

71

This paper analyses how order is maintained in hunter-gatherer societies through analysing Yanomamo violence, San mockery, Mbuti views of the environment and Nuer's cattle use. The paper thus shows very varied interpretations of how order can be maintained in different societies. It also shows some great originality of thought in using Marx in the same paragraph with the environment. I think this is the direction future research is heading to or is already doing so, so well done for going beyond human exceptionalism. Excellent work.

The overall structure of the paper could have been enhanced for readability. For example Gray's theory could have been discussed concerning the societies where his theory is applicable (San, Mbuti) right from the start. Although the use of Marx was brave, it appeared slightly haphazardly. It could have been discussed for example in relation to Woodburn's immediate and delayed return: as societies become more complex, hierarchies develop with the societies becoming sedentary and individuals acquiring more possessions.

Overall the paper shows a broad understanding of how social order is maintained in different societies. Well done.

Jasmine Williams, 14th November 2019 - Explain Four different examples of how social groups maintain order:

Methods of order maintenance can vary from each social group, their environment, cosmology, age and gender are all attributing factors that can differentiate how they may maintain order within their communities. Many differentiations of societies have been depicted within indigenous groups such as the Mbuti and Yanomamo, including egalitarian and reverse dominance hierarchy; "hunter-gatherer societies are, of course, not all carbon copies of one another" (Gray, 2009). Woodburn coins egalitarianism as "greater equality of wealth, of power, of prestige" (Woodburn, 1982. P.2). Gray describes the elements of order maintenance as similar to that of child's play, all players have to be satisfied in order for the game to continue, otherwise the individual players will leave and the game will be over; "the great challenge is to keep all of the players happy without allowing anyone to violate

Commented [J1]: Do you mean differences?

Commented [J2]: No need to cite author here as he comes up in the sentence

the rules” (Gray, 2009). Without a set of rules, it becomes harder to maintain order within individual societies; some mechanisms of order are reliant on fear whereas others as based solely upon the equality of the individual.

Groups with segregated gender values such as the Yanomamo for example, use violence against women as a means of control and order; food is expected to be waiting for the male hunters – if women have failed this preparation the men have jurisdiction to beat their wives. (Changon, 1968) This suggests Violence is often used as a means of order maintenance within the Yanomamo; there is a gender hierarchy where men are positioned above women; therefore are within a position where violence against women is an accepted social practice, women's submission is a means of social control. Furthermore, however men within the Yanomamo are recognised to shave their heads so they are able to present their scars from previous fights as a show of dominance over the other males within the group; the more scars on the show and collected the greater social stance is possessed; (Changon, 1968). This suggests violence as a means of order and social maintenance is not only attributed to women but men as well.

Egalitarianism is an evolutionary perspective deciphered as a means of social order where the proletariat rise against the Bourgeois (Marx, 1848). The weak combine to dominate the strong therefore avoiding the dominance of an individual over a group, (Boehm, 1993); for example within the Mbuti a method of mockery is used against offenders who attempt to dominate within the group through means such as possession and skill. The San do not care about an individuals possessions, everyone is equal – there is no ownership everything is shared and provided by the forest, anyone who attempts to appear above the others is mocked into submission (Turnbull,1961). This suggests mockery is used as a means of control within some indigenous groups, the Egaletarian means of control and order can be adopted in order to retain individuality and equality within the group. However, the Mbuti also used their environment as a means of order maintenance. “Bodies cannot exist without engagement with materials” (Ingold, 2000. p5); the Mbuti believe the forest is the provider “supplies them with their needs” (Turnbull, 1961. P14). As a result the forest is also feared, if the forest revokes its gifts the group would be subject to issues such as starvation; the environment is thus a method of control the ‘spirits’ of the forest are feared therefore the Mbuti maintain order to please the forest, their livelihood is in equilibrium with the forest

Commented [J3]: This is great analysis of Gray’s argument, but to which group are you referring to in particular? Maybe here you could already say you will be discussing this in relation to San (and Mbuti – mockery)

Commented [J4]: Delete one of them. I would say however is extra

Commented [J5]: I see what you mean, but the choice of words here is a bit unclear.

Commented [J6]: Great! You’re using Marx! We love Marx. But I’m left slightly wondering what you mean with this sentence. Are the proletarians in this sentence an example of an egalitarian society? Didn’t Marx examine egalitarian societies and argue that societies evolve dialectically, so proletarians are a stage that comes somewhere after egalitarian societies? To that note, the evolutionary thesis of Marx has been criticized. It has a potential to legitimize a dogmatic view of the world.

Commented [J7]: Capital letter

Commented [J8]: This is great!

they provide for the forest and the forest provides for them; as a result the Mbuti self maintain order in respect to

the forest, anyone who differentiates is mocked or shunned (fear of being left alone to the elements being their most feared punishment). This suggests the methods of order maintenance within the Mbuti also fall into an environmental category, they use the environment as a basis of undoubtable dominance over the group.

Commented [J9]: Excellent observation!

The hunting hypothesis states that man's evolution from ape developed so drastically due to our livelihood 'man is man and not a chimpanzee, because of evolving we killed for a living' (Ardrey, 1977. P.15). Our methods of hunting with tools suggest cognitive advancement away from the primates we once were; there is assumed aggression and greed to hunting (materialistic culture) however many groups including the San do not kill more than they need there is a respected equality within their community nobody takes more from the environment than needed. Evening mechanisms are used; there is a kinship involving food shares within the San, those with more give to those with less in order to create an equilibrium between the groups individual families, (Marshall Thomas, 1959). This maintains order as no member is seen below another depending on their ability to hunt/provide – everyone is equal as shared consensus. Nobody has the ability to grow from outside the group; all members have the same social status and hold no possessions to be held over other members; this suggests kinship can be used as a means of order maintenance if all players (Gray, 1982) are equal then nobody grows tired of the game and deters from the rules – order is maintained.

Commented [J10]: Full stop.

Commented [J11]: Levelling

Commented [J12]: Creating fictional kin/ extending kinship ties to the whole group

Commented [J13]: Full stop

Commented [J14]: good

Unlike the San other group such as the Nuer show to deter from leveling mechanisms such as kinship; within the Nuer cattle are a possession of pride the more cattle an individual male owns the higher social status they retain; this does not extend to women as they are unable to own cattle within the Nuer community, they are to care for the cattle as milkmaids but never possess their means of labour (Evans-Pritchard, 1940). Similar to Marx's theory of alienation, the workforce (milkmaids) are alienated from their livelihoods, dominated by the male cattle owners; (Marx, 1848). This suggests the Nuer use possession as a means of social control and order maintenance, the men who possess the most cattle to dominate not only the women who work the cattle but the men within their community

Commented [J15]: I am not sure kinship is the correct word here, maybe you mean 'creating kinship'. What was described above was essentially a means to create kinship through sharing with people outside of your kin. That way, the whole group becomes your kin, and there is an obligation to share with everyone.

Commented [J16]: interesting

which do not possess a heard of the same value. Rather than retaining an order of equality this group maintains an order of male dominance.

Commented [J17]: explain how

Commented [J18]: very good

Overall the maintenance of order within different social and indigenous groups can deter from the Euro-American social consensus based upon varied factors such as their shared social values based upon gender, cosmology of the environment and value attributed to possession. Each individual group is different despite their affiliation to the egalitarian and other methods of control; their methods may differ such as violence and mockery. However all social groups including indigenous societies use levelling mechanisms and methods of control over the meanings attributed to an individual to maintain order within each groups society.

Commented [J19]: Why are you referring to Euro-Americans here? What is Euro-American? How is it different from Australian, middle-class South-African or Latin American? In other words, I think the word Euro-American is slightly confusing and very generalizing. Please use references when using it, or avoid using the term at all. Western might indeed be a better option, although it is highly criticized too, but it appears in literature more. By using the term Euro-American, you are neglecting the rest of the world who are very similar in terms of social structure, economics and religion to the Europeans and Americans.

Reference List:

- Ardrey, R. (1977) *'Hunting Hypothesis: A Personal Conclusion Concerning the Evolutionary Nature of Man'*, Glasgow: HarperCollins Distribution Services.
- Bohem, C. (1993) *'Egalitarian Behaviour and Reverse Dominance Hierarchy'*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Chagon, N. (1968) *'Yanomamo: The Fierce People'*, Boston: Thomson Learning.
- Evans-Pritchard, E. (1940) *'The Nuer'*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gray, P. (2009) *'Play as a foundation for hunter-gatherer social existence'*, Illinois: The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois.
- Ingold, T. (2000) *'The Perception of the Environment, Essays on livelihood, dwelling and skill'*. London: Routledge.
- Marshall-Thomas, E. (1959) *'The Harmless People'*. New york: Vintage Books.
- Marx, K. (1848) *'The Communist Manifesto'*, London: Communist League.
- Turnbull, C. (1961) *'the forest people'*. New york: Simon & Schuster.
- Woodburn, J. (1982) *'Egalitarian Societies'*. United Kingdom: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.