

# W

---

**war, warfare** is deadly VIOLENCE between groups. Some investigators specify that war occurs between distinct political or territorial units, and that killing has social legitimacy, although any such definition encounters exceptional cases. War is often contrasted with FEUD, in which socially sanctioned killing occurs within such units, and HOMICIDE, where killing is usually defined as socially illegitimate. Some theorists separate war from raiding, and others restrict "true war" to state-level societies, particularly in models of evolutionary sequences.

War developed rather late in human history. The first evidence of multiple killings is from semisedentary peoples of the Nile Valley from about 14,000 years ago (Wendorf et al. 1986), and around the world, war generally appears long after the shift to settled villages (Haas & Creamer 1993). The walls of Jericho are often taken as the earliest evidence of war, but these may have been for flood control not war (Bar-Yosef 1986). Besides Jericho probable indications of war occur in the seventh millennium B.C.E. Near East, and seem conclusive in the sixth millennium B.C.E. (Roper 1975). In the ethnohistorical and ethnographic record, war is common, although many societies have little or none of it (Knauff 1991).

Since the late nineteenth century, the longest sustained anthropological scrutiny of war has focused on the relationship between war and political evolution, particularly on how war changed with, and promoted greater, centralization and complexity. Although there is considerable argument over details, dissenting voices (C. Ember 1978), and a wide range of empirical variation acknowledged by all, the general conclusion of repeated investigation is

that waging war becomes more sophisticated and efficient with political evolution, and that war plays *some* role, primary or secondary, in moving that process along (Otterbein 1970).

A flurry of investigations on the subject of war attracted anthropological attention in the period of World War II. Malinowski (1941) and others attempted to synthesize existing knowledge. Turney-High's *Primitive war* (1949) remains unsurpassed on the actual practice of fighting. Several studies reexamined North American Indian warfare as a strategic response to changing circumstances with an expanding Euro-American presence (G. Hunt 1940) – a line of investigation that is receiving renewed attention today (R. Ferguson & Whitehead 1992a).

After diminished interest in the 1950s (Newcomb 1960), studies of war increased in the 1960s, stimulated by the American war in Vietnam and the wide publicity given to instinct explanations of war (Fried et al. 1968). The latter had a long history in psychology (Freud 1964), and the arguments were made anew by theorists in ethology such as Konrad Lorenz (1966), who argued that war was an outgrowth of an innate aggressive drive. This entered popular culture through a best-selling book by screenwriter Robert Ardrey (1966), who portrayed humans as descendants of "killer apes" with violent territorial instincts. Such simple instinct theories were criticized from many angles – such as the apparent absence of war during most of human evolution. They have few (if any) serious advocates today, in part because they were replaced in late 1970s by SOCIOBIOLOGICAL approaches, which posited that going to war might be a strategy to increase reproductive success, with special reference to

the well-known case of the Yanomami (Chagnon 1992). This work continues today, embroiled in controversy over evidence, theory, and even politics.

The role of warfare as an adaptation of people to the natural environment has had a much greater impact in anthropology, particularly ECOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY. These range in scope from war as a way of effectively distributing populations to resources (Vayda 1969a) to a global theory of war as regulating population growth and promoting a male supremacist complex (Divale & Harris 1976). More recent ecological studies (R. Ferguson 1984) see environmental resources and other characteristics as often involved in war but without the FUNCTIONALISM.

Research in POLITICAL ANTHROPOLOGY has examined the relationship between war and politics, from the structural absence of overarching conflict resolution mechanisms (Koch 1974), to the self-interested machinations of a BIGMAN (Sillitoe 1978), to the logic of imperial hegemony (Hassig 1988). These studies argue that political organization provides a necessary base for understanding how and why a people wage war.

CROSS-CULTURAL STUDIES employing statistical comparisons have been prominent in the anthropological understanding of war. Such studies have explored the relationship between war and social structure, where strong evidence links local warfare and "fraternal interest groups" of agnatically related males (Otterbein 1977). A weaker association exists for long-distance warfare and "cross-cutting ties" of uxoriality (Divale 1984). Other structural characteristics have been linked to aspects or types of war, such as the segmentary lineage as "an organization of predatory expansion" (Sahlins 1961) or exchange and intermarriage as the alternative to war (Lévi-Strauss 1943). Psychological variables and SOCIALIZATION practices and their relationship to war have also been examined, although this work has been less conclusive (M. Ember & Ember 1994).

Since the 1980s new and overlapping lines of investigation have developed. One focuses on PEACE, arguing that peace is more than just the absence of war; it is a

positive state with its own supporting institutions, practices, and beliefs. Another seeks to delineate the local cultural logics that shape and give meaning to military action. A third frames war in historical perspective, often stressing long-term exogenous influences on warfare of people once thought to be "isolated" (for examples of each, see Haas 1990). The latter approach calls into question the Hobbesian condition often inferred from bloody reports of tribal warfare, recasting it not as a result of the absence of a STATE system but as a consequence of recent state intrusions.

Another noteworthy trend in recent anthropological works has been the increased attention to the problems of war in the contemporary world. Volumes have focused on a variety of such timely concerns as the culture of international security professionals (Foster & Rubinstein 1986), local variations in the Guatemalan civil war (Carmack 1988), cultures of domination, resistance, and terror (Nordstrom & Martin 1992), and the rise of "ethnic" and other violence in challenges to post-Cold War states.

**further reading** R. Ferguson 1988, 1995; Meggitt 1977; Otterbein 1994; Reyna & Downs 1994; Rodman & Cooper 1979; R. Rosaldo 1980; P. Turner & Pitt 1989; K. Warren 1993; N. Whitehead 1988

**water** See IRRIGATION

**Weber, Max (1864–1920)** Max Weber is probably the most prominent figure in the history of sociology. Three-quarters of a century after his death hardly a year goes by that a commentary on his work is not published in the English-speaking world as well as elsewhere. His native Germany was somewhat slow in recognizing his genius but is now treating him as a national monument. His collected works are being published in a scholarly edition of a scope that is usually only given to literary or philosophical giants, like Kant or Goethe.

Both of Weber's parents were long-established members of the upper class. Weber's father was a fairly typical bourgeois German politician who served in the

**22745468320004646**

**Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey**

**New Brunswick Libraries**

**Library Annex**

**ils\_annex@libraries.rutgers.edu**

**Digitization Request-** This material may be protected by Copyright Law (Title 14 U.S. Code)

A11L09/22

39030024980155

FERGUSON, BRIAN

The dictionary of anthropology / edited by Thomas Barfield.

War, Warfare / R. Brian Ferguson

*Blackwell, 1997*

Pages: ~~477-479~~  
*488-489*