DT-02 Immediate-return and delayed-return societies: property, storage and inequality

The historical transition from egalitarian social structures to institutionalized, stratified hierarchies is traditionally, and somewhat erroneously, attributed entirely to the Neolithic adoption of agriculture. However, rigorous ethnographic analysis and deep-time archaeological evidence indicate that the critical threshold for the emergence of severe inequality was not the domestication of plants or animals, but the implementation of delayed-return economic systems. This distinction was formally introduced by anthropologist James Woodburn in his seminal 1982 paper, *Egalitarian Societies*, published in *Man*[1]. Woodburn categorized human foraging societies into two ideal types: "immediate-return" systems, characterized by the direct consumption of yields, minimal processing, simple tools, and a lack of binding interpersonal dependencies; and "delayed-return" systems, characterized by substantial labor investments in capital goods, intensive processing, food storage, and the inevitable creation of binding property rights and debts[2].

Concurrently in 1982, Alain Testart published *The Significance of Food Storage Among Hunter-Gatherers* in *Current Anthropology*, positing the "storage law"[4]. Testart demonstrated that nomadic hunting-and-gathering societies lacking intensive storage maintain egalitarian structures, whereas sedentary, food-storing hunter-gatherers universally exhibit social inequalities functionally identical to those of agrarian states[5]. Robert L. Kelly, in *The Lifeways of Hunter-Gatherers: The Foraging Spectrum* (1995, revised 2013), expanded this framework, demonstrating that as mobility decreases and reliance on localized, defensible stored resources increases, human societies consistently develop hierarchies, territoriality, and institutionalized leadership[6].

This report evaluates the mechanisms of self-governance, inequality, and institutional capture across three distinct foraging arrangements: the Immediate-Return Band, the Sedentary Storing Village, and the Stratified Maritime Chiefdom. It utilizes empirical compilations from the Standard Cross-Cultural Sample (SCCS), D-PLACE, and quantitative intergenerational wealth transmission data to construct a comprehensive ledger of how scale, capital, and the dark triad interact outside the reach of the state.

Arrangement 1: Immediate-Return Foragers (The Demand-Sharing Band)

The immediate-return arrangement represents the baseline of egalitarian human governance, documented extensively in Pleistocene models and surviving Holocene groups such as the Hadza of Tanzania and the !Kung of the Kalahari[1]. Governance in these societies operates through extreme fluidity and the active, aggressive suppression of wealth accumulation. The economy is structured around "demand sharing," wherein resources—particularly large

game—are distributed not as a reciprocal gift designed to build social capital, but as a binding obligation upon the successful producer, who cannot refuse a request[8]. This system prevents the formation of particularistic social ties and dyadic relations of indebtedness, stripping the "big man" of any ability to leverage his productivity into political power[8].

What the participants themselves say this arrangement does (the emic perspective) is rooted in moral and cosmological imperatives. Indigenous participants assert that the environment provides equally for all, framing egalitarianism as an automatic entitlement that requires no validation through personal competitiveness[3]. Hoarding or attempting to elevate oneself above peers is viewed as a spiritual and social offense that invites illness or misfortune[9].

What the archaeological and ethnographic record shows (the etic perspective) is a material culture utterly devoid of long-term storage facilities, homogenous burial treatments lacking prestige goods, and high residential mobility with group compositions shifting constantly[1]. Tools and weapons are portable and universally accessible, ensuring no single individual can monopolize the means of coercion[2].

Modern scholarship infers that immediate-return egalitarianism is not a passive, natural default state, but a highly sophisticated, energy-intensive risk-mitigation strategy. Evolutionary behavioral ecologists view demand sharing as a mechanism to insure against the high variance of daily foraging returns[1]. Furthermore, James Woodburn (1998) and Christopher Boehm (1999) re-evaluated egalitarianism as a specifically political phenomenon. Boehm, in *Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior*, conceptualized the "reverse dominance hierarchy." In this model, the rank-and-file deliberately form a united political coalition to continuously suppress alpha individuals who exhibit dark-triad traits (narcissism, Machiavellianism)[10].

The strongest case against the romanticized view of the immediate-return band comes from scholars like James G. Flanagan (1989), who documented pervasive hidden hierarchies in simple societies, and Luke Glowacki and Manvir Singh (2021)[12]. Glowacki highlights that decentralized warfare was endemic in the Pleistocene; individuals frequently initiated lethal raids to acquire status or mates without the consent of the broader group, imposing massive costs on the collective[14]. Furthermore, gender inequality is often pervasive; even in "egalitarian" bands, men historically dominated political decision-making, and male homicide rates were astronomically high compared to modern states[10]. Avoiding the naturalistic fallacy requires acknowledging that small scale does not equate to non-violence or universal fairness.

Scale Ledger: Immediate-Return Band

Scale Rung	Population	Operational Status	Rationale for Success or Failure
Household	4 to 10	Operated and Worked	Functions as the primary unit of production and consumption. Membership is

			highly fluid, resolving internal frictions through immediate spatial separation rather than structural conflict.
Hamlet or Band	30 to 50	Operated and Worked	The optimal scale for Dunbar-esque face-to-face monitoring. Enables effective consensus, constant peer pressure, and the collective sanctioning required to maintain the reverse dominance hierarchy.
Village	150 to 500	Failed	Cannot be sustained without storage or agriculture due to the rapid depletion of local wild resources. Anonymity increases, causing demand-sharing networks to collapse under free-rider problems.
Parish or District	1,500 to 5,000	Never Tried	Requires institutionalized representation,

			surplus extraction, and logistical coordination fundamentally incompatible with non-storing nomadism.
Town to Planet	> 15,000	Never Tried	Exceeds all thermodynamic and structural capacities of immediate-return foraging.

Capture Test: Immediate-Return Band

A person or faction with dark-triad traits attempts to capture this arrangement by monopolizing a high-value resource—either an unusually large game kill or, historically, an influx of modern capital like rifles—to distribute selectively, creating a coalition of indebted followers. Historical cases of capture are relatively rare in the deep past due to the fragility of the system, but when Western trade goods were introduced (e.g., among certain Inuit or Amazonian groups), individual men could bypass traditional hunting methods, hoard the surplus, and establish despotic dominance over the band[1].

The features that traditionally resisted or reversed capture are outlined by Boehm's reverse dominance mechanisms: public ridicule, disobedience, shunning, exile, and ultimately, coordinated execution by the collective[10]. Because tools are simple and lethal force cannot be monopolized (all men have equal access to projectile weapons), the physical cost to an aspiring tyrant is fatal[3]. Furthermore, the low cost of exit allows subjects to simply "vote with their feet," dissolving the group and leaving the aspiring leader with no one to command[1].

Arrangement 2: Sedentary Storing Foragers (The Delayed-Return Village)

When localized resources—such as nut groves or wild cereals—become hyper-abundant but remain highly seasonal, survival necessitates intensive harvesting and storage. Lewis Binford (1980) famously distinguished between "foragers," who move people to food, and "collectors," who move food to people through logistical mobility and storage[7]. Food storage fundamentally alters human relations by creating a temporal delay between labor and consumption, generating fixed capital assets (silos, granaries) that must be defended. This geographic anchoring drastically restricts spatial mobility, raising population density and establishing the

prerequisite conditions for social stratification without the need for agricultural domestication[5]. Two archetypal cases illustrate this phase: the Natufians of the Levant and the Jomon of Japan. At Ain Mallaha (Eynan) in the Upper Jordan Valley, occupied between 15,000 and 12,000 BC, the Early Natufian phase witnessed the construction of massive semi-subterranean circular structures up to 7 meters in diameter[16]. Governance transitioned from fluid egalitarianism to evident hierarchy. The Sannai Maruyama site in Aomori Prefecture, Japan (3900–2300 BC), mirrors this trajectory. The Jomon people established massive settlements sustained by managed chestnut orchards, building large elevated storage buildings and longhouses that imply corporate kin group ownership[17].

What the participants themselves said this arrangement did is generally reconstructed through ethnographic parallels of storing foragers, who justify inequality through cosmological stewardship. The physical granaries and monumental architecture are framed as belonging to the ancestors or the gods; the elites who control access to the surplus claim to be mere stewards, conducting the necessary rituals to ensure the return of the seasonal harvests[19].

What the record shows is a stark material bifurcation in wealth and status. At Ain Mallaha, Early Natufian burials contain significant wealth disparities, with select individuals adorned with imported *Dentalium* shell necklaces, bone beads, and occasionally buried with domesticated dogs, indicating elevated status[16]. At Sannai Maruyama, while many infants were buried in standard household jars, specific burial pits indicate differential treatment and the emergence of elite lineages[17].

Modern scholarship infers that storage creates localized rent-seeking opportunities, allowing aggrandizers to extract compliance in exchange for access to vital winter calories[5]. However, this system is highly fragile. Junko Habu (2006) demonstrates that the Jomon reliance on a narrow suite of stored plant foods (chestnuts) supported dense populations but caused the society to cross a point of no return; when the climate cooled, the rigid delayed-return system catastrophically collapsed, leading to site abandonment and a return to smaller, decentralized settlements[21]. Similarly, at Ain Mallaha, the intense early stratification collapsed by the Final Natufian phase; structures shrank to 3.5 meters, elaborate body ornaments disappeared, and deep pits were repurposed for mass, successive burials with no status differentiation[16].

The strongest case against the determinism of the "storage law" is articulated by archaeologists such as Brian Hayden (1982) and Robert L. Kelly (2013). Hayden argues that storage alone is insufficient to create inequality; it requires the deliberate, political manipulation of surplus by "aggrandizing" individuals—the accumulator personality[4]. Kelly adds that mobility operates on a spectrum; groups like those in the Great Basin stored food but remained relatively egalitarian because the spatial distribution of their stored resources was too diffuse to allow for effective monopolization by a single elite faction[6].

Scale Ledger: Sedentary Storing Foragers

Scale Rung	Population	Operational Status	Rationale for Success or Failure

Household	4 to 10	Operated and Worked	Shifted from open demand-sharing to private or lineage-based accumulation. Storage pits belonged explicitly to the household unit.
Hamlet or Band	30 to 50	Operated and Worked	Villages frequently fractured into discrete, competitive kin-based factions defending specific harvesting assets.
Village	150 to 500	Operated and Worked	The primary locus of the storing forager (e.g., Sannai Maruyama). Supported by dense, predictable local resources and monumental architecture.
Parish or District	1,500 to 5,000	Operated but Failed	Attempted via ritual centers (e.g., the Oyu Stone Circles of the Jomon[18]), but regional integration repeatedly fractured due to the inability to transport bulk foraging surplus over land without draft animals.

Town to Planet	> 15,000	Failed	Wild resource catchments cannot sustain this demographic density without the introduction of domestic cereals and intensified agro-logistics.

Capture Test: Sedentary Storing Foragers

A dark-triad individual captures this governance structure by seizing control of the primary means of storage or violently monopolizing the optimal harvesting sites (e.g., the most productive nut groves or choke points). By physically controlling the silo, they dictate the terms of survival during the lean season, transforming autonomous kin into dependent clients. Historical cases of this capture are evident in the Early Natufian sequence at Ain Mallaha, where certain lineages successfully secured access to prestige goods (Anatolian obsidian, Mediterranean shells) to solidify their status, burying their dead with elaborate grave architecture while others received simpler treatments[16].

The primary feature that resisted or eventually reversed this capture was the inherent volatility of wild resources. Unlike intensive agriculture, wild crop yields are highly susceptible to sudden ecological shifts. When chestnut yields at Sannai Maruyama plummeted, the elite superstructure could no longer extract rent or guarantee survival, leading to a total collapse of the hierarchical system and site abandonment[18]. The collapse of the Early Natufian hierarchy into the unornamented mass graves of the Final Natufian likewise demonstrates that wild-resource elites are highly vulnerable to ecological baseline shifts[16].

Arrangement 3: Stratified Maritime Chiefdoms (The Apex of Delayed Return)

When a highly predictable, ultra-dense wild resource—specifically anadromous fish runs or rich marine estuaries—is combined with complex, expensive capital equipment like plank canoes and massive fishing weirs, hunter-gatherers can achieve levels of stratification that rival agrarian empires[22]. This phenomenon was perfectly expressed in the Pacific Northwest Coast (Tlingit, Haida, Coast Salish), the Calusa of Florida, and the Chumash of Southern California[22].

The Pacific Northwest Coast societies recognized three rigid, heritable castes: nobles, commoners, and slaves[22]. Leland Donald's 1997 analysis, *Aboriginal Slavery on the Northwest Coast of North America*, establishes that slavery was not a marginal practice; in mid-19th century Hudson's Bay Company censuses, slaves constituted between 15% and 30% of the total population in many communities[22]. Slaves were absolute chattel, captured in warfare and forced to perform the intensive processing (gutting, drying, smoking) of the massive salmon catches during the brief annual runs, solving a critical labor bottleneck[22].

In Florida, the Calusa built an expansive hegemony without agriculture. By 1566, King Carlos met with Spanish governor Pedro Menendez de Aviles at Mound Key, the Calusa capital situated on a massive artificial island of shell middens featuring sophisticated water courts and canals[24]. The Spanish reported Carlos hosting them in a building large enough to hold two thousand people[26]. The Calusa exacted tribute from over 50 surrounding villages, maintaining a rigid hierarchy supported entirely by the hyper-productivity of the estuarine environment[26].
Among the Chumash of California, power coalesced around the *Brotherhood of the Tomol*, an exclusive guild that controlled the production and operation of the *tomol* (plank canoe)[23]. These canoes were essential for deep-sea fishing and cross-channel trade. The Chumash also developed a highly complex fiat currency system using *Olivella* shell beads measured in *ponco* units (two turns of the string about the wrist and the extended third finger)[28]. Wealthy elites (*wot*) and members of the *'antap* religious society controlled the bead money supply; membership in the *'antap* required a massive entry fee of shell bead money, effectively locking commoners out of political power[28].
What the participants themselves said this arrangement did was enforce divine order. Elites claimed divine descent and total ownership over subjects. John Swanton recorded in 1905 that Haida owners threw the bodies of deceased slaves directly into the sea, believing that properly burying a socially dead slave would curse the owner's ability to acquire more property[29].
What the record shows is staggering material disparity. Archaeological excavations reveal monumental architecture (the Mound Key water courts, Northwest Coast cedar longhouses), mass graves of violently dispatched captives, and the intense concentration of trade wealth in elite households[22]. The Chumash bead currency experienced massive hyperinflation following Spanish contact, leading to a total collapse of the indigenous financial system[28].
Modern scholarship infers that when resources are highly localized, predictable, and require complex capital to exploit (the "defensibility" hypothesis), elites can entirely monopolize the means of production. Slaves were economically vital; the massive influx of salmon required immediate, labor-intensive processing to prevent rot, and free commoners could not provide sufficient labor without abandoning their own subsistence[22]. Thus, extreme hierarchy was a direct thermodynamic output of the capital-to-resource ratio.
The strongest case against this ecological determinism is mounted by David Graeber and David Wengrow in *The Dawn of Everything* (2021)[32]. They highlight the Yurok of California, who shared identical environmental conditions with the slave-holding Northwest Coast chiefdoms but explicitly rejected slavery and institutionalized extreme hierarchy. Graeber and Wengrow argue that the transition to slavery was a conscious, ideological political choice, not an inevitable outcome of salmon storage and capital investment.

Scale Ledger: Stratified Maritime Chiefdoms

Scale Rung	Population	Operational Status	Rationale for Success or Failure
Household	4 to 10	Operated and	Basic unit of

		Worked	control; noble households frequently owned multiple slaves as pure chattel property.
Hamlet or Band	30 to 50	Operated and Worked	Subsumed entirely into larger corporate villages; independent bands were frequent targets for slave-raiding.
Village	150 to 500	Operated and Worked	High-density coastal settlements serving as fortresses and processing hubs.
Parish or District	1,500 to 5,000	Operated and Worked	Maintained through extended kin networks, marriage alliances, and localized tribute systems (e.g., Chumash *'antap* regional networks).
Town or Watershed	15,000 to 50,000	Operated and Worked	The Calusa hegemony successfully extended over an entire watershed and coastal zone, using canals to direct regional tribute to the capital at Mound

			Key.
Region to Planet	> 0.5 million	Failed / Never Tried	The absence of writing, bureaucratic permanence, and terrestrial transport infrastructure prevented scaling to true imperial or continental configurations.

Capture Test: Stratified Maritime Chiefdoms

A dark-triad elite captures this system by monopolizing the critical, expensive capital asset—be it the *tomol* guild, the massive salmon weir, or the water courts—and utilizing organized martial violence to capture external labor (slaves) to work those assets[23]. They subsequently establish ideological control (e.g., the Chumash *'antap* society) to mandate tribute from commoners under the guise of religious duty or physical protection[28].

Historical cases of this capture are abundant. The Calusa lineage of King Carlos maintained iron-fisted control over Southwest Florida through a standing warrior caste and the total monopolization of maritime trade routes, violently subjugating neighboring tribes for tribute and executing political rivals[26].

A unique feature that resisted or managed this capture was the "Potlatch" of the Northwest Coast. While often viewed as a mechanism for status-seeking, it effectively forced aspiring tyrants to routinely liquidate their accumulated material wealth by giving it away or deliberately destroying it (including the execution of slaves or the destruction of valuable "coppers"). This created an artificial ceiling on physical accumulation, forcibly converting dangerous material inequality into intangible social prestige, thereby preventing the permanent consolidation of absolute wealth across generations[22].

Quantifying the Transition: D-PLACE, SCCS, and Wealth Transmission

To verify the storage-to-inequality pipeline beyond qualitative ethnography, modern scholarship utilizes massive datasets to quantify wealth disparities and governance structures. The Standard Cross-Cultural Sample (SCCS), developed by George P. Murdock and Douglas R. White (1969) and accessible via D-PLACE, provides a rigorous statistical foundation for 186 pre-capitalist societies. When analyzing these datasets, variables measuring "class stratification" (SCCS variables v66-v69) show a massive, statistically significant positive

correlation with the presence of food storage and complex capital[34]. Pryor's analysis of the SCCS indicates that while classic immediate-return foragers possess an extremely low inequality of wealth, those dependent on stored resources show steep, statistically significant increases in class division, the occurrence of slavery (v73), and the formalization of unequal inheritance rules[35].

The exact mathematics of this trap are modeled through the intergenerational transmission of wealth. Monique Borgerhoff Mulder et al. (2009) analyzed 43 measures of wealth across various societies in *Science*, utilizing the intergenerational elasticity coefficient (β) and the Gini coefficient to measure inequality[37].

Economic System	Average Gini Coefficient	Intergenerational Elasticity (β)	Multiplier Effect 1/(1−β2)
Immediate-Return Hunter-Gatherers	0.25	0.17	1.03 (Shocks dissipate in one generation)
Horticulturalists	0.27	0.27	1.08
Pastoralists	0.42	0.66	1.77
Agriculturalists / Storing Foragers	> 0.48	> 0.50	1.33+ (Shocks compound across generations)

In a system where $\beta = 0.50$, the intergenerational transmission multiplier blows up the effect of any stochastic wealth shock, permanently altering the trajectory of a lineage[38]. In a hunter-gatherer system ($\beta = 0.17$), being born to a successful hunter confers almost no long-term advantage; shocks are effectively dissipated in a single generation[38]. Material wealth—specifically defensible land and stored food—transmits across generations far more effectively than embodied wealth (hunting skill) or relational wealth (social networks)[31]. Consequently, the invention of the storage pit effectively functioned as the invention of inherited poverty.

Summary of Robust Findings

1. The transition from equality to hierarchy in human prehistory was driven by delayed-return economics (storage and complex capital), rather than the domestication of plants and animals.
2. Immediate-return societies actively suppressed dominance through reverse dominance

hierarchies, utilizing lethal coalitionary sanctions and fluid mobility to check dark-triad traits.
3. The invention of food storage created the first fixed, defensible assets, physically anchoring populations and severely restricting their spatial mobility.
4. Restricted mobility enabled aspiring elites to monopolize resource bottlenecks, extracting rent and labor from populations who could no longer safely fission or flee.
5. In environments with hyper-abundant, predictable wild resources (e.g., salmon runs, marine estuaries), hunter-gatherers developed rigid social stratification identical to agrarian states.
6. Northwest Coast societies utilized chattel slavery to solve the severe labor bottlenecks of intensive seasonal resource processing, with slaves constituting up to 30% of the population.
7. Extreme inequality correlates strictly with the monopolization of expensive, specialized capital goods, such as the Chumash *tomol* or the Calusa water courts.
8. Intergenerational wealth transmission (β) jumps from 0.17 in immediate-return foragers to >0.50 in delayed-return systems, mathematically locking in class stratification.
9. Material wealth is vastly more transmissible across generations than embodied knowledge or social relational wealth, guaranteeing compounding inequality.
10. The successful suppression of dark-triad individuals requires low exit costs (high mobility) and ensuring no single individual or faction can monopolize lethal force or vital caloric choke points.

Contested or Open Questions

The sequence of causality between warfare and hierarchy remains fiercely debated. Deep-rooters argue that intergroup warfare is an evolutionary inheritance that preceded storage, while shallow-rooters argue that the fixed assets of storage strictly generated the incentive for organized lethality. Similarly, the collapse of Early Natufian stratification at Ain Mallaha poses an open question: what specific ecological or social trigger caused the collapse of intense early hierarchy, forcing a return to flatter, more egalitarian gravesites in the Final Natufian? Finally, the issue of ideological determinism is contested; it remains unclear why certain groups perfectly situated for delayed-return hierarchies (like the Yurok) explicitly rejected slavery, suggesting that culture can sometimes override thermodynamic imperatives.

Key Sources to Read in Full

Author(s)	Year	Work	Relevance
James Woodburn	1982	*Egalitarian Societies* (Man 17:3)	Foundational text defining immediate vs. delayed-return systems.[1]

Alain Testart	1982	*The Significance of Food Storage Among Hunter-Gatherers* (Current Anthropology 23:5)	Formalizes the "storage law" linking granaries to social inequality.[4]
Christopher Boehm	1999	*Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior*	Details the "reverse dominance hierarchy" and lethal sanctioning.[10]
M. Borgerhoff Mulder et al.	2009	*Intergenerational wealth transmission and the dynamics of inequality...* (Science)	Quantifies Gini and Beta coefficients across 43 societies.[37]
Leland Donald	1997	*Aboriginal Slavery on the Northwest Coast of North America*	Exhaustive quantification of maritime forager slavery.[22]
Robert L. Kelly	2013	*The Lifeways of Hunter-Gatherers: The Foraging Spectrum*	Synthesizes mobility, storage, and D-PLACE empirical data.[7]
Junko Habu	2006	*Growth and decline in complex hunter-gatherer societies: Sannai Maruyama*	Analyzes the ecological collapse of Jomon storage systems.[21]
Luke Glowacki & M. Singh	2021	*Human social organization during the Late Pleistocene*	Critiques the peaceful, egalitarian model of deep history.[13]
Jeanne E. Arnold	1992	*Complex*	Details the

		Hunter-Gatherer-Fishers of Prehistoric California	Chumash 'antap society and the Brotherhood of the Tomol.[23]
D. Graeber & D. Wengrow	2021	*The Dawn of Everything: A New History of Humanity*	Presents the strongest counter-argument to ecological determinism.[32]

Implementability after the Fall

The transition to a post-industrial, stateless world removes global supply chains, requiring a reversion to local carrying capacities. Attempting to manage this reversion without understanding the trap of delayed-return systems invites immediate capture by dark-triad actors.

For a household of 4 to 10 people rebuilding after the collapse, the minimum viable version of governance must balance the absolute necessity of delayed-return storage (to survive winters without a grid) with an immediate-return *ethos* regarding tools and daily calories. This requires basic literacy to maintain inventory, a shared physical calendar to track seasonal processing windows, and a physically secure, weather-proof storage location. The first failure to expect is internal tyranny: a charismatic or aggressive household member will inevitably claim exclusive physical authority over the lock to the root cellar, leveraging caloric access to extract unquestioning obedience and disproportionate labor from the rest of the household.

For a village of 300 people, the community must operate a mixed economy utilizing communal processing of hyper-abundant wild or feral resources. To prevent the Jomon or Natufian trap, storage must be physically dispersed into modular, household-level caches rather than a centralized, monumental granary. Initiating this requires a central, universally accessible meeting place for collective decision-making, distributed storage schematics, and a culturally enforced system of "reverse dominance" (e.g., institutionalized ridicule, mandatory term limits for organizers, and universal armament). The first failure to expect is the emergence of a "Brotherhood of the Tomol" scenario. A highly specialized, capital-intensive task essential for survival—such as maintaining the sole solar-powered water purifier or repairing the primary defensive perimeter—will be captured by a specialized guild. This guild will rapidly transition into an elite caste, demanding exorbitant rent and tribute in calories from the rest of the village, backed by the threat of withholding their technical expertise.

For a district of 3,000 people spread across multiple settlements, the minimum viable arrangement is a federated network operating on a ledger of reciprocal exchange, specifically designed to mitigate the high variance of local crop or foraging failures. Initiating this scale without the internet requires hard-copy, decentralized records of exchange, a shared calendar for regional assemblies, and a universally recognized, difficult-to-forge fiat currency (analogous to the Chumash *ponco* shell beads) to facilitate non-barter trade across long

distances. The first failure to expect is geographical capture. Differential positioning—such as a specific village located at a critical river crossing, mountain pass, or surviving infrastructure hub—will lead to an accumulation of transit tolls. This central village will inevitably transition into a Mound Key-style chiefdom, utilizing its concentrated wealth to fund a standing militia, monopolize the fiat currency, and violently subjugate the peripheral villages for tribute.

Principles

Governance Principle	Testable Claim
The Principle of Capital Defensibility	The degree of institutionalized social inequality in a stateless society is directly proportional to the spatial concentration and defensibility of its vital caloric resources.
The Principle of Asset Capture	Whenever survival depends on delayed-return assets (e.g., granaries, complex capital tools), individuals with dark-triad traits will preferentially attempt to monopolize the physical asset rather than increasing their own labor output.
The Principle of Reverse Dominance	Egalitarianism is not a passive biological default state, but an active, highly energy-intensive political process requiring the constant, coordinated, and occasionally lethal suppression of aggrandizing individuals.
The Principle of the Exit Cost	A population's vulnerability to authoritarian control is inversely proportional to the ability of its citizens to physically relocate (fission) without facing immediate starvation.
The Principle of Intergenerational Lock-In	Because material wealth generates a significantly higher intergenerational transmission multiplier than embodied knowledge or skill, the invention of secure property rights inevitably yields inherited class stratification.

Works cited

1. (PDF) Egalitarianism, Evolution of - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327454024_Egalitarianism_Evolution_of
2. Immediate return und delayed return Systeme im Vergleich, https://userwikis.fu-berlin.de/spaces/sozkultanthro/pages/293339349/Immediate+return+und+delayed+return+Systeme+im+Vergleich
3. Introduction | Cairn.info, https://shs.cairn.info/journal-l-homme-2020-3-page-5?lang=en
4. The Significance of Food Storage Among Hunter-Gatherers, https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/202894
5. alain testart - be you., https://redefineschool.com/alain-testart/
6. The Origins of Inequality: Insiders, Outsiders, Elites, and Commoners, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/46449800_The_Origins_of_Inequality_Insiders_Outsiders_Elites_and_Commoners
7. Hunter-Gatherer Behavior at Dorn Levee #1 (38FA608), https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=7034&context=etd
8. Non-Competitive Egalitarian Societies - P2P Foundation Wiki, https://wiki.p2pfoundation.net/Non-Competitive_Egalitarian_Societies
9. Beyond egalitarian/hierarchical hunter-gatherer societies - Cairn, https://shs.cairn.info/journal-l-homme-2020-3-page-77?lang=en
10. Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior, https://www.goodreads.com/en/book/show/2131522.Hierarchy_in_the_Forest
11. Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior, https://opac.uma.ac.id/repository/0674390318.pdf
12. Soziologie - Einfache Jäger- und Sammlergesellschaften, https://soziologie.philhist.unibas.ch/fileadmin/user_upload/soziologie/Paul_2022_Einfache_Jaeger_und_Sammlergesellschaften.pdf
13. Human social organization during the Late Pleistocene, https://www.thetedkarchive.com/library/manvir-singh-luke-glowacki-human-social-organization-during-the-late-pleistocene
14. The evolution of peace | Behavioral and Brain Sciences, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/behavioral-and-brain-sciences/article/evolution-of-peace/B3B894C67CF392DB7A0F326E1AF15883
15. Ancestral Inequality and Preferences for Redistribution - IRIS Unimore, https://iris.unimo.it/retrieve/aa56c139-4693-41b7-ae50-c9f1f60fc64b/0270.pdf
16. Eynan (Ain Mallaha) (Chapter 34) - Quaternary of the Levant, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/quaternary-of-the-levant/eynan-ain-mallaha/62FD218E7C6387D0E65E13F502FBD29D
17. 2.4: Early Jomon (5000 BCE – 2500 BCE) - Humanities LibreTexts, https://human.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Art/Art_History_and_Theory/Asian_Art_History_(Gustlin_and_Gustlin)/02%3A_Neolithic_Period_(5000_BCE__2000_BCE)/2.4%3A_Early_Jomon_(5000_BCE__2500_BCE)
18. About the Jomon period, https://jomon-japan.jp/en/learn/jomon-culture

19. JOMON PEOPLE (10500–300 B.C.) - Facts and Details, https://factsanddetails.com/japan/cat16/sub105/entry-5278.html
20. Changing relationship between the dead and the living in Japanese, https://royalsocietypublishing.org/rstb/article/373/1754/20170272/23552/Changing-relationship-between-the-dead-and-the
21. a case study from the Jomon period Sannai Maruyama site, Japan, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264839471_Growth_and_decline_in_complex_hunter-gatherer_societies_a_case_study_from_the_Jomon_period_Sannai_Maruyama_site_Japan
22. (PDF) The Northwest Coast - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274064369_The_Northwest_Coast
23. Tomol | Encyclopedia.com, https://www.encyclopedia.com/environment/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/tomol
24. Mound Key Archaeological State Park - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mound_Key_Archaeological_State_Park
25. Aboriginal Slavery on the Northwest Coast of North America [Reprint, https://dokumen.pub/aboriginal-slavery-on-the-northwest-coast-of-north-america-reprint-2019nbsped-9780520918115.html
26. Southwest Florida during the Mississippi Period, https://edwardwimberley.com/courses/80458/swflmissprd.pdf
27. Ancient engineering of fish capture and storage in southwest Florida, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1921708117
28. Navigating cooperative marketplaces: the Chumash Indians and the, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/human-dynamics/articles/10.3389/fhumd.2025.1606256/full
29. Sah Quah - The Alaska Landmine, https://alaskalandmine.com/landmines/sah-quah/
30. UC Santa Barbara - eScholarship.org, https://escholarship.org/content/qt4z95n42f/qt4z95n42f.pdf
31. Market integration, income inequality, and kinship system among the, https://loca.fudan.edu.cn/Doc/B44.pdf
32. The mismeasure of human history? - Stone Centre at UCL, https://www.stone-econ.org/news-and-blogs/the-mismeasure-of-human-history
33. Intergenerational Wealth Transmission among Horticulturalists, https://scholarship.richmond.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1014&context=jepson-faculty-publications
34. The Handbook of Historical Economics 9780128158746, 0128158743, https://dokumen.pub/the-handbook-of-historical-economics-9780128158746-0128158743.html
35. Economic Systems of Foragers - Ovid, https://www.ovid.com/journals/ccres/pdf/10.1177/1069397103254032~economic-systems-of-foragers
36. (PDF) Pre-Coded Variables for the Standard Cross-Cultural Sample, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/2575100_Pre-Coded_Variables_for_the

_Standard_Cross-Cultural_Sample
37. Intergenerational Wealth Transmission and the Dynamics of, https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1029&context=psychology_articles
38. Intergenerational Wealth Transmission and the Dynamics of, https://www.eva.mpg.de/documents/AAAS/Borgerhoff-Mulder_Intergenerational_Science_2009_2189437.pdf
39. (PDF) Intergenerational Wealth Transmission among Agriculturalists, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266396120_Intergenerational_Wealth_Transmission_among_Agriculturalists_Foundations_of_Agrarian_Inequality
40. Ecological variation and institutionalized inequality in hunter ... - PNAS, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2016134118
41. 1 The controversial origins of war and peace: apes, foragers, and, https://ecoevorxiv.org/repository/object/5201/download/14451/