



Introduction

**Paul Valentine
and Catherine Julien**

Warfare as a subject of anthropological enquiry has proven to be as intractable as the human conflicts anthropologists study. It is especially difficult to study indigenous warfare in the Americas, given that local practice was exacerbated as an initial effect of European colonialisation and that colonial states and independent nations tended to suppress local aggression as their control over the interior increased. Anthropologists have had to turn, in part, to ethnohistorical methodologies for dealing with the kinds of written sources they must study if they want to learn about past practice. These sources, however, were written by outsiders to the cultures anthropologists study. They must be carefully read. Anthropologists also have access to the tools of the ethnographer, but this brings other filters, since the ethnographer is generally working with memory, not with eyewitness testimony. There are processes at work that shape what is remembered, especially when memory takes a narrative format. Stories told about the past take on a life of their own. Despite the inherent defects of source materials, there is still every reason to try to work with them, and to try for a more coherent marriage between ethnohistory and ethnography.

The collection of papers published in this double issue of *Antropológica* was first given at the 50th International Congress of Americanists in Warsaw (2000). The session was framed around the opposing ideas of war and peace and around questions that try to explain the choices that are made when going to war. Rather than limit the participants to a particular focus, the organizers tried to pose the questions as broadly as possible and to involve a diverse group of people who would contribute to identifying issues that might otherwise be left out of consideration. The papers strive for breadth and try to maximize the researcher's own ability to contribute a perspective on what is one of the most enduring problems of human existence.

Because the use of ethnohistorical data is so prevalent, and because other issues related to developing perspectives on warfare have also been carefully and thoughtfully taken into account by the contributors, we have decided to explore how the contributors have approached historical topics in our introduction. Anthropologists have always written the history of indigenous peoples, but they are doing it with renewed insight into the evaluation of their sources and more respect for lived history in the near-past and not just for some pristine, pre-contact period. If aggression was expressed through coalitional violence or a substitute, how has that aggressive behavior either been nullified (to whatever extent) or evolved into some new form? How can living memory be connected with what was written? And, why not start with trying to locate what is in the memory of people alive now, in space and time? There is an increasing sophistication not only in method, but in the questions being asked. At the same time, some of the old strengths are there as well. Anthropologists who have invested in acquiring a deep knowledge of a particular people begin their queries from within that body of knowledge, expanding their framework when there are other anthropologists with the same deep knowledge whose work they can use in comparison and generalization. Some of the best work is regional, and there is no tendency in these papers to generalize findings across language group.

We have organized the papers in geographical order, roughly from east to west. It is perhaps most logical to group the papers this way: chronology would not have yielded as clean a result and neighboring groups seem to have more in common than non-neighbors. We make no claims to providing even coverage, although we will briefly present each paper here and try to tease out some of the underlying connections between them.

Ethnohistory and ethnography: a marriage of convenience

To begin at the beginning, a traditional strength of anthropology has been long-term research with a particular cultural group. The sort of universal knowledge that is gained through learning what it means to be part of that group can be used to fashion answers to any question about human society that might be put. Not only does the question find an answer, but the answer is embedded within a body of knowledge that at once allows it to be seen in terms of what is related to it. What it means in a larger universe can be grasped. These kinds of insights are never possible with historical documentation, even where the person doing the writing had been in close contact with the people being mentioned. Only a few works written during the time of colonial rule in the Americas can be described as ethnographic in a remotely similar way, and none of these can rival the ethnography produced by a good modern anthropologist, even given the flawed nature of the ethnographic project.

The first study in the collection, by Bill Crocker, exemplifies the durability of this sort of ethnography. He has the work of Curt Nimuendaju on the Eastern Timbira (who include the Canela), so the longevity of Crocker's own research is effectively extended. What is important in his paper is that Crocker chooses the 1814 pacification of the Canela as a baseline and attempts to work backwards from his oral sources to that time. This is, of course, exactly where an anthropologist should head first: into the near-past. He can test what was written about the Canela in the early nineteenth century -as he estimates, the time of the grandparents of the grandparents of the people with whom he spoke- and find a resonance between them. With admirable clarity, he describes the methods he used when interviewing his research assistant, who they were, and who had told them these oral histories. What is truly wonderful, in the year 2004, is that he can work with stories collected from people in the 1970s whose memories reached a time very different than now, and who knew people whose memories reached back to the time of pacification. He can also examine the organization of Canela men into age-sets and the preparation of young men for their future roles in warrior society because Canela society preserved these aspects of social organization and educational practice even though they live in a very different world than the one of two centuries ago. Structures remain even when motives and purposes change. What is most important about the way Crocker uses material from interviews is that he is trying to control for veracity and other aspects of the quality of information, and he tells us, convincingly, what it is worth.

Conklin's paper has some of the strengths as Crocker's, that is, she begins with what she knows well and deeply, and looks at what other anthropologists have learned about peoples in the same cultural universe. She asks, what motivated a Wari' warrior, and the community that supported him, to make war on his enemy? Is it for control of land, for control of foreign populations, or land? The Wari' answer to this question is seldom that concrete. They are not, it appears, motivated by material gain. She looks for interior perspectives and finds that in many Amazonian cultures, relations to the outside world and to beings external to their own society are essential for producing fully realized persons and for reproducing society. She suggests there is a basic principle, "that human agency -the ability to access creative, productive, generative powers- develops through interactions with others who are different from oneself." The hunter and shaman occupy key positions as mediators and transformers between the outside and the inside of society. The warrior similarly achieves this position by killing enemies and transforming foreign enemy elements into new forms of vitality.

Conklin points out that the Wari', as do other Amazonian groups, see a close association between the victim's corpse and the victim's blood in the killer's body. These spiritual elements acquired from the enemy have to be controlled ritually. Given the concerns for growth, health and biological

transcendence, it is not surprising to find these transformations of men's bodies conceived in terms of cultural images of the flow of blood in menstruation and childbirth. The incorporation and transformation of enemy blood was one native Amazonian mode for appropriating outsiders' vital energies and transforming these into new forms of fertility. The Wari' warrior emerged from his state of seclusion after killing an enemy in a highest state of well-being and fertility -a powerful motivation to risk his life in war. Moreover, Conklin succinctly compares her work with the Wari' with the work of Bruce Albert on the Yanomami, and can put them in the same universe although they have radically different ideas about what warrior blood means. There can be no way that earlier documents will inform us about such things, but her study is a very good indication of what we will be missing.

Conklin is dealing with the immediate past, but the next two studies are concerned with the remote past, and this is possible because of documents from the early colonial period for the peoples of the circum-Caribbean. The first is Karl Schwerin's work on Carib slaving and the second is Nalua Silva's work on the Caura region. Schwerin picks the Carib, defining them as Kariña. The Kariña occupied the Caura, so there is overlap between the two studies. Schwerin is trying to make sense of a complicated colonial landscape; Silva is working with a region but covering the entire time span from the early colonial period to the present.

Schwerin's paper is entirely based on historical documents, following the long-standing tradition of anthropologists doing the history of indigenous peoples. He does not use ethnographic material. What is anthropological about his approach (in addition to the interest in indigenous peoples) is that he casts the study within a theoretical framework, in this case, as a revision of Imanuel Wallerstein's world-systems theory. Wallerstein writes of "mini-systems" and "world-systems." But in the Orinoco basin Schwerin suggests we have something that falls between the two in terms of complexity, incorporating some elements from each but remaining distinct in others. He proposes a third category, "regional-system," the very characteristics of which are inherently unstable.

A great deal has been written about the Orinoco basin in recent years, particularly by the anthropologist and ethnohistorian Neil Whitehead. Schwerin is addressing this work. Schwerin chooses to counter Whitehead's contention that European contact produced "tribal" organization and argues for greater Carib autonomy in colonial interactions. The analysis is ethnohistorical but not ethnographic.

Silva works differently. She does not (perhaps because she cannot) delve deeply into any particular period of the history of inter-ethnic relations in the Caura valley, a region with a very long history of contact. Rather, she takes a broad view, focusing on the period from the eighteenth century, when the first encounters between Europeans and Kariña occurred, to the beginning of the twentieth century, when the last reported, violent conflict between the

Ye'kwana and Sanema took place. A great deal of contact went unrecorded, as she adduces from the existence of important routes through the Caura used by slavers and other outsiders. She reads the signs of a profound change in ethnic makeup/definition in the region in the late nineteenth century, and comes to the conclusion that warfare had a significant impact on population density and dispersal of ethnic groups. All of this is a set-up for examining the historical content of two Ye'kwana stories for their resonances with her historical sketch. Her enterprise is similar to Crocker's, but her argument is harder to support. Still, the narratives she reads do suggest that indigenous alliances were reoriented as a consequence of the arrival of European outsiders and they do reaffirm Ye'kwana identity during a time of profound socio-cultural change.

Mansutti adds a necessary correction to the overall treatment of warfare as coalitional violence. Without assuming that the Piaroa do not go easily to war but direct an equal quantity of violence elsewhere (that all societies are equally violent but express it differently), he shows that the Piaroa have ways of addressing grievances that others might settle by physical violence. Here, the written sources help him put the violence of the Piaroa's neighbors and their own lack of engagement on record, from which he infers a long tradition of shamanic violence. One is struck, in Mansutti's narrative, by what can be read as Piaroa response to the threat supplied by their neighbors, both in terms of defense measures inherent in their manner of settlement and their ability to serve as middlemen, thus securing a role in some kind of regional balance of power. Their reputation for shamanic violence was also a bulwark in these defenses. One is reminded of Robert Padden's work on the Mapuche of Chile (1974), where putting their society on a continuous warfare footing was the best defense against Spanish incursion. Here, the response is just as deep -and culturally transformative- but it does not involve physical violence, or even, the presence of European outsiders. This violent world also incorporates other, non-human powers.

Heinen's paper is very different from the others, and it is the only one that really addresses the various controversies that have raged over war and its causes. In comparing the Yanomami and Warao -who have been assigned to opposite ends of the war/peace continuum by other anthropologists- he finds that they have much in common, for example, their common reliance on shamanic violence, even if the Yanomami give more expression to physical violence than do the Warao. They have similar ideas about how to treat the bodies of warriors and others who participated in a killing. There are interesting connections to Mansutti's and Conklin's papers, and one would want to send Heinen to work on the Piaroa and War'i and Conklin and Mansutti to the Yanomami and Warao to see what could be done about their differences.

Valentine returns to the question of why people went to war, using his work with the Curripaco, principally oral histories. When the Curripaco made

war, there was a perception of debt, that the campaign addresses a wrong or an imbalance, even though the original source of the conflict could be lost in time (although the stories told usually tell of an initial incident often involving a woman or a homicide). Wars were fought primarily to right this wrong, but that explanation only focuses on the immediate or proximate cause. The Curripaco were also motivated to make war on their enemies to defend what they had and to gain women, children and land so that they could perpetuate themselves.

Like Crocker and Silva, he tries to date war stories collected from older men in four different villages who gave complementary accounts of wars witnessed by their fathers or their father's fathers. The Curripaco say that they never engaged in war among themselves. Rather, war was with those people who spoke other languages, and with whom they shared no kinship or affinal ties. However, the delineations of the boundaries of Curripaco moral community were not always that clear cut. The Curripaco, on occasion, did go to war among themselves, although never within the *clañ*.

Each clan is identified with a particular river section, exhibiting a common descent and language. Marriage does not occur within the clan, and it is these marriage alliances that are fraught with tension, especially since women come from different clans and a clan will have various alliances that tug at their allegiance to one particular affinal clan or another. Affines are known to renege on their debts. This loss creates a sense of vulnerability and indebtedness that can spiral into sorcery accusations and violence. Was this warfare on a different scale than that documented in the case of the Wari', described by Conklin? Were they perceived as enemy "other?" The Curripaco also went to war with non-Curripaco. Valentine analyzes a story about an attack on the Cubeo. The importance of war leaders and the taking of captives and booty are reminiscent in some ways of what can be known about warfare in the Cuzco region, described by Julien. Was there differential treatment afforded to segments of the group as compared with campaigns mounted against those who do not belong? It would be productive to examine these differences in more detail.

Wayuu warfare, studied by Perrin, is reminiscent of what Valentine has written about the Curripaco. The sense of debt, the specific nature of motive, difficulties with affines, the unsettling effects of homicide, are reminiscent of the Curripaco case. Yet here we see more of an attempt to redress perceived grievances through forms of recompense, usually material. Mediation is only a solution in cases of relative equality, because if one group is substantially superior, it can take what it wants. In this case, the balance -or imbalance- of power is a factor in determining the outbreak of war. The idea of some kind of local balance of power is something which lurks in the background of the other papers as well, for example, when Crocker tells us the Canela go to war before a group becomes large enough to be a serious threat. Since the Canela love to hunt, there are other reasons why population control would be

important, but their reasoning seems to imply that they were equally concerned with an upset in the balance of power. The strategies of counterbalancing powerful neighbors are evident in other papers, for example, in Mansutti's study of the Piaroa.

Boster has contributed two papers. One, on arutam spirit, was originally a long appendix. Neither of his papers uses written sources, except for the earlier works of his colleagues. Both papers deal with change. The work on arutam spirit, in particular, is sensitive to change in the meaning of the concept of arutam in the time since anthropologists began to study the Jivaro, due to contact -Boster argues- with Salesian missionaries. This interpretation is confirmed by Michael Harner's careful reading and critique of the paper. His other paper uses the restored definition of arutam to explain how a coercive ideology is a driving force in endemic cycles of warfare. Like Perrin's and Valentine's papers, he is working on two levels of group violence, intra-tribal feuding -with homicide as initiating event- and inter-tribal warfare. Not just a difference in scale -and there was much more killing when the enemy was outside the tribe- but other differences emerge. The taking of human heads as trophies (*tsantsaa*) was confined to this latter category. Boster argues that out-group violence may have curbed violence within the group, given that Jivaro ideology coerced violence and any killing could procure an arutam spirit. But this is a side issue when the main matter is how visitors who spit on the floor signal their peaceful intentions. Given this kind of test, it would be unwise to offer a visitor a drink. Perhaps this is why the Inca had so much trouble in lowland Ecuador.

Julien's paper is last. It is the only one to confine itself to the prehispanic past, and the only one on the Andes. The sources are all from the period just after the Spanish arrival, but look backward to the preceding century when Andean peoples went to war on their own terms. This period also saw the growth and expansion of the Inca empire, and presents a case of an indigenous American conquest state. Julien chose sources that would attempt to explain Andean practice in Andean terms, focusing very narrowly on the region near Cuzco where the Spaniards actually interviewed people about warfare in the past. Perhaps the purpose of such an exercise in ethnographic reconstruction is to try to see the Inca as South Americans. They have too often been compared to the Romans. And, there are clear points of comparison with the other papers, like the idea that wars might have been more frequent because future war-leaders needed to prove themselves (as in Canela society). There are references to looting and/or trophy-taking in several papers. It might be useful to look more generally at the treatment of both enemy and non-enemy bodies of those who met violent deaths.

Julien's paper returns us to our general theme, that there is good reason to marry the tools of the ethnographer and the ethnohistorian. Her enterprise is different from the others. To restore an ethnographic voice, she has chosen written sources that give the most voice to the peoples who appear in the

documents. The result is less than what an ethnographer might want to know. It is also less than what an ethnohistorian wants to know about the past, but these are the inherent limits in using materials collected in the sixteenth century. What should be apparent is that ethnography sets the bar for what might be done to query the written sources. There is an increasing level of sophistication in the use of written sources and in conceptualizations of processes of change, and this symposium is witness to that.

* * * * *

This publication is the fruit of a symposium, entitled 'War and Peace in Aboriginal America,' held in 2000 at the 50th International Congress of Americanists in Warsaw. The symposium was organized by Stephen Beckerman, Catherine Julien and Paul Valentine. Valentine and Julien later took on the job of editing the papers for *Antropológica*, under the guiding hand of general editor, Walter Coppens, at the Fundación La Salle. We extend an enormous thanks to him for the patience and dedication he has shown throughout the preparation of this work. In addition, we thank Bernarda Escalante for her extensive editorial assistance, and Professors Maria Susana Cipolletti and Stephen Beckerman for serving as outside readers.

* * * * *

El equipo editorial desea dejar constancia expresa de su sincero agradecimiento a Yazmin Rivero por su paciente y esmerado esfuerzo en el proceso de diagramación.