SCALPING, TORTURE, CANNIBALISM AND RAPE: AN ETHNOHISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF CONFLICTING CULTURAL VALUES IN WAR[1]

Thomas S. Abler
University of Waterloo

Abstract: All warfare involves rules which limit the violence inflicted upon the enemy. When combatants differ in culture, initially each side will observe its own set of rules. Conflict between Indians and Europeans in eastern North America is examined here. The Indian practice of scalping was soon adopted by Europeans. Both cultures had traditions of public torture, but Europeans never adopted the associated practice of cannibalism. Rape of females was found in European war; Indians did not rape. The failure of some practices of war to cross cultural boundaries allows each side to classify enemy behaviour as barbaric.

Résumé: La violence est limitée dans toutes les guerres par des règles. Lorsque les combattants sont de culture différente, chaque camp respecte ses propres règles. Cet article porte sur les conflits entre européens et amérindiens dans la partie est de l'Amérique du nord. La pratique amérindienne du scalpe fut rapidement adoptée par les européens. Les deux cultures partageaient déjà la pratique de la torture en public, mais jamais les européens n'adoptèrent le cannibalisme. Par contre, le viol des femmes pratiqué par les européens ne fut pas adopté par les amérindiens. Le fait que certaines pratiques sont demeurees l'apanage d'un seul camp, a permis aux européens et amérindiens de se qualifier mutuellement de barbares.

Introduction

It is universally true that societies which send their men to war have rules to limit the activities of those men who are engaged in killing and maiming in furtherance of societal goals. I suspect that it is also universal that all such men who go to war will break some of those rules, particularly if campaigns

Anthropologica XXXIV (1992) 3-20

are long, arduous, or particularly stressful. Often wars are conducted between two antagonists who share an identical or nearly identical set of explicit values of proper martial conduct. However war can, and often has, taken place between two peoples of vastly different culture, who do not share a common set of values as to its proper conduct.

In the former case, cries of atrocity and accusations of "barbaric" activity are not unknown and indeed are common, despite the fact that the two warring political systems share essentially the same values as to proper military conduct. I think this is inevitable because of two factors. First, rules are often broken in war. Deviant behaviour can be found in military units as well as in the general population; in addition the very stress of the combat situation leads to the commission of "war crimes." I think a cool and unbiased reading of military history would fail to uncover a single society which made war but also did not see those fighting in its name exhibit behaviour which was repugnant to its basic values of the proper conduct of war. Secondly, one hears cries of atrocity and "barbaric" activity because societies justify their wars by citing the deviant behaviour of the enemy. One is justified in killing and maiming someone who is less human than oneself, so typically enemy violations of a common code will receive wide publicity while the violations made by one's own forces will be denied or excused and justified as "retaliation."

Norms governing the conduct of war deal with such matters as when and where it is appropriate to fight, what weapons and tactics are permissible, whom among the enemy it is appropriate to kill, what treatment is accorded enemy dead, what treatment is accorded non-combatants among the enemy, what treatment is accorded captives or prisoners, and what conventions are observed allowing for communication between the warring parties. Despite claims of "total war" at various points in human history, I suspect that there are very few, if any, conflicts where cultural conventions in the above areas have not limited the degree of destructiveness inflicted by the stronger power on the weaker.

As with most aspects of human behaviour, there is often difference between the rules explicitly expressed and those actually observed. Admittedly this is not the easiest area of human behaviour to approach with a hope of learning the truth. Stories of enemy atrocities are often inflated for propaganda purposes, while tales of atrocities committed by one's own side are often hearsay and, quite possibly, they have become embroidered in the telling and retelling (see stories repeated in Karsten 1978 and Bryant 1979).

One notable area where the de facto rules are at variance with the de jure rules of war in modern usage is the bombing of civilian targets from the air. One "senior [U.S.] air force officer" is reported to have argued against the issuing of a manual on the rules of war to the U.S. Air Force. "I'll put it to

you frankly. If they come out with a book on the laws of air warfare, and then go by it, we're all going to be out of jobs" (quoted in Karsten 1978:150). It appears that Winston Churchill must take some of the blame for originating the practice of bombing civilians during World War II (Karsten 1978:86); earlier in his life he had been quite cavalier about international conventions in war. When captured as a war correspondent during the Boer War he had to surreptitiously dispose of the illegal dum-dum bullets he had been using in his pistol (Manchester 1983:301).

If one looks at the treatment of prisoners by armies in this century it is not difficult to find examples of prisoners being executed, although this is usually phrased as "not taking prisoners." Clearly, if one wants to give up the fight and surrender, one has to find someone on the other side to accept one's surrender. The Coldstream Guards had a reputation for not taking prisoners in World War I, which caused a young Lieutenant, left behind at Dunkirk, to worry how the Germans would react to his regimental cap badge (Lord 1982:264). In the Second World War the First Special Service Force, composed of American and Canadian personnel, also had a reputation for not taking prisoners, even though they *sometimes* did (Bryant 1979:281-282). In the same conflict the Japanese carried a reputation for not surrendering, but even so I find it difficult to believe that the nearly 5000 troops defending Tarawa in November 1943, were so committed to the Emperor as to make the ultimate sacrifice with almost no exceptions. Even the wounded did not surrender. Only 17 were taken prisoner (Toland 1970:470).

The murder of prisoners in modern war seems to have three aspects. First, in so-called "elite" units ("If you kill for pleasure, you're a sadist[;] if you kill for money, you're a mercenary[;] if you kill for both, you're a RANGER!!" [Karsten 1978:73]) such a policy is viewed, by some commanders at least, as producing a more effective killing machine.[2] Second, among more run-of-the-mill troops, killing of prisoners may be done as a matter of expediency, e.g., a too rapid advance (or retreat) would prevent their being taken under guard to the rear. Third, it is not uncommon for prisoners (or persons attempting to surrender) to be murdered in retaliation for what is perceived as an enemy transgression of the rules of war. An example of this was at the battle of Goose Green in the Falklands campaign. Lieutenant Jim Barry and two of his men were killed as they approached an Argentinian trench flying a white flag. No more Argentines surrendered (or, rather, were taken prisoner) in that segment of the battle (Eddy, Linklater, and Gillman 1982:219).

It is this last characteristic of warfare, that of retaliation, that is of importance to this paper. The situation being considered is one where societies with quite differing systems of values are fighting each other. Initially each fights under its own rules. The battlefield, though, can become an arena of

culture change, for each side reacts to the "inhuman" behaviour of the other. It may adopt a new practice in revenge or retaliation. It might, however, continue to reject such behaviour, hence emphasizing the social and cultural distance between itself and the "barbarous" enemy.

European Views of Indian War Practices

In this paper I will consider warfare involving Indians and Europeans in the northeastern portion of North America in the 17th and 18th centuries. For both sides one must reconstruct the norms or rules followed in military engagements, inasmuch as the Indians were a non-literate people with no recorded code of warfare while the Europeans were emerging into a modern military system, indeed undergoing a "military revolution" (see Roberts 1967; Parker 1988), establishing professional standing armies and only beginning to codify formally the rules of war. The evidence is almost entirely from the European side. Some of the documents, however, while still showing European ethnocentrism, emanate from Europeans who were allies rather than enemies of the Indians. In addition we have many, probably valid, translations of Indian speeches throughout the two centuries. Here the Indian viewpoint is often eloquently presented.

Clearly in European eyes, a deviant, incredible, or at least strange, Indian practice was the taking of scalps. Scalping involves cutting a circle about the head of the victim and then removing the hair and skin. The scalp would be stretched and dried (and possibly smoked) and would survive for a long period of time (as numerous specimens preserved in North American ethnographic museums will testify). Scalping was most often done to enemy dead, but many victims of scalping are known to survive (see Nadeau 1941:184-186; Abler 1989:85; Ewers 1958:139). Axtell and Sturtevant (1980) have hopefully forever laid to rest the unscholarly assertion that Indians learned to scalp from Whites. They provide ample proof that scalping was pre-Columbian in North America. While it is not the focus of their paper, they also provide documentation, easily supplemented and amplified in readily available sources, that scalping diffused in the other direction. Indians did not learn scalping from the Whites; Whites, however, very quickly and quite enthusiastically learned scalping from the Indians.

Mutilation of the dead and public display of portions of human bodies was part of European tradition in the 17th and 18th centuries. In particular, the public display of human heads, often on pole or pike, was common. A 16th-century English commander in Ireland brought "greate terrour to the people when thei sawe the heddes of their dedde fathers, brothers, children, kinsfolke, and freinds" (quoted in Jennings 1975:168). Indeed, the practice continued into the 20th century. Axtell and Sturtevant point out that the

British were publicly displaying Burmese heads as recently as 1931 (Axtell and Sturtevant 1980:463 n.). While mutilation of bodies in other ways existed (and continues) in cultures with a European tradition, head taking and exhibition is clearly the practice closest to scalping which appears to predate European knowledge of North American scalping practices.[3]

European taking and exhibiting of heads appears to have involved persons killed or executed for criminal activity and to be calculated as a deterrent or to inspire terror. Scalps to North American Indians clearly had sacred or ritual importance in their "mourning war" complex (see Smith 1951; Richter 1983). Indians over much of North America, including those in the northeast, went to war to restore a balance disturbed by a death in their community. That balance could be restored by returning either with a captive or with a scalp. Upon the return of the war party, the scalps received considerable ritual attention. Women played a prominent role in these rituals, found from the Atlantic to the Rockies, dancing with the scalp or scalps brought home by their brothers and husbands. Champlain described a Montagnais party returning with Iroquois scalps in 1609.

> I went with them in their ceremonies. Approaching the shore each took a stick, on the end of which they hung the scalps of their slain enemies with some beads, singing meanwhile all together. And when all were ready, the women stripped themselves quite naked, and jumped into the water, swimming to the canoes to receive the scalps of their enemies which were at the end of long sticks in the bow of their canoes, in order later to hang them round their necks, as if they had been precious chains. And then they sang and danced. (Biggar 1925:106)

Europeans clearly viewed the taking of scalps as exotic (or deviant) behaviour worthy of note. Indeed, they seem to have a ghoulish fascination with the practice. When Theodore De Bry published some of Jacques Le Moyne's renderings of the Indians of Florida in 1591, one of the 42 engravings was devoted to a graphic depiction of the process of taking and preserving (through smoking) a scalp (see Hulton 1977:208, Plate 107).

The bulk of the earliest written accounts of scalping describe Indians scalping other Indians. Whites and Indians soon came into conflict, and Indians scalped their White enemies just as they did their Indian foes. It was in 1540 that Simon Rodrigues, a member of De Soto's expedition, gained his place in history as (probably) the first European to be scalped by Indians in the "classic" style (Friederici 1907:424). It appears to not have been long before Europeans were scalping Indians. Whites, however, incorporated scalping into the values of their own culture, so that when they got into the scalping business they made it just that, a "business." Whites do

appear to have scalped Indians for fun, but they also on many occasions scalped for profit.

It is not clear which colonial government merits the honour of being first to pay for scalps. Since scalping was not a European custom, European languages had no word for the practice. It is not until the last quarter of the 17th century that "scalp," as a verb, becomes common in English usage (Friederici 1907:423; Axtell and Sturtevant 1980:462). Earlier, "head" appears to be used as a short form for head-skin or similar construction. Hence it is not clear whether Connecticut was paying for Pequot scalps or heads in 1637, or whether New Netherland was paying for Raritan scalps or heads in 1641. In 1688 the government of Canada was paying for scalps, and the list of acts of other colonial governments in North America to pay for scalps is a lengthy one (see Friederici 1907:433-436; Axtell 1981:143;223-234). An early and famous case of White scalping was that of Hannah Dustin. Being held captive by an Indian family, she killed and scalped its four adult members and six children for good measure and upon returning home applied for bounty payment for her 10 scalps (see Mather 1697).

Scalps which merited bounties were sometimes burned or buried, although Axtell (1981:218) feels this was not done out of respect for the dead but rather to prevent being "duped into paying two large bounties for one small scalp." The public display of scalps was also known to happen. Boston cheered Capt. John Lovewell and his men as they marched through its streets bearing 10 scalps on poles in 1725 (Axtell 1981:231-232). The town fathers of Salem, Massachusetts, displayed in the local courthouse the collection of scalps purchased over the years through various scalp bounties (Axtell 1981:218).

In the 18th century scalping had become part of White frontier culture and scalp bounties became a bonus for a customary practice in the waging of war in the region. Indians also viewed scalp bounties as such a bonus, although selling a scalp conflicted with its social and ritual functions. It was sometimes possible to solve this dilemma by dividing a scalp in two, retaining half for home use while selling the other portion to White authorities (e.g., John Campbell to Bradstreet, 12-xi-1764 [in Bradstreet to Gage 7-xii-1764], Gage Papers [A.S.], vol. 28).[4]

Indians continued to scalp, whether paid for it or not.[5] So did their White neighbours on the frontier. A few examples might suffice. After the Battle of Bushy Run (August 1763) the Indian dead were not mutilated by regular British troops, but some were scalped by frontiersmen acting as rangers and teamsters with Col. Bouquet's force (Bouquet to Amherst, 6-viii-1763, published in Brymner 1890:64-65). A year later Col. Bouquet found his peace negotiations in danger of collapse when a Shawnee hostage was murdered and scalped by an officer in the Pennsylvania volunteers who displayed his

trophy "publickly and with great ostentation" to the folks back home (H. Bouquet to Governor Sharpe, 20-xii-1764, Bouquet Collection). The Seneca chief Governor Blacksnake reported finding an aged Seneca couple killed and scalped in the closing years of the American Revolution. That the intruding party wore shoes, as demonstrated by their tracks, was conclusive to Blacksnake that the killings were the work of Whites (Abler 1989:134-135).

A second aspect of Indian warfare viewed as deviant by European observers was the cannibalism-torture-human sacrifice complex found among Indians of the northeast. Elsewhere (Abler 1980) I have called attention to a few of the eye-witness accounts of cannibalism found in the historical record of this complex. Careful reading of these accounts has impressed modern scholars with the patterning and regularity of the ritual (see, for example, Knowles 1940; Rands and Riley 1958; Tooker 1964:31-39; Wallace 1970:103-105; Trigger 1976:70-75; Abler and Logan 1988).

One might say the ritual pattern begins on the site of the battle itself with the scalping of the dead and what I think might be called battlefield cannibalism. The latter consists of drinking the blood of slain enemies and, if time avails, making soup of them. Although there is no solid supporting evidence that I am aware of in the literature, I feel it reasonable to see this activity as at least analogous to the ritual eating of a portion of a recently slain animal common among many North American peoples. To cite an 18th-century source, we have the testimony of Alexander Henry's Ojibwa brother that dead were consumed immediately after the Michilimackinac battle for ritual rather than gastronomic purposes (Henry 1971:69).[6]

Captives being taken back to the enemy's home village were subjected to ritualistic abuse while *en route*. For the most part, this abuse centred upon the victim's hands, involving the tearing out of nails, severing of finger joints, and the burning (often in a pipe) of the ends of fingers. In addition to allowing the warriors to vent their hostility on the captive, this activity also made escape more difficult since captives found it at best most painful to attempt to use their hands.

Upon arrival at the home village, the captive was then forced to run the gauntlet. It would appear that the severity of this task was variable, and the condition of the captive when he reached the end ranged widely. Axtell has, I judge correctly, described the gauntlet as a *rite de passage*, with the captive being adopted into Indian society after completing the run. Indeed, I am tempted to go even farther, couching the gauntlet in Freudian terms. It seems to be a symbolic birth canal, through which the captive is reborn as a member of a new society. However, his or her fate was not secure, having been thus reborn. New kinsmen would make the decision of life or death and if the latter, the captive was then subjected to the long torture ritual.[7]

In its most common form the torture ritual appears to have been an all-night affair. The victim was "caressed" by his new kinsmen,[8] that is burned with torches and red hot irons. Only the lower portion of the body was burned initially. Portions of flesh might be cut off and fed to the captive. At least periodically he was expected to sing his personal death song. A girdle of bark was sometimes made and set on fire. Finally he was scalped, often with coals or hot sand and ashes being poured upon the wound, and his heart was torn out. Ideally this took place at dawn. His head would be cut off, the corpse might then be butchered and portions of it eaten, with his bones eventually ending in the village midden. The village would resound with the noise of staves being beaten on the sides of the houses as his spirit was driven from the community.

The form, if not the complete content, of the ritual is well documented historically among the Iroquoians and their neighbours. There do exist some descriptions of such tortures taking place near the site of the battle rather than at the home village (as when Brébeuf and Lalemant were executed), but the vast majority of descriptions in the literature regularly follow the above pattern.

In the popular view of Canadian and Indian history, such torture of captives is presented as primarily or exclusively a trait of the Iroquois (see Jennings 1975:160-161). Such is not the case. In fact the historic record contains far more descriptions of Iroquois being tortured, burnt and eaten by others than there are of Iroquois engaged in such activity. The first clear picture we have of the torture-sacrifice complex is not of Iroquois as torturers but rather Iroquois as victims. Champlain described Montagnais, Algonquin and Huron treatment of an Iroquois prisoner in 1609 (Biggar 1925:101-104).

> Our Indians kindled a fire, and when it was well lighted, each took a brand and burned this poor wretch a little at a time in order to make him suffer the greater torment. Sometimes they would leave off, throwing water on his back. Then they tore out his nails and applied fire to the ends of his fingers and to his *membrum virile.* Afterwards they scalped him and caused a certain kind of gum to drip very hot upon the crown of his head. Then they pierced his arms near the wrists and with sticks pulled and tore out his sinews by main force, and when they saw they could not get them out, they cut them off. . . . When they saw I was not pleased, they called me back and told me to give him a shot with the arquebus. I did so. . . . When he was dead . . . they opened his body and threw his bowels into the lake. Afterwards they cut off his head, arms and legs, which they scattered about; but they kept the scalp. . . . They did another awful thing, which was to cut his heart into several pieces and give it to a brother of the dead man to eat and to others of his companions who were prisoners. These took it and put it into their mouths,

> but would not swallow it. Some of the Algonquin Indians who were guarding the prisoners made them spit it out and threw it into the water.

Champlain apparently did not observe cannibalism at this time, but it was not an invariable inclusion in the torture ritual (see Boucher 1883:68). A year later Champlain saw an Iroquois corpse "cut into quarters, to be eaten" (Biggar 1925:134). At this same time he noted that some Iroquois prisoners "were reserved to be put to death at the hands of the wives and daughters of these [Algonquins and Montagnais], who in this matter show themselves no less inhuman than the men; in fact they greatly surpass the men in cruelty; for by their cunning they invent more cruel torments, and take delight in them" (Biggar 1925 2:137).

Torture was certainly not unknown to Europeans. Extracting confession by torture was an officially recognized and sanctioned part of European judicial process to almost the end of the 18th century (Langbein 1977; Peters 1985). Public execution involving torture of the convicted entertained French and English crowds through the 17th and 18th centuries (for detailed accounts of a 1757 execution in Paris see Foucault 1977:3-6). A 1762 treatise made the following observations:

> Some prisoners may be condemned to be hanged, others to having their hands cut off or their tongues cut out or pierced and then to be hanged; others, for more serious crimes, to be broken alive and to die on the wheel, after having their limbs broken; others to be broken until they die a natural death, others to be strangled and then broken, others to be burnt alive, others to be burnt after first being strangled; others to be drawn by four horses, others to having their heads cut off, and others to have their heads broken. (Quoted in Foucault 1977:32)

In 1584 the assassin of William of Orange was publicly tortured for 18 days with boiling water, red-hot pincers, clubs, the wheel and other instruments (Foucault 1977:54). As a climax to the torture spectacle, European crowds could watch all four limbs ripped from the living body – "quartering, which carries pain almost to infinity" (Foucault 1977:33). Burning people at the stake was a European tradition. Smith (1951:354), in fact, raises the possibility of diffusion from Europeans to Native North Americans, "because burning was so obvious a trait in the European punitive pattern and contact with these tribes was established so early." However, although both Europeans and Indians put people to death at the stake, the technique each used was quite different. Among Europeans the stake and fire were the instrument of death; the victim perished in the flames. Among Indians the victim was tied to a stake and tortured by fire, but death ideally came not as a result of flames but instead by a knife or axe. Moreover, Europeans tied prisoners with their backs to the stake whereas Indians tied their captives facing the

stake (Boucher 1883:67-68; Trigger 1976:584,765). One aspect of the torture ritual which may have been learned from Europeans, though, was the use of red-hot iron (gun barrels or axe heads) to burn the victim.

It has been suggested that what shocked Europeans about Indian torture and execution of prisoners of war was the degree to which the entire community participated. Such activities in Europe were a spectator sport (Jennings 1975:162). Torturers and executioners in the European tradition are a profession, almost a caste. Europeans were appalled that all ages and sexes took turns at tormenting the prisoner.

The French tortured and executed a number of Iroquois prisoners at Montreal and elsewhere in Canadian settlements in the latter part of the 17th century (Beauchamp 1904:115-116;122-124). Frontenac appears to have been particularly enthusiastic about this. Although it is almost certain Indian techniques were used to torture these prisoners, the setting of the execution was in the European tradition. The torture was a public spectacle to be enjoyed by all, but the actual torture was carried out by the colonial equivalent of the professional executioner, that is by Indian allies of New France.

One of the Iroquois being thus tortured gave the French a lesson as to proper behaviour at the stake.

> He exhorted those who tortured him to remember his death, in order that they may display similar courage when those of his nation should avenge his murder on them. And when a Savage, weary of his harangues, gave him some cuts of a knife: "I thank thee," he said, "but thou oughtest rather complete my death by fire. Learn French dogs! And ye Savages, their Allies, who are dogs of dogs, remember what you have to do when you will occupy a position similar to mine." (Quoted in Beauchamp 1904:124)

Europeans, although torture was very much part of their own traditions, viewed the public participation in the torture-sacrifice-cannibalism ritual with a certain amount of distaste or horror. Clearly they initially regarded it, as they regarded scalping, as deviant behaviour relating to the barbarous or savage nature of the Indian population of northern North America (in the ethnocentric 17th-century European eyes). However, as was the case with scalping, at least some of the colonists began to view the use of Indian torture methods as appropriate in waging war. Its adoption, though, was purely secular, lacking the religious overtones which were part of the Indian performance of the ritual. There is also no evidence that any European felt compelled to carry the adoption of the torture complex to the point of eating the victim. Clearly Christianity and other sources of European values permitted involvement as spectators in the systematic torture of enemy human beings, but they seem not to have encouraged or allowed full community

participation in the torture or the ritualistic ingestion of the corpse of the torture victim.[9]

Unfortunately we do not have as many comments concerning Indians' views of the European method of waging war as we have of European opinions on Indian behaviour. It seems incontestable that many European conventions and practices would seem as barbaric to Indians as Indian practices did to Europeans. For example, the Narragansett complained of the tactics of their Puritan allies—"it is too furious and slaies too many men" (quoted in Washburn 1978:90). The particular practice I choose to discuss is not well documented, but the slim documentation that does exist is reasonably consistent. Indians in eastern North America did not rape female captives; Europeans did.

With respect to European values, the right to rape females among the enemy is a grey area. An early treatise on the conduct of war, Hugo Grotius's *Law of War and Peace* published in 1625, argued that rape should not be permitted. He noted, however,"you may read in many places that the raping of women in time of war is permissible"(Friedman 1972:41). Brownmiller (1975:35) has argued that such "outlawing of rape in warfare, at least on the books, was an important advance for women, but despite the penalties, and whether or not they were rigorously applied, rape in warfare continued to flourish." She presents (Brownmiller 1975:31-113) a discussion of rape in war which is in part a political statement (on aspects of relations between males and females which she believes to be universal), in part a discussion of the psychology of war and of rape, and in part a discussion of rape in various conflicts throughout history. It is not appropriate to discuss here the considerable strengths and also the notable weaknesses of the first two aspects of her discussion; it is her historical discussion that is important for an assessment of the normality of rape in warfare as waged by Europeans. Although she unfortunately tarnishes a strong case by a sometimes uncritical acceptance of wartime propaganda, her presentation is convincing to even the most sceptical reader that rape has been and remains part of the European tradition of waging war.

Rape does not appear to have been practised by Indian warriors in eastern North America. A large number of persons, both female and male, who had been captured by Indians have testified to the fact that rape was not among the abuses Indians heaped on their captives. Thomas Ridout, captured in 1788 by the Shawnee, commented, "I never once witnessed an indecent or improper action among any of the Indians, whether young or old" (Ridout 1928:303). James Axtell surveyed over 100 captivity accounts and felt there was not the "least exception" to the generalization that Indians in the east did not sexually assault their female captives (Axtell 1981:181). Axtell is an ethnohistorian who could be accused of too much sympathy for the Indians,

but another commentator on captivity narratives, Frederick Drimmer, bears different credentials. He is a popular historian of the "gleefully [Indians] . . . popped the infants' heads against nearby trees" school. Drimmer (1961:12) notes, "Anyone reading early accounts of captivity among the Indians is struck by the fact that female prisoners do not appear to have been abused by the Indians in the eastern section of the country."

Brownmiller disagrees, stating "the rape of white women by Indians was a casual by-product of the move westward" (Brownmiller 1975:140). She appears to assume that the universal assertion of female captives taken in the 17th and 18th centuries that they had not been raped is proof that they must have been. While it may be correct that these women would have reason to deny such violations of their "purity," as Brownmiller suggests, she does not explain why male captives also asserted that they did not observe females being sexually assaulted. Moreover, Brownmiller appears to equate the marriage of adopted female captives to Indian males with rape. In some cases this might be arguable, but it certainly was not rape but rather marriage in Indian eyes. The case Brownmiller cites, Mary Jemison, is a most curious choice for the point she is trying to make. Jemison was captured in the mid-18th century as a child and lived the rest of her life, by her own choice, as an Indian. She had two Indian husbands, bore nine Indian children, and was watching 39 grandchildren mature when she "took the long path," to use the Iroquois phrase for death. While Brownmiller makes much of female captives becoming wives to Indians, she ignores the fact the male captives, adopted into the tribe, became husbands to Indian women (as in the case of Peter Crouse—see Francello 1980; Abler 1983).

Jaenen (1982:50-51) while not discussing rape *per se*, has discussed French amazement at the "alleged indifference of these peoples [Indians] to sexual activity." One writer attributed it to "an organic imperfection, a sort of infancy of the people of America." Their "impotence . . . reveals clearly how new the continent is." Another attributed "their indifference to sex" to "the non-usage of salt" while a third felt it was "a sign of the feebleness of their constitution."

It is not just the captivity literature which provides convincing evidence that eastern Indians did not rape. William Smith, who wrote a contemporary account of Bouquet's expedition into the Ohio country in 1763, noted "no woman . . . need fear violation of her honour" if captured by Indians (Smith 1765:78). General James Clinton cautioned his army in 1779 not to rape Indian women because "they never violate the chastity of any women their prisoners" (Stone 1838 1:404).

Clinton's orders apparently were not obeyed. An Onondaga chief complained of American actions.

> When they came to the Onandago Town (of which I was one of the principal Chiefs) They put to death all the Women and Children, excepting some of the young Women that they carried away for the use of their Soldiers, and were put to death in a more shameful and Scandalous manner. Yet these Rebels call themselves Christians. (Haldimand Papers, B.M. Add. Ms. 21 779, pp. 109-110)

I know of no clear evidence why Indians in the east did not rape female captives, even in retaliation for White practices. Smith (1951) has pointed out that refraining from sex was part of the ritual observances of the Indian warrior in much of North America, and, while we can not be certain this was true for all Indians in the east, it does seem a possible explanation. Axtell (1975) points to the practice of adopting captives, hence for many members of a war party rape of a captive might be equivalent to incest.

Possibly, in asking why Indians did not rape, one is as guilty of ethnocentrism as was Brownmiller. I am not certain that we should assume it is "natural" to rape without extremely compelling taboos or other cultural mechanisms to prevent such behaviour.[10]

In this paper we have dealt with only a few aspects of warfare in northeastern North America. The record is a bloody one, and it would be possible to go on and on with example after example of behaviour by one side which the other viewed as violation of the conventions of warfare. It is clear that conflicting practices of war can lead to retaliation in kind. Scalping is an example of such retaliation. European traditions of mutilation of enemy dead certainly contributed to their adoption of scalping. It is also clear that the value systems held by the combatants place limits on the degree or manner in which they retaliate. European ideas about cannibalism and Indian ideas about rape prevented retaliation. The failure of such practices to cross cultural boundaries allows each side to view the actions of the other with horror and to classify enemy behaviour as barbaric.

Notes

1. Research for this paper was supported by a grant (410-82-0456R1) from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. Linda Arbuthnot-Moroz and Kimberly Hornburg were employed as research assistants through that grant, providing patient labour helping to survey large quantities of printed primary sources on warfare and human sacrifice in northeastern North America. The paper was originally presented to a conference, "Deviance in a Cross-Cultural Context: An Ethnographic/Interactionist Perspective," Waterloo, Ontario, June 1984. Thanks are due to conference organizers Dorothy Counts and Robert Prus for inviting me to participate. I also thank conference participants for their comments and extend similar thanks to two anonymous reviewers for *Anthropologica*.

2. I recall graffiti observed on a National Army Museum poster in an underground station in London in 1974. "Join the Army; See the world; Meet all sorts of interesting

people; And kill them." Modern recruiting methods, at least in North America, do not make explicit that the function of the military is to extinguish human life.

3. An American practice reported as "relatively common in Viet Nam" may have some time depth. Collection of enemy ears as trophies is reported for that conflict, against the Japanese in World War II (Bryant 1979:302), against the Germans in World War I (Karsten 1978:42) and against the British and Tories during the American Revolution (Bryant 1979:303).
4. The taking of multiple scalps from a single body could also be a technique to defraud bounty payers. Indian allies of the French are said to have taken 32 scalps from 11 dead English soldiers in 1757 (Axtell 1981:222).
5. As, for example, in the American Revolution. Indians scalped in that conflict, but I have seen no evidence in British sources which suggests to me that scalp bounties were paid during that conflict, despite American propaganda that the British were doing this. One can contrast this with open references to scalp bounties in British military papers only 15 years prior to the American Revolution (Bouquet Collection; Gage Papers).
6. Marvin Harris (1985), however, sees battlefield cannibalism as a solution to problems of supply faced by far-ranging war parties.
7. It is important to note that many people captured by Indians were not tortured but rather were incorporated into the Indian community as full and free members (see Hallowell 1963; Axtell 1975). However, at least some of these captives may have led a life close to that of slave (see Starna and Watkins 1991). The English, of course enslaved many Indian captives (Jacobs 1969:97) while the French sent Iroquois prisoners to serve in the Mediterranean galleys of their "Sun King" (Eccles 1960, 1969; Leclerc 1961).
8. While torture of females was not unknown, sources suggest the torture-sacrifice victim was almost always a male.
9. Jennings (1975:146-170) discusses some of the issues raised here. However, while he may be correct that "about midway through the seventeenth century . . . European attitudes toward mutilation of the human body began to turn negative" (Jennings 1975:163), it is clear from sources cited here that public torture and display of mutilated human remains was a feature of European culture for most or all of the 18th century. Torture, while no longer public, remains a feature of some representatives of Euro-American civilizations today (see Peters 1985).
10. Students studying the question of rape cross-culturally have reached differing conclusions as to whether or not rape is universal (see Minturn, Grosse and Haider 1969; Sanday 1981; Palmer 1989). These studies fail to distinguish between the rape of a female in the rapist's own community and the rape of outsiders.

References Cited

Abler, Thomas S.

1980 Iroquois Cannibalism: Fact not Fiction. Ethnohistory 27:309-316.

1983 Review of Joseph A. Francello, The Seneca World of Ga-no-say-yeh (Peter Crouse, White Captive). American Indian Quarterly 7(4):68-70.

1989 Chainbreaker: The Revolutionary War Memoirs of Governor Blacksnake. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Abler, Thomas S., and Michel H. Logan

1988 The Florescence and Demise of Iroquoian Cannibalism: Human Sacrifice and Malinowski's Hypothesis. Man in the Northeast 35:1-26.

Axtell, James
1975 The White Indians of Colonial America. William and Mary Quarterly (3rd series) 32:55-88.
1981 The European and the Indian: Essays in Ethnohistory of Colonial North America. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Axtell, James, and William Sturtevant
1980 The Unkindest Cut, or Who Invented Scalping? William and Mary Quarterly (3rd series) 37:451-472.
Beauchamp, William M.
1904 A History of the New York Iroquois Now Commonly Called the Six Nations. New York State Museum Bulletin No. 78.
Biggar, H.P., ed.
1925 The Works of Samuel De Champlain. Vol. 2. Toronto: The Champlain Society.
Boucher, Pierre
1883 Canada in the Seventeenth Century. Montreal: G.E. Desbarats.
Bouquet Collection
British Library, London (B.M. Add. Mss. 21 631-21 660). Microfilm in Public Archives, Ottawa.
Brownmiller, Susan.
1975 Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape. New York: Simon and Schuster.
Bryant, Clifton D.
1979 Khaki-Collar Crime: Deviant Behavior in the Military Context. New York: Free Press.
Brymner, Douglas, ed.
1890 Before and After the Battle of Edge Hill. Report of the Canadian Archives 1889:59-71.
Drimmer, Frederick, ed.
1961 Scalps and Tomahawks: Narratives of Indian Captivity. New York: Coward-McCann.
Eccles, W.J.
1960 Denonville et les galériens iroquois. Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française 14:408-429.
1969 Brisay de Denonville, Jacques-René de. Dictionary of Canadian Biography 2:98-105.
Eddy, Paul, Magnus Linklater and Peter Gillman
1982 The Falklands War. London: Sphere Books.
Ewers, John C.
1958 The Blackfeet: Raiders on the Northwestern Plains. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
Foucault, Michel
1977 Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Translated by Alan Sheridan. London: Allan Lane.

Francello, Joseph A.
1980 The Seneca World of Ga-no-say-yeh (Peter Crouse, White Captive). Washington: University Press of America.

Friederici, George
1907 Scalping in America. Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution . . . for the Year Ending June 30, 1906, pp. 423-438.

Friedman, Leon
1972 The Law of War: A Documentary History. New York: Random House.

Gage Papers (A.S.)
William L. Clements Library. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

Haldimand Papers
British Library, London (B.M. Add. Mss. 21 661-21 892). Microfilm in Dana Porter Arts Library, University of Waterloo.

Hallowell A. Irving
1963 American Indians, White and Black: The Phenomenon of Transculturation. Current Anthropology 4:519-531.

Harris, Marvin
1985 Good to Eat: Riddles of Food and Culture. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Henry, Alexander
1971 Attack at Michilimackinac: Alexander Henry's Travels and Adventures in Canada and the Indian Territories between the Years 1760 and 1764. Edited by David A. Armour. Mackinac Island: Mackinac Island State Park Commission.

Hulton, Paul
1977 The Work of Jacques le Moyne de Morgues: A Huguenot Artist in France, Florida and England. London: Trustees for the British Museum.

Jacobs, Wilbur R.
1969 British-Colonial Attitudes and Policies toward the Indian in the American Colonies. *In* Attitudes of Colonial Powers toward the American Indian, edited by Howard Peckham and Charles Gibson, pp. 81-106. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Jaenen, Cornelius
1982 "Les Sauvages Ameriquains": Persistence into the 18th Century of Traditional French Concepts and Constructs for Comprehending Amerindians. Ethnohistory 29:43-56.

Jennings, Francis
1975 The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest. New York: Norton.

Karsten, Peter
1978 Law, Soldiers, and Combat. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Knowles, Nathaniel
1940 The Torture of Captives by the Indians of Eastern North America. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 82:15 1-225.
Langbein, John H.
1977 Torture and the Law of Proof. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Lasswell, Harold D.
1972 Propaganda Technique in the World War. New York: Knopf.
Leclerc, Jean
1961 Denonville et ses captifs iroquois. Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française 14:545-558.
Lord, Walter
1982 The Miracle of Dunkirk. New York: Viking.
Manchester, William Raymond
1983 The Last Lion, William Spencer Churchill: Visions of Glory. Boston: Little, Brown.
Mather, Cotton
1697 Humiliations Follow'd with Deliverances. Boston: B. Green and J. Allen. Reprint: Early American Imprints No. 39325.
Minturn, Leigh, Martin Grosse and Santoah Haider
1969 Cultural Patterning of Sexual Beliefs and Behavior. Ethnology 8:301-318.
Nadeau, Gabriel
1941 Indian Scalping. Bulletin of the History of Medicine 10:178-194.
Palmer, Craig
1989 Is Rape a Cultural Universal? A Re-examination of the Ethnographic Data. Ethnology 28:1-16.
Parker, Geoffrey
1988 The Military Revolution: Military Innovation and the Rise of the West, 1500-1800. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Peters, Edward
1985 Torture. New York: Blackwell.
Rands, Robert L., and Carroll L. Riley
1958 Diffusion and Discontinuous Distribution. American Anthropologist 60:274-297.
Read, James M.
1941 Atrocity Propaganda 1914-1919. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Richter, Daniel K.
1983 War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience. William and Mary Quarterly (3rd series) 40:528-559.
Ridout, Thomas
1928 An Account of My Capture by the Shawanese Indians. Blackwood's Magazine 223:289-314.
Roberts, Michael
1967 Essays in Swedish History. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Sanday, Peggy Reeves
1981 The Socio-Cultural Context of Rape: A Cross-Cultural Study. Journal of Social Issues 37(4):5-27.
Smith, Marian
1951 American Indian Warfare. New York: Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences (2nd series) 13:348-365.
Smith, William
1765 Historical Account of Colonel Bouquet's Expedition against the Ohio Indians, in 1764. Philadelphia: William Bradford.
Starna, William A., and Ralph Watkins
1991 Northern Iroquois Slavery. Ethnohistory 38:34-57.
Stone, William L.
1838 Life of Joseph Brant—Thayendanegea, Including the Indian Wars of the American Revolution. New York: Blake. Reprint: New York: Kraus Reprint, 1969.
Toland, John
1970 The Rising Sun: The Decline and Fall of the Japanese Empire. New York: Random House.
Tooker, Elisabeth
1964 An Ethnography of the Huron Indians, 1615-1649. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin No. 190.
Trigger, Bruce G.
1976 The Children of Aataentsic: A History of the Huron People to 1660. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
Wallace, Anthony F.C.
1970 The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca. New York: Knopf.
Washburn, Wilcomb E.
1978 Seventeenth-Century Indian Wars. *In* Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 15: Northeast, edited by Bruce Trigger, pp. 89-100. Washington: Smithsonian.