an individual hunter to kill two or three caribou in a single day. And, as with collective salmon fishing, the temporary social benefits to be derived from increased interaction between otherwise isolated domestic groups, was replaced by the intermittent aggregates of people which formed around the trapping post throughout the year.

By the end of March and during April the only big game that was highly valued was the bull caribou. For some reason, in contrast to all other big game, this animal is able to put on
weight during the late winter and relatively speaking its meat is rich in fat. Nevertheless other big game were also hunted and, during early April, when a crust formed on the snow the Kasini were able to chase down moose with dogs. However, from all accounts this style of hunting was only occasionally successful and seems to have been valued primarily for its excitement.

From September to mid-April the life of domestic groups was dominated by the hunt, the demands of winter living, and by a more or less sedentary existence. By this we mean that a group, for four to ten weeks, would form a main camp, around which all exploitative activities would center. Meat, when obtained, would most frequently be transported back to camp by dogs. In the fall this was often done in relays by some of the non-hunting members of the group in order that hunters could continue the chase. Meat at this time of year was either back-packed or packed by dogs and the technique usually involved partially drying the meat and skins in a temporary camp near the kill site before transporting it to the home base.

As winter progressed the whole business of transporting meat into camp was resolved by the ease with which dogs could pull heavy weights on a toboggan. By this method a large moose which would involve two trips with a toboggan, could easily be brought into camp in a single day from five miles away.

From late April through May and into early June, the sedentary winter living changed as the Kasini turned to quite different exploitative techniques. If we can temporarily ignore the business of winter trapping it could be said that at this
time of year the Kasini shifted from hunting to gathering. As we have already mentioned, the winter grazing patterns of the caribou change at this time of year making them less easy to hunt. Similarly the moose are difficult to hunt for they are either not moving at all, as in the case of the cow about to give birth, or moving very quickly in the high country. In addition, with the exception of the bull caribou, the meat of big game was considered to be so lean as not worth the effort, although an attempt to kill any game casually intercepted at this time of year would be made.

During spring, therefore, the Kasini began to focus their interests on small mammals, fish and birds. This required a relatively high degree of mobility for if a domestic group had not acquired some food surplus towards the end of winter to carry them through the spring they had to rely entirely on food sources which were scattered and which existed in relatively small amounts. As a result a domestic group could afford to stay in one place for no longer than a few days at a time.

This period of rapid and frequent movement was over at the latest by mid-June when hunting of big game was resumed. In a sense the summer hunting was similar to the gathering activities of spring for instead of being geared to individual pursuit of mobile, large animals the emphasis was on intercepting such animals at particular places. It was at this time of year that "salt licks" were hunted. Apart from a few weeks salmon fishing in July this pattern prevailed until preparation for the fall hunt began in late August.
CHAPTER IV

THE COMPOSITION OF DOMESTIC GROUPS

AND EXPLOITATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Kasini domestic groups were self-sufficient units which could provide all materials necessary for existence. They ranged in size from 5 - 15 individuals, were mobile and usually included members of different generations. They were not, however, stable membership units. Neither groups nor individuals held rights over land and since movement and group personnel realignment were frequent the residents of a given area in one year might be scattered in a number of different areas in the next, and could subsequently reform again as a group in the original area at some later date. Thus no host and guest arrangement emerged with respect to land; for today's hosts might be tomorrow's most recent arrivals. The domestic group, therefore, had no corporate center that was fixed in time or space. Furthermore, it did not reflect or approximate for the Kasini a single type of social arrangement. The term for domestic group was "camp", but this was not an exclusive category referring to a particular type of social unit for it applied to either an individual or group and simply meant any place people were staying at a particular time. Thus, although domestic groups formed "camps" a camp might consist of any number of people and include either a single person or the large clusters that formed around trapping posts.

In this chapter we examine Kasini domestic groups as productive units which are in business primarily for survival.
Membership in these groups was interchangeable and the group per se was valued for what its members could accomplish by pooling their variously developed skills and talents. As a result Kasini domestic groups emerge as a modular construction of functional components set within specific parameters of habitat, and in terms of Kasini technology and resource base these groups are shown to possess a necessary class of people without which they would not be economically viable.

Estimate of Kasini Population: 1900-1945

No reliable census material is available for the Kasini during 1900-1945 although the DIA has been issuing sporadic reports on this region since the early part of this century. How these reports were acquired or compiled is not clear although it is likely they are a tabulation of rough estimates on the part of local traders and prospectors who had some contact with government officials. The first representative of the DIA to visit the area was J. Meek in 1949. Nevertheless, available figures do give a rough indication of the relative size of the population in the region and they are presented here simply for that reason.
Table 4.1

KASINI POPULATION 1904-1944 *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trapping Posts</th>
<th>1904</th>
<th>1907</th>
<th>1909</th>
<th>1924</th>
<th>1929</th>
<th>1934</th>
<th>1939</th>
<th>1944</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ross River</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelly Lakes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelly Banks</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This table was taken from tabulations of Indian Affairs census reports made by Bob Steventon, who generously provided me with the results of some of his own unfinished research. Although we have not had access to other sources, relevant material might also be acquired from Northwest Mounted Police files. The ledgers and reports of the trading company of Taylor and Drury would also have been useful but they were destroyed sometime in 1965-66.

Although the figures in Table 4.1 are rough estimates, the fluctuations may reflect some important events and changes. As we indicated in Chapter two, the opening of new trapping posts on the Macmillan river and down the Pelly in the 1930's did drain certain numbers away from the Ross River area, although we have no way of knowing what proportion of the above figures were represented by Kasini. In addition an influenza epidemic hit Ross River in the late 1920's, but again we do not know how many of those who died could be classed as Kasini. Most apparent is the consistently small population of the 7,500 sq. mile area delineated in Map 2.

Ridington (1968) provides a means of roughly estimating population size among Beaver Indians, who also live in the boreal forest region. His technique involves an estimate of the moose population of a given area and then, assuming this to be
the main food staple, inferring the size of the pre-contact Beaver population accordingly. His results are of relevance here in that they are concerned with an area which is similar in many respects to Kasini territory. He arrives at an estimate of 1781 persons in the 75,000 sq. miles of Beaver territory — assuming the same ratio for Kasini. We have an estimate which falls comfortably within the extremes indicated in Table 4.1. However, our own feeling is that 178 Kasini in their 7,500 sq. mile territory may be an underestimate; for unlike the Beaver people the Kasini had access to caribou as well as moose.

**Kasini Spatial Arrangements: Some Material Considerations**

Having described Kasini resources and the size of their domestic groups we will now consider how these groups were dispersed throughout the land. It would be insufficient to infer from our meagre demographic knowledge the amount of land at the disposal of a particular domestic group. This is not simply a function of the quality of information on Kasini population, it is due to the uneven resource bases of any two areas in a given year and striking variations in the resources of any one area in different years. A group of ten people might require an area of 400 sq. miles in some years or seasons, while in others the same area might support two or three such groups. At other times and for a variety of reasons (cf. Keith 1963) the same area might barely support a single group.

We have already referred to the fact that in Kasini territory rich fur areas were small and could be rapidly exhausted. As a result most trapping posts were opened and closed a number of
times between 1900-1950. For some Kasini this required movement into an area closer to the new trapping post, for others exploiting areas which still had adequate fur resources, it simply involved a realignment of their travel routes towards the new post. Accommodation of Kasini interests in trapping went hand in hand with their need to produce most of their own food. Consequently, even when fur resources were adequate and trapping posts remained open Kasini were also obliged to respond to area-specific fluctuations in available food. The reasons suggested (ibid: 100-116) for changes in animal populations that were preyed upon by the Kasini, are beyond our competence to assess and really beyond our concerns. It is sufficient to note that Kasini moved frequently and realigned themselves in different groups, and that they saw most, but by no means all, of these activities as being a result of shifting resources base. It is necessary to indicate and describe more fully the factors involved and draw out what implications these have for Kasini social organization.

The Kasini had no commonly recognized boundaries which located groups of people in space. The general interpretation they had about this state of affairs was that anybody could go anywhere and live anywhere they pleased. However, their movements did not in fact possess this insouciant quality and it is the object of this discussion to outline those practical considerations which were influential in restraining individuals from exploiting any area they wanted.

There seems to have been a rather unclear manifestation
of usufruct which operated on a "first come, first serve" basis. This, however, was not unequivocally a matter of recognized rights for it was bound up directly with the amount of resources (fur and food) available in a given area and often this could not be predetermined. Thus two groups might form one camp or live in immediate proximity to one another only to find in the course of time that they were having to exploit a very large area to satisfy their needs. Therefore, as a matter of convenience, part of the group, but not necessarily those who were in the area first, might move into a new area. On the other hand, if the group first in the area were having a hard time satisfying their needs and were subsequently joined by others, the second group would most likely leave within a few days. For them to stay on would probably have meant that both groups would have been deprived. And for them not to leave first would have been, among other things, an unnecessary solecism. This was not, however, a function of explicit rules or regulations about how anybody should perform in such a situation. The implications of the situation itself were obvious and it could, or perhaps would, be construed as an attempt to avoid unnecessarily inconveniencing others when there was no intention of doing so. To infer from this a right of usufruct would be misleading, to elevate it to a system of tenure, quite wrong.

Our interpretation is clearly illustrated in a story involving two women setting their salmon nets in the same slough of the river. Both individuals were of the same domestic group. One woman (the informant) had already set her net, and
the second then set hers about 15 feet down river, successfully blocking the first net from the likelihood of catching any salmon. The informant, in telling the story, did not say that the second woman had no right to set her net where she had, but simply commented on the stupidity of the second woman for doing what she had done. The informant's response had been to move her own net to a new spot. She did not, apparently, openly debate the issue with the second woman although she was sufficiently irritated to remember the incident clearly twenty years later.

Dispersal of groups through the region seems to have been a function of people being able to appraise resource potential and a general disinclination to avoid irritating one's neighbors and potential companions. People in groups sorted themselves out in an area in terms of the population density they thought it could bear and also in terms of where they thought other people might be. The former information could only be acquired in situ, whereas a rough outline of the latter was obtained during seasonal visits to trapping posts (see Table 3.1).

This situation becomes even more fluid when we consider the fact that domestic groups were only spatially discrete. Socially they were not in the least exclusive units even though the members of one group might be more or less insulated from the intrusion of certain others on the basis of a mutually recognized, but negotiable, social distance. This we will discuss presently. It is sufficient to say at this point that when a separation between members of a single group took place there was no necessary division of the group according to members' association with a particular area.
To illustrate some of the material considerations which constrained people from moving anywhere at any time they pleased we will consider the case of three siblings. These individuals, two men and a woman, were all born between 1900-1910. In combination with a number of others in a series of domestic groups they all remember living together more or less constantly until about 1918. The areas that each of them could recollect as being the place they were living when they were about 5 years old (i.e. their earliest recollection) were overlapping but not coincident. These different areas, which were presumably being exploited between 1905 and 1915, are outlined in Map 3 and they clearly indicate rather extensive movement by the three siblings. In Map 4 we outline in some detail one of the areas in Map 3 and show, in conjunction with Table 3.1 on subsistence activities, the kinds of movements which took place within a given area during a one year period. In Map 5 we outline the same area indicated in Map 4 and after granting the approximate date of exploitation in 1905 show, for the individual concerned, the successively larger areas that he became familiar with during the periods 1905-1920 and 1920-1945. On the same map we also show the maximum area the other two siblings had become familiar with by 1945.

In Map 3 three contiguous areas are designated, each one of which could have been sufficient for the needs of a domestic group for one year. In size they range between 100-150 sq. miles. Such figures are only rough approximations, however, and the maximum sized areas used in any one year could have been
MAP 3
CONTIGUOUS AREAS USED DURING 1905-1915
BY SIBLINGS X, Y & Z
much larger. One individual remembers that in a single year the people he lived with fished in the lake in the eastern extremities of area B and also hunted around the lakes at the southern extremities of area C. Thus, under certain circumstances these three areas could be used exclusively or in piecemeal combination. Furthermore they were not the only areas utilized by the three siblings during the period in question. Some of the land between and adjacent to that outlined in Map 3 was also utilized during 1905-1915, but just what the extent of this total area might have been is hard to say. In Map 5 there is a rough outline of the area where the three siblings lived between 1905-1920; however, the peripheries of this area were imprecise in the minds of our informants and there are few natural boundaries or obvious landmarks which allowed them to provide a more exact demarcation.

For instance, in their reminiscences, all three siblings agreed that, by the marriage of the eldest sibling (estimated at 1920), they had exploited past the headwaters of a certain stream but not as far as a large lake ten miles farther on. Thus, not knowing where to draw a precise boundary we are faced with having arbitrarily to outline an area which could in fact have been half as large again. However, if we allow for the limited accuracy of our information the area utilized by the three siblings during 1905-1920 was roughly 1,000 sq. miles. Within this area 25-30 individuals lived in shifting combinations in different domestic groups. Some of these people used only part of the area and the demarcation, such as it is, pertains only to a particular time period and to the three siblings we are discussing. If we had centered on any of the other people the
area outlined would have been quite different, although overlapping.

In Map 4 the demarcation is more exact since we had occasion to live with one of the siblings and assist in the exploitation of this particular area. For a number of reasons the pattern of exploitation we followed at this time did not correspond to that which existed during the hunting-trapping period. However, we did acquire a good deal of data concerning earlier exploitation patterns, and, in conjunction with similarly acquired experience and knowledge of other areas, these data provide the basis for the following reconstruction.

From late April until early June the area seven miles south and two miles north of the Pelly river was exploited (Map 4). If they had been fortunate in late March or early April the domestic group could have acquired a limited quantity of caribou meat which would have supplemented the food gathering activities during the spring months. Out of a total of 39 place names for the entire area 20 of these names referred to points within the smaller region exploited in the spring time. And of these 20 names 18 explicitly referred to particular kinds of food that were acquired in the spring time. Thus this smaller area was punctuated with such names as "Blue grouse hill" , "Pike lake" , and "Grayling creek" . In some cases the names for different places were identical, in others they varied only slightly. In addition the names might refer either to a particular place or to a general locality such as a two mile stretch along a hill.
Transport was by foot at this time of year and goods were carried by both humans and dogs. Shelters were of brush or lean tos and made from canvas. Movement was frequent and a camp-site was seldom used for more than a few days (see Table 3.1). Routine activities might be engaged in at any time of day aside from the few hours of total darkness but movements of camp frequently occurred in the early morning before the remaining snow had lost its crust for this made walking much easier.

Food resources systematically exploited at this time of year included birds, fish and small mammals and to acquire these efficiently some of the people in the domestic group had to have an intimate knowledge of the area. Place names indicated the main food supply in a particular area, although other resources in smaller amounts would also be available. Thus "Grayling Creek" would provide the group with a certain amount of fish but snares for ground squirrel would also be set within a mile radius of the camp and grouse and willow ptarmigan would be shot if intercepted.

Knowledge of place names indicated two things about an individual; firstly, that he knew an area well enough to exploit it efficiently during the spring and, secondly, that he was, or had been, in fairly close contact with all others who shared the same knowledge. A stranger to the region would be entirely ignorant of what locality a particular place name referred to, although he would probably possess knowledge of similar if not identical names which applied to a different region. As a stranger the only way he could learn to exploit a new area effectively in spring, avoiding a risky trial and error method, was to
affiliate himself with people who already knew the area well.

Spring camp sites were seldom returned to consecutively and four to five years might elapse before anybody returned to the same place in spring. There was, of course, no guarantee that others would not exploit the site in the interim, although information concerning where anybody had been living during a particular season was shared during the intermittent meetings of domestic groups throughout the year. The reason for not returning to the same place annually was that food resources were temporarily exhausted.

Spring exploitation required no extended absences from camp but did involve considerable co-operation between certain members of the domestic group. Women customarily set nets and snares. Babysitting on the other hand required more or less constant vigilance, so checking snares, which could be done at any time during the day, led to co-operative effort so women could take turns at leaving camp.

At this time of year some of the men, or a young couple without children, would travel away from the camp in an attempt to intercept beaver on larger creeks and rivers. Frequently they would be gone for (5-6) days at a time and would meet up with the main domestic group at a prearranged place. Usually two men would travel together as they hunted the beaver; however, they did so primarily for companionship for there was no obvious benefits to be derived from having more than one person engage in this kind of activity.

During summer the group movements slowed down and camps
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were situated within the vicinity of a salt lick for weeks at a time. Often the natural shift in the emphasis on food production at this time of year was attended by the members of existing domestic groups realigning themselves with others to form new ones.

The meat acquired during this period was preserved by stripping it into thin sheets and drying on racks and here again circumstances encouraged co-operation by the women, who usually performed this task. Similarly women would frequently co-operate in tanning skins for there were critical stages in this procedure which involved hours of sustained activity. Thus women took turns cooking, supervising children, sewing, checking snares, stripping meat and preparing leather. The men apparently spent most of their time loafing during the mid-summer. For them, it was a slack time.

From mid-July until about the first week in August the domestic group would camp near one of the two good salmon fishing spots in the vicinity where they would meet another domestic group. Most salmon were eaten when caught but a few would be dried for use later in the winter. Apart from the occasional expedition to an adjacent salt lick very little movement took place while salmon fishing was in progress.

By the second week in August the bulk of the dry fish and meat that were on hand were placed in an elevated log cache for use in winter. The group then moved south up the valley for the fall hunt in September and October. The pace was typically unhurried and the walk usually took two to three days
and even more. Hunters were sent ahead so that a fresh supply of meat would be on hand when the main group arrived. The camp site for fall hunting in this particular valley was always situated near a tall cache on which most of the meat would be left when the group again moved north as winter arrived in mid-October. The cached meat was retrieved sometime in November when sufficient snow made toboggan travel possible.

All adults were extremely busy during this period. The women stripping meat, preparing skins, collecting berries, sewing winter garments, and the men hunting almost constantly for any big game they could find.

During late October or early November the group moved back towards the Pelly river, and usually camped in the cabin. Here the adults engaged in manufacturing or repairing equipment necessary for winter: this involved toboggans, dog harnesses, snowshoes, packs and toboggan cases.

The cabin was both a temporary domicile and also a place to leave equipment. None of the siblings could remember spending more than two or three winter months in the cabin in any one year. During the 15 years in which they lived in the general area they remember spending only four to five non-consecutive winters in this cabin. In the general region there was another cabin which they used in the same intermittent fashion and up to a third of the time they spent the entire winter period in canvas tents.

Sometime in November certain individuals or occasionally the entire group would make a trip to the nearest trapping post
for supplies. Usually rivers and streams were frozen over by this time and barriers to speedy transportation of goods were much reduced as dog teams and toboggans were put into use. Upon their return trapping began in earnest.

Trapping was primarily engaged in by men. An individual's trap line varied from year to year and even was changed during a single season. If there were sufficient fur two individuals from different domestic groups might set their traps in the same area. Thus the outline in Map 4 did not necessarily constitute a "trap line" even for those who happened to have used it for food exploitation in the previous year. Parts of it could have been used by individuals from different domestic groups.

Nor was winter moose hunting restricted to the area in Map 4. An individual on a fresh track would follow it wherever it took him. Frequently tracks were intercepted while traps were being checked and thus the general orientation of trapping and winter moose hunting could roughly correspond. Just as frequently, however, an individual while hunting could be drawn close to the main camp of another domestic group — this might occasion an overnight visit.

All or part of the main camp moved north during mid-December to hunt small caribou herds on their winter grazing route. Nets would also be set in the large lake to catch the spawning run of whitefish.

Around the end of December — first week of January the entire group would usually travel to the nearest trapping post. This allowed people from different groups to meet and was a time of dancing, gambling and, sometime after 1915, drinking of homebrew.
January, which was typically the coldest month of the year, witnessed near total cessation of trapping. Temperatures in excess of \(-40^\circ F\) brought the movement of almost all fur-bearing animals to a complete halt. If food supplies allowed the group would spend most of January travelling slowly back to their food caches, visiting other groups on the way.

The activities of February - March were roughly similar to those which occurred before the turn of the year. However, the snows in the mountains had by this time forced most moose into grazing around lowland lakes and along the banks of the main river. With decreasing degrees of success, hunting and trapping continued until the spring, at which time the group would move to an area quite different from that used the previous year. Movement to a new area was facilitated by the hard snow crusts of early April.

Map 5 outlines the progressively larger area which the oldest sibling lived in and exploited between 1905-1945. The move out of his natal territory was initiated by his marriage (c. 1918-20) to a woman who lived in the region to the west. As was typical in such cases this arranged union resulted in the man living with his new wife and her parents in a region which was quite outside the area he had grown up in. This represented, however, an addition to, not a replacement of, his natal territory and in time the entire area was exploited by the couple as they became members of various domestic groups. The area to the north, which the man and his spouse moved into during the late 1930's, became available by an arranged marriage between one of
his sons and a woman of a group currently living in the area. In this case it was not only the son who moved into the area of his spouse but his parents and his siblings as well. By 1945, therefore, through a series of relationships which were either pre-existing, created by others (such as the man's own marriage), or created by himself and his spouse this man became a user of an area of about 1800 sq. miles. This was just under a quarter of the size of the entire Kasini territory. In much the same time the two other siblings of this man had managed to exploit comparable but not coincident areas. Towards the end of the trapping era each of these siblings were involved in groups which sold their furs at different trapping posts and apparently there were periods of several years when they would not see each other at all.

In summary, we can say that restrictions of Kasini movements were in part a consequence of two things directly related to the production of food. Firstly, at particular times of the year the Kasini built up considerable food surpluses which they cached before moving on to the next strategic point in the food quest. This meant, in turn, that Kasini movement was restrained by where these caches were; for they could not afford to abandon them completely and had to stay in the vicinity. Their mode of transportation prevented them from being able to move people and equipment as well as food surpluses effectively and simultaneously. It had to be one or the other in every season of the year except the spring, when food surpluses were negligible and equipment was reduced to a minimum.

The second key factor which restricted movement was
the necessity for some individuals to possess intimate knowledge of the land in order for a group to effectively exploit an area during the weeks of spring. A domestic group could not just find itself anywhere in the spring — it had to be situated in a region familiar to at least some of its members. In the case of strangers to an area the most common mechanism of ensuring access to such strategic knowledge was to associate oneself through marriage with those who possessed it.

Mobility and the Size of Domestic Groups

Many descriptions of group size amongst nomadic people are presented with an eye to the ecological context in which the group operates. As this study itself indicates, we personally have nothing against such functionalist descriptions except that in certain obvious respects they are inadequate and usually provide room for alternative interpretations. This point is clearly illustrated in a recent discussion (Lee and Devore 1968: 245-48) on the determinants of local group size among modern hunting peoples, in which it was noted that although groups of roughly 25 individuals were found with fair consistency around the world, there seems to be no single set of factors that explains this figure as a necessary consequence of anything. Thus the figure "25" obtained a magical quality which, despite its ubiquitous empirical status, seemed to defy any single explanation. The present discussion can lay no claim to a general explanation of this phenomenon. It is an attempt to provide a parameter for the small domestic groups of 5-15 individuals in which Kasini lived.
Our position here can be made clear if we consider for a moment a description of relationships that pertain to one of the most rudimentary social organizations that has been documented in North America. The people in question are those who lived in the Basin-Plateau region of the west-central United States. Steward (1938) was among the first to give these people extensive treatment, in a study which emphasized both cultural ecology and the sociology of work (Murphy 1970). As Murphy (1971:34) has pointed out, the importance of Steward's study is that he attempts to stress cause and to derive patterns of behavior from certain key forms of activity. This attempt was not entirely successful, however, and the analysis is weakened at critical points when Steward lapses into arguing his position from the point of view of "fitness".

In a recent synopsis of Basin ethnography the limitations of Steward's position are clearly revealed by the following excerpts:

"...the small family cluster based on bilateral principles was the inevitable response to areas of meagre resources, low population density, and an annual cycle of nomadism ..." (Steward, 1970:115).

"The region supported only a sparse population, and the inhabitants had to scatter to exploit every possibility and to avoid intrusion upon the subsistence activities of others. Neither game nor vegetable foods were to be found with predictability in a delimited area, and a disposition towards mobility was a factor in survival." (Murphy, 1970:158).

What we are given in the above excerpts is the description of a number of factors which neither alone nor in combination warrant the tone of inevitability given to the size of domestic groups or their dispersal throughout the area. Essentially, all we are presented with are two premises that in themselves allow
for a number of different organizational solutions: (1) the premise that a finite food supply places a limit on the size of the population in a given area and, (2) the premise that the exploitation of a widely scattered food supply requires some degree of mobility.

To our way of thinking the organizational solution to the above situation depends directly on the degree of mobility that the population as a whole can achieve. However, if this is not specified or placed within limits there is nothing that necessarily follows from the circumstances as outlined by Steward, and one can easily think of other alternatives which could cope with these conditions just as effectively. Consider, for instance, the possibility that over a 30 mile route in the Basin area there could be found sufficient seeds, berries, roots and small mammals to feed a group of 100 people for a single day. Now if it is admitted that there is nothing in the circumstances themselves that suggests that this hypothetical and somewhat hyperbolic example is impossible, how then do we explain why the Shoshone and every other hunting-gathering people have not opted for this particular solution, or even the majority of the 99 other possible solutions involved. Some of the possibilities in our hypothetical case give some clue as to an answer here and we will list them below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Size</th>
<th>Required Mobility for One Day's Food Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 people</td>
<td>30 miles/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 people</td>
<td>15 miles/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;25&quot;people</td>
<td>7.5 miles/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 people</td>
<td>3.75 miles/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 people</td>
<td>1.9 miles/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considerations of convenience would be a plausible but insufficient reason why any hunting people might opt for the smaller size groups; for obviously they would have to move much shorter distances than otherwise. Convenience, however, is a very subjective assessment and there is clearly no way we can submit it as a factor in the determination of group size. The only factor that we can suggest here involves the obvious fact that any self-perpetuating population exhibits wide discrepancies with respect to ages and, by implication, physical abilities. The explanation here places the emphasis not on a generalized context of scattered resources, etc., but on the natural limitations of the people who are required to be mobile in pursuit of those resources. Any able-bodied adult is probably capable of walking 30 miles a day for a considerable period of time. But no lasting form of organization can gear itself solely to the capacities of those who are ablest. In the case of mobility, just the contrary is true; for the group can only move as quickly as its slowest members. Therefore it is the young and the old who restrict the size of local hunting groups. One can, of course, leave the old behind, and numerous examples in the literature illustrate that this has occurred. But no viable population can afford to abandon the young. The solution therefore is to keep the size of the group small in order that the resources in any one area are not exhausted at once and the need for mobility controlled.

Let us now return to the Kasini and see in what way we can actually relate this factor of age to the mobility of their
domestic groups. In Table 3.1 we can see that throughout the year the number of different camps formed by domestic groups was not large. There were probably not many more than 23 main camps at most throughout the year. However, more than two thirds of these camps occurred in a single short season, and for at least 10 months of the year the Kasini moved camp less than once a month. Obviously something other than restrictions imposed by age and meagre or diminished physical abilities is required to explain why domestic groups were not at least twice as large as indicated for most of the year. Convenience, as we have suggested, may have been a factor here; for the logistic problems of moving people and equipment across country is certainly diminished the fewer the people involved. However, social considerations are also very relevant, and it seems that for most of the year there was no single factor, but rather a combination of things which induced the Kasini to restrict their domestic groups to approximately 5-15 individuals.

The Kasini claimed that any able-bodied adult would probably be capable of subsisting on meagre spring-time resources by wandering at random in a strange area. But no domestic group could afford to do so simply because the young and the very old could not keep up the pace for six to eight weeks. The actual solution entailed moving well within their physical limitations for, even though the resources of a particular site were exhausted relatively quickly, movement was required only every two to four days and distances involved no more than two to five miles. From personal experience with the present day counter-part of
this kind of group, the rate of travel, especially if the terrain
was rough, was frequently less than one mile per hour. Consequently
a five-mile trip might take seven to eight hours to complete.
Furthermore, a particular site seldom provided a food surplus
that would allow for more than one or two days of non-productive
activity. Therefore, in order to insure that such movements
were neither in vain nor too distant from the point of departure,
at least somebody in each domestic group had to possess a detailed
knowledge of the spring-time food resources in the area to be
exploited.

All of these additional factors however do not reduce
the significance of the age differential and its relationship to
group size and mobility for at a particular time of the year age
does place limitations on the size of the group devoted to mobile
exploitation of the habitat. Why this size was sustained through­
out most of the year we will presently consider in terms of the
implications of certain social categories and ideas held by the
Kasini. However, even here only a tendency is indicated, and
there seems to be no overall causal explanation to support the
intriguing possibility of a sociological version of Liebig's law.

In conclusion we can simply state that the Kasini did
not have any conscious ideal size in mind when forming domestic
groups. Decisions to reduce the size of domestic groups were made
for many reasons and might amount in most cases to nothing more
complicated than the gradual recognition at times that there was
not sufficient food in the area to support a given number of
people. Thus a split would occur. However, what is of even
greater sociological moment is that the Kasini did not have any notion of an ideal internal composition for domestic groups. As we stated in the introduction to this chapter the domestic group was primarily responsible for providing necessities of life and it is primarily in these terms that regularities in its composition may be understood.

Composition of Domestic Groups

The preceding chapter outlined in some detail the resources that the Kasini exploited for food and equipment and revealed striking variations in availability and suitability of these resources throughout the year. These seasonal fluctuations have been further simplified in Table 3.1 and in a very general sense they provided the single most demanding framework within which all Kasini had to operate. Thus we have a pattern through time which, although being largely culturally defined, involved a habitat with certain ineluctable qualities. This in itself means little more than that Kasini could not fish salmon in spring time, expect to have any success at a salt lick in mid-winter or be able to find a market for pelts taken in summer. That they could not do these things is certainly important but in order to appreciate its sociological relevance other material factors must be considered. This involves the obvious fact that the necessary combination of knowledge and physical abilities required for exploitation of the habitat were unevenly distributed through Kasini population. Here again we must emphasize the factor of age -- obvious, but neglected in the literature of northern Athapaskans.
The required combination of knowledge and physical ability was found only among able-bodied adults and they constituted a sector upon which all the rest of the population depended. In varying degrees the young were both ignorant and physically immature and the old, although knowledgeable were physically weak. Kasini population can be divided into two broad categories, "providers" and "dependents", and it is in terms of this distinction that we can understand a great deal of Kasini behavior.

We will consider these categories "provider" and "dependent" individually before turning to what is implied by the relationship between them. In doing so it must be remembered that our breakdown of Kasini population in this manner has no direct correspondence with Kasini conceptualization for they had no comprehensive categories explicitly referring to asymmetrical economic relations between classes of people. Their concern was with relationships between individuals or, as with the moiety system, comprehensive categories that had no explicit economic connotation. However, this does not mean that the breakdown of the Kasini into "providers" and "dependents" did not have a subjective reality for them. On the contrary, it is the purpose of this section to show how, regardless of other circumstances, Kasini invariably formed domestic groups including people from both these categories. Other considerations were important but secondary, and solely from the economic viewpoint we will see that domestic groups, although appearing flexible from other perspectives, reflect an enduring structure.

"Providers" refers to those who were able to produce
the food and materials necessary for survival and included all able-bodied adults. In an economic sense these individuals were independent, but since this was contingent on their possessing in combination both relevant knowledge and physical ability theirs was necessarily a transitory condition. Every Kasini began as a dependent child and although all could reasonably expect to become providers they would eventually pass into old age and again become as dependent on the activities of others as they were when children. Being a "provider" then was a strategic but transitory stage in the life of every Kasini.

The class "dependents" comprises all those who, for one reason or another, were restricted in their mobility -- the old, young, infirm, and women in an advanced stage of pregnancy all may be subsumed under this classification. We do not mean that "dependents" were necessarily cared for as infants might be for there were many camp-oriented tasks for which they were responsible. Indeed, many of these were indispensable to the running of a domestic group and dependents stood in complementary relationship to those who supplied most of the raw materials. In this respect it is necessary to point out that "providers" were quite capable of performing all those tasks themselves. However, every individual was expected to do what he or she could and the fact of the matter was that "providers" did things which were of critical economic importance, chiefly hunting down big game -- tasks which could not be accomplished by "dependents".

Kasini resource use depended on distinct kinds of knowledge and techniques which are usually denoted by the terms
hunting and gathering. We have already indicated that in some respects these modes are not mutually exclusive and that some activities combine both. Nevertheless their recognition is useful for they loosely accommodated two quite different orientations in Kasini economic pursuits and can generally be summarized as follows:

**Hunting**

1. **Resource:**
   - Big game (moose, caribou)

2. **Knowledge:**
   - a) Topography and flora conducive to supporting a species in a particular season.
   - b) Animal behavior patterns according to season.
   - c) Ability to assess tracks and other spoor while hunting.
   - d) Habitual responses of animals when being hunted.

3. **Technique:**
   - Mobility in pursuit

**Gathering**

1. **Resource:**
   - Fish, birds, small mammals

2. **Knowledge:**
   - a) Location of small game resources in specific areas.
   - b) Knowledge of time when resources are clustered and most suitable for exploitation.

3. **Technique:**
   - Interception based on predictability of resource in time and space.

A recent discussion (Brown, 1970) on the division of labour by sex points out certain sociological implications of the relationship between subsistence activities and demographic composition of domestic groups. In noting the failure of various physiological and psychological explanations of a sexual division of labour, Brown argues that, purely in a functional sense, certain kinds of subsistence activities are compatible with
other domestic activities. Among other things this involves the
critical activity of caring for dependents in the group. Sub-
sistence activities amongst hunting-gathering peoples most
compatible with this job, according to Brown, would have the
following characteristics:

"...they do not require rapt concentration and are relatively
dull and repetitive; they are easily interruptible and easily
resumed once interrupted; they do not place the child in potential
danger; and they do not require the participant to range very
far from home." (ibid: 1075-76)

Insufficient as they are Brown's conclusions are interest-
ing and relevant to our Kasini material for females are at least
periodically immobilized as they reach an advanced state of
pregnancy and as they are required to nurse infants. And thus
"repetitive, interruptible, non-dangerous tasks that do not
require extensive excursions are more appropriate for women when
the exigencies of child care are taken into account." (op cit: 1077).

In our Kasini data there is clear indication that
something like Brown's perspective was, or might have been,
visualized at some point by the Kasini, for both hunting and
gathering are activities which have a strong symbolic weight
which is related to gender. However, we are not interested here
in the sociology of atavistic forms or the question of emergence.
What we wish to emphasize is that although on a symbolic and
conceptual level sex was integrated into the Kasini interpretive
framework in a very significant way, much behavior was not
structured in terms of this framework nor was it relentlessly
imposed on behavioral arrangements as they emerged in the course
of time. In response to questions concerning what is customarily
referred to as the normative dimension of roles Kasini answers provided this kind of outline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking, manufacturing clothing</td>
<td>Provision of raw materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of children</td>
<td>Acquisition of subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td>Hunting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although these contrasts are real, from the cases we examine below it will be evident that nothing like a strict separation of male-female activity could have been sustained for very long. For the most part decisions on these matters were not made on the basis of choice between a series of alternatives, for the reflection, volition and preferential decisions which are the presupposed conditions of choice frequently did not exist for the Kasini. Often the arrangements that emerged between individuals, however temporary they might be, were a result of selecting from a narrow range of possibilities.¹ Thus two men out hunting would not go hungry simply because they had no woman to cook for them, nor would a man hesitate to carry a child if the woman along was feeling ill or had a strained back.

The importance of this for understanding the nature of domestic groups is that even though certain activities were disjunctively associated with a specific sex in actual fact these activities were performed from time to time by all adults. What the normative statement might imply is that women by and large did not hunt as well as men, and men did not sew or tan skins as well as women. However, the gradual and informal basis upon which

¹. On choice and selection see A. Schutz, 1964:78.
all technical knowledge was learned ensured that access to it was not restricted and consequently by the time any individual had matured he or she had a sound working knowledge of all those skills of manufacturing and exploitation practised by adults. This had an obvious adaptive significance for it meant that insofar as a domestic group had a contingent of able-bodied adults it did not matter who they were or whether or not they were of the same or opposite sex. All that mattered was that they were on hand to care for those who were dependent on them.

The following cases will illustrate such generalizations and the range of domestic group composition. We are not presenting kinship relations per se although for ease of discussion we use quasi-genealogical charts. Strictly speaking these charts are a combination of genealogical information and recognized kin relations. A solid vertical line represents descent in the sense that two individuals are recognized as being of close connection both genealogically and socially. A broken vertical line (\(\text{\textbullet}\)) indicates recognition of a close social connection with no direct genealogical relatedness. The same applies to horizontal lines indicating collateral relations. The signs \(\Delta, \bigcirc\) which indicate gender are shaded when the individual represented is the provider in the domestic group. A cross mark placed on such signs indicates the individual is deceased. Finally, the domestic group is enclosed by a dotted line.
A childless couple adopted a male infant. The child remained with the couple after adulthood and in time became their closest filial tie. Over the years this triad formed a part of numerous domestic groups. When the son eventually married an extended arrangement of what is illustrated in Diagram 4.7 emerged (see below). However, as the son and his spouse produced children the domestic group became too large to stay intact. The split which occurred resulted in the combination of individuals circumscribed by the dotted line in the above chart forming one domestic group. At this time the son and his spouse were the productive center of the group which formed. The older couple in this case had been prematurely reduced to a dependent state by a number of serious illnesses which had had permanent effects.
The provider in this case was a man. The circumstances which led up to this arrangement, which lasted for five months one winter and on and off for a period of two years, were as follows: the mother of the children had died in the early fall and the father attempted to join up with another brother and his wife, who were in the immediate area but for a number of reasons this second couple did not welcome the addition to the domestic group of which they were already a part. The father, whose oldest child was 13 years old, was in a difficult position for not only would he frequently have to leave his young dependents for days at a time while he hunted and trapped, there was no one on hand to tan skins and make various articles of clothing and equipment for the group as a whole. For the father this was a problem of organization and time rather than ignorance or inability and his solution was to join up with his bachelor brother who, sometime after adulthood, had become totally blind. Despite this handicap, this brother was capable of performing all domestic tasks which were required — making clothing, snowshoes, dog harnesses, etc. as well as supervising the children during intermittent absences of the father.
The blind brother, in this case, was a provider only in a marginal sense. However, as we have pointed out, dependency is a matter of degree and for a period of years most individuals would be hovering in a borderline position. In this case the blind man obviously had restricted mobility, but relative to the children in the group he was a necessary component even though he could not possibly have survived by himself. Three years later, after the death of the blind brother and remarriage of the father, the domestic group in Diagram 4.3 emerged.

Diagram 4.3

At about the time of the death of the blind brother the oldest child, a 16 year old girl, acquired a spouse. This resulted in the mature girl, her spouse, and her father all acting as providers for the rest of the children. About a year later the father took as his wife a woman who had become recently widowed. Thus four providers existed in the domestic group. Off and on for the next few years the younger couple detached themselves from this group and joined up with others for brief periods of time.
Emergence of this domestic group occurred intermittently for a number of years. The circumstances centered around the fact that the spouse of the provider in the senior generation suffered from a periodic illness which rendered her incapable of even cooking meals for her children. The children of this couple and the younger female sibling of the woman were under 13 years of age, the younger sister having been cared for by the couple since infancy. To mitigate the periodic inconvenience of having only one provider in this group the step-daughter of the ill woman's older sister and her spouse, who was a younger sibling of the senior provider, became part of this group from time to time.
For a period of two years the couple in the senior generation and the providers in the junior generation stayed together in whatever domestic group they happened to be living. Upon the death of the couple indicated in the chart the orphaned children were adopted by the providing couple. The arrangement, which emerged was subsequently changed through the addition and subtraction of others in different seasons and years. However, as an aggregate of individuals the domestic group outlined in the above diagram remained intact regardless of their periodic assimilation in other domestic groups. As a unit of spatially proximate individuals it was eventually changed only as a result of births, deaths and marriages.

Diagram 4.6

The polygynous union in the senior generation emerged as a result of the following circumstances. The senior male provider and his first wife cared for, from early adolescence onward, the female who eventually became the second wife. The taking of a second spouse by the man was partly a result of the first not producing any children. From the second union numerous children were produced, of which the first three are indicated in the above diagram. When the oldest daughter of the junior
generation married the result was a rather unusual concentration of providers. This arrangement was perhaps the least common for there appears to have been a tendency, presumably for demographic reasons, of having two to three providers in each domestic group. In the present case, however, due partly to the closure of various trapping posts and extensive movement required by the people involved, this group remained more or less intact for four years.

This group, consisting of four providers and nine dependents, formed every summer for five consecutive years and each year it stayed intact for 6-8 weeks. The providers, two married couples, were on congenial terms with one another, the children of the two couples were potential marriage partners and the long range intent of this particular grouping was that some of the children would eventually marry. There were no pressing economic or demographic circumstances which made this combination in any way necessary. It was simply a choice between a number of alternatives. For the rest of the year each couple with their respective dependents were engaged with other individuals in a series of different domestic groups.
The providers in this case are opposite sexed siblings. The deceased spouse of the female was operative in this group when his spouse's younger brother was still a dependent. At the time of his death, however, both himself, his spouse and his spouse's brother were all providing for the group. After his death the remainder were engaged in a series of other domestic groups as well as occasionally operating as the domestic group outlined above. The male provider did not become disengaged from this collection of individuals until his sister had taken a second spouse.
Unfortunately we were able to obtain no example of a Kasini domestic group whose providers were all female. This final example is a case from the people who originally came to the Pelly river region from the Selwyn mountain area and who hunted and trapped along Macmillan river and upper reaches of the Ross river. It is introduced here simply as an illustration of a possibility which we consider to be inherent to Kasini organization. Numerous Kasini women were alleged to have had the strength, endurance and tracking ability to hunt and travel as well as any man. The providers in this case were two females who within a year of each other had both lost their respective spouses. For two years these two women hunted and trapped for the various dependents outlined in the above diagram. The situation was not realigned until one of the providers took a second spouse and one of the female dependents had matured and married.

These cases illustrate a range of possibilities manifest in domestic groups and are not intended to show what was typical for we have no way of knowing this. Our emphasis in describing each case has involved the distinction "provider" and "dependent" and each case presented (and all those recorded) may be analyzed in terms of these two criteria. We are claiming that whatever other considerations Kasini might have entertained in forming domestic groups the economic implications of these two general classes of personnel always obtained priority, and it was only after satisfactorily establishing a workable baseline of providers in a domestic group that other alternatives could be considered.
It is not satisfactory to adopt the perspective that "other things being equal" a family-type grouping would emerge under these conditions, for things were never equal and no particular kind of biological arrangement or set of categorized social relations was ever anything but a transitory stage. Women were always getting pregnant, individuals were always growing up and growing old, people were always dying and anyone could get hurt or become ill at any age. It was in the face of the economic implications of this constantly fluctuating state of affairs that domestic groups were formed, not in response to an idealized internal configuration.

In this chapter we have shown that Kasini became separated and that frequency of interaction varied. We have also stated that relative capability was significant in the formation of groups even though we have been able to argue this only in a very general sense. If we may be allowed to anticipate our discussion slightly it will be useful to have some idea of the broader significance of these two factors for Kasini social life.

It has been argued that there must have been a point when, for the elderly, ability was not commensurate with knowledge and, for the young, when neither knowledge nor ability were sufficient for survival. Strictly in terms of age therefore we have a profile of the Kasini population that when broken down into classes "providers" and "dependents" reveals the following arrangement:
The arrow in the above diagram indicates the progression of most individuals from infancy to old age and as one can see this traverses the "provider" class. Economically an individual ends up where he began. We are, in most cases, dealing here with a tendency rather than bounded strata based strictly and unambiguously on economic capacity. The stratification, such as it is, involves an ego-centered recognition of people being as able, less able or more able than oneself. A hierarchy is involved and so is mobility in the sense that there is a shifting evaluation of the capabilities of those with whom one comes in contact. This may be brought about either by a change in one's own abilities or a change in others.

Different capabilities and the process of evaluating them had important implications for the Kasini experience of social relationship. In Chapter seven we discuss age in the context of ideology and Kasini social categories and show that in a gradient from young to old a hierarchy exists which implies the subordination of the younger vis-a-vis the older. Thus the Kasini possessed a model of their relationship to one another which can be abbreviated in the following way:
These diagrams are not isomophic. Most importantly they reflect two different ways Kasini experienced relationship — one is derived from activity, the other from social categories. In Chapters seven and eight we examine these different perspectives closely and demonstrate their relevance to the Kasini logic of interaction.

Due to the demands of the food quest, fluctuations in the resource base, and the closing and opening of trapping posts Kasini were constantly moving about and becoming separated. They were also extremely sensitive to frequency of contact in experiencing relationship. Consequently, as people moved in and out of the ambience of an individual, he would portray his changing relationship to them by categorizing them in different ways. To this end Kasini employed a graded series of social categories which ranged from intimates and close associates, on the one hand, to strangers and remote associates, on the other. We examine the nature of these categories in Chapter nine and in Chapter ten we show how strangers could become intimates by arranging marriage between their respective dependents.
CHAPTER V

KASINI IDEAS AND BELIEFS

The picture we have presented so far has been mechanical and biased in that we have portrayed the individual as having little control over his circumstance. It has suggested a personal impotence that Kasini would not have been prepared to admit or even, perhaps, to fully understand. In their view individuals possessed intuitions, talents and impulses which were ultimately derived from sources quite independent of social and material existence. This perspective contributed to a sense of personal autonomy critical to a full understanding of Kasini social organization. It allowed everyone the potential of taking initiative in redefining the areas of relevance in his own life and everyone was thought capable of transcending the strictures of circumstance, both material and social, although it was a matter of degree to what extent this was possible for any individual.

We are not certain whether this ability is isolated in the Kaska dialect as a noun or whether it was only expressed in verb form. Our information indicates the latter. Thus, Kasini could say "I feel powerful" nitsit in the sense that the individual is in active and controlled contact with the world around him. This is quite distinct from "I feel strong" nisit which refers simply to a physical or mechanical strength. The first is a sensation located in the head tsí, specifically the mind di, whereas the second is located elsewhere in the body, e.g. the arms or legs. The brain tsí ka (literally: head fat) is the organ of the body in which di exists, although, di is not
spatially restricted to the brain. When a Kasini speaks of another being "powerful", he would say "his mind is powerful". Individuals of exceptional ability, that is Shamans, were referred to as medi, although they were addressed with the appropriate kin term by others.

For the Kasini "power" was naturally imminent in everything with the exception of man himself. In a very real sense a Kasini infant was the only powerless thing in a world infused with power and fully animated. If the child was to survive and successfully cope with life he had to acquire power. An insufficiency in power, either the individual's own or the protective power of others, resulted in death.

When an individual eventually acquired power it was by contacting a non-material realm. The way or ways that he became powerful always required a mediator and communication with this mediator involved di. A mediator could be of almost any class of things in the Kasini world and included natural phenomena such as lightning and most species of mammals, fish and birds. Plants, rocks, earth, water and a small number of animals do not appear to have been in themselves available to the Kasini as power mediators although all were recognized as embodiments of power.

As he matured an individual would discover he had special abilities due to contact with a limited class of things such as salmon, blackbird or mouse. It was the class rather than any particular representative of the class that was important. Two individuals might also derive their power from the same class
of things although this might involve different kinds of power for each individual or different degrees of the same kind of power.

Before discussing the acquisition and expression of power it is necessary to outline more fully the notion of di. At this time we can make no claim to a full understanding of this word and our translation should, perhaps, be taken as a suggestive orientation rather than a comprehensive semantic equivalent. By rendering di as "mind" it must therefore be remembered that we do so largely in terms of our current descriptive and analytic concerns, for even though this word seems to refer to some sort of mental process or capacity this does not by any means exhaust the semantic potential indicated in its usage.

"Mind" refers not to any particular thought or idea a Kasini might have had but rather to his ability to have certain kinds of thoughts for which there was no generally visible empirical suggestion. For instance a Kasini might say "somebody's mind hit me" dena di skidigit when he sensed that people were on their way to his camp. The people allegedly coming were not thought to have intentionally sent a conscious mental message. Nor would the person who uttered the above be reading the others' thoughts as they were deciding to move. The interpretation was that the di of both parties had come into contact — for the recipient who was "hit" this was manifest in a physical sensation (a slight pain or twinge of the scalp) at the back of the head. Only some people had the ability to make this kind of prediction and a few could apparently tell what moiety the imminent visitors were in by what side of the head the sensation was felt; the
right back of the head indicated the same moiety as the recipient of the "hit", the left back of the head indicated the visitors would be members of the opposite moiety.

In the above case di was not a thought, e.g. "somebody is coming" but the ability to have the thought. Thus it seems to refer to some sort of process. However, it was also some kind of entity or substance which could reach out and "hit" somebody else's mind. This at least suggests that it was spatially indiscrete, i.e. an individual's di was not restricted to his physical person. At the same time it was also somehow located in the brain of the recipient. The physical sensation was an indication that the recipient's di had been "hit" -- it was not a direct result of the "hit". If it turned out that no visitors arrived the event would be open to reinterpretation, perhaps simply a "twinge in the scalp at the back of the head". For those who never successfully predicted the arrival of anyone the sensation at the back of the head would eventually be ignored by the individual and no mention of it would be made to others. Such a person would conclude, or more likely others would conclude for him by ignoring or scoffing at him whenever he claimed to have anything to say on these matters, that he had no talent for this kind of prediction, i.e. his mind did not have the requisite kind of power for this sort of activity.

In a manner which is unclear to us di was also related to an entire universe of anthropomorphized beings which operated quite independently of any visible or empirical manifestation. We should also point out that the relationship we
speak of here was unclear to the Kasini themselves. However, perhaps this should not be surprising. The Kasini informants we spoke with on this matter did not feel any profound need to work out all implications that were to be derived from the postulated existence of $\textit{di}$ and certainly they had some difficulty in understanding any series of questions which led in the direction of precisely defining $\textit{di}$ in any narrow kind of way. Perhaps then it would be wise to follow the lead of others when speaking of similar ideas and consider $\textit{di}$ as an "imaginative construct" of some kind rather than a concept that might in some way be operationalized (cf. Evans-Pritchard 1956:321). Our own inclinations to unearth a "system of thought" can of course produce an entirely misleading picture especially if we fill the gaps with the implications of our own translations and what we think might be there if an informant had been around to "say it all". This precludes the important possibility that for them, just as for us, "it all" cannot be said. Consequently, as Hocart (1937, 1970:276) and others have taken the trouble to point out, lack of articulation and inconsistencies in the application of ideas should be construed as evidence of something and not necessarily an inadequacy. To recognize this would at least temper any premature or naive translation that does little more than accommodate the direction of a particular line of enquiry. It would also leave room and suggest a need for future research on the matter. At this time we can retain our translation of $\textit{di}$ as "mind" only if we recognize that it is not exhaustive. The following illustrations should make this only too clear even
though in presenting them we make only a modest acknowledgement to the difficulties of translating the ideas of one culture into the idiom of another (cf. Needham, 1972) and avoid completely the really awesome implications of taking a firm theoretical position on this matter one way or the other (Lhde, 1969:50-57).

The translation of \( \text{di} \) into "mind" refers to the direct association the Kasini made between mind, head and brain. When killing many animals the first ritual of butchering was to remove the head. The \( \text{di} \) could thereby escape through the foramen magnum which was considered its rightful point of exit from the head. This attitude also applied to the brain itself which was only removed from the head by cooking it whole and having the brain fall onto the ground at some point during this procedure. The brain was then removed from the cooking place or camp and deposited apart from where people were living. It was never eaten or used in the process of tanning skins. This activity only applied to animals whose heads were eaten such as caribou and moose, the heads of other animals were discarded with brains intact.

To allow the \( \text{di} \) to leave the head any other way was thought to be improper, a breach of etiquette, which could offend the \( \text{di} \) of the entire class of animals in question and might reduce a person's chances of obtaining that kind of animal in the future. Thus only under exceptional circumstances would the Kasini be able to rationalize shooting an animal in the head. However, nobody hesitated to say that they would shoot a charging and obviously dangerous moose or bear in the head. In fact most
of those to whom we posed this fanciful situation thought the question silly. To shoot an animal in the head would be to court potential disaster sometime in the future, however, not to do so in a situation like the above would be to court immediate disaster and probably death. In other situations involving fur bearing animals the room for choice was greater and the decisions made were rationalized, if it all, in terms of the class of animal collectively understanding the demands placed on the Kasini by the fur buyer. For instance the beaver was both frequently shot in the head and had its skin removed before the head was cut from the body. But even here special attention was paid to the beaver head after skinning for its head was either thrown into the river from whence it was taken or placed on a stick next to the river bank in order, it was said, to show other beaver that no offence was meant by this customary but unenfranchised treatment of the animal.

"Mind" therefore is only one connotation of\textsuperscript{128} and perhaps not even the most important one for \textit{di} was also used in such a way as to suggest "spirit" or "soul". It was in this second sense that the \textit{di} of a general class of animals was propitiated in rituals of butchering. However, it had this connotation of being disembodied even when used in reference to specific animals. For instance a particular animal was capable of detecting disrespectful thoughts that an individual might entertain while hunting it and the animal could find such thoughts so offensive that it would refuse to allow itself to be killed.
In addition the _di_ of a particular man and the _di_ of that class of animals from which he obtained power were thought of as being one and the same. Presently we will discuss in greater detail how the Kasini thought about this kind of identity but it is important to point out here that they did not interpret this relationship in metaphorical terms. With respect to _di_ the man and the class (or classes) of animals with which he was in contact and from which he derived his power were not differentiated. It was only on the empirical plane that they appeared different, on the plane of _di_ they were the same. This sort of thing was thought to be occasionally manifest when a particular animal would approach a camp or not run away when intercepted on a trail. The immediate interpretation of this kind of situation was that the animal was in fact somebody who had died and who was not running away because he felt himself to be among friends and former associates. Dogs were prevented from attacking such animals, generally they were feared and only infrequently were they ever killed.

Quite apart from being associated with the brain and head, therefore _di_ was also thought to be unsubstantial and was associated with the sky, air, high places, and water which came from the air (water which came from the ground had other associations). However, it is in this context that it becomes difficult to differentiate _di_ and the notion of "power". For instance, it was considered improper to step over a moose head while butchering it without making a remark such as "excuse me" (current usage) or _gha-kadal_ (roughly: It has got to be this way)
to avoid offending the $\text{di}$ of moose generally. At the same time it was considered dangerous for an individual to step over another person whom he considered more powerful than himself, or to stand above and move about such a person while he was eating, or even to step over his equipment while it was lying on the ground. This could result in the person with weaker power suddenly suffering from muscle cramps or becoming dizzy and sick.

Thus "power" was also associated with the ethereal and invisible and we find it difficult to differentiate clearly the two kinds of ideas in this context. Nevertheless the Kasini did recognize some sort of difference in that they thought $\text{di}$ did not necessarily indicate power for every child possessed $\text{di}$ but not all obtained power. For the Kasini the existence of $\text{di}$ was a postulate, an unexamined aspect of reality, in terms of which they interpreted much of what went on around them. However, the "power" of the $\text{di}$ of an individual was an inference, the existence of which could only be indirectly manifest to anyone and thus any alleged or suspected manifestation was open to doubt and could ultimately be put to an empirical test. We have already alluded to the possibility of this sort of thing happening when we were discussing the phrase "Somebody's mind hit me". In this case the existence of $\text{di}$ itself was not in doubt but rather the ability of the person who claimed his mind had been "hit". That is, the individual's "power" was in doubt. Immediately below and in subsequent chapters we turn our attention to this double aspect of "power" and discuss it both as something to be acquired and also as a framework for judging the abilities of others vis-a-vis oneself.
For reasons that had very little to do with kin relationships or any physiological differences between people the Kasini recognized that individuals measured unequally to one another. These differences were manifest in the degree to which any individual could successfully transcend the strictures of the visible and tangible world in which they all lived. Such inequality was always relative and most frequently manifest in cases where two individuals had approximately similar knowledge and skills concerning a certain task, e.g. hunting, and yet one individual was consistently more successful in accomplishing this task than the other. Less frequently but more dramatically it involved individuals who were able to come across game without tracking them, to predict where game would be, to move quickly through the country without walking or leaving any tracks, to cure others of illness, to control the weather, to predict future events, etc.

In being cognizant of these differences between people the Kasini also understood why this was so and how it came to be this way in every individual case. Their explanation involved not the notions of "luck", "talent" or "character", as it might in English when referring to similar kinds of individual differences, but rather the idiosyncratic quality of a person's \( \text{di} \) and the manifest differences this made to how capable or "powerful" that person appeared to others. The description which follows outlines a rough sequence of events which involves both public manifestation and personal interpretation of the acquisition, through \( \text{di} \), of an individual's power.
From his earliest years a Kasini was exposed to stories of individuals capable of extraordinary deeds. The accomplishments of these legendary Shamans (mostly men) were associated with the very remote past, events which no longer occur and things which no longer exist. Such stories, many of which were not restricted to the Kasini oral tradition, were (and still are) frequently interspersed with the isolated accomplishments of lesser figures (men and women), some of whom existed in living memory. In combination these stories provided the Kasini child with a general rationale for many natural phenomena that he could see around him, and they also gave him a loose framework to comprehend many of the activities of those with whom he lived and about which, initially at least, he had only peripheral involvement and marginal understanding. Among other things he learned how individuals obtained power, how they behaved while they were acquiring it and what they could or could not do with it after it had been obtained, and in his own life he could apply this schematic understanding to those around him who appeared to be having an experience involving "power". Thus, from very early childhood and long before he had any practical involvement in the relative potency of his capabilities the individual was predisposed to think in terms of individual "power" and the existence of ⦿. And certainly to be surrounded by adults and older siblings who were naturally so much more capable than himself would do nothing to dissuade him from the aptness of these thoughts. In addition it was during these early years that the child learned what he could one day expect for himself
in terms of obtaining a "powerful mind" and also, in terms of its acquisition and expression, what would eventually be expected of him by others. In this he was frequently coached by those much older than himself to recognize symptoms in his own behavior which indicated the approaching acquisition of "power". Indeed he was even primed to anticipate what class of animal might be the source of his future power. For instance were a child to feel dizzy or faint after a handling a particular kind of animal, or to vomit or feel ill after eating some of its meat this would be a hint to others about where a potential source of power for the child might exist. If the association of "illness" and a particular kind of animal recurred the possible implications might be pointed out to the child. However, no specific action was prescribed. This child might or might not decide to avoid such an animal, and initially his behavior would be based simply on his own conclusions derived from personal experience. The open question of "why that child?" and "why that animal?" was posed but not answered and indeed it might never obtain a satisfactory answer. Nevertheless, it did allow those involved to entertain the possibility that a relationship between "that child" and "that animal" was developing and about to receive fuller expressions. If this never occurred the matter would be dropped and eventually forgotten. If it did occur, the following kinds of things were involved.

Unorthodox behavior was the hallmark of anyone acquiring power. To observers the behavior of such individuals appeared at the very least odd, frequently outrageous and always somewhat
frightening. Such behavior might range from intentionally burning one's clothes, breaking one's equipment, abusing those to whom deference was expected, or, as in one legendary instance, setting rabbit snares in front of a bears' den. However, it also might entail breaking taboos and could involve quite violent activity such as sexual assault. A person in this condition was considered "crazy" (current usage) (no literal translation) and although the condition was usually temporary it could result in death. The individual's behavior was interpreted as a struggle between himself and the "animal-people" with whom he was in contact, for in the initial stages this contact was not controlled by the individual. If he never succeeded in controlling it he would die, if he did succeed in doing so, this contact, through the medium of , was the individual's source of "power". However, this was an external perspective and the individual was not thought to be aware of his activities as they appeared to others. Certainly there was no sense of shame or guilt and he was not held responsible for anything which took place during this period. In terms of how others knew him the individual was not considered to be self-aware and thus customary expectations concerning his behavior were all placed in temporary abeyance. Typically this sort of behavior was intermittently displayed by males and especially adolescents and young men between 14-18 years of age, and at any one time lasted for only a few days. It was assumed that the more sustained and extreme the behavior the greater the "power" the individual would eventually have.
Females were recognized as having power but these, in every case we heard of, were shamans and elderly women past the child bearing period. There does not, however, appear to have been a rule concerning this fact or even a recognition of it. Some forms of instruction, seclusion and fasting were engaged in by young girls during menarche, but these did not lead to or include the unorthodox kind of behavior described above. Nevertheless, in the course of time women somehow did obtain "power" and could become shamans.

As we have already said _di_ not only referred to something like "mind" but also to the general idea of a spiritual essence with mental properties. Thus the _di_ of an entire class of animals existed and continued to exist irrespective of the condition of any member of the class. For Kasini this non-empirical world of _di_ was anthropomorphized and was thought to involve, according to the recognized classes of animal in the empirical world, discrete classes of "animal-people". Consequently they recognized "beaver-people", "salmon-people", "goat-people", etc., all in the context of _di_, and the acquisition of power involved an individual achieving a controlled contact with one or more of these classes of "animal-people". Such contact involved in some way the assimilation of the _di_ of the individual with that of a particular class of "animal people". If the contact was controlled then the Kasini individual was given special abilities or privileged knowledge which could be used in coping with material and social circumstances in the empirical world. For each individual this resulted in varying degrees of ability
although to the extent that any adult individual continued to cope at all this was tangible evidence for everyone that he had some contact with "animal-people" and it could thus be said of him that medi-nut'sit "his mind is powerful". If the contact proved to be uncontrollable this resulted in the death of the individual who might eventually become an empirical manifestation of that class of animal with whom he had been in contact while still in human form. Eventually everyone lost such controlled contact with "animal-people" and they died; however, as we will eventually discuss this was by no means the only rationale for death.

Contact with "animal-people" was thought to occur in a number of ways. Some claimed that contact was direct and that one could come across such people while alone in the bush, others claimed it was only while "dreaming" that an individual achieved contact with "animal-people". However, "dreaming" is a current Kasini translation of na'stin which could, but did not necessarily involve "sleep" s'ustin. "Dreaming" could occur while an individual was doing anything and it suggests, among other things, special awareness. For our purposes it will suffice to speak of obliviousness of immediate surroundings. Although we have been advised otherwise1, we are tempted to translate the bound morpheme

---

1. This qualification results from discussion with Dr. Eung-Do Cook, Dept. of Linguistics, University of Calgary. Dr. Cook has done extensive work with the Athapaskan Sarcee language, as well as some brief pilot studies with Tahltan and Kaska. It was he who isolated for me the root xin, xin, xin, etc. as indicative of "awareness" and cautioned against a premature translation of na, which, with slight variation of tone and positioning, obtains quite different meanings. Therefore our translation of na in this case is more of a suggestion than anything else. Dr. Cook was not certain that it was not correct and I, from his cautionary advice, am not now certain that it is.
as "unpredictable or potentially dangerous" for certainly it does have this meaning and seems an apt translation in this instance. The Kasini considered "dreaming" and indeed the whole business of "power" and contact with "animal-people" to be outside the confines of social constraints and taboos, although the degree to which this was possible for any individual depended on his "power". When an individual was "dreaming" he was considered to be aware only of his relationship to his "animal people", his awareness of other Kasini was temporarily non-existent. Consequently the relationships that might normally describe the kind of interaction between the individual and others were not to be counted on -- in this limited sense "dreaming" for Kasini lacked "self-awareness". However, for the dreamer no such line was drawn, for he considered his own di and that of the "animal-people" he could contact to be one and the same. Thus, when we attempted to elicit the nature of this relationship from informants who could appreciate some niceties of English, our metaphorical interpretation was more than once corrected to an emphatic "I am such-and-such an animal". It therefore seems that interaction between a Kasini and a class of "animal-people" was considered possible because both parties shared the same di. This will be clear in the following illustrations.

One individual related an experience where he lost an opportunity at sustaining contact with the first "animal-people" he had ever met. When he was a boy (14-15 years old he guessed: c.1925) he was out hunting alone in the mountains where he heard the sound of drums and people singing. The area was somewhere
northeast of Frances Lake. Although he looked around he could not make out where the sounds were coming from. Eventually he sat down to rest. Presently he saw in a small area between the grass and rocks at his feet some tiny people singing and dancing together. He bent down to take a closer look and as he was doing so he suddenly became smaller and found himself standing at the edge of a clearing in the woods watching a group of people he had never seen before. One man in the group beckoned him to come closer. The people talked with him and fed him; they identified themselves as "porcupine-people" and taught him some of their songs although they never told him what the songs meant or why they were being sung. The "porcupine-people" told him he could visit them again and that eventually they would teach him many things that would be of use to him. Upon returning to his camp the boy related this incident to his parents, only to learn from them that he was not supposed to relate any events of this kind to others until many such contacts had been made. He never made contact with "porcupine-people" again.

Another instructive case involved a Kasini's attempt to explain the non-empirical yet real relationship between an individual and "animal-people". The following account paraphrases remarks made in response to a series of insistently naive questions, such as; "What happens to the animal (i.e. the empirical entity) when an individual talks to him as an animal-person?", "Do they really look like people?", "Are they covered with hair?", etc. Most Kasini to whom we posed such questions simply thought them amusing and a few provided answers. The
following synopsis is the most coherent, clever and intriguing of these. The discussion took place while waiting for sunrise so the informant and I could begin beaver hunting. It was late April 1969. The vernacular has not been retained simply because the discussion was not written down when heard; however, subsequent discussion clarified certain points.

"When you stand here and look over there (pointing to the beaver dam) you can see a pile of sticks. Over there another pile we call sa'kle (beaver lodge). When you see a beaver running his paws through his fur it is just that, an animal doing something with his fur. If you could get inside his lodge you would see the beaver resting his head on a pile of mud or eating some bark and wood. But that is only from standing here, looking from over there we look just as different to him as he does to us. However, if we could look from over there things would be different; that pile of sticks would be a tent, that fur would be clothes and blankets, that pile of mud would be a comfy jacket rolled up under his head while he rests, that bark would be good things to eat and the things he does with it before putting it into his mouth would look like cutting up meat and cooking it. So you see it is only when looking from here or there that it appears different but its really all the same. If, when you dream, you talk to "beaver-people" you find out there really is no difference between either of you, it just looks that way to others. However, another person might be able to talk to "geese-people" and for those who can talk only
to "beaver-people" a goose would always be just a bird. A person who received his power from "geese-people" might dream he was rafting down the river with them. Suddenly he gets into rough water and there is lots of noise and the people are shouting to one another and somebody falls off one of the rafts. For everybody who can't talk to "geese-people" this just looks like a flock of geese flying overhead, so they rush and get their guns and start firing and they hear the geese honking to one another, and they shoot one and it falls away from the rest and drops to the ground."

Thus, even though only a few were able to articulate the distinction, Kasini appear to have held a dual interpretation of reality. On the one hand this involved the material world with which everyone was in more or less equal contact, and on the other there was the transcendental realm of _di_ with which every Kasini had a quite unique and restricted access. Nevertheless, it was through access to the latter that the Kasini considered themselves able to cope at all for it was recognized that although the empirical world was roughly patterned it also had a highly contingent and unexpected quality about it. For instance, moose, in any condition could in fact be found anywhere at any time of the year despite the recognized seasonal regularities of their whereabouts and physical condition. Similarly salmon runs could be unexpectedly large or small in particular years or unseasonal temperature changes could hinder, enhance or completely realign one's exploitative activities. Such phenomena were usually beyond
Kasini comprehension, although how they affected any individual was assessed in terms of individual "power". To the extent that the unexpected had deleterious consequences for any individual, the conclusion was that his "power" was inadequate. To the extent that the individual appeared able to anticipate and capitalize on irregular events his actions and their consequences were judged to be a manifestation of his "power". This latter interpretation held even when it was known that certain taboos had been broken, for in such a case it was simply assumed that his "power" was such that he could do so with impunity.

"Power", then, was special ability that an individual developed with the help of "animal-people". Contact with "animal-people" was elicited by singing special songs which the individual had been taught while "dreaming". Such songs were incomprehensible to other Kasini. During contact the individual might be taught how to accomplish certain tasks or given instructions on what the future might bring. But just as importantly the individual would be informed of things he must and must not do if he was to remain in contact and enhance whatever abilities he had acquired. Among other things this usually involved avoidance of particular kinds of food, and in some cases avoidance of even the utensils used to cook such food. It could also entail a small bag, in which was placed idiosyncratic items that enhanced individual ability. In addition the intermittent wearing of insignia (e.g., feathers of a bird, the tail of a small mammal) which had a purely private significance, might also be involved. Therefore, through his singing, avoidance
of certain foods, occasional visual insignia, and the accumulation of certain paraphernalia the young Kasini gradually began to make a clearer and clearer expression of his individuality.

To Kasini the relatedness of the realm of \( \mathcal{d}_i \) to the material world in which they lived was manifest in repeated demonstrations of "power". This both sustained their postulated belief in a transcendental existence and gave them reason to think they could continue to cope with the contingencies of everyday life. Above all else "power" was the demonstrated ability to deal successfully with whatever problem was at hand. In very bald terms "power" may be thought of simply as the ability to endure, to survive the vicissitudes of a world which was never under total control. The visible and tangible never in itself revealed the whole story. Inferences from past experience were only a guide and frequently the unexpected occurred which, at the time, required something extra if the individual was to cope at all. Unlike the realm of \( \mathcal{d}_i \) or the empirical world a manifestation (or perhaps even existence) of "power" was not a fundamental dimension of Kasini reality. "Power" was the focal point upon which the realm of \( \mathcal{d}_i \) and the material everyday world were demonstrated to be in contact. Unlike "power", the dimensions of Kasini reality were construed as being in some sort of interdependent balance which could emerge in the mind of an individual who was thereby, to his advantage, simultaneously in contact with both dimensions. The opposition between these two realms involved a balanced complementarity and every object and event was construed as having both an empirical and transcendental quality which simultaneously constituted the Kasini
experience. "Power", as we have said, was above all demonstrated ability. It was associated with the realm of \( \text{di} \) not because it emanated from there but because contact with this realm had to be achieved if one was to obtain it. By contrast, contact with the empirical world was in the nature of being alive.

As brief and inconclusive as the foregoing description has been it does reveal certain considerations which were fundamental to the way Kasini interpreted the world they lived in. Therefore, as we turn to broader expressions of these ideas and relationships it will be useful to summarize them as explicitly as we can.

1. "Kasini reality" was composed of a balanced duality consisting of the mutually exclusive but exhaustive dimensions -- transcendental and material.

2. Contact with both dimensions was necessary for survival. An individual was born without such contact and hence initially had to depend on others who had it.

3. An individual achieved contact with the transcendental independent of his relationship with others.

These three propositions are implicit in the foregoing discussion and the first two are fundamental to the analyses which follow. The third places an individual somewhat outside the social world in which he lives. It accurately suggests that independent resources were available to the individual. In Chapter nine, below, we return to this statement and closely examine the recognized potential of the individual when analyzing Kasini interpretations of relationship.
We have begun with the ideas inherent in certain Kasini beliefs not because we believe them to be the base-line of all their interpretations but rather because in these ideas exists a fairly clear manifestation of certain kinds of relationships. It is, in other words, a point of departure in an analysis which is not concerned with causal relations or historical priority.
CHAPTER VI
BALANCED DUALITY REFLECTED

In this chapter we present evidence from a variety of Kasini institutions, activities and attitudes in an attempt to establish: (1) the prevalence of a certain perspective in Kasini thought, and (2) the analogous relations that exist between certain Kasini social categories and the properties and activities associated with gender. To this end we employ the broad formula derived in the previous chapter where we stated that Kasini reality\(^1\) was comprised of a balanced duality consisting of transcendental\(^2\) and material dimensions. We understood this duality to have been immanent to all phenomenon Kasini experienced. Thus no thing, no custom, no event is, in principle, devoid of conceptual unity in terms of this axis. As we have seen, an animal as an empirical entity is only half the story -- the totality in Kasini terms being animal/animal-people. Similarly a statement about men's activity alone is conceptually incomplete -- the full expression being found in complementary statements.

1. We did not enquire whether such a broad notion as "reality" exists in the Kaska dialect. The fact that Kasini recognized both a difference and an interdependence between two dimensions that were aspects of all phenomena simultaneously is sufficient reason to use this comprehensive word.

2. The term transcendental may seem, for some, an unfortunate choice since it is so closely linked with Kantian philosophy and various kinds of mysticism. There is, however, no other which adequately provides the scope we require in this discussion. To us, therefore, transcendental is meant to refer to something which in any way is beyond discrimination through sense perception. As such it may be manifest and spoken of in a variety of ways, e.g., intangible, invisible, homogeneous, amorphous, etc. and in what follows we use whatever substitute word seems apposite in context.
about women's activity. Furthermore, these two representations, animal/animal-people and women's activity/men's activity, may be viewed as different expressions of the same kind of relationship and unity. This more general statement of relationship we have chosen to speak of as transcendental/material and it is in terms of this axis that we attempt to show below the concordance of the conceptual order that is brought to bear in many different areas of Kasini life.

In what follows we draw on Kasini analogies and associations in an attempt to establish and clarify what to us seems to be a Kasini structural premise. There is no attempt to center this premise in a particular institution or give it a specific moral cast. On the contrary, it is our intention to present it in such a way that it appears beyond normative and practical considerations. In doing so, however, it should be pointed out that Kasini were generally inarticulate about the symbols they employed and we found nobody who could or was willing to engage in extensive discussion on these matters. As a result it is impossible to indicate the degree to which Kasini were conscious of the synthesis we present.

Stars/Ghosts

Kasini believed the final resting place of the dead was in the sky, specifically the stars \textit{sun}, which are to be viewed only at night. Stars are seldom visible in the sky during the long daylight hours from spring until late summer. They are associated with the darkness of winter. The dead who
reached the stars were thought to have lived a satisfying life on earth and to be no longer concerned with mundane affairs. Nevertheless, stars were not to be pointed at for fear of attracting the attention of the dead, who might then return to earth and seek out the company of the living and perhaps take somebody with them when they returned again to the heavens.

Ghosts were the dead who had not moved beyond the earth. The word "ghost" is a current Kasini translation of two separate words in their own language and for this reason we must remain somewhat undecided about what it might mean. Two obvious explanations for this are possible: either the Kasini words are synonyms or the Kasini have imbued the word ghost with a much broader meaning than it customarily possesses in English. On the one hand, we have the term ḏجموعة which was frequently used as a metonym for the Kasini term for shadow and it does appear to involve the root word which indicates something like "awareness" (نية). This term might therefore be more accurately translated as "spirit" or "soul" to indicate something which is coherent, in the sense of being aware, and yet, like a shadow, without substance. On the other hand, we have the term 지연 which was also used as a metonym for candle and referred both to the candle's white colour as well as to its shimmering neck when lit, which, like the glow of a star, ghosts were thought occasionally to resemble.

Among ghosts were those who had recently died and

3. Kasini accounts varied on the relationship between stars and the dead. Some thought that the dead became stars, others, that the dead resided in stars.
thought still to have worldly concerns, and those who had lived
an unhappy or unfulfilled life. In the former case they were
assumed to be staying on earth eventually to be reborn. In the
latter, they were waiting to redress a wrong and for this reason
they were feared. They moved about by night, by day they lived
under the ground. By night they could be visible or invisible
and might, in the latter case, appear in a human form that
glowed. When invisible only animals could see them and frequently
dogs barked at them at night when they tried to approach a camp.
They could also be heard rattling equipment during the night and
occasionally their passing presence was evident in the morning
by equipment that had been re-arranged or tampered with. Seeing
a ghost in human form foretold the viewer's imminent death.

We can see from the above that certain paired contrasts
are evident between ghosts and stars. In summary, ghosts have
mundane concerns, reside underground, are for the most part
invisible and dangerous to humans, whereas stars have no worldly
concerns, reside in the heavens, are visible and not dangerous.

**Dead/Living**

With the exception of a few constellations stars were
unidentified and none were associated with any particular
ancestor. Similarly ghosts were usually unidentified and their
presence was frequently a surmise about strange noises in the
night. By contrast the living were mostly inactive by night and
always visible as they moved about by day. They could be
identified by kinship and name and were distinctly heterogeneous
in character. For a Kasini to meet another person it usually
meant, from prior meetings or common acquaintance, that each knew a good deal about the other. But even if this knowledge amounted to little there was the opportunity to interact and clarify the relationship. In contrast the dead were beyond negotiation and one could expect from them unpredictable and probably dangerous behavior.

Not all associations with the dead were construed as inauspicious and dangerous, however, and certain indications of the presence of the dead were considered to be "good news" (as phrased in the current vernacular). One instance of this involved those who had been dead for many years and whose presence was manifest in whirlwinds and localized gusts around a camp. Always such gusts occurred during summer months and are associated with day time rather than night and darkness. Some individuals might shout a greeting when such gusts occurred and, if plans were then being made to hunt or move camp, this was considered a sign all would go well.

At this point we are not so concerned with Kasini attitudes to things as we are with the contrasts they recognized between things. Nevertheless, in regards to attitudes we can see that these changed, depending on context, and for this reason we cannot unequivocally associate a single attitude or sentiment with, for instance, the dead. As we shall see in the following chapter nor can we associate a single attitude to the recognized classes of living people. Regarding contrasts, however, there appears to be a consistent emphasis on sight as opposed to other senses and on those contexts, such as daylight and proximity,
which aid in the visual discrimination of particulars. We have, on the one hand, the dead who live beneath the ground and those who live above it, the dead who are heard and those who are seen, and the dead who appear at night and far away and those who appear during the day at close range. On the other hand we have the living who are associated with daylight, who live on the ground, and who are visually discrete and composed of well defined parts -- all of which is in clear contrast to the glowing stars, noises at night or rustling leaves and rising dust which are the vicarious and most frequent indications of the dead.

Classes of Animals

In the previous chapter we mentioned that upon death a person's di might be retained in some way by that class of animal-people with whom the person had been associated while still alive. Thus it was understood that an animal which did not run when approached by humans or which walked into or near a camp was a manifestation of a dead person. Such animals were usually avoided and feared, although the apprehension was not nearly as severe as that evoked by ghosts. On occasion, as during a prolonged period of hunger, it was even thought that such animals were some unknown ancestor feeling compassion for those with whom he had formerly associated and was in this way offering them assistance. In such an event the animal was killed and eaten.

There were also animals which were not available for contact by individual Kasini in the medium of di. In every case these animals were scavengers or carnivores and in direct
competition with Kasini for food resources. In some way, never clearly explained, all of these animals were associated with the dead. Dreaming of some indicated that a death was about to occur. Kasini believed that long ago most animals and some plants were in competition with man and they attacked him and stole food from him whenever they could. At some point in the distant past a man with very strong power was born and he proceeded to destroy or change the nature of many of those animals threatening to man. After this Kasini existence improved greatly. Whether this shaman's task was uncompleted or, for unknown reasons, he neglected to change certain animals, a small number of them continued to coexist with Kasini. These included the wolverine, marten, fisher, weasel, otter, wolf, fox, raven, crow, owl, and perhaps the gray jay and others.

Prior to the fur trade none of these animals were used either for food or for skins. They were considered contaminating and physical contact with them was avoided. After the advent of the fur trade all these mammals were killed for their skins although special care was taken when handling them and the treatment of the carcass was quite different than that given to other animals. Frequently gloves were worn during skinning and a special knife was used -- one never used for eating or butchering animals that were to be eaten. A special pack or toboggan sack was used for carrying the skins of these animals and some Kasini were even known to sling the pack on a carrying pole to keep it away from their body so there would be no chance of the contaminating blood seeping through the pack onto their clothing. Such
skins were neither cached with food nor in proximity to the cooking and sleeping places in a camp. Certain skins, like that of the otter, were considered especially dangerous for women and were therefore not brought into the vicinity of the camp at all when they were being prepared for storage. The carcasses of all these animals were left intact after skinning. If skinning took place near the camp the carcass was simply dumped on the ground some distance away and no special attention was paid to the head.

Animals which may be eaten were available for contact through the medium of _Dj_. Interaction between man and these animals was thus interpreted in two ways for it resulted in co-operation on both an instrumental and mental level. Such interaction was circumscribed by rituals which defined and sustained the relationship. In this regard we have mentioned butchering procedures, treatment of the head, accumulation of various paraphernalia, singing of special songs, avoidance of certain foods, etc., all of which were either collective or individual manifestations of the relationship between Kasini and these animals. By contrast, animals which competed with man for the same resources were not eaten and man did not achieve any mental contact with them. Prior to the fur trade interaction between man and these animals consisted mostly of the animals exploiting man's food caches or plundering his fish nets or snares. In such cases it was a matter of true competition the outcome of which, based as it was on scarcity of resources, resulted in either one side or the other gaining from the inter-change. In this sense the relationship was poorly defined and the outcome of interaction never certain. This uncircumscribed
quality was further enhanced by the direct association Kasini made between these animals and the dead, who were also beyond mental contact and with whom interaction was just as unpredictable. Even after the introduction of trapping the general rule was to avoid direct contact with these animals as much as could be. Concerning the oppositions between night/day, sky/land, stars/ghosts, and dead/living we have seen that in every case there is a correspondence with the distinction of homogeneity and heterogeneity. The sky, the darkness of the night, and the dead do not facilitate discrimination. Aside from the acoustical evidence of wind in the trees and noises in the night there is nothing to assist in the identification of parts although, as in the case of the dead, it was assumed that the dead existed as individual ghosts or spirits. Therefore, lacking a means to determine whether the presence of the dead, and things associated with the dead, might indicate a beneficial or destructive kind of interaction, contact with them was viewed with apprehension and avoided if possible. By contrast, the living, the visibility afforded by the day and the tangible quality of the land and things of the land all enhance discrimination and the classification of particulars. The opportunity for such sensory discrimination not only allows for a clear conceptual recognition of differences, i.e. heterogeneity, it can also suggest relationship in the process.

Moiety Names

The Kasini moiety system consisted of two matrilineal exogamous aggregates of persons designated by the categories
maska (Raven) and čajuna (Wolf). An individual was ascribed status in one moiety at birth and membership was sustained throughout life. Ascription was determined by a unilineal reckoning of descent through the matri-line; hence, if an individual was a Wolf this indicated that his mother, her siblings and their descendents through the matri-line, his own siblings, and his sisters' children were categorized as Wolf also. Being a Wolf, however, implied that one could not marry a Wolf and although there was no prescription involved this usually meant that one married someone categorized as Raven. This resulted in a closed system consisting of the categories Wolf and Raven being opposed as marriagable and unmarriagable.

There can be little strength to the argument that the wolf and raven were originally selected as moiety totems because of the relationship that naturally obtains between these two animals. Nevertheless it is interesting to note that it is now a matter of ethological record that wolves and ravens maintain a close relationship with each other and that they "have reached an adjustment in their relations such that each creature is rewarded in some way by the presence of the other and that each is fully aware of the other's capabilities" (Meck, 1970:288). This in itself suggests the possibility that the selection of these two animals involves more than an arbitrary choice of labels and that the Kasini (or whoever created these moiety totems) may have been prompted to recognize a similarity between their own interaction in certain contexts and what appeared quite independently to Meck as the mutually rewarding relationship between wolves and ravens.
Apart from this, however, nothing more can be said on the matter and we must stick to a consideration of Wolf-Raven as a Kasini symbolic expression and see in what way it is homologous to the transcendental/material opposition.

Wolves and ravens, it will be remembered, are associated with death and thus they are opposed to the Kasini as the living are to the dead. Furthermore, they are animals which are physically avoided and beyond mental contact. Thus they are doubly removed from the Kasini and appear not available for that mysterious unity in the realm of di between individual Kasini and other animals. In this sense there is a clear suggestion that the Kasini could only conceive of the wolf and raven totems in broad metaphorical terms. However, this is an inference based on our interpretation. From our limited data such differences are not reflected in sentence structure and can only be adduced from the context in which they are uttered. Thus nug'a jesta (I am a wolverine) can mean "I am like a wolverine" in the context of, for example, a person tirelessly hauling a heavy load through the snow. Whereas, depending again on context, xx'ox jesta (I am a blackbird) might mean either "I am blackbird-people" or "I am like a blackbird".

Finally there is a double opposition to consider. The raven is an animal of the sky, the wolf an animal of the land. Fortuitously or not, the fact that both are associated with death is further reflected in wolves living under the ground in dens and ravens nesting in trees and cliffs above the ground and thus corresponding to the places where the dead are thought to reside.
Body Parts

Sensory homogeneity is, of course, one property of the transcendental which previously we associated with the mind to suggest the immaterial quality of all mental activities. In this way Kasini opposition between mind _di_ and head _tsi_ also parallels the foregoing oppositions and serves as a useful starting point in considering relationships recognized between various body parts.

In the context of opposing the head to the mind it is the head which emerges as the material, discrete entity. However, the head itself was composed of two main entities which were opposed in similar fashion; thus the brain _tsi_ 'ka_ (head fat) was opposed to the skull _etsi_ zana_ (head bone). The noun _'aga_ (fat) is phonologically distinct from the modifier _nat森_ (e.g. _kitda_ nات森_ : a fat moose) and refers directly to any amorphous white mass extracted from the body. In this case its opposite, bone, consists of a rigid formation with a clearly defined structure.

As we have already explained it was forbidden to eat the brain of animals used for food. Nor was the brain used in tanning skins even though, since 1900 at least, the Kasini were well aware that other people did use it for this purpose. Tanning, which requires a special kind of fat, was accomplished by using the spinal column and extracting a grease from the knee bones of the moose. In this sense, as well as others already mentioned, contact with the brain of many edible animals was avoided and it was awarded special treatment. However, other kinds of fat
were greatly prized and, in general, the more an animal possessed the more it was valued as a food. Of these other fats there was one which was especially prized and it was considered a great treat to eat. This fat encased the colon of the animal. Visitors to a camp were invited to partake of this only if they were on very good terms with their hosts or if the hosts were intent on making a friendly gesture. This fat was not detached from the colon when cooked and was served by slicing it into rings about two inches wide.

There is a direct reversal in the attitude towards the elements associated with either end of the body in the context of the two main types of animals we have considered and which have been variously contrasted as herbivores/carnivores, edible/inedible, etc. As we have seen the brains of those animals which were eaten were often given special treatment and avoided; colon fat, however, was especially prized as food. In the process of hunting the excrement of such animals was frequently handled, smelt, etc., and during butchering all internal organs were handled freely as were the contents of the stomach and intestines. When the size of the animal warranted it, the blood of such animals was collected and used as soup. By contrast the brain of the other animal type was treated indifferently and the entire carcass was simply disposed of with head intact. Generally the meat of such animals was considered inedible although Field (1957) recorded a case that involved a woman eating otter meat. This event, which occurred before 1900, resulted in wholesale starvation and was only resolved by shamanistic intervention. As a
rule the meat and blood of such animals was considered contaminating. Also the excrement and urine of such animals was never touched if possible, and it was the concern of anybody leaving equipment behind that there should be no chance of any of these animals defecating or urinating on or near such equipment. This applied especially to eating utensils but also included anything they wished to use again. Dogs were treated like these carnivores, perhaps because they so closely resembled the wolf and fox in form and food preferences. Hands were always washed after handling dogs and if a dog were even to place his nose inside a cooking pot it was considered irrevocably contaminated and was never used thereafter in food preparation.

This manifest opposition between one end of the body and the other emerges, in the context of the human body, as an opposition between head and excrement. The head is associated with the mind, the brain, the upper part of the body and, as we have indicated, with air, invisibility and the intangible. Excrement, on the other hand, corresponding as it does with the brain as an amorphous mass, is opposed to it in colour and associated with the lower part of the body and unequivocally with the ground and the mundane. The word was, furthermore, not used in many social situations and in most contexts it was considered a solecism to utter the word in front of a person who was of the opposite sex and same moiety as oneself. Finally, the head/excrement opposition found vicarious reflection in the flow of things in and out of the camp. The meat of big game animals that was brought into camp was acquired largely as a result of a
hunter's power and thus there is the meat, power, mind, head association which is directly and graphically opposed to excrement which was deposited outside and away from the sleeping, cooking and food cache areas of a camp.

Other body parts were considered analogous in various ways and identified specifically with sex. As a food, fat generally was associated with physical strength but it was also considered similar to semen which is also formless and whitish. A remedy for infertility, which was considered equally the fault of the male, was to eat copious amounts of moose kidney. This was thought to be most effective when the kidney was encased in the large amounts of fat which were accumulated before and dissipated during the rutting season. Kasini men spoke of ejaculation as a kind of power release and a metonym for a man who slept with women indiscriminately or who took more than one wife was *gutsih ḥa* (bull caribou). This animal was considered especially aggressive during the rut and always took as many cows as he could keep.

We could obtain no clear picture of Kasini ideas on procreation although it was believed that physical contact between males *ṭa* and females *ma* was involved. Semen seems certainly to have been thought the main male element involved although exactly what contribution it made to reproduction we are not certain. There was some suggestion that blood was the main female element which corresponded to semen, however, no informant seemed certain of this and many appeared to have no idea about it at all. But even if we (and perhaps they) have no clear idea about how males and females were related physically the Kasini were quite explicit about how the sexes were related functionally.
Men/Women

Men were hunters. They were mobile and solitary in their tracking of large game animals. They produced meat and skins. Women were gatherers of roots, berries, fish, birds and small mammals. They were camp oriented, socially inclined and cared for small children. They also tanned hides, manufactured clothing and cooked meat.

Hunting was an activity that required skill, endurance and often prolonged absences from camp. It also required very special abilities when game was scarce. Moose and caribou were themselves mobile animals and a man could not rely on his knowledge of where they had been to predict with much accuracy where they might be in the future. To hunt with success a man had to know how to anticipate the movement of animals and in many instances this had less to do with generally known habits than with a direct understanding of the situation at hand. A particular hunting situation, however, was never totally revealed at a given time. Why a hunter might choose to run to one side of a grove of trees, rather than the other, in order to successfully intercept a moose was rationalized in terms of power. That is, since there was no empirical basis for such a decision it was understood that the hunter must have relied on his contact with animal-people in order to achieve success.

Collectively the relationship between Kasini and these large land based ungulates was circumscribed by rules concerning thought and behavior. These rules were thought to sustain the relationship between man and animal and to prevent an entire
class of animal (e.g. moose, caribou, etc.) from taking offence
and avoiding man altogether. We have considered the rules
concerning the treatment of the animal's body after the kill.
During the kill itself one did not shoot at the animal's head nor,
if one was snaring the animal, set a snare so large that it could
slip over the head of a fully antlered male. It was acceptable
to strangle cows, but bulls found it offensive to die of suffoca-
tion. There were also other rules involving preparations for a
hunt which promoted an attitude of care and respect and discouraged
anyone from taking for granted the possible outcome of a hunt.
Children were scolded if they talked about the meat they were
going to eat upon the hunters' return, men avoided sharpening
their butcher knives before actually making the kill, ropes and
large back packs used in hauling meat were not taken on a hunt
and an individual disciplined himself not even to think of
butchering or cooking meat before going out hunting. However,
occasionally auspicious signs heralding the successful outcome
of a hunt were manifest to camp members at large. These were
associated with hunting only if they occurred while activities,
discussion or thinking about a hunt were taking place. If other
activities were taking place some of these signals were considered
a commentary on them. One of these signs was a gray jay landing
near the camp and uttering a noisy staccato series of notes
which was thought to sound like tsi tsi tsi tsi (i.e., head-
head-head-head). This signal was associated with hunting only
and was considered especially promising if the bird was sitting
near the meat cache. Another promising sign was if somebody
dreamt of a successful hunt; however, in this case we also have a commentary on the power of the person who makes his dream public and consequently only the dreams of some people would be heeded or even heard. Other signals, which were not restricted to hunting, involved gusts of wind, noises in the fire, and sensations in the nose. The wind we have already discussed and like the gray jay and hunting dreams it was its presence which was indicative, its absence indicated nothing. A fire, on the other hand, could emit two loud pops in quick succession to indicate that an idea or venture was promising, one pop indicated the contrary. Similarly an itchy sensation in the right nostril was a promising sign, an itch in the left nostril indicated the reverse.

Thus a man could set out on a hunt in a very buoyant frame of mind, although he might also have need to begin a hunt even when there were numerous prior indications that it would not be successful. In any event a hunter was always in the position of having to cope with the unknown thoughts and misdeeds of the other members of his camp who might have offended the game which he sought. If he was continually unsuccessful any person in the camp might eventually admit to having previously done something offensive, however, it was also thought possible that somebody outside the camp was using their power to thwart the efforts of the hunter. If the hunter was continually successful it was simply assumed that whatever anyone did was incidental compared to his power.

It also bears repeating that hunting, as compared to intercepting game at a salt-lick, occurred primarily during the
fall and winter months. Winter, however, was generally associated with death as the fall time was with things dying. In recognizing this men were often known to ask of each other, "Do you think you will die this time (i.e. this winter)?" or "Do you think you will make it this winter?" By doing so they were referring not to the shortage of food, which seems to have been no more acute in winter than at other times, but to the dangers of the extreme cold which hunters were directly exposed to when away from camp. Such dangers included the possibility of being caught out in the sustained cold winds *itsi pa*= that occasionally blew during the winter months. Such winds, which were contrasted with the warm gusts *itsi 3eli* of the summer months, were thought to be capable of killing the yearlings of even the largest animals hunted by the Kasini.

Finally, it was assumed that a hunter provided meat and skins for a woman in a camp. Such raw materials were not handed over for general consumption to the camp as a whole and it was not thought that they were given either to children or to other men.

Gathering was an activity that could be pursued intermittently within proximity to a camp. It required considerable technical skill and a detailed knowledge of the resources on the land. It also relied heavily on being able to predict with considerable accuracy where certain animals and vegetation would be and when they would be most suitable for exploitation. Such predictability in time and space was due to the regular habits and movements of the animals and the localized nature of the
vegetation, and hence to know an area well was usually sufficient to ensure successful exploitation.

Aside from the snowshoe rabbit, which was primarily exploited during the winter months, all of the food resources gathered by women in the spring and summer were opposed in various ways to the large game hunted by men in the fall and winter. In the first instance we have unpredictability and mobility compensated for by the hunter's individual power. This is opposed to the localized nature or regular habits of gathered resources which were exploited by means of a shared, or at least shareable, knowledge of an area. Secondly, we have the contrast of the habitual element associated with the different animals. Large ungulates being definitely of the land, as contrasted with birds of the air, fish of the water (which was assumed to come from the air), and ground squirrels, which lived under the ground. Thus we have a certain complementarity of the methods and objectives of exploitation. The men relying on power to exploit the land and the women using empirically based knowledge to exploit the subterranean and the air (water).

The animals exploited by women were treated in various ways but in almost all cases there was not the same attention paid to the head as the case with large game. Fish were cached for later use with heads intact. In the spring and summer they were gutted and scaled for drying, the guts also being preserved if they were sufficiently rich in fat. If winter fishing occurred the fish was allowed to freeze whole. For reasons we neglected to enquire about salmon were not subsumed under
the category of fish and their heads were removed before they were hung to dry. No special attention was paid to the head of any of the birds that were taken although the eyes of a certain sub-species of ptarmigan were thought to induce sore eyes in the person who killed it. This could be prevented by detaching the eyes from the body immediately after killing the bird and was accomplished by wringing the head off and throwing it on the ground. In addition birds were frequently shot in the neck or head to avoid damaging the meat. Ground-squirrels were snared at the mouth of their burrows or, less frequently, shot in the head to prevent the wounded from escaping down their burrows. Preparing these animals for eating involved throwing the entire carcass onto a fire in order to singe the hair. The charred skin and hair was then scraped off and the animal gutted save for the kidneys which were left attached to the visceral cavity. The carcass, usually unsectioned and with head intact, was then placed in a boiling pot.

The camp was associated with women and the main items of food and most equipment in a camp were assumed to be the property of women. These included the meat, hides, leather, the tent (cabin or brush shelter included), and stove or hearth. It was the woman's prerogative to distribute goods within the camp. Most of these she had acquired in raw form from a particular man, but although she was obliged to provide him with food and clothing he shared the results of her labours with others in the camp. If goods, such as meat and hides, were un-processed, she might, at her own discretion, distribute them to other women in the camp or to visiting women.
Disposal of the Dead: an interpretation

Death, as many have observed, is not only the end of something it is, for the living, also a point of departure. Regardless of individual power death came to all Kasini, whether infant or shaman. In acknowledging the event, however, what could it possibly mean to Kasini and how did it reflect on their purchase on an orderly existence? For the Kasini, as for all people, the implications were immense and hardly reassuring. And like most they simultaneously acknowledged it and, as it were, averted their eyes and brought into focus other, more stable considerations. We would now like to examine what these considerations were and how Kasini appreciated death and transformed it from an ambiguous to an orderly event.

A corpse was prepared for inhumation (or cremation) by adults of the same sex as the deceased and of the opposite moiety. This was done at the place of death. It involved straightening the limbs and arranging the body in a face-up and unflexed position. Usually, but not necessarily, the corpse was dressed in new clothes. On elevated ground in the vicinity of the place where death had occurred, a grave was dug (or pyre constructed) by men of the opposite moiety to the deceased. Since the 1920's, and probably earlier, plank coffins were most often used to inter the corpse. And if death occurred near a trapping post, the body was disposed of in a cemetery. Cemeteries were used only for this purpose, and once a burial had been completed the grave site was avoided by everyone, regardless of moiety affiliation. If coffins were not available, the bottom of the
grave was lined with a bed of spruce boughs, and the sides were shored with spruce poles. The men then carried the body to the grave site and entombed it in a supine position by covering it with more spruce poles and filling in the recess with the excavated dirt. After marking the grave site with a stake, the men then returned to the camp.

Those adults who were in the same moiety and domestic group as the deceased were responsible for a number of tasks. Among these was the disposal of the dead person's personal possessions. This was done at, or within a few days of, the time of burial. In no instance did this involve a great many items, and those that were well used or that had been used exclusively by, or possessed a special significance for, the deceased were destroyed by fire at the time of death. Ideally these same adults were also responsible for inviting members of the opposite moiety to dispose of the body in the manner already described and, when this was accomplished, in providing them with a light meal. This meal was prepared by women of the same moiety as the deceased and served by both men and women of this moiety. The ceremony, such as it was, was referred to as "feeding the hunters". It did not involve any special kinds of food or drink, and no great amounts were consumed; in fact it was considered a solecism if anyone asked for more than the small amounts they received. Those who were of the same moiety as the deceased abstained from eating or drinking at this ceremony and participated only to the extent that they prepared the meal and served it to the "hunters". The completion of this modest ceremony usually marked the end of the post-mortem activities of the Kasini.
It would not be accurate to say that the above description exhausts the details of Kasini activities following death. However, such details as we were able to gather constitute variations and embellishments in special cases to the general format we have presented and this is similar to but generally less elaborate than those which have been described for other cultures in contiguous areas on the Yukon-Stikine (Emmons 1911, Teit 1956 and McClellan 1954, n.d.) and Mackenzie (Honigmann 1954) drainage systems. Whatever the reasons for the relatively unelaborate style of Kasini post mortem ceremonies, it is clear that they did not involve any complex manipulation of symbols and that an adequate performance of them did not seem to require the presence of ritual specialists.

The presence of a shaman, for instance, was a common but not always necessary feature of these activities. What was necessary was to have on hand someone who, it was generally thought, had sufficient power to control the spirit of the deceased. When a child or adolescent died the mere presence of adults was usually judged adequate to this end. It was only when the circumstances of death were extraordinary or the deceased were judged to have had substantial power of their own (as was the recognized case with most adults) that the participation of a shaman was considered propitious and necessary. For this reason a shaman often accompanied the "hunters" when a body was entombed or cremated, and, by using his superior power, he somehow attempted to control the spirit of the deceased. Usually, but not necessarily, the intention was to exorcize the spirit
from earth and prevent it from trying to contact the living or doing them any future harm. However, other intentions were also entertained and an example of this involves the suicide of a young girl. In this case, after the appropriate ceremonies had been completed, the shaman present gathered together the women in attendance and asked who among them would be willing to accept the spirit of the girl into her womb so that she might, by being reborn, be given a chance to live a more fortunate life than she had.

Variations were also evident in the disposal of goods after a death; for some things were not usually destroyed even though the deceased was recognized to have had in them privileged rights of use and allocation. Thus dogs, traps, a still serviceable tent or toboggan, and sometimes a rifle were appropriated by the domestic group of which the deceased was a member at the time of death. There were in this procedure no clear avenues of inheritance, pattern of redistribution in terms of moiety membership, or special category of person responsible for the reallocation of these things. An item, such as a tent, might simply continue to be inhabited and a question of proprietary interest never arise. Dogs were taken over by someone willing to feed them and be responsible for their welfare, most commonly a young person without dogs. The transfer was often initiated by the simple expedient of an adult's suggesting that the new owner begin feeding them. It was also on this apparent basis of

4. A log cabin was usually abandoned if a person had died in it. Similarly a tent was sometimes burnt if a death had occurred within its walls.
current need and adult suggestion that a young person might acquire a rifle or some traps. In any case, there was little reason in the economic scheme of things to accumulate or hoard such goods, and there is no evidence to suggest that relationships were broken in competition for them.

Finally there were variations in the number of people involved in the ceremony referred to as "feeding the hunters". This appears to have co-varied very roughly with the combined factors of age, marital status, and the political significance of the deceased as a structural link between two aggregates of people. When a child died, for instance, only those who were currently members of his domestic group would usually be involved, or concerned, and this might simply entail the child's mother "feeding" his father. When a married adult died, however, more than one domestic group was involved. Parents of the deceased, siblings in the immediate area and, it seems, most of those who could be contacted and who were categorized as es'dena (my people) would be immediately informed of an adult's death and be expected to participate in one way or the other. But interestingly enough, the numbers of people attending did not seem to vary greatly according to the age of the deceased adult; thus a young adult and a very old one received approximately the same attention in this regard. Where people appear to have attended in the largest numbers the deceased constituted part of a marital linkage between aggregates of people who had recently begun to exploit the same region or to patronize the same trapping post. The longer such a linkage existed and the more frequently it was
 duplicated by others in subsequent marriages, the less crucial and significant it became. However, when it was the sole expression of a recent alliance between two large aggregates its function as a tangible and isolated statement of relationship possessed an affective significance for relatively large numbers of people, and the death of either party to such a marriage received special attention. At the time of death this was not so evident, and the numbers of people involved would only be those in the immediate vicinity who, shortly after death, performed the activities we described above. But at this time these same people would arrange to meet later in the year when, along with all those who could be contacted in the interim, a large feast would be held.

Most informants were quite certain that the rationale for this larger ceremony was the death of an individual although not all were convinced that it was referred to as "feeding the hunters". Its occurrence was apparently rare and only one informant claimed to have attended such an event which seems to have been something of a fete lasting some days and which involved, in addition to the feast, dancing, gambling, and various competitions. Thus the overall tone of this ceremony seems to have been different and more obviously geared to encouraging interaction of various kinds and allowing the participants to become more  

5. This occurred in or around Ross River c.1915. We were told of another of these ceremonies taking place at Husky Dog City or Russel Post (c.1930-1935) on the North Macmillan river. This seems to have been very similar to the Kasini ceremony and took place between Tutchone and Slave speakers who had previously traded out of Fort Selkirk and Fort Forman posts respectively.
firmly acquainted.

Typically the activities began with something called a "wolverine party" in which those who were serving the food called everyone to eat and then, when all were present, providing only the smallest amounts of food and drink to each person. This was proffered in a single plate and cup served from old containers and was rejected by the would be recipients with exclamations of mock indignation and charges that they had been tricked into coming to eat with wolverines, whose indiscriminate eating habits were well known. Eventually the real feast was presented, and in this it was clear that every consideration had been given to the convenience and satisfaction of the recipients. Only new pots were used in the preparation and service of particular foods, and different cuts and kinds of meat were served separately. Thus every individual could select what he wanted to eat in accordance with his own idiosyncratic food avoidances without danger that the container and its contents had been contaminated by previous contact with a forbidden food.

The one obvious contrast, at least on the surface, between this feast and the "feeding the hunters" ceremony is the way the division of labour emerged among the participants; for this did not involve a division along moiety lines. It involved a separation in terms of those aggregates of people whom the deceased and his (her) spouse had respectively designated es'dena (my people) prior to their marriage to each other. It was only very occasionally that a newly married couple would represent one of the only linkages between large aggregates of
people. However, for various reasons this sometimes happened, and in the historical period in question the circumstances which helped bring such a situation about involved the arbitrary attraction of a new trapping post and the sporadic opening and closing of trapping posts generally. In any event the opposition involved a "my people"/"other people" distinction with the "people" of the deceased temporarily forming a co-operative unit to provide for and serve the "others". This opposition was achieved because of the relative degree of acquaintanceship of those involved and was focused on the only link, or the only recent link, that existed between a "we" and "they". In the two aggregates, this opposition was bound to dissipate and lose relevance as boundaries of exclusion and inclusion became rearranged in the new ambience.

These various activities seem to center on two related questions or problems that were posed by the event of someone's dying. Taken together, they are simply a sweeping acknowledgment of the event; taken piecemeal they carve out and reveal narrow spheres of significance. One of these involves a broad and rather eclectic definition of boundaries and an emphasis on the difference between the living and the dead. A shaman, for instance, functioned to locate and ritually circumscribe a spirit in a particular domain (material or transcendental). Whether he relocated it among the living or attempted to ensure it a speedy passage to the heavens, which was most frequently the case, his main concern was to exorcize it from the structurally ambiguous position of an earth-bound ghost. In other words the middle place was excluded emotionally and intellectually, but not
phenomenally; for it could be, and was, populated by ghosts. To avoid attracting a spirit from prolonging his attachment to the living, other precautions were also taken such as avoiding burial or cremation sites and burning (rendering ethereal) the personal possessions of the deceased. But this did not mean that the spirits of the dead were in themselves dangerous or even a matter for concern; it was only when the dead and the living interacted that things could become unpredictable and dangerous. In this regard it is worth repeating that stars, which were spirits of the dead with no mundane interests, were not pointed at for fear that this might attract their attention and induce them to return to earth. However, star-spirits were in themselves of little interest to the Kasini since, as manifestations of the dead, they were so clearly removed from the living. It was only when the differences were not maintained, as when attracting a star-spirit to earth, or not yet firmly established, as immediately after a person's death, that problems could arise.

Within this framework of post-mortem activity, and counterposed to the attempt to control the spirit of the deceased and ensure a separation between the living and dead, Kasini also attempted to restate in general terms the differences and relationship that obtained between the living. In this chapter we have surveyed a number of symbolic expressions that are analogous in various ways to the dead/living opposition. One of these was the opposition man/woman. In the activities we are discussing, this second opposition emerges again, although in this case it is not simply man/woman that is evident, but the specific opposition husband/wife. This assertion is clearly supported if we consider
the ceremony "feeding the hunters" and remember that it involved people of opposite moieties. Hunting and activities away from the camp were generally associated with men, just as were cooking and camp oriented activities associated with women. In itself this draws out the female/male opposition in that it explicitly involves an adumbration of the functional complementarity which Kasini attributed to such relationships. As we shall learn in chapter eight, however, among those male-female relationships that obtained between people in opposite moieties, the only one that was characterized by functional complementarity was that between husband and wife. Thus we have groups of people representing a relationship that was thought of, and indeed apprehended in the ordinary course of Kasini affairs, as obtaining between two people. The fact that this relationship could have been represented in numerous other ways indicates how suggestive such a representation must have been to the participants; but perhaps no other way of expressing this relationship would have been so cogently reinforced by habitual experience or so easily performed. In this regard one need only reflect on the relative difficulty of expressing the same relationship if one chose, in this context, to manipulate and display the recognized and analogous contrasts between, for example, mind and head.

The relationship man/woman we have already characterized as a "balanced duality" and in order to appreciate it more fully in this context it is worth anticipating here some features of the husband/wife relationship that we consider in depth in subsequent chapters. (1) Despite differences of moity and perhaps
even substantial differences in age the "powers" of husband and wife were not mutually harmful and were considered broadly equivalent in nature. (2) There was no competition between husband and wife with respect to the various economic activities they performed. In this context an advantage was always jointly realized. (3) Unlike arrangements between any other two categories of people, that between husband and wife endured. These properties of equality, stability and perdurability were to be found in combination only in a marriage union and were, in this form, unique to Kasini experience. As we shall see, all other social relations were characterized, separately or in combination, by inequality, competition, or transience.

This static order, this "balanced duality", which Kasini employed in this context, precisely countered the disorder and lack of clarity engendered by death, which muddled the boundaries between the material and transcendental by allowing things, corpses and detached spirits, to settle uncomfortably and dangerously between the symbolic seams. The order, which in this case simply reaffirmed a viewpoint, was neither developmental nor transitional in nature and hence was itself countered, or at least constantly challenged by such events as death, maturation and, as we shall see presently, relations involving competitors and strangers. It did not function to deny or gloss over such things but rather it was the means, the base-line of discrimination, whereby such things could be acknowledged, judged coped with and even, in some respects, experienced.
Summary

Throughout the rather discursive presentation of Kasini ideas, categories and activities in this chapter we have been concerned with displaying a specific kind of structural continuity. To this extent our enquiry has the appearance of marking time for we simply found what we already claimed to be there. However, it should be remembered that in this regard the relationship examined is in fact based on Kasini ideas and not simply a convenience we have adopted to articulate a general argument. We adopted the terms transcendental and material as a convenient method of describing the axis along which the relationship of balanced duality regularly found expression. This relationship is based on the premise that there is a double aspect to all phenomena; one that is evident to the senses the other that is beyond discrimination by the senses. Every object, activity and event in principle possessed this duality for Kasini and it was one way they recognized and expressed relationship. Together transcendental-material constituted a unity in which neither dimension was more or less significant than the other. In some instances, as we saw with "mind" and "animal-people", the transcendental dimension was postulated, in others it emerged as a contrasting feature based on sense perception, e.g., unidentified noises/identified noises, amorphous/structured, invisible/visible, intangible/tangible, etc. In the chapters which follow we encounter this same duality as we examine specific contexts of Kasini interaction and the premises which underlie their recognition and portrayal of social relationship.
We concluded earlier that contact with both transcen­
dental and material dimensions was necessary for Kasini survival
and that an individual, being born without this double contact,
had initially to depend on others. We shall now try to develop
some implications of these Kasini ideas on super-subordinate
relationships as they derive from their understanding of the
relative potency of individual power. We also wish to demonstrate
how these ideas relate to social categories. The notion of
subordination had no meaning outside the specific framework of
ideas the Kasini had concerning their relationships to one another.
Consequently, we are required to examine specific relationships,
not generalized relationships between broad sectors of the
population such as those identified above as individuals central
(providers) and peripheral (dependents) to basic economic
activities.

Despite the rather rigorous environment Kasini gave
little heed to particular dangers or discomforts. To be sure
most of our informants who had matured prior to 1950 claimed to
have had experiences when no food, or at least very little, was
available for up to a week at a time. Everyone had made walks
of 20-30 miles without sustenance of any kind, and certainly every
hunter had found himself, at all seasons of the year, away from
camp for two or three nights with little food or shelter. It
would be a mistake, however, to view Kasini recognition and
experience of hunger, exposure and exhaustion as in any way
obsessive or colouring their interests and attitudes toward life. For while they knew scarcity, discomfort and exhaustion, they also knew abundance, the pleasures of sheltered camps with adequate heat and protection, and what it was to rest in comfort for days at a time.

We heard many stories of fatal and near fatal mishaps but virtually always they had an undercurrent of disaster averted, resolved or somehow made comprehensible. This does not mean that serious events were minimized or made light of; for certainly Kasini recognized the ever present dangers and inconveniences as very tangible problems indeed. But it does, we think, indicate that such things were appreciated in a much wider context than is frequently suggested in the literature on northern hunting peoples. Again and again in the stories we heard concerning the personal trials of the informants themselves or of people they had known, we were led through a series of events to a point where the central character achieved his or her desired goal. This might involve nothing more specific than staying alive, but being able to do so was understandably as significant as the tribulations endured. In the recounting, what was emphasized was why the events had occurred, how they had been overcome, or why some individuals had achieved more success than others. In every instance these explanations referred to rules and circumscriptions which bounded the life of every Kasini in both a public and private manner. These boundaries were of two general kinds: those associated with abundance, good fortune, and health, and those connected with the absence of scarcity, misfortune, and sickness.
Throughout life a person accumulated prohibitions and prescriptions from specific classes of animal-people. Observance of these was believed to sustain contact with the animal-people who provided the knowledge and techniques to succeed. Exercise of these was not reserved for critical situations only, and any individual could choose and pursue selected goals — even at the expense of others. It was therefore understood that one individual could "overpower" another as it were, maximizing his own ends while decreasing the chance of others to cope effectively in a situation where both parties were competing for the same resources. It was at the same time clear that this overpowering did not necessarily entail conscious intent; for the animal-people of the dominant individual looked to his interests even when he himself did not know where they might lie. We will elaborate on the implications of this presently. The points we wish to stress here are that success was interpreted as a function of personal power and this could, under certain circumstances, be seen to result in one-sided benefits.

The circumscriptions and boundaries associated with individual power were not public knowledge; for generally they were not the concern of anybody but the person involved. However, a spouse might share a specific food avoidance with his or her marriage partner, and their eating utensils might be marked so that others would not make the error of placing forbidden foods on their plates. To some extent this appears to have been a matter of domestic convenience; for a joint possession of power was not implied. Such sharing between spouses could also result
from consultation with a shaman who might diagnose the cause of misfortune in a way that bound both partners and perhaps some of their immediate dependents to the long term remedies prescribed — usually food avoidances. The proscription from one shamanistic consultation concerning a woman's physical ailment, for example, was that both she and her spouse were to avoid eating or having any contact with the neck of caribou. Some time later this same couple suffered two months of bad hunting and having their tent and most of their belongings burnt, and these were diagnosed by another shaman as the result of the activities of a ghost. The ghost was identified as one who had died seven years before, and its destructive concern was explained by the facts that disagreement between the deceased and the male victim or target had occurred just prior to the death, and that a few months before the misfortunes took place the woman had made some casual but wry mention of the fact that the form of a particular up-turned root resembled the distinctive manner in which the deceased used to kneel while studying tracks. The shamanistic remedies in this case entailed for the couple, and those of their dependents who shared in the misfortune, avoidance of a particular species of fish which was known to be a food avoided, for unknown reasons, by the shaman himself. It is worth noting that an adult daughter of the couple, living with her spouse and children in a separate domestic group from her parents, did not experience the same misfortunes and neither she nor anyone else felt it necessary for her to observe the food proscriptions adopted by her parents and younger siblings.
The Kasini also observed many rules which affected broad classes of people and the transgression of which could have detrimental and sweeping consequences. For instance, if anyone were to kill the pika, a small herbivore that lives in rocky terrain at high altitudes, it was thought that a premature advance of snow and cold weather would result. Since movement at high altitudes took place primarily during the hunting season from late August to October such a transgression could significantly hinder the productive activities of all who lived in the area whether or not they were in association with the transgressor. The one recorded case concerning the infraction of this rule involved a young boy who killed a pika to satisfy his hunger while out hunting in the mountains. At the time the boy told nobody what he had done, but the heavy snows and cold winds which ensued within a few days made him very apprehensive and he soon admitted to his mother what had happened. Fortunately, his mother's father was a powerful shaman and living in the same domestic group as the boy he was able to stop the snow and induce return of more temperate conditions. One part of his reaction was to place the boy under the injunction of not eating a particular species of berry. When the story was told to us the boy -- now an elderly man -- had let this constraint lapse as he eventually came to suspect it had long since served its purpose and was perhaps nothing more than a punishment that an irritated grandfather wished to inflict on a negligent and wilful grandson.

It will be apparent from these brief illustrations that Kasini found it necessary to defend themselves against uncontrollable
negligence or ignorance of others, activity of the dead and competitive interests of the living. For the most part the power of each adult was sufficient to cope with everyday affairs and the minor setbacks which these were bound to bring. But as we have seen there were occasions when it was necessary to seek assistance from those possessing superior power. We are entirely uncertain as to the basis for selecting one shaman over another but we suspect it had a great deal to do with geographical proximity and social conditions which did not suggest that the shaman himself was responsible for the particular problem at hand. In the case of ghost exorcism described above, the shaman was apparently not contacted for over a month after the camp had been burnt out and even then it appears to have followed on a chance meeting at the Ross River post. Nor is it clear, even, how shamans attained their status. In this particular case the term of reference medi was never assumed by the individual or accorded him as a term of address. He was simply referred to by this term as a result of his willingness and proven ability to help others. We suspect that some individuals became shamans by force of circumstance — they acted during emergencies when no other help was available. To the extent that their treatment was successful they would be called on again and their reputation would gradually grow. It was also true, however, that recognized shamans often attempted to pass on their power to others before they died. This, of course, did not necessarily mean that power was actually transmitted but it could influence the choosing of such a person when others of proven ability were not available.
This, in fact, took place in 1944 when an infant boy became very ill. A man who had never functioned as a shaman before was sent for; however, his grandfather (MMB) had been a powerful shaman, and it was known that when he was very elderly he had tried to pass on his power to his grandson (ZDS), then a boy of about seven years of age. At the time of the incident the potential recipient of power was about 35 years old. He was living within one day's walk of the camp of the sick child. Asked to help by the father of the sick child, the suspected shaman agreed to come and see what he could do. His treatment proved successful and from that point on he received increasing numbers of requests for assistance and became known as a powerful shaman.

The relationship between individuals of ordinary power and a shaman was one of dependency. If a shaman became ill or suffered misfortune he was understood to be beyond help for he could go to none of those who came to him, nor could he go to another shaman. A conscious decision to seek assistance of a shaman had to be made by those who required his help and presumably there were times when a choice between shamans was possible. This general situation, involving as it does an assessment of relative power and the opportunity for an individual to decide when others might help him when he was beyond helping himself, is in direct contrast to the circumstances of a young child, who was born without personal power of any kind and entirely vulnerable to the many dangerous and malevolent forces at large in the world around him.

To cope with life required access to the transcendental realm of animal-people. For the most part such access was direct,
but, as we have seen, there were times when extraordinary power was required and for most people this came through the medium of a shaman. Such vicarious access to animal-people was, however, an inherent feature of infancy and it is our purpose here to describe how Kasini appreciated this fact.

We may begin our considerations with the Kasini belief that the power of adults was either destructive and dangerous, or beneficial and protective for specific children. It is our intention to demonstrate how broad classes of Kasini kinship terms are related by this belief. In doing so we are not concerned with the business of applying these terms to any specific situation. We are simply interested in demonstrating how certain terms are related by particular ideas. The implications this had for interpreting interaction does not concern us here for we are interested in elucidating a specific interpretive framework, not in describing the jugglings and manipulations of this framework in the process of interaction.

Underlying the opposed Kasini attitudes toward the power of different classes of individuals are the two criteria of moiety membership and sex. In the simple table of Kasini attitudes that follows we indicate a positive attitude with a + sign and a negative attitude with a – sign. Ensuing discussion makes it clear what these signs stand for.
Table 7.1

KASINI ATTITUDES TO CLASSES OF INDIVIDUALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opposite Moiety (-)</th>
<th>Own Moiety (+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older Females (-)</td>
<td>Older Males (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Males (+)</td>
<td>Older Females (-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two things should be noted. Firstly there is a relative aspect to the + and − signs from which one could infer a potential contradiction. For instance the older males in one's own moiety are ascribed a − sign and yet we attach a + sign to the moiety. This is simply meant to indicate that members of Ego's own moiety are positively viewed vis-a-vis members of the opposite moiety and within the framework of "own moiety" females are positively viewed vis-a-vis males. Secondly we are considering here only general classes which are distinguished in Kasini kinship terminology as being older than Ego. These classes refer to a property of categories (see Table of kinship terms below) and not to whether a particular individual was or was not older than Ego. We wish to emphasize this point because Kasini expressed their relations with one another in a kinship idiom if they were concerned with suggesting social proximity and a certain kind of order. In doing so they were nearly always bound to recognize the criteria of generation and relative age. However, implicit to this recognition was an assessment of relative power and thus difference in age and generation on the level of terminology, implied differences of individual power.
Table 7.2
CATEGORIES OF PEOPLE OLDER THAN EGO IN OPPOSITE MOIETY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opposite Moiety</th>
<th>Older Females</th>
<th>Older Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Su *</td>
<td>eTSiA</td>
<td>eTSiA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM,FMZ,FZ,SpM</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>MFB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__1 A F</td>
<td>__1 ETA ETA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In this table and the next the genealogical descriptions subsumed by different kinship terms are to be taken as illustrative rather than fundamental. In fact all of these terms could refer to the genealogical position indicated or anyone whom a person in that position might refer to as same sexed sibling or parallel cousin. They thus indicate a sociological rather than biological point of departure. Where finer distinctions exist, e.g. between ETA and EStA, we have a situation which could, but need not, be translated as genitor and genitor's brother. The term ETA refers to pater or spouse of Anke and thus possesses a meaning that can not be separated from the context in which it was applied. The frequent incidence of death and adoption produced situations in which ETA could in fact be FB or any of father's male parallel cousins and it was from this point of departure, whomever it involved, that EStA was reckoned. For the sake of consistency in these tables we have adopted the expedient of giving genealogical linkages in terms of the lineal alignment that is partially reflected in the terminology and implied in the moiety system. In fact there is more than one way to describe all of these terms from the point of view of genealogy. Consequently, in the following table the translation MMB, for instance, could also be described as FF and in some cases, to the extent that such linkages were actually reckoned, the latter is the only possible linkage that could have been envisioned. We should also note that our abbreviations SpF and SpM refer to spouse's father or mother and this remains consistent with 1) the fact that the terms involved were employed regardless of the sex of the speaker and that 2) the Kasini made no recognition of sex in the single term they used for a marriage partner.*
Procreation and birth through females provided a natural manifestation of a relationship which was considered the usual basis for the adult-child relationship. Thus genetrix emerged in most cases as mater and she was addressed by the child as ance. To whomever this term might apply in fact it did constitute a center of recognized intimacy between Ego and an older woman in his (or her) own moiety who had cared for and nurtured him in his infancy. As a point of departure between Ego and all other Kasini the relationship with ance was therefore recognized as the first and most crucial one. In varying degrees all other categories of people were judged to be more remote and of these the most remote were older women in the opposite moiety.

Older women in the opposite moiety included FZ and FM and the female parallel cousins of these two women. The single term ēsu was used in referring to any member of this class. There is no evidence to suggest that a woman in this class was necessarily harmful to Ego although she could not, if a shaman, attempt to transmit power to Ego without doing harm to herself. The situation in fact was just the opposite for it was thought that the incipient power of a child could be re-inforced just as adequately by this class of woman as a woman in Ego's own moiety. This, however, was a potential source of confusion, danger and political disadvantage for it was believed that the existential fact of a child's physical dependencies were somehow related to the alignment of his power as it began to emerge. As we have said this usually involved a child-mater relationship but to the extent that this relationship was not necessary it was a recognized
possibility that the alignment of power between adult and child could take any number of different forms. This seems to have been especially true for boys rather than girls for the alignment of male power generally was more tenuous, insular, and less predictable than that of females. Nevertheless, it did mean that a person's power was not necessarily coincident with how he might classify others or they him for if he, during his childhood and very early adolescence, depended on the power of women in the opposite moiety it was possible that moiety membership and kinship terminology would not reflect the customary implications concerning the power of this individual and anyone else. Consequently, the various attitudes which attended the power of general classes of people, e.g., own moiety and opposite moiety members, would not allow anyone to anticipate the real but hidden facts of power alignment. Alter, in other words, might possess or develop power aligned with those in the opposite moiety to Ego although Ego would categorize Alter as a member of his own moiety. As we shall see, a lack of correspondence between power alignment and recognized moiety affiliation could have dangerous consequences for those concerned.

The result of the implications of these ideas was that those in the opposite moiety who were categorized by the term $e_{\nu}$ (e.g. PZ and FM) were seldom considered for any extensive child care and were not considered at all as possible adoptees of a child. We have recorded only one case illustrating such an arrangement. It involved the death of the $\alpha\nu\kappa\rho\iota$ of five children. Our informant was a woman of over fifty years of age.
and she was the oldest of the five siblings. At the time of the mother's death this woman was fifteen years old and she was living with her father (ετα) and her siblings in a place which was much closer to her ἕςυκκ (FZ and FM) than to her ἓςυκκ (MM) or any of her ένακ (MZ's). The time was early fall and hence pedestrian travel was still required. As a consequence the father took the expedient of joining up with the domestic group composed of his parents, his sister and her spouse, and his sister's children. After which he set off to inform his spouse's parents of the death of their daughter. The oldest daughter (i.e. our informant) thought that all the children should accompany their father and go and stay with their ἕςυκκ. She objected to the arrangement her father had made on the grounds that her ἕςυκκ would "take" the younger children. Apparently there was no likelihood the children would be forced to stay with their ἕςυκκ in a physical sense; the girl's apprehension concerned the possibility that the children would be permanently influenced by being in proximity to the power of their ἕςυκκ without any insulation, as it were, from their ἓςυκκ or their ένακ.

Similar to avoidance of older women in the opposite moiety, but narrower in expression, was avoidance of objects associated with power of older men in the opposite moiety. It was customary for most young men to carry a small bag _καχτ_ containing a few articles assumed to enhance hunting abilities and little else. Items in such bags were selected on advice of animal-people and a boy usually made one for himself within a few years after he obtained contact. The bag was used after the
young man had matured and taken a spouse, but after birth of the first child it was necessary for him to destroy the bag by fire in order that the children of his spouse would not be endangered by coming too close or achieving physical contact with it. Young men were said to have experienced extreme mental discomfort as a result of destroying these objects but not to do so would place small children of the opposite moiety in great danger.

If an \textit{\textit{eta}} were not a shaman it was assumed that any beneficial results to be derived by his children from his power came indirectly through his provision of most of the raw materials with which their \textit{\textit{dne}} fed and clothed them. The bond between \textit{\textit{eta}} and child was based primarily on frequency of contact and quality of emotional attachment that developed as the child matured. For this reason it was considered unwise for the \textit{\textit{eta}} to discipline children of the opposite moiety. If a stern lecture or spanking was required the mother \textit{\textit{dne}} or mother's mother \textit{\textit{zue}} either did so themselves or called upon an unmarried mother's brother \textit{\textit{esta}} to administer such discipline. The quality of the connection between father and child is well exemplified in the comment of an old woman who explained that if a man's spouse died his children would abandon him and not care for him when he was old if he had been too severe with them when they were young. By contrast, in the context of protective power, there seems to have been an irrevocable and much stronger attachment between Ego and those he categorized as being in his own moiety.
The positive and, it could be said, sympathetic attitude between members of the same moiety is evident in the few cases of inherited power which we recorded. The attempt to transmit power from one moiety to another was apparently an infrequent occurrence and was initiated only by recognized shamans. Power was passed through the matriline, and one expressed view held that a person would probably die if any other transmission were attempted. Our suggestion that power might be passed to a member of the opposite moiety was considered incredible and humorous by most. The four cases on which we were able to get any information, involved shamans who attempted to transmit power to individuals in the first, second and third descending generation: M → S; MMB → ZDS; MB → ZD; MMB → ZDD.

Within this framework we have quite different attitudes concerning the power of older men and women. Very roughly we can
say that the power of males was dominating and potentially
dangerous, while that of females, protective, helpful and safe.
The attitude towards the former was manifest by gestures of
deferece and towards the latter by acts suggesting familiarity
and trust. All of these descriptive words, however, by no means
exhaust the attitudinal dimension we are trying to outline.
They are derived inferentially and thus, like so much of what
we have been describing, they are indicative of an orientation
and, we think, a feeling and they should not be taken too literally
or be expected to have a precisely defineable referent.

The power of older males was thought to be dangerous
in some ways to Ego and he thus had to take certain precautions
when in proximity to these individuals and their possessions.
Apparently these precautions were observed as much for reasons
of etiquette as for any real apprehension even though they
implied that Ego, who was categorized as younger, possessed
power of inferior strength. Most often they involved an avoidance
of moving into a space that was physically above these individuals
or their equipment -- to do otherwise would expose the younger
person to the danger of suffering cramps and physical illness.
The younger would avoid stepping or reaching over the older when
the latter was relaxing or sleeping, would not move about while
the older was sitting down and eating, and would not step over
or move the equipment of the older without his express permission.

These deferential gestures were not practised with any
regularity until after puberty. A girl's menarche was signified
by confinement and fasting, after which she avoided speak-
ing to her older brothers or mother's married brothers. For
boys the transition or passage into adulthood was a more gradual and less well defined event whose beginning was variously and cumulatively signified by the first big game the boy killed and the adolescent "madness" associated with his initial contact with animal-people. Prior to these events the older brother kudia and unmarried mother's brother estaga frequently functioned as disciplinarians to their younger siblings and sister's children. Girls in these cases were apparently not so directly involved as boys and contact between young females and their kudia and estaga were avoided in the context of sleeping and any direct physical contact of a disciplinary nature. However, it was not uncommon for young boys to sleep with their kudia and estaga and in such instances sodomy was not unknown. We, of course, have no way of telling what normally took place in such cases although one informant assured us that it was the older who penetrated the younger, the younger was satisfied, if at all, by being fondled by the older. A common gesture still to be observed which indicated, in some situations, the assumed dominance of one male over another, involved a man reaching out towards the genitals of another, usually much younger male, as if he were about to fondle him.

The trusting attitude towards the protective power of older women in Ego's own moiety was manifest in numerous ways, one centering on the small bag kunts which was the personal possession of either the ande or su. To the extent that an older sister edada could adopt her younger siblings and eventually, in this context, be referred to by the term ande.
we have included her here even though the relationship between a male Ego and his _edada_ was characterized by speech avoidance. This bag, which was larger than that carried by young men, contained idiosyncratic items that were somehow instrumental in the exercise of power by the possessor. It was carried by the woman when she was away from camp and, when in camp, was attached to either her blankets or hung on the tent or cabin wall next to her customary place of sleep. Up until the age of four or five years the child was allowed to sleep with his _ante_ or _Suc_ (along with their respective spouses) and no avoidance between the child and the _kunnts_ was customary. The fact that direct contact was allowed reflects the view that, for the child, it was really the power of either of the two women which was responsible for his well-being. It also reflects the trust and intimacy that Ego enjoyed with the power of these two women and is in direct contrast to the attitude towards a similar article that was previously possessed by Ego's _eta_. In addition the father of Ego would himself avoid even sitting or leaning on the sleeping blankets of his spouse's mother (_Suc_ i.e. an older woman in the opposite moiety) if such an article was attached to them.

This protective concern was also manifest in a ritual the _ante_ or _Suc_ performed to exorcize harmful forces and interests that might affect their children and grandchildren. This ritual, which was performed when a boundary into the unpredictable was being crossed, had to be performed by one of these women if the desired result was to be achieved. It involved placing a willow branch so that it rested half on the land and half on
a body of flowing water. This act was accompanied by some private utterances and was followed by instructions to the children to drink a small sip of water. The ritual was performed primarily during the spring and summer months and is thus to be associated with gathering and hence female initiated exploitation. It occurred on three different kinds of occasions: (1) when the domestic group was passing through or near a place where a death or some grave misfortune was known to have happened, (2) when the domestic group was moving into new territory with which they were unfamiliar or in which they had not lived for many years and were thus relatively unfamiliar with some of the people who currently lived there and (3) when the only water available to them at their campsite was that of a spring which bubbled out of the ground. Adult men of either moiety (e.g. the father of the children or mature sons of the women) were not involved in this ritual; for it was assumed that their own power was sufficient protection.

In the first two kinds of situation the unpredictable nature is obvious. In the last, however, we have an association with ghosts who, it will be remembered, live under the ground. Hence, spring water, which comes out of the ground, is assumed to have a dangerous quality about it which must be constrained by this ritual before it is considered safe to use domestically. Even grown men would not drink spring water if an alternative were available.

Water contained many properties which were central to a great deal of Kasini thought. Prior to the advent of tea and kettles water, it was said, was not consumed in large quantities -- to do so was thought to weaken the individual
physically and to induce sweating which was a sign of sickness. The preferred drink was animal blood prepared in soups that were cooked with hot stones in the stomach bag and other natural containers found in the animals that were killed. Sweating was referred to as "bad water" and was considered identical to the "bad water" that caused many internal ailments and discomforts which, if serious enough, could be cured by a shaman. One of the objects frequently used by a shaman in curing was a small wooden cup from which the patient was expected to sip water. Presumably this was thought of as "good water" although it was not referred to as such.

No Kasini explanation of the significance of water could be obtained, although it is worth noting that, as a fluid, it naturally suggests a transition between the concreteness of the land and the ethereal quality of the sky from which the majority of water was assumed to come in the form of snow and rain. Within this framework, assuming it to be relevant, we can also understand the significance of the willow branch in the ritual performed by women when proximity to unpredictable surroundings were encountered. For just as water emerges as a liminal and connecting substance between the land and sky, so too does the willow possess this quality in the context of an opposition between land and water. The species of willow used in the ritual is found only on flood plains and in swampy areas and it thus assumed an ambiguous quality in that it exists in places which are both of the land and of the water. (A possible reason for why the willow was selected from among the other species of
vegetation which grow in such areas is that it does contain acetylsalicylic acid, and its bark was prepared in a brew for purposes of relieving pain).

Returning now to the relationship described as a balanced duality, and applying it to what we have just described, it will be useful to think of it in the social domain as horizontal. By this we mean that although the parts are recognized as different, neither is in an ascendent position. They may be thought of as being balanced or even. We also suggested that moiety names reflect this balanced duality and may, in a sense, be considered simply "out there" as an encompassing and comprehensive expression of a particular kind of relationship. We would now like to examine this balanced duality from a different point of view in order to contrast it to the socially vertical and asymmetric relationship we have described in the present chapter.

Our discussion may begin with a basic fact that has been the focus of a protracted although somewhat intermittent and one-sided anthropological concern since the early days of the study of kinship nomenclature (cf. Aberle, 1967). This concern centers on the fact that two individuals may explicitly categorize each other by the same term or they may use different terms. The former style has been variously called "symmetrical" and "non-polarized" and the latter "asymmetrical" and "polarized" and, as Aberle and others have suggested, (cf. Aaby, 1970) the interest in this phenomenon has frequently been attended by a certain confusion in perspective. For our purposes we need not engage the issue because, in the main, we are interested only in relating
linguistically explicit categories by considerations that are external to the terminology itself. Thus in attempting to unify Kasini kin terms we are not interested in deriving a system of components which might allow for the definition of particulars, i.e. the treatment of terms as units within a larger whole. Rather we are concerned with arguing how these terms function as a framework for the expression of kinds of relations.

In the following table we present Kasini kin terms in four columns that are divided according to moiety membership, sex and generation. This orthodox outline illustrates the fact that, in every case but three, reciprocal pairs of kin terms involve two different words. In total we have 26 reciprocal pairs and thus in 23 of these we have pairs in which A categorizes B with a term different from that which B uses to categorize A. This sort of imbalance between polarized and non-polarized term pairs is, of course, a very common and well documented feature of kinship terminology but, to our knowledge, it has never received serious consideration outside of studies on social psychology (Brown, 1960; 1967:51-100) and psychotherapy and communication (cf. Watslavick, 1967). In the study of kinship terms the concern with this issue has usually stopped short with an analysis of how the terms have been formed and how the terms themselves seem to correlate with behavior and various kinds of expectations.

1. There is a fourth possibility where polarity may not have been recognized. This involves the term ūspək which refers to unmarried female cross-cousin. Our impression was that this (now obsolete) term was used by males only, however, we neglected to make clear whether or not it could be used between two unmarried female cross-cousins.
### Table 7.4

**KASIMI KINSHIP TERMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Own Moiety</th>
<th>Opposite Moiety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grandparents Generation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF and FFB</td>
<td>MM and MMZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents Generation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) MB</td>
<td>M and MZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) HF, WF, and &quot;father-in-law&quot; of siblings and parallel-cousins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Own Generation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) B+ and older &quot;parallel-cousins&quot;</td>
<td>a) &quot;Cross-cousin&quot;, &quot;brother-in-law&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudia</td>
<td>edada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esanzia</td>
<td>edatsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Childrens Generation (Male speaking)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) ZS and S of female parallel cousins</td>
<td>a) ZD and D of female parallel cousins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esuwa</td>
<td>Esuwa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5. Children's Generation (Female speaking)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S and &quot;ZS&quot;</td>
<td>D and &quot;ZD&quot;</td>
<td>DH and &quot;BS&quot;</td>
<td>SW and &quot;BD&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Grandchildren's Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;SS&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;SD&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;DS&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;DD&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very little attention has been paid to why the imbalance exists or how it might relate to a people's interpretation of their interaction.

A concern with reciprocal pairs of terms should indicate to the reader that we are not interested in working within the common and somewhat utopian postulate of systematic unification in which the terminology and the (often inferred) norms associated with these terms are viewed as some sort of template within which behavior is constrained, focussed and articulated to form a coherent social system. By contrast, to the extent reciprocal pairs can be unified at all it would seem to be only by an hypothesis of homology. This too poses problems, for other than the rather abstract feature of polarity there is nothing in the terminology which might suggest that a pair, for example, any | estua | is in any other way similar to edada | edatsa | or even kudia | edatsa |. These pairs are simply asymmetrical terms of reference with which Kasini categorized and referred to one another and there is no indication in the words themselves that they function as expressions of kinds of relationship.

However, from the point of view of power alignment which we have
just discussed we can see a similarity in form existing between all reciprocal pairs of terms in which polarity is manifest for in every case an asymmetry in terms implies or assumes an asymmetry in power. In various ways the younger person defers to, is dependent on or is in some manner subordinate to the power of the older. Despite the fact that some terms were used to classify people in different moieties and generations, e.g. esu, estsia, esua, to the extent that the reciprocal terms are polarized, the relationship was automatically taken to be one of inequality and the person categorized as younger was assumed to be subordinate to the power of the older.

This feature is one upon which the Kasini placed great emphasis in their attempt to give form to interaction, and they tried, whenever possible, to ensure that an assumed asymmetry in power corresponded to reciprocal polarized terms. As one might expect, however, there were limits to what could be done and we found no indication that the application of polarized terms was in any instance reversed. What seems to have been in operation was a scale, and indeed in most cases a sliding scale, of the sort indicated in the tables below where we have outlined reciprocal terms used between males in the same and opposite moieties.
Table 7.5

RECIPROCAL TERMS BETWEEN MALES IN SAME MOIETY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate</th>
<th>MMb</th>
<th>ESTS</th>
<th>SbP</th>
<th>ESTS</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>ESTSA</th>
<th>Ego ------------</th>
<th>kudia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.6

RECIPROCAL TERMS BETWEEN MALES IN OPPOSITE MOIETIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate</th>
<th>FMB</th>
<th>ESTS</th>
<th>FB</th>
<th>ESTA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>ETA</th>
<th>Ego ------------</th>
<th>FZS</th>
<th>MBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sla</td>
<td>sla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five other tables could be constructed, and would involve the terms used between: a) males and females in the same moiety (man speaking), b) males and females in the same moiety (woman speaking), c) males and females in opposite moieties, d) females in opposite moieties and, e) females in the same moiety. We have focussed on reciprocal terms for males because they provide a manageable corpus to which reference can be made and introduce one of the few examples where polarity is not
manifest. Furthermore, it was primarily males who attempted to manipulate the manner in which they categorized each other as they vied in different ways to assume ascendency or to reduce or enlarge the implied degrees of difference between their respective "power". This does not mean that the categorizations between female and female, and between male and female did not also change but they did so less frequently and the interests and concerns of those involved did not lead so directly to the kinds of competitive arrangements in which men frequently found themselves.

From what we have previously said it is evident that relative power was implicit in Kasini kin terminology. It still could be argued, however, that changes in the application of terms was simply a result of an attempt to label others in accordance with certain terminological rules and that power was of little direct pragmatic significance to Kasini. In answer to this possible line of argument we must focus on the fact that in their small and demographically vulnerable population Kasini frequently found themselves potentially related in more than one way. By this we are not referring to alternative genealogical linkages such as, for example, MMB-FF, because this did not imply a difference in relationship and the term estsine and its reciprocal esu were used whichever linkage might have been envisioned. Rather, we are referring to the consequences of the fact that Kasini did marry individuals who were categorized as being outside of their own generation. This resulted both from an uneven distribution of marriageable partners within one
generation and the extended fertility of most women, who were often bearing children at the same time as their oldest children. In any case the Kasini rule of exogamy stated that Ego must not marry within his own moiety, it did not state that he or she must marry someone in a specified generation of the opposite moiety. Most marriages, it seems, entailed persons of the same generation and thus involved cross-cousins. But PZ-BS and PB-BD marriages also took place and even more remote generational unions, such as PMZ-ZZS, seems to have been possible although the rather distinctive Kasini incest-rule (see Chapter eight) precluded, at least in principle, the likely development of these more remote unions. In the cases we discuss below we will concentrate on some of the implications for social categorization which arise from PZ-BS and PB-BD marriages. However, before doing so we must first make a brief statement concerning some aspects of Kasini marriage.

Following Riviere (1971, 57-74), we are inclined to look on marriage as one manifestation of the more general relationship between males and females. Structurally, therefore, we may look at marriage as a particular illustration of functional complementarity which was described in the previous chapter and where it was demonstrated that certain beliefs and ideas concerning the respective activities of men and women expressed a balanced duality -- a relationship that was also reflected in Kasini moiety names. In this chapter we have shown that different attitudes were associated with the power of people in opposite moieties and that within the moiety framework nearly all reciprocal pairs of kin terms were polarized
and that this polarity reflected different degrees of individual power. Exceptions to this polarity of terms included those used by marriage partners whose respective power, although aligned in terms of moiety membership, was broadly equivalent. This balance or equivalence between the different power of spouses was manifested most clearly in the lack of avoidance practised between Ego and the small bag carried by and associated with the power of his or her spouse. A man kept his _kunts_ with him after marriage, it was not destroyed until after the birth of the first child, and it was not considered dangerous for his wife. Similarly the woman's _kunts_ was not a danger to her husband and he was in direct physical contact with it during sleep throughout most of his married life. Accordingly the terminology employed between a married couple was non-polarized and the single term _se'etliga_ was used by both males and females to refer to spouse.

The other two terms, _sla_ and _etlxe_hc, which referred to male and married female cross-cousins respectively, could be used in a way that did not manifest polarity. When cross-cousins of opposite sex were involved, these terms were polarized and formed a reciprocal pair, it was only when they were used between same sexed cross-cousins that they were non-polarized. The relation between cross-cousins was characterized by joking, teasing, and a fairly wide licence when it came to making sexual allusions and using certain words that were customarily avoided in public discourse. The power between cross-cousins was considered either balanced, as between those of opposite sex who were also potential spouses, or, if different, as could happen between same sexed...
cross-cousins, then different in an irrelevant manner to be discussed in the following chapter. Very briefly, this recognition of power differences involved, for a male Ego, maintaining and keeping a spouse without any implication that his sla might be usurping his position in such a relationship. Consequently, regardless of whether an individual excelled over his sla in providing for a camp, there was a certain stasis built into their relationship because no possibility existed of one assuming complete dominance over the other with respect to the women to whom they were married, i.e. each other's female siblings or parallel cousins. Regarding the relationship between two women who categorized each other as etlx.ch, the ultimate concern of each was the care and protection of their respective children and, to the extent that this could normally be ensured, it was accomplished simply by staying in proximity to their respective children.

The marriage union therefore existed as an insular expression of equality in a framework of social categories that were predominantly hierarchical and unequal. As such it could and did function as a point of departure in the reckoning of other relatives and people (especially men) inevitably tried to manipulate social categories in the context of cross generational marriages to collapse, increase, or sustain the implied discrepancy between their own power and that of others. We can appreciate this more clearly by considering the following cases:

PB-BD Marriages

The alternatives in any cross generational marriage are introduced by the possibility of a shift in generation for either
member of the couple concerned. In a FB-BD marriage the man
could either remain within the terminological framework he employed
before his marriage or he could drop, so to speak, to the level
of his wife and take her as his point of departure in reckoning
how to categorize others. Conversely, the woman could either
remain stationary or figuratively rise to the level of her
husband. The alternative for the man in this kind of circumstance
was to substitute the term for brother (usually older brother)
Nduia and brother's spouse etela for the terms spouse's
father estsia and spouse's mother esiu. The alternative
for the woman was to substitute father eta and mother ane
for spouse's brother sla and older sister edada.

In the two case illustrations which follow, and in all
the evidence we have on this kind of event, there was no instance
of an attempt to reduce the distance between people related
matrilineally. The individuals involved either remained stationary
or the distance between them was expanded. There was no explicit
Kasini rule concerning this fact but it does indicate a tendency
for the FB to descend to the generational level of his wife. That
this did not occur in every instance is the concern of the second
case we consider below.

Diagram 7.1

FB - BD MARRIAGE
Individual A married E who was the daughter of C and D. Prior to this marriage A was related to C as same sexed parallel cousin and the terms _Kudia_ (B+) and _Esdi'da_ (B-) were used by these two in referring to each other. There was, however, a difference of twenty years separating the ages of A and C and thus C had matured and begun a family at about the time A was born. Consequently, throughout A's youth, C (B+) stood to A (B-) as a person who was in fact far more removed in ability and concerns than the minimum distance that the reciprocal terms _Kudia_ and _Esdi'da_ implied. Upon the marriage of A and E there was no resistance by A when C, allegedly, initiated a ritual removal of A by recategorizing him as _Esua_.

**Diagram 7.2**

FB - BD MARRIAGE

Individuals H and I were born within a few years of one another and had married sisters (i.e. women who recognized the same person as _Ange_). After the death of H's first wife H married K. Until this event there was no reason for either H or I to think about redefining their relationship which, since childhood, had involved the terms _Kudia_ (B+) and _Esdi'da_ (B-), individual I in this case being the older of the two. The woman K, however, had been adopted when a small child by I and J.
whom K referred to by the terms \textit{eta} and \textit{ana} respectively. As a child K also referred to H as \textit{esta}. After marriage K referred to H as \textit{se'etiga} and retained the filial terms she had always used for I and J. However, H, in referring to K as \textit{se'etiga} retained his use of \textit{kudia} and \textit{etlahe} for I and J. This produced considerable ambiguity for all concerned because in different ways H was in both generations and in the early years of his marriage to K he continued to indulge in a joking and teasing relationship with the woman (i.e. J) whom his spouse (i.e. K) recognized as her \textit{ana}. Apparently I, at the time of K's marriage to H, attempted to resolve the ambiguity by referring to H as \textit{esua}, but this H ignored as he continued to refer to I as \textit{kudia}. Eventually I relented and began to refer to H with the term \textit{esdola} with which, in fact, he had been classifying him for the previous thirty-five years.

At the time information was gathered, H and K had been married for over twenty years. In recalling the above events H and I emphasized two quite different things; I claimed H was not behaving properly by resisting the application of the \textit{estlije} - \textit{esua} reciprocal pair which were appropriate to the context of a SpF - D3p relationship. In other words I's frame of reference were rules or what might be called the syntactical element in the application of kin terms. Conversely, H claimed I was attempting to be "high toned" and "smart" in trying to replace the pair \textit{kudia} - \textit{esdola} by the pair \textit{estlije} - \textit{esua} and this clearly has nothing to do with correct procedures of application but rather with what the first pair implied about H and I's
relationship in contrast to the second pair. In other words, H's frame of reference was semantic.

Over the years this situation had been partially resolved even though H and I continued to refer to each other with B+ and B- terms and K continued to use filial terms when referring to I and J. The solution, marginal though it was, involved H referring to J as $\text{etl}\times\chi_k$, but adopting the ritual of avoidance that was customarily associated with a $\text{SpM} - \text{DSp}$ relationship. The semantic implications of the $\text{etl}\times\chi_k$ relationship which H had insisted on retaining were simultaneously neutralized by him in that he behaved as if J and himself referred to each other as $\text{esu}_c$ and $\text{esu}_c$. This arrangement was considered workable for brief encounters, and infrequently the couples H-K and I-J were known to form a single domestic group. Nevertheless, the competitive circumstances that usually attended a $\text{kudia} - \text{esc\ido}$ arrangement (see Chapter Eight) were never entirely obliterated in the relationship of H and I, and for this reason they could never stay together for very long.

**FZ - BS Marriages**

The alternatives for vertical movement in a FZ - BS marriage are the opposite from the kind we have just discussed because, in these cases, it is the woman who can drop and the man who can rise in the hierarchy of terms. The alternate term pairs are almost the same in this form of marriage as the last. They are simply associated with different sexes. Thus the alternative for the woman was to substitute $\text{kudia}$ and $\text{etl}\times\chi_k$ for $\text{esu}_c$ and $\text{esu}_c$, and for the man the choice was between
The particulars of the two cases we consider below are again centered on the fact that people in different generations could be similar in age and people who recognized each other as being in the same generation could be twenty or more years apart in age.

Diagram 7.3

PZ - BS MARRIAGE

Individual L married Q who was the son of N and P. Prior to this marriage the woman L referred to N as kudia (B+), to P as etlehe and to Q as esua. However, over thirty years separated the ages of L and both N and P, and L was only a few years older than Q. From the fact that L and Q became married we can reasonably assume that the differences and distance implied in the terms which they used for each other, i.e. esua, were ignored, and it seems, presumably because of their proximity in age, they must have behaved towards one another as sla - espehe. In any event their marriage resulted in Q remaining stationary in the hierarchy of terms and continuing to use filial terms for N and P, whereas L was recategorized by N and P as Q's spouse. For the N-L relationship this involved the pair estside - esda and the P-L relationship it involved esua - esua.
The individual V referred to U and W as and respectively, to the couple X and T as and and to R as . At the time W took his second wife U, V was about fifteen years old, R was slightly younger than V, and X and T were in their late twenties. It appears that the filial terms for U and W were always used by V during the life of his parents. We are concerned here with the terms used between R and V, who married in their early twenties, and the couple X and T.

When R and V were married R was recategorized into the generational level of her spouse by X and T. At the time, probably because X was beginning to acquire a considerable reputation as a shaman, this structuring was not disputed by the younger couple. However, when R and V were in their early thirties, R died and V himself, through a series of rather dramatic accomplishments, also began to acquire a reputation as a shaman. This resulted in V and X being partially re-categorized, on V's initiative, when V attempted to replace the reciprocal pair by the pair . We say partially because it seems that X never wholly acquiesced to this structuring and consequently, although X apparently never made an issue out
of being referred to as $\text{sla}$ by $V$, he continued to refer to $V$ as $\text{es}^{\text{cua}}$. At the same time and in spite of the fact that $V$ categorized $X$ as $\text{sla}$, $V$ continued to refer to $T$ as $\text{en}^{\text{x}}$.

The above account was recorded over twenty years after the events had occurred, but it is interesting to note that the use of the non-reciprocal ($\text{sla} - \text{es}^{\text{cua}}$) and non-complementary ($\text{sla} - \text{en}^{\text{x}}$) were still being used between $V$, $X$ and $T$ at the same time field work was being carried out. Both $V$ and $X$ presented their case to us in terms of alternate but, it would seem, equally correct syntactical arguments. From $X$'s point of view $V$ was his spouse's sister's child and hence the term $\text{es}^{\text{cua}}$ applied. From $V$'s point of view $X$ was his (deceased) spouse's brother and hence the term $\text{sla}$ applied, however, in this second case $V$'s re-categorization of $X$ did not involve a complementary categorization of $T$. Furthermore $V$ took the initiative in this case only after he had become a shaman himself and to the extent it was directed at $X$ we have, it seems, a case of one shaman trying to express a relationship of equality with another. That this resulted in a stalemate, neither $X$ nor $V$ clearly attaining ascendency over the other, speaks most clearly of the semantic implications of power inherent in Kasini kin terms as well as the unsystematic application and yet creative use to which such terms could be put.

We argue then that a hierarchy is implicit in Kasini conceptualizations of relationships between most kinsmen and that this hierarchy was informed by considerations of relative degrees of power. To the extent that this was evident in
differences of age and generation we have, or rather the Kasini had, a natural order which functioned in the conceptual recognition of power discrepancies. Within Ego's own moiety these conceptual differences were exhaustive and there was no way he could categorize another as an equal and consequently he recognized everyone as having more or less power than himself. Furthermore, we noted that individuals within the same moiety took advantage of only two alternatives open to them. Either they remained stationary with respect to others in their matriline or the implied differences were expanded by a re-categorization using terms that were generationally more remote. The relations between individuals of opposite moieties were somewhat different for here, at least, there was the opportunity to assume a relationship of equality and realize, socially, something which corresponded to either a balanced duality, as between spouses, or a nullified and, as we shall see, ultimately insignificant inequality, as between same sexed cross-cousins. We further demonstrated that filiation and age differences could be predicated on this framework of relative power rather than the reverse and that when clear alternatives were open the choice could rest either on the correctness of syntactical linkages or on the demonstrated differences of power between the individuals involved.
We wish in this chapter to concentrate on the implications of certain configurations of social relations and their place in the formation and internal organization of Kasini domestic groups. It bears repeating at this point that the composition of domestic groups was not idealized, the groups were unnamed and their formation was not a function of a residence rule. The acid test of Kasini domestic groups was economic viability and in order to ensure self-sufficiency a core of able-bodied and knowledgeable "providers" was a requisite in their composition. At any given time the factors of illness, death or advancing senescence could, severally or in combination, all produce a need for a new "provider" and since the Kasini population was small and demographically vulnerable the scope for selection was often restricted. As a result many different combinations of males, females or males and females emerged as "providers" in domestic groups and we have given illustrations of some of these.

Presumably any groups of people who possessed a comparable technology and exploited identical resources in the same region would be subject, with only slight variation, to the kinds of demands and limited alternatives we have considered. Certainly Kasini were sometimes required by circumstance to respond in their domestic arrangements to a narrow and by no means accommodating state of affairs. In accepting the exigent demands of their material existence, however, we do not thereby discount that Kasini exercised preferences when they could nor that the various combinations
of people who constituted domestic groups were all equally acceptable.

It is the purpose of this chapter to examine preferred domestic arrangements and describe those conditions which led to strain between certain classes of people. In doing so we are obliged to adopt an egocentric perspective for although Kasini domestic groups functioned as organized units in the empirical sense, they did not function as units of organization on the conceptual level and individuals in a group did not consider themselves to be once and for all members of such units. Strictly speaking it was people not groups which were interrelated conceptually and for this reason we are no more in a position to speak of the interrelation of Kasini domestic groups than we are able to speak, for example, of the interrelation of egocentric kindreds. As a perspective it does have the advantage of presenting a picture of the formation and internal organization of domestic groups in which the group per se does not compete for center stage in the analysis, but in doing so it unfortunately produces a fragmented and rather inelegant exposition which we have not been able to avoid.

Throughout the first two sections of the discussion that follows it is necessary to incorporate certain features of the argument developed in the next chapter where we examine Kasini kin terms as a sub-class encompassed by a broader framework of social categories. It will be necessary, therefore, to examine briefly certain aspects of this later discussion and indicate how it relates to the description and line of argument presented below.
Kasini kin terms were always used as terms of address and consequently they bear directly on a discussion of domestic group relations. As terms of reference, however, kin terms were used only in regard to those with whom ego was currently in frequent contact. People with whom he interacted infrequently or with whom he had ceased to interact, he referred to with non-kin terms. Hereafter we will refer to these non-kin categories as "other people" names. This total set of categories, including kin terms and "other people" names, functioned as a means of portraying social distance and it is the recognition and affective significance of this felt distance which indirectly intrudes in two related ways below.

First, there is the question of defining social categories and describing the relationship that obtains between reciprocal pairs of categories. Ignoring for the moment the hierarchy implicit in Kasini kin terms we can take, as example, the relationship between "brother" and "sister" (B-Z). These two classes of people could not marry by virtue of the explicit Kasini proscription of moiety exogamy. However, apart from this rule, which obtained regardless of social distance, there was a whole series of contradictory features which could characterize the B-Z relationship. The following things were frowned upon between B and Z in frequent contact: speaking to each other, sleeping together, making sexual allusions and exposing their genitals. Conversely, people who addressed each other with the terms B and Z, but who had only infrequent contact, not only spoke to each other quite freely they were also known to sleep together and make sexual allusions in each other's company.
The B-Z relationship can be cast in a quite different light depending on how these facts are interpreted. One could, for instance, associate B and Z directly with various mutually proscribed activities and take this to be the definition of their relationship. In which case one might underplay the factor of social distance and simply conclude that B-Z relationship dissipated the less frequently B and Z interacted. On the other hand, one could accept both ends of the social distance spectrum as being valid expressions of the B-Z relationship. In which case a synthesis could be achieved by writing in the implicit rule that B-Z relationship varied according to social distance. The relationship, from this perspective, would not be subject to a single definition -- it could have multiple definitions and each would be contingent on the social distance experienced at a given time.

The problem we pose here cannot, we believe, be resolved simply by reference to the evidence itself. How, after all, is one to decide that an implicit rule induced from the material is more important than an explicit prohibition uttered by informants? For that matter, how is one to decide whether general questions are narrowly understood and receive narrow answers couched in general terms, e.g., B and Z should not speak to each other? Our solution, such as it is -- and perhaps must be -- is to weigh the evidence in a manner which is consistent with a premise that underlies this study of Kasini social organization.

The premise centers on issues considered in the next chapter and asserts that Kasini social identity was subject to change. As individuals moved in and out of each other's ambience
their relationship and mode of categorizing one another varied and every Kasini was engaged in a continuous reciprocal process of identifying himself in terms of others and others in terms of himself. Social identity was not, generally speaking, fixed and Kasini relations were not moored to a static framework of discrete segments which once and for all defined Ego with respect to Alter. The structural shape of Kasini in relationship did not, therefore, entail closure into discrete and enduring segments and it is in terms of this fact that we have been prompted to emphasize or play down aspects of the material presented below. In the discussion of Kasini incest, for instance, the evidence we provide has a rather anfractuous quality which allows for two quite different interpretations. One of these — the more orthodox — is that Kasini recognized specific kin-types between whom sexual activity was forbidden. This perspective fragments Kasini population into discrete segments defined by the so-called incest rule. The other interpretation isolates strata in Kasini population between whom sexual activity was forbidden. Instead of isolating clusters of kin-types who avoided sexual relations we will see, from this perspective, that broad classes of people did so, and these classes cut right across Kasini society. In the description and analysis which follows we base our argument on the second viewpoint rather than the first. This is not, however, because the evidence is unequivocal, but rather because we are interested in developing a line of argument consistent with our premise. To this end the second rather than the first perspective is apposite.

The description proceeds as follows: First we consider relations between males and between females in terms of those
activities in which they are generally associated. From this we suggest certain general features of the arrangements which obtained between individuals of the same sex. Secondly, we consider the general male-female relationship within a framework of custom and behavioral rules pertaining to kinship and sharing practices. In terms of the preceding we then examine the implications of clusters of relationship that obtain between those who functioned as "providers" and "dependents". Finally, we suggest some sociological reasons for the size of domestic groups, the separation of people who are of close genealogical connection, and the isolation of the married couple as a pivotal unit in the wider organization of Kasini affairs.

Males, Hunting and Competition

Beginning in early adolescence Kasini males were concerned with demonstrating their abilities or powers and the context in which they most frequently found themselves able to do this was in the quest for food. This gave a connotative if not denotative individualism to the activity of hunting, where the abilities of two hunters were open to mutual assessment and reassessment and the relative capabilities of each could be compared through time. This kind of relationship between men was broadly competitive in nature for it will be remembered that "power" generally existed in two related but semi-autonomous ways in Kasini culture. First, "power" was proven and observed ability. Consequently, two individuals always had some measure of the relative efficacy of their capabilities. This recognition was an empirical matter; it was a conclusion based on comparison of demonstrated achievements and since any individual's
capabilities were subject to change no such conclusion need endure through time. Secondly, "power" was an abstraction incorporated in Kasini kin terms. In this context assumed differences between the power of two individuals were postulated, and although the discrepancies implied between a specific reciprocal pair of terms could be replaced by another pair, these changes not only were constrained by the small number of available alternatives, but they also did not allow for the reversals that might be evident in a comparison of actual capabilities.

The relationship between these two ways of recognizing discrepancies between the power of individuals is that they both hinge on recognized differences in ability. But whereas the kinship terminology seems to be an attempt to freeze the manifest differences between infant and adult into a fixed and enduring quality of all those separated by age and generation, the Kasini also had to contend with the fact that regardless of the limitations of their system of categorizing one another, the younger person was often more capable than the older and the person in the junior generation inevitably became, at least in the important context of exploitation, much more capable than the person in the senior generation. In other words implied differences of ability did not necessarily coincide with observed differences, and this raises the question of which took precedence or, as Firth has put it, which was "master" in the interpretation of social relationships.¹

We alluded to this same issue when in Chapter seven we

¹ cf. "The terminology of a classificatory kinship system is the servant, not the master, of the social relationship which it portrays" (Firth. 1936:267).
saw that considerations of actual capabilities influenced how individuals were inclined to categorize each other. However, we also noted limitations to how extensively this was done and there were exceptions which prevented us from asserting unequivocally that either some phenomenal consideration or the relationship between categories functioned as the deciding factor in interpretation of interaction. For instance we possess no evidence of individuals in the same moiety reducing, on the level of social categories, the implied differences between their respective powers and, regardless of moiety membership, no evidence that application of social categories was in any instance reversed. For many Kasini men this inevitably produced a situation which, from the perspective of social categories, implied a relationship like this,

\[
\begin{align*}
A & \downarrow \\
B
\end{align*}
\]

and yet from the perspective of demonstrated abilities emerged like this,

\[
\begin{align*}
B & \downarrow \\
A
\end{align*}
\]

We could conclude logically that Kasini would be forced to do one of three things. They could ignore the observed differences and emphasize the differences implied by social categories. They could recognize the observed differences and ignore differences of category. Or they could insulate individuals A and B in such a way that the differences made no difference. With respect to the
first alternative we already know Kasini were not so inclined, and with respect to the second we know that these categories were meaningful and although Kasini played with them a good deal there were limitations they seemed to recognize. This suggests there were more reasons than one preventing them from abandoning this interpretive framework altogether. As we shall see it was the last alternative they employed and although in doing so they were largely successful in preventing disputes between A and B concerning how their interaction might be interpreted, there did exist lacunae in their methods; for there were activities, like hunting, where a discrepancy between implied differences and actual differences of ability were significant to the participants concerned.

Females, Gathering and Co-operation

The domestic tasks associated with women were group oriented and in a camp setting lent themselves to co-operative activity. A constant among these tasks was care of infants and supervision of children, and those activities which could easily be carried out in conjunction with this primary concern have been aptly described as being "interruptable", "easily resumed" and "repetitive" in nature. Sewing, cooking, tanning leather and checking snares and fish nets are such activities and although they possess no obvious interdependence in the sense that performance of one is a requisite for performance of another, they are related in the sense that each lends itself and, in principle, could be performed in conjunction with the demands of caring for children.

These various activities all fall together and were thought to do so by the Kasini in that they were all considered to be the activities of women. However, even if this does mean that
a single adult could perform all of these tasks it would be a matter of obvious convenience if two women could co-ordinate their work schedules so that, for instance, an hour could be spent checking nets or snares without having a small, dawdling and easily tireable child in attendance or without having to carry an infant. In point of fact Kasini women customarily made such arrangements and in a very important sense their constant exchange of services provided one of the most stable frameworks of interaction within domestic groups. What was involved was reciprocation of identical services at different times and in principle each day could bring such an exchange full circle, neither party gaining at the other's expense. And since such arrangements were engaged in for reasons of convenience rather than any real necessity there would be little inclination for either party to endanger the relationship by attempting to manipulate a one-sided rather than joint pay-off.

Thus women were inclined to co-operate in pursuit of their respective activities and to co-ordinate their work schedules so that they would achieve the joint advantage of being in each other's company. For this reason alone the implied differences of power between women of different ages and generations was seldom a matter for debate or negotiation. On the one hand the power of an older woman implied protection for the younger and it did not lead to a strategic and oppressive advantage of the older over the younger. On the other hand, the manifest differences in ability between women in the context of the various crafts which they pursued did not have the dramatic quality and serious implications that stemmed from the activity of hunting. To be
sure differences of skill in manufacturing a pair of mocassins, for instance, were critically appreciated but there were limitations to the significance of these differences and, to the extent that a given pair of mocassins was serviceable, for all practical purposes one pair was as good as another. By contrast the difference between a good (i.e. successful) and bad hunter was clearly apparent and could be very significant to all concerned.

Male-Female Relations

We argued in Chapter six that all Kasini males and females were thought to be related in terms of a functional and sexual complementarity. It is the purpose of this section to demonstrate that all relationships within the framework of kinship were a contrived, highly stylized and for the most part limited expression of this more general relationship. In the chart below we provide a list of reciprocal pairs of kin categories which are arranged according to same or opposite moiety membership, sex, generation and relative age. We will consider each of these pairs of terms in conjunction with various proscriptive and prescriptive behavioral rules.
### Table 8.1

**MALE-FEMALE KIN CATEGORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Own Moiety</th>
<th>Opposite Moiety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second</strong></td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending and Descending</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>ESU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESU</td>
<td>ESU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First</strong></td>
<td>AN</td>
<td>ETA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending and Descending</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>ESTUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>ZD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESU</td>
<td>ESU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESU</td>
<td>ESU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Own</strong></td>
<td>HF</td>
<td>ESU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESU</td>
<td>ESU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESU</td>
<td>ESU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESU</td>
<td>ESU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESU</td>
<td>ESU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESU</td>
<td>ESU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following discussion takes into consideration the fact that all but one of the above pairs of terms are polarized and hence imply a difference in the power of the participants to whom they refer. On the level of terminology, therefore, this produces a picture which indicates that a full expression of the female-male relationship existed only between spouses; for it is they alone who used non-polarized terms for each other. This picture is correct in a sense, but it does not indicate who in fact could be a spouse, how the objective fact of relative age intruded into Ego's assessment of another and how various relationships...
with their attendant behavioral injunctions and reciprocal term pairs could be, under certain conditions, changed into other kinds of relationship. For reasons that will be clear presently, it is necessary to assume that the classes of people referred to in the following subsections are in frequent contact. In addition, when we speak of prohibited activities below we are referring to activities which were subject to public censure only, and not to activities that were forbidden (ω) because they were intrinsically dangerous to enact.

1) an여(M), en여(MZ), edaالأ(Z+) and male Ego.

The term an여 could refer to any female in the first ascending generation who was in the same moiety as Ego. Like its male complement eta, the term an여 singles out a person in this class who actually nurtured Ego; the remainder of the class was referred to by the term en여. Therefore, these two forms could, and probably most frequently did, correspond to M and MZ respectively. However, the distinction of general and particular filiation was based on the actual intimacy developed between a woman and dependent child. Consequently, in the event of a woman's death, it did happen that her children (i.e. those who recognized her as an여) could be adopted by different women in the same moiety as the deceased. In this event the children would grow up referring to quite different women as an여 even though they were themselves full siblings.

Before mentioning the various kinds of activity associated with the above categories it is first necessary to introduce
the factor of relative age. If an individual categorized as \( \textit{enx} \) was close in age to Ego he behaved to her as if she were categorized as \( \textit{edada} (Z+) \); conversely, if a person categorized as \( \textit{edada} \) was a mature adult with children of her own before Ego reached puberty and acquired power, he would often treat her as if she were his \( \textit{enx} \) and occasionally, if adoption took place, he recategorized her as \( \textit{anx} (M) \). These facts point up an apparent dissonance between actual behavior and appropriate behavior associated with specific category pairs which cannot be ignored. But since this lack of correspondence is also evident in the three subsections below, we will postpone our consideration of it until all the material has been presented.

Appropriate behavior between Ego and \( \textit{anx} (M) \) was as follows: after Ego was about eight years of age they did not share the same sleeping blankets, they did not make sexual allusions in each other's company, and they did not expose their genitals while in the other's presence. If Ego were to ignore any of these customary ways of behaving he would usually receive a reprimand from his mother. Apart from these injunctions, however, the two spoke freely to each other and, before Ego's marriage, they stood in a relationship of functional complementarity — Ego provided meat and skins for his mother, and she cooked his meals and sewed his clothes, etc. These same characteristics were also associated with Ego's relationship to his \( \textit{emx} (MZ) \).
When both Ego and edada (Z+ and older female parallel cousins) were past puberty the appropriate behavior between them was as follows: they did not share the same blankets, they did not make sexual allusions in each other's company, they did not expose their genitals while in the other's presence and they did not speak to each other. In addition they were not assumed to stand in a relationship of functional complementarity.

Speech avoidance and its relationship to cooperative activities between males and females is illustrated in a story concerning two young siblings whom circumstance had forced into being hunting partners. The time of year was early March and because food supplies were low the father, and sole adult male of the domestic group, had gone to the trapping post to pick up supplies. While he was there he became ill and his return to his camp was delayed with the result that his wife and children began to starve. After two weeks of hunger and waiting, the mother, who had become weak, asked her young son to take the gun and try and get some food. The son, however, was too weak to carry the gun. The mother then asked the boy's older sister to carry the gun and break a trail in the snow for her brother. The two set off; the older sister in front with the gun and the younger brother, the hunter, following behind. Whenever the sister sighted something she wordlessly pointed it out to her brother and handed him the gun. The boy then shot at the quarry. After a full day of this the siblings returned to their camp with a grouse and a rabbit.
This story was told to us to emphasize speech avoidance between brother-sister in frequent contact and whatever its historical accuracy, it may be largely allegorical in nature. There was no reason why, in an actual situation, the stronger older sister would not have gone off hunting alone.

ii) \textit{estside} (HF), \textit{estaga} (MB), \textit{kudia} (B+) and female \textit{Ego}.

The term \textit{estside} was the apical male term and therefore referred to incumbents of positions in the second ascending generation and above. It also referred to spouse's father and it is in respect to this position that we are interested in it here. Usually a spouse's father was also a married MB or any of mother's males parallel cousins who were married. The term \textit{estaga} referred to MB and mother's male parallel cousins who were unmarried. The term \textit{kudia} referred to any male older than Ego and in the same generation and moiety.

If \textit{estaga} was close in age to Ego he was treated as if he was categorized as \textit{kudia}; conversely a \textit{kudia} who was very much older than Ego was treated as if he were categorized as \textit{estaga}; and depending on whether Ego married her BS or MBS either \textit{estaga} or \textit{kudia} could eventually be replaced by \textit{estside} (HF).

It was necessary to take certain precautionary measures concerning interaction with an older male of the same moiety and in the first ascending generation. These measures we have called gestures of deference and they involved being careful when moving about the older person or his belongings.
in order to avoid feeling sick or ill. Between estaza (MB) and Ego this relationship was also characterized by the younger person obeying the occasional instructions of the older and receiving scoldings from him and it found its most consistent expression when the younger had not yet reached menarche and the older was nearing the time when he would take a wife. When estaza did take a wife and was recategorized as estasix speech avoidance was observed and in this regard the relationship was similar to that between Ego and her kudia.

At no age was it considered appropriate that Ego sleep in the same blankets as her estasix, estaza, or kudia, and after the younger person had passed puberty the older did not expose their genitals or make sexual allusions when she was present. Nor was Ego thought to cook, sew or otherwise stand in a functional relationship with people categorized by these terms.

iii) esu_n (WM), esu_n (FZ), espeh_c (PZD, M3D), estua (BD) and male Ego.

The term esu_n referred to women in the second ascending generation and above, although the prefix e- was usually dropped to form _su_n in specific reference to MM. The term esu_n also referred to spouse's mother and all women in the first ascending generation and opposite moiety to Ego. The term espeh_c referred to any unmarried female in the same generation and opposite moiety to Ego, and the term estua to any female in the first descending generation and opposite
moiety. In what follows we omit discussion of women in the second ascending generation.

With the exception of WM, Ego could marry any person in the opposite moiety whom he categorized by the above terms. They involve individuals in Ego's own generation and the first ascending and descending generations. Ego usually married somebody of approximately his own age; this perhaps was a matter of preference but it seems to have been primarily a function of the fact that those older than Ego were already married and those younger were not old enough (i.e. they had not reached menarche). In any case despite the implied difference of power between Ego and EZ on the level of terminology, if the two individuals were of approximately the same age they behaved towards one another as if they categorized each other as cross-cousins. Similarly for Ego and his BD and, as we saw in Chapter seven, in either case the person in the senior generation dropped, terminologically, to the level of their spouse.

The relationship with WM was characterized by avoidance of speech and exposing their genitals in each other's presence. The power of WM was also considered dangerous for Ego and, since this was associated with the WM's Kunts that was usually carried on her person, located near her sleeping area or attached to her blankets, Ego avoided physical contact with her. If Ego and a married EZ were widely separated in age, the same kinds of avoidance were observed.
Appropriate behavior between Ego and his female cross-cousins, (including \textit{etlæh}_c (EW)), was characterized by joking and making sexual allusions in each other's company. They were also permitted to sleep together. If a BD was approximately the same age as Ego the same kind of relationship obtained. But if Ego was married and widely separated in age from BD they could only speak to each other. They did not sleep together or make sexual allusions in the other's presence and, in these respects, the two behaved as if they were related as \textit{eta} (F) - \textit{estua} (D).

There was no assumption that a man stood in a relationship of functional complementarity to any female incumbent of the positions considered here — that is to say, no male was thought to be providing meat and skins, etc., for any female in the opposite moiety whom he categorized as \textit{esu}_c, \textit{espæh} or \textit{estua}.

iv) \textit{estsia} (HF), \textit{esta} (FB), \textit{sia} (MBS, FZS), \textit{esu} (BS) and female Ego.

The term \textit{estsia} referred to men in the second ascending generation and above. Often, the prefix \textit{es-} was abbreviated to form \textit{estsia} in reference to MF. The term \textit{estsia} also referred to spouse's father and it is solely with respect to this position that it concerns us here. The term \textit{eta} could refer to any male in the first ascending generation who was in the opposite moiety to Ego. It distinguishes between a person in this general class with whom Ego was or had been
directly dependent, and the remaining members of this class whom Ego referred to with the less familiar esta. Frequently, therefore, the distinction corresponded to F and FB although it did happen that full siblings used the more intimate term to refer to quite different individuals. This occurred if some older children were near maturity when their eta died and consequently never achieved the intimacy with their mother's second husband that was possible for their more dependent younger siblings. In such a case the mother's second husband might be referred to as esta by the older siblings and as eta by the younger. The term sla referred to all males (married or unmarried) in the same generation as, and opposite moiety to Ego. The term esud referred to all persons in the second descending generation and to children of male siblings and parallel cousins. We are interested here only in male esud who were in the first descending generation and opposite moiety to Ego, e.g., BS.

The relationship between Ego and those categorized by the above terms is simply an inversion, from the female perspective, of the considerations in subsection (iii) above. Thus, with the exception estsla (HF), Ego could marry anyone in the opposite moiety whom she categorized as esta, sla or esud. She usually married someone of approximately her own age and if this happened to be a person in a different generation than herself, then usually the person in the senior generation figuratively dropped to the generation of his (her) spouse.
Relationship with HF was characterized by an avoidance of speech, exposing their genitals and sleeping together. Appropriate behavior between Ego and her male cross-cousins was characterized by joking and making sexual allusions in each other's company. They were also permitted to sleep together. If FB or BS were approximately the same age as Ego the same kind of relationship obtained. If FB was very much older than Ego, or BS very much younger, then F-D and FZ-BS kinds of activity were considered appropriate. These we have considered above. Ego was not assumed to stand in a relationship of functional complementarity to any of the males we have considered here, and she was not, therefore, thought to cook meals or manufacture clothing, etc., for them.

In gathering material on Kasini regulation of various activities we began by asking questions concerning those classes of men and women between whom verbal communication, sexual activity, topics of discussion, gestures, etc., were either prescribed, prohibited or permitted. Consequently, our initial enquiries were along the lines of, "May one speak with a person categorized as Y?", and "May you speak to your X?", etc., and our intention was to isolate sets of people who categorized each other in particular ways and between whom speech or sexual activity, etc., was prohibited, permitted and so on. As it turned out, the rather slipshod construction of initial questions frequently produced contradictory answers that would not yield to a synthesis such as, for example, speech was prohibited between individuals who categorized each other with the reciprocal terms X and Y. This led us to change our line of enquiry. Instead of trying to
achieve a sweeping correlation between categories and appropriate behavior by direct questioning, we attempted to reconstruct the specific contexts in which interaction took place. Consequently, after establishing that within a class, e.g., opposite sexed siblings and parallel cousins, some were subject to censure if they spoke to each other and others did so with impunity, we began asking informants about the circumstances surrounding their relationship to certain individuals in particular. Hence, we asked, "Have you ever spoken freely or had sex with, etc., that (specified) woman whom you categorize as, e.g. edada (Z+)?", if so, "Did anyone else object, or do you think they would have done so if they had known?". If they had behaved in a particular manner and no one had objected, we concluded that, at least in some circumstances, the activity was permitted. We would then ask further questions concerning the circumstances in which interaction was engaged between these specific individuals. By collating this evidence we found that its quaquaaversal character became more orderly when we isolated the factors of relative age and frequency of contact.

Regarding the factor of relative age, we have already seen that there were a variety of circumstances in which behavior engaged in by people in frequent contact did not correspond with the appropriate activity associated with the reciprocal categories employed. If, for instance, a boy's older sister was married and had begun producing children before he had matured and acquired power, then the two would behave "as if" they were in a M-S (or MZ-ZS) relationship which was not characterized by a prohibition
concerning verbal communication. This might involve a separation between older and younger of 15 years or more and, in the event of the older caring for the younger much as she would her own children, this could result in an actual change of the kin terms each used to address the other, i.e., \( \text{εδάδα}_{(Z+)} - \text{εσδίδα}_{(E-)} \) replaced by \( \text{αμα}_{(M)} - \text{εσύμα}_{(S)} \). However, older and younger might be separated by only 8-10 years (i.e., 10 years old vs. 20 years old), in which case they might speak to each other but not change kin terms of address. As the boy matured, this difference in age could become less significant and the two might begin, at some unspecified time, not speaking to each other.

In cases like the above, as well as others mentioned in this chapter, we have not so much a lack of correspondence between appropriate behavior and reciprocal categories, as evidence of a transitional phase in which the mode of portraying relationship had not caught up, as it were, with how relationship was being expressed in activity. We do not, therefore, view the above kind of phenomenon as evidence that Kasini were haphazard in their censure or indifferent to what activity occurred between various classes of people. What they lacked, it seems, was any concise way of signifying that a relationship between two people had changed, or was changing, into a qualitatively different kind of relationship. Consequently, appropriate behavior and social categories often did not change in concert; it is this temporary dissonance Kasini tolerated and not, for instance, that opposite sexed siblings in frequent contact could speak together.
By the time any two people had matured and married their relationship had usually been sorted out in one way or the other, and the activity between most adults in frequent contact corresponded to how they categorized one another. As we noted previously there were exceptions to this, but these primarily seem to have involved relations between men (see Diagrams 7.2 and 7.4). In order to avoid any torturous backtracking over this issue we will assume, therefore, that male-female relations in domestic groups are established, and in all the cases we discuss below they were. Consequently, for people in frequent contact, the reciprocal term pairs in Diagram 8.1 are to be associated with the appropriate activities we describe above.

We may now turn to variations in behavior between different couples, or the same couple in different circumstances, who employed the same reciprocal categories in addressing each other and who were of roughly the same age. There was no indication in these cases that the participants were behaving "as if" they were related in a way not implied by the categories they employed. The most dramatic and instructive variation of the kind we speak of here, involves the class "opposite sexed siblings and parallel cousins". As we saw above, members of this class who were in frequent contact were to avoid speaking together, sleeping together, making sexual allusions and innuendo in each other's company, and exposing their genitals to the other. On the other hand, we recorded a number of instances (and heard rumour of many more) in which, without any public censure, members of this class not only spoke to each other, they also engaged in sexual activity.
Since many peoples, who employ classificatory kin terminologies, let various prohibitions lapse between those of remote genealogical connection, our first inclination was to try and correlate the discrepancies in our Kasini material with degrees of genealogical distance. But this procedure did not produce the consistency we expected, and the observance or non-observance of, what we had taken to be appropriate behavior, did not covary with genealogical degree. This fact produced an interesting difficulty because it prevented us from resorting to genealogy in developing a basic definition and translation of the kin terms associated with specific kinds of activity. For this reason we could not conclude that any particular manifestation of the relationship between $\text{Kudia}^{(B+)} - \text{Edatsa}^{(Z-)}$ or $\text{Edada}^{(Z+)} - \text{Escidda}^{(B-)}$ was exemplary, and that other manifestations were simply dissipated versions that displayed infractions of the norm. Logically, therefore, we are obliged to accept all examples of permitted behavior as valid expressions of the relationship obtaining between those who addressed each other with the above terms. Although by doing so we are also obliged to resolve the fact that relationship between opposite sexed siblings and parallel cousins appears to have both permitted and prohibited verbal communication, etc.

This problem is resolved by introducing the factor of frequency of contact, which was closely related to how Kasini experienced social distance. A clear and fairly unequivocal

2. Here, as elsewhere, we attend genealogical translation to Kasini kin terms. These, however, are minimal and not fundamental translations.
illustration of this variance of behavior associated with the same reciprocal categories involves a middle-aged man in the context of current Kasini life. This man behaved quite differently to two women who were equally remote from him genealogically, both of whom he categorized with the term $\textit{edatsa}$ $(Z-)$. One woman he had not seen for many years and, apparently, quite infrequently throughout his entire life. However, they were acquainted, and in the presence of his wife this man was observed to joke with this woman and sometimes make risque sexual allusions. The other $\textit{edatsa}$ was a woman who, with her husband, frequently shared a domestic group with the man and his wife. The man was never observed to speak with this woman or even to look directly at her.

All evidence we have on this matter indicates quite clearly that verbal communication and sexual activity was permitted between opposite sexed siblings and parallel cousins who met only occasionally around trapping posts. "Frequency of contact", however, is only a very rough way of speaking about the matter since, on the one hand, it is itself a vicarious indicator of Kasini experience of social distance and, on the other, the largely reminiscent material we have does not allow "frequency" to be qualified. Nevertheless, (as they had more or less contact,) we have record of numerous instances of members of this class changing their behavior regarding sex and speech. And although we have no example in which sexual activity seems to have been permitted between full siblings, from our understanding of related evidence we see no reason why it would not have been tolerated under certain circumstances — certainly full siblings were permitted to speak freely if they had been separated for some years.
We have introduced the factors of relative age and frequency of contact to impress on the reader how deceptive the empirical and reminiscent evidence has sometimes been. But more importantly, it is necessary to keep these factors in mind if we are to appreciate Kasini attempts to regulate activity regardless of these factors. And with this in mind we may now turn to questions of marital relations and incest among Kasini.

a) Exogamy

Kasini claimed that no two individuals in the same moiety could marry. Below, in section (c), we discuss the Kasini institution of marriage at length. It will suffice here to say that Kasini marriage was characterized by both sexual intercourse and those complementary activities associated with men and women that we have already described. The Kasini rule of exogamy, therefore, prevented those in the same moiety having a relationship that was defined by both these characteristics although in different ways, as we shall see, one or the other was permitted between various classes of males and females in the same moiety. Marriage also involved a degree of permanency and it is partly this enduring quality that distinguishes it from other relationships.

It was generally thought that an infraction of the rule of exogamy would result in misfortune, although nobody was clear what this might entail. We have no evidence that a marriage between individuals from the same moiety occurred before 1950.

On the level of moiety membership Kasini recognized no other proscriptions or prescriptions concerning marriage. On the face of it therefore the Kasini rule of exogamy provides the
following restrictions and options: 1) Ego may not have a relationship defined by both sexual and functional complementarity with a person of the opposite sex and same moiety as himself (herself) and, 2) all people of opposite sex and moiety were available for such a relationship.

b) Incest and Speech Avoidance

Before engaging the notion of Kasini incest it will be useful to indicate certain instances in which sexual activity was permitted between members of the same moiety who interacted only infrequently. All of the ten cases for which we have evidence were well known by both sexes and, among men at least, their recounting was a source of amusement and entertainment just as were stories of any sexual exploit. In some instances the male party to the event described was the raconteur. There were five cases of sexual activity between $e_dada_- (Z^+)$ - $e_doidla_- (Z^-)$, two cases between $u_dia_- (B^+)$ - $e_datsa_- (Z^-)$, and three cases between $enak_- (MZ)$ - $e_duak_- (ZS)$. At the time these events occurred all participants met only occasionally at various trapping posts. In the 1960's, however, some of these people were to become co-members of the town of Ross River and, in this context, the appropriate behavior for those in frequent contact was observed.

This evidence clearly indicates that a parameter of opposite sexed siblings and parallel cousin relations was not avoidance of sexual activity. In accepting this fact, however, something of a problem emerges concerning the meaning of those activities between members of this class who were in frequent contact, i.e., speaking together, sleeping together, exposing
their genitals and making innuendo and sexual allusions in each other's presence. We really do not know what to make of these prohibitions because, with the exception of "speaking together", all of them seem to have something to do with sex. If, however, under certain conditions, sexual activity is permitted between members of this class then a clue to the meaning of these prohibitions is indicated in the two basic attributes of a complete male-female relationship, i.e., sexual activity and functional complementarity. If sexual activity is permitted, then, in a much disguised form, what is being prohibited is functional complementarity. From this optic, the prime property of the activities described above is not so much their content but the fact that they are all avoided, and in this respect we have seen how an avoidance of one kind hindered the co-operation of two siblings out hunting. In what follows, therefore, we subsume all of the above kinds of activity under the avoidance of speech and consider this injunction as indicative of a lack of functional complementarity between the sexes. In the above cases of sexual activity between members of the same moiety there was apparently no thought that any permanent arrangement would emerge. If one were to emerge, it would constitute a marriage in Kasini eyes and this would breach the rule of exogamy.

We have no doubt that many readers will object to our treatment of the data here and judge our methods to be defective, if not perverse. If they do, however, it will only be by claiming that an avoidance of sleeping together, etc., is actually and fundamentally indicative of a prohibition on sexual activity between members of the class we are discussing. In which case
they would be flying straight in the face of the fact that such activity was permitted. We can now turn our attention to how Kasini regulated sexual activity between various classes of people.

Kasini did not have a word for incest, although they had criteria for recognizing when two people could not engage in sexual activity. In such contexts they classified sexual activity as forbidden, ąj, and they possessed a clear idea about what sorts of misfortune would ensue from sexual activity in such circumstances.

By definition incest is a negative act. It is the sexual activity of classes of men and women between whom such activity is prohibited. We have shown, however, why our initial attempts to establish how Kasini regulated activity between certain classes of people were unsuccessful. In doing so we also indicated how significant the contextual features of social distance and relative ability affected Kasini appreciation of social categories and their use. It is for these reasons that we are largely unable to relate Kasini regulation of sexual activity to social categories without introducing other considerations. Strictly speaking the notion of Kasini incest can only be understood as a condition or context within which sexual activity was prohibited. Its definition, therefore, involves a description of a kind of context and, with one exception, this cannot be reduced to rule-category propositions.

Earlier we noted that ejaculation was spoken of as some sort of power release and that semen was associated with fat, physical strength and potency generally. We also noted that ętséj ča (bull caribou) was used in reference to a man who had more than one spouse, and in this sense it
signified someone who possessed above average capabilities in the context of providing for a domestic group.

These associations and interpretations are critical to a proper understanding of Kasini regulation of sexual activity. Our male informants always rationalized why they would not have (or had not had) sex with a particular woman in terms of a direct association between semen and individual power. In this respect semen seems to have been an embodiment of power since what Kasini wished to avoid was mixing the semen of two individuals whose power was very different. If the attempt to keep semen of different potency separate was not achieved then the following things could happen: 1) a child produced from an uneven admixture of male power could be malformed or chronically sick and was sure to have an early death, and 2) the male participant, who had weaker power, was likely to become ill or even die as a result of having his power (as semen) engulfed, as it were, by a much stronger power in the context of a woman's womb.

In Kasini terms, therefore, incest entailed three individuals: a woman, and two men whose power was significantly different in degree. Consequently, the regulation of sexual activity was not so much avoidance between people who categorized each other in a particular way, but of Ego knowing who was having sex with whom and judging the neutral or negative implications of engaging a particular individual in such activity. In this regard any Alter was potentially a sexual partner until specific knowledge of his (or her) sex life indicated otherwise.

The most obvious indication that sexual activity was
occurring between two people was if they were married. A married couple and their children are, therefore, a useful point of departure.

All Kasini we spoke to claimed that sexual activity between _iX(E) and _X(E) was forbidden ( _a_ ), and there was no question that such a relationship would be acceptable or tolerated under any circumstances. No one, however, offered reason why this was so, although we can see from the above considerations how dangerous it would be for a son to come in direct contact with the semen of his older and more powerful _eta_ (F). On the other hand, there was no restriction between mother and son on the functional level and it was in the context of this relationship that a man first began providing for a woman by hunting. In addition, verbal communication between mother and son was open and friendly.

Since the sexual activity of an unmarried woman was not so obvious, the relationship between _eta_ (F) and unmarried _estua_ (D) was not so clearly circumscribed as that between mother and son. Sexual activity was at least conceivable between such people. A story is told of a blind girl becoming pregnant. One day the girl overheard some women saying that her lover was her father and she was so ashamed that she hanged herself. This story suggests clearly how unacceptable such a relationship between father and daughter was thought to be, and it is perhaps significant that no analogous account was available concerning a mother-son relationship. On the other hand, the relationship between father and daughter existed only indirectly on the functional level.
The two could speak together although, in the context of current Kasini life, they did so with a marked restraint and never engaged in lengthy conversation. In this regard, it is of interest to note that some of Honigmann's Kaska-speaking informants, who came from around Frances Lake and Upper Liard river, claimed that speech between father and daughter was inappropriate (Honigmann, 1949:123). In any case, unmarried daughters were assumed to be only helping their mothers in whatever cooking or sewing they did. They were not considered to be complementing directly their fathers' hunting activities by accepting, for instance, skins from them and manufacturing them into leather and clothing for their use. The first male a woman established such a functional relationship with was her spouse, and eventually she was related in such a way to her sons.

Regarding sexual activity between an individual and those in the first ascending generation in his (or her) own moiety we have no record of a estaza (MB) - eszua (ZD) relationship. This is perhaps a result of the fact that the power of the estaza was potentially harmful to eszua, and the latter took care in moving about the former and avoiding physical contact with him. When estaza became married he was recategorized as estsi (HF) and speech between HF-SW was avoided. The three cases of sexual activity between enxe (MZ) - escua (ZS) include two in which enxe was unmarried and roughly the same age as escua; the third involved a married enxe and a younger escua, who was experiencing "madness" in the process of achieving power.

Sexual activity and marriage between esta (FB) and estua (BD) was allowed. We have a current case, however, in
which the FB refused, despite opportunity, to have sex with a BD. When asked why he would not, he answered that his \textit{snaža} (ZS) was already doing so and that he did not wish to harm him or make him ill. The younger man and woman in this instance were not married, but it was well known that they were on intimate terms.

Sexual activity and marriage between \textit{ěšůč} (FZ) and \textit{ěšůd} (BS) was also permitted, although if the two were of substantially different ages or married to people in different generations they did not speak to each other. We have no instance of sexual activity between \textit{ěšůč} (WM) - \textit{ěšůd} (DH), and we failed to ask why it would not occur. We can assume, however, that, just as in the former case of a MB not wishing to harm his ZS, in the context of WF-DH, the DH would not wish to engage in sexual activity with his WM for fear of being over powered by the semen of his WF.

In very broad terms the above considerations block off different strata of married couples in Kasini society, between which sexual activity was forbidden and considered dangerous. This produces the following profile of social categories for a male Ego:
Diagram 8.1
INCEST PROHIBITION AND THE STRATIFICATION OF KASINI SOCIETY

It should be clear from this diagram that an avoidance of incestuous behavior functions to insulate the generations. This, however, is a general picture that, in any particular case, was contingent on Ego's knowledge of who was having sex with whom. Nevertheless, to the extent that this knowledge was indicated by who was married to whom, the above diagram does provide an accurate outline. In doing so, it reveals that those to whom Ego had sexual access were the various females in his own generation. These include edada (z+), edatsa (z-), se'etliga (w), etlæh (BW) and espařehc (FZD,MBD). Speech avoidance, as we have said, was most rigorously observed between opposite sex siblings and parallel cousins who were in sustained contact, and it must be remembered that such people were not necessarily of close genealogical connection. It may be assumed, perhaps, that speech avoidance, rigorously observed, would influence the likelihood of other, more
intimate, forms of communication from occurring. But, in any case, sexual access was only half the story of male-female relationships, and there was never any question that an effective co-operative arrangement could emerge between two individuals who could not speak to each other. Thus, regardless of the absence of Kasini incest considerations between opposite sex siblings and parallel cousins, the avoidance of verbal communication between members of this class in frequent contact, simply reinforced what was stipulated in the rule of exogamy.

c) Marriage as relationship and event

A complete lack of ceremony attended Kasini marriages. First marriages were arranged by the parents of the couple and simply involved the young man (18-25 years of age) moving in with a young woman (15-20 years of age), sleeping with her, providing meat and skins for her and having her cook for him and make and mend his clothes. Initially this usually meant the parents of the young couple formed a common domestic group for some months in the area in which either the young man and his parents or the young woman and hers were currently living. Domestically it involved either the young couple living in a separate tent in the camp or the man moving into his wife's mother's tent. Apparently in many cases the young couple had to be encouraged to stay together for if they did not know each other very well the man especially was inclined to try and stay in the tent of his parents. If the relationship appeared to be harmonious the parents of the young man, after some weeks, would begin to take intermittent departures, leaving their son for brief periods of time solely
in the company of his new wife and her parents. Gradually, as circumstances demanded and opportunity allowed, the relationship was tested in this way until the parents of the young man became confident their son would not suddenly abandon the camp of his new wife whenever he missed his parents and siblings. At the point at which the young couple began producing children the relationship was assumed by all to possess an enduring quality which could not be threatened by some passing mood or whim on the part of either spouse.

Approximately a year elapsed, therefore, before a marriage was generally considered to have been established, and occasionally new marriages foundered within this "trial period" and the relationship was terminated. The reasons appear to have been many. They ranged from the couple deciding they did not like each other, to the man's wife's father openly but vicariously criticizing his daughter's husband in the latter's presence by complaining to his wife or daughter that the young man was lazy or disrespectful, or it could involve a young man becoming resentful of a nagging mother-in-law who, although not speaking to him directly, might criticize her daughter for not having enough meat on hand, and so on. In some instances young men were known to leave their new spouses for such reasons and, if the marriage did not constitute a crucial alliance of some kind, they were known to have returned without too much resistance to the domestic groups in which their parents were then living. If, however, the marriage was important to the parental generation and did provide them access to areas in which it might otherwise be unsafe for
them to travel, then the young man was rejected by his parents and told to return to his wife's camp.

It was not unknown for a newly married man to have his unmarried ēsēdīla (B-) come and stay with him and his young wife. Often this was simply out of friendship between the brothers although if the wife of the man had some unmarried sisters it was likely that in time the younger brother would marry one of these girls. Frequently but not necessarily female siblings would marry male siblings in the opposite moiety. In addition if either spouse died one of the deceased's siblings would be offered by his or her parents as a replacement. However, it must be remembered that half the individuals in Ego's own generation were categorized by the terms that he used for female or male siblings, and also that it was frequency of contact and not necessarily genealogical connection which determined application of a kin term. Thus in most cases a widower or widow could not help but remarry someone whom the deceased spouse had categorized as kudīa (B+), ēsēdīla (B-) or edāda (Z+), edatsa (Z-) and this could involve either a sibling or parallel cousin of the deceased.

Polygyny was practised by the Kasini and in the four cases we know of all but one involved a man marrying women who were siblings or parallel cousins who had previously spent most of their lives together in the same domestic groups. A man was promoted to take a second wife for any number of reasons, but perhaps one of the most important was his confidence in his ability to provide for two wives and the children they would produce. One individual apparently took his second wife under the following circumstances.
Soon after marriage the parents of his wife died leaving a number of unmarried children. His wife then took under her care the oldest of these children, who was a young girl who had just reached menarche. After some years the man and his first wife had failed to produce any children, but the younger sister of the first wife had become pregnant by the man. From this point on the man was considered to have two wives. The first wife never produced any children but the second wife had four. As members of various domestic groups in subsequent years this polygamous triad remained inseparable.

Lacking any ceremony which marked the beginning of a marriage the Kasini had perforce to lay considerable stress on the observable aspects of this relationship. Two people who did not live together were simply not married in Kasini eyes. But what exactly did this living together imply, and how exactly was it thought to differ from the relationship between any two other individuals of the opposite sex who shared the same domestic group? If we remember that a full expression of the relationship between the sexes involved both sexual and functional complementarity we can examine a contrived situation, from a male Ego perspective, in which a domestic group was composed of two sets of parents whose children were marriageable. This leaves out the second ascending and descending generations which, because of incest considerations, are in any case pretty well irrelevant to this discussion but it includes almost all other reciprocal pairs of kin terms. And since a young woman was thought to be only helping her mother and not providing services directly to any male she was, as a matter of Kasini interpretation, related functionally to a male
only as a spouse or a mother. This is satisfactorily viewed from
the male Ego perspective.

The diagram below illustrates a not uncommon combination
of individuals (cf. Diagram 3.7) but because we have given everyone
the closest possible genealogical linkage it should not, therefore,
be thought that this was either typical or preferred.

Very briefly we can block off the various reciprocal pairs with
respect to incest and speech avoidance. The latter we take as
indicating a very truncated if not non-existent relationship on
the functional level.

i) anγ  -  Ḥṣua

(M)  (S)
No sexual relationship due to incest; extensive functional
relationship. Relationship shared with Ḥṣidla (and Ḥudia).

ii) Ḥudia  -  Ḥdatša

(B+)  (Z-)
No functional relationship. Sexual relationship not expressly
forbidden but unlikely due to speech avoidance and dangerous
power of older male in same moiety.

iii) Ḥsu  -  Ḥsu

(WM)  (DH)
No sexual relationship due to incest and no functional relationship due to speech avoidance:

iv) $se'tli\hat{a} - se'tli\hat{a}$

\[ (H) \quad (W) \]

Functional and sexual relationship; the latter shared, in principle, with $es\check{c}idla$ (and $\check{kudia}$).

v) $sla - es\check{parch}$

\[ (ZH) \quad (WZ: unmarried) \]

No functional relationship. Sexual relationship; also shared with $es\check{c}idla$ (and $\check{kudia}$).

We can see from the above that the relationship Ego has with his spouse is partly expressed in a number of other relationships and that other males share with him, at least in principle, a sexual relationship with his spouse. This meant that the relationship between spouses assumed non-exclusive sexual activity but that it found its deepest expression in observable functional complementarity between each party to the marriage as they provided in different ways for each other. As far as the marriage relationship could be assumed to exist, therefore, a great deal hinged on Ego being able to provide for his spouse so that she in her turn could provide for him. This was not a matter of a relationship existing because it was stipulated in contract, or because it was a matter of public knowledge. Ego was obliged to demonstrate that such a relationship existed and this he could only do by providing effectively.

In a significant although subtle way patterns of sharing produce with a camp were also directly related to the kinds of
male-female relationships we have been discussing. Like many other nomadic peoples subsisting largely upon hunting and gathering the Kasini system of distributing food may be characterized by what Sahlins has described as "generalized reciprocity" (1965:148). The main features of such a system are that there is no exact standard of equivalence between items exchanged and no stipulated time span in which repayment is expected. In a Kasini domestic group nearly all food was shared and there was no exact tally concerning either who actually provided the most for a camp or who consumed the most. But even though there was no keeping of accounts and no exact or immediate repayment expected there was always sustained and tangible evidence to co-camp members as to who was actually providing the most. We are not speaking here of the obvious and likely possibility that people could remember who actually provided the most meat for a camp; for this need only result in a person being known as a "good hunter" and thereby achieving some sort of prestige. Rather, we are speaking of a sustained empirical manifestation of a person being a "good hunter" and the implications that arose from this regarding certain classes of male-female relationships.

We discussed with a number of elderly informants the phenomenon of food sharing in a domestic group and we have been assured that in all important respects existing pattern in Kasini domestic groups reflects that which existed before the decline of the fur trade in 1945.

One to three men constituted the usual hunting party.
The general direction and locale in which the hunt would occur would be discussed beforehand. If hunting had recently taken place and there was already a supply of meat in the camp then often the suggestion of some junior and not very experienced individual would be taken up and they would hunt in the area he had proposed. If this was unsuccessful then the younger person would generally be required to endure the good natured jibes of his companions, who would blame the day's failure of him by telling him they should never have listened to him or asking him if he was trying to play a joke on them by making them walk all day for no purpose. The same sort of teasing occurred between all young men of approximately the same age. But a youth would not tease a substantially older hunting companion.

At any rate neither guessing at a likely hunting area nor the process of tracking game was critical in how the produce from a kill was divided. Everything, or almost everything, depended on who actually killed the animal. Frequently, it is true, this was difficult to tell since such a volley of shots were fired when the moose or caribou was in range, that nobody had the slightest idea whose shot had actually killed the animal. Nevertheless, in many cases it was clear who actually killed the animal and to this individual went certain prerogatives denied the others.

After a kill the animal was skinned, quartered and gutted. Some meat was usually eaten on the spot and the rest piled up and covered over with the skin. Whether alone or in company the hunter then returned to camp.
Later in the day or on the following day all dogs, either with packs or toboggans, were mobilized to bring in the meat. Whether they had participated in the hunt or not this, in most cases, involved all able-bodied men in the camp meeting at the kill site. At this point the meat and skin were divided, however, the person who had made the kill was allowed to select one or two portions before division took place. Occasionally he would select something he particularly wanted to eat but most frequently he would have had previous instructions from either his mother or his spouse to get something in particular. This might involve the skin, or long back sinew used for sewing, or the knee bone or spinal column used in tanning, or a particular organ thought necessary to strengthen an ailing child or sibling. In no case did such choices involve large quantities of the animal, but they were always very significant from the point of view of the woman for whom the hunter was then providing. After this selection the carcass was then further cut up, and everyone participated in making what was considered an equitable distribution of the meat. Individuals with numerous dependents got most and those with fewer, less and so on. Thus from one kill everyone, according to their needs, acquired some meat and this could mean that in quantity the man who killed the animal took back to camp less than anyone else. It also meant that the woman who was provided for by a constantly successful hunter always had on hand those things which were crucial to the activities which she performed as a mother and a spouse. If she did not have such things on hand when the need arose then she was obliged to ask
another woman in the camp who did, and it is in this context that there was always a clear and recurring manifestation of which hunter in the camp was the best provider.

Women generally shared such things as sewing sinew quite readily and frequently they co-operated in tanning hides. However, if a particular woman was consistently better equipped than others this had additional implications. Since marriage consisted of assumption of a sexual relationship and demonstration of a functional relationship, an imbalance in hunting abilities between two married men could carry the implication that one was providing for both women. If, as in some of the relationships we have described, this was also accompanied by no restriction of sexual activity between the men and their wives then the man who was a less able hunter could appear, as a matter of interpretation, not only significantly inferior to the more able man but also irrelevant to an arrangement which was beginning to emerge as a polygynous union between the two women and the more able hunter.

In conclusion at this point we need only emphasize this empirical aspect of Kasini marriage which, as a social relationship, had not only to be acclaimed but also demonstrated. As we shall see, it was the opportunity for competing or alternative demonstrations allowed by this kind of marriage that influenced the composition of Kasini domestic groups.

Providers and Dependents as Kinsmen

In distinguishing within Kasini domestic groups, two gross classes, "providers" and "dependents", we consider only
relative economic capabilities and these need not correspond with other social attributes. A hearty 60 year old or precocious 15 year old could be equally knowledgeable and capable. Thus individuals widely separated by age might be "providers" in the same domestic group. But under usual circumstances "providers" in any group were of the same generation and bounded by an ascending and descending generation of "dependents".

i) Providers:

Individuals of critical economic importance to a domestic group included siblings and parallel cousins of both sexes as well as cross-cousins. Diagrammatically we will represent those in the same moiety as siblings, and these are the relevant terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Own Moiety</th>
<th>Opposite Moiety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kudia (B+)</td>
<td>se'etliga (Sp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edada (Z+)</td>
<td>sLaa (ZSp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esciola (B-)</td>
<td>etla (BSp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edatsa (Z-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some combinations of people were preferred over others in domestic groups. Considering first individuals of opposite sex, there are two main possibilities:

(1) \[ \Delta = 0 \]  

As we have seen a functional relationship between brother and sister was discouraged by the rule of speech avoidance. Thus combination (1) is barely workable as a provider section of a domestic group, and we know of no case in which this
relationship existed without certain other mediating relationships being interposed, as it were, between the siblings (see discussion on Diagram 8.2). By contrast a functional relationship was inherent in the status of spouses and for this reason alone the combination of husband and wife was a "provider" combination preferred over a brother and sister.

Relationship between "providers" of the same sex will be examined in the wider context of "providers" and "dependents" to follow. We may now turn to an examination of various combinations of married couples who might have functioned as "providers" in a domestic group. We consider the following.

(3) (4)

The least preferred of the above combinations was (3), two brothers married to two sisters. In our investigations we often heard it remarked that "brothers" did not speak to one another and that they frequently became "bad friends". However, this recurring and rather sweeping observation requires qualification to be properly understood. In the first place it was never stated that "brothers" should not speak to each other, it was claimed and sometimes lamented that they did not; therefore, the assertion, at least in intent, constitutes an empirical observation and, without further modification, a generalization rather than a normative dictum analogous, for instance, to the avoidance required between "brothers" and "sisters". In the
second place, as an empirical generalization it is vague and misleading for it does not take note of the fact that relationships between youths who were "brothers" were often friendly and open before both were married and that as old men they frequently did not avoid each other's company. As it turned out the so-called "male sibling avoidance", apparent in Kasini statements and documented for other cultures in the southern Yukon (McClellan 1961) applied only between "brothers" who were both married and who functioned as "providers".

No informant was able to state clearly why male siblings and parallel cousins avoided each other although the phenomena was widely recognized and when it was mentioned women were often heard to lament the fact. Indeed, since its generality was so consistently over-stated one suspects that Kasini viewed the phenomena as a significant and irritating enigma. Later we will discuss those factors which temporarily drew married "brothers" into the same domestic group; here we wish to describe those factors which encouraged separation and prevented an enduring bond from developing. Here we are in a sense classifying social situations and it is assumed that "brothers" were subject to the inherent strains and paradoxes without necessarily being aware

3. In reference to McClellan's article (1961) dealing with "male-sibling avoidance" in the southern Yukon it is extremely unclear what status she presume to give to this phenomenon. The theoretical difference between an empirical generalization and a normative rule is of course very significant, but this is no less so when it involves statements made by informants and they should not be confused or lumped together. Given McClellan's documentation without further refinement it still remains to be shown which features of "male sibling avoidance" are common to southern Yukon cultures.
of their structural significance. For instance in attempting to elicit a common rationale from male informants who had fallen out with a "brother" the replies were not so much evasive as vague. The most consistent reason given was that the other was either "lazy" or "smart". In the current vernacular these adjectives were often used to describe another person in the context of his success as a hunter and the former indicated a person who was unsuccessful because he did not exert himself enough, whereas the latter referred to a person who was cocky and confident because he was so consistently successful. With these meanings such answers were concise and to the point.

When we interpret interaction, therefore, we are not simply reiterating informants' articulation of their experiences, for in this their abilities and inclination to do so varied greatly; nor are we claiming that any informant actually spelled out the situation which promoted strain between "brothers". It seems unlikely that an individual would display the sociological imagination required to see the broader picture or have reason to formulate the objective criteria necessary to do so. The individual had, understandably, a fragmented outlook on social relations and, initially at least, he was concerned with this or that "brother". His horizons were narrow and his aspirations or fears were specifically located and, without necessarily understanding why, he gradually learned to recognize and avoid, if he could, certain types of situations in which he had previously experienced stress and strain.

We have already developed the idea that hunting, as an activity, constituted a competitive framework in which an individual
could compare his abilities with another. This does not mean that hunting was the ultimate demonstration of "power" but it was a prominent context in which the degree and sustained quality of a person's contact with animal-people could be measured. This was especially so in a man's youth for not only was hunting the main medium of expressing a growing independence it also possessed an unpredictable quality which required the exercise of "power".

There are, of course, many ways to contain a competitive arrangement so that it results in no lasting or one-sided benefit for either party, but in the particular combination of hunters indicated in diagram (3) there is a situation in which competition had broad implications for all. We have already alluded to this possibility in our discussion of the Kasini institution of marriage when we pointed out that this relationship achieved full expression only as a demonstrated functional complementarity between a man and woman. In the combination of "providers" we are discussing there is, therefore, the likelihood that the "brothers" would not be consistently equal as hunters. This would not mean that either was inadequate, but to the extent that one was better it is possible it would appear as if he were providing for both women even if this simply involved the other woman being required to ask his spouse for such items as sinew. The appearance of providing for a woman was the crucial element in marriage. Combination (3) is inherently unstable and potentially the stage for emergence of:-
What this might mean for the ousted male in the long run will be evident in Chapter ten where we discuss arranging marriages of dependents. In the short run there is simply possibility of strain due to the fact that one was appearing to usurp the other's woman. This, however, does not appear to have been a matter of "sexual jealousy" for in the hypothetical case we are discussing both men still retained access to both women. In actual fact, although known to Kasini, it was considered extremely bad manners for men to express jealousy openly and only one man we heard of was known to do so with any regularity. To achieve a sexual relationship with another man's wife had to be done with discretion and in any case it was an irregular event which occurred mainly during the seasonal gatherings around a trapping post. Discretion was warranted not because of the nature of the activity but in order to avoid giving the appearance that the man's feelings on the matter were of no account. Most husbands (and wives) were apparently well aware of who their spouse slept with occasionally and they often gave their tacit assent to such relationships. Therefore "sexual jealousy" does not appear to have been a sufficient reason for strain between "brothers". However, by measuring unequally to his "brother" the less successful hunter would also begin to appear as a dependent and this would be cause for real concern since it would reduce his status and enhance that of the more successful hunter to something like
Whether or not the less successful hunter was the older or younger brother he would object to being placed in such unflattering perspective.

The relationship of dependency to marriage in this case may be better understood in the light of a remark made by a middle-aged male informant who said, regarding marriage, "When you take a woman you sing alone". This remark was made while the man was exhorting his brother's son to return to his wife of two years. The brother's son had left the household of his spouse and her parents a number of times since he moved in with the woman in 1967 and in this case he was simply being sternly told that he must not leave his spouse whenever some domestic difficulty arose. But even if this example is current, the idiom in which the man expressed his advice is not, for he was stating very concisely, although somewhat anachronistically, that when a man married (took a woman) he had to provide for his spouse by exercising his own powers (singing alone) and not relying on others. Singing, it will be remembered, is directly associated with the acquisition of power and contact with animal people.

Strain that developed in such situations could be resolved in one of three ways; the inferior man could rid himself of his "brother" (who might be superior in hunting only) through sorcery, or he could take his spouse and leave the domestic group. In addition the better hunter might not want to chance provoking his "brother" into practising sorcery and take the option of leaving himself. We heard of only three instances in which sorcery was allegedly practised between brothers and two
of these involved precisely those circumstances which we have described above, however, physical separation was by far the most common strategy employed.

It should be clear that the combination of "providers" isolated in diagram (4) is not subject to anything like the same kinds of strains inherent to (3) and in fact (4) frequently emerged as the core of "providers" in a domestic group if the two couples intended their children to marry. In contrast to (3) the cross-cousins in (4) are of the same sex and the siblings are of the opposite sex. Cross-cousins of the same sex teased one another and were considered to be always on congenial terms. In hunting or trapping cross-cousins were considered to be ideal companions and although competition did exist between such individuals it had, in the domestic scene, a certain intransitive quality to it for the spouse of one was the sister of the other and vice-versa. Regardless of whether one man was consistently more successful as a hunter, therefore, the marital arrangements of each remained intact and unchallenged. This sort of neutralized competition between cross-cousins was also characteristic of the relationship between "brothers" prior to marriage.

ii) Dependents

In our discussion of sharing practices we observed that meat was initially divided at the kill site by men and that an equitable distribution was arrived at on the basis of the number of dependents of each man who was present. This, of course, implies a quite different use of the word "dependent" and accurately suggests that a more strictly sociological connotation of "dependency" is contained within the rather sweeping economic definition we have been using. Since the social reckoning of "dependency" and the
economic fact of being dependent did not necessarily correspond, our first task here is to make the differences clear and this can best be done by examining an actual case of a domestic group.

The case below is the same as Diagram 3.8 considered above. It is reintroduced here because it reveals a clear distinction between social reckoning of dependency and economic "dependents". The signs for gender have been coloured in to indicate which individuals were "economic providers", and in this and all following examples an Ego has been isolated to reveal, where necessary, the application of kin terms. In addition the dotted line encircling a specific cluster of people delineates those who shared, within the domestic group, a common living space and "hearth".

Diagram 8.2

This case is presented for two main reasons: first, it illustrates the only kind of arrangement in which, as far as we could gather, a brother and sister could function as the main core of "providers" in a single domestic group, and secondly, it clearly reveals a
situation in which the "providers" were not, as a matter of interpretation, functionally related to each other.

Ego (our informant) did not speak to his *edada*(Z+) and he thought of himself as providing for his _andše_(M) who was, at the time, a woman of about 55 years of age. Thus it was the older woman who in this case had direct access to a male hunter and the flow of goods acquired through hunting centered on Ego's _andše_and were distributed to others in the camp through her. As a matter of interpretation, therefore, Ego's sister, who was the only other able-bodied adult in the domestic group, did not have direct access to the meat and skins that came into the camp and was required to rely on her mother for such necessary commodities.

This particular combination of individuals remained intact for just over a year but it functioned alone as a domestic group in the above form only occasionally. Some of the other clusters with which they severally joined during this period were the following: Ego's oldest sister and her spouse and children, a female parallel cousin (MZD) and her spouse and children, and a father's sister with her spouse and children. The last combination resulted in both the re-marriage of Ego's widowed sister and Ego's own marriage and subsequently Ego became separated from the individuals indicated in the above diagram. But before this took place Ego was clearly a member of a number of domestic groups in which he shared responsibilities of hunting with his "sisters'" husbands. When this occurred, Ego, as a male participating in the distribution of meat at a
kill site, was apportioned an amount suitable to his "dependents" as these were reckoned through the woman to whom he stood in a complementary functional relationship. In this case that woman was Ego's anil.

In Chapter six we mentioned that the living space (tent, cabin, brush shelter) and hearth (or stove) were considered the preserve of a particular woman. Any woman in a domestic group who had access to a male "provider" staked out within a camp such a center of operations and in the illustration we have been discussing Ego stated that he, his sister and her children all stayed in his mother's tent and thus for this particular domestic group there was a single hearth (as we shall call it).

4. This fact points up an interesting feature of male-female relationships which we will not be able to deal with here. It appears that economically a woman could sustain direct access to a productive man (i.e. her unmarried son) considerably longer than a man could be productive as a hunter. In addition those sedentary and relatively less intense activities associated with women could also be effectively performed well into old age. Thus we have men being obliged to give up hunting in old age, whereas even the oldest woman could manage to scrape a hide, clean fish or set a snare. From the economic viewpoint this suggests that men and not women had to undergo a profound shift in their life style as they became older. The situation was not, however, as clear cut as this for just as men lost their agility and endurance to hunt in old age, so too the woman lost her ability to produce children. Functionally, therefore, the man was eventually obliged to pursue camp-oriented activities like a woman and physically the woman lost one of her most distinctive sexual attributes and in this respect became similar to a man. It cannot be demonstrated but it is certainly possible that there might arise, for some individuals, a need to compensate for diminished physical abilities and if so the above could well lend itself to an explanation of why the majority of Kasini shamans were elderly and reached their greatest powers after middle age.
However, in the likely event that there was more than one woman in this position there could be a number of such hearths within the camp of a single domestic group. An illustration of this is presented below and involves the same Ego as in Diagram 8.2 although the time is about 10 years earlier and Ego's parents were still functioning as economic "providers".

Diagram 8.3

![Diagram](image)

There was no stipulated time at which a young woman would establish her own hearth and live in her own tent after marriage but it seems usually to have occurred sometime after the birth of the first child and was brought about primarily for reasons of convenience in such activities as cooking and to alleviate the difficulties of movement and sleeping in an overcrowded 8' x 12' canvas tent. But whatever the rationale for establishing a separate hearth the event itself did provide tangible evidence of the recognized cleavages that existed in a domestic group and when a group split it was usually, although not necessarily, on lines of specific hearths that the split occurred.
In Diagram 8.3 the dotted lines indicate those associated with separate hearths, and it was on these lines that members of this group separated on occasion and joined with others in different domestic groups.

This example illustrates how social cleavages were manifest in spational arrangements within a camp. It also introduces a basic issue which centers on what may be called Kasini units of organization. The reader may be tempted to conclude that "family type groups" were associated with different hearths, as indeed they were in this particular case. But since this impression lends itself so readily to the related and widely held viewpoints that "society is composed of groups" and that "families are basic social units" we wish to state again that this impression suggests an entirely misleading and irrelevant orientation to Kasini organization. In the first place individuals were not concerned with the group as a conceptual unit, they were concerned with particular relationships and clusters of relationships and what these implied about their interaction with others. In the second place, besides "family"arrangements, others emerged also and although some of these were not necessarily preferred they were not thereby less fundamental as group configurations. The only way this can properly be appreciated is by examining domestic groups and their division into hearths from an egocentric perspective and the basic division we shall work with here involves the perspective of males and females. As we shall see these two perspectives are not coincident and that what was preferred or suitable from one point of view was
not necessarily shared by the other and it is only by examining both that we are given some indication what might be a suitable domestic arrangement to all concerned.

In examining the perspective of females the following considerations are of primary relevance: 1) The activities associated with women lent themselves to co-operative kinds of interaction. 2) Communication between a female Ego and her spouse's mother was forbidden. 3) The protective power required by children was preferably employed by older women in the same moiety as the children and usually involved those who were categorized as \(\text{an}_\{M\}, \text{en}_\{MZ\}\) and \(\text{su}_\{MM\}\).

If it is granted that extensive co-operation is facilitated between individuals who can speak to one another then we can assume that of all the combinations of females that might emerge in a domestic group the one that lends itself least readily to such an arrangement is that which exists between \(\text{esu}_\{HM\}\) and \(\text{esu}_\{SW\}\). This proscription did not obtain between female cross-cousins who communicated openly and were generally expected to interact with a congenial air and an inclination to accommodate each other's interests. Thus in choosing to interact with women in the opposite moiety the existence of a rule of speech avoidance produced a clear definition of alternatives and although virtually every woman we spoke to had frequently lived in a domestic group with a female cross-cousin for limited periods of time we have evidence of only one instance in which, with regularity, two women who were in different generations and opposite moieties constituted the adult women in a domestic group. However, regardless of the
relative ease with which co-operation might occur between different classes of women in opposite moieties, for any sustained inter-action women preferred to associate with those in the same moiety as themselves for in this case there existed no speech avoidance between such women and they shared a protective interest in children they produced. Regardless of moiety membership a woman who cared for a child was thought to be in a position to influence the alignment of his power as it began to emerge. This influence appears to have had more affect over the emerging power of boys rather than girls but it does in any case provide a sound rationale for a woman to choose another in her own moiety to share in the care of her children.

As far as we know there was nothing in the possible relationships which could obtain between women that suggests intrinsically unworkable combinations for domestic purposes. But as we have seen there were considerations which made some combinations more preferrable and, taken together, these were conducive to formation of clusters of females (and their children) who were in the same moiety. From the one-sided point of view of women in the same moiety there was nothing in their relationships with each other that automatically discouraged a proliferation of their numbers in the same domestic group. Concern was for providing protective power required by their immature children and in facilitating performance of camp oriented activities. Simply as a matter of preference among women, therefore, there seems to have been a tendency for the following sort of arrangement to emerge:
We have no record of a domestic arrangement of such size.

However, an unmarried Ego would have assisted her mother in the care and supervision of her younger siblings and probably also assisted her older sister in the care of her children. In the same way her £tn^ and £tu would have co-operated in caring for her when she was a child. If, as in the above diagram her mother shared her spouse with a sister then Ego would address both with the term £nX and recognize no socially significant difference between the two. In cases where Ego and her £nX had

5. In partial illustration of both the socially insignificant difference that was appreciated here, as well as the very shallow genealogical knowledge that was typical of the Kasini, one young woman was entirely undecided which of the two wives of her £tnX(MF) was the genetrix of her mother. This, to us, was all the more striking since the woman's mother, mother's father and both his wives are still living and in the context of current Kasini life frequently interact. We refer to this as a partial illustration since our informant was in her mid-twenties and therefore does not constitute an entirely apt illustration of the historical period we are discussing. However, regardless of age very few people were certain as to who were the siblings as opposed to the parallel cousins of their grandparents, and in many instances this uncertainty applied to their parents' generation as well. To our mind this does not indicate what has often been rather loosely described as "genealogical amnesia" since this implies that something has been forgotten. In the Kasini case it seems that it was not a matter of forgetting but of having never known or, it appears, of having ever really cared.
been in sustained contact with each other when Ego was a child she would not, as a married woman with children, hesitate to join up with her \_en\_ in a domestic arrangement and neither would she hesitate to "adopt" an aged \_en\_ whom she knew well but whom had not produced any daughters of her own whom would have felt responsible for her welfare.

These facts clearly indicate that regardless of whether or not a woman was married she was willing to engage in sustained interaction with almost any other female in the same moiety whom she knew well. The relationships involving the term pairs and chains \_an\_ - \_est\_ , \_en\_ - \_est\_ , \_ed\_ - \_edats\_ and \_su\_ - \_an\_ - \_est\_ could thus, separately or in combination, emerge as a workable and satisfactory arrangement between females in a domestic group.

In the following case we illustrate the genealogically varied composition that could obtain between women of the same moiety who lived in the same domestic group. The genealogical chart of the relevant individuals, each of whom is ascribed a number, will facilitate reference in the following discussion.
Most of the members of this single hearth functioned within a larger domestic group but at times they coped as a domestic group in isolation. It is one of the smallest of such groups about which we have evidence and considerably below the usual range of 8-15 individuals. The emergence of this group occurred under the following circumstances:
Ego, who was the youngest child of her parents, was adopted by her _enx_, a younger parallel cousin of her _anx_, when her parents died. Two years later she married but she did not produce any children of her own for five years. In the interim three things occurred: 1) her _esta_ (#14) died, 2) her "brothers" (#'s 7 and 8) married and 3) an older "sister" (#5) died, who had had five children and who for some reason had previously been abandoned by her spouse (#6). Two of these children (#'s 20 and 21) were adopted by (#3) who was a younger sister of the deceased woman, one child (#24) was adopted by a couple not on the chart but in the generation above Ego, and two of the children (#'s 22 and 23) were adopted by Ego. The result for Ego was the domestic group in the above diagram and either as a hearth or a separate domestic group this combination of people remained together for at least two years. During this time both of the children (#'s 22 and 23), who were 5-7 years of age at their mother's death, began to address Ego with the term _anx_ and (#13) (i.e. MMZ) with the term _Su_. Ego and her husband were the "providers" in this group and in both an economic and social sense (#13), (#22) and (#23) were dependents.

This illustration is an example of an arrangement which was not common but it does show clearly that direct lineality was not required when women of the same moiety formed domestic groups. In addition, since for (#13) there did exist more immediate genealogical alternative than Ego, it does indicate a preference for women in the same moiety to co-operate. Ego (our informant) was fond of her _enx_ and was quite ready to
assume responsibility for her welfare after the old woman's husband had died and sons had married. For (#13) this necessarily meant living with her estua, rather than vice-versa, and having vicarious access to raw materials through the efforts of (#1) who provided directly to his spouse (Ego). Nevertheless, for the two women the arrangement was much more suitable than the alternatives; for Ego this would have meant having no other adult woman in her hearth upon whom she could always rely for help in domestic chores, and for (#13) it would have meant going to live with one of her married sons and being in a relationship with her son's wife. This latter alternative was the least preferred arrangement between women and from our evidence quite uncommon. Why this was so we examine more closely below.

In Chapter seven (see Diagram 7.2 and discussion) we noted that the power alignment of children could be influenced by women in the opposite moiety. However, it was thought that such influence could only be exerted if women in the opposite moiety were the only ones around. Simply by being on hand, therefore, the anax (or enax, 3ua, etc.) could apparently insulate the children from the unwanted influence of a woman in the opposite moiety. Thus, negative though it was, there was nothing intrinsically unworkable in a domestic arrangement emerging between esu (HM) and esu (SW). Speech avoidance was also another limitation and discouragement to extensive co-operation, but this was appropriate behavior only, and as such could be ignored if necessary for no unpleasant consequences ensued from ignoring this norm. But perhaps the most important difficulty
inherent in an εςυα - εςυα relationship centered on the fact that both women stood in a functional relationship to the same man — the older woman to her son and the younger to her spouse. This could lead to a man being subject to identical, simultaneous demands. When the man killed a moose and both mother and wife asked for the sinew to whom did he give it? Presumably such a development could have emerged between co-spouses of a man but since such women shared the same hearth the implications were negligible and as far as we know HM - SW was the only inherently competitive pair of women. Obviously this could have been resolved if the man was unconditionally committed to either one or the other, but this does not seem to have been the case since the situation itself would have emerged in the first place only at the behest of the man.

We have only one case to illustrate this combination of women in a domestic group. The circumstances surrounding the emergence of this group we have already discussed (Diagram 3.1).

Diagram 3.5

Although the younger couple were the economic "providers" in this domestic group it is significant that both the man's anax
and _se'etliga_ maintained separate hearths within the camp as if they both had direct access to a productive male hunter. However, the other factors we have mentioned probably also played a part in this spatial separation within the camp. Nevertheless, the two women did co-operate extensively in their domestic activities and accomplished this by employing a simple expedient — they spoke to one another. By doing so they reduced the hierarchical distance separating them by behaving, perhaps with some reserve, as if they were cross-cousins; although this repunctuation of their relationship was only partial since they addressed each other with the terms _es'ua_ (HM) and _esua_ (SW).

We would now like to examine the perspective of males. In doing so we will take for granted that a person's _anx_ and other women in the same moiety as himself were most prominent in his life as he began to develop hunting skill in adolescence and early manhood. A Kasini male was assumed to be in a functional relationship with only two classes of women; those categorized as _anx_ (M) and those categorized as _se'etliga_ (W) and as we have just seen in the previous illustration it was possible for a man to stand in a functional relationship to both classes simultaneously. However, the relationship between _anx_ (M) — _es'ua_ (S) preceded that between _se'etliga_ (H) — _se'etliga_ (W) and so we will examine them in this sequence. In doing so we are interested primarily in the relationship between males but since these, from adolescence onwards, were infused with a competitive attitude that found its most pervasive expression in the activity of hunting we are obliged to consider them in regard to the women for whom the men hunted.
Sometimes the presence of certain classes of women sharpened competition between "brothers" to an unacceptable point and for this reason they tended to avoid each other's company as much as possible. This, however, was not a necessary feature of kudia\textsuperscript{(B+)} - es\textsuperscript{1}idla\textsuperscript{(B-)} relationships, but a function of special kinds of circumstances in which "brothers" regularly found themselves. Other circumstances did obtain and these had an emollient effect on competition, reducing the significance of manifest differences of ability between any two males. As we shall see Kasini males preferred domestic arrangements where such differences were socially inconsequential.

Except for the first relationship, all those we consider below involve males who were either in the same or in adjacent generations and who were subject to direct comparison when changes in relative ability were apparent.

1) \textit{etsi\textsuperscript{x}e} (MP) - \textit{es\textsuperscript{u}du} (DS)

It would have been very unlikely that two individuals who categorized each other with these terms would be hunters and providers at the same time. If the older still functioned as a provider the younger would probably be too immature to do so, and if the younger was capable of hunting effectively the older would usually be well advanced in age. Frequently neither was a capable provider and the activities of both centered around the camp. Such people were usually on friendly terms with each other and although the older person was assumed to possess "power" and could perhaps be a shaman his presence was not considered to be dangerous to the younger person. Apparently as children \textit{es\textsuperscript{u}du} (DS or DD) would often sleep with his \textit{suc} and \textit{etsi\textsuperscript{x}e} and sit...
on their laps or lean against them while they performed some task. Thus, despite being an older person in the opposite moiety the "power" of etshwe was considered to be unharmed and potentially beneficial for esuq. As if to emphasize this benevolent tone to the relationship one old man was remembered to have encouraged his numerous esuq to pat his head while they sat on his lap even though he was known to be a man of considerable "power".

2) etu (F) - esuq (S)

In this relationship and the others we consider below it was entirely possible that at some period both individuals could be, in varying degrees, "providers" for the same domestic group and we will consider them in this context. A father and his sons were both, of course, functionally related to the same woman and, initially at least, the father would have been an unquestionably superior hunter. The superiority of the older over the younger was largely a result of physical ability and experience but since these were subject to change we would like briefly to examine what was implied about their relationship in the event that their relative capabilities were reversed.

The relationship between a man and his wife consisted of an assumed and, in principle, non-exclusive sexual relationship and a functional relationship. That between son and mother consisted of a functional relationship only and, because of incest, there was no question of a sexual relationship. Consequently, regardless of their relative abilities as hunters there was no possibility that father or son could appear to supplant each other in their respective relationships to a woman who was either ane or se'etliga to them. Socially their positions were not
interchangeable and thus the only result that need follow from either emerging as more capable was that one would be recognized as a better hunter. In this sense the competition inherent in two men hunting for the same domestic group was nullified when it involved father and son, for it could never eventuate in either gaining a socially significant advantage over the other. This general circumstance seems to be reflected in the fact that fathers were the only class of males who were acknowledged to have in any way taught young men hunting techniques. In no case does this instruction ever seem to have been very extensive.

6. Older males very infrequently set about to teach a younger one any specific hunting technique. In asking middle-aged and elderly Kasini informants who it was that taught them how to hunt and trap they always claimed that they had developed these abilities on their own or that their eTa had taught them a few things. From our observations on present day hunting companions this still seems to be true but only in the sense that no verbal explanation was usually provided for the deductions that were made concerning an examination of an animal's spoor. A young man nevertheless acquired most of his knowledge from his elders just by being in attendance and having constant exposure to their interpretation of animal signs and gauging whereabouts of game. Most such knowledge was not transmitted verbally, it was learned by observation, imitation and practice and it was of an extremely complex nature which seldom surfaced into conscious articulation. From our experience at being "taught" to hunt in this manner we often felt that there was no precise way in which a particular deduction could be verbally justified. In other words we felt our questions were not being answered because our would-be informant did not quite know how to give one. In our opinion, and especially if one were not in the habit of doing so, it would take both a good command of a language and a better than average analytical ability to tell anyone else how one, for instance, determined that a moose or wolf had made a certain configuration of marks in the snow a hundred yards away. And yet all Kasini adults can easily and accurately make such a distinction. Therefore, when our informants claimed that nobody taught them how to hunt this does not mean that they did not learn from others; it means that they were not exposed to extensive verbal explanations of hunting procedures. It also means that they were reticent to acknowledge any debt for the current state of their hunting abilities.
and young men appear to have hunted with their estazhe no more frequently than with others. However, as our analysis shows, a father had nothing to lose by teaching his son to hunt well and, as we shall see, he in fact had something to gain by trying to ensure his son was a desirable marriage partner in the eyes of others.

3) estazhe (MB) - snazhe (ZS)

These terms were applied only if both people were unmarried. If they were of approximately the same age they behaved to one another much as if they categorized each other as kudia (B+) - es fleda (B-); similarly if "brothers" were widely separated in age the younger was expected to observe gestures of deference usually associated with an estazhe - snazhe relationship. The estazhe was expected to discipline his snazhe when the latter was a child. As the younger person matured he might accompany his estazhe on hunting trips and then an asymmetrical form of teasing often developed in which the older youth would mock and lightly criticize the younger if he made a foolish deduction or error when examining spoor. For the most part this relationship was friendly although there also seems to have been an effort on the part of the older to impress the younger with his abilities. One informant (a man of about 40 years) recounted an incident when he and his estazhe were resting during a hunt. Suddenly the older of the two started sniffing the air and got to his feet saying he smelt something good to eat. Still sniffing he wandered around as if tracing the direction of the scent. Finally he decided on the direction and walked
straight to a hollow stump from which he lifted a dead grouse and this they subsequently ate. Our informant (about 14 years old at the time of the incident) was much impressed with this performance and concluded that his must have had strong powers to have been able to have detected the grouse in this manner. Apparently the idea that the entire situation had been contrived did not occur to him for some time; not, as he admitted, until the opportunity arose some years later in which he thought of employing a similar ruse himself on a much younger brother.

As competitors, therefore, usually had an advantage of age and experience over his and the question of who was more able was not at issue. In any case the two individuals were functionally related to their respective and as such their positions were not interchangeable and neither objected to being in close association.

4) \[ kud'ia^{(B+)} - es'd'ja^{(B-)} \]

Prior to marriage "brothers" were frequently friends and hunting companions and they comfortably shared the same hearth if they had an in common. If they were close in age and still had many things to learn about hunting they would test their developing skills against each other and friendly rivalries and a symmetrical form of teasing and joking emerged on this account. However, if both were of approximately the same age and in the process of becoming "providers" their inexperience would probably allow neither to sustain the initiative for very long and no significant difference in hunting ability need be manifest. Thus "brothers" in adolescence and early
manhood were often constant and, it appears, congenial companions who hunted together for their ariya. But since they were hunting for their mother because they were her sons and not in order to demonstrate such a relationship the competitive striving between "brothers" in this context could never result in a decisive social advantage or even the appearance of such an advantage.

When a young man had proven himself capable of "providing" effectively as a hunter his parents would arrange his marriage. Such a marriage could involve a girl he knew quite well and who had been living in the vicinity of the young man or it could involve a girl he had seldom, if ever, seen before. In the latter case the domestic group in which either the youth or the girl were then living would have moved into a new area and the marriage constituted an alliance of sorts between those who had arranged this relationship between the young couple. If this involved people who categorized each other by an "other people" term such an arrangement between their children could in time result in the social distance between them being reduced to the extent that they would begin to refer to each other as es'denä (my people).

We will assume in this case that the young man moved into the domestic group of his new wife for this was a frequent occurrence, although it must be reiterated, this was not a result of a rule of residence. It was the result of the preferred arrangements between women, especially those which encouraged mother and daughter to stay together. Such preferences did not
negate other arrangements (cf. Diagram 8.4) from developing but, at least in the initial stages of a marriage, they were a strong influence on how the couple was disposed in a particular domestic group.

By staying with his wife and her parents and siblings the young man was placed in direct contact with two new classes of males — (WF and (WB). However, he could also establish or re-establish contact with men he categorized as (B+) or (B-) who could be already married to or who might eventually marry his spouse's sisters. The relationship between married "brothers" we have already discussed at some length and we know that in such a situation they were inclined to avoid each other.

5) (WB) — (ZH)

The relationship between men who categorized each other with the non-polarized term (WF was characterized by a symmetrical form of teasing and joking and whether married or not they were considered ideal hunting companions. We have already discussed the nature of their relationship when both were married. When only one was married the same neutralized competition obtained for each was then functionally related to women in different generations and their relative abilities did not impinge on such relationships in any way.

6) (WF) — (DH)

A man's wife's father could have been, prior to the marriage of either, related to the man as (MB) or (B+). On the marriage of a mother's brother the term —
was replaced by estsire and could, perhaps, be more correctly translated in this case as "potential" wife's father. On the other hand the marriage of an older brother need not entail a change in terminology unless the man married a woman who referred to his kudia as eta (F); in which case kudia was replaced by estsire (WF).

The relationship between those who employed the term pair estsire (WF) - esua (DH) was characterized by speech avoidance. Both men were married to women in the same moiety but of different generations.

Like all men they were competitors but since they were separated so widely in years the advantage in hunting was on the side of the younger man who in time inevitably began to function as the main "provider" in a domestic group in which both were members. Barring an accident or debilitating illness the process in which the manifest differences between the older and younger became reversed presumably involved gradual changes over the years. No particular event signified that such a change had taken place and no particular strain emerged between estsire and esua while this was occurring. In principle, neither man shared sexual access to their respective spouses and neither was thought to be in a functional relationship with both women. There was no implication that the younger was replacing the older in the latter's relationship with his wife. The younger simply provided raw materials for his spouse who shared such things with her mother. The mother, in her turn, behaved as she had always done with respect to her spouse. Thus
an _estsiær_ was fed and clothed because of the efforts of his _esua_ and there was no necessary reason why the hierarchical distance between them was being minimized on this account; indeed _estsiær_ were (and still are) known to construe such an arrangement as an indication their "power" was still recognized as superior by their _esua_. The extensive activities of the younger man could thus be also interpreted as an indication of subservience in which the _esua_ was humbly and obediently exerting himself on behalf of his _estsiær_ just as he was thought to have previously behaved with respect to his _estząæ_ (MB). An apparent reversal of ability could, therefore, be looked at in more than one way and in this case it usually was. The interpretation that a man was being subservient even though he was the more able hunter and provider was voiced only by those who were viewing such a situation from the point of view of an _estsiær_ (WF) regarding his _esua_ (DH). The same informants did not interpret their own previous behavior in this way at all and, in retrospect, they virtually always saw the activity not as subservient but as an act of kindness and munificence. The term "bride service", might loosely be used in this context, but it does not denote obligatory service on the part of the younger, it emerges simply as a strategic and one-sided view of activity.

The perspective of males and females from which we have examined various combinations of "co-providers" and assorted "dependents" indicate that, beyond the demands of demographic imbalance and material necessity, there existed certain
limitations to both the size and composition of Kasini domestic groups. These limitations may be understood as a consequence of the fact that married male siblings and parallel cousins preferred not to stay in close proximity. We have discussed at length why this was so but it should be re-emphasized that "brothers" were not obliged to avoid each other, they learned to do so and avoidance did not simply involve a lack of verbal interaction but, wherever possible, physical separation. Therefore, we would like very briefly to examine those conditions in which "brothers" learned to behave in this way.

When Ego married he usually lived in a domestic group composed of his wife, her unmarried siblings and her parents. Others would have been present from time to time but such a grouping, either in one or two hearths, would constitute a more or less enduring cluster of people. If Ego's _sla_ (WB) were unmarried and functioned as a "provider" then Ego, his wife and their children would usually leave and join up with others at different times of the year. In the interim his wife's parents and younger siblings would be provided for by his _sla_ (WB) and perhaps _espeh_ (unmarried WZ). Eventually, however, his _espeh_ would get married and this would result in someone joining the domestic group whom Ego would probably address as _esk idla_ (B-) and this would produce an arrangement in which married "brothers" were living in the same domestic group.

There is no need to re-iterate what sorts of strain were inherent to such a combination of males but, in our opinion, it is doubtful that the existence of the _esk idla_ would provoke
Ego's immediate departure for we can think of no way in which he could have envisioned what would eventually unfold until it actually took place. Both "brothers" it must be remembered were in open communication with their respective spouses and they could tease and laugh with one another quite publicly. In addition there was no rule forbidding sexual access to their respective wives. As adults, Ego and his $es^{	ext{d}}$ $id^{	ext{a}}$ would be no longer subject to the vicissitudes of inexperience that might have favoured neither in their developing skills as hunters and it is likely that one of them would emerge as a more successful "provider". The suggestions of the more successful hunter would be favoured in discussions as to where the camp might be moved and his wife would be in a position to distribute goods to other women in the camp. How long it took before the implications of this began to bear heavily on the less successful hunter would probably depend on the sensitivity of the person involved. When it did occur it was, perhaps, simply evident in a gradual moroseness, a disinclination to endorse even the most sensible suggestion of the other, a tendency to be taciturn and eschew badinage and to show a preference to hunt alone. Any of these kinds of behavior could easily give the more successful hunter reason to ponder what might be the cause and if he concluded that it was himself he would also have reason to feel alarmed and to fear possible retaliation through sorcery. Whether successful or unsuccessful as a hunter those who left the domestic group were usually the older married daughter, with spouse and children. This did not mean the man and his wife never formed a domestic group with any of these people again,
for the wife would still wish to visit her mother and sister, but instead of being separated for five weeks or so they would only join up with them for a few weeks once or twice annually. In Chapter ten we shall see how and why such separations between mother and daughters could last for a few years at a time, and could become permanent between sisters.

If we follow this pattern to its conclusion we can see that through a series of departures by older sisters and their spouses, the mother would finally be left with her youngest daughter since there would be no reason why her spouse would be encouraged to leave. As a unit, however, the relationship between mother and youngest daughter was only sometimes realized (cf. Diagram 8.4) and it emerged as an empirical consequence of other factors. In itself it had no recognized social significance whatever, and the reciprocal pair \( \_{anx} \) (M) - \( \_{esta} \) (D) were the only categories that obtained between mothers and daughters.

We can see from the above that no large face to face group of women in the same moiety was ever likely to emerge. This was not because the women would not choose to do so had they been given the opportunity but because their spouses developed strained relations and preferred to avoid one another. An arrangement such as the following was therefore bound to be short lived:
This was because the "brothers" not the "sisters" wished to avoid each other. The "sisters" had no objection to being in close proximity and although they seldom realized it empirically they had nothing against such an arrangement in principle. This is most clearly borne out by the fact that Kasini did practise polygyny and the fact that a polyandrous union never seems to have emerged as a permanent relationship. Given the empirical facts of Kasini marriages and the importance of demonstrating a functional complementarity in such relationships the above diagram can easily be transformed into either form of polygamy. As a matter of interpretation it was only seen as potentially polygamous and to this the men, not the women, objected. However, if married siblings of the same sex tended to avoid each other important social forces exist that limit the size of domestic groups.

In Chapter three we argued that factors of age, mobility and distribution of food resources offered only partial explanations of Kasini domestic group size. These factors set limits which Kasini never seemed to have come close to realizing. We still do not possess information which fully explains limitation of group size but if we include in our considerations the implications of avoidance between married siblings and parallel cousins of the same sex the matter does become more comprehensible. There are, in fact, only a few likely combinations and most of these we present below:
We have omitted here the possibility of a domestic group composed solely of an able-bodied married couple. We feel this to have been possible and even probable for short periods of time but we have no evidence on a group of this size. Nor do we have evidence of a group as small as diagram (6) above.

The remainder of these examples all represent actual group sizes and although we have arbitrarily provided each couple with only two children and conveniently made them of the opposite sex the above diagrams clearly indicate, especially in diagram (9), the implications of what might be called a structure of preferences
for understanding the size of Kasini domestic groups. If we assume there were seldom more than two adult generations living at one time we can see that diagram (9), which numbers only 12 individuals, can only be enlarged by adding unmarried individuals to the group. The most likely way this could occur is that they be produced by the group members themselves. No married couple could be introduced into the senior or medial generation in this diagram without involving a male sibling or parallel cousin of one of the men already there. Consequently, if the adult male members of this group had any choice, the group, aside from birth or adoption, is near maximum size as outlined and this we suggest is the main sociological reason which limited Kasini domestic groups to roughly 15 individuals.

The above combinations involve arrangements of categories of people which emerge as a result of simultaneously considering the preferences of both males and females. They were not recognized as preferred group-types by the Kasini and genealogical linkages indicated were not a parameter of such arrangements although they did exist quite frequently. In all of the movements and shifts from one domestic group to another few relationships between actual people seemed to have endured. Parents were separated from their children as the latter matured, siblings of the same sex became separated after marriage, and siblings of opposite sex only occasionally lived together in the same domestic group after they were married. Regardless of the intimacy of prior interaction both radical changes in social circumstances and material necessity required most people to separate. Once
separated they would often gradually move into a new ambience, separation would become sustained and in some cases permanent. Former intimates could thus eventually end up being on the peripheries of their respective social horizons and the application of "my people" and "other people" shifted to accommodate such changes. In all of this there seems to have been only one kind of relationship which endured the vicissitudes of circumstance and functioned as a perdurable unit in space -- the married couple.

A man and his wife (or wives) were the only class of people who remained in close proximity and who did not separate either out of material necessity or the kinds of social pressures we have discussed. In saying this we are speaking of established marriages that had survived the initial trial period and although men were known to have abandoned their wives after they had produced a number of children this was infrequent. We know of only three instances in which this took place prior to 1945; one man, for reasons unknown, abandoned his wife and children and left Kasini territory entirely, and the two others intermittently left their respective wives and returned to them throughout their married lives. But, broadly speaking, spouses lived in one domestic group and the options for inclusion or exclusion from other domestic groups were shared. In time the designation of es'dena (my people) employed by the husband became identical in practice to that employed by the wife. The couple constituted a single unit and they were situated by each other and by others in, socially speaking, the same place. This does not mean that
social horizons of both were coincident, for each brought to the marriage their respective orientation to prior acquaintances. However, in practice these two orientational frameworks became one and what eventually emerged was a structure of acquaintanceship which was acceptable to both husband and wife. In this sense the married couple constituted the only concrete and enduring expression of a "nos" in Kasini organization. In domestic arrangements it was only the marital nos which remained intact. As "providers" in a domestic group the married couple was variously bounded by different classes of individuals in the ascending and descending generations. Most frequently these involved a parent or parents or parallel cousins of the parents of the woman, but as we have seen they could also involve the parents of the man. Virtually always the descending generation involved children in the same moiety as the woman but these could be her own children or the children of any same sexed sibling or parallel cousin of either the man or the woman. As "dependents" the married couple also remained intact and any "provider" who assumed responsibility for one in practice assumed it for both.
SOCIAL DISTANCE, SPACE AND THE AMBIGUITY OF POWER

The key to the practical implications of all forms of Kasini social classification rests on the interdependent duality of the material and transcendental. When conjoined in the individual they were located, in a static sense, in the brain and the body, the former being hidden, enclosed, and known to be amorphous, the latter being tangible, observable and possessing well defined parts and a recognizable form. In a dynamic sense these dimensions were manifest in thought and action, and it was at this level that this fundamental Kasini duality was related to social classification. Action, of course, is observable, and any framework of sustained interaction suggests an orientation from which intent may be inferred. From this point of view an alter-ego is, in theory (cf. Schultz 1962:67-96), at least partly understood by virtue of Ego projecting himself into the observed situation in which Alter is acting, and, from the basis of prior experience, understanding the activity by interpolating the end result and imputing a familiar set of motives to Alter. We have no doubt that in many instances something like this process of projection occurs, but as the Kasini recognized and as Goffman (eg.1957) has so frequently made clear this perspective suffers from the serious flaw of considering actions as if they were more than merely suggestive of intentions, motives, and interests. Only the most naive do not make some allowance for the black-box of another's mind and for the possibility that what is said and done may be a front or contrived presentation which
is designed to mislead, and which conceals much more about motives, interests and intentions than it reveals.

The possibility that what is said and done may not reflect what is meant and intended is an endemic and perhaps specifically human feature of communication (cf. Watslawick, 1967:60-67,99-107), which all people are especially sensitive to in situations involving competitors and strangers. Scarcity of resources, which is a basic postulate of all competitive relations, implies that somebody stands to win at another's expense. Behavior of any kind in such a situation allows for the possibility of a one-sided rather than joint pay-off. The relationship between strangers does not allow for so narrow a description but it suffers from the same imprecision concerning expectations. In the first situation there is a backlog of shared experience and activity which gives an unsettled quality to the order of interaction. In the second situation it is precisely because there is no backlog of shared experience that the order of interaction is unsettled and poorly defined. And in both cases the question "What is the other fellow really up to?" lurks behind their mutual cognizance of what the other is saying and doing. With any group of people such doubts can never be nullified entirely, but they can be partially resolved if a reciprocal order of narrowly defined relations is shared, which is not the case with strangers, and minimized greatly if the activities which are engaged in do not in some way place in question a particular order of relations. If this occurs the simple fact of sustaining contact can produce for the participants a confident belief that the appearance is also the reality.
The fact that the Kasini saw much of their social life in terms of the above sorts of issues is reflected in both the variety of ways they represented social relations and in how they behaved in certain kinds of situations. To develop this interpretation a useful point of departure is the idea of "Kasini man" even though in no demonstrable sense is this a datum or baseline upon which everything else is built.

We have stated that "an individual achieved contact with the transcendental independently of his relationship with others". This referred to the Kasini belief that every individual had access to resources which were not derived from nor constrained by his relationship with others. Through the medium of every individual had a quite unique access to specific classes of animal-people who provided the information to cope with the contingencies of the everyday material world in which he lived. "Power", in its broadest sense, seems to have been understood as the conjunction of the material and transcendental dimensions and was manifest in any specific instance of an individual coping with a problem at hand. Thus the individual was understood to be simultaneously and necessarily constituted by both dimensions. However, because contact with the realm of was a private matter the constraints placed on an individual by animal-people were generally unknown and this posed something of a problem. If it was true on the one hand that everyone required contact with animal-people in order to acquire power there was, on the other hand, no guarantee that this private resource, which could be used for the public benefit, would in fact be used to this end. In other words power had a
profoundly ambiguous and amoral quality; for it could be used either to further the interests and welfare of others or exercised solely in the advance of individual interests at the expense of others. Understandably, whichever of these alternatives was judged to be more likely was a matter of some concern to all Kasini, and it was directly reflected in how they categorized their relationships with one another.

The Kasini utilized two main styles of social categorization, which, in their application, reflected relative degrees of social stability and reliability of expectations. The first involved kin terms, and, as we have already seen in Chapter six, within this mode the Kasini recognized degrees of uncertainty regarding the power of different classes of kinsmen. Furthermore, attendant to this set of categories there were various rules of conduct which, if observed, ensured that those with inferior power were not injured or weakened by contact or proximity with those of superior power. All of those whom Ego referred to with a kin term very roughly fell within the more encompassing category es'den (my people). The second style, which is significantly less elaborate and refined than the first, involved the categorization of vaguely defined clusters of people by reference to place names. In future we will refer to these as "other people" names. In the diagram below we situate these two modes of categories, along with others to be discussed, in a continuous series emanating from Ego. This general diagram constitutes a gradation of recognized classes of people whose power was judged to be more or less dependable.
Table 9.1
SOCIAL DISTANCE REFLECTED IN KASINI SOCIAL CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Bushmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My People</td>
<td>Other People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Moiety</td>
<td>Opposite Moiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGO</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>Mind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to appreciate the pragmatic implications of the different opposed categories in this diagram it is necessary to assume that each pair of categories reflects, in various ways, the opposed and fundamental properties of all Kasini in a social milieu. By doing so we will also see that the diagram above consists of a taxonomic hierarchy of homologous relations which may be read as a series: body:mind; female:male; own moiety:opposite moiety; my people:other people; people:bushmen. To achieve this understanding, however, we must first briefly review and also elaborate on our knowledge of Kasini man.

An individual was born with a mind and a body. As a child his mind was a latent capacity which had no independent contact with animal-people. His ability to survive was thus assumed to be directly brought about by contact with those who had power — most importantly this involved his mother, who provided him with protection and physical nurture. As an adolescent he acquired power of his own by contacting animal-people, and during this stage he periodically went mad as he attempted to achieve some control and balance in this new
relationship. His madness was manifest in unpredictable, unorthodox, and sometimes violent and frightening behavior. There was some danger during this period that he would die and that his mental activity would destroy his material form. If he survived this struggle — as most did — he was reintegrated at once into the ordered set of social relations which had existed prior to his madness. There was, however, a subtle difference in this reintegration; for the individual was no longer coping, as it were, by proxy, since he had achieved personal and direct contact with animal-people. This gave him a new social potency which would become increasingly significant as time passed. Whereas before he had managed to survive by virtue of the unquestionably superior power of others, he now functioned as a self-contained manifestation of power. Even so it was rather uneasily assumed that this power was somehow aligned with others in his matriline. This alignment was uneasy not because it was not to some extent true, but because it could not be demonstrated to be true in any final sense. It was one thing to think that moiety membership was indicative of a likelihood; it was quite another to believe that a method of labelling a person was necessarily a reflection of an actual state of affairs. A person's power, after all, was not given to him or ascribed to him at birth but rather achieved in a private struggle in which he was given no help and where he made his own secret pacts and agreements with animal-people.

The broad social significance of the private nature of an individual's mind in the context of power stems from what the Kasini believed the individual capable of doing both to and for
others. We have already discussed some of the benefits to be derived from the power of another person. Curing illness, prophecy, controlling the movements of game, and providing protection from the harmful intent or negligent activity of others were cited as illustrations of power exercised in the public interest. In these we have clear examples of powerful people who were also believed to be good (dena Ti a lit. good man; since the 1940's also a Kasini translation for Christ and the Christian god).

However, in citing these cases, especially the last, something of a question remains: who or what brought about the misfortune that required such intervention and protective measures in the first place? With few exceptions the answer to this question involved a reference to either ghosts or people.

Ghosts, it will be remembered, were the dead who stayed on earth to be reborn or to redress a wrong done to them while still alive. People, as we have seen, fell into any of a graded and continuous set of categories emanating from Ego, and it was in terms of how they were categorized that they were also assumed to be committed in varying degrees to different social and economic concerns. In a way we will presently modify this continuum of categories corresponded on the ground to a spatial arrangement like the following:
The horizontal plane represents geographical space and more or less coincident with the spatial boundaries inhabited by those whom Ego recognized as "my people", he also recognized something which he referred to as _es'kałja_ (my land) which could mean either the land where Ego grew up as a child or the land where he was currently living. Within the latter virtually all people were referred to and addressed by kin terms. The different domestic groups that formed consisted of individuals with whom Ego sustained interaction and face to face contact. It was also within this ambience that the incidence of something like sorcery seems to have been most prevalent. This involved observable techniques such as casting spells and using potions and fetishes in order to inflict misfortune on particular individuals or simply to influence their behavior in some way to suit one's own interests. For the most part it is clear that they did involve set procedures which could be learned from another, and that could be used for any reason whatever. Our

---

1. What we have to say from this point on bears directly on what Helm (e.g.1968:118-125) and others have done in attempting to classify socio-territorial groupings among Mackenzie Athapaskans. These efforts conclude at approximately the stage indicated in the above diagram. To our way of thinking this is but a point of departure.

2. The customary anthropological distinction between witchcraft and sorcery, which would seem to apply here, did not receive linguistic recognition by the Kasini — although in the current vernacular the word "witching" refers to many observable techniques which could be used to influence the course of human affairs. In the Kasini culture both seem to have been thought of as a kind of ability or power and — just as the mother's _kunts_ was used to protect her children — either could result in benefits or misfortunes for others.
evidence suggests that they were directly employed between people who disagreed with one another, who were envious of one another, or who found themselves in direct competition for the same resources — all of which involved some kind of direct contact.

The use of such techniques involved a specific focus of some kind. Most frequently this involved another individual and at the very most a cluster of people in close association. Care had to be taken, however, for it was believed that if the person initiating such activity did not have superior power to his intended victim(s) then the full weight of his spell might then fall on himself. In the event that a person did fall ill, then a shaman was brought in to diagnose the cause — which need not involve sorcery — and to try to effect a cure.

Our information on this aspect of Kasini social life is negligible. The activity of intentionally trying to harm a kinsman was considered shameful, and no informant ever admitted to having employed such methods against another. In the half dozen cases on which we do have some information, only two involved verbal threats of impending disaster which passed between aggressor and intended victim via a third party in an attempt to force the one to acquiesce to the wishes of the other. In the four other cases, all involving deaths, it was a matter of singling out a likely protagonist-cause after the deaths had occurred. This, for the informant, involved considerable familiarity with the victim and an ability to assess the relative significance of the events in his past which might suggest one person over another as the cause. Such assessment, however, was not beyond question,
and in one of these cases two informants singled out quite
different causes; one, a ghost, the other, a living person.

We do not feel free to go into this matter in much
greater detail. With one exception the cases we know of all
involve people who are still alive. To isolate for analysis their
participation in these activities would necessarily involve an
examination of the informant's position vis-a-vis the accused
and the victim. In a population as small as the Kasini we do not
feel we could present this material in a sufficiently anonymous
manner so that it would protect both the feelings and the
confidences of those involved. Consequently, we will restrict
ourselves to a summation of the aggressor-victim relations in
terms of social categories; three involved $\text{kudia}^{(B+)} -$
$\text{esdila}^{(B-)}$, one involved $\text{edada}^{(Z+)} - \text{edatsa}^{(Z-)}$, one
involved $\text{estse}^{(WF)} - \text{esue}^{(DSP)}$, and one involved
$\text{asaz}^{\text{a}(\text{friend})} - \text{asaz}^{\text{a}(\text{friend})}$. As scanty as these are
statistically, they do indicate a bias towards social strain between
$B+$ and $B-$; this we have examined closely in the previous chapter.

We have no way of knowing how extensively employed were
the above kinds of practises and, because they could be secretly
engaged in and were considered shameful, neither, should we assume,
does any one else. However, as in so many other cultures it was
not so much their practise that was an important influence on
social relations but rather the widely held belief that such
knowledge existed and could be put to use. It is our opinion
that this belief as much as anything else encouraged the Kasini
to avoid, if possible, any direct confrontation. They would rather
not say anything than say "no" to a proposal or request, and they would rather separate and go their own way rather than argue and fight with each other. To do otherwise would place two parties in direct disagreement and this could lead to people becoming na'asaGro (bad friends). With the added implication that people who felt this way about each other were the most likely to try and harm each other through sorcery, any open disagreement was potentially a serious matter. Consequently, a person who proposed something that was generally thought to be questionable, unwise or unsuitable was not apparently received with a straight out verbal negation -- if anything his proposal was received with silence.

As an answer silence has some obvious strategic advantages; for it is only under exceptional circumstances that it does not communicate a number of things simultaneously. No doubt, the Kasini often intended this although to the extent that it was a style of communicating many must have also engaged in it as much out of habit as out of any conscious fear of possible retaliation. Apart from the unlikely interpretation "nobody heard me" a response of silence clearly leaves a proposal up in the air, and the person who made it is never certain whether it is being mulled over, whether some agree but do not want to commit themselves just yet, whether some are waiting to hear all suggestions before they voice an opinion, or whether some actually disagree. The one thing that is not communicated is who might actually dispute the proposal. From our own experience in present day Kasini domestic groups, the advantages of a proposal for collective action is
only very infrequently argued by the person who makes it. If it finds approval others will point out the advantages and its various merits. The person who initiates the idea is frequently left out of the conversation altogether. If the proposal seems highly questionable to begin with people will simply lower their eyes, stare into the distance, or busy themselves with something.

In English, we have many ways of classifying a social silence, and the phenomenon itself possesses a multiple semantic quality (stoney, embarrassed, eerie, thoughtful, etc.). As a communicative act it is, by its non-verbal nature, highly ambiguous. It is not because it lacks meaning but because it possesses so much that it lends itself so well to the kind of social situation we have been describing. When a person presents an idea to a group it is only in very special circumstances that he may conclude that the silence of one is the silence of all.

To avoid direct confrontation by invoking ambiguity seems therefore to have functioned to lessen or at least buffer the development of strained relations, but it could, for the Kasini, never entirely nullify such developments. Over time, assuming the proposals of some were never acted upon, such individuals might come to feel they were not near the social center of things and that others constantly maintained the initiative in guiding the course of their behavior and of camp life generally. If they felt that such peripheral positioning was unwarranted or, more important, that it implied a weakened relationship between themselves and certain subordinates, then they might decide to move, and Kasini camps did break-up to
form spatially separated domestic groups for this reason. In some ways, however, spatial separation contained as a message, some of the strategic ambiguity inherent to silence; for although the splitting of a camp could mean its co-members had become "bad friends" it could also mean that there were sound material reasons for this behavior. Allegedly, all imminent separations of people were discussed as a practical economic matter, and we have no evidence to suggest that people ever went their separate ways by publicly mentioning discontent with each others' company. If our own latter day experience with Kasini domestic groups are any indication, such discontent was expressed only after a separation had been made. At other times material considerations did become paramount, not as a rationalization but as an exigent fact which had to be accommodated, and often true disappointment attended the necessary separation that ensued. But even if the real reason for separation was tactfully rationalized in terms of material necessity, the result in the long run, assuming the parties remained separate, could be roughly the same as if they had parted "bad friends". This was the result of two things: (1) people in different domestic groups were to some extent economic rivals, and (2) the Kasini recognized a crude correlation between power alignment, frequency of interaction, and spatial proximity.

In Chapter six we mentioned that the Kasini believed that animal-people were able in some way to look to the interests of those who were in contact with them even when the individuals themselves might not be conscious of where their best interests might lie. These interests were primarily, but not exclusively, exploitative in nature. For others outside of an area, and hence
not in sustained contact with those within, the very fact that 
the area's residents were engaged in successful exploitation was 
evidence that the power of some among them was sufficiently strong 
to cope with all the contingencies the area had to offer. In 
other words there existed tangible evidence that the members 
within had a workable, ordered and harmonious relationship, in 
the realm of *di*, to the things (i.e. animals, ghosts, etc.) 
that inhabited the area in which they lived. Furthermore, 
because people in different areas were committed to the current 
demands of the domestic group of which they were a part, there 
was necessarily some doubt as to whether or to what extent they 
would be willing to exercise their powers in conjunction with 
or on behalf of those whom they were not currently in contact. 
If for various reasons a domestic group found it necessary to 
move into a new area, such considerations influenced their 
assessment of where and how far they might go. To the extent 
that no major move was required, there was usually no problem 
for all domestic groups in one vicinity had occasional 
commensal relationships. Beyond this association of acquaintances 
there were others with whom they had only intermittent contact 
at most and whom they categorized by reference to place names. 
These other people (i.e. those not referred to by kin terms) 
were clearly committed to the welfare of a quite different 
association of people. If, when they were moving into the region 
in which these others lived, there occurred any sustained lack 
of success in the hunt, any illness or any damage to equipment, 
and the like, it was automatically construed as a sign that the
power of these others was somehow being used to protect their interests by discouraging the intrusion of newcomers. This in no way was thought to be a matter of conscious intent on the part of the extant residents, who in any case might not even suspect that people were moving into the area in which they were living; it was thought of rather vaguely as the protective penumbra of their power over the land in which they lived. This could only be overcome by the newcomers if they possessed equal or superior power of their own with which to ward off any ill effects.

We can see from the above that, although the act of separation did not necessarily entail bad feelings and ill will between people, spatial separation itself and the decreased interaction it involved did contain a significant and mainly pejorative connotation. It was pejorative in the sense that it implied a diminished confidence in expectations and hence a diminished sense of orderliness in interaction. When it came right down to it, they simply did not know what to expect from others with whom they interacted rarely or not at all and, not knowing, the Kasini, rather than leaving their appreciation of another in abeyance, prejudged the situation by expecting the worst. They had, as we have seen, good reason for doing so on the most fundamental grounds.

Internal coherence — that is to say the balanced relationship between mind and body — was something which Kasini developed and achieved. Somehow, privately, this occurred, but not without a struggle and not without involving considerable danger to himself and to others; for this reason an individual
would always remain partly unclassifiable to his associates. On the one hand, by virtue of the articulate and recognizable form of his body, he could be categorized as a person (dena); on the other, there was his mind, a non-empirical and inherently enigmatic entity. When he began to acquire power the individual did and said things that nobody could anticipate or channel, he was considered temporarily mad mešudite ndua, and his behavior was disorderly and for this very reason frightening. Because of this his power, that is his effective capabilities, possessed an undetermined and individualistic quality, and the question of his social allegiance and how this power might be aligned was, therefore, always in some doubt. It was also a matter of crucial social importance.

The extent to which another was categorized more or less precisely than dena was contingent on what assumptions could be reasonably made concerning his power and how it might be used. On the more intimate and reliable side there was the general category es'dena (my people) which referred to all those with whom Ego sustained interaction and who thus lived in the same general area. It encompassed those who were customarily referred to and addressed by kin terms. As we have already seen in Chapter seven, kin terms, which constituted the majority of Kasini social categories, were directly related to relative degrees of power and power alignment. Within this framework an individual was assumed to be most intimately related, both in body and mind, to his mother anke with whom, at one time, he had been physically united. Less directly, but at times just as intimately this relationship also included his mother's mother
Others in the same moiety as himself were not assumed to be so intimately related although, as evidenced by the unilineal inheritance of power, their power was not intrinsically dangerous to Ego. By contrast, if certain precautions were not taken, the power of those in the opposite moiety could be extremely dangerous and even lethal.

The internal structure and face to face contact associated with those categorized as "my people" was in direct contrast to "other people" who were categorized by reference to place names. Categories such as ṭuča denṭa (big water people), peli ḷẹk denṭa (Pelly lake people), etc., referred to vaguely circumscribed and internally undifferentiated aggregates of people. Some of these people Ego might have met occasionally at a trapping post, and some he would only have heard of from others. The difference between "my people" and "other people" is that the former was internally structured and implied frequent contact with specific individuals, whereas the latter was internally amorphous and referred to anybody who lived in a general and rather vaguely circumscribed region Ego did not inhabit at the time. These "others" were nevertheless "people" in that something was known about them on either a first or second hand basis. In other words, at some time either Ego himself or somebody he referred to as a kinsman had seen and interacted, however briefly, with these others and this superficial but empirical knowledge of them was sufficient reason to include them within the general category "people". This categorization of others as "people" clearly implied a recognition of similarity, but this did not in itself allow for the conclusion that relations would be necessarily
congenial or co-operative. Indeed, for Ego to refer to an aggregate of people with anything less intimate than es'dena, it meant that he assumed out of hand that, just as he and his associates were not particularly concerned with their best interests, they would not be greatly concerned with his. In this sense the category "other people" was clearly understood as an "alteri nos".

Beyond the realm of anybody who could be categorized as a "person" were the "bushmen". This term, which is widespread in the English vernacular of many northern Athapaskans, is, for the Kasini, a substitute word for na'kani, which can be more accurately translated as "bad, mean, and strange thing". From the empirical point of view, many diverse characteristics were attributed to the na'kani and it is because of its uncertain status as a substantive entity that we have some clue as to its affective significance as a social category. The na'kani was variously thought to be giant sized or very tiny, to possess human form and habits, or to be covered with hair, to make strange noises and to eat raw meat, to desire Kasini children in order to raise them as their own, or to desire children in order to eat them as food. It could also be capriciously malicious, and when people were away from their camps it would whistle to them or call them in a familiar voice in an attempt to get them lost. These different and occasionally contradictory properties constitute an amalgam which does not cohere to give a clear and unequivocal definition of a reverse picture of the Kasini. Some inversions exist, to be sure, and for certain Kasini we spoke to on this matter, na'kani seems to have been thought of as something
which was "not us". It thus clearly constitutes a definition of the social residuum. For these individuals the geographical placement of this strange being was beyond the boundaries of all those they recognized, or were prepared to recognize, as "people", and consequently, as their knowledge of others increased during the fur trade, their geographical placement of this unpleasant thing receded. Today, in answer to the question "Where are the na'kani?" we have been variously answered with a "don't know" or "maybe what you call Cree people". To those who answered in this way it seems that the boundaries of the social residuum have been pushed out to the limits of all the named groups of which they have ever heard anyone speak. There was, however, another meaning to na'kani which did not have any particular association with space, and regardless of whether or not they understood the word in the former sense all people we spoke to on this matter appreciated it as referring to something which was simultaneously both "mad" and "bad". There was, insofar as the Kasini knew, no reason for the na'kani to be malicious or to harbour ill will towards them. Nevertheless, they were so inclined, and in being so, or rather in the allegations concerning their capabilities to this end, they emerged as something which was perverse, perverted and capricious. In other words the na'kani was nothing less than incomprehensible and as such constituted at least a partial definition of the Kasini intellectual residuum. What was their appearance? -- it was unclear. What were their motives? -- these were uncertain. What were their habits? -- these were often loathsome. What were their methods? -- these were invariably cunning and full of trickery. From this point
of view the na'kani were the converse of everything the Kasini considered necessary for a balanced, well ordered and harmonious social relationship; they were, in effect, the Kasini idea of social chaos.

These various categories and classes of categories that we have considered reflect, relative to each other, a similarity of relationship. On the one extreme we have the individual dena, who, as an empirical entity localized in space, possessed a familiar bodily form and comprehensible needs and interests. On the other extreme we have na'kani whose whereabouts, interests and physical form were all a matter of varied and contradictory opinion. We can think of these two categories being opposed in many ways and it would be well to consider a few of these before selecting any of them. A person was a tangible, empirical entity who was constituted by a particular arrangement of parts, e.g., arms, legs, head, etc. On the level of observation this clearly defined and familiar heterogeneity reflected a coherent order of relationship that was common to all. But to recognize another as being a dena was to classify him, and this, for the Kasini, involved going beyond the external form, which was there for anyone to see, and assuming knowledge about his internal nature: his interests, his motives, his needs and his general capabilities or powers. By contrast, experience with na'kani was, if not non-empirical, at least oblique and vicarious. From the stories told about this creature, even his physical appearance was unclear, and although some tentatively suggested that he could change his appearance at will, others were not so sure that he possessed
this capacity. Simply from the empirical viewpoint, therefore, *na'kani* was physically imprecise and indefinite. As a substantive entity what then were the Kasini to judge about this thing which corresponded to so much in general and yet to nothing in particular? In being undecided about its external appearance what assumption could be made about its internal nature? The overall impression given in Kasini accounts was that of the unexpected and unreliable; for *na'kani* did not seem to possess the same interests and needs as *dena*, and his actions were often quite unaccountable in their terms.

We have introduced a number of opposed terms in the above comparison, and it seems that in their different and partial ways tangible/intangible, order/disorder, familiar/unfamiliar, empirical/non-empirical, coherent/incoherent, heterogeneity/homogeneity are all in some way germane to the differences between

3. Recently Needham (1973:122-125) has written an exegesis on the English word "belief" and in doing so remarks that: "Belief is indeed a word of extremely ramified and extended uses, but there is essentially nothing unusual about it in these respects. Its use often appears confused, also, but in this regard it is merely like other psychological verbs ..." In some respects *na'kani* seems to function as a psychological noun which defies any "unitary or regular interpretation" for the Kasini; but unlike "belief" which, as Needham argues, is a word that "...is not likely to be a discriminable inner state, and that.... phenomenally it has no specific features", *na'kani* seems very much to be a commentary on an experience and also, in principle, an observable phenomenon, i.e., social disorder and chaotic social relations.

4. We have used here, in a few cases, only one term in a specific context and not its contrary in another. In most instances the implied opposition seems to be clear enough, but we feel some question may arise concerning the term "homogeneity". The opposition between hetero./homo. must, like all the others be understood as analytical devices only -- idiomatically to speak of the infinite and unordered many (as the Kasini did regarding the physical attributes of *na'kani*) is the same as speaking of a totally unified oneness; for neither invites sensory discrimination nor thereby suggests an order of things. Hence the relevance of homogeneity in this instance.
dena_ and na'kani_ as these have been described. They only fall together as bundles of opposed properties, however, if it is understood that the Kasini were in all cases interested in the internal and hidden dimensions of others. To this end they relied on externals to provide the suggestive clue to what might be reasonably concluded concerning what another was about and to what end his power might be employed. As we have seen the mind of all others was in certain respects hidden and in doubt; for nobody really knew what private pacts another person had made with the animal-people with whom he was in contact. Given this datum, the most intimate and reliable contact was assumed to exist between Ego and his aníka_ (which need not entail genetrix). Beyond the mother were those related in the matriline (i.e. those in the same moiety). Next came those in the opposite moiety, and in combination all of these people Ego interacted with frequently and categorized as es'dena_. Those with whom he did not sustain contact he categorized as "other people" and it was automatically assumed that these others would be using their powers entirely in their own interests, and in these Ego had little part. Beyond this there was na'kani_ of whom Ego possessed little understanding and with whom no orderly interaction was

5. It would be erroneous for the reader to conclude at this point that there seems to be a contradiction between what we say here and our earlier claim that no absolute moral or ethical weighting attends the transcendental and material dimension. The mind was dangerous, it is true, but it was also a requisite for survival and hence equally a source of safety and security — it is for this reason also that we may speak of the ambiguity of power.
considered possible; from na'kani he expected the worst and, as the stories go, he got it.

If we return now to the chart of Kasini social categories and the diagram showing how these categories appeared on the ground, we can see that by centering Ego spatially, there existed a graded series of categories which emphasized degrees of something rather than disjunctively categorizing others into qualitatively different segments. When we take these categories as a set and attempt to understand them as representing a system, it is only by recognizing that each category signifies different arrangements of identical properties that the total set achieves coherence. This method of categorizing others roughly corresponds to what Turner (1967:116) has referred to as an "analogue-model", and it is to be contrasted with what is usually called a segmentary model in the sense that the emphasis is on recognizing a conjunctive both/and rather than a disjunctive either/or quality in the total set of categories. The incomprehensible and chaotic na'kani does after all find correspondence in the intermittent "madness" of every individual, however intimate and reliable Ego may consider his relationship to him at other times. Thus we seem to have a continuum along which, in keeping with our former distinction, the material and transcendental aspects of others were weighted differently. This might lead us to conclude that in order to have a clear idea about how this framework of categories corresponded to the objective facts of who actually interacted with whom, all we would really have to know is what area Ego designated as es'kaija (my land) and from this base line trace out a "web of relations" that serially and gradually indicated "my people".
"other people", and so on. It might also lead us to suspect that a spatial correspondence existed between those who were designated as "my people" and who were referred to by kin terms, and those who were of close genealogical connection. This, however, was not the case; for people of quite remote genealogical connection often lived in the same area and included each other in the category "my people", whereas people who were of very close genealogical connection often referred to each other as "other people" (i.e. people of such and such a place)^.  

At this point we must abandon the diagram that indicates that social categories and geography were in any direct correspondence because the passing heuristic benefits derived from this simple model are much too static and do not in the least accommodate the "orientational technique" that pervaded the Kasini application of social categories. Neither land, in the sense of a specific territory, nor genealogical connections constituted the base line from which relationship was reckoned; rather the individual himself and where, for various social and economic reasons, he was currently situated constituted his point of departure. This meant that the designation "my land" and the category "my people" were not restricted to specific empirical objects in their application, and that social and spatial boundaries of inclusion and exclusion were not only rather fuzzy but were also subject to change.

6. To translate Es'dena as "relative" or "kinsmen" would be to gloss over this significant fact even though all those categorized as "my people" were referred to by kin terms and "other people" were not.
It is appropriate at this juncture to say something about the common and, in this study, frequently used distinction between terms of address and terms of reference, and also to elaborate on the Kasini social categories "friend" and "stranger". A Kasini addressed another with either a kin term or with the term (*asaga* (friend). Those with whom he was in contact as he grew up he addressed and referred to by kin terms. Presumably he was taught what terms were appropriate during the process of interaction. He established a kinship relation with others he met later as an adult by reckoning through a third party, who need not be present, whom both he and the others knew in common. This rudimentary process seems to have been very simple and a minimal amount of information was required. It appears to have gone something like this: "If A calls the third party C by the term (*kudia* (B+) and I call C by the term (*esta* (FB) then I must also call A by the term (*esta* ." If no third party could be decided upon then the two would reckon, if both recognized moiety membership, an appropriate reciprocal pair of terms on the basis of their relative ages. If one individual did not recognize any moiety affiliation the term (*asaga* (friend) was used if the two people were of approximately the same age. This term was only used between men and indicates that one of them came from the culture areas to the east or southeast which do not have moiety systems. We do not have any case of women using this term but neither do we have any evidence that non-Kasini women (i.e. adults) entered the area. One old informant
attributed the origin of the term to the few people? who entered the area from the region of the lower Liard river in the 1920's. In the application of kin terms the associates of "friends" behaved as if the "friends" addressed each other as cross-cousins (i.e. the term $\textit{sla}$ which, like $\textit{asaz}$, forms a non-polarized reciprocal pair). The term $\textit{asaz}$ did not itself achieve much currency for there was really almost no occasion to use it. Nevertheless, it entailed a non-kinship expression in a context where kin terms predominated, and its converse $\textit{na'asaz}$ (bad friend) prevailed as a convenient way of referring to a relationship between kinsmen which had become strained. In the current vernacular this term is used in assertions such as; "They are bad friends (to each other)" and "He is bad friends to me", etc.

Terms of reference consisted of three classes of social categories and these involved kin terms, terms for "other people" and the term $\textit{kistan}$ (stranger). The last of these was the least frequently used and seems to have been employed in situations where others were seen but not recognized and hence were not classifiable in a narrower and more precise manner. As far as we could gather, the term "stranger" was always eventually replaced by one of the other two kinds of terms. Aside from the exception already noted, all people were addressed by kin terms, although they were not all referred to as such.\(^8\) Ego both addressed and

\(^7\) These people consisted of a domestic group composed of a man and his children (no mother) and, arriving separately, a single adult man.

\(^8\) Everyone seems also to have had a personal name which was not used to address them. They were probably used to distinguish in discussion precisely whom one was speaking about for this would not necessarily be clear from the use of a kin term alone. Such names were usually acquired in infancy and frequently involved names like "little fat thighs", "baldy", etc.
referred to, with kin terms, all those he considered "my people" and with these people he sustained interaction. Those with whom he interacted less frequently he also addressed by kin terms, although he referred to them as "other people". This situation obtained even between those who were primary kin in the genealogical sense. In the course of their diverse movements through the region siblings often ended up referring to each other as being a "person of such and such a place" rather than by the relevant kin term.

As we have already argued, the set of social categories employed by the Kasini formed a continuum, and for any person to be categorized by Ego along this continuum implied degrees of confidence in the orderliness of the relationship between the two. However, because of the considerable internal movement resulting from both material and social considerations the same individuals were, in time, categorized in quite different ways. This was not a matter of face to face contact for with the exception of the term "friend" all were addressed by kin terms. It was a matter of reference, of talking about them and, indeed, thinking about them in which these changes in the application of social categories occurred.

Very roughly the designation "my land" corresponded with the application of the category "my people" although for the older generation the designation of the former often exceeded in space the application of the latter. Our evidence suggests that "my land" in such cases included an area that the older person felt confident enough to move into without having recourse
to the stronger protective power of a shaman. Most within this area involved those with whom Ego had at some time in the past engaged in sustained interaction. This did not prevent Ego from recognizing some social distance between himself and these others but, for the most part, this distance seems to have been highly negotiable in nature. "Other people" within the space "my land" could thus readily become "my people", as they probably had been in the past, if Ego and these others began to live in close proximity to each other. Beyond this ambience Ego recognized still others with whom interaction had been non-existent or much less frequent. At some arbitrary point in space Ego therefore recognized perimeters to "my land"; if Ego was an older woman it was at these points that the "willow ritual" was performed in an attempt to ensure safe passage if movement into the new territory was required. Occasionally such points coincided with those recognized by others, but this was not necessary. A clear example of this involves the case of two sisters who were about 12 years apart in age. The older was born somewhere around Frances lake, where she spent the first 10 years of her life. During this period she considered this area as her land and designated it accordingly; however, when she was about 10 years old a number of murders and deaths through sorcery occurred and this prompted her parents to move into the area around Pelly Banks on the Pelly river. From this point on the older sister considered the area around Frances lake to be a dangerous place and although she briefly returned to the area twice as an adult she felt it necessary to perform the "willow ritual" at the first
point of moving water she encountered after sighting a particular mountain which was, to her, a familiar part of her childhood landscape. Her younger sister, on the other hand, was born a few years after the move to Pelly Banks. This woman, as a married adult, had developed a network of relations which spatially covered the area between Pelly Banks and Frances lake. This area she designated as "my land" and therefore the two sisters (full siblings in this case) recognized a network of relations which overlapped in space but did not coincide. Similarly their categorization of "my people" and "other people" did not correspond and it appears that there were times when they were inclined to refer to each other as "other people" although this development never matured due to their intermittent meetings at the trapping post of Pelly Lakes. For the older sister this post was near the peripheries of what she considered her land, for the younger sister this post was roughly situated in the center.

Young adults, whose network of relations was narrower and less extensive than older people, generally recognized a much closer correspondence between "my land" and "my people". If a young couple and their children were contemplating movement without being accompanied by a person in the senior generation they then assessed their alternatives in terms of those with whom they had actually had some contact. In doing so, however, they might go to the peripheries of what they considered their land and in time, through interaction with those on the peripheries and beyond, they could broaden their social and territorial horizons.
As to the use of place names in categorizing others it should be mentioned that there was not one single set of such names which was shared by all. For instance those who lived in the area of Frances lake referred to the lake as _tićo mìnä_ (big whitefish lake), those who lived away from the area variously referred to these people as _tićo mìnä_ (big water people) or Frances lake _dëną_. In addition place names changed over time. This was to some extent a result of shifting economic conditions. Those who lived in an area customarily referred to particular places in terms of what was exploited there. A few place names were thus substituted for what the fur buyers had named the various trapping posts, e.g. _tú dísík mìnä_ (clear water lake) — a reference to the exceptionally clear ice that formed on this lake which was an advantage in ice fishing) became Pelly Lake, _nusōa ṭx GI_ (fox') became Ross River, and _d'ait_ (this word was considered onomatopoeic for the sound that clay makes when falling from a bank into water — refers in this case to a particularly large bank) became Pelly Bank. In other instances names of places changed according to shifts in the method of exploitation; for instance, the outlet of one lake was known at the turn of the century as a productive salmon fishing spot, it was called at this time _gës mìnä_ (salmon lake). After shotguns became widespread the same lake became significant in the spring time for the large flocks of Canada geese that stopped there. It thus became known to some as _sunča mìnä_ (goose lake).

We can see then, that an order of place names was not
arbitrarily imposed on the land. It was to a very great extent derived from activities which habitually occurred in a particular locale. Thus as old places became less significant and new places more so or old places became significant and productive in new ways the place names changed and shifted accordingly. This had the consequence of hindering the emergence of a comprehensive territorial grid which might have been used unequivocally to define "other people" once they moved into a particular area. Through time, therefore, such social categories as _tudusuk_dena_ ceased to be used and were replaced by Pelly Lake _dena_, and, because of the internal movement of the Kasini, not only did the category change but so also did the aggregate of people to whom it was applied. As the Kasini pursued their economic interests, individuals became separated and regardless of their genealogical connection or prior frequency of interaction, these individuals could come to view previous acquaintances as "other people". We have no example where this actually seems to have taken place between mother and child⁹ although we do for all other primary genealogical connections and beyond. And even though a reference to place names was seldom if ever invoked between mother and child the following example shows clearly how separation was not incidental even in this context.

9. In making this assertion it must be remembered we are speaking within the context of the application of the term _anë_ as distinguished from _enë_ -- the fact that _anë_ was usually applied to a person's genetrix is, to our way of thinking, irrelevant and it does not constitute a basic or fundamental translation of this term. _anë_ meant primarily mother and within the constraints of moiety membership this was applied to that female who actually mothered the child.
To indicate how pervasive were the implications that accrued from a decrease in interaction it will be perhaps permissible to describe some events which occurred between a mother and son in the summer of 1968. We introduce this recent illustration because both individuals were adults by the end of the historical period we are discussing and it seems reasonable to think that they would, in some respects, still think and behave in a manner which was typical of this period. We also had some direct experience with the events in question.

The son, a man in his late forties, had returned to Ross River for a visit after an absence of some years in Watson Lake. The mother, who was also a grandmother many times over, had not seen her son at all for over three years. At the time of the events to be described the mother was camped on the Pelly river with the man's sister, his sister's son, who had himself returned from Watson lake only the year before, and his sister's daughter with some of her children. The place was easily accessible only by boat and the recently returned son of the old woman asked me to take him down river to visit his mother.

On the trip down river the man told me that he thought his mother would be annoyed with him. When I asked why this might be he said "I never visit her too long time". He then offered a number of rationalizations for his negligence in this respect -- such as the difficulties of travelling to Ross River, and the demands of his job. At the time it seemed to me strange that he would bother to justify himself to me; for although I had visited his mother's camp a number of times, the man himself I barely knew at all and had met for the first time only the evening before.
When we reached the camp the only people in view were his mother, who was sewing, his sister, who was tending the fire, and his sister's son, who was reclining. The man stepped off the boat and walked into the camp with a smile and a friendly greeting to all. The young man sat up and returned the greeting with a broad smile but said nothing. The old mother just stared at the man, as did the sister. Suddenly the mother screeched a number of things (untranslated) at her son and, throwing her sewing to the ground, turned her back on him. This was followed, for me at least, by an awkward silence during which the man glumly hunkered to the fire. Eventually his sister's son began asking me questions about what was going on in Ross River. Our conversation drifted on for about ten minutes until the old woman interrupted us by asking the young man to go to the tent and get her kunts (i.e. the small bag in which are contained items which a mother uses to protect her children from harm) -- at this the young man looked at his mother's brother who nodded back to him with a slight smile. When the kunts was brought forward the old woman gave further instruction (untranslated) but still did not look at her son. As far as I could see all the man did when he received the kunts was to hold it in his left hand and put his right hand inside and blindly finger the items it contained. After about two minutes of this the man's sister, who had her back turned during these proceedings, asked her son if her brother had done as was instructed. When it was affirmed that he had the kunts was then returned to the tent. Within a few minutes the old woman began asking her son questions and shortly an animated and what appeared to be congenial conversation ensued.
On the return trip in the boat some hours later I asked the man what had been going on. His immediate reply was "my mummy wants to know if I still her sonny" but, as if recognizing the immense gulf between us that this remark implied, he subsequently became evasive and the matter had to be dropped.

Later on we were to learn how the **kunts** of a mother (or MM) functioned as a protective device and how children were caressed with this object if they became sick or if, for instance, the group encountered fresh bear spoor on the trail. We also learned how dangerous such objects could be for young men of the opposite moiety and it is in this sense that we have some clue as to what was being attempted in the case described above. We were not able to gain more information from the participants themselves and the activity of a mother insisting that her child handle such an item was not a common one. However, even though some of those with whom we discussed this matter had never heard of such a thing before it was found interesting and comprehensible to all and their interpretations of it were entirely consistent with what we have already said concerning the degree of interaction, spatial proximity and power alignment. In effect, by asking her son to handle the **kunts** the mother was interrogating him. The son had been away for a long time, he had been living with "others" and many of these were strangers to the mother. It was therefore possible that during this separation his interests and commitments had become re-oriented in some fundamental way. The problem for the mother was to decide whether or not this had happened. The son was not in a position to demonstrate his
commitments one way or the other because it is in the very nature of verbal and many kinesic messages that they may be contrived and not true. For the son to say, for instance, "Mother I am still your son, your best interests are also mine" would be open to doubt for the same reason that a smiling face might not mean friendship. The only way the mother had of checking out her son was to test the alignment of his inner resources -- his mind and the commitment of his power vis-a-vis herself. She was not therefore interested in his smiling face or anything he had to say, she was interested in how he reacted to a concrete embodiment of her power. If he became dizzy or ill as a stranger with inferior power or a younger man in the opposite moiety might have done, it would mean her suspicions or fears were well founded. If nothing happened, as nothing did in this case, it would mean that he was, as he always had been, her son.

This example, we think, clearly supports the interpretation of the material we have presented. But in offering it as supportive evidence it clearly dramatizes a problem in handling the largely reminiscent data we are trying to understand. This problem can be stated as follows: At what time during their separation did the mother begin to doubt her son or, perhaps, at what time did she begin to think that he might appropriately be categorized as "another person" beyond the boundaries of "my people"? So many things seem potentially relevant here that we have really no certain way of assessing this. Questions of congeniality, political significance and even, it may be supposed,
something like love all seem to tumble in a confused array of possible reasons why in this particular case both the mother and the son seemed to care that their relationship remain close. To analyze this for 1968 would necessarily involve elucidating a context which does not concern us — but the questions it poses are just as relevant for the period in question and unfortunately they require a degree of reconstructive detail we have not been able to achieve. Nevertheless, it was a fact that individuals who became separated did not uniformly re-categorize each other through time and that some were re-categorized as "other people" in a relatively short period of time after separation whereas others were not. Furthermore there seems to be no obvious correspondence between a lag in re-categorization and relative genealogical proximity. People of close or remote genealogical connectedness are therefore not a parameter of this phenomenon.

Our efforts to reconstruct changes in how people referred to one another were largely unsuccessful. They were confounded,

10. In this illustration we should not discount that although the idiom of expression does, as a specific set of manipulated representations, imply something about inner states (suspicion, trust, etc.) — there is no way of demonstrating this in any particular case. The mother was above all trying to communicate something to her son. The fact that she used the symbolic vehicle that she did is a commentary on her being a Kasini and not necessarily a commentary on her thoughts or feelings — rather than actually suspecting the alignment of his power, for instance, she may have felt upset that a son whom she cared for had not been more considerate and attentive. However, since anthropological theories are not yet sufficiently subtle to penetrate such nuances of sentiment contrary to form and since our concerns do not in any case require such penetration this example can be left within the relatively gross framework by which it has been just examined.
in the first place, by the fact that people never stayed in an area for more than a few years. This in itself places the emphasis on following the application of categories through time and it was very difficult for informants to isolate past sequences in this regard. In the second place, from an egocentric perspective, many individuals were categorized in different ways as their interaction with Ego was alternately more or less frequent. In the third place most Kasini who currently live in Ross River refer and address each other with either kin terms or anglicized names. It is only when they become "bad friends" that one hears reference to place names and although this referral usually indicates where the individuals or their mothers were living at the decline of the fur trade in the mid 1940's it quite often reflected spatial arrangements which preceded this period. Therefore, in a rather fragmented way this method of categorizing others is still in operation and for this reason it was extremely difficult to determine to what extent the answers to our questions were strategically centered in the present or some poorly defined period in the past.

In possessing some knowledge of the semantic structure of Kasini social categories we are therefore unfortunately unable to provide a case illustration which would clearly indicate how this structure functioned as a pragmatic tool. Why and under what conditions of separation some people were still referred to as "my people" and some were quickly jettisoned into the category "other people" are obviously extremely important questions concerning the organization of Kasini social life. However, the above mentioned difficulties have so seriously qualified our
attempts along these lines that we possess only the most fragmented and incoherent picture; at times such factors as congeniality and affection or its lack seem to have been involved and at others clear political and economic motives obtained and only in a few instances were we able to determine which it might have been. Some of the latter cases we discuss in the following chapter.

In this chapter we have shown that the Kasini process of applying social categories was primarily orientational in nature and that through time individuals could categorize each other in quite different ways. This introduced an empirical dimension into our consideration of the relationship between different classes of Kasini social categories and for the most part it seems that what prompted the use of one category over another was not, or at least not solely, contingent on an abstract set of syntactical rules but rather on the frequency with which two individuals interacted. Spatial proximity, which was variable, and the activity of movement both towards and away from Ego were thus seen to express a message and contain a structural eloquence which in themselves suggested the appropriate application of different classes of social categories.

Very roughly, we can say that Ego was the center of his social universe and regardless of where he found himself spatially he could always orient himself and structure his relations with others in accordance with where he was and with whom he was interacting at a given point in time. At one period he might distinguish between his immediate acquaintances (es'dena) who lived in the region of place X, and others (dena, dena etc.) who lived in the vicinity of places Y and Z. If he moved to
place Y, however, he would categorize his current acquaintances as *es'dena* and distinguish others as being *X dena*, *Z dena* and so on. In the foregoing we have shown that this was not mere labelling and that the distinctions being made did possess a meaning to the Kasini without which the social categories themselves would, in our opinion, remain totally incomprehensible.

By using this method of categorizing others they were in effect indicating social distance and their orientational technique reflects the changing and rather malleable character of this phenomenon. Social distance as a notion is largely meant to refer to a felt or sensed "distance" rather than anything precisely quantifiable and for this reason it has always settled rather uneasily into most social analyses. It points towards the semantic dimension of social relations rather than the syntactical and it cannot be understood simply in terms of the application of certain rules. For this reason it necessarily has an ambiguous this and that quality which does not allow for any precise demarcation of social boundaries. As indicated, Kasini had their own reasons for taking more than a passing interest in this phenomenon which they attempted to structure in terms of a spatial axis and presumably this criterion was generally adequate to their needs. Nevertheless, in attempting to formulate an order to their relations with one another they chose an empirical datum (i.e. space) which could not accommodate every case and there was always a favourite *enae* (MZ) or a strategically located *edada* (Z+) whom Ego referred to by such terms and considered *es'dena* but from whom he was widely separated in space and with whom he might not have interacted for two or three years at a time.
CHAPTER X

ARRANGED MARRIAGES, SOCIAL REALIGNMENT
AND THE MOIETY SYSTEM

A Kasini marriage was arranged by members of the parental generation. The relationship between husband and wife developed gradually and, other than living together, there was no ceremony or event that conclusively established that a couple were married. As a couple learned the advantages of functioning on their own behalf as a political unit, their marriage developed broader significance. In this chapter we will examine the married couple as a political unit influential in creating relationships between people throughout Kasini territory.

Married couples can be roughly divided into those with marriageable "dependents" and those without. Elderly couples and young couples without marriageable dependents were unable to arrange marriages with others. The elderly had, in a sense, exhausted their capacity to arrange marriages by having already had their former dependents married off, and the young had not yet reached a stage in which their dependents were of a marriageable age. This produces an overall stratification of the Kasini population of marital units in which only some were capable of arranging marriages. It roughly corresponds to age differences in the population and may be outlined as follows:
Table \[1\]

**AGE STRATA OF MARRIED COUPLES CAPABLE OF ARRANGING MARRIAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Couple</th>
<th>Potential or Capacity to Arrange Marriages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 years old and above</td>
<td>No potential or capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50 years old</td>
<td>Capacity and potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-30 years old</td>
<td>Potential, but capacity pending the maturation of dependents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order for those in the medial age strata to be able to arrange marriage with others, it was necessary that they have as dependents (or incipient providers) individuals, whether adopted or procreated, who were old enough to be married. If we assume that first marriages occurred when the woman was about 15 years old and the man about 20 years old, a marital unit would not be in this position before their early 30's and usually not after their late 40's. In saying this much, however, it should be re-emphasized that although elderly couples were usually economic dependents themselves, there were instances in which such a couple still retained a capacity to arrange a marriage (cf. Diagram 8.5 and discussion). This fact qualifies any general correspondence that might be said to exist between recognized generational differences and strategic and non-strategic strata.
of married couples in the Kasini population. Nevertheless, it is useful to view the overall situation as if it were stratified in terms of generations. Demographically it would seem reasonable to assume this out of hand; for certainly some, if not most, married couples who formed alliances would categorize each other as being in the same generation. This is indirectly supported by the fact that when in doubt about how to categorize each other generationally, i.e., when genealogical specifications were unknown, couples who arranged a marriage between their respective dependents employed reciprocal categories which indicated they were both in the same generation.

In what follows we examine the political advantages that attend a capacity to arrange marriages. Our description traces a sequence of marriages that occurred between 1900-1952, and we show how individuals, originally from the same domestic group, became "other people" to each other and subsequently, through arranging marriages, merged again as "my people". The evidence we present reflects Kasini spatial movement and social realignment and we conclude by examining the relevance of these facts for understanding the Kasini moiety system.

In Diagram 10.1 we indicate a series of marriages which occurred around 1900. This genealogical profile is a synthesis of how numerous individuals perceived the linkages portrayed and indicates only some of the Kasini marital arrangements that emerged at this time. We do not, in every case, know the actual sequence in which these marriages took place, although a few older informants were able to provide a rough indication of where they thought these people lived prior to the marriage of the
eldest sibling. Thus in discussing this and other such diagrams we are able to make some references to Map six, on which is superimposed a wide grid to indicate general areas lived in and exploited by various people around 1900. In doing this, it must be borne in mind that our knowledge of this period is rather vague and impressionistic and must be treated as indicative rather than precisely empirical in nature. This general character of our data is also reflected in the fact that no single informant was able to describe in their entirety the various genealogical outlines we discuss.

Diagram DQ1

GENEALOGICAL PROFILE OF SOME KASINI MARRIAGES (c.1900)

The letter above each individual or set of siblings corresponds to one of the large areas on Map six in which these people lived prior to the marriage of any of them. Unless indicated on the diagram, there is no implication that those who are associated with the same territory are of close genealogical connection. The letters refer to large tracts of land and thus individuals P1, P2 lived in area P as children and adolescents, individuals K1, K2, K3 lived in area K prior to their respective marriages and so on. One can see from this diagram that around 1900 a
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series of marital linkages traversed the Kasini territory from Frances lake to the then newly established trapping post at the mouth of Ross river. We have, however, quite arbitrarily broken this series at the contrived boundaries of Kasini territory. Marital linkages in fact continued southeast from Frances lake down the Frances and Liard rivers and extended northeast from Ross River (then known as Mahanie House) down the Pelly river.

Around 1900, individuals K1 and K2 were adolescent boys and K3, their sister, was still a young girl. They were living with their parents in the southern portion of area K near the headwaters of the Nisutlin river. Their mother, who died about this time, came from the region south of area K and their father (or father's mother) came from area O. After the death of the mother their father, who was known as a shaman, moved with the children towards the Pelly river. This move corresponded with and was probably influenced by the newly established trapping posts on the upper Pelly river.

We are not certain whether this domestic group made their move towards the Pelly river in the company of others. Within five years of their arrival in the area the father of K1, K2, and K3 had arranged marriages for each of them. The first of these, K1-P3, constituted a link between the new arrivals and some of those who inhabited the general area around the trapping post of Ross River. There is some indication that this arrangement was forged on the basis that the father of K1 would retaliate with sorcery if his interests in this marriage were
not accommodated. 1 About two years after this marriage, the trapping post at Pelly Banks was re-established. At this time the marriage of K2=N2 was arranged and the father of K3 went to live with this couple in the northeastern sector of area K. The couple K1=P3 stayed in area P and for some years continued to sell its furs at Ross River. Three years after the second marriage the marriage of K3 and N1 was arranged, and this couple lived in the southeastern sector of area N and sold its furs at Pelly Bank.

We can resume our story as K2=N2 were beginning to create alliances of their own, about 1920. At this time K1=P3 and K2=N2 were living in the vicinity of Pelly Banks. For some years both had been out of contact with K3=N1, who were living somewhere around Frances Lake. We have no detailed knowledge of the actual movements of these three couples in the period between their respective marriages and 1920. It is, however, clear that these were quite extensive, and all, individually or in combination sold their furs at the trapping post of Ross River or the occasional posts of Pelly Bank and Frances Lake.

In the following tables of married couples and genealogical diagrams we have isolated, from the perspective of

---

1. We have occasion to examine another, fuller example of this below. Our information does not indicate a direct oral threat of sorcery in this case. The father's wishes were known, and it was also known that he was a powerful man -- in which case it might simply have been rather threatening even to contemplate thwarting the wishes of such a man. Our informant, who was the daughter of P3's older brother, was asked why P3 had not married one of her (i.e. our informant's) mother's brothers, admittedly a leading question. At any rate, our informant replied that this was what had been wished, but that K1's father was too strong and that nobody wanted any trouble.
K2•N2, the marital connections that existed between parts of those aggregates that frequented the posts of Ross River, Pelly Bank, and Frances Lake during the period 1920-1940. Individuals in the generation below K2•N2 are classified according to their association with such posts. Like the regional classification of the senior generation, the letters used provide a rough temporal representation of the shifting orientations to others that occurred. Thus, for example, the regional opposition K/N merged and became irrelevant as it was subsequently replaced by the narrower opposition afforded by reference to trapping posts which produced, in this case, Pelly Bank people (B)/Ross River people (R) and Frances Lake people (F)/Pelly Bank people (B).

Diagram 16.2
SOME KASINI MARRIAGES (1920-1940)
Table 10.2
KASINI MARRIAGES (1920-1940)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ross River people/ Pelly Bank people (1920-30)</th>
<th>Pelly Bank people/ Frances Lake people (1931-40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) B4=R6</td>
<td>5) B8 =F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) B5=R11</td>
<td>6) B7 =F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) B5=R13</td>
<td>7) B9 =F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) B6=R12</td>
<td>8) B10 =F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9) B11 =F5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since its inception in the early part of this century the Pelly Banks post intermittently opened and closed a number of times. Accordingly, various people rather quickly moved into and then away from what could loosely be described as the hinterland of the Pelly Bank post. The extent and rapidity of these movements depended greatly on the fur and game resources available in any given area. Where these were marginal the "providers" in a domestic group would not hesitate to initiate an extensive move. But where they were abundant a domestic group would stay put and, by arranging a marriage, achieve access to a more remote trapping post. During the period 1920-30 it was the latter circumstance which obtained for the couple K2-N2; for although the Pelly Bank post was in operation throughout most of this decade, it was closed from 1917-21 and during this period K2-N2 were obliged to sell their furs directly to the fur buyer at Ross River.

To ensure safe and independent access into the area of the Ross River post, K2-N2 arranged a marriage with K4-F1. This
resulted in the young couple B4-R6 living for a few years in the vicinity of Ross River with the parents of R6. In the interim the Pelly Bank post had reopened, and R4, with her spouse and his children by a former marriage, moved into the vicinity of Pelly Bank and subsequently formed an alliance with K2=N2 through the marriage B5=R11. Thus by 1924 the people we are discussing had become spatially realigned in the following manner:

**Diagram 10.3**

**SOME MARRIAGES BETWEEN "ROSS RIVER PEOPLE"**

**AND "PELLY BANK PEOPLE" c.1924**

Ross River vicinity  

Pelly Bank vicinity

---

Shortly after his marriage R11 died, and his wife, B5, re-married his younger brother R12. This was soon followed by the marriages of B6-R12, and both of these younger couples remained in the vicinity of Pelly Bank when R5 and her spouse moved back into the Ross River area around 1927.

Shortly before or after this move, K4 and P1 both died, and the couple B4-R6, with their youngest son and the youngest
unmarried sister of R6, moved into the vicinity of Pelly Bank. Thus by 1927 or 1928 these people had again become spatially realigned:

During this decade numerous other marriages were arranged between those around Pelly Bank and Ross River and these also were attended by the same kind of back and forth movements of people. It would thus be impossible to give any general picture of who was categorizing whom by what "other people" name; for, socially speaking, people were constantly receding or advancing, so that for any individual or marital unit there would always be some on the verge of becoming either "my people" or "other people". There was no specific lapse of time, precise distance, or generally recognized topographic feature that indicated when a category shift from "us" to "them" was warranted. In the examples we have been discussing, certainly these boundaries became very unclear
for many, and for the couple B4=R6, during this period, all of those in the above two diagrams were categorized as "my people" regardless of their current residence locale.

Towards the end of the 1920's the area within a 20-30 mile radius of Pelly Bank was becoming over-trapped, and the hinterland of this post began to grow as the Kasini spread out in their search for better trapping areas. These moves coincided, at least in this area of the Yukon, with the introduction of out-board motors and commercial air freighting. The former allowed Kasini to take supplies up river from Pelly Bank during the summer months. Among those who did this were B4=R6. The latter allowed fur buyers to consider establishing posts in areas which had previously been out of reach because of the high cost of packing in supplies to places inaccessible by water.

The first of the new posts to be established was at Frances Lake and those who were by then in the southeastern hinterland of the Pelly Bank post suddenly found themselves closer to a new trapping post. Among these were the couple K2=N2.

The marriages that K2=N2 arranged with those in the Frances Lake region began with K3=N1. These two couples comprised

2. This post has been in operation in the early part of the century but it had turned out to be economically unviable because of the high costs of shipping supplies by horse pack. However, it was intermittently opened for a few years at a time between 1910-30. Between times the Indian people in the area sold their furs at Lower Post. This involved a leisurely down river trip by raft in the early summer, during which they shot, dried and cached what moose they could for the return trip. Very occasionally some obtained horses to assist in packing back the supplies.
pairs of opposite sex siblings (i.e., K2, K3, and N1, N2), who previously had shared domestic groups in areas K and N respectively. Nevertheless, in the preceding decade these two couples had met infrequently and there is some evidence that they had come to use "other people" names in reference to each other. They thus had good reason to reduce the social distance between themselves by arranging the marriage B8=F1. For K2=N2 this arrangement also functioned as a liaison to prior acquaintances of K3=N1 and it was this "friends of friends" approach that promoted the marriage B7=F3 after the death of F3's first husband.

In about 1934 the post of Pelly Bank was closed, and a new post at Pelly Lakes was opened. This stimulated a move into this area on the part of people from Frances Lake and Pelly Bank, and during the six or seven years that this post was in operation there was considerable movement back and forth between Frances Lake and Pelly Lakes. During this period the marriages of B9=F2, B10=F4 and B11=F5 all took place.

As World War Two began, the Pelly Lakes post was closed down and Pelly Banks reopened and stayed open until 1949. During this period a great deal of erratic movement began to occur as news of the construction of the Alaska highway and Canol road attracted the curious, either southeast towards the new highway town of Watson Lake or northwest towards Ross River. In Ross River the presence of earth-moving machinery and over a

3. The couple K2=N2 were not informants, but some of their children were and it is from the way they categorized K3=N1 (in this case as "Frances Lake people") that we infer a recognition of distance on the part of the couples in the senior generation.
thousand men in various construction camps was curiosity enough, but to this spectacle there were added the attractions of gambling, bootlegged beer, and cheap commodities. There was also part-time employment and the opportunity to exploit the vast refuse dumps produced by these newcomers who, in 1945, went away as mysteriously as they had arrived a few years before.

Virtually all the Kasini had visited either Ross River or Watson Lake during this period, and most did so a number of times. A few women married American soldiers and left the area entirely; others simply never returned from Watson Lake. Those who returned to their customary activities of hunting and trapping had to contend with a declining fur market. But since virtually all Kasini had been drawn together while watching the activities of the American Engineering Corps there developed at this time an uncommonly broad and direct knowledge of many who had previously been known as "other people". This facilitated subsequent movement throughout the area, and between 1943-49 the Kasini moved freely between Ross River, Pelly Bank and Frances Lake. 4

In 1950 the Pelly Lakes post re-opened and Pelly Bank closed for the last time. The Frances Lake post was also closed during this period. In 1951 the fur buyers could no longer realize a profit and advised their Kasini patrons that the Pelly Lakes post would be closed at the end of the season. To the southeast the closest fur buyer was in Watson Lake 150 miles

4. The Frances Lake post was closed during this period, but Kasini nevertheless trapped and hunted in the area.
away. Ross River itself was over 90 miles away. Thus if the Kasini wished to continue trapping in the area around Pelly Lakes they would have been obliged to travel long distances to sell furs which were rapidly decreasing in value. They could have moved closer to such places but due to the dwindling number of trapping posts generally, people were beginning to congregate in those that remained and, in the case of Ross River, hunting and trapping prospects were becoming seriously limited. But for the Kasini at Pelly Lakes there was a third alternative and it is this, as a final illustration, that we would now like to describe.

About 50 miles northeast of Pelly Lakes an independent fur buyer had established the Sheldon Lake post in the 1930's. This enterprise was eventually bought and run by the same company that operated the Pelly Lakes, Pelly Bank, and Ross River posts. The Sheldon Lake post was not patronized by the Kasini; it was patronized by those whom the Kasini referred to as "Mackenzie people". These were in fact a mixture of Tutchone and Mountain speakers who had perpetuated marriage ties since the early part of the century. They had frequented trapping posts on the upper Macmillan river and occasionally made extensive trips to either Fort Norman on the Mackenzie river or Fort Selkirk near the mouth of the Pelly river. Since about 1910 these people had seldom visited Ross River and had not ventured into any area on the upper Pelly river. Until the 1940's they were accustomed to referring to all those in the region of the upper Pelly as na'kani, a word that is almost identical in meaning to the Kasini word na'kani. In short, the relative proximity of those at Pelly Lakes and those at Sheldon Lake did not reflect the extreme
social distance that existed between the two. However, in this case it was not simply a matter of acquaintance or its lack; there were also recognized differences of dialect and custom, which abetted their reciprocal sense of "otherness".

Nevertheless, in 1951, the Kasini at Pelly Lakes were faced by a no means accommodating set of circumstances. The area which they were exploiting around Pelly Lakes was still productive, and the even topography across to Sheldon Lake provided quick and convenient access to a fur buyer. The route to Ross River was almost twice as far, and there were rumours that the moose population was decreasing in that area. The route to Watson Lake was not only long and difficult; there was no way in which supplies could be brought back to the Pelly Lakes region in adequate amounts. On the face of it, therefore, staying where they were and reorienting themselves towards the Sheldon Lake post was the most obvious solution to their problem. They overcame the difficulties inherent in the extreme social distance involved by arranging a marriage with the people at Sheldon Lake.

Among the Kasini at Pelly Lakes there was a shaman who, in 1951, was living in an area about twenty miles out of Pelly Lakes in almost a direct line with the Sheldon Lake post. It was this man who was largely responsible for overcoming the resistance of the so-called Sheldon Lake people to the proposal of an arranged marriage. Those at Sheldon Lake had already well developed ties with their former associates on the North Macmillan river. After the close of the trapping posts in that area some of the people went to Sheldon Lake, but most of them went either to Selkirk or Fort Norman. In any case, during the
1940's those at Sheldon Lake had managed to sustain relations by creating marriages with these people, and even in 1948 there were still people travelling on foot or by dog team and toboggan along the Canol road between Sheldon Lake and Port Norman. Relative to the social distance they felt towards the Pelly Lakes people, who, as na'hani, could hardly have been more remote, the Sheldon Lake people still retained close ties with those in Port Norman. Consequently, when, in 1951, some Pelly Lakes people went to Sheldon Lake and attempted to arrange a marriage, the Sheldon Lake people tried to avoid these overtures by claiming that they had already made commitments to others in Port Norman. At first this resulted in a stalemate, which in turn resulted in the multicephalous aggregate of domestic groups at Pelly Lakes organizing themselves to bring about a commonly desired end. In the following genealogical diagram and table of marriages we present the results of these efforts:

**Diagram 10.5**

**SOME KASINI MARRIAGES (1951-56)**

**Sheldon Lake**

[Diagram showing family relationships with names and symbols]

**Pelly Lakes**

[Diagram showing family relationships with names and symbols]
In the vicinity of Pelly Lakes in 1951 there were three men and one woman (i.e., L3, L1, L5 and L4) who were marriageable. The Sheldon Lake people had only one marriageable young man (i.e., S9). The Pelly Lakes people therefore had no recourse but to attempt to arrange the marriage S9=L3. The parents of L3 were not able to arrange this themselves, and their attempts to do so were turned down a number of times by S1=S2. Others spoke on their behalf, and among these, according to our informant S9, was the Pelly Lakes shaman B4. These requests went on for some months before the Sheldon Lake people capitulated and allowed the marriage S9=L3 to occur. The reason they did so was that they had been told that B4 was going to try to harm them through sorcery if they did not acquiesce.

It is plain from this that a category like "Pelly Lake people" which was usually applied externally to a localized aggregate, could, as in this case, refer to a loosely integrated group of people capable of collective political action. Such political integrity was, however, short lived, and as soon as one marriage had been arranged, the Sheldon Lake people seemed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10.3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KASINI MARRIAGES (1951-56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c.1951-53)</td>
<td>(c.1954-56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) S9 =L3</td>
<td>4) S5 =L7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) S11=L1</td>
<td>5) S8 =L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) S12=L5</td>
<td>6) S4 =L4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) S10=L6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to have entirely given up their interests in their former
associates at Selkirk and Fort Norman. Other marriages occurred
easily. In this way the fleeting coherence of the Pelly Lakes
people in their opposition to those at Sheldon Lake quickly
began to dissipate as subsequent marriages were arranged.

Like most marriages that Kasini arranged, the strategic
advantages of those with the Sheldon Lake people were short
lived. In 1953 the Sheldon Lake post was abandoned. Some of
the Kasini from the Pelly Lakes area moved back to the Frances
Lake post, which was opened briefly in 1953-54. When this post
also closed down, these people moved to the Alaska highway near
Watson Lake. The others, along with their recent associates of
Sheldon Lake, moved into Ross River, which was the last remaining
supply post on the upper Pelly.

The foregoing provides an overview of the movements and
associations in which some Kasini were involved between 1900 and
1951. Each genealogical chart reflects the kinds of oppositions
that existed between people from different areas at certain
periods. It also illustrates how these oppositions could merge
and, under certain conditions, the tension created by a confronta-
tion with strange and unfamiliar people could collapse and be
re-ordered in terms of a different framework of categories. This
fact is reflected in the different ways we have classified people
in these genealogical charts. Thus the regional differences
between people from K area and P area (or K area and N area, etc.)
could merge and become replaced by a new locality designation,
e.g. "B" (Pelly Bank) or "F" (Frances Lake), which, for some,
in their turn merged to become "L" (Pelly Lakes) as opposed, for example, to "S" (Sheldon Lake). By tracing these movements and associations of people through time, it becomes clear that just as some oppositions between strangers could dissipate and merge, so too familiars became separated and gradually opposed as strangers to each other. Consequently, those Kasini and their descendants who came from area R around 1900 gradually moved in and out of each others' ambience as they pursued their own interests, and in subsequent decades they re-categorized each other in accordance with these shifting involvements.

The sequence of cases we discussed were selected because they so clearly corresponded with the emergence of trapping posts and gaining social access to these posts. However, it must not be concluded from this single sequence that trapping posts were the only consideration for, as we discussed in Chapter two, access to hunting areas was also important. Therefore, simply because the material we present emphasizes relations between people around different posts, it should not be thought that the patrons of a specific post functioned as an exogamous unit. When material and economic circumstances were sufficiently stable so that no one was seeking social access to an area inhabited by strangers, then marriages could and did occur between those who were well acquainted. Nevertheless, since 1900 the goods that were acquired from trapping posts did become increasingly important to the Kasini, and after 1920 they did begin to respond more rapidly to area fluctuations in fur resources. Accordingly the velocity with which they engaged and disengaged themselves from each other was increased, and, for many, no association with a
particular trapping post was sustained for very long.5

This rapid movement and the inevitable separations that it entailed posed a special kind of problem for Kasini, one that centered on shifting social identity. We saw in the previous chapter that frequency of interaction influenced Kasini experience of social relationship, and that Kasini resolved the problem of familiars becoming strangers and strangers becoming familiars by employing different frameworks of social categories. It is now clear that changes in material circumstances could force strangers into proximity. The discrepancy between felt distance and spatial distance was resolved in many such cases by providers, who were strangers, arranging a marriage between their respective dependents. This had the result of blurring a "my people"/ "other people" opposition and also, by implication, any sharp difference of economic interests that were thought to obtain between those who had previously been separated but who currently shared the same domestic group.

The general impression from the evidence we have presented above is that a married couple, who were providers,

5. At any time there were always those who could be classified as "other people" in a number of different ways by patrons of the same trapping post. For instance, during a period of about seven years during the 1930's one couple and their "dependents" lived in a region almost equidistant from the Pelly Lakes post and the Frances Lake post in the vicinity of a large lake. They irregularly sold their furs at either post, and for a year at a time they would be absent from one post or the other. There were those more consistently associated with both places who considered these people "my people" and referred to them with kin terms. There were others who referred to them either as "Frances Lake people" or "Pelly Lakes people" and still others who referred to them by reference to the lake near which they habitually lived.
moved frequently and exploited many different areas in their efforts to accommodate shifting food and fur resources. Social ties between strangers were created by arranging marriages and as a result marriageable dependents were deployed, as it were, around the territory as providers pursued their economic concerns. This had the result of fracturing domestic group membership and we would now like to examine the implications of this fracturing in understanding the social significance of the Kasini moiety system.

In a recent synopsis of the cultures of the western subarctic, Eggan has written,

"The utilization of the potlatch as the mechanism for trading led to the organization of several of the interior groups on the model of their Northwest Coast neighbors, so that they came to have a matrilineal moiety organization and intermarried to some extent with the Tlingit and related groups. In this process ... the matrilineal moiety patterns and cross-cousin marriage spread as far as the Kaska ... (although) there is evidence that during much of the year these elaborations were in abeyance, as the various (inland) bands moved seasonally to exploit limited food resources" (Eggan, 1968:187).

There is in fact very little evidence to support Eggan's sweeping assertion that matrilineal moiety organization originated on the coast and subsequently spread to inland Athapaskans in a more or less dissipated form. This does not deny the limited truth of his opinion, which is also shared by others (cf. Jenness, 1932; Honigmann, 1954), for there is evidence that among some Athapaskan speakers a form of dual organization did emerge only after contact with coastal peoples. What we would like to qualify and examine more closely is the assertion that the exemplary form of dual organization is to be found only on the coast, because there is evidence that among some inland peoples a moiety
system existed in aboriginal times (Field, 1957; Honigmamn, 1954:88). Our Kasini evidence suggests, furthermore, that the Athapaskan moiety system is qualitatively quite different from anything that existed on the coast. In the following examination we would like to show how misleading is the broad taxonomic class "moiety system" when attempting to understand cultural differences and similarities between Kasini and their neighbors to the west.

We may begin by isolating those features that Eggan and others\(^6\) have emphasized in describing the dual organization of the Tlingit, since it is these people, more than any other, who are credited with providing the model upon which is based the moiety system of inland Athapaskan speakers in the southern Yukon.

Tlingit society was divided into matrilineal exogamous moieties called Wolf and Raven. The population was divided into local groups that lived in winter villages and used particular territories for exploiting raw materials. Each village was comprised of a number of houses and each house was owned by a local segment of one of the moieties. A house was owned and occupied by men related through the matriline. The alignment of males in a particular house was achieved by a rule of avuncular local residence. Each house was distinguished by ownership of crests and by privileged rights to plots of land and fishing sites. Household members also recognized a chief who exercised some authority over them concerning the disposal and use of

property and who functioned as a spokesman and house leader on ceremonial occasions. Inheritance of property rights and succession to high office by the men of a house was reckoned through the matriline. Consequently men related matrilineally and associated with a particular house were able to work together in managing the corporate assets of their household.

The composition of a Tlingit village, therefore, included two sets of houses, each set associated with a moiety. These different sets exchanged wives and services, and engaged in ceremonial exchanges of property on the occasion of death and marriage. Regarding the marriage of Yakutat Tlingit, for instance, De Laguna writes that,

"Whenever possible there was ... an exchange of gifts ... (and) although marriage was important for the individuals concerned, it was not regarded as a union between private parties but rather as an alliance between two family lines ... in opposite moieties" (De Laguna, 1972:525).

We can see from the above outline that the only thing Kasini and Tlingit really had in common regarding dual organization was that they both possessed matrilineal exogamous units named Wolf and Raven. For the Tlingit, however, moiety affiliation at the village level was also associated with property owning groups who lived in particular households. Consequently, the conceptually distinct categories of Wolf and Raven also corresponded to physically separate groups with exclusive rights in various kinds of property. These groups interacted through ceremonial exchanges of property and services, and they were integrated in marriage by exchanging women. As De Laguna observes, marriage was, "an alliance between two family lines... in opposite
moieties." In any socially significant sense, therefore, we can see that the moiety affiliation implied political separateness and that a marriage functioned to link, or bring together, two groups that were otherwise apart.

This correspondence between Tlingit moiety affiliation and socially (and physically) separate groups is in direct contrast to how the Wolf-Raven dichotomy was experienced in Kasini social life. We can best appreciate this difference by tracing the dialectical process of identification that operated in one of the Kasini cases described above (see Diagram 10.3). This involves the couple K2 = N2 of Pelly Bank ("B" people) arranging the marriage R6 = B4 with the couple K4 = P1 of Ross River ("R" people). From the external perspective of one group viewing the other, the circumstances preceding the marriage B4 = R6 can be diagrammed as follows:

![Diagram](image-url)
After the marriage, not only did the empirically discrete boundaries of these two groups dissolve as they merged for a time to form a single domestic group, but the social categories which reflected their separateness were replaced by the single, encompassing category es'dena (my people), and all the individuals subsumed by "my people" would thenceforth order their relations with each other in terms of the criteria of moiety membership, generation, and so on. Thus instead of the marriage of B4=R6 forging an alliance between groups, which might be diagrammed as:

It involved stepping out of this "other people" framework entirely and the merging of the two groups like this:
The various moves and spatial realignments that followed the marriage B4=R6 give us some indication of where, in these events, an alliance may be said to exist. It will be remembered that a year after the marriage of B4=R6 the Pelly Bank post was reopened, and that this was followed by a series of marriages initiated by K2=N2 and R4 and her husband. During this period (c.1920-30) the couple B4=R6 lived in the region around both Pelly Bank and Ross River and subsequently moved up the Pelly river into the vicinity of the yet to be established post of Pelly Lakes. In the early 1930's K2=N2 gradually moved southeast of Pelly Bank in search of a more productive resource area. When the Frances Lake post opened, they shifted their social orientation to accommodate the material interests they had developed in this region. In the meantime B4=R6 and a number of others from Pelly Bank, including B5=R13 and B6=R12, had become separated from K2-N2 as they each, in terms of their respective assessments of the productive potential in the region, began to exploit different areas. Thus in a fairly short time those who had been members of the same domestic group in 1920 had become spatially separated and were not to come into frequent contact again until the closure of the Pelly Bank post and the opening of the Pelly Lakes post.

When "B people" (i.e. K2=N2 and their dependents) originally attempted to achieve social access to Ross River, it must be remembered that K2=N2 were still the pre-eminent "providers" in the group, and all major decisions about where to move and what areas to exploit were still in their hands. Presumably their oldest son, B4, was verging on being a competent "provider", but he was also still young and inexperienced, and the group was
moving into an area inhabited by those with whom he was largely unacquainted. It should not be thought, therefore, that K2=W2 were in a position of authority vis-a-vis their children. What they possessed was not authority but experience and confidence, and it was with these that they sustained the initiative and influenced the behavior of their "dependents" and quasi-dependents. When they arranged a marriage, they did so with other "providers" regarding their dependents. The marriage itself was not, however, the result of a direct fiat on the part of those who had agreed to allow it to develop. As we have already discussed, a marriage developed over time and without ceremony. It was encouraged by providing those conditions most conducive to its emergence, and this was brought about by bringing the couple together for an extended period in the same domestic group.

We can see from this that it was not groups that formed alliances; for the groups clearly dissipated over time. They simply did not endure, either conceptually or empirically. What endured, and this only relatively, were the individuals who functioned as "providers" in domestic groups. Around these individuals there was a circulation, as it were, of "dependents" who could be used to forge ties between two sets of "providers" in their efforts to accommodate and exploit changing material and social circumstances. Such marriages did not indicate an immediate union of the young couple; for there was no ceremony that clearly and concisely defined their relationship. For a marriage to exist at all, it required an incubation period and a coming into being in which the couple gradually demonstrated the existence of a
union. What was immediately achieved at the moment this process began, however, was the collapse of social distance between "other people" and the increased order of relations implied by the recognition of moiety membership, generation, etc. In other words, what the marriage achieved was the replacement of a vague, remote, and unpredictable "otherness" for one that was more orderly and precisely defined. This was brought about by creating those conditions in which each marital set of "providers" shared close ties with a third party, i.e., one member of the couple whose marriage they had arranged. Each set of providers benefitted by narrowing the social distance between itself and the other, for this reduced the tension experienced by having in the vicinity those whom they considered dangerous, unpredictable "other people".

In the case of the marriage B4=R6 this form of alliance can be diagrammed as follows:

```
Providers "R"

Providers "B"
```

```
\[ \text{Providers} \quad \text{"R"} \]

\[ \text{Providers} \quad \text{"B"} \]

\[ \text{\ding{55}} = \triangle \]

\[ \text{\ding{55}} = \triangle \]

\[ \text{~K4~} \text{P1} \]

\[ \text{~K2~} \text{N2} \]

\[ \text{~K6~} \text{B4} \]
```
We have delineated the marriage B4=R6 with broken lines to indicate the incipient quality of this union in contrast to those already established unions which brought it into being. The one in the junior generation was only beginning to emerge and was, as yet, a long way from demonstrating itself as an enduring unity. On the other hand, those in the senior generation were, by their actions, demonstrating such unity and political coherence.

As one can see in the above diagram the social units in alliance comprised the couples K4=P1 and K2=N2. Unlike the Tlingit dual organization in which conceptually and socially, moiety members were distinct and apart, the Kasini form of alliance presupposed that the conceptually distinct moiety parts were socially together. From this perspective we can see the most obvious contrast between the Kasini and Tlingit moiety systems as these relate to social organization. Furthermore, we see no reason how one could argue that either form is a dissipated or more developed version of the other for, socially, they constitute inverted methods of ordering relations. The only thing they share is an identical conceptual apparatus.

The Tlingit, on the one hand, begin with the social segments corresponding to moiety membership being apart, and these separate entities have to be linked together through marriage. The Kasini, on the other, draw people together through marriage by virtue of members of different moieties already functioning as coherent political entities.

These considerations clearly show how necessary it is to
refine the diagnostic criteria required to recognize different kinds of "moiety systems". In order to fruitfully begin a comparison of Kasini social organization with others in the western subarctic and adjacent regions on the coast we must first understand the moiety system, and other institutions such as marriage, incest and the division of labour, in terms of the kinds of activity and forms of co-operation which follow from them in any particular case. By doing so we can avoid the trap of presupposing that we know what should follow from them regardless of the evidence, and assume out of hand that "moiety systems", for instance, are intrinsically related to segmentary models of society. The only thing this can achieve, in our opinion, is to create an artificial dissonance between behavior and cultural ideas. It would also play down the significance of the sort of contextual emphasis and orientational framework employed by Kasini in their attempts to organize activity in terms of the transcendental-material duality that was simultaneously, not separately, evident in the events and social relations experienced by them.
CHAPTER II
CONCLUSION

In this study we have focused on certain aspects of Kasini social organization and we have shown that Kasini experience of social relationship was subject to change. Social relationships were examined both in terms of the order implicit in Kasini social categories and the structural significance of certain kinds of activity.

We show, in the first place, that, in their quest for food and furs, Kasini were subject to frequent movement and group realignment. Kasini domestic groups were examined in terms of their economic viability and from this perspective it was demonstrated that they possessed a modular construction and that their composition could be understood in terms of interchangeable functional components. Kasini group membership was unstable and there was no enduring social significance in being a member of any particular group.

We have argued, in the second place, that Kasini recognition of relationship was based on a duality consisting of conceptually distinguishable dimensions -- transcendental and material. Through an examination of various objects, events and entities we saw this duality evident in different areas of Kasini life, both aspects of it simultaneously immanent in phenomenon.

This duality allowed us to appreciate the conceptual order underlying Kasini social categories as these were employed by an individual in his continuous efforts to identify others in terms of himself and himself in terms of others. The
relationship between Ego and Alter was not fixed for it was influenced by changes in relative individual ability, especially evident in the food quest, and varying frequency of contact. To a very large extent Kasini used social categories to portray shifting social relations as these were reflected in changes in behavior. Kasini social order was thus presented with an emphasis on the individual and on how he oriented himself to others and assessed his relationship to them in particular contexts.
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APPENDIX A
GLOSSARY:

KASKA WORDS USED IN TEXT

A phonemic analysis of Kaska has not yet been published. Our transcription below is to be taken as a guideline to Kaska words used in this study; it is not to be taken as a technically competent cross-section of Kaska phonemes. The work of Dr. Eung-Do Cook of the University of Calgary, and others, will hopefully provide a phonemic analysis of Kaska in the near future. The word list below does not include Kasini kin terms, these are to be found in Table 7.4, p. 200, above. The following outline of consonant and vowel sounds with English examples is intended to assist the reader in pronouncing the Kaska words listed.

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\vspace{1cm}
\alpha & -- & \text{bath} & \sigma & -- & \text{sister} \\
\alpha & -- & \text{father} & \varepsilon & -- & \text{bend} \\
\alpha:i & -- & \text{pike} & \varepsilon & -- & \text{very similar to} \\
\iota & -- & \text{feet} & /\varepsilon/\text{'}, \text{lower mid} \\
\lambda & -- & \text{pit} & \text{positioning, usually} \\
\upsilon & -- & \text{fool} & \text{initial consonant sound} \\
\vspace{1cm}
\kappa & -- & \text{cat} & \eta & -- & \text{lung} & \xi & -- & \text{chap} \\
\lambda & -- & \text{dope} & \eta & -- & \text{lip} & \rho & -- & \text{pot} & \varsigma & -- & \text{shoe} \\
\chi & -- & \text{badge} & \mu & -- & \text{moose} & \sigma & -- & \text{sole} & \iota & -- & \text{yes} \\
\gamma & -- & \text{gun} & \nu & -- & \text{nose} & \theta & -- & \text{think} & \zeta & -- & \text{zeal} \\
\vspace{1cm}
\end{array}
\]
&'ga  -- n. fat
asagaz (azi) -- n. friend
cajuna  -- n. wolf
dena  -- n. person, people
dena ziq  -- n. spirit
di  -- n. mind
di  -- n. grouse
dica  -- n. Blue grouse
disgi'ëd  -- n. greyling
ejin  -- v. sing
es'dena  -- n. my people, close associates
es'kaja  -- n. my land
etsi gana  -- n. head bone, skull
gies  -- n. salmon
gutsig  -- n. caribou
gutsig ca  -- n. big (bull) caribou
his  -- n. hill, mountain
itsi pau  -- n. cold wind
itsi zeli  -- n. warm gusts, whirlwind
kistana  -- n. stranger
kritda  -- n. moose
kunts  -- n. small bag
ma  -- adj. female
maska  -- n. raven
medii  -- n. shaman
mide  -- n. lake
na'kani  -- n. bushman
na'stin  -- v. dream
nat'nen -- adj. fat
ndua -- adj. nothing
ni -- n. earth, ground
misit -- v. being physically strong
mitsit -- v. being capable, power
ni'tua -- n. ground water, spring
nuqua -- n. wolverine
nuq'da -- n. fox
sa -- n. beaver
sa'ki -- n. beaver lodge
sun -- n. stars, sun or moon
š'stin -- v. sleep
ta -- adj. male
té'ce -- n. blackbird
tis -- adj. good
tluqa -- n. fish.
tsi -- n. head
tsi'ka -- n. head fat, brain
tsunæ -- n. ghost
tsy -- n. excrement
tua -- n. creek
tu -- n. water
wastaji -- n. Northern Pike
gane -- n. bone
The Kasini reveal the greatest similarity to Kaska (cf. Denniston 1966) for the dialect they speak is closely affiliated with what Honigmann (1954:20) described as the Frances Lake Kaska. Organizationally and ecologically, however, they are more similar to the class of people known as Tutchone who also possess a moiety system and have in the past been able to form relatively large groups for the purpose of salmon fishing for a few weeks each year. From this viewpoint, therefore, the people we are concerned with could also be tentatively classified as Tutchone.

The problem of classification is compounded by the fact that Tutchone and Kaska territories are usually shown as adjacent to one another and sharing a common border (see Map seven). Kasini live in territory straddling this border. For the purposes of this study, therefore, we elect to call these people Kasini. It should be kept in mind, however, that depending on one's criteria Kasini may be viewed as a subdivision of either Tutchone or Kaska.

Neither "Tutchone" or "Kaska" indicate political units. They are simply gradations along a linguistic continuum in a region which lacks a "precisely definable cultural base" (Spencer et. al., 1965:155). As Maquet (1969:9) has remarked, such situations are frequently characterized by the anthropologist himself accidentally forming the geographical center of such units.
MAP 7
KASINI TERRITORY
SUPERIMPOSED ON
ETHNOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES
FOR SOUTH YUKON

- KASINI AREA

Boundary Designations from National Museum of Canada Map I, Native Tribes of Northwestern North America - compiled 1950
and the base line tends to become the customs, dialect and range of interaction displayed by the people with whom the anthropologist is in most intimate contact. Thus a core unit is formed and classified as "X people"; subdivisions are then recognized in terms of variations in custom, dialect and degree of interaction. Usually a boundary is formed where linguistic intelligibility and interaction cease to exist for "X people".

The similarity and differences of people on the peripheries and beyond, may be noted -- all from the limited and, as it were, ego-centric position. This is well and good for an actor's view of the setting, but when such information is presented in the form of a map it becomes unrealistic. Arbitrary lines cut the gradual continuum. And unfortunately, once cultural units are presented in map form they persist with considerable tenacity. For instance the category "Mahani" which Jennes very briefly outlined in 1932 and applied rather generously to the southeastern Yukon, was convincingly debunked by Honigmann in 1956. Yet it still persisted in an ethnographic map compiled in 1965 by the D.J.A.

From this it should be clear that despite their heuristic use, such categories have little to recommend them as basic cultural and social units, for the boundaries so formed are merely an arbitrary circumscription around a fortuitously chosen center. If, for instance, it had happened that the anthropologist had settled in another area and carried out his field work primarily with a neighbouring people it is likely the boundaries would have been different.
The term Tutchone appears first to have been given some sort of official sanction by Osgood when he published his *Distribution of the Northern Athapaskan Indians* in 1936. It was a dialect group which has since been applied to a fairly large area of the south-central Yukon. The term is a useful means of designating a linguistic group, however, the people so designated do not lay claim to, or even recognize that they inhabit a discrete territory or exist in any way as a social unit.

The term Kaska like that of Tutchone has no general sociological relevance. Unlike Tutchone, however, Kaska have received comparatively extensive documentation and a number of subdivisions have been isolated. In 1944-45 Honigmann collected material on the Kaska which he subsequently published in two monographs and a number of papers. His monograph (1954) which focused on the pre-contact and early historical life style of the Kaska is of special interest to us here for in this work Honigmann not only criticizes earlier attempts at defining the geographical extent of the Kaska culture-area but also, with some finality, he dispenses with many of the subdivisions and more general categories previously in use (see also: Honigmann, 1956). In their place he proposes five Kaska subdivisions, characterized by dialects and long standing relations based on intermarriage.

In establishing these subdivisions, however, Honigmann spent most of his time at Lower Post and Watson Lake and acquired his information from a few individuals (Honigmann, 1970). Some of the divisions were based on very little information provided by a single informant who had, at some time in the
past, immigrated to the Lower Post area. The deficiencies in sampling and perspective inherent in such an approach have been discussed and it appears that Honigmann was not unaware of them at the time (op. cit., 1954:6). However, the circumstances under which field work was carried out did not allow him to resolve the problems.

This is especially true of the geographical boundaries that he outlines for the northern-most subdivision, the Frances Lake Kaska. These boundaries seem to be based merely on Osgood's earlier location of the Kaska which restricts them to the watershed of the Arctic drainage system. This is done despite evidence to the contrary which Honigmann himself provides. We are not simply referring here to shared cultural traits which are considered in detail for only three of the five subdivisions Honigmann outlines. Although in this regard it is worth pointing out that in the tabulation of Kaska cultural traits (Honigmann: 1954:145-160), over 600 traits were considered and out of these, information pertaining to the Frances Lake Kaska was obtained for only 25 traits. This paucity of information is, we suspect, a function of where Honigmann carried out his fieldwork and who his informants were. The area and people in question, therefore, represented the extent of his informants' knowledge of them. In support of this we only have to consider the fact that for some Kaska the Frances Lake people were classed by the same term that was used for the people of the Pelly river and for others the Pelly river people
were classified as Na'hani (ibid. 1954: 20-21). In the former case at least something was known of the people of the area, the extent of their interaction with others and the range of their movements. In the latter case, which presumably involved informants who were even more removed, both socially and spatially, the Frances Lake people represented the absolute limits of those who could be positively identified. Beyond this was the social residuum as implied by the use of term Na'hani, which is, among other things, a commentary on the ignorance of the people who use it. However, quite apart from this lack of consensus on the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion, Honigmann also states that the so-called Frances Lake Kaska also went to the Pelly River and fished for salmon and some of the Pelly river people readily joined up with the Frances Lake people after being threatened with attack by Indians from the Mackenzie river (op. cit. 22-23). We must conclude that there is little reason to accent Honigmann's boundary as significant. And there is even less reason to favor the earlier suggestion of Jenness (1932: 396) that a culture or society was annihilated and subsequently replaced by a variety of other people. This, of course, does not deny that conflict resulted from movements into the area.

Most Kasini today are aware that some of their ancestors migrated to the area between Ross River and Frances Lake, and some even claim to know a few words from the dialects of these earlier migrants. Nevertheless, all Kasini now speak a common
dialect, use the same kinship terms, make similar marriage arrangements and hold similar beliefs. Furthermore, and very significantly, they retain stories concerning the arrival of the first whiteman in the 1840's; a time which apparently predates the various movements into the area and the subsequent conflicts which took place (cf. P. Field 1915). This last fact suggests something about the commonality of important aspects of the cultural traditions still retained by Kasini. In the first place, a sense of continuity is implied, for the descendants of people who came after a certain period are aware of events which took place prior to their ancestors' arrival. In the second place, this continuity suggests that the diverse groups which did come to the area were absorbed by those who were already there, for with respect to dialect and the different features of social organization that we have mentioned, there is no indication Kasini constitute an amalgamation of different cultural traditions. Conflict and some killing would be unlikely to destroy a group entirely, for nearly all accounts concerning warfare in this region emphasize the fact that the victors killed men only. Women were taken as wives. Since it is through the mother that Kasini decide which dialect to learn, which phratrie in the moiety system to belong to, and which beliefs to adopt, warfare would not eradicate indigenous cultural tradition.

The designation Kasini, therefore, means that we do not begin an examination of the people from the upper Pelly region by postulating a confrontation of traditions between
Kaska and Tutchone. It is a question of accepting Kasini as representing a cultural experience in their own right rather than a fragmented manifestation of two different traditions. The term "Kasini" simply refers to the aggregate of people who lived and, in part, continue to live in the region between Ross River and Frances Lake.