

CEDI - P. I. B.
DATA 17/10/88
COD. KYD 71

William Fisher
March 24, 1988
Comments on "THE KAYAPO OF SOUTHEASTERN PARA - prepared for CEDI,
POVOS INDIGENAS DO BRASIL VOL. VIII, SUL DO PARA, PART II" by Terry
Turner

Notes on the historical section with pages numbers for point
of reference to Turner's text: As a question of ethics - although
Verswijver is mentioned two times in the historical section,
Turner's entire chronology follows and is clearly based on
Verswijver's thesis as far as essential data and even the
organization of divisions that make up the presentation. This is not
made clear to the reader. It should be said outright that the
account summarizes the essential facts of Verswijver's thesis or
research or whatever. Give the man the credit he deserves. It is not
enough to say his data are invaluable.

59 107: The information about Cunha Matos needs a reference
since 1834 doesn't ring a bell. He wrote in 1824 (published only in
1874) about the Northern Kayapó which he called Gradáu. Couto de
Magalhães in his *Viagem ao Araguaia* mentions that the Colégio Isabel
founded in 1871 with his support at Santa Maria by Capucine
missionaries had students from many Indian nations: "entraram logo
uns 20 meninos de ambos os sexos das tribus dos Chavantes,
Gorotirés, Cayapós, Carajás, Tapirapés, e 3 da extinta tribu dos
Guajajaras." (p. 25 preface to second edition of *Viagem ao
Araguaya*).

There is no reason to doubt this and this would place the
contacts with colonists to a date earlier than the that implied by

1
NB. ignore box after pagination:
59 107 = 592 or 59, 1st paragraph
page

Turner (at least from 1859 with the founding of Santa Maria Nova) and directly contradicts his assertion that the Gorotire could not have acquired manufactured goods and arms through trade. The government provided agricultural implements among other goods and even, to those Indians who married, cattle. Eventually corruption and mistreatment of interns finished with the Colégio according to Ehrenreich who visited the school in 1888. (1891 article translated as Contribuições para a Ethnologia do Brasil. *R.M.P.*, N.S. II, (1948) pp.7-135.) . It is probable, though, that the trade practiced at the Colégio was merely part of a wider trade network that included diverse Indian groups.

Nimuendajú mentions that the Gorotire were still at peace with colonists in 1908 according to the engineer responsible for the opening of a road between the Araguaia and Rio Fresco. Kissenberth, the German ethnologist already encountered a hostile Gorotire tribe when he visited the Pau d'Arco Kayapo the same year. Nimuendajú supposes that the Gorotire and Pau d'Arco actually maintained friendly relations until towards the end of the 19th century and cites the agitation of a Pau d'Arco chief, Wanaó, well known for his attacks on the Karajás across from the settlement at Santa Maria , for initiating hostile relations between the Gorotire and Pau d'Arco Kayapo. (cf. Nimuendajú, *Os Gorotire*, *Revista do Museu Paulista* N.S. Vol. VI p.428). Turner himself notes that relations between Gorotire and Pau d'Arco were not "invariably hostile" (p. 60).

59 20¶: I do not know of specific information on Xikrin exchanges with Brazilians, although there is good reason to suppose that these occurred from early on, since the end of the last century. There is the single testimony of man who worked on the Cateté river between 1903 and 1913 who said that he personally had friendly relations during this period with the Xikrin who already were living along the Cateté but that hostilities between rubber collectors and Xikrin also began in 1903. (Frikel, Protasio, 1963. *Notas sobre os Xikrin do Cateté. Revista do Museu Paulista* (N.S.) 14: 147.) Lux Vidal mentions in her book that the Xikrin claimed that late in the last century a Brazilian began farming near a Xikrin village along the Rio Seco and that they had good relations with him. Soon the area became more heavily populated and the Xikrin withdrew after suffering at least two fatalities at the hands of Brazilian newcomers (Vidal, Lux 1977. *Morte e Vida de uma Sociedade Indígena Brasileira* p.28). We do know that the Xikrin had friendly relations with the Xambioá Karajá and allied with them against the Pau d'Arco Kayapó. See the below for further comment on the idea that raiding was the only solution open to the Gorotire for the obtention of firearms.

60 40¶: Turner says that "[t]he Gorotire and Mekranoti thus approached the inception of peaceful relations with the Brazilians having established themselves in the eyes of the regional Brazilian population as formidable adversaries, too strong to make military repression practicable, whom it was therefore in their interest to

placate by peaceful overtures". (p.60-1). This is somewhat misleading in that it downplays the previous regional history of contact between expanding Brazilian society and the Indians. If the entire history of contact is taken into account the Gorotire Kayapo, spent more time in semi-peaceful and permanent contact with the Brazilians in their area: almost 130 years of intermitant contact with only a 19 year period between 1908 and 1937 of total hostility. Even this period was not completely barren of peaceful contacts. When the Bishop of Conceição do Araguaia, D. Frei Sebastião Thomas made three trips up the Rio Fresco to the Gorotire, peacefully contacting them in 1931, they received him on friendly terms and he even managed to take 5 children with him to be educated in a mission school, although these same children fled at the first opportunity. There is also the fact that the Gorotire tried to make friendly contact with the settlement at Campos do Araguaia in 1937 but were repulsed by the population (this may be relevant to insert on p. 63 2^a¶). Shortly afterwards they persisted and tried to enter into friendly relations with Nova Olinda at which they succeeded. In these attempts at contact the Kayapo made use of Brazilian captives (in exactly the same manner as the Brazilians made use of "civilized" Kayapo) to make the first overtures and explain their motives. During this time Kubenkraken Kayapo also made use of this technique and made contact with different settlements along the Xingu (cf. Nimuendajú, *Ibica*).

p.61, 200¶: An interesting note is made by Verswijver(1982, The Intertribal relations between the Juruna and the Kayapo Indians (1850-1920), *Jahrbuch des Museums für Volkerkunde zu Leipzig* Band XXXIV:305-315) about trade between the Juruna of the Xingu and the Mekragnotire faction at Gorotire in the late 19th century which the latter undertook in order to acquire glass beads that were given to the Juruna in large quantities by European explorers along the Xingu. This contradicts the assertion by Turner that the only way the Gorotire could acquire manufactured goods was through raids. The Kayapo *had* made raids in the Xingu basin probably since the middle 18th century. This suggests to me that 1: the Kayapo were perfectly capable of engaging in friendly trading relations if this was a more adequate way to obtain what they needed. This is proven in the case of contacts with colonists and with groups like the Juruna with whom the Kayapo alternately fought or traded. 2: the Kayapo switch to raiding of Brazilian colonists cannot be attributed solely to the armed incursions by rubber gatherers between the Araguaia and Rio Fresco but mostly to the decline in the boom which caused a decrease in the commerce and population in rubber gathering areas and made these populations more vulnerable to Kayapo attack. Turner's claim that the raiding was stimulated by the acquisition of arms by the Pau d'Arco seems without basis since the Gorotire began raiding only after 1908 when the Pau d'Arco were suffering from a terrible depopulation and there are no records of their raiding the Gorotire at this time. Since the middle 19th century, the Pau d'Arco made no

secret that the Gorotire village lay a few days walk to the west of their settlements and conflicts between the two groups did not pass unnoticed (cf. Coudreau, 1897:200). Moreover, there were at least two Pau d'Arco villages that sought to avoid contact with Brazilian invaders, the village led by a chief Aminti and another called "Aldeia Fechada" (Coudreau, Henri. 1897. *Voyage au Tocantins-Araguaya*, p.206). The various villages that came together at the urging of the Dominican Mission were composed of factions that had split from the single village that lay near the Brazilian settlement and Capucine Mission at Santa Maria (Ibid, p.201). If these villages were suffering from military pressures from other Kayapo groups, including Pau d'Arco rival factions or the Gorotire, it is probable that they too would be forced by the arms race into either hostile or trading relations with Brazilians. But we do not have any indication that such an arms race occurred. However, the conclusion is almost inescapable that the village fragmentation that occurred later at Gorotire had already occurred to the Pau d'Arco Kayapo several decades earlier.

As far as the beginning of the Kayapo raids are concerned, one must assume that it is more than a coincidence that they erupted with the decadence of the rubber movement. In some areas this decline was quite dramatic. Nimuendajú notes that when he went up the Xingu River in 1915 there were thousands of inhabitants, and the rubber bosses maintained private armies of hundreds of hired guns. In the beginning of 1940 when Nimuendajú undertook his study of the

Gorotire, the entire population strung along the upper Xingu above Altamira numbered only several hundred and wrung out a miserable existence collecting rubber and Brazil nuts. (Nimuendajú, *op. cit.* p.436) Compare Nimuendajú's remarks on the changes along the Xingu with the population figures for the municipality of Conceição do Araguaia: in 1911, there were more than 15,000 persons, more than 8,000 of whom lived in the countryside extending towards the Xingu; in 1920 the total municipal population was 11,000; in 1940 this was down to 4,715 for the entire municipality! (p.62-63 Otavio Ianni, 1979. *A Luta pela Terra*). The formation of population concentrations in Gameleira, Triunfo, Novo Horizonte, along the Rio Fresco; Nova Olinda at the mouth of the Riozinho and São Félix on the right bank of the Xingu were founded as a result of the rubber movement including the opening of a passage between the Araguaia and the Xingu in 1909 and impinged upon the range of the Gorotire and Mekragnotire Kayapo and the Xikrin. However, in 1912 with the collapse of the rubber market these appear not to have posed a military threat to the Kayapo.

The same general lesson holds for the Xikrin who moved away from the then populated main watercourses to the headwaters of the Itacaiúnas for part of the rubber boom. (Vidal, *ibid.*). This period also marks the height of warfare between the Gorotire and the Xikrin.

One of the fundamental differences between the rubber expansion and the cattle expansion into Indian territories, is that

the former often tried to make use of Indian labor for the extraction of latex and even as rowers on the boats that shipped rubber to the state capital in Belém. A participant in the missionary administration Frei José M. Audrin wrote: "As estradas que conduziam às matas do caucho atravessavam os territórios dos índios, sendo que algumas passavam por suas aldeias [my emphasis]. Tropeiros e seringueiros contratavam jovens silvícolas iludindo-os com promessas irrisórias e, ao fim de longas viagens e duras pelejas no interior das florestas, pagavam-nos com miseráveis salários. Muitos exploravam os índios simplórios ou viciados. Por numa simples garrafa de péssima aguardente, por um punhado de sal, uma rapadura ou alguns litros de farinha de mandioca, subtraíam aos pobres selvagens roupas novas e ferramentais recebidas poucos antes, das mãos dos missionários; alguns se apoderavam até de ubás novas, que custavam longas semanas de trabalho" (*Os Sertanejos que Eu Conheci*, 1963, p.184 *apud* Ianni, p.25). I think this passage is important because it gives some idea of the nature, closeness and permanence of indigenous contacts with Brazilian society in the area.

One problem of emphasis should be taken up: the point made clear in the accounts of Moreira Neto and Octavio Ianni which credits the Pau d'Arco Kayapo not with mere acceptance of colonial settlement in the fields neighboring the Araguaia and its tributaries but *their irreplaceable assistance* to the colonists and especially the Dominican Missionaries. Ianni points out that before its founding the area around Conceição do Araguaia had been criss-

crossed and explored by many kinds of representative of Brazilian society with diverse motives: collectors of products and medicines from the sertão such as clove, vanilla, sasparilla, cacau, Brazil nuts, timber, animals skins, oils, etc. as well as fishermen, cattlemen, backwoods people, small scale horticulturalists, travellers and explorers. In short, by 1897 and the inauguration of Conceição do Araguaia, the area could hardly be called pristine and untouched. More to the point, the Indians were instrumental in the colonization of the regions beyond the Araguaia. The pioneer cattle ranching wave was rapidly expanding northward up the Araguaia during the latter part of the 19th century due to the precious collaboration of the Kayapo. Contacts between cattlemen and Indians were "eased by the presence of Indians who were fluent speakers of Portuguese and who had been students at the Colégio Isabel founded on the Araguaia by Couto de Magalhães.....Indian trails were the first cattle roads and their villages spread along the Arraias and Pau d'Arco rivers were the primary source of provisions and first points of settlement in the pastures of the interior." (Moreira Neto, *A cultura pastoral do Pau d'Arco. Boletim do Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi, N.S.*

Antropologia (10) 1960, p.12) Convinced by the Dominican missionary Frei Gil, three Kayapo chiefs united their villages and began construction of a unified settlement a mere kilometer from the site which chosen for the nucleus of Conceição do Araguaia and simultaneously constructed a "magnificent" road connecting the two settlements. Once the Indians were installed they were joined by

colonists from Barreira who were persuaded that the presence of the Indians and mission provided better security (Ianni, 1979, *A Luta pela Terra* p.14.) The attraction of the new settlement was so great that by 1902, the missionary was able to report that a "veritable migratory current" was bringing in settlers from all the surrounding provinces into the new town (*Ibid.* p.19). Interestingly enough in that same year the priest had the Indians make feather ornaments and bracelets, bows and arrows, lances, clubs and other crafts and sold them in Belém do Pará to make money for the settlement.

This is not to claim that the Pau d'Arco Kayapó were inherently either peaceful or warlike (they continued to have hostile encounters with other Indian groups especially the Karajás). They conducted their affairs in the way that they calculated most advantageous for themselves. The missionaries were convinced that contacts and missionary activity among other Kayapo groups, including the Gorotire and Xikrin, would be fairly easily accomplished if funds and personal were applied towards that end. However they realized, as is clear from the documents quoted in a report by Frei Gil Vilanova to his superiors in France, that for all their compliance the Pau d'Arco Kayapo had not assimilated Christianity and there was always the risk that they would return to their old ways and abandon the settlement. However, they had no doubts about the possibility of involving the natives in the political economy of the region which they saw as the crucial first

step while emphasis would be given to converting and training the children and young people.

Other similarities to the contact experience of other Kayapo groups also stand out. The chiefs of the different groups, the leaders and intermediaries of interethnic relations, acquired a renown. One even took on the military prefix "coronel", becoming "Coronel Becca" in his dealing with Brazilians. The incident anticipates by more than 60 years the well-known Coronel Pombo, leader of the Kikretum village. As in all the later expeditions made with the purpose of contacting independent Kayapo groups, the contacting parties made use of Kayapo Indians who spoke Portuguese, had experience with Brazilian settlements and who could act as guide and interpreter. And as was made clear from the experience of the cattle expansion, it is probable that many of the Indians spoke at least some rudiments of portuguese.

63, 29¶: "Goroti-kumren" was a term for the settlement that originated both the Pau d'Arco and Gorotire groups. "Gorotire" was a term of reference for this Kayapó group since their split with the Pau d'Arco.

64, 20¶¶: Gives the impression that the Kubenkraken chief Ngroy died in 1951. This chief is mentioned in an article in "O Cruzeiro" (1952. "Homens brancos na aldeias dos Caiapós. ano 24, nº 34, 6/7/52 [Rio de Janeiro] Arlindo Silva & José Medeiros) describing a visit reporters made to his village in 1952 and Simone Dreyfus comments

on chief Ngroy on the occasion of her visit in 1955. (*Les Kayapo du Nord*, 1963).

65, 10¶: Ku'at is a chief mentioned as one who split from Megkragnetire in 1944 to unite with the village of Kubenkracken. In the Turner account Kuat is put in the *Me no kane* society led by chief Tapiet that split from the Gorotire village and joined the Mekragnetire in 1937 where he remained until 1944. Nimuendajú personally talked with Kuat when he visited the Gorotire *in 1940*. (cf. Nimuendajú, op.cit.p.447 and mss. at Museu Nacional in Rio) Turner follows Verswijver in this idea , but it looks like there was more movement and contact between, Kubenkracken, Gorotire and Mekragnetire than is recorded during the period immediately following their split. Apparently Kuat was part of each of these groups during this period.

p 66, 10¶ Sentence reading "A group of senior men of the Metukti, still fearful fo reprisals from the *Metukti*, left to join Kremoro." The italicized word should be changed to "Mekrure".

66, 30¶: According to Verswijver, the raid led by Kromare against the Tapirapé did not lead to any deaths. However, there was a raid earlier that year against the same group in which the Mekragnetire did kill Tapirapé, however, Kromare was not the leader of the raid.

67 10¶ In the sentence which has ... "the Metuktire and Metukre, were reorganized"..., "Metukre" should probably read "Mekrure".

73, 109]: The information about the Karara'ô is a bit confused. A group of Karara'ô was contacted along Igarapé do Lima, a tributary of the Curuá river during the same expedition led by Francisco Meireles which eventually pacified the Northern Mekragnotire and convinced them to settle along the Curuá river. According to Verswijver (p.198) the number of Karara'ô was approximately 50. These are the Karara'ô eventually settled at the Baú FUNAI post. The Karara'ô of Penetecaua were contacted in 1965 when their population numbered 48. This population was almost completely decimated by illness when they were transferred to another local, well-removed from their gardens, in order to work on Brazil Nut collecting (Arnaud, 1971, p.3 and my field notes). Of the nine survivors, one died on the way to the Bakajá post in 1967 and three made their way to the Xikrin of Catete the year following their transfer. The third group of Karara'ô was contacted in the 1970's. Verswijver mentions the date of 1970 for their pacification (p.41) but gives no reference for this information. However, they are not mentioned by Arnaud in his 1971 survey of indigenist activity in Southern Pará and may have been contacted shortly after this article was published in October, 1971. It is safe to say that their population numbered approximately 30 when contacted. They were transferred to the FUNAI post at Bakajá during 1979 and shortly thereafter were definitively established on their own reserve area close to Altamira. Although I do not have a copy it seems that more potentially useful information might be found in Arnaud, Expedito, 1974. A extinção dos índios

Karara'ô (Kayapó) - Baixo Xingu, Pará. *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi, Antropologia* (N.S.) nº53.

75, 200: It seems unjustified to omit mention that so-called men's societies were also often comprised of age-grades according to Verswijver's account and that they often engaged in raiding and even occasionally founded their own villages.

76, 200: I believe that the Indians "Kraniakarare" should be written "Kreen Akrore" or some other form widely recognized, or at the very least the synonymous form should be mentioned.

I have added some thoughts on the rest of the analysis and theoretical armature of the report. The comments comprise a short "internal critique" and are based on the content of the report without regard to competing ethnographical accounts and points of view.

The general framework set out at the opening part of the paper stresses that "accommodation" and "resistance" were at the opposite ends of the range of contact experiences. This is not stressed in later parts of the paper and appears not to be borne out by the descriptions of Kapot and Gorotire. This could be easily removed from the beginning of the paper without doing any harm to the basic line of argument.

The description of Kayapo society lacks key descriptive terms necessary for an apprehension of current organizational divisions of the Kayapo. For instance, while Turner's insistence that the important distinction between men's associations is always framed in

terms of junior vs. senior men's association, in living villages or historical villages one finds age associations of "boys who have just received their penis sheath", "young bachelors", "old bachelors", "men with few children", "men with many children", etc. Obviously the Kayapo find these divisions sociologically and symbolically useful. It is symptomatic of Turner's whole enterprise that he spends numerous pages describing the vagaries of the moiety system and its fundamental importance for Kayapo social life when such a system hasn't existed at Gorotire in over 50 years and at Mekragnotire for over 40 years and the point of the paper is to show how these societies are alive and prospering. Moreover the named men's groups that Turner refers to often in his previous works - the tchêt - that as corporate groups play an obviously important role in social reproduction are not mentioned. Most importantly the relationship of chiefs to the system of age-grades and men's associations is not described in enough detail for us to judge Turner's affirmations about the role of so-called communal institutions in the circulation of commodities that are awarded to chiefs by mediating agencies. These details are crucial to weigh the argument that traditional culture has shaped intrusion of market relations into the village.

The essence of Turner's argument can be presented by quoting one of his paragraphs: "The structure of Kayapó communal institutions directly embodies, in a generalized form, the structure of extended-family and matri-uxorilocal household relations, and

serves to reproduce that structure, it follows that reinforcing the communal institutions of the village will, other things being equal, have the effect of reinforcing the traditional forms of extended family and household structure. That the influx of commodities and their accumulation as private property at both Kapot and Gorotire has been channeled through, and thus has been in a sense dependent upon, the chiefs and communal age-sets and associations, has had the effect of strengthening that structure in a least some respects".

A major focus of attention are the so-called "communal institutions" - an expression I find troubling because it takes for granted an undefined "communality" whose very definition is problematic and could well be the focus of inquiry. First we can ask about the way that community institutions directly embody the structure of extended-family and matri-uxorilocal household relations and reproduces their structure. There is a problem with critique because "structure" has the dual meaning of its structuralist à la Lévi-strauss and functionalist à la Fortes senses. How else could we in some places be talking about "transformations" of a structure and later (in the paragraph cited above) talk about the "strengthening of that structure". There are also times when Turner mentions a "statistically demonstrated change in structure" (p.113) where structure could conceivably receive a third definition. I think it is clear from reading Turner that he is interested in understanding political and communal *behavior* and seeks the ideological underpinnings that serve as the rationale for

collective action. In this sense his notion of structure is closer to that of structural-functionalists although complicated by an attempt to construct a conceptual structure in which a few contrasts and a series of their transformation succeed in accounting for the variety of forms of relationships in Kayapo society. Another element of his sympathy with a purely structuralist approach is his emphasis on what he perceives to be the "total structure". Of necessity moieties must be emphasized here. While not currently existing in any Kayapo community these have the analytical importance of being the only institution that is universal in extension, classifying all the inhabitants of a village, or at least all the adult members and boys above the ages of eight or so.

We can briefly examine Turner's reasons for asserting that the general form of household structure is embodied in communal institutions. In the first place, the men's associations reproduce the hierarchical relationship existing between younger men and older men. This relationship holds between the male heads of households and their resident son-in-laws. This difference in status is related to fundamental values of Kayapo culture concerning hegemony and beauty which are created through their relations with the younger generations and appropriated by the elder male generation. The younger generations are incapable of resisting this and creating new status values precisely because their own personal and political status depend upon their entering into the sorts of relations that permit the codification of status differentials that temporarily

benefit the elder men but simultaneously assure themselves of a possibility of reaching such privileged level in the future. With the birth of a child to an acknowledged wife, a man enters into relationship with his parents-in-law and also his child, simultaneously subordinating him to his parents-in-law and giving him the potential to be a father-in-law in the future.

In the second place the men's communal institutions also assert symbolically that in order to effect these changes in status one must undergo a process of detachment from the natal household and eventual re-attachment to a household of procreation. The men's associations are responsible for the detachment, as a substitute father and never the socially recognized genitor that conducts the initiate to the men's house, site of male communal activity. The re-attachment is recognized by a change in affiliation of men's associations where a man transfers his participation to the association composed of men with children.

There are the other "communal" institutions that must be mentioned and these are ceremonial groups which count on the temporary dissolution of men's associations as vital for their formation. The holding of ceremonies relies on ritual specialists who may or may not have chiefly status. But it is always the sponsors of the celebration who have the responsibility of providing the food that feeds the community, ensures general participation and thus validates the ceremony as being efficacious. However, the influx of commodities into the Kayapo community has been through the

chiefs and this, in spite of what Turner says, is not solely due to the fact that most early contacts between the Kayapo and Brazilian society were mediated either by missions or government Indian agencies. The larger point is valid, however, that the government policy has been to channel their donations through chiefly intermediaries. The chief then becomes in some ways responsible to assistance agencies like the FUNAI, as well as to the community.

However, one problem with thinking about a social structure in which each term has a position in the definition of the configuration of a total structure is that it makes it difficult to disassemble a social formation and analyse the way that different parts collaborate to produce a result which can be evaluated in terms of political strategy or performance. Such approach require other assumptions about the way that roles are articulated with one another. In practice, it seems to me that the investigator also makes such assumptions in his or her descriptions when explanation of different social roles must be made in terms of other roles. The point of departure of the description thus weights the analysis by making certain relations or institutions more fundamental and these are precisely what "less" fundamental relations must be described in terms of. The emphasis of the Harvard/Central Brazil project on communal institutions and corporate groups becomes clear on a reading of the collection "Dialectical Societies". In one tribe name holders comprise corporate entities, in another, ceremonial moieties, in another, matrilineal clans and in the Kayapó we have

men's association led by chiefs. This choice of focus then leads to a description of the rest of the society in relation to these central institutions which constitute and give continuity to the social whole.

We may rephrase Turner's hypothesis. Admitting that the chiefs are the main conduits through which commodities enter Kayapo society we must create hypotheses about the conditions that make possible the reproduction of Kayapó men's associations and ceremonial activity and specify in greater depth the relationship of the chiefs with so-called communal institutions. Verswijver account brings out the relative stability of chiefly position when compared to the changing membership and uncertain continuity of the men's associations.

Now we learn at one point that there are no rules of succession for chiefs. If we are to maintain the emphasis on corporate groups, this would be a rarity for groups that have continuity, by definition of their corporateness, but no rules for generating this continuous existence. A chief may name a successor according to Turner and his nominee is often his son or name-receiver according to different ethnographic sources.

Age grades imply a promotion from one grade to another as a man's life progresses. In some villages these age grades are the form under which men's associations operate and it must be specified how chiefly authority would be exercised under these conditions - are chiefs part of the age grade they lead, if they are, would the

promotion of a chief leave an age grade leaderless, is it even necessary for age grades to have leaders with chiefly status for their concretization as a group? As Turner's examples of different chiefs make clear his claim that the office of chief is a combination of political and ritual roles is only partially true in the real world, although this may be at odds with the Kayapó ideal. It is clear that if there is any articulation between the ritual and the political it must center on the role of the chief.

Consequently, Turner's main point that the men's political associations structure and reproduce the the extended household organizations, or segmentary units of society, demands that he spends more time clarifying this since, except for the central role of the chief in ceremony and politics, these are mutually exclusive forms of activity and it would seem that the Kayapo could just as well be symbolically marking the relative independence of the ceremonial and political domains. Even more fundamentally it must be explained in what way are men's associations communal institutions. Do they hold things in common and if so, what? Again is it the presence of a chiefly leader that defines communal. Turner says that "[a]s a leader, the chief is expected to generate effective solidarity and a capacity for collective action among his followers, meaning particularly the members of his own society [note that Turner doesn't define "men's society" in this text although it figures prominently in his other writings], but in a wider sense the community as a whole. Yet as the historical section shows Kayapo

life is full of chiefs who can mobilize their followers even to the point of breaking off relations with the parent community but who could not be imagined to speak for the community as a whole. We know that there are always numerous associations in a village, but what are the relations between them that allow them to be considered as "communal". As far as ritual goes, it is also unclear just what are the communal institutions since the men's associations must dissolve as a prerequisite for the performance of naming ceremonies. In their place we have performances by "those who have nothing" and those whose transmitted ritual privilege gives them the right to don certain ritual items and perform in the center of the village plaza. Are "those who have nothing" and those with *nekretch* (or transmitted privileges or ritual items) communal institutions? The community as such doesn't sponsor such ritual events, these must be convened by the parents of those children to be honored, assisted by classificatory parents of the child in a mobilization of what amounts to a bilateral kindred of the child. What is the relationship of the bilateral kindred and the men's associations which are formed by free association? What does this have to do with the introduction of commodities into the village which are through men's associations (non-operational at the time of ceremonial performance) and the collective socialization of these commodities that Turner claims as the role for collective rituals?

An important omission, given the emphasis on the historical record of Mekragnotire and Gorotire, is the lack of focus on the

structural causes of village instability. Turner's argument that the focus on raiding gave more emphasis to individual chiefs at the expense of community cohesion is another way of saying that the Kayapo social organization was more successful at coping with post-contact circumstances than a pre-contact raiding tradition à la Apache. However, in some contexts he claims that this reputation for fierceness derived from the raiding tradition is serving as a basis for successful manipulation of imagery by the Kayapo to influence their interactions with non-Indians. In the pre-contact raiding situation one could conclude that the chief really does not act as a unifying force and far from being communal institutions, men's associations constitute, in fact, the fracture lines of a society. [...]"the intensification of raiding tended to undermine the importance of *normative communal institutional forms*, [emphasis added] emphasizing instead the solidarity of charismatic war leaders and their followings. As the Kayapo society became dependent upon raiding Brazilians to obtain the weapons and other commodities which had increasingly assumed the character of social necessities, such leaders and their cliques of militant followers could justify their activities and dramatize their importance as suppliers of the essential means of communal survival. Raiding groups and leaders, in other words, acquired a base of social legitimation independent of the traditional institutional structure, with its symbolic and ritual mechanisms for extracting and circulating social values from the reproduction of extended families and domestic households". What

really prevented this in former [pre-raiding ?] times was that the chief's leadership and the loyalty of his followers depended on "the system of communal groups and ceremonies which generated the organizational basis of chiefly authority. The focus of this system was not the individual men's society, but the structure of the community as a whole, defined as comprising at least two men's societies, and ideally constituted as a moiety structure with two men's houses." But two points speak to such an explanation for village fragmentation: either communal institutions are weaker and less pervasive than Turner implies in his his analysis and, therefore, are probably less influential in maintaining the internal structure of matri uxorilocal households or one should seek some structural cause for the divisiveness of Kayapó society (other than men's contact with woman) and the moiety system by itself is not adequate as an explanation since there is no indication that villages without a moiety system are not subject to constant fissions as well (cf. Turner on p.41, 3rd paragraph where he begins to say to describe the potential instabilities of undoing the moiety organization but note that in other sections the recreation of the moiety system would only add to the potential tensions in the village - he wants to have it both ways - the moiety system is stabilizing and destabilizing, or at the very least symbolically redundant). But in the end of the above quote we finally have the answer to what the connections between the men's associations and communal structure seems to be. The men's groups only make sense as

communal groups in terms of a moiety structure. Now raiding and the dependence on captured manufactured goods weakens the moiety structure according to Turner and destroys the traditional systems of constraints on action by individual chiefs and their followers. This is because of the relations of formal respect that should hold between members of different men's houses and the fact that the chief cannot exercise complete liberty because he is also a "spokesperson of communal values and a ritual chanter for the community as a whole" (p.80). There is not much to differentiate the pre- and post-contact situations as far as this goes. The chiefs are still the organizers and recipients of the influx of commodities into the village and as Turner himself points out may be even less responsive to internal controls since some have assumed their leadership at least in part due to indications by the FUNAI or its predecessor. In fact, in various sections of the account on both Kapot and Gorotire, Turner makes clear that the ability of the chiefs to mobilize their followers for armed confrontations are still an important part of Kayapo strategy for dealing with aspects of the contact situation. The power and charisma of chiefs is probably greater than ever before, and chiefly orations are received with expectation and attention even in villages where they have never set foot.

More attention to the detailed history of Kayapo fissions may hold a key but these fissions are schematically presented by Turner so that one does not get an idea of the variety of forms that

fissions can take: along age grade lines (even by bachelors and their "wives"), along men's society lines, separation of a group of kin, or by two or more allied men's associations. The fact that villages are formed that have difficulty reproducing the hierarchical systems of junior and senior men's associations may indicate something of the significance of this hierarchy for the Kayapo system of relations.

In summary, there is no question about the interest or the importance of the point of view presented. However, perhaps because of the novelty or the complexity, the text does not give the reader a sufficient descriptive basis to judge whether Turner has been successful in deciphering the properties or workings of Kayapó society. What has to be evaluated is whether a presentation of the workings of any society, particularly one as complex and dynamic as the Kayapó, can or should be attempted in the format of the CEDL series on Brazilian Indians.