

INTRODUCTION

Foragers and others

RICHARD B. LEE AND RICHARD DALY

Recently an aboriginal guide was showing a group of tourists around Alberta's renowned Head- Smashed-In Buffalo-Jump, a UNESCO World Heritage Site staffed by First Nations personnel. The guide graphically described how in ancient times the Jill Sullivan buffalo would be driven over the edge of a fifteen meter precipice, to land in a gory heap at the base of the cliff. A diorama showed men and women clambering over the bodies to club and spear those still living. When one tourist expressed shock at the bloody nature of the enterprise, the guide responded simply but with conviction, "We were hunters!" connecting her own generation with those of the past. She then amended her statement with equal conviction, adding, "Humans were hunters!" thus expanding complicity in the act of carnage to the whole of humanity, not excluding her interlocutor.

This incident summarizes neatly the historical conjuncture that brings *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Hunters and Gatherers* to fruition. The world's hunting and gathering peoples -the Arctic Inuit, Aboriginal Australians, Kalahari San, and similar groups -represent the oldest and perhaps most successful human adaptation. Until 12,000 years ago virtually all humanity lived as hunters and gatherers. In recent centuries hunters have retreated precipitously in the face of the steamroller of modernity. However, fascination with hunting peoples and their ways of life remains strong, a fascination tinged with ambivalence. The reason for public and academic interest is not hard to find. Hunters and gatherers stand at the opposite pole from the dense urban life experienced by most of humanity. Yet these same hunters may hold the key to some of the central questions about the human condition -about social life, politics, and gender, about diet and nutrition and living in nature: how people can live and have lived without the state; how to live without accumulated technology; the possibility of living in Nature without destroying it. This book offers no simple answers to these questions. Hunter- gatherers are a diverse group of peoples living in a wide range of conditions. One of the themes of the book is the exploration of that diversity. Yet within the range of variation, certain common motifs can be identified. Hunter- gatherers are generally peoples who have lived until recently without the overarching discipline imposed by the state. They have lived in relatively small groups, without centralized authority, standing armies, or bureaucratic systems. Yet the evidence indicates that they have lived together surprisingly well, solving their problems among themselves largely without recourse to authority figures and without a particular propensity for violence. It was *not* the situation that Thomas Hobbes, the great seventeenth-century philosopher, described in a famous phrase as "the war of all against all:' By all accounts life was not "nasty, brutish and short:' With relatively simple technology - wood, bone, stone, fibers -they were able to meet their material needs without a great expenditure of energy, leading the American anthropologist and social critic Marshall Sahlins to call them, in another famous phrase, "the original affluent society:' Most striking, the hunter- gatherers have demonstrated the remarkable ability to survive and thrive for long periods -in some cases thousands of years -without destroying their environment.

The contemporary industrial world lives in highly structured societies at immensely higher densities and enjoys luxuries of technology that foragers could hardly imagine. Yet all

these same societies are sharply divided into haves and have-nots, and after only a few millennia of stewardship by agricultural and industrial civilizations, the environments of large parts of the planet lie in ruins. Therefore the hunter-gatherers may well be able to teach us something, not only about past ways of life but also about long-term human futures. If technological humanity is to survive it may have to learn the keys to longevity from fellow humans whose way of life has been around a lot longer than industrial commercial "civilization." As Burnum Burnum, the late Australian Aboriginal writer and lecturer, put it, "Modern ecology can learn a great deal from a people who managed and maintained their world so well for 50,000 years:"

Hunter-gatherers in recent history have been surprisingly persistent. As recently as AD 1500 hunters occupied fully one third of the globe, including all of Australia and most of North America, as well as large tracts of South America, Africa, and Northeast Asia. The twentieth century has seen particularly dramatic changes in their life circumstances. The century began with dozens of hunting and gathering peoples still pursuing ancient (though not isolated) lifeways in small communities, as foragers with systems of local meaning centered on kin, plants, animals, and the spirit world. As the century proceeded, a wave of self-appointed civilizers washed over the world's foragers, bringing schools, clinics, and administrative structures, and, not incidentally, taking their land and resources.

The year 2000 will have seen the vast majority of former foragers settled and encapsulated in the administrative structures of one state or another. And given their tragic history of forced acculturation one would imagine that the millennium will bring to a close a long chapter in human history. But will it? We believe not. Hunter-gatherers live on, not only in the pages of anthropological and historical texts, but also, in forty countries, in the presence of hundreds of thousands of descendants a generation or two removed from a foraging way of life, and these peoples and their supporters are creating a strong international voice for indigenous peoples and their human rights.

Among the public-at-large, images of hunters and gatherers have swung between two poles. For centuries they were regarded as "savages," variously ignorant or cunning, beyond the pale of "civilization." This distorted image was usually associated with settler societies who coveted the foragers' land; the negative stereotypes justified dispossession. In recent years a different view has dominated, with hunter-less gatherers as the repository of virtues seemingly lacking in the materialism and marked inequalities of contemporary urban life. How to balance these two views? For many current observers the contrast between savage inequities of modernity and the relative egalitarianism of the so-called "primitives" gives the latter more weight on the scales of natural justice. Jack Weatherford's eloquently argued book, *Savages and civilization: who will survive?* (1994), draws on a long intellectual tradition dating from Rousseau which, contemplating the horrors of the modern world, raises the question of who are the truly civilized: the "savage" with his occasional blood-feud, or the "civilized" who gave the world the Inquisition, the Atlantic slave trade, the Gatling gun, napalm, Hiroshima, and the Holocaust? (For an opposing view see Robert Edgerton's *Sick societies* [1992].)

The present work thus grows out of the intersection between three discourses: anthropological knowledge, public fascination, and indigenous peoples' own world-views. The Encyclopedia speaks to scholars, to general readers, and particularly to the members of the

cultures themselves. The book offers an up-to-date and encyclo- pedic inventory of hunters and gatherers, written in accessible language by recognized authorities, some of whom are representatives of the cultures they write about.

Foraging defined

Foraging refers to subsistence based on hunting of wild animals, gathering of wild plant foods, and fishing, with no domestication of plants, and no domesticated animals except the dog. In contemporary theory this minimal definition is only the starting point in defining hunter- gatherers. Recent research has brought a more nuanced understanding of the issue of who the hunters are and why they have persisted. While it is true that hunting and gathering represent the original condition of humankind and 90 percent of human history, the contemporary people called hunter-gatherers arrived at their present condition by a variety of pathways.

At one end of a continuum are the areas of the world where modern hunter-gatherers have persisted in a more or less direct tradition of descent from ancient hunter- gatherer populations. This would characterize the aboriginal peoples of Australia, northwestern North America, the southern cone of South America, and pockets in other world areas. The Australian Pintupi, Arrernte, and Warlpiri, the North American Eskimo, Shoshone, and Cree, the South American Yamana, and the African Ju/'hoansi are examples of this first grouping, represented in case studies in this volume. In pre-colonial Australia and parts of North America we come closest to Marshall Sahlins' rubric of "hunters in a world of hunters" (Lee and DeVore 1968). But even here the histories offer examples of complex interrelations between foragers and others (see chapters by Peterson, M. Smith, Feit, and Cannon).

Along the middle of the continuum are hunting and gathering peoples who have lived in degrees of contact ~d integration with non-hunting societies, and these include a number whose own histories include life as farmers and/or herders in the past. South and Southeast Asian hunter-gatherers are linked to settled villagers and their markets, trading forest products: furs, honey, medicinal plants, and rattan, for rice, metals, and consumer goods. Some of these arrangements have persisted for millennia (see chapters by Bird- David, Morrison, Endicott, and Bellwood). Similar arrangements are seen in central Africa where pygmies have lived for centuries in patron-client relations with settled villagers while still maintaining a period of the year when they lived more autonomously in the forest (see chapters by Bahuchet and Ichikawa). And in East Africa the foraging Okiek traditionally supplied honey and other forest products to neighboring Maasai and Kipsigis (see chapter by Cory Kratz).

South American hunter-gatherers present an even more interesting case, since archaeological evidence indi- cates that in Amazonia farming replaced foraging several millennia ago. In the view of Anna Roosevelt, much of the foraging observed in *tropical* South America represents a secondary readaptation. After the European conquests of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries many groups found that mobile hunting and gathering made them less vulnerable to colonial exploitation (see chapters by Rival and Roosevelt). Other groups had been operating this way far longer, back into the pre-colonial period. And almost all *tropical* South American

foragers today plant gardens as one part of their annual trek. There are parallels here with Siberia, where most of the "small peoples" classified as hunter-gatherers also herded reindeer, a practice which greatly expanded during the Soviet period.

Finally, at the other end of the continuum are peoples who once were hunters but who changed their subsistence in the more distant past. And that includes the rest of us: the 5 billion strong remainder of humanity.

Social life

In defining foragers we must recognize that contemporary foragers practice a mixed subsistence: gardening in tropical South America, reindeer herding in northern Asia, trading in South/Southeast Asia and parts of Africa. Given this diversity, what constitutes the category "hunter-gatherer"? The answer is that subsistence is one part of a multi-faceted definition of hunter-gatherers: social organization forms a second major area of convergence, and cosmology and world-view a third. All three sets of criteria have to be taken into account in understanding hunting and gathering peoples today.

The basic unit of social organization of most (but not all) hunting and gathering peoples is the *band*, a small-scale nomadic group of fifteen to fifty people related by kinship. Band societies are found throughout the Old and New Worlds and share a number of features in common. Most observers would agree that the social and economic life of *small-scale* hunter-gatherers shares the following features.

First they are relatively *egalitarian*. Leadership is less formal and more subject to constraints of popular opinion than in village societies governed by headmen and chiefs. Leadership in band societies tends to be by example, not by fiat. The leader can persuade but not command. This important aspect of their way of life allowed for a degree of freedom unheard of in more hierarchical societies but it has put them at a distinct disadvantage in their encounters with centrally organized colonial authorities.

Mobility is another characteristic of band societies. People tend to move their settlements frequently, several times a year or more, in search of food, and this mobility is an important element of their politics. People in band societies tend to "vote with their feet," moving away rather than submitting to the will of an unpopular leader. Mobility is also a means of resolving conflicts that would be more difficult for settled peoples.

A third characteristic is the remarkable fact that all band-organized peoples exhibit a pattern of *concentration and dispersion*. Rather than living in uniformly sized groupings throughout the year, band societies tend to spend part of the year dispersed into small foraging units and another part of the year aggregated into much larger units. The Innu (Naskapi) discussed by Mailhot would spend the winter dispersed in small foraging groups of ten to thirty, while in the summer they would aggregate in groups of up to 200-300 at lake or river fishing sites. It seems clear that the concentration/dispersion patterns of hunter-gatherers represent a dialectical interplay of social *and* ecological factors

A fourth characteristic common to almost all band societies (and hundreds of village-based societies as well) is a land tenure system based on a *common property regime (CPR)*. These regimes were, until recently, far more common world-wide than regimes based on private property. In traditional CPRs, while movable property is held by individuals, land is held by a kinship-based collective. Rules of reciprocal access make it possible for each individual to draw on the resources of several territories. Rarer is the situation where the whole society has unrestricted access to all the land controlled by the group.

Ethos and world-view

Another broad area of commonalities lies in the domains of the quality of interpersonal relations and forms of consciousness.

Sharing is the central rule of social interaction among hunters and gatherers. There are strong injunctions on the importance of reciprocity. Generalized reciprocity, the giving of something without an immediate expectation of return, is the dominant form within face-to-face groups. Its presence in hunting and gathering societies is almost universal (Sahlins 1965). This, combined with an absence of private ownership of land, has led many observers from Lewis Henry Morgan forward to attribute to hunter-gatherers a way of life based on "primitive communism" (Morgan 1881, Testart 1985, Lee 1988; see Ingold, this volume).

Found among many but not all hunter-gatherers is the notion of the *giving environment*, the idea that the land around them is their spiritual home and the source of all good things (Bird-David 1990, Turnbull 1965). This view is the direct antithesis of the Western Judeo-Christian perspective on the natural environment as a «wilderness; a hostile space to be subdued and brought to heel by the force of will. This latter view is seen by many ecological humanists as the source of both the environmental crisis and the spiritual malaise afflicting contemporary humanity (Shiva 1988, 1997, Suzuki 1989, 1992, 1997).

Hunter-gatherers are peoples who live with nature. When we examine the *cosmology* of hunting and gathering peoples, one striking commonality is the view of nature as animated with moral and mystical force, in Robert Bellah's phrase "the hovering closeness of the world of myth to the actual world" (1965:91). As discussed by Mathias Guenther (this volume), the world of hunter-gatherers is a multi-layered world, composed of two or more planes: an above/beyond zone and an underworld in addition to the present world inhabited by humans. There are invariably two temporal orders of existence, with an Early mythical or "dreamtime" preceding the present. In the former, nature and culture are not yet fully separated. Out of this Ur-existence, a veritable cauldron of cultural possibilities, crystallizes the distinction between humans and animals, the origin of fire, cooking, incest taboos, even mortality itself and virtually everything of cultural significance.

The world of the Past and the above-and-below world of myth are in intimate contact with the normal plane of existence. The Australian Aborigines present the most fully realized instance of this process of world-enchantment. The famous "songlines" of the Dreamtime criss-cross the landscape and saturate it with significance.

Every rock and feature has symbolic meaning and these are bound up in the reproduction of life itself. It is these totemic elements that are the sources of the spirit children that enter women's wombs and trigger conception. Parallels are found in many other hunter-gatherer groups.

The *Trickster* is a central figure in the myth worlds of many hunting and gathering societies. A divine figure, but deeply flawed and very human, the Trickster is found in myth cycles from the Americas, Africa, Australia, and Siberia. Similar figures grace the pantheons of most village farming and herding peoples as well. The Trickster symbolizes the frailty and human qualities of the gods and their closeness to humans. These stand in pointed contrast to the omnipotent, all-knowing but distant deities that are central to the pantheons of state religions and their powerful ecclesiastical hierarchies (Radin 1956, Diamond 1974, Wallace 1966).

Shamanism is another major practice common to the great majority of hunting and gathering peoples. The word originates in eastern Siberia, from the Evenki/Tungus word *saman* meaning "one who is excited or raised." Throughout the hunter-gatherer world community-based ritual specialists (usually part-time) heal the sick and provide spiritual protection. They mediate between the social/human world and the dangerous and unpredictable world of the supernatural. Shamanism is performative, mixing theatre and instrumental acts in order to approach the plane of the sacred. Performances vary widely. Among the Ju/'hoansi the "owners of medicine" after a long and difficult training period, enter an altered state of consciousness called *!kia*, to heal the sick through a laying on of hands (Marshall 1968, Katz 1982). The northern Ojibwa practiced the famous shaking tent ceremony or *midewiwin*, while other shamans used dreams, psychoactive drugs, or intense mental concentration to reach the sacred plane. The brilliant use of language and metaphor in the form of powerful and moving verbal images is a central part of the shaman's craft (Rothenberg 1968). So powerful are these techniques that they have been widely and successfully adapted to the *visualization therapies* in the treatment of cancer and other conditions in Western medicine.

Ethos and social organization are both essential components of hunter-gatherer lifeways. Laura Rival (this volume) makes the point, that two South American tropical forest peoples may well have a rather similar subsistence mix, but different orientations: analyzing them on the basis of their social organization and mobility patterns, as well as mythology, rituals and inter-personal relations, the researcher finds that one has a clearly agricultural orientation, the other a foraging one.

What is remarkable is that, despite marked differences in historical circumstances, foragers seem to arrive at similar organizational and ideational solutions to the problems of living in groups, a convergence that Tim Ingold, the foremost authority on hunter-gatherer social life, has labeled "a distinct mode of sociality" (this volume).

Divergences

Despite these commonalities, there are a number of significant divergences among hunters and gatherers. And consideration of these must temper any attempt to present an idealized picture of foraging peoples. First the foragers as a group are not particularly peaceful. *Interpersonal violence* is documented for most and warfare is recorded for a number of hunting and gathering peoples. Although peaceful peoples such as the Malaysian Semang are celebrated in the literature (Dentan 1968), for many others (Inupiat, Warlpiri, Blackfoot, Ache, Agta) raids and blood-feuds are common occurrences, particularly before the pacification campaigns of the colonial authorities (see for example Bamforth 1994, Ember 1992, Moss 1992). But mention of the colonial context raises another important issue. Did high levels of "primitive" warfare represent a primordial condition, or were these exacerbated by the pressure of colonial conquest? The question remains an ongoing subject of debate (Divale and Harris 1976, Ferguson 1984).

Gender is another dimension in which hunting and gathering societies show considerable variation. As Karen Endicott argues (this volume), the women of hunter-gatherer societies *do* have higher status than women in most of the world's societies, including industrial and post-industrial modernity. This status is expressed in greater freedom of movement and involvement in decision-making and a lower incidence of domestic violence against them when compared to women in farming, herding, and agrarian societies (Leacock 1978, 1982, Lee 1982). Nevertheless variation exists: wife-beating and rape are recorded for societies as disparate as those of Alaska (Eskimo) and northern Australian Aborigines (Friedl 1975, Ablert 1992) and are not unknown elsewhere; nowhere can it be said that women and men live in a state of perfect equality.

A third area of divergence is found in the important distinction between *simple vs. complex* hunter-gatherers. Price and Brown (1985) argued that not all hunting and gathering peoples - prehistoric and contemporary - lived in small mobile bands. Some, like the Indians of the Northwest Coast (Donald 1984, 1997, Mitchell and Donald 1985) and the Calusa of Florida (Marquardt 1988), as well as many prehistoric peoples, lived in large semi-sedentary settlements with chiefs, commoners, and slaves, yet were entirely dependent on wild foods. In social organization and ethos these societies showed significant divergence from the patterns outlined above, yet in other ways a basic foraging pattern is discernible. For example the Northwest Coast peoples still maintained a concentration-dispersion pattern, breaking down their large permanent plank houses in the summer and incorporating them into temporary structures at seasonal fishing sites (Boas 1966, Daly, this volume). A related concept is James Woodburn's notion of *immediate-return vs. delayed-return societies* (1982). Although both were subsumed under the heading of "band society," in immediate-return societies food was consumed on the spot or soon after, while in delayed-return societies food and other resources might be stored for months or years, with marked effects on social organization and cultural notions of property (Woodburn 1982).

In a superb synthesis Robert L. Kelly has documented these divergences on many fronts in his book *The foraging spectrum: diversity in hunter-gatherer lifeways* (1995). Recently Susan Kent (1996b) has attempted a similar exercise for the diversity and variation in the hunting and gathering societies of a single continent,

Africa. The point is that hunter-gatherers encompass a wide range of variability and analysts seeking to make sense of them ignore this diversity at their peril!

The importance of history

Any adequate representation of hunting and gathering peoples in the twenty-first century has to address the complex historical circumstances in which they are found. Foragers have persisted to the present for a variety of reasons but all have developed historical links with non-foraging peoples, some extending over centuries or millennia. And all have experienced the transformative effects of colonial conquest and incorporation into states. Situating the foraging peoples in history is thus essential to any deeper understanding of them, a point that was often lost on earlier observers who preferred to treat foragers as unmediated visions of the past.

One recent school of thought has questioned the validity of the very concept "hunter-gatherer" Starting from the fact that some hunter-gatherers have been dominated by more powerful outsiders for centuries, proponents of this school see contemporary foraging peoples more as victims of colonialism or subalterns at the bottom of a class structure than as exemplars of the hunting and gathering way of life (Wilmsen 1989, Wilmsen and Denbow 1990, Schrire 1984). This "revisionist" view sees the foragers' simple technology, nomadism, and sharing of food as part of a culture of poverty generated by the larger political economy and not as institutions generated by the demands of foraging life. (There is a large and growing literature on both sides of this issue known in recent years as "the Kalahari Debate:" Readers interested in pursuing this issue should begin with Barnard [1992a]).

While recognizing that many foraging peoples have suffered at the hands of more powerful neighbors and colonizers, *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Hunters and Gatherers* challenges the view that recent hunter-gatherers are simply victims of colonial forces. Autonomy and dependency are a continuum, not an either/or proposition, and as John Bodley documents (this volume), despite the damage brought by colonialism, foragers persist and show a surprising resilience. Foragers may persist for a variety of reasons. As illustrated by the example of the Kalahari San of southern Africa, where much of the debate has focused, some San *did* become early subordinates of Bantu-speaking overlords, but many others maintained viable and independent hunter-gatherer lifeways into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Solway and Lee 1990, Guenther 1993, 1997, Kent 1996a; Robertshaw, this volume). Archaeological evidence reviewed by Sadr (1997) strongly supports the position that a number of San peoples maintained a classic Later Stone Age tool kit and a hunting and gathering lifeway into the late nineteenth century. When Ju/'hoan San people themselves are asked to reflect on their own history they insist that, prior to the arrival of the Europeans in the latter part of the nineteenth century, they lived as hunters on their own, without cattle, while maintaining links of trade to the wider world (Smith and Lee 1997).

The general point to be made is that outside links do not automatically make hunter-gatherers subordinate to the will of their trading partners. Exchange is a universal aspect of human culture; all peoples at all times have traded. In the case of recent foragers, trading relations may in fact have allowed foraging peoples to maintain a degree of autonomy and continue to practice a way of life that they valued (Peterson 1991, 1993).

Another case in point is exemplified by the Toba of the western Argentinean Gran Chaco. Gastón Gordillo (this volume) notes how the foraging Toba have maintained their base in the Pilcomayo marshes as a partial haven against direct exploitation. As the Toba say, "At least we have the bush;" seeing their Pilcomayo territory as a refuge to come home to after their annual trips to the plantations to earn necessary cash. The view of the

"bush" as a refuge seems to be a common theme among many hunter-gatherers. What it brings home is that foragers believe in their way of life: foraging for them is a positive choice, not just a result of exclusion by the wider society.

To the contrary, the authors of this book, led by Lakota anthropologist Beatrice Medicine in the Foreword, question whether victimhood at the hands of more powerful peoples is the only or even the main issue of interest

about hunters and gatherers. The authors start from the position that the first priority is to represent the life- worlds of contemporary hunter-gatherers faithfully. This invariably includes documenting the peoples' sense of themselves as having a collective history as hunter-gatherers. Whether this foraging represents a primary or secondary adaptation, it often continues because that way of life has meaning for its practitioners. It seems unwise, if not patronizing, to assume that all foragers are primarily so because they were forced into it by poverty or oppression.

It is more illuminating to understand hunter-gatherer history and culture as the product of a complex triple dynamic: part of their culture needs to be understood in terms of the dynamic of the foraging way of life itself, part from the dynamic of their interaction with (often more powerful) non-foraging neighbors, and part from the dynamic of their interaction with the dominant state administrative structures (cf. Leacock and Lee 1982).

A brief history of hunter-gatherer studies

If a single long-term trend can be discerned in hunter-gatherer studies it is this: studies began with a vast gulf between observers and observed. Eighteenth- and nine-teenth-century treatises on the subject objectified the hunters and treated them as external objects of scrutiny. With the development of field anthropology, observers began to know the foragers as people and the boundaries between observers and observed began to break down. Finally in the most recent period, the production of knowledge has become a two-way process; the role of observer has begun to merge with the role of advocate and the field of hunter-gatherer studies has come to be increasingly influenced by agendas set by the hunter-gatherers themselves (Lee 1992).

The more formal history of hunter-gatherer studies parallels the history of the discipline of anthropology. The peoples who much later were to become known as "hunters and gatherers" have been an important element in central debates of European social and political thought from the sixteenth century forward (Meek 1976, Barnes 1937, 1938). As described in the chapter by Alan Barnard (this volume, Part II), philosophers from Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau onward have drawn upon contemporary accounts of "savages" as a starting point for speculations about life in the state of nature and what constitutes the good society.

These constructions became more detailed as more information accumulated from travelers' accounts, resulting in elaborate schemes for human social evolution in the works of the eighteenth-century Scottish Enlightenment-Smith, Millar, and Ferguson -as well as on the continent -Diderot, Vico, and Voltaire (Barnes 1937, Harris 1968).

Well before the 1859 publication of Darwin's *The origin of species* the question of the antiquity of humanity became a central preoccupation of scholars, initiated in part by John Frere's famous 1800 essay which made the then heretical suggestion that teardrop-shaped, worked-stone objects found buried in river gravels at Hoxne, Suffolk, UK in association with extinct mammals indeed not have been Zeus' thunderbolts, but instead implements made by humans that could be traced "to a very distant period, far more remote in time than the modern world" (quoted in Boule and Vallois 1957:11).

With the rise of European imperialism and the conquest of new lands came the beginnings of anthropology as a formal discipline. In the academic division of labor, while sociologists adopted as their mandate understanding urban society of the Western metropole, anthropologists took on the rest of the world: classifying diverse humanity and theorizing about its origins and present condition. The nineteenth-century classical evolutionists erected elaborate schemes correlating social forms, kinship, and marriage with mental development and levels of technology. The world's hunters were usually relegated to the bottom levels. In Lewis Henry Morgan's tripartite scheme, of "Savagery, Barbarism, and Civilization;" hunters were either Lower or Middle Savages, depending on the absence or presence of the bow and arrow (Morgan 1877).

William Sollas was one of the first to define hunting and gathering as a specific lifeway, and in *Ancient hunters and their modern representatives* (1911) he linked ethnographies of recent hunters with their putative archaeological analogues. Modern Eskimo resembled Magdalenians, African Bushmen stood in for Aurignacians, and so on.

Essential to the development of modern anthropology was the decisive repudiation of the classical evolutionary schemes and their implicit (and often explicit) racism. Franz Boas' watershed study *Race, language and culture* (1911) demonstrated that the three core factors varied independently. A "simple" technology could be associated with a complex cosmology, members of one "race" could show a wide range of cultural achievements, and all languages possessed the capacity for conveying abstract thought. It was only on the twin foundations of Boasian cultural relativism and the emphasis on field-work that modern social and cultural anthropology could develop.

It is striking that most of the founders of the discipline both in North America and in Europe carried out land-mark studies of hunters and gatherers. Boas himself went to the Canadian Arctic in 1886 as a physical geographer (his doctoral dissertation was on the color of sea water), but his ethnographic study of the Central Eskimo (1888) became one of the seminal works in American anthropology. He went on to carry out decades of research with the KwaKwaKa'wakw (Kwakiutl) on the Northwest Coast of British Columbia, a classic example of a complex hunter-gatherer group (Boas 1966). Boas' close associates A. L. Kroeber and Robert

Lowie also established their reputations through major research on hunting and gathering peoples, Californian and Crow Indians respectively (Kroeber 1925, Lowie 1935).

Founders of British anthropology shared a similar early focus, beginning with A. R. Radcliffe-Brown's study of the Andaman Islanders in 1906-8 (1922, see Pandya this volume). The great Bronislaw Malinowski, before going to the Trobriand Islands, wrote his doctoral dissertation on the family among the Australian Aborigines (1913). In France, while neither did hunter-gatherer fieldwork, both Emile Durkheim and Marcel Mauss carried out intensive library research on foraging peoples, with the former writing about Australian aboriginal religion in *Elementary forms of the religious life* (Durkheim 1912) and the latter writing his seminal essay on the seasonal life of the Eskimo (Mauss 1906). Two decades later Claude Levi-Strauss began his distinguished career with a 1930s field study of the hunting and gathering Nambicuaru in the Brazilian Mato Grosso, before returning to Paris to write his influential works on the origins of kinship and mythology (1949, 1962a, 1962b, 1987).

Mention should also be made of the 1898 British expedition, led by A. C. Haddon, to the Torres Strait Islanders with their affinities to the Australian Aborigines (see Beckett, this volume), of the American Museum of Natural History's Jesup North Pacific Expedition to Siberia in 1897 (see Grant 1995), and of the brilliant series of expeditions by Danish anthropologists to Greenland and the Canadian Arctic led by Mattiessen and Rasmussen (see Burch and Csonka, this volume). Important research traditions can also be discerned in Australia and Russia (see Peterson and Shnirelman, this volume).

Modern studies of hunting and gathering peoples can be traced arguably to two landmark studies of the 1930s. First is the 1936 essay by Julian Steward who, in a *fes schrift* for his mentor, A. L. Kroeber, wrote on "The social and economic basis of primitive bands" (1936). After four decades of scholarly emphasis on careful description without theory building, Steward sought to revive an interest in placing hunter-gatherer studies in a broader theoretical framework. Steward argued that resource exploitation determined to a significant extent the shape and dynamics of band organization and this ecological approach became one of the two foundations of hunter-gatherer studies for the next thirty years.

The second base was the classic essay by Radcliffe-Brown on Australian Aboriginal social organization (1930-1). The peripatetic R-B had begun his career in South Africa and from there moved to Sydney, São Paulo, and Chicago before taking up the chair in social anthropology at Oxford. During his Australian tenure he wrote a series of influential overviews of Aboriginal social organization. But unlike Steward, for whom *ecological* factors were paramount, R-B saw structural factors of *kinship* as primary. Australian Aboriginal societies were usually divided into moieties, and these dual divisions were often subdivided into four sections or eight subsections. These divisions had profound effects on marriage Jaterns, producing an intricate and elegant algebra of prescriptive alliances between intermarrying groups. Radcliffe-Brown was far less interested than Steward in what the Aborigines did for a living. While the clan and section membership ruled the kinship universe and nominally held the land, it was the more informal *horde, I band-Iike entity, whose members lived together on a daily basis and shouldered the tasks of subsistence.*

In the 1940s Radcliffe-Brown's kinship models were taken up by Levi-Strauss, who placed Australian Aboriginal moieties at the center of his monumental work *Les structures elementaires de la parente* (1949). It is worthy of note that theories of band organization have continued to be dominated by these two alternative paradigms: an ecological or adaptationist approach which relies on material factors to account for forager social life, and a structural approach which sees kinship, marriage, and other such social factors as the primary determinants. The two approaches are by no means incompatible, and although the two tendencies are still discernible in hunter-gatherer studies, many analysts have posited a dialectic of social and ecological forces in the dynamics of forager life (see Ingold, this volume; also Leacock 1982, Sahlins 1972, Lee 1979, Peterson 1991, 1993, and others).

The Man the Hunter conference

In 1965, Sol Tax announced the convening of a conference on "Man the Hunter" at the University of Chicago; the conference, organized by Irven DeVore and Richard Lee, took place April 6-8, 1966 and proved to be the starting point of a new era of systematic research on hunting and gathering peoples. One commentator called the Man the Hunter conference "the century's watershed of knowledge about hunter-gatherers" (Kelly 1995:14).

Present at the conference were representatives of many of the major constituencies in the field of hunter-gatherer studies (though no hunter-gatherers themselves), including proponents of the *ecological* and *structural* schools. There were critics of the late Radcliffe-Brown's theories as well as supporters; there were archaeologists, demographers, and physical anthropologists, reflecting the revival of interest in evolutionary approaches then current in American anthropology. Among the key findings of the Man the Hunter conference were the papers focusing on the relative ease of foraging subsistence, epitomized in Marshall Sahlins' famous "Notes on the original affluent society" (1968). Gender and the importance of women's work was a second key theme of the conference. The name "Man the Hunter" was a misnomer since among tropical foragers plant foods, produced largely by women, were the dominant source of subsistence.

After Man the Hunter

A burst of research activity followed the convening of Man the Hunter and the publication of the book of the same title (Lee and DeVore 1968). Scholars present at the conference brought out their own monographs and edited volumes (Balicki 1970, Bicchieri 1972, Binford 1978, Damas 1969, Helm 1981, Laughlin 1980, Lee 1979, Marshall 1976, Sahlins 1972, Suttles 1990, Watanabe 1973).

The field of hunter-gatherer studies has always been a fractious one and consensus is rarely achieved. After 1968 new work critiqued key theses from Man the Hunter. The irony of the mistle was not lost on feminist anthropologists who produced a series of articles and books with the counter theme of "Woman the Gatherer" (Slocum 1975, Dahlberg 1981, Hiatt 1978). The feminist critics were certainly taking issue with the concept of Man the Hunter, and not necessarily with the book's content since the latter had gone a long way toward reestablishing the importance of women's work and women's roles in hunter-gatherer society. This last point was taken up in detail by Adrienne Zihlman and Nancy Tanner in an important article which drew

upon the evidence assembled in *Man the Hunter* to place "woman the gatherer" at the center of human evolution (Tanner and Zihlman 1976).

At the same time a counter-counter-discourse developed among scholars who questioned whether women's subsistence contribution had been *overestimated*, and several cross-cultural studies were produced to argue this view, summarized in Kelly (1995:261-92). A related development was the discovery that women in hunter-gatherer societies *do* hunt, the most famous case being that of the Agta of the Philippines (Griffin and Griffin, this volume).

Original "affluence" came in for much discussion and critique, with a long series of debates over the definition of affluence and whether it applied to all hunters and gatherers at all times or even to all the Kung (Altman 1984, 1987, Bird-David 1992, Hill *et al.* 1985, Hawkes and O'Connell 1981, 1985, Kelly 1995:15-23, Koyama and Thomas 1981). Seeking to rehabilitate the concept, Binford (1978) and Cohen (1977) addressed some of these issues, while James Woodburn's introduction of the distinction between immediate- and delayed-return societies (1982) helped to account for some of the variability in the level of work effort among hunter-gatherers.

A major development in hunter-gatherer research was stimulated by this debate. Struck by the often imprecise data on which arguments about affluence (or its absence) had been based, a group of younger scholars resolved to do better. They adopted from biology models about *optimal foraging* (Charnov 1976) and attempted to apply these rigorously to the actual foraging behaviors observed among the shrinking number of foraging peoples where it was still possible to observe actual hunting and gathering subsistence. Important work in this area was carried out by a close-knit group of scholars, often collaborating, and variously influenced by sociobiology and other neo-Darwinian approaches: Bailey (1991), Blurton Jones (1983), Hawkes (Hawkes, Hill, and O'Connell 1982, Hawkes, O'Connell, and Blurton Jones 1989), Hewlett (1991), Hill and Hurtado (1995 and this volume), Hurtado (Hurtado and Hill 1990), Kaplan (Kaplan and Hill 1985), O'Connell (O'Connell and Hawkes 1981), Eric Smith (1983, 1991), and Winterhalder (1983, 1986). Reviews and summaries of Optimal Foraging Theory are found in Winterhalder and Smith 1981, Smith and Winterhalder 1992, Bettinger 1991, and Kelly 1995. For critiques see Ingold (1992) and Martin (1983).

More classically oriented research on hunter-gatherers attempted to bring together much of the rich historical and ethnographic material that had accumulated since the 1940s. *The Handbook of North American Indians*, under the general editorship of William Sturtevant, chronicled the 500 Nations of the continent in a series of landmark regional volumes. Six of these deal largely if not exclusively with hunting and gathering peoples: *Northwest coast*, edited by Wayne Suttles (1990); *Subarctic*, edited by June Helm (1981); *The Great Basin*, edited by Warren D' Azevedo (1986); *California*, edited by Robert Heizer (1978); *Arctic*, edited by David Damas (1984); and *Northeast*, edited by Bruce Trigger (1978) (see also Trigger and Washburn eds. 1996). On other continents Barnard (1992b) and Edwards (1987) produced overview volumes on the Khoisan peoples and Aboriginal Australians respectively.

A new generation of research

While the optimal foraging researchers based their work on models from biology and the natural sciences, a larger cohort of hunter-gatherer specialists were moving in quite different directions. Drawing on symbolic, interpretive, and historical frameworks this group of scholars grounded their studies in the lived experience of foragers and post-foragers seen as encapsulated minorities within nation-states, who still strongly adhered to traditional cosmologies and lifeways. Examples include Diane Bell's *Daughters of the dreaming* (1983), Hugh Brody's *Maps and dreams* (1981), Julie Cruikshank's *Life lived like a story* (1990), Fred Myers' *Pintupi country, Pintupi self* (1986), Elizabeth Povinelli's *Labor's lot* (1993), and Marjorie Shostak's *Nisa: The life and words of a !Kung woman* (1981).

The Conferences on Hunting and Gathering Societies (CHAGS)

One way of tracking broader trends in hunter-gatherer research is to follow the CHAGS series of conferences through the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. In 1978 Maurice Godelier convened a Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies in Paris to observe the tenth anniversary of the publication of *Man the hunter*. The conference brought together scholars from a dozen countries including the Dean of the Faculty of the University of Yakutia, himself an indigenous Siberian (Leacock and Lee 1982). The conference proved such a success that Laval University offered to host a follow-up conference in Quebec in 1980. Organized by Bernard Saladin d' Anglure and Bernard Arcand, the conference continued the tradition begun in Paris, wherein anyone who wanted to participate could do so as long as they were self-financing. Inuit broadcasters were among the several members of hunter-gatherer societies present.

By now it was becoming clear that a need existed for continuing the series, and Professor I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt of the Max Planck Institute in the Federal Republic of Germany took on the task of organizing CHAGS III. The Munich CHAGS in 1983 was a smaller, by-invitation affair, and the book that resulted reflected one particular school (revisionist) of hunter-gatherer studies (Schrire 1984). CHAGS IV, held at the London School of Economics in September 1986, returned to the more open policy with a wide range of constituencies represented. The active British organizing committee led by James Woodburn and Tim Ingold along with Alan Barnard, Barbara Bender, Brian Morris, and David Riches produced two strong thematically organized volumes of papers from the conference (Ingold *et al.* 1988a, 1988b).

CHAGS then moved to Australia. Hosted by Les Hiatt of Sydney University, CHAGS V convened in Darwin, capital of the Northern Territory, in August 1988. CHAGS V proved to be a marvelous world showcase for the active community of anthropologists, Aboriginal people, and activists working on indigenous issues in Australia.

Fairbanks, Alaska was the location of CHAGS VI (1990), the first of the CHAGS series to be held in the United States since the original 1966 Chicago conference. Convened by the late Linda Ellanna, the Fairbanks conference was memorable for being the first CHAGS at which a large delegation of Russian anthropologists was present, flying in from Provideniya just across the Bering Straits in Chukotka. Indigenous Alaskans played a prominent role in Fairbanks as well (Burch and Ellanna 1994). CHAGS VII, in Moscow in August 1993, convened by Valeriy Tischkov and organized by Victor Shnirelman at the Russian Academy of Sciences, is discussed below. The international hunter-gatherer community convened for CHAGS VIII, at the National

Museum of Ethnology in Osaka, Japan, in October, 1998, with future meetings projected in the new millennium for Scotland, India and southern Africa.

This ongoing series of CRAGS gatherings held on four continents has provided an excellent monitor on the state of hunter-gatherer research in recent decades, and a unique perspective on its increasingly international and cosmopolitan outlook.

While the theoretical debates of the Man the Hunter conference of 1966 had revolved around issues of the evolution of human behavior, the recent series has moved relatively far from evolutionary and ecological preoccupations. In their stead hunter-gatherer specialists have developed several major foci of inquiry.

At the Moscow CHAGS in August 1993 and at Osaka, 1998, a large and active scholarly contingent focused on foragers in relation to the state; papers on land rights, court battles, bureaucratic domination, and media representations documented the struggles of foragers and former foragers for viability and cultural identity in the era of Late Capitalism. Many of the research problematics grew out of close consultation with members of the societies in question. Increasingly it is they who are setting research agendas, and in some cases -Aleuts at Fairbanks, Evenkis at Moscow and Ainu at Osaka - presenting the actual papers. This branch of hunter-gatherer studies is closely aligned with the emerging world- wide movement for recognition of the significance of "indigenous peoples" and their rights (see chapters by Trigger and Hitchcock, this volume).

The humanistic wing of hunter-gatherer studies has been represented by a major focus at the recent CRAGS on symbolic and spiritual aspects of hunter-gatherer life. Here were found richly textured accounts of forms of consciousness, cosmology, and ritual, while other papers dealt with the changing world-views of foragers under the impact of ideologies of state and marketplace. To show- case the offering of the Moscow CRAGS there is an excellent volume of papers edited by Biesele *et al.* (1999), with an equally rich set of publications planned for Osaka.

One theme unifying these diverse scholars from many countries was that all were able to see in hunter-gatherer society *some* component of historical autonomy and distinctiveness. The notion of "pristine" hunter-gatherer was nowhere in sight, but neither did anyone argue that the cultural practices or cosmological beliefs observed were simply refractions of dominant outsiders, Soviet or Western. Refreshingly, the "other's" reality was not considered to be so alien that the ethnographer was incapable of representing it with some coherence.

Another unifying theme was the recognition that change was accelerating, and that the magnitude of the problems faced by these indigenous peoples was enormous, especially those in the Russian North, for whom ecologically destructive socialist industrialization has been followed directly by the advent of get-rich-quick capitalism. Similar conditions were replicated in most of the world's regions where foragers persist.

Hunter-gatherer studies today

As humankind approaches the millennium, what are some of the main currents in research about hunter-gatherers, present, past, and future? Four principal tendencies can be discerned. These are set out below with two provisos: first, none of these approaches has a monopoly on "the truth"; each has something to offer and each has its shortcomings. Second, none in practice is air-tight, and many scholars may participate in two or more.

1. *Classic*. The internal dynamics of hunter-gatherer society and ecology continue to interest many scholars. Kinship, social organization, land use, trade, material culture, and cosmology provide an ongoing source of ideas, models, and analogies for archaeologists and others reconstructing the past. When due account is taken of the historical circumstances, ethnographic analogies can be a valuable tool. Archaeologists are now arguably the largest "consumers" (and producers) of research on hunting and gathering peoples, even though the opportunities for basic ethnographic research are shrinking rapidly. Robert Kelly's book *The foraging spectrum* (1995) is an excellent example of work in the classic tradition (with a minor in behavioral ecology). Tim Ingold has authored several works which sought to integrate the social and the ecological through an application of neo-Marxist theory (1986), and Ernest Burch Jr. continues to produce meticulous ethnographies on arctic Alaska and Canada in the classic tradition (e.g. Burch 1998). Theorists *beyond* anthropology continue to turn to the hunter-gatherer evidence in constructing their own models about economics or gender roles or cosmology or many other subjects where a basic human substrate is sought. The results are highly variable.

2. *Adaptationist*. Discussed above, the second "tendency" is the area of behavioral ecology and Optimal Foraging Theory, with a strong presence in the US, particularly at the Universities of Utah and New Mexico. The adaptationists are the prime advocates of a strictly "scientific" paradigm within hunter-gatherer studies and this places them, to a degree, at odds with others in the field for whom humanistic and political economic approaches are primary (cf. Lee 1992). While some behavioral ecologists approach issues of demography and subsistence from a historically contextualized position, a significant number continue to march under the banner of neo-Darwinian sociobiology. And while some acknowledge the impact of outside forces -such as dam construction, logging, mining, rainforest destruction, bureaucracies, missionaries, and land alienation -on the people they study, others focus narrowly on quantitative models of foraging behaviors as if these existed in isolation. In addition to criticizing their science, critics of this school have argued that by treating foragers primarily as raw material for model building, the behavioral ecologists fail to acknowledge foragers' humanity and agency, as conscious actors living through tough times and facing the same challenges as the rest of the planet's beleaguered inhabitants. Having fought to maintain their scientific rigor as anthropology-at-large moves in a more humanistic direction, the challenge for the behavioral ecologists now is to make their work also relevant and useful to their subjects in their fight for cultural, economic, and ecological survival.

Within the field of behavioral ecology of hunter-gatherers, and in relation to the terms of this field, Kristen Hawkes has been the most articulate spokesperson, while Hill and Hurtado (1995) and Smith and Winterhalder (1992) offer some of the best recent work.

3. *Revisionist*. This school of thought argues that the peoples known as "hunter-gatherers" are something quite different: primarily ragged remnants of past ways of life largely transformed by subordination to stronger peoples and the steamroller of modernity. Two of the principal authors of this view are Schrire (1984) and Wilmsen (1989). Although the evidence presented in this volume challenges this thesis at a fundamental level, the "revisionists" do raise serious questions. For too long students of hunter-gatherers and other pre-state societies tended to treat in isolation the peoples they researched, regarding them as unmediated visions of the past. Today history looms much larger in these studies. Hunter-gatherers arrive at their present condition by a variety of pathways. By acknowledging this fact and being sensitive to the impact of the wider political economy, the authors of this volume are responding to the challenges made by the revisionists. Beside the archaeological and historical evidence contra the revisionist position, the most eloquent testimony in the revisionist debate is the voices of the people (found in sidebars throughout the book) setting out their ongoing sense of themselves as *historically rooted* peoples with a tradition and identity as hunters and gatherers. Their eloquence, resilience, and strength demonstrate that even in this hardbitten age of "globalization" other ways of being are possible.

4. *Indigenist*. This fourth perspective brings the people studied, their goals and aspirations, firmly into the center of the scholarly equation. For many of the authors in this book the indigenist perspective represents the outcome of a long search for an anthropology of engagement that is also scientifically responsible. The long revolution in *the* ethics of anthropology has come to the present conjuncture in which the still-legitimate goals of careful scholarship must be situated *in tandem with ethical responsibilities* to the subjects of inquiry. This involves at the very least attempting to account for the forces impacting on peoples' lives in ways that valorize their choices and give them useful tools to work with.

For example, in the volume *Cash, commoditization, and changing foragers* (1991), co-edited with Toshio Matsuyama, Nicolas Peterson offers a coherent frame- work for understanding the complex impacts of the market economy on the internal dynamics of foraging peoples. This issue has tended to polarize the field of hunter-gatherer studies into two camps: the revisionists who see capitalism as having long ago destroyed the foraging economy, and the "pristinists" who deny or minimize these effects. Peterson's subtle and insightful analysis succeeds in bridging these two entrenched positions and showing areas of common ground. The market and the welfare state, in Peterson's view, have altered but not destroyed foraging economies; in many cases the impacts have been absorbed and put to use in reproducing forager communities and identity *within* the wider society. A similarly lucid and original analysis underlies Peterson's re-analysis of the subject of sharing and gift-giving (1993). He focuses on the ways in which sharing reproduces core values within foraging communities, enabling them to maintain independent identity in spite of the vastly greater power and reach of the enveloping market-based society.

Researchers in the indigenist perspective must perform a difficult balancing act: how to combine advocacy and good rigorous scholarship, without subsuming ethical obligations of the scholar to political expediency (or vice versa).

In addition to a number of authors in this volume, the "indigenist" perspective on hunter-gatherers is evident in the work of such scholars as Eugene Hunn (1990), Joe Jorgensen (1990), Basil Sansom (1980), Janet Siskind (1980), and Polly Wiessner (1982).

Given the growing political visibility of modern foragers within their respective nation-states and the world-wide movement for indigenous rights (see chapters by Trigger and Hitchcock), recent research has been based increasingly on agendas arising from within the communities themselves. Land claims, social disintegration, substance abuse, and the concomitant movements to reconstitute "traditional" culture and revitalize institutions have become central concerns.

About this book

Part I is arranged into seven sections, based on the world's principal geographical regions. Each is introduced by an overview of the region's foraging peoples by the regional editor, followed by an essay on the area's prehistory. The heart of the Encyclopedia is the individual case studies of the history, ethnography, and current status of over fifty of the world's best - documented hunter-gatherer groups. The goal here is to present a balanced account that includes both the traditional culture and social forms, and the contemporary circumstances and organization for resistance. Authors were chosen not only for their expertise as authorities but also for the contributions they have made as advocates for the well-being of the people they write about. Each chapter also contains a sidebar in which members of the society speak to the reader in direct quotations. Part II contains thematic essays covering a broad array of topics: from mythology, religion, nutrition, gender, and social life, to experience at the hands of colonial forces and status in contemporary states and human rights. Other essays address the traditional and contemporary music of hunter-gatherers on the "Worldbeat" scene, and their current position in world art markets where works by aboriginal artists may fetch four and five figures. These essays thus situate the hunting and gathering peoples not only in their own world but also in the wider world's political economy and the emerging global culture.

The regions

1 North America (regional editor: Harvey A. Feit; archaeological background: Aubrey Cannon)

Prior to colonization about two-thirds of North America was occupied by hunters and gatherers, including most of what is now Canada and much of the United States west of the Mississippi. Some of the best-known recent foragers reported in the Encyclopedia include the James Bay Cree (Feit) and Labrador Innu (Mailhot), the Subarctic Dene in western Canada and Alaska (Asch and Smith), and the Inuit (Eskimo) of Arctic Canada (Burch and Csonka) and Alaska (Worl). The foragers of the Great Basin are represented by the Timbisha Shoshone of Nevada (Fowler). The mounted hunters of the Plains and intermontane West represent a successful secondary adaptation to big-game hunting by former farmers and foragers after the arrival of the horse in the seventeenth century (Kehoe). Complex foraging societies, with slavery and rank distinctions, occupied all of the west coast of North America from California to the Alaskan panhandle (Daly).

2 South America (regional editor: Laura M. Rival; archaeological background: Anna C. Roosevelt)

The southern cone of the South American continent was occupied by foragers including, at the extreme south, the

Blackfoot and other hunters on the North American Plains

Alice B .Kehoe Marquette University

Introduction

Thanks to Hollywood and the visual reconstructions of aboriginal life by photographer Edward Curtis, the image of the Plains warrior adorned with bow and arrows, war paint, and feathered headdress, and mounted on a spotted pony, has come to represent North America's hunter-gatherers to the world. "Indian spirituality" has been defined through the popularity of John Neihardt's poetic *Black Elk Speaks*, a version of Lakota beliefs transcribed from a cosmopolitan Oglala man. "Sacred pipes" and sweat lodges are purveyed by "plastic medicine men" to a gullible public. Such distortions affront members of the First Nations.

The popular image is misleading. The economic, cultural, and historical components producing nine-teenth-century Plains hunting life were complex. This chapter seeks to unravel a number of these factors and present a brief case study of the Blackfoot people of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Plains History

The Plains in the nineteenth century, already well populated, became a refuge for midwestern Indigenous Nations forced out of their homelands by advancing invasions of Anglo/Euro-Americans. Add to this the refugees from Spanish invasions into the American Southwest, and Numa migrations out of the Great Basin. Now pepper the mix with European epidemics, entrepreneurs trafficking in horses, guns, slaves, ornaments, amulets, and foodstuffs; toss in gamblers and adventuring youths, and the task of disentangling ethnic histories is formidable. Wissler's list of Plains tribes (1941 [1912]:19) presents the situation *only as* it stood in the mid-nineteenth century; this shows how arbitrary the "ethnographic present" can be. Wissler's "typical" Plains Nations include only those who were nomadic, dependent upon bison hunting, lived in tipis, used horses, policed camps with men recruited into soldier sodalities, and celebrated the Sun Dance (Wissler 1941 [1912]:18). His "typical" list included the Blackfoot, Gros Ventre, Arapaho, and Cheyenne (Algonquian speakers), the Assiniboin, Crow and Teton Dakota/Lakota (Siouan speakers), the Comanche (Numic speakers), and Kiowa (Kiowa- Tanoan phylum). He listed as "marginals" the Sarsi (Dene speakers), Kiowa-Apache (Plains Apache) (Apachean speakers), and the Plains Cree and Plains Ojibwa (Saulteaux or Bungee) (Algonquian speakers).

There were, in addition, those who were not primarily hunters, the "village tribes" (living in earth lodges and farming the bottomlands of the Missouri and its tributaries). They traveled long distances twice a year to hunt bison (Mandan, Hidatsa [Siouan speakers] , and Arikara and Pawnee [Caddoan speakers]). Wissler adds the farming prairie Siouans: the Iowa, Kansa,

Missouri, Omaha, Osage, Oto, Ponca and (eastern) Dakota, and the Caddoan Wichita. He takes cognizance of the nations west of the Cordillera who traveled east to hunt on the Plains: the Bannock, Wind River, and Northern Shoshone (Numic speakers), the Ute (Uto-Aztecan speakers), and the Nez Perce (Sahaptin speakers). He could have added the Kutenai (language isolate, possibly Salishan) and Yakima (Sahaptin), and the Salish-speaking Flatheads, Kalispel, and Pend d'Oreilles.

Population

155,000 in the USA (1980 US Census): Blackfoot (22,000), Gros Ventre (2200), Arapaho (4500), Cheyenne (10,000) Assiniboin (4000, excluding those in Canada), Crow (7000), Teton Dakota/Lakota (78,000), Comanche (9000), Kiowa (7400), Kiowa-Apache (Plains Apache) (260), Plains Cree (7000 in the USA; about 20,000 in Canada).

Location

From Mexico-US border, into Canada, from steppe grasslands behind the Rockies to the Mississippi valley in the east, about 30° and 50° N, and from 98° W in the east, to the northwest-trending rocky Mountains in the west.

I present this extensive, varied list to emphasize that it holds barely true for the middle of the nineteenth into soldier sodalities, and celebrated the Sun Dance (Wissler 1941 [1912]:18). His "typical" list included the Blackfoot, Gros Ventre, Arapaho, and Cheyenne (Algonquian speakers), the Assiniboin, Crow and Teton Dakota/Lakota (Siouan speakers), the Comanche (Numic speakers), and Kiowa (Kiowa- Tanoan phylum). He listed as "marginals" the Sarsi (Dene speakers), Kiowa-Apache (Plains Apache) (Apachean speakers), and the Plains Cree and Plains Ojibwa (Saulteaux or Bungee) (Algonquian speakers). There were, in addition, those who were not primarily hunters, the "village tribes" (living in earth lodges and farming the bottomlands of the Missouri and its tributaries). They traveled long distances twice a year to hunt bison (Mandan, Hidatsa [Siouan speakers], and Arikara and Pawnee [Caddoan speakers]) .Wissler adds the farming prairie Siouans: the Iowa, Kansa, Missouri, Omaha, Osage, Oto, Ponca and (eastern) Dakota, and the Caddoan Wichita. He takes cognizance of the nations west of the Cordillera who traveled east to hunt on the Plains: the Bannock, Wind River, and Northern Shoshone (Numic speakers), the Ute (Uto-Aztecan speakers), and the Nez Perce (Sahaptin speakers). He could have added the Kutenai (language isolate, possibly Salishan) and Yakima (Sahaptin), and ~e Salish-speaking Flatheads, Kalispel, and Pend d'Oreilles.

I present this extensive, varied list to emphasize that it holds barely true for the middle of the nineteenth century when the northern Plains Nations had possessed horses for only one hundred years. Around 1750, the Kutenai and Shoshone held the western Montana Plains, the Cheyenne occupied the eastern prairie, and the Hidatsa probably ranged the Missouri-Saskatchewan watershed.

Two smallpox epidemics devastated the Plains, in 1780-1 and 1837-8 (before any of the Plains people subsequently interviewed by ethnographers had reached adulthood). When professional ethnography began, all informants (by then, reservation dwellers) had spent their entire lives in communities suffering endemic warfare promoted by government and private interests bent on an ethnic cleansing to ready the Plains for Euro- American settlement. The post-contact Plains Nations adapted to radical depopulation, politics centered on armed defense/offense, destruction of pastures by wagon trains, the substitution of imported metal for indigenous raw materials (stone), and, just prior to conquest and forced settlement, an increased demand for women's labor to process bison hides. Historical contingencies powerfully affected the nations found living on the Plains.

The prehistoric Plains had been inhabited since the terminal Pleistocene (14,000 years ago) by nomadic bands hunting principally bison. They used the impoundment method of hunting for at least 2000 years. From Hopewell times (beginning of the first millennium AD), surpluses (probably pemmican) were produced and traded downriver into the Midwest region, and overland to the Southwest. It is likely that loosely structured bands moved through seasonal rounds in recognized territories, although distances moved and loads conveyed were probably more modest before horse transport. Farming towns appeared in the Missouri trench, westward to western North Dakota at the beginning of the second millennium AD.

Following the American Civil War, the campaign to "pacify" Native Nations, already decimated by epidemics and the strain of endemic war, had succeeded by the 1880s. The final blow was the extermination of the wild bison herds, from overhunting (by native and non-native alike), the destruction of grazing patterns and pasture lands, and drought.

The Indian Nations were then confined to reservations; these were subsequently reduced in size, and reduced again. Reservations were allotted in severalty, contrary to local social structure, destroying Native social systems. Children were removed from families and incarcerated in boarding schools. Schools forbade children their languages and religions. Pupils were taught manual and menial trades thought useful for those at the bottom of the labor force. Reservation men were instructed in farming methods, but inept government agents often undermined successful farming or ranching ventures, selling stock, leasing land to immigrant settlers, and refusing credit.

The Collier New Deal (*1930s*) restored some land, reversed policies outlawing native languages and religions, but imposed the United States' "democratic" government model of elected district representatives in council. The ethos of consensus by persuasion (or dissenters separating) was replaced by majority rule.

After a post -World War II policy of moving families into urban areas, the Nixon administration promulgated a policy of "self-determination" that, through many efforts and endless struggles, is slowly achieving some reality.

Ecological conditions

The vast Great Plains region is marked by the paucity of water. The western portion lies in the rainshadow of the Rocky Mountains. Rivers drain east to the Great Lakes, or southeast to the Mississippi basin which provides a conduit for moisture from the Gulf of Mexico. Some rivers disappear into underground aquifers. Agriculture is precarious except in larger river floodplains. Grazing animals are forced constantly to move, and formerly with them, dependent human societies like the Blackfoot. Herding remains ecologically feasible today, with bison herds now supplanted by cattle.

Major subsistence species included bison, cervids (also for clothing), and wild or partially cultivated plant foods. Population density was necessarily low. Kroeber (1939:78) argued that possibilities for a Plains culture did not exist before the horse, that the region was economically marginal. Archaeology contradicts this inference, except for reduced habitation during the Altithermal period (c. 3000-2000 BC) (Schlesier 1994) .Archaeological work since the 1950s demonstrates the central importance of the bison drive in the long-term Plains economy. Impounding herds was the core of subsistence until conquest (Verbicky-Todd 1984).

The Blackfoot Nation

Let us now examine one of Wissler's "typical" mid-nine-teenth-century Plains tribes, the *Nitsitapii* or Blackfoot, who occupied the northwestern Plains (present-day Alberta, Saskatchewan, Montana) from at least the four-teenth century.

Subsistence

The Blackfoot dwelt in tipis secured against the wind by rocks, which left innumerable "tipi rings." Blackfoot moved in relation to the wild herds, transporting their shelters with dog-pulled travois (Bozell1988). They relied upon the bison pound, a corral toward which a herd was enticed by a young man singing a spiritually potent song in the mode of a bleating calf; meanwhile, in camp, spiritually adept adults prayed over an *iniskim*, usually a fossilized ammonite possibly resembling a sleeping bison. Close to the pound, V-shaped lines of rock or brush piles hid the main hunting team. As the herd entered this funnel the whole band jumped up, waving robes and shouting, to stampede the herd either over a bluff or up a closed ravine to the corral where men waited to kill the milling animals with clubs and bows and arrows. From a few dozen to two hundred bison would be killed. There was no way to let the surplus escape.

All able-bodied adults worked to process the kill. One source reported six-person teams working on each carcass. Stomach contents and organs were eaten fresh. Most flesh was dried in thin strips, bones were cracked for marrow, chopped and boiled to extract fat. Pemmican (dried meat and rendered fat combined, often with dried berries) was packed into hide bags for storage.

Pemmican, or simple dried meat, may have been a prehistoric trade item, downriver to farming towns (Brink 1990, Kehoe 1973). The historic fur trade brigades depended on tons of pemmican traded by Plains hunters.

Blackfoot women harvested plant foods (berries, camas bulbs, and prairie turnips) which they cultivated knowledgeably. (Among the eastern farming nations such as the Cheyenne, women cultivated maize, surpluses going for trade.) Not glamorous, nor often described by explorers, the care and harvesting of carbohydrates were tasks essential to the Plains diet.

Hunters or pastoralists?

Blackfoot bands, like other Plains Nations, burned large stretches of grassland to improve forage for the wild herds. In the less arid eastern prairies, burning also prevented reversion to forest. (Seasonal grass burning has been associated with the name "Blackfoot;" from moccasin soles blackened by walking over burned land. One of the confederated Nitsitapii groups is the *Siksika* [Blackfoot].)

In the sense that the Blackfoot and other Plains Nations managed pasture and corraled herds in order to slaughter them, they could be considered pastoralists, although no one, including modern "buffalo ranchers;" has succeeded in domesticating bison. The strategy of maximizing forage, moving with the herds' annual round, and seducing the lead cows to slaughter with a bleating calf song was highly efficient for exploiting this unique, rich, renewable resource.

When horses were adopted in the seventeenth (southern Plains) and eighteenth (northern Plains) centuries (Ewers 1955:3-10) families could carry more possessions further, but the horse elaborated, rather than supplanted, the basic impounding method of hunting (Morgan 1991:154-8). Politically, horses enabled rapid attacks and retreats, ideally far from home camps, during the years of endemic warfare of the eighteenth and nine-teenth centuries.

Social relations and residential patterns

The band/residential group was the unit task force for obtaining bison. With ten to twenty tipis (80-160 persons), its nucleus was twenty to forty able-bodied men and an equal number of able-bodied women. The band followed its prey onto the grasslands in spring, rendezvoused with other bands in early summer, and returned to sheltered stream valleys in autumn (Epp 1988). Bands had a core of close kin, though one was free to move, even to join a band of another Nation (Sharrock 1974).

Certain families considered themselves of higher status, training their children to exercise leadership; well dressed, they were absolved from daily drudgery. Such families maintained their relative economic advantage by lending horses to others, receiving in return a share of the hunted, raided, or harvested produce. Inssiraa, daughter of one such family, recalled she accompanied cousins to the hunt because "Father would never get a chance to go because he had two fast buffalo horses and some one [sic] would ask to borrow them and they would bring him meat" (Kehoe 1996:392).

Mobility and political organization

In summer, both bison and Blackfoot aggregated. Bands met at a location well supplied with horse pasture, water, and wood. They engaged in trade/barter, performed spiritual ceremonies (including the Sun Dance, to bring health and prosperity), danced, gambled, adjudicated disputes, and discussed common concerns and policies toward outsiders. These rendezvous of several thousand people, Blackfoot and others, the majority sharing general language and beliefs, functioned in Aristotle's sense as a *polis* (Kehoe 1981:506-7), although the low-density migratory habits of the principal game put seasonal constraints on political organization.

Herds could not be owned, nor individuals bound to one leader or band. Families voted with their feet when leaders proved undiplomatic or stingy. Personal autonomy was highly prized. Even opinions of children were respected. Personal autonomy was linked to the gift of spiritual power. Health and prosperity signaled spiritual blessing; elders were the living proof of blessedness. Respect for the elderly reflected respect for spiritual powers.

It is saturated with holy power, this sweetgrass, take some of it.

I use it [as incense] for a holy purpose.

There he comes, Man of the Dawn of Time. He is walking this way. He is coming in.

Come in with safety.

Now then, that which is Above, He knows me.

It is saturated with holy power. This here, that which is below, He knows me.

Woman of the Dawn of Time, she has come in with happiness.

Man of the Dawn of Time, he has come in with happiness.

Morning Star, he has come in with Happiness. It is saturated with holy power.

Prayer Songs, Beaver Bundle Ritual, D. C. Duvall, rec. and trans., 1911, from Tom Kyaiyo, Heart Butte, Blackfeet Reservation, Montana.

Gender relations

Women were innately blessed with power to reproduce, both children and the whole society's materiality. Men were believed impulsive, poor at crafts, prone to disaster unless pitied by a manifestation of the Almighty (sought by vision quest, in the Lakota phrase "going crying for power" [Kehoe 1995]). Women created the camp, and fed, clothed, and sheltered everyone. Men dealt with outsiders, though it was not uncommon for Blackfoot women to go to war alongside their husbands. Blackfoot women were/are ritual intermediaries between spiritual power and men; they alone have power to unwrap and rewrap medicine bundles (tokens with which power was invoked with song and dance), and they lead the Sun Dance. No other Plains Nation gave women this role in the Sun Dance, though others had women's sodalities with ritual responsibilities.

Current situation

Much of the current "Plains renaissance" is fueled by a new, college-educated generation of Plains people. On the Blackfoot Reservation in Montana, a Harvard graduate has opened Blackfoot language immersion schools, while his colleague, directing the Head Start Program, introduces the Blackfoot language into her classrooms. Contemporary Plains leaders are frustrated by the marginal locations of reservations, rising populations too large to be accommodated by ranching, the inertia of federal programs that foster dependency, and lack of capital. Bison herds are being rebuilt *op* reservations, but a welter of wheat farms seriously constrains any return to the pre-conquest economy.

Reading list

- Bozell, J. R. (1988) .Changes in the role of the dog in proto- historic Pawnee culture. *Plains Anthropologist* 33(119):95-111.
- Brink, J. (1990). Bison butchering and food processing at Head-Smashed- In buffalo jump, Alberta. Paper presented to the 48th Plains Conference, Oklahoma City.
- Epp,H. T. (1988). Way of the migrant herds: dual dispersion strategy among bison. *Plains Anthropologist* 33(121):309-20.
- Ewers, J. C. (1955). *The horse in Blackfoot Indian culture*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 159. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- (1958). *The Blackfeet: raiders on the northwestern plains*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Kehoe, A. B. (1981) .Revisionist anthropology: aboriginal North America. *Current Anthropology* 22(5):503-17.
- (1995) .Blackfoot persons. In L. F. Klein and L. A. Ackerman (eds.), *Women and power in native America*, pp.113-25. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- (1996). Transcribing Insima, a Blackfoot "old lady:' In J. S. H. Brown and E. Vibert (eds.), *Contexts for native history*, pp. 381-402. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
- Kehoe, T. F. (1973). *The Gull Lake site: a prehistoric bison drive site in southwestern Saskatchewan*. Milwaukee Public Museum Publications in Anthropology 1. Milwaukee.
- Kroeber,A. L. (1947 [1939]). *Cultural and natural areas of Native North America*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 38. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- McClintock, W. (1910) .*The old north trail*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. (Reprint: Bison Book Facsimile,1968.)
- Morgan, R. G. (1991). Beaver ecology/beaver mythology. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Schlesier, K. H. (ed.) (1994). *Plains Indians, A.D. SOO-IS00*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Sharrock, S. R. (1974). Crees, Cree-Assiniboines and Assiniboines: interethnic social organization on the far northern plains. *Ethnohistory* 21:95-122.
- Verbicky-Todd, E. (1984). *Communal buffalo hunting among the plains Indians: an ethnographic and historical review*. Archaeological Survey of Alberta Occasional Papers 24.

Wissler, C. (1911) .The social life of the Blackfoot Indians. *American Museum of Natural History Anthropological Papers* 7 (part 1):1-64. New York: American Museum of Natural History.
(1941 [1912]). *Indians of the plains*. New York: American Museum of Natural History.
Wissler, C, and D. C. Duvall (1908). Mythology of the Blackfoot Indians. *American Museum of Natural History Anthropological Papers* 2 (part 1):1-163. New York: American Museum of Natural History.
(Reprinted University of Nebraska Press, 1995.)
Wood, W. R. (1980) .Plains trade in prehistoric and proto- historic intertribal relations. In W. R. Wood and M. Liberty (eds.), *Anthropology on the great plains*, pp. 98-109. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

The Caribou Inuit

Ernest S. Burch, Jr. Research Associate, Smithsonian Institution and
Yvon Csonka University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland

-

Introduction

"Caribou Inuit" is a label assigned by ethnographers to a population of Inuit-speaking Eskimo living on and near the west coast of Hudson Bay. They first came to scientific attention as having the lowest population density in the entire ethnographic record. This was an historical accident: the census was taken in 1922, late in a ten-year famine when their numbers declined dramatically. More significantly (thanks to unique ethnohistoric sources), scholars have traced, at least in broad outline, Caribou Inuit history for the past three centuries.

The culturally conservative Caribou Inuit remained autonomous long after contact and, quite unique for foragers, increased numerically and expanded territorially for nearly two centuries after European contact. During this time, they experienced social fissioning, a process through which a single founder society (see *Domestic organization* below) increased to five, while the subsistence base shifted from generalized foraging (a broad array of resources) to specialized hunting, overwhelmingly focused on caribou; hence the name, "Caribou Inuit."

History

The first recorded European-Caribou Inuit contact occurred in 1718, with a Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) trading vessel based at Churchill in 1718. The HBC was the major agent of contact for the next 200 years; other encounters featured American whalers and occasional explorers.

Permanent nation-state outposts were not established in Caribou Inuit territory until the early twentieth century, when the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) set up bases, the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches opened missions, and the HBC and various independents erected trading posts. These developments initiated the "contact-traditional" era (Damas 1988), which lasted until the late 1950s. Since then, the population has clustered in four modern hamlets, each of which possesses permanent houses, schools, government offices, medical facilities, and other contemporary amenities.

Birket-Smith (1929) and Rasmussen (1930) were the first ethnographers to visit the Caribou Inuit, in 1922. Their monographs constitute the "classic" early ethnographies. More recent studies (Burch 1978,1988, Csonka 1995) supplement their findings and place them in historical perspective.

Setting

Caribou Inuit country is a treeless, heavily glaciated, low- elevation plain, with tundra vegetation and postglacial landforms. Water covers much of the land surface. The climate is cold both winter and summer, with frost occurring more than 260 days a year. Precipitation is light, the wind incessant. Important animal species include caribou, various fur-bearers and grizzly bears (on land), and seals, beluga whales, and polar bears in Hudson Bay itself. Musk oxen, walrus, and bowhead whales were numerous until overhunted. Arctic char, lake trout, and whitefish Occur in the lakes and streams. Waterfowl abound in summer.

Demography

Location.

Western shore of Hudson Bay, and adjacent interior, District of Keewatin, Northwest Territories, Canada. On April 1, 1999, they will become residents of the newly created territory of Nunavut, They live in the hamlets of Arviaq, Kangiqling, Qamanittuaq, and TlkJrarjuaq.

Population

Since 1718 the population 1718 the population fluctuated between 300 and the present figure of About 5000.

In the eighteenth century, the few hundred members of a "founder society" occupied the central portion of the coast and the adjacent interior. By 1915, the population had expanded to 1500 people distributed over a huge area, including part of the transitional forest/tundra zone south of their traditional homeland. Each of the five societies of the period was socially and territorially distinct. A prolonged famine subsequently destroyed the demographic foundations of these societies, and reduced the total population to about 500 by 1922 (today, 5000).

Economy

The Caribou Inuit were primarily hunters. Their eighteenth-century mixed economy was based on appropriating terrestrial and marine mammals, fish, and migratory waterfowl (using harpoons, lances, and bows and arrows, augmented by snares and pitfalls). Fish were caught with weirs, spears, and hook and line. Gathering was limited to berries, and dwarf willow for fuel. Wood for tent poles, weapons, sleds, and boat frames and soap- stone for pots were acquired in neighboring territories. Dwellings consisted of winter snow houses and summer tents.

During the nineteenth century the economy lost its diversity, becoming progressively more focused on terrestrial resources, particularly caribou, supplemented by musk oxen. Muzzle-loading guns were adopted but had little effect on hunting practices.

The Caribou Inuit became heavily involved in the fur trade in the 1920s because the price of white fox pelts had escalated, trading posts had been built nearby, and the caribou population had crashed. This last development necessitated the use of modern rifles for hunting the increasingly scarce prey. People trapped furs in order to purchase rifles and ammunition. Dependence on the fur trade continued until the late 1950s.

The Caribou Inuit still harvest country foods, particularly caribou and fish, although households vary widely in their degree of dependence on such resources. Trapping has declined, but polar bear and wolf hunting have increased. Wage employment and welfare have become the principal sources of cash.

Settlement pattern

The Caribou Inuit did not recognize territorial boundaries or the exclusive use and ownership of real property. Their land occupancy took the form of focused ranges, each with a well-established core area and vaguely defined outer limits.

People were highly mobile, moving from place to place according to expectation of the most productive harvest of fish and game. In the eighteenth century, this brought people to the coast for the spring and summer, and took them inland for the fall and winter. In winter, they traveled on foot with the aid of dogsleds; in summer, they used kayaks. This pattern persisted until well into the twentieth century, except that, in the 1840s, members of some societies (see below) began to spend the entire year inland. Many made annual visits to the HBC posts at Churchill (after 1792) and Brochet (after 1868), and seasonal visits to more northerly posts after 1910.

The population became concentrated in four settlements during the 1960s. Since then, they have shifted from camp life with occasional visits to trading centers, to living in trading centers from whence they make expeditions to hunt and fish. Motor-powered boats and snowmobiles have greatly facilitated this process. People make frequent trips between communities to visit, for cultural or sporting events, or on business.

Each family now has a house, and each person has a legal domicile in a hamlet. The land on which the houses stand is leased from the government (this may soon change). Many spend part of the year in family hunting or fishing camps.

Domestic organization

Each Caribou Inuit *society* was comprised of a number of bilaterally extended families, with considerable variation in unit composition. These families were linked to one another in the larger social system through kinship ties, co-marriages (spouse exchanges), namesake relation-

ships, and joking (dancing) partnerships. The members of each society collectively held dominion over a territory with a well-defined core but vaguely defined border.

Spouses in first marriages were arranged through parentally organized child betrothal. The often elusive ideal was a brother-sister exchange among first cousins. Monogamy was the norm, but polygyny also occurred. Divorce was common.

Labor was generally divided along gender lines. However, some cross-gender socialization in childhood and pragmatic considerations could bend this rule. Men and women respectively exercised substantial authority over different spheres of life, all of which were necessary for survival. Both men and women could be shamans, but only men were extended family heads.

Traditional social organization is changing slowly in the modern hamlets. The cash economy and the construction of single-family dwellings have weakened traditional extended family bonds, but only slightly. Cousin and polygynous marriages have been reduced or halted. However, many traditional elements remain, including extended family networks of mutual assistance, namesake relationships, joking partnerships, and occasional co-marriages. Spousal assault is a problem; consequently, divorce is not uncommon.

Political organization

Each extended family was hierarchical, based on differences in generation, relative age, and gender. Parents had authority over children, older siblings and cousins had authority over younger ones, and, in certain spheres, men had authority over women. The family head, or *ihumataq*, was a man who wielded authority by virtue of his superior position in a number of hier-archical kin relationships, and by demonstrated competence. Shamans also were able to wield authority over many activities. There were no councils or other governing bodies. Relations between families and between different societies were handled on an *ad hoc* basis.

The RCMP began to establish outposts in, and to conduct patrols across, Caribou Inuit country early in the twentieth century. The authority of the police was imposed gradually-initially only in extreme situations. Later, missionaries and traders exercised a high level of influence over Inuit affairs. Nevertheless, most families retained considerable autonomy until moving into hamlets in the 1950s and 1960s.

Religion

The Caribou Inuit have practiced an animistic religion, believing that everything has a soul/energy source and a disposition/personality. Some spirits had souls and dispositions but no physical manifestation. One of the latter, *Hila*, constituted the supreme force to which all others were subordinate. *Hila* determined which acts were good and which were bad. However, it was a companion spirit, *Pinga*, who actually monitored human behavior and interfered from time to time in human affairs.

Hila promulgated rules, or taboos, to which humans had to conform in order to avoid calamities like famine, sickness, or death. The existence and nature of specific taboos were

discovered by shamans (*anakkut*), each of whom was associated with a familiar spirit. When prolonged bad weather or an accident occurred, the shaman performed a ceremony during which the familiar spirit was asked to discover the source of the by communicating with other, more knowledgeable spirits. The answer always was that a taboo, often one previously unknown, had been broken. Once it was added to the general stock of prohibitions. Over the generations, this led to the accumulation of an enormous body of rules affecting practically every thing a person did.

Christian missions were established in Caribou Inuit country approximately between 1910 and 1930. Missionaries attacked the animistic beliefs of the Inuit and challenged shamanistic authority. The Inuit are now Christian, but a strong undercurrent of traditional belief remains. Recently, people have been attracted to those Protestant denominations whose rituals involve visions and "speaking in tongues:" and which therefore resemble traditional shamanistic performances.

Current situation

“Inuit and Qallunaat (whites) should not try to be the boss over animals that they have not made themselves (wildlife). Animals were given to all the people in the world – like a welfare check – to help them. We have to treat the land and the animals the way we were told to treat them. That is the real inuit way. (The Inuit) want cooperation between the white people and the Inuit concerning the land and its animals.

The Caribou Inuit are now full citizens of the Northwest Territories, and indeed of Canada. Laws are promulgated by various levels of government, including locally elected hamlet councils chaired by mayors. Control of illegal behavior, under Canadian law, is an RCMP responsibility. There is also a Native "by-law officer" in each hamlet; sentences for minor infractions are handed out by Native justices following Inuit rather than Canadian customary law.

Formal education is controlled by the territorial government and conducted in Inuktitut (the Inuit/Eskimo language) for pupils' first three years, thereafter in English with Inuktitut as a second language. Instruction has little traditional content, but recently this has changed somewhat. Inuit are encouraged to study, in the hope of replacing non-Inuit teachers and school principals.

The main employers are public (governmental) services, followed by private businesses owned by non- Inuit, as well as Inuit-owned firms. Art, clothing, and craft production at the individual and family levels provide additional income, as does fur hunting and the sale of country foods. Unemployment varies seasonally, but usually ranges between 20 percent and 30 percent. Welfare payments are widespread. Under the Nunavut Agreement (see below), it is intended that the public service should be the main employer by 1999, providing 30 percent of employment. It is hoped that at least 80 percent of the jobs will be filled by Inuit.

Modern medical health care provided by government is supplemented by elements of shamanistic healing. Public health programs are emphasized, but require major lifestyle changes. Individuals needing major or extended hospital care are sent to southern Canada.

Caribou Inuit communities are afflicted by an array of social problems stemming from rapid social change. Among these are domestic violence, sexual abuse, substance abuse, suicide, parental neglect, lack of motivation, and general anomie.

The primary threat to the cultural survival of the Caribou Inuit is language loss. Inuktitut is still the first language, but is rapidly losing the subtlety and elegance of former times. Most young people nowadays master neither English nor Inuktitut.

Organization for resistance

Inuits never signed treaties with or ceded land to the Canadian government. Canada merely asserted its sovereignty over Inuit country. When the present hamlets were founded in the late 1950s and 1960s, government administrators took control of many aspects of Inuit daily life. As government hegemony increased, a movement developed across the Canadian north to resist this trend. At issue were land ownership and self-government.

The Caribou Inuit joined with other Canadian Inuit to pursue their collective interests. Over many years, representatives from Canada's eastern and central Arctic successfully negotiated solutions with the federal government. These are now being implemented. On April 1, 1999, a new territory, Nunavut, will be carved out of what is now the central and eastern Northwest Territories. Inuit (including Caribou people), comprising more than 80 percent of the new territory's population, will in effect be in control of the new government. (They currently have a substantial measure of self-government at the hamlet level.) Inuit living in various parts of the future Nunavut have received fee simple title to some 350,000 km², and, in Nunavut, will have variable rights to use, manage, and receive income from a much larger area.

The Hadza of Tanzania

Bwire Kaare Institute of Finance Management, Dar es Salaam and
James Woodburn London School of Economics

Introduction

The Hadza area hunter-gatherer people in northern Tanzania who, throughout their known history, have sought to maintain a degree of autonomy and isolation in relation to the many neighboring ethnic groups appropriating their lands. They are also known as *Tindiga* (Swahili) and *Kindiga* (Isanzu) but dislike these terms for their derogatory and discriminatory connotations. They speak a click language, an isolate with no proven linkages with other languages.

Many researchers, Tanzanian and foreign, have worked among the Hadza during the past forty years. It sometimes becomes difficult for so small a community to cope with the constant questioning associated with much of this research.

History

The Hadza proudly assert that their ancestors have been hunter-gatherers since the dawn of time. They are confident of the merits of their way of life, strongly rejecting views of neighboring agricultural and pastoral peoples that hunting and gathering is a backward way of life.

Hadza view history as a struggle to maintain their life in the face of great pressures to change. European colonial powers came late to this part of East Africa. In the process of asserting colonial control, the Germans fought with the Isanzu, Bantu-speaking neighbors of the Hadza. Some Isanzu subsequently became refugees among the Hadza. This is the only known in-migration among the Hadza, and there has been no significant out-migration.

Through the periods of German and British administration, the Hadza were largely ignored by the authorities. The first prolonged contact did not occur until 1911, when German geographer Erich Obst walked through their country. The Hadza remained untaxed and without chiefs or courts. They, and a few other small groups, were given some exemptions from the game laws by the British authorities, although they were not permitted to live free of outside interference.

Population

Approximately 1000. Precise numbers are difficult to determine owing to the flexible ethnicity of peripheral persons.

.

Location

The hills and valleys east and southeast of Lake Eyasi, due south of Ngorongoro Crater, northern Tanzania.

The British administration twice (in 1927 and 1939) made short-lived attempts to force groups of Hadza to settle down as agriculturalists. Both attempts led to disease and several deaths in the community. They confirmed the view of Hadza people that contact with outsiders was dangerous, and reinforced their policy of minimizing such contact. After independence from Britain, pressure to adopt agriculture increased. Since 1964, the Tanzanian government has adopted a systematic policy of sedentarization. Hadza continue to object to settlement, especially when it involves living near non-Hadza people.

Ecological setting

Hadza country is in the dry savannah of East Africa, part grassland, part thorn bush. Rocky hills are interspersed with plains areas. Apart from Lake Eyasi (a salt lake) and Yaida swamp, surface water is scarce, especially in the dry season. The landscape is dominated by the fan acacias

and baobab trees which are so familiar to viewers of television wildlife documentaries. Tsetse flies are abundant almost everywhere, but very few cases of human sleeping sickness have been recorded.

A wide range of game animals live in the area and are still hunted by some Hadza with bows and poisoned arrows. Game Populations which were never at risk from outside Hadza country, who have *killed* off the rhinoceros population and most of the elephants. The Hadza have *also* been threatened by the encroachment of pastoral and agricultural *peoples* who fence water sources and block game migration routes.

The evidence suggests that many of the open areas were in the past kept open by the feeding and trampling of elephants and rhinoceroses. The recent dramatic decline in their population is expected to lead to an increase in dense stands of thorn trees and a decline in grazing game animal populations, and in the wild food plants on which the Hadza depend.

Economy

The Hadza obtain their food requirements from wild roots, fruits, the honey of wild bees, and the flesh of game animals, currently supplemented by the fruits of their small *plots* of maize and sweet potato. They also occasionally persuade government and aid agencies to donate *lorry* loads of maize. Impala, zebra, buffalo, eland, wildebeest, and many animals large and small are felled with bow and arrow, or scavenged from lion kills. Hadza are denied access to guns and they use no traps, pits, or snares. Roots, berries, and baobab fruit are generally gathered by groups of Women. Few Hadza work for outsiders or are engaged in trade.

In areas where Hadza have retained their land, food is obtained relatively easily. Here, nutritional status is high by East African standards. Like all human populations, the Hadza do not eat all potential foods in their region. They reject almost all insects, reptiles, fish, and fresh-water molluscs. However, they attach particular value to meat and honey. Meat must be shared by everyone in the camp. It cannot be reserved for the hunter and his family. Accumulation, whether of food or of more enduring material objects, is seen as immoral and unacceptable. Successful hunters or traders are obliged to share the yield of their labor and their skill. Poisoned arrows, knives, stone pipes, and other objects circulate in the *lukucuko* gambling game. Exchange or barter with other Hadza is usually deprecated. Hadza strongly believe that people should share and not expect recompense.

Settlement, mobility, and land tenure

Until the early 1960s, almost all Hadza lived in small nomadic camps (averaging eighteen adults) and moved every two or three weeks. These camps moved for all sorts of reasons, not only to improve access to food, water, and material needs, but also to abandon areas where persons had fallen ill or died. They moved to where the gambling game was in session, to visit friends, or to avoid persons with whom they were in dispute. Camp composition was flexible. Individuals and families constantly moved in and out, for all sorts of personal reasons.

More recently they have been under pressure from the Tanzanian authorities to settle and grow crops. Some have done so, but many still lead a nomadic life for much of the year. Their movements are now more restricted as a result of the very serious loss of land in recent years. Every Hadza can live, hunt, and gather wherever he/she chooses, within Hadza country. People are associated with territories they and their close kin mainly use, but they never seek to exclude other Hadza from these regions.

Kinship, marriage, gender, and domestic organization

Hadza treat all other Hadza as kin and address them by kinship terms. They stress the importance of informal mutuality and sharing between kin and reject the notion that kin are bound to each other by ties of authority and dependency, or formally differentiated obligations. Individual choice and personal autonomy are highly respected. Women, like men, usually make their own decisions about who they will marry (with minimal intervention from parents and other kin). Husband and wife each have the right of immediate divorce. Post-marital residence is usually with the wife's mother and sisters; female solidarity is important for a wife in her dealings with a domineering husband. Households of husband, wife, and small children merge into the camp community in most daily activities, including childcare and much of the cooking and eating.

Political organization

Hadza ideology strongly stresses the importance of equality of power, wealth, and status among men. The Hadza differ from their pastoralist neighbors in so far as age differentiation is unimportant to them, and principles of equality apply even between close male kin, including father and son. Leveling mechanisms, the most important being to share and not to accumulate, prevent men from exercising authority or making others dependent on them; There are no chiefs or formal leaders.

Religion

Hadza men and women are differentiated in religious contexts. Men are initiated into an egalitarian community of men which has privileged rights over certain portions of the best meat or most game animals. Initiated men meet on their own and have secrets from women and children. Men are liable to respond violently to perceived encroachment on their secret activities. Women too have secrets from men. Female circumcision, in which the men have little interest, is organized by the women alone, and is seen as a matter entirely for women. After the operation, the newly circumcised young women chase after and violently attack the men, especially their potential husbands, with specially decorated staves. There are at present some indications that Hadza women may, on their own initiative, soon decide to give up circumcision.

The most important Hadza ritual, the *Epeme* Dance, is a solemn affair carried out in total darkness on moonless nights. The men become sacred beings and dance, one by one, communicating with the women, who sing sacred accompaniment in a special whistling language reserved for this context. The men are secretive about what is going on and sit apart from the women and children. Despite this, the ritual emphasizes the shared interests of men and women, especially as parents of children. This ritual is considered indispensable for

Hadza well-being. It may be interpreted as a recurring ceremonial reconciliation of men and women, and indeed all Hadza. Attendance is obligatory for all the camp's dwellers.

Current situation and organization for resistance

The independent post-colonial governments of Tanzania have, for more than thirty years, pursued an assimilationist policy designed to create an integrated, unified country in which ethnic distinctions are reduced. In practice, the focus for this integration has been a sedentary agricultural way of life, which the major population follows. Nomadic pastoralists and particularly nomadic hunter-gatherers have been treated as backward. Efforts are constantly made to persuade them to settle and adopt agriculture.

Either openly or covertly, most Hadza consistently reject this policy. They wish to retain their way of life and modernize according to their own needs. As they constitute a political threat to no one, they do not see why they should be pressed to give up their way of life. Despite government and NGOs, most Hadza are reluctant to remain in government settlements for long. The few Hadza who have completed secondary education are entrapped. The only paid work normally available to them in their region is as government employees, responsible for applying government policies in Hadza country. At times, Hadza have been subjected to strong measures directed by their educated brothers seeking to enforce government policy.

The Hadza currently face three major threats. The first is land loss. Throughout the colonial and post-colonial eras, governments have treated Hadza hunting lands as unoccupied, and have encouraged agricultural and pastoral peoples to settle on them. The Hadza have lost most of their territory. In 1994, after efforts by Hadza and volunteers working with CUSO, a Canadian NGO committed to land rights issues, some traditional territory was registered as Hadza land, the area around a village settlement in which Hadza constitute the majority. However, they are entitled to, and deserve, an area ten times that which is presently registered. To acquire more government registered land the Hadza face a much more difficult struggle.

The second threat is at least as serious. Most Hadza children of primary school age, as young as six, have been taken from their families and placed in a boarding school on the edge of Hadza country. On the whole, people want education for their children, for the new opportunities that this may afford, and to develop literate advocates to defend against further Hadza losses. Rather than residential schooling, the Hadza want primary day schools locally, in their own settled and nomadic communities. At present, young children away from home most of the year cannot learn properly their subsistence skills, language, or culture.

The third threat lies in the hunting leases and licenses granted by the government to commercial hunting companies on Hadza land. These constitute an overt breach of Hadza land rights and endanger the Hadza's continuing land use, as the Hadza know so well. Hadza have attended indigenous rights meetings organized by the United Nations in Geneva. However, they have not found it easy to organize themselves and present their common viewpoint. What, then, do they want?

They want what other citizens of Tanzania are entitled to. They want to be appreciated as valued citizens, and their way of life considered valuable and worthy, rather than as a curiosity, a primitive relic to be abolished. They want the same primary day schools as other Tanzanians. They want the recognition of their land rights, the right to hunt, and the right to exclude commercial hunters from their territories.

The danger is that they may become a stigmatized, dispossessed, impoverished, landless group of laborers, as has happened, only a few hundred miles away, to the Batwa of Rwanda and Burundi.

Reading list

- Hawkes, K. (1991). Hunting income patterns among the Hadza: big game, common goods, foraging goals and the evolution of the human diet. In J.,F. O'Connell and N. G. Blurton Jones (eds.), *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society, London, Series B*, 334:243-51.
- Kaare, B. T. M. (1994). The impact of modernization policies on the hunter-gatherer Hadzabe: the case of education and language policies in post-independence Tanzania. In E. S. Burch and L. Ellanna (eds.), *Key issues in hunter-gatherer research*, pp. 315-32. Oxford: Berg.
- Ndagala, D. K. (1988). Free or doomed? Images of the Hadzabe hunters and gatherers. In T. Ingold, D. Riches, and J. Woodburn (eds.), *Hunters and gatherers*, vol. I, *History, evolution and social change*, pp. 65-72. Oxford: Berg.
- Sands, B. E. (1995). Evaluating claims of distant linguistic relationships: the case of Khoisan. PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Tucker, A. N., M. Bryan, and J. C. Woodburn (1977). The east African click languages: a phonetic comparison. Part Two: Hadza. In W. J. G. Mohlig, F. Rottlanrl, and B. Heine (eds.), *Zur Sprachgeschichte und Ethnohistorie in Afrika: Neue Beitrüige Afrikanistischer Forschungen. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.*
- Woodburn, J. C. (1968). An introduction to Hadza ecology. In R. B. Lee and I. DeVore (eds.), *Man the hunter*, pp. 49-55. Chicago: Airlie.
- (1979) .Minimal politics: the political organization of the Hadza of Tanzania. In P. Cohen and W. Shack (eds.), *Politics in leadership: a comparative perspective*, pp. 244-6. Oxford: Clarendon.
- (1980). Hunters and gatherers today and reconstruction of the past. In E. Gellner (ed.), *Soviet and western anthropology*, pp. 95-117. London: Gerald Duckworth.
- (1982). Egalitarian societies. *Man* 17(3):431-51.

(1988). African hunter-gatherer social organization: is it best understood as a product of encapsulation? In T. Ingold, D. Riches, and J. Woodburn (eds.), *Hunters and gatherers*, vol. I, *History, evolution and social change*, pp. 31-64. Oxford: Berg.

Film

The Hadza: the food quest of an east African hunting and gathering people. 1966. (40 min.). Camera dir. S. Hudson: anthropological dir. J. Woodburn. blw. Distributor: J. Woodburn, 140 Cherry Hinton Road, Cambridge CB1 4AJ, UK.

The Ju/'honsi of Botswana and Namibia
Meghan Biesele Rice University, University of Nebraska and
Kxao Royal-/0/00 Grootfontein, Namibia

Introduction

Ju/'hoansi, a !Kung-speaking group divided between Botswana and Namibia, are well known ethnographically to the general public. Famous for their sharing, logically adaptive foraging way of life, the Ju/'hoansi have been romanticized in films such as *The Gods must crazy*, and more realistically portrayed in ethnographic films like John Marshall's *N!ai: the story of a !Kung woman*. Most Ju/'hoansi have lived in close association with blacks and whites since at least 1900. However, in Dobe area of Botswana and the Nyae Nyae area of Namibia a significant number chose to maintain their aging way of life into the 1950s and 1960s.

History

Divided between nations, Ju/'hoan colonial history is a study of contrasts: British influences predominate in the Bechuanaland Protectorate and Afrikaner culture in the South African-controlled South West Africa (Namibia). Differences in the post-independence national governments (Botswana since 1966 and Namibia since 1990) have continued to divide the Ju/'hoansi, even though the pre-colonial experiences of Ju/'hoan people and their ancestors were quite similar over the whole region. Prior colonial times they lived relatively isolated lives in small groups, trading wild produce and meat with distant farmer-herders, or, in some cases, performing services for the pastoralists.

Ju/'hoan historical links to the wider African world have been the subject of debate. Were Nyae Nyae and Dobe areas foraging strongholds prehistorically, or did they have mixed subsistence dominated by pastoralism? Historical/archaeological research supports the foraging stronghold view: there is no evidence for non-Ju/'hoansi occupying the Nyae Nyae-Dobe area prior to the twentieth century, although the Ju/'hoansi have maintained trading relations with Iron Age neighbors on their periphery for at least 1000 years (Smith and Lee 1997).

The 1870s arrival of European hunters and traders initiated a brief era of prosperity for the Ju/'hoansi, followed by gradual economic decline as game animals were decimated. Since 1920, when black pastoralists began digging wells for cattle, the Ju/'hoansi and their resources have come under increasing pressure. While even in the 1950s there were fewer than one

hundred non- Ju/'hoansi in the Nyae Nyae-Dobe area, Ju/'hoan history in the twentieth century, like that of virtually all Bushman peoples, has been dominated by land dispossession and marginalization.

Ecological setting

Blessed by a number of permanent waters in limestone outcrops, pans, seasonal river courses and springs, the Nyae Nyae and Dobe areas lie in semi-arid savannah about 1100 m above sea level. The region is traversed by parallel sandy dunes running east to west and supporting distinctive edible vegetation. The international border bisects the Aha Hills which provide another economically important micro-environment. Annual rainfall is about 400 mm, mainly in summer (November-March). Winter (May-August) can produce freezing temperatures by night and bitter south winds by day.

Economy

In the past, and to some extent today, Ju/'hoan people have depended on wild plants and animals to feed themselves. The sandy savannah is home to over one hundred edible plant species, dominated by a few highly nutritious staples, like the *mongongo* or *mangetti* nut. Mongongo trees (*Ricinodendron rautanenii* Schinz.) grow in abundant groves along dunes, producing a delicious nut which is roasted after the purplish fruit is boiled off into edible porridge. Other major foods include the *tsin* or *morama* bean, *baobab* fruit, the *marula* nut, and eight species of *grewia* berries.

In the 1960s, detailed studies of the Dobe camp documented the dynamics of hunting and gathering subsistence (Lee and DeVore 1976, Lee 1979). Two-thirds of the diet was vegetable foods gathered by women, confirming women's economic and decision-making power. Meat was of secondary importance, although much desired and the result of great skill, strength, and knowledge. Men hunted up to fifty-five animal species, often assisted in tracking by their wives. In the 1990s, Ju still eat bush foods, gathering at weekends and hunting as allowed by game conservation departments.

The Ju/'hoansi (1960s) had a favorable demographic profile. Although infant mortality was high, those who survived childhood had a reasonable life expectancy (Howell 1979). Overall, the quality of Ju/'hoan life as hunter-gatherers was relatively good. Their diet and level of exercise have been characterized as among the world's healthiest (see Baton and Baton, this volume). They had few of the "civilized" world's diseases like cancer, heart disease, arthritis, or high blood pressure. They suffered mainly from introduced infectious illnesses like tuberculosis.

Thus, Ju/'hoansi contradict the popular belief that hunting and gathering is a risky or unreliable form of existence. Though strenuous at times, the way of life involves plenty of leisure time. For example, Ju/'hoan adults could provide the group's food by working two or three days a week. This led Sahlins (1968) to call Ju/'hoansi and other hunter-gatherers "the original affluent society." They were affluent, however, only when they controlled their environment and way of life.

Settlement patterns

Today as in past times, Ju!'hoan local groups do not have exclusive rights to resources. Instead, groups share access using agreed rules. The frequent visiting and sharing among the different groups smooths out local disparities. Groups related by marriage cooperate, coming together in a given area when there is sufficient food and water, living apart when sources of food and water are scarce and elusive.

Today, despite changes wrought by economic and governmental pressures toward permanent settlement, much of the reliable sharing system remains. When food is brought into camp, it is distributed widely. Many *hxaro* gifts of tools and clothing are given and received among group members, so that an individual can still rely on the community's resources.

Domestic organization

Settlements were small (about 15-50 persons), arranged in a circle of grass dwellings around a central plaza. During winter, people aggregated at larger camps close to permanent water. In summer, they dispersed in smaller groups to occupy seasonal water points. Land was inalienable and was owned collectively by a group of male and female kin. Core composition of local groups tended to be several siblings of both sexes, with their in-marrying spouses. Marriage was important, with most living monogamously. Girls were betrothed young and married in their mid-teens. Divorce, not infrequent, was usually initiated by women. The large majority of Ju settled into permanent unions by their mid-twenties. They are known for their gender egalitarianism. Women's status was based partly on their economic contribution (gathering). Men often joined the wife's family group upon marriage.

Ju kinship is of the Eskimo type (similar to Euro- Americans'), where parents are terminologically distinguished from aunts and uncles, and siblings from first cousins. Relatives are divided roughly by generation into *joking* and *avoidance* relations. Elaborate rules of etiquette apply to each category. One joked with one's own generation and that of grandparents and grandchildren. One avoided one's parents' and children's generations. But the genius stroke of Ju kinship revolves around their well-documented "name relationship" (Marshall 1957). There is a limited repertoire of personal names, about fifty for males, and fifty for females. These are transmitted between generations by strict rules. There were no surnames until recently. All Ju were named after relatives: first children after grandparents, subsequent children for aunts, uncles, and other kin.

A special relationship obtained between name-takers and namesakes. Regardless of actual relationship, they called one another "Old Name" and "Young Name." Despite their age differences they enjoyed the warmth of the joking relationship. The name relationship was widely applied in social life. Owing to the limited number of personal names and rules of inheritance, the same names were used over and over in different families. A man called :j:oma might, for example, meet up to thirty other :j:omas in his travels around the Dobe-Nyae Nyae area. For each of these the name relation rules applied. This institution remains of vital importance today.

Political organization

Ju/'hoan political ethos abhorred wealth and status differences. No one should stand out from the rest of the group. If someone returned from a successful hunt showing excessive pride, he was put firmly in place, even if the kill was large. Emphasis on sharing and lack of status roles produced a high degree of egalitarianism. These rules, based on living in small groups of kin, worked successfully. Anger and resentment were low as each person's opinion was respected. Conflicts could be terminated by a disputant leaving to join another group.

Ju/'hoan bands used the resources of their own *n!ores*: named, collectively owned territories which provided sufficient annual food and water. Visiting arrangements gave band members access to resources of other *n!ores*, especially useful when rains were spotty and food species appeared unevenly. Hosts expected to pay return visits when other *n!ores* were able to reciprocate. Agreements regarding access to various territories were based on well-known kinship rules.

Equality and sharing remain important. Social techniques like "leveling" hunters help maintain harmony. *N!ore* ownership remains non-exclusive: each has core siblings with the right to share its resources, and the duty to share produce with others. Such stewards ensure a region is not overexploited. However, today Ju say they follow their black neighbors, with "chiefs" and status differences emerging. In response to government demands, *!lore* ownership is more circumscribed.

Religion and spirituality

Ju/'hoansi have a great god, known as *!Xu, Old G kao, or Kaoha*, who created the earth and all that is in it, including death and evil. This creation includes a super-natural world (parallel to that of the living) populated by spirits of deceased kin. This god has a wife, *Koba*; deities include a lesser god, *G//aoan*, who lives in the western sky, sending misfortune to the living, via their ancestors. The dead follow the doings of the living; they are considered sources of sickness and misfortune.

To counter these forces, Ju healers have access to supernatural power such as *n/om*, magical energy/ potency with which Ju/'hoansi can counter malevolent ghosts, heal the sick, and resolve conflicts. When one sings special songs, Ju say, *n/om* comes out. Ju/'hoan ceremonies feature intense, exhilarating, all-night healing dances, where the power of *n/om* heals, protects, and gives well-being. Despite the use of medicinal herbs and some access to antibiotics, Ju/'hoansi treat virtually every illness with the healing dance. Dances also mark general celebration because, as the Ju say, "with food in the camp our hearts are sweet."

Current situation

The pace of change in Ju/'hoan life has accelerated rapidly since the 1950s. Boreholes, tractors, and vehicle transport have impacted both the society and the fragile ecosystem. The growth of inequality, domination by neighbors, and land loss have made life less and less secure. Ju!'hoansi

are less confident of their future. Nation-states and other outside forces increasingly control their lives.

Following Botswana's independence in 1966, a store, schools, a clinic, and an airstrip soon appeared in the Dobe area. By the mid-1980s many Ju lived in semi-permanent villages with livestock. Yet Tswana and Herero with large herds dominated the water sources, grazing, and government services. Government drought relief led to further dependency in the 1980s. Under the South West African administration's "Odendaal" plan for apartheid "homelands" more than 900 Jui'hoansi were induced to leave their *nlores* (on Nyae Nyae land), in the 1960s and settle in the administrative center, Tjum!kui. Here a school, clinic, church, jail, and store were built. There was some construction wage labor for men, but the local gatherable resources were soon depleted and the population became government dependents, with crowded conditions, hunger, enforced idleness, public health problems, drinking, and family violence.

When Odendaal had taken 70 percent of their land (late 1970s), Ju'hoansi began to move back to save their remaining territory. Three groups returned in 1981, and by 1997, thirty-five. Emulating the "Outstation Movement" of Australian Aborigines, the Ju'hoan communities sought to combine foraging with pastoralism, wage labor and ecotourism. In 1985, John Marshall and Claire Ritchie began a foundation which became the Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia (NNDFN), with international funding for Ju'hoan boreholes and cattle herds, and generally assists Ju'hoansi to counter the disintegration, poverty, and illness which had ravaged their former self-sufficiency.

Ironically, the cattle program had strict limits and some pressures the Ju'hoansi now face arise from their good environmental stewardship. Cattle-owners look covetously at the unspoiled grasslands of San areas and try to invade with their herds. Despite encroachment, the Nyae Nyae Ju'hoansi have held part of their land, and in the process have had to reinvent themselves as politicians, nationally and internationally.

Organization for resistance

In the 1970s South Africa recruited Ju'hoan trackers for the war against the South West African Peoples' Organization (SWAPO), which eventually liberated Namibia from South African rule. Soldiers' pay and alcohol led to further inequities, drunkenness, and violence among Ju'hoansi. In 1986 the community started the Julwa (Ju'hoan) Farmers' Union (JFU), signaling their intention to be considered active planners of their own future. Their traditional form of leadership being unknown to outsiders, they used JFU (later NNFC: Nyae Nyae Farmers' Cooperative) to develop leadership and management skills for the new political context. Formalized in 1988, NNFC had two representatives from each community to act on land allocation, cattle, infrastructure, and new *nfore* applications. With Namibian independence, NNFC accomplished an effective public awareness program in their settlements, about UN Resolution 435, SWAPO's war of liberation, and apartheid South Africa's anti-liberation propaganda. The National Conference on Land Reform (1991) promised special protection to Ju communal land rights and recognized the *nfore* system as the basis for future land allocation in Nyae Nyae (although yet to be written into law).

As Nyae Nyae people drill boreholes, build stronger kraals against lions and elephants, and expand dryland *t£* farming, irrigation, and craftwork, the once-egalitarian communities face the frictions of ceding decision-making to elected representatives, who in turn must find *iv* ways to maintain community roots. In 1991, at NNFC's request, a professional orthography and grammar of Jul'hoansi made possible a growing, community-based *indigenous* education program, enhancing the prognosis

The Tiwi of Melville and Bathurst Islands, north Australia

Jane C. Goodale Bryn Mawr College

Introduction

The Aboriginal peoples of Melville and Bathurst Islands, North Australia, were referred to as Tiwi in 1930, by Hart, using their word *tiwi*: people (*tini*: man; *tinga*: woman). They continue to attract ethnographers and are well known in print, art galleries, and film. Permanent European settlement began in the early 1900s, yet, since 1976, the Tiwi have regained control of all their island lands. They continue to forage and exploit the marine resources with weekly (sometimes daily) regularity while maintaining residence in one of three modern townships: Nguiu (the former mission), Pularumpi (a former school for part-Aboriginal children), and Milikapiti (the former government settlement).

Tiwi social organization is based on matrilineal clan and patri-based local group organization; both types of relationship remain strong forces today. Although the extreme polygyny of the past has given way to serial monogamy, clan and local group marriage exchange remains an important consideration. The Tiwi are distinct from mainland Aboriginal groups (Arnhem Land) in lacking moiety divisions and named sections. Their concept of the Dreaming is also distinct. Their language is distantly related to other Aboriginal languages. Since regaining control of the land, Tiwi have revived their culture primarily by focusing on mortuary rituals and associated art.

History

In 1995, the Tiwi and the Netherlands commemorated the first recorded European contact in 1705 by placing, with due ceremony, a large stone monument on the beach at Karlslake, Melville Island. The Portuguese and English soon followed the Dutch arrival. The British established Fort Dundas in 1824 near the present-day Pularumpi Township, and abandoned it in 1829, leaving behind a legacy of buffalo and horses. Seventy-five years later, the buffalo and timber resources lured a few entrepreneurs to the islands. In 1911, Father Gsell, MSC, established a Catholic mission (Sacred Heart) on Bathurst Island (now Nguiu Township). The Australian government established a settlement at Garden Point (now Pularumpi Township) in 1939; this became a mission-directed boarding school for part-Aboriginal children (from the islands and other Northern Territory Catholic missions). In 1945 the government settlement moved to Snake Bay (Milikapiti Township) on the north coast of Melville Island. The mission and government

managed the islands as reserves until the passing of the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976 when reserves were automatically returned to their original owners -in this case, to the Tiwi. In the early 1980s, all three townships became incorporated, with elected local councils; non-township affairs on the island are decided by the Tiwi Land Council.

Major ethnographic studies were made by Spencer in 1912; Hart in 1929-30; Pilling, Mountford and Goodale, all working in 1953-4; and Venbruxin 1988.

Ecological setting

The islands are relatively flat, with a central ridge (about 100 m) running east-west on Melville. Nine rivers flow north from this ridge to tidal mangrove estuaries. On Bathurst there is less elevation and rivers are small and tidal. Mixed eucalyptus and cypress pine forests characterize much of the uplands; there are, as well, patches of true tropical rainforest. The climate is onsoonal; heavy rains fall from December to March; the dry season is June to September.

Economy

This setting provided food riches for the Tiwi in the past, and does so largely today. Both men and women hunt small species (possums, goannas, honey bees, shellfish, turtle eggs, and wallabies) using stone (later steel) axes and probing/digging sticks. Women collect tubers, and cycad nuts (elaborately prepared to remove the poison). Traveling by dugout canoe (now outboard fiberglass boats), men hunt and fish the seas/estuaries for turtle, dugong, and fish, using wooden (later iron) pronged spears, and kill fruit bats and migrating magpie geese with throwing sticks (now with shotguns). All three communities have tried vegetable gardening and animal husbandry on numerous occasions, with limited success. On Melville Island, a cypress pine plantation of many hectares was started in the 1950s. This was changed to Caribbean pine in the 1970s. The Tiwi now own the plantations (which have yet to produce marketable lumber). Each township has one or more workshops producing Tiwi-designed items for sale to tourists and art dealers: silk-screened fabrics and clothes; cards, carvings, and paintings. Carved mortuary poles are the artwork most widely known. They are found in museums and galleries throughout Australia and abroad.

Settlement patterns, mobility, and land tenure

The islands are at any given time divided into geographically distinct "countries" (*murukupupuni*) to which groups of Tiwi are differentially affiliated. Until the latter half of the twentieth century, affiliation was with the *murukupupuni* in which the person's father was buried. More recently, the affiliation has become basically patrilineal. Fusion and fission of these groups and territories remain responsive to population fluctuations. The boundaries apparently have always been flexible. There are at present eight countries, each represented by delegates to the Tiwi Land Council. Previously, within the larger areas, people lived in *taputa* (camps), the location of which changed frequently in response to food availability. The minimal group residing in these camps in pre-mission days consisted of a married man, or related married men, wives, married daughters with sons-in-law, unmarried sons, and grandchildren. An unmarried

man affiliated with camps of his father. When he acquired a mother-in-law he moved to her camp. In the contemporary townships, *murukupupuni* affiliation is still an important residential factor. People of one country tend to live in townships geographically close to, and in houses oriented toward, the district with which they are affiliated. In the past, residence outside one's country was not unusual. When a man was buried in another country, this allowed his children to affiliate there. Countries were preferentially endogamous, although important men frequently obtained wives from different countries. Today, residence in one township or another is fairly stable, although people are free to move to any township; a tendency has developed whereby people leave townships and return to the quieter life near the ancestors of the *murukupupuni*.

Kinship and marriage

The Tiwi consider all humans in their universe to be related to each other in some way. Spirit-child centers are affiliated with matrilineal clans and localized within that geographical *murukupupuni* such that conception means the transfer of a spirit-child (by the father through dreams) to a mother of the same clan for nurturing and growth. This is reflected in the skewed distribution of clan members in the townships. The clans are grouped into exogamous phratries (today, four). The preferred clan exchange is to marry into one's father's matrilineal clan (called "my dreaming") and this may reflect the *underlying dual organization ideology. Unnamed endogamous generation moieties exist, as seen in terminology for "long-way" kin, but not between "close kin" (those "having in common either a mother's mother or a father's ~;father, or both). Iroquois cousin terminology distinguishes cross- from parallel-cousins, and marriage is preferred between second cross-cousins. Matrilateral kin are distinguished from patrilineal.

In the past, the most prestigious marriage for a man was arranged by mother-in-law bestowal: the universal form for all women's first marriages. A woman was given a son-in-law by her father at the time of her puberty rituals (*muringaletta*). A man might expect to receive as wives all his mother-in-law's daughters. As a result, husbands were at least twenty years senior to their bestowed wives. With the coming of the Catholic mission, the age at first marriage became more equal. However, bestowals of mothers-in-law are still carried out. They reflect the continuing political importance of women exchanges between clans. While there has been a gradual increase in marriage to mainland Aboriginals, and other ethnic groups including Europeans, most Tiwi prefer to have their daughters marry Tiwi men, thereby granting their grandchildren affiliation with the land of the Islands.

Political organization

Formerly, men gained power and prestige through intensive negotiations for wives. In any given generation a few were able to collect «one hundred wives:» as Tiwi recall. Some wives were inherited; others were obtained through negotiation with previous husbands. The most prestigious wives were the daughters, born and unborn, of women acquired as mothers-in-law. For "big men" such negotiations extended outside one's country. A woman who was the eldest wife gained prestige and power by managing a large extended camp, providing good health and welfare to the entire residential group. Respected and obeyed, senior men and women were fluent and skilled in ritual singing and dancing, and in the production of carved and painted mortuary poles, painted bark baskets, and other ritual symbols. Since the Aboriginal Land Rights

(Northern Territory) Act 1976 was passed, a number of Tiwi men have gained political power as elected members of the Northern Territory Assembly and, together with women, as members of government advisory boards. Local township councils are arenas for politics and influence for both men and women. To date, only men have been selected to serve on the Tiwi Land Council.

Religion and spirituality

Ancestral beings who created land, animals, and people were female, but the major creator, who established the Tiwi concept of death, is the male figure, Purukupali. After his son died, following his wife's affair with Moon, Purukupali declared that all men should die and never return. Tiwi mortuary rituals occur months after the death and burial. They involve preparing a dozen or more elaborately carved/painted poles, and numerous preliminary dances. The final ritual may involve an over-night dance at the gravesite by painted participants. Poles, dance, and song allow for individual creative variation, and resultant praise and prestige. Men, women, and children participate, although there are some specifically gendered roles. Changes in the ritual are apparent over the recorded history. The number and variety of original songs and dances have been noticeably reduced. The major dance focus has become the one that symbolizes the dancer's relationship to the deceased.

The *Kulama* ritual, a complex annual event at the end of the rainy season, involves the preparation of a toxic yam, *kulama*, and the singing of original songs for three days. *Kulama* song leaders require sophisticated language skills. In the past, both men and women were initiated into *Kulama*, though some aspects were gender-specific. With the current decline in language fluency, only a few men attempt the public performance of their song compositions. Tiwi *Dreaming* partially involves a concept of unborn spirit children located in sacred places, from whence they are gathered by their predestined father, and sent to a wife. Men are solely responsible not only for conception, but also for all physical transformations in the lifecycle: menarche, bestowal of a "mother-in-law;" *Kulama* initiation, and the passage to the world of the dead. Women are conceptually responsible for the health and well-being of all living individuals, beginning with their development in the womb.

Many Tiwi are adherents to a Catholicism that, since the 1980s, has accepted and integrated much Tiwi ritual.

Current situation

Tiwi in all three communities, and in Darwin, earn wages, and receive Australian pensions and allotments. In addition, craft/art sales bring money into the communities. Local gambling for money is an important pastime, and redistributes wage and pension monies. Township councils and Northern Territory education and health departments are major employers. A number of enterprises, such as tourist ventures (fishing, touring, camping), buffalo trading, fish and shellfish cultivation and distribution, and the Tiwi Forest Plantation, are local ventures sanctioned by the Land Council.

Tiwi townships have their share of social problems (violence, physical abuse, and alcohol), although narcotics have not been a problem to date. Tiwi attribute social problems to

overcrowding and lack of adequate housing. They are fortunate that, in owning the islands, they can foresee the establishment of additional settlements as suburbs and/or townships as soon as financial support (for which they are in competition with other Australians) can be found. Some have already made this move. The Catholic administered school at Nguuu has an extensive bilingual Tiwi/English program.

Archaeology and evolution of hunters and gatherers

Andrew B. Smith University of Cape Town

The history of modern hunters and gatherers is as long as the history of any human group or way of life. The following account describes a legacy common to all of humanity and not just to the subjects of this Encyclopedia.

Much of what we think of as "human" properties exist among chimpanzees today. The idea of hunting and foraging was probably already embedded in the social life of our non-human primate ancestors before they walked on two legs. Plant foods predominate in the diet of the great apes. As one moves away from the equatorial regions, access to above-ground plant foods may be seasonal, but in the tropics there are usually above-ground plant foods available most of the year; moreover, as Vincent (1985) has demonstrated, the high productivity of underground plants, such as tubers in the savannah areas of East Africa, could have sustained a foraging population through most of the year. Chimps today have a "mental" map of where plant foods are to be found. Such "mapping" may have been more developed in early humans, giving them the ability to locate and keep track of the availability of underground plants, as well as of sources of scavengeable meat in the form of large ungulate carcasses. Modern chimps will also eat meat, by seizing young animals or otherwise hunting. Their main prey are Colobus monkeys, which are hunted in a communally organized campaign that often involves both males and females, although males usually do the actual killing. One author suggests that male chimps use the meat to solidify political bonds and obtain access to sexually receptive females (Stanford 1995). Meat-eating is a consistent and widespread activity, observed in such diverse locales as the Tai Forest of Ivory Coast and the Gombe Reserve in Tanzania, and would indicate that hunting of smaller animals by chimps may have considerable antiquity (Boesch and Boesch 1989). It is obvious, however, that access to meat is somewhat irregular, and it ought not to be considered a major part of the diet (Foley 1987:143).

Our hominid ancestors, prior to 2.5 million years ago, probably had physical and mental restrictions similar to those of chimps today: they would have been small in size and relatively slow moving, and needed places of refuge from larger predators. Beginning from the period 2.5 million years ago, we start to find stone tools associated with the bones of larger animals. This roughly coincides with the appearance of the genus *Homo*, and it is the first evidence of human cultural activity. However, this does not mean that the larger animals were hunted; it is probable that meat was obtained by scavenging from the kills of large predators. Taphonomic studies of lion kills in the Serengeti suggest that riparian woodland areas would have allowed sufficient protection and sanctuary for hominids who could escape up trees. It is in these areas that there is most evidence of carcasses. There would have been less

competition here from the hyenas that dominate the scavenging niche of the open plains. It is possible that scavenging for meat was an important dry-season activity when fewer above-ground plant foods were available (Blumenschine and Cavallo 1992).

Important at this stage of human development was the fact that the exploitation of the larger and deeper tubers would have required some form of digging implement. Stone tools took the place of powerful jaws and allowed hominids to rip open a carcass, as well as to crush the leg bones to extract marrow, or the skull to extract the brain. Hence, early humans' should be considered in relation to the other carnivores in the environment, as part of what Milo (1994) calls carnivore "guilds" which formed a larger predatory system, with each member having a considerable adaptive overlap with the others.

The archaeological record reveals a significant shift in the ability of early humans by 1.5 million years ago. *Homo erectus* made the first recognizable bone digging tools, found at Swartkrans in South Africa. These tools are striated, which suggests they were used to extract underground plant foods. *Homo erectus* also developed a more sophisticated stone tool kit, called the Acheulean. In this industry, we find the repeated fabrication of handaxes and cleavers, a fact that indicates an important abstract threshold had been crossed. The handaxe maker would have had in mind a template which allowed him to envision the tool before he began to remove flakes from the core. This same mental ability presumably went along with important communication skills that are embedded in complex social organization. Beginning 1 million years ago, *Homo erectus* spread from Africa to Europe (where handaxes have also been found) and to eastern Asia and Southeast Asia (where the handaxe culture is missing, and where stone tools are found in the form of chopping implements). The line separating the two stone tool industries geographically is referred to as the Movius Line, roughly in the vicinity of modern Bangladesh. Occupation of more northerly latitudes, however, may have had less to do with increased ability of Middle Pleistocene humans and more to do with changes within the large carnivore guilds. According to Turner (1992), there were considerable changes in the large carnivore species, particularly hyenas, during the Middle Pleistocene of Europe. This may have reduced scavenging opportunities of early humans until the guild changed and resembled that of East Africa today.

The large animal bones from Acheulean sites show many more meat-bearing body parts, indicating that *H. erectus* was a more efficient scavenger (Shipman 1983). Evidence from late Acheulean sites, such as Schonipgen in Germany, where wooden spears associated with thousands of horse bones have been dated to 400,000 BP, indicates that hunting of large game may well have taken place (Dennell 1997). At Torralba and Ambrona in Spain, evidence dated to around 300,000 BP, suggests that these early people dismembered the carcasses of elephants which were bogged down in swampy terrain (Shipman and Rose 1983). Larger amounts of meat suggest a surplus that would have been socially distributed. Glynn Isaac (1978) has offered a theory about an important feedback mechanism which could have taken place in human development. This revolved around a central-place sharing locus where communal activities would have taken place. This successful meat-acquiring and distribution strategy probably developed over a million years with the possibility that the early hominids were able to outcompete (and eventually become) the prime predator, sabre-toothed cats, leading to the latter's extinction in Europe by 500,000 BP. If this was indeed the case, it would have been further impetus for hominids to develop the technology to bring down the big game themselves.

The earliest compound ballistic tools are probably the spear points which appear in the Middle Stone Age of Africa or the Middle Palaeolithic of Eurasia about 150,000-200,000 years

ago. This came about through another change in technology: the development of the Levallois or prepared core technique that started to appear in the later Acheulean industries. Once again the envisioned end-product must already have existed as a mental template, as a conceptualization, but now mapping was paired with the flint-knapping skills that prepared the core before knocking off the desired flake: a Mousterian point, which could be hafted to a wooden shaft and used as a stabbing or throwing weapon.

The producers of this industry were an archaic form of *Homo sapiens*, found at such sites as Klasies River Mouth (KRM), South Africa. There is considerable disagreement among faunal specialists as to whether humans were actually hunting or scavenging at this time. Binford (1984) is convinced that the body part representation of large bovids from KRM, mainly head and foot bones, indicates scavenging. Klein (1986) disagrees. He looked at the age-profile of the eland from the site and suggested that it contains roughly the same proportion of prime-age adults that one would find in a stable live population. By contrast, prime-age adult bones are missing from the buffalo remains, and since the very young and the old animals would have been the most common carcasses in the landscape, the accumulation of buffalo bones could have been the result of scavenging, as opposed to the intentional hunting of eland. Klein suggests the latter could have been killed by driving whole herds over cliffs, a process that Shipman (1983) calls a strategy of targeting a single species.

An example of such targeting can be seen in the Mousterian hunting tradition of the Russian steppes where, over 40,000 years ago, people were moving into colder latitudes and hunting woolly mammoths. The archaeological evidence for this comes from the shelters of these hunters. In this treeless environment, shelters were made from the bones of the mammoths, carefully arranged, then covered with skins to keep out the bitter Siberian winds (Klein 1974).

Occupation of Australia was relatively late. The earliest undisputed evidence for humans on the continent is dated to only 33,000 years ago, but there is a general belief that people lived there much earlier (many sites would have been inundated by rising sea levels). By 70,000 years ago the technology of simple bamboo rafts could have been used by people crossing the 130 km of open water between Indonesia and the palaeocontinent of Sahul (existing when Australia and New Guinea were joined, and, from trapping ocean waters in the polar ice caps, caused a drop in sea level of over 100 m). The human population of Australia was never very great, possibly because vast expanses supported only a low animal and plant biomass. Although there were changes in the stone tool technology through time (White and O'Connell 1982) it never seems to have reached the sophistication found elsewhere in the world. Instead, other aspects of hunting technology were developed, such as the boomerang and atlatl (spear-thrower), but these were never ubiquitous, and there never was an Australian bow and arrow. In spite of the low population density, Aboriginal colonization of Australia was quite successful, as indicated by the depletion, attributed to human agency, of the Pleistocene megafauna of the continent.

Hunting large game is a dangerous business at the best of times, but without power weapons it would have been successful only through communal effort, either by driving the animals, or digging pitfalls and killing those wounded. The ability of the individual hunter to select and stalk, and then immobilize, prey bigger than himself would have been possible only with ballistic weapons. Even hunting with a spear is very dangerous, since the hunter must

approach within throwing distance. It is only with the appearance of *Homo sapiens sapiens* that other techniques were developed that allowed the successful small-group or solitary hunting of large ungulates. Such techniques included the bow and arrow and the spear-thrower. Here we come up against the archaeological problem of when the bow and arrow were first invented. Some people see the development of the microlithic stone tools of Europe and Africa as the technology which enabled the making of arrow points. If this was the case, we could push back the stone-tipped arrow to close to the limits of radiocarbon dating (i.e., 45,000 years ago) at Umhlatuzana Rock Shelter in Natal, South Africa (Kaplan 1989), considerably earlier than the suggested evidence for bows in the late Solutrean of Spain, dated to 17,000 BP, or the Ahrensburgian of Germany, dated to c. 10,500 BP (Clark 1963).

An alternative view suggests that the introduction of the bow and arrow was a late phenomenon, especially as the earliest direct evidence of a bow is from Holmegaard in Denmark, c. 8000 BP. The antiquity of the use of poisons on arrows is also uncertain, although it would appear that they are associated with the three-piece compound arrow-bone point, link shaft, and reed main shaft (Deacon 1984) - which probably dates back about 8000 years (see Noli 1992 for discussion). This does not exclude the possibility that more powerful fully recurved bows were used earlier, as indicated in the rock art of southern Africa (Manhire *et al.*, 1985).

There can be little doubt that the Late Stone Age hunters of southern Africa were much more efficient than their Middle Stone Age counterparts. The large faunal assemblages of Klasies River Mouth (MSA) and Nelson Bay Cave (LSA) (Klein 1989) have demonstrated the shift from eland and buffalo hunting to buffalo and bushpig hunting. Klein attributes this change to the surmounting of the greater difficulty and danger of bushpig hunting by superior hunting technology. Klein assumes this technology was the bow and arrow (1989:322).

After the glacial maximum of 18,000 BP, conditions in Europe began to change radically as the ice sheets covering much of the continent receded. Lake and river environments were created, which offered new ecological niches for Mesolithic humans. As the habitats changed, deer hunting emerged in western Europe and gazelle or Barbary sheep hunting in the Near East and North Africa, as these animals began to replace the cold-adapted Late Pleistocene megafauna. This was the beginning of the creative period of the Upper Palaeolithic when *Homo sapiens sapiens* in Europe (Cro-Magnon) depicted art and religion on the rock walls of caves in southern France and northern Spain. There was a move toward the exploitation of smaller "packages:" for example aquatic mammal and fish, shellfish (and marine life generally), and grass seeds, with people using

waterways as communication routes. At Star Carr in Yorkshire, England, dated to c. 9000 BP, a paddle has been found. The site was located on the edge of a swampy area across which a jetty had been built for access to the deeper water, presumably for canoe use. By 12,000 BP, humans had occupied all the world's landmasses. Despite a great deal of controversy, there is little evidence that humans were in the Americas until after the last glacial maximum. When the sea level dropped a land bridge was formed in the Bering Strait between Siberia and Alaska and a corridor was opened between the Laurentide and Cordilleran glaciers.

Hunting people moved across, presumably following the megafauna, such as woolly mammoth, rhino, and giant elk, which they hunted to such an extent that they may well have been partly responsible for the extinction of these species in North America (Martin and Klein 1984; Owen-Smith 1987). With the retreat of the glaciers at the end of the Pleistocene, the open grassland plains of North America were exploited by hunters focusing on the large herds of buffalo. These animals were driven over cliffs in large numbers, and butchered *in situ*. One such site, Olsen-Chubbock in Colorado, dated to *c.* 8000 BP, contained the bones of 200 animals of all ages (Frison 1992).

Elsewhere in the world the intensification of use of resources at the end of the Pleistocene, *c.* 12,000 BP, heralded new experiments in the food quest. In the Near East, hunters intercepted the migration routes of gazelles, trapping them in large numbers in desert "kites" (walled enclosures into which the animals were driven). In this way, large amounts of seasonal meat could be obtained. At the site of Abu Hureyra in Syria, for example, the period 11,000-8500 BP showed a faunal component of 80 percent gazelles as against 10 percent sheep and goats. By 8000 BP this frequency had been reversed to 80 percent ovicaprids and less than 20 percent gazelles. Legge and Rowley-Conway (1987) suggest the shift was due to overexploitation of the gazelles, and replacement by early domesticated animals.

During this same period, the Natufian fisher-gatherers of the coastal plain of the Levant adopted increasing sedentism, with the result that the wild grass seeds (wheat and barley) which they were harvesting became the basis of controlled genetic experiments to produce higher yields. This manipulation can be called domestication (Hillman *et al.* 1990, Henry 1989).

Similarly, in Meso-America *c.* 7000 BP, a significant shift in resource management resulted in economic changes; deer hunting and the collection of a wide range of seasonal plants gave way to a much more restricted economy based on maize cultivation. It has been suggested, following a study of modern Zapotec farmers, that maize cultivation had the effect of removing large tracts of the mesquite which provided sanctuary for deer (Flannery 1986). This diminished habitat, with increasing human populations in the Oaxaca valley, led to exploitation of deer beyond sustainable reproduction, with the result that people had to rely on rabbits and ultimately small dogs for animal protein, or on beans for plant protein.

The important question to ask at this point is, if hunting and gathering was so successful for so long, why domesticate? There is *no* simple answer to this. From the available evidence, we can surmise that the intensification of use of resources allowed the environment to support larger populations in various parts of the world, and that, with larger numbers of people in denser concentrations, new methods of food procurement became necessary to maintain energy levels: either changes in technology or changes in the relationship between humans and plants/animals. In large areas of the Near East (including North Africa), Meso-America, and southern China/Thailand, food-producing societies developed independently of hunting-foraging people, who still continued their old way of life. This meant that there was the potential for hunters and food producers to live side by side. In fact we know this to have been the case, with each society offering the benefits of its production for exchange with the other, for example hunters provided game meat and honey in exchange for domestic grains. This situation has been recorded historically in South and Southeast Asia and elsewhere. There may well have been more than just

purely economic exchange. There are historic examples of the San in the foothills of the Lesotho mountains serving an important rain-making function for their Bantu-speaking agricultural neighbors (Jolly 1996). At the same time, where game was still freely available, farming people would continue to hunt, although the larger game would quickly become depleted around settled communities.

For the last 2000 years right up to the beginning of the colonial period, the archaeological record in the south- western Cape, South Africa shows that hunters and herders occupied different types of sites, although at the coast they both exploited marine resources. The herding people occupied large open-air sites and targeted seals as a source both of food and of fat used as a body coating (Patrick *et al.* 1985), while the hunters used small rock shelters or overhangs where available (Smith *et al.* 1991). This may be an indicator of differences in group size. Historic information on the interaction between the two economic groups indicates that, on the one hand, stock theft by hunters often strained relations, but on the other, cooperation between the groups was common, as can be seen in this quotation from a Dutch journal entry for September 16,1685: "these Sonquas are just the same as the poor in Europe, each tribe of Hottentots having some of them and employing them to bring news of the approach of a strange tribe. They steal nothing from the kraals of their employers, but regularly from other kraals ...possessing nothing. ..except what they acquire by theft" (Waterhouse 1932:122). Here we see an example of a social hierarchy between hunters (Sonqua/San) and herders (Hottentot/Khoekhoen).

By AD 1500, on the eve of European expansion, hunter-gatherers still occupied almost one-third of the world's landmass, including all of Australia, the north- western half of North America, and the southern part of South America, as well as smaller parts of sub-Saharan Africa and south, southeast, and northeast Asia. Food producing societies continued to expand into the more productive areas of the world, where the best soils could be farmed or could support herds of domestic animals, or where there was easy access to water (dependable rain- fall or permanent rivers). The result was that the remaining hunters were often marginalized -living on the edges of farming societies, and seen as "Other." One reason for this would have been the potential for greater political complexity and military power among farmers and herders, making it difficult for the hunters to compete. Increasingly, hunters were only able to survive independently in those areas of less value to food producers, such as areas of low or unpredictable rainfall, dense tropical forest, or frozen Arctic wastes. It is obviously possible for hunters to become food producers and to start to take on responsibility for plants or animals, but the difficulties of overcoming cultural tradition should not be underestimated, particularly if the hunters become locked into hierarchies which make it difficult to compete for status and to cross cultural divides.

Nineteenth- and twentieth-century information on the relationship of hunters to herders shows just how extreme this marginalization had become. The Solubba hunters of Arabia were considered almost subhuman by their Bedouin neighbors, although they were feared for their mystical abilities in coping with the desert (Doughty 1927). On the southern edges of the Sahara the Nemadi hunters still eked out an existence until the 1950s, very much on the edge of the more dominant herding societies of the former French Sudan (Gabus 1952).

On the other hand, eighteenth-century accounts by early voyagers to the Pacific Northwest Coast described complex social conditions among powerful and independent hunter-gatherers who were able to store surplus food and use it to gain status during ceremonial Occasions (Suttles 1968). In southern Africa, hunter-foragers were able for several decades to fend off trekboer attempts to take over their land and waterholes (Giliomee 1979:340), until ultimately they were won over with gifts of livestock, to keep them from raiding farms.

In a number of areas, such as southern Africa, Australia, and the southwestern part of the United States, there is an unbroken record of occupation by hunter-gatherers down to the present. In these areas the tradition of rock art continued, if not to the present as in Australia, at least to the nineteenth century, as the last of the great parietal art traditions which existed in Europe as far back as 30,000 years ago (although the majority, such as the paintings at Lascaux in southern France, are Magdalenian, dating to between 17,000 and 10,000 BP). Recent interpretations of rock art, where there is an ethnographic record to back them up, indicate that the art was part of the ritual and beliefs that revolved around shamanism (Lewis-Williams 1981).

The hunting way of life was universal in the past, but most hunters became food-producers, and this required a significant shift in both social organization and the meaning of product and property. Some groups, like the Efe of Zaire, remained as hunters on the periphery of farming society, while others adapted, for example raising goats as a cash crop in the central Kalahari or herding reindeer in the Eurasian Arctic. What appears to define these groups as foragers is not purely their means of primary subsistence, but how they are organized socially, and their beliefs in how a product should be distributed.

References

- Binford, L. R. (1984). *Faunal remains from Klasies river mouth*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Blumenshine, R. J. and J.A. Cavallo (1992). Scavenging and human evolution. *Scientific American* 267:70-6.
- Boesch, C. and H. Boesch (1989). Hunting behavior of wild chimpanzees in the Tal National Park. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 78:547-73.
- Clark, J. D. (1963). Neolithic bows from Somerset, England, and the prehistory of archery in north-western Europe. *Proceedings (If the Prehistoric Society n.s., 29:50-98*.
- Deacon, I. (1984). Later Stone Age people and their descendants in southern Africa. In R.G. Klein (ed.), *Southern African prehistory and paleoenvironments*, pp. 221-328. Rotterdam: Balkema.
- Dennell, R. (1997). The world's oldest spears. *Nature* 385: 767-8.
- Doughty, C. M. (1927). *Travels in Arabia Deserta*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Flannery, K. V. (1986). *Guila Naquitz: archaic foraging and early agriculture in Oaxaca, Mexico*. New York: Academic Press.
- Foley, R. (1987). *Another unique species: patterns in human evolutionary ecology*. Harlow: Longman.
- Prison, G. C. (1992). *Prehistoric hunters of the High Plains*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gabus, J. (1952). Contribution a l'etude des Nemadi, chasseurs archaïques du Djouf. *Bulletin de la Societe Suisse d'Anthropologie et d'Ethnologie* 1951/2:50-83.

- Giliomee, H. (1979). The burger rebellions on the Eastern Frontier, 1795-1815. In R. Elphick and H. Giliomee (eds.), *The shaping of South African society, 1652-1820*, pp. 338-90. Cape Town: Longman Penguin Southern Africa.
- Henry, D. O. (1989). *From foraging to agriculture: the Levant at the end of the Ice Age*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Hillman, G. C., S.M. Colledge and D. R. Harris (1990).
- Plant food economy during the epi-Paleolithic period at Tel Abu Hureyra, Syria: dietary diversity, seasonality and modes of exploitation. In D. R. Harris and G. C. Hillman (eds.), *Foraging and farming: the evolution of plant exploitation*, pp. 240-68. London: Unwin- Hyman.
- Isaac, G. (1978). The food-sharing behavior of proto- human hominids. *Scientific American* 238:90-108.
- Jolly, P. (1996). Symbiotic interaction between black farming communities and the south-eastern San. *Current Anthropology* 37: 277-305.
- Kaplan, J. (1989). 45,000 years of hunter-gatherer history in Natal as seen from Umhlatuzana Rock Shelter. In J. Deacon (ed.), *Goodwin's legacy*, pp. 7-16. South African Archaeological Society, Goodwin Series 6.
- Klein, R. G. (1973). *Ice-age hunters of the Ukraine*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (1974). Environment and subsistence of prehistoric man in southern Cape Province, South Africa. *World Archaeology* 5(3): 249-84.
- (1986). Carnivore size and Quaternary climatic change in southern Africa. *Quaternary Research* (New York) 26(1): 153-70.
- (1989). *The human career: human biological and cultural origins*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Legge, A. J. and P.A. Rowley-Conwy (1987). Gazelle killing in Stone Age Syria. *Scientific American* 257:76-83.
- Lewis- Williams, J. D. (1981). *Believing and seeing: symbolic meanings in southern San rock art*. London: Academic Press.
- Manhire, A., J. Parkington, and R. Yates (1985). Nets and fully recurved bows: rock paintings and hunting methods in the Western Cape, South Africa. *World Archaeology* 17:161-74.
- Martin, P. S; and R. Klein (1984). *Quaternary extinctions: a Pleistocene revolution*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Milo, R. G. (1994). Human-animal interactions in southern African prehistory: a microscopic study of bone damage signatures. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Noli, D. (1992). Archery in southern Africa: the evidence from the past. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cape Town.
- Owen-Smith, N. (1987). Pleistocene extinctions: the pivotal role of megaherbivores. *Paleobiology* 13:351-62.
- Patrick, M., A.J. de Koning and A. B. Smith (1985). Gas liquid chromatographic analysis of fatty acids in food residues from ceramics found in the southwestern Cape, South Africa. *Archaeometry* 27:99-111.
- Shipman, P. (1983). Early hominid lifestyle: hunting and gathering or foraging and scavenging? In J. Clutton- Brock and C. Grigson (eds.), *Animals and archaeology*, vol. I, *Hunters and their prey*, pp. 31-49. Oxford: BAR International Series 163.

- Shipman, P. and J. Rose (1983). Evidence of butchery and hominid activities at Torralba and Ambrona: an evaluation using microscopic techniques. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 10:465-74.
- Smith, A. B., K. Sadr, J. Gribble and R. Yates (1991). Excavation in the southwestern Cape, South Africa, and the archaeological identity of prehistoric hunter-gatherers within the last 2,000 years. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 46:71-91.
- Stanford, C.B. (1995). Chimpanzee hunting behavior and human evolution. *American Scientist* 83:256-61.
- Suttles, W. (1968). Coping with abundance: subsistence on the Northwest Coast. In R. B. Lee, and I. Devore (eds.), *Man the hunter*, pp. 56-68. Chicago: Aldine.
- Turner, A. (1992). Large carnivores and earliest European hominids: changing determinants of resource availability during the Lower and Middle Pleistocene. *Journal of Human Evolution* 22:109-26.
- Vincent, A. S. (1985). Wild tubers as a harvestable resource in the East African savannas: ecological and ethnographic studies. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Waterhouse, G. (1932). *Simon van derStel's Journal of his expedition to Namaqualand, 1685-6* (edited from MS at Trinity College, Dublin). London: Longman Green.
- White, J. P. and J. F. O'Connell (1982). *A prehistory of Australia, New Guinea and Sahul*. New York: Academic Press.
- Yates, R., J. Parkington, and T. Manhire (1990). *Pictures from the past*. Pietermaritzburg: Centaur.

On the social relations of the hunter-gatherer band

TIM INGOLD University of Manchester

Do hunters and gatherers live in societies? If so, do these societies possess any common characteristics? In the history of anthropology, answers to these questions have turned upon the nature of a peculiar collectivity known as the *band*. In this chapter I review anthropological thinking about bands and band-living in two stages.

First, I show how alternative characterizations of the band mirrored three different senses of society current in the discourse of Western modernity. Each of these characterizations has purported to provide the corresponding notion of society with a natural, essential, or "primitive" foundation. Second, by focusing on the themes of immediacy, personal autonomy, and sharing, I shall argue that the forms of hunter-gatherer life cannot be understood as instances of any essential type of society. The distinctiveness of hunter-gatherer sociality lies in its subversion of the very foundations upon which the concept of society, taken in any of its modern senses, has been built. Hunter-gatherers show us how it is possible to live socially, (that is, to conduct one's life within an unfolding matrix of relationships with others, human and non-human) without having to "live in societies" at all.

Society in the state of nature

Hunter-gatherers occupy a special place in the structure of modern thought so special, that had they not existed they would certainly have had to have been invented (which, to a large extent, they *have* been; see Kuper 1988). From the eighteenth century to the present, the problem facing modern thinkers has been to reconcile the thesis that the human is but one species of many (differing from the others by degree rather than kind), with the conviction that, alone among animals, human beings have progressively raised themselves above the purely natural level of existence, and, in so doing, built themselves a history of civilization. The solution has been to distinguish two axes of development and change: the biological and the cultural. Along the first axis are placed those changes that, ever since Darwin, have allegedly linked our ape-like ancestors, through various hominid grades, to human beings of an anatomically "modern" form. Along the second axis are placed those changes that led from the earliest fully human ways of life to modern science, technology, and civilization, apparently without entailing any significant further change in the biological form of the species.

The intersection of these two axes constitutes a point of origin, from which history rises upon the baseline of an evolved human nature. It was to characterize the condition of humanity at the junction of evolutionary and historical change, that modern thought posited "the hunter-gatherer." History, by the same token, came to be viewed as a process where human beings, through their intellect and their labor, gradually assumed control both over the nature around them (conveyed by the notion of domestication) and of their own inner nature (conveyed by the notion of civilization). Just as the hunter-gatherer, was positioned at the fulcrum between evolution and history, so the band was located on the fulcrum between nature and society. For an anthropology bent on discovering the "elementary" foundations of human sociality, stripped to its barest essentials, there seemed to be no better way than through the ethnographic study of the modes of association of contemporary hunters and gatherers. "The conditions of life contingent on hunting and gathering:' as Peter Wilson has put it, "indicate a minimal sociology, suggesting what is absolutely necessary and sufficient for the survival and well-being of a human society" (1988:23).

The notion of society, however, has no fixed, unitary meaning; it has been pulled this way and that within a discourse in which it has been variously contrasted to such terms as individual, community, and state. To cut a long story short, the recent history of ideas has bequeathed to us three different and apparently quite contradictory notions of what a society *is*. All three are situated within a long and continuing controversy among Western philosophers, statesmen, and reformers about the proper exercise of human rights and responsibilities. In one sense, also the oldest, society stands for the positive qualities of warmth, intimacy, familiarity, and trust in interpersonal relations which are also summed up in the concept of community. But while in certain contexts particularly those of emergent nationalism -society and community have come to mean much the same thing, namely a group of people bound by shared history, language, and sentiment, in others, society stands *opposed* to community, connoting the mode of association of rational beings bound by contracts of mutual self-interest, as epitomized by the market, rather than by particularistic relations like those of kinship, friendship or companionship. In yet other contexts, transactions based on self-interest are conceived as the very antithesis of the social. Here, society connotes a domain of external regulation -identified either with the state or, in politics lacking centralized administration, with comparable regulative institutions -which

curbs the spontaneous expression of private interests on behalf of public ideals of collective justice and harmony.

To each of these three senses of "society" there corresponds a particular discourse on the hunter-gatherer band. In each case, the burden of this discourse is to establish the "naturalness" of society in the sense implied by it. In the following sections I shall consider the significance of the band, as, first, an elementary form of community; second, an outcome of strategic interaction; and third, an egalitarian social structure.

Communism, familism, and reciprocity

Taken in the first sense, the essence of band society is said to lie in the intimacy, conviviality, and familiarity inherent in what anthropological literature has conventionally called "face-to-face relationships." Lewis Henry Morgan, describing the domestic arrangements of certain native North American peoples (whose mode of subsistence, in fact, combined hunting and gathering with cultivation), had spoken of a "communism in living" (1881:63-78). By this he meant the pooling of effort and sharing of produce that were the natural concomitants of living under one roof. Morgan's idea inspired Marx and Engels to characterize the original state of human society as one of "primitive communism." Many subsequent commentators have followed this lead (see Lee 1988 for a review). Yet the notion of communism, removed from the context of domesticity and harnessed to support a project of social engineering for large-scale, industrialized states with populations of millions, eventually came to mean something quite different from what Morgan had intended: namely, a principle of redistribution that would override all ties of a personal or familial nature, and cancel out their effects.

As Elman Service (1966) pointed out, the communism of hunter-gatherer societies, if we can call it that, is embedded in relations of immediate kinship. Essentially "familistic" it has its counterpart even in modern states with industrial capitalist economies, as seen in the sociality and redistributive practices of family and close friends. For Service, family and society in band societies are effectively coterminous, whereas in states, "society" is identified, if anything, with the framework of public institutions that partition and envelop the innumerable little domains of "private" family life. As, in the course of social evolution, societies increase their scale and level of integration, so families grow smaller, and family relations become increasingly removed from social relations. "If we compare comparables," Service observes, ("we find the primitive band of thirty to sixty persons larger, to be sure, than the family in urban America, but it is still a family and it is still a very small-scaled society, as *societies* go" (1966:24 [original emphasis]).

That Service's concept of familism failed to take root in anthropological discussions of band society was due in part to an attractive alternative formulation offered by Marshall Sahlins. Sahlins viewed the sharing of effort and resources in the hunter-gatherer band as a prototypical instance of what he called *generalized reciprocity* (Sahlins 1972:193-4, 231ff.): a kind of give and take characterized by diffuse obligations to help others who may be in need, regardless of the specific balance of account, of how much has been given or received, by whom, in the past. Sahlins contrasted this with *balanced reciprocity*, in which every gift anticipates an equivalent return, and *negative reciprocity*, characterized by persistent and underhand attempts to get

something for nothing. Sahlins' aim, in setting up this continuum of reciprocities from generalized to negative, with balanced at the midpoint, was to establish a systematic correlation between the quality of reciprocity obtaining in a given relationship and the social distance between the parties. This distance was reckoned in terms of a model of society envisioned from the vantage point of a particular individual as a series of ever-widening social sectors in which he or she is perceived to belong: household, lineage, village, tribe, etc. (1972:199, see also Sahlins 1968:16,85).

Although at first glance, Service's *familism* and Sahlins' *generalized reciprocity* seem much the same (both echoing Morgan's ('communism in living')), there is, in fact, an important difference. While Sahlins draws his examples freely from societies of hunter-gatherers, agriculturalists, and pastoralists, his general theory of reciprocity appeals to a segmentary or "tribal" model of society, attributed in the main to agricultural and pastoral peoples. According to this model, the elementary units of society are autonomous and discrete households, each centered on the relations between husband and wife, and between parents and children. As a relatively self-sufficient unit of production and consumption, every household enjoys immediate access to its own means of subsistence. Thus, the agricultural household has its cultivated fields, and the pastoral household its flocks and herds, islands of "domesticated" resources over whose yield it has the prior claim. Acts of reciprocity are then conceived to inhere in distributive relations *between* these household units, in more or less inclusive sectors of the wider society.

On the other hand, for Service the essence of the hunter-gatherer band lies in the extension of familial relations which, in other societies, are internal to the household, across the entire community. Such a society is not internally differentiated by boundaries of segmentary exclusion into relatively close and relatively distant sectors, nor is access to the resource base divided between its constituent units. The band is conceived as one big household, whose members enjoy unrestricted use of the resources of its country and who labor in common to draw a subsistence from them. Thus, *contra* Sahlins, sharing in a hunter-gatherer band is not generalized reciprocity at all. Far from overriding the limits of domestic self-sufficiency, it is underwritten by a principle of collective access. On these grounds, Price (1975) has argued that sharing and reciprocity should be clearly distinguished: the former is the "dominant mode of economic allocation" in band societies, whereas the latter is the dominant mode in tribal societies. The band, in short, is no mere collection of domestic units, each of which places its own interests before those of the collectivity; rather, it is an "intimate social group. ...small in scale and personal in quality" (Price 1975:4). The internal cleavages of the band (most apparent in times of crisis, whether caused by food shortages or interpersonal conflict) are not, then, between families, but between men and women, and between generations (Ingold 1986:231).

Behind these debates lurks the issue of the status of the nuclear family as a fundamental building block of human society. One view, going back to Engels (Sacks 1974), holds that the minimal domestic unit in the original band society, comprising a couple and their children, had not precipitated out, as a separate proprietorial interest, from the larger, band-wide household; thus, rather than being primarily husbands and wives, parents and children, people were brothers and sisters, of both older and younger generations. It was supposed that within this band-household, men and women played complementary roles: men sharing the hunting; women

collectively bringing in the gathered produce, preparing the food, and carrying out other aspects of housework.

The alternative argument maintains that the nuclear family, integrated by a division of labor between husband and wife, is the basic unit of production and consumption in every human society, and that the band is an aggregate of such units bound together by ties of reciprocity. "There can," claims Fried, "be no disputing the significance of the nuclear family as the main component of the band" (1967:67). This is the assumption behind Sahlins' (1972) assertion that every primitive economy, hunting and gathering included, is underwritten by what he calls a "domestic mode of production." There is, however, a third alternative, which is to suggest that the band is neither a single unit of householding, nor an aggregate of such units, but is rather formed of two relatively autonomous domains of production and consumption, respectively male and female. What we might recognize as "families" are then constituted at the multiple points of contact between these domains, through relations of exchange involving food and sex. In many societies, for example, a husband's first obligation is to provide meat for his wife's mother, who will share it with her daughter. The latter, in turn, will provide her husband both with a share of gathered produce and with sexual favors. As for children, they share in what their mothers have collected, and take meat from anyone who has it (Hamilton 1980).

Cooperation and residential Organization

The studies reviewed above all trace the essence of human sociality to the familiarity and mutual concern generated through prolonged living at close quarters. For other writers, however, band organization is the result of strategic decisions made by individuals or families in the interests of survival and reproduction under particular environmental conditions. These writers consider social organization to be a component of ecological adaptation, on the assumption that people will associate, and engage in various forms of cooperation and sharing, if, by doing so, they enhance the security of their food supply.

The *locus classicus* for this view is the early work of Julian Steward. In an article dating from 1936 on "The economic and social basis of primitive bands," Steward distinguished between two types of band organization: "patrilineal" and "composite" (Steward 1955:122-50). The patrilineal band is a relatively small group (about fifty persons), comprising a nucleus of agnatically related men with their in-marrying wives and children. Steward reasoned such a group would be well adapted to hunting relatively sedentary, dispersed fauna within restricted territories, using a technology of individually wielded weapons (bows, spears, clubs) calling for only limited cooperation. The composite band is larger, numbering some hundreds of persons, and consists of "many unrelated nuclear or biological families" affiliated on the basis of "constant association and co-operation rather than actual or alleged kinship" (1955:143). Since the families of the band are not already bound by relations of kinship, they may freely intermarry. This kind of band, according to Steward, arises as an adaptive response to the exploitation of large herds of nomadic, migratory fauna, by means of techniques (such as game drives) involving large-scale cooperation.

Steward's typology has been much criticized. One prominent critic was Service (1962). He was convinced that the original human society, regardless of local environmental conditions,

took the form of groups of related men (exogamous "patrilocal bands") establishing the basis for peaceful coexistence through the exchange of women in marriage. Following Levi-Strauss (1949), Service reckoned that the establishment of intergroup alliance was the critical feature distinguishing human marriage from the mating systems of non-human primates, thereby laying the foundation for human society. Service thus explained the patrilocal band on structural rather than ecological grounds. Although Service's patrilocal band did not differ in composition from Steward's patrilineal band, Service chose the term "patrilocal" to emphasize the significance of place rather than genealogical descent in the recruitment of band members. Both Steward and Service agreed that *men* stayed together while *women* moved on marriage to join their husbands' groups; yet they disputed the reasons for this: Steward (1955:135) emphasized the importance of local knowledge for success in hunting, which would place a premium on male hunters emaining in the country where they grew up; Service pointed out (correctly) that, in many societies, women's gathering is a more significant source of subsistence than men's hunting, and that hunters' knowledge of the terrain generally extends far beyond the locality of their particular band. The real reason why male agnates stay together? Service surmised, is because, having grown up together, they know and trust one another. Such knowledge and trust, he suggested, is essential not only for cooperative hunting but also in the event of potentially hostile encounters with other bands (1962:33-5).

The major disagreement between Steward and Service, however, concerned the nature of the composite band. Having posited the patrilocal band as the universal, original form of human society, Service saw the composite band as an aberration of history, namely "a product of the near-destruction of aboriginal bands after their contact with civilization" (1962:97). The remnants of the original patrilocal bands which had been broken up and scattered, their populations decimated by genocide and disease, were supposed to have coalesced to form the composite bands recorded by ethnographers. Though the destructive impact of the West's initial encounter with indigenous hunter-gatherers is undeniable, there is little evidence to support Service's interpretation, largely because the model of the composite band that both he and Steward worked with is an ethnographic fiction.

The organization of those peoples reputed to live in composite bands differs from the model in three respects. First, the constituent families are not unrelated: the affiliation of any family with the band depends on at least one kinship link of the first degree, through one or the other spouse, to an already established member. The resulting genealogical structure typically consists of a senior sibling group, with in-marrying spouses and children, together with a selection of the siblings of these spouses and *their* spouses and children. Second, band membership is not permanent but fluctuates as people freely shift their affiliations from one group to another in response to environmental conditions and the rise and fall of personal reputations. Third, the large aggregates of people that attract Steward's attention are only seasonal, the high point of an annual cycle of concentration and dispersal. For most of every year, people live in small, local bands (Helm 1965). Though similar in scale to Steward's patrilineal bands, local bands recruit bilaterally, not patrilineally. Kinship is cognatic, and residence ambilocal (a woman may move to her husband's place on marriage, or vice versa, or the family may switch between these alternatives on any number of different occasions).

Somewhat paradoxically, recent research in cultural ecology has identified the band with a form of organization that, for Steward, represented the exception rather than the rule. This is what he called the "family level of social integration." Societies at this level appeared to lack any enduring social, corporate aggregates beyond the nuclear family. Individual families would come together and split apart, in an annual cycle of aggregation and dispersal, in different combinations and under different leadership from one year to the next.

Steward had always insisted, following Murdock (1949), that for any social aggregate to count as a band, it must have "first, a fairly wide-ranging nomadism. ..and second, permanent membership" (1969:187). Since the multi-family associations found in societies at the family level of integration lacked permanent membership, they did not count, in Steward's terms, as bands at all. Ethnographic research has shown, however, that such flux in the composition of co-residential groups, far from being exceptional, is a widespread and striking feature of hunter-gatherer social arrangements (Turnbull 1968). It also emphasizes the importance of distinguishing analytically between residential flux and the physical impermanence of settlement: between changing company and changing places (Ingold 1986: 176-7). The concept of nomadism, strictly speaking, refers specifically to the latter. In this strict sense, the nomadism of most hunter-gatherers is of a fairly restricted kind, very often tied to sites that are more or less continually occupied, even though the list of inhabitants of each may change almost from day to day.

Following this line of thinking, we arrive at a view of the band as a loose and unbounded association of individuals or families, each related to one or more others through immediate kinship, occupying a particular locale and its environs. It is the outcome of a series of choices about where to go, and with whom to affiliate, in order to make the best of environmental resources which *are* never quite the same, in abundance or distribution, from one season or year to the next. Recent proponents of this view (e.g., Winterhalder and Smith 1992) set out to analyze the incidence of sharing and cooperation in co-resident groups explicitly in terms of the costs and benefits of participants. Hunters and gatherers, it is assumed, seek "to maximize the net rate of energy gain," much as entrepreneurs in a modern market-oriented society seek to maximize financial profit (Bettinger 1991:84). However, whereas entrepreneurs calculate their own strategies, it is supposed that hunters and gatherers, like non-human foragers, are programmed to execute strategies worked out for them *a priori*, through a quasi-Darwinian process of variation under selection, operating not on genes, but on the elements of a cultural tradition that is "passed along" in parallel with genetic inheritance, from one generation to the next. Their adaptive strategies and resulting patterns of association are thus attributed to natural selection, not to rational choice. Here we have one more example, from contemporary theory, of the "naturalization" of band society.

The evolution of egalitarian society

Much of the confusion in anthropological discussions of band organization arises from confounding two quite distinct theoretical concerns: the first (reviewed in the previous section) with principles of local group organization; the second, with social evolution. If one takes "band" to refer to a local group of a particular kind, then there is no *a priori* reason why such groups should be exclusive to hunters and gatherers. One could just as well find "bands"

among nomadic pastoralists or swidden cultivators, in cases where the principles of organization are found to be precisely the same (as they often are). In the context of a concert} with social evolution, however, the band is conceived as the first in a series of social forms, of increasing scale, integration, and complexity, running through tribes and chiefdoms to states. This series is generally held to correspond, albeit imprecisely, to a parallel series of transitions in modes of subsistence, of which the most critical is that from hunting and gathering to agriculture and pastoralism. Accordingly, the band is taken to be the social form corresponding to hunting and gathering, and the tribe the social form corresponding to agriculture and pastoralism. Because of the way in which narratives of social evolution are generally constructed, as the step-by-step development of the whole panoply of institutions associated with complex, state-level societies, the earliest stages in the sequence tend to be characterized negatively, in terms of the *absence* of institutional forms that have yet to emerge. This is certainly the case with the band, which, as Eleanor Leacock has observed (1969:3) , is more easily described by what it lacks: specialization of labor beyond that based on sex, class divisions, a formal priesthood, hierarchical political organization, and -most critically - private ownership of basic sources of livelihood. For those who would identify the concept of society with the third of the senses adduced above, as a framework of regulative institutions, the problem is whether the band - characterized by the apparent lack of such institutions - can be regarded as a society at all. Can there be societies with no, or hardly any, structure (Bloch 1977)?

This question can be framed in both political and economic terms, and I begin with the former. One of the key debates of Western political philosophy has surrounded the possibility of a truly egalitarian society. It has been argued, for example by Ralph Dahrendorf (1968), that society cannot be without rules for regulating conduct; that such rules would be meaningless without sanctions to back them up; and that the existence of sanctions requires that there be persons in positions to impose them, to exercise power over those who are sanctioned. In any society, therefore, "there has to be inequality of rank among men" (1968:172). The notion of an original band society from which all distinctions of rank are absent, Dahrendorf claims, is a figment of the imagination. Yet this notion has long been central to anthropological classifications of social forms, whether or not conceived in an evolutionary mould. In their celebrated comparative survey of *African political systems*, Meyer Fortes and E. E. Evans-Pritchard distinguished between societies with centralized authority, administrative machinery, and judicial institutions (primitive states) and societies without (stateless societies), but added a third type: "very small societies.... in which even the largest political unit embraces a group of people all of whom are united to one another by ties of kinship, so that political relations are coterminous with kinship relations and the political structure and kinship organization are completely fused" (Fortes and Evans-Pritchard 1940:6-7). Evidently, in the delineation of this third type, they had the hunter-gatherer band in mind.

Morton Fried (1967) draws on hunter-gatherer ethnography to exemplify what he calls "simple egalitarian societies," as opposed to "rank societies;" "stratified societies;" and "pristine states;" and identifies the band as the principal form of associating in these societies. An egalitarian society, according to Fried, is one that contains as many valued statuses as there are people to fill them, so that power can be exercised by any or all with the capability to do so (1967:33).

More recently, James Woodburn (1982) has drawn attention to the ways that certain hunter-gatherer societies, namely those who produce for "immediate return" (see below), "systematically eliminate distinctions of wealth, power and status:' Far from depicting the egalitarianism of these societies negatively, as the absence of hierarchy, Woodburn argues that their equality is positively *asserted* in the conduct of everyday life (1982:431). To eliminate distinctions of power, however, is not the same as eliminating power itself. Despite their egalitarianism, hunter-gatherers generally attribute great importance to power and its effects. For them, power is not power *over*, nor are its effects coercive in nature. Rather, power takes the form of the physical strength, skill, or wisdom that draws people into relations clustered around individuals renowned for one or more of these qualities. Ethnographers have often resorted to the notion of prestige to describe the appeal of such individuals. In one sense, this notion is highly misleading, for it suggests a competitiveness and ostentation which are wholly foreign to the tenor of hunter-gatherer life. It does, however, serve to bring out the point that power works by attraction rather than coercion. Bands do have leaders, but the relationship between leader and follower is based not on domination but on trust. I return to this distinction below.

Turning from polity to economy, the question of whether there is a distinctive social form of the band hinges on whether it is possible to specify a set of *positive* rules or principles that govern the activities of production and distribution among hunters and gatherers. In the terms of Marxian theory, if hunting and gathering is not just an assemblage of subsistence techniques -if it is a mode of production -then it must entail certain rules for the division of labor, access to productive means, and distribution of produce which together make up the social relations (as opposed to the technical forces) of hunter-gatherer production (Godelier 1978). Leacock and Lee (1982:7-9) have isolated six "core features" of these relations: (i) collective ownership of the means of production by a band, "horde," or camp; (ii) reciprocal rights to the resources of other bands through the formality of asking "permission;" which cannot be withheld; (iii) lack of concern with the accumulation of personal wealth, with storage only as a technique for tiding over seasonal shortfalls; (iv) "total sharing" of produce within the co-residential group, encompassing both hosts and visitors; (v) access of all to the "forces of production;" including skills (which may however be gender-specific), and (vi) individual "ownership" of tools, which are nevertheless freely lent and borrowed. These features, Leacock and Lee argue, underwrite the quality of what they call "band-living."

Within this Marxian framework, however, the patterns of cooperation and residential affiliation described by Steward and his followers would not fall within the category of social relations of production. Arising as they do from specific technical and environmental conditions, they are aspects of the organization of work, and as such belong with the forces rather than the relations of production. We might find that the residential composition of the camp among nomadic pastoralists is indistinguishable from that of the local band among hunter-gatherers (Ingold 1980:265), but the social relations of production in the two cases would be quite different, since pastoralism is characterized by a principle of divided access to the means of production (living animals), a strong concern with the accumulation of wealth, and limited sharing of produce.

In most so-called "tribal" societies, of course, the division of labor, access to means of production, and the distribution of produce are specified in terms of relations of kinship: thus in

these societies, relations of production *are* kinship relations. Claude Meillassoux (1981) has criticized the tendency in anthropology to assume that kinship-based models of social structure, developed in the analysis of agricultural and pastoral societies, are equally applicable to the analysis of hunter-gatherer bands. Kinship places people from birth in determinate relations with fixed, lifelong obligations, whereas "in the band an individual's position depends on voluntary, Unstable and reversible relationships in which he is involved for the limited period during which he actively participates fully in common activities" (1981: 18). Such relations, Meillassoux argues, should be regarded as of "adhesion" rather than kinship. In the next section I shall consider the appropriateness of the notion of adhesion and whether (or in what sense) the relations entailed in "band-living" are kinship relations.

The social relations of immediacy

Let us return to my original question: do hunters and gatherers live in societies? To answer it, I shall consider the significance of three terms which appear together in the ethnography with such regularity and consistency as to suggest a distinctive form of sociality. These are *immediacy*, *autonomy*, and *sharing*.

The "immediate" quality of hunter-gatherer social relations may be understood in two ways: in terms either of their lack of temporal depth, or of the direct, unmediated involvement of self and other. To begin with the temporal aspect, immediacy implies that social relations are of minimal duration, lived, as it were, for the here and now rather than establishing promises for the future through the fulfillment of obligations carried over from the past. One observer after another has reported a "lack of foresight" among hunters and gatherers, particularly in relation to the husbandry of food. They are inclined to share out whatever is to hand, eating prodigiously in times of plenty only to go hungry in lean periods, instead of rationing supplies to make them last. In this, as Sahlins notes (1972:30), it seems that they are "oriented forever in the present." According to Meillassoux (1973), immediacy is a definitive property of hunting and gathering as productive enterprises: yield follows directly from labor invested, whereas much of the work of farmers and herdsmen (in preparing or planting fields, or pasturing livestock) is done with the expectation of future yield. There may, however, be significant time-lags between the construction of equipment or facilities (particularly for hunting and trapping) and their use, a point which led Meillassoux (1981:14-15) to qualify his original distinction. Labor returns in an economy of hunting and gathering, he now suggests, are not necessarily immediate, but they are nevertheless *instantaneous*. By this he means that nothing holds band members together save their involvement in the current round of activity, beginning when they team up to search for food, and ending with the sharing out, and consumption, of the resulting produce. The band is thus "defined in terms of its *present membership*" rather than in terms of relations of filiation or descent linking past and future generations (Meillassoux 1981:17, original emphasis).

The distinction between systems of production in which the returns on labor are immediate, and those in which they are delayed, has been further refined by Woodburn (1982). Like Meillassoux, Woodburn admits that many hunter-gatherer systems (and of course all agricultural and pastoral systems) are of the delayed- return type. The time-lags may be of three kinds: between the manufacture and use of facilities, between harvesting and consumption

(where food is stored for any length of time), or -in the cases of farming and herding -between the investment of labor in establishing the conditions for the growth and reproduction of plants and animals, and their eventual harvesting. Woodburn predicts that wherever such time-lags are found, people will be tied to one another for the duration, by "binding commitments and dependencies:' Only in systems of the immediate-return type do we find a form of sociality - more or less corresponding to what Meillassoux has in mind with his notion of instantaneity - characterized by flexible social groupings, residential flux, absence of formal commitments between persons in specific, jurally defined positions, and a stress on generalized mutuality and sharing (Woodburn 1982:433-4), My own view (Ingold 1986:213-J 7) is that this form of sociality is not incompatible with time-lags of the first two kinds, and therefore that it exists more generally among hunters and gatherers than Woodburn allows. Only the third kind of time-lag- in which the initial investment of labor entails a movement of *appropriation* -establishes dependencies of the sort that Woodburn associates with delayed-return systems. The question remains, however, as to whether the absence of long-term, binding commitments implies that social relationships are immediate (or even instantaneous) in the temporal sense, within the fully enveloped concerns of the present. The answer depends on our understanding of what it means "to relate. In characterizing the constitutive relationships of the band as adhesive, Meillassoux implies that each person is like an atom, individual and discrete, unchanging through time. In their pragmatic associations, atomic individuals are assumed to "adhere" to one another, now in one combination, now in another, through an external contact that leaves their inner being unaffected. Recently, however, Bird-David (1994) has suggested a quite different image. The person in a hunter-gatherer band, she writes, is like a drop of oil floating on the surface of a pool of water. When these drops come together, they coalesce into a larger drop. But drops can also split up into smaller ones that may then coalesce with others. Likewise persons, "throughout their lives. perpetually coalesce with, and depart from, each other" (1994:597). The distinction between adhesion and coalescence, as principles of relationship, effectively corresponds to that (following Schutz and Luckmann 1973) between anonymity and immediacy, that is between "they relationships" in which the parties, as experiencing subjects, remain closed to one another, and "we relationships" in which each enters into the experience of the other and makes that experience his or her own as well. The forms of human sociality, Bird-David argues, can be ranged along a continuum from immediacy to anonymity: the band may, then, be characterized as "a social environment which specifically elaborates about the range of immediacy" (1994:599).

This, of course, is to conceptualize immediacy in the second of the two senses adduced above, namely as the direct, intersubjective involvement of self and other. *As such, it depends upon the deep mutual knowledge that people can only gain through spending time together: on the intertwining or even merging of their respective life histories. Unlike relations of adhesion, which are frozen in the present instant, the coalescence and splitting apart of persons, according to this "oil-in-water" sociology, has to be understood as a process in real time. The sociality of the band, therefore, cannot be immediate in the temporal sense.*

How, then, are we to contrast immediate relationships with those based on binding commitments, if not in terms of their respective duration? The conventional notion that relationships among hunter-gatherers are conducted "face-to-face" is too crude to be of analytic value, combining as it does the connotations of mutualism and role-play. Everything depends on

the connection between person and face, which remains unspecified. Price's (1975) notion of "intimacy" is more promising, although Bird- David rejects its implications of exclusivity, which she finds out of place in the virtually boundary-less context of the hunter-gatherer band (1994:591).

Gibson (1985) suggests that relations based on the experience of living and doing things together, on "shared activity in itself," can best be described as ones of *companionship*. He opposes companionship to kinship: "a relationship based on kinship is involuntary, non-terminable and implies the dependency of one of the parties on the other. By contrast, a relationship based on companionship is voluntary, freely terminable and involves the preservation of the personal autonomy of both parties" (1985:392). The idea that shared activity (residing together in a place and cooperating in everyday tasks) constitutes people as related resonates throughout hunter-gatherer ethnographies (e.g., Myers 1986:92, Bird-David 1994:594). These sources are equally insistent, however, that the resulting relationships are predominantly of kinship. In light of this, Gibson's opposition between companionship and kinship seems overdrawn. More accurately, kinship relations in the band context are of a different order from those to which we are accustomed from studies of "tribal" societies (Bird- David 1994:593). They are constituted more by the sharing of food, residence, company, and memory, than by specific commitments and obligations incumbent on the occupants of positions within a formally instituted structure of social rules and regulations.

Autonomy, trust, and sharing

In our comparison of relations of adhesion and coalescence, we have already foreshadowed the particular kind of autonomy that, judging by the ethnography, is a general feature of hunter-gatherer social life. The basic principle is that a person's personal autonomy should never be reduced or compromised by his or her relationships with others. Or, more positively, it is through their relationships that persons are constituted as autonomous agents. That this might appear strange to the Western reader owes something to hidden assumptions about the nature of personhood. To expose these assumptions, we may consider another fundamental value which ethnography consistently attributes to hunters and gatherers. This is the value of individualism. This same value is frequently adduced as one of the diagnostic features of a specifically "Western" sensibility, where it is linked to political ideals of liberty and equality. How, then, does the individualism of hunters and gatherers differ from that of the modern West?

The Western individual is a self-contained, rational subject, locked within the privacy of a body, standing against the rest of society consisting of an aggregate of other such individuals, and competing with them in the public arena for the rewards of success. Relationships in this arena are characterized by their anonymity- that is, by the absence of direct, intersubjective involvement. They are brittle, contingent, and transient affairs. By the same token, the autonomy of the individual is given from the start, prior to his or her entry into any social relationships at all. For hunters and gatherers, by contrast, the dichotomy between private and public domains, respectively of self and society, has no meaning. Every individual comes into being as a center of agency and awareness within an unbounded social environment which provides sustenance, care, company, and support. The people around him, the places he knows, the things he makes and uses, all are drawn into a person's subjective identity (Ingold 1986:239). Selves, in other words,

are "grown" within a field of nurture; as their capacities for action and perception develop, so they expand to incorporate the very relationships that nourish them. Personal autonomy arises as the enfoldment of these relationships, and unfolds in purposive action. A person acts *with* others, not against them; the intentionality driving that action both originates from, and seeks fulfillment through, the community of nurture to which they all belong.

Evidently these are *just* two ways of managing what Myers (1988:55) calls "the dialectic of autonomy. . .and relatedness". In the first, epitomized by the modern Western ideal of civil society, relationships are strictly confined to external contacts in the public domain, and do not violate the integrity of the private, subjective self. In the second, exemplified by the hunter-gatherer band, selves expand to fill the entire field of relationships that constitute them. In this light, Meillassoux's mistake, in characterizing band relations as adhesive was to have imported into the context of hunter-gatherer social life, a model of association of modern Western provenance. Yet, granted that the hunter-gatherer's autonomy is constituted by involvement with others, how can this be reconciled with the fact that such involvement entails considerable dependency? People who draw their livelihood from hunting and gathering *do* depend materially and otherwise upon one another. Does not dependency inevitably compromise autonomy? I would argue that it does not. Rather, the combination of autonomy and dependency calls into being relationships that are founded on the principle of *trust*.

To trust someone is to act with that person in mind, in the hope and expectation that they will do likewise, by responding in ways favorable to you. On no account, however, should you attempt to force a response by placing the other person under obligation or compulsion. To do so would represent a betrayal of the trust you have placed in them, and would be tantamount to a renunciation of the relationship. Trust is founded upon a . respect for the autonomy of the other on whO1T1 one depends (Ingold 1993:13). By recognizing that relationships are based on trust, we can make better sense of the dynamics of power and leadership in the hunter-gatherer band. Leaders depend upon followers to uphold their reputations. But followers join the band of a leading individual, such as a renowned hunter, because they trust him. Here, trust is conditional upon leaders respecting followers' autonomy. Should the former, at any stage, seek to dominate the latter, whether by threat or command, the latter, feeling their trust to have been betrayed, will take their loyalties elsewhere. A follower, as Henriksen (1973:42) observes, can always move to join another band if he feels that his autonomy is unduly curtailed. Thus, the good hunter should never make his superiority obvious, and should always refrain from telling others what to do -an injunction that tends to impede effective decision-making (Henriksen 1973:40-54). In the context of band-living, as we have seen, power works by attraction, not coercion, and the slightest tip in the balance from trust to domination will cause it to self-destruct.

Finally, we come to the phenomenon of sharing. This has been regarded, in the literature, either as an innate human disposition (with possible but disputed homologues in non-human primates), or as a rule or convention fundamental to society as an instituted order. Representative of the first view is Glynn Isaac's (1978) celebrated reconstruction of the adaptive complex of the earliest human hunter-gatherers, in which sharing was linked to bipedal locomotion, tool-making, language, the sexual division of labor, and daily return to a home- base. This is to treat sharing as an evolved behavioral trait, as much a part of human nature as walking on two feet.

The second view is exemplified by Morton Fried's (1967:106) declaration that sharing was "the paramount invention that led to human society," and by Peter Wilson's (1975:12) claim that, in hunter-gatherer societies, "sharing has the status of a rule;' carrying all the force of a moral obligation. Meyer Fortes (1983), for whom there could be no society without rules, regarded sharing among hunters and gatherers as an instance of "prescriptive altruism;' by which he meant acts of self-denial that are obligatory and rule-governed -quite unlike the allegedly altruistic, but in fact genetically programmed, behavior of certain non-human animals (1983:26).

My position differs from both alter Latives. While there is certainly more to sharing than the output of a behavioral program, sharing is not a rule-governed, obligatory act. The more that actions are attributed to the determination of rules, the more the responsibility for those actions is removed from persons and attributed to the imaginary agency of society. In the limiting case, the complete prescriptive altruist- entirely beholden to society in everything he does -ceases to be accountable for his actions at all. He has no personal autonomy left. Yet, by sharing, persons surrender nothing of themselves to society. The scope of their autonomy, far from being diminished, is enlarged. We should not, of course, confine our understanding of sharing to exchange of food. In addition to material goods, people share tasks, dwelling spaces, company, stories, and memories. In a word, they share "*each other*" (Ingold 1986:117, original emphasis). Thus food-sharing is just one aspect of the total process by which persons are "grown" In a context of immediate sociality, through incorporating the substance, knowledge, and experience of others within a field of nurturance.

The practice of sharing makes it possible for people to depend on one another, in a general way, without losing autonomy. It is thus based on the same principle as the relation of trust. In sharing, as in trust, one avoids any form of pressure or coercion. One cannot reasonably press for more than what others manifestly have to offer (Bird-David 1992:30). Conversely, sharing rarely if ever takes the form of unsolicited giving. No one put under pressure to receive what they have not asked for. Sharing almost invariably takes place in response to requests, directed from those who lack something, toward those whom they perceive to be in possession of it. Myers (1988:57) describes this as "mutual taking;' while Peterson (1993) has elevated it to a general principle of "demand sharing." Since it conflicts with the Western ideal of generosity willingness to give without being asked, demand sharing has tended to be construed rather negatively, as evidence for a certain stinginess that persists beneath the surface of hunter-gatherer life. But as Peterson points out, if commitments to others are "construed not in terms of giving freely, but in terms of responding positively to their demands, the morality of demand sharing is as positive as that of generosity" (Peterson 1993:870).

Conclusion

Together, the principles of *immediacy*, *autonomy*, and *sharing* add up to a form of sociality utterly incompatible with the concept of society, whether by society is meant the interlocking interests of 'civil society;' the imagined community of the ethnic group or nation, or the regulative structures of the state. First, the hunter-gatherer's claim to personal autonomy is the very opposite of the individualism implicated in the Western discourse on civil society. While the latter posits the individual as a self-contained, rational agent, constituted independently and in advance of his or her entry into the arena of social interaction, the autonomy of the hunter-gatherer is *relational*; a person's capacity to act on his/her own initiative emerges through a

history of continuing involvement with others in contexts of joint, practical activity. Second, in a world where sociability is not confined by boundaries of exclusion, people do not define themselves as "us" rather than "them:" or as members of this group rather than that, nor do they have a word to describe themselves as a collectivity apart from the generic word for persons. This is why outsiders -explorers, traders, missionaries, anthropologists -seeking names to designate what they have perceived as societies of hunter- gatherers, have often ended up by borrowing exogenous labels applied as terms of abuse by neighboring peoples toward hunter-gatherers in their vicinity. Finally, the principle of *trust* that lies at the heart of hunter-gatherer sociality will not accommodate relations of domination of any kind. Yet, such relations are necessarily entailed in any system of regulative institutions which legitimate and empower certain persons, in the name of society, to control the actions of others. It is not enough to observe, in a now rather dated anthropological idiom, that hunter-gatherers live in "stateless societies:" as though their social lives were somehow lacking or unfinished, waiting to be completed by the evolutionary development of a state apparatus. Rather, the principle of their sociality, as Pierre Clastres (1974) has put it, is fundamentally *against* the state.

In the extensive discussions which have surrounded the question of whether hunter-gatherer "societies" have distinctive features in common, few have stopped to consider the applicability of the concept of society itself. Taken in any of its modern senses, however, this concept is rooted in the discourse of domination. One might even say, with Levine and Levine (1975:177), that society *is* domination. The concept of society carves the world of human beings into mutually exclusive blocks in much the same way that the concept of territory carves up the country they inhabit into domains of political jurisdiction. If the latter implies a relation of control over the land, the former implies a relation of control over people. In this light, hunter-gatherers exist in "societies" for those seeking to exert control over them, but not for the hunter-gatherers themselves. Their world is not socially segmented; it is constituted by relations of incorporation rather than exclusion, by virtue of which others are "drawn in" instead of parcelled out" (Ingold 1990). As Peter Wilson observes, hunter-gatherer sociality is guided by focus rather than boundary: people "organize their social lives through focusing attention rather than referring it to a rigid structure" (1988:50):

In the conduct of their mutual relations, hunters and gatherers demonstrate the possibility of a perceptual orientation toward the social environment that is direct, rather than mediated by structures of control. Perhaps we could go further, to suggest that this perceptual orientation is not confined to relations among human beings. It also extends to non-human components of the environment: to animals and plants, even to features of the landscape that we might regard as inanimate. Hunters maintain relations of trust with their animal prey, as they do with human persons, assuming that animals present themselves with hunters in mind, allowing themselves to be taken so long as hunters treat them with respect and do nothing to curb their autonomy of action (Ingold 1993). The powerful hunter attracts animals as he attracts followers. For gatherers, the forest nurtures humans in the way adults do children -comprising together what Bird-David (1990) calls "the giving environment:" Generally, human relations with the non- human environment are modeled on the same principle of sharing that applies within the human community (Bird-David 1992). In short the rigid division that Western thought and science draws between the worlds of society and nature, of persons and things, does not exist for hunters and gatherers. For them there are not two worlds but one, embracing all the manifold beings that

dwell therein (Ingold 1996:128). Far from seeking control over nature, their aim is to maintain proper relationships with these beings (Ridington 1982:471). There are, of course, as many kinds of relationships as there are kinds of beings, but the differences are relative, not absolute. And if no absolute boundary separates relationships that are social from those that are not, then what need have we for a concept of the social at all?

References

- Bettinger, R. L. (1991). *Hunter-gatherers: archaeological and evolutionary theory*. New York: Plenum.
- Bird-David, N. (1990). The giving environment: another perspective on the economic system of gatherer-hunters. *Current Anthropology* 31:183-96.
- (1992). Beyond "the original affluent society": a culturalist formulation. *Current Anthropology* 33:25-47.
- (1994). Sociality and immediacy: or, past and present conversations on bands. *Man*, n.s., 29:583-603.
- Bloch, M. (1977). The past and the present in the present. *Man*, n.s., 12:278-92.
- Clastres, P. (1974). *Society against the state*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dahrendorf, R. (1968). *Essays in the theory of society*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Fortes, M. (1983). *Rules and the emergence of society*. Royal Anthropological Institute Occasional Paper 39. London: RAI.
- Fortes, M. and E. E. Evans-Pritchard (1940). Introduction. In M. Fortes and E. E. Evans-Pritchard (eds.), *African political systems*, pp. 1-23. London: Oxford University Press.
- Fried, M. H. (1967). *The evolution of political society: an essay in political anthropology*. New York: Random House.
- Gibson, T. (1985). The sharing of substance versus the sharing of activity among the Buid. *Man*, n.s., 20:391-411.
- Godelier, M. (1978). Infrastructures, societies and history. *Current Anthropology* 19:763-71.
- Hamilton, A. 1980. Dual social systems: technology, labour and women's secret rites in the eastern Western Desert of Australia. *Oceania* 51:4-19.
- Helm, I. (1965). Bilaterality in the socio-territorial organization of the arctic drainage Dene. *Ethnology* 4:361-85.
- Henriksen, G. (1973). *Hunters in the barrens: the Naskapi on the edge of the white man's world*. Newfoundland Social and Economic Studies 12. Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Ingold, T. (1980). *Hunters, pastoralists and ranchers: reindeer economies and their transformations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1986). *The appropriation of nature: essays on human ecology and social relations*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- (1990). Comment on J. S. Solway and R. B. Lee, 'Foragers, genuine or spurious? Situating the Kalahari San in history'. *Current Anthropology* 31:130-1.
- (1993). From trust to domination: an alternative history of human-animal relations. In A. Manning and J. Serpell (P.J.-), *Animals and human society: changing perspectives*, pp. 1-22. London: Routledge.
- (1996). Hunting and gathering as ways of perceiving the environment. In R. F. Ellen and K. Fukui (eds.), *Redefining nature: ecology, culture and domestication*, pp.117-55. Oxford: Berg.

- Isaac, G. (1978). The food-sharing behavior of protohuman hominids. *Scientific American* 238(4):90-108.
- Kuper, A. (1988). *The invention of primitive society: transformations of an illusion*. London: Routledge.
- Leacock, E. (1969). The Montagnais-Naskapi band. In D. Damas (ed.), *Contributions to anthropology: band societies*, pp. 1-17. National Museums of Canada Bulletin 228. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Leacock, E. and R. B. Lee (1982). Introduction. In E. B. Leacock and R. B. Lee (eds.), *Politics and history in band societies*, pp. 1-20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, R. B. (1988). Reflections on primitive communism. In T. Ingold, D. Riches and J. Woodburn (eds.), *Hunters and gatherers*, vol. I, *History, evolution and social change*, pp. 252-68. Oxford: Berg.
- Levine, D. P. and L. S. Levine (1975). Social theory and social action. *Economy and Society* 4: 162-93.
- Levi-Strauss, C. (1949). *Les structures elementaires de la parente*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Meillassoux, C. (1973). On the mode of production of the hunting band. In P. Alexandre (ed.), *French perspectives in African studies*, pp. 187-203. London: Oxford University Press.
- (1981). *Maidens, meal and money: capitalism and the domestic community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morgan, L. H. (1881). *Houses and house-life of the American aborigines* (Contributions to North American Ethnology, vol. IV). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Murdock, G. P. (1949). *Social structure*. New York: Macmillan.
- Myers, F. (1986). *Pintupi country, Pintupi self: sentiment, place and politics among Western Desert Aborigines*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.
- (1988). Burning the truck and holding the country: property, time and the negotiation of identity among Pintupi Aborigines. In T. Ingold, D. Riches, and J. Woodburn (eds.), *Hunters and gatherers*, vol. II, *Property, power and ideology*, pp. 52-74. Oxford: Berg.
- Peterson, N. (1993). Demand sharing: reciprocity and the pressure for generosity among foragers. *American Anthropologist* 95:860-74.
- Price, I. A. (1975). Sharing: the integration of intimate economies. *Anthropologica* 17:3-27
- Ridington, R. (1982). Technology, world view and adaptive strategy in a northern hunting society. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 19:469-81.
- Sacks, K. (1974). Engels revisited: women, the organization of production, and private property. In M. Z. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere (eds.), *Woman, culture and society*, pp. 207-22. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Sahlins, M. (1968). *Tribesmen*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- (1972). *Stone Age economics*. London: Tavistock.
- Schutz, A. and T. Luckmann (1973). *The structure of the life-world*, trans. R. M. Zaner and H. T. Engelhart, Jr. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Service, E. R. (1962). *Primitive social organization: an evolutionary perspective*. New York: Random House.
- (1966). *The hunters*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Steward, J. H. (1955). *Theory of culture change: the methodology of multilineal evolution*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

- (1969). Observations on bands. In D. Damas (ed.), *Contributions to anthropology: band societies*. National Museums of Canada Bulletin 228. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Turnbull, C. M. (1968). The importance of flux in two hunting societies. In R. B. Lee and I. DeVore (eds.), *Man the hunter*, pp. 132-7. Chicago: Aldine.
- Wilson, P. J. (1975). The promising primate. *Man*, n.s., 10:5-20.
- (1988). *The domestication of the human species*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Winterhalder, B. and E. A. Smith (1992). Evolutionary ecology and the social sciences. In E. A. Smith and B. Winterhalder (eds.), *Evolutionary ecology and human behavior*, pp. 3-23. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Woodburn, J. (1982). Egalitarian societies. *Man*, n.s., 17:431-51.

Facets of Hunter-Gatherer Life in Cross-Cultural perspective

Gender relations in hunter-gatherer societies i

KAREN L. ENDICOTT Dartmouth College

For years many feminist anthropologists and hunter-gatherer specialists have been at odds in their interpretations of gender relations in foraging societies. This chapter presents overviews of gender relations in various hunter-gatherer societies, explores interpretative differences, and examines some common misconceptions about hunter-gatherer gender relations.

Anthropology traditionally neglected to study women; this led to theories that overly emphasized men. Durkheim (1961 [1915]:53) categorized Aboriginal men as sacred and women as relatively profane. Radcliffe-Brown (1930) concluded that the patrilineal, patrilocal "horde" was the basic unit of Aboriginal society. Service (1966) postulated that the patrilocal band, which kept male hunters together, was the natural form of social organization for hunter-gatherer societies. However, beginning with Phyllis Kaberry (1939), who showed that East Kimberley Aboriginal women had their own sacred ceremonies and ties to the Dreamtime, a few voices gradually spoke up for hunter-gatherer women (see Berndt 1965, Turnbull 1965, Lee and Devore 1968, Goodale 1971, Briggs 1970).

Fueled by feminism in the 1970s, the anthropology of women focused new attention on hunter-gatherer women, especially "woman the gatherer" (see Dahlberg 1981, Reiter 1975). Underscoring that biology is not destiny, anthropologists dropped the term "sex roles" and adopted "gender" to refer more broadly to the ways societies define, elaborate and evaluate sexual dimorphism. How, they asked, is gender used as a tool for organizing social life? Ironically, however, some feminist anthropologists carried over anthropology's emphasis on males and developed gender theories that interfere with understanding gender complexities in hunter-gatherer societies. Rosaldo and Lamphere asserted that male dominance and sexual asymmetry are universals (1974:3). Friedl (1975, 1995) argued that sexual asymmetry is unavoidable in hunter-gatherer societies because men hunt and distribute meat beyond the family. Collier and Rosaldo (1981) contended that women are merely objects of male manipulations in the marriage systems of simple societies, including hunter-gatherers. Various anthropologists who have done fieldwork with hunter-gatherers have described gender relations in at least some foraging societies as symmetrical, complementary, nonhierarchical, or egalitarian. Turnbull writes of the Mbuti: "A woman is in no way the social inferior of a man" (1965:271). Draper notes that "the !Kung society may be the least sexist of any we have

e~erience" (1975:77), and Lee describes the !Kung (now known as Ju/'hoansi) as "fiercely egalitarian" (1979:244). Estioko-Griffin and Griffin report: "Agta women are equal to men" (1981:140). Batek men and women are free to decide their own movements, activities, and relationships, and neither gender holds an economic, religious, or social advantage over the other (K. L. Endicott 1979, 1981, 1992, K. M. Endicott 1979); Gardner reports that Paliyans value individual autonomy and economic self-sufficiency, and "seem to carry egalitarianism, common to so many simple societies, to an extreme" (1972:405). Stressing complementarity, Sharp observes that women are as fully involved with and responsible for generating Chipewyan culture as are the men (1995:47). Leacock (1981) interprets the historical record on seventeenth-century Montagnais-Naskapi (Innu) gender relations as egalitarian, with individuals, male and female, making decisions about their own lives and activities. In short, differences between what men and women do in these societies make no difference. Instead of reinforcing inequalities and constructing hierarchies, these societies deliberately level differences.

Some anthropologists dismiss the term "egalitarian" as a Western political concept inapplicable to non-Western cultures. (The same can be said about "inequality," yet that concept continues to be considered a useful analytical tool.) It is true, for example, that the Batek do not articulate their egalitarianism as a kind of political philosophy. But as Woodburn observes in general, "The verbal rhetoric of equality may not be elaborated but actions speak loudly: equality is repeatedly acted out, publicly demonstrated, in opposition to possible inequality" (1982:432). There is no theoretical justification for anthropologists to accept that many societies construct gender inequalities but to deny that some construct gender equalities or that some societies create inequalities in some aspects of life and equalities in others.

What do men and women do in foraging societies?

The stereotype of man the hunter, woman the gatherer accurately describes only how many forager peoples divide daily work responsibilities. In reality, many hunter-gatherer men also gather vegetable foods and women procure animal foods, though the latter is not always called hunting.

Where vegetable foods comprise the dietary staple, women commonly take responsibility for gathering them on a regular basis. The general pattern is that women from each household collect vegetable foods for their own household needs. Women's gathering provided as much as 60 to 80 percent by weight of the diet of the Ju/'hoansi (Lee 1968:33) and of Australia's Western and Central Desert Aborigines (Tonkinson 1991:43, citing Gould 1969:258 and Meggitt 1962). Foragers may not define gathering as women's work. The Batek, for example, do not, even though women take primary responsibility for gathering. The Nyae Nyae Ju/'hoansi, on the other hand, say that gathering "is what women are made for" (Marshall 1976:96).

Still, Ju/'hoansi men, like Agta, Hill Pandaram, Hadza, Australian Aboriginal, and many other hunter-gatherer men, gather vegetable foods when the need or opportunity arises (Marshall 1976:96-7, Shostak 1981:14, Lee 1979:192,262, Estioko-Griffin and Griffin 1981:133, Morris 1982:100,101, Gardner 1993:117, Tonkinson 1978:35, Woodburn 1968:51). Ju/'hoansi "men account for as much as 20% of all food gathered" (Shostak 1981:244). Batek men gather when

hunting fails, when wives are tired or sick, or when they come across large wild yams. In 1975-6, Batek men's gathering, and their procurement of rice and other cultivated foods through trading rattan, accounted for 42 percent of the diet by weight; women's similar efforts accounted for 43 percent. Hadza men gather most of their own vegetable foods, while women gather most of the vegetable food they and their children consume (Woodburn 1968:51). Men's gathering adds flexibility to a group's food-procurement efforts; it gives men independence from women when necessary. The Tiwi are a notable exception: they consider it "wrong" for men to collect vegetable foods (Goodale 1971:154). A Tiwi man may do no food-getting work if he has several wives providing vegetables and meat for the family (Goodale 1971:154).

In most foraging societies, a man's primary work responsibility is hunting, especially hunting for game that is large enough to be subject to the society's sharing rules, but often women also hunt. Anthropologists have tended to say that men hunt meat but that women gather or collect it, even when the animals are the same. Tonkinson (1974:35) reports that Australian Western Desert men "hunt lizards and smaller game;" while Shostak (1981:244) writes that Ju!'hoansi women "collect lizards, snakes. ..as well as occasional small or immature animals." It is often unclear whether the different terms reflect anthropologists' own analyses and biases, or the foragers' indigenous distinctions.

Linguistically distinguished or not, men's and hunting techniques and/or quarries often differ. Australian Western Desert men use spears, whereas "women never hunt large game with spears, but may use their dogs to run down kangaroos, emus, etc. and then club them to death" (Tonkinson n.d.:6). Ju!'hoansi women procure game but are prohibited from touching the bows and arrows men use (Marshall 1976:1'17). Ache women have occasionally killed animals; however, they have never used bows and arrows, despite there being no taboo against touching men's equipment (Kim Hill and A. Magdalena Hurtado, personal communication). Batek women are free to use blowpipes to hunt, as do men, but most Batek women concentrate on game they can dispatch with digging sticks. The Jahai prohibit women from handling blowpipes and poison darts because, they say, children who accompany the women "might prick themselves with the darts or lick the poison and die" (van der Sluys, this volume). Andamanese women, emically defined as the gender that bleeds, avoid hunting that causes animals to bleed, and instead catch fish and crabs in nets and baskets (v: Pandya, personal communication; Pandya 1993). In the nineteenth century Yahgan/Yamana women dived for shellfish in frigid waters while men hunted marine mammals and birds (Steward and Faron 1959:398-9; Vidal, this volume). The Tiwi define several species of land animals, including bandicoot and opossum, as foods that women traditionally procured (Goodale 1971:152). "Tiwi women not only provide the majority of the daily food supplies, but also the daily protein" (Goodale 1971:337).

In some societies women routinely participate in communal hunts. In Mbuti net-hunting and *begbe* bow- and-arrow hunts, women act as beaters to drive game within range of the armed men (Turnbull 1965:157, 162). When Batak were hunting pigs, women would drive them towards the men, who would shoot them (James Eder, personal communication). Netsilik women and children help men with seal hunting and everyone used to fish (Balikci 1970:34,82-83).

Inuit women participate in the hunting economy in other ways as well. If an Inuit family has no sons, the father may train one or two daughters to hunt (Briggs 1970:271). (Similarly,

families with few daughters may teach sons sewing and other female skills, and orphans learn both men's and women's skills [Briggs 1970: 270-1] .) Inuit women sew the clothes that make hunting possible, and process skins, meat, and fish. Countering ! the stereotype that Arctic women do no economic work, Halperin argues that if we expand the definition of division of labor to include such work, "we find a basically egalitarian pattern of labor division for hunter-gatherers in a variety of latitudes" (Halperin 1980:379, ", 1988:87).

The most extreme case of women hunters is probably the Agta (Estioko-Griffin and Griffin 1981:121-51), who put most of their food-getting efforts into trading meat for foods cultivated by their agricultural neighbors. Agta women regularly hunt, either in pairs or with men, using machetes or bows and arrows and hunting dogs. Women forgo hunting altogether only during late pregnancy and the first months following childbirth.

Many hunter-gatherers engage in sporadic horticulture or trade. Commonly, men clear and help plant the fields, and women plant, tend, and harvest them. But the exact division of labor derives from particular historical circumstances rather than constant biological or social causes. In 1990, for example, some Batek women avoided horticultural work because they feared their children would follow them into the fields and die from the heat, as they said had happened previously. Trade commonly is undertaken by whoever happens to produce what the market demands. For example, when rattan is in demand, Batek men and women collect it, but when incense wood is in demand, young men tend to do the work. Penan women make rattan baskets and mats for trade; in the past men traded resin and wild latex (Brosius 1995). Toba women make handicrafts, and men, who are more proficient in Spanish, market them (Gastón Gordillo, personal communication).

Hunter-gatherer societies variously divide non-food- getting tasks. Men and women tend to perform jobs ancillary to their food-getting work. Other tasks are more variable from society to society. Inuit men construct igloos and women organize the interior. Batek women usually construct lean-to shelters, though men know how and sometimes do.

Healing and the performance of rituals may be highly specialized and gender specific or open to whoever wants to learn the skills. Australian Aboriginal men keep certain rituals secret from women and uninitiated men, and many Aboriginal women perform ceremonies of their own (Kaberry 1973 [1939], Berndt 1965, Goodale 1971, Hamilton 1981, Bell 1983, Tonkinson 1993). Among the Iukagir, both men and women could become shamans (Ivanov, this volume). Tlingit men and women could become both shamans and witches (Klein 1995:36). Tolowa shamans were always women or transvestites (Halperin 1980:388). Only Batak men become shamans, while women make the music that enables the shaman/curer to contact his spirit familiars (James Eder, personal communication). A few Batek, usually men, become shamans who communicate with spirits through trance, but any Batek man or woman can experience spirit communication through dreams and participation in communal singing and dancing rituals. Similarly, Shoshone men and women have developed relationships with spirits through dreams and visions (Fowler, this volume).

Women tend to be the primary caregivers for infants and very young children. Fathers help to varying degrees. Aka fathers play major childcare roles (Hewlett 1992), as do Batek

fathers (K. L. Endicott 1992). Andamanese regard men and women as equally responsible for raising children (Pandya 1993:263-79). Young children learn the skills they see their mothers perform, especially gathering. As children grow up, boys accompany their fathers and other male relatives on hunts and learn the various skills men perform, while girls deepen their knowledge of women's skills. If ritual knowledge is gender-specific, as in Australia, men and women provide separate training to their sons and daughters, though Catherine Berndt (1983:21) observes that in Australia mothers and other women provide a boy's and girl's first exposure to religion. Some hunter-gatherers, including the Mbuti, Ju!'hoansi, Ongee Andamanese, Ache, and many Australian Aborigines, perform puberty ceremonies, while others, like the Batek, do not.

A few hunter-gatherer societies recognize a third gender. Three percent of Ache men behave like women, collecting foods and doing childcare but remaining uninvolved sexually with either sex (Kim Hill and A. Magdalena Hurtado, personal communication). Item'i transvestite men wore women's clothing and did women's work (Shnirelman, this volume).

Does meat-sharing lead to male power?

Arguing universal sexual asymmetry, some scholars contend that male dominance is unavoidable in hunter-gatherer societies because male hunters share the societies' most valued commodity (meat) beyond the household, thus gaining prestige and creating debts that can be used to exert power over others (Friedl 1975:12-45, 1995, Collier and Rosaldo 1981:281, Collier 1988). The argument makes several unwarranted or faulty assumptions: that meat is always the most valued commodity, that men have a monopoly on supplying meat, that dealings in the "public" sphere outside the household are more prestigious or valued than dealings within the household (Rosaldo 1974:23-42), and that hunters can turn prestige into power (see Friedl 1975:12-45).

Evidence from hunter-gatherers contradicts these assumptions. The Batek, for example, do not prefer meat over all other foods; they usually mention fruit as the favored food of both humans and spirit beings. Women's hunting in many hunter-gatherer societies undercuts the idea that men have a monopoly on meat. Many hunter-gatherer societies do not recognize a public sphere versus a domestic sphere, and there is no evidence that they value extra familial activities more than familial activities. The ill-defined notion of prestige is problematic. Is it admiration or something more? Some anthropologists unjustifiably assume that activities prestigious in our society (for example, leadership and politics) are prestigious in hunter-gatherer societies -or assume that men's activities are always the most prestigious (Mead 1935:302; cf. Sanday 1990:2 and Sacks 1979:88-93). The Batek admire industriousness, whatever the activity and whoever the worker; so do the Gidjingali (Meehan 1982:119). Even where people admire successful hunters, people usually undermine any hunter's attempt to exert power over others.

Ultimately the argument that meat-sharing gives men power misinterprets hunter-gatherer sharing practices. Many scholars think of sharing as two separate networks: women share vegetable foods within the family and men share meat beyond the family. Yet, vegetable and meat sharing are two parts of the same process of generalized reciprocity among camp members. The difference is that vegetables are more reliable food sources than animals. Most gatherers are likely to succeed in finding food each day, obviating the need to regulate sharing. In some societies gatherers are expected to feed their families first; further sharing is up to the

gatherer. Elsewhere gatherers share more routinely. "Among the Hadza it would be out of the question for a woman to hoard food while others are hungry" (Woodburn 1982: 442). Batek families often send children to give vegetable food to other families in camp, even when everyone has managed to gather food.

Hunters are far less likely to succeed in taking large game each day. The success rate for Ju/'hoansi hunting is 25 percent (Lee 1968:40), and for Batek hunting 50 percent. Small game is commonly exempt from obligatory sharing. Large game must be shared. Many scholars interpret meat-sharing as generosity, but many societies make sure that the hunter does not have a choice. Some foragers have set rules about which cut of meat goes to which relative, while others assign distribution rights to people other than the hunter. The Ju/'hoansi say that the owner of the arrow that killed the animal is the owner/distributor of the meat (Marshall 1976:296, Lee 1979:247). Either a man or a woman can own the arrow. "There is much giving and lending of arrows. The society seems to want to extinguish in every way possible the concept of the meat belonging to the hunter" (Marshall 1976:297). By this and other leveling mechanisms - including ridiculing the meat and cutting cocky hunters down to size - the Ju/'hoansi prevent hunters from turning the sharing network into a political power base (Lee 1979:244,246). The Ju/'hoansi actively encourage hunting through rituals, admiration of hunters, and nagging, then just as actively prevent hunters from using their successes for personal advantage.

Do hunter-gatherer men control women?

Anthropologists have argued that hunter-gatherer men control women through arranging marriages, appropriating women's labor, excluding women from prestigious or authority-laden activities or realms of knowledge (such as hunting, religion, or politics), or through violence. Empirically there is wide variation in how men and women divide authority and control. Not all hunter-gatherers have arranged marriages, and in those that do, generally both parents have a say in arrangements for their sons and daughters. Defining marriage as wife-exchange is one way anthropologists inadvertently overlook women's influence over their own marriages and those of their children. Like many foragers, Batek men and women choose their own spouses. Ju/'hoansi parents arrange first and sometimes second marriages for their young sons and daughters (Marshall 1976:266). But unhappily married young daughters may move back home or divorce (Shostak 1981:127-30 158). Adult Ju/'hoansi women and men select subsequent marriage partners for themselves (Marshall 1976:266). The Tiwi defined women as wives, even before their births. Although a girl's grandfather, father, or brothers formally arranged her marriage, her mother's relationship with the prospective groom most influenced whether the marriage would take place (Goodale 1971:54-6). A prospective son-in-law had to please his future mother-in-law by doing all she asked of him, or she could void the contract (Goodale 1971:56). Though anthropologists often interpret Tiwi society as men exchanging women, Tiwi women exercised their own control of men through the mother-in-law relationship and extramarital affairs (Goodale 1971:130-1).

Rather than assigning all authority in economic, political, or religious matters to one gender or the other, hunter-gatherers tend to leave decision-making about men's work and areas of expertise to men, and about women's work and expertise to women, either as groups

or individuals. When decisions affect an extended household or group, age and gender are factored in in various ways. Older men and women may coordinate the activities of a household, as among Evenki (Anderson, this volume). Netsilik husbands decided where families moved; wives were autonomous in their domains and often influenced their husband's decisions (Balicki 1970:109). Guemple (1995:22) reports that in Inuit inter-personal "politics" the general rule is that younger answer to older and females answer to males; men may "give the orders" at home but do not interfere with women's work; moreover, Inuit men tend to defer to their grandmothers. Observing that Chipewyan women defer to their husbands in public but not in private, Sharp cautions against assuming this means that men control women: "If public deference, or the appearance of it, is an expression of power between the genders, it is a most uncertain and imperfect measure of power relations. Polite behavior can be most misleading precisely because of its conspicuousness" (Sharp 1995:53). Some foragers place the formalities of decision-making in male hands, but expect women to influence or ratify the decisions. Gitksan male chiefs do not support community-wide initiatives without their mothers' and aunts' approval (Richard Daly, personal communication). Andamanese men act together to make a decision, then get women to endorse it before its implementation. Sometimes, too, women instruct men to undertake specific tasks (V. Pandya, on the Andamanese, personal communication). Other foragers expect both men and women to participate in group decisions. Kim Hill and A. Magdalena Hurtado (personal communication) report that Ache men and women traditionally participated in band-level decisions, through some men commanded more respect and held more personal power than any woman." The Batek expect individual men and women to have their say; when interests diverge, families or individuals may leave a camp group to pursue their own plans.

In addition to consensus and discussion as the means of decision-making, some foragers have leaders, either formal or informal. The oldest Netsilik male in an extended family is considered the headman for that group. He coordinates hunting activities and his wife distributes the food (Balicki 1970:118). Various Australian Aborigines recognize ritual leaders, usually elders. Some societies, like the Batek, have "headmen" positions that were introduced by outsiders to serve as liaisons. Such people may or may not have a "following." The Batek, like some other foragers, also have "natural" or informal leaders, whose intelligence and abilities tend to attract people who seek their advice. Some Batek natural leaders are women. Commonly, if leaders - whether formal or informal try to coerce others, families and individuals move away from them.

Indeed, many hunter-gatherers limit authority to specific situations like organizing rituals or arranging marriages, and leave individuals to exercise personal autonomy in broad areas of everyday life (Leacock 1978, Ingold 1987:223-40, Woodburn 1982, Hamilton 1981:85). People cannot extend such situational authority into generalized control over others. Even when people exercise situational authority, individuals exercising personal autonomy may refuse to abide by the authority. For example, children may refuse arranged marriages or may divorce shortly after the marriage takes place, even when the parent has had the right to make the arrangement. Personal autonomy and situational authority apply to both men and women, though the configurations may differ in each society. Nowhere do men or women control all aspects of each other's lives.

Some anthropologists argue that men have an ultimate advantage over women because men are stronger and will tend to be the winners in violent confrontations. In any human interaction violence is a possibility, and women may well be the losers. The real question is whether the society institutionalizes violence, especially against women. Among some foragers, like the Batek, violence is strictly taboo and violators are scorned. For the Mbuti, "a certain amount of wife-beating is considered good, and the wife is expected to fight back" (Turnbull 1965:287), but too much violence results in intervention by kin or in divorce. Some Australian Aboriginal men use threats of gang-rape to keep women away from their secret ceremonies. Burbank argues that Aborigines accept physical aggression as a "legitimate form of social action" and limit it through ritual (1994:31, 29). Further, women know how to deal with physical aggression, unlike their Western counterparts (Burbank 1994:19). According to Bell (1983:31, 41, 161), Australian men's violence toward women increased with settlement life, largely under the influence of alcohol.

Do foragers symbolically devalue women?

There are few systematic accounts of gender symbolism in specific foraging societies, but even partial accounts suggest that foragers' ideas about gender lack the kind of overt sexual antagonisms found in the ideologies of many South American and New Guinea horticultural societies. Often both male and female characters are prominent in foragers' myths and cosmologies. Australian Aboriginal "Dreamtime" myths are replete with male and female creator beings. In Arnhem Land ceremonies men repeat "the actions of the creative feminine ancestresses, the Wauwalak sisters" (Hamilton 1981:81). The Batek alternatively describe a punitive thundergod as a single male, two brothers, and a brother/sister pair; reflecting widespread Asian ideas, they picture the punitive underground deity as a huge snake or an old woman.

Various foragers view men and women as different in some ways and the same in others, without attaching greater value to either gender. Corporeal distinctions often focus on menstruation, but even societies that consider menstruation dangerous or polluting may limit these qualities to menstruation itself rather than extending them to womanhood in general. For example, the Batek say that menstrual blood smells bad, but they do not consider women themselves to be offensive.

Gender may matter little in beliefs about the human spirit. In the traditional Inuit "ontological formulation of humanity, maleness and femaleness are only transitory states of being" (Guemple 1995:27). The same named personality that circles between the spiritual and corporeal world can attach to either a male or female (Guemple 1995:27). "Since the Native theory holds that the inheritor of a name assumes the identity of the spirit associated with it - and becomes that person in adulthood - there can be no fundamental difference in the statuses of individual Eskimos, because gender is not an essential attribute of being as such" (Guemple 1995:27). Netsilik beliefs about the afterlife reflect non-hierarchical yet gender-specific values. "Energy, endurance, fearlessness for young men and the ability to endure suffering for women are the qualities most rewarded in the afterlife. Laziness, idleness, apathy, and refusal to accept pain are punished" (Balicki 1970:215).

Does incorporation into nation-states affect gender relations?

For some societies contact with outsiders and incorporation into nation-states undermined gender relations, especially women's lives. Leacock (1978,1981:37) argued that the fur trade broke down egalitarian gender relations among the Montagnais-Naskapi by separating foraging groups into single household units in which women were increasingly cut off from economic activity. She also argued that this made it easier for Jesuits to introduce changes that deliberately undercut traditional Montagnais-Naskapi gender relations (Leacock 1980:38; for other analyses, see Anderson 1985 and Van Kirk 1987). Draper (1975) documented how JuJ'hoansi sedentization disrupted work and sharing patterns: men found work with neighboring pastoralists, and women became dependent on men. Bell (1983) argued that Kaytej Aboriginal women were less autonomous in settlements than in the bush, though conversely their ritual life increased, and government welfare checks enabled women to live independently of men if they so chose. Among the Batak, government and non-government organizations have created more opportunities for men than women (James Eder, personal communication).

Elsewhere contact increased options for women. Tonkinson (1990) reports that Mardu women in Western Australia acted as liaisons between Aborigines and missions and cattle stations. The women learned more English than the men and earned money through employment opportunities, including prostitution, which they did not view pejoratively. More recently, government welfare checks have given women more independence than ever. Government checks have similarly increased Chipewyan women's economic independence and have enabled young people to reject arranged marriages (Sharp 1995:65). Since the 1970s many Evenki women live in single-parent households supported by government checks. Evenki women also dominate in professions that require higher education (Anderson, this volume). Bruce Grant (personal communication) reports that Sovietization of Nivkh in the 1920s brought women into the Soviet workforce and education and states that "all women I knew felt that their position had been greatly improved through Sovietization." Batek economic opportunities have changed as Malaysia has logged the forests, but gender relations have not changed, except among Muslim converts. So far, most Batek are responding on their own terms as much as possible, foraging in remaining forests, trading, growing crops, and working for wages.

Gender relations are most likely to change if contact with outsiders involves playing by the outsider's rules (especially if those rules favor one gender over the other or deliberately undermine existing gender relations). Rather than assuming that all contact with outsiders and all economic change entail changes in gender relations, especially changes that favor men, we must look at the historical specifics.

References

- Anderson, K. (1985). Commodity exchange and subordination: Montagnais-Naskapi and Huron women, 1600-1650. *Signs* 11(1):48-62.
- Balikci, A. (1970). *The Netsilik Eskimo*. Prospect Height, IL: Waveland Press.
- Bell, D. (1983). *Daughters of the Dreaming*. North Sydney: McPhee Gribble/George Allen and Unwin.

- Berndt, C. H. (1965). Woman and the "secret life." In R. M. Berndt and C. H. Berndt (eds.), *Aboriginal man in Australia*, pp. 238-82. Sydney: Angus and Robertson.
- (1983). Mythical women, past and present. In F. Gale (ed.), *We are bosses ourselves: the status and role of Aboriginal women today*, pp. 13-23. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Briggs, I. (1970). *Never in anger: portrait of an Eskimo family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brosius, P. (1995). Bornean forest trade in historical and regional perspective: the case of Penan hunter-gatherers of Sarawak. In I. Fox (ed.), *Society and non-timber forest products in tropical Asia*, pp. 13-26. *East-West Center Occasional Papers* 19. Honolulu.
- Burbank, v: K. (1994). *Fighting women: anger and aggression in Aboriginal Australia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Collier, I. F. (1988). *Marriage and inequality in classless societies*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Collier, I. F. and M. Z. Rosaldo (1981). Politics and gender in simple societies. In S. B. Ortner and H. Whitehead (eds.), *Sexual meanings: the cultural construction of gender and sexuality*, pp. 275-329. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahlberg, F. (ed.) (1981). *Woman the gatherer*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Draper, P. (1975). !Kung women: contrasts in sexual egalitarianism in foraging and sedentary contexts. In R. Reiter (ed.), *Toward an anthropology of women*, pp. 77- 109. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1961 [1915]) .*The elementary forms of the religious life*. New York: Collier Books.
- Endicott, K. L. (1979). Batek negrito sex roles. M.A. thesis. Canberra: Australian National University.
- (1981). The conditions of egalitarian male-female relationships in foraging societies. *Canberra Anthropology* 4(2):1-10.
- (1992). Fathering in an egalitarian society. In B. Hewlett (ed.), *Father-child relations: cultural and biosocial contexts*, pp. 281-95. New York: Aldine.
- Endicott, K. M. (1979). *Batek negrito religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Estioko-Griffin, A. and P. B. Griffin (1981) .Woman the hunter: the Agta. In F. Dahlberg (ed.), *Woman the gatherer*, pp. 121-51. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fleddl, E. (1975). *Women and men: an anthropologist's view*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- (1995). Society and sex roles. In E. Angeloni (ed.), *Annual editions: anthropology*, pp. 136-41. Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group.
- Gardner, P. M. (1972). The Paliyans. In M. Bicchieri (ed.), *Hunters and gatherers today*, pp. 404-47. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- (1993). Dimensions of subsistence foraging in South India. *Ethnology* 32(2):109-44.
- Goodale, I. (1971). *Tiwi wives: a study of the women of Melville Island, North Australia*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Gould, R. B. (1969). Subsistence behavior among the Western Desert Aborigines. *Oceania* 39(4):253-74.
- Guemple, L. (1995). Gender in Inuit society. In L. F. Klein and L. A. Ackerman (eds.) , *Women and power in native North America*, pp. 17-27. Norman; University of Oklahoma Press.

- Halperin, R. (1980). Ecology and mode of production: seasonal variation and the division of labor by sex among hunter-gatherers. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 36(3):379-99.
- (1988). *Economies across culture: toward a comparative science of the economy*. New York; St. Martin's Press.
- Hamilton, A. (1981). A complex strategical situation: gender and power in Aboriginal Australia. In N. Grieve and P. Grimshaw (eds.), *Australian women: feminist perspectives*, pp. 69-85. Melbourne; Oxford University Press.
- Hewlett, B. S. (ed.) (1992). *Father-child relations: cultural and biosocial contexts*. New York: Aldine.
- Ingold, T. (1987). *The appropriation of nature: essays on human ecology and social relations*. Iowa City; University of Iowa Press.
- Kaberry, P. (1973 [1939]). *Aboriginal woman: sacred and profane*. New York; Gordon Press.
- Klein, L. (1995). Mother as clanswoman; rank and gender in Tlingit society. In L. F. Klein and L. A. Ackerman (eds.), *Women and power in native North America*, pp. 28-45. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Leacock, E. (1978). Women's status in egalitarian society; implications for social evolution. *Current Anthropology* 19(2):247-75.
- (1980). Montagnais women and the Jesuit program for colonization. In M. Etienne and E. Leacock (eds.), *Women and colonization: anthropological perspectives*, pp. 25-42. New York: Praeger.
- (1981). *Myths of male dominance: collected articles on women cross-culturally*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Lee, R. B. (1968). What hunters do for a living, or how to make out on scarce resources. In R. B. Lee and I. DeVore (eds.), *Man the hunter*, pp. 30-48. Chicago: Aldine.
- (1979). *The fKung San: men, women and work in a foraging society*. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, R. B. and I. DeVore (eds.) (1968). *Man the hunter*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Marshall, L. (1976). *The fKung of Nyae Nyae*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mead, M. (1935). *Sex and temperament in three primitive societies*. New York: William Morrow and Company.
- Meehan, B. (1982). *Shell bed to shell midden*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Meggitt, M. (1962). *Desert people*. London: Angus and Robertson.
- Morris, B. (1982). *Forest traders: a socioeconomic study of the Hill Pandaram*. London; Athlone Press.
- Pandya, V. (1993). *Above the forest: a study of Andamanese ethnoanemology, cosmology and the power of ritual*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. (1930). The social organization of Australian tribes. *Oceania* 1:34-63, 322-41, 426-56.
- Reiter, R. (1975). *Toward an anthropology of women*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Rosaldo, M. Z. (1974). Woman, culture, and society: a theoretical overview. In M. Z. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere (eds.), *Woman, culture and society*, pp. 17-42. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rosaldo, M. Z. and L. Lamphere (eds.) (1974). *Woman, culture and society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Sacks, K. (1979) .*Sisters and wives: the past and future of sexual equality*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Sanday, P. R. (1990). Introduction. **In** P. R. Sanday and R. G. Goodenough (eds.), *Beyond the second sex: new direc- tions in the anthropology of gender*, pp. 1-19. Philad~lphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Service, E. R. (1966) .*The hunters*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ : Prentice- Hall.
- Sharp, H. S. (1995). Asymmetrical equals: women and men among the Chipewyan. **In** L. F. Klein and L. A. Ackerman (eds.), *Women and power in native North America*, pp. 46-74. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Shostak, M. (1981). *Nisa: the life and words of a lKung woman*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Steward, J. H. and L. C. Faron (1959). *Native peoples of South America*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tonkinson, R. (1974). *The Jigalong mob: Aboriginal victors of the desericusade*. Menlo Park, CA: Cummings Publishing Company.
- (1978). *The MardudjaraAborigines: living the dream in Australia's desert*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- (1990) .The changing status of Aboriginal women: "Free agents" at Jigalong. **In** R. Tonkinson and M. Howard (eds.), *Going it alone? Prospects for Aboriginal autonomy*, pp. 124-47. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- (1991). *The MarduAborigines: living the dream in Australia's desert* (2nd edn). Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- (1993) Foreword. **In** R. M. and C. H. Berndt, *A world that was: the Yaraldi of the Murray River and Lakes*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- (n.d.) The foraging mode of production among Aborigines of Australia's Western Desert. Unpublished paper.
- Turnbull, C. M. (1965). *Wayward servants: the two worlds of the African Pygmies*. Garden City, NY: Natural History Press.
- Van Kirk, S. (1987). Toward a feminist perspective in native history. **In** W. Cowan (ed.) , *Papers of the eighteenth Algonquian conference*, pp. 377-89. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Woodburn, J. (1968). Stability and flexibility in Hadza resi- dential groupings. **In** R. B. Lee and I. DeVore (eds.), *Man the hunter*, pp. 103-10. Chicago: Aldine.
- (1982). Egalitarian societies. *Man*, n.s., 17:431-51.

-