
Marvin Harris Cows Pigs Wars And Witches

*Marvin Harris Cows
Pigs Wars And Witches*

*Downloaded from
web1.enteraskincare.com
by Janelle & Sage*

INTRODUCTION: UNRAVELING THE MYSTERIES OF CULTURE WITH MARVIN HARRIS

Why do some cultures worship cows while others abhor pork? Why do societies, both ancient and modern, erupt into waves of paranoia about witches? These are not just trivial quirks of history; they are profound puzzles

about human behavior. In his landmark book, *Cows, Pigs, Wars, and Witches: The Riddles of Culture*, the renowned anthropologist Marvin Harris offers a bold and controversial answer. He argues that the seemingly irrational, exotic, or even bizarre practices of different societies are actually rooted in practical, material conditions. Harris dismantles the notion that beliefs are just whimsical expressions of the human mind. Instead, he presents a powerful

case for **cultural materialism**, a theoretical framework that suggests our most sacred rituals and deepest prejudices often arise from the mundane realities of feeding, clothing, and protecting ourselves. This article dives deep into the core arguments of Marvin Harris, exploring how cows, pigs, wars, and witches are all connected by a single, unifying thread: the struggle for survival and the optimization of resources.

THE ENIGMA OF THE SACRED COW: WHY INDIA'S CATTLE ARE UNTOUCHABLE

Perhaps the most famous riddle Harris tackles is the Hindu reverence for the cow. To an outside observer, particularly one from a Western capitalist

background, the practice seems economically disastrous. A nation with widespread poverty and malnutrition possesses a vast population of cattle that are forbidden from being eaten. Why not slaughter them for food? This is the central question Harris addresses in the first part of his book.

The Materialist Reinterpretation of a Religious Taboo

Marvin Harris rejects the simple answer that it is "because of religion." Instead,

he asks: what conditions led to this religion? He argues that the sacred cow is not a cause of India's poverty, but a brilliant adaptation to it. Through meticulous analysis, Harris demonstrates that the living cow is far more valuable than a dead one. The Indian farmer relies on the cow for several critical functions that are invisible to the outsider.

- **Traction and Power:** Draft oxen, the descendants of the sacred cow, are the primary source of power for plowing fields and hauling goods. In a nation lacking cheap fossil fuels, these animals are the engine of the agricultural economy. Killing them for a single meal would be akin to scrapping a

tractor for spare parts.

- **Fuel and Fertilizer:** Cow dung is a vital resource. It is used as a cheap, plentiful fuel for cooking, and as a high-quality fertilizer to replenish the soil. In an ecosystem without synthetic alternatives, the cow is a living, breathing recycling machine.
- **Milk and Nutrition:** While beef is forbidden, dairy products like milk, yogurt, ghee, and buttermilk are essential sources of protein and fat in a largely vegetarian diet. The cow provides a steady, renewable stream of nutrition over its lifetime.
- **Economic Security:** For the poorest farmers, the cow is a form of insurance. It can be sold in

times of extreme duress, and its offspring represent capital growth. The cow is a bank account on four legs.

Harris argues that the sacred cow prohibition evolved over millennia precisely because it was a **rational ecological and economic strategy**. The taboo against slaughter protected a vital resource from being squandered during periods of drought or famine. By making it a sin to kill a cow, the culture ensured that the animal's long-term value to the community was preserved. This is the core of **cultural materialism**: the idea that the "superstructure" of a society—its religion and ideology—evolves to serve the "infrastructure"—its economy,

technology, and environment. The cow is not worshipped because it is divine; it is considered divine because it is so incredibly useful.

THE ABOMINABLE PIG: WHY PORK IS FORBIDDEN IN THE MIDDLE EAST

If the cow riddle is about the logic of keeping an animal alive, the pig riddle is about the logic of banning it. The prohibition against eating pork in Judaism and Islam is one of the world's most enduring dietary laws. Marvin Harris applies the same materialist lens to this question, rejecting purely symbolic or arbitrary explanations.

The Ecological Failure of the Pig in Arid Lands

Harris argues that the pig was declared "unclean" not because of some inherent filthiness, but because it was an **ecological disaster** for the environment of the ancient Middle East. Unlike cattle, goats, or sheep, pigs are not ruminants. They cannot survive on grass and coarse vegetation. Instead, they are omnivores that compete directly with humans for food, requiring grains, tubers, and protein-rich scraps. In the dry, forest-scarce landscapes of the Middle East, raising pigs was simply too

expensive.

1. **Competition for Resources:** To raise a pig, you must feed it food that you could eat yourself. In a marginal environment where calories were scarce, this made no sense. Ruminants, on the other hand, convert inedible grass into edible milk and meat.
2. **Water Requirements:** Pigs need shade and water to cool down, as they cannot sweat effectively. In a hot, arid climate, this makes them extremely difficult to manage. They are prone to heat stress and disease.
3. **Lack of Secondary Products:** Unlike cows and goats, pigs provide no milk, no wool, and are

useless for traction. Their only value is their meat, and once slaughtered, that value is gone. They do not provide the ongoing, multi-purpose utility of other livestock.

4. **Environmental Damage:** In their natural state, pigs root in moist forest floors. In the Middle East, they would have damaged fragile ecosystems. Their need for mud and water would have led them to ruin water sources.

Harris concludes that the pig taboo was a practical solution to an environmental problem. By making pork abhorrent, the ancient Hebrews and later Muslims discouraged a costly and

inefficient use of resources. The rule was not arbitrary; it was a survival mechanism that prevented the waste of precious grain and water. Again, the **material base** of the society shaped its **ideological superstructure**. The "uncleanliness" of the pig was a powerful metaphor for its economic uselessness in that specific environment.

WARS AND THE POTLATCH: THE ECONOMY OF CONFLICT AND GENEROSITY

Harris doesn't stop at food taboos. He extends his materialist analysis to the most destructive of human behaviors: war. In the chapter on

war, he explores the seemingly irrational warfare of the Yanomamo people of the Amazon, often called the "Fierce People."

Protein Scarcity as a Driver of Conflict

Conventional explanations for war often focus on aggression, revenge, or glory. Harris, however, suggests a more basic driver: a shortage of animal protein. In the Amazon rainforest, game is

notoriously scarce. Harris argues that Yanomamo warfare, particularly the raids for women and the constant feuding between villages, was fundamentally a response to this scarcity. When game ran low, villages would fission and fight. The capture of women was not just about sex; it was about reproduction. More women meant more children, which meant more labor for gardening and, critically, more potential hunters to bring in precious meat.

This interpretation is deeply controversial, but it illustrates Harris's core principle: even the most violent and "irrational" human behaviors can be traced

back to material constraints. War, in this view, is not a primordial instinct but a strategic, if brutal, adjustment to ecological pressure. The "fierceness" of the Yanomamo was a cultural adaptation to a world of limited resources.

The Potlatch: The Paradox of Generosity

In contrast to the scarcity-driven warfare of the Amazon, Harris examines the potlatch ceremony of the Kwakiutl people of the Pacific Northwest. The potlatch is a

famous anthropological puzzle where chiefs would engage in "competitive feasting," giving away or even destroying vast quantities of blankets, coppers, and canoes. To the Western eye, this looks like wild, irrational waste.

Harris again applies a materialist lens. The potlatch was not wanton destruction. It was a sophisticated system of **resource management and status competition** in an environment of extreme abundance and seasonal fluctuation. The Pacific Northwest had a feast-or-famine cycle. Salmon runs and other resources were abundant but unreliable. The potlatch served several key

functions:

- **Redistribution:** It forced successful chiefs to distribute their surplus to the community. If one village had a great salmon run and another had a poor one, the potlatch was a way to move food and goods between groups.
- **Incentive to Produce:** The status competition of the potlatch drove people to work hard and be efficient. The desire to host a bigger potlatch than your rival was a powerful economic motivator.
- **Population Regulation:** By concentrating resources in

the hands of a few chiefs and then forcing them to redistribute them, the system prevented hoarding and ensured that the entire community survived the lean months. The destruction of goods, while shocking, was a symbolic message: "I am so wealthy, I can afford to waste." This signaled high status while simultaneously reducing the total amount of stored goods, preventing inflation and stabilizing the social hierarchy.

In both war and generosity, Harris finds a material logic. The potlatch was not madness; it was a culturally coded system of

economic regulation.

WITCHES IN THE SHADOWS: SOCIAL CONTROL AND THE SCAPEGOAT

Finally, Harris turns to the terrifying subject of witchcraft and witch hunts. Why do societies periodically erupt into paroxysms of fear, accusing innocent members of their community of consorting with the devil?

The Witch as a Mechanism of

Social Control

Harris argues that witchcraft accusations are not simply a symptom of superstition or mass hysteria. They serve a distinct social and political function. In many pre-industrial societies, including those of medieval Europe and tribal Africa, witches were almost always the most vulnerable members of the community: the old, the poor, the widowed, or the socially awkward.

He proposes that the witch hunt is a **mechanism of social control** that is activated during times of great stress, such as crop failure, plague, or political upheaval.

When the ruling class, the priests, or the community elders are unable to solve the real problems (like a bad harvest), they need a scapegoat. By identifying a "witch," they can channel the community's anxiety and anger toward a single, helpless target. The punishment of the witch serves as a terrifying example to everyone else. It reinforces the status quo by saying, "The gods are angry because of this deviant person, not because of the king or the system."

This analysis is a clear application of materialist thinking. The witch hunt is not divorced from material reality; it is a direct response to it. When the material base of society

(food production, health, economic stability) is threatened, the superstructure (religion, ideology) generates a solution: the witch. The accusation is a form of **negative feedback** that allows the social system to stabilize itself by purging a vulnerable member. The energy of the community is redirected from challenging the real causes of suffering toward destroying a symbolic enemy.

Harris's take on witches is a chilling reminder of how ideology can be weaponized to protect power and property. The fear of witches was not just a theological error; it was a political tool. And the fuel for that tool was real, material anxiety about survival.

CRITICISMS AND LEGACY OF HARRIS'S MATERIALISM

The work of Marvin Harris is not without its critics. Many anthropologists argue that his brand of **cultural materialism** is overly reductionist. By insisting that all cultural practices can be traced back to material and economic causes, he is accused of ignoring the power of human agency, history, and pure ideas. Critics point out that the same material conditions can give rise to different cultural solutions, and that cultures often seem to behave in ways that are patently not optimal for their survival.

Furthermore, the "protein scarcity"

explanation for Yanomamo warfare has been heavily disputed by other ethnographers who argue that the data is flawed and that other factors, such as the desire for prestige and revenge, are far more important. *Cows, Pigs, Wars, and Witches* is a work that invites debate, and that is part of its lasting value.

Despite these critiques, the legacy of the book is immense. It remains one of the most accessible and thought-provoking introductions to anthropological thinking ever written. Its power lies in its ability to make us question our own assumptions. It forces us to pause and ask: "What is the real reason we do what we do?" Harris does

not claim that culture is a simple

machine. Instead, he presents a powerful hypothesis. He