

Cooperation and Competition in Peaceful Societies

Bruce D. Bonta
Pennsylvania State University

Most of the world's nonviolent societies base their peaceful worldviews on cooperation and an opposition to competition. Although they have nurturant, affiliative societies, many raise their children to be hesitant and fearful about the intentions of others so that they will internalize nonviolent values and never take their peacefulness, or that of others, for granted. The children in these societies lack competitive games; although they are loved as babies, by the time they are 2 or 3 years old, they are made to feel no more important than others. These societies devalue achievement because it leads to competition and aggressiveness, which leads to violence they feel. Their rituals reinforce their cooperative, harmonious beliefs and behaviors. They have internalized their peaceful, cooperative values so that their psychological structures accord with their beliefs in nonviolence.

Most people in the United States, according to A. Kohn (1986), fervently believe in competition: It is a fundamental aspect of human nature; people live in a dog-eat-dog world; people need to compete to survive and prosper. Competition, it is argued, is necessary for the United States' economic prosperity, and it is essential for achievement in sports, science, arts, and music (Abra, 1993).

However, many social scientists do not share this enthusiasm for competition. The investigations of some psychological researchers reflect an unease about the supposed competitive nature of humanity and its benefits to society. Whatever the views of the researchers may be, there is undeniably an extensive literature on the psychology of competition and cooperation.

Most of the literature is limited, however, by its focus on the United States, and to some extent European, cooperation and competition; this limits the studies to issues that are appropriate to the competitive Western context. For instance, researchers have investigated many ramifications of whether a cooperative or competitive environment fosters higher levels of achievement. However, in their research, they did not appear to ask an even more fundamental question: Is an emphasis on achievement, whether produced by cooperation or competition, really essential to Western societies? To ask questions such as this, to really examine the essence of cooperation and competition as manifestations of human cultures, researchers need to step back from their U. S. and European participants and look at the ways these elements of human behavior are handled in societies that are not so competitive.

Much as international exchange faculty gain fresh perspectives on their own societies by living abroad (Dudden, 1987), particularly in significantly different cultures, researchers interested in competition and cooperation can gain valuable reflections from the mirrors provided by very different, less competitive societies. The images are often quite unlike the originals:

sharper, fuzzier, more distorted, or even completely reversed. To carry the metaphor one step farther, this article is based on the premise that the concave mirror provides the best possible reflection of the U. S. society of competition. To reverse the image and turn it upside down, to look at societies that completely eschew competition, exhibit virtually no competitive behavior patterns, and highly value cooperation, it should be possible to throw the U. S. psychology of competition into the greatest possible relief.

Cross-cultural studies might be expected to provide additional insights into the issues relative to competition, cooperation, and individualism. Can a cross-cultural approach shed any light on the psychology of these different goal orientations? The answers from the psychological literature are mixed. Although many of the studies of competition and cooperation undertaken in countries other than the United States report on useful research, some of it is not clearly tied to the cultures of the countries where the investigations are carried out (Erev, Bornstein, & Galili, 1993; Okebukola, 1986). Other cross-cultural literature is more instructive about cultural differences in competitive and cooperative environments, such as some articles on the subject that have appeared in the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (Domino, 1992; Friedman, Todd, & Kariuki, 1995). A few studies on competition and cooperation reported in other journals are also explicitly cross-cultural, such as studies by Cox, Lobel, and McLeod (1991) who compared European Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanic Americans; by Espinoza and Garza (1985) who compared the competitiveness of Hispanic and American students when each group was in a minority situation; and by Shwalb, Shwalb, and Nakazawa (1995) who analyzed the dichotomy among the spirit of cooperation, self-sacrifice, loyalty, and teamwork that the Japanese believe in and the highly competitive examinations that Japanese school children take to help them achieve successful careers.

However, this literature does not address these issues from the perspective of societies that are highly opposed to competition. The question raised earlier bears repetition: Are there any such societies? The answer—from the psychological literature—appears to be negative. However, there is a fairly substan-

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Bruce D. Bonta, University Libraries, Pennsylvania State University, E108 Pattee, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802. Electronic mail may be sent via Internet to bdb@psu.edu.

tial body of scholarly literature on nonviolent or peaceful societies—groups of people who live without much or any violence in their lives. Perhaps some or most of these societies are also noncompetitive? A review of this literature shows that, in fact, many of them are highly noncompetitive.

More than 40 societies have been identified as *peaceful*, where people live with virtually no, or in some cases absolutely no, recorded instances of violence. The literature about these societies has been produced primarily by social scientists, with psychologists, historians, theologians, folklorists, and others adding important insights. The research reported in this literature, if examined carefully, does turn up a rich and interesting vein of information on competitive, cooperative, and individualistic behaviors, which should be useful to researchers concerned with these issues—particularly those who are interested in the connections between competition and aggression or, the converse, between cooperation and nonaggression. Most of it is not psychological research literature because the social scientists did not conduct empirical psychological experiments on the peoples they studied, although some of the literature on the peaceful societies does report the results of psychological studies and experiments. Virtually all of the literature is taken from scholarly publications, however. As I describe in more detail later, basic to the worldviews of these 40 or more societies is their absolute opposition to manifestations of violence. The literature makes it clear that 23 of them link competition quite firmly to aggression, and as a result they are opposed to both; but 2 of the societies do not seem to have any problem with competition.

In this review, I do not cover or take a sample from small-scale societies in general; neither do I attempt to produce a statistical analysis from the literature about the peaceful societies. This literature varies widely in purpose and scope, and of course the societies themselves also vary, united only in that they all have a strong commitment to nonviolence. These conditions would weaken any attempts of one to derive statistics. Instead, this review looks at the subject of competition and cooperation, and to some extent individualism, in 25 of the nonviolent societies covered in a previous book (Bonta, 1993), where information is available on how to find about their competitiveness and cooperativeness in the literature. One exception is the Mbuti, a society included in the earlier book but not here because, clearly from the information available, their society is significantly more violent than any of the others. The literature on the other peaceful societies (Bonta, 1993) covers a variety of topics related to their nonviolence but does not really touch on competition, cooperation, or individualism. To summarize, these 25 societies were selected because (a) they appear to be somewhat, highly, or totally peaceful; and (b) information is available about their competition, cooperation, and individualism. This article is a search for alternative ideas about the ways that societies build a psychology of peacefulness and an opposition to aggression and violence. I intend to illuminate the discussions of researchers who are already concerned about these issues.

Definitions

A few brief definitions are needed to establish the parameters of this review.

Nonviolent (or Peaceful) Society

Sources vary on the definition of a *nonviolent* society, but they all converge on the proposition that a small number of societies are extremely harmonious on both intragroup and intergroup levels. They are almost completely without violence or, in some cases, have so few cases of violence that they can safely be referred to as “absolutely” nonviolent. A *peaceful* society would carry the added implication that the society is particularly tranquil and lacking in conflict, although some researchers and social scientists use nonviolence with the same meanings. Because these differences are not germane to the thrust of this article, both peaceful and nonviolent are used to describe these societies for the sake of stylistic variety. In addition to an annotated bibliography (Bonta, 1993) that summarizes the literature on these peoples, several scholarly, comparative analyses list the peaceful societies and discuss many aspects of their nonviolence (Fabbro, 1978; Howell & Willis, 1989; Montagu, 1978; Ross, 1993; Sponsel & Gregor, 1994). Of course, many hundreds of works have been devoted to these societies individually, some of which focus on competition, cooperation, and individualism. The Appendix lists the 25 societies I include and describes briefly the nature of their peacefulness as well as arguments for the violence of some of them.

Competition, Cooperation, and Individualism

These concepts are frequently defined (Deutsch, 1949, 1973; Johnson, Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson, & Skon, 1981) as three types of goal structures: competitive goal structures, in which the attainment of interlinked goals is negatively correlated among different people; cooperative goal structures, in which there is a positive correlation for people whose interlinked goals are attained; and individualistic goal structures, in which goals are not linked at all. Johnson and Johnson (1983) summarized these concepts in straightforward terms: *competition*—people attain their goals only if other participants do not—*cooperation*—people attain their goals only when other participants do also—and *individualism*—people attain their goals without affecting the goal attainment of others. These definitions, originally by Deutsch (1949), have been modified by others or other definitions have been substituted in some of the literature (Bay-Hinitz, Peterson, & Quilitch, 1994; Vealey, 1994), but they are quite adequate for the purposes of this review. Behaviors based on those goal structures—cooperative behavior and so forth—are discussed frequently in this article, and their meanings are derived from the goals. That is, cooperative behavior refers to behavior based on a goal structure of cooperation, and so forth.

Purpose and Scope

People in the United States are both cooperative and competitive at virtually the same time, even though some laboratory experiments may make it appear as if there is an either-or choice. As an example, a U. S. politician normally has to win an office through a competitive process, and the operation of a legislature such as the U. S. Congress involves constant competition among its members for their many different competing agendas. Yet to effectively pass legislation, the legislators must

constantly cooperate with other members because the helping of others, the giving of support to gain reciprocal support, is the essence of the political process (Axelrod, 1984). Most other social interactions in the United States also involve elements of cooperation and competition operating, in many cases, almost simultaneously. This familiar (to Western researchers) mixture of cooperation and competition differs from most of the peaceful societies, which are highly cooperative in nature and carefully eliminate any manifestations of competition.

The purpose of this review is to examine the psychology of cooperation, competition, and individualism in the peaceful societies and to see how the same topics are treated, by comparison, in the Western-oriented psychological literature. The goal of this article is not necessarily to answer whether competition causes violence. The nature of the literature does not allow one to go that far. That 23 out of the 25 societies examined shun competition as inimical to their beliefs and firmly link it with aggression and violence must be contrasted with the 2 that do not—and still have peaceful societies. That the vast majority of peaceful societies are also opposed to competition does not prove a conclusive link between the two concepts that competition causes aggression and violence. But there is no question that the peacefulness of these societies is dependent, in the minds of the peaceful peoples, on their continuing opposition to competition. By virtue of the 2 exceptions, the literature also shows that it is possible to have a peaceful, yet competitive society if all of the other circumstances, beliefs, and attitudes of the society focus on nonviolence.

Because the goal of finding definitive cause and effect relationships between competition and violence does not appear within reach, a more modest goal for this article is to look instead at the psychological issues that relate to competition, cooperation, and individualism within the peaceful societies. By studying the web of supporting details, researchers may be able to understand the complexities of competition, cooperation, and individualism and how they relate to aggression, conflict, and violence. One of the major issues for both the psychological literature and the social science literature on the peaceful societies is that of raising children in a cooperative environment: Do the nonviolent peoples raise and educate their children differently from Western societies to emphasize and reinforce their opposition to competition? Another significant issue in both literatures is that of achievement: Do the peaceful societies promote individual achievement as Western societies do?

Some psychological research suggests that competition promotes aggression. Almost all of the peaceful societies would agree and would link aggression to violence, but the literature on the peaceful societies goes farther by providing details on the psychological structures that control competition and nurture cooperation. The literature suggests other important questions about competition in the peaceful societies: What are the relationships between intergroup and intragroup competition, cooperation, and individualism? Is competition as ubiquitous as some researchers maintain? How do rituals in the peaceful societies reinforce the peoples' beliefs in cooperation? How do the highly individualistic, and highly competitive, peoples among the nonviolent societies maintain their peacefulness?

As already stated, these specific discussions do not answer conclusively the question of whether competition causes vio-

lence. But the specific issues that are addressed here provide pieces for the larger puzzle, and they form a fairly clear picture. The details show societies that rely on the absence of competition, and to a greater or lesser extent on the presence of cooperation, as essential to their peacefulness. The two competitive, but nonviolent, peoples demonstrate the variability of human societies—all the pieces are still not available, and the picture about the relationship between competition and violence may become somewhat more clear as a result of this literature, but puzzling aspects remain nonetheless.

Raising Children in a Cooperative Environment

From the point of view of the peaceful societies, the major question about their children is How are they raised and educated so that they will adhere to the nonviolent value structures of their communities? What psychological structures are in place to ensure the successful adoption of social values? How are children taught so that they internalize the society's beliefs about competition and cooperation? How do their games and play activities relate to competition and cooperation?

Researchers have produced a rich literature on these issues in their work with European and U. S. children. Johnson and Johnson (1979) summarized the results of over 600 research projects with students; their summary of the literature is still valid today: (a) Students master, retain, and transfer principles and concepts more effectively when they learn in a cooperative environment than competitive or individualistic ones, and cooperation promotes more and better learning than does competition; (b) students have more intrinsic motivation to learn in a cooperative setting; (c) cooperative environments are better than competitive or individualistic ones in the facilitation of communication skills, ability to resolve conflicts, and social and cognitive developments; (d) students' attitudes toward teachers and their schools are more positive in cooperative environments; (e) students have a more positive attitude toward their classmates, including members of the opposite gender, other ethnic groups, social groups, and people with differing abilities, in cooperative environments; and (f) mental health and self-esteem are more positive among students in cooperative learning situations than competitive or individualistic ones.

The social science literature on the peaceful societies would not disagree with that summary, but it does provide additional perspectives to the psychological literature, such as the strategies some of these peoples use to indoctrinate their children in their nonviolent, noncompetitive, cooperative ways. For instance, one widespread child-raising technique used among a number of the peaceful societies is the phenomenon of the dramatic plunge in status of 2- to 3-year-olds. Infants and very small children are cherished by parents, older siblings, and other members of the community. They are fondled constantly and nursed on demand, and their other needs are satisfied as quickly as possible. But when they reach Age 2 or 3—the age varies in the different societies—at roughly, although not necessarily, the time when another baby is born, the status of the child abruptly and dramatically plunges. From being the center of everyone's attention, the child suddenly gets little notice at all and is made to feel like a very insignificant member of the community. In some of the societies, adults and older children actively make sure the

3-year-old no longer has any illusions of special status; whereas in other societies, the child is simply ignored. To emphasize, in many of these societies the change is sudden and dramatic.

In some of the societies, the child may go through a period of very lengthy temper tantrums, almost all of which are completely ignored. But soon the point becomes clear—no one is special, stands out, or is above anyone else. In a few of the societies where children are more closely controlled, they would not dare have temper tantrums, but the point remains the same. The infant learns quickly the importance of love, closeness, and dependence on others; the 3-year-old learns that the individual cannot dominate others. A spoiled 5-year-old might lead progressively to an egocentric, dominating, competitive, aggressive, and perhaps even violent adult. Some examples help flesh out this pattern.

Infants of the Paliyan people who live in the hills of southern India are weaned between Ages 2 and 2½.¹ When their mothers go back to work and ignore the child's demands, they often have protracted temper tantrums that are usually ignored. This period may last until Age 4 or 5. The child soon learns to adhere to the social rules, play quietly without fighting, and be reticent (Gardner, 1966, 1972). Children in the Semai society, a people of Peninsular Malaysia, face a similar rude awakening when they are very small. Although nursing is not necessarily stopped, the constant nurturance practically ceases; parents must go back to work, and no amount of screaming by the child does any good. Temper tantrums of 1 hr or longer are ignored by everyone during a period that may last until the child is 4 years old. This has the effect of transferring and broadening the child's dependency from the parents to the broader household and entire community. The Semai children quickly learn that they are helpless to control events around them and are totally dependent on the good will and support of the group (Robarchek, 1977).

Very similar patterns have been observed among the Tahitians, a society of French Polynesia, where children learn by the time they are 5 years old that they are powerless to rebel, subvert, or evade the whole community, which might be possible if they were still just dependent on their two parents (Levy, 1973, 1978). Comparable patterns have been reported among the Ifaluk, a society who lives on a small island in the Federated States of Micronesia (Spiro, 1953); the Zapotec, an American Indian society of southern Mexico (O'Neill, 1979); the Inuit of northern Canada (Briggs, 1971); and the Lepchas, a Himalayan society in northern India (Gorer, 1967). The Amish (Hostetler, 1980) and Hutterites (Hostetler & Huntington, 1967), rural Christian peoples who live in the United States and Canada, also cherish their infants, but they instill in their small children an obedience to higher authority as one of their foremost principles. Children in those societies would not dare have open temper tantrums.

The literature gives examples of the ways some of the nonviolent societies actively teach their children to be noncompetitive. Several social scientists have maintained that the people of Bali, an island in Indonesia, control all their emotions and thus have a peaceful, reserved society. Balinese mothers teach their children to avoid strong personal involvement by ignoring their temper tantrums (Bateson, 1963; Connor, 1979). Mothers may tease their children by offering a breast to another's child and react with amusement when their own children try to push away the intruder. This strategy diminishes tendencies toward compet-

itiveness and rivalry, although there are certainly instances of competitive behavior in Balinese society.

Various visitors to the Hutterite colonies on the plains of Canada and the United States have observed how cooperative the children are (Sawka, 1968), an attitude they are taught in their homes. Outside teachers in the colony schools are sometimes frustrated when they try to get the Hutterite children to become motivated by competitive means. If a teacher makes a special point of praising one of the children, the entire class reacts with embarrassment (Bennett, 1967). The Hutterites raise their children to be loved and enjoyed, but, even as an infant, the child is expected to adapt to the work schedule of the colony. Children quickly learn to be happy with the group, the unchanging pattern of colony life, and that individuals have little control over their environment. Because the colony is more important than the individual and older people are more important than younger ones, the child learns to accept a very low status in the colony. Children 3 years old can no longer scream lustily; they must be quiet around adults and even have to cry quietly. They are readily dismissed from activities when adults or older children do not want them around (Hostetler & Huntington, 1967). In this kind of an environment, children quickly adopt the cooperative values that are an essential aspect of their communal lives.

Amish children are educated through the eighth grade in schools run by the local Amish people. They approach education quite differently than the mainstream U. S. public schools. Whereas the public schools stress speed, learning the subject matter as a way to get ahead, and individual attainment, the Amish focus on thorough learning and accuracy at the expense of speed, the socialization of the child into the community, shared knowledge, and the importance of tradition. In the public schools, individualism and competition are promoted by the narrow age groups of the children, which separate them from their siblings; whereas the Amish include siblings together in the classroom and emphasize group excellence. Public schools emphasize children overcoming their weaknesses because the focus is on the intellect of the future citizen; Amish schools accept human weakness, and they concentrate on the belief that people need help from others and God to improve. The competition that exists in the Amish school is group centered; it encourages the children to try to improve on their previous records—to get better spelling scores for instance. Amish children thus encourage each other to perform well, so the whole class and school will succeed (Hostetler & Huntington, 1971).

The Inuit of the central Canadian Arctic studied by Briggs (1982, 1987, 1991, 1994) have psychological structures in place that teach their children to internalize their cooperative values and abhor aggression. Inuit children are socialized with games—small, spontaneous exchanges—in which an older person teases a child to be selfish or aggressive toward someone else such as a sibling. Although these games are cathartic for the children and the adults, they also create feelings of ambiguity,

¹ The ethnographic present is used because it generally is that way in the anthropological literature, even though societies may have changed since social scientists reported on them. However, in cases where the literature clearly indicates that changes in a society have affected their nonviolence and noncompetitiveness, the past tense is used.

conflict, and danger about the values they cherish, thereby strengthening their commitment to those values. The contradictions about their nurturant, nonviolent values are not only felt rationally but also accepted as feelings. Children are encouraged through behavior with animals to engage in contradictory activities—to love, cuddle, and protect a little animal, such as a baby duck, and then injure or even kill it. This builds conflicting feelings of aggression and protectiveness. Complex messages such as those aroused by aggressive games, or the loving and destroying of the same duckling, create doubt in the child that society is predictable, people are always nonviolent and nurturant, and one is always secure. This doubt, and the fear that it arouses, serves to secure an adherence to the values of society and to be constantly careful to maintain the love and support of the group. Values are not learned in a straightforward manner or neatly compartmentalized; one acts in a socially approved fashion because the consequences of not doing so are so personally frightening and relevant.

The Ifaluk described by Lutz (1988) similarly instill in their children a strong reserve that borders on fear about the intentions of others as a means to maintain their values of opposition to competition and violence. When Ifaluk children are weaned at about Age 2, they are believed capable of learning some of the society's social rules, although their educability is believed to be limited. The children are thought to learn their incorrect behavior from their peers, and parents have the responsibility of correcting those bad examples. The children usually learn by example, but the Ifaluk also believe that it is important to lecture them on proper behavior. The parents lecture in a form of stylized preaching; the children, they believe, listen, inevitably understand, and learn; they obey the rules of correct behavior because of the adult discourses (Lutz, 1983, 1985).

The Ifaluk believe that the proper inculcation of their children's understanding of major cultural concepts such as *metagu*—a situationally relevant word for anxious fear—is important for proper socializing and inhibiting misbehaviors. Adults indicate to children that they should beware of the *metagu* that comes from strangers outside the house or being in large groups of people. Although they believe that the children will experience *metagu* naturally, they feel that the process should be encouraged. One way to assist this process is by the parent displaying justifiable anger (*song*) whenever the child misbehaves. Adults teach children that a special kind of ghost will “get them” if they wander away from the house or misbehave, and they go so far as to have one of the women dress up in a costume and impersonate the ghost, which appears menacingly at the edge of the compound threatening to kidnap and eat the wayward child. When the child reacts in terror, the protective adult tells the ghost that the child will not misbehave any more, so “go away.” Antisocial and aggressive actions are thus firmly imprinted in the child in association with *metagu* and the parents' response of justifiable anger. Parents teach their children to not be assertive, aggressive, or disruptive and to be sensitive to other people's needs. For the Ifaluk, *metagu* encourages peaceful participation in cooperative group activities (Lutz, 1983).

In a psychological study, Bay-Hinitz et al. (1994) demonstrated that when children play cooperative games their aggressions decrease and cooperative behaviors increase; conversely, when they play competitive games their aggressive behavior

increases and cooperative behavior decreases. This finding seems to be supported by the literature on the nonviolent societies. Not only are the children in the peaceful societies raised in an environment without competition, but they also do not play competitive games. Examples include the Semai (Dentan, 1968), the Chewong (Howell, 1988, 1989), and the Batek (Endicott, 1979), three societies of the Malay Peninsula; the Piaroa, an American Indian society of Venezuela (Overing, 1989b); and the G/wi, a society of Botswana (Silberbauer, 1981). Kadar children in southern India also play without any element of competition such as hiding, catching, or running away—their games are based on simple enjoyment of the activities of the moment (Ehrenfels, 1952). When Chewong children spin tops, which they acquire from the more aggressive Malay people of Malaysia, they leave out the competition that characterizes the Malay top-spinning games (Howell, 1984).

Most of the games of the children in these societies are cooperative activities, which involve demonstrating physical skills, mimicking adult activities, or telling stories. Semai boys play at hunting, while girls play house; they swing on vines, jump down waterfalls, and play fantasy games (Royce, 1980). A favorite game among the !Kung children of Namibia and Botswana is *zeni*, in which the children use a stick to throw into the air and catch a weight that is attached by a thong to a feather. Although children exhibit widely differing abilities in the game, they do not compete: All play for the sheer pleasure of it (Draper, 1976).

According to Draper (1976), one of the reasons that the games of the !Kung lack competitive elements—this might be true for many of the other peaceful, small-scale societies—is that there are few children in a !Kung band—perhaps 14 of both genders, ranging from infants to 14-year-olds. Consequently, competitive games would be hard to organize because it would be difficult to find age mates to compete with, much less form viable teams for some sports. But this accords with the !Kung cultural opposition to competitiveness. The argument that the lack of suitable age mates helps inhibit competitive games may be true in societies that are otherwise predisposed to nonviolence; however, in other small-scale societies that are highly aggressive and violent, children have the virtues of competition instilled in them at an early age (Brown, 1986; Herdt, 1986).

To conclude, practices such as the child suddenly losing parental attentions, the child destroying cuddly baby animals, parents teasing about hurting others, or the child developing fears about the intentions of others could all lead children to become resentful and violent rather than cooperative and peaceful. Why should these practices necessarily lead to cooperative, peaceful behavior? The answer seems circular in nature: These practices are carried out in societies that are already highly nonviolent. The Inuit child who is taunted with “Why don't you kill your baby brother?”, to use Briggs's (1994) haunting example, only has one possible way of dealing with the issue, and he or she already knows what society expects. The child has no other example than the peaceful one, so the adult's teasing question serves to build uncertainty about the permanence of a peaceful society and develop deeply felt concerns about the ambiguities of social relationships. Everyone always appears peaceful, but each individual has to be on guard constantly to not offend others, to actively to keep the peace. This guardedness, a feeling

of ambiguity about the intentions of others, is the result of psychological practices, but it is only effective in societies where there is already little or no ambiguity about violence, which is always rejected.

Achievement

Nearly as much psychological literature on competition and cooperation focuses on achievement as on education. In fact, in much of that literature, achievement and education are closely related. But competitiveness and achievement are not necessarily linked—it is quite possible to have a strong drive for achievement without a high need for competition (Smither & Houston, 1992). Thus, it is important to separate the motivations for achievement from the motivations to cooperate or compete (Simmons, Wehner, Tucker, & King, 1988).

Attitudes toward achievement vary in the psychological literature, although the most common theme is that participants prefer to use cooperative strategies to attain success rather than competitive ones (Sherman, 1986; Simmons, King, Tucker, & Wehner, 1986). More important in the literature than attitudes, however, is the question of real achievement: Do competitive conditions prompt people to achieve more than cooperative ones? A large body of literature shows that cooperative school environments promote higher levels of achievement than competitive or individualistic ones (Cosier & Dalton, 1988; Johnson & Johnson, 1983; Johnson et al., 1981). However, it appears as if some tasks might be learned more effectively in competitive group environments (Okebukola & Ogunniyi, 1984), and people who are already achievement oriented may learn more effectively by performing competitive tasks than cooperative ones (Epstein & Harackiewicz, 1992). As mentioned at the beginning of this article, some researchers also argued that competition produces the highest achievements in all fields, including the arts, sports, science, and so on (Abra, 1993).

From the perspective of the peaceful societies' literature, when psychologists try to evaluate the effects of cooperation and competition on achievement, they may not ask the right questions. More fundamental than whether one practice more effectively fosters achievement would be to question the value of individual achievement itself. Why do some of the nonviolent, noncompetitive societies try to minimize or eliminate manifestation of achievement? What are their reactions to leaders and the need for leadership? Can highly peaceful, cooperative societies recognize achievement and leadership without introducing elements of competition? Whereas some researchers might argue that modesty and peacefulness are not necessarily incompatible with achievement and leadership, most of the peoples in the nonviolent societies would not agree (although few would debate the point because that would be considered too aggressive). Out of the nonviolent societies that are explicitly opposed to competition, many are also opposed to the recognition of individual achievement, success, and leadership. Instead, they highly value humility and modesty and do not tolerate achievement-oriented people.

The opposition of these societies to achievement appears to be based on the concern that successful individuals will threaten the overall stability and peace of the group. For instance, the Tahitians value their individual autonomy, and they are not

highly ambitious. They lack a sense of personal striving; when they cannot meet their goals, they substitute others. If people are not successful in achieving things, they feel that substitutes will come along. This lack of striving minimizes social situations that produce anger and helps them maintain their nonviolent values (Levy, 1973).

Amish societies provide a second perspective on the uneasy relationship between cooperation and achievement in a nonviolent society. The basis of Amish peacefulness is their commitment to *Gelassenheit* (submission or the spirit of yielding themselves to God's way). Their belief in submission, also called "nonresistance," prevents them from using force in any social relationship, such as serving in the armed forces, filing suits in courts, or engaging in competitive practices. They believe in humility, silence, and self-denial, and they do not engage in professional or competitive practices that could foster arrogance and conceit. The Amish cooperate in many mutually beneficial activities because their belief in *Gelassenheit* focuses their energies on the community (Kraybill, 1989).

Cooperative as they might like to be, however, more than half of the Amish living in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, now operate their own small businesses because they no longer can obtain enough land for all of them to continue their traditional farming operations. The Amish who run businesses understand and deal with competition; they are quite familiar with the market-driven, profit system; and they can formulate effective strategies for managing their operations. However, their society limits the size of their business operations—they cannot grow too large because of potential criticism from within their church that they will abandon traditional values. One successful Amish businessman complained that "my own people look at my growth as a sign of greed" (p. 310), although he recognized that his identity with his people was the most important thing to him (Kraybill, 1989).

A third example of dealing with achievement in a peaceful, cooperative society is provided by the !Kung, who are very strongly opposed to competition (Draper, 1976). They also are very strongly opposed to any signs that one person might think he or she is superior to another. They constantly find ways to make sure that people relate modestly with others and that there is absolutely no appearance of people making anything of their individual achievements. Even an elaborate gift if it is perceived as self-display is challenged (Lee, 1969). For example, when a hunter successfully kills an animal and goes back to his band, he cannot just walk in and announce his achievement. Correct procedure is to return to the group and wait for someone else to ask him "Well, what did you see today?" The hunter replies, with his head in his hands, "I didn't see anything." The other person responds "What do you mean you haven't killed anything? Can't you see that I'm dying of hunger!" To that, the hunter replies "Well, there might be something out there. I just might have scratched its elbow." The hungry inquirer gets the point and smiles, and they agree to round up some other men and go out to the bush to "have a look" and bring back the "scratched" animal (Lee, 1979). The Buid—people who live in the mountainous interior of Mindoro Island in the Philippines (Gibson, 1990)—and the Ladakhis—a Tibetan Buddhist people of Kashmir, in northern India (Harvey, 1983)—also con-

demn bragging and expressions of pride much as the !Kung do because they believe it leads to physical violence.

Many of the nonviolent societies, although not all, avoid having leaders—another aspect of their tendency to refrain from focusing on individuals and their achievements. The !Kung traditionally had no leaders with authority, although certain individuals exhibited leadership characteristics such as being able to speak wisely or hunt effectively. These leaders, whose personalities were varied, were never aloof, overbearing, boastful, or arrogant—characteristics the !Kung could not accept. Also, the leaders received and owned nothing more in the way of material goods than anyone else, and they lived no differently (Lee, 1978). Similarly, leadership among the G/wi derives from the authority—knowledge, experience, and persuasiveness—of a speaker more than anything else. However, prestige that a person may have from knowledge of a field, which enables him or her to exert some leadership, does not carry over into other fields (Silberbauer, 1982).

Among some of the societies, the lack of leadership is based on their belief in an absolute condition of equality, in which no one individual can tell another what to do (K. L. Endicott, 1984; Howell, 1988). In several societies in addition to the !Kung and the G/wi, individuals with a lot of ability or wisdom are given considerable respect, although without any authority. Among the Tristan Islanders, a South Atlantic island society, prestige is accorded to people who mind their own business, and the only leadership exercised is by personal example (Munch, 1970). Other societies that lack leaders include the Batek (K. Endicott, 1979, 1988; K. L. Endicott, 1984, 1987); Chewong (Howell, 1984, 1988); Nayaka, a society of southern India (Bird-David, 1987); and Inuit (Langaard, 1986).

Some of the peaceful societies, of course, do have leaders, such as the Buid (Gibson, 1986) and Piaroa (Overing Kaplan, 1975). Most of the societies with leaders, however, do not give them power, prestige, or privileges that would distinguish them from others, despite the fact that they may be expected to perform rituals, help resolve disputes, foster fidelity to group traditions, and recommend strategies for economic survival and prosperity. The Amish (Kraybill, 1989) and some of the more traditional Mennonite groups (Juhnke, 1989) choose their leaders by lot so that God is seen to have made the choice rather than humans. The Hutterites (Hostetler, 1974) elect their leadership council, but all of the men on the executive body feel that their decisions are directed by the whole society. The individual leaders must be submissive because authority is centered in the group not the individual.

Modesty and humility are behavioral strategies used by a number of the societies to prevent competition and conflict. The list would include, among others, the Tahitians (Levy, 1973), Paliyan (Gardner, 1985), Amish (Kraybill, 1989; Savells, 1988), traditional Mennonites (Driedger & Kraybill, 1994; Juhnke, 1989), and Inuit (Briggs, 1994). The nonviolent societies, in summary, are reticent, cautious, and modest about personal achievements, and they avoid leadership, or at least the arrogance of leadership, as a major strategy to maintain their peacefulness.

To conclude this section, the societies that highly value cooperation and strongly link competition with aggression also see individual achievement as a threat to their peacefulness. If indi-

viduals are allowed to stand out as superior to their peers, their pride might lead to the buildup of hostility and violence. The only prestige allowed is to follow the societal norms for peaceful behavior. Otherwise, humility, modesty, and leadership avoidance seem to characterize these societies.

Competition Promotes Aggression and Violence

A significant body of psychological literature suggests that competition fosters aggression. One study demonstrates that people who played a game competitively were much more aggressive in their approach to the game than those who were instructed to play it cooperatively. The competitive players used killing techniques to win far more than the cooperative players, who tended to use avoidance techniques (Anderson & Morrow, 1995). These results demonstrate that, when people are in a competitive frame of mind, their aggressive tendencies increase, even if those aggressions are not directed at a competitor. Conversely, the results show that a cooperative frame of mind leads to a reduction of aggressive tendencies. In another study, children displayed more aggressive behavior and less cooperative behavior when they played competitive games (Bay-Hinitz et al., 1994). Because aggressive behavior by children is an effective predictor of aggressions by adolescents—a major social problem—Bay-Hinitz et al. advocated that cooperative games should be introduced in preschool settings to promote prosocial behavior patterns.

Does the literature on the peaceful societies support the findings of the psychological studies that competition promotes aggression? If so, how do these societies promote cooperation and maintain their opposition to competition and aggression? How do the worldviews of the nonviolent peoples relate to competitiveness and aggressiveness? What mechanisms do they use to internalize values that are opposed to competition and aggression?

Some answers to the effective management of psychological needs can be found in Inuit society, particularly among some of the bands in the central Canadian Arctic who have a strongly felt ideology of their nonviolence, cooperativeness, equality, and generosity. Their ideology is based on extremely strong controls, particularly their psychology of contradictions, which prevent the expressions of anger and aggression. To the Inuit, opposite values are important, constructive aspects of their society: As a hunting people, killing is essential, but nonviolence is an equally essential value to maintain the society (Briggs, 1971, 1982). These people generate contradictory values by creating and managing conflicting psychological need through their socializing techniques, as described in *Raising Children in a Cooperative Environment*. The Inuit enjoy killing—their eyes shine with excitement when they tell hunting stories—yet they react with horror, not only to the idea of killing a human but also to any form of interpersonal aggression, such as shouting. They clearly associate danger with aggression, from the animal deaths that they witness around them to their own repressed hostilities toward others and a realization that others might reciprocate the same feelings. However, they think that aggressive, contradictory behavior can also be nurturant, such as their aggressive, mildly hurtful treatment of their children as described already. This kind of behavior is rationalized with the idea that the hurt

child is more lovable and that to hurt a loved one tests one's own ability to endure pain—rationalizations that show that mildly aggressive behavior sometimes expresses nurturance and affection (Briggs, 1982, 1987, 1991, 1994).

The Semai, who live in a society in which interpersonal violence is almost completely absent (Dentan, 1968; Robarchek, 1979), do not even link competition and cooperation as contradictory goals. Instead, they conceive of aggression as the opposite of cooperative group harmony. Robarchek (1989) investigated this issue with the Semai by administering self concept sentence completion tests to 19 participants. The questions probed their values about what they would do under hypothetical stress situations, such as hunger. Most of the participants indicated in their replies that they would rely on the nurturance of others to solve their problems rather than try to solve the problems by themselves. Questions that were directed toward positive and negative values showed that the Semai do not even view *goodness* and *badness* in exactly the same dimensions: The former is defined in terms of nurturance (giving and helping), while the latter is conceived in terms of behaviors that inhibit group cohesiveness, particularly aggressiveness, quarreling, and anger.

A third example can be found in the literature on a Zapotec village in the state of Oaxaca, in southern Mexico. Several social scientists have focused a considerable amount of research on one particular village, nicknamed "La Paz," which is far less violent than other neighboring villages. The residents of La Paz are quite competitive in their business dealings, which concentrate wealth and power in the hands of a few people, and they are not averse to cheating both outsiders and their fellow villagers. But their values are opposed to actual physical conflict, and whenever a fight threatens to erupt, someone always intervenes. Machismo is virtually absent in the village, although it is a dominating trait in nearby communities (Paddock, 1976).

The nonviolence of La Paz seems to be based on the fact that the residents have deeply internalized the values of cooperation, responsibility, and respect which are generally accepted, although apparently not so fervently practiced, by the rest of the Zapotec people. To the La Paz villagers, cooperation includes acceptance of responsibility for community service; it also implies avoidance of tense situations in public and doing anything necessary to promote the appearance of social harmony (O'Neill, 1986). O'Neill (1981) administered a questionnaire in La Paz that showed that Zapotec men do feel some justification at times for initiating aggression, such as in defense of themselves or their property, but the responses also show that the men preferred an indirect response to aggression from others. Most of the men said that they would appeal to others in the event of an aggressive attack, particularly the community authorities.

Fry (1988, 1992) has written on the social psychology of child raising in La Paz and compared it with another nearby town, referred to as "San Andres," which has a much higher level of measurable violence—although both towns share the same basic Zapotec ideals and are similar in most other ways. However, there are significant differences in observable levels of adult aggression between the two Zapotec towns. In San Andres, teenage boys normally engage in roughhousing, while the ones in La Paz do not; sometimes teenagers in San Andres have serious fights, but they never do in La Paz. Men in San

Andres greet one another with slaps and punches, have mock fights, swear at one another, and steal and hide other men's hats. Men in La Paz do not engage in this kind of rough behavior, and they refer to the inhabitants of San Andres condescendingly as "unfriendly barbarians." Children in San Andres see adults engage in fist fights when they are drunk, which rarely occurs in La Paz. Fry observed instances of wife beating and child abuse in San Andres but not in La Paz. The men of San Andres assume that their wives will have sex with other men any time they can, so they try to control them through fear and force. The women of La Paz do not have to deal with this problem very often because they are respected and treated as equals by the men (Fry, 1992).

Fry's (1992) analysis of the difference between the two communities is that, while they both adhere to ideals of cooperation, respect, and equality, antisocial actions such as stealing, adultery, and physical violence are strongly disapproved in La Paz. The inhabitants of San Andres believe that it is natural for some people to act violently, the killing of a rival for reasons of jealousy is understandable, sometimes aggressiveness is justified, fighting when people are drunk is normal—people are just that way. Children raised in San Andres frequently hear adults admit that violence is a part of life; they do not learn about and witness a consistently peaceful view of their village. By contrast, the people of La Paz consistently express the view that their community is peaceful, no one fights there, and they are cooperative, never jealous, and respectful of others—views that the children who grow up there hear constantly. Thus, the children in the two communities absorb the different self-images and learn by example the way adults treat one another—to build up grudges and feuds and to escalate disputes into violence versus to approach human relationships peacefully taking great care to avoid aggression.

To conclude, the literature on the nonviolent peoples, despite variations from society to society, shows that the societies have structures that reinforce their beliefs that competition fosters aggression: They have developed strong psychological controls, which nurture cooperative, helpful, peaceful behaviors and limit competitive and aggressive ones. The techniques vary: for the Inuit, a psychology of contradictions; for the Semai, an identification of cooperation with goodness and aggression with badness; and for the Zapotec of La Paz, an ability to strongly internalize cooperative, peaceful values. But it is safe to conclude that the worldviews of all the peaceful societies, which link beliefs in cooperation with ideals of nonviolence, also combine those beliefs with various psychological structures to ensure the continuity of their harmonious social lives.

Intergroup Cooperation

Researchers have studied the differences between the ways individuals within groups, and groups as a whole, relate to competitive, cooperative, and individualistic environments. Psychological research shows that individuals tend to interact less competitively than groups or that groups act more competitively than individuals (Insko et al., 1994; McCallum et al., 1985). This "discontinuity effect," as it is called (Schopler et al., 1993), is prompted by a fear of exploitation by the out-group, although a variety of mediating mechanisms are possible. How-

ever, tendencies for groups to act in more competitive fashions are counterproductive because intergroup cooperation produces less friction and disagreements and more collaboration and support than competition does (Johnson & Johnson, 1985). Furthermore, whereas competition between groups may foster a focus by group members on their common tasks, cooperation between groups tends to promote interpersonal attractions (Betencourt, Brewer, Croak, & Miller, 1992).

These studies might help to throw light on the psychologies of the nonviolent societies, but in turn those societies may have patterns that could enlighten researchers. Are the intergroup relations in the peaceful societies more cooperative than competitive? How do their intergroup relationships compare with their intragroup relations? Are they just as cooperative? How does intergroup cooperation relate to the peacefulness of these societies?

For many of the nonviolent societies, people can survive quite well in the annual economic cycle of food production, gathering, hunting, and trading by interacting primarily with the small number of individuals in their groups, plus some traders from the outside society—conditions of the surrounding natural environment do not require more than that. For other societies, economic conditions appear to dictate cooperation among groups, either regularly, annually, or when needed, and there are social and psychological implications.

Economic benefits are a significant reason for intergroup cooperation among the Hutterites, who live on rural communes but use modern farm equipment to run large operations on the midwestern prairies. Hutterite colony members frequently visit with other colonies to borrow heavy pieces of machinery they might need, such as cement mixers, specialized types of planters, or bulldozers (Bennett, 1967). This kind of economic exchange ensures that colonies will help one another if times of scarcity should arise. Another good example is the !Kung, who have very clearly understood territories where different bands hunt and gather (Marshall, 1960), but at certain times of the year when one band is living in an area and has a plentiful supply of food and water but others do not, the other bands are welcome to come and share in the surplus (Lee, 1972). The good will that this kind of economic cooperation, or "generalized reciprocity," generates allows societies to ensure that resources will be shared very widely in the event that shortages or other troubles threaten.

Economic cooperation between groups is also important for the Mennonites, who live as peacefully as they can, even though they are mostly integrated into modern U. S. and Canadian societies. Although informal, voluntary assistance is widespread, particularly to needy Mennonites or those struck by illness or disaster, they have created more formal institutions to provide mutual aid, such as cooperative fire and casualty insurance, health and life insurance, and disaster relief (Redekop, 1989). On a broader level, the various Mennonite churches have organized the Mennonite Central Committee, which has a worldwide relief and service mission. In addition to the exemplifying of the Mennonite feeling to give service, support social innovation, and provide an outlet for personal creativity, the Mennonite Central Committee encourages cooperation among the very diverse congregations, which would not be available through any other means (Redekop, 1989).

In addition to the economic motivators for intergroup cooper-

ation, cooperative behavior between groups is also essential to the society's social and psychological health. Intergroup cooperation among the Hutterites provides a social function because many marriages result from the intercolony visiting, and it gives the colonies opportunities to monitor, criticize, and help one another (Bennett, 1967). But there also are instances of intergroup competition, especially among the managers of the different enterprises carried on by the colony who sometimes compete for resources to pursue their particular activities. When this happens, the colony executives have to override this competitiveness and make decisions for the good of the whole society. But these instances of intergroup competition among the Hutterites represent only a very minor aspect of their society. Hutterite managers are simply trying to make their operations as successful as they can for the benefit of the whole society. Their entire training and socialization emphasizes that they not assert themselves and work for the benefit of the colony rather than for themselves. Furthermore, in the well-integrated colonies, men progress as they age from laboring positions to management positions to, finally, offices of executive authority. Hutterites believe that they have to wait until God chooses them for advancement. Influence, authority, and power are diffused among the mature men, who cooperate in their colony activities. Before an overpopulation of men can cause problems with dissatisfied individuals who do not rise to higher positions, the colony will split into two—which maintains the proper proportion of adult men for all of the necessary positions in the colony, without any surplus (Bennett, 1967; Hostetler & Huntington, 1967).

Intergroup cooperation also seems to symbolize for nonviolent peoples their cultural emphasis on peacefulness. For example, the Mennonite Central Committee provides a symbol of Mennonite identity that helps them maintain their commitment to the faith. Many might otherwise become alienated by the narrow, parochial nature of some of their congregations (Redekop, 1989). On the rare occasions that intergroup cooperation has been possible for the Tristan Islanders, who have traditionally lived in an extremely isolated situation, their cooperative, helpful service to strangers has apparently bolstered their identity. When a Norwegian scientific expedition was visiting the island in 1937–1938, they were treated with constant kindness and generosity by the islanders, who seemed pleased to have the opportunity to be of service to the visitors (Munch, 1971).

Thus, so far as one can tell from the available literature, if the nonviolent societies have intergroup relationships at all, they are highly cooperative—just as they are in person-to-person relations. With the exception of the Fipa and Jains, to be discussed in *Elements of Competition in Nonviolent Societies*, there is no evidence in these societies of the pattern described in the psychological literature on Western societies of intragroup cooperation flourishing within environments of intergroup competition. Intergroup cooperation in the nonviolent societies is based on economic motives for one sharing risks and providing mutual assistance, social and psychological factors that foster marriages and allow people to move from one group to another, and the need for symbolic indicators of their peacefulness.

Competition Is Ubiquitous

Researchers in the field of Darwinian, or evolutionary, psychology believe that many aspects of human behavior are based

on the processes of natural selection; whereas some are concerned primarily with the phenomena of cooperation and altruism (Barkow, Cosmides, & Tooby, 1992), others focus on anger and aggression (Palmer, 1993). Some argue that competition is a ubiquitous social behavior, which is pervasive throughout modern life (Walters & Crawford, 1994).

The assertion that competition is ubiquitous is clearly contradicted by the evidence of the nonviolent societies. Montagu (1976) pointed out that cooperation is also a ubiquitous social behavior, in fact, it is more prevalent than competition. The literature on the peaceful societies supports and amplifies Montagu's conclusions: Peaceful societies are highly cooperative in nature, and competition is relatively rare. Of the 45 unique societies listed by Bonta (1993), only 2 appear to explicitly thrive on competition, as already mentioned—the Fipa and Jains—and a few others exhibit very modest instances of competition on occasion.² Although numerous examples of cooperative, noncompetitive behaviors have already been presented, the argument that cooperation and an opposition to competition are prevalent among the nonviolent societies can be strengthened by a brief review of the evidence, with a particular focus on the strength of feelings about the subject in some of the societies.

The Buid is one of the societies that is very strongly opposed to competition. The two central symbols of their social organization are groups of companions engaged in cooperative tasks and closely companionable marriages. Their society is based not on relationships of kinship or proximity but on friendly relations and a desire to cooperate in shared activities (Gibson, 1986). The Piaroa are also intensely opposed to competition—they identify it with cannibalism as a highly destructive force (Overing, 1986). The Chewong are so strongly opposed to competition that they have no word for it. They have adopted Malay words for *anger*, *war*, and *fighting*, which they understand but never experience, and they never use the Malay words for *coercion* or *competition* (Howell, 1989).

Other peaceful peoples also never permit competition to be part of their societies. For instance, the Ladakhis traditionally did not experience—and were opposed to—competition, intergroup hostility, and hurting anyone (Harvey, 1983; Norberg-Hodge, 1991), and they were committed to friendship, cooperation, and mutual helpfulness (Mann, 1986). The Tristan Islanders had virtually no knowledge of competition until they were forced to evacuate their island in 1961 when a volcano erupted. They were moved to Great Britain for 2 years until they were able to return to their homes, but they were quite unprepared to adjust to the highly competitive English society. A researcher who worked with them during that period felt that they easily accepted themselves and their lack of competitiveness, were free of anxiety, and had an atmosphere of cooperation and tranquility in their homes (Keir, 1966).

Another society that does not accept competition is the Ifaluk, who were described in *Raising Children in a Cooperative Environment*. They place a high value on helpfulness, sharing, and cooperation as part of their strongly felt ethic of nonaggression (Lutz, 1983, 1985; Spiro, 1952). The Ifaluk most highly value a person who is *maluwelu*, quiet, calm, respectful, obedient, kind, and gentle—the word is also used to describe a lagoon when the wind is calm. Their calmness and culture of nonviolence arises not so much from an inner tranquility as from their

cultural norms: They strongly devalue traits such as one showing off, lacking respect for others, displaying personal possessions, or other competitive behaviors that might imperil their egalitarian, cooperative, harmonious society (Lutz, 1985).

A few more examples of nonviolent societies that abstain from competition conclude this section. The Paliyan reject competition because they believe it leads to social disharmony and threatens self-reliance and egalitarianism, which they highly value (Gardner, 1969). A different tribal society of India, the Birhor, is characterized by economic cooperation and individual independence. There is virtually no competition among them for scarce resources, and individuals rarely accumulate possessions (Adhikary, 1984b). The Montagnais-Naskapi Indians of Labrador, Canada, have a social life of harmony and cooperation based on ethical beliefs, behavior patterns, and a rational utilitarian approach to human conduct (Speck, 1933). Finally, the Lepchas suppress competition almost completely in their society (Gorer, 1967).

The anticompetitive values of these societies, and of the others that are cited in this article, do not prove that cooperation is ubiquitous among all human societies; neither do they disprove the argument that competition is based on Darwinian processes of natural selection. But they do raise doubts about the observation that competition is universal. From the perspective of Western societies, it may well appear to be so; psychological research carried out in the Western environment might bear out that thinking. From the perspective of the nonviolent societies, however, cooperation is the predominating behavior and the most effective strategy to ensure all other social goals.

Furthermore, social scientists who study the nonviolent societies extensively, such as Robarchek (1989), tended to reject deterministic theories that suggest that humans are primarily reactive, respond to environmental forces in a mechanistic fashion, or act only in a biologically evolved fashion. Although Robarchek did not reject the influence of biological and ecological factors on human actions, he argued from his study of the Semai that people are also motivated by systems of beliefs, values, and meanings—that is, by their culture. Humans respond to situations based on their interpretations and appraisals of them, which are formed within their cultural contexts. He saw people as actively able to make choices as they pursue their unique goals.

Rituals That Foster Competition and Cooperation

Rituals have the effect of integrating groups, reinforcing their beliefs and practices, and providing cathartic emotional experiences. Although they are essential to many religions, rituals are also an important aspect of a secular society, such as the United States. As the rituals of the quadrennial U. S. presidential elections support a belief in representative democracy, the rituals of competitive sports provide the psychological structure for the U. S. belief in competition and free market capitalism. Competitive sports provide ritual experiences not only for Western socie-

² The bibliography includes 48 societies, but 3—the Anabaptists, Orang Asli, and San—are simply group names for ethnically related societies, which are also included individually.

ties but also for cultures worldwide (Harris & Park, 1983). Whereas it can be argued that sports are not really "true" rituals (Guttman, 1985), they still provide emotional experiences and legitimate the existing social order through symbolism (Harris, 1983).

Sport competitions do more than that. Baseball represents the U. S. rite of spring (Grella, 1985), and all sports, with their timed periods of play (or baseball with its timeless innings), correspond to the liturgical calendars of religions (Novak, 1985). But football, of all the sports in the United States, has come to represent the competitive ethos of the nation, to provide the glue which binds a diverse people together (Pope, 1993). Football, according to Pope, provides a civil religion for the people of the United States that touches "a deep, vital core within the national soul, perhaps because of its aggressiveness, territoriality and fluid interplay between community and individualism" (p. 243).

Do rituals in the nonviolent societies similarly serve to integrate the people and reinforce their cooperative, peaceful values? Do their rituals support their worldviews, their individual self concepts, and the structures of their social relations? Are they in any way as cathartic as a football game is in the United States for its fans? Some examples from the literature provide answers to these questions.

The Piaroa view competition with revulsion. Competition over resources and the power to transform earth's resources into human goods is the primary force that produces human violence, in their view, and the Piaroa's political process rejects competition and the ownership and control of resources. But they still suffer from the violence of their mythic past. They believe that the forces that created the universe were both productive and dangerous, and to this day these forces have to be mastered within the individual or the result will be ugliness and madness. Their creator god was evil, mad, and physically ugly. He derived his capabilities to produce from the earth's resources—to hunt, garden, and cook—from hallucinogenic poisons given to him by the supreme god in the earth. His poisonous powers affected all the other gods of Piaroa mythic times, which was when the technologies for using natural resources were developed. Thus, the forces of production became infused by competition, violence, greed, arrogance, and lust, which poisoned peaceful relations within and between communities. The shaman, through ritualistic chanting every night, enables the people to survive another day in the face of these hostile forces. The shaman blows the words of the chant into water and honey, which when consumed the next morning by adults and children will keep them safe and peaceful (Overing, 1986, 1989a).

The primary !Kung rituals, their trance-healing ceremonies, are cooperative efforts characterized by mutual aid and the absence of secrecy (Lee, 1967). Healing for the !Kung includes the spiritual, social, physical, and psychological levels of individuals; it includes the whole group, other groups that may be camped nearby, and the surrounding natural environment. The healing process is an integrating force that is an essential aspect of their cooperative, egalitarian, community-focused tradition. The healing takes place at a dance that lasts all night, usually with women sitting around the fire singing and men, sometimes joined by women, dancing around the circle of singers. The growing warmth of the dancing generates *n/um* within the danc-

ers, a powerful energy that wells up within the body. This *n/um* leads to !kia, an altered state of consciousness, which permits the healing. Healing may focus on individuals who are ill, but it also heals divisive issues and reunites the group into a greater spiritual union. The onset of !kia intensifies the emotions of the dancers so that they may see illnesses within others, perceive events at a great distance, handle live coals, walk into the fire without harm, or interact with their gods (Katz, 1982).

The *n/um* is a shared resource that is not controlled by any particular individual—all members of the community can partake of it during the dances. They do not attach any particular prestige to a person who effectively can raise *n/um*, properly control it to manage !kia, and become a successful healer. The process is painful and dangerous for the healer; whereas many men and some women become healers, many do not. Because *n/um* is a limitless energy, no one controls or manages it, which is a characteristic of their egalitarian society. As the dance proceeds, the healer puts the *n/um* into the sick person and literally "pulls out" the illness into himself or herself and discards it, pleading with the spirit to leave the person alone. If the natural environment has been harsh, the healer may plead with the gods for relief from their harshness (Katz, 1982).

The !Kung thus feel that the benevolent healing powers, which rise up in the healers during the dance, are derived from the social group itself, in contrast with other peoples who believe their shamans receive their healing ability from their own spiritual contacts. Whereas shamans in other societies may form a separate priest class, with followers and authority, the !Kung healers, half of the men and some women, are fully part of the community. Thus, their concept of health as derived from the cooperation of the social group tends to further strengthen their ties against hostile forces (Lee, 1967).

A third example of the power of ritual to help maintain a cooperative society is provided by the Buid, who believe that physical violence is the product of self-assertion, boasting, quarreling, competition, and aggression—all of which they value negatively (Gibson, 1990). Buid social structure limits dependency of one individual on another in favor of dependency on the group, and their ritual life confirms and emphasizes that individuals are mystically dependent on the group (Gibson, 1986). When a couple becomes divided, however, the Buid believe that the spirits of the earth could become angered by their quarreling and terminate their protection of humans, which would endanger human life and fertility. Benevolence of the spirits is restored after a quarrel through a ritual sacrifice of one of the couple's pigs, whose meat is shared with the entire community and a portion reserved for the spirits. Their moral universe is symbolized by their human society, which is symbolized by the couple, who are in turn symbolized by the sacrificed pig. These critically important sacrificial rituals of the Buid are called *fanurukan*; they reaffirm the cooperation and companionship of humans and the earth spirits. The pig is sacrificed as a fertility symbol to the spirits of the earth because they provide the foundation of a safe house, and the sharing of the meat strengthens social units and the collective society against external threats. Buid rituals provide the mystical vitality for their idealized image of a tranquil, cooperative household, free of domination, possessiveness, jealousy, and quarrelling (Gibson, 1985, 1986, 1988).

Because the fourth example, the Hutterites, are a totally communal society, they must be highly cooperative to survive—which they have done, in the face of considerable persecution from European, American, and Canadian governments since the mid-16th century (Hostetler, 1974). Their worldview, along with the rituals that express and reinforce it, is based on the authority of God and oriented toward life after death rather than enjoyment of this life or individual self development. Their thinking is infused with a respect for authority and order; God has established a hierarchy of relationships, with the lower always obeying the higher; the younger person, the older; the woman, the man—and the man obeys God. They feel that the individual will must be broken, self-denial must be accepted rather than self-fulfillment, and individuals must become submissive and humble before the will of the colony in which they live. Individuals are never secure: Their security is only guaranteed by their daily behavior, not their baptism or verbal affirmations. Because the will of God is expressed through the decisions of the community, the individual must be obedient to group will. Communal living is God's order, and private possessions express man's greed (Hostetler & Huntington, 1967).

These beliefs are supported by their daily ritual, the evening church service. All members of the colony follow the preacher to the school house or other large room—an undecorated space furnished only with benches—and always sit in the same seats, with men, women, and young people segregated and seats arranged by age as befits the separate stations in their hierarchy. Every person has his or her regular place in the worship service, and an individual is missed if absent for some reason—everyone is an integral part of the community. The congregation sings traditional hymns, and the preacher recites a sermon consisting of Bible passages and the text of a message that is centuries old. The exhortation to be spiritual, obey the commands of Christ, and reject the ways of the flesh is familiar from constant repetition. The ritual not only serves to integrate the community but also provides didactic instruction. It reinforces the basic Hutterite patterns of behavior on both the daily and spiritual levels. Life, like the worship service, is predictable and part of God's order; the message of the sermon flows from God, repeating a teaching that everyone has long since internalized. The singing, which is loud and vigorous, has a cathartic function to release emotion, provide purification, and empty burdens of guilt and sin from the group. The church ritual thus serves to integrate the group and provide emotional meaning to the lives of the Hutterites (Hostetler, 1974).

These four examples—the Piaroa, !Kung, Buid, and Hutterites—show how ritual in the nonviolent societies reinforces the essence of their cooperation and opposition to competition. Their spiritual lives are in harmony with their social and economic lives, which are all strongly committed to peacefulness being one of the paramount goals of the society. Competition must be eliminated and cooperation fostered to achieve and maintain nonviolence, and their rituals are a key part of the process.

Individualistic Societies

Although three types of goal structures are commonly defined, most of this review has concentrated on cooperation and competition. It is also important to look at individualism in the

context of the nonviolent societies. Questions that guide this section include the following: How do the highly individualistic peaceful societies cooperate, if they do? Can they maintain their individualism and still cooperate on necessary economic, social, or spiritual occasions? What psychological and social structures do they use to maintain a minimal level of cooperation?

The Nayaka provide an example of a society that avoids conflict situations by refraining from cooperating or competing with one another in most situations; for example, they avoid sharing their harvests or exchanging gifts (Bird-David, 1992). The only level at which cooperation operates constantly in Nayaka society is between husband and wife. Whereas young people tend to go through repeated marriages, after a period of several years, they settle down to life-long marriages in which both man and woman consider their spouse their only friend, the only person with whom one can speak freely. Even parent–children and sibling relationships are fragile and maintained only if they live in close proximity. The couple works together, bathes together, eats together, and sleeps together—they are inseparable (Bird-David, 1987).

However, Nayaka village cooperation is essential for certain purposes, despite the autonomous nature of their society. This cooperation is established and maintained by single men, who live with unrelated conjugal couples in attached lean-tos or well-defined, separate portions of the main family hut. The single man has no formal, contractual basis for his accommodations, but he contributes toward the economic welfare of the family unit. He sleeps on a separate mat, cooks his meals over a separate fire 1 meter away from the family fire, and eats separately from the family close to his own fire. These arrangements may last from a few days to several months before he moves on to live with another family. Although the single men can easily live in the forest alone or become wage workers in an outside village, when they live within the Nayaka settlements, they live in cooperation with families, even though they are fully independent of any one family, because they shift their living arrangements about from one family to another (Bird-David, 1987).

The importance of this arrangement is that, every evening after finishing their meals, the single men visit the fires of other couples in the settlement and socialize. The social cohesion of a Nayaka community is thus formed, above the level of the married couple, by these shifting single men, who provide linking information through socializing and assist the group to come to consensus decisions. In one settlement, for instance, people might begin to vaguely express the idea that they might have an annual village festival. The various ideas are carried around the settlement by the single men, opinions converge, a consensus is reached, and a date is set. In other years, when there is no effective convergence of opinions, the festival is not held (Bird-David, 1987).

The Buid, who are highly individualistic like the Nayaka, also base their social and moral order on the companionship of closely cooperative, although fragile and transitory, marriages. To the Buid, their marriages symbolize the positive values of personal autonomy and voluntary relationships; they negatively value kinship, dependence, and permanence (Gibson, 1985). Whereas Buid ritual, as mentioned earlier, focuses on mystically uniting individuals together into the group, one of their primary beliefs and the basis of their peacefulness is that dyadic relation-

ships can lead to competition and aggression. Therefore, their social interactions are all based on individuals interacting with undifferentiated groups. When two men converse, for instance, they do not face one another or address comments or questions directly to the other man; instead, they may sit facing the same direction or back to back, making comments that the other man may or may not respond to, depending on whether he agrees. Rather than contradicting the speaker, the listener may make a comment on a different subject, to which the first speaker may respond or change the subject again in turn (Gibson, 1985).

When the Buid prepare to engage in cooperative agricultural tasks, such as slashing, burning, planting, or harvesting, the community gets together—everyone squatting and facing in the same direction, perhaps concentrating on a distant mountain. Each person addresses the group and indicates his or her need for assistance; if conflicts are perceived, the parties talk them out. In no case, though, do two individuals address each other, instead, all individual comments are made to the group as a whole. Because the speaker is always an individual and the listener a group, clashes of wills are avoided. Avoidance of social interaction between symmetrical units such as individuals minimizes competition and confrontations, they feel (Gibson, 1985). This process of individual dependence by the Buid on the group also preserves individual autonomy and equality (Gibson, 1990). They feel that the calculation of equivalent value and reciprocity is completely incompatible with their egalitarian ethos. Reciprocal relationships would place people in situations of competition in which one or the other must lose, which they do not tolerate (Gibson, 1986).

Like the Nayaka, the Paliyan also base their peacefulness on a strongly felt belief in personal autonomy, which prompts them to avoid both cooperation and competition. Avoidance of competition, they assert explicitly, is an essential aspect of nonviolence. They feel that competitiveness is part of a human urge to influence, control, rival, and outperform others, and it undercuts their cherished autonomy and egalitarianism. They avoid any perception of doing more or better than others in work activities, and their games lack cooperation or competition. In a variety of the game called "prisoner's base" played by adults, no one catches anyone else, and players have little interest in the performance of others—it is like a ballet of prima donnas who perform for themselves (Gardner, 1972).

A fourth individualistic society is the Tristan Islanders, who have a long tradition of anarchy (Munch, 1945). People get together in large groups if a large project is at hand, such as putting a new thatched roof on a dwelling where as many as 20 men cooperate on the project and many women provide the food for the day. People have a variety of different mutual-aid relationships to handle the numerous small jobs that require a few people—to shear sheep, fence a garden, and so on. Sharing and gift giving is not done with neighbors by virtue of the fact that they live nearby; instead, it is based on existing personal relationships. Everyone on Tristan is related to a wide range of individuals, and those ties are reinforced and expanded over time through the establishment of friendships and marriages. The selective, reciprocal gift giving and cooperation represents a continuing way for the islanders to develop and support some relationships and downplay or ignore others. The economic functions are an essential aspect of the development of the webs

of personal relationships on the island (Munch, 1970; Munch & Marske, 1981).

Despite the cooperativeness that pervades many economic activities on Tristan da Cunha, the islanders can be so highly individualistic that they may not feel the need to cooperate on projects that would benefit the entire community. For instance, a vital road past a bluff collapsed and was neglected for several years for want of a group action to repair it. As a result of the neglect, cattle on the north side of the bluff died because of the inability of the people to care for them (Munch, 1945). Among these people, individualism implies that they cooperate often, but only if they feel like it. If group projects do not inspire them, they do not cooperate and the work does not get done.

Like almost all of the nonviolent societies, the Nayaka, Buid, Paliyan, and Tristan Islanders avoid competition, although these four also focus strongly on the autonomy of individuals. Despite that focus, three of the four have structures in place that foster cooperative work efforts, such as highly cooperative marriages, single individuals who live with families, and an avoidance of dyadic relationships. Only one society, the Paliyan, in the literature of the peaceful societies has no structures at all to promote at least some form of cooperation.

Elements of Competition in Nonviolent Societies

Despite the overwhelming focus of the nonviolent societies on cooperation, the literature shows that two of them enthusiastically embrace competition and that there are instances of competitive behavior in three others. Why are these societies competitive in contrast to all of the others? How does their competitiveness integrate into peacefulness?

The Fipa society of western Tanzania is described by Willis (1985, 1989) as highly peaceful—he never witnessed any violence in their villages—yet they are quite competitive in their business dealings. Also there is a strong undercurrent of competition in their communities between the major families and their supporters for alliances and power. Stresses and tensions related to their competition are periodically resolved by cults that arise and target the wealthy minority households. For example, wealthy, elite individuals are accused by the cult leaders of using sorcery to kill livestock, crops, and other villagers, and the members of the elite confess to the crimes in an effort to restore village unity. After the cult fervor abates, however, the wealthy people remain and resume their regular social roles. These cults seem to arise every 10 years or so, perhaps connected to rainfall cycles. The process of public identifications and confessions by the accused people is part of continuing village dialogues (Willis, 1985).

Willis (1989) explained with historical and social references this perceived paradox of a peaceful society that is aggressively competitive. Over 100 years ago, shortly before European contacts were established, the Fipa transformed their society from one based on violence and war into one based on nonviolence and peace. The change did not eliminate negative emotions such as hatred and anger, but it did transform their aggressiveness into positive, nonviolent competitiveness. Willis argued that their aggressive competitiveness is still constructive, affiliative, and peaceful.

The Jains, an important religious group in India, are also

quite peaceful and quite competitive. The basis of the Jain worldview is their belief in *ahimsa*, nonviolence; their other beliefs are seen as ancillary to the avoidance of violence. To turn that around, various socially harmful activities that Jains take vows to avoid, such as the committing of thefts or speaking of falsehoods, are to them forms of violence. The Jain ethical system includes four types of *himsa*, violence; but only one, intentional *himsa*, is strictly prohibited to all Jains. The other three types of *himsa*—accidental, occupational, and protective—should be avoided as much as possible but are not absolutely forbidden to Jains who have not renounced all aspects of worldly life and become ascetics. Thus, because occupations such as soldiers and farmers include occupational violence, most Jains tend to avoid these fields, although not all do. Some Jains serve in the Indian army, and there are Jain agriculturalists. Jains tend to prefer, however, occupations that do not appear to them to include violence, such as merchants, teachers, lawyers, and doctors (Sangave, 1980).

Are the Jains actually nonviolent? Despite the service by some of them in the military—a contradiction to the Western view of nonviolence—their peacefulness is attested to by the fact that relatively few are ever convicted of crimes (Sangave, 1980). But they are also highly competitive because competition does not violate their ethical system. Jain businessmen are quite competitive and successful (Laidlow, 1985), and the different Jain sects can be highly competitive in their construction of grand temples, for example. (Carrithers, 1988). They see no dichotomy between the competitive aspects of their society and their beliefs in nonviolence.

In addition to the Fipa and Jains, three of the nonviolent societies that make a point to avoid competition do have some competitive elements, according to the literature. Although cooperation and an opposition to competition are essential ingredients of the traditionally peaceful Ladakhi way of life (Harvey, 1983), they frequently organize archery competitions in their villages. These competitions are the main features of village festivals that include dancing, singing, drinking, and, of course, target shooting (Mann, 1986). As noted in *Intergroup Cooperation*, researchers have observed instances of competition among the managers of Hutterites farming operations, despite the highly cooperative nature of their colonies. But these examples of competition are never overtly between individuals; instead, they represent the commitment of individuals who are dedicated to pursuing activities for the good of the colony. They also do not reflect any self-assertiveness on the part of the individuals (Bennett, 1967; Hostetler & Huntington, 1967).

The most surprising contradiction between ideals of cooperation and real instances of competition occurs among the Piaroa, who were described in *Rituals That Foster Competition and Cooperation*, as people whose entire mythology focuses on the control of competition (Overing, 1986, 1989a). This contradiction is found in the behavior of the leaders (*ruwang*) of the large Piaroa communal houses, who normally epitomize the commitment of their society to nonviolence. The *ruwang* must ensure the tranquility of their followers by example. They especially try to exemplify Piaroa beliefs that strongly idealize humankind as peaceful, in control, and tranquil and just as strongly de-emphasize a person as hunter, warrior, or even field worker.

In addition, the leaders have the most knowledge of the magic and sorcery that will protect their people.

Yet, interesting enough, the *ruwang* are quite competitive in seeking political power. These leaders, and potential leaders, attain power by making sure that their marriages, and the marriages of their kin, are made with the kin of other potentially powerful people. They gain and hold on to their territory through skillfully maintaining political alliances. Whereas younger potential leaders might not directly challenge the older *ruwang*, they jockey for strength so that they will be in the best position to succeed the old leaders on their deaths. For example, the death of the wife of a leader can sever the alliances that the marriage represented, so the leader may have to move quickly to form another union to preserve the connections. To summarize, the leadership of the *ruwang* is based on accomplishments, knowledge, and commitment to Piaroa ideals—and competitive political skills (Overing Kaplan, 1975).

To conclude, although most of the nonviolent societies are strongly opposed to competition, abstain from competition, or foster cooperation as important elements of their peacefulness, some of them contradict these patterns. These societies, exceptions to the general pattern, are able, perhaps paradoxically, to mix competitive and cooperative behaviors and still maintain their peacefulness. There is one obvious question to raise about this perceived paradox: Because U. S. society is also a mixture of competition and cooperation, why are the United States and other Western nations not more peaceful? Fully developed answers are beyond the scope of this article, but clues could be found in a broader reading of the peaceful societies literature. These societies not only have psychological structures that strongly focus on cooperation and nonviolence, but they also have very strong systems of beliefs and attitudes that concentrate on their need to be peaceful. Through their worldviews, they see themselves as peaceful, in most senses. Quite obviously, they have histories, geographical situations, and many other social and cultural factors that have served to build reasonably, or in some case highly, peaceful societies. The elimination of competition from the United States would not automatically make this nation peaceful—U. S. society is far too complex for that. But having said that, I suggest that the lessening emphasis on competition in the United States might result, over time, in subtle changes in this society that could lead to less violence.

Conclusion

Several conclusions are possible from this review of the literature on the scores of nonviolent societies around the world. The most striking conclusion is that, for many of these societies, the central, defining elements in their beliefs are strong opposition to competition and support for cooperation. Whereas the literature varies, some of the societies are described as strongly opposed to competition, others as never experiencing it, and others as highly cooperative. Whichever the case, only two societies, which can be described as nonviolent, are also quite competitive, and the literature reveals instances of competition in a few others. Cooperation is overwhelmingly the dominant orientation of the peaceful societies.

One of the psychological structures in these societies that fosters opposition to competition and support for cooperation

is the element of hesitation, even fear, about the intentions of others. In a number of the societies, people are always uncertain about others, which forces individuals to constantly reaffirm their mutual commitments to cooperative, peaceful relationships. Furthermore, a cognitive understanding of the importance of nonviolence is not enough in these societies; people constantly reinforce and mold their values into a consistently peaceful worldview, which is not only shared by virtually everyone but is also integrated into all levels of individual and group self concepts and relationships with others.

Another important psychological structure that reinforces opposition to competition and acceptance of cooperation is ritual. Whereas in Western societies, competitive activities such as ritualized sports promote social cohesion and civic pride in the virtues of competition, "manliness," and aggressiveness, the rituals of peaceful societies help integrate the society, protect them from hostile outside forces, and focus people on worldviews of opposition to competition, a need for harmony, and the virtue of nonviolence. Whether these societies base their beliefs in monotheism, polytheism, or animism, their rituals hold their societies together and reinforce their beliefs.

The literature on peaceful societies includes some discussion of various strategies for parents to use when they raise their children, so they will avoid competition. One that is used by a number of the societies consists of the parent lavishing affection on—and paying endless attention to—infants but quickly demoting them from their special status at about 2 or 3 years old, to the point where the child is ignored and made to feel as if a minor part of the community. Even temper tantrums are completely ignored, with the result that, after a few years of trauma, children become strongly socialized into an acceptance and internalization of the nonviolent values of the entire group.

A number of social scientists have observed a complete absence of competitive games in such societies, and some have gone on to describe the elements of cooperation they saw in children's activities. Clearly from the literature, children in many of these societies learn by example; they observe only cooperative and peaceful behavior and never competitive or aggressive behavior. In these societies, the children absorb cooperative, anticompetitive values consistently from all adults, and in some cases teachers—all of whom frequently and clearly explain their nonviolent beliefs to the children. Almost all of the societies are committed to raising their children without competition; as part of this, they seek to instill in the children a sense of their place within the community. This helps the children to internalize the society's social values that oppose competition and promote cooperation.

The nonviolent societies clearly link competition with aggression and violence. Those who are hunting peoples see the need for the killing of animals, but they react with horror at the thought of violence to other humans. Anger and aggressiveness are negatively valued, whereas in general, nurturance and cooperation with the group are positively valued. These societies also strongly de-emphasize individual achievement, which for some of them shows the close identification with competitiveness and hence aggressiveness. Even the societies that emphasize personal autonomy do not allow individuals to stand out to the extent of overshadowing others. Most of the societies foster modesty, humility, and an opposition to general leadership as part of

their egalitarian, cooperative ethos. But does competitiveness necessarily lead to violence? The examples of the Fipa and Jains show that it does not. However, many of the peaceful societies view competitiveness as a dangerous behavior that should be avoided and strongly opposed. In addition, because most of them have such a negative attitude toward competition, there is an implication—not necessarily an absolute cause-and-effect relationship—that competitive behavior does help produce violence in human societies.

An objection that could be raised is that, because most of these societies view violence as a product of competition and individual achievement, why are large-scale collective societies (such as the former Soviet Union) so violent? Part of the answer is that the lack of individual competition and achievement, an important aspect of all but 2 of the peaceful societies cited in this review, does not imply that those societies are necessarily collectivist. Among the 25 societies considered in this article, only the Hutterites are truly collective, in the sense that the production and distribution of goods is controlled by the group. The small-scale societies vary in their degrees of collective sharing: Some share game animals, others share game and gathered foods, and some share very little.

In any case, the reasons for the peacefulness in these societies transcend their economic organization. Peacefulness is an essential aspect of the worldviews, attitudes, and beliefs of the nonviolent societies. From societies as diverse as the Amish, Semai, and Tristan Islanders, the peacefulness that they achieve is not due to their collective, or lack of collective, economic behavior but to their very strong beliefs in their need to be peaceful, and—as the essence of this article—their psychological strategies that reinforce, strengthen, and cement those shared beliefs and attitudes into daily practices that work most, or in some cases all, of the time. Cooperation is more than just an economic consideration.

In conclusion, the psychological literature on cooperation and competition does differ from the social science studies of the peaceful societies. The difference stems chiefly from the fact that one body of research has been conducted within societies that generally accept competition as beneficial, aggression as necessary, and violence, to some extent, as inevitable. The other body of literature describes societies whose members strongly believe in cooperation, nurturance, and peacefulness. In addition, the designs of psychological studies, and the responses of the participants, originate within a worldview that accepts competition and the violence that at times is implicit in it. Even the many studies in which researchers challenge competition still work with participants who were raised to be competitive.

In contrast, most of the investigations of the nonviolent societies reveal people with worldviews that highly oppose competition and focus on cooperation as essential to their peacefulness. Researchers who are concerned about violence, aggressiveness, and competition might wish to investigate the literature of the nonviolent societies. By studying further the strategies of people who so successfully reject competition, researchers might be able to use their training and skills to find new and innovative approaches to the problems of aggression and violence in U. S. and other Western societies.

References

- Abra, J. (1993). Competition: Creativity's vilified motive. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 119, 289–342.

- Adhikary, A. K. (1984a). Hunters and gatherers in India: A preliminary appraisal of their structure and transformation. *Journal of the Indian Anthropological Society*, 19, 8–16.
- Adhikary, A. K. (1984b). *Society and world view of the Birhor: A nomadic hunting and gathering community of Orissa*. Calcutta: Anthropological Survey of India.
- Anderson, C. A., & Morrow, M. (1995). Competitive aggression without interaction: Effects of competitive versus cooperative instructions on aggressive behavior in video games. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 1020–1030.
- Axelrod, R. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Barkow, J. H., Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (1992). *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bateson, G. (1963). Bali: The value system of a steady state. In M. Fortes (Ed.), *Social structure: Studies presented to A. R. Radcliffe-Brown* (pp. 35–53). New York: Russell & Russell.
- Bay-Hinitz, A. K., Peterson, R. F., & Quilitch, H. R. (1994). Cooperative games: A way to modify aggressive and cooperative behaviors in young children. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 27, 435–446.
- Belo, J. (1935). The Balinese temper. *Character and Personality*, 4, 120–146.
- Bennett, J. W. (1967). *Hutterian brethren: The agricultural economy and social organization of a communal people*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bettencourt, B. A., Brewer, M. B., Croak, M. R., & Miller, N. (1992). Cooperation and the reduction of intergroup bias: The role of reward structure and social orientation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 28, 301–319.
- Betzig, L., & Wichimai, S. (1991). A not so perfect peace: A history of conflict on Ifaluk. *Oceania*, 61, 240–256.
- Bhattacharyya, A. (1953). An account of the Birhor of Palamau. *Bulletin of the Department of Anthropology (India)*, 2, 1–16.
- Bird-David, N. (1987). Single persons and social cohesion in a hunter-gatherer society. In P. Hockings (Ed.), *Dimensions of social life: Essays in honor of David G. Mandelbaum* (pp. 151–165). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter.
- Bird-David, N. (1992). Nayaka. In P. Hockings (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of world cultures. Vol. 3: South Asia* (pp. 194–196). Boston: G. K. Hall.
- Bonta, B. D. (1993). *Peaceful peoples: An annotated bibliography*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- Briggs, J. L. (1971). *Never in anger: Portrait of an Eskimo family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Briggs, J. L. (1982). Living dangerously: The contradictory foundations of value in Canadian Inuit society. In E. Leacock & R. Lee (Eds.), *Politics and history in band societies* (pp. 109–131). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Briggs, J. L. (1987). In search of emotional meaning. *Ethos*, 15, 8–15.
- Briggs, J. L. (1991). Expecting the unexpected: Canadian Inuit training for an experimental lifestyle. *Ethos*, 19, 259–287.
- Briggs, J. L. (1994). "Why don't you kill your baby brother?" The dynamics of peace in Canadian Inuit camps. In L. E. Sponsel & T. Gregor (Eds.), *The anthropology of peace and nonviolence* (pp. 155–181). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Brown, P. (1986). Simbu aggression and the drive to win. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 59, 165–170.
- Carrithers, M. (1988). Passions of nation and community in the Bahu-bali affair. *Modern Asian Studies*, 22, 815–844.
- Connor, L. (1979). Corpse abuse and trance in Bali: The cultural mediation of aggression. *Mankind*, 12, 104–118.
- Cosier, R. A., & Dalton, D. R. (1988). Competition and cooperation: Effects of value dissensus and predisposition to help. *Human Relations*, 41, 823–839.
- Cox, T. H., Lobel, S. A., & McLeod, P. L. (1991). Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 827–847.
- Deets, L. E. (1931). The origins of conflict in the Hutterische communities. *Publications of the American Sociological Society*, 25, 125–135.
- Dentan, R. K. (1968). *The Semai: A nonviolent people of Malaya*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Dentan, R. K. (1988). [Response to Knauff and Otterbein]. *Current Anthropology*, 29, 625–629.
- Dentan, R. K. (1995). Bad day at Bukit Pekan. *American Anthropologist*, 97, 225–231.
- Deutsch, M. (1949). A theory of co-operation and competition. *Human Relations*, 2, 129–151.
- Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Domino, G. (1992). Cooperation and competition in Chinese and American children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 23, 456–467.
- Draper, P. (1976). Social and economic constraints on child life among the !Kung. In R. B. Lee & I. DeVore (Eds.), *Kalahari hunter-gatherers: Studies of the !Kung San and their neighbors* (pp. 199–217). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Draper, P. (1978). The learning environment for aggression and anti-social behavior among the !Kung. In A. Montagu (Ed.), *Learning non-aggression: The experience of non-literate societies* (pp. 31–53). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Driedger, L., & Kraybill, D. B. (1994). *Mennonite peacemaking: From quietism to activism*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.
- Dudden, A. P. (Ed.). (1987). *The Fulbright experience, 1946–1986*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Ehrenfels, U. R. (1952). *Kadar of Cochinchina*. Madras, India: University of Madras.
- Endicott, K. (1979). *Batek Negrito religion: The world-view and rituals of a hunting and gathering people of Peninsular Malaysia*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- Endicott, K. (1988). Property, power and conflict among the Batek of Malaysia. In T. Ingold, D. Riches, & J. Woodburn (Eds.), *Hunters and gatherers. 2: Property, power and ideology* (pp. 110–127). Oxford, England: Berg.
- Endicott, K. L. (1984). The Batek De' of Malaysia. *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, 8, 6–8.
- Endicott, K. L. (1987). The conditions of egalitarian male–female relationships in foraging societies. *Canberra Anthropology*, 4, 1–10.
- Epstein, J. A., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (1992). Winning is not enough: The effects of competition and achievement orientation on intrinsic interest. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 128–138.
- Erev, I., Bornstein, G., & Galili, R. (1993). Constructive intergroup competition as a solution to the free rider problem: A field experiment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 29, 463–478.
- Espinoza, J. A., & Garza, R. T. (1985). Social group salience and inter-ethnic cooperation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 21, 380–392.
- Fabbro, D. (1978). Peaceful societies: An introduction. *Journal of Peace Research*, 15, 67–83.
- Friedman, A., Todd, J., & Kariuki, P. W. (1995). Cooperative and competitive behavior of urban and rural children in Kenya. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26, 374–383.
- Fry, D. P. (1988). Intercommunity differences in aggression among Zapotec children. *Child Development*, 59, 1008–1019.
- Fry, D. P. (1992). "Respect for the rights of others is peace": Learning aggression versus nonaggression among the Zapotec. *American Anthropologist*, 94, 621–639.
- Gardner, P. M. (1966). Symmetric respect and memorate knowledge: The structure and ecology of individualistic culture. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 22, 389–415.

- Gardner, P. M. (1969). Paliyan social structure. In D. Damas (Ed.), *Contributions to anthropology: Band societies* (pp. 153–171). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: National Museums of Canada.
- Gardner, P. M. (1972). The Paliyans. In M. G. Bicchieri (Ed.), *Hunters and gatherers today: A socioeconomic study of eleven such cultures in the twentieth century* (pp. 404–447). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Gardner, P. M. (1985). Bicultural oscillation as a long-term adaptation to cultural frontiers: Cases and questions. *Human Ecology*, 13, 411–432.
- Gibson, T. (1985). The sharing of substance versus the sharing of activity among the Buid. *Man*, 20, 391–411.
- Gibson, T. (1986). *Sacrifice and sharing in the Philippine highlands: Religion and society among the Buid of Mindoro*. London: Athlone Press.
- Gibson, T. (1988). Meat sharing as a political ritual: Forms of transaction versus modes of subsistence. In T. Ingold, D. Riches, & J. Woodburn (Eds.), *Hunters and gatherers. 2: Property, power and ideology* (pp. 165–179). Oxford, England: Berg.
- Gibson, T. (1990). Raiding, trading and tribal autonomy in insular Southeast Asia. In J. Haas (Ed.), *The anthropology of war* (pp. 125–145). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Gorer, G. (1967). *Himalayan village: An account of the Lepchas of Sikkim*. New York: Basic Books.
- Grella, G. (1985). Baseball and the American dream. In D. L. Vanderwerken & S. K. Wertz (Eds.), *Sport inside out: Readings in literature and philosophy* (pp. 267–280). Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press.
- Guttmann, A. (1985). The sacred and the secular. In D. L. Vanderwerken & S. K. Wertz (Eds.), *Sport inside out: Readings in literature and philosophy* (pp. 298–308). Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press.
- Harris, J. (1983). Sport and ritual: A macroscopic comparison of form. In J. C. Harris & R. J. Park (Eds.), *Play, games and sports in cultural contexts* (pp. 177–189). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Harris, J. C., & Park, R. J. (Eds.). (1983). *Play, games and sports in cultural contexts*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Harvey, A. (1983). *A journey in Ladakh*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Herd, G. (1986). Aspects of socialization for aggression in Sambia ritual and warfare. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 59, 160–164.
- Hildebrand, M. A. (1992). Domestic violence: A challenge to Mennonite faith and peace theology. *Conrad Grebel Review*, 10, 73–80.
- Hostetler, J. A. (1974). *Hutterite society*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hostetler, J. A. (1980). *Amish society* (3rd ed.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hostetler, J. A., & Huntington, G. E. (1967). *The Hutterites in North America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Hostetler, J. A., & Huntington, G. E. (1971). *Children in Amish society: Socialization and community education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Howe, L. E. A. (1989). Peace and violence in Bali: Culture and social organization. In S. Howell & R. Willis (Eds.), *Societies at peace: Anthropological perspectives* (pp. 100–116). London: Routledge.
- Howell, S. (1984). *Society and cosmos: Chewong of Peninsular Malaysia*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Howell, S. (1988). From child to human: Chewong concepts of self. In G. Jahoda & I. M. Lewis (Eds.), *Acquiring culture: Cross cultural studies in child development* (pp. 147–168). London: Croom Helm.
- Howell, S. (1989). "To be angry is not to be human, but to be fearful is": Chewong concepts of human nature. In S. Howell & R. Willis (Eds.), *Societies at peace: Anthropological perspectives* (pp. 45–59). London: Routledge.
- Howell, S., & Willis, R. (Eds.). (1989). *Societies at peace: Anthropological perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Insko, C. A., Schopler, J., Graetz, K. A., Drigotas, S. M., Currey, D. P., Smith, S. L., Brazil, D., & Bornstein, G. (1994). Interindividual–intergroup discontinuity in the prisoner's dilemma game. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 38, 87–116.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1979). Cooperative learning: The power of positive goal interdependence. In R. E. Chasnoff (Ed.), *Structuring cooperative learning experiences in the classroom: The 1979 handbook*. Minneapolis, MN: Cooperative Network.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1983). The socialization and achievement crises: Are cooperative learning experiences the solution? *Applied Social Psychology Annual*, 4, 119–164.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1985). Relationships between Black and White students in intergroup cooperation and competition. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 125, 421–428.
- Johnson, D. W., Maruyama, G., Johnson, R., Nelson, D., & Skon, L. (1981). Effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal structures on achievement: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 89, 47–62.
- Juhnke, J. C. (1989). *Vision, doctrine, war: Mennonite identity and organization in America, 1890–1930*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.
- Katz, R. (1982). Accepting "boiling energy": The experience of !kia-healing among the !Kung. *Ethos*, 10, 344–368.
- Keir, G. (1966). The psychological assessment of the children from the island of Tristan da Cunha. In C. Banks & P. L. Broadhurst (Eds.), *Stephanos: Studies in psychology presented to Cyril Burt* (pp. 129–172). New York: Barnes & Noble.
- Knauff, B. M. (1987). Reconsidering violence in simple human societies: Homicide among the Gebusi of New Guinea. *Current Anthropology*, 28, 457–500.
- Kohn, A. (1986). *No-contest: The case against competition*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Kraybill, D. B. (1989). *The riddle of Amish culture*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Laidlaw, J. (1985). Profit, salvation and profitable saints. *Cambridge Anthropology*, 9, 50–70.
- Langgaard, P. (1986). Modernization and traditional interpersonal relations in a small Greenlandic community: A case study from southern Greenland. *Arctic Anthropology*, 23, 299–314.
- Leacock, E. (1969). The Montagnais-Naskapi band. In D. Damas (Ed.), *Contributions to anthropology: Band societies* (pp. 1–17). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: National Museums of Canada.
- Leacock, E. (1981). Seventeenth-century Montagnais social relations and values. In J. Helm (Ed.), *Handbook of North American Indians. Vol. 6: Subarctic* (pp. 190–195). Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.
- Lee, R. B. (1967). Trance cure of the !Kung Bushmen. *Natural History*, 76, 30–37.
- Lee, R. B. (1969). Eating Christmas in the Kalahari. *Natural History*, 78, 14–22, 60–63.
- Lee, R. B. (1972). !Kung spatial organization: An ecological and historical perspective. *Human Ecology*, 1, 125–147.
- Lee, R. B. (1978). Politics, sexual and non-sexual in an egalitarian society. *Social Science Information*, 17, 871–895.
- Lee, R. B. (1979). *The !Kung San: Men, women, and work in a foraging society*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Levy, R. I. (1973). *Tahitians: Mind and experience in the Society Islands*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Levy, R. I. (1978). Tahitian gentleness and redundant controls. In A. Montagu (Ed.), *Learning non-aggression: The experience of non-literate societies* (pp. 222–235). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lutz, C. (1982). The domain of emotion words on Ifaluk. *American Ethnologist*, 9, 113–128.

- Lutz, C. (1983). Parental goals, ethnopscychology, and the development of emotional meaning. *Ethos*, 11, 246–262.
- Lutz, C. (1985). Ethnopscychology compared to what? Explaining behavior and consciousness among the Ifaluk. In G. M. White & J. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *Person, self, and experience: Exploring Pacific ethnopscychologies* (pp. 35–79). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lutz, C. A. (1988). *Unnatural emotions: Everyday sentiments on a Micronesian atoll & their challenge to Western theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mann, R. S. (1986). *The Ladakhi: A study in ethnography and change*. Calcutta: Anthropological Survey of India.
- Marshall, L. (1960). !Kung Bushman bands. *Africa*, 30, 325–355.
- Marshall, L. (1961). Sharing, talking, and giving: Relief of social tensions among !Kung Bushmen. *Africa*, 31, 231–249.
- McCallum, D. M., Harring, K., Gilmore, R., Drenan, S., Chase, J. P., Insko, C. A., & Thibault, J. (1985). Competition and cooperation between groups and between individuals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 21, 301–320.
- Misra, R. (1972). The Jains in an urban setting: The ascetics and the laity among the Jains of Mysore City. *Bulletin of the Anthropological Survey of India*, 21, 1–68.
- Montagu, A. (1976). *The nature of human aggression*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Montagu, A. (Ed.). (1978). *Learning non-aggression: The experiences of non-literate societies*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Munch, P. A. (1945). *Sociology of Tristan da Cunha*. Oslo, Norway: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi.
- Munch, P. A. (1970). Economic development and conflicting values: A social experiment in Tristan da Cunha. *American Anthropologist*, 72, 1300–1318.
- Munch, P. A. (1971). *Crisis in utopia: The ordeal of Tristan da Cunha*. New York: Crowell.
- Munch, P. A., & Marske, C. E. (1981). Atomism and social integration. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 37, 158–171.
- Norberg-Hodge, H. (1991). *Ancient futures: Learning from Ladakh*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Novak, M. (1985). Sacred space, sacred time. In D. L. Vanderwerken & S. K. Wertz (Eds.), *Sport inside out: Readings in literature and philosophy* (pp. 725–733). Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press.
- Okebukola, P. A. (1986). Impact of extended cooperative and competitive relationships on the performance of students in science. *Human Relations*, 39, 673–682.
- Okebukola, P. A., & Ogunniyi, M. B. (1984). Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic science laboratory interaction patterns—Effects on students' achievement and acquisition of practical skills. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 21, 875–884.
- O'Neill, C. W. (1979). Nonviolence and personality disposition among the Zapotec: Paradox and enigma. *Journal of Psychological Anthropology*, 2, 301–322.
- O'Neill, C. W. (1981). Hostility management and the control of aggression in a Zapotec community. *Aggressive Behavior*, 7, 351–366.
- O'Neill, C. W. (1986). Primary and secondary effects of violence control among the nonviolent Zapotec. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 59, 184–190.
- Overing, J. (1986). Images of cannibalism, death and domination in a "non-violent" society. In D. Riches (Ed.), *The anthropology of violence* (pp. 86–101). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Overing, J. (1989a). The aesthetics of production: The sense of community among the Cubeo and Piaroa. *Dialectical Anthropology*, 14, 159–175.
- Overing, J. (1989b). Styles of manhood: An Amazonian contrast in tranquility and violence. In S. Howell & R. Willis (Eds.), *Societies at peace: Anthropological perspectives* (pp. 79–99). London: Routledge.
- Overing Kaplan, J. (1975). *The Piaroa, a people of the Orinoco basin: A study in kinship and marriage*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- Paddock, J. (1976). Values in an antioleant community. *Humanitas*, 12, 183–194.
- Palmer, C. T. (1993). Anger, aggression and humor in Newfoundland floor hockey: An evolutionary analysis. *Aggressive Behavior*, 19, 167–173.
- Pope, S. W. (1993). God, games and national glory: Thanksgiving and the ritual of sport in American culture. *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 10, 242–249.
- Redekop, C. (1989). *Mennonite society*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Robarchek, C. A. (1977). *Semai nonviolence: A systems approach to understanding*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Riverside.
- Robarchek, C. A. (1979). Conflict, emotion, and abreaction: Resolution of conflict among the Semai Senoi. *Ethos*, 7, 104–123.
- Robarchek, C. A. (1989). Primitive warfare and the ratomorphic image of mankind. *American Anthropologist*, 91, 903–920.
- Robarchek, C. A., & Dentan, R. K. (1987). Blood drunkenness and the bloodthirsty Semai: Unmaking another anthropological myth. *American Anthropologist*, 89, 356–365.
- Ross, M. H. (1993). *The management of conflict: Interpretations and interests in comparative perspective*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Royce, J. (1980). Play in violent and non-violent cultures. *Anthropos*, 75, 799–822.
- Sangave, V. A. (1980). *Jaina community: A social survey*. Bombay, India: Popular Prakashan.
- Savells, J. (1988). Economic and social acculturation among the Old Order Amish in select communities: Surviving in a high-tech society. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 19, 123–135.
- Sawka, P. (1968). The Hutterian way of life. *Canadian Geographical Journal*, 77, 126–131.
- Schopter, J., Insko, C. A., Graetz, K. A., Drigotas, S., Smith, V. A., & Dahl, K. (1993). Individual–group discontinuity: Further evidence for mediation by fear and greed. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 419–431.
- Sherman, L. W. (1986). Cooperative versus competitive educational psychology classrooms: A comparative study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2, 283–295.
- Shwalb, D. W., Shwalb, B. J., & Nakazawa, J. (1995). Competitive and cooperative attitudes: A longitudinal survey of Japanese adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 15, 145–168.
- Silberbauer, G. (1981). *Hunter and habitat in the Central Kalahari Desert*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Silberbauer, G. (1982). Political process in G/wi bands. In E. Leacock & R. Lee (Eds.), *Politics and history in band societies* (pp. 23–35). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Simmons, C. H., King, C. S., Tucker, S. S., & Wehner, E. A. (1986). Success strategies: Winning through cooperation or competition. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 126, 437–444.
- Simmons, C. H., Wehner, E. A., Tucker, S. S., & King, C. S. (1988). The Cooperative/Competitive Strategy Scale: A measure of motivation to use cooperative or competitive strategies for success. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 128, 199–205.
- Smither, R. D., & Houston, J. M. (1992). The nature of competitiveness: The development and validation of the Competitiveness Index. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52, 407–418.
- Speck, F. G. (1933). Ethical attributes of the Labrador Indians. *American Anthropologist*, 35, 559–594.

- Spiro, M. E. (1952). Ghosts, Ifaluk, and teleological functionalism. *American Anthropologist*, 54, 497–503.
- Spiro, M. E. (1953). Ghosts: An anthropological inquiry into learning and perception. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 48, 376–382.
- Sponsel, L. E., & Gregor, T. (Eds.). (1994). *The anthropology of peace and nonviolence*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Thomas, E. M. (1994). Management of violence among the Ju/wasi of Nyae Nyae: The old way and a new way. In S. P. Reyna & R. E. Downs (Eds.), *Studying war: Anthropological perspectives* (pp. 69–84). Langhorne, PA: Gordon & Breach.
- Van den Berghe, P. L., & Peter, K. (1988). Hutterites and kibbutzniks: A tale of nepotistic communism. *Man*, 23, 522–539.
- Vealey, R. S. (1994). Competition. In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 1, pp. 655–664). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Walsh, L. (1994, March 24). Amish criticized in murder trial. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, p. D1.
- Walters, S., & Crawford, C. B. (1994). The importance of mate attraction for intrasexual competition in men and women. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 15, 5–30.
- Wikan, U. (1987). Public grace and private fears: Gaiety, offense, and sorcery in northern Bali. *Ethos*, 15, 337–365.
- Willis, R. (1985). Do the Fipa have a word for it? In D. Parkin (Ed.), *The anthropology of evil* (pp. 209–223). Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Willis, R. (1989). The “peace puzzle” in Ufipa. In S. Howell & R. Willis (Eds.), *Societies at peace: Anthropological perspectives* (pp. 133–145). London: Routledge.
- With sympathy for killer, Amish are coping with rare murder. (1995, February 11). *The New York Times*, p. A33.

Appendix

Nonviolent Societies

The following list is provided for readers who may not be familiar with the nonviolent societies in this article. Each entry gives a description of the economic basis of the society, its location, and a brief overview of the nature of the nonviolence of the society. At least one social scientist has convincingly described the nonviolence of each society included in this review, although some scientists have challenged the peacefulness of a few of these societies and have cited incidents of violence to make their points. These challenges are briefly mentioned in each entry. Some of the societies have virtually (or absolutely) no recorded instances of violence, according to the social science literature. Others clearly experience conflict and violence on an infrequent, but regular basis, but they are relatively peaceful and have reasonably effective strategies for maintaining their peacefulness. If readers are interested in obtaining further information about the nonviolence (or lack thereof) of these societies, they should consult *Peaceful Peoples: An Annotated Bibliography* (Bonta, 1993) as a guide to the literature.

Amish

An Anabaptist Christian people who live in the rural United States and Canada, the Amish are famed in the media, such as in the movie *Witness*, as people who never resist authority, ride in horse-drawn buggies, refuse to accept many modern technologies, and dress in “quaint” garb. Most still operate family farms, although in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania—the traditional center of Amish culture—over half of the Amish men work in small-scale businesses. Numerous social scientists, such as John Hostetler (1980) and Donald Kraybill (1989), as well as some historians and a host of writers, have described the very strong Amish commitment to peacefulness—particularly their conception of nonresistance. A murder by an Amish man in western Pennsylvania in 1993 (Walsh, 1994) and one in Maryland in 1995 (“With Sympathy,” 1995) are the first acts of this kind of violence in Amish history; their “freak” nature does not discredit the very strong commitment to nonviolence of these people.

Balinese

An agricultural and commercial people with a mixture of Hindu and traditional beliefs who live on the Indonesian island of Bali, the Balinese maintain a reasonably high degree of peacefulness in their society

through their self-control and (usually successful) ability to suppress conflicts. Belo (1935) indicated that, in 4 years of living on the island, she never witnessed, for example, a case of a boy beating up another, although more recently social scientists have described the society’s destructive, aggressive behavior during funerals and theatrical performances (Connor, 1979) and a fear of possible sorcery attacks from others (Wikan, 1987). The Balinese have a hierarchical society with a history of warfare and slavery, and violence evidently still occurs on the island (Howe, 1989), although Howe did not indicate how frequently. Whereas earlier social scientists may have glossed over the extent of conflict and violence on the island, the Balinese are usually peaceful, if not highly so, in daily social dealings, despite the tensions.

Batek

A Negrito *Orang Asli* (aboriginal) people living in the highlands of the Malay Peninsula traditionally subsisted mostly by hunting, gathering, and trading the products of the forest; they have been affected by extensive lumbering in more recent years, the same as the other traditional societies in Malaysia. Kirk Endicott (1988), who lived with the Batek for 18 months during three different research periods, described them as highly peaceful in his writings: “The Batek abhor interpersonal violence,” (p. 122) and the women as well as men in their society are free from threats of physical violence. His wife, Karen L. Endicott (1984, 1987), who joined him during one of his trips, concurred in her analyses of their peacefulness.

Birhor

A nomadic hunting, gathering, and trading people who live in the forests of central India, the Birhor are honest, peace-loving people who rarely fight among themselves and are never involved in crimes (Bhattacharyya, 1953). One social scientist who spent 14 months doing fieldwork among them described their harmonious relationships with neighboring Hindu villagers as well as their close family peacefulness (Adhikary, 1984a, 1984b).

Buid

The Buid are an aboriginal people of the highlands of Mindoro Island in the Philippines who live by swidden^{A1} agriculture and trading with the lowland Filipino peoples. Thomas Gibson (1986), who spent 24 months living with the Buid, indicated that they never quarrel and "never show any signs of aggression or violence" (p. 7) toward outsiders. But because their traditional approaches to conflict resolution are undermined due to their contact with the Christian lowland peoples, at least one incident of murder has occurred among them.

Chewong

An *Orang Asli* society who live in the mountains of the Malay Peninsula, some of the Chewong are settled agriculturalists, while others live in the forests by hunting, fishing, foraging, and trading. As the government of Malaysia has clear cut the forest, the lives of all of the traditional societies in the mountains have been severely affected. The Chewong have been described by Signe Howell in a number of works as people who have absolutely no mythology of violence; whose language includes no words for quarreling, fighting, aggression, or warfare; and who are completely unable to adapt to any conflict. During her 17 months of living with the Chewong, Howell (1984) "never witnessed a quarrel, nor an outburst of anger, except among small children" (p. 37).

Fipa

A settled agricultural and trading society of western Tanzania, the Fipa have been described by a succession of outside observers as friendly, good hearted, and talkative with strangers. During nearly 2 years of living with them, Roy Willis (1989) "never saw anyone fighting, even children, except in play" (pp. 139-140).

G/wi

The G/wi are a so-called "San" or "Bushman" society of the Central Kalahari Desert of southern Africa; the traditional economy of the G/wi was based on hunting and gathering, although today most are laborers on farms. George Silberbauer (1981), who worked with them extensively for an 8-year period, described their "abhorrence of any violence" (pp. 174-175) other than domestic conflicts. Although they have low-level conflicts over issues such as the equitable division of meat after an animal has been killed, the G/wi only take pleasure from fortunate events, such as a successful hunt or a plentiful rain shower, if they are in the harmonious company of their fellow band members.

Hutterites

An Anabaptist Christian society that holds similar beliefs to those of the Amish and Mennonites, the Hutterites live on communal farms on the central plains of the United States and Canada; unlike the Amish, they use modern technology to run their farms profitably. Their peacefulness is based on their Anabaptist belief in nonresistance; there are no recorded incidents of violence, and they have never experienced a murder. One social scientist has indicated that the Hutterites are unique for their lack of conflict: "Adult quarreling in the community is practically unheard of in recent years" (Deets, 1931, p. 130). This assessment seems a bit excessive, particularly because Bennett (1967) more recently indicated that there is a lot of interpersonal tension in the Hutterite colonies, which is generated by disagreements about issues. The Hutterites generally manage to avoid open conflicts and maintain their cooperative spirit despite the presence of divisive issues, primarily because they have very strong constraints on the open expression of hostilities (Van den Berghe & Peter, 1988).

Ifaluk

The Ifaluk are a fishing and gardening people who live on a small Pacific atoll in the Federated States of Micronesia. Their peaceful ways have been described by several social scientists, including Catherine Lutz (1982) who indicated that the most serious act of aggression that occurred during the 12 months she lived on the island was when one man touched another on the shoulder in anger, an offense which resulted in a stiff fine. Although they sometimes express their anger through shouting at one another, murder is unknown among these people; their primary values are nonaggression, sharing, cooperation, and obedience to social superiors within their highly ranked society. One article seeking to debunk the peacefulness of these peoples, by Betzig and Wichimai (1991), was singularly unconvincing; they mentioned one violent incident several generations ago, a violent mythology, and the existence of privileged classes as support for their argument.

Inuit

Aboriginal peoples who live in the Arctic from western Siberia across northern Alaska and Canada to Greenland, the Inuit traditionally subsisted on fishing, trapping, and hunting, although now they are part of the cash economy. The two bands that Jean Briggs visited numerous times between 1963 and 1980 at their camps in the central and eastern Arctic of Canada have a very strong fear of aggression; they use a variety of strategies to control anger and prevent violence from occurring. Briggs (1994) indicated that "murder was known in many—perhaps all—Inuit societies, and in some it seems to have been a very frequent occurrence" (p. 156). From her books and many articles, however, it appears as if the two bands that she regularly visited have been very successful at restraining outbursts of anger and violence most of the time.

Jains

Adherents of an ancient religion of India, the Jains live in many major Indian cities and, to some extent, villages. Jain involvement in serious or violent crimes is very rare, and habitual criminals are unknown in the Jaina community (Sangave, 1980). Although they may fight in self-defense and some may serve in the Indian armed forces, more traditional Jains recognize that military service is contradictory to their traditional beliefs in nonviolence (*ahimsa*), and they are opposed to it (Misra, 1972). Many Jains are successful and competitive businesspeople.

Kadar

A traditional, tribal people who subsist on hunting, gathering, and trading near the southern end of the Western Ghats mountain range in India, the Kadar almost never have physical fights: For example, a wife might berate her husband for not having enough Western material comforts or people might accuse others of taking their money, but fighting does not result. U. R. Ehrenfels (1952) found that there was no memory among the Kadar of murder or violent acts of revenge, and local forestry or police officials confirmed that crime was totally absent.

!Kung

The !Kung are a San or Bushmen society in Botswana and Namibia, southern Africa, who traditionally subsisted on hunting and gathering but today live off their wage labor on farms plus their own livestock and gardening. Social scientists have written about the various ways

^{A1} A temporary plot produced by the cutting back and burning off of vegetative cover.

the !Kung traditionally fostered peacefulness (Draper, 1978; Marshall, 1961), although Lee (1979) discredited their nonviolence by analyzing the rate of murders that have occurred among them in comparison with the murder rate in modern U. S. cities. However, there is contradictory evidence (Thomas, 1994) that, during the period when the !Kung still lived primarily as a nomadic people, they were peaceful overall, despite the tensions that flared up fairly frequently in their camps: The murders that occurred were the result of exceptional circumstances such as a case of mental illness. Clearly from the literature, overall they had a fairly, if not highly, peaceful society. Whereas they did, on occasion, experience violent conflicts, Lee's analysis appears to exaggerate the evidence.

Ladakhis

The Ladakhis are a Tibetan Buddhist society in the mountains of Jammu and Kashmir in northern India. Their traditional livelihood has been based on keeping livestock that can live in the high mountains and farming near their villages. Norberg-Hodge (1991), who lived for 16 years among the Ladakhis, described aggression as "exceptionally rare" in traditional Ladakh, before the introduction of outside values and goods. Arguments were rare, and people avoided situations that could produce conflicts. Villagers who were asked about the nonviolence in their communities indicated that "there has been no fighting in the village in living memory" (p. 46).

Lepchas

The Lepchas are an agricultural people who primarily follow Tibetan Buddhist practices in the mountains of Sikkim, a territory of northern India in the Himalayas between Nepal and Bhutan. According to Gorer (1967), who lived among them for 3 months in the spring of 1937, the Lepchas suppress aggression and competition almost completely. They strongly disapprove of quarreling, which occurs very rarely, and whatever aggression does exist is attributed to the actions of supernatural beings. They are tolerant of extramarital sexual activities by their spouses, so long as the spouse is discrete about them.

Mennonites

Until the 20th century, most Mennonites were rural farmers; today many are fully integrated into industrial U. S. and Canadian life, although some still live in the plain manner of their ancestors. Mennonites have evangelized extensively, establishing congregations worldwide. Their peacefulness, as with the Hutterites and Amish, has historically been based on their Anabaptist belief in nonresistance, the Christian ideal of turning the other cheek and not resisting evil (Matthew 5:39). In recent decades, they have lessened their commitment to nonresistance—they are now more concerned with active peacemaking than passively yielding to others. As the percentage of Mennonites who believe Christians should actively promote peace has increased, the percentage who believe they should not take part in warfare has declined (Driedger & Kraybill, 1994). In the 1990s, Mennonite women have started to charge their patriarchal society with the concealment of spouse abuse; they argued that the Mennonite belief in nonresistance fostered an acceptance of family violence (Hildebrand, 1992).

Montagnais-Naskapi

These American Indian people, also called the Innu, traditionally subsisted on hunting, trapping, and trading in the forests of the Labrador Peninsula in Canada, although today they are primarily dependent on the cash economy. They fought some wars historically, although they usually preferred quiet, peaceful relations with each other and the Euro-

pean fur traders who established trading posts in their territory in the early 17th century. There are reports of domestic violence caused by alcohol (Leacock, 1981). An important feature of their traditional society was that they would never fail to share scarce food resources with other families who might be in danger of starvation (Leacock, 1969).

Nayaka

The Nayaka are a tribal society that lives on hunting, gathering, trading, and some wage labor at the southern end of the Western Ghats in India. According to Nurit Bird-David (1992), who lived among them for 1 year in the late 1970s, the Nayaka "prevent conflicts by avoiding cooperation and competition and by moving away from potential confrontation. The few conflicts that occur are mainly over women" (p. 196).

Paliyan

The Paliyan have an explicit code of nonviolence, an essential aspect of which is avoiding competition. One Paliyan man told Peter Gardner (1972), who lived among them from 1962 to 1964, that he believed "if struck on one side of the face, you turn the other side toward the attacker" (p. 425). Gardner did not mention the obvious parallel to Christ's famous statement, but because the Paliyan live in the forest fringes of remote Hindu villages in southern India (near the Nayaka and Kadar), subsisting on nomadic gathering and contract labor, it is unlikely that the Paliyan man was familiar with Christian beliefs. The most important issue for the Paliyan is to avoid any conflict, hostility, or aggression. They flee into the forest at the slightest sign of hostility and then return only gradually and tentatively, months or even years later (Gardner, 1985).

Piaroa

These Native American people of Venezuela formerly lived in forest villages along the highland tributaries of the Orinoco but moved downriver in the 1970s to live in permanent settlements. Their earlier homeland in the forest was "a place almost totally free of all forms of physical violence, where children, teenagers, and adults alike never express their anger through physical means" (Overing, 1986, p. 88), according to Joanna Overing who spent 1 year studying this society in 1968 and another 6 months in 1977. She indicated that spouses and children are never struck, and they are "appalled by any display of aggression, much less physical aggression" (p. 88). But the Piaroa believe that diseases and death are caused by sorcery attacks from other villages, and their shamans launch attacks of sorcery on other villages in retaliation for perceived injuries. In Western terms, they are highly nonviolent; but, in their terms, they have to make daily use of violent supernatural means to protect themselves.

Semai

These *Orang Asli* people subsisted on swidden agriculture and gathering, fishing, and hunting in the mountains of the Malay Peninsula until recently, when their traditional economy was significantly modified by the lumbering of their area forests. Their nonviolence was originally described by Robert Knox Dentan, who spent 14 months of fieldwork among them. Dentan's (1968) pioneering book has been very influential in the study of peaceful societies. Proponents of the existence of peaceful peoples have relied on Dentan's, and a little later Clayton Robarchek's (e.g., 1977), works about the Semai; conversely, detractors of the idea that peaceful societies exist (Knauff, 1987) have tried to denigrate the nonviolence of the Semai based on a violent incident that Dentan related in his book. Both Dentan and Robarchek continue to argue for the highly

peaceful nature of Semai society (Dentan, 1988; Robarchek & Dentan, 1987), although they continue to acknowledge that incidents of violence have occurred among the Semai on a few occasions (Dentan, 1995).

Tahitians

Tahitians are a fishing and farming society of the Society Islands in French Polynesia. Robert I. Levy (1973), who lived among the Tahitians for over 2 years, indicated that there is very little conflict, open hostility, or aggression in the Society Islands. The people exhibit a gentleness and lack of anger toward one another and visitors, and children play without aggressiveness and conflicts. On occasions when conflicts do arise, the parties quickly defuse them. During periods of drinking at the two major festivals of the year, there is no more violence than when the people are sober. However, violence is not completely absent from their society: For example, sometimes people who drink at home or return home drunk will hit family members. Also, some of the historical reports of the Tahitians describe scenes of warfare and violence.

Tristan Islanders

These fishing and agricultural people of mixed European and African (or Southeast Asian) descent have lived on a remote south Atlantic island, west of the Republic of South Africa since the early 19th century.

Peter A. Munch (1945), who lived with the Tristan Islanders for 12 months in three different visits, indicated that quarrels are rare. The highest level that hostility reaches on the island is when two people occasionally stop talking to each other, although they do not maintain even that level of tension very long and fights have never occurred in living memory. For example, a man who loses his temper would have that blemish on his reputation for life, whereas one diffusing a tense situation with jokes earns respect. Virtually all men treat their wives extremely well; the only instance of violence that Munch reported was the rumor that a couple of men had allegedly abused their wives.

Zapotec

The Zapotec are a Native American agricultural people who live in the mountainous state of Oaxaca in southern Mexico. Several researchers have been fascinated that one community is particularly peaceful, with very strong values that oppose violence, in contrast to the other communities nearby where fighting and machismo are comparable with the rest of Mexico. Fighting is not completely absent in the peaceful town, but violence occurs far less than in other communities.

Received February 29, 1996

Revision received July 2, 1996

Accepted July 3, 1996 ■