

Discuss the logics,
illogics, meanings,
function, or non
functions of war from
an...



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The Logics, Illogics, Meanings, Function, or Non-Functions of War from an Anthropological Viewpoint

INTRODUCTION War is a prolonged disagreement carried among nations, parties, or states characterized by societal disruption, extreme aggression, and increased mortality. As a pattern of behavior, warlike trends are found in primates including humans. Such a clash is always an attempt to either change the material hierarchy of power or psychological equality between such kinds of groups. Logics, illogics and meaning of war

The general idea of the human warfare from anthropological point of view is largely focuses on small societies such as Yanomani, Masai, Dani and Nazis. The matters of anthropological discussion are the individual motivations, socio-cultural purposes, biological predispositions, and causal significance manifest in warfare (Peter, Ember and Human Relations Area Files 415). For example, in Yanomani territory, there lived uncontested Yanomani known as Moxateteu that had the highest population of illegal gold miners. The gold miners, who were illegally working in yanomani, transmitted deadly diseases such as malaria and caused pollution in forests and rivers with mercury. Ecological models illustrated that war had a constructive feedback for smaller scale communities by exercising a hidden role in intervening relationships with the surrounding. However, warfare was ethnographically considered to maintain a space between settlements and therefore, prevented the degradation of the resources. Lastly, the models of socio culture developed the fact that some social organization encouraged people to war as illustrated by (Lockard 944). The opposed constitution clan and lineage groupings were practiced to create perennial tensions that might result into war. Nevertheless, the inadequacies of such models become very clear when clarifying the meanings and motivations that warriors gave to

<https://assignbuster.com/discuss-the-logics-illogics-meanings-function-or-non-functions-of-war-from-an-anthropological-viewpoint/>

their acts. Functions and Structures of Warfare A functional and structuralism theory of warfare emphasized its responsibility in creating a basic aim and interest within a social group. In the presence of common rival, the members of Yanomani and Dani alliances and confederations set aside their local differences and united for the common action against their enemies. Group harmony, continuity, and identity were therefore, insured both by warfare, victory and the funeral rituals that were connected to it. Moreover, Lockard pointed out that constant warfare in its ritual stage was mainly functional in the Yanomani, Masai, and even Dani social landscapes, which involved groups whose associates did not participate in specialized occupations and thus had no natural unity and gave no basic incentives for help (944).

CONCLUSION The factors that led to war, according to the anthropological perspective, based on individual motivations, socio-cultural purposes, biological predispositions, and causal significance in the warfare. In the face of common rival, the societal alliances and confederations set a side their local differences and united for the common action against their enemies. The opposed constitution clan and lineage groupings, were practiced to create perennial tensions that might result into war. Works cited Human Relations Area Files, Melvin Ember and Neal Peregrine Peter. Encyclopedia of Prehistory: South and Southwest Asia London: Springer. 2002. Print Lockard Craig A. Societies, Networks, and Transitions. Massachusetts: Cengage Learning. 2010. Print .