Mangyan Conflict Resolution

Andrea Lauser

Mangyan Conflict Resolution

Andrea Lauser

Between December 1986 and May 1988 I spent time in Mangyan with my partner Peter Bräunlein in order to carry out anthropological field work, financed by the DAAD (German Academical Exchange Service). After five years of absence we visited the Mangyan again for a short period in summer 1993.[1] We had not been long in Malula, an Alangan-Mangyan settlement in Mindoro, when one night we were startled by a completely unfamiliar disturbance. Loud agitated screams and shouts coming from the neighboring dispersed settlement caused chaotic activity even within the huts of the main settlement. A few men were calling out to one another. At that time we were only able to understand fragments of their calls. It must have been about an attack by armed Tagalog men from the Lowlands. Obviously the acute danger during the night was averted and the Tagalog were driven away. Still in the same night all the inhabitants from the small hamlet left their homes to be with their relatives or friends in the main settlement. Over the next few days the entire hamlet transferred to the main settlement, taking with them not only their baskets stowed with household goods, but also their roofs (a roof made from cogon grass is really the most lengthy and expensive part of house construction). During the following days and weeks, the conversation revolved permanently around those events. To us newly arrived anthropologists it seemed instructive, how the feeling of fear and the frankness in voicing and displaying this feeling was thought not to be disgraceful, but to be a basic human characteristic. Another thing appeared to us while reconstructing the actual event. It was that these Tagalog attacks were not nearly as dramatic and dangerous as we fantasized first according to the narratives of the Mangyan.

This example gives various pieces of information with regard to the way the Mangyan conduct themselves during periods of conflict. I would like to present it, from the very beginning, in its complexity. The example characterizes the relationship of the Mangyan with the Lowland inhabitants, the Tagalog. It is instructive insofar as mobility, flight or retreat is discussed as a solution to conflict, and it also says a lot about authority and leadership qualities to emphasize only a few of the important aspects.

Mangyan Conflicts

The minimal demand of trade relations is the starting point for Mangyan / Tagalog relations, which can be very variable. As a rule however, the Mangyan run into debt (*utang*), and because of their entirely different value system they get dependant on the Tagalog traders, without accepting its full consequences. Regarding the clashes of two different cultures with their different values due to binding trade relations see in detail Bräunlein and Lauser (1993, 112ff.) This conflict is somewhat like this: Pedring was involved in long, drawn out debts with a Lowlander. For two tree trunks and some firewood he "bought" from the Tagalog, Armani, an air gun. But it seemed that there was a discrepancy with the payment. While Pedring claimed to have handed over the planks and firewood, Armani saw things in quite a different light. Finally, one night three Tagalog men crept into the Mangyan hamlet to raid Pedring in the hope of recapturing the air gun, to give him a jolly good scare and to make a statement about their rights. They mixed the huts up at night and instead of attacking Pedring they attacked Cassio and took his air gun with them, which he himself had borrowed. This in turn led to a further internal Mangyan conflict. Extremely terrified, the Mangyan fled in the night to the shelter of the main settlement. This nocturnal attack plunged the Mangyan into total dismay. At first they thought it was the NPA (New Peoples Army—the name given for the communist oriented guerilla army) and then the military. For the next time they decided to be quite courageous and wanted to fight with wooden clubs and machetes.

However, first of all everyone moved to Malula. They waited for the return of *kuyay* (elder) Miranda, who had been away for a few days, to discuss further action. (Miranda was the local group elder

of that hamlet, which was composed, more or less, of the extended household of his married daughters and sons. So Pedring was his son and Cassio the father of one of his sons-in-law). However, the following meeting did not lead to an agreement and consequently more of the families left Malula once and for all, going to relatives in other settlements.

The Mangyan condemned the injustice the Tagalog had brought with strong language, saying that they must make a complaint to the police in the town. This defiant act, including a visit to the judicial authorities in the lowlands, did not happen. Conversations in the following weeks showed that the fear of reprisals, real and imaginary, might have been the reason this course of action was not taken. In addition they were just as suspicious of the lowland police as they were of the Tagalog in general—after all were they not also Tagalog with whom the Mangyan did not have experiences. It was discussed at length as to which threat the Tagalog would follow up on, when and where they would strike again and which weapons they would use. Again, during these discussions always acknowledging the great fear they still felt: *"malimuon wa kami mga Mangyan*—we are timid people," "we are afraid (*agkalimo kami*)." Our rhetorical question that perhaps the three Tagalog had been even afraid of the Mangyan as the Mangyan had been of them met with no response whatsoever and was passed over without comment. Although kuyay Miranda loudly supported the argument of bringing the case before the court in the provincial town he was reluctant to actually do this, using all possible excuses. There were grounds for supposing that for Miranda a confrontation with Armani would not suit his own interests as he was well known for countless dealings with the Tagalog and a few *utang* (debt)-relations with Armani and his friends. On the other hand as kuyay he was expected to contribute to the well being of all by resolving the problem.

Miranda's speeches and dealings illustrate the ambivalent relationship between the Tagalog and the Mangyan. He was also well known for countless even sensational utang-relations. Years before he had turned in desperation to the Mission in Paitan to buy back several hectares of Mangyan land which he had previously mortgaged. This initial contact finally lead to missionary work for Malula, with kuyay Miranda as contact person for the Mission. From time to time in his speeches Miranda swung from one extreme, of accepting the lowland culture, to the other extreme of complete withdrawal from it. On one day he loudly announced that Malula should come to terms

with the lowland culture, yet on other days he vehemently advocated exactly the opposite: the Mangyan were the better Filipinos, they did not need any Tagalog, the Tagalog should stay away (from the hills and the land of the Mangyan). All the Mangyan should try to avoid and hide from the Tagalog.

In that conflict triggered by the Tagalog attack Miranda was challenged and he resolved matters in his own manner. After Juanit and Tina (the "local community organizer" supported by the Mission) gave the opinion to notify the district court, Miranda and two companions set out to do this. When they came back, they maintained the police had been informed but could not come to investigate. A few days later he allegedly went back once more with his friends. Again only fragments of information were received. Uncertainty and fear prevailed in Malula, in many conversations a clearly irreconcilable gap formed between the Tagalog and Mangyan. The situation resolved slowly and resistantly. One week later again a loud *miting* (an open gathering—the anglicized version of *agpulong*) broke out, in which it finally emerged that the three men have never been in the province town, that the police were not informed, moreover they have all been at a *tindahan* in the plains and had got themselves really drunk.[2] Armani had with his nocturnal attack taken Cassio's air gun as a deposit, which Cassio had himself borrowed from Rizal and was not able to return it. Therefore Miranda could not simply push the conflict aside, sit it out or push the costs onto the wicked Tagalog. The conflict had also lead to intense internal tensions. One day, after drinking excessive amounts of alcohol in the lowland, Oscar (Cassio's son and Miranda's son-in-law) loudly voiced his resentment towards his father-in-law and this strong display of emotion frightened the people of Malula once more.[3] The expression of violent and negative feelings is regarded as extreme within the Mangyan value system which includes the idea of keeping a tight control upon ones feelings. When everything had calmed down again the outburst was interpreted as a consequence of the alarming "Armani conflict":

Oscar was infuriated by the selfish character of his father-in-law. His father-in-law was only concerned with his own interests and managed to get everybody—especially himself—into difficulties. He was mean and self-centered (in the Mangyan value system this was considered to be a very brutal, even monstrous accusation). The Tagalog Armani had mixed up the huts during his nocturnal attack and had not aggravated Pedring but Cassio, Oscar's father. As stated they did not take Pedring's air gun, but one which Cassio had borrowed

from Rizal. Miranda drew a veil over the whole situation ensuring that he seemed brave and determined to find a solution that was satisfactory to everyone. Those *kai* (near) Miranda are like what I heard through my questioning and that they kai Miranda were 'shameless' (*dapo rikoy*) and from time to time they dealt with their conflict loudly, vehemently and indignantly, but now this time the whole of Malula was threatened if the Tagalog could be so brutal as to carry out their "murder threat."

Eventually after a few more meetings the conflict was cleared up. Following general discussions and the weighing up of the different claims it was decided that Miranda and his son Pedring should give to Rizal two young pigs as a replacement for the weapon stolen by the Tagalog plus he should provide a further pig for a ritual slaughter (*agpansula buyok*). With that Oscar's father Cassio would be exonerated. A meeting to clear the air between Miranda and Armani was also arranged which resulted in Armani getting the wood in exchange for the air gun. The neighborhood group however no longer settled down together in its original form.

In the following sections I will discuss a few of the aspects in this example of "conflict resolution." Next I want to place the value system of the Mangyan, which emphasizes reserve and the striving for harmony, in an historically produced context. Then by consulting further conflict cases a few of the principles of conflict settlement should become clear. In a concluding outlook the example of the placid Mangyan will be embraced in an anthropological discussion about peaceful societies.

Fear and Flight and Courage

To the fundamental characteristics of the Mangyan belongs a definite defensive strategy for coping with difficulties when facing conflict with strangers as well as when facing conflict within the settlement society itself. To retreat and to flee belong to a traditional repertoire of behavior which the Mangyan already followed in Spanish times and probably also in pre-Spanish times (Mindoro was taken over by the Spanish in 1570). Retreating to the inaccessible hills of the hinterland made life possible without colonial rule and missions, without hard labor or having to pay tribute and without the danger of being sold as a slave. Even though few direct sources are known about the fate of the Mangyan during the last 400 years, there exist

little doubt that the Mangyan have always been too weak in organization and in number for an effective defense against foreign intruders. So the Muslims were mostly slavers, the paying of tribute was a prime importance to the Spanish and the Lowland society saw the non-Christian hill dwellers as no better than animals that could be exploited without scruples. In pre-Spanish times the coastal strips of Mindoro were inhabited by Muslim traders whom the Spanish in the course of their colonization tried to drive out. During a period of 300 years, in the seventeenth and eighteenth hundreds, Mindoro was a target for Muslim pirates, and slave abductions occurred frequently. Slavery and the flight of the threatened into the hills, were widespread during this period throughout the whole of Southeast Asia. As Anthony Reid (1983, 28f.) emphasizes, the preferential goals of the slave raiding were the foraging groups and the shifting cultivators in the hills. Gibson (1990, 129) distinguishes between the different types of slaves in Southeast Asia: 1) the weak fragmented societies in the mountainous regions, who provided the Lowlanders with natural products and (slave) work power, 2) higher organized societies in the hills, who recognized slavery as a ritual offering, 3) predatory lowland societies who hunted slaves and sold them in urban centers. The fact that the Lowlanders used and abused the Mangyan as forced labor in their plantations, is also one of the aspects of the life histories which Pennoyer (1980, 704) recorded of the Taubuid of Safa:

> Raiding parties once searched for hamlets, capturing all available people to work in rice fields or labor in the coconut groves. Some were kept as long as a year and worked from sunrise to sunset for food, clothes and lodging. They were held as prisoners, and recaptured escapees were beaten severely and threatened with death. If anyone was captured in a certain hamlet, the Taubuid ran far away and built new houses. For months afterward, they lived in trepidation and when the women went to the fields, everyone followed. The men spent the day in the tops of the trees watching for the arrival of strangers. If anyone came down the trail, the people deserted the fields for their secret hiding places.

The Mangyan have been, until recent history, witness to terrible fighting and destruction. The Mangyan from the island of Mindoro belong to the so called minorities of the Philippines and live today mainly in the hills. Studies have defined seven different Mangyan groups by distinguishing between their speech and other cultural

features. We did our research with a group of *Alangan-Mangyan*. The name Alangan-Mangyan is a reference to the river Alangan which for a long time was the location of their main settlements. They call themselves Mangyan which in their language means "human being." Their numbers are estimated at between 5000–9000 in total. The Japanese invasion of 1942–1945 was a turning point in the older inhabitants biographical memory. And shortly before our departure in the early part of 1988 many Mangyan fled in fear and horror from isolated areas of the mountainous regions to find refuge at the mission station in the lowlands. The majority of these Mangyan were people who have had little contact with the lowland population, who until recently have fearfully avoided living in remote mountain valleys. The reason for this flight was a new phase in the anti-guerilla-campaign waged by the Philippine Army: they bombed the alleged hideout of the NPA which was supposedly in the hills on the island. The slightest rumor about destroyed Mangyan houses and wounded people was enough to cause the Mangyan to flee.

Such historical experiences make an explanation of the defensive evasion value system of the Mangyan possible, which is expressed especially in the confrontation with strangers. In another essay (Lauser 1995) I discussed at length a "mythical" explication. In this story set in primeval times eight brothers separated and the Mangyan became the followers of one of these brothers. The Mangyan distinguish between themselves and the other groups—descendants of the other brothers—some of whom they clearly perceive as "wild species." Gibson (1989) writes about the neighboring Buhid-Mangyan, where aggressive anti-social behavior is interpreted not only as a deviation from social convention but as against the Buhid's human nature. This can also be similarly argued in the case of the Alangan-Mangyan. It is striking that the language of the Alangan-Mangyan regarding emotions like fright, fleeing and fear demonstrates a large spectrum of corresponding words whereas in the area of pleasant joyful feelings the range is limited. Fearful feelings are especially expressed. The reaction is normally to retreat and flee and this frequently practiced method of resolving conflict was by no means judged negatively. To be afraid and to show fear is often considered to be a fundamental human characteristic. With regard to their own self appraisal and self description the inhabitants of Malula said often: "We are anxious people, we are afraid." This explanation was not in the character of an excuse, but it was a factual reality. To be brave and to be full of fighting spirit is not considered desirable by

the Mangyan. In their language there is no word to describe this characteristic. In conversation one would always fall back on the Tagalog term *matapang*. However, Tagalog speaking Lowlanders would understand matapang to be more a compliment that describes brave but also dangerous men. Our informants stressed again that those associated with this characteristic were considered by the Mangyan to be bad. To describe the positive aspect of a certain fearfulness in particular circumstances (e.g. in typhoons) the Mangyan word used is simply the negation of timidity (*idapo agkalimo*). One admits that in contact with non-Mangyans, a certain audacity and boasting is to be marvelled at, yet within the settlement one does everything to give such attributes no room at all. Behavior patterns which result in putting oneself above others would be ignored already in small children or ridiculed as bragging.

The following example illustrates what has been discussed:

> During an expedition in the mountainous hinterland the group consisting of Philippine botanists, the German anthropologist and a few Mangyan carriers from the mission station moved along steep and narrows paths. Mangyan coming from remote mountainous regions and who were heading towards the lowlands caught sight of the small expedition in the distance and worked themselves into a frenzy. They cried at the top of their voices *"agkalimo, agkalimo"*—"fear, fear," trying to get out of the way of the oncoming group they frantically cleared a path through the thick undergrowth. Some who could not get out of the way pushed themselves passing the strangers with fear and wide open eyes, despite the lowland Mangyan having given them a reassuring explanation.

Pennoyer (1975, 124–25) also described in detail the panic-stricken fear of the Taubuid (Mangyan):

> If strangers are met on the trail every effort is exhausted to make a fast escape. When an encounter is unavoidable, precautions are taken to avoid any physical contact with the outsiders. I once met a large party of Taubuid returning from working in the rice fields of the Buhid, and since they were carrying large loads and the narrow path bordered on a high rock cliff, they were unable to run away. The party stopped and a man shouted to someone at the end of the line, "Give me that rain cape." When the rattan leaf cape reach him, he passed it to the woman in front of him and the reluctant people started up to my perch, where I had flattened my body against the rock wall so that they could step around my feet and continue along the cliff. As

the woman came closer she lowered the leaf cape with one hand so that it formed a buffer between her body and mine, and ballet-stepped around my feet.

Worth mentioning at this point are Mangyan houses, especially the traditional big houses (*balay lakoy*) which are only accessible by a narrow ladder (*sakbawan*) made out of tree trunks. The size i.e. narrowness of the entrance allows only one person to enter at a time. A second sakbawan on the opposite side serves as an emergency exit if strangers / enemies enter the house without warning. Pennoyer (1975, 120ff) also provides further examples of the panic like xenophobia of the Taubuid which shows many similarities with the Alangan-Mangyan: both Mangyan groups place sentries everywhere to warn the settlements behind them in time or to cut out paths through the thicket along the way to mislead the intruders.

It should be clear through these observations that the Mangyan always make the effort to flee and retreat in order to avoid conflict and violent clashes with non Mangyan. Now certain aspects of intersociety rules of conflict should be described, which are characterized through a conspicuous striving for harmony, conflict avoidance, control of feeling and being reserved.

Conflict and Conflict resolution

Occurring conflicts and especially their solutions give an important insight into the continuing order of society. A social life would be practically impossible if there was no agreement about acceptable and unacceptable behavior patterns in everyday community interaction. In the case of the Mangyan these norms are not formulated in a devised law system. There are also no specialized "judges" who can pass judgement.

In the literature of legal anthropology the lack of quarrel mediation authorities in akephalen societies is given as an explanation for the warlike dispute resolutions of Hacephalous societies in New Guinea (e.g. Koch 1974, 166). The conflict resolutions of the Mangyan also lack a constitutionalized quarrel mediation authority. However it does not follow the principle of violent self help with the motto "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth," but follows quite the opposite principle of negotiations. The goal of such proceedings is to discuss the difference of opinion during the exchange of ideas until a

solution satisfactory to all has been found. The experienced kuyay steps in as mediator not so much to speak for "justice" but to lead the arguing parties to an agreement by picking out relevant arguments and proposing some reasonable advices. This mediation is not comparable with the role of a judge as practiced by the Hanunoo-Mangyan (Miyamoto 1988, 150ff.). Rather it must be discussed until the antagonists agree of their own free will. In this process the opinion of the community (discussed by all those present men and women) pressures the rivals into being willing to compromise and to return to harmonious relations once more. It is hard for the Mangyan to imagine a sustained open conflict over a long period of time.

Following Simmel's (1968, 248) opinion who wants to see the quarrel examined less in its negative form but rather as a constructive feature I have more examples of conflict in day to day life of the settlement under research. In the case of the Mangyan, arising conflicts are always followed by a meeting in which the supreme goal is to have a peaceful strengthening of the community. In this kind of "quarrel culture" conflicts can be discussed to the point of exhaustion. As "conflict avoidance behavior" is generally held as the ideal, day to day discord is generally expressed through a remoteness in manner. Only open gatherings (*agpulong*) provide the Mangyan with a framework to let their negative feelings out. Where oral negotiations are the only quarrel resolution and mediation instances, the willingness to come to a compromise must be one of the predominate values of that society. Immediate readiness to converse and the gesture of reconciliation must be considered as a proven reaction within society (Roberts 1981, 177). The flexibility of the norms creates free space where constructive compromises can be brought to a successful end through negotiations.

In our discussions about the arising conflicts when we tried to understand the effort, cause and solution of conflict, the explaining answers often sound like: That's our Mangyan custom (*ugali*). With ugali there are a wide range of connotations: ugali is when in the event of illness an *agpansula buyok* (pig slaughtering) is carried out exactly as it is ugali when at night it is not possible to leave the huts. To harvest someone else's plants without their consent goes against Mangyan ugali. To kill another is absolutely forbidden. With regard to this ban there is less to quibble about and in the case of such crimes compensation payments are appropriately established. Less clear conflicts are characterized by an atmosphere of haggling and negotiating during the "quarrel settlement" period when, for

example, a compensation payment which both parties will find fair is being discussed. In Malula the majority of binding solutions are sealed with a ritual pig sacrifice not only out of a religious point of view but it also means a coveted meat feast for all the participants. Next to socialization of fleeing and fear the Mangyan focus in the upbringing of children is on the main value of non-violence and non-aggression.[4] The emotional behavior of the Mangyan is similar in many respects to that of the Semai (Malaysia), whose "non-aggressiveness" and "non-violence" is well known throughout anthropological literature (Dentan 1968, 1978; Robarchek 1977a, 1977b, 1979, 1986, 1989; Howell and Willis 1989). It was noticeable that in general the Mangyan would consciously hold back from displaying any emotion. Emotional escape like joy, dancing or resounding laughter on the one side and grief, rage and anger on the other are held back as much as possible. This emotional reserve is not only for dealing with outsiders like the two anthropologists but also with relationships among the Mangyan themselves Dentan (1968) and Robarchek (1979) speak about it as if a "thin glass wall" exists between themselves and their Semai neighbors, a view that corresponds with my own feelings about the Mangyan and which occasionally prompts me to imaginations how this glass will eventually be brought to a breaking point. Open statements of feeling, for example tenderness, are never to be seen except with young children, exactly as we got entangled of the "cold" grief behavior on the occasion of a bereavement. An exception in this general emotional reserve seems to be the observed willingness to be afraid.

Anger is not an unknown feeling for the Mangyan. Because anger can lead to bodily crimes of violence and deathly sorcery (paraya) the Mangyan are afraid of volatile people and undertake every effort in day to day life to avoid furious violent conflict. Anger and quarrels are considered to be dangerous characteristics and as something to be overcome. Therefore quarrelling children are warned not to become angry. And parents who are quarreling risk their children becoming ill due to cannibalistic greedy demons.

The Mangyan concept of the human being can be further understood and interpreted by placing it in the larger context of the cosmography. The Mangyan's world view can be outlined with dualistic opposing categories. The "actual," visible world—the familiar world of community surrounded by "wilderness," a world full of hidden danger and enemity, have their counterparts in the "spiritual" world. In the material world, contrasts are defined in categories such as

community versus strangers, danger and hunger versus food and contentment whereas in the non-material world oppositions exist between helpful spirits *Taga-Bulod, kamuruan* or *diwata* (who help people to yield food and heal sickness) and the greedy, aggressive cannibalistic adversaries *mamaw* or *bukaw*. Both of these categories are personified by the Mangyan. These "quasi people" serve as a spiritual foil for good and bad humans. "Bad" behavior like aggression, fighting, raging and anger, quarrelling and also being excessively greedy would attract the bukaw or mamaw to be active with their threatening characteristics. Whereas good behavior such as modesty, reserve and generosity will convince the kamuruan to become allies to the Mangyan. This world view has to be described—using Thomas Gregor's words—as an "anti-violent value system" (1990). Peaceful behavior is promoted by stigmatizing that quarrel, anger, power, selfishness and greed and prestige is awarded for being generous and unassuming and avoiding conflict—and this entire "value system" finds its parallel in supernatural beliefs.

At the same time the Mangyan reflect also that they as human beings employ controlled and ritualized violence in their relationship with animals, which they slaughter and consume. In a discussion this was clearly formulated in the following analogy: As humans eat and desire pig meat so too the bukaw are greedy for *abiyan* (souls) (Gibson 1989, 73). That which is pig flesh to humans is to the cannibalistic demons the human soul. This direct comparison of bukaw and humans shows that human ideology of non-aggression is precarious and must be controlled in the ritualistic "sacred" framework of *agpansula buyok* (pig sacrifice).

Public Discussion—Agpulong—As Conflict Resolution

The Mangyan have a tendency to ignore a difference of opinion as long as possible, nevertheless they have situations where despite defensive avoidance behavior, conflict is unavoidable and, as the entrance example has shown, to hide violent feelings. The listing of the following punishments was communicated to us during discussions, but none of these methods were used during our stay. For the completeness a brief explanation is set out: *Agpansiban* is a method of punishment whereby the hands of the culprit are plunged into boiling water. In cases of guilt the heat would cook the arm like a hot stone and lead to a cardiac arrest and death. We were laughingly told that before this method is used on anyone a confession would

be made and a negotiated compensation paid and future good behavior would be guaranteed. *Busong* is a form of punishment through a higher power and it manifests itself with a swelling of the stomach. *Pangaw* (foot shackles) and *bilanguan* (imprisonment) or *kiyupit* (being locked up) are forms of punishment which are most frequently used for adultery and unfaithfulness. Such a prison is a simple open hut. In Malula there were no bilanguan, although a few notorious adulterous people have had to serve this sentence from time to time. In dramatized reports several women told me, how habitual re-offenders despite repeated meetings and warnings were finally imprisoned in an unoccupied "prison"-hut. They were not tied up or locked in but stayed in the hut voluntarily and were allowed unlimited visits and to hold discussion. The longest prison sentence in Malula was for three days. With the foot-shackle punishment *pangawan* the guilty party is shackled for up to three days. Besides imprisonment and foot-shackles there is also punishment by whip (*piyagbugbug*) made with a special rattan type cane. In so far as sanctions such as imprisonment and foot shackles are concerned we are unable to decide whether they are "traditional" Mangyan punishment methods or results from cultural contact with Hispanic inhabitants of the lowland. In discussions it was repeatedly stressed that these punishments were already known and were also practiced in the Hinterland in the *balay lakoy* (big houses).

Such conflicts would be quickly noticed by the entire community as an aggressive potential challenge and would be discussed openly in public meetings (*agpulong*). Of interest is the conflict-solution-behavior. Occasionally after long, violent and loud discussions we (as non-Mangyan observers) were astonished about the moderate, harmonious decision. The Mangyan had a range of punishment measures at their disposal, but these were never put to use during our stay. During the discussions of some agpulong, forceful, harsh penalties such as lashing (*bugbog*) and foot pincers/pliers (*pangaw*) are called for, but at the end not finalized. Usually these disputes go on for so long that everyone has repeatedly stated their arguments time and again. The ideal of peacefully and quietly stating one's interests would not necessarily be held up by both men and women alike. Meetings in which controversial stand points and conflict situations are themes were at times quite lively. In contrast with the ideal of gentle reserved manner they sometimes broke out into really tumultuous competition, the goal of which was to succeed at being heard

above the others. Now and then at least three to five people were speaking out simultaneously and in astonishingly powerful voices. In this confusion, listening and understanding was quite impossible. After the ebbing away of this emotionally charged floodtide of competing opinions and commentaries came the soft spoken voices of the participants of the arguments which were worth mentioning, but were again and again overwhelmed by the uproarious muddle. The constant repetition, the untiring recapturing of the event and the examination of all perspectives to the point of exhaustion leading to the conflict could have pragmatic psychological functions: Violent feelings were relived again and again within the discussion until a certain de-sensitisation and an emotional plateau was reached, where a "sensible" solution could be realized. Usually in the end a solution is favored which does not deepen the rift between the opponents, and the use of harsh punishment of the so called guilty would maintain the conflict potential at a boiling point. Rather an amicable balance is struck. The aim of the agpulong is to find a "judgment" through which "normal" social relations can be restored and the possibilities of hostile behavior can be reduced to a minimum. The accepted "moral" values of the Mangyan, such as generosity and the readiness to help, as well as autonomy on the one side and togetherness on the other would during the discussion be picked out by the kuyay who would at regular intervals urge everybody to remember them.

On the one hand an agpulong can take place spontaneously and unexpectedly if a sudden conflict breaks out. On the other hand they can be planned and summoned if an intense difference of opinion had already been up in the air for a while and one of the adversaries demands an agpulong. In this case it will start at the beginning of the evening darkness and can be drawn out for hours until sunrise. If no solution was found then the following evening would also be set aside. In principle anyone who had an interest in the agpulong could attend. In the agpulong we observed participants from the concerned neighboring groups (kabalayan) were completely present, while Mangyans from the other neighboring groups occasionally kept themselves somewhat aloof. In another situation in an already described conflict (Lauser 1994a) between two brothers their father was called over from another village because without his presence they didn't want to begin the agpulong.

Agpulong Between Husband and Wife

The Mangyan said the most cases of conflict arise due to "marriage difficulties," adultery and divorce. The problem emerges swiftly from the individual context of the married couple in question to a search for a solution in the broader framework of the open meeting. During our stay there did not appear to be noticeably more marriage conflicts in comparison to other conflicts. A part must have been played by the fact that the Malulans had only recently brought a very violent and dramatic conflict relationship to a successful conclusion. The time of endless meetings and disharmony, which affected many, as was suspected during one of our discussions, was now happily consigned to their memory (Bräunlein and Lauser 1993, 222 ff).

In "women talks" there was always some gossip about clandestine meetings in the *kubat* (the jungle), when anyone left the village without companion. However none of these speculations led to public marriage complications. Palaiina was a desirable widow who left the settlement very often without companion and there was a variety of speculations. She had a few offers lined up but was frequently to be seen with the widower Cassio. After going to and fro the two finally married i.e. they made their liaison public, coordinated their economic activity and moved into a hut together. Cassio moved into Palaiina's hut in order to share her mattress and her food. The children from their previous marriages moved into the household of their respective married siblings. The marriage of the newly weds was accompanied from the start by difficulties. Apparently their idea of life together was entirely different. Palaiina was considered to be a hard working woman while Cassio on the other hand was regarded to be "lazy," who neglected to clear his own field. Instead he preferred to go to the lowland where he was involved in countless debt relationships. After donating a skirt and a red scarf to his new wife he was hoping now she would appropriately provide for him.

The ideal relationship of a Mangyan marriage is described with complementary images (Lauser 1994b). While the man provides his wife in optimal ways with meat, tobacco and other goods which can be purchased in the lowland, she takes care of the day to day food normally existing of *kamote* (sweet potatoes). Throughout this complementary social and economic unity the individuality and autonomy of each person is also stressed. In the balancing of their needs, loud differences of opinion emerged shortly after the marriage of Palaiina

and Cassio. One evening they boisterously unloaded their grievances and this led to an agpulong in the hut of Palaiina's uncle.

In the evening loud shouting came from Paulino's hut, Cassio was the loudest, complaining about his wife Palaiina. Palaiina lay on the mat. Next to her sat Paulino. The hut was full with Mangyan men and women. At the other end sat Cassio with his back to those present so that he shouted his accusations more or less to the outside. The Mangyans' effort to keep themselves at a distance is also shown in their conversation style (and particularly in conflict): when the Mangyan talk in groups they do not sit facing one another, but they all look in the same direction avoiding eye contact. When quarrelling they even sit with their backs to one another talking in the opposite direction to the addressee. Gibson (1986, 46) describes similar behavior with the Buhid (Mangyan):

> Conflict is then avoided through each of the participants "sharing" his or her thoughts with the group as a whole, without ever addressing anyone in particular. This is true of conversations more generally. Whenever Buid gather to chat, one will find that the majority are facing in the same direction, or sitting with their backs to one another. Eye contact is seldom made, and never when the topic of conversation may be in any way controversial. When a disagreeable statement is made, it may simply be ignored by the auditors, and the conversation may shift to an entirely unrelated topic, or else the auditors may simply sidle off and discontinue the exchange.

Cassio does not want to be married any longer. He feels shamefully neglected by his new wife. She does not provide suitable food. Palaiina still wants to be married, but in the proper sense. Cassio does not take care of her sexual needs properly and that is also the reason why she neglected to provide his food. After seven years of being a widow she now has a great need for tenderness and affection. Out of frustration she has not provided Cassio with food and in the morning instead giving him cooked kamote for breakfast she laid an empty plate at his feet. Then at noon Cassio came home and there was nothing at all left for him. She had shared everything between the children. Cassio was so angry about it that he loudly demanded a punishment for Palaiina because she was not fulfilling her duties as a wife. He obviously felt that he was in the right, and as her husband, should be provided with sufficient food. Regarding the accusation against himself, he used as an excuse that he was no

longer young and being so old was unable to do it as often as Palaiina demanded. The assembled Mangyans laughed at such statements. Philimonina and Linda even laughingly provoked Cassio. After these jocular sexual suggestions, both women argued for Palaiina. They remember the equal rights principles and if Cassio is hungry then he must not only contribute sexually but also contribute more economically to the entire household. These loud and serious protestations found a clear wide assent with those present. After hours long negotiations, in which everyone, male and female gave their opinions about marriage (taybalang) a conclusion was reached that both parties should try once more. Nobody is regarded as "guilty." Decisive to the solution was above all the knowledge that Palaiina did not want to separate, although Cassio had hit her. She still wanted to live with him, to have a sexual relationship with him and perhaps to even have a child with him. Cassio had to distance himself from his ideas of punishment which found little sympathy with those present. The call for a ritual pig slaughter to bring the conflict to an end was quickly picked up, which promised with it a bountiful meat meal for everyone. But very quickly those present disassociated themselves from the suggestion because both of the quarreling partners would have been economically overcharged. The quarrel was characterized as not too serious to justify a pig slaughtering (agpansula buyok). Besides the two parties were again ready for marriage and compromise. After a couple of weeks, after renewed arguing and "miting," they split up. A year later they got back together again and after a further year they split once more. At our last visit in 1993, Cassio was married again to another woman with whom he also had a child, while Palaiina lived without a man and was happy to do so as she laughingly assured me.

Agpulong Between Two Kuyays (Elders)

At the beginning of June the Mission organized a fiesta to take place annually. This fiesta should stabilize the village as a community. The Mission-Sisters see this also as a reason to visit the village and to organize community games and the giving of clothes. On the occasion of the coming local elections to which Malula for the first time was to be participated the question of a candidate for mayor was up in the air. The "community development programme" on the part of the Mission expressly encouraged such "leadership" and regu-

larly invited prospective candidates to "leadership seminars." The elder of Malula who had already filled this position could not and would not have it monopolized by one person on a long term basis. Too great was their control to let someone upset the delicate balance. No one should be able to enrich themselves through a better contact with the Mission and because of that bring into danger the ideal of equality. On the occasion of the fiesta the excitement of the leadership rivalry intensified.

Every year the Sisters brought rice and *pancit* to the fiesta. A pig was raised and bought by the Malula community. Juanit as "community organizer" collected forty pesos from every household, (which was not easy and was not even achieved from some householders), to be able to acquire the pig from the lowland. The pig was slaughtered on the evening before the fiesta and divided between the households. On the day of the party *aplaki* (old man) Sagani asked aplaki Pinong to cook and to divide the rice and pancit brought by the Sisters. This task was conscientiously done by aplaki Pinong. In the subsequent night a loud scream arose. Fernando was dissatisfied supposing that he had received too little pancit and rice from that which Pinong had divided. He also continued to complain about the clothes sharing and his small ration. It was a way of "singing for your supper i.e. for clothes." The shy and ashamed singers were challenged by the Sisters to sing in front of all if they wanted to keep the items. Later Pinong took over the role as a kind of announcer (or emcee— master of ceremonies), he invited individuals to step forward to sing a few songs and afterwards they were awarded with an item of clothing by a Sister. Pinong's duty from here on was a little tricky because the clothes were autocratically divided out whether the recipient was happy or disappointed with it. Aplaki Sagani for example (who had hidden himself anxiously behind the others) received a pair of fine ribbed underpants for his serenade, which he was not at all pleased about. His attempt to complain and to try to make an exchange was unsuccessful with Sister Ester.

Already the fact that Pinong had taken over the division of the meal and afterwards had also become involved with the "singing-distribution" game had induced Fernando to make a defiant retreat into his hut. In order to avoid any quarrelling and conflict Pinong decided not to share the remaining rice and pancit, but to give it all to Fernando. Fernando greedily devoured the meal but evidently he could not swallow his rage. In the evening his annoyance came out

241

and he swore at Pinong with the foulest insult the Tagalog language could put at his disposal. Fernando had lived for a long time in a lowland settlement, and even in Malula spoke more Tagalog than Mangyan. Pinong wanted again to avoid conflict so he moved back into his hut, but Fernando let himself get carried away and swore at Pinong "as if he were an animal." Pinong's sons were so furious about the insults that they were ready to defend their father's honor with fists and blows. After they had feigned a pair of symbolic punches in the air and had stayed way from other quarrel mediators this symbolic gesture would have been translated into action. The conflict extended over meetings lasting several days. Fernando's anger, which was considered by the majority to show weakness of character and to be unjustified, could not be so simply cooled down. Support and solidarity for Fernando came only from his brother-in-law, Arbas, who explained this obligation of solidarity himself with family ties. Fernando was his wife's brother and the uncle of his children and because of this he must stand by him, said Arbas. Fernando not only worked off his anger outside the home, but also at home by hitting his wife. Without an official conflict resolution having been formulated, he moved back to a lowland settlement to stay with siblings for considerably longer than a few days. In the following period Malula was shaken by a new conflict. It was about the already described "conflict of the nocturnal attack" by a few Tagalog and the unresolved debt relationships of Miranda and his son Pedring. The conflict concerning the injustice of the furious Fernando was put to one side as trivial and it perished under the new excitement. Only a few weeks later, when Fernando's wife Andai died, the questioning of death, *tari*, formulated the resentment of her husband as a basic cause of death. This time Fernando left Malula for a few months.

Juanit suggested that behind Fernando's anger about the small amount of food he was given lay the frustration his efforts as a *Capitan* (position of mayor which follows the lowland settlements model)-candidate had not been recognized. I would go still further and suggest it was a general unwillingness to see his weak position as an established elder. In the neighborhood group in which he lives allegiance is given mostly to Dario (the husband of his step-daughter) and Sagani (the brother of Dario). In the meeting it was obvious that Fernando's position of authority seemed to be weak and mar-

ginal. Fernando must have realized that not only had Dario, the son-in-law of his wife, (and his step son-in-law) ambitions for the position of Capitan (Dario was considered at that time as the favorite of the "community organizer"), but also clearly realized his own poor chances and his weak position.

These examples illustrate some aspects about the little regimented way of dispute settlement: The lack of a binding judgement and the shortcoming of a sanctioned authority led quite often to a break up of a meeting without having reached a conclusive result. In these cases one of the parties gave way and preferred a change of residence and the principle "let sleeping dogs lie" as the factual conflict solution.

The role of mediator embodied in experienced kuyay can never go beyond helping and offering a solution. Their task consists mainly of selecting respective opinions and certain elements from arguments of the quarreling parties and to throw them into the rounds of discussions suggesting new way of compromise. Therefore they cannot ignore the voices of loyal supporters. A kuyay who was able to unite loyal supporters behind himself has a good chance that his advices are accepted. On the other hand solutions cannot be carried out if the supporter does not find them appropriate. Although it is men who take up the prestigious role of mediator, women are not excluded from this political process. Women take part in the discussions and attempts at mediation, a fact you would be aware of in Malula, as there were several self-confident and strongly voiced women.

In principle there is no interest in punishment but rather in restoring a condition of harmony and balance. Usually a moderate solution is found with a reasonable compensation given to the recognized injured party. As is the custom the regained peace is confirmed by a ritual pig slaughter which helps to remove bad feelings. The meat meal is regarded by the Mangyan as the most useful and harmonious solution. Normally day to day meals do not contain meat and are usually eaten within the household, but highly prized meat meals are always shared amongst the entire settlement. Besides the ritual aspect there is also the sociological aspect: a pig slaughtering serves as an important ritual to replace the emerging and feared unrest and appeals to the community as a way to strengthen ties. For the accused such a meal involves large costs if he must pay for it alone, but it means a festive meal for everyone to enjoy.

Peaceful Societies

What I have attempted to illustrate is that the Mangyan empha-
size both an ideological value system, peace awareness and conflict
avoidance and the practicing of these values in everyday life. What
is striking is that western science focuses its research interest less on
peaceful societies but above all on the opposite behavior—namely on
the investigation of war, aggression and violence. It may be related
to the fact that there are noticeably more war societies than peaceful
societies. Keith Otterbein found in a "cross cultural study of war"
(1970), only four peaceful societies out of a sample of fifty. Richard
Sipes researched 130 societies, of which he could only validate six
as "relatively peaceful societies" (1973, 68, quoting Gregor 1994, 242).[5]
On the other hand it certainly has to do with the selective view of
western scientists whose formulation of the questions was influenced
by the events of two devastating world wars during this century.

In anthropological literature there are relatively few descriptions
of "peaceful" societies (Wiberg 1981). Comparisons of peaceful soci-
eties are still rare (Fabbro 1978). Instead scholars concentrated on the
few available descriptions: Elizabeth Marshall's characterization of the
Kalahari Bushmen as "Harmless People" (1958), Robert Dentan's
description of the Senoi as "Non-violent people of Malaya" (1968),
Robert Levy's "Ethnography of Tahitians" (1973) and Jean Briggs
description of the Inuit (1970, 1975, 1994) are highlighted as the most
well known. While these primary ethnographies impart a multi-di-
mensional, differentiating view of the complex life of such peaceful
cultures, the secondary and tertiary constructions reduce these some-
times to a romantic picture as an antithesis to our modern, urban
industrial, self alienating world. According to (unwillingly) carica-
tured (popular scientific) romanticisms, that was certainly the case with
the reception of the Senoi as "non-violent people" (Bräunlein 1984).

The tendency to portray such societies as "non-violent" societies
where egoism, self absorption and the pursuit of profit (as charac-
teristics typical of the modern world) are absent and where coop-
eration and reliance on the community predominates, has less to do
with the first hand sources, but more to do with a selective view
tired of civilization. The question often posed in this context, whether
to follow the philosophy of enlightenment—the explanation that the
Hobbes' human picture is natural or in contrast with Rousseau's
human picture—implies an "either / or" that according to the ex-
ample of the Mangyan is unproductive and irrelevant. Let us remem-

ber the Hobbes' position which suggests that human nature has a basis of three main principles of conflict motives, namely competition, mistrust and the search for fame. So long as humans must live with these conflicts, without the power to curb them, they will find themselves in a war where everyone fights with each other. In other words, this argumentation suggests that non-violence and individualism are incompatible; that individualism necessarily leads to competition and therefore to conflict and violence. The Mangyan emphasize not only group orientation, which is expressed through the ideal of general reciprocity as well as through the ideal of non-violence, but they also emphasize individuality and autonomy as important categories in their everyday lives. Their peacefulness is balanced in a dynamic process between these two poles. With reference to the philosophy of Enlightenment one could say the explanation lies between the Hobbes and Rousseau human picture.

Mostly peace is explained by the absence of conflict and of war and one concentrates the analytic interest, as mentioned, on explanation models for conflict and war and less on peace. In social anthropology arises the question of peaceful societies less in an "anthropology of peace," but in an "anthropology of war." Mostly in recent years a wide range of culture comparison studies about war, aggression and violence have appeared (Vayda 1976, Fergusen 1984, Le Crone Foster & Al. 1986, Riches 1986). With the exception of Montagu (1978) they deal above all with the search for an explanation of violent and warlike behavior. An informative overall view of the actual standpoint of the discussion is collated in a symposium "The Anthropology of War" (Haas 1990). Continued research approaches are suggested in new readers as the result of two symposiums "Societies at Peace" (Howell and Willis 1989) and "The Anthropology of Peace and Non-violence" (Sponsel and Gregor 1994). Peaceful societies are rare and sometimes turn out after a closer inspection not to be as absolutely peaceful. For example the Kung Bush people in Africa, who arose in anthropological literature as the "Harmless People" are according to actual researches involved in feuds which claim a considerable number of lives (Knauft 1987 quoting from Gregor 1994). Initiatives in the direction of a "peace theory" were proposed by Galtung (1968), who suggested a difference between negative peace and positive peace. "Negative peace in a pure form is based on minimal relationship: 'Good fences make good neighbors'" (Galtung 1968 quoted by Gregor 1990, 122). Positive peace, however depends on an active exchange and the maintenance

of many and diverse peaceful relationships. "Exchange leads to the creation of a common culture. Parallel institutions in different societies can generate a consensus of values and stimulate the kind of diffuse emotionally meaningful relationships that would inhibit violence" (ibid.).

In this context runs a theme of "cross-cutting ties" in the field of socio-structural theories of conflict. Quite apart from the fact that satisfactory explanations of the peaceful manner of the Mangyan must be multi-dimensional, an aspect mentioned there may be also relevant to the Mangyan. Such socio-structural theses are correlating war-avoiding and war-promoting conditions with loyalty structures. Let me outline shortly these structures: The use of force and warlike defences of interests is connected with patrilocal residence along with agnatic fraternal interest groups. In non-patrilocal and matrilocal residence groups are created "cross-cutting ties" where the resulting loyalties are more likely to swing toward peaceful solutions than toward warlike solutions. (Thoden van Velzen and Weterin 1960). In other words, in matrilocal (and non-patrilocal) societies the men of a related group are dispersed in several settlements after marriage. These men keep both their pre-marital and post-marital residence loyalties and therefore try to mediate in cases of conflict (Le Vine and Campbell 1972, 47 ff). Such an argument seems plausible if the kinship loyalty factor is not taken as the only independent variable exclusively creating "cross-cultural ties." Other bonds (such as friendship, trade and exchange relations to name only a few) should not be ignored. In the case of the Mangyan, a de facto bilateral residence choice and the different multilateral possibilities of association creates a dense network of individual relation-friendship and loyalty-bonds. These networks of peaceful "cross ties" are not only to be traced back from matrilocal sources. On the other side the reversed arguments that patrilocality would favor wars through fraternal interest groups could be empirically disproved as a one-sided generalizing cause-correlation.[6]

Concerning the distinction between a negative and a positive peace thesis, the Mangyan stand as an example for a balance between both mechanisms. While the Mangyan show with non-Mangyan a timorous, ethnocentric and hostile behavior, which will correspond to a negative peace behavior, they maintain on the other hand flexible dealings within the Mangyan peoples. Their social organisations are structured so openly that alliances and exchanges based on individual decisions are possible on a large scale and are not something lim-

ited by territorial boundaries. Such a behavior is described, at least exemplified, with the Mangyan as peaceful in the sense of the positive peace thesis. It should become clear, that "both-and-also" can lead to further explanations rather than excluding constructions of opposition. Beyond that, concerning the argument about positive and negative peace, it must be critically noted that the narrow association between groups with similar values and high rates of bartering might not necessarily be the key to peace. Violent conflict might also break out due to value and level of bartered goods. Just so, cultural distance, mutual fear and mutual deterrent has to be seen as a very sensible, conflictive or even provoking model of peace.

"Peaceful society" is described by Fabbro as (1978, quoted by Gregor 1990, 106):

> A peaceful society is one that is not involved in internal collective violence, one that exhibits relatively little interpersonal violence, one that provides no special roles for warriors, and one that has values and sanctions precluding violence as a means for resolving conflict.

Societies which correspond to this peaceful model were counted to be mostly hunters and gatherers, communities of modest size and in geographical isolated places. Otterbein (1970) argues that societies without military organizations live on islands, in mountainous hinterlands, in arctic desert wastelands and in regions which are surrounded by jungle. Also Dentan (1994) argues in this direction when he arranges peaceful societies into two social types and with it lists secluded groups (enclaves), for example, the Hutterer and Amish next to very little tribal societies which mostly consist of foragers and gardeners. This second category is according to Dentan composed of retreating groups ("refugees") who had suffered to a larger or smaller extent traumatized experiences with powerful neighbors.

A lack of quarrel-settlement-institutions, as well as an economy based on "shifting cultivation" is considered by a few anthropologists to promote war. Vayda (1961) argues in a functionalistic-cultural-ecologicalistic way, that the practice of 'swidden-agriculture' and the existence of an already cultivated land gives an incentive for its possession and consequently influences and encourages wars. He tries to prove his basic hypothesis that population pressure leads to wars over territory with the examples of the Iban in Borneo, the Maori of New Zealand and later with the Maring of Papua New Guinea. The belligerent and yet non-expanding behavior of the Maring he explains

in accordance with his hypothesis on the adaptive nature of war maintaining the human-resources-ratio, that the Maring had not yet reached the threshold of the population pressure. Therefore there occurred already wars but no territorial conquests (Vayda 1971). While Vayda in later works (1976) recognized the weakness of his previous approaches and rejected single tracked ecological explanations searching now for multi-causal answers, his epigonuses didn't follow a differentiated approach. The case of the Mangyan, whose economy is based on shifting cultivation and where there is a lack of official quarrel-settlement-institutions as mentioned above, does not apply to this one-sided argument. On the contrary the quarrel settlement forms of avoidance, separation and negotiation are described as peace making mechanisms, while the economy of shifting cultivation has not led to campaigns of expansion even though in recent times since the Second World War politically induced population pressure has led to cutting back the land and to over exploitation of parts of the Alangan valleys. Helbling (1991) discusses in detail with examples of the Maring in New Guinea and the Yanomamö in South America that the trade in tribal shifting cultivation societies is less ecological determined. Rather it is influenced by political factors.

Once again the explanation models for conflict and war (and also for peaceful behavior) exemplify clearly that they are bound very tightly to theoretical approaches and context and so they can reach very different perspectives and conclusions. Besides the biological or psychological studies about the universal phenomenon of aggression are ecological-functionalistic theories in the sense of the culture materialism represented by Marvin Harris widely accepted. Such a focusing on material causes neglects a multidimensional approach of the human decision processes, as Robarchek (1990, 69; see also Sahlins 1976) questions basing on his data on Semai-research:

> Are material causes, in fact, material? And are they causal? That is, even if people specifically reason together and decide to go to war to acquire more wives, or more buffalo horses, or a better salmon stream, does the ultimate cause or the behavior lie in the "material" end to be served? Or is it to be found in the cultural values that put a premium on salmon over other foods, or on buffalo horses as sources of status, or on multiple wives as symbols of virility or success? If we put aside the assumption of an innate drive to maximize material good, is greed a material cause? Put another way, if I own a Volkswagen and I steal a Mercedes, is the cause of my behavior "material"?

Violence is neither a necessary aspect of social life nor must it necessarily be considered as something terrible. In cultural studies the exploration of aggression as an absolute, the human nature inherent phenomenon—as most ethologists and socio-biologists continue to argue—leads to an impasse. More of interest is the research of the specific cultural pattern of behavior and the ideological constructions which support and give meaning to aggressive and peaceful behavior. Meaningful are the enemic explanations and the indigenous concepts. What does certain behavior mean to the people involved? Do they see themselves as "aggressive" or "peaceful"? What are the semantic connotations of these words in a cultural context? Are they alike for all persons, e.g. for men and women or which characteristic distinctions are meant? (see also Robarchek and Dentan 1987). The discussion regarding the "nonviolent" Semai (egalitarian slash and burn field farmer on Mainland Malaysia) is misleading and misunderstood. The Semai were recruited by the British to fight against the Japanese occupation during the war. At that time cases of "Blood Drunkenness" was observed, the surfacing of unrestrained aggression triggered off a discussion about the universality of aggression. But as Robarchek and Dentan can convincingly point out that it happened during exceptional circumstances: the cultural value system was forcibly destroyed. "Blood Drunkenness" describes an acute state of nausea, fear, disorientation, and disgust which the sight of human blood evokes among the Semai" (Robarchek and Dentan 1987, 361).

Peaceful societies are rare and are often not entirely peaceful, nevertheless they show us more than a utopian fantasy. If we are ready to closely inspect the relative peace capabilities of so-called peaceful societies instead of glorifying the "peaceful Others," we would be able to observe specific structure and mechanisms of avoiding and minimizing conflict. As the example of the Mangyan can and should point out, social practices, political organisations, relationship networks and a definite value system all reflect the message of non-violence.

Notes

1. With reference to the Alangan-Mangyan see also Bräunlein and Lauser 1993, Lauser 1994a, 1994b, 1995.

2. *Tindahan* are Tagalog trading posts in the lowland and are a form of trade support points where among other things the wooden products of the Mangyan are marketed.

3. Confer Bräunlein and Lauser 1993; 163ff, where kinship relationships in general, the son-in-law relationship (*taybilasan* i.e. *biyanan*) in particular and Oscar's position within the neighborhood group (*kabalayan*) to kuyay Miranda are discussed in depth.

4. For the upbringing of children see also Lauser 1994a.

5. For examples of "peaceful societies" see also Montagu 1978.

6. See also at this point Hanser 1985, 287ff.

References

Bräunlein, Peter. 1984. *Das "Traumleben" der Senoi (Malaysia)—Inspirative erfahrung und gemeinschaftsprägende kraft.* Unveröffentlichte Magisterarbeit. Freiburg.

Bräunlein, Peter J. and Andrea Lauser. 1993. *Leben in Malula. Ein Beitrag zur ethnographie der Alangan-Mangyan auf Mindoro (Philippinen).* Pfaffenweiler (Centaurus-Verlag, Kulturen im Wandel, Bd.1).

Briggs, Jean. 1970. *Never in anger: Portrait of an Eskimo family.* Cambridge.

———. 1975. The origins of nonviolence: Aggression in two Canadian Eskimo groups. In *Psychoanalytic Study of Society* 6, ed. W. Muensterberger, 134–203. New York.

———. 1994. Why don't you kill your baby brother? The dynamics of peace in Canadian Inuit camps. In *The Anthropology of peace and nonviolence,* ed. Leslie E. Sponsel and Thomas Gregor, 155–82. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Dentan, Robert Knox. 1968. *The Semai: A nonviolent people of Malaysia.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

———. 1978. Notes on childhood in a nonviolent context: The Semai case. In *Learning non-aggression,* ed. Ashley Montagu. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 1994. Surrendered men: Peaceable enclaves in the post-enlightenment west. In *The anthropology of peace and nonviolence,* eds. Leslie E. Sponsel and Thomas Gregor, 69–108. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Fabbro, D. 1978. Peaceful societies: An introduction. In *Journal of Peace Research* 12.

Galtung, J. 1968. Peace. In *International encyclopedia of social sciences,* eds. J. Goody and S.J. Tambiah. Cambridge.

Gibson, Thomas. 1986. *Sacrifice and sharing in the Philippine highlands: Religion and society among the Buhid of Mindoro.* London.

———. 1989. Symbolic representations of tranquility and aggression among the Buhid. In *Societies at peace: Anthropological perspectives,* eds. Signe Howell and Roy Willis, 60–78. London and New York.

———. 1990. Raiding, trading, and tribal autonomy in insular Southeast Asia. In *The anthropology of war,* ed. Jonathan Haas, 125–45. Cambridge.

Gregor, Thomas. 1985. *Anxious pleasures: The sexual lives of an Amazonian people*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

————. 1990. Uneasy peace: Why Xinguanos don't make war. In *The anthropology of war*, ed. Jonathan Haas, 105–24. Cambridge.

————. 1994. Peace in Brazil's Upper Xingu. In *The anthropology of peace and nonviolence*, eds. Leslie E. Sponsel and Thomas Gregor, 241–57. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Hanser, Peter. 1985. Krieg und recht. Wesen und ursachen kollektiver gewaltanwendungen in den akephalen gesellschaften neuguineas. Berlin.

Helbling, Jürg. 1991. Einige bemerkungen zur ökologie tribaler schwendbaugesellschaften. In *Ethnologie im widerstreit. kontroversen über macht, geschäft, geschlecht in fremden kulturen*, 121–41. Herausgegeben von Eberhard Berg u.a. München.

Howell, Signe and Roy Willis, eds. 1989. *Societies at peace: Anthropological perspectives*. London and New York: Routledge.

Knauft, Bruce M. 1987. Reconsidering violence in simple human societies. In *Current Anthropology* 28:457–500.

Koch, Klaus-Friedrich. 1974. *War and peace in Jalémó. The management of conflict in highland New Guinea*. Cambridge.

Lauser, Andrea. 1994a. Die geschwisterschaft als soziales netz. Zur tayarian (Geschwisterbande) bei den Mangyan Malulas (Mindoro / Philippinen). *Kea—Zeitschrift für Kulturwissenschaften* 6 (Kinderwelten): 71–96.

————. 1994b. Geschlechterverhältnisse in einer 'egalitären' Gesellschaft: Ein Fallbeispiel aus den Philippinen. *Kea-Zeitschrift für Kulturwissenschaften* 7 (Geschlechterkonstruktionen): 119–48.

————. 1995. Are inquisitive Anthropologists too varacious? *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 23:118–37

Le Vine, Robert A. and Donald T. Campbell. 1972. *Ethnocentrism: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes, and group behavior*. New York.

Levy, Robert. 1973. *Tahitians: Minds and experience in the society islands*. Chicago.

Marshall, E.T. 1958. *The harmless people*. New York.

Miyamoto, Masaru. 1988. *The Hanunoo-Mangyan: Society, religion and law among a mountain people of Mindoro island, Philippines*. Osaka (SENRI Ethnological Studies).

Montagu, Ashley, ed. 1978. *Learning non-aggression: The experience of non-literate societies*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Otterbein, Keith, F. 1970. The evolution of war: *A crosscultural study*. New Haven: HRAF Press.

Pennoyer, Douglas F. 1975. Taubuid plants and ritual complexes. Ph.D. diss., Washington State University.

————. 1980. Rituals in Taubuid Life (Mindoro, Philippines). In *Anthropos* 75: 693–709.

Reid, Anthony. 1983. Introduction: Slavery and bondage in Southeast Asian history and closed and open slave systems in pre-colonial Southeast Asia. In *Slavery and bondage in Southeast Asian history*, ed. A. Reid. Queensland.

Robarchek, Clayton A. 1977a. Semai nonviolence: A system approach to understanding. Ph.D. Diss., University of California, Berkeley.

————. 1977b. Frustration, aggression and the nonviolent Semai. *American Ethnologist* 4:762–79.

————. 1979. Learning to fear: A case study of emotional conditioning. *American Ethnologist* 4(4): 555–67.

————. 1986. Helplessness, fearfulness, and peacefulness: The emotional and motivational context of Semai social relations. *Anthropological Quarterly* 59(4): 155–204.

————. 1989. Hobbesian and Rousseauan images of man: Autonomy and individualism in a peaceful society." In *Societies at peace: Anthropological perspectives*, eds. Signe Howell and Roy Willis. London and New York.

————. 1990. Motivations and material causes: On the explanation of conflict and war. In *The Anthropology of war*, ed. J. Haas, 56–75. Cambridge.

————. 1994. Ghosts and witches: The psychocultural dynamics of Semai peacefulness. In *The anthropology of peace and nonviolence*, ed. Leslie E. Sponsel and Thomas Gregor, 183–96. Boulder and London.

Robarchek, Clayton A. and Robert K. Dentan. 1987. Blood drunkenness and the bloodthirsty Semai: Unmaking another anthropological myth. *American Anthropologist* 99(2): 356–65.

Roberts, Simon. 1982. *Ordnung und konflikt: Eine einführung in die rechtsethnologie.* Stuttgart (Original: *Order and dispute. An introduction to legal anthropology,* 1979).

Sahlins, Marshall D. 1976. *Culture and practical reason.* Chicago.

Simmel, G. 1968. Soziologie. Untersuchungen über die formen der vergesellschaftung. 5. Auflage Berlin

Sipes, R.G. 1973. War, sports and aggression: An empirical test of two rival theories. *American Anthropologist* 75:64–86

Vayda, Andrew P. 1961. Expansion and warfare among swidden agriculturalists. *American Anthropologist* 63:346–58..

————. 1971. Phases of the process of war and peace among the Maring of New Guinea. *Oceania* 42(1): 1–24.

————. 1976. *War in ecological perspective: Persistence, change, and adaptive process in three Oceanian societies.* New York.

Wiberg, H.. 1981. What have we learned about peace? *Journal of Peace Research* 15:110–49.