

WORKING PAPERS OF THE AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION EL DORADO
TASK FORCE SUBMITTED AS A PRELIMINARY REPORT

INTRODUCTION TO THE PRELIMINARY REPORT

The American Anthropological Association El Dorado Task Force is charged by the Executive Board of the AAA to inquire into the allegations about anthropologists and others made by Patrick Tierney in his book *Darkness in El Dorado* (2000). The present set of working papers is a revised version of the preliminary report posted November 19, 2001 for discussion at the Business Meeting November 30, 2001. These working papers are preliminary, and are posted at this time because the charge to the Task Force requires a preliminary report. A number of sections that the Task Force plans to include in the final report are not yet posted, because work on them continues. This posting includes a few sections that were not posted in late November prior to the Annual Meeting. We invite comments on the materials posted here; comments can be addressed to individual members of the Task Force who are listed as having primary responsibility for the individual sections, or to the Chair of the Task Force, Jane H. Hill (jhill@u.arizona.edu), who will share comments with other Task Force members. For those who prefer to address primary researchers of each section, the e-mail addresses are as follows:

Janet Chernela (chernela@fiu.edu)

Fernando Coronil (coronil@umich.edu)

Ray Hames (rhames@unl.edu)

Trudy Turner (trudy@uwm.edu)

Joe Watkins (jwatkins@telepath.com)

The reasons for posting preliminary sections rather than drafts of the entire report are that, first, our work is guided by the basic principle that anthropological engagement must be conducted in dialogue and collaboration with the people thus engaged, and that such people should be regarded as fully autonomous participants in the development of research in their communities. Representatives of the Task Force met with representatives of the Yanomami in Venezuela November 16-21; there has not yet been time to fully incorporate the results of their discussions there. Second, Venezuelan colleagues have undertaken some archival research for the Task Force that is not yet completed, and that will include materials from Venezuela not available in the United States. We wish to give full attention to these materials before submitting a final report. Third, we have not had sufficient time to discuss among ourselves all of the materials that we have been reviewing; the present preliminary report has had only one preliminary editorial pass through the entire Task Force membership. Some editing was done after the representatives to the meeting with the Yanomami, Janet Chernela and Fernando Coronil, had already left for Venezuela in late November. In order to clearly reflect the role of each member of the Task Force at this stage, we are posting this Preliminary Report as a set of working papers, with each section headed with a list of those who claim research and/or editorial responsibility at this stage of our work.

Our final report will be presented to the AAA Executive Board at its Spring meeting and will be distributed to members once it is accepted by the Board. The present preliminary report will review materials that we are prepared to discuss at this time. These materials will, we hope, give a general idea of the tone and tenor of our discussions and the general direction we are going. In the final report, new materials will be added and there may be some revisions in the language of this preliminary report.

EDITORIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR PREAMBLE: ENTIRE TASK FORCE

PREAMBLE: The Executive Board of the American Anthropological Association established the El Dorado Task Force to conduct what the Board termed an “inquiry” on the allegations about anthropological practice among the Yanomami contained in *Darkness in El Dorado*, by Patrick Tierney. Such an “inquiry” is unprecedented in the history of the Association, so that the Task Force began by exploring exactly what an “inquiry” might be. The term implies both investigation – the determination of the truth or falsity of allegations -- and of reflection, of both a moral and a scholarly kind. Where we found that it was possible to make a determination of the truth or falsity of allegations (or of the approximate location of an allegation in the large zone that exists between these two poles) we have done so. This preliminary report includes some examples of such findings, which we approach as case studies. However, we have also undertaken a reflexive exercise, on the implications not simply of some specific moments of anthropological practice

among the Yanomami, but on anthropological practice more generally, and its location in those relatively enduring regimes of knowledge and power which we can refer to in shorthand as the confrontation of Western elites with “others” whose presence requires classification, explanation, and incorporation into the systems of knowledge through which that power is in part constituted. These regimes do more than merely shape anthropological practice; they make it possible. However, at the same time, they make possible the use of anthropology to interrupt these very regimes, to expose their contradictions, and to open within them spaces within which new forms of knowledge can be uttered and new voices can be heard. By locating the work of our Task Force partly in the space of reflection, we hope to accomplish such an interruption. But at the very minimum we hope to inspire a movement in anthropological exchange beyond the relatively narrow zones in which debate over the meaning of *Darkness in El Dorado* has too often been restricted: Beyond a spurious distinction between value-free “science” and value-involved “humanities”, and, especially, beyond individuals and personalities. All anthropological practice is implicated in what went wrong in “El Dorado” – and we believe that things did go wrong. Some of the things that went wrong involved styles of anthropological investigation that are taken for granted or even explicitly advocated by many colleagues. Should the kinds of specific conjunctions of politics and personalities that developed around Yanomami anthropology take shape around other challenging field situations, the AAA may have to commission new task forces. However, we believe that such discussions should not take place only at moments when our discipline is threatened by scandal. Instead, “inquiry into allegations” – on the history of practice in our discipline, on our own practices, and on those of our colleagues -- should be part of the everyday work of all anthropologists. To make such reflection possible, we urge the use, at every level of every anthropological practice, of forms of discourse that will make that practice relatively transparent to ourselves, to those among whom we study, and to those who come after us, so that our own practices, as much, at least, as the lives of our subjects, can be targets of inquiry. We hope to provide here an exemplary framework for such reflection, and for how we might use such an evaluation of our past, and our present, to shape our future.

EDITORIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR PART I: ENTIRE TASK FORCE (WITH THE EXCEPTION OF SECTIONS WHERE ANOTHER PRINCIPAL RESPONSIBILITY IS INDICATED)

PART I: BACKGROUND

A. *Darkness in El Dorado*. Before proceeding, we attend briefly to the central place in our inquiry of Patrick Tierney’s *Darkness in El Dorado* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2000). Clearly, Tierney’s book provided the impetus for the Association to set up a Task Force for the unprecedented purpose of inquiry into the conduct of anthropology in a specific field situation over more than 30 years. We regard the work with profound ambivalence, finding the book deeply flawed, but nevertheless highlighting ethical issues that we must confront. However, our task is not to critique the volume. Many reviews of the work have been published (although almost none of these were by scholars who have actually worked among the Yanomami or even among indigenous peoples of the Amazon-Orinoco Basin more broadly; an exception is Arvelo-Jiménez 2001. For other reviews see Geertz 2001, Grandin 2000, Proctor 2000, Sahlins 2000, Tooby 2000, Van Arsdale 2001, to mention only a few). One very detailed critique of the book can be found at the website of the University of California at Santa Barbara (“Preliminary Report”, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara” (<http://www.anth.ucsb.edu/chagnon.html>); see also <http://www.psych.ucsb.edu/research/cep/eldorado>. Extensive discussions of the book can also be found at <http://www.publicanthropology.org>. An exceptionally complete collection of documents regarding the book and debates about it can be found at <http://www.anth.uconn.edu/gradstudents/dhume/Dark/darkness>.

Darkness in El Dorado is the single most complete source on the history of anthropology and other scientific endeavors among the Yanomami. We concur with the findings of the AAA Executive Board and our predecessor ad hoc task force, the “Peacock Task Force” chaired by former president of the Association James Peacock, that the allegations in the book are by no means trivial, that much evidence is presented in the book in support of the allegations, and that they must be taken seriously. *Darkness in El Dorado* has served anthropology well in that, in making these allegations, it has not only inspired us to inquire into its specific claims, but has opened a space for reflection and stocktaking about anthropology more generally, and especially for reflection about our relationships with those among whom we study. But the required reflection goes beyond this specific relationship. The response to the book on the part of

the U.S. anthropological community – which often simply reproduced the highly polemical tone of the book – is itself worthy of our attention, raising questions about the nature of our disciplinary community within the United States and the ways in which we engage with one another's work. Further, we must attend carefully to the responses of colleagues internationally, who have asked why American anthropologists are moved to action by an attack from outside the profession, but not by the collegial inquiry and concerns of our fellow anthropologists in other countries. We are aware that many of the allegations raised by Tierney's book have been raised before by other scholars and journalists, including Brazilian and Venezuelan colleagues. We are thus moved to reflection about our relationships with our colleagues around the world and especially in Venezuela and Brazil. We take *Darkness in El Dorado* seriously and, following suggestions of the Peacock Task Force and the AAA Executive Board, have used it as a framework to guide our inquiry.

B. The El Dorado Task Force: Charge, Membership, Procedures. The AAA El Dorado Task Force was constituted by the Executive Board of the AAA at its meeting of February 3 & 4 2001 (see <http://www.aaanet.org/press/eldoradoupdate.htm>). Louise Lamphere, President of the Association, named 5 members to the Task Force, following the text of the Board motion. These are Jane H. Hill (Chair), Janet Chernela (Chair, AAA Committee for Human Rights and liason to that committee), Fernando Coronil, Trudy Turner, and Joe Watkins (Chair, AAA Committee on Ethics and Liason to that committee). In August 2001 President Lamphere appointed Raymond Hames as a sixth member. The Task Force has had two face-to-face meetings (April 20-21, 2001, October 26-28, 2001) and has also conducted extensive exchange by e-mail and telephone.

Each member of the Task Force has had specific tasks and obligations. All members have made every effort to become thoroughly acquainted with the anthropological literature on the Yanomami in the specific area that they were assigned, consistent with their expertise. In addition to reading in the anthropological literature, we have consulted other materials including newspapers, films, grant proposals, and correspondence. Trudy Turner has conducted research in the James V. Neel Archives at the American Philosophical Society. We have conducted a number of interviews, emphasizing interviews of persons with first-hand knowledge of the Yanomami. As of the preparation of this report, Janet Chernela has conducted formal interviews with Davi Kopenawa Yanomami in Demini Village, Roraima State, Brazil, with Jose Seripino, a representative of the Yanomami from Venezuela, at the Latin American Studies Association meetings in Washington DC, and with Jose Wichato, a Yanomami nurse of Platanal, Upper Orinoco, Venezuela. In addition Dr. Chernela has interviewed leaders of COIAB and CIR, indigenous organizations that represent the Yanomami; and with leaders of CCPY and URIHI, NGOs that bring services to the Yanomami and work on behalf of Yanomami defense. In addition, Fernando Coronil has conducted discussions with Josø Seripino, a representative of the Yanomami from Venezuela, and with many other representatives of the Yanomami during the meetings November 20-23 in Shakita (Upper Bisaasi-Teri), Upper Orinoco, Venezuela. Note that only very preliminary results of these meetings are incorporated in this posting (primarily in Chernela's section entitled "The Yanomami of Venezuela: Human Rights Update" in Part C (1) below. Trudy Turner undertook interviews and correspondence with 16 anthropologists and biologists who have undertaken research that involved the collection of biological samples in indigenous populations. A complete bibliography of materials consulted by the Task Force will be provided in the final report. The bibliography will include mention of consultations where we were asked to keep the consultation in confidence.

In taking *Darkness in El Dorado* as a framework, one of the first tasks for the group was to develop a set of priorities for inquiry. The book includes hundreds of specific allegations. Following the Board resolution, the Task Force grouped the allegations into five major sets, and has focussed on a few instances in each set that seemed most amenable to inquiry. The sets are (1) fieldwork practices of anthropologists, (2) representations and portrayals of the Yanomami that may have had a negative impact (3) efforts to create organizations to represent the interests of Yanomami or efforts to contribute to Yanomami welfare that may have actually undermined their well-being, (4) activities that may have resulted in personal gain to scientists, anthropologists and journalists while contributing harm to the Yanomami, and (5) activities by anthropologists, scientists and journalists that may have contributed to malnutrition, disease, and disorganization. In addition, we have considered allegations relating to medical research and medical emergencies among the Yanomami. In this preliminary report we include a sample of our results. The method of inquiry that we have settled upon is the case study. The format for these studies is as follows. First, we lay out the relevant texts and other information, such as personal communication

information, that we have collected. We lay out what we think happened, and why we think it happened. We then discuss the lessons that the case holds for anthropological practice and the training of anthropologists.

EDITORIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR PART C: MAJOR RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS BY JANET CHERNELA AND RAY HAMES, WITH SUPPLEMENTARY EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY THE OTHER TASK FORCE MEMBERS

C. The Yanomami. The Yanomami Indians are located in the *municipio* (county) of Alto Orinoco, Amazonas, in southern Venezuela, and also in north-central Brazil in the states of Roraima and Amazonas. “Yanomami” is the usual representation of the name of the tribe in Venezuela and in Brazil. There are at least five major subgroups of the Yanomami (Yanomamö, Yanomam, Ninam, Sanumá, and Aica; see Map). There are also various regional communities within the linguistic groups. The Yanomami are semi-sedentary forest dwellers, inhabiting communal longhouses, known as *shabonos*, ranging in number of inhabitants from 30 to 350. Shabonos are in turn linked by kinship, alliance, and proximity.

The population of the entire group is uncertain; recent estimates range up to 27,000. The Venezuelan population in 1992 was reported as 15,193 in 150 villages (@-venezuela web site). The Brazilian population is approximately 11,000. There is a good deal of movement by Yanomami back and forth across the international boundary.

The Yanomami practice a number of low-impact subsistence activities, including hunting, gathering, and small-scale cultivation, mainly of plantains and root crops. About 70-75% of protein is acquired by hunting, fishing, and collection. In Brazil, recent policy is that bases occupied by health care workers and employees of FUNAI (*Fundação Nacional do Índio*) do not distribute food to the Yanomami. Hunting is still a primary source of meat for those Yanomami who do not live in areas that have been destroyed by goldmining. Because Yanomami resource use is extensive, rather than intensive, the natural regeneration dynamics of the forest is unimpeded, although there is much evidence that the Yanomami landscape is as “anthropogenic” as any other in the tropics (Smole 1976). The dramatic exceptions are the areas in Brazil that have been devastated by goldmining operations.

The Yanomami of Venezuela have had a long history of direct and indirect contact by outsiders (although they have been less strongly affected by outsiders, especially in recent years, than the Brazilian Yanomami). The first reports we have of the Yanomami come from the Bobadilla expedition of 1789 (de Civrieux 1970). Brief descriptions of the Yanomami by later explorers are found in Schomburgk (1840), von Humboldt (1967[1859]), Koch Grünberg (1965 [1917] and Rice (1921). Smole (1976) argues that the Yanomami were probably directly and indirectly affected by slaving and rubber tapping incursions beginning in the late 1800s and early 1900s which decimated many of the riverine dwelling native peoples along the upper Orinoco and its major affluents. There is evidence to suggest that the Yanomami were able to avoid some of this catastrophic contact because they were remote interfluvial dwellers at the time. Ethnohistorical data suggests (Chagnon, 1997) that the Yanomamö have been expanding into the riverine vacuum created by initial contact over the last eighty to ninety years. There was some short-term rubber tapping in the area in the 1930s. Sustained contact by outsiders probably began in the 1950s with James Barker’s entry into various places such as Ocamo, Platanal and Mavaca on the upper Orinoco. Barker was a New Tribes Missions linguist whose goal was to learn the Yanomami language, translate the Bible into the Yanomami language, and to assist in the creation of a string of New Tribes missions in the area. Soon after Baker arrived, the Catholic Salesian Order of missionaries arrived in the area and began to compete for Yanomami souls with the New Tribes Missions, often setting up their missions on the opposite side of the river where New Tribes missions were located. In the 1950s Otto Zerries (1955, 1964) was the first ethnographer to work among the Yanomamö (it should be noted however, that James Barker published scholarly ethnographic accounts of the Yanomamö in major Venezuelan anthropological journals, e.g., Barker, 1953). In the 1960s a sustained era of ethnographic research was initiated by Napoleon Chagnon and Jacques Lizot.

Sporadic government presence in the area began in the late 1950s when malaria health services workers began to visit Yanomamö villages along the upper Orinoco. Government presence became more sustained following growth of missionary work in the 1960s, leading to permanent installations along the upper Orinoco (at Tamatama, La Esmeralda, Ocamo, Mavaca, and Platanal and in the Parima highlands). Commercial penetration into the area has been sporadic. In the 1950s and 1960s occasionally petty traders would work their way into the area to trade with the neighboring Ye’kwana and Yanomamö villages

associated with Ye'kwana villages (Arvelo Jiménez, 1971). Very little exchange occurred between the Yanomamö and traders because the Yanomamö had little to offer. Today, commerce between outsiders is largely restricted to major mission and governmental sites and it is effectively regulated by *Guardia Nacional* units at La Esmeralda and elsewhere.

The current legal status of the Venezuelan Yanomami is as follows. In 1991, following upon recommendations made by an international conference on the Yanomami held in Caracas in 1990, President Carlos Andres Pérez issued a decree (No. 1635) establishing the Reservo de Biosfera Yanomami/Parque Nacional Parima-Tapirapeco (PNPT). The Reservo de Biosfera is established under a UNESCO program for biosphere preserves and, at over 30,000 square miles, is slightly larger than the PNPT. The PNPT encompasses all of the lands used by the Yanomami during recent history (J. Cardozo, personal communication, 5-25-01). No more than 30-40 non-Yanomami live in the region (J. Cardozo, personal communication, 5-25-01). Within the PNPT the Yanomami possess *derecho de usufructo en perpetuidad* 'use rights in perpetuity'. They are the only indigenous group in Venezuela that has this level of land rights and land protection. However, they do not hold title to the land. They cannot dispose of it, nor can they sell the land or rights in it (such as mineral or timber concessions). Furthermore, their rights to development within the PNPT are constrained: they cannot use technologies or methods of exploitation (such as new types of fish poison or dynamite) that are not part of their customary techniques of exploitation as determined by the government at the time of the establishment of the PNPT. The use of firearms is apparently permitted. Arvelo Jiménez and Cousins (1992) suggest that there are many problems with the level of land protection afforded by the RBY/PNPT. In addition to the National Park and Biosphere Reserve and the State governments, the *municipio* of Alto Orinoco is designated as an indigenous *municipio* with representatives from Ye'kwana and Yanomami. The current *alcalde* is Jaime Turon, who is Ye'kwana.

Since the first announcement of the publication of *Darkness in El Dorado*, the Venezuelan government has closed the RBY/PNPT to all but official government visitors (November 17, 2000, "Statement by the Office of Indigenous Affairs of Venezuela (DAI) Concerning the Allegations of the Book *Darkness in El Dorado*", 99th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, November 17, 2001).

In addition to their rights as users in perpetuity of the RBY/PNPT, the Yanomami have the status of *indígenas* under Title II, Chapter VIII, articles 119-126 of the Venezuelan Constitution of 1999 (revised and corrected 2000). These articles guarantee rights to language, culture, religion, social organization, political organization, economic practice, and land adequate to develop and guarantee their forms of life, with the state charged to use resources on indigenous lands without infringement on this guarantee. In addition, as indigenous people they are guaranteed rights to health care that takes into account their specific cultural needs, and to culturally appropriate bilingual education. Under Title II, Chapter VIII, by virtue of birth on Venezuelan soil or having a father or mother born on Venezuelan soil, the Yanomami, like all indigenous people, are full citizens with all of the rights of citizens specified in Title III and other sections of the Venezuelan constitution.

Beyond participation as citizens in all levels of political process, Yanomami representatives participate in organizations of indigenous peoples, including ORPIA (*Organización de Representativos de los Pueblos Indígenas de Amazonas*) and CONIVE (*Consejo Nacional de los Indios de Venezuela*). Many Yanomami are also organized through a trade and marketing cooperative, SUYAO (*Shaponos Unidos Yanomami de Alto Orinoco*), initially established with support from the Salesian Mission but now fully independent and run by Yanomami, who may solicit advice from the missionaries. A number of Yanomami have settled at the mission stations, where health care and education is available. There is now a small cadre of Yanomami who are literate and who even have advanced training in fields such as nursing. Some Yanomami are active in local and state-level politics beyond the indigenous organizations specifically.

In spite of constitutional guarantees in support of the well-being of the Yanomami, serious problems remain (see, for instance, Colchester and Watson 1995; U. S. Department of State, Venezuela Country Report on Human Rights Practices for 1998). Pursuant to a judgement of the Interamerican Court in 1996 that Venezuela failed to protect its Yanomami citizens against incursions from Brazil that led to the murder of at least 16 Yanomami at Haximu (Hashimo-teri, in Chagnon's spelling) on August 15, 1993, the Venezuelan government has agreed to provide health care to the Yanomami by funding new health posts in isolated regions, with the goal of providing access to basic health care to 80% of the Yanomami population. This plan is still under discussion and has not been implemented (J. Cardozo personal communication 5-25-

01). Yanomami who live near the international border often cross into Brazil to seek health care at clinics there run by NGO's discussed below. Adequate access to health care is clearly a major concern for the Yanomami (Chernela, interviews with Davi Kopenawa and Jose Seripino; see also Chernela's Human Rights Update below). We note that the Venezuelan Constitution now specifies health as "a fundamental social right and obligation of the State, which will guarantee it as a part of the right to life." (Title III, Chapter V, Article 83).

The approximately 11,000 Yanomami in Brazil live primarily in indigenous zones administered by FUNAI (*Fundaçao Nacional do Indio*), primarily in the *Terra Indigena Yanomami* in the states of Roraima and Amazonas. This territory, established in 1992 by the federal government of Brazil, comprises 9,664,975 ha, guaranteed in usufruct to the Yanomami. Under the Brazilian Constitution of 1988, revised in 1999, Indians are full citizens by virtue of birth on Brazilian soil or by virtue of having either a father or mother born in Brazil. Indians have certain special constitutional rights: They are permitted to use indigenous languages in public education (Title VIII, Chapter III, Section I, Article 210, Paragraph 2). The state is assigned special responsibility for protecting indigenous cultural expression (Title VIII, Chapter III, Section II, Article 215. Title VIII, Chapter VIII, *Dos Indios*, is devoted particularly to indigenous land rights; Indians are granted "originary rights" over their traditional territories, to which they have exclusive usufruct. At present, only the National Congress can authorize hydroelectric projects or mining on these territories. A special provision permits the removal of Indians from their territories, by act of the National Congress, in an emergency (the only case mentioned is that of epidemic), with immediate return guaranteed once the period of risk is over.

The zone inhabited by the Brazilian Yanomami is of strategic and geographic import, and the legitimacy of the demarcation of Yanomami lands specified in 1992 continues to be challenged by powerful interests including representatives in the state and federal governments. Yanomami territory is the site of the water divide between two major river systems, the Orinoco system to the north in Venezuela and the Rio Branco system to the southeast in Brazil. The area was relatively isolated until invasions in the 1980's by gold miners, which continue today.

From 1910 until 1970 contact between the Yanomami and national Brazilian society was intermittent or small-scale. However, a number of permanent posts were established in the region beginning in 1940 by mission orders and the *Serviço de Proteção aos Indios* (SPI), now known as FUNAI. As foci of manufactured goods and health care, these permanent centers served to stimulate processes of sedentarization among formerly nomadic peoples.

Large government projects reached the Brazilian Yanomami in 1971 (Ramos 1995) when the Plano de Integração Nacional (PIN) was instituted to integrate the northern frontiers into the ambit of commerce and modernity that characterized the Brazilian south. One component of this program was the Perimetral Norte (northern perimeter roadway), constructed between 1973 and 1976 through the southeastern sector of Yanomami territory. Much of the PN is now abandoned. However, some remnants continue in use and constitute a principal entry way into the Yanomami area for ranchers and other invaders. By 1981 colonization projects brought into the region settlers, sawmills, and goldminers. In addition to demographic losses due to diseases, the invasions brought social disintegration and environmental destruction. Colonization projects constitute an expanding frontier that, unless curbed, threatens the integrity of Yanomami society and territory (see Saffirio and Hames (1983) and Chernela (1988) on the impact of the northern perimeter roadway).

In the latter part of the 1970's newly available public satellite imagery called the attention of mining interests to the Parima Range. Within a few years, prospecting rights and mineral concessions covering every portion of Yanomami territory were officially registered with the national Mineral Production Department (DNPM). Until the present time, active mining and exploration has been blocked by regulations prohibiting mining in indigenous areas – although recently-proposed legislation threatens to remove these legislative obstacles. Small-scale "wildcat" mining, however, was well underway by the mid-1980's. The progressive invasion of wildcat prospectors, the *garimpeiros*, was disastrous. In 1985 President Sarney, responding to pressure from the mining lobby, issued decrees reducing the area of demarcated Yanomami territory. By 1987 a notorious "gold rush" was underway, with approximately 40,000 wildcat miners estimated to have entered Yanomami territory between 1987 and 1992. This is four times the population of Yanomami. The invasion brought violence, disease, social chaos, deforestation, and the pollution of land and water. Miners served as dispersal agents of contagious diseases such as measles, influenza, whooping cough, and venereal disease. Morbidity and mortality rates soared among the Yanomami.

Miners were concentrated in the riparian forests of the affluents of the Rio Branco. They entered the area by means of clandestine airstrips or along the water courses. With the demarcation and registration (*homologação*) of Yanomami lands in 1992, prospectors were removed by federal forces. Over one hundred clandestine airstrips created by miners in the Yanomami area were destroyed. Yet many prospectors remained. Among them were those on the upper reaches of the Rio Mucajai near the Venezuelan border in the vicinity of Haximu. In 1993, after the official removal of miners from the area, remaining illegal miners massacred seventeen Yanomami from Haximu, including children. Survivors of the massacre at Haximu fled in several directions, with a number finding refuge with relatives in the nearby villages of Totoobi and Homoxi. Two miners were found guilty on charges of genocide and sentenced accordingly. This judgement was challenged in July 2000 but was sustained in September 2000. Haximu is in Venezuela, and the Venezuelan government sent investigating commissions to the area. Venezuelan Yanomami accused the Venezuelan government in the Interamerican Court of failure to defend them against border incursions (the Venezuelan government has one small army post in the Parima region). The court ruled against Venezuela, and the Venezuelan government has been ordered by the court to compensate the Yanomami. The form of compensation is a plan for improved health care in the region (see above), that has yet to be implemented.

In spite of laws to the contrary, miners still carry out clandestine activities on Yanomami lands in Brazil. FUNAI openly recognizes the ongoing illegal presence of miners (personal communication to Chernela, July 2001), but is constrained by resource limitations. Miners therefore remain with impunity in the most remote regions.

Military bases provide additional problems. Although conscription among the Yanomami has stopped, complaints of sexual abuse near military facilities continue. More military bases are planned by the government but are opposed by the Yanomami, the CIR (*Conselho Indígena de Roraima*, an indigenous organization representing the Yanomami of Roraima), and advocates of indigenous rights.

Several NGOs, based in Boa Vista, carry out health and educational projects in the Brazilian Yanomami territory. In Venezuela medical care is available only at mission posts, so many border-region Venezuelan Yanomami cross the border for health care.

CCPY (*Comissão Pro-Yanomami*, originally “Committee for the Creation of the Yanomami Park”), an NGO formed in defense of Yanomami land rights in the 1980’s, now carries out an educational project for bilingual literacy. It reports 91 literate Yanomami. CCPY develops pedagogical booklets or readers, written by Yanomami and edited and selected by anthropologists and pedagogues. The content of the readers is thus closely related to Yanomami knowledge and concerns, in contrast to the conventional materials used in state education programs.¹

URIHI, based on a Yanomami term glossed as “forest”, is an NGO that emerged from CCPY. The two have overlapping boards of directors that include the anthropologists Bruce Albert and Alcida Ramos. URIHI works with the Brazilian government to bring health care to the Yanomami. In April 2001 they held the first conference on Yanomami health in Boa Vista. Since URIHI began working among the Yanomami, infant mortality has dropped dramatically and malaria has been brought under control in a number of areas. However, problems of tuberculosis and other upper respiratory infections continue. Moreover, 100% of all Brazilian Yanomami tested positive for onchocerciasis (African River Blindness), and are undergoing regular treatments.

The work of these two NGOs is exemplary and should be considered as a model for what might be accomplished in Venezuela.

(In addition to references cited above, see also Chernela 1988, 2000, 2001).

C(1) Human Rights Issues Concerning the Yanomami in 2002. Editorial Responsibility: Janet Chernela (chernela@fiu.edu) (This two-part report also appears on the web site of the AAA Committee for Human Rights)

The Yanomami of Brazil: Human Rights Update

Janet Chernela, Chair

Committee for Human Rights

American Anthropological Association

LAND RIGHTS

The Yanomami Territory, created by the Brazilian state in 1992, is under a number of threats.

1. Since 1994 the agency charged with indigenous affairs in Brazil, known by the acronym FUNAI, has presented numerous claims of land invasion on behalf of the Yanomami in regional federal courts. Among these include approximately ten that demand the removal of colonists practicing ranching or agriculture within the reserve. Recently (June 1 & 2, 2001), 143 Yanomami representatives met in the village Yawaripe to discuss removal of ranchers along the margins of Brazil Road 210, also known as Perimetral Norte. According to reports by the state indigenous association CIR, (Council of Indigenous Peoples of Roraima), Yanomami arrived in war paint and armed with bows and arrows. A "confrontation" was "narrowly avoided," according to these reports, by the timely arrival of FUNAI representative Manuel Reginaldo Tavares. One participating Yanomami, Marino Yanomami, asked this rhetorical question: "Must we present official documentation of our complaints daily [before action is taken]?" The episode illustrates the transition in Yanomami strategies from civil action to performative measures, and evidences failures in the participatory political process, guaranteed to the Yanomami and all other indigenous peoples in the 1988 Brazilian constitution.
2. The Yanomami estimate approximately 2,000 wildcat gold prospectors illegally operating within their territories. FUNAI is aware of this, and, in media interviews, acknowledges the presence of "between 400 and 1000 illegal miners operating within Yanomami territories." These intruders have long been recognized as sources of disease and social destruction. In October of 2000, the deaths of four Yanomami and one miner were linked to clashes with miners. In response to that tragedy a petition to then-FUNAI President Glenio da Costa Alvares, and signed by 78 Yanomami, demanded the immediate removal of miners. FUNAI proposed a "Permanent Monitoring Plan" (Plano de Vigilância Permanente); this plan received the backing of CCPY (*Comissao Pro-Yanomami*), an advocacy NGO that has worked with the Yanomami for 25 years. Yanomami spokespersons to the media recalled the massacre of Haximu of 1993 and the importance of avoiding such disasters. Although FUNAI is the federal agency responsible for removal of these trespassers, to do so it requires resources from the federal government, as well as participation of the Minister of Justice and federal law enforcement agents (Policia Federal).
3. A strong mining lobby would pass legislation allowing for mining in indigenous territories; the Yanomami lands in the states of Roraima and Amazonas would be among those most affected. A powerful legislative proposal (Projeto Ley 1610/96), introduced by Senator Romero Juca of the state of Roraima where the majority of Yanomami lands are located, is still under consideration. It has been approved by the Senate and received amendments in the House of Representatives. It must receive further approvals, including the Commission of the Environment and Minorities; if approved in these it would pass to the Commission of Constitutional Justice and then to the Congress.
4. Three military bases now exist inside the reserve, and others are planned. The Yanomami have formally registered, through FUNAI, the governmental body in charge of indian affairs, sexual abuses by army recruits against Yanomami women at Surucucu, a large military base with several resident shabonos. The United Nations has stipulated that national security does not justify a failure by states to guarantee the rights of indigenous peoples.
5. The position of the military regarding the reserve is ambiguous. In March of 2001, the Minister of Defense, Geraldo Quintao, called the demarcation of the reserve a "mistake." Although this was quickly corrected, much of the Yanomami reserve falls within the zone "Calha Norte," a strip that includes all lands 60 kms from the northern borders of Brazil; these lands are under military and national security jurisdiction.
6. A number of "conservation areas" exist inside the reserve. By law, units of conservation are under the protection of the national environmental agency, IBAMA, not the national bureau of Indian affairs, FUNAI. This, and the relaxed definition of one type of reserve (the FLONA, or National Forest), which allows for economic activities of all kinds, could threaten the integrity of the reserve. It is of concern, for example, that among the most vociferous supporters of the National Forest are lumber interests. Moreover, a National Park that also overlaps with the Yanomami reserve, carries with it the greatest amount of activity restrictions.
December, 2001.

The Yanomami of Venezuela: Human Rights Update

1. This list of concerns is based upon interviews with Yanomami and with representatives of the Venezuelan government in attendance at the National Conference of Yanomami, held in the Yanomami village Shakita (Bisaasi-teri), Upper Rio Orinoco, November 20-23, 2001. The concerns refer to wording

from the 1999 Venezuelan Constitution and this National Conference of Yanomami. The meeting was attended by 300-500 Yanomami (depending upon reporters' estimates and the fluidity in attendance) with 25 representatives from the Ministries of Health, Education, Environment, Indigenous Affairs (part of Educational Ministry), as well as high-ranking members of the legislature, the National Guard and the Army.

2. INDIGENOUS RIGHTS AND THE NEW CONSTITUTION

In terms of indigenous rights, the new Venezuelan constitution, adopted in 1999 and revised and corrected in 2000, may be regarded as a model. It recognizes the Venezuelan state as having a pluralism of ethnicities and polities. According to Tit. III, Art 21, "All people are equal under the law" (this differs from constitutions elsewhere in Latin America). It guarantees the inalienable rights of indigenous peoples to their lands, their lifeways, self-governance, and political participation in every phase of civil life. It considers health to be a fundamental social right of all citizens, and the obligation of the government to provide it. Suffrage is a right of all peoples, and is not contradictory to indigenous identity or communal land rights.

3. HEALTH CONDITIONS AND SERVICES

According to the constitution, health is a "fundamental social right; an obligation by the state to guarantee health as part of the right to life. All people have the right to health care and sanitation" (Tit. 3, Art 83). However, medical attention in the Yanomami area is minimal. Mortality figures for Yanomami in Venezuela are far higher than those for Yanomami in Brazil. There are fewer than ten health posts for a 30,000 square mile area in which Yanomami communities are dispersed. The health posts are understaffed with poorly trained personnel and high turnover; few health workers speak Yanomami. Venezuelan Yanomami near the Brazilian border cross it with frequency to obtain health care. This is a source of concern to the Venezuelan government.

4. POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

The Yanomami are guaranteed the right to vote by the constitution. However, in order to vote, a citizen must have an official identity card. Most Yanomami do not. The notable exception to this generality are the Yanomami who are allies of the mayor. In the absence of a neutral mechanism to register the Yanomami as citizens, the process of registration is in the hands of politicians whose interests it is to provide identification to supporters. Although Yanomami representatives and advocates petitioned DIEX (Dirección de Identificación de Extranjería) to provide itinerant boats with registration capabilities, the petition was rejected.

5. LAND TENURE

All indigenous peoples are guaranteed the right to demarcate their lands by September of 2002. The process of demarcation requires mapping of resident areas, use areas, ancestral areas, sacred areas, etc. It also requires a complete census of peoples claiming the identity "Yanomami." Neither mapping nor census activities have begun. The Biosphere Reserve of the Upper Orinoco is inhabited by indigenous groups of several ethnicities. These groups could find themselves in positions of vying for portions of the reserve. The neighboring Ye'kwana (Makiritare), whose numbers are lower than the Yanomami, have begun the demarcation process; it is possible that conflicts could arise.

A National Park, the Parque Nacional Parima-Tapirapoco, was established in 1991. The environmental category "National Park" carries with it the greatest amount of regulation. In Venezuela, for example, even extractive activities such as hunting are regulated. The park coincides with the distribution of Yanomami settlements. Human rights advocates of the Yanomami perceive Yanomami land rights as having precedent over environmental regulations. This is not the position of members of the Environmental Ministry who emphasize the prior existence of the park. One possible accommodation, recommended by one interviewee, is a redefinition of a national park, that would recognize the needs of the Yanomami.

December 12, 2001

C(2). Interview with Davi Kopenawa Yanomami. Research and editorial responsibility: Janet Chernela

Interview with Davi Kopenawa

Recorded in Demini, Parima Mountain Range, Brazil, June 7, 2001 by Janet Chernela

This interview was conducted June 7, 2001, in the Yanomami village of Demini, Parima Highlands, Brazil. Arrangements for the interview were made through CCPY, a Brazilian non-governmental organization (NGO) working on behalf of the Yanomami. (Specific personnel of CCPY who provided assistance

included Marcos Wesley de Oliveira, Bruce Albert, Alcida Ramos, and Ari Weidenshadt.) In this I relied on long-term contacts with CCPY and their abilities to reach Davi by radio. Although Davi now lives in Demini, he is from Totoobi, where, as a child of 9 he was vaccinated by the Neel team. In the measles epidemic of 1968 Davi lost his mother and siblings. He and his older sister are the only remaining members of his immediate family. Both recall having supplied blood to the researchers.

I was accompanied in this interview by Ari Weidenshadt of CCPY, who participated actively in the discussion.

Davi understood that he was invited to speak to the AAA membership in this interview and refers to the Association in the course of his talk. I invited Davi to participate in what I called "reciprocal interviewing." Davi only exercised his privilege to question me toward the end of the interview.

Davi was quite familiar with the debate over *Darkness in El Dorado*. Indeed, he had met with Tierney and had shared views on the debate with Bruce Albert and Leda Martins (both participants in the Borofsky Rounds). Leda Martins (2001) cites an interview she conducted with Davi and other Yanomami visitors to a conference in the city of Boa Vista.

The interview was conducted in Portuguese and recorded on audio and video-tape. Paragraphs, titles, and bracketed comments were added. The translation into English is my own. In some cases I included Davi's choice of Portuguese terms so that his intent could be reviewed in the future.

VIDEO:

Janet Interviews Davi:

Davi: An anthropologist entered Yanomami lands in Venezuela. Many people know about this. ...This book told stories about the Yanomami and it spread everywhere. So I remembered it when our friend [unnamed anthropologist] mentioned his name. When that young man spoke the name I remembered. We called him Waru. He was over there in Hasabuiteri... Shamatari...A few people -- Brazilian anthropologists -- are asking me what I think about this.

Anthropologists who enter the Yanomami area -- whether Brazil or Venezuela -- should speak with the people first to establish friendships; speak to the headman to ask for permissions; arrange money for flights. Because nabu (the white) doesn't travel without money. Nabu doesn't travel by land. Only by plane. It's very far. So he's very far away, this anthropologist who worked among the Shamatari. Those people are different.

He arrived, like you, making conversation, taking photos, asking about what he saw. He arrived as a friend, without any fighting. But he had a secret. You can sleep in the shabono (longhouse), take photos, I'm not saying no. It's part of getting to know us.

But, later what happened was this. After one or two months he started to learn our language. Then he started to ask questions, "Where did we come from, who brought us here?" And the Yanomami answered, we are from right here! This is our land! This is where Omam placed us. This is our land. Then the anthropologist wanted to learn our language. I know a little Shamatari, but not much. So, he stayed there in the shabono (longhouse), and he thought it was beautiful. He thanked the headman and he took some things with him.

He brought pans, knives, machetes, axes. And so he arrived ready, ready to trick the Yanomami. This is how the story goes. I was small at the time...[pointing to a boy] like this..about nine. I remember. I remember when people from there came to our shabono (longhouse). They said, "A white man is living there. He speaks our language, [he] brings presents (hammocks)." They said that he was good, he was generous. He paid people in trade when he took photos, when he made interviews, [or] wrote in Portuguese [likely Spanish], English, and Yanomami, and taperecording too. But he didn't say anything to me.

[tape changes here]

An anthropologist should really help, as a friend. He shouldn't deceive. He should defend...defend him when he is sick, and defend the land as well...saying "You should not come here -- the Yanomami are sick." If a Yanomami gets a cold, he can die. But he didn't help with this. The first thing that interested him was our language. So today, we are hearing -- other Yanomami are talking about it -- people from Papiu, Piri, and here. People of Tootobi -- my brothers-in-law -- they also are talking about the American anthropologist who worked in Hasabuiteri.

He wrote a book. When people made a feast and afterward a fight happened, the anthropologist took alot of photos and he also taped it (audio). This is how it began. The anthropologist began to lose his fear -- he became fearless. When he first arrived he was afraid. Then he developed courage. He wanted to show that he was brave. If the Yanomami could beat him, he could beat them. This is what the people in Tootobi

told us. I am here in Watorei, but I am from Tootobi. I am here to help these people. So I knew him. He arrived speaking Yanomami. People thought he was Yanomami. There was also a missionary. He didn't help either. They were friends. That's how it was.

He accompanied the Yanomami in their feasts...taking [the hallucinogen] ebena, and after, at the end of the feast, the Yanomami fought. They beat on one another's chests with a stone, breaking the skin. This anthropologist took photos. And so he saved it, he "kept" the fight. So, after, when the fight was over, and the Yanomami lay down in their hammocks, in pain, the anthropologist recorded it all on paper. He noted it all on paper. He wrote what he saw, he wrote that the Yanomami fought. He thought it was war. This isn't war, no! But he wrote without asking the people in the community. You have to ask first. He should have asked, "Yanomami, why are you fighting? You are fighting, hitting your very brother." He should have helped us to stop fighting. But he didn't. He's no good.

I will explain.

The nabu [whites] think that every type of fighting is war. But there are three kinds of fighting [as follows].

Ha'ati kayu [titles were added later]. The chest fight to relieve anger ("briga de peito para passar raiva"). Let's say your relatives take a woman. So you get angry. The Yanomami talk and form a group to fight against the other group that took the woman. So they make a feast. They call him [the relative that took the woman.] They hold him and use this club [gesturing to indicate a length about a foot long] to hit him on the chest. This club [-striking] is not war. It's struggle ("luta"). So, let's say this guy took my woman. I become his enemy. So I hit him here [pointing to chest]. I want to cause him pain. He can hit me too. This club is not war. It's to get rid of a mess in the community. Then there's the headman. What does the headman do? He says, "OK, you have already fought. Now stop this." So they stop. This fight doesn't kill anyone.

Janet: what is this fight called?

Davi: Ha'ati kayu.

Xeyu. There's another kind of fight. Let's say I have a friend who speaks badly of me. He might say I'm a coward, or he might say I'm no good. So he has to fight my relatives, my family. I have ten brothers. So I can decide whether he's a man, whether he has courage. So we call friends from other shabono (longhouse)s and set a date. We go into the forest and make a small clearing for the fight, so people can see that we are angry. We take this weapon -- it's a long stick -- about 10 ms long. So everyone is there. I'm here, and the enemy is there. Everyone is ready to hit. When I hit the enemy he hits me as well. My brother hits his brother and his brother hits mine back. This is how we fight [two lines with people fighting in pairs].

J: How does it end?

D: When everyone is covered with blood -- heads bloodied, everyone beaten. So the headman says, 'OK, enough. We've already shed blood. So, it's over. This isn't war either, no.

J: What is it called?

D: Xeyu.

J: It's not war. But it includes one group lined up on one side, and another on the other -- yes?

D: Yes. One group of brothers or the members of a shabono in one line and the other brothers in another line.

D: Then there is another kind of fight with a club that's about a meter long -- Genei has one. Everyone gathers and stands in the center of the shabono. The enemy comes over. But again the headman is there. He says, 'you can't hit here, you can't hit here [showing] -- you can only hit here -- in the middle of the head. It doesn't kill anyone.

Yaimu, Noataiyu, Nakayu, Wainakayu, Bulayu. But if you hit in the wrong place, he can die. So, if this happens, a brother will grab an arrow and go after the one who killed his brother. They will both die -- the first with club, the second with arrow. So, what happens? The relatives of the man killed with the club carry the body to the shabono (longhouse). They take it there. They put it in the fire, burn it, gather the ashes and remaining bones and pound them into powder. They put the ash in a calabash bowl. His father, his mother, his brothers, all of his relatives sit there at the edge of the fire, crying. So the warrior thinks. If they have ten warriors, all angry, they are going to avenge the death. So the father may say, "Look, they killed my son with a club, not with arrow."* He can stop the fighting right there and then. Or, he can say, "Now we will kill them with arrows." Then they would get all their relatives and friends from the shabono and nearby communities. They make a large feast, bringing everyone together. We call this Yaimu, Noataiyu, Nakayu, Wainakayu, Bulayu. Then they get beiju [manioc bread]; they offer food to everyone.

Everyone is friends -- the enemies are way over there. Then they leave together. The women stay in the house, and the warriors leave to make war (*os guerreros sai para guerrilhar*). They cover themselves in black paint [using sorva mixed with charcoal]. This is war. This is war: Waihu, Ni'aiyu. Waihu, Ni'aiyu, Niaplayu, Niyu aiyu.

Then, at about nine or ten o'clock at night they start walking. These warriors are going to sleep at about 5 AM. In the forest they make a small lean-to of saplings. The next day they leave again. They are nearing the enemy. After tomorrow they are there. They don't arrive in the open -- they sneak up on the shabono (longhouse). They move in closer about 3 or 4 in the morning. The enemies are sleeping in the shabono (longhouse). The warriors arrive just as the sun is coming up. This is 'fighting with arrows' -- Waihu, Ni'aiyu, Niaplayu, Niyu aiyu. These are war -- war with arrows, to kill. He [the enemy] can be brother, cousin, uncle.

Janet: Is it vengeance?

Davi: It is vengeance.

Davi: So this Chagnon, he was there. He was accompanying. He took photographs, he recorded on tape, and he wrote on paper. He wrote down the day, the time, the name of the shabono (longhouse), the name of the local descent group. He put down these names. But he didn't ask us. So we are angry. He worked. He said that the Yanomami are no good, that the Yanomami are ferocious. So this story, he made this story. He took it to the United States. He had a friend who published it. It was liked. His students thought that he was a courageous man, an honest man, with important experience.

Janet: What is the word for courageous?

Davi: waiteri. He is waiteri because he was there. He is waiteri because he was giving orders. [INT] He ordered the Yanomami to fight among themselves. He paid with pans, machetes, knives, fishhooks.

Janet: Is this the truth or this is what is being said?

Davi: It's the truth.

Janet: He paid directly or indirectly?

Davi: No, he didn't pay directly. Only a small part. The life of the indian that dies is very expensive. But he paid little. He made them fight more to improve his work. The Yanomami didn't know his secret.

Janet: But why did he want to make the Yanomami fight?

Davi: To make his book. To make a story about fighting among the Yanomami. He shouldn't show the fights of the others. The Yanomami did not authorize this. He did it in the United States. He thought it would be important for him. He became famous. He is speaking badly about us. He is saying that the Yanomami are fierce, that they fight alot, that they are no good. That the Yanomami fight over women.

Janet: It is not because of women.

Davi: It's not over women that we go to war.

Janet: It's not over women that one goes to war with arrows?

Davi: It's not over women that we go to war with arrows. It is because of male warriors that kill other male warriors.

Janet: to avenge the death?

Davi: to avenge.

Davi: So now I think that the Yanomami should no longer accept this. The Yanomami should not authorize every and all anthropologist who appears. Because these books already came out in public.

I ask if he has message.

Davi: I don't know the anthropologists of the United States. If they want to help, if ...you whites use the judicial process ..

Janet: Would you like to send a message to the American Anthropology Association?

Davi: I would like to speak to the young generation of anthropologists. Not to the old ones who have already studied and think in the old ways. I want to speak to the anthropologists who love nature, who like indigenous people -- who favor the planet earth and indigenous peoples. This I would like. This is new, clean, thinking. To write a new book that anyone would like, instead of speaking badly about indigenous peoples. There must be born a new anthropologist who is in favor of a new future. And the message I have for him is to work with great care. If a young anthropologist enters here in Brazil or Venezuela, he should work like a friend. Arrive here in the shabono (longhouse). He should say, "I am an anthropologist; I would like to learn your language. After, I would like to teach you." Tell us something of the world of the whites. The world of the whites is not good. It is good, but it is not all good. There are good people and bad people. So, "I am an anthropologist here in the shabono (longhouse), defending your rights and your land, your culture, your language, don't fight among yourselves, don't kill your own relatives."

We already have an enemy among us -- it is disease. This enemy kills indeed. It is disease that kills. We are all enemies of disease. So the anthropologist can bring good messages to the Indian. They can understand what we are doing, we can understand what they are doing. We can throw out ideas to defend the Yanomami, even by helping the Yanomami understand the ways of the whites to protect ourselves. They cannot speak bad of the Yanomami. They can say, "The Yanomami are there in the forest. Let's defend them. Let's not allow invasions. Let's not let them die of disease." But not to use the name of the Indian to gain money. The name of the Indian is more valuable than paper. The soul of the Indian that you capture in your image is more expensive than the camera with which you shoot it. You have to work calmly. You have to work the way nature works. You see how nature works. It rains a little. The rain stops. The world clears. This is how you have to work, you anthropologists of the United States. I never studied anything. But I am a shaman, hekura. So I have a capacity to speak in Yanomami and to speak in Portuguese. But I can't remember all the Portuguese words.

Ari: You have to be clear, this is important.

Davi: To repeat, Chagnon is not a good friend of our relatives. He lived there, but he acted against other relatives. He had a lot of pans. I remember the pans. Our relatives brought them from there. They were big and they were shallow. He bought them in Venezuela. When he arrived [at the village], and called everyone together, he said, [Yanomami]... "That shabono, three or four shabonos," as if it were a ball game. "Whoever is the most courageous will earn more pans. If you kill ten more people I will pay more. If you kill only two, I will pay less." Because the pans came from there. They arrived at Wayufteri, Wayukupteri, and Tootobi. Our relatives came from Wayufteri and said, 'This Chagnon is very good. He gives us a lot of utensils.' He is giving us pans because we fight a lot.

Janet: They killed them and they died?

Davi: Yes. Because they used poison on the point of the arrow. This isn't good. This kills. Children cried; fathers, mothers, cried. Only Chagnon was happy. Because in his book he says we are fierce. We are garbage. The book says this; I saw it. I have the book. He earned a name there, Watupari. It means king vulture -- that eats decaying meat. We use this name for people who give a lot of orders. He smells the Indians and decides where he will land on the earth. He ordered the Yanomami to fight. He never spoke about what he was doing.

Davi: And, the blood. If he had been our friend he would not have helped the doctor of the United States. He would have said, you can go to the Yanomami. The Yanomami don't kill anyone -- only when you order them to. Chagnon brought the doctors there, he interpreted because the Yanomami don't speak English. When the doctor requested something he translated it. So when the doctor wanted to take blood, Chagnon translated it. But he didn't explain the secret. We didn't know either -- no one understood the purpose of giving blood; no one knew what the blood had inside it. ...

After, the missionaries who lived in Tootobi spoke to my uncle, my father-in-law. He said, "Look, this doctor would like to take your blood; will you permit it?" And the Yanomami said, "Yes." He agreed because he would receive pans -- pans, machetes.

Janet: But he didn't explain why?

Davi: The Yanomami was just supposed to give blood and stand around looking. He didn't talk about malaria, flu, tuberculosis, or dysentery. He said nothing about these things. But he took a lot of blood. He even took my blood. With a big bottle like this. He put the needle here [pressing the veins of his inner arm]; put it here, the rubber tube over here. He took a lot! I was about nine or ten. He arrived there in Tootobi with the doctor. Chagnon translated. The missionaries, Protestants, lived there in Tootobi. They camped there. They slept there. And they ordered us to call other relatives: there were three shabono (longhouse)s. They called everyone together. Husband, wife, and children, altogether. They always took the blood of one family together. They took my mother's blood. They took my uncle's blood. My father had already died. And me. And my sister. She remembers it too. It was a bottle -- a big one -- like this. He put a needle in your arm and the blood came out. He paid with matihitu -- machete, fishhooks, knives. The doctor asked him to speak for him. He translated. He would say, "Look, this doctor wants you to allow him to take your blood." And the Yanomami understood and allowed it. The missionaries who lived there hardly helped. They were mimahodi, innocents.

Janet: The law controls this now.

Davi: Nobody can do this anymore. So now we are asking about this blood that was taken from us without explanation, without saying anything, without the results. We want to know the findings. What did they find in the blood -- information regarding disease? What was good? Our relatives whose blood was taken are now dead. My mother is dead; our uncles, our relatives have died. But their blood is in the United

States. But some relatives are still alive. Those survivors are wondering -- 'What have the doctors that are studying our blood found? What do they think? Will they send us a message? Will they ask authorization to study and look at our blood?' I think that Yanomami blood is O positive. Is it useful in their bodies? If that's the case, and our blood is good for their bodies -- then they'll have to pay. If it helped cure a disease over there, then they should compensate us. If they don't want to pay, then they should consider returning our blood. To return our blood for our terahonomi. If he doesn't want to return anything, then lawyers will have to resolve the issue. I am trying to think of a word that whites do...sue. If he doesn't want to pay, then we should sue. If he doesn't want a suit, then he should pay. Whoever wants to use it, can use it. But they'll have to pay. It's not their blood. We're asking for our blood back. If they are going to use our blood then they have to pay us.

Janet: I don't know where it is. It may be in a university.

Davi: The blood of the Yanomami can't stay in the United States. It can't. It's not their blood.

Janet: So this is a request for those who have stored the blood?

Davi: I am speaking to them. You take this recording to them. You should explain this to them. You should ask them, "What do you Nabu think?" In those days no one knew anything. Even I didn't know anything. But now I am wanting to return to the issue. My mother gave blood. Now my mother is dead. Her blood is over there. Whatever is of the dead must be destroyed. Our customs is that when the Yanomami die, we destroy everything. To keep it, in a freezer, is not a good thing. He will get sick. He should return the Yanomami blood; if he doesn't, he [the doctor] and his children will become ill; they will suffer.

Janet: Were there repercussions in the area of medical services after this book came out?

Davi: No. FUNAI used to bring in vaccines. When they stopped the government health agency, FUNASA, took over. Now it's [the NGO] URIHI. They are itinerant and they bring vaccines to all the shabonos. They have ten posts in the region. Each post has an employee.

Janet: Are these services only on the Brazilian side of the border?

Davi: Only in Brazil.

Janet: Is that why Yanomami from Venezuela frequent the URIHI posts?

Davi: Yes. Here we have a chief. The president of Brazil. He is bad. But he is also good. He provides a little money for us to get medicines. He provides airplanes and nurses to bring vaccinations and treatments from Boa Vista all the way here. The Brazilian government is now helping -- somewhat. It's not very much, but it is something. We in Brazil are very concerned about our Venezuelan relatives. Because over there people are dying -- many people -- from malaria, flu.

Ari: I am referring to the epidemic of measles in 1968. I am asking Davi if this began before or after the arrival of Neel and Chagnon.

Davi: I think it began before their arrival. Many were dying. After they took blood, many died. So this missionary went to Manaus, Kitt. He went to Manaus and there his daughter became ill with measles. She picked up measles in Manaus. At first they didn't know it was measles. They took a plane from Manaus to Boa Vista and from there to Totoobi. She arrived sick there, all three -- father, mother and child. Then they realized that it was measles. So they asked us to please stay away from them. He said, "If you get measles you will all die. Please stay far away." They had no vaccine in those days. A Yanomami entered to greet her and he ordered the Yanomami to leave. But he had already caught it. So then the missionary spoke to us all, saying, "Look, you can't come to our house because my daughter is ill with measles. Stay in your house." It didn't accomplish anything. The disease spread. It went to the shabono. Everyone began to get sick, and to die. Three [nearby] shabonos -- each of them with people ill and dying. My uncle was the first to die. Then my mother died. Another sister, uncle, cousin, nephew. Many died. I was very sick but I didn't die. I think Omam protected me to give this testimony. My sister and I remained.

Janet: Your uncle died, your nephew, your mother...

Davi: uncle, nephew, mother, relatives...So, later [when the road opened], we died also. This place was part of Catrimani. When the road [BR 210, Perimetral Norte] was open, there were MANY people here. Most died then of measles. Only a few survived [he recalls the names of the survivors] -- only ten men survived. I was here [working with FUNAI at the time], we brought vaccines for the measles epidemic then. These things happened in our land.

Ari: ...[Inaudible].

Davi: FUNAI didn't take care of us before the road opened.

Janet: What years are we discussing?

Davi: 1976, no 1975.

Ari: The road went from the Wai Wai to the mission at Catrimani.

Davi: They had roads BR 210-215.

Ari: After it was closed the forest reclaimed the road.

Janet: When was it closed?

Davi: After the invasion of the garimpeiros.

Janet: Did the garimpeiros come in this far by road?

Davi: Yes. We would try to stop them. I once got everyone together to go to the road with bows and arrows to block the entrance. I said, this isn't a place for miners. We won't allow it. I said if you want to mine, it had better be far from here, because if you stay here you will die here. Our warriors are angry. So they left. I invented all that so they would leave and they did. So they passed by. There were more than 150 -- more people than we had.

Janet: Is there a word for "guerrilhero" in Yanomami?

Davi: Yes, waiteri.

Janet: Waiteri means warrior.

Ari: ...[inaudible].

Davi: Yes; waiteri is courageous, brave. Those that aren't are horebu.

Janet: And that means..?

Davi: Scared, fearful, weak.

Janet: Do these concepts have power still today?

Davi: No. This fight isn't going on any more. But we are still waiteri. No one controls us. Here, we control ourselves. And there are some warriors. There's one over there in Ananebu. A waiteri is there in Ananebu. In the forest. Here, at home [in THIS shabono (longhouse)], we are all cowards.

Davi Interviews Janet:

Davi: I want to ask you about these American anthropologists. Why are they fighting among themselves? Is it because of this book? Is this book bad? Did one anthropologist like it and another one say it's wrong?

Janet: First, in the culture of anthropologists there is a type of fighting. This fight comes out in the form of publications. One anthropologist says, 'things are like this,' the other one says, 'no, things are like this.' So, after Chagnon's book came out he received many criticisms from other anthropologists. Some said, this should not be called war. Just what you said. But Chagnon provided a definition of war and continued to use that word. This was one of the criticisms made by other anthropologists. After this there were others, and these debates went on in the publications and in conferences. In the year 1994 there was a conference in which anthropologists debated the anthropology of Chagnon and others among the Yanomami. In 1988-89, when there was a struggle over demarcation of Yanomami lands and the Brazilian government favored demarcation in island fragments, the anthropologists of Brazil criticized Chagnon's image of the Yanomami as "fierce," saying it served the interests of the military in limiting Yanomami land rights. At that time the American Anthropological Association did not have explicit ethical guidelines. At that point they formed a committee to develop guidelines for ethical fieldwork and a committee of human rights. Now, with the book by Tierney and the support of anthropologists who have had criticisms of Chagnon, the issue was brought before the Association. This raises questions about the ethical conduct of anthropologists.

Davi: But the anthropologists will resolve this problem?

Janet: They will demand that anthropologists conform to the norms of the newly revised ethics. They will explicitly clarify the obligations of the anthropologists.

Ari: In 1968 when Chagnon worked, there was no code of ethics of the Association.

Davi: What about the taking of blood?

Janet: Performing any experimentation has been controlled by the medical profession since 1971. It is now prohibited to involve people in experiments without their explicit authorization. They must be made completely aware of the advantages and disadvantages, and all purposes. They must decide whether they will agree or disagree to participate. Nowadays, this consent has to be in writing or taped.

Davi: This Yanomami blood is going to stay there? Or will they return the blood?

Janet: I don't know. It must be in a blood bank, perhaps at the University of Michigan.

Ari: Chagnon [once] proposed an exchange between the Universidade Federal of Roraima and the University of California at Santa Barbara. He was proposing a collaboration in human genetics with a graduate student in biology. She worked with DNA. He invited her there. Her name is Sylvana Fortes. She is now doing a doctorate at FIUCRUZ in Rio de Janeiro. Another issue in this dispute is Darwinian evolutionism. Is this the idea of the impact of the environment on man?

Davi: I don't like this, no. I don't like these anthropologists who use the name of the Yanomami on paper, in books. One doesn't like it. Another says it's wrong. For us Yanomami, this isn't good. They are using our name as if we were children. The name Yanomami has to be respected. It's not like a ball to throw around, to play with, hitting from one side to another. The name Yanomami refers to the indigenous peoples of Brazil and Venezuela. It must be respected. This name is authority. It is an old name. It is an ancient name. These anthropologists are treating us like animals -- as they would fish or birds. Omam created us first. We call him Omam. He created earth, forest, trees, birds, river, this earth. We call him Omam. After him, he called us Yanomami [Yan-Omam-i?]. So it must be respected. No one uses it on paper to fight -- they have to respect it. It is our name and the name of our land. They should speak well of us. They should say, "These Yanomami were here first in Brazil and Venezuela." They should respect us! They should also say that we preserve our land. Yanomami knows how to conserve, to care for their lands. Yanomami never destroyed the earth. I would like to read this. Speaking well of Omam, and of the Yanomami. This would be good. But if they are going to go on fighting like this -- I think that the head of the anthropologists has money ..

Ari: But Tierney's book, even as it criticises Chagnon, has become a major seller. He is earning money selling his book because of the theme. ...

Janet: He is not the first to criticize.

Davi: Bruce Albert, Alcida Ramos are not Yanomami. You have to call the very Yanomami, to hear them speak. Look, Alcida speaks Sanuma. Chagnon speaks Shamataari. And Bruce speaks our language. So there are three anthropologists who can call three Yanomami to speak at this meeting. The anthropologists should ask us directly. The Yanomami can speak his own language. These anthropologists can translate. They have to hear our language. They have to hear us in our own language. What does the Yanomami think? What does the Yanomami think is beautiful? You have to ask the Yanomami themselves. These people are making money from the Yanomami name. Our name has value. They are playing with the name of an ancient people. I don't know a lot about politics. But I see and hear that an anthropologist is becoming famous. Famous -- why? Some think it's good. So he became famous, like a chief. So among them nothing will be resolved. One becomes famous, the other one [his critic] becomes famous, and they go on fighting among themselves and making money...

Janet: Did you know Tierney?

Davi: I met him in Boa Vista. I went to his house. He didn't say anything to me about what he was doing.

Davi: So, Chagnon made money using the name of the Yanomami. He sold his book. Lizot too.

I want to know how much they are making each month. How much does any anthropologist earn? And how much is Patrick making? Patrick must be happy. This is a lot of money. They may be fighting but they are happy. They fight and this makes them happy. They make money and fight.

Janet: Yes; the anthropologists are fighting. Patrick is a journalist.

Davi: Patrick left the fight to the others! He can let the anthropologists fight with Chagnon, and he, Patrick, he's outside, he's free. He's just bringing in the money -- he must be laughing at the rest. It's like starting a fight among dogs. Then they fight, they bark and he's outside. He spoke bad of the anthropologist -- others start fighting, and he's gaining money! The name Yanomami is famous [and valuable] -- more famous than the name of any anthropologist. So he's earning money without sweating, without hurting his hands, without the heat of the sun. He's not suffering. He just sits and writes, this is great for him. He succeeded in writing a book that is bringing in money. Now he should share some of this money with the Yanomami. We Yanomami are here, suffering from malaria, flu, sick all the time. But he's there in good health -- just spending the money that he gained in the name of the Yanomami Indians.

Ari: One American had patented the name Yanomami on the internet.

Davi: She was using our name for the internet [site] or to write a book and earn 20,000 dollars. A Canadian working for CCPY discovered this. My friend explained that they are using the name of the Yanomami without requesting authorization. I said I didn't like it. So I sent her a letter. She was an American journalist. So she stopped. So I was able to salvage the name of the Yanomami. ... They have a lot of names. They don't know the trunk and the roots of the Yanomami. They only know the name. But the trunk and the roots of the Yanomami, they don't know. They don't know where we were born, how we were born, who brought us here. Without knowing these things, no one can use the name.

I am speaking to the American Anthropology Association. They are trying to clean up this problem. They should bring three Yanomami to their meeting. There are three anthropologists who understand our three languages: Chagnon, Alcida, and Bruce. These anthropologists could translate. We could speak, and people could ask questions of us. I could go myself, but it would be best to have three from Venezuela, or

four, perhaps one from Brazil. They need to see our faces. Alcida doesn't look like a Yanomami. Nor do Bruce or Chagnon. They don't have Yanomami faces. The Americans will believe [us] if they see us. I went to the United States during the fight against the goldminers. They believed me. For this reason, I say, it's important to go there and speak to them.

I ask for names of any advanced Yanomami students.

Davi: Jose Seripino is studying in the mission school at Mahikakoteri and speaks Spanish.

Davi: This is a fight between men who make money.

I ask what the appropriate form of compensation for an anthropology interview, and he says money. "That way he can buy what he wants -- pan, machete, axe, line, fishing hooks. It is good to speak to Yanomami. If you give money to the whites, they put it in their pocket. Nabu loves money. It's for this reason that the nabu are fighting. Its not for him, for friends, its for money.

D. The Role of the American Anthropological Association in Advocacy for the Yanomami and Debates on Yanomami Anthropology (Principal researcher: Jane H. Hill)

We briefly review here the actions of the American Anthropological Association over the last 30 years or so in reference to concerns and debates about the situation of the Yanomami. This section does not address any allegations made in *Darkness in El Dorado*. Space limitations prohibit attention to the involvement of the Association in the situation of other Amazonian indigenous groups during this period.

Resolutions in support of the protection of Yanomami lands, reviewed below, were introduced from time to time at the Annual Meeting over a number of years, beginning in 1970. All these resolutions were passed, and appropriate communications made to governments and international agencies over the signature of the AAA President. A major AAA effort was the establishment and funding of a temporary commission, the AAA Yanomami Commission, which functioned during 1990-91.

AAA Resolutions on the Yanomami

Major AAA resolutions for which the Task Force has been able to identify texts include the following. In 1979, Shelton Davis, Judith Shapiro, Louisa Stark, Kenneth Taylor, Charles Wagley, and Napoleon Chagnon co-sponsored a resolution to the Annual Meeting of the Association objecting to plans by the Brazilian government to fragment Yanoama lands, and in support of an initiative developed by Brazilian colleagues, the creation of a Yanoama [sic] Park "as defined by the Committee for the Creation of the Yanoama Park (CCPY)" (ANL 21:1(4)).ⁱⁱ At the same meeting Kenneth Taylor introduced a motion against a proposal to devolve guardianship and protection of Indians to individual Brazilian states and territories, and in support of the responsibility of the Brazilian federal government for Indian affairs. Both motions were passed, and the AAA delivered them to the Brazilian government and other appropriate recipients.

In 1980-81 the AAA co-signed with the Brazilian Anthropological Association a complaint to the Organization of American States against actions of the Brazilian government in regard to Yanomami lands.

In 1982 in Washington DC, Kenneth Taylor offered another motion condemning the interdiction of Yanomami lands in Brazil. The motion passed unanimously and was communicated to the government of Brazil.

In 1987, the Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting of May 22-24 report that a letter was sent to the President of Brazil thanking him for signing a decree creating a *Parque Indigena Yanomami*.

The Carneiro da Cunha Letter

In 1989, the Association published in its *Newsletter* a letter from Maria Manuela Carneiro da Cunha, who wrote as immediate past President of the Brazilian Anthropological Association (ABA). The letter was published under a note from the then Editor of *Anthropology Newsletter* that stated:

“The following letter from Maria Manuela Carneiro da Cunha [President of ABA at the time of the original posting of the letter in 1988] was addressed originally to the AAA Committee on Ethics. Subsequently, the president of the Brazilian Anthropological Association (ABA), Antonio Augusto Arantes, stating that Carneiro da Cunha’s letter “expresses the (Brazilian Anthropological) Association’s point of view about Prof. Chagnon’s (Science) article”... asked that the letter be published in AN. We herein publish the exchange between Carneiro da Cunha and Napoleon Chagnon (California-Santa Barbara), which will appear concurrently in Portuguese in the ABA’s bulletin. Ordinarily, AN Correspondence submissions are not to exceed 500 words. This exchange, between one of our own distinguished members and another national anthropological association, is extraordinary and an exception to the rule.”

Carneiro da Cunha cited the use in the Brazilian press of stereotypes of the Yanomami as “violent” and suggesting that these stereotypes played into the hands of enemies of the Yanomami. The editor of the *Anthropology Newsletter* solicited a reply by Chagnon, who wrote at similar length rejecting in strong terms the accusation that he was at fault.

The AAA Yanomami Commission

In August 1990, Judith Lisansky wrote Jane Buikstra and Annette Weiner, AAA President and President-Elect, calling their attention to the great threat to the Yanomami in Brazil, suggested that “The AAA could join with ... Brazilian and international efforts by forming a special commission or temporary committee to investigate the situation of the Yanomami and add its voice to the international outcry.” Lisansky suggested immediate action rather than any delay to wait for an Annual Meeting resolution. Buikstra suggested such a commission to the Board of Directors and Executive Committee of the Association. In 1990, the Board of Directors of the Association unanimously recommended the formation of an AAA Yanomami Commission (BOD 118.14 Fall 1990). By action of the Executive Committee at its Fall 1990 meeting, the AAA established a special Commission to Investigate the Situation of the Brazilian Yanomami. Terry Turner was appointed Chair, with members Bruce Albert, Jason Clay, Alcida Ramos, Stephan Schwartzman, Anthony Seeger, and consultants Claudia Andujar, Manuela Carneiro da Cunha, and Davi Kopenawa Yanomami (AAA 1991). Among the AAA funding for the work of the Commission was a grant of \$1500 for Chairperson Turner to go to Brazil. In February and March 1991 Turner visited Boa Vista, capital of the state of Roraima, where most Yanomami live, and consulted widely with government officials, missionaries, members of NGO’s, and Davi Kopenawa (AAA 1991; Turner notes that the work cost him considerably more than \$1500 (Turner 2001a)). Turner met again with Davi Kopenawa in April 1991. The Commission produced a 23-page, single-spaced report.

While the work of the Commission was just beginning, the President of the Association, Jane Buikstra, on November 29, 1990, wrote President George H. W. Bush a letter regarding the situation of the Yanomami.

The Commission planned a publicity campaign to coincide with a state visit to Washington DC by Brazilian President Collor de Mello June 17-19, 1991. President Bush raised the matter of Yanomami lands with Collor during the state visit. Results of the Commission’s activities included a two-part series on the Yanomami in the *Washington Post*, in which Commission member Steve Schwartzmann was quoted, and an op ed piece by Commission Chairperson Turner (1991a) which was published in the *New York Times* and the *International*

Harold Tribune. In addition, coverage of the Yanomami situation just before Collor's visit appeared in *In these Times* (Moberg 1991) and *Science* (Gibbons 1991). The Voice of America broadcast an interview with Turner on its "Report to the Americas," and National Public Radio in New York City also broadcast an interview. Turner (1991:1) commented in a memorandum to Commission members that "Ironically, this was virtually the only press coverage Collor, or Brazilian affairs more generally, received during his visit." Members of the Commission believe that this campaign had an impact on subsequent actions by Collor de Mello. Turner and Schwartzmann were attacked in an editorial in *O Estado de Sao Paulo* ("A Ecomentira") that coincided with Collor's return to Brazil. On July 12, 1991 the *International Harold Tribune* reported that "Mr. Collor sacked the head of the Brazilian Indian Bureau last month following criticism from Mr. George Bush, the US president, that he had failed to demarcate the territory of the Yanomani [sic] Indians." (Johnson and Fidler 1991; Turner 1991b). By July 14, Collor had installed a new FUNAI director "with instructions to demarcate the Yanomami reserve without delay, with the 1985 boundaries", and had released funds for expulsion of miners from the Yanomami area and for an antimalaria campaign (Turner memo to President and Executive Board, AAA, and Members and Consultants of Yanomami Commission, 91-07-14). Correspondence between the AAA and the Brazilian government continued, and on January 9, 1991, President Collor wrote to AAA President Annette Weiner stating his commitment to a positive indigenist policy and requesting her views as to whether or not his initiatives had "fulfilled the expectations manifested in your previous correspondence." (Letter Collor to Weiner Brasilia 92-01-09). Yanomami lands were demarcated and registered during 1992, within a year of Collor's state visit to the U.S.

The minutes of the meeting of the AAA Executive Committee for Spring 1991 (EXC 13.72) unanimously accepted the report of the Commission on the Yanomami and an amended public statement. The Executive Committee thanked Terry Turner for his efforts and dedication.

The Commission for Human Rights

In 1992, partly as an outgrowth of the Commission on the Yanomami, and partly as the result of independent efforts beginning in 1990, the AAA established a Commission for Human Rights. The Commission, led by its first chairperson, Leslie Sponsel, early involved itself in threats faced by the Yanomami, especially the Haximu Massacre of Aug. 15, 1993 (AAA Human Rights Commission Meets, 1993. *Anthropology Newsletter* November 1993:3,4; Turner 1993). Work of the Commission at that time included letters to government officials in Brazil and the US, the UN, and the OAS. Commission for Human Rights member Terry Turner published a *New York Times* op-ed article (August 26, 1993; this piece was followed by a *New York Times* editorial on Aug. 27, 1993), and was interviewed on CNN and the Brazilian television network GLOBO. The Commission for Human Rights also requested that all anthropologists send letters of concern to officials of the Brazilian and Venezuelan governments. AAA President Annette Weiner wrote the Brazilian Ambassador to the U.S. and the Brazilian Minister of Justice expressing the "outrage" of the Association at the Haximu massacre and calling for protection of the Yanomami. The AAA Department of Government Relations also conducted an extensive letter-writing campaign. The Commission for Human Rights has since become the permanent standing Committee for Human Rights of the AAA, and has continued to involve itself in issues involving threats to the human rights of indigenous populations in Latin America and elsewhere.

The Continuing Debate on Chagnon's Work

The AAA continued to receive communications regarding the work of Napoleon Chagnon. At the 1993 Annual Meeting, anonymous pamphlets and fliers attacking Chagnon for alleged unethical practices were distributed. While no one has been willing to publicly claim responsibility for the anonymous materials, Salamone (1997:17) states that

... it is beyond dispute that the Salesians carried a package of materials to the 1993 American Anthropological Association meetings in Washington, DC, leaving this package on a display table with no identification as to their origin. Unfortunately, the Salesians still do not understand the anger most anthropologists feel regarding the receipt of anonymous mailings and handouts.

During 1994 the AAA was asked to defend Chagnon against attacks (Letter by James P. Hurd to President, AAA, St. Paul, MN February 17, 1994). Jack Cornman, then Executive Director of the Association, reported to Jim Peacock, President, that the Commission on Human Rights had already declined to become involved in the matter because "From the Commission's perspective, the Chagnon dispute was not about human rights." Cornman suggested to Peacock that the AAA lacked the resources to do more than "deplore anonymous attacks on anyone" (Cornman, Memo to Peacock, Arlington, VA 94-04-03). However, during this period the *Anthropology Newsletter* published letters in defense of Chagnon and in response to the anonymous pamphlets (e.g. Wolfⁱⁱⁱ *AN* March 1994:2, Fox *AN* March 1994:2). The same year the *Anthropology Newsletter* published letters and commentary in opposition to Chagnon (Cappelletti *AN* May 1994:2; Turner *AN* May 1994) and by Chagnon (Chagnon and Brewer Carias "Response to Cappelletti and Turner", *AN* September 1994:2).

At the 1994 meeting, a major session, chaired by Frank Salamone, met to consider scholarly debate around Chagnon's work, and included comments by Chagnon himself, by Terry Turner, and by representatives of the Salesians, including Fa. Jose Bortoli, and of the New Tribes Missions (Gregory Sanford) (Salamone 1997).

On August 14, 1996, AAA President Yolanda Moses wrote a strongly worded letter to Brazilian President Fernando Henrique Cardoso, expressing the concern of the Association "about the failure of the Brazilian government to take action against the new invasion of Yanomami reserve by over 3,000 gold miners," and insisting that the Brazilian Government release funds for a program, *OperaHao Selva Livre*, which had blocked entry of miners into the Yanomami lands. The letter was copied to the Minister of Justice and the President of FUNAI (*FundaHao Nacional do Indio*).

Most recently, in 2000 and 2001, the AAA established two successive task forces to evaluate the allegations against anthropologists and the implications for anthropology of Patrick Tierney's *Darkness in El Dorado*. As part of this work, AAA officers and members of the El Dorado Task Force have met with representatives of the Brazilian Anthropological Association and with representatives of the Venezuelan Commission on the Yanomami.

Criticisms of AAA Involvement

It must be pointed out that, in spite of this record of activity, colleagues, especially in Brazil, who have been active on the front lines of advocacy for the Yanomami – to the extent of placing themselves in personal danger from opponents of Yanomami land rights – believe that the AAA has been unresponsive to their concerns. Brazilian colleagues were distressed at what they regarded as a long delay in the publication of the Carneiro da Cunha letter, written in 1988 and published in 1989. A decision by the editor of the *Anthropology Newsletter* to end the debate after the exchange between Carneiro da Cunha and Chagnon meant that a request by Bruce Albert to reply to Chagnon's attack on himself and on Alcida Ramos (in Chagnon's reply to Carneiro da Cunha) was denied (although a letter by Richard Machalek (1989), in support of Chagnon, was admitted). Brazilian anthropologists were also offended that, having denied Albert the opportunity for a communication in 1989, the *AN* published letters by Eric Wolf and Robin Fox defending Chagnon in 1994. They are particularly disturbed that the *AN* approved language in the letter from Robin Fox (1994) that characterized Brazilian concern about the impact of Chagnon's work as motivated by "confused grievances". Members of the Task Force concur that it is regrettable that this language appeared in the *AN*. The delay in the publication of Carneiro da Cunha's letter, given the urgency of the situation of the Yanomami in 1988 and 1989, is also regrettable (we note that the delay may be partly due to the fact that the letter was addressed to the Committee on Ethics, not to the *AN* itself. Terence Turner (e-mail to Coronil November 13, 2001) recalls that the Committee on Ethics was at that time inactive. Furthermore, Turner recalls internal debate about the disposition of the letter, with then-President

of the AAA Roy Rappaport arguing in an AN publication that the ABA's complaint was not really about an ethical matter).

It must also be noted that Napoleon Chagnon disapproves of the way that the AAA has handled attacks on him. He wrote (1994) that the AAA, its staff, its officers, and its journal editors were all hopelessly "political". Chagnon has written that he believes that he was treated unfairly by Don Brenneis, then editor of the *American Ethnologist*, when he was given only a very short time to reply to an article by Jacques Lizot such that his reply could appear in the same issue with Lizot's paper (Chagnon 1994, 1995). The Task Force notes that Brenneis was under no obligation to invite a reply from Chagnon, and issued the invitation as an act of scholarly courtesy.

One reason that there is dissatisfaction with the role of the Association is that many members have hoped that the AAA would censure individuals accused of unethical conduct. Such censure is not within the power of the Association, which is not a certifying body. Even during the period before 1992, when the Committee on Ethics from time to time received charges against members, the Committee was able to function only as a mediator. The Association, as a scholarly society, has attempted to provide a forum for open exchange about the situation of the Yanomami, and continues to take seriously that responsibility. Reflecting on the handling of communications in the *Anthropology Newsletter* in the late 1980's and early 1990's, we believe that it would have been appropriate for the AN editor to receive all appropriate communications from international colleagues with expertise about the situation of the Yanomami. Communications from outside the U.S. should be treated with special attention, not only because international colleagues are often in possession of key information and ideas not accessible to U.S. anthropologists, but also because it is quite difficult for them to dispute from a distance what may be regarded as arbitrary bureaucratic decisions and policies. This is, of course, easier to do in an era of universal fax and e-mail than it was in the period between 1988 and 1994. We also believe that editors of all AAA publications must be especially careful to work with contributors to eliminate ad hominem or uncivil language, regardless of its target, in letters, articles, and reviews. In addition, I believe that the American Anthropological Association must work to build better communication with our sister associations in other countries.

Acknowledgement

In developing this review we used summary minutes of meetings of the Executive Board and Board of Directors, and materials that appeared in the *Anthropology Newsletter*. We also have materials from the work of the Special Commission to Investigate the Situation of the Brazilian Yanomami, which functioned in 1990-92. We are grateful to Bill Young, Stacy Lathrop, Peggy Overbey, and Kim Guthrie of the Association's staff for retrieving the relevant documents for us.

ⁱ A contact for this program is Marcos Wesley de Oliveira, Coordenador do Programa de Educação, Rua Pres. Costa e Silva 40-Sao Pedro, 69306-030 Boa Vista RR (ccpyeduc@technet.com.br)

ⁱⁱ The Report of the Special Commission to Investigate the Situation of the Brazilian Yanomami (AAA 1991) notes another resolution in 1978. We have not been able to retrieve its text but we believe that it was similar to the 1979 resolution.

ⁱⁱⁱ Eric Wolf was one of the directors of Chagnon's 1966 University of Michigan Ph.d. dissertation.