

Nonkilling Anthropology

A New Approach to
Studying Human Nature,
War, and Peace

Leslie E. Sponsel

CENTER FOR GLOBAL
nonkilling

Honolulu, September 2021

© Leslie E. Sponsel, 2021
© Center for Global Nonkilling, 2021 (for this edition)

ISBN 9798467846811

Cataloging in Publication Data (CIP)

Sponsel, Leslie E.

Nonkilling Anthropology: A New Approach to Studying
Human Nature, War, and Peace / Leslie E. Sponsel.

ISBN 9798467846811

I. Nonkilling. 2. Pacifism – Nonviolence. 3. Peace.

I. Title. II. Sponsel, Leslie E.

A catalogue record is also available from the Library of Congress.

CENTER FOR GLOBAL
nonkilling

3653 Tantalus Drive
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822-5033
United States of America
Email: info@nonkilling.org
<http://www.nonkilling.org>

Dedicated to
Glenn D. Paige and
David Bidney

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	9
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	13
1. Peace Studies, Nonkilling, and Anthropology: Toward Synergy	15
2. The Actualities of a Nonkilling Society: No Delusion	49
3. The Possibilities of a Nonkilling Anthropology: Wishful Thinking?	61
4. Rethinking the Yanomami: Killing or Nonkilling Society?	75
5. The Role of Spiritual Ecology in Nonkilling: Beyond Secular	111
6. Teaching Nonkilling Anthropology: Sample Course Syllabus	127
<i>About the Author</i>	147
<i>References</i>	149

Preface

“Contemporary thinkers in all walks of life are acutely aware that this is an age of crises and that all the resources of human intelligence and wisdom should be utilized to provide basic diagnoses and to indicate directions of resolution” (David Bidney, 1967, *Theoretical Anthropology*, page 345).

War and other forms of violence are obviously of great relevance, indeed, increasingly so. For example, one only need consider the increased frequency and death toll from gun violence in America in recent decades. According to the website of the Gifford Law Center (2019), over 1.2 million Americans have been shot in the past decade while millions more have witnessed gun violence. Statistics include 36,000 Americans killed by guns annually, an average of 100 daily. Gun deaths reached their highest level in at least four decades in 2017, with 39,773 deaths that year. Gun deaths increased by 16% from 2014 to 2017. According to the University of Washington's Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, the U.S. had 4.43 deaths from gun violence per 100,000 people in 2017, nine times higher than Canada (0.47 deaths per 100,000) and 29 times higher than Denmark (0.15 deaths per 100,000). Clearly in this and other ways the U.S. is a very sick society and deteriorating, a killing society (cf., Edgerton 2010).

According to the website called the Cost of War in the Watson Institute (2019) at Brown University, from 480,000 to 507,000 people have been killed in the American post-9/11 wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan up until October 2018. That includes 244,124 to 266,427 civilians, 362 journalists and media workers, and 566 humanitarian and NGO workers. Moreover, these wars continue in various ways and degrees. What has killing solved?

The American war of revenge in Afghanistan started after short-lived diplomacy failed to bring to justice Osama bin Laden and other leaders of Al-Qaeda who implemented the horrific 9/11 attack on U.S. territory. The Iraq war started as a result of misinformation, if not just plain lies, about its leader Saddam Hussein developing weapons of mass destruction. In both cases, diplomacy and various nonviolent alternatives were not exhausted by any means. Instead, far more violence was generated by warfare. Violence just fuels more violence. The American wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have not secured any genuine peace. Will more killing help?

Furthermore, many people who survive war are injured physically and/or emotionally, and often for life. In contrast, peace encompassing non-violence facilitates the cultivation of the best in human nature; the cultivation of human potential, creativity, and goodness to the benefit of society and humanity; enhances the quality of life; and facilitates spiritual development. Usually war does just the opposite. Peace is not any fantasy; however, belligerent militarism is as any means to resolve conflicts.

Given considerations such as the above crises, among many others that could be cited, it is absolutely crucial to pursue a new vision of human nature, war, and peace including nonviolence. As political scientist Glenn D. Paige (2009a:127) perceptively asserts: “The time has come to set forth human killing as a problem to be solved rather than to accept enslavement by it as a condition to be endured forever.” Paige’s profound and provocative research, publications, and website associated with the Center for Global Nonkilling that he developed, influenced in part by his military experience during the Korean War, poses many questions, among other matters, that merit the most serious consideration in a world with so much worrisome killing and insecurity because of growing epidemics of conflict, violence, and war.

The primary purpose of this book is to explore the mutual relevance of anthropology, nonkilling, and peace studies, and facilitate their synergy. All three are maturing in their development with increasing potential for benefiting society and humanity. In particular, the challenging perspective, actualities, and possibilities of the nonkilling paradigm envisioned by Paige generate inspiring new knowledge, understanding, and insights with very practical as well as significant theoretical relevance. Much of this is demonstrated in the website of the Center for Global Nonkilling, including in its numerous free books and research committees among an abundance of other resources and accomplishments (<https://nonkilling.org>).

Here Chapters 2-5 are reproduced, with only a few very minor modifications and updating citations, from previous publication in books skillfully edited or coedited by Joám Evans Pim, Director of the Center for Global Nonkilling (Sponsel 2009, 2010d, 2014). Chapters 2 and 3 are split from a previous book chapter (Sponsel 2009). A second purpose of this present book is to make all of these chapters more readily available in a single volume for a much broader and more diverse audience. Moreover, combining them with Chapter 1, which is entirely new, although also drawing in part on my previous publications since 1994 as well as on a recent extensive literature survey, provides context to help highlight the potential of a nonkilling anthropology. Nonkilling, as one focus in anthropological research and

teaching, can generate inspiring new knowledge, understanding, and insights with very practical as well as significant theoretical relevance.

Like many of my other publications, these chapters reflect decades of exploring the phenomena of peace, ecology, and religion, and especially the interfaces among them. Naturally, there is some repetition among the chapters because of overlap in the subject matter and also it is retained to emphasize especially important matters.

Allowing for less sensitivity to gender in language more than a half century ago, the following quote encapsulates the underlying central pivotal concern in the chapters throughout this book:

Man has always been a problem to himself. Throughout the ages he has sought to understand himself and to lead a harmonious existence in a society of men. The history of human civilization may, from one point of view, be understood as the history of man's ideas of himself and of the practical consequences to which these ideas have led him (David Bidney, 1967, *Theoretical Anthropology*, p. 3).

Hopefully this book will encourage others to also engage in helping to continue advancing the exciting and promising arena of science and scholarship in nonkilling anthropology. Any constructive criticisms and other comments are most welcome. The author's email is psonsel@hawaii.edu.

Finally, this book is dedicated to the fond memory of the unique life and work of political scientist Glenn D. Paige (1929-2017) and philosophical anthropologist David Bidney (1908-1987). Both were truly extraordinary scholars and professors; genuine humanitarians; highly respected, admired, and coveted colleagues; and dear friends. Paige's seminal book *Nonkilling Global Political Science*, and likewise Bidney's *Theoretical Anthropology*, have been profoundly influential for the present author like for a multitude of others. (For background on Paige see Radhakrishnan, et al., 2012, and also the website of the Center for Global Nonkilling). For background on Bidney, see Martin Bidney 1995, and Grindal and Warren 1979). Their legacy continues in the present book and in many other ways.

Acknowledgments

This book could not have been written without the information, ideas, and insights from a multitude of scholars as cited in the text and bibliography. However, in particular, the seminal influence of several persons should be singled out: David Bidney, Bruce A. Bonta, Robert K. Dentan, R. Brian Ferguson, Douglas P. Fry, Kenneth A. R. Kennedy, Ashley Montagu, Georg K. Neumann, Glenn D. Paige, Joám Evans Pim, David H. Price, Alcida Rita Ramos, and Terence S. Turner. For Chapter 4 in particular, Kenneth R. Good generously shared some of his wealth of profound knowledge and understanding of the Yanomami after living with them in the Venezuelan Amazon for 14 years. Nevertheless, I am solely responsible for any deficiencies in this book.

Chapter I. Peace Studies, Nonkilling, and Anthropology: Toward Synergy

“That since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed.” (UNESCO Constitution, November 16, 1945).

Synergy refers to a dynamic, mutual, and amplifying interaction that creates a new whole system that is far greater than the mere sum of its components. This is the potential of the interaction of peace studies, the nonkilling paradigm, and anthropology each discussed in succession in this chapter. This synergy can become a very interesting and significant field for both research and teaching, here identified as nonkilling anthropology.

Peace Studies

The phenomena of nonviolence and peace are not rare, only they rarely attract much attention, perhaps because they are so common, while violence and war are more dramatic (cf., Strathern and Stewart 2008). For example, in the *Journal of Peace Research*, Hakan Wiberg (1981) found only one article on peace (Fabbro 1978) out of 400 articles over a period of 17 years from 1964-1980. Another example is the *Encyclopedia of Violence, Conflict and Peace* edited by Lester Kurtz (2008) where among 289 entries only 10 (3.5%) are on nonviolence and 29 (10%) on peace. Another example is the very useful bibliography on the anthropology of war compiled by Brian Ferguson and Leslie Farragher (1988) where among 1,888 citations only 64 (3%) are about peace. However, this may only reflect Ferguson’s primary interest which is the scientific and scholarly study of war. Alice Beck Kehoe (2012:196) refers to any systemic bias of privileging war over peace as a Western hegemonic culture bound paradigm. (Also, see Gleditsch 1993 and Gleditsch, et al., 2014, for the same conclusion about the disproportionate attention to war over peace).

As another illustration, publications on the origin and evolution of war are fairly common, but any on the origin and evolution of peace are quite rare to absent. For instance, Ruth Benedict wrote on “The Natural History of War” in 1959. Because I could not find any article on the subject, I wrote one on “The Natural History of Peace” (Sponsel 1996a). Playing devil’s advocate for heuristic purposes, I took the opposite position and presented the argument and evidence that peace has a natural history. That chapter in turn was one influence generating an interest in the anthropology of peace by Douglas P. Fry (2013:545) who is among the foremost anthropological scholars on war and peace. (That chapter is available free on the website developed by Bruce D. Bonta at <https://peacefulsocieties.uncg.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Sponsel96.pdf>).

The relative neglect of peace compared to war is unrealistic. For example, historian Francisco A. Munoz (2010a:51) affirms: “Peace has prevailed in all the cultures of the ancient world, on different scales and with different meanings, and it has responded to the need for maintaining the maximum well-being in societies.” Another historian, Matthew Melko (1973:9) confirms: “Peace is a fact, not a vision. It is ubiquitous, incessant, normal. Peace prevails in most places at most times.” Many other affirmations of this fact will follow in this and other chapters of the present book. (Also, see, for example, Bonta 1993, Fry 2006, 2010, 2015, Kelleher 2010, and Munoz 2010b). This gross neglect is, in effect, a form of censorship and repression of the peace literature (Trautman and Turetzky 2010). As discussed later, peace literature does not serve the interests of what I identify as the military-industrial-media-academic complex, might even be viewed as subversive, and considered a threat to war profiteers, including many scientists and academics who are, in effect, propagandists and apologists for war (Sponsel 2017a, 2018). Yet it should be obvious that a more nonviolent and peaceful world will never be approximated by neglecting these two and related phenomena to attend exclusively to violence and war. Anyone genuinely concerned with peace needs to grapple with it, rather than ignore it.

As philosopher Michael Allen Fox (2014:xvi) asserts in his superb textbook *Understanding Peace: A Comprehensive Introduction*: “Since peace needs to dethrone war, a reversal of the usual emphasis is needed: Peace, not war, must be our primary focus and central concept.” Fox (2014:31) identifies the advantages of peace as constructive discourse, greater cooperation, better use of resources, general violence reduction, focus on equality issues, sustainable peace initiatives, personal growth, and new ways to

coexist. Furthermore, Fox (2014:xviii) recognizes that the main obstacle to peace is “clinging to the status quo and thinking inside the box.”

As we shall see shortly, Glenn D. Paige (2009a) with his nonkilling paradigm escaped from such obstacles. In his own manner Paige championed the epistemological and ethical reversal that Fox (2014:4, 7) prescribes as an antidote to the absurdity of the war disease which renders anonymous strangers into lethal enemies. Fox (2014:51) stresses that “There is therefore a pressing need to highlight nonviolence in history in order to counteract this imbalance of perspectives and open up the possibility of a different kind of future.” Nevertheless, violence and war are “normalized” by the media, militaristic values, male stereotypes, products of pop culture, and other forces (Fox 2014:138). Pop culture embraces violent toys for boys, television cartoons, video games, football as ritualized warfare, and other agents of socialization and enculturation that help normalize violence.

Peace studies has many deep roots, but post-World War II publications by scholars like Quincy Wright (1942) and Lewis Richardson (1960) were foundational. The Cold War (1947-1991) and associated nuclear arms race, U.S. civil rights movement (1954-1968), and the American war in Vietnam (1955-1975) were other important stimuli. Christian colleges and universities were also influential, especially those associated with the Brethren, Roman Catholic, Mennonite, Methodist, and Quaker religions. They facilitated the normative component often associated with peace studies, many considering war to be fundamentally immoral. As early as 1948, the first peace studies program was established at Manchester College in Indiana, a Church of the Brethren institution (Fahey 2010: 490-491). (Also, see *Nonkilling Spiritual Traditions* co-edited by Joám Evans Pim and Pradeep Dhakal in 2015).

In recent decades, peace studies have been flourishing as a loosely organized interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and transdisciplinary arena of research, education, and action, ideally focused on all aspects and levels of conflict, violence, war, peace, nonviolence, and related matters (Evans Pim 2010b, Fahey 2010, Rank 2010). Apparently, the first substantial textbook on the subject was authored by David P. Barash (1991).

In the Fourth Edition coauthored with Charles P. Webel (2017) the broad and diverse scope of peace studies in general is identified in the table of contents:

Table I. The Contents of Peace Studies

Part I. The Promise of Peace, the Problem of War

1. The Meanings of Peace
2. Peace Studies, Peace Education, and Peace Research
3. The Meanings of War
4. Terrorism Versus Counterterrorism
5. The Special Significance of Nuclear Weapons

Part II. The Reasons for Wars

6. The Individual Level
7. The Group Level
8. The State Level
9. The Decision-Making Level
10. The Ideological, Social, and Economic Levels

Part III. Building “Negative Peace”

11. Peace Movements
12. Diplomacy, Negotiations, and Conflict Resolution
13. Disarmament and Arms Control
14. International Cooperation
15. Peace Through Strength
16. International Law
17. Ethical and Religious Perspectives

Part IV. Building Positive Peace

18. Human Rights
19. Ecological Well-Being
20. Economic Well-Being
21. Movements Toward Democracy
22. National Reconciliation
23. Nonviolence
24. Toward a More Peaceful Future

The revealing distinction between the negative and positive concepts of peace was developed by Johan Galtung (1964, 1969, 1985, 2010a). (Also, see Pieper 2008). Galtung is a Norwegian sociologist, transdisciplinary in approach, and one among the few most important founders of peace and conflict studies. He established the Peace Research Institute Oslo in 1959 and the *Journal of Peace Research* in 1964. He became a Professor at the

University of Oslo in 1969. Galtung has published over 1000 articles and 100 books. However, it should be noted that this distinction was also made by Martin Luther King, Jr., in his famous “Letter from a Birmingham City Jail” of April 16, 1963, where he mentions negative peace as the absence of tension and positive peace as the presence of justice (Washington 1991).

Galtung (1969) explains that: “Positive peace is a societal condition in which structures of domination and exploitation, which underlie war, have been eliminated.” Another definition is that “Positive peace is the dynamic processes that lead to the relative conditions of the absence of direct and indirect violence plus the presence of freedom, equality, economic and social justice, cooperation, and harmony” (Sponsel 1996a:98). Nonviolence is an integral component of positive peace too.

As these paired concepts have developed, the characteristics of negative peace are basically the ideal condition of the absence of violence including war. However, this perspective usually focuses on national defense and conflict resolution through violence or its threat. War is considered to be natural and normal. Negative peace tends to treat only the superficial symptoms of war and other forms of violence. It reflects so-called realistic ideology.

Positive peace emphasizes the recognition, protection, and advancement of human rights as pivotal and the nonviolent defense of humanity. It critically challenges indirect or structural violence, a concept discussed below. Positive peace addresses the ultimate causes of war and other forms of violence. It pursues nonviolence in conflict resolution and other matters. Peace is considered to be natural and normal. In short, positive peace is the enduring absence of violence and the persistent presence of justice. It reflects so-called liberal ideology. (For human rights, see Goodale 2009a,b, and Rentein 2008).

While various kinds and degrees of conflict appear to be inevitable in relationships between human individuals, groups, and nations, violence is not. There are many nonviolent mechanisms for resolving conflicts (e.g., Barash and Webel 2018, and Wood 2016). It should also be noted that “... there can be nonviolence without peace, but not peace without nonviolence prevailing” (Fox 2014:183).

Bruce D. Bonta (1993) thoroughly defines peacefulness:

... a condition whereby people live with a relatively high degree of interpersonal harmony; experience little violence among adults, between adults and children, and between sexes; have developed workable strategies for resolving conflicts and averting violence; are com-

mitted to avoiding violence (such as warfare) with other peoples; raise their children to adopt their peaceful ways; and have a strong consciousness of themselves as peaceable.

Religious communities like the Amish, Hutterites, Mennonites, and Quakers pursue these ideal attributes.

Bonta (1993) published a bibliography with 438 citations on peaceful societies, and he later developed a website documenting many peaceful societies. Anthropologist Johan G. van der Dennen (1995) identifies 518 societies as not having warfare or only for defense, and another 290 societies with low level or ritualized warfare.

Linda Groff (2010:126) also lists the basic characteristics of peace:

Peace is a multifaceted process, not just the absence of war. Peace is multileveled, covering macro- and microsystem levels in the external world, as well as inner peace. Peace involves many types of actors on different system levels, not just nation-states. Peace reflects different dimensions and levels of consciousness and inner peace. Peace involves not only what one wants to eliminate, but also what one wants to create as a positive alternative. Peace honors the unity and interdependence, as well as the diversity, of the world's many cultures, civilizations, religions, and species.

It should be emphasized that peace is a complex multifaceted phenomenon involving psychological and spiritual aspects as well as historical, cultural, social, economic, political, legal, religious, moral, and ethical ones. This is demonstrated, for example, in the remarkable series of anthologies from different academic, professional, and scientific disciplines available free on the website of the Center for Global Nonkilling: anthropology, education, engineering, future studies, geography, health, history, linguistics, media, philosophy, political science, psychology, spirituality, and so on (<https://nonkilling.org>). (Also, see Swarup 2019 which reprints many of the introductory chapters from the aforementioned anthologies).

In the present author's opinion, although not common, it is also important to make a distinction between war studies and peace studies. Usually both are embraced under the rubric of peace studies, the general sense of the term (cf., Miall 2010). War studies usually focus on the negative concept of peace, whereas peace studies focus on the positive concept of peace. However, peace is far more than merely the absence of war. To un-

derstand and promote peace, it is insufficient to only study war and other forms of violence. It should be obvious that one cannot understand and promote something by ignoring it, but that is common in war studies, including those that profess to pursue peace. Accordingly, the positive concept of peace is much broader than the negative one. Again, for emphasis, the positive concept views peace as not only the absence of war and other forms of violence, but also the presence of freedom, equality, human rights, economic and social justice, nonviolent conflict resolution, cooperation, and harmony (Barnaby 1988:24, Galtung 2010a, Groff 2010).

War studies gradually developed after World War II. It focuses on direct physical violence, security, stability, and order at the national and international levels. The emphasis is on the dynamics of conflicts (regional, national, and international), history of arms control, nuclear weapons, war, and alternative security systems. The working assumption is that knowing the causes and functions of war can help reduce its frequency and intensity.

Peace studies in the narrow sense focus on indirect (structural) violence, nonviolence, peace, and human rights at all levels (individual, group, society, region, national, international, global). The emphasis is on the study of conflicts (root causes and wider consequences), nonviolent conflict management and resolution, human rights, economic and social justice, and environmental movements. The working assumption is that the most common ultimate cause of war is violations of human rights including social and economic injustice. Exclusive focus on violence and war is considered to distract from underlying processes, problems, and issues of peace (e.g., Gittings 2012). It is encouraging that there is increasing attention to peace in various ways and degrees. (See, for example, Fedigan and Strum 1997, Fox 2014, Fry 2006, 2018, Sapolsky 2006, and Younger 2007. Also, see many of the citations listed here in the bibliography for Sponsel since 1989).

A substantial literature in peace studies in the general sense has been accumulating since World War II. Quincy Wright (1964) published the first major modern study of war in 1942, while Harry Turney-High (1991) published the first substantial anthropological study of war in 1949. During the American war in Vietnam, in 1968 Morton Fried, Marvin Harris, and Robert Murphy coedited another benchmark book, *War: The Anthropology of Armed Conflict and Aggression*. Recent textbooks have been published by Barash and Webel 2017, Fox 2014, and Wood 2015, among others. Barash 2011 and Gonzalez, et al., 2019, are important anthologies. On peace see Gittings 2012, Kemp 1985, and Richmond 2014. Nonviolence is addressed by Kurlansky 2006, Sharp 1973, 2005, and Sibley 1963. Reference works in-

clude Bonta 2020, Center for Global Nonkilling 2020, Edsforth 2020, Harris and Shuster 2006, Kurtz 2008, Powers and Vogele 1997, Thomas and Klare 1989, Webel and Galtung 2007, and Young 2010. (The encyclopedias edited by Kurtz 2008 and Young 2010 were especially helpful in providing background for the present chapter and articles from them are often cited here. Likewise, Fox 2014 was particularly useful).

After some five decades of development there are now journals, professional organizations, bibliographies, textbooks, courses, programs, certificates, and degrees focused on the general field of peace studies, although usually the emphasis is on war (Boulding 1977, 1978a,b, Harris and Shuster 2006, Kelman 1981, 2010, Kemp 1985, Stephenson 1989, 2008, and Thomas and Klare 1989). Among the more prominent periodicals published are the *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *International Journal of Peace Studies*, *International Journal of World Peace*, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *Journal of Peace Education*, *Journal of Peace Research*, *Peace and Change*, *Peace and Conflict Studies*, *Peace Research*, and *Peace Review*. Some major peace research and studies organizations are the Center for Global Nonkilling, International Peace Research Association, Matsunaga Institute for Peace, Peace and Justice Studies Association, Peace Research Institute Oslo, Peace Science Society, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, The Albert Einstein Institution, The Organization for World Peace, University for Peace (Costa Rica), and United States Institute for Peace. (See English 2018 for the history of the U.S. Institute for Peace).

For institutions see Ahmed 2010a, journals Ahmed 2010b, university departments and programs Rank 2010, textbooks Webel 2010, and bibliographies Noake 2010. Wood (2016:255-258) lists numerous organizations and their websites. The *Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace* (Young 2010) also contains numerous articles on peace movements, even regional ones. Among the more noteworthy NGOs promoting peace are Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, Center for Global Nonkilling, Citizens for Global Solutions, Code Pink, Common Dreams, Peace Brigades International, Project Ploughshares, Search for Common Ground, Veterans for Peace, Waging Nonviolence, Witness for Peace, and War Resisters League. See Wood 2016:255-258 for an extensive list of such organizations, their mission, and website. For an extensive timeline of peace events, treaties, and related matters see Young 2010:xxxvii-lviii.

As previously noted, many peace studies programs are associated with religiously affiliated universities and colleges. Often some faculty in peace studies are drawn from the natural sciences and humanities although most

are from the social sciences. The website of the Peace and Justice Studies Association posts under Resources lists of academic programs, journals, films, and videos. It also publishes the open access journal *Peace Chronicle*.

Participants in peace studies tend to be idealistic, leftist, and normative. However, except for extreme critics (e.g., Horowitz 2006, Horowitz and Laksin 2009), these attributes do not automatically invalidate or diminish the professional quality and significant achievements of the work. Indeed, many would assess these attributes as desirable and admirable. It would seem that relatively few individuals and organizations explicitly prefer violence and war to nonviolence and peace. Combat veterans know very well that war is hell (See English 2018 and Fahey 2010:491, respectively, for criticisms of peace institutes and peace studies programs).

The International Peace Research Association on its website explicitly identifies its “core values” as:

Impactful and socially relevant research: We value original research, and peace activities informed by that research, that contributes to the world community and engages key stakeholders. Positive Peace: We value peace and justice by nonviolent means. Respect: We value respecting dignity, humanity, identity and diversity. Empowerment: We value research by people of and within the most vulnerable and marginalized areas of our world community.

Human nature is elemental and pivotal, albeit often only implicit, in much of war studies and peace studies, as well as elsewhere (Barash 2010b, Davies 2008:959, Galaty 2010:2). As Stevenson and Haberman (1998:3) write:

So much depends on our conception of human nature: for individuals, the meaning and purpose of our lives, what we ought to do or strive for, what we may hope to achieve or become; for human societies, what vision of human community we may hope to work toward and what sort of social changes we should make. Our answers to all these huge questions depend on whether we think there is some “true” or “innate” nature of human beings. If so, what is it? Is it different for men and women? Or is there no such “essential” human nature, only a capacity to be molded by the social environment—by economic, political, and cultural forces?

Realists, conservatives, and the political right tend to view human nature as basically evil and instinctively selfish; focus on international politics as

competition for power and national interests; consider war to be inevitable and common; subordinate everything to national interests; pursue defensive strength to deter or subdue a perceived or invented enemy; resolve conflicts through violence; and are generally pessimistic about humankind. Such views are often associated with philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) and contemporary proponents referred to as Hobbesians or neo-Hobbesians. Hobbes is known for his presupposition that the original natural state of humans was brutal competition for survival in a war of all against all, *bellum omnium contra omnes*. This fatalistically negative Hobbesian mindset has even been identified as the charter myth of Western societies (Kelleher 2010:382). In literature, this view is celebrated by William Golding's (1954) classic novel *Lord of the Flies*. In anthropology, this presupposition underlies the (in)famous ethnography of Napoleon A. Chagnon (1968, 1988). (For various Hobbesian considerations see, for example, Dawson 1996, Ehrenreich 1998, Feibleman 1987, Gat 2006, Hames 2019, Hillman 2004, Morris 2014, Robarchek 1989, Sussman, et al., 2010, and Watson 1995).

Liberals and leftists tend to view human nature as basically good; altruism as innate; international politics as cooperation for mutual interests and principles; peace as inevitable and common; national and international interests as coinciding; international associations as pivotal; and conflicts resolved nonviolently through diplomacy, negotiation, mediation, or arbitration. They are generally optimistic about humankind. Such views are often associated with the philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), and contemporary proponents are referred to as Rousseauans or neo-Rousseauans (Kegley and Raymond 1999:20-21, 245). (See Roosevelt 1990).

At the same time, it should be cautioned that Hobbesians and Rousseauans are not monolithic groups, but each is quite varied. There are also scientists and scholars who are somewhere in between these two polar extremes. Most arguments between the two positions have not been very productive, each usually talking past their opponent. The antithesis and corresponding antagonisms usually persist (e.g., Hames 2019, Sponsel 2018). Fox (2014:97) cautions that "We must take care not to project upon other societies—and even more so on humanity in general—a warlike image that may only be a reflection of our present society and its values."

Human nature may be considered from the individual to the species level and everything in between. Many different scientific and/or academic disciplines address human nature, such as anthropology, biology, philosophy, political science, psychology, sociology, and theology. There is still a misleading tendency for individuals to emphasize either nature or nurture,

which respectively refer to genetics and biology in the former case, and society and culture in the latter. The former asserts that much of human behavior is ultimately instinctive or innate while cultural diversity is merely superficial noise; whereas, the latter considers by far most of human behavior to be learned and that overwhelmingly predominant. (Human nature is variously treated by Barash 1998, Curti 1980, Dupre 2001, Fry 2013, Fuentes and Visala 2016, Kohn 1990, Kupperman 2010, Roosevelt 1990, Smith 2007, Sponsel 2007d, Trigg 1999, and Watson 1995. Pojman 2006 provides a most thorough survey of theories of human nature from different religions, philosophers, and other sources, and provides a very useful summary table on pages 276-277).

Michael L. Galaty (2010:2) observes that anthropologists tend to fall into two opposing camps, those who are convinced that war is not a universal, but a relatively recent development in human prehistory on the one hand (e.g., Fry 2015), and on the other those who are convinced that it is a universal and has been common from the earliest period of prehistory (e.g., Chagnon 1988). Galaty (2010:2) writes that: "At the crux of this issue are fundamental disagreements about human nature: Are human beings culturally and/or genetically predisposed to war or peace?" However, this question, and related ones, were answered convincingly decades ago, it is not a matter of either-or. As one example, in 1986, in Seville, Spain, a multidisciplinary group of 20 prominent scientists from 12 nations collaborated in scrutinizing the relevant scientific data and unanimously concluded that war is not an inevitable manifestation of human nature. Specifically, they made five core assertions: it is scientifically incorrect to say that we have inherited a tendency to make war from our animal ancestors; war or any other violent behavior is genetically programmed into our human nature; through human evolution there has been a selection for aggressive behavior more than for other kinds of behavior; humans have a 'violent brain'; and war is caused by 'instinct' or any single motivation. In short, human aggressive behavior is not biologically determined and inevitable; instead various social and cultural factors are the main causes (see Fry 2006, 2013, 2015).

The Seville Statement on Violence was endorsed by UNESCO and many professional scientific organizations, including the American Anthropological Association and the American Psychological Association. Moreover, it was reconsidered and reaffirmed 25 years later at another international multidisciplinary conference held in Rome in September 2011 (Adams 1989, Beroldi 1994, Scott and Ginsburg 1994, Pagni and Ramirez 2011). However, the Seville Statement on Violence is usually conveniently ignored by

Hobbesians (e.g., Wilson 2012:57-76, c.f., Wood 2016:179-197). Confirmation bias persists; that is, seeking, favoring, interpreting, and considering only the arguments and evidence that fit one's own views, while discounting or simply ignoring anything that does not.

The Seville Statement on Violence basically reaffirmed anthropologist Margaret Mead's (1940) thesis that war is a cultural invention, rather than any biological inevitability (Beeman 2012). In general, anthropologists usually define culture, more or less, as a socially patterned, learned, and shared system of views, values, attitudes, actions, and institutions that relates people to each other, nature, and the supernatural (Kroeber and Kluckhohn 1952). As a specific example, philosophical anthropologist David Bidney (1967:xxx) writes: "Culture in general may be defined as the totality of the arts of living exercised by man individually and collectively in interaction with his ecological environment to promote survival and the enjoyment of life." (This remains my favorite definition, except for the gender references, but it was constructed more than half a century ago).

Most anthropologists stress the overwhelming influence of culture over biology in the human species (Bidney 1967, Bodley 2020, Borofsky 1994, Sidky 2004). In part, this surely reflects their recognition and appreciation of the tremendous diversity of the more than 7,000 distinct languages in the world today, usually with corresponding cultures (Summer Institute of Linguistics 2020). This empirical reality should automatically challenge any simplistic biological reductionism about human nature and war. Yet confirmation bias persists among the propagandists and apologists for war.

Advocates of the ubiquity of war throughout human prehistory and history as an inevitable manifestation of human nature often accuse their critics of being against science, biology, and evolution, or in some cases against sociobiology or evolutionary psychology in particular (e.g., Chagnon 2013). However, an honest reading of many of the critics from Montagu (1976) to Fry (2006, 2013, 2015), and beyond, reveals that this accusation is invalid and, in effect, if not intentionally, merely a diversionary tactic. (Also, see any publications by Sponsel, including this book).

Recently some scientists have transcended the antithesis of human nature as either warlike or peaceful, such as sociologist Nicholas A. Christakis (2019) in his book *Blueprint: The Evolutionary Origins of a Good Society*. Christakis (2019:xxi) observes that: "For too long, in my opinion, the scientific community has been overly focused on the dark side of our biological heritage: our capacity for tribalism, violence, selfishness, and cruelty. The bright side has been denied the attention it deserves."

Christakis (2019:xxi) summarizes the thesis that he develops in his book:

“Natural selection has shaped our lives as social animals, guiding the evolution of what I call a “social suite” of features priming our capacity for love, friendship, cooperation, learning, and even our ability to recognize the uniqueness of other individuals. Despite all the trappings and artifacts of modern invention— our tools, agriculture, cities, nations— we carry within us innate proclivities that reflect our natural social state, a state that is, as it turns out, primarily good, practically and even morally. The bright side, or social suite, would apparently foster a nonviolent and peaceful society, although it would not necessarily completely exclude the converse. (As another example of an author considering both the dark and the bright sides of human nature, rather than championing of one or the other side, see the book *The Goodness Paradox: The Strange Relationship Between Virtue and Violence in Human Evolution* by primatologist Richard Wrangham 2019. Also see Eisler 2011, Eisler and Fry 2019, Kohn 1990, and de Waal 1992, 2009. For useful background on such matters see Fuentes 2012, Milam 2019, Perry 2015, and Sahlins 2008, and also other sources previously mentioned in connection with human nature).

The presupposition that human aggression is simply biologically determined, inevitable, and irrevocable has extremely serious implications and consequences that can be very dangerous. It can be used to promote and justify war; diminishes human moral responsibility for war; discourages peace activism; provides a rationalization for the rampant, rapacious, and belligerent militarism of the U.S. military-industrial-media-academic complex; prioritizes militarism and warfare over nonviolent alternatives, such as dispute resolution through diplomacy, negotiation, mediation, or arbitration; becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy facilitating war; and perpetuates military profiteering with the absurd waste of resources that could be far better used for more constructive life-enhancing purposes such as advancing human rights which in turn would reduce violence and war (e.g., Andreas 2004). Such considerations are why I candidly recognize Hobbesian anthropologists as apologists and propagandists for war (Sponsel 2015:627-628). Clearly, many Hobbesians suffer from confirmation bias, and thereby help facilitate militarism, as well as sell popular books which indoctrinate the public, many of whom also suffer from confirmation bias. Bookstores often devote a section to war, but not to peace.

Militarism is described by Bucholz and Lalgee (2008:1219):

Death undergirds and animates the organizations that pursue it—known as armies—and the individuals who engage in it—called soldiers.... Because armies serve as instruments of death, a point that cannot be overemphasized, and because of their size and the extent and manner in which they command the loyalties of their societies, armies are unique among the organizations of human society. Because soldiers deal, sooner or later, in their mind or in practical experience, with large-scale death, their occupation is different from all others in society.

War, however, is often a very vague idea, perhaps in many cases purposefully so to avoid actually facing its horrific realities. Yet to be usefully considered, war needs to be explicitly, systematically, and carefully defined and analyzed (Creswell 2010:23, Galaty 2010:2). Anthropologist David Levinson (1994:183) defines war as “a form of human conflict between politically autonomous communities using organized force and weapons, and killing of the enemy.” Here are some other definitions illustrating the range of variation. “War is the legal condition which equally permits two or more hostile groups to carry on a conflict by armed force” (Wright 1964:7). “War is armed aggression for political goals between or within nation-states involving a military sector (separate from a civilian one) with 50,000 troops and 1,000 combat dead” (Barash 1991:32, 82-83). “War is large-scale violent conflict between organized groups that are governments or that aim to establish governments” (Glossop 1994:9). “War, then, is armed conflict between states or nations, or between identified and organized groups of significant size and character, and can include armed hostility which verges on actual conflict and which typically sponsors proxy conflicts” (Grayling 2017:9). Although there is some overlap among the above definitions of war, each emphasizes somewhat different stipulations such as political, weapons, military, government, and large-scale.

If war is defined too broadly, such as conflating it with interpersonal violence like homicide, then it can be fallaciously reduced to an inevitable manifestation of human nature and be considered ubiquitous in time and space (e.g., Chagnon 1988, Keeley 1996). As Fry (2015:614) cautions: “The way in which war is defined has direct relevance for answering questions about its origin, frequency, and distribution.”

Confusing feuding and war is problematic too. Most researchers view feuding and war as qualitatively distinct phenomena (Boehm 1984, Fry 2015:614, Otterbein 1968, 1970, 1996:494, 2004, 2008, Sponsel 1998,

2015:626). For example, feuding usually involves kin groups, whereas war usually does not (Otterbein 2006). As Creswell (2010:23) astutely asserts:

Many theories attempt to account for the causes and prevalence of violence. This multiplicity of explanations suggests that the notions of violence, aggression, conflict, and war need to be carefully differentiated and distinguished, analyzed, and then compared, rather than simplistically conflated into a single construct, as has been done historically. (For more on blood feuds see Antonia Young 2010 and the many publications of Keith L. Otterbein. Also, see Barash 2010a).

On the other hand, if war is defined too narrowly, as in Barash's definition above, then it becomes restricted to nation states. Thus, whether or not a society, like for example the Yanomami, engages in war depends on how broadly or narrowly it is defined. That in turn may reflect more confirmation bias, or some other bias, than anything else. Furthermore, one may wonder about the motives of the author in either case. However, frequently an author does not even define war, thereby avoiding the complexities and nuances required for an adequate definition.

Philosopher Michael Gelvin (1994:22) provides further critical analysis for the concept of war. He writes that "War is a vast and violent struggle between the we and the they with historical significance and communal values, organized on rational principles and exacting sacrifice from its heroic participants in a horrific game whose goal is victory for what is ours and defeat for what is theirs." Gelvin identifies the essence of war as hatred, love, pride, and freedom. He identifies the elements of war as vast, organized, communal, historical, sacrificial, violent, game, horrific, and heroic. (Also, see Grayling 2017, and Boggs and Pollard 2007).

Incidentally, the element of horrific is shockingly illustrated in the book *War Surgery in Afghanistan and Iraq: A Series of Cases, 2003-2007* (Nessen, Lounsbury, and Hetz 2008). If only every president and member of Congress in the U.S. were to examine the war injury photos in this book, then there might be fewer wars! Moreover, war can have devastating impacts on the innocent civilian population, noncombatants, or the euphemism of so-called collateral damage. Hollywood movies and national holidays in the U.S. rarely consider the real horrors of war, instead celebrating the heroism and other aspects, a partial and grossly misleading and distorting consideration of war (e.g., Boggs and Pollard 2007). Also, the impact on innocent civilians is usually ignored.

Journalist Chris Hedges (2003:10), a witness in the front lines of wars in the Middle East and Central America for 15 years, asserts that: “War makes the world understandable, a black and white tableau of them and us. It suspends thought, especially self-critical thought.... And tragically war is sometimes the most powerful way in human society to achieve meaning.” Othering, active derogatory discrimination rendering us versus them, can be a dangerous dehumanizing pursuit, a major facilitator of genocide, such as in Nazi Germany, former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Cambodia, and Myanmar (e.g., Kapuscinsky 2018, Smith 2011, Staub 1989).

In *War Gives Us Meaning* Hedges (2003) argues that war is essentially state sanctioned mass murder, including of innocent civilians, facilitated by dehumanizing the enemy. This immorality and criminality can be tolerated only by creating a mythical reality for justification—the cause and the means are just, he argues. Heroic action is celebrated by ignoring the sensory reality of hell experienced by the soldier. It is all a lie! Profits are hidden. The public is misinformed, misguided, and uncritical. Critics are silenced. (Also see Hedges 2013, Junger 2011, Solomon 2005).

Hedges discusses the American war in Vietnam (1959-1975), noting that President Lyndon B. Johnson, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, and others realized that the war could not be won and that the U.S. should withdraw seven years before the end. In the interim, 50,000 U.S. soldiers and many more Vietnamese were killed! In my opinion, the big lies involved should have been cause for a trial for crimes against humanity in the International Criminal Court. The same applies to the American war in Iraq launched with falsehoods about Saddam Hussein’s weapons of mass destruction.

Affirming Hedges assertion that war is lies, a December 9, 2019, report by Craig Whitlock and others at the Washington Post newspaper exposed and documented the fact that for decades U.S. presidents have lied to the American people about the progress of wars (cf., Rampton and Stauber 2003). Accordingly, lies should be included in Gelvin’s list of the elements of war, at least in the case of the recent history of America’s lethal habit of belligerent militarism. (Also, see Andreas 2004, Gonzalez, et al., 2019, Lutz 2010, Model 2005, Rampton 2003, and Solomon 2005).

At the same time, some would point to the beneficial functions of war as promoting group integration; distracting from other unresolved problems; elevating people beyond the trivia of daily life to glory; giving purpose, meaning, and a reason for living; and communicating a message through violence to the enemy. War is good for business too, especially the enormous weapons industry and other means of war profiteering (cf., Butler 1935). However, an

economy in which the weapons industry is a major component simply cannot facilitate peace (Fox 2014:225). Such matters of militarism are reinforced by what appears to be a usually unconscious presupposition called warism; namely, that war is justifiable in principle and in many actual cases (Cady 2010a). (Also, see Gusterson and Besteman 2009, Lutz 2010).

It is also noteworthy that in the very midst of war on the frontlines there are nonviolent heroes saving many lives. An outstanding example is the unaligned humanitarian White Helmets (Syria Civil Defense) in the terrible civil war in Syria. Since 2014, they number more than 3,000 individuals. More than 200 of them have been killed. These courageous volunteers pursue urban search and rescue operations and medical evacuations in response to government bombings of cities within the opposition-controlled areas of Syria. They are funded by multiple Western countries.

While many wars are started by political leaders of nation states, conveniently they themselves do not fight on the battlefield. Instead, the troops on the ground suffer the casualties, including many with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder which can be a persistent long-term condition. Nevertheless, ultimately the military personnel on the ground, in the air, and aboard the ships pull the trigger or push the button, unlike conscientious objectors. The Cree singer Buffy Sainte-Marie from Canada affirms this in her song *The Universal Soldier* (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VGWsGyNsw00>). It might have been more precisely called the universal killer.

Barash, Gelvin, Hedges, and others are thinking within the framework of the nation state and civil wars of recent history (cf., Keegan 1993). Until recent decades, anthropologists have tended to concentrate almost exclusively on non-state societies, so-called bands, tribes, and chiefdoms (e.g., Bodley 2019, Gonzalez, et al., 2019:16, Sanders 2008, Strathern and Stewart 2008:75). In such societies interpersonal and intergroup aggression may involve blood feuding, often with the tactics of ambush and raiding. If feuding is distinguished from war, then anthropologists have much less to say about war, and especially in state societies, although that has been changing in recent decades (Furani and Rabinowitz 2011, Gonzalez, et al., 2019, Gusterson 2007, Gusterson and Besteman 2009, Ferguson 2003, Lutz 2001, Nagengast 1994, Nordstrom 1997, Nordstrom and Robben 1995, Simons 1999). At the same time, states may have a significant influence on the character of so-called tribal warfare, along with its form, frequency, and intensity (Ferguson 1992a, Ferguson and Whitehead 1992).

Such considerations are critical. For example, for several decades in various publications Chagnon (1968, 1988, 2013) asserted that not only do the

Yanomami have chronic endemic tribal warfare, but that they are even our contemporary ancestors, and their case affirms that war was a causal factor throughout cultural evolution. (Such assertions will be critically analyzed here in Chapter 4, and previously were in Sponsel 1998, 2010).

Fox (2014:8-17) exposes these myths about war: history is about war; the great leader is a great warrior; wars solve human problems and advance interests; wars defend cherished values; wars define nations and peoples; and humans are innately warlike. Fox (2014:xvii) also affirms that “war is fundamentally immoral,” thus it should not be considered a cherished value. This judgement seems substantiated, if one considers that many killed in war are entirely innocent civilians including women and children.

Returning to peace studies in the general sense, the concept of just war which raises the issue of the morality and ethics of war has evolved over more than 1,500 years. Certainly the concept is as significant as it is interesting, but it remains problematic and debated, although much more so in practice than in theory (Burns 2010, Hallett 2008, Cady 2010a, Zook 2010). It is also neglected, if not completely ignored, by terrorists, and in some cases, states responding to them (Zook 2010:551). It was totally ignored in the case of bombing cities during World War II like the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki (Burns 2010:363). It continues to be neglected or ignored to this day in wars in Afghanistan, Syria, Yemen, and elsewhere.

Philosopher Donald A. Wells (1991:21) perceptively reveals that: “The moral problem of war is that it obligates us to do abroad what we have established is criminal to do at home: to kill neighbors whom we have never met, to destroy their homes, desecrate their national treasures, plunder their natural resources, and hold their innocent men, women, and children hostage. War entails that we engage in acts that expose the innocent to hunger, disease, wounds, and death.” The subject of child victims of war is much neglected (Schwebel 2010). Philosopher Paul Christopher (1999:95) observes that: “The moral prohibition against killing other human beings is overridden when they are engaged in the war effort as combatants.” For instance, there is the paradox of soldiers who identify themselves as Christians, yet do not truly follow Jesus Christ as the Prince of Peace (True 2010).

Just cause, or ends, encompass a just need for war; legitimate authority to launch a war; the right intention; the likelihood of success and emergent peace; and that it should be the very last resort. Just means in fighting war encompass proportionate action; immunity of innocent civilians; immunity of persons who kill; weaponry rules; absence of malevolent means; humane treatment of prisoners of war; and no reprisals (Cady 2010a: 352-534). The

just war theory also applies to the post-war period with honoring human rights, types of punishment, compensation, and rehabilitation. In short, just war theory has a very long history and is quite complicated, the latter only alluded to here because of space limitations. Its application in practice is often deficient, to say the least. (See Fox 2014:105-134 for a detailed evaluation of the moral arguments against war).

Whether a war is just in ends and means, however, may be in the eye of the beholder. For instance, during the Gulf War (1990-1991) U.S. President George H.W. Bush stated that: "We know that this is a just war, and we know that, God willing, this is a war we will win." The President of Iraq, Saddam Hussein, said that "We are being faithful to the values which God almighty has inspired in us." Also, the Wehrmacht, the armed forces of Nazi Germany, wore belt buckles with the words "Gott mit Uns" ("God with Us" in English). In such cases of opposing sides in a war claiming that God is on their side, Fox (2014:113) wonders if God is at war with himself!

A related issue is the transparent and full accounting of war which is generally hidden. The costs are direct and indirect, monetary and other kinds, and likewise with the benefits (see Fox 2014:17-30). Furthermore, all sides need to be considered, to be completely truthful and transparent. Needless to say, this ideal is seldom approximated in practice (Hedges 2003, Moyers 2012, Nessen, et al., 2008, Watson Institute 2020). In the prolonged war in Afghanistan, the American media attends far more to the deaths of Americans than Afghans. Yet Afghans also have family and other acquaintances, achievements, stories, hopes, dreams, and human rights.

The fact that theological, philosophical, and legal deliberations about just war have a history in the West extending back at least 1,500 years reflects the realization that war is ultimately a choice, one that involves deciding under what conditions it is absolutely necessary to pursue war, and if so, then the choice of how to pursue it as humanely as possible, both just ends and just means. Such matters and issues have also been considered in Buddhist, Hindu, and Islamic societies, among others (Zook 2010:547-548). These facts would seem to be yet another challenge to the presupposition of Hobbesians that war is simply an inevitable manifestation of human nature, and therefore unavoidable and necessarily acceptable. While conflicts or disputes may arise between societies and nations as well as individuals and groups, the conscious choice can be made to resolve them nonviolently in various ways, such as withdrawal, diplomacy, negotiation, mediation, or arbitration. Ultimately, it is primarily a matter of values, available methods, and commitment.

On the other hand, war realism is the idea that war is completely independent of any morality. Cady (2010a:552) writes that: “For the realist, war is simply a fact of nature, neither right nor wrong, so the best course of action in war is guided by expediency, not concerns about good and evil; in war, one should win first and concern oneself with morality only after the war is over.”

The UNESCO Constitution (November 16, 1945) states: “That since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed.” Thus, it is crucial that thinking about war and peace be well informed, rational, objective, systematic, penetrating, and critical. This has most serious practical implications and ramifications. For instance, beyond the Iraq War dead, involving innocent civilians as well as military personnel, millions of people including refugees are still suffering in the Middle East, America, and elsewhere because of the misinformation, if not just plain lies, that Saddam Hussein was developing weapons of mass destruction. The legacy of this misinformation involves terrorism through the horrific tragedy of 9/11 and beyond to this day, and likely well into the future.

A related matter is national security. A realist conception of national security is the defense of a country’s territory from foreign invasion and occupation, of strategic raw materials and economic markets, and of the country’s social and political values (Barnaby 1988:42, 210). A liberal conception of national security is more holistic: “True security rests on: a supportive and sustainable ecological base, spiritual as well as material well-being, trust and reliance on one’s neighbors, and justice and understanding in a disarmed world” (Barnaby 1988:212). Like other distinctions already discussed, this has far reaching implications, ramifications, and consequences. Ideas influence actions, for better or worse.

Beyond the usual meaning of national security, however, there are far more threats to security at the individual level. For instance, various estimates are that 4,000 individual Americans have been killed from terrorism in the 20th and 21st centuries. Yet in the U.S. far more deaths result from other causes annually with estimates of 500,000 from cancer, 45,000 lack of health care, 40,000 auto accidents (17,000 of them drunk drivers), 40,000 AIDS, 34,000 seasonal flu, 30,000 gun shots, and 9,000 food poisoning. In short, actual homeland security involves far more deaths than from wars and terrorism, yet these other threats to individual security are grossly neglected, especially by recent federal governments.

Another example is the horrific Coronavirus (COVID-19) global pandemic of 2020 which should make it obvious that health care and related medical research are far more critical for national security than the military and its asso-

ciated industries, if priority is afforded to life over war fever and profiteering. The health care system in the U.S. was sorely ill prepared, given the greater priority previously afforded to the military, even though warnings about eventual pandemics as a threat to national security had been sounded by intelligence agencies and others for many years. The difference is in prioritizing life destroying activities, instead of life-enhancing activities. Most unfortunately, in the U.S. the full capacity of the military has not been activated to respond to the national emergency and national security threat of the Coronavirus pandemic in the way its components have occasionally responded with humanitarian assistance to tsunami victims and other natural catastrophies in many parts of the world. There can be life-enhancing functions of the military.

Consider the fact that, in America, nearly half of annual tax revenues fund the military, while health research and care are grossly underfunded. What would be the benefits for Americans if even only 10% of the military budget were allocated instead to medical research? The fact that the three largest industries in the world are the military (including weapons sales), illicit drugs, and oil helps explain a lot. This also reflects poorly on the associated world views, values, and attitudes.

Perpetual war is priceless! The cost to the U.S. taxpayers of a single M1 Abrams tank is \$6,000,000, and that of one F1 Fighter Jet is \$18,000,000. Note that so-called realists and idealists, the political ideological distinction discussed previously, would have very different monetary priorities. Ultimately, the Hobbesian view of human nature helps generate grossly disproportionate economic expenditures for the military. This is the issue of guns versus butter that General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Europe during World War II, later worried about in his 1961 farewell address to the American nation as president wherein he worried about the development of what he identified as the military-industrial complex.

This complex is succinctly exposed by Arden Bucholz and Rennison Lalgée (2008:1218):

Key features here include sophisticated weapons that are continually becoming obsolete and constantly replaced by the next generation, an elaborate publicity system, a burgeoning federal defense budget, military contractors in the private sector, and the flow of retired officers from active duty to defense contractors, lobbyist groups, and congressional committees.

They also recognize that since the Cold War the increase in the defense budget requires searching for, identifying, or inventing a threat to national security. This could be rogue states, President George W. Bush's axis of evil (Iran, Iraq, North Korea), global terrorism, or militant Islamic extremist groups (Bucholz and Lalgee 2008:1226). Thought, discourse, and policies are simplified, reduced to good versus evil, and us versus them. There is no complexity, subtlety, or nuance (c.f., Andreas 2004, Churchill and Glenndinning 2003). For instance, it is quickly forgotten, and even obscured, that Osama bin Laden, who was behind 9-11, was once an ally, trained, and funded by the U.S. as a mujahideen fighter against the Soviets in their war in Afghanistan.

If such enemy threats were not genuine, still they would need to be invented or constructed to perpetuate the war machine. Fox (2014:121) cautions: "That the war system is self-perpetuating, that it contains a momentum of its own which, if permitted, will hold any society hostage to its dictates, should be evident to anyone who contemplates the massive military budgets prevailing in the world today." (For more detail on the military-industrial complex see Gonzalez, et al., 2019, Hooks 2008, and Ritter and McLauchian 2008).

A recent example of perpetual war is the American war of revenge in Afghanistan, going on for 19 years by 2020. (See, for example, the website of the Watson Institute's Cost of War Project 2020 at Brown University). The revenge war that America started in Afghanistan in 2001 reached its peak in 2013 with the involvement of more than 150,000 U.S. and allied troops from more than 50 countries. Although the coalition was international, it was in response to the horrific terrorist attack in America of 9/11. In Afghanistan some 2,500 military persons were killed while over 20,000 were wounded. Furthermore, over 111,000 Afghans have been killed in that war, including civilians, soldiers, and militants. The war has cost the U.S. taxpayers more than \$2,000,000,000. All of these and other statistics are probably underestimates. The war has declined, but is not yet over, this after nearly two decades, surely proving that war is no solution. The previous American war in Vietnam was also a quagmire, to say the least.

Many people who have experienced war describe it as suffering through hell (e.g., Hedges 2003, Junger 2011). Even after a war like Vietnam is declared ended, large numbers of survivors, civilians as well as veterans, continue to suffer physical, psychological, social, economic, and spiritual trauma (e.g., Figley 2008). Post-traumatic stress disorder is just one symptom among many, although it may well be the most serious and enduring. Fox (2014:24) also mentions "moral injury" thereby alluding to the natural aversion to killing.

It must be emphasized repeatedly that civilian casualties in wars are often neglected, while the euphemism collateral damage is deployed to obscure the horrific realities they suffer. Galtung (2010b:336) reveals that: "The civilian proportion of those killed in warfare goes from about 10 percent in the early twentieth century to about 90 percent in the late twentieth century." Yet the means of just war are supposed to minimize harm to civilians, although often indiscriminate killing even occurs purposefully (Brandsh 2020). Galtung's statistics contradict some of Steven Pinker's (2011) misconceptions and misinformation in his popular book *The Better Angels of Our Nature* (cf., Ferguson 2013a,b).

The war may have made many Americans feel good about their revenge against Al-Qaeda and the Taliban, but obviously it has not achieved peace, democracy, and prosperity for Afghanistan. This reflects not only the immorality and futility of war, but its irrationality, if not insanity. The path to justice, reconciliation, and peace is not war, but sustained genuine diplomatic negotiation and mediation by the international community. The United Nations has also been a failure in this case. One would think that, by the 21st century, civilization would be more civilized, and war would be considered a pathological and obsolete folly.

The last basic concept to be considered here for peace studies is structural violence (Galtung 1969). This refers to systemic, institutional, and indirect violence. It includes unequal access to resources and power. It seriously inhibits the realization of human potential and diminishes the quality of life for its victims. For example, poverty severely degrades health and reduces longevity. Among factors involved in structural violence are racism, sexism, ageism, classism, ethnocentrism, religious prejudice, colonialism, and imperialism. Kathleen M. Weigert (2008) says that structure refers to patterned relationships among components of a social system. In peace studies the concept of structural violence calls attention beyond direct, personal, physical violence to in addition wider systemic and usually unrecognized or hidden forces. This is the significance of the concept. Among other anthropologists, David Graeber (2004) researched and protested structural violence in America and beyond. One relevant adage is that, if you want peace, then work for justice.

The above considerations clearly point to the fact that war and peace are inherently, and thus inescapably, controversial, moral, ethical, and political issues, whether or not scientists, scholars, and others recognize or admit it. Some consciously hide this fact under the pretense of objectivity, whereas others openly acknowledge and grapple with it, and thereby are far more objective (cf., Galaty 2010:5). Nevertheless, as anthropologists

and others engage with war studies and/or peace studies they bring their own individual philosophical, ideological, political, historical, cultural, and perhaps religious as well as moral, ethical, and psychological baggage that can never be completely discarded or transcended, no matter how much they strive ideally for neutrality and objectivity as scientists and scholars (Sponsel 1996c).

So far this chapter concentrates on trying to provide a fairly thorough overview of peace studies. However, next peace studies will be briefly related to the nonkilling paradigm and anthropology. The following discussion is brief because the rest of the book considers these two subjects in great detail.

Nonkilling

It is very rare that an extraordinarily insightful and visionary individual asks a question which is so very profound that it generates an entire new field of inquiry, and sometimes even a paradigm shift as a whole new conceptual framework for scientific, scholarly, and practical engagement with some phenomena (see Bhaneja 2008). This is exactly what political scientist Glenn D. Paige (2009a,b) initiated when he repeatedly asked in various venues: Is a nonkilling society possible?

Paige (2009a:22) offers this meticulous definition of a nonkilling society: “Thus life in a nonkilling society is characterized by no killing of humans and no threat to kill, neither technologies nor justifications for killing, and no social conditions that depend upon threat or use of lethal force.”

Paige’s elemental, pivotal, and provocative question was formulated and explored in his 2002 pioneering book titled *Nonkilling Global Political Science* and its Second Edition in 2009. So far this seminal book has been translated into 28 languages, one measure of the recognition of its global meaning and significance. Moreover, these and many other books are generously available free on the website of the Center for Global Nonkilling (<https://nonkilling.org>). Paige started the Center for Global Nonviolence in 1988, and it became the Center for Global Nonkilling in 2009.

For a clearly affirmative anthropological answer to Paige’s question see the extensive documentation over several decades in Baszarkiewicz and Fry 2008, Bonta 1993, 2008, Bonta 2020, Dennen 1995, Fry 2006, 2007, 2013, 2015, Howell and Willis 1989, Melko 1973, Montagu 1978, Sponsel 2015, 2018, Sponsel and Gregor 1994, plus subsequent chapters in the present

book. These readily available publications have been continually neglected by Hobbesians who apparently are ignorant of them not having done thorough research, avoiding them because of their unconscious confirmation bias, or simply disingenuous and dishonest. In any case, they are failing to honor the common standards of science and scholarship. Even worse, many are public intellectuals publishing popular books which are misleading naïve readers (e.g., Pinker 2011, Wilson 2012). However, they help fuel the military-industrial-media-academic complex as well as profit from war mindset royalties.

Paige (2009a:129) stresses the empirical fact that, while humans are capable of both killing and nonkilling, more than 95 per cent of humans are not killers. Furthermore, he highlights the fact that nonkilling capabilities are daily realized in a very broad and diverse range of social, cultural, and historical situations and institutions. For instance, on a daily basis medical personnel, police, and fire fighters are among the populace saving and enhancing lives and communities. The relatively rare cases of gross misconduct only affirm the commonplace.

Psychological research demonstrates that normal humans are strongly averse to killing other humans, and in the military must be systematically trained and rigorously conditioned to do so. Nevertheless, even then, many military persons refrain from killing (Christie and Evans Pim 2012, Grossman 2008, Hughbank and Grossman 2013; cf., Hillman 2004). Furthermore, many soldiers who have killed in war suffer emotional problems, often long-term (Kiernan 2020). Clearly the human brain did not evolve to generate killing other humans. These facts alone should refute the presumption that killing is an inevitable expression of human nature. Indeed, it is more likely that nonkilling is human nature. Otherwise, many soldiers who kill would not afterwards experience serious and often long-term emotional disturbances.

Objective scrutiny of the prehistoric and historical records disproves the idea of any universality and inevitability of war as human nature (Bonta 1993, Bonta and Fry 2020, Ferguson 2002, 2006, 2008, 2013a, Fry 2006, 2007, 2010, 2013, 2015, Melko 1973). War is not normal.

To be candid, war can be considered, in effect, systematic mass killing, and some would say systematic mass murder (e.g., Hedges 2003). This is not by any means to disparage military persons who courageously serve their country honorably risking their lives for causes that they believe in and making enormous sacrifices. They certainly deserve the annual Memorial Day and Veterans Day celebrations in the U.S. and much more. I am not anti-military per se, but I am anti-war, principally because of the innocent

civilians who suffer and are killed. This is to forthrightly recognize reality; war is systematic mass murder. Also, see Levison (2014) and websites such as Veterans for Peace and Iraq Veterans Against War.

Paige (2009a) systematically and critically challenges the assumption that killing is an inevitable manifestation of human nature, the human condition, and/or social life. Thereby he critically challenges the very foundational and pivotal acceptance of war and other forms of violence in society by most of science, academia, government, politics, religion, and other sectors of contemporary life (cf., Barash and Webel 2018, Fox 2014, Gat 2008, Wood 2015). Thus, in the introduction to Paige's book, James A. Robinson writes: "The book you hold in your hand, when read widely and taken seriously, will subvert certain globally prevailing values and the institutions that shape those values" (Paige 2009a:13). Paige (2009a:78-79) points out that, while the nonkilling paradigm is value-laden, so is the currently dominant killing paradigm of political science and related perspectives. He also points to the potential for a productive interaction between the normative and empirical.

Paige (2009a:78-85) identifies the revolutionary potential of his scientific paradigm shift with its normative, factual, theoretical, applied, educational, methodological, and institutional components. While his book naturally and skillfully concentrates on political science given his profession, it has far broader ramifications and implications as evidenced in the numerous and diverse books offered in the website of the Center for Global Nonkilling and the corresponding research committees.

Paige challenges scientists and scholars to research both the actualities and the potentialities of nonkilling. Furthermore, Paige (2009a:74-75) promotes serious thinking and research through a set of secondary questions for logical analysis: What are the conditions, causes, and consequences of killing, nonkilling, the transition from killing to nonkilling, and the transition from nonkilling to killing?

Paige argues that killing is the primary source and sustainer of war and other forms of aggression. He critically challenges the hegemony of what I recognize as the military-industrial-media-academic complex by calling for liberation from killing through no less than a radical paradigm transformation from the political ideology of killing to that of nonkilling (e.g., Gonzalez, et al., 2019, Pilisuk and Pellegrini 2010).

Paige (2009a:127) perceptively asserts:

The time has come to set forth human killing as a problem to be solved rather than to accept enslavement by it as a condition to be

endured forever. The deliberate killing of human beings, one by one, mass by mass, and the many machines, has reached a stage of pathological self-destruction. Killing that has been expected to liberate, protect, and enrich has become instead a source of insecurity, impoverishment, and threat to human and planetary survival.

Independent confirmation of Paige's evaluation results from the World Health Organization grounded in three years of research consulting 160 experts from many different countries. The survey concluded that human violence is a preventable disease and should be treated as a public health epidemic (Krug et al., 2002).

António Guterres, the ninth Secretary-General of the United Nations, who took office on January 1, 2017, made an extraordinary statement during the global pandemic crisis on March 23, 2020:

Our world faces a common enemy: COVID-19. The virus does not care about ethnicity or nationality, faction or faith. It attacks all, relentlessly. Meanwhile, armed conflict rages on around the world. The most vulnerable — women and children, people with disabilities, the marginalized and the displaced — pay the highest price. They are also at the highest risk of suffering devastating losses from COVID-19. Let's not forget that in war-ravaged countries, health systems have collapsed. Health professionals, already few in number, have often been targeted. Refugees and others displaced by violent conflict are doubly vulnerable. The fury of the virus illustrates the folly of war. End the sickness of war and fight the disease that is ravaging our world. That is why today, I am calling for an immediate global ceasefire in all corners of the world. It is time to put armed conflict on lockdown and focus together on the true fight of our lives.

This profound declaration recognizes that war is a choice, neither inevitable nor necessary, and a dangerous folly. What a radical thought— that people can choose to not kill! (See the full statement titled "The fury of the virus illustrates the folly of war": <https://www.un.org/en/un-coronavirus-communications-team/fury-virus-illustrates-folly-war>).

It is noteworthy that in a statement at the Human Rights Council on March 12, 2020, Christophe Barbey, the representative of the Center for Global Nonkilling at the United Nations in Geneva, Switzerland, recognized the Republic of San Marino as the first nonkilling country in the world. Apparently during the last five years there were no murders, suicides, or dead-

ly traffic accidents in the entire country. Again, this provides another affirmation to Paige's key question.

Returning directly to Paige, the website of his Center for Global Nonkilling clearly demonstrates that, in recent years, his largely new perspective has generated increasing attention, research, publications, affirmation, acclaim, and practical initiatives in peace studies, and far beyond. Future decades will reveal whether the accelerating momentum and manifold ramifications of his potentially revolutionary new paradigm continues and its practical as well as scientific, academic, social, political, and historical significance.

Excellent overviews of Paige's nonkilling paradigm are provided by Balwant Bhaneja 2008 and Joám Evans Pim 2010a. Aspects of Paige's work are discussed further in subsequent chapters of this book.

Anthropology

Peace studies and anthropology are complementary in many ways. Both have interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary affinities as evidenced by their history (e.g., Tax 1956). Furthermore, they share global thinking, anthropology because of its concerns with human prehistory and evolution, non-human primates, ethnology, and cross-cultural studies. The breadth and diversity characteristic of American anthropology can contribute to peace studies (cf., Barth, et al., 2005, Bodley 2020, Kuklick 2008). Collectively anthropologists holistically consider all aspects of humanity in all times and places from both biological and cultural perspectives.

Anthropology is like the astronomy of the social sciences and humanities whereas individual disciplines like political science, sociology, and history are far more narrowly focused, albeit each with its own virtues, achievements, and contributions. Civilization, or the state form of sociopolitical organization, evolved only about 5,000 years ago. The nation state system began developing only around 300 years ago. In contrast, anthropology's diachronic dimension extends back some six million years to the ultimate beginnings of humankind. This long period was characterized by mobile hunter-gatherers or foragers representing 99% of human existence on the planet. Of supreme importance is that it was during this prolonged period that human nature evolved. Moreover, most mobile foragers are largely nonviolent, while war is absent to very rare (cf., Fry and Soderberg 2013, 2014, Gat 1999, Hames 2019, Kelly 2000, Provan 2013:41-56). Again, this should abolish any idea that war is an inevitable expression of human nature.

Anthropologists also consider cultural diversity and relativity as reflected in more than 7,000 extant cultures, and surely many times more in prehistory. Thus, so-called war varies tremendously among the cultures of the Apache, Cheyenne, Dani, Iroquois, Jivaro, Kayapo, Mae Enga, Maori, Nuer, Tausug, Waorani, Yanomami, and Zulu. Furthermore, cultural differences, including the component of religion, can be involved in violence, some with ethnocide and genocide, such as in Myanmar (Burma) with the Rohingya and in China with the Tibetans and Uighurs (e.g., Sponsel 2000). Another aspect of cultural diversity is the existence of societies that traditionally are relatively nonviolent and do not engage in war, such as the well-documented Semai of Malaysia (Dentan 1968).

At the same time, anthropology can attest to the neglected underlying unity of humankind through all of its subfields (biological anthropology, archaeology, cultural anthropology, linguistic anthropology, and applied anthropology). Numerous cross-cultural universals exist and are arguably a manifestation of human nature (Brown 1991, 1996). Human unity merits far more attention because the emphasis is usually only on diversity. This is important because the denial of humanity, dehumanization, and othering are often components of violence and war. Even genocide and ethnocide (Hinton 2001, 2002, Kapuscinski 2018, Montagu and Matson 1983, Smith 2011, Staub 1989). What humans have in common, as well as what differences distinguish them, are both important to research, document, understand, respect, and appreciate. Such considerations can help counter ethnocentrism, racism, sexism, and other prejudices. A world that recognizes the underlying unity of humankind and is also safe for the apparent diversity surely would be far more peaceful.

Anthropology can scrutinize commonplace beliefs, philosophical concerns, scientific and academic theories, and sociopolitical problems and issues through its evolutionary, diachronic, cross-species, cross-cultural, and ethnographic resources. This is particularly important when it comes to ideas about human nature, war, and peace (Fry 2006, 2013, 2015). Anthropologists have also facilitated a broader cultural understanding of conflict, conflict resolution, and mediation (Bonta 1996, Fry and Bjorkqvist 1997, Greenhouse 1985, Kemp and Fry 2004, Kyrou and Rubinstein 2008).

The relevance of peace studies for anthropology is also interesting and important to consider. Peace studies can be a catalyst for rethinking much of anthropology, not the least of which is its history. For instance, the Bureau of American Ethnology was established by the U.S. Congress after a period of severe warfare between indigenous peoples and colonists. Its

primary purpose was to provide reliable information for the U.S. government to more effectively administer the indigenous populations as invading colonists (Hinsley 1979). Much of the development of professional ethics in anthropology is related to controversies and scandals involving war (Fluher-Lobban 2002). In an article in *The Nation*, Franz Boas (1919) exposed several American anthropologists pursuing field research in Central America who were also working as spies for the U.S. government (Price 2000, Silverstein 2004). Ashley Montagu (1972) was an important influence on the development of the UNESCO Statement on Race in 1950. The anthropology of human rights is another arena meriting far more attention (Goodale 2009a,b, Messer 1993, Nagengast and Velez-Ibanez 2004, Nagengast and Turner 1997, Sponsel 1996b, 1997a). Noteworthy too is exemplary work with Marshallese victims of U.S. bomb testing by Holly Barker (2004) and Barbara Rose Johnston (2007). (Also, see Johnston and Barker 2008). The entire history of anthropology could be fruitfully reconsidered, scrutinized, and assessed from the perspective of involvement in war and peace matters (e.g., Gonzalez, et al., 2019, Price 2004, 2008a,b, 2016).

The field of peace studies can provide much relevant background for understanding conflicts, violence, war, and other problems and issues faced by societies and communities in the Third World and elsewhere, especially indigenous peoples, the traditional focus of ethnography. The concept of structural violence illuminates many problems concerning the violation of the human rights of indigenes and ethnic minorities (Weigert 2008). Advocacy anthropology developed to address these and other matters (Johnston 1997, Paine 1985, Sponsel 1997a,b, 2001, 2015, Wright 1988).

The concept of positive peace can facilitate a broader and more balanced approach to research and teaching about violence, war, nonviolence, and peace. This can help remedy the systemic bias in anthropology of focusing on violence and war to the neglect, or even total exclusion, of nonviolence and peace. This systemic bias can lead to distorted views of human nature, archaeology, ethnology, and ethnography, as discussed in subsequent chapters in the present book, especially Chapter 4 on the Yanomami.

Ashley Montagu, the seminal pioneer in the anthropology of peace studies, published numerous books critically challenging pseudoscientific ideas about simplistic biological determinism associated with discussions of aggression, race, ethnicity, gender, and age and corresponding prejudice and discrimination (Sponsel 2006c). (His work is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3). One of the deficiencies of sociobiology and evolutionary psychology is that they are simply irrelevant for answering most of the main

concerns of anthropology, such as the variation through space and time in the frequency and intensity of war, the absence of war in numerous societies, and the enormous diversity in the characteristics and meanings of war (Harrison 1996:561). Consideration of ecological, economic, political, social, cultural, and historical factors are far more revealing and convincing in explaining the specifics of particular wars than biology or genetics can ever be (Fry 2006, 2013, 2015, Haas 1996). Also, it is noteworthy that humans, common chimpanzees, and pygmy chimpanzees (bonobos) all share about 99% of their DNA, yet obviously they are extremely different in their behavior (c.f., Wrangham and Peterson 1996).

It should also be recognized that peace is the norm, both in a statistical sense of being the most common condition of societies, and in the moral sense of the killing of other humans being prohibited by all world religions, like the fifth of the Ten Commandments in Christianity. In contrast, war is extraordinary and abnormal, and can be considered maladaptive and even pathological (cf., Hillman 2004).

In effect, many anthropologists have explored phenomena associated with positive peace, but rarely explicitly. There is a need to more overtly identify and publicize such work. Also, there is a need for more anthropologists to publish in the periodicals of peace studies and war studies, such as the *Journal of Peace Research* as well as others like *Foreign Affairs*. Too often anthropologists publish mainly, if not exclusively, for other anthropologists, perpetuating the image that some have that anthropology is just an intellectual social club. As one student framed it, sometimes anthropology appears to be the study of esoteric aspects of exotics by eccentrics! This impression may be tested by a perusal of the programs for the annual conventions of the American Anthropological Association.

Franz Boas, Margaret Mead, and Ashley Montagu were public intellectuals as well as scientists. However, in recent decades the public intellectuals dealing with anthropological subjects usually are not anthropologists and their writings are often deficient in the subject, such as Jared Diamond (1999), Steven Pinker (2011), and Edward O. Wilson (2012). For instance, Wilson (2012:62) claims:

Our bloody nature, it can now be argued in the context of modern biology, is ingrained because group-versus-group was a principal driving force that made us what we are. In prehistory, group selection lifted hominids that became territorial carnivores to heights of solidarity, to genius, to enterprise. And to fear. Each tribe knew with justification

that if it was not armed and ready, its very existence was imperiled. Throughout history, the escalation of a large part of technology has had combat as its central purpose.

Then Wilson (2012:65) asserts:

It should not be thought that war, often accompanied by genocide, is a cultural artifact of a few societies. Nor has it been an aberration of history, a result of the growing pains of our species' maturation. Wars and genocide have been universal and eternal, respecting no particular time or culture.

Such untenable vacuous assertions would not pass a college student in an Anthropology 101 class! They are soundly refuted by much of the scientific information discussed in the present book, including this first chapter (cf., Sponsel 2018:3-4). (On public anthropology, see Borofsky 2019. Borofsky and De Lauri 2019, and the website of the Center for a Public Anthropology).

Militarization and war impact many communities and societies in the world including indigenes (Gonzalez, et al., 2019). Peace studies provides background, context, and other crucial information for ethnographic research as well as for advocacy anthropology and human rights concerns in the arenas of conflict, war, and militarization.

Peace studies can also facilitate the development of more explicit, systematic, and relevant agendas of priorities for research, teaching, advocacy, and action. This is increasingly important given the growing gravity and urgency of many of the contemporary world's social, economic, political, and environmental problems and issues, something which is only becoming far worse with global climate change (Alvarez 2017, Kaplan 1994, 2000, Lee 2009, Parenti 2011, Welzer 2017). By now there are ample publications to focus an entire course on the anthropology of nonviolence and peace to complement another separate course on the anthropology of violence and war, if the systemic bias privileging the latter two phenomena can be transcended thereby liberating minds (see, for example, Bonta 1993, Bonta and Fry 2020, Sponsel 2018). (For more on the history of anthropology in peace studies see Dentan 2012, Gonzalez, et al., 2019:1-25, Ferguson 1984, Fry 2006, Kehoe 2012, Kemp 2004, Otterbein 1999, Sponsel 1994, 2000, 2018, and Whitehead 2000).

Nonviolence and peace may appear to be rare, given the grossly disproportionate attention to violence and war of the government, media, sci-

ence, academia, and other venues as demonstrated at the beginning of this chapter. However, nonviolence and peace are just rarely recognized and pursued systematically in depth. For example, Barash (1991:33) observes that: “Based on the number of national states existing since 1815, there have been approximately 16,000 nation-years, and during this time, war has occupied ‘only’ 600 of these nation-years, or somewhat less than 4 percent of the possible total.”

Barash’s understanding is affirmed by others as well. For instance, Munoz (2010b:473) points out that: “Peace can be recognized repeatedly throughout history.” He also cautions that peace may not be absolute, full, or perfect, and it may coexist with conflict and violence (Munoz 2010b:474). He writes that: “For instance, the World Wars arguably did not directly affect a majority of places and actors around the planet: the justifications for using the term “World” for those wars is inadequate. The same applies to many other generalizations based on discourses of violence. It is thus necessary to make a special effort to deconstruct these visions that hide the multiple realities of world peace” (Munoz 2010b:475). (For some other authors with this understanding see Boulding 2000, Cartright 2008, Gittings 2012, Kurlansky 2008, and Melko 1973).

The anthropology of peace studies, and other approaches such as history, promise to offer society a greater degree of sorely needed optimism about human nature, war, and peace (e.g., Fry 2006, 2013). Also, see Boas 1938, Dentan 2012, Hebert 2010, McGowan 2014, Mead 1940, and Sponsel 2006c for the contributions to peace studies of prominent scholars in the history of anthropology. More details and additional aspects of the above subjects are discussed in Sponsel (1994a,b, 2017, 2018), as well as the following chapters in the present book.

Conclusions

Since World War II, the field of peace studies has flourished, especially in recent decades. By now it is a fully established academic field with all of the indicators of maturation, such as programs, courses, and texts as well as a substantial literature encompassing encyclopedias and journals. There are also peace research and professional organizations. However, most of this is actually focused on war rather than peace, thus it seems most appropriate to distinguish war studies and peace studies. Different conceptions of human nature, war, negative and positive peace, just war, national security, militarism, warism, war realism, and structural violence are crucial in influ-

encing an individual's considerations about war and peace. Ultimately, values as well as political ideologies are inescapably behind the differences.

Paige's nonkilling paradigm is an important component of peace studies. He carefully defines a nonkilling society, identifies a four-part logic for analysis, and in many other ways develops a solid foundation for his nonkilling paradigm, not the least of which is a website with a wealth of information containing numerous free books. His seminal book is translated into 28 languages, an indication of the reception of his paradigm as very meaningful and significant for a broad and diverse range of academics, scientists, and professions. Arguments and solid evidence from archeology, history, cultural anthropology, psychology, and other disciplines demonstrate that nonkilling societies are possible, and that war is a relatively recent and aberrant activity, instead of some eternal universal. Human nature is nonkilling. Paige's nonkilling paradigm is radical, subversive, and revolutionary, but only in many positive ways (e.g., see Swarup 2019).

Anthropology and peace studies are mutually complementary, peace studies in the broad sense encompassing both war and peace. Paige's provocative question regarding the possibility of nonkilling societies can be answered in the affirmative by empirical evidence accumulated for decades in archaeology and cultural anthropology as well as history and psychology. Nonkilling societies are not only a possibility, but an actuality. In particular, human nature evolved over several million years when societies were limited to mobile hunter-gatherers or foragers wherein war was essentially absent. The ethnographic record of cultural diversity associated with thousands of societies also refutes the simplistic reductionism of biological determinism by anachronistic Hobbesians. At the same time, peace studies can help anthropologists rethink their discipline, its history, priorities, and research agenda.

By now it should be clear that peace studies, the nonkilling paradigm, and anthropology can interact in synergy to become a very interesting and significant field for both research and teaching, here identified as nonkilling anthropology out of respect and appreciation for Paige. Subsequent chapters in this book will explore this synergy further in far more detail. Hopefully this book will encourage many others to engage in this exciting and promising new subject of nonkilling anthropology.

Chapter 2. The Actualities of a Nonkilling Society: No Delusion

“Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.” (United Nations, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, December 10, 1948, Article 3).

“The time has come to set forth human killing as a problem to be solved rather than to accept enslavement by it as a condition to be endured forever” (Paige 2002:145).

“True security rests on a supportive and sustainable ecological base, on spiritual as well as material well-being, on trust and reliance in one's neighbors, and on justice and understanding in a disarmed world” (Barnaby 1988: 212).

Is a nonkilling society possible? What are the possibilities of a nonkilling political science? These are the two elemental, central, and pivotal questions that Glenn D. Paige (2002) raises and explores in his ground breaking book which is generating a quiet but accelerating and far-reaching revolution in theory and praxis throughout the world (Bhaneja 2008, <https://nonkilling.org>). The present essay addresses these two questions and related matters from one anthropologist's perspective and cites some of the extensive literature for documentation and as sources for further information, although no attempt has been made at a thorough literature review, especially for periodicals.

The particular approach to anthropology used here needs to be clearly specified at the outset. American anthropology may be defined as the holistic scientific and scholarly study of human unity and diversity in all of its aspects throughout time and space. It encompasses the five subfields of archaeology, biological (or physical) anthropology, cultural anthropology, linguistic anthropology, and applied anthropology. In varying ways and degrees, American anthropologists share a concern for human evolution, human diversity (biological, cultural, and linguistic), culture and cultures, field-work, and comparison (especially cross-cultural). Anthropology is also unique in its scope which ranges from in depth studies of local communities

to surveys of the human species as a whole (Birx 2006, Bodley 2020, Perry 2003, Salzman and Rice 2004).

Is a nonkilling society possible? Without any hesitation, my answer is affirmative. As a political scientist, Paige pursues the framework of nation states or countries noting that today there are 195 such entities. In contrast, an anthropologist would more likely pursue the framework of cultures. Estimates of the number of extant cultures in the world today are around 7,000 (Summer Institute of Linguistics 2008). Furthermore, whereas countries typically range in age from a few decades to a few centuries, cultures are centuries to millennia old. Accordingly, examples of nonviolent and peaceful cultures can also be important evidence in answering Paige's first question in the affirmative. Such socio-cultural systems generally accord with Paige's (2002:1) definition of a nonkilling society as "... characterized by no killing of humans and no threats to kill; no weapons designed to kill humans and no justification for using them; and no conditions of society dependent upon threat or use of killing for maintenance or change."

At the same time, the logic that Paige pursues regarding the frequency of killing by humans is affirmed as well by anthropology. He argues that women seldom kill other humans, and that only a minority of men kill other humans (cf. Levinson 1994, WHO 2002). To phrase it another way, the overwhelming majority of humans have not been involved directly in any kind of killing. The Yanomami are an anthropological case in point. They were stereotyped and stigmatized in a derogatory way as "the fierce people" by Napoleon Chagnon (1968, 1992). However, if one actually scrutinizes his own ethnography (description of a culture), then it is apparent that most individuals within Yanomami society do not kill others. There is no mention of a woman killing a man or another woman. Raids and other forms of intergroup aggression are not ubiquitous in space and time by any means. Not all men from a village participate in a raid on another village. Also, Chagnon mentions that often many members of a raiding party find excuses to retreat rather than participate in the entire process (Sponsel 1998).

Other anthropologists who have conducted research with the Yanomami, some living with them for many more years than Chagnon, like Bruce Albert, Gale Goodwin Gomez, Kenneth Good, Jacques Lizot, and Alcida Ramos, have all called into serious question Chagnon's characterization of the Yanomami as the "fierce people." Apparently as a result of such authoritative criticism, Chagnon dropped that subtitle from later editions of his book, yet his characterization in the text persists anyway (Sponsel 1998). The ethnography by Chagnon together with the wealth of dozens of

other books on the Yanomami could be examined to identify a multitude of examples of nonviolent and peaceful behaviors that prevail in the daily life of most individuals and communities (see especially Dawson 2006, Ferguson 1992, 1995, Good 1991, Lizot 1985, Peters 1998, Ramos 1987, 1995, Smole 1976, Sponsel 1998, 1999, 2006c). (The Yanomami case is discussed in much more detail in Chapter 4 of the present book).

A nonkilling society is not only just a possibility as Paige theorizes, rather in reality many such societies actually exist today. The most famous one is the Semai of the Malaysian forest. They fit Paige's criteria for a nonkilling society and were first described through field research by Robert Knox Dentan (1968). Years later Clayton Robarcheck (1979, 1992, 1996, 1998a,b) independently confirmed Dentan's characterization of the Semai. Much later Clayton and Carole Robarcheck worked among the Waorani who were supposedly one of the most violent societies known, as will be discussed here later. In an ingenious comparison between the Semai and Waorani, the Robarcheck's (1992, 1998a) concluded that the worldview of each of these two cultures was the single most important influence on whether they were peaceful or warlike. Otherwise, they were very similar in many respects such as their subsistence economy.

Beyond the Semai, dozens of other nonkilling societies have been documented extensively in the anthropological record. David Fabbro (1978) published the earliest modern cross-cultural study identifying the basic attributes of existing peaceful societies which accord with Paige's criteria. The most systematic and extensive documentation of such societies is by Bruce D. Bonta (1993, 1996, 1997). He compiled an annotated bibliography of 47 cultures that are generally nonviolent and peaceful (Bonta 1993). A wealth of information on these and other aspects of this subject are archived on his encyclopedic website called "Peaceful Peoples" (<https://peacefulsocieties.uncg.edu/>). By now there are several other surveys and inventories of nonviolent and peaceful societies including those by Baszarkiewicz and Fry (2008), Bonta and Fry (2006), Melko (1973, 1984), and van der Dennen (1995). Three edited books of ethnographic case studies of nonviolent and peaceful cultures have also been published as well (Howell and Willis 1989, Montagu 1978, Sponsel and Gregor 1994). Most recently, Douglas Fry (2006, 2007) has systematically and vigorously argued with ample evidence for the human potential and actuality of nonviolence and peace.

Given this extensive documentation of nonviolent and peaceful socio-cultural systems, the only way that any author, scholar, or scientist can possibly assert that human nature is inherently murderous and warlike is by ig-

noring the ample evidence to the contrary from a multitude of diverse sources. Nevertheless, that fact has not prevented many from doing so as apologists and propagandists for warfare (Barber 1996, Cannel and Macklin 1974, Ehrenreich 1998, Feibleman 1987, Ghiglieri 1987, 1999, Guilaine and Zammit 2001, Kaplan 1994, 2000, Keeley 1996, LeBlanc and Register 2003, Otterbein 1993, 1999, 2004, Smith 2007, and Wrangham and Peterson 1996). Either they have not adequately covered the documentation that is readily available in the published literature, or they just purposefully ignore other arguments and evidence that do not fit their own ideology, theory, arguments, advocacy, and so on. In either of these two instances, their science, scholarship, and writing is seriously deficient and suspect, to say the very least (Franfurt 2005, 2006). Yet the unproven assumption that human nature is inherently murderous and warlike still dominates the majority of publications by anthropologists and others to the nearly total exclusion of any serious and systematic attention to nonviolence and peace.

Most mobile hunter-gatherer bands epitomize Paige's attributes of a nonkilling society. They are grounded in an ethos of routine cooperation, reciprocity, and nonviolent conflict resolution as documented for the San and Mbuti of Africa, Semai of Malaysia, and many others (Bonta 1993, 1996, 2008, Dentan 1968, Fry 2006, 2007, Fry and Soderberg 2013, 2014, Kelly 2000). Furthermore, for 99% of human existence, from more than two million to roughly 10,000 years ago, humans lived exclusively as mobile hunter-gatherers (Hart and Sussman 2009, Kelly 2000, Lee and DeVore 1968, Shepard 1973).

Although certainly captivating, William Golding's (1999) novel *Lord of the Flies*, which was originally published in 1954, and the ensuing two Hollywood movies based on it released in 1963 and 1990 in the contexts of the Vietnam and Gulf wars, respectively, are not by any means accurate anthropologically and otherwise as a reflection of human nature. Nevertheless, Golding's Hobbesian novel was a literary phenomenon, selling tens of millions of copies and translated into 35 languages. His book was popularized in schools and colleges, on lists of the most important novels, in theater and radio plays, and more recently through his official website. He won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1983.

In the real world, however, there is a remarkable case of six Togan boys shipwrecked on a remote island in the South Pacific in 1965 that played out in a positive way just the opposite of Golding's novel (Bregman 2020a,b). Another variant on the Hobbesian theme is the 2006 Hollywood movie called *Apocalypto* which appears to have been made to insult the Mayan people. Yet

another extremely violent film in 2008 about the Yanomami and missionaries also has a Hobbesian spin, *The Enemy of God: Yai Wanonabalewa*. Golding's novel and these films are examples of the confirmation bias regarding the dark side of human nature, or what Kehoe (2012:196) refers to as a Western hegemonic culture bound paradigm, as previously mentioned.

Returning to reality, with regard to nonlethal weapons and weapon-free societies (Paige 2002: 109, 113), it is important to note that weapons specifically designed for warfare do not appear archaeologically until very late in human prehistory, although tools employed in hunting such as a spear or a bow and arrow could easily be used to kill or injure another human being. The archaeological record does not evidence any regular warfare until relatively late in human prehistory (Ferguson 2002, 2006, Fry, 2006, 2007, Grossman 2008, Guilaine and Zammit 2001, Keegan 1993, Keeley 1996, Kelly 2000, LeBlanc and Register 2003).

Paige (2002: 101) refers to the 20th century as "the era of lethality." Anthropology, with its unique combination of temporal depth and spatial breadth offers great hope in this regard, because such widespread lethality is an extremely recent aberration in human nature and experience, judging by evidence from evolution and prehistory accumulated by archaeologists and evidence from the record of some 7,000 cultures in the world (ethnographies) and from cross-cultural comparisons (ethnology). Torture, terrorism, genocide, weapons of mass destruction, and the like are all relatively rare in the vast range of human experience (cf. Levinson 1994). The "era of lethality" endures for decades or so, not millennia or millions of years. However, structural violence in various forms and degrees is coincident with the origin of inequality (social stratification) which emerges most of all with civilization as the state level of sociopolitical organization and complexity (Bodley 2008a, 2020).

Actually warfare and the institution of the military are relatively recent inventions, as noted long ago by Margaret Mead (1940). There is relatively little evidence of warfare until the Neolithic some 10,000 years ago, depending on the region. The military as a social institution is mostly coincident with the evolution of the state around 5,000 years ago, depending on the region (Bodley 2008a, Fry 2006, 2007, Keegan 1993, Kelly 2000). Moreover, anyone who is a genuine evolutionist realizes that change is inevitable; thus, there is no reason to think that warfare and the institution of the military, not to mention other lethal aspects of humankind or a culture, are inevitable and eternal. Humanity as a whole cannot return to a hunter-gatherer lifestyle, at least at the current level of world population and given

economic dependence and preferences (Shepard 1973). However, mobile hunter-gatherers can provide heuristic models of the socio-cultural possibilities of a nonkilling society (Fry 2006, 2007, Kelly 2000).

Resource scarcity and the resulting competition may well lead to conflict, violence, and even warfare as many have asserted (Hastings 2000, Homer-Dixon, et al., 1993, Kaplan 1994, 2000, Klare 2001, 2002, Lanier-Graham 1993, Myers 1996, Renner 1996). But as Fredrik Barth (1956) demonstrated for three different ethnic groups in the Swat Valley of Pakistan, niche differentiation may be an alternative. They effectively reduced most direct competition by developing different foci for land and resource use as well as complementary trading relationships. However, this inter-ethnic system was probably seriously disrupted by refugees from the successive Soviet and American invasions of Afghanistan.

The above are indisputable scientific facts, this in spite of the biased approaches, pseudoscience, and disinformation campaigns of a few anthropologists and others who have gained notoriety. Many anthropologists have been apologists and propagandists for war, not only political scientists. Without meaning to denigrate the substantial contribution of anthropologists who have focused on studying warfare and other forms of aggression, such as Eller (1999, 2006), Ferguson (1995, 2007), Nordstrom (1997, 1998), clearly many others are in effect apologists for war (cf. Paige 2002:136). (For additional case studies, see compilations such as those by Fried, et al., 1968; Ferguson and Farragher 1988; Ferguson and Whitehead 1992; Ferguson 2003, and Nordstrom and Robben 1995). Since at least the 1960s the apologists for war pursue and even champion the pivotal assumption that humans are innately, instinctively, genetically, or biologically programmed to be aggressive, and, therefore, that war is an inevitable manifestation of human nature (Ardrey 1961, 1966, 1976, Chagnon 1992, Ghiglieri 1987, 1999, Keeley 1996, Lorenz 1966, Morris 1967, 1969, Otterbein 1993, 1999, 2004, 2008, Wilson 2012, Wrangham and Peterson 1996). Their absolutist, universalist, and essentialist posture conveniently ignores the contrary examples within our own species of *Homo sapiens* and, as will be discussed later, from our closest relatives in the animal kingdom, the chimpanzees (see Bonta 1993, 1996, Dennen 1995, Fry 2006, 2007, Howell and Willis 1989, Melko 1973, 1984, Montagu 1978, Sponsel 1996a, Sponsel and Gregor 1994).

Some of these apologists for warfare claim to have discovered extraordinarily violent and warlike societies, such as the Yanomami in the Brazilian and Venezuelan Amazon. However, the Yanomami, although not free from low levels and frequencies of some types of aggression do not pursue warfare by

any meaningful definition of the term and are relatively nonviolent in their daily lives (Barash and Webel 2002, Gelvin 1994, Keegan 1993, Jeong 2000, Sanders 2008, Sponsel 1998, Stoessinger 2008). Chagnon (1968, 1992) stereotyped and stigmatized the Yanomami as the “fierce people,” and even after he dropped that designation as the subtitle of his famous (now infamous) book, his myopic fixation on aggression still exaggerated it to the point of being misleading (Good 1991, Sponsel 1998, 2006c). Chagnon exemplifies some anthropologists who have been so focused on the violent aspects of a society, often to the point of obsession, that they have provided a grossly distorted and problematic perspective, neglecting the far greater frequency of nonviolence and peace in the daily life of most people in the society.

It should also be noted that, even within relatively violent societies, most people are nonviolent in their own behavior (cf., Nordstrom 1997, 1998). Furthermore, there are individuals, groups, and subcultures that explicitly pursue nonviolence and pacifism such as the Amish and Hutterites. In addition, even in the midst of wars, such as the recent ones in Afghanistan and Iraq, there are medical doctors and other persons who are saving lives and reducing suffering instead of the opposite. Nevertheless, the prevalence of many forms of violence in American society and culture to the point of obsession in the media and elsewhere should be obvious, especially with inventories like that by Paige (2002). Transcending this phenomenon is as much a problem for science as for society as he discusses.

History provides examples of nation states such as Germany and Japan that have been transformed from a society frequently engaged in war to one pursuing peace. Costa Rica is an instructive example as well. This country abolished the military and instead invested its resources in life-enhancing activities. Cases like Costa Rica merit much greater recognition, documentation, and analysis by anthropologists and others (Biesanz, et al., 1982).

Among ethnographic cases, perhaps the most remarkable example of a rapid transformation from a killing to a nonkilling society is the Waorani of the Ecuadorian Amazon as amply documented by the Robarcheks (1992, 1996, 1998a,b). Traditionally the Waorani were frequently involved in inter-group feuding. Through contact with American missionaries the Waorani imagined the possibilities of a nonviolent and peaceful society, they considered this to be far more attractive, and within a few decades the majority of the Waorani communities voluntarily changed. The Waorani demonstrate the plasticity and adaptability of human nature. Accordingly, they hold the promise for the possibility of other societies undergoing such a transformation, another case of an affirmative answer to Paige’s first question. Furthermore, it is noteworthy

that many societies in Oceania and elsewhere which had traditionally engaged in some kind of warfare to some degree were rapidly pacified by Western colonial forces, albeit often through violent means (Bodley 2008b, Ferguson and Whitehead 1992, Rodman and Cooper 1979).

There are also societies which have courageously persisted in their pacifist commitment in the face of terrible violence. The Amish are pacifists, like the Hutterites, Mennonites, and Quakers. Americans and many in the rest of the world were shocked when a psychotic gunman shot to death five girls and wounded five others in an Amish one-room school in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, on October 2, 2006. Many people were impressed as well when representatives from the same Amish community attended the funeral of the gunman which police had killed in order to forgive and comfort his widow and children. The Amish did not respond to this horrific crime by initiating a cycle of blood revenge (Kraybill 2008, Kraybill, et al., 2006). This should have been a lesson to the larger world, and especially American society in general and its government. It has direct relevance to the aftermath of the terrible unjust tragedy of the 9-11 attacks. What if a similar Christian response had been pursued then? What if the federal government of the U.S. had responded to 9-11, not by military attack on Afghanistan, but instead capitalized on world sympathy and advocated concerted action by its leaders through the United Nations, Interpol (International Criminal Police Organization), and other nonviolent means? Whether or not this would have brought the surviving perpetrators of the 9-11 attacks to justice is uncertain. However, it is certain that U.S. militarism has not achieved that goal in the many years since 2001. Moreover, it is certain that in the interim hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians, including women, children, and elderly, have been killed and injured, so-called collateral damage. Millions have been displaced as refugees internally and beyond their homeland in Afghanistan and Iraq. Billions of dollars have been sacrificed from constructive life-enhancing initiatives to promote nutrition, health, education, economy, and other things in the U.S. and elsewhere. As Mahatma Gandhi observed, an eye for an eye leads to blindness. All of the vast resources—personnel, financial, institutional, technological, and so on—of the Pentagon, State Department, C.I.A., and other U.S. federal government agencies failed to prevent 9-11. The time is long overdue to open the minds of government leaders and the populace regarding the nonkilling alternatives available for dispute resolution and conflict prevention (Barnes 2007, Bonta 1996, Fry and Bjorqvist 1997, Kemp and Fry 2004, Ury 1999, 2002).

Tibet also provides a particular case to illustrate several crucial points previously identified. During its long history, in spite of some episodes of violence, Tibet was transformed into a mostly nonviolent society. The spread of Buddhism was the seminal influence in this transformation. Today the power and wealth of Tibet are not military, political, and/or economic, but religious and cultural. That Tibetans have suffered terribly since the 1950 invasion and occupation by the Chinese with more than a million killed and thousands imprisoned and tortured to this day, and that more than 100,000 Tibetans have risked their lives in the Himalayan winter to flee to exile as political refugees in adjacent countries and beyond, does not diminish this power. Although initially there was militant resistance by some Tibetans to the Chinese invasion, subsequently under the leadership of His Holiness the XIVth Dalai Lama of Tibet, Tibetans appear to present the most outstanding case of a nonviolent response to violent invasion, occupation, and suppression. While this nonviolent approach has not liberated Tibet from Chinese imperialism, it has avoided far worse conflict and suffering by the Tibetans who are greatly outnumbered and outgunned by the Chinese. It may be only a matter of time before the situation improves significantly, although it could be decades or more before the central government of the People's Republic of China promotes a more democratic society and moral civilization in the entire country. However, there is reason for optimism, given the religiosity, courage, and resilience of Tibetans. There is also some hope, given historical precedents like the expulsion of the British colonial empire from India, the dissolution of the apartheid system in South Africa, and the overthrow of the Ferdinand Marcos regime in the Philippines, all generated by the nonviolent actions of courageous and persistent leaders and commoners in the face of overwhelming lethal force. (For more on Tibet see Blondeau and Buffetrille 2008, Dalai Lama 1987, Kapstein 2006, Shakya 1999, Sperling 2004, Thurman 2008, the official website of the Tibetan Government in Exile at <http://www.tibet.com> and the International Campaign for Tibet <https://savetibet.org/>).

To go even deeper, into human nature, that is, while many biologists and psychologists might favor nature over nurture as the primary determinant and shaper of aggression, some have revealed strong evidence to the contrary. Of all of the species in the animal kingdom, the closest to humans are the common and pygmy chimpanzees, *Pan troglodytes* and *P. paniscus*, respectively. Only after many years of observations on a few social groups of the common chimpanzee at Gombe Stream Reserve in Tanzania did Jane Goodall and her research associates discover what they described as the

rudiments of war (Goodall 1986, Wrangham and Peterson 1996, Ghiglieri 1987, 1999). However, Margaret Power (1991) and others have argued that this aggression may be influenced by external factors, at least in part, and especially by the primatologists provisioning the chimpanzees with bananas in order to bring them closer for more detailed observation.

In sharp contrast to some groups of the common chimpanzees, independent studies of the pygmy chimpanzees, also called bonobos, have not revealed comparable aggression either in the wild or in captive colonies. In fact, they are just the opposite. They seem to pursue behavior according to the motto make love and not war! Bonobos use a wide variety of sexual behaviors to avoid or reduce tensions within the group on a daily basis (Kano 1990, 1992, Waal 1989, 1996, 2006, Waal and Lating 1997). However, the scientists who favor the Hobbesian view of human nature, apparently have ideological blinders that channel them to emphasize violence to the near exclusion of nonviolence, stressing the common chimpanzees at Gombe and largely ignoring other common chimpanzee groups elsewhere where such behavior has not been observed. Also, they ignore or downplay the evidence of the peaceful bonobos. (Also, see Aureli and de Waal 2000, Harcourt and de Waal 1992, and Kohn 1990).

As a heuristic exercise, Leslie E. Sponsel (1996a) marshaled the arguments and evidence for the natural history of peace, pursuing just the opposite position from that of the apologists for war. The fields of biology, primate ethology, human ethology, human palaeontology, prehistoric archaeology, ethnography, and ethnology were surveyed. The basic conclusions were that: (1) although conflict is inevitable and common, violence is not; (2) human nature has the psychobiological potential to be either nonviolent/peaceful or violent/warlike; (3) nonviolence and peace appear to have prevailed in many prehistoric and pre-state societies; (4) war is not a cultural universal; and (5) the potential for the development of a more nonviolent and peaceful world is latent in human nature as revealed by the natural history of peace (Sponsel 1996a: 114-115).

Douglas P. Fry (2006, 2007) elaborated this approach further in much greater detail. He observes that the "Man the Warrior" model asserts that war is ubiquitous in time and space, natural, normal, and inevitable. Fry asserts that this reflects a Western cultural bias that selectively focuses on certain kinds of evidence to the exclusion of contrary evidence. He observes that this Hobbesian model also stems from muddled thinking that confuses almost any kind of aggression such as homicide or blood feuding with warfare. Fry concludes that the "Man the Warrior" model is fantasy in-

stead of fact. Moreover, he warns that this model is dangerous because it may contribute to policies of belligerent militarism as well as to inaction by peace advocates, if war is considered to be an inevitable manifestation of human nature. Fry argues that evolutionary pressures would select for restraint and for the ritualization of aggression to reduce harm as well as for alternatives in nonviolent conflict resolution because the costs of aggression can far exceed any possible benefits. He affirms that war can be eliminated in the 21st century by transcending the narrow, unrealistic, and culturally biased mentality of “Man the Warrior” and the associated belligerent militarism to replace it with an emphasis on extending nonviolent conflict management alternatives practiced within democratic nation states to an international system of world and regional cooperative governance and justice such as in the United Nations and the European Union.

Such studies are an independent and objective confirmation of the assertions in the UNESCO “Seville Statement on Violence” of May 16, 1986, cited by Paige (2002:39-40). (Also see Adams 1989). They affirm as well the statement in the charter of UNESCO; namely, that just as war begins in the minds of men, then so can peace (Barnaby 1988). They sustain Mead’s (1940) contention that war is only an invention, and that, as such, it can be transcended.

What is needed more than ever is a collaborative project to research nonviolence and peace in both theory and practice with a commitment, expert personnel, and adequate resources on a scale equivalent to the Manhattan Project of WWII. If that war effort was so important to the world, then why isn’t a peace effort even far more so? Modern warfare is simply much too expensive in terms of human deaths, injuries, and suffering as well as money, resources, and the environment (Andreas 2004, Cranna and Bhinda 1995, Hastings 2000, Lanier-Graham 1993, U.S. Army 2008). Indeed, war is rapidly becoming an unaffordable anachronism in the 21st century (cf. Younger 2007). Just consider the fact that a significant percentage of the American troops returning from Afghanistan and Iraq are bringing the war home in the form of not only physical injuries, but also post-traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse, domestic violence, homelessness, and even suicide. The expense of all of this—medical, psychological, and social as well as economic—will be long-term and immense (Grossman 1995, Hedges and Al-Arian 2007, McNair 2002). (Also see “Iraq Body Count” at <http://www.iraqbodycount.org>). Incidentally, the facts that soldiers have to be trained to injure and kill other human beings, and that many of those who do so often suffer serious emotional problems that may endure over

many years, are yet another line of evidence invalidating the Hobbesian myth of dismal human nature. (Also see <http://www.refusingtokill.net>).

As in political science (Paige 2002: 74), likewise in anthropology, authors who have dared to consider the possibilities of nonviolence and peace have been variously accused, stigmatized, and dismissed as unrealistic, idealistic, romantic, or utopian dreamers (Otterbein 1999, Sponsel 1990, 1992, 2000b, 2005). But such feeble attempts at a counter argument are not sustainable in the face of the wealth of scientific evidence that has been rapidly accumulating since the 1970s.

In summary, although anthropology certainly has its limitations, it offers a far broader temporal and spatial perspective than that of political science which tends to be constrained by its focus on the governments and politics of historic and contemporary nation states (Barash and Webel 2002, Jeong 2000). Anthropology offers not only an affirmative answer to Paige's first question, but also amplification and substantiation based on numerous and diverse well-documented cases in the real world. Paige discusses how individuals in different contexts from different professions or disciplines and countries answer his elemental question. No doubt he would also find a variety of responses to this question if he were to ask individuals in societies like the Amish, Semai, Tibetans, Waorani, and Yanomami. Hopefully, future anthropological researchers may do just that.

Chapter 3. The Possibilities of a Nonkilling Anthropology: Wishful Thinking?

“Historians, by centering violence, conflict and war have also, if counter to their intentions, contributed to their enduring legitimization, popularization and perpetuation by marginalizing nonkilling, nonviolence, and peace” (Adolf and Sanmartin 2009:206)

What are the possibilities for a nonkilling anthropology? At first glance, probably most anthropologists would be puzzled to consider the idea of either a killing anthropology or a nonkilling anthropology. However, consider this proposition: either you are part of the solution or a part of the problem, there is no space for neutrality. For example, if you witness a person who is apparently being beaten to death and do nothing to intervene, such as call for anyone nearby to help or telephone the police, then aren't you complicit in murder to some degree? Similarly, if you are an anthropologist in a killing society and do nothing to intervene in any way, then are you not complicit in the killing to some degree? Moreover, even from an egocentric perspective, it might be argued that ignoring the human suffering caused directly and indirectly by a killing society, diminishes one's own humanity and increases one's own suffering, because we are all interconnected and interdependent (cf., Dalai Lama 1999). Such considerations may stimulate some to contemplate the possibilities of a killing anthropology and a nonkilling anthropology.

Answering Paige's second question, about the possibility of a nonkilling political science, in the case of anthropology, is much more difficult than answering the first one because it requires thinking more “outside of the box” since much of anthropology supports, indirectly if not directly, and inadvertently if not intentionally, the military-industrial-media-academic complex. To be blunt, the modern war-making machine's main effect, if not primary purpose, is usually to generate death, destruction, and suffering, as, for example, in the March 2003 U.S. “shock and awe” bombing campaign over the city of Baghdad. At the same time, it should be mentioned that I respect those in the military who serve honorably and even place themselves in harm's way; however, I respect even more highly someone like

the courageous First Lieutenant Ehren Watada who refused to serve in an unjust Iraq War in spite of tremendous institutional, social, and legal pressures to conform. Another difficulty with the nonkilling aspects of anthropology is that they are so diffuse that a special effort is required to identify and explicate them. Furthermore, much of what would help generate a nonkilling anthropology is at the early stage of critical analysis and focused on the military as an institution, its origin, evolution, structure, functions, beliefs, values, symbols, rituals, customs, and practices, rather than on positive alternatives, such as the interrelated human rights and peace movements and organizations throughout the world.

In recent decades, an increasing number of publications have critically analyzed in historical perspective the relationships between anthropology and war since colonial times to the current wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, this endeavor not to be confused with the anthropological study of war as such. (See Ben-Ari 2004, de Wolf 1992, Frese and Harrell 2003, Goldschmidt 1979, Gordon 1988, Gough 1968, Gusterson 1996, 2003, 2007, Hickey 2003, Hinsley 1979, Hymes 1999, Jell-Bahlsen 1985, Mabee 1987, Neel 1994, Patterson 2001, Penny and Bunzl 2003, Price 2008, Schaft 2004, Simons 1997, 1999, Starn 1986, Stauder 1999, Suzuki 1986, Wakin 1992, Williams 1986). Among other influences, pursuit of this subject reflects the correlated development since the 1960s of a code of professional ethics for anthropologists emphasizing the primary ethical principle of do no harm. That code was largely stimulated by the reaction to covert counterinsurgency research by anthropologists in Thailand during the American war in Vietnam and adjacent countries, although its roots are deeper in time and broader in experience (Fluehr-Lobban 2002, 2003, Hymes 1999, Whiteford and Trotter 2008, Wakin 1992).

At the same time, some anthropologists have been pacifists, like Edward B. Tylor and Franz Boas, although rarely does this surface in their research and publications. It was not until the 1960's, and in connection with the Vietnam War in particular, that a variant of what might be called nonkilling anthropology began to develop. Perhaps more than any other single anthropologist before or since, Ashley Montagu as a prominent public scientist pioneered the groundwork for a nonkilling anthropology through many of his publications addressing nonviolence and peace as well as violence including even structural violence (racism, sexism, ageism) (Lieberman, et al., 1995, Montagu 1968, 1972, 1989, 1998, Sponsel 2006b, cf. Paige 2002:97). He rigorously challenged the idea that there is any biological basis for racial superiority, distinguishing between biological and social ideas about race

(Montagu 1998). Montagu (1972) was one of the leaders in the development of the UNESCO Statement on Race. Likewise, he critically analyzed and dismissed the Hobbesian view of human nature (Montagu 1976). He edited the first anthology documenting nonviolent and peaceful societies (Montagu 1978). Montagu and Matson (1983) scrutinized dehumanization as a tactic facilitating violence toward “the other” (Hinton 2001, Staub 1989). More recently, several other pioneers laying the groundwork for a nonkilling anthropology stand out in various ways, including Baszarkiewicz and Fry (2008), Bodley (2008a,b), Bonta (1993, 1996, 1997), Dentan (1968), Ferguson (1995, 2002, 2003, 2006, 2007, 2008), Fry (2006, 2007), Gonzalez (2004), Graebner (2004), Gusterson (1996, 2003, 2007), Hymes (1999), Kyron and Rubenstein (2008), Lutz (2001, 2002), Nordstrom (1997, 1998), Nordstrom and Robben (1995), Price (2004, 2008), Sanders (2008), Sluka (2000), Sponsel (1994a,b, c, 1996a,b,c, 1997a,b, 2000b, 2006b), Sponsel and Good (2000), and Strathern and Stewart (2008).

Recently, the U.S. military initiated the special program called the Human Terrain System (HTS) that embeds anthropologists and other social scientists with troops on the ground in conflict zones in Afghanistan, Iraq, and probably elsewhere as well. The main purpose appears to be to enhance the cultural information and understanding of the soldiers in order to help make their operations more effective (Kipp, et al., 2007, McFate 2005a,b, Renzi 2006, Sewall, et al., 2007). It is claimed that HTS reduces conflict, saves lives, and may shorten the wars; however, so far these assertions have not been proven.

The American Anthropological Association (AAA) is the major professional organization of anthropologists in the U.S. with a membership of well over 10,000. Its executive officers charged a special commission with investigating the role of anthropologists in the HTS (AAA ad Hoc Committee on the Engagement of Anthropology with US Security and Intelligence Communities or CEAUSSIC). The results of their inquiry were summarized in an Executive Board Statement on October 31, 2007. Their 62-page Final Report was posted on November 4, 2007. The main conclusion is that anthropologists involved in HTS may compromise or violate the principles in the 1998 AAA Code of Ethics in various ways. They may not be able to openly disclose their purpose, obtain voluntary consent from informants, and their information may be used by the military in ways that harm their informants and/or others in their community. Another concern was that anthropologists working anywhere in the world might be mistakenly identified as associated with the U.S. military and/or HTS and thereby their personal safety might be placed at risk

(<http://www.aaanet.org>). In addition, a number of prominent anthropologists have been very critical of HTS, among them Roberto J. Gonzalez (2007, 2008), Hugh Gusterson (2003, 2007), and David H. Price (2000, 2007, http://homepages.stmartin.edu/fac_staff/dprice). An organization was also formed among such critics called the Network of Concerned Anthropologists (<http://concerned.anthropologists.googlepages.com>). (Also see Ferguson 1988, Fluehr-Lobban 2002, 2003, Glazer 1996, Whitehead and Trotter 2008)

There is no doubt that anthropology can be relevant in facilitating cross-cultural understanding and communication as, for example, in the pioneering research by Edward T. Hall (1990) on proxemics (spatial relationships). The main problem is the ends to which anthropology is a means—causing harm or promoting welfare, violence or nonviolence, war or peace, militarism or pacifism, and so on. As part of the creative challenge of a nonkilling anthropology it is imperative to imagine the practical possibilities of a non-violent alternative to HTS. For example, some anthropologists might have less concern if the field anthropologists were engaged with the U.S. Department of State instead of the Department of Defense, but that would also depend on current government policies. For instance, by now it is widely recognized in the U.S. and worldwide that many of the policies of President George W. Bush's administration have been disastrous, to say the least (Carter 2005, Chomsky 2001, Gore 2007, Govier 2002, Singer 2004, Wright and Dixon 2008).

In thinking through Paige's Chapter 3, one of the challenges is that anthropologists usually focus on culture and community, whereas political scientists tend to focus on power and polity, especially in the context of the nation state. However, anthropology also deals with many subjects basic to political science such as human nature, the origin of the state as civilization, and the emergence and maintenance of social inequality. In any case, thinking through the relevance of this chapter for anthropology has the potential to transform the discipline, if not even to revolutionize it. In the first paragraph of Chapter 3, Paige poses several questions about political science that can be pursued through anthropology as well as other disciplines. For example, his third question asks what values would inspire and guide the work? His sixth question asks what uses of knowledge would we facilitate? These two questions were previously answered in another context by the present author who pointed to the various United Nations declarations and conventions on human rights as a framework for developing anthropological thinking and actions (Sponsel 1994a, 1995:277-278, 1996b,c, 1997a,b, 2001). Before and since then, many other anthropologists have conducted

research on human rights theory and practice (Bell, et al., 2001, Downing and Goodale 2009a,b, Kushner 1988, Messer 1993, Nagengast and Turner 1997, Nagengast and Velez-Ibanez 2004). Anthropologists have also addressed the important issue of universal human rights versus cultural relativism mentioned by Paige (2002: 117). (See Bell, et al., 2001, Herskovits 1972, Nagengast and Turner 1997). Three tasks for applied science that Paige (2002:104) identifies are prevention, intervention, and post-traumatic nonkilling transformations, and each of these can be pursued through various forms of applied anthropology (e.g., Rubenstein 2008). Articulating teaching, research, and service with human rights, even just in a general way as a conceptual framework, can generate more social meaning and significance in the anthropological endeavor.

For the professional training of nonkilling anthropologists, the curriculum and the pedagogy would need to be substantially changed, if not revolutionized (cf. Paige 2002: 127-129). The curriculum would need to be reoriented from a structure around standard courses on subfields, topics, areas, and methods to one more explicitly focused on the important problems and issues of contemporary society and the world. It would have to emphasize aspects of nonviolence and peace, although not to the exclusion of also considering violence and war. These are among some possibilities for a curriculum:

- Unity and Diversity of Humankind
- Professional Values and Ethics in Anthropology
- History of Anthropology from War to Peace
- History of Colonial and Development Anthropology
- Anthropology of Colonialism and Neocolonialism
- Cultural Evolution, Change, and Revolution
- Anthropology of Violence and War
- Anthropology of Nonviolence and Peace
- Science, Technology, and Economics as if People Mattered
- Quality of Life: Environment, Water, Food, and Health
- Anthropology of Environmentalism, Environment, and Gaia
- Comparative Religion: Worldviews, Values, and Spiritual Ecology
- Alternative Political and Legal Systems
- Culture in Conflict Management and Resolution
- Problems and Solutions in Applied Anthropology
- Human Rights and Advocacy Anthropology
- Collaborative Ethnographic Methods

Each of these courses would address as feasible Paige's (2002:72-74) four principles of logical analysis (see below). (Also, see McKenna 2008 and Smith 1999). Although some of these courses mirror traditional ones, the focus would be changed significantly. For example, the orientation of a course on Alternative Political and Legal Systems, formerly political and legal anthropology, would shift to themes such as the mechanisms of nonviolent dispute resolution traditionally practiced by hunter-gatherer cultures (Avruch 1998, Bonta 1996, Bonta and Fry 2006, Fry and Bjorkqvist 1997, Greenhouse 1985, Kemp and Fry 2004, Rubinstein 2008, Wolfe and Yang 1996).

The faculty would be dedicated as much to teaching and service as to research, genuinely recognizing and rewarding the significance of all three. They would be engaged in cooperative rather than competitive activities aimed at applying their science to understanding and helping to resolve practical problems and issues, rather than advancing egocentric career trajectories by pursuing the latest academic fashions and theoretical fantasies. Accordingly, overall there would be a shift in emphasis, albeit not exclusively, from basic to applied aspects of anthropology (Barker 2004, Fry and Borquist 1997, Gwynne 2003, Johnston 2007, Johnston and Barker 2008, Kemp and Fry 2004, Paine 1985, Sponsel 2001, and Ury 1999, 2004).

At the same time, there are economic obstacles to be overcome. For example, at the University of Hawai`i, in spite of near unanimous opposition from faculty and students, some top administrators and a few researchers in the physical sciences embraced a 5-year contract for \$50,000,000 from the U.S. Navy for the development of a University Applied Research Center. At the same time, it is simply inconceivable that even a fraction of that amount would ever be invested in the annual budget of the Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace at the University of Hawai`i (<http://www.peaceinstitute.hawaii.edu>). Such are the priorities in a killing society and in the most militarized state in the union (Blanco 2009, Kajihira 2007, <http://www.dmzhawaii.org>). War remains more profitable than peace. As General Dwight Eisenhower also warned in his farewell presidential speech to the nation on January 17, 1961: "The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present –and is gravely to be regarded." (See Feldman 1989, Giroux 2007, and Simpson 1998).

Likewise, within the professional organization of the American Anthropological Association and others, the structures and priorities would have to change radically. For example, within the AAA the Committee on Ethics and the Committee for Human Rights would have to be given top priority

with corresponding financial and other resources. [Update: These committees were abolished in the 2017 in the AAA's reorganization!]. The themes of the annual conventions would have to place far greater emphasis on the more applied aspects of anthropology. Current priorities are crystal clear. For instance, the topical index of key words from sessions at the 2008 annual convention of the AAA lists ten sessions on violence and eight on war, but only one on peace and none on nonviolence. On the other hand, it lists nine sessions on human rights and a dozen on ethics which is more positive, a much larger number than prior to the 1990's (AAA 2008). Incidentally, the AAA is not atypical in this respect. As another example, the second edition of the multidisciplinary *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict* (Kurtz, 2008) contains 289 entries, but only ten (3.5%) with nonviolence and 29 (10%) with peace in their titles, although these topics may receive some attention in articles without these words in their titles.

Many of the phenomena that Paige (2002:133) worries about were not problems until the evolution of the state, and especially modern nations, so they are very recent (Nagengast 1994). Contemporary issues include abortion, capital punishment, conscription, war, armed revolution, terrorism, genocide, criminality, social violence, disarmament, and economic demilitarization (Paige 2002:133, cf. Levinson 1994). According to Paige (2002: 111-112), five problems that are globally salient are: continued killing and the need for disarmament, poverty and the need for economic equality, violations of human rights and the need for greater respect for human dignity and human rights, destruction of nature, and other-denying divisiveness that impedes problem-solving cooperation. (See Donnelly 2003, Mahoney 2007). In one way or another, anthropologists have been addressing these and related matters to varying degrees. Indeed, there are many books on each of these subjects, but if any one might be singled out, including as a possible textbook, then it would be *Anthropology and Contemporary Human Problems* by John H. Bodley (2008a).

Paige concludes Chapter 3 by inviting "... thought about what political science would be like if it took seriously the possibility of realizing nonkilling societies in a nonkilling world." He goes on to write that "Acceptance of such a possibility implies active political science engagement in nonviolent global problem-solving" (Paige 2002: 97). This is certainly a provocative question for anthropology as well. Applied, advocacy, action, public, and engaged are various qualifiers associated with anthropology that deals with practical problem solving in promoting human survival, welfare, justice, dignity, and rights in various ways and degrees (Barker 2004, Besteman and

Gusterson 2005, Eriksen 2006, Gonzalez 2004, Gwynne 2003, Hinton 2001, Johnston 1994, 1997, 2007, Johnston and Barker 2008). Already many anthropologists are contributing to the development of a nonkilling society and nonkilling world, although not exactly with those terms in mind. Still there is enormous potential for further work in this regard. However, a major obstacle is that often such practical work is not considered to be as prestigious or valuable as basic research, as for example, in the assessment for tenure and promotion of academic faculty at universities and colleges, and especially among those who are still under the illusion that science is apolitical and amoral (cf. Giroux 2007).

The framework and questions for research and praxis that Paige develops so boldly and profoundly in his book and other work opens up an entire new world of exciting and promising possibilities for anthropological research, teaching, and service with potentially far reaching practical consequences. His pursuit of a medical model for the sciences, humanities, and other professions pivoting around a central concern for saving lives, reducing suffering, and promoting well-being calls for a paradigm shift, if not even a nonviolent revolution. While he emphasizes nonkilling, ultimately this transcends stopping the negative—lethality, to also advance the positive—protection and enhancement of the quality of life. In the present author's opinion, the subject of human rights provides the conceptual and practical framework for such a noble endeavor.

Paige challenges the prevailing assumption that (1) killing is an inescapable or inevitable part of human nature or of the human condition, and the corollary that (2) it must be accepted in political theory and practice as well as elsewhere. He implies that this assumption stems from the long history of American warfare and militarism by citing numerous examples (Paige 2002:7-8). Even more revealing and disturbing are the more detailed historical inventories of these aggressive activities in sources such as by Andreas (2004) and Churchill (2003). Thus, a systemic bias toward violence including war appears to be a product of Western and especially American history and culture (Duclos 1997, Hofstadter and Wallace 1971, Keegan 1993, Lewis 2006, Palmer 1972, Sponsel 1994a, 1996a.). The U.S. is grounded in the invasion and conquest of the continent by European colonial displacement or compulsory relocation, forced assimilation and acculturation, and downright systematic ethnocide and genocide of a multitude of indigenous societies (Bodley 2008b, Churchill 1997, Diamond 1999, Ferguson and Whitehead 1992, Jaimes 1992, Kroeber 1961, Patterson 2001, Starkey 1998, Steele 1994). Another factor is the militarism and warfare that per-

meates U.S. history (Andreas 2004, Churchill 2003, Hedges 2002, Hillman 2004, Ury 2002). Since at least WWII, the Hobbesian view of human nature has been increasingly reinforced by the development of the industrial-military complex that President Dwight Eisenhower warned about in his farewell speech to the nation. Moreover, subsequent developments have resulted in an industrial-military-media-academic complex that infiltrates American society like a cancer, and with the most rapid and penetrating growth during the presidential administration of George W. Bush as part of the post-9/11 paranoia it helped to create and maintain. Thus, for instance, for several years Americans were kept terrified with a system of periodic color coded alerts and other tactics that helped generate the lucrative profits of the weapons, military, and security industries since 9-11. The interconnected weapons and oil industries are not only the most profitable ones in the world along with illegal drugs, but also the most powerful politically as well as economically (Andreas 2004). Accordingly, it is most sad to recognize that peace is likely to emerge and prevail globally only when it becomes more profitable than war.

American anthropologists who stress a Hobbesian view of human nature may be culturally as well as ideologically biased (Clark 2002, Curti 1980). On the one hand not all American anthropologists share the ideology that encompasses the Hobbesian view (Kegley and Raymond 1999:20-21, 245, Patterson 2001). On the other hand, to some degree all American anthropologists share the same generic culture. In anthropology, the common assumption about dismal human nature and the inevitability of war and other forms of aggression appears to still prevail. For instance, this is reflected in the fact that there are many more books on violence and war than on non-violence and peace, whether general surveys or particular case studies. Those on nonviolence and peace number about a dozen, whereas there are many times more that number on violence and war (Ferguson and Faragher 1988, Sponsel 1994a,b, 1996a,c, Wiberg 1981). Members of the American Anthropological Association may list their specializations in a special online directory. The specializations available for listing in the AAA form include conflict, conflict resolution, ethnic conflict, violence, and warfare, but most revealingly, neither nonviolence nor peace are listed.

The idea of human nature also needs to be problematized (Cannel and Macklin 1974, Curti 1980, Sponsel 2007, Stevenson and Haberman 1998). Logically, human nature may or may not exist, it may be uniform or multifarious, it may good or bad, and so on. For example, some anthropologists would argue that there is no single, uniform human nature; instead, there

are numerous human natures as expressed in the diversity of some seven thousand different cultures extant in the world today. From such a perspective, human nature is manifest in cultural diversity and is generated by nurture (social environment) instead of nature (genetics). Human nature is tremendously plastic and adaptable as well as diverse, the latter the expression of the former two attributes (Sponsel 2007). Thus, many anthropologists would see cultural relativism as their primary disciplinary value, while some extreme cultural relativists would even dispute the existence of any meaningful cross-cultural universals common to all of humanity (Brown 1991, Herskovits 1972). Furthermore, within science and academia, there are many different theories of human nature (Cannell and Macklin 1974, Curti 1980, Feibleman 1987, Kupperman 2010, Pojman 2006, Sahlins 2008, Stevenson and Haberman 1998). Likewise, each of the world's religions has a somewhat different concept of human nature distinctive to their own worldview (Matthews 2004). This diversity itself undermines the assumptions of a single, uniform human nature, and of the inevitability of violence and war in spite of the reductionistic and simplistic speculations of the apologists and propagandists for war.

As a political scientist concerned with international relations, Paige tends to focus on the modern nation state. Anthropology also problematizes this focus because the state is actually a relatively recent invention and could well be a transitory stage of political organization in cultural evolution (cf. Ferguson 2003, Nagengast 1994). As conceived by anthropologists, the state is basically coincident with civilization and only about 5,000 years old, depending on the region. Actually 99% of human existence from origins dating back to at least two million years ago was dominated exclusively by mobile hunting-gathering lifestyles. If there is anything universal in human culture and/or such a thing as human nature, then most likely it is a result of this mobile hunter-gatherer legacy (Lee and DeVore 1968, Shepard 1973). Moreover, the overwhelming majority of mobile hunter-gatherer societies are mostly egalitarian, cooperative, nonviolent, and peaceful, as demonstrated by evidence from archaeology, ethnohistory, ethnography, and ethnology, this notwithstanding the contrary opinions of the apologists for warfare.

As a political scientist, Paige considers power to be pivotal in society and in his discipline, and power is political with economics, religion, and other factors secondary. The parallel focus in anthropology is culture. Culture is pivotal in society and in the discipline. However, both of these are only partial considerations, albeit very important ones. Particular circumstances can be decisive. For instance, in the case of Tibet as previously discussed, Buddhism as a

religion is pivotal, and the power of His Holiness the XIVth Dalai Lama of Tibet as a spiritual leader is primary and even in exile. Given the relationship of Tibetans with China and other countries, these factors also become political, but that is secondary, even though it is often difficult to consider the religious and political as separate in this case, especially given Tibet's history since the Chinese invasion and occupation. Similarly, in the case of the Middle East, religion is a tremendous influence; it is not simply a matter of secular politics. Indeed, in Islam, politics is subordinated to religion. It is impossible to understand the Middle East purely in secular terms (Eickelman 2002, Eickelman and Piscatori 1996, Esposito and Mogahed 2007, Khan 2006).

Paige is challenging not only the inevitability of violence, but also its efficacy and legitimacy. A nonkilling anthropology would reject these tenets as well. However, legitimacy invokes normative considerations, and some might reject this by claiming that science must be amoral as well as apolitical to maintain neutrality for the sake of objectivity. But, that is an illusion. To take an extreme case, the Manhattan project was grounded in hard science. Yet Paige (2002:81) notes that 19 out of 150 scientists on the Manhattan Project voted against any military use of the atomic bombs. Personally, the present author does not see any difference during WWII in incinerating Jews in the Nazi concentration camps and in incinerating Japanese in the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Both are absolutely immoral. Furthermore, the scientists who made these atrocities possible cannot be considered amoral and apolitical. Indeed, they can be considered complicit in such crimes against humanity (cf. Christopher 1999).

Postmodernists have called into question the assertion that science is neutral, objective, apolitical, amoral, and the like (e.g., Sokal and Bricmont 1998). As an example, in the controversy over the scandalous behavior of some researchers working with the Yanomami generated by the publication of the book *Darkness in El Dorado* by investigative journalist Patrick Tierney (2000), some of those who portrayed themselves as scientists clearly exhibited behavior that was just the opposite of scientific, lacking in objectivity, rife in political ideology, and downright unethical and immoral (Borofsky 2005, Fluehr-Lobban 2003, Gregor and Gross 2004, Gross 2004, Robin 2004, Sponsel 2006a, Sponsel and Turner 2002, Tierney 2000). The larger hidden agenda of many of the negative responses to Tierney was to try to invalidate a penetrating critic of one example of Cold War anthropological research (also see Neel 1994, Price 2008, Wax 2008).

The above are some of my reservations, qualifications, and elaborations regarding Paige's book and thesis. At the same time, what he has to say is ob-

viously extremely important, and increasingly so, given the so-called global war on terrorism, the dire problems of globalization, the developing consequences of global climate change with all of its widespread and profound impacts on society and the environment, and the increasing militarization of the planet, even outer space, and its infiltration of scientific and academic institutions (Giroux 2007). These are all interrelated and acting in synergy to the point of being not only alarming, but potentially catastrophic, to say the least.

Consequently, the time is not only most propitious, but also most urgent to consider the possibilities of a nonkilling society at every level – family, community, regional, national, international, and global. Paige's four-component logical analysis is most valid and useful; namely, to consider the conditions, processes, and consequences of (1) a killing society, (2) a nonkilling society, (3) the transition from a nonkilling to a killing society, and (4) the transition from a killing to a nonkilling society. Tibet could be a very revealing case study for illuminating these four components. In various ways anthropology offers evidence and insights that are very relevant to all four of these components, ranging from the earlier work of Franz Boas, Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, and Ashley Montagu, and others to the most recent work of pioneers previously mentioned.

Finally, Paige (2002:143) asserts that: "Every political scientist and each person can be a center for global nonviolence to facilitate transition to a nonkilling world." More anthropologists need to become such a center. In 1993, I was privileged to participate in a small multidisciplinary conference titled "What We Know About Peace" in Charleston, South Carolina, sponsored by the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation (Gregor 1996). Among the participants were Kenneth Boulding and Johan Galtung. However, I quickly became very disappointed and even disillusioned when it became clear that almost all of the participants were actually talking about war instead of peace. One participant even went to the extreme of asserting that peace is the presence of war (Tuzin 1996:3). Thank you, Glenn Paige, for opening some minds to the social and scientific possibilities of nonviolence and peace, and hopefully many more in the future.

Glenn Paige (2002) has dared to ask the very profound and provocative primary question: Is a nonkilling society possible? From my perspective as an anthropologist who has paid some attention to anthropological aspects of peace and nonviolence, and not only war and violence, unlike most colleagues, I find the answer to this question quite simple. A nonkilling society is not only possible to conceive of theoretically, such societies exist in reality as revealed by the overwhelming evidence from archaeology, ethnohisto-

ry, history, ethnography, and ethnology. Thus, nonviolence is an actuality, not merely a possibility. Nonviolence and peace are scientific facts; the evidence is overwhelming and undeniable, as alluded to in this essay and sustained by the accumulating documentation, such as Bonta's website Peaceful Societies. The time is long overdue to systematically make this explicit and pursue it in every constructive way possible to create a nonviolent and life-enhancing society for the realization of the human potential for freedom, justice, peace, harmony, and creativity. Anthropology has an important role to play in such a noble and vital endeavor, if only more anthropologists can open their minds to the revolutionary possibilities of a nonkilling society and a nonkilling anthropology.

Chapter 4. Rethinking the Yanomami: Killing or Nonkilling Society?

“The most famous study of conflict in the ethnographic literature is Chagnon’s work on the Yanomamo. Chagnon described Yanomamo warfare as a longstanding pattern of conflict attributable to particularities of social organization, ecological pressures, and the “fierce” personality type” (Heider 2001:335).

“They are probably not the kind of people you would invite over for afternoon tea. They are quick to anger, will bear a grudge for years and often launch violent attacks on members of their own tribe” (Allman 1988:57).

“Contemporary anthropology continues to invent other peoples to serve as vehicles to conceptualize important social and intellectual problems of the Western human self today. We have invented the Yanomamo of South America as a symbol to conceptualize human aggression and sexuality” (Pandian 1985:48).

Introduction

In the early 1970s, in a graduate seminar called Ethnology of Lowland South America facilitated by Professor Thomas Gregor at Cornell University, I first read the then famous ethnography by Napoleon Chagnon (1968a) titled *Yanomamo: The Fierce People* based on his extensive fieldwork starting in 1964. My impression was that the Yanomamo are essentially Hobbesian savages with a nasty and brutish lifestyle wherein violence is ubiquitous. My reaction was that these were about the last people in the world that I would ever want to visit. But then in planning the research design for my doctoral dissertation I asked a former student of Professor Gregor, then already a leading Venezuelan anthropologist Dr. Nelly Arvelo-Jimenez, which indigenous society in the Amazon would be the most appropriate for the fieldwork component of my dissertation focused on a biological approach to indigenous hunt-

ing behavior and ecology (Sponsel 1981). She responded that the Yanomamo would be best. She mentioned that she had met them in the forest while working with the adjacent Yecuana, and found them very friendly. She kindly agreed to serve as my sponsor where she worked in the Department of Anthropology at the Venezuelan Institute for Scientific Investigations (IVIC) near Caracas, and she proved most kind, generous, and helpful with her expertise, advice, and time. There I also met briefly with the French social anthropologist, Jacques Lizot, who by that time had already lived and worked with Yanomamo for several years. He assured me that there was violence among the Yanomamo, but volunteered that it had been grossly exaggerated by Chagnon. Later, Kenneth Good who also lived with the Yanomami for many years, confirmed the views of Arvelo-Jimenez and Lizot.

After traveling five days up river by motorized dugout canoe with Yecuana and then walking half a day into the forest I finally entered my first Yanomamo village, a northern subgroup known as the Sanema in the Erebatto River region, a tributary of the Caura River. From the outset and throughout my stay the Sanema proved to be most kind, courteous, and helpful, like other indigenous peoples I visited and worked with in the Amazon. Moreover, the Sanema, although a subgroup of Yanomamo, were not the "fierce people" at all as initially labeled by Chagnon in the subtitle of the first three editions of his book. Nevertheless, there were three alarms of an incipient raid on the village although they turned out to be false, merely some strange noise alerting the village but later recognized as harmless. From the trembling women standing next to me at the time of one alarm it was quite obvious that villagers took the matter very seriously. However, my experiences with the Sanema made me begin to wonder about Chagnon's depiction of Yanomamo as such a violent society, as had the previous remarks of Arvelo-Jimenez, Lizot, and Good.

Since my fieldwork in 1974-75 for six months sampling the behavioral ecology of Sanema predator-animal prey interactions, most regrettably I have never enjoyed the opportunity to return to them, but worked elsewhere in the Venezuelan Amazon with Yecuana and Curripaco in association with IVIC and on research grants from Fulbright and the UNESCO-Man and the Biosphere Programme. Then, in 1981, with my regular employment at the University of Hawai`i and marriage to a Thai, I turned to Thailand instead of Venezuela where I have worked ever since. Nevertheless, I have pursued any publication on the Yanomamo that I could find, over the decades reading most of the more than 60 books and other literature on the Yanomamo (Sponsel 1998).

By now I am fully convinced that Chagnon's representation of the Yanomamo as the primitive "fierce people" living in chronic endemic tribal warfare is problematic in numerous ways. Indeed, some anthropologists who have lived and worked with the Yanomamo for many years more than Chagnon view his ethnographic description of their aggression as grossly exaggerated, distorting, and misleading, as will be discussed later. This derogatory characterization of the Yanomamo has even proven dangerous for them as a very vulnerable indigenous society (Albert 2001, Davis 1976, Martins 2005, Ramos 2001, Rifkin 1994, Tierney 2001:328-331).

The above considerations combined with the emergence of the revolutionary research and other initiatives on nonkilling societies by Glenn Paige (2009), and his diverse collaborators (e.g., Evans Pim 2009), leads to the primary goal of this essay, to rethink the Yanomamo by pursuing the basic question: Are the Yanomamo a killing society, a nonkilling society, or something in between? To answer this question, the fifth edition of Chagnon's (1997a) own ethnographic case study will be scrutinized, following Paige's (2009:85-87) insightful challenge to reconsider classic texts. Space does not allow a review of other publications by Chagnon or additional authors, but some will be cited as supporting documentation and to provide leads for readers who may wish to pursue some matters further. But, first, for those who are not familiar with the Yanomamo, a brief description will be provided which is summarized from one of my previous publications (Sponsel 2006b). (For other surveys of Yanomamo culture see Chagnon 1973, Hames 1994, Lizot 1988, Peters-Golden 2009, Rabben 2004, and Wilbert 1972, and for the broader context see Sponsel 1986a, 2008, 2010a).

Yanomamo

The Yanomamo are one of the most famous of all cultures in anthropology and beyond, they are truly ethnographic celebrities. More than 27,400 Yanomamo live in some 360 scattered communities that range in size from 30 to 90 individuals with a few reaching more than 200. They reside in a vast area of some 192,000 square kilometers in the Amazon rainforest. Their mostly mountainous territory overlaps the border between north-western Brazil and southeastern Venezuela. (See Lewis (2009) for the population estimate). Reciprocity is one of the most outstanding attributes that distinguishes this unique culture. It is a pivotal social principle applied in almost every aspect of their daily life, and most frequently through kindness, sharing, cooperation, and camaraderie. However, this principle is also

applied in resolving disputes, occasionally even through violence between individuals, groups, or villages, the focus of Chagnon's famous case study.

The Yanomamo live in an intensely intimate world, socially and ecologically. Traditionally they dwell together in a big, palm leaf thatched, communal, round house with a large open central plaza. Their egalitarian society is structured primarily through kinship. Each village is relatively autonomous politically. A charismatic headman can lead only by persuasion in developing a consensus, there is no chief or other authority uniting more than one community let alone Yanomamo society as a whole. However, alliances among several villages are common for economic, social, and political purposes. In their society the units of residence, kinship, and politics are not isomorphic, but they overlap in diverse, complex, and fluid ways.

This fluid dynamic is mirrored by a subsistence economy that entails almost daily forays into the surrounding forest for gardening, hunting, fishing, and gathering. Over two millennia the Yanomamo developed a sustainable society in terms of their low population density, limited interest in accumulating material culture, high mobility, subsistence economy, environmental knowledge, and world view, values, and attitudes. They practice a rotational system of land and resource use not only in their shifting or swidden horticulture, but also in their rotation of hunting, fishing, and gathering areas.

Since the mid-19th century more than three dozen anthropologists have worked with the Yanomamo in various areas and ways, but for widely different lengths of time. For instance, the French social anthropologist Jacques Lizot actually lived with them for about a quarter of a century. By now several dozen books have been published about the Yanomamo, although with diverse approaches, scope, foci, depth, quality, and accuracy. With so many different anthropologists publishing this much on the Yanomamo for over a century, it is quite feasible to compare accounts to identify points of agreement, presumably indicative of ethnographic "reality," and other points of disagreement, presumably reflecting the individual ethnographer's interpretations, idiosyncrasies biases, and other phenomena. The first comprehensive ethnography on the Yanomamo was published in Spanish by Louis Cocco in 1972 after living with them as a Salesian missionary for 15 years and remains most informative. Already at this time there was enough research on them by various investigators to allow Cocco (1972:35-102) to include several chapters on the history of Yanomamo studies. (Also see Margolies and Suarez 1978, Migliazza 1972:357-393).

The Yanomamo are neither noble nor ignoble savages (Sponsel 2005, 2006b). They live in neither a utopia nor a dystopia, but in the real world.

They are simply fellow human beings with a distinctive culture. As one observer of the Yanomamo, Greg Sanford (1997:63) has written: "I have a hard time looking at the Yanomami as 'natives,' 'Indians,' 'aborigines' or whatever you may choose to call them. I see them as human beings, people who have the same emotions and feelings as you and I. After all, the word Yanomami simply means "human being." Must we look at them as some kind of exotic beings that exist only to satisfy our curiosity?"

In this essay the spelling used by Chagnon is followed only because the focus is on his ethnographic case study. However, there are numerous other spellings in the literature including Yanoama, Yanomama, and Yanomami. In the earlier literature they are also referred to as Guaika, Shiriana, Shirishana, and Waika, among other ethnonyms (Loukottka 1968:224-226, Olson 1991:411-412, Salazar Quijada 1970). Yanomami is most commonly used by anthropologists who have worked most extensively with their society. Also, here diacritical markings are omitted.

First, the attributes of Yanomamo as a killing society will be surveyed next, and then the characteristics of Yanomamo as a nonkilling society, both based solely on Chagnon (1997a)'s book. Finally, the numerous and diverse problems with his work will be explicated.

Killing Society

Chagnon (1997a:206) claims that resort to violence is the only possibility in a violent world like that of the Yanomamo; killing is the only practical alternative for their survival. However, in the fifth edition of his case study Chagnon presents a new model of "Bellicose and Refugee Strategies" that fits his description of geographical, ecological, social, political, and cultural variation. The model seems quite plausible, but remains hypothetical although the limited data he provides is suggestive (p. 91). The bellicose strategy characterizes the lowlands, while the refugee strategy characterizes the highlands, but this dichotomy may be too simple (cf. Sponsel 1983:207).

At the same time Chagnon asserts that war is the central and pivotal factor in Yanomamo life: "The fact that the Yanomamo have lived in a chronic state of warfare is reflected in their mythology, ceremonies, settlement pattern, political behavior, and marriage practices. Accordingly, I have organized this case study in such a way that students can appreciate the effects of warfare on Yanomamo culture in general and on their social organization and political relationships in particular..." (p. 8). He goes on to write that: "And, the history of every village I investigated, from 1964 to 1991, was in-

timately bound up in patterns of warfare with neighbors that shaped its politics and determined where it was found at any point in time and how it dealt with its current neighbors” (p. 9).

Chagnon equates warfare with raiding: “Yanomamo warfare proper is to go on a raid. Most definitions of war emphasize that it is a ‘military contest between two independent groups’ with the intent of ‘inflicting lethal harm.’ Raiding between villages fits this definition....” (p. 185). He goes on to state that “it is sometimes more meaningful to look at their wars as contests between groups of kinsmen who collectively may live in several different villages over short periods of time....” (p. 185). Chagnon writes that: “Most wars are merely a prolongation of earlier hostilities, stimulated by revenge motives. The first causes of hostilities are usually sorcery, killings, or club fights over women in which someone is badly injured or killed.... The Yanomamo themselves regard fights over women as the primary causes of the killings that lead to their wars” (p. 190). A treacherous feast in which many guests are massacred is considered by the Yanomamo themselves to be the ultimate form of violence (p. 190). (See pages 191-204 for a detailed description of a specific war and settlement relocation).

Aggressive behavior is highly ritualized, including vocalizations, postures, rattling arrows against a bow, and so on (pp. 175, 178). However, Chagnon asserts that Yanomamo warfare is not merely ritualistic because at least 25% of all adult males die violently in the area where he conducted field research (pp. 7, 205).

From Chagnon’s perspective then, the Yanomamo are “the fierce people” (*waitiri*), not only in the subtitle of the first three editions of his book, but in his persistent characterization of their culture (Chagnon 2013). Accordingly, the Prologue sets the tone for much of the remainder of Chagnon’s book. It describes the brutal axe murder of Ruwahiwa while visiting in the Bisaasi-teri village, and subsequently the revenge killing of a dozen Bisaasi-teri while guests at a treacherous feast (pp. 1-3). Moreover, this event initiated a war between the Bisaasi-teri and Shamatari that lasted 20 or 25 years (pp. ix, 207). However, it should be cautioned that this did not involve regular daily battles.

Chagnon summarizes his controversial 1988 article in the journal *Science* (pp. 204-206). The “facts” place the nature and extent of violence among Kaobawa’s people, the focus of much of the book, into regional perspective: 40% of the adult males participated in the killing of another Yanomamo, the majority of them, 60%, killed only one person. But some men par-

ticipated in killing up to 16 other people. Moawa killed single-handedly a total of 22 people (pp. 205, 213).

Aggression is the primary theme which reoccurs throughout the entire book, but is concentrated in the Prologue and Chapters 5, 6, and 7. From the beginning aggression shapes Yanomamo culture (p. 9). The Yanomamo creation myth emphasizes that men are inherently fierce (p. 104). (For rather different versions of Yanomamo creation accounts consult Wilbert and Simoneau 1990). Boys are socialized to be assertive, for example, returning blow for blow with a stick. Older men instruct them in war games (p. 131). Some men display deep scars on the shaved top of their heads from club fights as a badge of endurance, courage, and fierceness (p. 52)

Unokais are adult males who have killed one or more individuals. They have two and a half times as many wives, and three times as many children. In other words, males who kill more people also have greater reproductive fitness. Chagnon implies that this is the pattern for Yanomamo in general, ignoring here the matter of variation that he discussed earlier. Moreover, Chagnon asserts that this may be the pattern in the history of the human species as a whole, but without citing any scientific evidence to substantiate such a claim (p. 205). However, Chagnon also mentions that males with a reputation for being fierce are sometimes killed before other males in a village, thereby leaving the village weakly defended (p. 195).

Chagnon identifies “a graded series of of aggressive encounters” from duels (chest-pounding, side-slapping, club fighting, and ax fighting) to raids. The treacherous feast in which several invited guests from another village may be massacred is another type of aggression. Another form is to shoot a volley of arrows into a village hoping to hit someone (pp. 185-189).

The main objective of lower levels of aggression seems to be to injure the opponent without drawing blood or killing him, and then withdraw from the contest. Thus, for example, the flat blade of a machete or axe is more likely to be used than the cutting edge. However, sometimes injuries are so severe that an individual is killed. Also, the aggression may escalate to higher levels (p. 186).

Chagnon describes the raid: “The objective of the raid is to kill one or more of the enemy and flee without being discovered. If, however, the victims of the raid discover their assailants and manage to kill one of them, the campaign is not considered to be a success, no matter how many people the raiders may have killed before sustaining their single loss” (p. 189). Capturing women is a desired side benefit of a raid (p. 189). One village was

raided approximately 25 times over the 15 months during Chagnon's first fieldtrip (p. 9).

Ten is the smallest number of raiders that can be effective (p. 202). When raiders approach an enemy village to stage an ambush they divide into subgroups of four to six individuals and then work in relays, one subgroup ambushing some individual from the village around dawn as they come down the main trail to fetch water at the river or perform some other morning routine. Then the raiders flee, and some split into a subgroup to wait in ambush for any males from the village that chase after them (p. 198). Most of the time the raiders manage to ambush a single individual, kill him, and retreat before they are discovered. This is considered to be the most desirable outcome of a raid" (p. 199). However, raiders will not attack a large well-armed group as they guard others leaving their village for their early morning activities (p. 199). It should be noted that such descriptions are based on interviews, not on Chagnon's firsthand observations.

Feasts are where one village invites another to visit. Feasts and trade usually cultivate friendly relationships and alliances, thereby reducing duels and more serious forms of violence. However, of the six feasts that Chagnon witnessed during his first 18 months with the Yanomamo, only two ended in fighting (p. 183).

A *himo* may be used in a club fight, a special palm-wood weapon made for that purpose with a sharp pointed end that can be used to spear if the fight escalates (pp. 106-107, 187). Chagnon mentions "war arrows" as lanceolate bamboo points coated with curare drug, but he does not describe these as distinctive from those used in hunting prey animals (pp. 49, 66, 181). Villages at war may also erect a defensive wooden wall or palisade around the perimeter of their communal shelter (pp. 59, 194). The entrance of the village may be sealed off at night to make it more difficult for any intruders (p. 132). In addition, barking dogs serve as an alarm to alert villagers about the approach of strangers who may be raiders (p. 59). Chagnon does not provide any data on how many villages are palisaded.

Chagnon devotes a whole chapter to discussing alliances in general, next a particular feast in dramatic detail, and then the chest-pounding and side slapping duels, all against the background of intervillage hostilities and histories. Allies provide a safety net for up to a year when fissioning of a village occurs and the resulting refugees need a safe haven with food before their new gardens are productive (p. 159). The forest cannot supply sufficient wild foods to allow a large group to be sedentary, they depend on garden produce. However, a smaller group is vulnerable to hostile others (p. 160).

Because of the risk of being driven from their gardens, no village can exist in isolation without some sociopolitical alliances with other villages as recourse for food and shelter (p. 160).

Chagnon asserts that there is no simple single cause of aggression within and among Yanomamo communities; instead, a somewhat different combination of factors may act in synergy varying in space and time with particular circumstances. The main proximate causes of fights between men within and between villages are women, including extramarital affairs, accusations of sorcery causing a death, and theft of food, although the latter accusation is often aimed at provocation (p. 186). Chagnon rejects animal protein scarcity as a causal factor in Yanomamo aggression (pp. 91-97). [See Chagnon (1997a:93) and Sponcel (1986a, 1998:100-101) for leads to most of the pertinent literature on the animal protein hypothesis. Also see Good (1989, 1995a,b) and Harris (1984). Wilbert (1972:15) anticipated the animal protein hypothesis as an explanation of Yanomamo aggression].

Yanomamo society is male dominated. Sex is a common motif in the oral literature of Yanomamo culture (p. 103, cf. Wilbert and Simoneau 1990). Most fighting within a village stems from sexual affairs and failure to deliver a promised woman (pp. 7, 79). Competition for women stems in large part from the combination of preferential female infanticide and polygyny. Female neonates are more likely to be killed than male ones when a woman has another nursing infant to support. Preferential female infanticide leads to an unbalanced sex ratio which would otherwise be nearly the same; that is, about as many males as females in the population. Instead, there are more males than females in the population (pp. 94, 97). The imbalance is further aggravated by polygyny as some males have more than one wife. An extreme example is Matakuwa who had 11 wives and 43 children (p. 208). One result of competition among men for female mates is the role of women in exchange between villages (p. 160). Sometimes females are also abducted in a raid. Indeed, when raiding is a serious threat, women always leave the village with the danger of being abducted in their minds, and they may be guarded by men with one of their arrows already set in their bow ready for defense against any potential ambush by raiders (pp. 126, 129).

In general, the Yanomamo consider almost any death not caused by observing some kind of physical aggression to be the result of spiritual aggression. Furthermore, in principle, deaths require revenge by the closest relatives and allies. Thus, death from illness also fuels the cycle of blood revenge. This may be aggravated by introduced disease and epidemics from Western contact, a fact that Chagnon appears to downplay.

Apparently Chagnon has a deep understanding of intra- and inter-village sociopolitical dynamics; however, clearly he interprets these principally in terms of aggression (p. 79). He observes that villagers have to find a balance between village size for defense and village size growth which inevitably generates tensions, conflicts, and eventually violence (pp. 76-77). He notes that "... intervillage warfare was an indelible force that affected village size and village distribution..." (p. 31). The larger the village, the more fighting that occurs (p. 188). Villages are rarely able to exceed 300 individuals without fissioning into smaller new villages because of increasing tensions, conflicts, and violence (p. 152). The violent death of someone through aggression within a village leads to fissioning (p. 77).

Communities based solely on kinship cannot be maintained when they increase to a size of around 300. To hold a larger community together it needs to develop a new organizing principle, such as lineages or clans, or greater political authority, and the Yanomamo do not have such principles. In addition, a larger community would need more formal conflict resolution mechanisms. Chagnon mentions that the largest village is 400 (p. 211), although in the final chapter on cultural change he mentions that some mission villages range up to 600 Yanomamo (p. 229).

What Chagnon identifies as macro movements are motivated by politics and warfare, and he asserts that they must be understood in that context. The initial phase of a macro move is a response to the recognition of the potential of some killing, if people continue to reside in the same village (p. 75). A macro move may also be initiated in response to chronic raids by an enemy with their cumulative death toll (p. 76). Villages within walking distance of one another have to be either allies or enemies because neutrality is not any option (p. 185). The physical size of a communal dwelling is even related to warfare in terms of the space needed to house guests who are allies (p. 58). However, other factors may also influence movement, such as the presence of another indigenous culture, the Yecuana, epidemics, and the attraction of missions for trade goods, medical care, schooling, and security (pp. 63-64).

Chagnon asserts that there is a population explosion among Yanomamo (p. 64), and that a "demographic pump" is pivotal in helping to explain warfare (p. 89). This relates to growth in village size beyond the upper limit of around 300, and also to maintain intervillage spacing to exploit needed natural resources and to keep distance from enemies. [However, it should be noted that village size and population growth does not necessarily generate aggression among other indigenous societies (e.g., Sponsel 1986b, Thomas 1982)].

Yanomami male personalities vary in fierceness and bravery (pp. 25-31). An especially aggressive personality and also leadership style can be important determinants of the frequency of different levels of aggression within and between villages (pp. 191, 212-213). The personality of an individual male can generate or reduce violence. In particular, a headman may be a valiant warrior as well as a peacemaker, depending on the specifics of a situation. But Chagnon asserts that "Peacemaking often requires the threat or actual use of force, and most headman have an acquired reputation for being *waiteri*: fierce" (p. 7). In some circumstances, a man can be fearful and avoid conflict. For instance, one of Chagnon's guides, Bakotawa, abandoned him and took his canoe to return home because of fear of an enemy village that Chagnon wished to visit in his research (pp. 36, 41).

There is a whole other dimension of aggression among the Yanomamo and that is very important to them. Chagnon alludes to it repeatedly, but does not pursue it in any depth. Physical aggression, including raids, can be generated by a belief that an enemy shaman from another village has caused death within one's own village (pp. 55, 70, 97). The religious component of Yanomamo culture and aggression might have been documented in much more detail, given its importance for Yanomamo (cf., Good 1997, Lizot 1985:85-137, Peters 1998:151-161, Rifkin 1994:302-306, 310, 318, Wilbert and Simoneau 1990). (For Chagnon's brief comments on shamanism and spirits see pp. 113, 116-119, 128, 131, 133, 196, and 216).

Nonkilling Society

From Chagnon's ethnographic observations and interpretations as briefly summarized above it is clear that the Yanomamo are a killing society. Or, are they? Is aggression ubiquitous through space and time? The present author's answer is that, like many societies, while there are killers among the Yanomamo, most people do not kill. There are several reasons for this which are also embedded in Chagnon's ethnography, but not highlighted by him as of any significance.

First, there is the fact that Yanomamo villages lack food surplus, social specialization, and an authority, and thus they lack anything that comes close to the common meaning of a military institution, unlike chiefdom and state sociopolitical systems. As Chagnon observes: "Much of the daily life revolves around gathering, hunting, collecting wild foods, collecting firewood, fetching water, visiting with each other, gossiping, and making the few possessions they own...." Men hunt almost daily (p. 5). In many villag-

es there are several shamans who almost daily use hallucinogenic drugs to communicate with their spirits (p. 118). A feast for allies from another village requires a week of hunting in order to accumulate a sufficient quantity of meat for guests, and a day of preparing a banana soup as well, plus a surplus of ripe bananas from the gardens (pp. 170-173). Chagnon states that many activities do not really vary much seasonally (p. 133). Raiding can detract attention from the necessities of everyday survival and it can become intolerable to the point of necessitating a move to gain a modicum of peace and security (p. 76). If the above factors are taken into consideration, then it would appear that the daily routine in which Yanomamo are usually engaged to sustain their lives is simply incompatible with any regular aggression at any level. In this regard, a systematic and detailed time allocation study would be revealing to determine the time invested in different activities during the annual seasonal cycle, but such a quantitative inventory is lacking in Chagnon's publications. [See pp. 121-137 for a wealth of detailed information about daily village and social life, and also Peters (1998) and Smole (1976)].

A second factor is demographic. About 30-40% of a village population is comprised of children (p. 247), and children are not killers. Females do not participate in raiding, yet they comprise about half of the population of adults. Elderly males do not kill. Also, if 40% of adult males are killers, then 60% are not. Clearly the majority of Yanomamo are not killers. Chagnon (1997:93) asserts that "The group is in a fundamental sense a sum of its individual parts." If this is so, then on Chagnon's own terms his characterization of the Yanomamo as "the fierce people" is a gross misrepresentation, because it does not reflect the proportions of killing and nonkilling individuals within Yanomamo society. Of course, the majority of the people, even in a society engaged in full-fledged warfare, are not killers, but Chagnon's focus on aggression tends to obscure this reality for the less cautious reader. (For demographic data see Chagnon 1974:158-159 and Early and Peters 1990, 2000).

If 25% of all adult males die from violence, then the remaining 75% of all adult males die from non-violent causes. Usually women are not killed on a raid, except by accident if a volley of arrows is shot into a village (p. 24). Old women are highly respected, immune to raiders, and can safely serve as intermediaries between enemy villages. They have a unique position in intervillage politics and warfare (p. 126), but this is not detailed. Therefore, most Yanomamo are not killed by others, but die from diseases and other natural causes. (For some details about the causes of death see Chagnon 1974:160).

A third factor is time, and in particular seasonality. The usual timing of raids is during the dry season and in the early morning hours (pp. 7, 46, 48,

129). The wet season which extends for about six months discourages raiding, among other things because many impassable swamps that inundate the forest in the lowlands require walking around them (p. 194). Also, snakes concentrate in the higher ground to escape flood waters in the forest (pp. 199, 204). In short, what Chagnon calls warfare is a seasonal activity mostly limited to a few months of the year wherever it occurs, and that is not everywhere.

A fourth factor is space. Neighboring villages are usually on at least trading terms and not actively at war (pp. 164, 183). Alliances serve to limit warfare (p. 160). Raiding between villages keeps them widely separated (p. 46). Also, there is far more aggression including warfare in the lowlands than in the highlands. Accordingly, there are extensive areas where relative peace prevails.

A fifth factor is conflict avoidance. Chagnon writes that: "The warfare pattern waxes and wanes in all Yanomamo areas. Years may go by in some regions, such as on the periphery of the tribe, where no intervillage conflicts occur.... Several years might pass without shooting difficulties with some neighboring group, but anything beyond that is not common" (p. 75). Yet one village remained in one area for 60 to 80 years (p. 72).

There are several other hints that at least in some situations some Yanomamo try to avoid conflict. Intervillage alliances provide a safe haven for refugees (pp. 80, 86-87). "The Yanomamo tend to avoid attacking those villages with which they trade and feast, unless some specific incident, such as the abduction of a woman, provokes them" (p. 160). Alliances between villages may stabilize with reciprocity in trading, feasting, and/or women exchange (p. 163). Some villages may retreat into the forest rather than pursue an enemy, and some men may fail to take responsibility to revenge some offense (p. 193). A special ritualistic visitor's pose symbolizes that he has come in peace, but if any host has reason they may shoot him then or not at all (p. 174). Headman Rerebawa sought peace between his village of Mishimishimabowei-teri and the village of Bisaasi-teri (pp. 215, 223). Some in Bisaasi-teri opposed and tried to prevent the ambush of Ruwahiwa (p. 222). A few individuals in the village of Mishimishimabowei-teri helped some of Kaobawa's people escape a massacre (p. 214). Some men avoid or refuse to participate in a massacre during a treacherous feast (p. 166). Some men avoid duels, and a headman opposes escalation of violence to the level of an axe fight (p. 180). Within hours of setting out on a raid some men turn back with excuses like having a sore foot or being sick (p. 198). Males are not always enthusiastic about raiding, even though they feel the

social pressure of the obligation to revenge the death of a relative (p. 203). A headman may attempt to keep a fight from escalating (p. 188). A headman may order individuals to leave in order to prevent further bloodshed (p. 189). Chagnon himself helped make peace by transporting a headman to another village in his canoe (p. 217). When these scattered points are considered together they undermine the characterization of the Yanomamo as the "fierce people." Incidentally, apparently for Chagnon peace is merely the absence of war, nothing more.

A sixth factor is conflict reduction. Chagnon mentions that in some fights between two individuals, others seem to join in to balance the sides out of a sense of fairness (pp. 186-187). He writes that: "Indeed, some of the other forms of fighting, such as the formal chest-pounding duel, may even be considered as the antithesis of war, for they provide an alternative to killing. Duels are formal and are regulated by stringent rules about proper ways to deliver and receive blows. Much of Yanomamo fighting is kept innocuous by these rules so that the concerned parties do not have to resort to drastic means to resolve their grievances. The three most innocuous forms of violence, chest pounding, slide slapping, and club fights, permit the contestants to express their hostilities in such a way that they can continue to remain on relatively peaceful terms with each other after the contest is settled. Thus, Yanomamo culture calls forth aggressive behavior, but at the same time provides a somewhat regulated system in which the expressions of violence can be controlled" (pp. 185-186).

Hallucinogenic drugs that are used in shamanic rituals can also contribute to the violence of an individual. Chagnon notes that ordinarily timid men may become fierce when on drugs, and people try to calm them down because they can become dangerous to others (p. 118). Also, women may apply a magical plant to try to make men less violent (p. 69). Apparently, fierceness is not always positively valued by every Yanomamo.

Chagnon says: "There are also more customary ways to resolve conflicts- each increasingly more violent and dangerous than the previous way" (p. 212). "But their conflicts are not blind, uncontrolled violence. They have a series of graded forms of violence that ranges from chest-pounding and club-fighting duels to out-and-out shooting to kill. This gives them a good deal of flexibility in settling disputes without immediate resort to violence." Also, alliances and friendships limit violence as does intervillage trading, feasting, and marriage (p. 7).

A headman may be engaged in nonviolent conflict resolution, negotiation, peace making, and related initiatives within and between villages to reduce

tensions and conflicts or resolve disputes nonviolently, sometimes even intervening in fights or duels, disarming a dangerous individual high on drugs or just out of control, arrange safe conduct in hostile territory, and so on (pp. 134-135). Chagnon does not elaborate further on mechanisms of conflict avoidance, reduction, and management, these were not the focus of his research.

A man who has killed someone undergoes seclusion for a week during a process of a special purification ritual (p. 200). From Chagnon's description, it appears that killing another human is recognized as something quite extraordinary, personally disturbing to the killer and other villagers, and the aftermath is considered dangerous to the killer. But Chagnon does not elaborate on this matter (cf. Barandiaran 1967, Grossman 1995, McNair 2009:327, 345).

In conclusion, more than enough has been said about nonkilling, based on Chagnon's own ethnography, to demonstrate that killing is not ubiquitous among the Yanomamo. Furthermore, this raises the possibility that it might well have been very revealing if Chagnon had also considered nonkilling in systematic detail, and, perhaps, even inserted a whole chapter on it in his case study.

Problems

Chagnon mentions that "Some anthropologists argue that the Yanomamo I have studied are unusual or very different, not representative of the larger population. If the Yanomamo I have studied are "special" or "unusual" by comparison to Yanomamo studied by others, it should also be made clear that they represent 25 percent of all known Yanomamo. Until we know how large and representative other samples are, we at least know this one is not an insignificant one." However, while a quarter of a population is an impressive sample size, that alone does not automatically validate any scientific analysis and interpretations. For instance, one of the problems with Chagnon's argument that males who kill more have higher reproductive fitness is the likelihood that they may also be more likely to be killed themselves in revenge and that obviously ends their reproduction. Chagnon does not adequately address this problem (cf. Chagnon 1997b).

Chagnon notes that at the time of his research there were 250-300 villages, and that each village is somewhat different, although commonalities exist as well (pp. 207-208). Furthermore, he mentions that much of his monograph is about the village of Bisaasi-teri in the Mavaca area, although he also worked in one other village called Mishimishimabowei-teri, and he

places these in a larger regional context as well (pp. 2-3). Thus, Chagnon offers one explanation for possible differences in the observations of different researchers among the Yanomamo; namely, geographic and ecological variation within the immense territory of the Yanomamo may be related to large variations in warfare intensity and other forms of violence across regions (pp. xi-xii). Indeed, it is likely that Yanomamo villages in the highlands where there is less violence are more representative of traditional society than the villages in the lowlands where there is more violence and more influence from Westerners.

Another variable may be contact history, no less than 250 years of it to varying degrees (Cocco 1972, Ferguson 1995, Migliazza 1972, Smole 1976). Although Chagnon portrays the Yanomamo as a largely isolated, uncontacted, and traditional primitive tribal society, especially until the last chapter of his book, he notes that the first missionary, James Barker, had sustained contact beginning in 1951, 13 years before Chagnon first started his fieldwork (p. 3). However, Chagnon asserts that significant cultural change did not begin to occur until the 1990s (pp. ix-x, 1), one of the reasons for the new fifth edition of his book. Yet Brian Ferguson (1995) in a meticulous and penetrating ethnohistorical and ethnological study reveals with substantial documentation that the Yanomamo have been influenced to varying degrees by external forces for centuries, sometimes directly along the perimeter of their territory, but more often indirectly diffusing inward, especially by Western trade goods and diseases. Thus, Ferguson reaffirms Chagnon's claim that "past events and history must be understood to comprehend the current observable patterns" (p. 1). Had Chagnon himself considered in a scholarly manner the material of others as Ferguson did, then perhaps his characterization of the Yanomamo might be somewhat different. (Also, see Curtis 2007, Ferguson 1992a,b, Ramos 2001, Wright, et al. 1999:367).

Chagnon mentions assertions by critics that he invented data, exaggerated violence, and so on, and suggests that this may simply reflect researchers working in different areas given the spatial variation among the Yanomamo in terms of geography, ecology, culture, politics, conflict, and contact (pp. 82, 90-91). He writes that: "In Chapter 2 I discussed what is now beginning to look like a major difference in the degree to which violence, warfare, and abductions characterize different areas of Yanomamoland." He asserts: "... the known variations in warfare intensity and fighting over women are so extreme from one region of the Yanomamo to another" (p. 82). In an interview Chagnon states: "No serious scientist has ever doubted my data" (Wong 2001:28). Actually many have, including 18 anthropologists who have also

lived and worked with the Yanomami, some far more years than Chagnon (Albert, et al., 2001, 2013). (For the controversy over the allegation that Chagnon invented and/or manipulated his data and related problems see Albert 1989, Beckerman, et al., 2009, Carneiro da Cunha 1989, Chagnon 1988, 1989, 1990, 1995, 1997b, Early and Peters 1990, 2000, Ferguson 1989, Fry 2006:184-199, 2007:135-139, Good and Lizot 1984, Lizot 1989, 1994a, Moore 1990, Ramos 2001, and Tierney 2001:158-180).

The above considerations regarding regional variation, however, do not effectively respond to two among Chagnon's most serious critics. Jacques Lizot (1985) who actually lived with Yanomamo for more than a quarter of a century starting in 1968, and Kenneth Good (1991) who lived with them for 14 consecutive years from 1975-1988 for 68 months. According to Good (personal communication), Lizot's main base for most of his fieldwork was Tayari-teri which is located only about an hour farther up the Orinoco river, depending on water conditions, from Bisaasi-teri which was Chagnon's main base. Good's main village of Hasupuwe-teri was much farther up the Orinoco above the Guajaribo rapids, but he emphasizes that all of the communities are the same Yanomamo. Furthermore, spatial variation among Yanomamo does not explain why almost all anthropologists who have worked extensively with the Yanomamo are critical of Chagnon's persistent depiction of them as the "fierce people" long after he dropped that phrase from the subtitle in the fourth edition of his book. (See Albert 2001, 2013, Lizot 1985, 1988, 1994).

Chagnon's whole emphasis throughout his book and elsewhere is on conflict, violence, and warfare, which certainly can be a legitimate focus for any researcher (Chagnon 1968a,b, 1996a, Ferguson 1984, Lizot 1977, Sponsel 2000a, Sponsel and Good 2000). His particular focus may be the result of some combination of factors such as personal and/or professional interests (aggression including warfare), individual personality, preoccupations of American culture and society, and historical context. For example, the first edition of Chagnon's book was published in 1968 during the extremely tragic and controversial Vietnam War. In contrast, French anthropologists like Bruce Albert and Jacques Lizot (1985), Brazilian anthropologist Alcida Ramos (1995), and Canadian anthropologist John Peters (1998) do not concentrate on aggression, although they do not deny by any means that aggression can be one element in Yanomamo village life, society, and culture. However, other American anthropologists who have worked with the Yanomamo, including Kenneth R. Good (1991) and Gale Goodwin Gomez do not concentrate on conflict, violence, and warfare either. (Incidentally, Chagnon does not men-

tion Good's 1991 book, although he does cite the dissertation of his one-time student). Accordingly, Chagnon's research focus on the subjects of conflict, violence, and warfare, in contrast to other anthropologists who have spent very substantial amounts of time in the field living with and studying the Yanomamo, some of them far longer than Chagnon, is not simply a product of his cultural, sociopolitical, and historical context alone.

Chagnon points out that high levels of violence and warfare are also found elsewhere as reported by Etorre Biocca (1970 1996) and non-anthropologists Luis Cocco (1972), Margaret Jank (1977a), Mark Ritchie (1996, 2000), and Helena Valero (1984) (p. 208). (Also, see Dawson 2006, Jank 1977b, Lizot 1985:141-185, and Peters 1998:207-220). Consider the following data extracted from a very close reading of one of the sources that Chagnon cites as confirmation of his account of Yanomamo, Biocca (1996). This text certainly contains some shocking anecdotal accounts of brutal violence. An analysis reveals 46 episodes of aggression over a period of 24 years, about two annually on average. However, these episodes included only two homicides, six blood feuds, and six raids. Accordingly, Biocca's does not provide very strong confirmation for Chagnon's representation of the Yanomamo as the fierce people. Furthermore, Biocca's account is based on the memory of a single informant who was a victim, Helena Valero, having been abducted by the Yanomamo at 11 years of age in 1932 and lived with them for 24 years. Biocca taped her recollections in 1962-1963 and cross-checked them with other informants. Yet apparently Valero was dissatisfied with Ettore's account since she published her own book later (Valero 1984). Nevertheless, Steven A. LeBlanc (2003:152) and Smith (2007:12-15) both cite an anecdote of an episode of brutal violence recounted in Biocca's book with the misleading implication that violence and warfare are ubiquitous among the Yanomamo. It would appear that science is trumped by the ideology of the apologists for war. It would be interesting to systematically compare the accounts of Biocca and Valero, and also to compare them with a biography from the Waorani, another Amazonian indigenous society that is also infamous for its violence (Wallis 1965). However, such comparisons are beyond the scope of this chapter.

In the most extensive and sophisticated demographic study of any Yanomamo population, John Early and John Peters (2000:230) point out that in the entire 66-year period covered by their research on the demography of the Xilixana Yanomami of the Mucajai River area in Brazil, there were only five raids. That is an average of one raid about every 13 years. They also note that there were no raids during Kenneth Taylor's 23 months

of fieldwork among eight villages of the Auaris Sanuma subgroup of Yanomami. Early and Peters (2000:203) conclude: "The Yanomami do conduct deadly raids, but the stereotype of all Yanomami as engaged in chronic warfare is false and resented by the Yanomami themselves" (cf., Salamone 1997:20). Peters lived with the Yanomamo in Brazil for a decade.

Lizot (1985: xiv-xv), who lived with Yanomamo starting in 1968 for more than a quarter of a century and virtually in the same area where Chagnon worked, writes: "I would like my book to help revise the exaggerated representation that has been given of Yanomami violence. The Yanomami are warriors; they can be brutal and cruel, but they can also be delicate, sensitive, and loving. Violence is only sporadic; it never dominates social life for any length of time, and long peaceful moments can separate two explosions. When one is acquainted with the societies of the North American plains or the societies of the Chaco of South America, one cannot say that Yanomami culture is organized around warfare. They are neither good nor evil savages. These Indians are human beings."

Good (1991:13), who lived with Yanomamo for 14 consecutive years mostly in the same general area as Chagnon, from 1975-1988, writes: "To my great surprise I found among them a way of life that, while dangerous and harsh, was also filled with camaraderie, compassion, and a thousand daily lessons in communal harmony." Furthermore, Good (1991:73) says: "The more I thought about Chagnon's emphasis on Yanomama violence, the more I realized how contrived and distorted it was. Raiding, killing, and wife beating all happened; I was seeing it, and no doubt I'd see a lot more of it. But by misrepresenting violence as the central theme of Yanomama life, his *Fierce People* book had blown the subject out of any sane proportion." (Also, see pages 13, 55, 56, 73, 174-175 in Good's book). Indeed, Good was far more impressed with the relative harmony within the intimate communities of the Yanomamo (pp. 13, 33, 69, 80, 82). It should be possible to reach some conclusion about such issues by pursuing a systematic comparison of the several dozen ethnographies on the Yanomamo; however, this may not be easy because the foci, depth, quantification, and other aspects of the contents of different books are very uneven.

Anthropological filmmaker Timothy Asch (1991:35) who collaborated closely with Chagnon in most of his Yanomamo films wrote: "'The fierce people,' indeed, you can't call an entire society the fierce people or any one thing for that matter.... Asch (1991:38) also mentions the "irresponsibly categorized and grossly maligned "fierce people." Asch's different view of the Yanomamo are reflected in several short films he made that are availa-

ble from the Documentary Educational Research such as “A Father Washes His Children.” (Also, see Asch 1992 and Lewsi 2004).

The above conclusions coincide with the observation by Bruce Albert, Alcida Ramos, Kenneth Taylor, and Fiona Watson (2001) who have all worked with Yanomamo, the first three for many years: “We have, between us, spent over 80 years working with the Yanomami. Most of us speak one or more Yanomami dialect. Not one of us recognizes the society portrayed in Chagnon’s books, and we deplore his sensationalism and name-calling” (Albert, et al., 2001). In February 26, 2013, no less than 18 anthropologists who have lived and worked with the Yanomami signed a statement posted on the website of Survival International including this sentence: “We absolutely disagree with Napoleon Chagnon’s public characterization of the Yanomami as a fierce, violent and archaic people” (Albert, et al., 2013). Ramos (2001) even refers to Chagnon’s description of the Yanomamo as “character assassination.”

Other factors which may explain the differences between depictions of the Yanomamo by Chagnon and almost all other anthropologists who have worked with the Yanomamo include personal differences. Indeed, Chagnon himself recognizes that “... the anthropologist’s reactions to a particular people are personal and idiosyncratic....” (p. 10). Furthermore, Karl Heider (1997) mentions several reasons why ethnographers may arrive at different perspectives and interpretations about the same culture: someone is wrong; they are observing different subcultures; they are studying the same culture but at different times; and/or they are looking differently at the same culture. Perhaps some of these reasons apply in the case of different anthropologists who have conducted research with the Yanomamo. At the same time, almost all anthropologists who have worked extensively with Yanomamo are in agreement that Chagnon exaggerated and distorted the violence in Yanomamo society (e.g., Albert, et al., 2001, 2013). Even Chagnon’s filmmaker, Timothy Asch (1991, 1992), eventually arrived at this same conclusion.

Something else that initially seems to be peculiar about Chagnon’s ethnography is his assertion that nonviolent conflict resolution mechanisms are absent among the Yanomamo (p. 211). Although possible, this seems peculiar because such mechanisms are known to be well developed in numerous and diverse other sociocultural systems (Bonta 1996, Fry and Bjorkqvist 1997, Kemp and Fry 2004). Perhaps Chagnon simply wasn’t interested in them, or just didn’t look for them among his Yanomamo. But this is not necessarily unusual. Researchers and others tend to pay far more attention to killing than to nonkilling in many contexts, marginalizing nonviolence

while privileging violence (e.g., Evans Pim 2009). In trying to understand violence it might well be revealing to also consider nonviolence, as for example, why some men do not join raids or engage in other forms of aggression in Yanomamo society.

As Jacob Pandian (1985: 104) astutely remarks in a discussion about the Yanomamo: "In other words, the social and cultural reality constructed by the anthropologist is actually a portrait of his own psychological reality, as dictated by the ideas that are considered meaningful to him and his audience." (Also see Ramos 1987, 2001). Accordingly, further discussion of Chagnon's personality is merited here (cf. Dyer 2006, Irons 2004).

Chagnon's first person accounts of his ethnographic experience reveals his remarkable persistence, stamina, and courage in facing many difficult challenges, hardships, and dangers throughout the 60-63 months of actual fieldwork during some 25 fieldtrips stretching over a period of approximately 30 years. Chagnon says that he risked his life, and it was endangered on several occasions (pp. 42, 209, 254-258). He learned to defend himself fiercely to gain respect (p. 17-19). Given the nature of his research problems, he needed to collect detailed genealogies which is extremely difficult and can even be dangerous in a society in which it is taboo to mention the personal names of individuals and especially deceased persons (cf. Wilbert 1972:51). Chagnon describes how he ignored Yanomamo customs and etiquette in pursuing personal names in spite of the taboo (pp. 13-21, 251-252). Also, he learned to manipulate and deceive informants to collect accurate genealogies (pp. 22-25). Chagnon mentions that the Yanomamo are not always truthful (pp. 221-222) and that he himself has lied in dealing with them (p. 252). He also states that among the Yanomamo "Strategically deployed, deception and self deception are survival enhancing social tools" (p. 222). [See Chagnon (1974) for more details about his field methods].

Chagnon's personal presence throughout his book holds the attention of readers and helps to understand his fieldwork methods and experiences, an approach reminiscent to some degree of postmodernist reflexivity. Indeed, Chagnon is unusually candid in his book. For instance, he mentions that he facilitated a raid by providing transportation for ten raiders in his motorized canoe (pp. 201-202). However, it may be a weakness in revealing some of his ethical misconduct which an extraordinary number of individuals have questioned on that and other grounds (Albert 2001, Albert and Ramos 1989, Begley 2000, Booth 1989, Borofsky 2005, Carneiro da Cuna 1989, Chagnon 1974, 1995, 1997b, Coronil 2001, Davis 1976, Fischer 2001, Fluehr-Lobban 2002, Geertz 2001, Good 1991, Gregor and Gross 2004,

Horgan 1988, Hume 2010, Johnston 2010, Landes, et al., 1976, Mann 2001, Miller 2001, Monaghan 1994, Nugent 2001, Padilha 2010, Rabben 2004, Ramos 1987, 2001, Rifkin 1994, Robin 2004, Sahllins 2001, Salamone 1997, Salzano and Hurtado 2003, Sponsel 1998, 2010b, Sponsel and Turner 2002, Stoll 2001, Tierney 2000, 2001, Time 1976, Terrence Turner 1994, 2001, Trudy Turner 2005, Whiteford and Trotter 2008:5, 40, Wilson 2001, Wolf 1994, Wong 2001).

Chagnon tries to take much of the credit for the visibility of the Yanomami that helped gain them recognition and assistance during the 1980s massive and catastrophic invasion of illegal gold miners into their territory in Brazil. Chagnon credits his publications and films with making the Yanomamo known to the world, although he admits that publications of other “knowledgeable anthropologists” contributed to their “international visibility” (p. 232, also pp. 253, 259, cf. 1997b). While Chagnon’s books reached American audiences, Lizot (1976a, 1978) reached audiences in France and in Spanish speaking countries like Venezuela. Moreover, as mentioned previously, there is a long history of numerous and diverse anthropological accounts of the Yanomami extending back into the early 19th century. In addition, Chagnon discusses his personal heroism again in connection with the investigation of the massacre of Yanomamo by gold miners at Hashimu. However, he avoids mentioning the controversy that surrounded his role in the inquiry including being expelled from Venezuela by a judge and military officials on September 30, 1993 (Stoll 2001:37), even though he cites some of the literature in a footnote albeit without providing complete citations in the bibliography (pp. 233-235).

Chagnon concludes his book with the assertion that: “The Yanomamo are now a symbol for all tribesmen and their habitats, everywhere” (p. 259). However, many readers may not be clear about precisely what the Yanomamo actually symbolize in Chagnon’s ethnography other than Hobbesian savages. In using his case study among others in teaching various anthropology courses for more than three decades it is clear to the present author that the main message that most readers acquire on their own reading is that the Yanomamo are Hobbesian savages who would be better if civilized (cf. Sponsel 1992, 1994a). Another message is that as primitives the Yanomamo reflect the inherent aggressiveness of human nature (cf. Sponsel 1996a, 1998, 2009). In short, without the benefit of informed and critical analysis this book may simply reinforce preconceived American cultural stereotypes, ethnocentrism, and racism. This is extremely serious, because through the six editions that have been commonly used in anthropology

courses since 1968, several million students have been exposed to what the Yanomamo symbolize for Chagnon.

The American cultural mindset appears to be influencing Chagnon's conceptual framework. In his ethnography about the Yanomamo he uses concepts reflecting American militaristic ideology such as credible threat and peace through strength (p. 158). A cold war mindset with its nuclear weaponry for mutually assured destruction as a credible threat to sustain peace between superpowers is mirrored in Chagnon's view of intervillage politics, as for example, when he mentions the "politics of brinkmanship," bluff, intimidation, and detente (pp. 160-161, 216). It appears that his conceptual framework is not totally devoid of ethnocentric conceptualizations and interpretations of the Yanomamo, although the same could be said of many other ethnographers. Science is not ahistorical, acultural, apolitical, and amoral, no matter how much one may attempt to be neutral and objective or claim to be so (e.g., Holmes 2008).

Chagnon's (1996, 1997a) use of the concepts of war, peace, and military are problematic as well (Lizot 1994b). The nature and scale of aggression among the Yanomamo include raids and massacres, but they hardly merit the designation of war, except by the broadest definition as a potentially lethal conflict between two political entities which might be considered villages in the case of the Yanomamo. Such a vague conception of war almost renders it a cross-cultural universal which is counter to the overwhelming bulk of evidence (e.g., Fry 2006, 2007, Kelly 2000, Sponsel 1998:106-109). Intervillage raids among the Yanomamo are more reminiscent of the famous blood feud between the extended families of the Hatfields and McCoys in the mountains of Appalachia in Kentucky and Virginia from 1882 to 1890 that involved the killing of a dozen individuals (Rice 1982, Waller 1988). (For similar cases of blood feuding see Boehm 1984, Keiser 1991, Kelly 2000, and Otterbein 1985, 1994, 2004).

In the case of the Hatfields and McCoys, "yellow journalism" in the popular press focused on selected fragments of reality thereby exaggerating and sensationalizing them into a myth of savagery, although there were feuds many times worse elsewhere. Some think that Chagnon's ethnography is a similar distortion, including most anthropologists who have spent any length of time working with the Yanomamo.

As Good (1991:44) observes: "The Yanomama, I knew, never engage in anything like open warfare. They think it's absurd to risk your life that way and possibly get a lot of people killed. Instead, a raiding party will sneak up on an enemy village and hide in the bushes overnight, maybe on the trail

leading to the village gardens. Then next morning they will wait until someone passes, shoot him, then run off. No heroics, no single combat, no massed battles. Just hide, shoot, and run. You accomplish your purpose, and you don't get yourself killed in the process."

In response to Chagnon's (1968a,b) earliest publications on the Yanomamo, Robin Fox (1969) and Elman Service (1968) both questioned his equation of feuding and raiding as warfare. (Also see Fry 2006, 2007, Sponsel 1998). David P. Barash (1991: 32, 82-83) in the first major textbook in peace studies defines war as armed aggression for political goals between or within nation-states involving a military sector separate from a civilian one with 50,000 troops and 1,000 combat dead. However, this definition is too narrow and exclusive for most anthropological students of warfare. What is sorely needed is a systematic and objective typology of warfare and other forms of aggression (Sponsel 2000, Sponsel and Good 2000). (Also, see Keegan 1993:97, 121, Kelly 2000:122-123, 139-142; LeBlanc 2003:57, Levinson 1004:63-66; Otterbein and Otterbein 1965, and Smith 2007:15-17).

Likewise, Chagnon uses the concept of the military so loosely and carelessly as to be meaningless (e.g., pp. 160-162). The term usually refers to full-time professionally trained armed combatants of a nation state. Levinson (1994:115) states: "A society is considered militaristic when it engages in warfare frequently; when it devotes considerable resources to preparing for war; when its soldiers kill, torture, or mutilate the enemy; and when pursuit of military glory is an objective of combat." (See also Eckhardt 1973). The Yanomamo do not conform to the normal conception of the military. Furthermore, among the Yanomamo, there is nothing comparable by any stretch of the imagination to the military of the Venezuelan state based in the vicinity of some of their communities (Chagnon 1997a:238). But reference to war and military among the Yanomamo connects Chagnon's work with the broader discourse on these subjects, thereby lending him notice and prestige. (On American militarism see Andres 2004 and Hedges 2002).

The negative concept of peace is implicated in Chagnon's perspective; namely, peace is no more than the absence of war (pp. 168, 216). Adherence to such a simple and myopic concept of peace may help explain why Chagnon focuses on killing to the neglect of nonkilling in Yanomamo society. However, peace is not rare, it is just rarely studied, contrary to Chagnon in the case of the Yanomamo and also to some of his partisans (Gregor 1996:xii-xiv, cf., Sponsel 1996a). As Kelly (2000:75) observes: "Warfare is not an endemic condition of human existence but an episodic feature of human history (and prehistory) observed at certain times and places and

not others.” Furthermore, empathy, cooperation, and altruism are no less a part of Yanomamo character than they are part of animal nature in general (Bekoff and Pierce 2010, Good 1991). [For further explication of the distinction between negative and positive peace see Sponsel (1994b:14-16), and for an elaboration of the problems with Chagnon’s conceptual framework regarding warfare, military, and other concepts see Sponsel (1998). The distinction was also discussed in Chapter I of the present book].

In Yanomamo society women appear to be passive rather than active agents, only laborers, producers of children, sex objects, and items of exchange (Chagnon 1997a:210). Yanomamo culture is “decidedly masculine—male chauvinistic” (p. 122) and Chagnon is male; thus, these two factors may help explain why he has relatively little to say about the role of women in intra- and inter-village politics among other matters related to gender, even though women like males in villages are readily observable. Some anthropologists have accused him of male sexist bias (Tiffany and Adams 1994, 1995, 1996). Research is sorely needed on all aspects of women in Yanomamo society, culture, economy, politics, violence, and nonviolence. For instance, Chagnon does not consider the reproductive fitness of women, only that of men.

Evolution as cumulative change through time is certainly a scientific fact, but evolutionism is a political ideology; that is, viewing so-called primitive cultures as survivals from some prior stage of cultural evolution (e.g., Fabian 1991). When Chagnon asserts that Yanomamo reflect some aspects of “our entire history as humans” (p. 154), he is not referring to cross-cultural or panhuman universals shared by humanity. Instead, he is referring to the Yanomamo as representing an earlier stage of cultural evolution, rather than merely an alternative lifestyle among our contemporaries. Obviously Chagnon views the Yanomamo as some kind of primitive survivals from the Stone Age; that is, foot Indians with minimal horticulture at an early stage of the Neolithic (p. 45, cf. Wilbert 1972). He mentions the term primitive throughout his book (pp. 5, 10, 11, 19, 31, 79, 121, 139, 144, 145, 164, 211, 243, 247, 248) and also in his 2013 memoir. However, the concept of primitive was challenged as derogatory stereotyping and went out of fashion among professional anthropologists five decades ago, unless very carefully qualified in special contexts (e.g., Montagu 1968, cf. Roes 1997). One of Chagnon’s collaborators, James V. Neel (1970), also viewed the Yanomamo as “primitive,” as did Wilbert (1972: 4, 13-15). However, Chagnon (1997) persists in applying the term in the fifth edition of his book (cf. Fabian 1991). The Yanomamo are not anachronistic, but Chagnon’s

continuing use of the term primitive is (Wong 2001:26-28). Nevertheless, this adds to the attraction of his book for many naïve readers (cf. Chagnon 1973, 1997b, Fischer 1969). Yet using the term primitive without appropriate qualification in the media may serve to reinforce negative stereotypes of the Yanomamo held by the general public including government officials in Venezuela and Brazil (Wong 2001:26-28).

Chagnon has spent a total of 63 months (p. viii), or 60 months (p. 1, 8), actually living with Yanomamo during his field research, this stretched out over a period of about 30 years (p. vii, xii). He made 20 (p. 8) or 25 (p. viii) separate fieldtrips, and visited some 60 villages (p. 27). Chagnon says that "... I have been studying the Yanomamo now for nearly 30 years" (p. 204), states that he has been studying the Yanomamo for 32 years (pp. 248, 257), and claims that he has "25 years of field data" (p. 213). Whichever the correct numbers, given the nature of his research Chagnon has likely visited a greater number of villages than any other field researcher. However, his fieldwork was curtailed during various periods by the refusal of the Office of Indian Affairs of the government of Venezuela to issue further research permits. Chagnon (1997b:101) attributes curtailment during 1975-1984 to professional jealousy and nationalism of Venezuelan anthropologists. However, many Venezuelan anthropologists have their own achievements that are widely recognized nationally and internationally, thus no reason to be jealous. In addition, any Venezuelan nationalism did not prevent other foreigners from conducting long-term field research in the Amazon, such as the American Kenneth R. Good and the Frenchman Jacques Lizot. In short, it is likely that other reasons were involved for the Venezuelan government's refusal of his application to return to the Yanomamo. The government rejected his applications at least three times (Wong 2001:27).

Chagnon asserts that he has studied 25% of his estimated some 20,000 individuals among the Yanomamo (p. 83). At the same time, he writes that: "Only two of the seven population blocs shown in Figure 2.14 are the focus of most of the discussion in this book...." (p. 80). He resided mainly in two communities, Kaobawa's village of Bisaasi-teri (pp. 3, 83-84), and to a much lesser degree Mishimisimabowei-teri (p. 209). Both of these two villages are within the sphere of contact influences from missionaries and other Western forces, and were so even before Chagnon started. The Venezuelan Malaria Control station was located near the Mavaca mission for over 25 years (p. 246). Bisaasi-teri was a base of the New Tribes Mission, and a Salesian mission was directly across the river (Kenneth R. Good, personal communication). Chagnon emphasizes the necessity to not limit ethnographic obser-

vation to one community at a single point in time (p. 207). However, he initially spent some 15 months in the village of Bisaasi-teri (p. 208). [For more on the context of Chagnon's fieldwork, see Cocco (1972) and Ferguson (1995: 277-306)].

Another dimension of his research sample is his recognition of five distinct ecological zones within the territory of the Yanomamo (pp. 83-88). Moreover, he asserts that: "These ecological and geographical differences seem to lie behind social, political, demographic, and historical differences when villages from the two areas are compared" (p. 87). "The most startling difference is the degree to which violence and warfare – and the consequences of these– distinguish highland and lowland groups from each other. Warfare is much more highly developed and chronic in the lowlands. Men in the lowland villages seem 'pushy' and aggressive, but men from the smaller, highland villages seem sedate and gentle. Not unexpectedly, alliance patterns are more elaborate in the lowlands and dramatic, large, regular feasts are characteristic, events in which large groups invite their current allies to feast and trade. Larger numbers of women in the lowland villages are either abducted from or "coerced" from weaker, smaller neighbors – including highland villages.... In addition, fewer of the adult men in the highland villages are unokais, i.e., men who have participated in the killing of other men...." (p. 87). (Also, see pp. 88-91). But these zonal differences are not systematically, quantitatively, and statistically demonstrated, he offers mostly qualitative assertions instead (Table 2.1, p. 88). Regional differences need to be far more carefully pursued and documented. For instance, Chagnon suggests that resources in the highlands are less abundant than in the lowlands, thus perhaps protein capture from animal prey may be more of a problem in the former (p. 94).

Chagnon depicts Yanomamo as traditional primitives little influenced by external forces, yet he was led into his first village called Bisaasi-teri by missionary James P. Barker who started in 1950 (p. 11) or 1951 (p. 3), and had lived there for five years (p. 11). The Venezuelan Malaria Control Service had their first permanent field station next to the village and had been in the area for decades (p. 17). He arrived in the village shortly after a serious fight and was confronted by men with drawn arrows (pp. 11-12). He set up temporarily in Barker's hut (p. 13) and Bisaasi-teri remained his base of operations for many years (p. 17).

Chagnon notes that it is difficult to generalize about contact because there is much regional variation in its kind and degree (p. 228). He mentions that Kaobawa's community, Bisaasi-teri, had direct contact with mis-

sions for over four decades by the time of the fifth edition of his book (p. 228). He identifies gradual change in contrast to catastrophic change. But, other than a page or so on gold miners, he focuses almost exclusively on the impact of the Catholic Salesian missionaries, and affords almost no consideration to the Protestant New Tribes missionaries. He discusses mainly the impact of guns from the Salesians on raids of weaker villages and on diseases from contact, especially in intermediate villages that are not isolated, but do not have regular access to medical care from the missions. It becomes obvious that the Salesians and Chagnon have some kind of dispute (pp. 257-258). Protestant missionaries, especially the New Tribes Mission, generally have far more deleterious impact on indigenous communities and their cultures than Catholic ones. [Also see Capelletti (1994), Salamone (1997), Tierney (2001:315-326), and Wong 2001:27]. In 1974, Chagnon released films on both of the missionary organizations, *Ocamo Is My Town*, and *New Tribes Mission* (pp. 271-272)].

Yanomamo village size at missions varies from 400-600, a result of the missionization process of centralization for access and administration, plus the attraction of the Yanomamo to missions for trade goods, medical care, schools, and security (p. 229). Warfare is diminishing in the vicinity of missionaries because shotguns afford an advantage against any potential raiders. However, guns may also be used by Yanomamo living in or close to missions as an advantage to raid more distant villages (pp. 238-239). In 1964, there were no shotguns in Mavaca, but by 1975 missionaries had introduced them to some members of at least 8-10 villages and this impacted warfare patterns (p. 60). [Note that ten villages is a fraction of the estimated total of 360 villages in Yanomamo territory]. Clearly Chagnon is preoccupied with the introduction of guns by the missionaries as complicating Yanomamo aggression (pp. 190-191, 204, 215, 224, 226) (cf. Chagnon 1996b, Ferguson 1995, Tierney 2001: 18-35).

Chagnon uses quantitative data and graphs to reveal that the Salesian missions are responsible for disease and deaths, up to 25% in some of 17 villages, but he doesn't consider Protestant missions (pp. 234-254). He writes that: "Contact with foreigners at the Salesian Mission in Venezuela is the most likely explanation of the higher mortality patterns in these groups" (p. 250), and that "we [Westerners] initiated contacts and brought new sickness" (p. 258, cf., Tierney 2001:53-82, 334-337).

The forces of culture change or acculturation are mentioned throughout the book. Crude clay pots were still used in 1965, but were replaced by aluminum containers from Western trade by the late 1970s (pp. 49, 172).

Matches replaced wooden fire drills (pp. 50-51). Airplanes were rare until after 1964 (p. 101). Chagnon says that we [Westerners] caused the Yanomamo to crave trade goods (pp. 16-19, 242, 250, cf., Ferguson 1995).

Culture change raises the question of just how traditional were some of the Yanomamo communities that Chagnon visited, and especially his main village of Bisaasi-teri which is the basis for much of his case study. Ferguson (1995) has argued in a meticulous systematic survey of ethnohistorical and ethnological literature that the society that Chagnon views as engaged in chronic, primitive, endemic, and tribal warfare has been influenced directly on the periphery of its territory and indirectly in the interior by Westerners of various kinds for centuries. For instance, the first European contact with Yanomamo appears to have been in 1787 with the Portuguese Boundary Commission. (Also see Chagnon 1996b, Chernela 1997, Cocco 1972, Ferguson 1992a,b, 1995, Migliazza 1972, Peters 1998).

Ferguson raises the possibility that at least some of Yanomamo aggression is a product of contact influences, especially competition for trade goods. In a whole chapter on Chagnon, Ferguson (1995:277-306) even notes that the aggression in the areas where he worked may be influenced by his distribution of trade goods. But in his book Chagnon only mentions Ferguson in a footnote of one sentence (p. 208, cf. Chagnon 1996b). Perhaps Chagnon's focus in his book on the Salesians is an attempt to deflect attention from Ferguson's critical analysis and its ethical implications. [For another example of Chagnon's response to critics, and to Ferguson in particular, see Curtis (2007), an interview where he abruptly walks away after mention of Ferguson].

The use of literature that fits one's observations and interpretations, and the avoidance of literature that does not is a common tactic of an advocacy argument and a sign of confirmation bias, but does not advance science and scholarship. For example, Chagnon's critique of the animal protein hypothesis formulated by Marvin Harris (1984) to try to explain aggression among the Yanomamo totally ignores the dissertation by Good (1989) even though it directly addresses that very issue. He only cites that dissertation in a completely unrelated matter (p. 230). Also, he ignores Good (1995a,b), and Good and Lizot (1984).

In discussing the illegal invasion of gold miners into Yanomamo territory in Brazil in the 1980s, Chagnon ignores the critical role of the Pro-Yanomami Commission, the Yanomami Commission of the American Anthropological Association, Survival International, and other organizations (pp. 231-233). In discussing the controversy surrounding the investigation of

the massacre of Yanomamo by gold miners at Hashimu Chagnon cites four publications including those of three critics in a footnote, but the full citations are not provided in the bibliography (p. 234). He does not cite an important report on the massacre by the French anthropologist who was part of the official investigation team, Bruce Albert (1994). (Also see other documentation by Ramos, et al., 2001, Rocha 1999 and Turner 1994). The reader begins to wonder how much other relevant information is ignored in Chagnon's book and other publications. (On the tragic consequences of the mining invasion in Yanomamo territory see Albert 1994, Berwick 1992, Pro-Yanomami Commission, Rabben 2004, Ramos 1995, Sponsel 1979, 1994a, 1995, 1996b, 1997, 2010c, Survival International 2010, Tierney 2001, and Turner 1991).

There is also selectivity in quantification. Chagnon's use of quantification and statistical analysis is uneven, not always systematic and clear. For example, he mentions that: "At this time the Patanowa-teri were being raided by a dozen different villages" (p. 135) Also, Chagnon mentions "... the several clubs fights that took place while I was in the field on my first trip..." (p. 136). Episodes of fighting are described throughout the book with varying degrees of detail, but often in anecdotal fashion; for example, "Club fighting is more frequent in large villages..." (p. 188). Again, "The Patanowa-teri then became embroiled in new wars with several villages..." (p. 192). In one year at least eight individuals were killed by raiders. The Pantanowa-teri were raided 25 times during Chagnon's initial fieldwork (p. 194). Chagnon writes that sporadic intervillage raiding may endure a decade or more (p. 204). In addition, serious physical abuse of a wife appears to be rather common among the Yanomamo. Wife abuse occurs, including beating, serious injuries, and even killing (pp. 124-126, 135). In short, Chagnon's quantification of phenomena is not systematic, thorough, and precise; some numbers are specified while others are not. It is impossible to obtain a clear idea of the frequency and intensity of each of the different levels in the hierarchy of aggression for a single village during a particular period of time, even for the most studied village of Bisaasi-teri, this in spite of Chagnon's apparent wealth of knowledge and data. This belies Chagnon's seeming scientific rigor including instrumentation for measurements and for some subjects statistical and computer analysis. Numbers are magic to many readers in the sense that they impart the appearance of real science, but this can be deceptive. (Also, see Chagnon 1974, and his films *Yanomama: A Multidisciplinary Study* in 1971, and *A Man Called Bee: Studying the Yanomamo* in 1974).

The Yanomamo also need to be considered in cross-cultural perspective (Sponsel 1998:109-110). Types of aggression that are present among the Yanomamo are found in the following percentage of societies for various sample sizes: violence as a means of solving problems (54%), female infanticide (17%), wife beating (84.5%), bride raiding (50%), rape (50%), anger and aggression over the death of a loved one (76%), blood feuding (53.5%), village fissioning (78%), and sorcery as a cause of illness and death (47%) (data extracted from Levinson 1994). Types of aggression that are rare to absent in Yanomamo society but found in a percentage of other societies for various sample sizes include physical punishment of children (74%), suicide (47%), gerontocide (25%), capital punishment (96.2%), human sacrifice (17%), cannibalism (34%), internal warfare (67%), external warfare (78%), and torturing enemies (50%) (data extracted from Levinson 1994). Thus, from a cross-cultural perspective the Yanomamo are not such an extraordinarily violent society.

Chagnon's violentology with its distorting focus on the Yanomamo as essentially a killing society, and the problematic nature of some of his fieldwork, data, analysis, and interpretations raise another very serious issue. His "fierce people" characterization of the Yanomamo is parroted by many apologists for war and others as reflecting primitive tribal warfare and even human nature in general. Logically, either the authors who uncritically broadcast Chagnon's work to an unsuspecting public are ignorant of the broader literature on the Yanomamo and the criticisms of other anthropologists with extensive experience among the Yanomamo, or they purposefully ignore them. In either case, their indiscriminant use of Chagnon's construction of the Yanomamo as the "fierce people" does not reflect quality science and scholarship. Considering that the criticisms of Chagnon's work have been made for decades by numerous and diverse anthropologists, many of them Yanomamo experts (Sponsel 1998:114), one might well suspect that the apologists and proagandists for warfare utilize Chagnon's work simply because it conveniently fits and reinforces their political ideology (cf., Kegley and Raymond 1999: 20-21, 245, Lewontin 1993).

Just to mention a few, among the apologists and propagandists for war who seem to uncritically use Chagnon's work as if it were canonical are Ghiglieri (1999), Keeley (1996), LeBlanc (2003), Smith (2007), Watson (1995), and Wrangham and Peterson (1996). However, even more politically neutral scholars of violence and war also use Chagnon's work indiscriminately (eg., Eller 2006, Keegan 1993, Otterbein (2004). The same applies to the authors of numerous introductory textbooks in cultural anthropology.

However, Richard H. Robbins (2009:291-293, 300-305) is more cautious than most when he recognizes Chagnon's representation of the Yanomamo as Hobbesian. Of course, if the raiding and other forms of aggression which occur in some places and times among the Yanomamo do not merit the term war, then the relevance of Chagnon's work to the apologists and propagandists for warfare, and the study of war in general, is reduced, if not eliminated. In any case, some of these scientists and scholars would do well to learn how to distinguish truth and its opposite (Frankfurt 2005, 2006, Levitin 2016). They might also consider some of the literature that has been accumulating for decades on the anthropology of peace and nonviolence which most neglect or ignore entirely (Bonta 2010, Howell and Willis 1996, Montagu 1978, Sponsel and Gregor 1994). (For more on assessing ethnographic texts in general see Atkinson 1992 and Hammersley 1990).

It is unlikely that the apologists and propagandists for war and others of various persuasions are totally unaware of the criticisms, controversies, and scandals that have periodically erupted around Chagnon's work at least since the mid-1970s (e.g., Landes, et al., 1976, Time 1976). They have appeared not only in specialized scientific and academic publications, but also in the broader public media, including periodicals such as the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Guardian Weekly*, *Natural History*, *New York Review of Books*, *Newsweek*, *Scientific American*, *The New Republic*, *The New Yorker*, *Time*, and *U.S. News & World Report*.

The net effect of the publications of Chagnon and his disciples has been to stereotype and stigmatize the Yanomamo as "the fierce people" focusing attention on their internal aggression and deflecting it from the aggression impacting on them from outside influences, including introduced Western diseases that have repeatedly precipitated devastating epidemics including in 2020 (Sponsel 1994a, 1997, 2006a,b, 2010c).

Smole (1976:14-15) writes that: "Unfortunately, most explorers have been unable to appreciate the humanness of the Yanoama. Instead, adventurers helped give them a reputation for being more 'wild' (bravo or salvaje in Spanish), violent, and potentially dangerous than most other Indians of South America. Over the years they have become legendary." The fierce characterization by Chagnon has negatively impacted on the Yanomamo in various ways. As just one example, the famous British social anthropologist, Sir Edmund Leach, refused to lend his name as a sponsor for a campaign by Survival International in London to raise funds to develop educational programs for the Yanomamo in the 1990s (Albert, et al., 2001).

In spite of the numerous and diverse problems with Chagnon's work revealed above and in the supporting literature cited, his loyal partisans act as if they believe that only Chagnon is right and instead all of his critics are wrong, an improbable scenario to say the least (e.g., Borofsky 2005, Gregor and Gross 2004). This scenario is obviously improbable, given the extraordinarily large number of critics of Chagnon's work, among them many with extensive field experience living and working with the Yanomamo (e.g., Albert, et al., 2001, 2013). Chagnon's (1997b) and his partisans have attempted to frame his critics as simply a matter of individuals who are anti-science, anti-evolution, anti-biology, postmodernists, or jealous. However, any examination of the resumes of the varied critics would not sustain such simplistic tactic of dismissal.

An observation from Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999:7-8) applies here: "Research is one of the ways in which the underlying code of imperialism and colonialism is both regulated and realized. It is regulated through the formal rules of individual scholarly disciplines and scientific paradigms, and the institutions that support them (including the state). It is realized in the myriad of representations and ideological constructions of "the Other" in scholarly and 'popular' works, and in the principles which help to select and recontextualize those constructions in such things as the media, official histories and school curricula."

There is no scientific reason for privileging internal aggression over external aggression from culture contact influences when the latter actually threatens the very survival of the vulnerable population of the Yanomamo, except, perhaps, a lingering colonial mentality fixated on the primitive tribal other and its supposed endemic and chronic tribal warfare. Myths have their uses, ideological and otherwise (cf., Albert, et al., 2001). In his critique of Chagnon's work Rifkin (1994:320) goes to the extreme of asserting that: "This anthropology is, then, not an anthropology at all but a deformed social science in the service of the engineering sciences of destruction." [For the broader Cold War context of Chagnon's research see Johnston (2007), Price 2016, Tierney (2001), and Wax (2008)].

Conclusions

The Yanomamo are especially relevant to the subject of nonkilling societies because they have been celebrated as the most famous ethnographic case of essentially Hobbesian savages by apologists and propagandists for warfare among others, yet this canonical representation is seriously flawed

on many counts as demonstrated above using Chagnon's own main book. The pivotal point of this whole chapter is that thinking in terms of nonkilling can open up an entirely new dimension in studying sociocultural systems, and also it can expose the biases and distortions from whatever source that is focusing so much on killing. Certainly there is considerable aggression among Yanomamo, there is no doubt about that from Chagnon's documentation and that of many other anthropologists and non-anthropologists. However, killing is not ubiquitous in time and space, and not everyone is a killer, indeed only a relatively small portion of the whole population kills. To generalize in the subtitle of his book, and to persistently characterize them after the subtitle was dropped from the fourth edition as "the fierce people," is a misleading oversimplification and overgeneralization that seriously distorts the nature of Yanomamo daily life, society, and culture. Moreover, this derogatory stereotype and stigmatization may influence others in ways that harm, or at least do not help, the Yanomamo as a vulnerable indigenous population in the Amazon (Chagnon 1997a,b, Davis 1976, Lizot 1976, Martins 2005, Rabben 2004, Ramos 1995, Ramos and Taylor 1979, Rifkin 1994).

The nonkilling perspective reveals that the Yanomamo case as depicted by Chagnon is problematic in several respects, and, in turn, that renders the arguments of the apologists and propagandists for war who rely on it uncritically most problematic as well. Their reliance on this case without taking into consideration more of the literature including by other anthropologists, and especially critics of Chagnon, is simply careless scholarship and scientifically unreliable and even misleading. If their use of Chagnon's case reflects the quality of their science and scholarship in general, then the entire edifice of their work may be questionable as well. Ironically, individuals, many of whom purport to be hard core scientists and accuse others of being anti-science, reveal their own work as shoddy, unreliable, and irresponsible. Many are the same individuals who accuse critics of Chagnon's work and advocates of the study of nonviolence and peace of being ideological when their own work evinces ideologically driven Hobbesian bias and advocacy in argumentation. Most of all, science, scholarship, and society cannot advance by ignoring the largest part of reality in any society; namely, nonkilling (cf., Paige 2009, Evans Pim 2009). Yanomamo sociocultural reality is grossly distorted when this dimension of their life is neglected, and that can have very serious negative consequences for them.

In conclusion, the Yanomamo are neither a killing society nor a nonkilling society, but exhibit some attributes of each, and this varies tremendously regionally and temporally. Chagnon and his partisans have exaggerated

aggression among the Yanomamo to the point of distortion in the view of almost all of the anthropologists who have lived and worked extensively with this society. Ultimately, the Yanomamo are our contemporary fellow human beings with a distinctive lifestyle, not an exemplar of some primitive stage of cultural evolution or of an inherently violent human nature. For cultural anthropologists, the challenge is to document and publicize the humanity of the so-called Other, not to stigmatize and dehumanize them (e.g., Kapuscinski 2018, Smith 2011).

Update: Since racist Jair Bolsonaro became President of Brazil in January 2019, encouraged by his rhetoric and policies, an estimated 20,000 gold miners have again invaded the traditional and legal territory of the Yanomami spreading disease, by 2020 including the Coronavirus (COVID-19). There is less information about the Yanomami in Venezuela, but no doubt they are also threatened, suffering, and dying. Clearly the miners and other alien forces are an existential threat to the Yanomami. Yet again the humanity of the Yanomami and their human rights sorely need to be recognized, defended, and protected. Reliable media like *The Guardian*, and advocacy organizations like Survival International, are monitoring and publicizing the situation and trying to help the Yanomami in various ways. There are heroic anthropologists as well, like Bruce Albert in Brazil and Hortensia Caballero Arias in Venezuela, trying to help the Yanomami, some risking their own lives. Anthropologists who have benefited in various ways and degrees from the Yanomami, including textbook authors and instructors at colleges and universities, also owe the Yanomami genuine help. One way is to donate to Survival International (<https://www.survivalinternational.org/>). Reciprocity is a pivotal principle of Yanomami society, can it be for anthropologists too?

Chapter 5. The Role of Spiritual Ecology in Nonkilling: Beyond Secular

“I need no inspiration other than Nature’s. She has never failed me as yet. She mystifies me, bewilders me, sends me to ecstasies” (Gandhi quoted in Moolakkattu 2010:152-153).

“Through the wider Self, every living being is connected intimately, and from this intimacy follows the capacity of identification and, as its natural consequences, practice of nonviolence.... The rock-bottom foundation of the technique for achieving the power of nonviolence is belief in the essential oneness of all life” (Naess 2008:90).

“... nonviolence is the fundamental condition in which all the great spiritual teachers have called upon humanity to live” (Paige 1993:142).

Spiritual Ecology

Spiritual ecology is a complex and diverse arena of intellectual and practical activities at the interface of religions and spiritualities with ecologies, environments, and environmentalism. The use of the plural in these terms reflects the variation and variability within each category. Some scholars prefer labels such as religion and ecology, or religion and nature, instead of spiritual ecology. However, spiritual is a more inclusive term since many individuals who do not choose to affiliate with any particular religious organization, or identify themselves with some religion in general, are nevertheless spiritual, while those who do choose to affiliate can also be spiritual. The term encompasses both the spirituality of the individual and the belief of many that there are spiritual beings and forces in nature (Harvey 2006, 2013, Sponsel 2007a, b, 2012).

The spiritual and practical aspects of spiritual ecology are very ancient, while the intellectual aspects in the modern academic sense are very recent. The earliest and still most widespread spiritual ecologists are the indigenous adherents to some manifestation of the generic label Animism

such as traditional Australian Aborigines (Harvey 2006). This religion encompasses a belief in spiritual beings and forces in nature. Within Western culture, one of the earlier outstanding examples of a spiritual ecologist is the Catholic Saint Francis of Assisi (1181/2-1226) who was ahead of his time by about a thousand years in his deep concerns for social justice and nature (E.A. Armstrong 1993, Nothwehr 2002, Sorrell 1988).

Within modern academia in America, more than anyone else, Lynn White, Jr. (1907-1987) initiated scholarship in this arena of spiritual ecology. His classic article published in 1967 in the prestigious journal *Science*, "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis," is supposed to be the most frequently cited article in the entire history of that periodical. It generated a discussion and debate that continues to this day, and it led to the development of ecotheology which usually focuses on Christianity and environment, often as an attempt to refute White's main thesis that the dominant interpretation of the Bible is the ultimate cause of the ecocrisis (Hargrove 1986, Nash 1989, Santmire 2003, Spring and Spring 1974, Sponsel 2012:75-81, 2017b). However, the various activities associated with the Forum on Religion and Ecology since the 1990s, developed largely by Mary Evelyn Tucker and John Grim, probably have done more than any other initiative to launch spiritual ecology as a contemporary field of academic and scientific research, publications, conferences, and teaching, although they label it religion and ecology. Two other extraordinary contributors are Bron Taylor and Roger S. Gottlieb. (See Gottlieb 2004, 2006a,b, 2007, Grim and Tucker 2014, Sponsel 2014b, 2019c, Taylor 2005, 2010, Tucker 1997, Tucker and Berling 2003, and Tucker and Grim 2001, 2007, 2009).

In general, each of the three primary aspects of spiritual ecology—intellectual, spiritual, and practical—can be pursued alone, but often two or all three of them reinforce one another in various degrees and ways. The intellectual aspect encompasses academic scholarship across the humanities and the natural and social sciences. This is an interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and transdisciplinary field of study which is growing exponentially (Kearns and Keller 2007, Narayan and Kumar 2003, Swearer 2009). Indeed, there is sufficient literature on many world religions in relation to ecology to launch an entire academic and/or activist career focused on pursuing just one religion such as Buddhist ecology and environmentalism (Kaza 2008, Kaza and Kraft 2000, Martin 1997, Sponsel 2014b, Sponsel and Natadecha-Sponsel 1991, 2008, Tucker and Williams 1997).

The spiritual aspect may be pursued by an individual or group in nature, or through participation in a religious organization. It may involve rituals,

ceremonies, sacred places, and mysticism. This is the least studied, documented, and understood aspect of spiritual ecology so far, although ultimately it is often the most important one. Many environmentalists and conservationists are ultimately motivated by some kind of personal spiritual or mystical experiences in nature, although this is usually implicit in their writings at best (Kaza 2008, Sponsel 2012, Taylor 2005, 2010).

The practical component of spiritual ecology refers to environmental action on behalf of nature or the environment, and some of this action is explicitly recognized as religious environmentalism (Bassett, et al., 2000, Dudley, et al., 2005, Gardner 2002, 2006, 2010a,b, Gottlieb 2004, 2006a,b, Palmer and Finlay 2003, Ramakrishnan, et al., 1998, Sponsel 2007b,c, 2014b, 2019c, 2020). A multitude of specific projects are well underway in this arena, such as Interfaith Power and Light in the U.S.A., and internationally the Alliance of Religions and Conservation, to mention just two.

As noted by the American Academy of Religion (2010): "Throughout history, it [religion] has expressed the deepest questions human beings can ask, and it has taken a central place in the lives of virtually all civilizations and cultures.... Religion persists and is on the rise, even as scientific and non-religious perspectives have become prominent." Humans are religious or spiritual beings in various ways and degrees, as well as biological, mental, social, cultural, economic, political, and aesthetic beings. Religion is a cross-cultural universal; no society is known that totally lacks religion, although some individuals within any society may not be religious or spiritual, or only nominally so (Smith 1992, 2001). Also, some individuals are spiritual, but not religious in the sense of belonging to some organization or institution devoted to a particular religious tradition. Furthermore, even some atheists may still be spiritual (Crosby 2002). However, religion is often the primary source of an individual's worldview, values, and attitudes, including elements related to nature and the environment. Religion can be an extremely powerful influence on individuals and groups, for better or worse (e.g., Wexler 2016).

Since Earth Day on April 22, 1970, the environmental crisis has not only continued, but also it has become progressively worse and more urgent (Nelson 2002, Sponsel 2019c). This situation has transpired in spite of many secular approaches ranging from the impressive developments in the second half of the twentieth century in the environmental components of education, natural and social sciences, humanities like history, philosophy, and ethics, and law and other professions, not to mention the establishment of numerous natural history, environmental, and conservations organizations since the nineteenth century. It should be obvious that secular approaches, although

certainly necessary and important, have proven insufficient in meeting the challenges of the ecocrisis. Organizations such as the Worldwatch Institute, the United Nations Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change have been systematically documenting the worsening ecocrisis from the local to the global levels. (Also, see Leslie 1996, McKibben 1989, 2019, Sponsel 2019c, and Wilson 2003, 2006).

Like White (1967:28, 30-31), many individuals from diverse backgrounds and persuasions are convinced that the ecocrisis will only be resolved, or at least markedly reduced, only if there is a fundamental rethinking, refeeling, and revisioning of the place of humans in nature. They believe that religion and spirituality can generate such a profound transformation in many individuals and societies where secular approaches have proven inadequate even though necessary (Berry and Tucker 2006, 2009, Grim and Tucker 2014, Sponsel 2012, 2014b, Tucker and Berling 2003, Watling 2009). For instance, The Global Forum in Moscow in January 1990 concluded: "The Environmental crisis requires changes not only in public policy, but in individual behavior. The historical record makes clear that religious teaching, example, and leadership are powerfully able to influence personal conduct and commitment. As scientists, many of us have had profound experience of awe and reverence before the universe. We understand that what is regarded as sacred is more likely to be treated with care and respect. Our planetary home should be so regarded. Efforts to safeguard and cherish the environment need to be infused with a vision of the sacred" (Global Forum 1990). Likewise, Rabbi Michael Lerner (2000:138) observes: "... the upsurge of Spirit is the only plausible way to stop the ecological destruction of our planet. Even people who have no interest in a communal solution to the distortions in our lives will have to face up [to] this ecological reality. Unless we transform our relationship with nature, we will destroy the preconditions for human life on this planet."

No particular religious or spiritual path is designated as the sole solution for the ongoing and worsening ecocrisis. Instead, numerous and diverse scientists, scholars, educators, clerics, adherents, politicians, and others are each looking into their own religion and/or spirituality for elements to help them construct more viable environmental worldviews, attitudes, values, and practices for themselves and like-minded others (Gottlieb 2006a,b, Sponsel 2014b, 2019c, 2020, Tucker and Berling 2003, Watling 2009). Individuals who are not religious or spiritual must pursue their own alternative paths. However, even atheists can be spiritual, such as in pursuing recognized as religious naturalism (Crosby and Stone 2018).

Whether or not spiritual ecology becomes a nonviolent revolutionary movement and finally resolves, or at least reduces, the ecocrisis, it remains a most fascinating and significant arena. Religions, spiritualities, ecologies, environments, and environmentalisms are each interesting and significant, and when one examines their interrelationships then it is even more interesting and significant (Sponsel 2007a,b,c).

Spiritual ecology has already demonstrated an extraordinary capacity to facilitate constructive dialog and collaboration between disparate and sometimes antagonistic parties, including religions, religion and science, and the humanities and sciences (Barbour 2000, Carroll and Warner 1998, Clayton and Simpson 2006, Conroy and Petersen 2000, Kellert and Farnham 2002, Vittachi 1989). It may even become a catalyst for a theoretical and practical new synthesis of human understanding of some of the most elemental, perennial, and pivotal questions: What is nature? What is human? What is the place of humans in nature? What should be the place of humans in nature? What is the meaning of life?

At the same time, there are some serious obstacles and limitations facing spiritual ecology. First, there is the powerful establishment which is seriously challenged by spiritual ecology, including hegemonic economic and political interests, individuals pursuing scientism, Marxists who ignore the significance of religion and spirituality, and so on (Haught 1990). Second, there is the discrepancy between ideals and behaviors among adherents to various religions as well as the need for going beyond rhetoric to take more practical action. Third, there are factions and tensions within any given religion or religious sect or school. Fourth, far more outreach to the grass roots or community level is sorely needed. However, in many respects while spiritual ecology is still in its infancy, it is likely to mature rapidly within coming decades. Indeed, there is certainly the substantial momentum of the exponential growth of spiritual ecology pursued in a multitude and diversity of ways in many sectors and levels of society (Sponsel 2010a, 2011, 2014b, 2019c).

Interfaith Harmony

In a world where the mainstream media often focus on religious or sectarian conflict and violence (Jurgensmeyer 2003, Kimball2002), it is important to consider and publicize counterexamples. Spiritual ecology is an arena of genuine nonviolent and constructive interfaith dialog and collaboration wherein individuals and organizations from diverse religious traditions

and spiritual orientations can find common purpose as co-inhabitants on planet Earth (Bassett, et al., 2000, McPherson 1991, National Religious Partnership for the Environment, Womersley 2005). This is in striking contrast, at least in the U.S., to sociopolitical issues like abortion, capital punishment, euthanasia, and war where there is often heated controversy among and even within religions. Here it must suffice to mention only a few of the more prominent initiatives of interfaith dialog and collaboration in the arena of spiritual ecology.

In 1986 the World Wildlife Fund International (WWF), one of the most prominent international conservation organizations, generated an interfaith dialogue among leaders in Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, and Judaism at Assisi, Italy. Each leader wrote a concise statement on the environmental ethics inherent in their own religion, and these were collectively published as the Assisi Declarations (WWF 1986). Some 800 people attended the conference which was held on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the WWF.

The Assisi conference led to the development of the international Alliance for Religions and Conservation (ARC) based initially at the International Consultancy on Religion, Education and Culture (ICOREC) in Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, England. ARC has been working on over a hundred conservation projects with 11 major faiths. Among these projects are the preservation of churchyards and sacred land in the United Kingdom, Huichol sacred landscapes and pilgrimage routes in Mexico, Buddhist and Daoist sacred mountains in China, and ancient pilgrimage sites of Vrindavan and Sri Jgannath Forests in India (Dudley, et al., 2005, Edwards and Palmer 1997).

The interfaith and interdisciplinary conference titled "Spirit and Nature: Why the Environment Is a Religious Issue" was held in 1990 at Middlebury College in Vermont. It yielded a wonderful documentary film televised nationally on the Public Broadcasting Station in the U.S. with the distinguished journalist Bill Moyers as narrator and also an edited book of revised conference papers reflecting on the environmental relevance of the Buddhist, Christian, Jewish, Muslim, and Native American religions (Moyers 1991, Rockefeller and Elder 1992).

The Interfaith Partnership for the Environment was founded as a project of the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) in 1986. It has become a worldwide network of different religious organizations working to promote collaboration between their representatives and environmentalists (Bassett, et al., 2000). (Also see the Earth Charter website, and Lynn 2004).

By now research and dialog on the environmental relevance of each of the world's major religions has advanced to the point that some attempts have also been made to identify common denominators, or at least parallels, among them. For instance, in the last chapter of the first textbook on spiritual ecology author David Kinsley (1995:227-232) identifies these ten basic principles:

1. Many religions consider all of reality, or some of its components, to be an organic whole or a living being.
2. There is an emphasis on cultivating rapport with the local environment through developing intimate knowledge about it and practicing reverence for its beauty, mystery, and power through ritual celebrations of recognition and appreciation.
3. The human and nonhuman realms are directly interrelated, often in the sense of some kind of kinship, and in certain cases, even to the extent of animals being viewed as another form of humans or persons.
4. The appropriate relationship between humans and nature should be reciprocal; that is, humans do not merely recognize interdependence, but also promote mutually beneficial interactions with nature.
5. Ultimately the dichotomy between humans and their environment is nonexistent; humans are embedded in nature as an integral part of the larger whole or cosmos.
6. This non-dualistic view reflects the ultimate elemental unity of all existence; nature and spirit are inseparable, there is only one reality, and this continuity can be sensed and experienced.
7. This underlying unity is moral as well as physical; humans and non-humans participate in a shared moral system wherein environmental issues are first and foremost ethical concerns; and nature has intrinsic as well as extrinsic values.
8. Humans should act with restraint in nature by avoiding the anthropocentric arrogance of excessive, wasteful, and destructive use of the land and other resources, and in other ways they should exercise proper behavior toward plants, animals, and other aspects of nature as sacred.
9. Harmony or balance between humans and the rest of nature must be maintained and promoted, and, if it is upset, then it should be restored.
10. Frequently the motivation, commitment, and intensity of ecological concerns are essentially religious or spiritual (cf., Pedersen 1998).

These can be a basis for further dialog and action. Many contributors to spiritual ecology tend to think that we already have the solution to the ecocrisis and how to live in balance and harmony with nature. We only need to more closely and effectively approximate the appropriate ideals and principles of our religion in actual practice. Religions are already in place, well-established, and followed in various ways and degrees by billions of people. The pivotal task ahead is for more people to better understand the environmental as well as human and social consequences of their behaviors and institutions in both the short and long term; systematically and explicitly construct and more closely follow a viable environmental ethic; and then recognize and effectively practice the spiritual ecology in their own religion including the sacredness of all life. As Huston Smith (1992, 2000) appreciates, the world's religions are the collective wisdom of humanity and they have the potential to be channeled for enormous good.

Speciesism

In its extreme sense, speciesism refers to the anthropocentric belief that the human species *Homo sapiens* is superior to all others in every respect and that other species can be indiscriminately exploited and harmed to suit human needs and desires. Accordingly, nonhuman beings may be excluded from moral consideration (Ricard 2017, Singer 1990, Waldau 2002, Waldau and Patton 2006). Spiritual ecology has the potential to extend nonkilling, or more broadly, non-harming, beyond humankind to all species and even to the biosphere as a whole. The three main religions and philosophies of Buddhism, Hinduism, and Jainism share the concept and precept of *ahimsa* which means nonkilling, or more broadly non-harming (Chapple 1993, Phillips 2008). To briefly consider one of these three, Jainism is probably the most extreme case of spiritual ecology. It is a universal belief in the sacredness of every being. Jains consider every organism to be an individual with basic needs, the capacity to feel pain, and even a soul. Thereby ideally they extend the principle of nonviolence beyond humans to all of nature as sacred and practice universal love. Their worldview, values, attitudes, and ensuing practices are the opposite of speciesism.

Ideally, a Jain reduces the suffering of other beings by limiting his or her resource consumption to basic needs, as for example through eating only one daily meal unless fasting. Jains are not only vegetarians, avoiding eating animal foods, but also they refrain from using animal products. As vegetarians they consume only certain fruits, nuts, vegetables, and grains. Jains re-

nounce all professions and trades that might harm animals in any way. They even visit markets to rescue animals destined to be slaughtered by others and they maintain welfare centers for old, sick, injured, and dying animals. The strictest Jains use a filter to drink water in order to minimize consuming organisms that might be in it. Also they walk naked and barefooted moving a small broom like a fan to push aside any organisms they might otherwise step on. The strictest Jains even practice celibacy to avoid killing sperm. In these, and many other ways, individual Jains daily maximize empathy, compassion, and reverence for all beings. Thereby they minimize their environmental impact, resource consumption, and violence. Jains pursue *aparigraha*, or non-materialism, limiting their acquisition of material goods and instead contributing their wealth and time to humanitarian charities and philanthropic causes (Chapple 1993, 2002, Singhvi 1997, Tobias 1991). As L. M. Singhvi (1997:93) perceptively says, "Jainism is fundamentally a religion of ecology and has turned ecology into a religion." Incidentally, Jainism is also behind the awesome work of Satish Kumar, head of Schumacher College in Devon, England, truly a great leader in spiritual ecology (Kumar 2002, 2007, 2010, Resurgence 2010). Non-materialism parallels the environmentally sensitive radical or voluntary simplicity movement in the West and beyond. One of its pioneers, Jim Merkel (2003:162-163) lists its spiritual principles as kindness, compassion, love, responsibility, limits, and fascination. (Also, see the Global Living Project 2010. For a survey of views on animals from another religion, Islam, see Foltz 2006. For Buddhist approaches to consumerism see Kaza 2005, Payne 2010).

Certainly the aim of nonkilling is most admirable. However, surely it assumes far greater admirability when it is not limited to human beings, but extended to all beings in the case of the Jain ideal of maximizing one's effort to minimize one's harm in the world. If an individual can hesitate to kill even an insect, then this magnifies manifold the goal of not killing another human being, given that most people retain some modicum of speciesism. Moreover, this realization should also make it easier for humans to empathize with fellow members of their own species and thereby extend compassion and loving-kindness toward them.

Empathy and Compassion

In his best selling book *Ethics for the New Millennium*, His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama of Tibet (1999) develops the foundation for a universal ethic that transcends any particular religion or philosophy. He argues that the un-

conditional love of the mother for her infant generates the basic goodness of human nature, including empathy, compassion, loving kindness, and nonviolence. He notes that all humans desire to be happy and to avoid suffering. Furthermore, since all beings are interconnected and interdependent in various ways and degrees, making others happy makes oneself happy and the converse. Accordingly, it is in everyone's interest to do whatever creates happiness and to avoid whatever generates suffering. This is the heart of his universal ethics. Moreover, genuine happiness is inner peace, and that is grounded in compassionate concern for others. Thus, the challenge is to extend empathy and thereby compassion and loving-kindness beyond one's own in-group. This requires individual restraint and good intentions, including the cultivating of an ethic of virtue to mindfully shift attention away from ego to others. That can even feed social and political policies to resolve problems that ultimately stem from the way we think about and act toward other beings. Ultimately societal peace and world peace depend on the inner peace of the collectivity of the individuals involved. Furthermore, minds as well as societies need to be demilitarized (Andreas 2004).

Parallel to the above view is the work by Karen Armstrong (2010) in developing the Charter for Compassion. She argues that compassion is celebrated in all of the major religious, spiritual, and ethical traditions. The Golden Rule is our primary duty and cannot be limited to only our own political, religious, or ethnic group. The cultivation of compassion can build common ground in our divided world, and thereby reduce tensions, conflicts, and violence.

Although space is not available here to provide the details, it should be noted that the role of empathy, compassion, and related phenomena in ethics and behavior is being documented through a variety of scientific research. Some of this work has been inspired by His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama of Tibet (Davidson and Harrington 2002, Mind and Life Institute 2010). However, there is also independent research pursuing the biological roots of behaviors like empathy and compassion in primates and other nonhuman animals (Bekoff 2007a,b, Bekoff and Pierce 2009, de Waal 2009, Hrdy 2009). Like the nonkilling perspective developed by Glenn D. Paige and his colleagues, this is a very exciting and promising new frontier for basic and applied research. (See Paige and Gilliatt 1991, and Evans Pim 2009).

His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama of Tibet asserts that a spiritual revolution is required to more effectively deal with the problems of the world created by humanity. Spiritual ecology is a vital component of such a revolution in the present author's opinion. Killing would be reduced and nonkilling

increased by extending empathy far beyond humankind to all species and ecosystems within the biosphere of planet Earth.

Gandhian Ecology

In various ways and degrees the voluminous writings and awesome lifestyle of Mohandas K. Gandhi (1869-1948) anticipated many elemental principles of ecology and environmentalism of today, including holism instead of atomism; monism instead of dualism; interconnections and interdependencies in systems; ecocentrism instead of anthropocentrism or egocentrism; intrinsic value of other beings instead of merely extrinsic or utilitarian value; unity of life and species egalitarianism instead of speciesism; reverence for all life as sacred; finite resources, environmental limits, and limiting wants to satisfy basic needs; voluntary simplicity; fasting, vegetarianism, and locavorism; decentralization, local rural community self-sufficiency, and sustainable livelihood; stewardship, conservation, and waste recycling; self-discipline, self-restraint, and minimizing one's ecological footprint; ethical responsibility to future generations; and critique of technology, industrialism, urbanization, capitalism, consumerism, colonialism, and development as material progress (e.g., Dobson 1991, Drengrson and Devall 2008, Lal 2000).

Gandhi recognized the relationship between nonkilling within human society and toward nature when he said: "We cannot have ecological movement designed to prevent violence against Nature, unless the principle of non-violence becomes central to the ethics of human culture" (quoted in Moolakkattu 2010: 155). As Moolakkattu (2010:157) observes: "Gandhi's ethical and religious approach to all fellow creatures was founded on an identification with all that lives.... Ahimsa, for him, envisaged or subsumed an awareness of the interdependency of all life. Ahimsa can emerge only in a disciplined environment in which a person renounces pleasures of the body in pursuit of a higher spiritual pursuit." (For more on Gandhian ecology see Bilimoria 2001, Guha 2006, Jones 2000, Khoshoo and Moolakkattu 2009, Kumar 2008, Lal 2000, Moolakkattu 2010, Shinn 2000, and Weber 1999. For Hinduism and ecology, see Chapple and Tucker 2000, Nelson 1998, and Prime 1992, 2002).

Gandhi is best known by far for his life, work, and writings on nonviolence and peace (Paige 1993:133-155). Less well known is his significant influence in the development of other pioneers in spiritual ecology, such as mountain philosopher Arne Naess (1912-2009), founder of deep ecology (1973, 1985, 1989, 2002), and economist E.F. Schumacher (1911-1977), initiator of

Buddhist economics including his ideas about small is beautiful, production by the masses instead of mass production, and intermediate or appropriate technology (1973). While Gandhi has been an inspiration for many people throughout the world, in his homeland of India he has also inspired environmentalists and others. One of the more prominent Indian personages in recent decades is Vandana Shiva. She is an internationally recognized quantum physicist, philosopher, ecofeminist, and environmental and social justice activist. For her various initiatives, including on earth democracy, seed sovereignty, and biodiversity conservation, Shiva received the Right Livelihood Award in 1993 and was identified by *Time Magazine* as a Hero for the Green Century in August 26, 2002 (London 2008, Shiva 2005, 2010).

Global Nonkilling

The rethinking and reinventing of scientific and academic disciplines from the perspective of nonkilling is necessary to promote nonkilling societies and a nonkilling world as a whole (Bhaneja 2008, Evans Pim 2009, 2010a, Hellwig 1992, Kurlansky 2008, Niwano 1977, Paige 2009a). However, such changes in scientific and academic work alone are not sufficient. Other sectors of society and culture must also change, and perhaps most of all, religious thinking, discourse, and institutions. After all, religions are the primary source of the worldview, values, and attitudes for many individuals, and religions have the potential to motivate and guide their behavior and its consequences for better rather than worse. Accordingly, religions must also rethink and reinvent their capacity for nonkilling (Gopin 2008, Groff 2008, McClymond and Freedman 2008, Rouner 1988).

Spiritual ecology can also help. It has the potential to contribute toward the primary goal of the Center for Global Nonkilling in the broadest possible sense— extending nonkilling worldwide encompassing all beings, at least as an ideal. It can complement and extend the life work of one of the most perceptive, courageous, and noblest personalities, intellectuals, scientists, and activists the world has ever known, Glenn D. Paige (1993, 2009a,b).

Appendix. Spiritual Ecology: A Resource Guide

The first general textbook on the subject is:

Kinsley, David, 1995, *Ecology and Religion: Ecological Spirituality in Cross-Cultural Perspective*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

The most recent general text is:

Grim, John, and Mary Evelyn Tucker, 2014, *Ecology and Religion*, Washington, D.C.: Island Press <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=15v6f2moleE>, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yGJ_r-pEH64.

Among related complementary books are these:

Bauman, Whitney A, Richard R, Bohannon II, and Kevin J. O`Brien, eds., 2011, *Inherited Land: The Changing Grounds of Religion and Ecology*, Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications.

_____, et al., eds., 2017, *Grounding Religion: A Field Guide to the Study of Religion and Ecology*, New York, NY: Routledge (Second Edition).

Berry, Thomas, 2009, *The Sacred Universe: Earth, Spirituality, and Religion in the Twenty-First Century*, New York., NY: Columbia University Press <http://thomasberry.org/>.

Bohannon, Richard, ed., 2014, *Religions and Environments: A Reader in Religion, Nature, and Ecology*, New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Foltz, Richard C., ed., 2003, *Worldviews, Religion, and the Environment: A Global Anthology*, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Gottlieb, Roger S., ed., 2004, *This Sacred Earth: Religion, Nature, Environment*, New York, NY: Routledge (Second Edition).

_____, 2006, *A Greener Faith: Religious Environmentalism and Our Planet's Future*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press https://www.wpi.edu/people/faculty/gottlieb#profile-faculty_profile, <http://users.wpi.edu/~gottlieb>, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BVpxddlOosg>.

Rockefeller, Steven C., and John C. Elder, eds., 1992, *Spirit and Nature: Why the Environment Is a Religious Issue*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Sponsel, Leslie E., 2012, *Spiritual Ecology: A Quiet Revolution*, Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger <http://spiritualecology.info>.

_____, ed., 2020, *Religious Environmental Activism in Asia: Case Studies in Spiritual Ecology*, Basel, Switzerland: MDPI/Religions <http://www.mdpi.com/books/pdfview/book/2169>.

Tanner, Ralph, and Colin Mitchell, 2002, *Religion and Environment*, New York, NY: Palgrave.

Taylor, Bron, 2010, *Dark Green Religion: Nature, Spirituality and the Planetary Future*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press <http://www.brontaylor.com>, <http://www.brontaylor.com/blog/>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uxlvBZEBSIM8>,

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2UtmRLL5e8A>.

Tucker, Mary Evelyn, and John A. Grim, eds., 1993, *Worldviews and Ecology*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Press.

Vaughan-Lee, Llewellyn, ed., 2013, *Spiritual Ecology: The Cry of the Earth*, Point Reyes, CA: The Golden Sufi Center.

Watling, Tony, 2009, *Ecological Imaginations in the World Religions: An Ethnographic Analysis*, New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Harvard University Press published the series *World Religions and Ecology* coedited by Mary Evelyn Tucker and John Grim

(<https://www.hup.harvard.edu/results-list.php?collection=1057>)

Chapple, Christopher Key, ed., 2002, *Jainism and Ecology: Nonviolence in the Web of Life*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____, and Mary Evelyn Tucker, eds., 2000, *Hinduism and Ecology: The Intersection of Earth, Sky, and Water*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Foltz, Richard C., Frederick M. Denny, and Azizan Baharuddin, eds., 2003, *Islam and Ecology: A Bestowed Trust*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Girardot, N.J., James Miller, and Liu Xiaogan, eds., 2001, *Daoism and Ecology: Ways Within a Cosmic Landscape*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Grim, John, ed., 2001, *Indigenous Traditions and Ecology: The Interbeing of Cosmology and Community*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hessel, Dieter T., and Rosemary Radford Ruether, eds., 2000, *Christianity and Ecology: Seeking the Well-Being of Earth and Humans*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tirosh-Samuels, Hava, ed., 2002, *Judaism and Ecology: Created World and Revealed World*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tucker, Mary Evelyn, and John Berthrong, eds., 1998, *Confucianism and Ecology: The Interrelation of Heaven, Earth, and Humans*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____, and Duncan Ryuken Williams, ed., 1997, *Buddhism and Ecology: The Interconnection of Dharma and Deeds*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

By now there are also several major reference works:

Crosby, Donald A., and Jerome A. Stone, eds., 2018, *The Routledge Handbook of Religious Naturalism*, New York, NY: Routledge.

Gottlieb, Roger S., ed., 2006, *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Ecology*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

_____, ed., 2010, *Religion and the Environment*, New York, NY: Routledge, Volumes 1-4.

- Hart, John, ed., 2017, *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Religion and Ecology*, Boston: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jenkins, Willis, and Whitney Bauman, eds., 2010, *Berkshire Encyclopedia of Sustainability: Volume I: The Spirit of Sustainability*, Great Barrington, MA: Berkshire Publishing Group LLC.
- _____, Mary Evelyn Tucker, and John Grim, eds., 2017, *The Routledge Handbook of Religion and Ecology*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Taylor, Bron, ed., 2005, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature*, New York, NY: Continuum Press, Volumes 1-2, <http://www.religionandnature.com/ern/>.

There are also two academic journals focused on this subject:

Journal for the Study of Religion, Nature and Culture (2007 -)
<http://www.religionandnature.com/journal/index.htm>, and

Worldviews: Global Religions, Culture, and Ecology (1997 -)
<https://brill.com/view/journals/wo/wo-overview.xml>.

The Forum on Religion and Ecology at Yale University has extensive resources and also publishes a monthly email newsletter: <https://fore.yale.edu/>. (There is a similar organization in Europe <https://www.religion-environment.com/about-the-forum/>). Also, see the website for the documentary film *Journey of the Universe* <https://www.journeyoftheuniverse.org/>. The International Society for the Study of Religion, Nature and Culture was founded in 2006: <https://www.issrnc.org/>.

These two articles provide overviews of spiritual ecology:

- Sponsel, Leslie E., 2014 (April), "Feature Article: Bibliographic Essay - Spiritual Ecology: Is it the Ultimate Solution for the Environmental Crisis," *CHOICE* 51(8):1339-1342, 1344-1348.
- _____, 2019, "Ecology and Spirituality," in *The Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion*, John Barton, ed., New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Chapter 6. Teaching Nonkilling Anthropology: Sample Course Syllabus

COURSE: **ANTH/PACE 345 Aggression, War and Peace (theory) 3 credits**

PLACE: Saunders Hall 637, University of Hawai`i @ Manoa

TIME: 1:30-4:00 p.m. Wednesdays, Fall Semester 2019

INSTRUCTOR:

Dr. Leslie E. Sponsel, Professor Emeritus

Office: 321 Saunders Hall

Office hours: 4:00-5:00 p.m. Wednesdays

Office phone: 956-3770

Email: sponsel@hawaii.edu

Autobiographical Sketch: <http://spiritualecology.info/author/|biographical-sketch/>.

“So much depends on our conception of human nature: for individuals, the meaning and purpose of our lives, what we ought to do or strive for, what we may hope to achieve or become; for human societies, what vision of human community we may hope to work toward and what sort of social changes we should make. Our answers to all these huge questions depend on whether we think there is some “true” or “innate” nature of human beings. If so, what is it? Is it different for men and women? Or is there no such “essential” human nature, only a capacity to be molded by the social environment- by economic, political, and cultural forces?” (Stevenson, Leslie, and David L. Haberman, 1998, *Ten Theories of Human Nature*, New York: Oxford

“Echoing the UNESCO Charter ... since killing begins in the minds of men and women, it is there that the change toward a nonkilling society must begin.” (Center for Global Nonkilling).

“Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.” (United Nations, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, December 10, 1948, Article 3).

“True security rests on a supportive and sustainable ecological base, on spiritual as well as material well-being, on trust and reliance in one’s neighbors, and on justice and understanding in a disarmed world” (Frank Barnaby, ed., 1988, *Gaia Atlas of Peace*, New York: Doubleday, p. 212).

Orientation and readings

The elemental and pivotal proposition explored in this course is that humans have evolved the psychobiological capacity for nonviolence/peace as well as violence/war. The correlated question is: What causes and conditions determine one or the other, and the transition from one to the other? After an overview through a PowerPoint lecture, these matters are considered throughout the five parts of the course.

Part One discusses the history of American militarism, based on the free online book by Joel Andreas titled *Addicted to War: Why the U.S. Can’t Kick Militarism* (2004 edition, <http://www.addictedtowar.com>). This will be followed by a guest lecture on the history of the militarization in Hawai`i and prospects for its demilitarization.

Part Two focuses on a monograph by anthropologist Douglas P. Fry and an anthology that he edited: *The Human Potential for Peace: An Anthropological Challenge to Assumptions about War and Violence*, and *War, Peace, and Human Nature: The Convergence of Evolutionary and Cultural Values*. Each student will sign up for a different chapter and report on its highlights for class discussion.

Part Three covers three free books from the website of political scientist Glenn D. Paige’s Center for Global Nonkilling (CGNK) (<https://nonkilling.org/center/publications-media/books-cgnk-publications/>). Each student will sign up for a different chapter and then report on its highlights for class discussion:

- Glenn D. Paige, 2009, *Nonkilling Global Political Science*;
- Joám Evans Pim, ed., 2009, *Toward A Nonkilling Paradigm*; and
- Joám Evans Pim, ed., 2010, *Nonkilling Societies*.

In Part Four opens with a documentary film on the Yanomami called *Warriors of the Amazon*. Next the instructor will present a PowerPoint lecture based on his forthcoming book on them.

Part Five concludes the course with a succession of student panel discussions on selected aspects of violence/nonviolence and war/peace in relation to global climate change in recent times and future possibilities.

This fifth part of the course aims to facilitate climate literacy and generate action by opening discussion and debate on the problem and solutions of global climate change, and also to provide resources to begin further study beyond the course. Global climate change is not a political issue, but a scientific fact. It is not only a current physical reality of the Earth as a result of increasing human impacts on the planet's systems during the Anthropocene, it is potentially an existential threat to humanity and the biosphere. There is no greater national security threat for all countries of the world including the United States of America. Extensive bibliographies of books, films, and websites on global climate change will be posted on the course website for use during the semester and available to be copied for subsequent reference.

You only need to purchase the two books by Fry. These two books were ordered by the UHM Bookstore. Less expensive used copies may be available from Amazon.com. You might defray expenses by sharing books with a classmate or reselling them after the semester ends.

In addition, a few selected readings will be assigned and discussed from other sources, such as the website by Bruce D. Bonta and Douglas P. Fry "Peaceful Societies: Alternatives to Violence and War" (<https://peacefulsocieties.uncg.edu/>). These will be sent to you as an email attachment and/or posted on the Lulima course website. However, the recommended readings will not be provided by email or on Lulima.

On average, you should faithfully set aside a period each week to devote at least one hour for every hour in class (2.5 hours total/week) for regularly reading assignments and making notes for class discussion, writing your weekly journal entry, and planning your final examination essay.

Thought questions

While you should acquire a general familiarity with the contents of the assigned readings, our primary purpose is to generate critical thinking, discussion, and debate about the subject matter with a focus on these five pivotal questions:

1. What are the conditions, causes, and consequences of violence?
2. What are the conditions, causes, and consequences of nonviolence?

3. What are the conditions, causes, and consequences of the transition from nonviolence to violence?
4. What are the conditions, causes, and consequences of the transition from violence to nonviolence?
5. What role does/will global climate change play in these four phenomena?

The first four questions were identified as the logic of nonkilling analysis by Glenn D. Paige, visionary pioneer and founder of the Center for Global Nonkilling in Honolulu, Hawai`i. The fifth question deals with what is by far the most serious national security threat for every country of the world. The terms violence and nonviolence are used here because they are far broader than killing and nonkilling.

These five questions comprise the final take-home essay examination, thus you should regularly make careful and detailed notes while reading and attending class throughout the semester, and then use your notes as well as journal as the basis to develop a substantial essay of about one page typed single-spaced for each question.

A copy of the file for your journal should be sent as an email attachment to the instructor for the mid-term examination due October 23. The whole journal and the final examination reflective essay are due by December 20 as two email attachments. Don't wait until the last minute to draft the essay for your final examination.

Format

As primarily a seminar, this class is reading, thinking, and discussion intensive. The volume of readings is modest because quality is more important than quantity. They are carefully selected to cover the subjects, and especially to provoke critical thinking and generate discussion and debate. You must be seriously committed to this entire approach, if you are to be successful in the course and earn a good grade. That requires the regular investment of your time and effort. Again, for emphasis, it is best to set aside a regular period each week to conscientiously prepare for this class. If you are not committed to this format and intellectual adventure, then it is best that you drop the course immediately, instead of waiting until the end of the semester to receive a poor or failing grade.

Note that the instructor will only present two lectures in the course this semester. However, PowerPoints are available from several other lectures

in previous course offerings. These will be posted on the Laulima course website and students encouraged to explore them. There will also be two guest lectures.

Learning outcomes

Through your class reports and discussions, journal, panel, and final essay examination, you should be able to demonstrate the progressive achievement of the following learning outcomes:

1. general familiarity with the course material;
2. with an open mind the ability to seriously, critically, and constructively consider in an informed manner the revolutionary alternative of a nonkilling paradigm with its new worldview, values, attitudes, and actions;
3. a better understanding of the role of global climate change in violence, war, nonviolence, and peace; and
4. a critical analysis and reflection on the customary aggressiveness and militarism of American culture.

Classroom etiquette

You are expected to arrive in class on time and to remain fully attentive for the entire period without any interruptions (1:30-4:00). Attendance will be taken at the beginning and end of every period. You are expected to avoid regular conversation or other distractive behavior out of respect and courtesy for fellow students and the instructor. No extraneous reading material may be used during the class period. Anyone who repeatedly falls asleep in class will receive one letter grade reduction. The final course grade will be reduced for any disruptive or inattentive behavior.

All electronic devices such as cell phones must be turned off before class and remain so throughout the entire period. The use of a laptop computer is not allowed in this class, unless a copy of your class notes is sent to the instructor as an email attachment for each class period after it is used. If you want to use electronic devices for matters unrelated to the class during the period, then you should not take the course.

The only prerequisite for this course is an open mind and willingness to learn through reading, discussion, and debate. In this class anyone is welcome to say or write anything with only three restrictions— it is relevant,

concise, and polite. This includes respecting the sensitivities of others and freely allowing others an opportunity to join in any class discussion. Although it will become obvious that the instructor has his own perspective, ultimately there is no “party line” in this course. Indeed, students are encouraged to politely and constructively disagree with the instructor, course material, and each other whenever they wish to do so. Ultimately, for the most part the instructor does not really care what students think; however, he does care very deeply that they think in an informed and critical manner.

See UHM The Student Code of Conduct at:

http://studentaffairs.manoa.hawaii.edu/policies/conduct_code/

Special needs

Reasonable accommodations can be arranged for persons with some disability by visiting the KOKUA Program in QLCSS 013 or by phoning them at 956-7511 or 956-7612.

Grade

You are required to regularly and effectively participate in all class activities. The final course grade will be calculated as follows:

- 30% attendance and participation in class discussions;
- 25% panel discussion;
- 15% mid-term intellectual journal submitted as an email attachment by October 23; and
- 30% final intellectual journal (15%) and a reflective essay for the take-home final examination (15%) submitted as two attachments in one email by December 20.

Regular attendance is imperative. Every two unexcused absences will result in the lowering of the final course grade by one letter.

No research papers or other special projects are required for this course. However, extra credit may be earned by writing essays (each about one-page typed single-spaced) in response to lectures, readings, panels, films and/or guests. These should be only reactions, not summaries. They can be accepted up through the date scheduled for the final examination. Five such essays may elevate a borderline grade, and ten may elevate the grade to the next higher level. Also, extra credit may be earned by finding

relevant YouTube videos to illustrate course material and emailing the title and link to the instructor. Another more ambitious alternative for extra credit is a substantial written report based on library and/or field research, but the topic must be approved by the instructor in advance. Another possibility is a book report on any of the titles listed at the end of this syllabus.

Any student caught cheating will automatically fail the entire course and be reported to the Dean for administrative action.

Schedule

PART I: Orientation and American Militarism

August 28. Orientation

PowerPoint Lecture: Anthropology of War, Peace, and Human Nature

Required Readings:

- Douglas P. Fry, 2015, "Conflict and War: Anthropological Aspects," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, James D. Wright, ed., Oxford: Elsevier 4:614-619. <https://hhs.uncg.edu/pcs/people/fry-douglas-p/>
- Leslie E. Sponsel, 2015, "Peace and Nonviolence: Anthropological Aspects," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, James D. Wright, ed., Oxford: Elsevier 17:624-630.

Recommended (Optional) Readings:

- R. Brian Ferguson, 2008 (Summer), "Ten Points on War," *Social Analysis* 52(2):32-49. <https://sasn.rutgers.edu/about-us/faculty-staff/r-brian-ferguson>
- David H. Price, St. Martin's University http://homepages.stmartin.edu/fac_staff/dprice/CW-PUB.htm, http://homepages.stmartin.edu/fac_staff/dprice/all.html.
- Anna Simons, 1999, "War: Back to the Future," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 28:73-108. <https://faculty.nps.edu/asimons/>.
- Leslie E. Sponsel, 1996, "The Natural History of Peace: A Positive View of Human Nature and Its Potential," in *The Natural History of Peace*, Thomas A. Gregor, ed. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, Ch. 4, pp. 95-125. <https://cas.uab.edu/peacefulsocieties/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2015/11/Sponsel96.pdf>

134 Nonkilling Anthropology

- Leslie E. Sponsel, 2006, “Ashley Montagu,” *Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, H. James Birx, ed., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 4: 1620-1622.

September 4. American Militarism

Required Reading:

- Joel Andreas, *Addicted to War: Why the U.S. Can't Kick Militarism* [2004 edition available free online at <http://www.addictedtowar.com>].

The Militarization and Demilitarization of Hawai`i - guest to be announced

Required Reading:

- Kyle Kajihiro, 2007 (March 1), “A Brief Overview of Militarization and Resistance in Hawai`i,” http://www.dmzhawaii.org/dmz-legacy-site/overview_military_in_hawaii.pdf
- DMZ Hawai`i <http://www.dmzhawaii.org/>
- Overview of Military in Hawai`i http://www.dmzhawaii.org/?page_id=10944

Recommended Films:

- Joan Lander, et al., 1992, *Kaho`olawe: Aloha Aina*, UHM Sinclair Library streaming video (56 minutes).
- McLeod, Christopher, 2015, *Island Sanctuary*, Oakland, CA: Sacred Land Film Project (UHM Sinclair Library streaming video, about 25 minutes).
- Amy Corbin, et al., 2013, “Site Report: Kaho`olawe, Hawai`i,” Sacred Lands Film Project: Standing on Sacred Ground: Island Sanctuary <https://standingonsacredground.org/film-series/islands-sanctuary/kahoolawe-hawaii/site-report-kahoolawe-hawaii>, <https://standingonsacredground.org/film-series/islands-sanctuary/kahoolawe-hawaii>.

Recommended Readings:

- Sebastian Blanco, 2009, *U.S. Militarism in Hawai`i: A People's History*, Kihei, HI: Koa Books.
- Hugh Gusterson, and Catherine Besterman, eds., 2019 (February), “Cultures of Militarism,” *Current Anthropology* 60(S19).

- Catherine Lutz, 2010, “Warmaking as the American Way of Life,” in *The Insecure American: How We Got Here and What We Should Do about It*, Hugh Gusterson and Catherine Besteman, eds., Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 45-62.

Part 2. Anthropology of War and Peace

September 11. *The Human Potential for Peace* – Douglas Fry - Chapters 1-11 [covered by a division of labor among students each reporting for class discussion on a different chapter, like the rest of the books listed below]

Recommended Film:

- John Lennon and Yoko Ono, 2008, “Imagine”, search *YouTube*.

September 18. *Chapters 12-20*

Recommended Documentary Film:

- *Dead Birds* (classic on Dani warfare in New Guinea) (2004, 2 DVDs 3976, 83 minutes)

September 25. *War, Peace, and Human Nature* - Fry - Chapter 1

- Part 1 - Ecological and Evolutionary Models - Chapters 2-5
- Part 2 - Lessons from Prehistory - Chapter 6-11

October 2

- Part 3 – Nomadic Foragers - Chapters 12-17
- Part 4 - Primatological Context of Human Nature - Chapters 18-22

October 9

- Part 5 - Taking Seriously Restraint Against Killing - Chapters 23-26
- Part 6 – Conclusions - Chapter 27

Recommended Documentary Film:

- Soetoro-Ng, Maya, 2015 (August 29), *Pacifism's Last Stand*, *Open Mind* hosted by Alexander Heffner [28 minutes].
<http://www.thirteen.org/openmind/government/pacifisms-last-stand/5208/>

Part 3. Global Nonkilling

October 16. Glenn D. Paige - *Nonkilling Global Political Science* (2009 edition) - Introduction and Chapters 1-6 <https://nonkilling.org/center/publications-media/books-cgnk-publications/>

Paige, Glenn D., 2009, "Nonkilling: A Better Way" <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p17tkl72PsA>.

Additional Required Reading for All Students:

- Leslie E. Sponsel, 2018, "One Anthropologist's Answer to Glenn D. Paige's Question Challenging Peace Studies" *Journal of Peace Education* 15(3): 267-287.
- Documentary Film: *Human Terrain: War Becomes Academic* [anthropologists with US military at war in Afghanistan and Iraq, 2010, DVD 84 minutes].

Recommended Reading:

- Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, 2002 (March), "A Century of Ethics and Professional Anthropology," *AAA Anthropology News* 43(3):20.
- Gusterson, Hugh, 2007, "Anthropology and Militarism," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 36:155-175. <https://anthropology.columbian.gwu.edu/hugh-gusterson>.
- Network of Concerned Anthropologists <http://concerned.anthropologists.googlepages.com>.
- Robert A. Rubinstein – Syracuse University https://www.maxwell.syr.edu/anthro/Rubinstein,_Robert_A/ <https://rar.expressions.syr.edu/>

October 23. Joám Evans Pim - *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm* – division of labor to cover all chapters <https://nonkilling.org/center/publications-media/books-cgnk-publications/>

Required Reading for All Students:

- Leslie E. Sponsel, 2009, "Nonkilling Anthropology: Reflections on the Possibilities of a Nonkilling Society," in *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm*,

pp. 35-72. <https://nonkilling.org/center/publications-media/books-cgnk-publications/>

October 30. Joám Evans Pim – Nonkilling Societies - Chapters – all chapters through division of labor

<https://nonkilling.org/center/publications-media/books-cgnk-publications/>

Recommended Documentary Film:

- *End of the Spear* [111 minutes, Waorani case, Maui CC DVD 420, May also be available on *YouTube*.

Part 4. Yanomami of the Amazon

November 6. Documentary film: *Warriors of the Amazon* [Yanomami of the Venezuelan Amazon, 1996, 56 minutes, VHS 18554]

Recommended Documentary Films:

- Napoleon Chagnon: Blood Is Their Argument, Edge 2013, https://www.edge.org/conversation/napoleon_chagnon-steven_pinker-richard_wrangham-daniel_c_dennett-david_haig-napoleon,
- Ben Tate, 2007. “A Conversation with philosopher Harry G. Frankfurt on his book *Bullshit*,” *YouTube* [11 minutes]. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lArA7nMlqSI>.
- Jose Padilha, 2010, *Secrets of the Tribe* [BBC and HBO film on ethical controversy surrounding fieldwork of Napoleon A. Chagnon with the Yanomami, 90 minutes] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zd7SXbsn0hU>.

November 13. PowerPoint Lecture: Questioning the Portrayal of the Yanomami as “Hobbesian Savages”

Required Reading for All Students:

- Leslie E. Sponsel, 2010, “Into the Heart of Darkness,” in *Nonkilling Societies*, Chapter 6, pp. 197-242. <https://nonkilling.org/center/publications-media/books-cgnk-publications/>

Part 5. War and Peace in Relation to Climate Change

November 20. Documentary Film: *This Changes Everything* [2015, 89 minutes, DVD 14201]

<https://thischangeeverything.org/>

<https://thischangeeverything.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/48780-this-changes-everything-curriculum-singlepages-1.pdf>

<https://theleap.org/portfolio-items/green-new-deal/>

<https://solutions.thischangeeverything.org/>

Guest to be announced

UHM Institute for Climate and Peace

<https://www.hawaii.edu/news/2019/03/15/youth-leadership-needed-climate/>

<https://www.climateandpeace.org/>

East-West Center - Pacific Regional Integrated Sciences and Assessments Program (Pacific RISA) <https://www.eastwestcenter.org/node/35719>

Recommended:

- Earthrise [Apollo 8, 2018, 29 minutes]
<https://www.globalonenessproject.org/library/films/earthrise/>
- *Six Degrees Could Change the World* [2008, 90 minutes, available as streaming video from UHM library]
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change <https://www.ipcc.ch/>
- Bill McKibben <https://350.org/>
- Al Gore's Climate Reality Project
<https://www.climateRealityProject.org/>
- George Monbiot – *The Guardian*
<https://www.theguardian.com/profile/georgemonbiot+environment/climate-change>
- Sunrise Movement <https://www.sunrisemovement.org/>.
- Green New Deal of U.S. Congresswoman Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez
<https://www.congress.gov/116/bills/hres/109/BILLS-116hres109ih.pdf>
- Gleick, Peter H., 2014 (July), "Water, Drought, Climate Change, and the Conflict in Syria," *American Meteorological Society Journal, Weather, Climate, and Society* 6(3):331-340.

November 27 - Student Panels on Global Climate Change

December 4 - continued

December 11 - continued

December 20 - Final examination due (2:15-4:15)

Appendices

1. GUIDELINES FOR JOURNAL

- Each week type an entry of at least one paragraph single-spaced in your accumulating intellectual journal for the course. Do this faithfully, don't get behind. Actually, you can draft this during class in your notebook, then type a revised version into an accumulating file on your laptop at home.
- Be sure to date each entry for the class period covered. Keep entries in a single file, don't make a separate file for each entry. Then submit the single file for the mid-term as an email attachment by October 23. The whole journal as a single file covering the entire semester should be submitted as an email attachment by December 20.
- The journal entries should clearly demonstrate that you are actively engaged with the class material and seriously thinking about it. Your own reactions to class material are far more important than a mere summary.

2. GUIDELINES FOR PANEL DISCUSSIONS

- **PANEL SIZE AND COORDINATION.** The optimum size for a student panel is around three individuals, a smaller or larger number can be awkward. One member of the panel should volunteer or be elected to serve as its coordinator. The coordinator should make a list of the names and email addresses of all members of the panel to set up a group email to facilitate effective communication and coordination of the panel as a whole outside of the classroom.
- **TWO MEETINGS.** Each panel should meet outside of class at least twice in order to successively plan, integrate, and rehearse the whole presentation. It is especially important for the panel to rehearse the presentation before it is given in class in order to work out any problems, gauge timing, and make it run as smoothly as possible. In effect, panel meetings outside of class should be like a small seminar on the subject under consideration as part of the active and collaborative

learning style emphasized in this course. The instructor will also schedule some class time for panels to get organized.

- **INSTRUCTOR FEEDBACK.** Ideally the entire panel or at least a representative should meet with the instructor during his office hours to outline the presentation and obtain feedback. Since the panel presentation comprises 25% of the final course grade feedback from the instructor can be especially helpful and important. The panel will be graded as a whole, although it will be noted if an individual panelist excels or falters. If any panel member does not do their fair share of the work, then the instructor should be informed.
- **CRITICAL ANALYSIS.** The members of each panel should dialog among themselves in person and by email to identify three to five key points to explore in their class discussion. In this presentation panel members should engage together in a conversation about their individual conclusions from their own case study, perhaps focusing in turn on each of three to five main points on the subject. Avoid each panelist simply summarizing their own reading or research in succession. The panel must involve a dialog among panelists.
- **IDEAS AND DELIVERY.** The panel should keep its presentation simple, just focus on discussing the primary argument and three to five main points. Try to accomplish this in a manner that attracts and holds the attention of the class. In other words, both the ideas and their delivery are important for an effective presentation. If feasible, it is desirable for the panelists to engage in a debate on the subject with different individuals taking opposing or alternative sides in a constructive argument. The panel presentation may be facilitated by a PowerPoint presentation, but keep it simple and relevant, don't get lost with details and gimmicks.

3. GUIDELINES FOR POWERPOINTS PRESENTATIONS

- Limit the number of frames in your PowerPoint to about one frame for every one to two minutes according to the time available. For example, use about a dozen frames if you have only 15 minutes for your presentation, or about two dozen frames if you have 30 minutes.
- When you start developing your PowerPoint presentation, carefully select a frame design and color combination that best reflects your subject matter. Be sure to use a strong contrast in the colors of the text and background. For instance, it is easy for your audience to read something like a yellow text on a dark blue background, or vice versa.

- Avoid using either a light or dark color for both text and background. Use a bold font in the largest size that will fit on the frame.
- The goal is to design the PowerPoint so that it can be easily read by the audience without straining. It should also be aesthetically pleasing as well as informative.
 - Limit the text on each frame of the PowerPoint to a few key words or phrases avoiding too much detail. The text is simply a guide to help your memory as the speaker and an outline for the audience to help them follow the main points of your talk. Do not read the text on each frame to your audience; they are literate and will be more actively engaged in your presentation if they read the text on each frame for themselves. Instead, explain the key words and phrases on each frame to elaborate on the main points outlined. If you use a quote, then ask the audience to read it for themselves in order to involve them more actively in the presentation.
 - Use a few striking but relevant illustrations or images for most frames, but not necessarily on every one of them. Careful selection of images that are most relevant and of the highest quality will greatly enhance your PowerPoint. Pictures and other illustrations may be found at Google Images.
 - Sometimes special effects or gimmicks with the PowerPoint such as animation can enhance a presentation, but if they are not handled very carefully, then they can be distracting for the audience. Your primary goal is to inform your audience, rather than dazzle them with your technical skills and in the process sacrifice your message.
 - Video segments from YouTube and/or another source may be useful, but only if you have time and if they can be accessed easily and quickly.
 - You should bring your PowerPoint file on a USB, flash drive, or other external storage device that can be installed easily and quickly in the computer provided in the classroom, rather than wasting time installing your laptop, trying to download the PowerPoint from your email, or some other venue. Install this device well ahead of the time for your panel presentation for efficiency. Your PowerPoint file can be inserted on the desktop of the classroom computer, then extract and keep your USB to avoid forgetting and losing it. Be sure to test and rehearse with any equipment in advance in order to avoid any frustration with technical problems for you and your audience.

4. GUIDELINES FOR FINAL EXAMINATION

- The reflective essay for the take-home final examination should be sent as an email attachment to the instructor by December 20. A late final examination cannot be accepted because of university regulations.
- One or more letter grades will be subtracted from the examination grade for failure to carefully follow these guidelines.
- Identify the number and topic of the question you are answering in your essay. Each answer should be a clear and concise but penetrating. Limit your answer to each of the five questions to one page typed single-spaced. (The instructor will not read more). Include introductory and concluding paragraphs. Explicitly identify by number 3-4 main points in answering each of the five questions. Use paraphrasing instead of quotes, don't waste space.
- Ultimately your essays must be the product of your own scholarship and creativity. However, you are welcome to consult with any person as well as any print and internet resources, although covering the required readings for the course is by far the most important. One or more letter grades will be subtracted from your final course grade if coverage of required readings and other course material is inadequate. Be careful to properly acknowledge the source for very specific information and ideas. Also, be sure to include your own insights, comments, reactions, criticisms, and questions, not just summarize course material.
- Your essay should be a thorough and penetrating synthesis of all of the relevant course material. Cite the course textbooks, other sources including publications, lectures, films, case studies, websites, class discussion, handouts, and guests. In each reading citation include the author, year, and page (for example, Paige 2009:54-55). Other sources can be documented as follows: (lecture November 13), (panel discussion November 25), (film title), or (personal communication with Mohandas Gandhi, September 2, 2019). It is not necessary to append a bibliography with the full citation of any sources provided that they are already in the syllabus, rather the name of the author and year of publication is sufficient.
- The purposes of each of the five essays are to: (1) convincingly demonstrate your general familiarity with the course material, (2) present a critical analysis of it, and (3) discuss your own reactions to it. Your grade will be based on fulfilling these three purposes, the guidelines for the examination and course, and the course learning outcomes as listed

previously in this syllabus. In grading the instructor will emphasize content. However, you should routinely perform a grammar and spelling check with your computer. Misspellings, typos, and/or grammatical errors will not impress any instructor.

- The instructor is willing to read and comment on an outline or draft of an essay sent by email well in advance of the due date for the examination.
- From past experience, students who do well on these essays start sooner than later. Since the questions are already available in the course syllabus by the first day of class it is possible and highly desirable to keep a file of reading and class notes, ideas, and observations toward answering each question throughout the semester. You might even keep a separate file for notes on each of the five questions.

The five questions are:

1. What are the conditions, causes, and consequences of violence?
2. What are the conditions, causes, and consequences of nonviolence?
3. What are the conditions, causes, and consequences of the transition from nonviolence to violence?
4. What are the conditions, causes, and consequences of the transition from violence to nonviolence?
5. What role does/will global climate change play in these four phenomena?

5. SELECTED RECOMMENDED BACKGROUND AND REFERENCE BOOKS

Alvarez, Alex, 2017, *Unstable Ground: Climate Change, Conflict, and Genocide*, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Barash, David P., and Charles P. Webel, 2018, *Peace and Conflict Studies*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers, Inc.

Brecher, Jeremy, 2017, *Against Doom: A Climate Insurgency Manual*, Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Coker, Christopher, 2014, *Can War Be Eliminated?*, Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Diamond, Jared, 2011, *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*, New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Diamond, Jared, 2019, *Upheaval: Turning Points for Nations in Crisis*, New York, NY: Little, Brown, and Company.

- Dyer, Gwynne, 2011, *Climate Wars: The Fight for Survival as the World Overheats*, London, UK: Oneworld Publications.
- Fagan, Brian, 2008, *The Great Warming: Climate Change and the Rise and Fall of Civilizations*, New York, NY: Bloomsbury Press.
- Fox, Michael Allen, 2013, *Understanding Peace: A Comprehensive Introduction*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fuentes, Agustin, and Aku Visala, 2016, *Conversations on Human Nature*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gittings, John, 2012, *The Glorious Art of Peace: From the Iliad to Iraq*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Goodell, Jeff, 2017, *The Water Will Come: Rising Seas, Sinking Cities, and the Re-making of the Civilized World*, New York, NY: Little, Brown and Company.
- Grayling, A.C., 2017, *War: An Enquiry*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hawken, Paul, ed., 2017, *Drawdown: The Most Comprehensive Plan Ever Proposed to Reverse Global Warming*, New York, NY: Penguin.
- Hedges, Chris, 2002, *War is a Force That Gives Us Meaning*, New York, NY: Public Affairs.
- Hedges, Chris, 2003, *What Every Person Should Know About War*, New York, NY: Free Press.
- Hiscock, Geoff, 2012, *Earth Wars: The Battle for Global Resources*, Singapore: John Wiley & Sons Singapore Pte. Ltd.
- Horgan, John, 2014, *The End of War*, San Francisco, CA: McSweeney's.
- Junger, Sebastian, 2011, *War*, New York, NY: Twelve.
- Keegan, John, 1993, *A History of Warfare*, New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Klein, Naomi, 2014, *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. the Climate*, New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Kurlansky, Mark, 2008, *Non-Violence: The History of a Dangerous Idea*, New York, NY: The Modern Library.
- Lynas, Mark, 2008, *Six Degrees: Our Future on a Hotter Planet*, Washington, D.C.: National Geographic Society.
- McKibben, Bill, 2019, *Falter: Has the Human Game Begun to Play Itself Out?* New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company.
- Moran, Daniel, 2011, *Climate Change and National Security: A Country-Level Analysis*, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Otterbein, Keith F., 2009, *The Anthropology of War*, Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Parenti, Christian, 2011, *Tropic of Chaos: Climate Change and the New Geography of Violence*, New York, NY: Nation Books.
- Radhakrishnan, N., et al., eds., 2012, *Towards a Nonkilling World: Festschrift in Honor of Prof. Glenn D. Paige*, Honolulu, HI: Center for Global Nonkilling.

- Scheper-Hughes, Nancy, and Philippe I. Bourgois, eds., 2003, *Violence in War and Peace: An Anthology*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sibley, Mulford Quickert, 1963, *The Quiet Battle: Writings on the Theory and Practice of Non-Violent Resistance*, Chicago, IL: Quadrangle Books.
- Solomon, Norman, 2005, *War Made Easy: How Presidents and Pundits Keep Spinning Us to Death*, New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sponsel, Leslie E., and Thomas Gregor, eds., 1994, *The Anthropology of Peace and Nonviolence*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Ury, William, 1999, *The Third Side: Why We Fight and How We Can Stop*, New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Wallace-Wells, David, 2019, *The Uninhabitable Earth: Life After Warming*, New York, NY: Tim Duggan Books.
- Welzer, Harald, 2015, *Climate Wars: What People Will Be Killed for in the 21st Century*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Zimmerer, Jurgen, 2015, *Climate Change and Genocide: Environmental Violence in the 21st Century*, New York, NY: Routledge.

About the Author

Leslie E. Sponsel earned the B.A. in geology from Indiana University (1965), and the M.A. (1973) and Ph.D. (1981) in biological anthropology from Cornell University. His doctoral dissertation is *The Hunter and the Hunted in the Amazon: An Integrated Biological and Cultural Approach to the Behavioral Ecology of Human Predation*.

Sponsel has taught at seven universities in four countries, including Canada and as a Fulbright Fellow in Venezuela and later a second Fulbright in Thailand. Since 1981, he serves on the anthropology faculty at the University of Hawai`i in Honolulu where he became a Professor Emeritus in 2010. He is the founder and former Director of the Ecological Anthropology Program. Twice he was given the Excellence in Teaching Award. Among the many courses he teaches are Primate Behavior and Ecology, Ecological Anthropology, Environmental Anthropology, War and Peace, Ethics in Anthropology, Anthropology of Buddhism, Spiritual Ecology, and Sacred Places.

He was a founding member of the Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace at the University of Hawai`i. He contributed to the development of Glenn D. Paige's independent Center for Global Nonkilling. He was invited by Paige to facilitate a weekly faculty research seminar on nonviolence, and it ran for three semesters with a cumulative total of more than a hundred guest speakers.

Sponsel was a founding member and the first chair of the Committee for Human Rights of the American Anthropological Association and its predecessor the Commission for Human Rights (1992-1996).

His interests focus on peace, ecology, and religion, especially their intersections. Sponsel pursued research in ecological anthropology in the Venezuelan Amazon with Yanomami and other indigenous cultures during several field trips from 1974-1981, and since 1984 in Thailand on Buddhist ecology and environmentalism including on sacred caves.

Sponsel's publications include numerous book chapters, journal articles, and encyclopedia entries as well as editing these books: *Indigenous Peoples and the Future of the Amazon: An Ecological Anthropology of an Endangered World*, *The Anthropology of Peace and Nonviolence*, *Tropical Deforestation: The Human Dimension*, *Endangered Peoples of Southeast and East Asia: Struggles to Survive*

and Thrive, Religious Environmental Activism in Asia: Case Studies in Spiritual Ecology. He is author of *Spiritual Ecology: A Quiet Revolution* which won the Green Book Festival Award for Science in 2014. His forthcoming book is *Yanomami in the Amazon: Toward a More Ethical Anthropology*.

For more information please see <http://www.spiritualecology.info>.

References

Note: All internet links were checked to be sure that they are active on May 26, 2020.

- Adams, David, 1989, "The Seville Statement on Violence: A Progress Report," *Journal of Peace Research* 26(2):113-121.
- Adolf, Antony, and Israel Sanmartin, 2009, "How to Historicize What Did Not Happen (But Makes the Past, Present and Future Possible)," in *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm*, Joám Evans Pim, ed., Honolulu, HI: Center for Global Nonkilling, pp. 203-216.
- Ahmed, Zahid Shabab, 2010a, "Institutions," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 3:470-475.
- _____, 2010b, "Journals," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 3:467-470.
- Albert, Bruce, 1989, "Yanomami "violence": Inclusive Fitness or Ethnographer's Representation," *Current Anthropology* 30(5):637-640.
- _____, 1994, "Gold Miners and the Yanomami Indians in the Brazilian Amazon: The Hashimu Massacre," in *Who Pays the Price? Sociocultural Context of Environmental Crisis*, Barbara Rose Johnston, ed., Washington, D.C.: Island Press, pp. 47-55.
- _____, 2001, *Research and Ethics: The Yanomami Case, Brasilia: Pro-Yanomami Commission Documentos Yanomami Number 2*.
- _____, and Alcida Ramos, 1989 (May 12), "Yanomami Indians and Anthropological Ethics," *Science* 244(4905):632.
- _____, Alcida Ramos, Kenneth I. Taylor, and Fiona Watson, 2001, "Yanomami" The Fierce People?" London: Survival International <https://www.survivalinternational.org/material/87>.
- _____, et al. 2013 (February 26). "Statement [signed by 18 anthropologists who have worked with the Yanomami]. <http://assets.survivalinternational.org/documents/891/2-2013-anthropologists-letter.pdf>.
- Alliance of Religions and Conservation/World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), 2010, <http://www.arcworld.org>.
- Allman, William F., 1988 (April 11), "A Laboratory of Human Conflict," *U.S. News & World Report* 104(14):57-58.
- Alvarez, Alex, 2017, *Unstable Ground: Climate Change and Genocide*, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- American Academy of Religion, 2010, <http://www.aarweb.org>.
- American Anthropological Association (AAA) <http://www.aaanet.org>.

- American Anthropological Association, 2008, *Program American Anthropological Association 107th Annual Meeting, November 19-23, 2008*, San Francisco, California, Arlington, VA: AAA.
- Andreas, Joel, 2004, *Addicted to War: Why the U.S. Can't Kick Militarism*, Oakland, CA: AK Press, <http://www.addictedtowar.com>.
- Ardrey, Robert, 1961, *African Genesis: A Personal Investigation into the Animal Origins and Nature of Man*, New York, NY: Atheneum.
- _____, 1966, *The Territorial Imperative: A Personal Inquiry into the Animal Origins of Property and Nations*, New York, NY: Atheneum.
- _____, 1976, *The Hunting Hypothesis: A Personal Conclusion Concerning the Evolutionary Nature of Man*, New York, NY: Atheneum.
- Armstrong, Edward A., 1973, *Saint Francis: Nature Mystic*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Armstrong, Karen, 2010, Charter for Compassion, <http://www.charterforcompassion.org>.
- Asch, Timothy, 1991, "The Defense of Yanomami Society and Culture: Its Importance and Significance," *La Iglesia en Amazonas* XII:35-38.
- _____, 1992, "Book Review: *Into the Heart: One Man's Pursuit of Love and Knowledge among the Yanomama*, Kenneth Good (with David Chanoff)," *American Anthropologist* 94(2):481-482.
- Atkinson, Paul, 1992, *Understanding Ethnographic Texts*, Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Aureli, Filippo, and Frans B.M. de Waal, eds., 2000, *Natural Conflict Resolution*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Avruch, Kevin, 1998, *Culture and Conflict Resolution*, Washington, D.C.: Institute of Peace Press.
- Barandiaran, Daniel de, 1967, "Vida y Muerte Entre Los Indios Sanema-Yanoama," *Antropologica* 21:1-43.
- Barash, David P., 1991, *Introduction to Peace Studies*, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. Upper Saddle River, NY: Prentice Hall.
- _____, 2010a, "Conflicts and War, Distinctions of," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 1:418-420.
- _____, 2010b, "Human Nature Debate," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 2:347-351.
- _____, 2011, *Approaches to Peace: A Reader in Peace Studies*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press (Third Edition).
- _____, and Charles P. Webel, 2017, *Peace and Conflict Studies*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications (Fourth Edition).
- Barber, Benjamin R., 1996, *Jihad vs. McWorld: How Globalism and Tribalism Are Reshaping the World*, New York, NY: Ballantine Books.

- Barbour, Ian G., ed., 2000, *When Science Meets Religion: Enemies, Strangers, or Partners?*, San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Barker, Holly M., 2004, *Bravo for the Marshallese: Regaining Control in a Post-Nuclear, Post-Colonial World*, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Barnaby, Frank, ed., 1988, *The Gaia Peace Atlas*, NY: Doubleday.
- Barnes, Bruce E., 2007, *Culture, Conflict, and Mediation in the Asian Pacific*, Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Barth, Fredrik, 1956, "Ecological Relationships of Ethnic Groups in Swat, North Pakistan," *American Anthropologist* 58:1079-1089.
- _____, Andre Gingrich, Robert Parkin, and Sydel Silverman, 2005, *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French, and American Anthropology*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bassett, Libby, Brinkman, John T., and Pedersen, Kusumitra P., eds. 2000, *Earth and Faith: A Book of Reflection and Action*, New York: United Nations Environmental Program Interfaith Partnership for the Environment.
- Baszarkiewicz, Karolina, and Douglas P. Fry, 2008, "Peaceful Societies," in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Elsevier 2:1557-1570.
- Beckerman, Stephen, Pamela I. Erickson, James Yost, Jhanira Regalado, Lilia Jaramillo, Corey Sparks, Moises Ironmenga, and Kathryn Long, 2009 (May 19), "Life Histories, Blood Revenge, and Reproductive Success among the Waorani of Ecuador," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106(20):8134-8139.
- Beeman, William O., 2012, "War and Peace and Margaret Mead: in Search of a Role for Anthropology in the Reduction of International Violence," in *Expanding American Anthropology 1945-1980: A Generation Reflects*, Alice Beck Kehoe and Paul L. Doughty, eds., Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, pp. 199-203.
- Begley, Sharon, 2000 (November 27), "Into the Heart of Darkness," *Newsweek*, pp. 70-75.
- Bekoff, Marc, 2007, *Animals Matter: A Biologist Explains Why We Should Treat Animals with Compassion and Respect*, Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, Inc.
- Bekoff, 2007, *The Emotional Lives of Animals: A Leading Scientist Explores Animal Joy, Sorrow, and Empathy - and Why They Matter*, Novato, CA: New World Library.
- _____, and Jessica Pierce, 2009, *Wild Justice: The Moral Lives of Animals*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bell, Lynda S., Andrew J. Nathan, and Ilan Peleg, eds., 2001, *Negotiating Culture and Human Rights*, New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Ben-Ari, Eyal, 2004 (August), "The Military and Militarization in the United States," *American Ethnologist* 31(3):340-348.
- Benedict, Ruth, 1959, "The Natural History of War," in *An Anthropologist at Work: The Writings of Ruth Benedict*, Margaret Mead, ed., New York, NY: Avon Books, pp. 369-382.
- Beroldi, G., 1994, "Critique of the Seville Statement on Violence," *American Psychologist* 49(10):847-848.

- Berry, Thomas, and Mary Evelyn Tucker, 2006, *Evening Thoughts: Reflecting on Earth as a Sacred Community*, San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club Books.
- _____, and _____, 2009, *The Sacred Universe: Earth, Spirituality, and Religion in the Twenty-First Century*, New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Berwick, Dennison, 1992, *Savages: The Life and Killing of the Yanomami*, London, CA: Hutchinson.
- Besteman, Catherine, and Hugh Gusterson, eds., 2005, *Why America's Top Pundits Are Wrong: Anthropologists Talk Back*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bhaneja, Balwant, 2008, "Nonkilling Political Science," in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, editor-in-chief, San Diego, CA: Academic Press 2:1356-1362.
- Biesanz, Richard, Karen Zubris Biesanz, and Mavis Hitunen Biesanz, 1982, *The Costa Ricans*, Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Bidney, David, 1967, *Theoretical Anthropology*, New York, NY: Schocken Books (Second Augmented Edition).
- Bidney, Martin, 1995, "Introduction to the Transaction Edition," *Theoretical Anthropology*, David Bidney, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, pp. ix-xxv.
- Bilimoria, Purushottama, 2001, "Mahatma Gandhi 1869-1948," in *Fifty Key Thinkers on the Environment*, Joy A. Palmer, ed., New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 160-167.
- Bioccal, Ettore, 1970, *Yanomamo: The Narrative of a White Girl Kidnapped by Amazonian Indians*, New York: E.P. Dutton & Co.
- _____, 1996, *Yanoama: The Story of Helena Valero, a Girl Kidnapped by Amazonian Indians* (Second Edition), New York, NY: Kodansha America.
- Birx, H. James, ed., 2006, *Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Blanco, Sebastian, 2009, *U.S. Militarism in Hawai'i: A People's History*, Kihei, HI: Koa Books.
- Blondeau, Anne-Marie, and Katia Buffetrille, eds., 2008, *Authenticating Tibet: Answers to China's 100 Questions*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Boas, Franz, 1919, "Scientists as Spies," *The Nation* 109:729.
- _____, 1938 (August 28), "An Anthropologist's Credo," *The Nation* 147.
- Bodley, John H., 2008a, *Anthropology and Contemporary Human Problems*, Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- _____, 2008b, *Victims of Progress*, Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- _____, 2020, *Cultural Anthropology: Tribes, States, and the Global System*, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield (Seventh Edition).
- Boehm, Christopher, 1984, *Blood Revenge: The Enactment and Management of Conflict in Montenegro and Other Tribal Societies*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- _____, 1997, "Feuding," in *Dictionary of Anthropology*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc., pp. 185-186.

- Boggs, Carl, and Tom Pollard, 2007, *The Hollywood War Machine: US Militarism and Popular Culture*, Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Bonta, Bruce D., 1993, *Peaceful Peoples: An Annotated Bibliography*, Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- _____, 1996, "Conflict Resolution among Peaceful Societies: The Culture of Peacefulness," *Journal of Peace Research* 33:403-420.
- _____, 1997, "Cooperation and Competition in Peaceful Societies," *Psychological Bulletin* 121:299-320.
- _____, 2008, "Peaceful Societies: Alternatives to Violence and War," <http://www.peacefulsocieties.org>.
- _____, and Douglas P. Fry, 2006, "Lessons for the Rest of Us: Learning from Peaceful Societies," *The Psychology of Resolving Global Conflicts: From War to Peace*, M. Fitzduff and C.E. Stout, eds., Westport, CT: Praeger 1:175-210.
- _____, 2020, Peaceful Peoples, <https://peacefulsocieties.uncg.edu/>.
- Booth, William, 1989 (March 3), "Warfare Over the Yanomamo Indians," *Science*, 243(4895):1138-1140.
- Borofsky, Robert, ed., 1994, *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- _____, ed., 2005, *Yanomami: The Fierce Controversy and What We Can Learn from It*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- _____, 2019, *An Anthropology of Anthropology: Is it Time to Shift the Paradigm?*, Kailua, HI: Center for a Public Anthropology.
- _____, and Robert Antonio De Lauri, 2019, "Public Anthropology in Changing Times," *Public Anthropologist* 1:3-19.
- Boulding, Elise. 2000, *Cultures of Peace: The Hidden Side of History*, Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Boulding, Kenneth, 1977, "Peace Research," *International Social Science Journal* 29(4):601-614.
- _____, 1978a, *Stable Peace*, Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- _____, 1978b, "Future Directions in Conflict and Peace Studies," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 22(2):342-354.
- Brandsch, Jurgen, 2020, *Killing Civilians in Wars: The Rationale for Indiscriminate Violence*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Bregman, Rutger, 2020a, *Humankind: A Hopeful History*, New York, NY: Little, Brown and Company.
- _____, 2020b (May 9), "The real Lord of the Flies: what happened when six boys were shipwrecked for 15 months," *The Guardian* <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2020/may/09/the-real-lord-of-the-flies-what-happened-when-six-boys-were-shipwrecked-for-15-months>.
- Brown, Donald E., 1991, *Human Universals*, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- _____, 1996, "Human Universals," in *Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology*, David Levinson and Melvin Ember, eds., New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company, 2:607-613.

- Bucholz, Arden, and Rennison Lalgée, 2008, "Militarism," *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Elsevier 2:128-1266.
- Burns, Richard Dean, 2010, "Combatants and Noncombatants in War: Protection of," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 1:360-364.
- Butler, Samuel, 1935, *War Is A Racket*, San Diego, CA: Dauphin Publications Inc.
- Cady, Duane L., 2010a, "Just War: Theory," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 2:551-554.
- _____, 2010b, "Warism," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 4:341-342.
- Cannel, Ward, and June Macklin, 1974, *The Human Nature Industry: How Human Nature is Manufactured, Distributed, and Consumed in the United States and parts of Canada*, Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Cappelletti, E.J., 1994, "Fighting the Common Enemy in the Amazon," *American Anthropological Association Anthropology News* 35(5):2.
- Carneiro da Cunha, Maria Manuela, 1989 (January), "Letter to the Editor/the AAA Committee on Ethics," *American Anthropological Association Anthropology News* 30(1):3.
- Carroll, John E., and Keith Warner, eds., 1998, *Ecology and Religion: Scientists Speak*, Quincy, IL: Franciscan Press.
- Carter, Jimmy, 2005, *Our Endangered Values: America's Moral Crisis*, New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Cartright, David, 2008, *Peace: A History of Movements and Ideas*, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Center for Global Nonkilling, 2020, Center for Global Nonkilling, Honolulu, HI <http://nonkilling.org>.
- Chagnon, Napoleon A., 1968, *Yanomamo: The Fierce People*, New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- _____, 1996a, "Chronic Problems in Understanding Tribal Violence and Warfare," in *Genetics of Criminal and Antisocial Behaviour*, Gregory R. Bock, and Jamie A. Goode, eds., New York: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 202-236.
- _____, 1968b, "Yanomamo Social Organization and Warfare," in *War: The Anthropology of Armed Conflict and Aggression*, Morton Fried, Marvin Harris, and Robert Murphy, eds., Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., pp. 109-159.
- _____, 1973, "Yanomamo," in *Primitive Worlds: People Lost in Time*, Washington, D.C.: National Geographic Society, pp. 141-183.
- _____, 1974, *Studying the Yanomamo*, New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- _____, 1988 (February 26), "Life Histories, Blood Revenge, and Warfare in a Tribal Population," *Science* n.s. 239(4843):985-992.
- _____, 1989, "Response to Ferguson," *American Ethnologist* 16(3):656-570.
- _____, 1990, "On Yanomamo Violence: Reply to Albert," *Current Anthropology*, 31(1):49-53.

- _____, 1992, *Yanomamo*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich (Fourth Edition).
- _____, 1995, "L'ethnologie du deshonneur: Brief Response to Lizot," *American Ethnologist* 22(1):187-189.
- _____, 1996c, "Book Review: *Yanomami Warfare: A Political History*, R. Brian Ferguson," *American Anthropologist* 98(3):670-672.
- _____, 1997a, *Yanomamo*, Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace (Fifth Edition).
- _____, 1997b, "Sticks and Stones," *Human Nature: A Critical Reader*, Laura Betzig, ed., New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 100-102.
- _____, 2013, *Noble Savages: My Life Among Two Dangerous Tribes—Yanomamo and Anthropologists*, New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Chapple, Christopher Key, 1993, *Nonviolence to Animals, Earth, and Self in Asian Traditions*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- _____, ed., 2002, *Jainism and Ecology: Nonviolence in the Web of Life*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press and the Harvard Center for the Study of World Religions.
- _____, and Mary Evelyn Tucker, eds., 2000, *Hinduism and Ecology: The Intersection of Earth, Sky, and Water*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press and the Harvard Center for the Study of World Religions.
- Chernela, Janet M., 1997 (February). "Book Review: *Yanomami Warfare: A Political History*, R. Brian Ferguson," *American Ethnologist* 24(1):227-229.
- Chomsky, Noam, 2001, 9-11, New York, NY: Seven Stories Press.
- Christie, Daniel J., and Joám Evans Pim, eds., 2012, *Nonkilling Psychology*, Honolulu, HI: Center for Global Nonkilling.
- Churchill, Ward, and Chellis Glendinning, 2003, *On the Justice of Roosting Chickens: Reflections on the Consequences of U.S. Imperial Arrogance and Criminality*, Oakland, CA: Ak Press.
- Craig, Whitlock, 2019 (December 9), "At War with the Truth: The Afghanistan Papers: A Secret History of War," Washington, D.C: *The Washington Post*.
- Cresswell, Michael H., 2010, "Aggression, Conflict, and War," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 1:20-36.
- Christopher, Paul, 1999, *The Ethics of War and Peace: An Introduction to Moral and Legal Issues*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Christakis, Nicholas, 2019, *Blueprint: The Evolutionary Origins of a Good Society*, New York, NY: Little, Brown Spark.
- Churchill, Ward, 1997, *A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial in the Americas 1492 to the Present*, San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books.
- _____, 2003, *On the Justice of Roosting Chickens: Reflections on the Consequences of U.S. Imperial Arrogance and Criminality*, Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Clark, Mary E., 2002, *In Search of Human Nature*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Clayton, Philip, and Zachary Simpson, eds. 2006, *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Science*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Cocco, Luis, 1972, *Iyewei-Teri: Quince anos entre los Yanomamos*, Caracas: Libreria Editorial Salesiana.
- Conroy, Donald B., and Rodney L. Petersen, eds., 2000, *Earth at Risk: An Environmental Dialogue between Religion and Science*, Amherst, NY: Humanity Press.
- Coronil, Fernando, et al. 2001 (April), "CA Forum on Anthropology in Public: Perspectives on Tierney's Darkness in El Dorado," *Current Anthropology* 42(2):265-276.
- Cranna, Michael, and Nils Bhinda, 1995, *The True Cost of Conflict: Seven Recent Wars and Their Effects on Society*, New York, NY: New Press.
- Crosby, Donald A., 2002, *A Religion of Nature*, Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Cultural Survival, Inc., 2010, Cultural Survival, Inc. Cambridge, MA., <http://www.cs.org>.
- Curti, Merle, 1980, *Human Nature in American Thought: A History*, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Curtis, Adam, 2007, "The Trap: What Happened to Our Dream of Freedom?," London, UK: British Broadcasting Corporation (2C 2:17 minute).
- Dalai Lama, His Holiness the XIVth, 1987, *The Buddhism of Tibet*, Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion Publications.
- _____, 1999, *Ethics for the New Millennium*, New York, NY: Riverhead Books.
- Davidson, Richard J., and Anne Harrington, eds., 2002, *Visions of Compassion: Western Scientists and Tibetan Buddhists Examine Human Nature*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Davies, James C., 2008, "Human Nature, Views Of," in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., New York, NY: Elsevier 2:958-967.
- Davis, Shelton H., 1976, "The Yanomamo: Ethnographic Images and Anthropological Responsibilities," in *The Geological Imperative: Anthropology and Development in the Amazon Basin of South America*, Shelton H. Davis, and Robert O. Matthews, eds., Cambridge, MA: Anthropology Resource Center, pp. 1-23.
- Dawson, Doyne, 1996 (February), "The Origins of War: Biological and Anthropological Theories," *History and Theory* 35(1):1-26.
- Dawson, Michael, 2006, *Growing Up Yanomamo*, Enumclaw, WA: WinePress Publishing.
- Dennen, J.M.G. van der, 1995, *The Origin of War*, Groningen, The Netherlands: Origin Press.
- Dentan, Robert K., 1968, *The Semai: A Nonviolent People of Malaya*, New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- _____, 2012, "'Honey Out of the Lion': Peace Research Emerging from Mid-20th Century Violence," in *Expanding American Anthropology 1945-1980: A Generation Reflects*, Alice Beck Kehoe and Paul L. Dougherty, eds., Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, pp. 204-220.
- de Waal, Frans, 2009, *The Age of Empathy: Nature's Lessons for a Kinder Society*, New York, NY: Harmony Books.

- DeWolf, Jan J., 1992, "Ethnology in the Third Reich," *Current Anthropology* 33(4):473-475.
- Diamond, Jared, 1999, *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*, New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- DMZ Hawai'i, 2020, Honolulu, HI <http://www.dmzhawaii.org>.
- Dobson, Andrew, ed., 1991, *The Green Reader: Essays Toward a Sustainable Society*, San Francisco, CA: Mercury House.
- Documentary Educational Research, 2010, Documentary Educational Research, Wattertown, MA. <http://www.der.org>.
- Donnelly, Jack, 2003, *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press (Second Edition).
- Downing, Theodore E., and Gilbert Kushner, eds., 1988, *Human Rights and Anthropology*, Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival.
- Drengson, Alan, and Bill Devall, eds., 2008, *The Ecology of Wisdom: Writings of Arne Naess*, Berkeley, CA: Counterpoint.
- Duclos, Dennis, 1997, *The Werewolf Complex: America's Fascination with Violence*, New York, NY: Berg.
- Dudley, Nigel, Liza Higgins-Zogib, and Stephanie Mansourian, 2005, *Beyond Belief: Linking Faiths and Protected Areas to Support Biodiversity Conservation*, Gland, Switzerland: World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and Alliance of Religions and Conservation.
- Dupre, John, 2001, *Human Nature and the Limits of Science*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Dyer, Elizabeth A., 2006, "Chagnon, Napoleon (1938-)," in *Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, in James H. Birx, ed., Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications 2:477-478.
- Early, John D., and John F. Peters, 1990, *The Dynamics of the Mucajai Yanomama*, New York: Academic Press.
- _____, and _____, 2000, *The Xilixana Yanomami of the Amazon: History, Social Structure, and Population Dynamics*, Gainesville: University of Florida Press.
- Earth Charter, 2010, <http://www.earthcharter.org>.
- Eckhardt, W., 1973, "Anthropological Correlates of Primitive Militarism," *Peace Research* 5:5-10.
- Edgerton, Robert B., 2010, *Sick Societies: Challenging the Myth of Primitive Harmony*, New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Edsforth, Ronald, ed., 2020, *A Cultural History of Peace*, New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic, Volumes 1-6.
- Edwards, Jo, and Martin Palmer, eds., 1997, *Holy Ground: The Guide to Faith and Ecology*, Northamptonshire, UK: Pilkington Press Ltd.
- Ehlers, Tracy Bachrach, 1980, "Central America in the 1980's: Political Crisis and the Social Responsibility of Anthropologists," *Latin American Research Review* XXV(3):141-155.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara, 1998, *Blood Rites: Origins and History of the Passions for War*, New York, NY: Holt.

- Eickelman, Dale F., 2002, *The Middle East and Central Asia: An Anthropological Approach*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Eickelman, and James Piscatori, 1996, *Muslim Politics*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Eisler, Rianne, 2011, *The Chalice and the Blade*, New York, NY: HarperOne.
- _____, and Douglas P. Fry, 2019, *Nurturing Our Humanity: How Domination and Partnership Shape Our Brains, Lives, and Future*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Eller, Jack David, 1999, *From Culture to Ethnicity to Conflict: An Anthropological Perspective on International Ethnic Conflict*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- _____, 2006, *Violence and Culture: A Cross-Cultural and Interdisciplinary Approach*, Belmont, CA: Thomson Higher Education.
- English, Michael D., 2018, *The U.S. Institute for Peace: A Critical History*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland, 2006, *Engaging Anthropology: The Case for a Public Presence*, New York, NY: Berg.
- Esposito, John L., and Dalia Mogahed, 2007, *Who Speaks for Islam?: What A Billion Muslims Really Think*, New York, NY: Gallup Press.
- Evans Pim, Joám, 2009, *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm*, Honolulu, HI: Center for Global Nonkilling.
- _____, 2010a, "Nonkilling, A New Paradigm Of," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 3:161-164.
- _____, 2010b, "Peace Research History," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 3:449-453.
- _____, and Pradeep Dhakal, eds., 2015, *Nonkilling Spiritual Traditions*, Honolulu, HI: Center for Global Nonkilling.
- Fabbro, David, 1978, "Peaceful Societies: An Introduction," *Journal of Peace Research* XV(1):67-83.
- Fabian, Johannes, 1991, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fahey, Joseph J., 2010, "Peace Studies: Beginning and Development," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 3:490-493.
- Fedigan, Linda M., and Shirley C. Strum, 1997 (August/October), "Changing Images of Primate Societies," *Current Anthropology* 38(4):677-681.
- Feibleman, James Kern, 1987, *The Destroyers: The Underside of Human Nature*, New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Feldman, Jonathan, 1989, *Universities in the Business of Repression: The Academic-Military-Industrial Complex and Central America*, Boston, MA: South End Press.

- Ferguson, R. Brian, 1984, "Introduction: Studying War," in *Warfare, Culture, and Environment*, R. Brian Ferguson, ed., Orlando: Academic Press, Inc., pp. 1-81
- _____, 1988a, "Anthropology and War: Theory, Politics, Ethics," *The Anthropology of War and Peace: Perspectives on the Nuclear Age*, Paul R. Turner and David Pitt, eds., Cambridge, MA: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, Inc., pp. 141-159.
- _____, 1988b (June), "How Can Anthropologists Promote Peace," *Anthropology Today* 4(3):1-3.
- _____, 1989, "Do Yanomamo Killers Have More Kids?," *American Ethnologist* 16(3):564-565.
- _____, 1992a, "Tribal Warfare," *Scientific American* 266(1):108-113.
- _____, 1992b, "A Savage Encounter: Western Contact and the Yanomami War Complex." in *War in the Tribal Zone: Expanding States and Indigenous Warfare*, R. Brian Ferguson, and Neil L. Whitehead, eds., Santa Fe: School of American Research, pp. 199-227.
- _____, 1995, *Yanomami Warfare: A Political History*, Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- _____, 2002, "The 'Violent' Human: Archaeological and Historical Evidence," *Must We Fight? From the Battlefield to the Schoolyard— A New Perspective on Violent Conflict and Its Preservation*, William Ury, ed., San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, pp. 26-38.
- _____, ed., 2003, *The State, Identity, and Violence: Political Disintegration in the Post-Cold War World*, London, UK: Routledge.
- _____, 2006, "Archaeology, Cultural Anthropology, and the Origins and Intensification of War," *The Archaeology of Warfare: Prehistories of Raiding and Conquest*, Elizabeth N. Arkush and Mark W. Allen, eds., Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
- _____, 2007 (February), "Eight Points on War," *Anthropology News* 48(2):5-6.
- _____, 2008, "Ten Points on War," *Social Analysis* 52(2):32-49.
- _____, and Leslie E. Farragher, 1988, *The Anthropology of War: A Bibliography*, New York, NY: Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation Occasional Paper 1.
- _____, 2013a, "Pinker's List: Exaggerating Prehistoric War Mortality," in *War, Peace, and Human Nature: The Convergence of Evolutionary and Cultural Views*, Douglas P. Fry, ed., New York, NY: Oxford University Press, pp. 112-131.
- _____, 2013b, "The Prehistory of War and Peace in Europe and the Near East," in *War, Peace, and Human Nature: The Convergence of Evolutionary and Cultural Views*, Douglas P. Fry, ed., New York, NY: Oxford University Press, pp. 191-240.
- _____, and Neil L. Whitehead, eds., 1992, *War in the Tribal Zone: Expanding States and Indigenous Warfare*, Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research.
- Figley, Charles R., 2008, "Traumatology," in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Elsevier 3:2192-2202.
- Fischer, A., 1969, "The Personality and Subculture of Anthropologists and Their Study of U.S. Negroes" in *Concepts and Assumptions in Contemporary Anthropology*

- gy, S.A. Tyler, ed., Athens: Southern Anthropological Proceedings No. 3, pp. 12-17.
- Fischer, Michael J., 2001, "In the Science Zone: The Yanomami, Science and Ethics," *Anthropology Today* 17(3):19-36, 17(4):9-14, 17(5):16-19.
- Fluehr-Lobban, Carolyn, 2002, "A Century of Ethics and Professional Anthropology," *American Anthropological Association Anthropology News* 43(3):20.
- _____, 2003a, "Darkness in El Dorado: Research Ethics, Then and Now," in *Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology: Dialogue for Ethically Conscious Practice*, Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, ed., Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press (Second Edition), pp. 85-106.
- _____, ed., 2003b, *Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology: Dialogue for Ethically Conscious Practice*, Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press (Second Edition).
- Foltz, Richard C., 2006, *Animals in Islamic Tradition and Muslim Cultures*, Oxford, UK: OneWorld Publications.
- Forum on Religion and Ecology (FORE), 2020, New Haven, CT: Yale University <https://fore.yale.edu/>.
- Fox, Michael Allen, 2014, *Understanding Peace: A Comprehensive Introduction*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fox, Robin, 1969, "Book Review: *War: The Anthropology of Armed Conflict and Aggression*, Fried, Morton, Marvin Harris, and Robert Murphy, eds.," *American Anthropologist* 71:314-315.
- Frankfurt, Harry G., 2005, *On Bullshit*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Frankfurt, 2006, *On Truth*, New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Frese, Pamela R., and Margaret C. Harrell, eds., 2003, *Anthropology and the United States Military: Coming of Age in the Twenty-First Century*, New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fried, Morton, Marvin Harris, and Robert Murphy, eds., 1968, *The Anthropology of Armed Conflict and Aggression*, Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Fry, Douglas, P., 2006, *The Human Potential for Peace: An Anthropological Challenge to Assumptions about War and Violence*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- _____, 2007, *Beyond War: The Human Potential for Peace*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- _____, 2010, "Prehistory, Archaeological Evidence of War in," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 3:565-568.
- _____, ed., 2013, *War, Peace, and Human Nature: The Convergence of Evolutionary and Cultural Views*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- _____, 2015, "Conflict and War: Anthropological Aspects," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, James D. Wright, editor-in-chief, Oxford, UK: Elsevier 4:614-619.
- _____, 2018, "The Evolutionary Logic of Human Peaceful Behavior," in *Peace Ethology: Behavioral Processes and Systems of Peace*, Peter Verbeek and Benjamin A. Peters, eds., New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., pp. 249-265.

- _____, and Kaj Bjorkqvist, eds., 1997, *Cultural Variation in Conflict Resolution: Alternatives to Violence*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- _____, and P. Soderberg, 2013, "Lethal Aggression in Mobile Forager Bands and Implications for the Origin of War," *Science* 341(6143):270-273.
- _____, and _____, 2014, "Myths about Hunter-Gatherers Redux: Nomadic Forager War and Peace," *Journal of aggression, Conflict and Peace Research* 6(4):255-266.
- Galtung, Johan, 1964, "An Editorial," *Journal of Peace Research* 1(1):1-4.
- _____, 1969, "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research," *Journal of Peace Research* 6(3):167-191.
- _____, 1985, "Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Resources," *Journal of Peace Research* 27(3):291-305.
- _____, 2010a, "Peace, Negative and Positive," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 3:352-356.
- _____, 2010b, "Primitive, Traditional, Modern, and Postmodern War," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 4:334-339.
- Fuentes, Agustin, 2012, *Race, Monogamy, and Other Lies They Told You*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- _____, and Aku Visala, 2016, *Conversations on Human Nature*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Furani, Khaled, and Dan Rabinowitz, 2011, "The Ethnographic Arriving of Palestine," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 40:475-491.
- Galaty, Michael L., 2010, "Early or Tribal War, Anthropological Perspective of," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 2:2-5.
- Gandhi, Mohandas K., 2010, <http://www.mkgandhi.org>.
- Gardner, Gary, 2002, *Invoking the Spirit: Religion and Spirituality in the Quest for a Sustainable World*, Washington, D.C.: Worldwatch Paper 164, <http://www.worldwatch.org/pubs/paper/164/>.
- _____, 2006, *Inspiring Progress: Religion's Contributions to Sustainable Development*, New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc. (Worldwatch Book).
- _____, 2010a, "Engaging Religions to Shape Worldviews," in *2010 State of the World: Transforming Cultures from Consumerism to Sustainability*, Linda Starke and Lisa Mastny, eds., New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, pp. 23-29.
- _____, 2010b, "Ritual and Taboo as Ecological Guardians," in *2010 State of the World: Transforming Cultures from Consumerism to Sustainability*, Linda Starke and Lisa Mastny, eds., New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, pp. 30-35.
- Gat, Azar, 1999, "The Pattern of Fighting in Simple, Small-Scale, Prestate Societies," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 55(4):563-583.
- _____, 2006, *War in Human Civilization*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Geertz, Clifford, 2001 (February 8), "Life Among the Anthros [review of Tierney 2001]," *New York Review of Books*, pp. 18-22.

- Gelvin, Michael, 1994, *War and Existence: A Philosophical Inquiry*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Ghiglieri, Michael P., 1987, "War Among The Chimps," *Discover* 8(11):67-76.
- _____, 1999, *The Dark Side of Man: Tracing the Origins of Male Violence*, Reading, MA: Perseus Books.
- Gifford Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence, 2019, Gifford Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence, San Francisco, CA <https://lawcenter.giffords.org/>.
- Giorgi, Piero, 2001, *The Origins of Violence by Cultural Evolution*, Brisbane, Australia: Minerva E & S.
- Giroux, Henry A., 2007, *The University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial-Academic Complex*, Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Gittings, John, 2012, *The Glorious Art of Peace*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Glazer, Myron Peretz, 1996, "Ethics," *Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology*, David Levinson and Melvin Ember, eds., New York, NY: Henry Holt and Co. 2:389-393.
- Gleditsch, Nils Petter, 1993, "The Most-Cited Articles in JPR," *Journal of Peace Research* 30(4):445-449.
- _____, Jones Nordkvelle, and Havard Strand, 2014, "Peace Research— Just the Study of War?," *Journal of Peace Research* 51(2):145-158.
- Global Forum, 1990 (January), "Preserving and Cherishing the Earth: An Appeal for Joint Commitment in Science and Religion," Moscow, Russia: Global Forum.
- Global Living Project, 2010.
- Glossop, Ronald J., 1994, *Confronting War: An Examination of Humanity's Most Pressing Problem*, West Jefferson, NC: McFarland Publishing.
- Golding, William, 1954/1999, *Lord of the Flies*, New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Goldschmidt, Walter, ed., 1979, *The Uses of Anthropology*, Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association Special Publication 11.
- Gonzalez, Roberto J., ed., 2004, *Anthropologists in the Public Sphere: Speaking Out n War, Peace, and American Power*, Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- _____, 2007 (June), "Towards Mercenary Anthropology?," *Anthropology Today* 23(3):14-19.
- _____, 2008 (December), "Imperial Tactics: Bribing the 'Tribes'," *Z Magazine* 21(2):37-40.
- _____, Hugh Gusterson, and Gustaaf Houtman, eds., 2019, *Militarization: A Reader*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Good, Kenneth R., 1989, *Yanomami Hunting Patterns: Trekking and Garden Relocation as an Adaptation to Game Availability in Amazonia, Venezuela*, Gainesville: University of Florida Doctoral Dissertation.
- _____, with David Charnoff, 1991, *Into the Heart: One Man's Pursuit of Love and Knowledge Among the Yanomami*, New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- _____, 1995a, "Hunting Patterns and Village Fissioning among the Yanomami: A Cultural Materialist Perspective." in *Science, Materialism, and the Study of Cul-*

- ture, Martin F. Murphy, and Maxine L. Margolis, eds., Gainesville: University of Florida Press, pp. 81-95.
- _____, 1995b, "Yanomami of Venezuela: Foragers or Farmers- Which Came First?," in *Indigenous People and the Future of Amazonia: An Ecological Anthropology of an Endangered World*, Leslie E. Sponsel, ed., Tucson: University of Arizona Press, pp. 113-120.
- _____, 1997, "Amazing Grace," *Natural History* 106(2):44-45.
- _____, and Jacques Lizot, 1984, "Letter to Science," in *Warfare, Culture, and Environment*, R. Brian Ferguson, ed., Orlando: Academic Press, Inc., pp. 133-135.
- Goodale, Mark, 2009a, *Surrendering to Utopia: An Anthropology of Human Rights*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- _____, ed., 2009b, *Human Rights: An Anthropological Reader*, Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.
- Goodall, Jane, 1986, *The Chimpanzees of Gombe: Patterns of Behavior*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gopin, Marc, 2008, "Spirituality and Peacemaking," in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Academic Press 3:1982-1993.
- Gordon, Robert, 1988, "Apartheid's Anthropologists: The Genealogy of Afrikaner Anthropology," *American Ethnologist* 15(3):535-553.
- Gore, Al, 2007, *The Assault on Reason*, New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Gottlieb, Roger S., ed., 2004, *This Sacred Earth: Religion, Nature, Environment*, New York, NY: Routledge (Second Edition).
- _____, 2006a, *A Greener Faith: Religious Environmentalism and the Our Planet's Future*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- _____, ed., 2006b, *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Ecology*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- _____, 2007 (November 15), "Religious Environmentalism: Promises and Challenges," Lecture at Vanderbilt University, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BVpxdd1Oosg>.
- Gough, Kathleen, 1968 (April 13), "Anthropology and Imperialism," *Monthly Review* 19(11):12-24.
- Govier, Trudy, 2002, *A Delicate Balance: What Philosophy Can Tell Us About Terrorism*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Graeber, David, 2004, *Fragments of An Anarchist Anthropology*, Chicago, IL: Prickly Paradigm Press.
- Grayling, A.C., 2017, *War: An Enquiry*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Greenhouse, Carol J., 1985, "Mediation: A Comparative Approach," *Man* 20(1):90-114.
- Gregor, Thomas A., ed., 1996, *The Natural History of Peace*, Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

- _____, and Daniel Gross, 2004, "Guilt by Association: The Culture of Accusation and the American Anthropological Association's Investigation of Darkness in El Dorado," *American Anthropologist* 106(4):687-698.
- Grindal, Bruce T., and Dennis M. Warren, eds., 1979, *Essays in Humanistic Anthropology: Festschrift in Honor of David Bidney*, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Groff, Linda, 2008, "Religion and Peace, Inner-Outer Dimensions of," in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Academic Press 3:1846-1859.
- _____, 2010, "Evolving Views of Peace," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 2:122-127.
- Gross, Paul R., 2004, "Politics and Science," in *Lost Paradises and the Ethics of Research and Publication*, Francisco M. Salzano and A. Magdalena Hurtado, eds., New York, NY: Oxford University Press, pp. 59-69.
- Grossman, Dave, 1995, *On Killing: The Psychological Costs of Learning to Kill in War and Society*, New York, NY: Little, Brown.
- _____, 2008, "Evolution of Weaponry," *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Elsevier 3:2442-2455.
- Guha, Ramachandra, 2006, "Mahatma Gandhi and the Environmental Movement," in *Debating Gandhi*, A. Raghuramaraju, ed., New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press, pp. 223-236.
- Guilaine, Jean, and Jean Zammit, 2001, *Origins of War: Violence in Prehistory*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gusterson, Hugh, 1996, *Nuclear Rites: A Weapons Laboratory at the End of the Cold War*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- _____, "Anthropology and the Military – 1968, 2003, and Beyond?," *Anthropology Today* 19(3):25-26.
- _____, 2007, "Anthropology and Militarism," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 36:155-175.
- _____, and Catherine Besteman, eds., 2009, *The Insecure American: How We Got Here and What We Should Do About It*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gwynne, Margaret A., 2003, *Applied Anthropology: A Career-Oriented Approach*, Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Haas, Jonathan, 1996, "War," *Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology*, David Levinson and Melvin Ember, eds., New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company 4:1357-1361.
- Hall, Edward T., 1990, *The Hidden Dimension*, New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Hallett, Brien, ed., 1991, *Engulfed in War: Just War and the Persian Gulf*, Honolulu, HI: Matsunaga Institute for Peace.
- _____, 2008. "Just War Criteria," in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 2:1097-1107.

- Hames, Raymond C., 1994, "Yanomamo," in *Encyclopedia of World Cultures: South America*, Johannes Wilbert, ed., Boston: G.K. Hall VII:374-377.
- _____, 2019, "Pacifying Hunter-Gatherers," *Human Nature* 30(2):155-175.
- Hammersley, Martyn, 1990, *Reading Ethnographic Research: A Critical Guide*, New York, NY: Longman.
- Harcourt, A.H., and Frans B.M. de Waal, 1992, *Coalitions and Alliances in Humans and Other Animals*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hargrove, Eugene C., ed., 1986, *Religion and Environmental Crisis*, Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Harris, Ian M., and Amy L. Schuster, eds., 2006, *Global Directory of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution Programs*, San Francisco, CA: Peace and Justice Studies Association and International Peace Research Association Foundation.
- Harris, Marvin, 1984, "A Cultural Materialist Theory of Band and Village Warfare: The Yanomamo Test," in *Warfare, Culture, and Environment*, R. Ferguson, ed., Orlando: Academic Press, Inc., pp. 111-140.
- Harrison, Simon, 1996, "War, Warfare," *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, Alan Barnard and Jonathan Spencer, eds., New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 561-562.
- Hart, Donna, and Robert W. Sussman, 2009, *Man the Hunted: Primates, Predators, and Human Evolution*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Harvey, Graham, 2006, *Animism: Respecting the Living World*, New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- _____, ed., 2013, *The Handbook of Contemporary Animism*, Durham, UK: Acumen Publishing Limited.
- Hastings, Tom H., 2000, *Ecology of War & Peace: Counting Costs of Conflict*, Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Haught, John F., 1990, "Critiques of Religion," in *What Is Religion? An Introduction*, John F. Haught, Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, pp. 199-250.
- Hedges, Chris, 2002, *War Is A Force That Gives Us Meaning*, New York, NY: Public Affairs.
- _____, 2003, *What Every Person Should Know About War*, New York, NY: Free Press.
- _____, and Laila Al-Arian, 2007 (July 30/August 6), "The Other War," *The Nation* 285(4):11-31.
- Heider, Karl G., 1997, "The Rashomon Effect: When Ethnographers Disagree," *American Anthropologist* 90:73-81.
- _____, 2001, *Seeing Anthropology: Cultural Anthropology Through Film*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hellwig, Monika K., 1992, *A Case for Peace in Reason and Faith*, Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press.
- Herbert, Martin, 2010, "Mead, Margaret," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 3:1-2.

- Herskovits, Melville J., 1972, *Cultural Relativism: Perspectives in Cultural Pluralism*, New York, NY: Random House.
- Hickey, Gerald C., 2002, *Window on a War: An Anthropologist in the Vietnam Conflict*, Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University Press.
- Hillman, James, 2004, *A Terrible Love of War*, New York, NY: Penguin Group (USA), Inc.
- Hinsley, C., 1979, "Anthropology as Science and Politics: The Dilemmas of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1870 to 1904," in *The Uses of Anthropology*, Walter Goldschmidt, ed., Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association Special Publications pp. 15-32.
- Hinton, Alexander Lahab, ed., 2001, *Genocide: An Anthropological Reader*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- _____, 2002, *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hofstadter, Richard, and Michael Wallace, eds., 1971, *American Violence: A Documentary History*, New York, NY: Random House.
- Holmes, Bob (2008, November 12). "How Warfare Shaped Human Evolution," *New Scientist* 2682 <http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg20026823.800-how-warfare-shaped-human-evo>.
- Homer-Dixon, Thomas F., Jeffrey H. Boutwell, and George W. Rathjens, 1993, "Environmental Change and Violent Conflict," *Scientific American* 268(2):38-45.
- Hooks, Gregory, 2008, "Military-Industrial Complex, Organization and History," in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Elsevier 2:1278-1286.
- Horgan, John, 1988 (May), "The Violent Yanomamo," *Scientific American*, 258(5):17-18.
- Horowitz, David, 2006, *The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America*, Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing.
- _____, and Jacob Laksin, 2009, *One-Party Classroom: How Radical Professors at America's Top Colleges Indoctrinate Students and Undermine Our Democracy*, New York, NY: Crown Forum.
- Howell, Signe, and Roy Willis, eds., 1989, *Societies at Peace: Anthropological Perspectives*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hrdy, Sarah Blaffer, 2009, *Mothers and Others: The Evolutionary Origins of Mutual Understanding*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hughbank, Richard J., and Dave Grossman, 2013, "The Challenge of Getting Men to Kill," in *War, Peace, and Human Nature: The Convergence of Evolutionary and Cultural Views*, edited by Douglas P. Fry, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 495-513.
- Hume, Douglas W. (2010). "Darkness in El Dorado," <http://anthroniche.com/darkness-in-el-dorado-controversy/>.
- Hymes, Dell, ed., 1999, *Reinventing Anthropology*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

- Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, 2019, Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, Seattle, WA: University of Washington <http://www.healthdata.org/>.
- Interfaith Power and Light Renewal Project, 2007, *Renewal: Stories from America's Religious Environmental Movement*, Documentary Film.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2010, <http://www.ipcc.ch>.
- Iraq Body Count, <http://www.iraqbodycount.org>.
- Irons, William (2004). "Chagnon, Napoleon A.," in *Biographical Dictionary of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, Vered Amit, ed., New York: Routledge, pp. 88-89.
- Jaimes, M. Annette, ed., 1992, *The State of Native America: Genocide, Colonization, and Resistance*, Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Jank, Margaret, 1977a, *Mission: Venezuela*, Stanford, FL: Brown Gold Publications Backroom.
- Jank, 1977b, *Culture Shock*, Chicago: Moody Press.
- Jell-Bahlsen, S., 1985, "Ethnology and Fascism in Germany," *Dialectical Anthropology* 9:337-347.
- Jeong, Ho-Won, 2000, *Peace and Conflict Studies: An Introduction*, Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Johnston, Barbara Rose, ed., 1994, *Who Pays the Price? Examining the Sociocultural Context of the Environmental Crisis*, Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- _____, ed., 1997, *Life and Death Matters: Human Rights and the Environment at the End of the Millennium*, Thousand Oaks, CA: AltaMira Press.
- _____, ed., 2007, *Half-Lives & Half-Truths: Confronting the Radioactive Legacies of the Cold War*, Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research Press.
- _____, 2010 (March 19-21). "Anthropologists in the Amazon: Secrets of the Tribe," *Counterpunch*.
- _____, and Holly M. Barker, 2008, *Consequential Damages of Nuclear War: The Rongelap Report*, Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, Inc.
- Jones, D.M., 2000, "The Greening of Gandhi: Gandhian Thought and the Environmental Movement in India," in *The Face of the Earth: Environment and World History*, New York, NY: M.E. Sharpe Inc., pp. 165-184.
- Junger, Sebastian, 2011, *War*, New York, NY: Twelve.
- Jurgensmeyer, Mark, 2003, *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Kajihiro, Kyle, 2007 (March 1), "A Brief Overview of Militarization and Resistance in Hawai'i," Honolulu, HI: DMZ-Hawai'i/Aloha 'Aina Paper, pp. 1-12, <http://www.dmzhawaii.org>.
- Kakvoort, Ilse, and Louis Oppenheimer, 1998, "Understanding Peace and War: A Review of Developmental Psychology Research," *Developmental Review* 18:353-389.
- Kano, Takayoshi, 1990, "The Bonobo's Peaceful Kingdom," *Natural History* 11:62-71.
- _____, 1992, *The Last Ape: Pygmy Chimpanzee Behavior and Ecology*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Kaplan, Robert D., 1994 (February), "The Coming Anarchy," *Atlantic Monthly* 273(2):44-76.
- _____, 2000, *The Coming Anarchy: Shattering the Dreams of the Post Cold War*, New York, NY: Random House/Vintage.
- Kapstein, Matthew T., 2006, *The Tibetans*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kapuscinski, Ryszard, 2018, *The Other*, New York, NY: Verso.
- Kaza, Stephanie, 2005, *Hooked!: Buddhist Writings on Greed, Desire, and the Urge to Consume*, Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, Inc.
- _____, 2008, *Mindfully Green: A Personal and Spiritual Guide to Whole Earth Thinking*, Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, Inc.
- _____, and Kenneth Kraft, eds., 2000, *Dharma Rain: Sources of Buddhist Environmentalism*, Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, Inc.
- Kearns, Laurel, and Catherine Keller, eds., 2007, *Ecospirit: Religions and Philosophies for the Earth*, New York, NY: Fordham University Press.
- Keegan, John, 1993, *A History of Warfare*, New York: Random House/Vintage Books.
- Keeley, Lawrence, 1996, *War Before Civilization: The Myth of the Peaceful Savage*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kegley, Jr., Charles W., and Gregory A. Raymond, eds., 1999, *How Nations Make Peace*, New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Kehoe, Alice Beck, 2012, "Legitimizing Peace Studies," in *Expanding American Anthropology 1945-1980: A Generation Reflects*, Alice Beck Kehoe and Paul L. Doughty, eds., Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 193-198.
- Keiser, Lincoln, 1991, *Friend by Day, Enemy by Night: Organized Vengeance in a Kohistani Community*, Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.
- Kelleher, Jr., William F., 2010, "Peaceful Societies," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 3:382-384.
- Kellert, Stephen R., and Timothy J. Farnham, eds. 2002, *The Good in Nature and Humanity: Connecting Science, Religion, and Spirituality with the Natural World*, Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Kelly, Raymond C., 2000, *Warless Societies and the Origin of War*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Kelman, Herbert C., 1981, *Reflections on the History and Status of Peace Research*, *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 5(2):95-110.
- _____, 2010, "Peace Research, Beginnings," *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 3:453-458.
- Kemp, Anita, 1985, "Image of the Peace Field: An International Survey," *Journal of Peace Research*, 22(2):129-140.
- Kemp, Graham, 2004, "The Concept of Peaceful Societies," in *Keeping the Peace: Conflict Resolution and Peaceful Societies Around the World*, Graham Kemp and Douglas P. Fry, eds., New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 1-10.

- _____, and Douglas P. Fry, eds., 2004, *Keeping the Peace: Conflict Resolution and Peaceful Societies Around the World*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Khan, Arshad, 2006, *Islam 101: Principles and Practice*, San Jose, CA: Khan Consulting and Publishing, LLC.
- Khosho, T.N., and J.S. Moolakkattu, 2009, *Gandhi and the Environment: Analyzing Gandhi's Environmental Thought*, New Delhi, India: Tehri Press.
- Kiernan, David, 2020, *Signature Wounds: The Untold Story of the Military Health Crisis*, New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Kimball, Charles, 2002, *When Religion Becomes Evil*, New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.
- Kinsley, David, 1995, *Ecology and Religion: Ecological Spirituality in Cross-Cultural Perspective*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kipp, Jacob, Lester Grau, Karl Prinslow, and Don Smith, 2006, "The Human Terrain System: A CORDS for the 21st Century," *U.S. Army Professional Writing Collection* 4:1-9.
- Klare, Michael T., 2001 (May-June), "The New Geography of Conflict," *Foreign Affairs* 80(3):22-49.
- _____, 2002, *Resource Wars: The New Landscape of Global Conflict*, New York, NY: Harry Holt.
- Kohn, Alfie, 1990, *The Brighter Side of Human Nature: Altruism and Empathy in Everyday Life*, New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Kraybill, Donald B., 2008, *The Amish of Lancaster County*, Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books.
- Kraybill, Steven M. Nolt, and David L. Weaver-Zercher, 2006, *Amish Grace: How Forgiveness Transcended Tragedy*, New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.
- Kroeber, Alfred L., and Clyde Kluckhohn, 1952, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, Cambridge, MA: Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology.
- Kroeber, Theodora, 1961, *Ishi in Two Worlds: A Biography of the Last Wild Indian in North America*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Krug, E.G., et al., 2002, *World Report on Violence and Health*, Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.
- Kuklick, Henrika, ed., 2008, *A New History of Anthropology*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Kumar, Satish, 2002, "Jain Ecology," in *Jainism and Ecology: Nonviolence in the Web of Life*, Christopher Key Chapple and Mary Evelyn Tucker, eds., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press and Harvard University Center for the Study of World Religions, pp. 181-190.
- _____, 2007, *Spiritual Compass: The Three Qualities of Life*, Foxhole, Dartington, Totnes, Devon, UK: Green Books.
- _____, 2008, "A Tribute to Mahatma Gandhi," <http://www.YouTube.com/watch?v=lnonj8xjYnc>.

- _____, 2010, *Earth Pilgrim: Conversations with Satish Kumar*, Foxhole, Dartington, Totnes, Devon, UK: Green Books.
- Kupperman, Joel J., 2010, *Theories of Human Nature*, Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.
- Kurlansky, Mark, 2008, *Non-Violence: The History of a Dangerous Idea*, New York, NY: Modern Library.
- Kurtz, Lester, ed., 2008, *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, San Diego, CA: Elsevier, Volumes 1-3.
- Kyrou, Christos N., and Robert A. Rubenstein, 2008, "Cultural Anthropology Studies of Conflict," in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Elsevier 1:515-521.
- Lal, Vinay, 2000, "Too Deep for Deep Ecology: Gandhi and the Ecological Vision of Life," in *Hinduism and Ecology: The Intersection of Earth, Sky, and Water*, Christopher Key Chapple and Mary Evelyn Tucker, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press and Harvard University Center for the Study of World Religions, pp. 183-212.
- Landes, S., Gerald D. Berreman, Kathleen Zaretsky, Michael Leonardo, Lawrence L. Michalak, Katherine S. Newman, James S. Boster, Maria Eugenia Villalon, Nancy Scheper-Hughes, Teresa J. Paris, and Kathleen Granpierre, 1976 (September). "Time Criticized for Yanomamo Characterization," *American Anthropological Association Anthropology Newsletter* 17(7):28.
- Lanier-Graham, Susan D., 1993, *The Ecology of War: Environmental Impacts of Weaponry and Warfare*, New York, NY: Waker and Company.
- Lassiter, Luke Eric, 2005, *The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- LeBlanc, Steven A., with Katherine E. Register, 2003, *Constant Battles: The Myth of the Peaceful, Noble Savage*, New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Lee, James R., 2009, *Climate Change and Armed Conflict: Hot and Cold Wars*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lee, Richard B., and Irven DeVore, eds., 1968, *Man the Hunter*, Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Lerner, Rabbi Michael, 2000, *Spirit Matters*, Charlottesville, SC: Hampton Roads Publishing Company, Inc.
- Leslie, John, 1996, *The End of the World: The Science and Ethics of Human Extinction*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Levinson, David, 1994, *Aggression and Conflict: A Cross-Cultural Encyclopedia*, Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Levison, Nan, 2014, *War Is Not A Game: The New Antiwar Soldiers and the Movement They Built*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Levitin, Daniel J., 2016, *A Field Guide to Lies: Critical Thinking in the Information Age*, New York, NY: Dutton.
- Lewis, Andrian R., 2006, *The American Culture of War: The History of U.S. Military Force from World War II to Operation Iraqi Freedom*, New York, NY: Routledge.

- Lewis, E.D., ed., 2004, *Timothy Asch and Ethnographic Film*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lewis, M. Paul, ed., 2009, *Ethnologue: Languages of the World* (Sixteenth Edition). Dallas, TX: SIL International, <http://www.ethnologue.com>.
- Lewontin, Richard C., 1993, *Biology as Ideology*, London: Penguin.
- Lieberman, Leonard, Andrew Lyons, and Harriet Lyons, 1995 (December), "An Interview with Ashley Montagu," *Current Anthropology* 36(5):835-844.
- Lizot, Jacques, 1976a, *Le Cercle des Feux: Faits et dits des Indiens Yanomami*, Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- _____, 1976b, *The Yanomami in the Face of Ethnocide*, Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs Document No. 22.
- _____, 1977, "Population, Resources, and Warfare among the Yanomami," *Man* 12:497-515.
- _____, 1978, *El Circulo de Los Fuegos: Vida y Costumbres de los Indios Yanomami*, Caracas: Monte Avila Editores.
- _____, 1985, *Tales of the Yanomami: Daily Life in the Venezuelan Forest*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____, "Los Yanomami" in *Los Aborigenes de Venezuela*, Walter Coppens, ed., Caracas: Fundacion La Salle de Ciencias Naturales No. 35, pp. 479-583.
- _____, 1989, "Sobra la Guerra: Una Repuesta a N.A. Chagnon (Science 1988)," *La Iglesia en Amazonas* 44:23-24.
- _____, 1994a, "Of Warfare: An Answer to N.A. Chagnon," *American Ethnologist* 21(4):845-862.
- _____, 1994b, "Words in the Night: The Ceremonial Dialogue— One Expression of Peaceful Relationships Among the Yanomami," in *The Anthropology of Peace and Nonviolence*, Leslie E. Sponsel, and Thomas Gregor, Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp. 213-240.
- London, Scott, 2008, "In the Footsteps of Gandhi: An Interview with Vandana Shiva."
- Lorenz, Konrad, 1966, *On Aggression*, New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Loukottka, Cestmir, 1968, *Classification of South American Indian Languages*, Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center.
- Lutz, Catherine, 2001, *Homefront: A Military City and the American 20th Century*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- _____, 2002 (September), "Making War at Home in the United States: Militarization and the Current Crisis," *American Anthropologist* 104(3):723-735.
- _____, 2010, "Warmaking as the American Way of Life," in *The Insecure American: How We Got Here and What We Should Do About It*, Hugh Gusterson and Catherine Besteman, eds., Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, pp. 45-62.
- Lynn, William S., ed., 2004, "Special Issue on the Earth Charter," *Worldviews: Environment, Culture, Religion* 8(1):1-149.

- Mabee, Carleton, 1987, "Margaret Mead and Behavioral Scientists in World War II: Problems in Responsibility, Truth, and Effectiveness," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 23:3-13.
- MacNair, Rachel M., 2002, *Perpetration-Induced Traumatic Stress: The Psychological Consequences of Killing*, Westport, CT: Praeger Publications.
- Mahoney, Jack, 2007, *The Challenge of Human Rights: Origin, Development, and Significance*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mann, Charles C., 2001 (January 19), "Scientific Community: Anthropological Warfare," *Science new series*, 291(5503):416, 419-421.
- Margolies, Luise, and Maria Matilde Suarez, 1978, *Historia de la Etnologia Contemporanea en Venezuela*, Caracas: Universidad Catolica Andres Bello Instituto de Investigaciones de Historicas Centro de Lenguas Indigenas.
- Martin, Julia, ed., 1997, *Ecological Responsibility: A Dialogue with Buddhism*, Delhi, India: Tibet House.
- Martins, Leda, 2005, "On the Influence of Anthropological Work and Other Ethical Considerations: The Impact of Chagnon's Work in Brazil," in *Yanomami: The Fierce Controversy and What We Might Learn From It*, Robert F. Borofsky, ed., Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Matthews, Warren, 2004, *World Religions*, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, Inc.
- McClymond, Michael J., and David N. Freedman, 2008, "Religious Traditions, Violence and Nonviolence," in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 3:1860-1869.
- McFate, Montgomery, 2005a (March-April), "Anthropology and Counterinsurgency: The Strange Story of Their Curious Relationship," *Military Review* 24-38.
- McFate, 2005b, "The Military Utility of Understanding Adversary Culture," *Joint Force Quarterly* 38:42-48.
- McGowan, Alan H., 2014, "The Lessons of Franz Boas," *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 149:558-564.
- McKenna, Brian, 2008 (May), "A Good Military Education is Hard to Find," *Society for Applied Anthropology Newsletter* 19(2):13-18.
- McKibben, Bill, 2006, *The End of Nature*, New York, NY: Random House.
- McNair, Rachel M., 2009, "Psychology of Nonkilling," in *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm*, Joám Evans Pim, Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling, pp. 327-347.
- McPherson, James, 1991, "Ecumenical Discussion of the Environment 1966-1987," *Modern Theology* 7(4):363-371.
- Mead, Margaret, 1940, "Warfare: It's Only an Invention- not a Biological Necessity," *Asia* 15:402-405.
- Melko, Matthew, 1973, *52 Peaceful Societies*, Oakville, Ontario: Canadian Peace Research Institute.
- _____, 1984, "Peaceful Societies," in *World Encyclopedia of Peace*, Ervin Laszol and Jong Youl Yoo, eds., New York, NY: Pergamon Press 2:268-270.

- Merkel, Jim, 2003, *Radical Simplicity: Small Footprints on a Finite Earth*, Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.
- Messer, Ellen, 1993, "Anthropology and Human Rights," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 22:221-249.
- Miall, Hugh, 2010, "Conflict Studies versus Peace Studies," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 1:445-450.
- Migliazza, Ernst Cesar, 1972, *Yanomama Grammar and Intelligibility*, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms/Indiana University Doctoral Dissertation.
- Milam, Erika Lorraine, 2019, *Creatures of Cain: The Hunt for Human Nature in Cold War America*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Miller, D.W., 2001 (January 12), "Academic Scandal in the Internet Age," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A 14.
- Mind and Life Institute, 2010, <http://www.mindandlife.org>.
- Model, David, 2005, *Lying for Empire: How to Commit War Crimes with a Straight Face*, Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.
- Monaghan, Peter, 1994 (October 26), "Bitter Warfare in Anthropology," *Chronicle of Higher Education* XLI Section A, pp. 11, 18-19.
- Montagu, Ashley, 1968, *The Natural Superiority of Women*, New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.
- _____, ed., 1968, *The Concept of Primitive*, New York: Free Press.
- _____, 1972, *Statement on Race: An Annotated Elaboration and Exposition of the Four Statements on Race Issued by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- _____, ed., 1976, *The Nature of Human Aggression*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- _____, 1978, *Learning Non-Aggression: The Experience of Non-Literate Societies*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- _____, 1989, *Growing Young*, Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.
- _____, 1998, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*, Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press (Sixth Edition).
- _____, and Floyd Matson, 1983, *The Dehumanization of Man*, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Moolakkattu, John S., 2010, "Gandhi as a Human Ecologist," *Journal of Human Ecology* 29(3):151-158.
- Moore, J., 1990, "The Reproductive Success of Cheyenne War Chiefs: A Contrary Case to Chagnon's Yanomamo," *Current Anthropology* 31(3):322-330.
- Morris, Desmond, 1967, *The Naked Ape: A Zoologist's Study of the Human Animal*, London, UK: Cape.
- _____, 1969, *The Human Zoo*, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Morris, Ian, 2014, *War! What Is It Good For? Conflict and the Progress of Civilization from Primates to Robots*, New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

- Moyers, Bill, 1991, "Spirit and Nature," Public Affairs Television, Inc., New York, NY: Mystic Fire Video.
- _____, 2012 (April 1), "The Real Costs of War," *Truth Out* <http://truth-out.org/news/item/8238-the-real-costs-of-war>.
- Munoz, Francisco A., 2010a, "Ancient World, Peace In," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 1:51-53.
- _____, 2010b, "Constructing Concepts of Peace," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 1:473-476.
- Myers, Norman, 1996, *Ultimate Security: The Environmental Basis of Political Instability*, Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Naess, Arne, 1973, "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movements," *Inquiry* 16:95-100.
- _____, 2002, *Life's Philosophy: Reason and Feeling in a Deeper World*, Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- _____, 2008, "Self-Realization: An Ecological Approach to Being in the World," in *Ecology of Wisdom: Writings of Arne Naess*, Alan Drengson and Bill Devall, eds., Berkeley, CA: Counterpoint, pp. 81-96.
- _____, and George Sessions, 1985, "Platform of Deep Ecology," in *Deep Ecology: Living as if Nature Mattered*, Bill Devall and George Sessions, Salt Lake City, UT: Peregrine Smith Books, pp. 69-73.
- _____, and David Rothenberg, 1989, *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Nagengast, Carole, 1994, "Violence, Terror, and the Crisis of the State," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23:109-136.
- _____, and Terence Turner, eds., 1997 (Fall), "Universal Human Rights versus Cultural Relativity," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 53(3):267-381.
- _____, and Carlos G. Velez-Ibanez, eds., 2004, *Human Rights: The Scholar As Activist*, Oklahoma City, OK: Society for Applied Anthropology.
- Narayan, Rajdeva, and Janardan Kumar, eds., 2003, *Ecology and Religion: Ecological Concepts in Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Islam, Christianity and Sikhism*, New Delhi, India: Deep & Deep Publications (P) Ltd.
- Nash, Roderick F., 1989, "The Greening of Religion," in *The Rights of Nature: A History of Environmental Ethics*, Roderick F. Nash, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, pp. 87-120.
- National Religious Partnership for the Environment, 2010, <http://www.nrpe.org>.
- Neel, James V., 1970, "Lessons from a "Primitive" People," *Science*, 170(3960):815-822.
- _____, 1994, *Physician to the Gene Pool: Genetic Lessons and Other Stories*, New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Nelson, Gaylord, 2002, *Beyond Earth Day: Fulfilling the Promise*, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

- Nelson, Lance E., ed., 1998, *Purifying the Earth Body of God: Religion and Ecology in Hindu India*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Nessen, Shawn Christian, David Edmond Lounsbury, and Stephen P. Hetz, 2008, *War Surgery in Afghanistan and Iraq: A Series of Case, 2003-2007*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Army.
- Network of Concerned Anthropologists
<http://concerned.anthropologists.googlepages.com>.
- Niwano, Nikkyo, 1977, *A Buddhist Approach to Peace*, Tokyo, Japan: Kosei Publishing Co.
- Noake, Caro, 2010, "Bibliographies," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 1:187-191.
- Nordstrom, Carolyn, 1997, *A Different Kind of War Story*, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- _____, 1998, "Deadly Myths of Aggression," *Aggressive Behavior* 24(2):147-159.
- _____, and Antonious C.G.M. Robben, eds., 1995, *Fieldwork Under Fire: Contemporary Studies of Violence and Survival*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Nothwehr, Dawn M., ed., 2002, *Franciscan Theology of the Environment: An Introductory Reader*, Quincy, IL: Franciscan Press.
- Nugent, Stephen, 2001, "Anthropology and Public Culture: The Yanomami, Science, and Ethics," *Anthropology Today*, 173:10-14.
- O'Connor, Geoffrey, 1990, *Contact: The Yanomami Indians of Brazil*, New York: Filmmakers Library.
- Olson, James Stuart, 1991, *Indians of Central and South America: An Ethnohistorical Dictionary*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Otterbein, Keith F., 1968, "Internal War: A Cross-Cultural Study," *American Anthropologist* 70:277-289.
- _____, 1970, *The Evolution of War: A Cross-Cultural Study*, New Haven, CT: Human Relations Area Files Press.
- _____, 1985, "Feuding - Dispute Resolution or Dispute Continuation," *Reviews in Anthropology* 12:73-83.
- _____, 1993, *Feuding and Warfare: Selected Works of Keith F. Otterbein*, New York, NY: Gordon and Breach.
- _____, 1994, *Feuding and Warfare*, New York, NY: Gordon and Breach.
- _____, 1996, "Feuding," in *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences*, James D. Wright, ed., Oxford, UK: Elsevier 2:493-496.
- _____, 1999 (December), "A History of Research on Warfare in Anthropology," *American Anthropologist* 101(4):794-805.
- _____, 2004, *How War Began*, College Station: Texas A & M University Press.
- _____, 2006, "Feuding," in *Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, H. James Birx, ed., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications 3:959.
- _____, 2008, "Clan and Tribal Conflict," *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Elsevier 1:268-275.

- _____, 2009, *The Anthropology of War*, Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- _____, and Charlotte S. Otterbein, 1965, "An Eye for an Eye, a Tooth for a Tooth: A Cross-Cultural Study of Feuding," *American Anthropologist* 67: 1470-1482.
- Padilha, Jose, 2009, *Secrets of the Tribe*, Watertown, MA: Documentary Educational Resources, <http://www.der.org/films/secrets-of-the-tribe.html>. (Available on YouTube).
- Pagani, Camilla, and J. Martin Ramirez, eds., 2011, *Violence Is Not Biologically Determined: The Seville Statement on Violence Twenty-Five Years Later.* Rome, Italy: Coloquios Internacionales sobre Cerebro y Agresion XXXIII CICA Conference.
- Paige, Glenn D., 1993, *To Nonviolent Political Science: From Seasons of Violence*, Honolulu, HI: Center for Global Nonviolence Planning Project and Matsunaga Institute for Peace.
- _____, 2002/2009a, *Nonkilling Global Political Science*, Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling.
- _____, 2009b (January 23), "Nonkilling: A Better Way," <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p17tkl72PsA&list=PLD2EBEF806D8F6DF8>.
- _____, and Joám Evans Pim, 2020, Center for Global Nonkilling, Honolulu, HI: Center for Global Nonkilling, <https://nonkilling.org>.
- _____, and Sarah Gilliatt, eds., 1991, *Nonviolence in Hawaii's Spiritual Traditions*, Honolulu, HI: Center for Global Nonviolence Planning Project and Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace.
- Paine, Robert, ed., 1985, *Advocacy and Anthropology*, St. John's, Newfoundland: Memorial University of Newfoundland Institute of Social and Economic Research.
- Palmer, Martin, and Victoria Finlay, 2003, *Faith in Conservation: New Approaches to Religion and Environment*, Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Palmer, Stuart, 1972, *The Violent Society*, New Haven, CT: College and University Press Publishers.
- Pandian, Jacob, 1985, *Anthropology and the Western Tradition: Toward an Authentic Anthropology*, Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.
- Parenti, Christian, 2011, *Tropic of Chaos: Climate Change and the New Geography of Violence*, New York, NY: Nation Books.
- Patterson, Thomas C., 2001, *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States*, New York, NY: Berg.
- Payne, Richard K., ed., 2010, *How Much Is Enough? Buddhism, Consumerism, and the Human Environment*, Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications.
- Pedersen, Kusumita P., 1998, "Environmental Ethics in Interreligious Perspective," Explorations, in *Global Ethics: Comparative Religious Ethics and Interreligious Dialogue*, Sumner B. Twiss and Bruce Grelle, eds., Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 253-290.
- Penny, H. Glenn, and Matti Bunzl, eds., 2003, *Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Perry, Richard J., 2003, *Five Key Concepts in Anthropological Thinking*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc./Prentice Hall.

- _____, 2015, *Killer Apes, Naked Apes, and Just Plain Nasty People: The Misuse and Abuse of Science in Political Discourse*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Peters, John F., 1998, *Life Among the Yanomami: The Story of Change among the Xilixana on the Mucajai River in Brazil*, Orchard Park, NY: Broadview Press.
- Peters-Golden, Holly, 2009, "The Yanomamo: Challenges of the Rainforest," in Peters-Golden, Holly, *Culture Sketches: Case Studies in Anthropology*, New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education (Fifth Edition), pp. 260-279.
- Phillips, Stephen H., 2008, "Nonharmfulness (ahimsa) in Classical Indian Thought," in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Academic Press 2:1347-1356.
- Pieper, Christopher, 2008, "Peace, Definitions and Concepts of," *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Academic Press 2:1548-1556.
- Pilisuk, Marc, and Gianina Pellegrini, 2010, "Military-Industrial Complex," *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 3:39-42.
- Pinker, Steven, 2011, *The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined*, New York, NY: Viking.
- Pojman, Louis P., 2006, *Who Are We? Theories of Human Nature*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Power, Margaret, 1991, *The Egalitarians Human and Chimpanzee: An Anthropological View of Social Organization*, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Powers, Roger S., and William B. Voegelé, eds., 1997, *Protest, Power and Change: An Encyclopedia of Nonviolent Action*, New York, NY: Garland.
- Price, David H., 2000 (November 20), "Anthropologists as Spies," *The Nation* 271(16):24-27.
- _____, 2004, *Threatening Anthropology: McCarthyism and the FBI's Surveillance of Activist Anthropologists*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- _____, 2007 (October 30), "Counterinsurgency Anthropologist Montgomery McFate's Role Under Attack," *Counterpunch*.
- _____, 2008a, *Anthropological Intelligence: The Development and Neglect of American Anthropology in the Second World War*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- _____, 2008b, David H. Price Faculty Homepage http://homepages.stmartin.edu/fac_staff/dprice/all.html.
- _____, 2016, *Cold War Anthropology: The CIA, The Pentagon, and the Growth of Dual Use Anthropology*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Prime, Ranchor, 1992, *Hinduism and Ecology: Seeds of Truth*, London, UK: Cassell Publishers Limited.
- _____, 2002, *Vedic Ecology: Practical Wisdom for Surviving the 21st Century*, San Rafael, CA: Mandala Publishing.
- Provan, Iain, 2013, *Convenient Myths: The Axial Age, Dark Green Religion, and the World That Never Was*, Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.

- Pro-Yanomami Commission, 2010, Pro-Yanomami Commission. Brasilia and Boa Vista, Brasil
http://www.proyanomami.org.br/v0904/index.asp?pag=htm&url=/apy/YU_ing/4.htm.
- Rabben, Linda, 2004, "Savage Anthropology," in *Brazil's Indians and the Onslaught of Civilization: The Yanomami and the Kayapo*, Linda Rabben, Seattle: University of Washington Press, pp. 132-149.
- Radhakrishnan, N., et al., eds., 2012, *Towards a Nonkilling World: Festschrift in Honor of Prof. Glenn D. Paige*, Thiruvananthapuram, India: Gandhi Media Center.
- Radical Simplicity, 2010.
- Ramakrishnan, P.S., K.G. Saxena, and U.M. Chandrashekara, eds., 1998, *Conserving the Sacred for Biodiversity Management*, Enfield, NH: Science Publishers, Inc.
- Ramos, Alcida Rita, 1987, "Reflecting on the Yanomami: Ethnographic Images and the Pursuit of the Exotic," *Cultural Anthropology* 2(3):284-304.
- _____, 1995, *Sanuma Memories: Yanomami Ethnography in Times of Crisis*, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- _____, 2001 (October 22), "Old Ethics Die Hard: The Yanomami and Scientific Writing," Paper read at the Townsend Center for the Humanities, University of California, Berkeley, Series Antropologia 302.
- _____, Bruce Albert, and Jo Cardoso de Oliveira, 2001, *Haximu: Foi Genocidio! Brasilia*, Brazil: Comissao Pro-Yanomami (CCPY) Documentos Yanomami N. 1.
- _____, and Kenneth I. Taylor, 1979, *The Yanomami in Brazil 1979*, Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs Document No. 37.
- Rampton, Sheldon, and John Stauber, 2003, *Weapons of Mass Destruction: The Uses of Propaganda in Bush's War on Iraq*, New York, NY: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Penguin.
- Rank, Carol, 2010, "University Departments and Programs," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 3:494-497.
- Refusing to Kill, <http://www.refusingtokill.net>.
- Renner, Michael, 1996, *Fighting for Survival: Environmental Decline, Social Conflict, and the New Age of Insecurity*, New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Rentein, Alison Dundes, 2008, "Human Rights," *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Academic Press 1:967-985.
- Renzi, Fred, 2006 (September-October), "Networks: Terra Incognita and the Case for Ethnographic Intelligence," *Military Review* 16-22.
- Resurgence Magazine, 2010, <http://www.resurgence.org>.
- Ricard, Matthieu, 2017, *A Plea for the Animals: The Moral, Philosophical, and Evolutionary Imperative to Treat All Beings with Compassion*, Boulder, CO: Shambhala Publications, Inc.
- Rice, Otis K., 1982, *The Hatfields and McCoys*, Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.
- Richardson, Lewis, 1960, *Arms and Insecurity: A Mathematical Study of the Causes and Origins of War*, Pittsburgh, PA: Boxwood Press.

- Richmond, Oliver P., 2014, *Peace: A Very Short Introduction*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rifkin, Jeffrey, 1994, "Ethnography and Ethnocide: A Case Study of Yanomami," *Dialectical Anthropology* 19(2/3):295-327.
- Ritchie, Mark A., 2000, *Spirit of the Rainforest*, Chicago: Island Lake Press (Second Edition).
- Ritter, Daniel P., and Gregory McLauchlan, 2008, "Military-Industrial Complex, Contemporary Significance," *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Elsevier 2:1266-1278.
- Robarcheck, Clayton A., 1989, "Primitive Warfare and the Ratomorphic Image of Mankind," *American Anthropologist* ns. 91(4):903-920.
- _____, and Carole J. Robarcheck, 1992, "Cultures of War and Peace: A Comparative Study of the Waorani and Semai," in *Aggression and Peacefulness in Humans and Other Primates*, James Silverberg and J. Patrick Gray, eds., New York, NY: Oxford University Press, pp. 189-213.
- _____, and _____, 1996, "Waging Peace: The Psychological and Sociocultural Dynamics of Positive Peace," *Anthropological Contributions to Conflict Resolution*, A.W. Wolfe and H. Yang, eds., Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, pp. 64-80.
- _____, and _____, 1998a, "Reciprocities and Realities: World Views, Peacefulness, and Violence among Semai and Waorani," *Aggressive Behavior* 24:123-133.
- _____, and _____, 1998b, *Waorani: The Contexts of Violence and War*, Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Robbins, Richard H., 2009, *Cultural Anthropology: A Problem-Based Approach*, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Robin, Ron, 2004a, "Violent People and Gentle Savages: The Yanomami Controversy," in Ron Robin, *Scandals and Scoundrels: Seven Cases That Shook the Academy*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, pp. 138-165.
- Robin, Ron, 2004, *Scandals & Scoundrels: Seven Cases That Shook the Academy*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rocha, Jan, 1999, *Murder in the Rainforest: The Yanomami, the Gold Miners and the Amazon*, London: Latin American Bureau.
- Rockefeller, Steven C., and John C. Elder, eds., 1992, *Spirit and Nature: Why the Environment Is a Religious Issue*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Rodman, Margaret, and Matthew Cooper, eds., 1979, *The Pacification of Melanesia*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Roes, Frans, 1997, "Napoleon Chagnon: Then You Are In Bad Luck," *Speak, Darwinists!*, <http://www.froes.dds.nl>.
- Roosevelt, Grace G., 1990, *Reading Rousseau in the Nuclear Age*, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Rouner, Leroy S., ed., 1988, *Human Rights and the World's Religions*, Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

- Rubenstein, Robert A., 2008, *Peacekeeping Under Fire: Culture and Intervention*, Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Sahlins, Marshall, 2001 (November 17), "Jungle Fever" [review of Tierney 2001], *Guardian Weekly*, p. 33.
- _____, 2008, *The Western Illusion of Human Nature*, Chicago, IL: Prickly Paradigm Press.
- Salamone, Frank, 1997, *The Yanomami and Their Interpreters: Fierce People or Fierce Interpreters?*, Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Salazar Quijada, Adolfo, 1970, *Onomastica Indigena Actual de Venezuela*, Caracas, Venezuela: Universidad Catolica Andres Bello Instituto Venezolano de Lenguas Indigenas.
- Salzano, Francisco M., and A. Magdalena Hurtado, eds., 2003, *Lost Paradises and the Ethics of Research and Publication*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Salzman, Philip Carl, and Patricia C. Rice, eds., 2004, *Thinking Anthropologically*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc./Prentice Hall.
- Sanders, Andrew, 2008, "Anthropology of Warriors," *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Elsevier 3:2432-2442.
- Sanford, Greg, 1997, "Who Speaks for the Yanomami? A New Tribe's Perspective," in *The Yanomami and Their Interpreters: Fierce People or Fierce Interpreters?*, Frank Salamone, ed., Lanham: University Press of America, Inc., pp. 57-65.
- Santimire, H. Paul, 2003, "Ecotheology," in *Encyclopedia of Science and Religion*, J. Wentzel Vrede van Huyssteen, ed., New York, NY: Thomson Gale, 1:247-251.
- Sapolsky, Robert M., 2006 (January-February), "A Natural History of Peace," *Foreign Affairs* 85(1):104-120.
- Schafft, Gretchen E., 2004, *From Racism to Genocide: Anthropology in the Third Reich*, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Schumacher College, 2010, <http://www.schumachercollege.org.uk>.
- Schumacher Society, 2010, <https://centerforneweconomics.org/>.
- Schumacher, E.F., 1973, *Small Is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered*, New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Schwebel, Milton, 2010, "Children in War and Peace," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 1:271-275.
- Scott, John Paul, and Benson E. Ginsburg, 1994, "The Seville Statement on Violence Revisited," *American Psychologist* 49(10):849-850.
- Service, Elman R., 1968, "War and Our Contemporary Ancestors," in *War: The Anthropology of Armed Conflict and Aggression*, Morton Fried, Marvin Harris, and Robert Murphy, eds., New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., pp. 160-167.
- Sewall, Sarah, et al., 2007, *The U.S. Army/Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Field Manual*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Shakya, Tsering, 1999, *The Dragon in the Land of Snows: A History of Modern Tibet Since 1947*, New York, NY: Penguin Group (USA) Inc.

- Sharp, Gene, 1973, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*, Boston, MA: Porter Sargent Publishers.
- _____, 2005, *Waging Nonviolent Struggles*, Boston, MA: Porter Sargent Publishers.
- Shepard, Paul, 1973, *The Tender Carnivore and the Sacred Game*, New York, NY: Scribner.
- Shinn, Larry D., 2000, "The Inner Logic of Gandhian Ecology," in *Hinduism and Ecology: The Intersection of Earth, Sky, and Water*, Christopher Key Chapple and Mary Evelyn Tucker, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press and Harvard University Center for the Study of World Religions, pp. 213-241.
- Shiva, Vandana, 2005, *Earth Democracy: Justice, Sustainability, and Peace*, Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- _____, 2010, "Navdanya International: Seeds, Food Security and Sustainability" <https://navdanyainternational.org/>.
- Sibley, Mulford Quickert, 1963, *The Quiet Battle: Writings on the Theory and Practice of Non-Violent Resistance*, Chicago, IL: Quadrangle Books.
- Sidky, H., 2004, *Perspectives on Culture: A Critical Introduction to Theory in Cultural Anthropology*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Silverstein, Leni M., 2004, "Uncensoring Boas." *American Anthropological Association Anthropology News* 48(8):5-6.
- Simons, Anna, 1997, *The Company They Keep: Life Inside the U.S. Army Special Forces*, New York, NY: Free Press.
- _____, 1999, "War: Back to the Future," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 28:73-108.
- Simpson, Christopher, ed., 1998, *Universities and Empires: Money and Politics in the Social Science during the Cold War*, New York, NY: New Press.
- Singer, P., 1990, *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for Our Treatment of Animals*, New York, NY: Avon (Second Edition).
- Singer, Peter, 2004, *The President of Good and Evil: Questioning the Ethics of George W. Bush*, New York, NY: Penguin Group.
- Singhvi, L.M., 1992, "Jainism," in *Holy Ground: The Guide to Faith and Ecology*, Jo Edwards and Martin Palmer, eds., Northhamptonshire, UK: Pilkington Press, pp. 91-93.
- Sluka, Jeffrey A., ed., 2000, *Death Squad: The Anthropological State of Terror*, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Smith, David Livingstone, 2007, *The Most Dangerous Animal: Human Nature and the Origins of War*, New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- _____, 2011, *Less Than Human: Why We Demean, Enslave, and Exterminate Others*, New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai, 1999, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, New York, NY: Zed Books Ltd.
- Smith, Huston, 1992, *Forgotten Truth: The Common Vision of the World's Religions*, San Francisco, CA: HarperCollins.
- _____, 2001, *Why Religion Matters: The Fate of the Human Spirit in the Age of Disbelief*, San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco.

- Smole, William J., 1976, *The Yanomama Indians: A Cultural Geography*, Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Sokal, Alan, and Jean Bricmont, 1998, *Fashionable Nonsense: Postmodern Intellectuals' Abuse of Science*, New York, NY: Picador.
- Solomon, Norman, 2005, *War Made Easy: How Presidents and Pundits Keep Spinning Us to Death*, New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Sorrell, Roger D., 1988, *St. Francis of Assisi and Nature: Tradition and Innovation in Western Christian Attitudes toward the Environment*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace at the University of Hawai'i <http://www.peaceinstitute.hawaii.edu>.
- Sperling, Elliot, 2004, *The Tibet-China Conflict: History and Polemics*, Washington, D.C.: East-West Center Washington.
- Sponsel, Leslie E., 1979, "A Note on the Urgency of Research among the Yanomami of the Brazilian Amazon," *Review of Ethnology* (Wien) 7(1-9):72.
- _____, 1981, *The Hunter and the Hunted in the Amazon: An Integrated Biological and Cultural Approach to the Behavioral Ecology of Human Predation*, Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International (Cornell University Doctoral Dissertation).
- _____, 1983, "Yanomama Warfare, Protein Capture, and Cultural Ecology," *Inter-ciencia* (Caracas), 8(4):204-210.
- _____, 1986a, "Amazon Ecology and Adaptation," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15:67-97.
- _____, 1986b, "Book Review: *Order Without Government: The Society of the Pemon Indians of Venezuela* by David John Thomas," *New Scholar* 10(1-2):318-321.
- _____, 1989, "An Anthropologist's Perspective on Peace and Quality of Life," in *Peace and Development: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*, Daniel S. Sanders and Jon Matsuoka, eds., Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i School of Social Work, pp. 29-48.
- _____, 1990, "Ultraprimitive Pacifists: The Tasaday as a Symbol of Peace," *Anthropology Today* 6(1):3-5.
- _____, 1992, "Our Fascination with the Tasaday: Anthropological Images and Images of Anthropology," in *The Tasaday Controversy: Assessing the Evidence*, Thomas N. Headland, ed. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association Special Publication No. 28, pp. 200-212.
- _____, 1994a, "The Mutual Relevance of Anthropology and Peace Studies," in *The Anthropology of Peace and Nonviolence*, Leslie E. Sponsel and Thomas A. Gregor, eds., Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp. 1-36.
- _____, 1994b, "Toward a Pedagogy of the Anthropology of Peace," in *The Anthropology of Peace and Nonviolence*, Leslie E. Sponsel and Thomas A. Gregor, eds., Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp. 259-269.
- _____, 1994c, "Book Review: *Societies at Peace: Anthropological Perspectives* co-edited by Signe Howell and Roy Willis," *American Ethnologist* 20(2):396-397.

- _____, 1994a, "The Yanomamo Holocaust Continues," in Johnston, Barbara Rose, ed., *Who Pays the Price? Examining the Sociocultural Context of the Environmental Crisis*, Washington, D.C.: Island Press, pp. 37-46.
- _____, 1995, "Relationships Among the World System, Indigenous Peoples, and Ecological Anthropology," in *Indigenous Peoples and the Future of Amazonia: An Ecological Anthropology of an Endangered World*, Leslie E. Sponsel, ed. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, pp. 263-293.
- _____, 1996a, "The Natural History of Peace: A Positive View of Human Nature and Its Potential," in *The Natural History of Peace*, Thomas A. Gregor, ed. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, pp. 95-125 [Reprinted in <https://peacefulsocieties.uncg.edu/archive/natural-history-peace-positive-view-human-nature-potential/>].
- _____, 1996b, "Human Rights and Advocacy Anthropology," in *The Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology*, David Levinson and Melvin Ember, eds., New York, NY: Henry Holt and Co. 2:602-607.
- _____, 1996c, "Peace and Nonviolence" *The Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology*, David Levinson and Melvin Ember, eds., New York, NY: Henry Holt and Co. 3:908-912.
- _____, 1996, "History, Conservation, and Human Rights: The Case of the Yanomami in the Amazon of Brazil and Venezuela," in *Managing Conflicts in Protected Areas*, Connie Lewis, ed., Gland: IUCN- The World Conservation Union, pp. 62-62.
- _____, 1997a, "Human Rights," *The Dictionary of Anthropology*, Thomas Barfield, ed., Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell Publishers, pp. 248-250
- _____, 1997b, "Peace and Nonviolence," *The Dictionary of Anthropology*, Thomas Barfield, ed., Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell Publishers, pp. 350-352.
- _____, 1998, "Yanomami: An Arena of Conflict and Aggression in the Amazon" *Aggressive Behavior* 24(2):97-122.
- _____, 1999, "Book Review: *Life Among the Yanomami: The Story of Change among the Xilixana on the Mucajai River of Brazil*, by John F. Peters," *American Anthropologist* 101(3):35-36.
- _____, 2000 (December), "Response to Otterbein" *American Anthropologist* 102(4):837-840.
- _____, 2001, "Advocacy in Anthropology" *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, N.J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes, eds., Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press, pp. 204-206.
- _____, 2005, "Noble Savage and Ecologically Noble Savage," in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature*, Bron Taylor, ed., New York, NY: Thoemmes Continuum, 2:1210-1212.
- _____, 2006a, "Darkness in El Dorado Controversy," in *Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, H. James Birx, ed., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2:667-673.
- _____, 2006b, "Yanomamo," in *Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, H. James Birx, ed., Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications 5:2347-2351. (Reprinted in Elvio Angeloni, ed., 2010, *Annual Editions Anthropology 10/11*, New York: McGraw-Hill, pp. 20-23).

- _____, 2006c, "Ashley Montagu," in *Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, H. James Birx, ed., Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications 4:1620-1622.
- _____, 2007a, "Spiritual Ecology: One Anthropologist's Reflections," *Journal for the Study of Religion, Nature and Culture* 1(3):340-349.
- _____, 2007b, "Religion, Nature and Environmentalism," in *Encyclopedia of Earth*, Sahotra Sarkar and Linda Kalof, eds., Washington, D.C.: Environmental Information Coalition, National Council for Science and the Environment.
- _____, 2007c, "Sacred Places and Biodiversity Conservation," in *Encyclopedia of Earth*, Sahotra Sarkar and Linda Kalof, eds., Washington, D.C.: Environmental Information Coalition, National Council for Science and the Environment.
- _____, 2007d, "Human Nature," *Encyclopedia of Environment and Society*, Paul Robbins, General Editor, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications 3:886-889.
- _____, 2008, "Amazon: Environment and Nature," in *Encyclopedia of the History of Science, Technology, and Medicine in Non-Western Cultures*, Helaine Selin, ed., The Netherlands: Springer (Second Edition), 1:757-762.
- _____, 2009, "Reflections on the Possibilities of a Nonkilling Society and a Nonkilling Anthropology," in *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm*, Joám Evans Pim, ed., Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling, pp. 35-72.
- _____, 2010a, "Yanomami," [webpage discontinued].
- _____, 2010b, "El Dorado Controversy," [webpage discontinued].
- _____, 2010c, "The Master Thief: Gold Mining and Mercury Contamination in the Amazon," in *Life and Death Matters: Human Rights and the Environment at the End of the Millennium*, Barbara Rose Johnston, ed., Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press (Second Edition), pp. 125-150.
- _____, 2010d, "Into the Heart of Darkness: Rethinking the Canonical Ethnography on the Yanomamo," in *Nonkilling Societies*, Joám Evans Pim, ed., Honolulu, HI: Center for Global Nonkilling, pp.
- _____, 2010, Research Institute for Spiritual Ecology (RISE) <http://spiritualecology.info/>.
- _____, 2012, *Spiritual Ecology: A Quiet Revolution*, Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger (<http://spiritualecology.info/>).
- _____, 2014a, "The Role of Spiritual Ecology in Nonkilling," *Nonkilling Spiritual Traditions*, Joám Evans and Pradeep Dakhal, eds., Honolulu, HI: Center for Global Nonkilling, pp. 15-34.
- _____, 2014b (April). "Feature Article: Bibliographic Essay - Spiritual Ecology: Is it the Ultimate Solution for the Environmental Crisis." *CHOICE* 51(8):1339-1342, 1344-1348.
- _____, 2015. "Advocacy in Anthropology," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, James D. Wright, ed., Oxford, UK: Elsevier (Second Edition) 1:223-228.
- _____, 2017a, "The Anthropology of Peace and Nonviolence," *Diogenes* 61(3-4):30-45.

- _____, 2017b, "Lynn White, Jr., One Catalyst in the Historical Development of Spiritual Ecology," invited for Lynn White Retrospective after 50 Years, Todd LaVasseur and Anna Peterson, eds. New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor and Francis, pp. 89-102.
- _____, 2018 "One Anthropologist's Answer to Glenn D. Paige's Question Challenging Peace Studies" *Journal of Peace Education* 15(3): 267-287.
- _____, 2019a, "Reflections on the Possibilities of a Nonkilling Society and a Nonkilling Anthropology," *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm*, Joám Evans Pim, ed., 2009, Honolulu, HI: Center for Global Nonkilling, pp. 35-72. Reprinted in *Give Nonkilling a Chance: Are Nonkilling Societies Possible?*, Anoop Swarup, ed., New Delhi, India: Konark Publishers Pvt. Ltd., pp. 1-44.
- _____, 2019b, "Reflections on the Possibilities of a Nonkilling Society and a Nonkilling Anthropology," excerpts reprinted in *Militarism: A Critical Reader*, Roberto J. Gonzalez, et al., eds., 2019, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 339-344.
- _____, 2019c, "Ecology and Spirituality," in *The Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion*, John Barton, ed., New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____, ed., 2020, *Religious Environmental Activism in Asia: Case Studies in Spiritual Ecology*, Basel, Switzerland: MDPI/Religions [open access] <http://www.mdpi.com/books/pdfview/book/2169>.
- _____, and Kenneth R. Good, 2000 (February), "Anthropologists Debate Future of War," *American Anthropological Association Anthropology News* 41(2):19-20.
- _____, and Thomas A. Gregor, eds., 1994, *The Anthropology of Peace and Nonviolence*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- _____, and Poranee Natadecha-Sponsel, 1991, "Nonviolent Ecology: The Possibilities of Buddhism," in *Buddhism and Nonviolent Global Problem-Solving*, Glenn D. Paige and Sarah Gilliatt, eds., Ulan Bator Explorations, Honolulu, HI: Center for Global Nonviolence Planning Project and Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace, pp. 139-150.
- _____, and Terence Turner, 2002 (August 9), "Counterpoint: Charges of Wrongdoing by Anthropologists," *The Chronicle of Higher Education The Chronicle Review Section 2*, B13.
- Spring, David, and Eileen Spring, eds., 1974, *Ecology and Religion in History*, San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Starkey, Armstrong, 1998, *European and Native American Warfare, 1675-1815*, Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Starn, Orin, 1986, "Engineering Internment: Anthropologists and War Relocation Authority," *American Ethnologist* 13:700-720.
- Staub, Ervin, 1989, *The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence*, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Stauder, J., 1974, "The "Relevance" of Anthropology to Colonialism and Imperialism," *Radical Science Journal* 1:38-61.
- Steele, Frank, 1994, *Warpaths: Invasions of North America*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Stephenson, Carolyn M., 1989, "The Evolution of Peace Studies," in *Peace and World Order Studies: A Curriculum Guide*, D.C. Thomas and M.T. Klare, eds., Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 9-19.
- _____, 2008, "Peace Studies, Overview," *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Academic Press 2:1534-1548.
- Stevenson, Leslie, and David L. Haberman, 1998, *Ten Theories of Human Nature*, New York, NY: Oxford University.
- Stoessinger, John G., 2008, *Why Nations Go to War*, Belmont, CA: Thomson Higher Education (Tenth Edition).
- Stoll, David (2001, March 19). "Science Attacks Amazon Tribe," *The New Republic*, Issue 4,496, pp. 34-39.
- Strathern, Andrew J., and Pamela J. Stewart, 2008, "Anthropology of Violence and Conflict, Overview," in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, Editor-in-Chief, San Diego, CA: Elsevier 1:75-86.
- Summer Institute of Linguistics, 2020, *Ethnologue World Languages*, Arlington, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics International, <https://www.ethnologue.com/>.
- Sussman, Robert, Joshua Marshack, and Richard Wrangham, 2010, "Are Humans Inherently Killers?," Honolulu, HI: Center for Global Nonkilling/Global Nonkilling Working Papers No. 1.
- Suzuki, Peter T., 1981, "Anthropologists in the Wartime Camps for Japanese Americans: A Documentary Study," *Dialectical Anthropology* 6:23-60.
- Swarup, Anoop, ed., 2019, *Give Nonkilling a Chance: Are Nonkilling Societies Possible?*, Seattle, WA: Konark Publisher International.
- Swearer, Donald K., ed., 2009, *Ecology and the Environment: Perspectives from the Humanities*, Cambridge: Harvard Divinity School Center for the Study of World Religions.
- Tax, Sol, 1955, "The Integration of Anthropology," *Yearbook of Anthropology*, W.L. Thomas, Jr., ed., Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 313-328.
- Taylor, Bron, ed., 2005, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature*, London, UK: Thoemmes Continuum.
- _____, 2010, *Dark Green Religion: Nature, Spirituality, and the Planetary Future*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Thomas, Daniel C., and Michael T. Klare, eds., 1989, *Peace and World Order Studies: A Curriculum Guide*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press (Fifth Edition).
- Thomas, David John, 1982, *Order without Government: The Society of the Pemón Indians of Venezuela*, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Thurman, Robert, 2008, *Why the Dalai Lama Matters: His Act of Truth as the Solution for China, Tibet, and the World*, New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, Inc./Atria Books.
- Tibetan Government in Exile Official Website, <http://www.tibet.com>.
- Tierney I, Patrick, 2000 (October 9), "The Fierce Anthropologist," *The New Yorker* 76(3):50-61.

- _____, 2000, *Darkness in El Dorado: How Scientists and Journalists Devastated the Amazon*, New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Co.
- Tiffany, S.W., and K.J. Adams, 1994, "Anthropology's "fierce" Yanomami: Narratives of Sexual Politics in the Amazon," *National Women's Studies Association Journal* 6:169-196.
- _____, and _____, 1995, "Feminists Re-Reading the Amazon: Anthropological Adventures into the Realm of Sex and Violence," East Lansing, MI: *Michigan State University Women and International Development Program Working Paper* No. 253, pp. 1-63.
- _____, and _____, 1996, "Housewives of the Forest: Representations in Ethnographic Film," *Women's Studies* 25:169-188.
- Time, 1976 (May 10), "Beastly or Manly?," *Time* 107(10):69.
- Tobias, Michael, 1991, *Life Force: The World of Jainism*, Berkeley, CA: Asian Humanities Press.
- Trautman, Brian J., and Marc David Turetzky, 2010, "Censorship and Repression of Peace Literature," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 1:248-252.
- Trigg, Roger, 1999, *Ideas of Human Nature: An Historical Introduction*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- True, Michael, 2010, "Christian Ethics and Peace," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 1:284-287.
- Tucker, Mary Evelyn, 1997, "The Emerging Alliance of Religion and Ecology," *Worldviews: Environment, Culture and Religion* 1(1):3-24.
- _____, with Judith A. Berling, 2003, *Worldly Wonder: Religions Enter Their Ecological Phase*, La Salle, IL: Open Court.
- _____, and John Grim, 2001 (Fall), "Religion and Ecology: Can the Climate Change?," *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 130(4): 1-307.
- _____, and _____, 2007 (February 9), "The Greening of the World's Religions," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 53(23):B9-B10.
- _____, and _____, 2009 (January 13), "Religion and a New Environmental Ethics," Yale University interview <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BG0bQ3SwDI8>.
- _____, and Duncan Ryuken Williams, eds., 1997, *Buddhism and Ecology: The Interconnection of Dharma and Deeds*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press and Harvard University Center for the Study of World Religions.
- Turner, Trudy, ed., 2005, *Biological Anthropology and Ethics: From Repatriation to Genetic Identity*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Turner, Terrence, 1991, *Report of the Special Commission to Investigate the Situation of the Brazilian Yanomami*, Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association.
- _____, 1994 (May). "The Yanomami: Truth and Consequences," *American Anthropological Association Anthropology News* 35(5):48, 46.

- _____, 2001 (November), *The Yanomami and the Ethics of Anthropological Practice*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Latin American Studies Program Occasional Paper Series Volume 6.
- Turney-High, Harry Holbert, 1991, *Primitive War: Its Practices and Concepts*, Columbia, SC: University of Southern Carolina Press.
- Tuzin, Donald, 1996, "The Spectre of Peace in Unlikely Places: Concept and Paradox in the Anthropology of Peace," in *A Natural History of Peace*, Thomas Gregor, ed., Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, pp. 3-33.
- U.S. Army, 2008, *War Surgery in Afghanistan and Iraq: A Series of Cases, 2003-2007*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense.
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) <https://en.unesco.org/>.
- United Nations Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2010, <http://www.millenniumassessment.org>.
- Ury, William L., 1999, *The Third Side: Why We Fight and How We Can Stop*, New York, NY: Penguin Putnam, Inc.
- _____, ed., 2002, *Must We Fight? From the Battlefield to the Schoolyard— A New Perspective on Violent Conflict and Its Preservation*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Valero, Helena, 1984, *Yo Soy Napeyoma: Relato de una Mujer Raptada por los Indígenas Yanomami*, Caracas: Fundacion LaSalle de Ciencias Naturales Monografía No. 35.
- Vittachi, Anuradha, 1989, *Earth Conference One: Sharing a Vision for Our Planet*, Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications.
- Waal, Frans de, 1989, *Peacemaking Among Primates*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- _____, 1996, *Good Natured: The Origins of Right and Wrong in Humans and Other Animals*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- _____, 2006, *Primates and Philosophers: How Morality Evolved*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____, and Frans Lating, 1997, *Bonobo: The Forgotten Ape*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Wakin, Eric, 1992, *Anthropology Goes to War: Professional Ethics and Counterinsurgency in Thailand*, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Monograph No. 7.
- Waldau, Paul, 2002, *The Spector of Speciesism: Buddhist and Christian Views of Animals*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- _____, and Kimberley Patton, eds., 2006, *A Communion of Subjects: Animals in Religion, Science and Ethics*, New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Waller, Altina L., 1988, *Feud: Hatfields, McCoys, and Social Change*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Wallis, Ethel Emily, 1965, *The Dayuma Story: Life Under Auca Spears*, New York, NY: Harper.

- Washington, James M., 1991, *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Watada, First Lieutenant Ehren [website discontinued].
- Watling, Tony, 2009, *Ecological Imaginations in the World Religions: An Ethnographic Analysis*, New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Watson Institute, 2020, *Costs of War*, Providence, Rhode Island: Brown University/Watson Institute <https://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/>.
- Watson, Lyall, 1995, *Dark Nature: A Natural History of Evil*, New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Wax, Dustin M., ed., 2008, *Anthropology at the Dawn of the Cold War*, Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.
- Webel, Charles, 2010, "Textbooks," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 3:493-494.
- _____, and Johan Galtung, eds., 2007, *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*, Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Weber, Thomas, 1999, "Gandhi and Deep Ecology," *Journal of Peace Research* 36(3):349-361, <http://www.mkgandhi.org/environment/envt.htm>.
- Weigert, Kathleen M., 2008, "Structural Violence," *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict*, Lester Kurtz, ed., San Diego, CA: Academic Press 3:2004-2011.
- Wells, Donald A., 1991, "Can Modern Wars Be Just?," in *Engulfed in War: Just War and the Persian Gulf*, Brien Hallett, ed., Honolulu, HI: Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace, pp. 21-41.
- Welzer, Harald, 2017, *Climate Wars: Why People Will Be Killed in the 21st Century*, Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Wexler, Jay, 2016, *When God Isn't Green: A World-Wide Journey to Places Where Religious Practice and Environmentalism Collide*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- White, Lynn, Jr., 1967 (March 10), "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis," *Science* 155:1203-1207.
- Whiteford, Linda M., and Robert T. Trotter II, 2008, *Ethics for Anthropological Research and Practice*, Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Whitehead, Linda M., and Robert T. Trotter II, 2008, *Ethics for Anthropological Research and Practice*, Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Whitehead, Neil L., 2000, "A History of Research on Warfare in Anthropology – Reply to Keith Otterbein," *American Anthropologist* 102(4):834-837.
- Wiberg, Hakan, 1981, "JPR 1964-1980— What Have We Learned About Peace?," *Journal of Peace Research* XVIII(2):111-148.
- Wilbert, Johannes, 1972, "The Hunters: The Yanoama of Territorio Amazonas," in *Survivors of Eldorado: Four Indian Cultures of South America*, Johannes Wilbert, New York: Praeger, pp. 13-64.
- _____, 1990, *Folk Literature of the Yanomami Indians*, Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Latin American Studies.

- Williams, Emilio, 1986, *A Way of Life and Death: Three Centuries of Prussian-German Militarism: An Anthropological Approach*, Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Wilson, Samuel M., 2001, "Informed Consent: A Muckraking Book Spotlights the Ethics of Anthropological Fieldwork," *Natural History* 110(2):90.
- Wilson, Edward O., 2003, *The Future of Life*, New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
- _____, 2006, *The Creation: An Appeal to Save Life on Earth*, New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- _____, 2012, *The Social Conquest of Earth*, New York, NY: Liveright Publishing Corporation.
- Wolf, Eric R., 1994 (March), "Demonization of Anthropologist in the Amazon," *American Anthropological Association Anthropology News* 35(3):2.
- Wolfe, A.W., and H. Yang, eds., 1996, *Anthropological Contributions to Conflict Resolution*, Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Womersley, Mick, 2005, "National Religious Partnership for the Environment," in *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature*, Bron Taylor, ed., London, UK: Thoemmes Continuum, 2:1158-1159.
- Wong, Kate, 2001 (March), "Fighting the Darkness in El Dorado," *Scientific American* 284(3):26-28.
- Wood, Houston, 2016, *Invitation to Peace Studies*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- World Health Organization (WHO), 2002, *World Report on Violence and Health*, Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.
- World Wildlife Fund International (WWF), 1986, *The Assisi Declarations: Messages on Man and Nature from Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, and Judaism*, Gland, Switzerland: World Wildlife Fund International.
- Worldwatch Institute, 2010,
<http://www.climatenetwork.org/profile/member/worldwatch-institute>.
- Wrangham, Richard, and Dale Peterson, 1996, *Demonic Males: Apes and the Origins of Human Violence*, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- _____, 2019, *The Goodness Paradox: The Strange Relationship Between Virtue and Violence in Human Evolution*, New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Wright, Ann, and Susan Dixon, 2008, *Dissent: Voices of Conscience*, Kihei, HI: Koa Books.
- Wright, Quincy, 1942, *A Study of War*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- _____, 1983, *A Study of War*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press (Second Edition).
- Wright, Robin, 1988, "Anthropological Presuppositions of Indigenous Advocacy," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 17:365-390.
- Wright, Robin, and Mauela Carneiro da Cunha, 1999, "Destruction, Resistance, and Transformation – Southern Coastal, and Northern Brazil (1580-1890), in *The Cambridge History of the Native Peoples of the Americas: Volume III South America*,

- Frank Salomon, and Stuart B. Schwartz, eds., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 287-381.
- Young, Antonia, 2010, "Blood Feuds, Mediation of," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 1:187-191.
- Young, Nigel J., editor-in-chief, 2010, *Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Volumes 1-4.
- _____, 2010, "Chronology of Peace in History," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 1:xxxvii-lviii.
- Younger, Stephen M., 2007, *Endangered Species: How We Can Avoid Mass Destruction and Build a Lasting Peace*, New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.
- _____, 2008 (October), "Conditions and Mechanisms for Peace in Precontact Polynesia," *Current Anthropology* 49(5):927-934.
- Zook, Darren C., 2010, "Just War: Law and Codification," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Nigel J. Young, editor-in-chief, New York, NY: Oxford University Press 2:546-551.