UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Massacre on the Gila: An Account of the Last Major Battle Between American Indians, With Reflections on the Origin of War. By Clifton 8. Kroeber and Bernard L. Fontana.

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1627z6vj

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 11(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Greenfeld, Philip J.

Publication Date

1987

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

countered and corrected by richly detailed fact, thick description, and penetrating interpretations. It is a must read, for anyone interested in particular, and for the few specialists concerned with the growth of anthropological ideas.

James A. Clifton
University of Wisconsin—Green Bay

Massacre on the Gila: An Account of the Last Major Battle Between American Indians, With Reflections on the Origin of War. By Clifton B. Kroeber and Bernard L. Fontana. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1986. 232 pp. $26.50 Cloth.

If one were to judge this book by its main title it would appear to be an ethnohistorical study of a particular battle between Indian tribes, perhaps of interest only to the Southwestern specialist. It is, however, the last line of the sub-title, "with Reflections on the Origin of War," that somewhat inconspicuously announces the much loftier intentions of the authors. As for the main title, the authors in fact seem almost apologetic for what they call, "an exercise in historical and anthropological sleuthing" and imply that such provincial focus is no more than "parochial antiquarianism (p. 148)."

Although as an anthropologist who has some pretentions at being a scientist I have no quarrel with any researcher who is interested in ultimate explanations, as a Southwestern specialist I am not totally convinced that everything we do must immediately be related to "larger" theoretical issues. Therefore both concerns in the study are of considerable significance.

In fact as the title implies, most of this work focuses on Southwest Indian warfare, and especially a single battle between Yumans from the lower Colorado area (primarily Mohaves and Quechans) and the amalgam of Yuman speaking tribes that have come to be known as the Maricopa along with their Pima allies who lived on the Gila.

The battle is distinctive for a number of reasons. These include its being the last all Indian engagement in the Southwest that we know anything about, along with the fact that we have both native (representing both sides in the conflict) and non-native observations and accounts of the battle. Some of these accounts

were recorded immediately following the battle, others were collected long afterward, but these complementary accounts provide a fairly detailed picture of the battle.

To provide background for this fight the authors bring together all the ethnographic information available on both Yuman and Piman warfare technology, ritual, social organization, and methods. This synthesis alone makes the book of interest to both the regional specialist and comparative generalist.

In this same synthetic vein the authors also summarize all sources which have discussed warfare in the Southwest (especially Yuman warfare) in terms of explanation, and criticize what they feel are the strengths and weakness of each view.

While the accounts of the battle vary in detail they are generally consistent as to what happened. The variation in details seems to reflect temporal and cultural factors. The white men's accounts, for example, are not overly precise as to what tribes participated, while the Indians vary depending upon whether they were recorded (remembered) soon after the fighting by first hand observers, or later second or even third hand.

The study fits well within a growing tradition of works which focus on war within the Southwestern context. We have for instance Hill's 1936 *Navaho Warfare* or Basso and Goodwin's 1971 *Western Apache Raiding and Warfare.* Yuman and Piman conceptions about warfare and various aspects of social organization with respect to warfare seem to parallel that of their Apachean neighbors. Distinctions were made, for example, between raiding and warfare, and between band or tribal leaders and warfare leaders. War and killing were in each case linked to ritual and the need for ceremonial cleansing. Their ethnohistoric and ethnographic accounts and synthesis are detailed and excellent.

The authors do not find various specific explanations which have been offered for Yuman warfare especially convincing. Ecological explanations focusing on the need for more land for farming, for example, apparently ignore the diverse food sources available and utilized by these tribes. Acculturation theories which assume that Spanish or Mexican inspired slaving contributed to increased warfare suffer from a lack of evidence that warfare actually increased through the centuries because we have no records which tell us about warfare prior to the 19th century.

Kroeber and Fontana do not offer any unique interpretation of why these tribes made war on each other. They ultimately fall

back on a specific cultural explanation originally summed up by A.L. Kroeber, the essence of which is that because they were demographically large, supported by agriculture, and war was defined as prestigious and "good" they participated. Culture then becomes the immediate explanatory device, and like other "too powerful" explanations to a certain extent comes out sounding trival.

The last chapter of the book presents a thesis which is an attempt to answer the ultimate question, "Why do human societies wage war?"

As with their synthesis of ethnographic materials relating to Yuman/Piman warfare the authors also provide us with an excellent survey of various explanations put forth by anthropologists as possible explanations for war. After noting that there is a confusing array of such materials the authors then attempt their own explanation.

It is both current and somewhat unique in that it hinges on evolutionary changes in cultures and their relationships to gender roles. Simply, war is "quintessentially" a male occupation, and the reason it is a male occupation is linked to cultural evolution which in the transition from hunting and gathering to agriculture left males without a well defined role. Prior to the neolithic revolution men had been the hunter/killers. The ones who provided the group with food. They were important. Agriculture was an activity which women could do as easily and conveniently as men, threatening male self worth, ego, and position. One way men choose to resolve the problem was for them to become the warrior/killers. This transition may have been stimulated by the fact that the neolithic was uneven in different societies. Hunter/gatherer groups may have raided neighbors who were agricultural, initiating a cycle of raid and revenge which ultimately culminated in defining a place for males and continuing war. They feel that most of the other anthropological explanations for war are immediate rather than ultimate causes, and often involve post hoc rationalizations.

Applying this theory in a deductive explanatory sense to Yuman warfare in the Southwest, they feel that it can be specifically explained by the fact that the Yumans lived in one of the best agricultural areas, which resulted in an imbalance of valued status positions in the society. Warfare provided high status for those males who participated in it, offsetting their otherwise insignificent contribution to the culture.

Pimans on the other hand had worked out a better balance in gender roles, males hunting more, being shamans, being more involved in agriculture and the like (they were irrigation not flood farmers). Warriors were not given as much prestige as in Yuman culture. Nevertheless, they were sucked into the cycle primarily in terms of defense against their neighbors.

The authors cite a variety of "cross-cultural survey" type studies and mythology to support their claim of the link between agriculture, war, and male roles.

As intriguing as the thesis is, there seem to be a number of counter examples. One comes directly from the Southwest. The Mescalero Apaches, unlike their Navajo and Western Apache neighbors engaged in no agriculture yet had an extensive warfare complex. Perhaps even more damaging are the Alaskan Eskimo data. Eskimos (a totally hunting/fishing society) in Alaska regularly engaged in warfare before Europeans stopped it in the 19th century. When they did so their primary tactical objective was "to annihilate the enemy (Ernest S. Burch, Jr., *Anthropological Papers of the University of Alaska* No. 16, 1974: 8). This is not to say that the thesis is totally untenable, but its application to a variety of other cases about which we have ample data seems to be problematic. It is certainly something scholars will debate for some time to come.

Philip J. Greenfeld
San Diego State University

Science Encounters the Indian, 1820–1880: The Early Years of American Ethnology. By Robert E. Bieder. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986. xii + 290 pp. $19.95 Cloth.

This volume is a valuable contribution to the growing literature on the history of anthropology. It was written to reconstruct the intellectual context for anthropological theory in America during the nineteenth century, and it succeeds admirably in explicating the major themes that shaped the development of the field. At the opening of the century, European philosophers held a variety of positions in relation to the American Indians. Some explained them as products of the American environment, primitive and inferior like the New World itself. Others embraced the idea of the Great Chain of Being, from primitive to complex,