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Like the subjects of its study, the field of hunter-gatherers has shown a remarkable capacity for survival. Making two thousand years on the Christian calender may have no necessary resonance with the calendrical systems of the Evenki, the Nayaka, the Arrente, or the Cree.

Nevertheless as hunter-gatherers (along with everybody else) are absorbed into "global" culture, it is appropriate that we take stock of foragers' present condition and future prospects, and at the same time assess the successes and failures of the scholarly field that has developed around them. It is remarkable that in spite of economic globalization, bureaucratic domination, and assaults on the cultural integrity of the world's "small peoples" something of value has persisted. Against all odds, these societies have maintained some portion of their life-worlds outside of the capitalist world system, showing that even in this hard-bitten age of globalization other ways of being are possible.

Simultaneously, indigenous peoples have emerged as actors on local, regional, and international, political stages. The challenge of the new millennium for hunter-gatherer scholars is therefore three-fold: to appreciate how hunter-gatherers operate in the world and yet apart from it;
to respect the sheer diversity of contemporary hunter-gatherer lifeways and adaptations, and finally to acknowledge that sound scholarship must be combined with ethical and political responsibility to the people whose lives we chronicle.

First of all I want to congratulate the CHAGS VIII organizing committee for their efforts in convening this historic conference. For many years Japanese scholarship has been in the forefront of international research in our field. The world community of hunter-gatherer scholars thank you for your efforts under difficult circumstances in bringing us all together. We are in your debt.

Hunter gatherers and the millennium? A curious title. I want to begin with a story told by a Canadian friend which sums up much of what we are try-
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ing to get across to the wider public. Recently an aboriginal guide was showing a group of tourists around Alberta's renowned Head-Smashed-In Buffalo-Jump, a UNESCO World Heritage Site staffed by First Nations personnel. The guide graphically described how in ancient times the buffalo would be herded to the edge of a 15 meter precipice and driven over to land in a heap at the base of the cliff. A diorama display showed men and women clambering over the bodies to club and spear those still living. When one tourist expressed shock at the bloody nature of the enterprise, the guide responded simply but with conviction "We were hunters!" connecting her own generation with those of the past. She then amended her statement with equal conviction, adding "Humans were hunters!" thus expanding complicity in the act of carnage to the whole of humanity, not excluding her audience.

This incident summarizes neatly the historical conjuncture that faces the world's hunting and gathering peoples as humanity approaches the Millennium. Hunter-gatherers represent the oldest and perhaps most successful human adaptation. Until 12,000 years ago virtually all humanity lived as hunters and gatherers. In recent centuries hunters have retreated precipitously in the face of the steamroller of modernity. Fascination, however, with hunting peoples and their ways of life remains strong, a fascination tinged with ambivalence. The reason for public and academic interest is not hard to find. Hunters and gatherers stand at the opposite pole from the dense urban life experienced by most of humanity; yet these same hunters may hold the key to some of the central questions about the human condition: about social life, politics, and gender, about diet and nutrition and living in nature.

Hunter-gatherers are a diverse group of peoples living in a wide range of conditions. Yet within the range of variation, certain common motifs can be identified: Hunter-gatherers are peoples who have lived until recently without the overarching discipline imposed by the State. They lived in relatively small groups, without centralized authority, standing armies or bureaucratic systems. Yet the evidence indicates that they lived together surprisingly well, solving their problems among themselves largely without recourse to authority figures and without a particular propensity for violence. It was not the situation that Thomas Hobbes described in a famous phrase as a life that was "nasty brutish and short." With relatively simple technology—wood, bone, stone, fibers—they were able to meet their material needs without a great expenditure of energy, leading Marshall Sahlins to call them, in another famous phrase, "the original affluent society." Most striking, the hunter-gatherers have demonstrated the remarkable ability to survive and thrive for long periods—in some cases thousands of years—without destroying their environment.

The contemporary industrial world lives in highly structured societies at immensely higher densities and enjoys luxuries of technology that foragers could hardly imagine. Yet all these same societies are sharply divided into haves and
have-nots, and after only a few millennia of stewardship by agricultural and industrial civilizations, the environments of large parts of the planet lie in ruins. Therefore the hunter-gatherers may well be able to teach us something, not only about past ways of life but as well about long-term human futures. As Burnum Burnum, the late Australian Aboriginal writer put it "Modern ecology can learn a great deal from a people who managed and maintained their world so well for 50,000 years."

Hunter-gatherers in recent history have been surprisingly persistent. As recently as AD 1500 hunters occupied fully one third of the globe, including all of Australia and most of North America as well as large tracts of South America, Africa, and northeast Asia. The twentieth century has seen particularly dramatic changes in their life circumstances. The century began with dozens of hunting and gathering peoples still pursuing ancient (though not isolated) lifeways in small communities, as foragers with systems of local meaning centered on kin, plants, animals, and the spirit world. As the century proceeded a wave of self-appointed civilizers washed over the world's foragers, bringing schools, clinics and administrative structures, and not incidentally taking their land and resources.

The year 2000 will have seen the vast majority of former foragers settled and encapsulated by one state or another. And given their tragic history of forced acculturation one would imagine that the millennium will bring to a close a long chapter in human history. But will it? We believe not. Hunter-gatherers live on, not only in the pages of anthropological and historical texts, but in the presence in over forty countries of hundreds of thousands of descendants, a generation or two removed from a foraging way of life, and these peoples and their supporters have created a strong international voice for indigenous peoples and their human rights.

The present conjuncture grows out of the intersection between three discourses: anthropological knowledge, public fascination, and indigenous peoples' own world views. It seemed appropriate to try to sum up these cross-cutting discourses with a volume devoted to the subject. This Richard Daly and I have tried to do in The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Hunters and Gatherers to be published in 1999. With over eighty-five authors, many of whom are here today, the Encyclopedia offers an up-to-date and encyclopedic inventory of hunters and gatherers, written for scholars and the general reader.

Like its subjects, hunter-gatherer studies have proved to be surprisingly persistent too. The discipline's continued viability has been due to many factors, not the least of which is its continuing willingness to adapt to change. One illustration of the way the field has moved with the times is changing definitions of hunting and gathering or foraging, as a mode of subsistence and as a way of life.

In the 1960s foraging used to refer to subsistence based on hunting of wild
animals, gathering of wild plant foods, and fishing, with no domestication of plants, and no domesticated animals except the dog. In contemporary theory this minimal definition is only the starting point in defining hunter-gatherers. Research over the last thirty years has brought a more nuanced understanding of the issue of who are the hunters and why have they persisted. While it is true that hunting and gathering represents the original condition of humankind and ninety percent of human history, we now know that the contemporary people called hunter-gatherers arrived at their present condition by a variety of pathways.

At one end of a continuum are the areas of the world where modern hunter-gatherers have persisted in a more or less direct tradition of descent from ancient hunter-gatherer populations. This would characterize the aboriginal peoples of Australia, northwestern North America, the southern cone of South America, and pockets in other world areas. The Australian Pintupi, Arrente, and Walpiri, the North American Eskimo, Shoshone, and Cree, the South American Yamana, and the African Ju/'hoansi are examples of this first grouping. In pre-colonial Australia and parts of North America we come closest to Marshall Sahlins' rubric of "hunters in a world of hunters." But even here the histories offer examples of complex interrelations between foragers and others.

Along the middle of the continuum are hunting and gathering peoples who have lived in degrees of contact and integration with non-hunting societies, and this includes a number whose own histories include life as farmers and/or herders in the past. South and South East Asian hunter-gatherers are linked to settled villagers and their markets, trading forest products: furs, honey, medicinal plants, and rattan, for rice, metals, and consumer goods. Some of these arrangements have persisted for millennia. Similar arrangements are seen in central Africa with pygmies, and in east Africa where the foraging Okiek traditionally supplied honey and other forest products to neighboring Maasai.

South American hunter-gatherers present an even more interesting case, since archaeological evidence indicates that in Amazonia farming replaced foraging several millennia ago. Much of the foraging in tropical South America may represent a secondary readaptation. Today almost all tropical South American foragers plant gardens as one part of their annual trek. There are parallels here with Siberia, where most of the "small peoples" classified as hunter-gatherers also herded reindeer, a practice which greatly expanded during the Soviet period. And the Ainu people of Japan, although hunter-gatherers in recent centuries, show a history of farming in their archaeological record.

Finally at the other end of the continuum are peoples who once were hunters but who changed their subsistence in the more distant past. And that includes the rest of us; the five point five billion strong remainder of humanity.
SOCIAL LIFE AND WORLDVIEW

In defining foragers we must recognize that contemporary foragers practise a mixed subsistence: including gardening, reindeer herding, trading. Given this diversity what constitutes the category "Hunter-Gatherer"? Contemporary theory answers that to subsistence as part of the definition must be added a consideration of sociopolitics and worldview. All three sets of criteria have to be taken into account in understanding hunting and gathering peoples today.

Most observers would agree that the basic unit of social organization of most (but not all) hunting and gathering peoples is the Band, a small-scale nomadic group of 15–50 people related by kinship. Although exceptions exist, most band societies share four characteristics:

1. First they are relatively egalitarian. Leaders can persuade but not command.
2. Second they are mobile. People tend to “vote with their feet.”
3. Third all band-organized peoples exhibit a pattern of concentration and dispersion. Band societies tend to spend part of the year dispersed into small foraging units and another part of the year aggregated into much larger units.
4. Fourth, almost all band societies (and hundreds of village-based societies as well) have a land tenure system based on a common property regime (CPR). These regimes were, until recently, far more common worldwide than regimes based on private property.

Another broad area of commonalities lies in the domains of the quality of interpersonal relations and forms of consciousness. Here, strengthened by decades of research documenting variation, and in spite of much research seeking to refute these generalizations, five strong commonalities stand out:

1. Sharing is the central rule of social interaction among hunters and gatherers. Generalized reciprocity, the giving of something without an immediate expectation of return is the dominant form within face-to-face groups. Its universality in hunting and gathering societies has led many observers, from Lewis Henry Morgan forward to attribute to hunter-gatherers a way of life based on “primitive communism.”
2. Also widespread is the notion pioneered by Nurit Bird-David of the giving environment, the idea that the land around them is their spiritual home and the source of all good things. This view is the direct antithesis of the Western Judeo-Christian perspective on the natural environment as a “wilderness,” a hostile space to be subdued and brought to heel by the force of will. This latter view is seen by many ecological humanists as the source of both the environmental crisis and the spiritual malaise afflicting contemporary humanity.
3. Hunter-gatherers are peoples who live with nature. On a deeper level this is the source of one striking cosmological commonality: the view of nature as animated with moral and mystical force, in Robert Bellah's phrase "the hovering closeness of the world of myth to the actual world." The multilayered world of hunter-gatherers is composed of several planes of existence: an afterworld above or below the everyday plane and, preceding the present, an Early mythical or "dreamtime." In the latter, nature and culture are not yet fully separated. Out of this Ur-existence crystallizes the distinction between humans and animals, the origin of fire, cooking, incest taboos, even mortality itself and virtually everything else of cultural significance.

The world of the Past and the above-and-below world of myth are in intimate contact with the normal plane of existence. The Australian aborigines with their songlines of the "Dreamtime" present the most fully realized instance of this process of world-enchantment. But parallels are found in many other hunter-gatherer groups.

4. A fourth common feature is the presence of the Trickster as a central figure in the myth worlds of many hunting and gathering societies. A divine figure, but deeply flawed and very human, the trickster is found in myth cycles from the Americas, Africa, Australia and Siberia. The trickster symbolizes the frailty and human qualities of the gods and their closeness to humans. These stand in pointed contrast to the omnipotent all-knowing but distant deities that are central to the Pantheons of state religions and their powerful religious hierarchies.

5. Shamanism is another practice common to hunters and gatherers. Community-based ritual specialists (usually part-time) heal the sick and provide spiritual protection. Shamanism is performative, mixing theatre, and instrumental acts in order to approach the plane of the sacred. The brilliant use of language and metaphor in the form of powerful and moving verbal images is a central part of the shaman's craft. So powerful are these techniques that they have been widely and successfully adapted to the visualization therapies in the treatment of cancer and other conditions in Western medicine.

Ethos and social organization are both essential components of hunter-gatherer lifeways. Laura Rival makes the point that two South American tropical forest peoples might well have a rather similar subsistence mix, but one would have a clearly agricultural orientation while the other a foraging one, based on a study of their social organization and mobility patterns, as well as their mythology, rituals and interpersonal relations.

What is remarkable that despite marked differences in historical circumstances, foragers seem to arrive at similar organizational and ideational solutions to the problems of living in groups, a convergence that Tim Ingold has labelled "a distinct mode of sociality."
DIVERGENCES

Despite these commonalities, there are a number of significant divergences among hunters and gatherers. And consideration of these must temper any attempt to present an idealized picture of foraging peoples. First as a group, foragers, though not inherently war-like, neither are they particularly peaceful. Interpersonal violence and warfare are recorded for a number of hunting and gathering peoples. Although peaceful peoples such as the Malaysian Semang are celebrated in the literature, for many others raids and blood-feuds were common, particularly before the pacification campaigns of the colonial authorities.

Gender is another dimension along which hunting and gathering societies show considerable variation. Women of hunter-gatherer societies do have higher status than women in most of the world’s societies, including industrial and post-industrial modernity. This status is expressed in greater freedom of movement and involvement in decision-making and a lower incidence of domestic violence when compared to women in farming, herding, and agrarian societies. Nevertheless variation exists: Wife-beating and rape are recorded for societies as disparate as the Eskimo of North Alaska and northern Australia and are not unknown elsewhere; nowhere can it be said that women and men live in a state of perfect equality.

A third area of divergence is the important distinction between Simple vs. Complex hunter-gatherers. Price and Brown argued that not all hunting and gathering peoples --prehistoric and contemporary-- lived in small mobile bands. Some, like the Indians of the North West Coast and the Calusa of Florida, as well as many prehistoric peoples, lived in large semi-sedentary settlements with chiefs, commoners, and slaves, yet were entirely dependent on wild foods. In social organization and ethos these societies showed a significant divergence from the patterns outlined above, yet in other ways a basic foraging pattern is discernible. For example the North West Coast peoples still maintained a concentration-dispersion pattern, breaking down their large permanent plank houses in the summer and re-erecting them in temporary structures at seasonal fishing sites. A related concept is James Woodburn’s important distinction between immediate-return and delayed-return societies. Although both were considered “band societies,” in immediate-return societies food was consumed on the spot or soon after, while in delayed-return societies food and other resources might be stored for months or years, with marked effects on social organization and cultural notions of property.

In a superb synthesis Robert L. Kelly has documented these divergences in his book “The Foraging Spectrum: Diversity in Hunter-gatherer Lifeways.” And recently Susan Kent has done the same for Africa. The point is that
hunter-gatherers encompass a wide range of variability and analysts seeking to make sense of them ignore this diversity at their peril!

THE IMPORTANCE OF HISTORY

Any adequate representation of hunting and gathering peoples in the twenty-first century has to address the complex historical circumstances in which they are found. Foragers have persisted to the present for a variety of reasons but all have developed historical links with non-foraging peoples, some extending over centuries or millennia. And all have experienced the transformative effects of colonial conquest and incorporation into States. Situating the foraging peoples in history is thus essential to any deeper understanding of them, a point that was often lost on earlier observers who preferred to treat foragers as unmediated visions of the past.

One recent school of thought has questioned the validity of the very concept "hunter-gatherer." Starting from the fact that some hunter-gatherers have been dominated by more powerful outsiders for centuries, this school sees contemporary foraging peoples more as victims of colonialism or subalterns at the bottom of a class structure than as exemplars of the hunting and gathering way of life. This "revisionist" view sees the foragers' simple technology, nomadism, and sharing of food as part of a culture of poverty generated by the larger political economy and not as institutions generated by the demands of foraging life.

Participants in CHAGS VIII are aware of the large and growing literature in "The Kalahari Debate." Anyone who argues today that foraging peoples have not suffered greatly at the hands of more-powerful neighbors and colonizers is seriously out of touch with reality. However I challenge the view that recent hunter-gatherers are simply victims of colonial forces. Autonomy and dependency are a continuum, not an either-or proposition, and as John Bodley has documented, despite the damage brought by colonialism, foragers persist and show a surprising resilience. Foragers may persist for a variety of reasons. As illustrated by the example of the Kalahari San of southern Africa, where much of the debate has focussed, some San did become early subordinates of Bantu-speaking overlords, but many others maintained viable and independent hunter-gatherer lifeways into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Archaeological evidence recently reviewed by Karim Sadr strongly supports the position that a number of San peoples maintained a classic Later Stone Age tool kit and a hunting and gathering lifeway up until the late 19th century. When Ju/'hoan San people themselves are asked to reflect on their own history they insist that prior to the arrival of the Europeans in the latter part of the nineteenth century, they lived as hunters on their own without cattle while maintaining links of trade to the wider world.
The general point to be made is that outside links do not automatically make hunter-gatherers subordinate to the will of their trading partners. Exchange is a universal aspect of human culture; all peoples at all times have traded. In the case of recent foragers, trading relations may in fact have allowed foraging peoples to maintain a degree of autonomy and continue to practise a way of life that they valued.

In the forward to the Encyclopedia, Lakota anthropologist Beatrice Medicine questions whether victimhood at the hands of more powerful peoples is the only or even the main issue of interest about hunters and gatherers. She and other Encyclopedia authors start from the position that the first priority is to represent the lifeworlds of contemporary hunter-gatherers faithfully, and their reality invariably includes a sense of themselves as having a collective history as hunter-gatherers. Whether this foraging represents a primary or secondary adaptation, many continue to forage because that way of life has meaning for them. It seems unwise if not patronizing to assume that all foragers are primarily so because they were forced into it by poverty or oppression.

HUNTER-GATHERER STUDIES TODAY

Given the diversity of hunting and gathering societies today and the diversity of schools of thought within the field how best to characterize contemporary hunter-gatherer studies? If a single long-term trend can be discerned in hunter-gatherers studies it is this: studies begin with a vast gulf between observers and observed. Eighteenth and nineteenth century treatises on the subject objectified the hunters and treated them as external objects of scrutiny. With the development of field anthropology observers began to know the foragers as people and the boundaries between observers and observed began to break down. Finally in the most recent period the production of knowledge has become a two-way process; the roles of observer began to merge with the role of advocate and the field of hunter-gatherer studies has come to be increasingly influenced by agendas set by the hunter-gatherers themselves.

The more formal history of hunter-gatherer studies parallels the history of the discipline of anthropology. The peoples who much later were to become known as “hunters and gatherers” have been an important element in central debates of European social and political thought from the sixteenth century forward. With the rise of European Imperialism and its conquest of new lands, came the beginnings of anthropology as a formal discipline. The nineteenth century classical evolutionists like Morgan, Lubbock and Tyler, erected elaborate schemes correlating social forms, kinship and marriage with mental development and levels of technology. The world’s hunters were usually relegated to the bottom levels.
Essential to the development of modern Anthropology was the decisive repudiation of the classical evolutionary schemes and their implicit racism. Franz Boas’ watershed 1911 study “Race, Language and Culture” demonstrated that the three core factors varied independently. It was only on the foundations of Boasian cultural relativism and the emphasis on field work that modern social and cultural anthropology could develop.

It is striking that most of the founders of modern anthropology both in North America and Europe carried out landmark studies of hunters and gatherers. We only have to mention Boas himself on the central Eskimos and his decades of research with the KwaKwaKa’wakw [Kwakiutl] on the Northwest Coast. Or Alfred L. Kroeber’s California work or Robert Lowie on the Crow Indians.

Founders of British anthropology shared a similar early focus, with A. R. Radcliffe-Brown’s study of the Andaman Islanders, and even the great Malinowski, before going to the Trobriands wrote his doctoral dissertation on the family among the Australian Aborigines. In France we only have to think of Durkheim’s famous work on Australian aboriginal religion and Marcel Mauss’ on the seasonal life of the Eskimo. Claude Lévi-Strauss began his distinguished career with a 1930s field study of the hunting and gathering Nam-bicuara in the Brazilian Mato Grosso.

Important hunter-gatherer research traditions can also be discerned in Denmark, Germany, India, Australia, southeast Asia, South Africa, and in Russia. Of particular interest is the powerful research tradition here in Japan. There is Watanabe’s and others’ Ainu researches. As an Africanist I am most familiar with the work of Harako, Tanno, and Ichikawa on the Pygmies, that of Tanaka and Sugawara on the Kalahari San, as well as the work of Koyama and Sasaki on Jomon, and Nobuhiro Kishigami on the Canadian arctic. The Senri Ethnological Studies published by this museum and the Kyoto African studies are two publication series of world importance in the field of hunter-gatherer studies.

Modern studies of hunting and gathering peoples can be arguably traced to two landmark studies of the 1930s. First is the 1936 essay by Julian Steward, who in a festschrift for his mentor A. L. Kroeber, wrote on “The social and economic basis of primitive bands.” Steward argued that resource exploitation determined to a significant extent the shape and dynamics of band organization and this ecological approach became one of the two foundations of hunter-gatherer studies for the next thirty years.

The second base was the classic 1930-31 essay by Radcliffe-Brown on Australian aboriginal social organization. Unlike Steward, R-B saw the structural factors of kinship as the prime movers in Australian aboriginal societies divided into moieties, sections or subsections. These divisions had profound effects on marriage patterns which produced an intricate and elegant algebra of
prescriptive alliances between intermarrying groups. Radcliffe-Brown was far less interested than Steward in what the aborigines did for a living. In the 1940s Redcliffe-Brown's kinship models were taken up by Lévi-Strauss who placed Australian aboriginal moieties at the center of his 1949 "Les Structures Élémentaires de la Parenté."

It is worth noting that theories of band organization have continued to be dominated by these two alternative paradigms: an ecological or adaptationist approach which relies on material factors to account for forager social life, and a structural approach which sees kinship, marriage, and like social factors as the primary determinants. The two approaches are by no means incompatible, and Sahlins, Ingold and many others have posited a dialectic of social and ecological forces in the dynamics of forager life.

The 1966 conference "Man the Hunter" organized by Irven DeVore and myself proved to be the starting point of a new era of systematic research on hunting and gathering peoples. Present at the conference were representatives of many of the major constituencies in the field of hunter-gatherers (though no hunter gatherers themselves), including proponents of the ecological and structural schools. Among the key findings of the Man the Hunter Conference and the book of the same name, were the papers focussing on the relative ease of foraging subsistence, epitomized in Marshall Sahlins famous "Notes on the original affluent society." Gender and the importance of women’s work was a second key theme. The name "Man the Hunter" was a misnomer since among tropical foragers, plant foods, produced largely by women, were the dominant source of subsistence.

After the 1968 publication of Man the Hunter new work critiqued its key theses. The irony of the mistitle was not lost on feminist anthropologists who produced a series of articles and books with the counter theme of “Woman the Gatherer.” These feminist critics were certainly taking issue with the concept of Man the Hunter, and not necessarily with the book’s content since, as Tanner and Zihlman pointed out in an influential paper, the latter had gone a long way towards establishing the importance of women’s work and women’s roles in hunter-gatherer society.

At the same time a counter-counter discourse developed among scholars who questioned whether women’s subsistence contribution had been overestimated, and several cross-cultural studies were produced to argue this view. A related development was the discovery that women in hunter-gatherer societies do hunt, the most famous case being that of the Agta of the Philippines.

Original “Affluence” came in for much discussion and critique, with a long series of debates over the definition of affluence and whether it applied to all hunters and gatherers at all times or even to all the !Kung. Seeking to rehabilitate the concept Lew Binford and Mark Cohen addressed some of these
issues, while James Woodburn’s 1982 introduction of the distinction between immediate- and delayed-return societies helped to account for some of the variability in the level of work effort among hunter-gatherers.

A major development in hunter-gatherer research was stimulated by this debate. Struck by the often-imprecise data on which arguments about affluence (or its absence) had been based, a group of younger scholars resolved to do better. They adopted from biology models about optimal foraging and attempted to apply these rigorously to the actual foraging behaviors observed among the shrinking number of foraging peoples where it was still possible to observe hunting and gathering subsistence. Important work in this area was carried out by a close-knit group of scholars often collaborating, and variously influenced by sociobiology and other neo-Darwinian approaches: including Bailey, Blurton Jones, Hawkes, Hill, O’Connell, Smith and Winterhalder. For critiques see Ingold and Martin.

More classically oriented research in the post Man the Hunter era attempted to bring together much of the rich historical and ethnographic material that had accumulated since the 1940s. The multi-volume Handbook of the North American Indians, under the general editorship of William Sturtevant chronicled the 500 Nations of the continent in a series of landmark regional volumes. Six of these dealt largely if not exclusively with hunting and gathering peoples: Northwest Coast, edited by Wayne Suttles; the Subarctic, by June Helm; Great Basin, by Warren D’Azevedo; California, by Heizer; the Arctic, by Damas; and the Northeast, edited by Bruce Trigger. On other continents Barnard and Edwards produced overview volumes on the Khoisan peoples and Aboriginal Australians respectively.

A NEW GENERATION OF RESEARCH

While the optimal foraging researchers based their work on models from biology and the natural sciences, a larger cohort of hunter-gatherer specialists were moving in quite different directions. Drawing on symbolic, interpretive, and historical frameworks this group of scholars grounded their studies in the lived experience of foragers and post-foragers as encapsulated minorities within Nation-States, but still strongly adhering to traditional cosmologies and lifeways. Examples from the ’80s and ’90s include Diane Bell’s “Daughters of the dreaming,” Hugh Brody’s “Maps and dreams,” Julie Cruikshank’s “Life lived like a story,” Fred Myers’ “Pintupi country, Pintupi self,” Elizabeth Povinelli’s “Labor’s lot,” and the late Marjorie Shostak’s “Nisa: The life and words of a !Kung woman.”

One way of tracking broader trends in hunter-gatherer research is to follow the CHAGS series of Conferences. In 1978 Maurice Godelier convened a Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies in Paris to observe the 10th anniver-
sary of the publication of "Man the Hunter." The conference brought together scholars from a dozen countries including the Dean of the Faculty of the University of Yakutia himself an indigenous Siberian. The conference proved such a success that Laval University offered to host a followup conference in Quebec in 1980. Inuit broadcasters were among the several members of hunter-gatherer societies present.

Prof. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt of the Max Planck Institute took on the task of organizing CHAGS III. The 1983 Munich CHAGS was a smaller, by-invitation affair, and the book that resulted reflected one particular (revisionist) school of hunter-gatherer studies. CHAGS IV, held at the London School of Economics in September 1986 returned to the more open policy with a wide range of constituencies represented and the active British organizing committee producing two volumes of papers.

CHAGS V then moved to Australia. Hosted by Les Hiatt of Sydney University, CHAGS V convened in Darwin, capital of the Northern Territory in August 1988 and provided a world showcase for Australian anthropologists, aboriginals, and activists.

Fairbanks, Alaska was the location of CHAGS VI (1990), the first of the CHAGS series to be held in the United States since the original 1966 Chicago conference. Convened by the late Linda Ellanna and Peter Schweitzer, the Fairbanks conference was memorable for being the first CHAGS at which a large delegation of Russian anthropologists were present, flying in from Providenya just across the Bering Straits in Chukotka. Indigenous Alaskans played a prominent role in Fairbanks as well (Burch and Ellanna 1994). CHAGS VII, in Moscow in August 1993, was convened by Valerie Tischkov and organized by Victor Shnirelman at the Russian Academy of Sciences. And now here we are at CHAGS VIII, at the National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka, Japan in 1998, with possible future meetings projected in the new millennium for India, southern Africa, and elsewhere.

This ongoing series of CHAGS gatherings held on four continents has provided an excellent monitor on the state of hunter-gatherer research and a unique perspective on its increasingly international and cosmopolitan outlook.

While the theoretical debates of the Man the Hunter Conference of 1966 had revolved around issues of the evolution of human behavior, the recent series has moved relatively far from evolutionary and ecological preoccupations. In their stead hunter-gatherer specialists have developed several major foci of inquiry.

At the Moscow CHAGS in August 1993 a large and active scholarly contingent focussed on foragers in relation to the State, land rights, court battles, bureaucratic domination, and media representations. The humanistic wing of hunter-gatherer studies was represented by richly textured accounts of cosmology, and ritual, while other papers dealt with the impact of state and
market on changing world views. To round out the offerings at the Moscow CHAGS there were excellent sessions on demography, ecology, gender, and aggression and peacemaking.

One theme unifying these diverse scholars from many countries was that all were able to see in hunter-gatherer society some component of historical autonomy and distinctiveness. The notion of “pristine” hunter-gatherer was nowhere in sight, but neither did anyone argue that the cultural practices or cosmological beliefs observed were simply refractions of dominant outsiders, Soviet or western.

Another unifying theme was the recognition that change was accelerating, and that the magnitude of the problems faced by these indigenous peoples was enormous, especially those in the Russian North, for whom ecologically destructive socialist industrialization has been followed directly by the advent of get-rich-quick capitalism. Similar conditions were replicated in most of the world’s regions where foragers persist.

As humankind approaches the millennium, what are some of the main currents in research about hunter-gatherers, present, past, and future? Four principal tendencies can be discerned. These are set out below with two caveats: first, none of these approaches has a monopoly on “the truth”; each has something to offer and each has its shortcomings. Second none in practice are air-tight, and many scholars may participate in two or more.

1. Classic. The internal dynamics of hunter-gatherer society and ecology continue to interest many scholars. Kinship, social organization, land use, trade, material culture and cosmology provide an ongoing source of ideas, models, and analogies for archaeologists and others reconstructing the past. When due account is taken of the historical circumstances, ethnographic analogies can be a valuable tool. Archaeologists are now arguably the largest “consumers” (and producers) of research on hunting and gathering peoples, even though the opportunities for basic ethnographic research are shrinking rapidly. Robert Kelly, Tim Ingold, and Ernest Burch Jr. are three of the prominent figures in this branch of the discipline.

2. Adaptationist. Discussed above, the second “tendency” is the area of behavioral ecology and Optimal Foraging Theory, with a strong presence in the US, particularly at the Universities of Utah and New Mexico. The Adaptationists are the prime advocates of a strictly “scientific” paradigm within hunter-gatherer studies and this places them, to a degree, at odds with others in the field for whom humanistic and political economic approaches are primary. While some behavioral ecologists approach issues of demography and subsistence from an historically contextualized position, a significant number continue to march under the banner of neo-Darwinian sociobiology. And while
some acknowledge the impact of outside forces—such as dam construction, logging, mining, rain forest destruction, bureaucracies, missionaries, and land alienation—on the people they study, others focus narrowly on quantitative models of foraging behaviors as if these existed in isolation. Critics of this school have argued that by treating foragers primarily as raw material for model building, the behavioral ecologists fail to acknowledge foragers’ humanity and agency, as conscious actors living through tough times and facing the same challenges as the rest of us. Having fought to maintain their scientific rigor, the behavioral ecologists can now contribute fundamentally to the field by making their work also relevant and useful to their subjects in their fight for cultural, economic and ecological survival.

Within the field and on its own terms, Kristen Hawkes has been the most articulate spokesperson for behavioral ecology of hunter-gatherers, while Hill and Hurtado (1995) and Smith and Winterhalder (1992) offer some of the best recent work.

3. Revisionist. This school of thought argues that the peoples known as “hunter-gatherers” are something quite different: primarily ragged remnants of past ways of life largely transformed by subordination to stronger peoples and the steamroller of modernity. Two of the principal authors of this view are Schrire (1984) and Wilmsen (1989). Although my opposition to the revisionist thesis is well-known, I want to acknowledge that the “revisionists” do raise serious questions. For too long students of hunter-gatherers and other pre-state societies tended to treat them in isolation as unmediated visions of the past. Today history looms much larger in these studies. Hunter-gatherers arrive at their present condition by a variety of pathways. By acknowledging this fact and being sensitive to the impact of the wider political economy, contemporary hunter-gatherer studies is responding to the challenges made by the revisionists. Beside the archaeological and historical evidence contra the revisionist position, the most eloquent testimony in the revisionist debate are the voices of the people, setting out their ongoing sense of themselves as historically-rooted peoples with a tradition and identity as hunters and gatherers. Their eloquence, resilience and strength demonstrates that even in this hardbitten age of “globalization” other ways of being are possible.

4. Indigenist. This fourth perspective brings the people studied, their goals and aspirations firmly into the center of the scholarly equation. For many of the eighty-five authors in the Cambridge Encyclopedia the Indigenist perspective represents the outcome of a long search for an anthropology of engagement that is also scientifically responsible. The long revolution in the ethics of Anthropology has come to the present conjuncture in which the still-legitimate goals of careful scholarship must be situated in tandem with ethical respon-
sibilities to the subjects of inquiry. This involves at the very least attempting to account for the forces impacting on peoples' lives in ways that valorize their choices and give them useful tools to work with.

For example, in the Senri volume "Cash, Comoditization, and Changing Foragers," (1991) co-edited with Toshio Matsuyama, my colleague on the podium, Nicolas Peterson offers a coherent framework for understanding the complex impacts of the market economy on the internal dynamics of foraging peoples. This issue has tended to polarize the field of hunter-gatherer studies into two camps: the revisionists who see capitalism as having long ago destroyed the foraging economy, and "pristinists" who deny or minimize these effects. Peterson's insightful analysis succeeds in bridging these two entrenched positions and showing areas of common ground. The market and the welfare state, in Peterson's view, have altered but not destroyed foraging economies; in many cases the impacts have been absorbed and put to use in reproducing forager communities and identity within the wider society.

Researchers in the Indigenist perspective must perform a difficult balancing act: how to combine advocacy and good rigorous scholarship, without subsuming ethical obligations of the scholar to political expediency (or vice-versa).

In addition to a number of authors in the Encyclopedia, the "indigenist" perspective on hunter-gatherers is evident in the work of such scholars as Eugene Hunn, Joe Jorgensen, Basil Sansom, Janet Siskind, and Polly Wiessner.

Given the growing political visibility of modern foragers within their respective nation states and the world-wide movement for indigenous rights, recent research has been based increasingly on agendas arising from within the communities themselves. Land claims, social disintegration, substance abuse, and the concomitant movements to reconstitute "traditional" culture and revitalize institutions have become central concerns.

FORAGERS AT THE MILLENNIUM

In the 500 years of European incursions into the rest of the world, band and village societies faced insurmountable odds and many succumbed to a combination of military predation, land loss, and the effects of introduced diseases. Yet despite the horrors of the colonial period, a surprising number of foragers survived and are present to witness the dawn of the third millennium.

As long as they had the frontier, hunting and gathering peoples could survive by moving beyond the reach of the colonial authorities. But with the arrival of the modern nation-state, administrative structures reached everywhere. David Trigger and others have surveyed the ways in which states of the First, Second and Third Worlds first pacified and censured, and then
divided and ruled foraging peoples, attempting to make them conform to the role of "good citizens." As they adjust to bureaucratic domination, foragers face significant differences between the situation in the First World capitalist states, and those in the developing world and the former U.S.S.R., a topic my colleague Nic Peterson will address next.

Given their new status as "wards" of states foragers have undergone transformations in political consciousness, increasingly coming to see themselves as encapsulated minorities, as ethnic groups, and as stakeholders within the civil societies of states. At a broader level they are coming to see themselves as part of the larger global community of indigenous peoples. But despite the U.N.'s declaration of the period 1995-2004 as the "Decade of Indigenous Peoples" the human rights of many continue to be abridged, violated and denied. Robert Hitchcock and others have surveyed the complex terrain on which foragers and post-foragers make claims on the political agendas of states and international organizations.

To conclude, I hope these comments have conveyed a sense of what makes the contemporary hunters and gatherers so intriguing. Long the subject of myth and misconception, in recent years the hunting and gathering peoples have come into focus. Far from being simply the cast-offs of creation or victims of history, the foraging peoples have become political actors in their own right, mounting land claims cases, participating in the environmental movement, and lobbying for their rights with governments and the U.N. Also they are being sought out by spiritual pilgrims from urban industrial societies seeking to recapture wholeness from an increasingly fragmented and alienated modernity.

As humanity approaches the millennium, there is an increasing preoccupation with where we have come from and where we are going. The accelerating pace of change and the ceaseless transformations brought about by economic forces has had the effect of obliterating history, creating a deepening spiritual malaise. To this has been added the threats of ecological catastrophe and world economic recession. Contemporary hunter-gatherer studies makes no claim to offer simple solutions to the multiple crises facing humanity. Yet to recall the deeper wisdom in Schumacher's famous adage, "Small is beautiful," it is to be hoped that in documenting foragers' history, culture, and current situation, scholars at the Eighth CHAGS will provide, as have their predecessors, a rich source of ideas, concepts, and alternatives to fuel the political imagination.
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