

Reciprocities and Realities: World Views, Peacefulness, and Violence Among Semai and Waorani

Clayton A. Robarchek* and Carole J. Robarchek

Department of Anthropology, Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas

.....

Implicit in all social relations, including those involving material transactions, are conceptions of reality that include fundamental assumptions about the nature of human beings, the relationships among them, and the world around them. This article examines economic exchange and reciprocity in two societies that are very similar in their ecological contexts, modes of subsistence, technologies, and social organizations but at opposite extremes in their attitudes toward violence. They are the Semai of Malaysia, one of the most peaceful societies known, and the Waorani of Amazonian Ecuador, the most violent society yet described.

Comparison of the norms of exchange in these two societies reveals two very different views of the world: The Semai see themselves as helpless in a hostile world that is beyond their control and the Waorani see themselves as self-reliant and capable in a world that they feel fully competent to control. Understanding these culturally constructed realities as they are embodied in Semai and Waorani exchange (and in other areas of life as well, of course) contributes to an understanding of the character of sociality generally in these two societies, including their diametrically opposed dispositions toward violence in human relations. *Aggr. Behav.* 24:123-133, 1998. ©1998 Wiley-Liss, Inc.

.....

Key words: peace; nonviolence; war; feuding; exchange; culture

The research from which this report is drawn is part of a long-term comparative study of cultures of peace and war. It is based on ethnographic research conducted by the authors in two societies that are very similar in their ecological contexts, modes of subsistence, settlement patterns, social organizations, and technologies: the Semai of the mountains of Peninsular Malaysia and the Waorani at the headwaters of the Amazon in eastern Ecuador. The former are known in the anthropological literature for their nonviolent way of life [cf. Dentan, 1968; C.A. Robarchek, 1977]; the latter were, until recently, the most warlike society known. During at least the past several generations, more than 60% of Waorani deaths have been homicides, the result of both internal feuding and external warfare [cf. Yost, 1981; Robarchek and Robarchek, 1992, 1998].

*Correspondence to: Clayton A. Robarchek, Department of Anthropology, Wichita State University, Wichita, KS 67260-0052. E-mail: robarche@cs.twsu.edu

Although we employed a variety of specialized data-collection techniques, participant observation was our primary research method in our studies of both of these societies. Our participation in the two socioeconomic systems generated insights not only into the nature of exchange, but also into some of the fundamental assumptions that each society holds about the nature of both the human and nonhuman worlds. Understanding these assumptions, in turn, sheds light on the fundamental differences in these two societies' orientations toward violence.

This article examines the forms of reciprocity practiced by Semai and Waorani. It compares assumptions about the nature of human beings and the relationships among them that are implicit in these modes of exchange, and it explores the relationships of these assumptions to the encompassing cultural constructions of reality within which these two societies have pursued their respectively peaceful and violent ways of life.

We want to make it clear that this analysis in no way purports to account for the origins of these two cultural patterns. Doing that would require an account of the historical contexts within which they arose, and those historical data simply do not exist for these two societies.¹ Rather, this article is about two groups of human beings who are very similar in the material aspects of their lives but who pursue their culturally and individually defined goals within two very different worlds of culturally constituted images and meanings, and about how those images and meanings have supported and contributed to the maintenance of these diametrically opposed patterns of peacefulness and violence.

THE SEMAI

The Semai are among the most peaceful people known. Physical violence is extremely uncommon: adults do not fight; husbands do not beat their wives, nor parents their children. Homicide is so rare as to be virtually nonexistent.²

At the time of our first study in 1973 and 1974, there were about 13,000 Semai living in small, politically autonomous bands whose populations seldom exceeded 100. These are scattered along the deep, densely forested valleys that dissect the mountainous spine of the central Malay Peninsula. Semai subsistence depended on swidden gardening supplemented by hunting, fishing, trapping, and gathering.

Each band occupied a well-defined territory, usually a small river valley or a segment of a larger one. Settlements were clusters of extended family or multifamily households that moved up and down the valleys, cutting new fields each year and leaving the abandoned gardens to be reclaimed by the forest for a fallow cycle of 30 years or more. Although a great many changes have occurred in the years since our first study, at that time—in the early 1970s—bands in the less accessible highland and deep jungle areas

¹See Dentan [1992] for a persuasive hypothetical reconstruction of the historical context of peaceful societies such as the Semai; see Robarchek and Robarchek [1998] for a summary of what is known historically about the Waorani.

²The 'nonviolent' characterization of the Semai has been questioned by Knauff [1987]. His estimate of a Semai homicide rate, based on the reports of two killings cited by Dentan [1978] (one of which was the abandonment of a terminally ill person) was computed on the basis of a population of 300, the size of Dentan's study community, rather than on the population of 15,000 from which the reports were drawn [also see Dentan, 1988; C.A. Robarchek, 1989; Robarchek and Dentan, 1987].

still largely persisted in that traditional way of life, although they were increasingly being drawn into the economy and politics of the Malaysian state [Robarchek and Robarchek, 1990].

THE WAORANI

The Waorani live between the Napo and Curaray Rivers, headwater tributaries of the Amazon in eastern Ecuador. In a notably violent region—the western Amazon basin—the Waorani, called "Auca" (savage) by surrounding peoples, were among the most feared. Into the late 1950s, they had no peaceful contacts with outsiders; they and their Lowland Quichua neighbors raided each other incessantly. Even though the Waorani numbered fewer than 700 and, unlike their neighbors, possessed no firearms, their 9-ft hardwood spears and their deservedly fearsome reputation allowed them to maintain control over a vast territory, some 8,000 square miles of deep valleys and dense tropical rain forest.

Widely dispersed and autonomous settlements, each an extended family band, were scattered over this vast territory, and raiding was endemic among them. Blood feuds and vendettas arising from past killings, from accusations of sorcery, and from quarrels over marriages were a way of life even among closely related bands. More than 40% of deaths were the result of such intragroup raiding [cf. Yost, 1981; Robarchek and Robarchek, 1992, 1996].

Relations with outsiders were no less hostile. The Waorani attacked and killed all who entered their territory, Indians and non-Indians alike. These violent clashes with surrounding groups accounted for nearly 20% of Waorani deaths [cf. Yost, 1981].

In 1957, the Waorani attained worldwide, if brief, notoriety when they speared to death five young American missionaries who, hoping to make peaceful contact, landed their small plane on a sandbar in the Curaray River. *Life* magazine sent a reporter and photographer to cover the story, and gruesome photos of bloated corpses bristling with spears testified to the "savagery" of the "Aucas."

Large-scale internal and external raiding by most groups ended in the 1960s, after initial peaceful contacts were established by a small group of American Protestant missionary women. A reserve comprising less than 10% of the traditional Waorani homeland was established by the Ecuadorian government, and most of the Waorani were persuaded to resettle on it.³ Several bands still remain off the reserve, however, and at least one continues to resist all contact. During our first fieldwork in 1987, two Catholic missionaries, a bishop and a nun, were speared to death when they attempted to make contact with this group.

During that time, we also heard unconfirmed reports of the spearings of several Indians working for the oil exploration companies that were active in the region, and we heard rumors of the killings of hostile Waorani by oil workers shooting from helicopters.

Large-scale violence has declined dramatically in recent years, although occasional raids still occur. Within the last several years, two raids against suspected non-Waorani

³We use the word 'persuaded' advisedly here; the Waorani were not conquered or coerced; there were never more than a half-dozen missionaries, all but one of whom were women, and the region was then, and remains today, largely beyond effective Ecuadorian political and military control [cf. Yost, 1981].

sorcerers have, in the precontact pattern, taken the lives of the primary victims and their entire families.

THE COMMON GROUND

The similarities between these two societies are striking: Both groups are swidden gardeners, hunters, fishers, and gatherers living at similar altitudes in an equatorial tropical rain forest environment. For both, sweet manioc is one of their two staple crops. For the Semai, the second staple is hill rice, and for the Waorani it is plantains. Both cultivate a number of minor crops, including corn, and both cultivate forest trees for fruit.

Gardening technologies—machetes, axes, and digging sticks—are virtually identical. Protein in both societies is derived from the hunting of small and large game, and hunters in both societies take the former with blowpipes and poisoned darts and the latter with spears and, increasingly, shotguns. Fishing with lines, nets, and poisons is also important to both.

Social organizations, including political organizations, kinship systems, and residence patterns are also remarkably similar. Both are band-level societies consisting of largely kin-based residence groups of generally fewer than 100 people. These residence groups are, in both societies, politically autonomous and essentially acephalous.⁴ Among both groups, a previous pattern of dispersed extended family households is being replaced, as a result of external influences, by nuclear family households and nucleated settlements, but in both societies, the household remains the basic economic unit.

In neither of these societies are there significant structural bases for group solidarity. With bilateral kinship in both societies, there are no lineages or clans to provide a framework for mutual obligations and support; thus, nothing resembling the fraternal interest groups that Otterbein [1980] found often accompanying external warfare exist in either. In neither society are there other social structural features that crosscut kinship to unite individuals or kindreds into interdependent groups.

There are no strong sex dichotomies or sex-based distinctions in rank in either society. Polygyny is permitted but infrequent in both. Socialization in both societies is indulgent and nonpunishing, and children's relations with both parents are warm and affectionate.

RECIPROCITY AND SEMAI REALITY

Economic exchange, in both of these settings, was of more than merely academic interest to us. When, as was the case in both of these projects, the research location is remote and external support is minimal, we are to some degree dependent on the local economy and exchange system for our own food supply.

When we began our fieldwork among both Semai and Waorani, we had some idea, based on previous accounts, of what to expect in terms of exchange, and we arrived prepared to participate. We brought trade goods—shotgun shells, matches, fishhooks, medicines, salt, soap, tobacco, sugar, coconut oil, and so on—that were desired but

⁴Semai bands have headmen; however, their authority is essentially moral authority deriving from their position as spokesmen for the band, and its exercise is limited to their powers of persuasion.

difficult for the people in our settlements to obtain. In return, we hoped to receive the meat, manioc, and fruit that would, at the very least, give us some relief from a diet of rice and canned fish.

Dentan [1968] described Semai food sharing, noting that meat and fish are not smoked or otherwise preserved but, rather, are distributed throughout the community and consumed immediately. When a large animal is killed it is divided equally among the households in the hamlet, among kin and nonkin alike. The hunter gets no more than anyone else, but he and his family can expect a share when other hunters are successful. This sort of exchange, paying into the system when you have it and drawing out when you need it—what Sahlins [1965] called "generalized reciprocity"—serves, as Semai themselves were well aware, as a kind of insurance against bad luck, illness, injury, and hard times.

We entered into this system with initial gifts of food, soap, and tobacco to each household, and we were quickly drawn into the community-wide circle of food exchange. Soon we began returning from our monthly supply trips bringing, in addition to our tobacco, sugar, and other gifts, 35 to 40 lb of fresh meat or fish from the lowland market. This we shared among all the households, just as we would have done with a large animal. Like a hunter or fisherman sharing his occasional success, we too were able to draw on the food resources of the community.

As our participation in the economic system grew, and as we continued to investigate Semai world view and values, it became apparent that these two realms were intimately interrelated. Where food was concerned, the constantly restated ideal was that anyone in need had a claim on any food in the community. "Why," the headman once asked me rhetorically, "should anyone go hungry when another has food?" This ideal was realized in practice to a striking degree and was, we came to realize, an expression of a key component of Semai world view: The world is a hostile and dangerous place in which humans are essentially powerless; only the nurturance and support of the band makes individual survival possible.

The forest that surrounds Semai communities is filled with malevolent "spirits," beings and forces that wait only the opportunity to attack and kill human beings. People seldom venture alone into the primary forest, and staying alone in the forest at night is so foolhardy as to be symptomatic of madness. Nearly every activity is hedged with rituals and taboos in an attempt to stave off the omnipresent dangers that menace just outside.

Against this stands only the band, the hundred or so neighbors and kin with whom life is bound up from birth until death. These are the people one can depend on and trust, who will provide food in the event of illness or injury, who will summon the community's spirit kin to exorcise the influence of the malevolent beings who inhabit virtually every aspect of nature and whose attacks cause human illness and death. Outside the band and its spirit kin, all else, human and nonhuman, is malevolence, danger, and death. In such a world, individual survival is impossible without the nurturance and support of the community [C.A. Robarchek, 1977, 1979a, 1986, 1989, 1994].

This interdependence is both symbolized and expressed in the exchange of food, which is supposed to be contingent only on need. No calculation of gain and loss is appropriate, no acknowledgment is expected (the language has no expression that glosses as "thank you"), and no direct repayment is expected. Direct repayment of a gift of food is, as we discovered to our chagrin, offensive, implying that the giver is keeping account and that the gift was not unconditionally given out of generosity.

All this receives succinct symbolic expression in the key concept of *pehunan*. If a person makes a request, especially for food, and that request is denied, the one whose needs are not met is placed in a state of extreme danger—*pehunan*—and is made vulnerable to attack by malevolent supernaturals or wild animals, snakebite, illness, injury, and death [cf. Dentan, 1968]. The cultural message here is abundantly clear: Denied the support and nurturance of the group, the individual is defenseless against the dangers of the world outside and cannot survive [C.A. Robarchek, 1977, 1979a, 1986].

When they are ill or in difficulty, Semai overtly seek help from, and expect to be assisted by, their neighbors and kin. The obligation for the community to provide that support, and the recognition that all are interdependent, is given additional cultural expression in *tinghaa'*, the belief that bad luck in subsistence endeavors—hunting, fishing, and gardening—will befall those whose neighbor dies as a result of their uncaring indifference [C.A. Robarchek, 1986].

Thus, when a death occurs, everyone in the band participates in the burial—clearing brush and trees, helping to dig the grave, cutting thatch for the grave hut, and so on. Even the smallest child will be helped to throw a handful of earth into the grave. This is the last opportunity for the community to demonstrate that it was not remiss in its obligations to nurture the deceased.

As the market economy has increasingly penetrated the Semai subsistence economy, however, an increasing variety of durable goods has become available and money has become increasingly important. Still, the ideal of an unselfishly sharing community is central to the Semai cosmos, and this image must be preserved, even in the face of glaring contradictions such as those involving the increasing importance of money and other goods that people are unwilling to simply give away. As monetary transactions—balanced exchanges with their explicit calculations—increase, they violate the principle of unconditional generosity and sharing, with all that it implies in Semai culture, and call into question the unconditional nurturance of the band.

For all these reasons, monetary transactions within the community are embarrassing and a little indecent, since the participants are not giving freely, but rather are calculating a return. In 1973, strictly monetary transactions were still not very common within the band we lived with, and when they did occur, they followed a peculiar form.

It would be highly insulting to appear at someone's house and launch immediately into a negotiation, so a typical transaction begins with casual conversation—gossip, hunting stories, anything but the real subject—to establish the priority of the participants' social relationship over anything else. When the transaction is finally broached, the buyer pushes some money toward the seller, who protests that it is too much and insists that the buyer take all or part of it back. The buyer refuses, pushing all or part of the money back again. This sort of "reverse bargaining" goes on for some time, the two pushing increasingly small amounts of money back and forth until both parties are satisfied that the portion of the original sum finally remaining with the seller is equitable, and that a fair price has been paid.

The transaction is completed to the satisfaction of both parties without either one having to openly calculate his gain. Instead, both have been able to demonstrate their generosity, to praise the generosity of the other, and to maintain the fiction that the ideal of freely giving generalized reciprocity has been maintained. That ideal, with all that it entails in the Semai psychocultural economy, must be maintained even as it is being violated.

RECIPROCITY AND WAORANI REALITY

James Yost [1981], a missionary and the only other anthropologist to have worked among the Waorani at the time of our first study, described their economic system also as one of generalized reciprocity. Given all of the other similarities between the two societies, we thus expected to find—and to be able to participate in—a pattern of exchange similar to what we were familiar with among the Semai.

The day after we arrived in the settlement that was to be our home base, we visited every household. At each house we left some canned fish, sugar, a bar of soap, and so on. Although we could speak only a few words of Waorani, we knew that, in a system of generalized reciprocity, gifts of food would be understood. We then returned home to await the return gifts of food.

They were not forthcoming. Our gifts of food to nonkin were incomprehensible, leaving our neighbors completely baffled [C.J. Robarchek, 1988]. One woman, we were later told, remarked that "those foreigners must be coming back; they left some of their food here."

Ultimately, we were able to enter into exchange relationships with our co-villagers, but only in a way that would have been absolutely unthinkable among the Semai: We resorted to the direct exchange of goods, specially shotgun shells, for food [Robarchek and Robarchek, 1998].

Generalized reciprocity does exist, we soon found, but the scope is much narrower than it was among the Semai. It encompasses only the bilaterally extended family, usually a group of siblings, their married and unmarried children and, perhaps, a grandparent—essentially those who, in the precontact period, would have constituted a household (and a settlement). These people can expect to eat in each others' houses, and sharing of meat and other food is common among them.

With contact and missionization, larger settlements that include distantly related or unrelated families developed around the clearings created as landing strips for the single-engine planes of the Missionary Aviation Fellowships.⁵

There are now a number of these "aggregated" communities on the reserve, but, within them, there is still little sharing or cooperation beyond the individual extended families. On two occasions, for example, when large numbers of peccaries (more than 10) were killed by kindreds in settlements where we lived, no meat was given to other families in the settlement.

Unlike the case with the Semai, on occasions when a large amount of meat or fish is acquired it is preserved by smoking and stored for later use or, occasionally, carried to the outside and sold. When exchanges do occur among nonkin, they are usually explicitly balanced. A widow who was running out of manioc in her own garden made arrangements to help weed another woman's fields in exchange for manioc—a straightforward exchange of labor for food.

Money, earned from the sale of captured animals or other forest products or by working on the oil exploration crews is increasingly important, and we found monetary transactions to be quite common within the community, even among close kin.

Implicit in the Waorani pattern of exchange is a conception of human beings as highly

⁵This organization, known locally as 'Alas de Socorro' (Wings of Mercy), flies to and from these jungle clearings, carrying small amounts of cargo and transporting sick and injured Indians to the missionary hospital located in the Andean foothills.

autonomous and individualistic. Waorani assume that everyone is capable of (and responsible for) providing for himself through hard work, and people who do not work hard are openly disparaged. Where Semai rely on others for assistance in times of trouble, Waorani, both men and women, are expected to be self-reliant and independent, and they see themselves as such. Outside the kindred, there is no obligation to give aid and assistance, and there is no expectation of receiving it.

Even within the kindred, one cannot automatically expect assistance, even in life-threatening situations. Women give birth alone and unattended, snakebite victims may be left in the forest to fend for themselves, and, in the event of a spearing raid, all flee for their lives, men often abandoning their wives and women their children. The elderly, when they become a burden, are sometimes neglected or even speared to death by their own kin [cf. Davis and Yost, 1983; Robarchek and Robarchek, 1992, 1998].

Almost paradoxically, this world is not seen by Waorani themselves to be inherently dangerous or malevolent; their world, as it is culturally constituted, holds few dangers beyond the human threats of witchcraft or a spearing raid. There are few hostile forces to be avoided by taboos or appeased by ritual; the dangerous supernaturals that do exist are sorcerers' familiars—extensions of human malevolence.

Even what would seem to be "objective" dangers are matters of relative unconcern; childbirth is not considered especially hazardous; people are wary, but not terrified, of jaguars. Even though poisonous snakes abound (the Waorani may also have the world's highest death rate from snakebite, on the order of 4% [Larrick et al., 1979]), and scarcely a day goes by without at least one close encounter, no particular precautions are taken. People run through the forest, even at dawn and dusk, knowing that they will sooner or later be bitten, but confident that they will survive.

The forest, in short, holds no terrors; people go off alone for days to hunt and fish, or just to wander. There is also little emphasis on magical techniques; there is little need for it since Waorani see their knowledge as adequate to their tasks. They are, in general, thoroughly self-confident, self-reliant, and pragmatic, a people living in a world that they feel fully equipped to control.

A few examples of this self-reliance and independence may serve to illustrate the point. In one case, an extended family was returning from a secondary residence in another valley where they had been living for some time. There were perhaps a dozen men, women, and children, including one young woman who was expecting her first child. Deep in the forest, a half-day walk from either hamlet, she went into labor. Her mother, her aunts, and her sisters continued on their way, leaving her to give birth on the trail and make her way home alone. Only her young husband remained with her. This was not seen as exceptional; women typically give birth alone, and neither she nor anyone else expected anything different.

On another occasion, a group of people went on a fishing expedition to an adjacent river valley. On the way, one of their number, a woman, was bitten by a venomous snake. The rest of the group went on and spent a day and a night completing their fishing before helping the victim back to the settlement. By that time her breathing was failing, and only an airlift to the missionary hospital saved her life.

Individual autonomy is also the norm, and even within the extended family individuals have but limited influence over one another's actions. This is well illustrated by a case, not atypical, described to us by an eyewitness, in which three young men—brothers and classificatory brothers—killed their paternal grandmother, bursting into her

house and spearing the old woman in her hammock. Their father, when he discovered the murder of his mother, was furious, but did nothing. "What could he do?" our informant observed. "They are his sons."

WORLD VIEW, SOCIAL RELATIONS, AND VIOLENCE

Implicit in all social relations, including those involving material transactions, are conceptions of reality, images of human beings, of the relations among them, and of the world they inhabit. Both these societies' conceptions of the nature of individuals and their relationships to one another and to the world around them are clearly reflected in the content of such social relations, especially as these relate to violence.

Among the Semai, we saw in these images a world of incalculable malevolence poised for an opportunity to attack and kill. This world is beyond human control, and misfortune, therefore, is not typically seen to be the result of deliberate human action. Rather, illness, injury, and death are the products of malevolent beings and forces that lie outside the human realm and that naturally prey on human beings. When these forces strike, the community draws together to defend itself, holding three-night community seances to summon the band's "spirit" kin for assistance in fending off the danger.

In the Semai view of the world, conflict is constantly equated with violence, and even minor conflicts are perceived as having the potential to destroy social harmony and to generate uncontrolled bloodshed. In a world so constituted, any conflict menaces the solidarity of the band, threatening to leave individuals defenseless against the forces that surround them. Violence, therefore, has no place in human relations, and nonviolence is a paramount Semai virtue. Not surprisingly, Semai have also developed an elaborate process for resolving disputes and restoring amicable social relations [C.A. Robarchek, 1979b, 1989].

Among the Waorani, too, we found that economic exchange entailed a particular image of reality, one that is manifested in social relations generally. But this is a very different reality; Waorani inhabit a world that is essentially benign and where people are capable, self-reliant, and independent entities who are in control of their lives and who have few obligations toward or expectations of others.

Here, however, and in contrast to the Semai, there are no cultural or psychological bases for group consciousness. With the exception of witchcraft, there is little concern with the "supernatural." With no tutelary spirits, few animistic beliefs, and little magic, there are no communal religious rituals or responsibilities to link people together. Lacking a strong gender dichotomy, there are none of the men's clubs or men's houses so prominent in other Amazonian societies to bind individuals into interdependent groups; all those outside the immediate extended family are actual or potential enemies.

Every kindred, and in the final analysis every individual, is an independent entity. Moreover, the world, including misfortune, is subject to human manipulation. There are no "accidents" and no "bad luck" here, and there are few, if any, "natural" deaths. A death from accident, disease, or snakebite has its roots in *human* malevolence exercised through the practice of sorcery, and the grief felt by surviving kin is inevitably laced with homicidal rage.

The husband of a woman who had recently died, possibly from the sting of a scorpion, we were told, was enraged and "he carried his spears with him as he gathered the

wood to make her coffin." Within days, his rage and that of his kin was expressed in the spearing of an entire family.

In such a cultural, social, and psychological context, with no valuation of nonaggressiveness, no social bases for the creation of mutual interest groups or for the suppression of self-interests, few obligations among individuals, few integrating social mechanisms, little expectation of or interest in group cohesiveness, no mechanisms for peacefully resolving disputes, and a belief system that sees sorcery behind every misfortune, the conflicts that are inevitable in any society—and the anger and hostility that they can engender—were given free rein. The expression of that rage was unconstrained, and any dispute was likely to escalate into a spearing raid that, in turn, called for endless retaliation.

CONCLUSION

We began our investigation of these two societies with a typological construct: generalized reciprocity. But as we examined and experienced the reality of exchange among Semai and Waorani—the ideals and the contradictions of them, and the resolutions and obfuscations of these contradictions—we began to see exchange not as a manifestation of an ideal type of economic transaction, but as social relations enacted in material terms and within a particular construction of reality.

Exchanges, like all social relations, are premised on conceptions of human beings, of the relationships among them, and of the world around them. These conceptions, however, are not mere reflections of an "objective" empirical world of rain forests and animals, of subsistence practices and technology, even of kinship and social organization. Rather, they are cultural constructions, both creations of and creating the societies that must make their lives within them. Understanding the world views embodied in Semai and Waorani economic exchange (and in other areas of life as well, of course) contributes directly to an understanding of the character of sociality generally in these two societies, including their diametrically opposed attitudes toward violence in human relations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Field research among the Waorani was made possible by research grants from the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation and the United States Institute of Peace (USIP-117 -925). The comparative analysis of the Semai and Waorani data was conducted under research grants from the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation. We gratefully acknowledge the support of these two institutions, without which this research would not have been possible.

REFERENCES

- Davis EW, Yost J (1983): The ethnomedicine of the Waorani of Amazonian Ecuador. *Journal of Ethnopsychiatry* 9:273-297.
- Dentan RK (1968): "The Semai: A Nonviolent People of Malaya." New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Dentan RK (1978): Notes on childhood in a nonviolent context: The Semai case. In Montagu A (ed): "Learning Non-Aggression." Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 94-143.
- Dentan RK (1988): On reconsidering violence in simple societies. *Current Anthropology* 29:625-629.
- Dentan RK (1992): The rise, maintenance and destruction of peaceful polity: A preliminary essay in political ecology. In Silverberg J, Gray JP

- (eds): "Aggression and Peacefulness in Humans and Other Primates." New York: Oxford University Press, pp 214-270.
- Knauff B (1987): Reconsidering violence in simple societies. *Current Anthropology* 28:457-499.
- Larrick JW, Yost J, Kaplan J, et al. (1979): Patterns of health and disease among the Waorani Indians of eastern Ecuador. *Medical Anthropology* 3:147-189.
- Otterbein K (1980): Internal war: A cross-cultural study. In Falk R, Kim S (eds): "The War System: An Interdisciplinary Approach." Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp 204-223.
- Robarchek CA (1977): Frustration, aggression and the nonviolent Semai. *American Ethnologist* 4:762-770.
- Robarchek CA (1979a): Learning to fear: A case study in emotional conditioning. *American Ethnologist* 6:555-567.
- Robarchek CA (1979b): Conflict, emotion and abreaction: Resolution of conflict among the Semai Senoi. *Ethos* 7:104-123.
- Robarchek CA (1986): Helplessness, fearfulness and Semai nonviolence. *Anthropological Quarterly* 59:177-183.
- Robarchek CA (1989): Primitive warfare and the ratomorphic image of mankind. *American Anthropologist* 91:903-920.
- Robarchek CA (1994): Ghosts and witches: The psychocultural dynamics of Semai peacefulness. In Sponsel LE, Gregor T (eds): "The Anthropology of Peace and Nonviolence." Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, pp 183-196.
- Robarchek CA, Dentan RK (1987): Blood drunkenness and the bloodthirsty Semai: Unmaking another anthropological myth. *American Anthropologist* 89:356-365.
- Robarchek CA, Robarchek CJ (1990): "Semai Ethnopolitics: Images of the Self and the State." New Orleans, Louisiana: Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, November 26-December 2.
- Robarchek CA, Robarchek CJ (1992): Cultures of war and peace: A comparative study of Waorani and Semai. In Silverberg J, Gray JP (eds): "Aggression and Peacefulness in Humans and Other Primates." New York: Oxford University Press, pp 189-213.
- Robarchek CA, Robarchek CJ (1996): The Aucas, the cannibals and the missionaries: From warfare to peacefulness among the Waorani. In Gregor T (ed): "A Natural History of Peace." Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, pp 189-212.
- Robarchek CA, Robarchek CJ (in press): "Waorani: The Contexts of Violence and War." Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- Robarchek CJ (March 1988): How do we get some meat? (II). Paper delivered before the Annual Meetings of the Central States Anthropological Society Annual Meetings, St. Louis, MO.
- Sahlins M (1965): On the sociology of primitive exchange. In Banton M (ed): "The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology." London: Tavistock.
- Yost JA (1981): Twenty years of contact: The mechanisms of change in Wao (Auca) culture. In Whitten N (ed): "Cultural Transformations and Ethnicity in Modern Ecuador." Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.