• Hobbes v Rousseau
• warfare =
  – organized purposeful actual/potential lethal force
  – homicide v. war
• archaeology of war
  – defensive & aggressive markers
  – settlement systems
    • fortifications; palisades; lookouts; aggressive/defensive positions; line-of-site connections; DMZ
  – burials
    • mass graves; warrior graves; sex/age bias in skeletal populations; traumas
  – sites
    • burned communities; deliberate destruction
  – technology
    • specialized projectiles; swards; clubs; shields; armor; military transport (e.g., chariots)
  – iconography/history
    • depictions/descriptions of war
  – negative evidence
• purpose/causes of war
  – elimination of people: competition
    • effects of aggregation
  – acquisition of resources/territory
    • surpluses; opportunity costs; protection racket
  – acquisition of prestige

the bias of anthropology?

human nature…

– Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679): Humans are evil and “warre” is the constant & natural state of human society

– Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778): Humans are good and peace is the constant & natural state of society

– What does archaeology tell us?
• warfare
  – armed conflict between societies?

• warfare =
  – organized, purposeful group action, directed against another group, that may or may not be organized for similar action, involving the actual or potential application of lethal force
    • organized = variously formal rules describing different social roles of actors during conflict
    • purposeful = action intended to serve a certain purpose
    • actual lethal force = application of lethal force achieves purpose
    • potential lethal force = threat of lethal force achieves purpose
  – Note: excludes types of non-violent conflict between societies
    • e.g., trade wars, price wars

• archaeology of warfare
  1. How were societies organized for war?
  2. What purpose did war serve?
  3. How was lethal force applied?
  4. How was potential lethal force applied?
    – Is that everything?

• archaeology of warfare: THE BIG QUESTION
  5. How has warfare influence the evolution of societies?
• warfare: between society v. within society

– is warfare different from homicide?

– Johnathan Haas argues difference is…
  • homicide: individual aggression WITHIN the same society
  • warfare: individual (group) aggression BETWEEN societies

– Do homicide and warfare require different explanations?

• archaeology of warfare
  – physical remains providing evidence of warfare in the past

  – defensive markers
    • physical remains that suggest societies were concerned defend themselves from aggression

  – aggressive markers
    • physical remains suggest societies were concerned with directing aggression against others

• archaeology of warfare: defensive v. aggressive remains
  – case study…Medieval Warfare (a la Monty Python)!

“fetchez la vache”
• archaeology of warfare
  – settlement systems: distribution of sites on landscape suggests defensive/aggressive postures of societies

  – fortifications & palisades
    • defensive structure consisting of walls or mounds built around a stronghold to strengthen it against attack

  – lookouts & line-of-site connections
    • structures commanding a wide view of its surroundings
    • two or more lookouts visually connected by a straight line of observations

  – DMZ or “no-man’s-land”
    • an area between two opponents where fighting is prevented (often by an absence of people)

Equifinality =
different processes generate the same physical remains

• archaeology of warfare
  – burials
    • mass graves
      – graves with numbers of bodies that cannot be explained by natural causes of death

    • sex/age bias in skeletal populations
      – graves that are disproportionately biased towards young males

Neolithic Jericho: Fortification against attack from people or water?
Victims of warfare?

Tomb 1001 at Anyang, last capital city of Shang Dynasty

Victim of Moche warfare

Warriors buried with the paraphernalia of their profession

• archaeology of warfare
  – EQUIFINALITY in burials?
    • mass graves
      – e.g., disease and natural disasters
    • warrior graves
      – is the paraphernalia really for war?
      – is the individual a true or fictive warrior?
    • sex/age bias in skeletal populations
      – are their gender biases in the society concerning who gets buried and where?
    • traumas
      – some traumas can happen through natural accidents

• archaeology of warfare
  – sites
    • burned communities
    • deliberate destruction
  – technology
    • specialized projectiles, swords & clubs
    • shields & armor
    • military transport (e.g., chariots)
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Greek helmet 7th Century BC
• archaeology of warfare
  – iconography & history
  • depictions & descriptions of war

[Image: Mesopotamian war “booty”]

• archaeology of warfare
  – iconography & history
  • real or fictive?

[Xena: Warrior Princess or Popular Culture Warrior?]

[Image: Iconography of a Moche sacrifice as seen on a ceramic vessel]

• burials at Sipán match the iconography on pots
• iconographic evidence should have supporting physical evidence

[Image: Moche sacrificial victim from Huaca del Sol showing the damage to the back of the skull from a “star-shaped” mace]

• archaeology of warfare
  – negative evidence
  • does the absence of evidence for warfare mean that peace prevailed?
  – preponderance of the evidence…
  • does the presence of a single line of evidence indicate that warfare was omnipresent
• “goals” of war…
  – resource competition at root?
  – eliminate people
    • free up resources for yourself
  – acquire territory
    • may or may not entail elimination of people
    • resources made available for victors

• What is the purpose/cause of war?
  – acquisition of prestige…
    • fighting wars provides individuals way to obtain prestige (honor and valor in battle…) and prestige leads to wealth
      – monetary and reproductive wealth!
      – political wealth (influence)
      – spiritual wealth
    • has become a common perspective in archaeology that war is waged often/primarily because of the ambitions of the few

• link to complex societies…

  – it takes resources to wage war…
    • if you are involved primarily in growing food, then you cannot be fighting a war

  • an early consequence of development of resources surpluses is support full-time warriors
    – i.e., individuals that can wage war without having to worry about the cost of not having enough food