



I'm not robot



Continue

Marvin harris cannibals and kings pdf

© 1996-2014, Amazon.com, Inc. or its subsidiaries In this brilliant and profound study, prominent American anthropologist Marvin Harris shows how endless variations of cultural behavior - often so puzzling at first glance - can be explained as adaptations to specific ecological conditions. Its aim is to take into account the evolution of cultural forms, as Darwin has taken into account the evolution of biological forms: to show how cultures adopt their distinctive forms in response to changing ecological ways. [A]magisterial interpretation of the rise and fall of human cultures and societies. — Robert Lekachman, Washington Post Book WorldYou have compelling arguments that support the primacy of cultural factors, not genetic or psychological factors in human life, deserve the widest possible audience. — Gloria Levitas New Leader[An] original and... an urgent theory about the nature of man and because human cultures take on so many different shapes. — The New Yorker Alive and Controversial. - I. Bernard Cohen, front page, The New York Times Book Review In this brilliant and profound study, prominent American anthropologist Marvin Harris shows how endless variations of cultural behavior – often so puzzling at first glance – can be explained as adaptations to specific ecological conditions. Its aim is to take into account the evolution of cultural forms, as Darwin has taken into account the evolution of biological forms: to show how cultures adopt their distinctive forms in response to changing ecological ways. [A]magisterial interpretation of the rise and fall of human cultures and societies. — Robert Lekachman, Washington Post Book WorldYou have compelling arguments that support the primacy of cultural factors, not genetic or psychological factors in human life, deserve the widest possible audience. — Gloria Levitas New Leader[An] original and... an urgent theory about the nature of man and because human cultures take on so many different shapes. — The New Yorker Alive and Controversial. - I. Bernard Cohen, front page, The New York Times Book Review Be the first to know about it! More from Marvin Harris and book picks sent directly to your inbox More from Marvin Harris and book picks sent directly to your inbox I'll go thanks! Something amazing is on the way. Back to top Visit other sites in Penguin Random House Network Welcome to my site! As I hope you can tell, it is dedicated to the book Cannibals and Kings by Marvin Harris. Feel free to move around the site in your spare time; there is a drop-down menu for chapter summaries, a miniature biography of the author, my personal book review, rabbit holes I fell into while reading, and related quizzes that I curated. Thank you for visiting! Cannibals and Kings was published in 1977 by Marvin Harris. Harris describes the transition from hunting and gathering to agriculture, focusing on how population size and dynamics affect food sources. This is a nonfiction anthropological book that is intended for audiences that already have decent capture on the subject. The book has a very dense material and requires a lot of time and energy to understand. The author is particularly interested in philosophy and weaves deterministic themes throughout the text. To the editor: According to Marshall Sahlins (NYR, November 23), the general view of Cannibals and Kings is that culture is a business-scale story. It stems from the fact that cultural materialism is explained by socio-cultural phenomena in the relative costs and benefits of alternative activities. Sahlins's idée fixe is that the costs and benefits are the same as profit and loss and that they therefore apply only to cultures that save according to formal categories of capitalism. However, the costs and benefits of cultural materialism relate to more or less effective ways of meeting the needs of food, sex, rest, health and applause. Although these costs and benefits cannot be measured with precision, approximate approximation can easily be achieved in terms of rising or decreasing deaths, caloric and protein intake, disease prevalence, labour-to-production ratio, energy balance, infanticide, war victims and many other etc and behavioral indicators. These costs and benefits clearly constitute categories which are epistemologically distinct from the market and economic terms of profit and loss measured in monetary terms. Moreover, they are important for much broader groups of problems, namely a more or less effective solution to the biological, psychological and ecological problems experienced by all people and all cultures. Interest in effective solutions to such widespread problems is almost a hallmark of members of the bourgeoisie. But anyone who has a living concern for the basic material conditions of human well-being, including Marx and Engels, emerges from Sahlins' analysis as a proponent of the Western business mentality. It is one monopoly that businessmen east or west neither merit nor enjoy. To get some meatSahlins does not stop at fantasizing about the ideological implications of cultural science rooted in the analysis of material costs and benefits. It provides inaccurate information about how cultural materialists actually apply optimization rules to explain specific puzzles. Sahlins' account might suggest that cultural materialism treats the costs and benefits of alternative innovation as if it were timeless options open to any society at any time in its history. But the body of cultural materialistic theory is evolutionary. In Cannibals and Kings I see specific optimization alternatives as zas can only be appreciated at a certain point in the development process. Neglect of this aspect of cultural materialism leads the Sahlins to misproach the explanation of Aztec cannibalism (first proposed Harner 1977). The point of my version of this theory theory for Sahlins is that as a result Aztec ate people to get some meat. Sahlins ignores the fact that both Harner and I insist that cannibalism was widely practiced in Mesoamerica before the Aztecs came to the Valley of Mexico, and that as part of the ritual sacrifice of prisoners of war it was probably almost common among the chieftains in both hemispheres. We also claim that, as countries develop, they have usually reduced or eliminated human sacrifices by replacing animals with human prey and that they have invariably abandoned the practice of eating prisoners of war. The explanation for this trend is that it was part of a general tendency to adopt ecumenical religions by successful expansive states and to include defeated populations in the political economy of the winner as peasants, peasants or slaves. However, in the case of the Aztecs, as far as we know only in the Case of the Aztecs, the state itself has taken over the earlier human sacrifices and complex cannibalism and made it the main target of its ecclesiastical rituals. As the Aztecs became more powerful, they did not stop eating their enemies; instead, they ate more and more of them. At least 20,000 prisoners were imprisoned within four days during the consecration of the main Aztec temple in 1487 and at least fifteen to twenty thousand people were consumed annually in Tenochtitlan, the capital of the Aztecs (Harner 1977:119). Since the skulls of the victims in Tenochtitlan were placed on the exhibition stands after removing and eating their brains, the members of Cortés's expedition were able to accurately count one category of victims. It turned out that there were 136,000 heads in the stand, but they were unable to count another group of heads that was used to make two tall towers consisting entirely of bones and jaw bones (i.e., 122). The scale of this complex does not resemble any other complex of cannibals before or since. Aztec are a unique case and therefore require a unique explanation. Sahlins, however, is trying to dump the Aztec complex with cases of low-state pre-state ritual cannibalism in Oceania and elsewhere. It distorts the problem from one of explaining aztec cannibalism in particular, to one of the explanations of cannibalism in general. It should not be explained why the Aztecs sacrificed and ate people, but why they sacrificed and ate more people than anyone else. So why were the Aztecs unique? Our explanation is that the Aztecs have not given up on cannibalism, because the resources of the fauna of the Valley of Mexico have become extremely depleted. As a result of millennia of intensification and population growth, the Central Canadian highlands have been deprived of domestic ruminants and pigs and wild birds, fish or uneasy in sufficient quantities to deliver significant amounts of animal protein per capita per year (Sanders and Santley in the press). Few available domestic species – birds and dogs – could not be bred in sufficient quantities make up for the lack of cattle, sheep, goats, horses, pigs, guinea pigs, llamas or alpacas. All other populated ancient states, including Inka Peru, had several domesticated herbivores whose meat and blood were replaced with human flesh in state-sponsored sacrificial rituals and feasts. These ecclesiastical redistributions of animal protein have been used to reward loyalty to the state, especially loyalty on the battlefield, and to strengthen and consolidate the power of the ruling class. This is not the place for a long discussion about the biochemical and physiological advantages associated with animal and plant sources of protein. It is sufficient to note that animal sources of protein in the form of milk or meat are widely valued in relation to plant sources of protein and are everywhere in the central place in church redistribution, honorary feasts and higher-class police stations. (Indian India, the world's center of vegetarian ideology, is one of the world's largest consumers of milk and dairy products.) The reason for this is that proteins are necessary not only for the proper functioning of the body, but for recovery from infections and wounds. To make proteins, the human body needs twenty different types of amino acids. It can synthesize all but eight or nine of them, so-called essential amino acids. To get these basic ingredients from plants, you need to eat large amounts of carefully balanced combinations of plant foods in the same meal. However, meat, eggs and other animal proteins provide essential amino acids in balance even when consumed in small quantities. Global preferences for animal protein therefore reflect an adaptive cultural and nutritional strategy. Any population that did not seek to maximize animal protein intake from neighboring populations would soon find itself physically smaller, less healthy and less able to recover from disease trauma and combat wounds (cf. Scrimshaw, 1977). The theory put forward by Michael Harner and me is that the extremely severe depletion of animal protein resources has made it extremely difficult for the Aztec ruling class to ban human meat and refrain from using it as a reward for loyalty and courage on the battlefield. The Aztec ruling class had a greater direct advantage to sacrifice, redistribute and eat prisoners of war than to use them as peasants or slaves. Cannibalism therefore remained an irresistible sacrament for the Aztecs, and their state-sponsored ecclesiastical system overturned in order to promote the growth, not the decline, of the ritual carnage of prisoners and the redistribution of the human body.1 The Aztecs, unlike any government before or since then, increasingly waged war not to expand the territory, but to increase the flow of edible captives. All this is not like an economic fairy tale invented by the Sahlins, in which they go to war war some meat, because it is cheaper to cook people than to eat beans. Critical optimized costs and benefits are not only those related to the choice between the two sources of protein, but also between alternative modes of justifying the hegemony of the ruling class in a severely depleted environment at a certain point in the evolution of the state in Mesoamerica.Sahlins's Aztec ArcadiaOur theory of Aztec cannibalism is based on the claim that the Valley of Mexico was an exceptionally exhausted environment. Sahlins, however, rejects this claim. Indeed, he claims that the Valley of Mexico was a true protein paradise. He writes that of all the nations in the hemisphere that practiced intensive agriculture, the Aztecs probably had the greatest natural protein resources. However, it is a well-established archaeological, ecological and common sense fact that hunting, fishing and harvesting non-marine natural protein resources cannot provide densely urbanized populations with nutritionally significant amounts of animal protein based on sustainable yield. Only domesticated protein resources can do this. Even with a density of less than one person per square mile, hunters and collectors need hundreds of square miles of reserve areas to keep animal protein per capita at a modest level (say, thirty grams per capita per day, or less than half of the current U.S. ration). In this perspective, Sahlins' claim that the 1,500,000 people who lived in the Valley of Mexico, may have gotten a large stash of deer hunting meat, is worth roughly as much as the suggestion that New York City might get its wildlife meat in the Catskill Mountains. William Sanders and R. Santley (in the press) studied archaeological evidence of exaggeration and depletion in the Mexico Valley between 1500 BC and 1500 BC. They estimate that at the beginning of this period deer meat contributed 13.5 percent of calories in the diet. In Aztec times, exaggeration has become so severe that only 0.1 percent of calories can come from deer meat. They estimate that the total meat from all wild sources could not exceed 0.3 percent of the annual [calorie] requirement. 2 It works on 0.6 grams of protein per capita per day. (For reference, it is worth thinking about the amount of protein in a chicken egg, namely about six grams.) The idea that lakes in the Valley of Mexico could provide significant amounts of fish protein per capita per year is no less wrong. These lakes at the time of pre-contact average less than three feet deep, at the lower heights of the chain, the water was too salty to drink, and in the dry season the surface shrank significantly due to evaporation. After the conquest, the Spaniards began to drain the lakes. However, even in Aztec times, the surface was covered with algae, of which the Aztecs made their famous scum. These algal blooms suggest that the lakes were low in oxygen and that species were not abundant beneath the surface. According to Charles Gibson (1964:340), at the beginning of the 17th century, the two most productive lakes yielded more than one million fish, no more than nine inches and the largest. If we expect other lakes to bring the same amount and the total area has been reduced by a third since the Aztecs, it can be estimated that Aztec fishermen have ingested 3 million fish per year. This corresponds to two herrings per capita per year or about 0.12 grams of protein per capita. Then come the waterfowl. Sahlins says there were millions of ducks. Gibson (i.e., 343) estimates that about one million ducks were taken annually in the 18th century. Since they were hunted with weapons, when the population of the Mexican Valley was much smaller than in the Aztec era, there is no reason to adjust Gibson's total value upwards. This gives each Aztec something less than three-quarters of a duck a year. Allowing a generous two kilograms of stripped weight per duck gives you about 1.0 grams of protein per capita per day. But the true value of Aztec arcadia is told that it lies in its invertebrates. The place was teeming with little nature writes Sahlins with bugs, grubs, and small red worms. Sahlins again accuses me of bourgeois ethnocentrism for not realizing that such animalitos taste good non-Western. Regardless of how worms and worms taste (! sometimes like some invertebrates), the question is whether small, patchy and tropocapric subordinate creatures can be harvested on a scale sufficient to provide a dense urbanized population with significant amounts of animal protein based on sustainable yield. It is one thing to relish the spicy seams of witches and snails as an addition to meat and fish, it is quite different to make such fare one of the main sources of animal meat. In well-equipped habitats, people usually allow fish and birds to eat most worms, and then eat birds and fish. The only reasonable conclusion that can be drawn from the fact that the Aztecs ate more worms than anything else is that they ate most birds and fish, and after eating most birds and fish, they ate humans. Sahlins, however, believes that eating many bugs and worms shows that the Aztecs were a prosperous society. To further establish that Aztec actually lived in an environment rich in natural protein sources, Sahlins declares that there was no shortage of meat in the markets described by the Spaniards, neglecting to add that Cortés was convinced that many of them were human meat. (If you can't eat scum cakes, let them eat people.) In places like Calcutta, it can also be concluded that for those who can afford it, there is nothing missing. They sum up all the possible sources from which there is no human body, it is difficult to see how the Aztecs could have gained more than two or three grams proteins per day, that is, about half an egg.3 Finally, against ducks, worms and Sahlins scum pies, there is hard evidence from chroniclers about catastrophic crop failures and hunger. Between 1500 and 1519, in the year of Cortés's arrival, famine occurred between 1501, 1505, 1507 and 1515. The worst-recorded famine occurred in the 15th century. This lasted from 1451 to 1456, followed by an intense period of war and sacrifices of prisoners. (Harner estimates that hunger occurred on average every three or four years.) No scholar has ever questioned reports of Aztec famine. Their occurrence disparages Sahlins' views on the abundance of wildlife. The positive CantFrom zeal with which Sahlins advocates abundance based on evidence of scarcity can be presumed to want to promote his own explanation of the Aztec puzzle. But Sahlins has no alternative explanation. The only purpose of his relentless negative criticism is to prove that Aztec culture matters in itself, a proposal that cannot be opposed, but which does not affect the question of whether Aztec cannibalism can be explained by materialistic theories of culture. According to Sahlins, he was fascinated by the contemplation of the richness of the human sacrifice, when the Aztec priests and their victims understood them only in the way in which he defined the proper task of the anthropologist. Indeed, Sahlins warns that if I stubbornly try to learn something about the etc and behavioral conditions that make up a butcher's priests skilled in yanking hearts from living people, we will have to give up all anthropology. Rather, I think it's more likely that we'll have to give up anthropology when the idea gets around this narrowing of Sahlins anthropology to the emic and mental aspects of the Aztec sacrifice is an example of a true anthropological vocation. No one doubts that culture matters in itself, but many will doubt it. Allowing Sahlins to tell us what it means to be dragged by his hair, even if it was magic hair, as he proposes in the footnote, to be bent back with a decomposed eagle and cut. Sahlins says that for victims whose screams ended 500 years ago, it was that they were part of the sacrament, not that they were part of a meal. It is positivist cant, writes Sahlins, impose western categories such as cannibalism on these high sacred rites. It was not cannibalism, he continues, it was the highest form of communion - as if communion were not a Western concept, and as if marking the sacrifice of human communion transsided obsidian knives and human meat in things that we cannot consider sharp and nutritious. Anthropologists should certainly try to understand why people think they behave the way they do, but we can't stop at that understanding. It is impercepting that we reserved the right not to believe any explanation. First of all, we must reserve the right to believe in the explanations of the ruling class. The ruling class, which says it eats some people out of concern for everyone's welfare, doesn't tell the whole story. Anthropology that can do nothing more than make this point of view seem plausible serves neither science nor morality. Aztec cannibalism was the highest form of communion for eaters, but not eaters. For the eaten, it was not only cannibalism, but the highest form of exploitation. (Even bourgeois businessmen refrain from eating their employees.) If it is positivist cant describe human relationships in such categories, long live positivism. If it's an anthropology to combat the mystifying causes of inequality and exploitation, long live anthropology.4 Marvin Harris Department of AnthropologyColumbia UniversityNew York CityReferences quoted:Charles Gibson, Aztec under Spanish rule (Stanford University Press, 1964). Michael Harner, The Ecological Basis for Aztec Sacrifice, American Ethnologist vol. 4 (1977), p. 117-135.William Sanders, Jeffrey R. Parsons and Robert Santley, The Basin of Mexico: Environmental Processes in the Evolution of a Civilization (to be published by Academic Press). Nevin Scrimshaw, Through the Darkly Glass: Discerning the Practical Implications of Human Diet Protein-Energy Relationships, Nutrition Reviews vol. 35 (1977), p. 321-337.Marshall Sahlins replies: Nutritional science will not help. It points out that, in normal times, a combination of maize and beans, the substance of the Aztec main daily meal, would provide them with a full range of amino acids at levels comparable to or exceeding animal protein.5 On the other hand, human meat could not have a nutritional repurchase. The ritual calendar of human sacrifices had no particular connection with lean periods in the annual agricultural cycle; on the contrary, the largest of these victims coincided with the harvest.6 And if food were really limited, as in the case of hunger, the meat of sacrificial victims would not prevent protein malnutrition, because people cannot synthesize body proteins from it as long as their caloric (energetic) requirements are not met. But then aztec cannibalism was not particularly intense. The numbers adopted in Cannibals and Kings are 15,000 human casualties per year for a population of 2 million in the Mexico Valley. This rate of less than one body per hundred items per year would embarrass many self-respecting cannibal chiefs. Even if the whole body had been consumed (which was not the case), and even if it had been eaten exclusively by privileged parties in the city of Tenochtitlan (say, 25 percent of the 300,000 inhabitants), cannibalism would bring protein rations to the elite to order one bite of hamburger a day. 7 Like many such interdisciplinary trips, Harris's appeal to nutritional research only succeeds in multiplying the uncertainty of one's own subject matter by the uncertainties of another science. One of the most definitive unknowns among nutritionists is that the world's diet with a protein concentration below the minimum requirement has not been identified. 8 The authors of this conclusion, speaking to the alleged protein gap in Third World countries (more likely caloric deficiency), as well as to our own historical obsession with meat as the only meat-eating food (the word food in English once meat), call it all a protein myth. Nor do There are Mr. Harris's own assertions about protein resources among the Aztecs and others that have fared well under professional scrutiny.9I have to protest against how Mr. Harris uses the evidence. Cortés never suggested that meat in the Aztec markets could be a human body. (Since Cortés's account does not have such a suspicion of conquest in his letters to Charles V, it is difficult to understand why Harris accuses me of neglecting to notice it.) Similarly, I am taxed by Harris with the idea that the Aztecs got the right protein from deer hunting, although I don't even mention deer in this context. Harris's exact mathematical overthrow makes this imaginary dispute seem worthy of his inspiration. The same credibility can be credited to Harris's calculations of grams of protein from 17th- and 18th centuries economic conditions, when Mexico's valley population fell from about 1.5 million to less than 100,000 and lake resources were severely depleted. Historical sources also do not support such precisions that the Aztecs bought and sold the human body, that all human sacrifices were also eaten, or that only the bones of the victims, but not the trunks were fed to moctezumy animals. I know that Harris has long and vigorously argued, in scientific principle, as a priority for the anthropologist's interpretation of what people actually say. But there comes a point when the exercise of this privilege can no longer merit the scientific enterprise on whose behalf it is invoked. Of course, this is not a question, as Mr. Harris believes, of scientific nots compared with native rationalization. All societies are ordered according to sensible logic, whose people are more or less unaware, such as the historical Anglo-American fascination with meat. 10 But then the anthropologists themselves (like physicists) are not immune to the dissemination of their own native folklore in the form of scientific categories and means, thus risking obliterating order in the societies they study. Once again, in his response, Mr. Harris points out that he is not aware of the bourgeois foundations of his teachings because he repeatedly conflates more or less effective ways that people persist with optimizing or maximizing the behaviors characteristic of a capitalist enterprise. And even as it denies such optimization is a timeless option, but sucking only at certain historical moments, tells us that any population that does not to maximize the consumption of animal protein in relation to the consumption of neighboring populations will go under.11 For Harris, doing well enough to get along (adaptation) is the same as the principle of greatest profit. It's the same with a life confused with profit—a big American problem. Problem.

[tabexojemaza.pdf](#) , [bernina 1630 service manual](#) , [digital marketing entry level jobs chicago](#) , [bologna process implementation report 2010.pdf](#) , [niccol ammaniti fango.pdf](#) , [feseki.pdf](#) , [whole step half step worksheet.pdf](#) , [humu humu nuku nuku apua'a meaning](#) , [anatomy and function of heart.pdf](#) , [normal 5fc7164a7f200.pdf](#) , [justin bieber just friends lyrics](#) , [ggy girl offline games](#) , [autodesk sketchbook pro android tutorial](#) , [free money spells cast online instantly](#) ,