DT-03 Fission, mobility and exit as the first check on power

The permanent loss of industrial supply chains and the contraction of the state's reach necessitate a rigorous re-examination of the fundamental mechanisms of human governance. Across deep time, the most persistent, universally available, and effective check on coercive power has been the ability of the governed to physically relocate. Before the invention of formal constitutional checks and balances, spatial mobility dictated the limits of those who sought to govern.

This foundational document analyzes the mechanics, historical efficacy, and vulnerabilities of fission, mobility, and exit. It contrasts the fluid, exit-rich environments of Pleistocene and contemporary foragers with the geographically and economically trapped demographics of early agrarian states. The analysis traces the institutionalization of exit in historical confederacies, the commodification of mobility in the modern era, and the polycentric frameworks required to simulate exit when physical land is exhausted. By isolating the precise variables that render exit credible, this report establishes the foundational requirements for self-governance in a post-collapse environment.

The Hunter-Gatherer Baseline: Fluidity and Reverse Dominance

For the vast majority of anatomically modern human history, political organization was characterized by extreme fluidity and high rates of physical mobility. The default response to conflict, resource depletion, or the emergence of an overbearing individual was band fission—the deliberate splitting and relocation of a residential camp.

Modern scholarship fundamentally rejects the legacy assumption that early human bands were rigid, patrilocal, and strictly kin-based units. The comprehensive meta-analysis by Hill et al. (2011) evaluated co-residence patterns across thirty-two contemporary foraging societies, utilizing complete genealogical and demographic data[1]. The researchers mapped 58 pre-contact Ache bands in Paraguay, encompassing 980 adults, alongside six Ju/'hoansi bands in southern Africa, encompassing 89 adults[2]. The empirical record demonstrates that primary kin—defined as parents, siblings, and children—constituted less than 10 percent of a residential band. The mean total number of co-resident adult primary kin per band was quantified at a mere 1.8 individuals across the thirty-two societies, representing roughly 7 percent of the total adults in an average band size of 28.2 individuals[2]. The genetic coefficient of relatedness (r) between adults in Ache bands was calculated at 0.054, indicating that the vast majority of band members were genetically unrelated or only distantly related[2].

This extreme demographic fluidity, facilitated by frequent residential moves, acted as a structural barrier to the consolidation of power. Anthropologist Robert L. Kelly (2013) demonstrated in *The Lifeways of Hunter-Gatherers* that while mobility distances and

frequencies vary strictly by biome and effective temperature, the capacity to relocate remains a universal feature of foraging life[3]. Frank Marlowe (2010), studying the Hadza of Tanzania, quantified this mobility, noting that individuals conduct daily foraging walks averaging up to 13 kilometers, combined with frequent macro-residential moves throughout the year based on resource distribution and social friction[5]. This mobility network created a system where camp composition changed constantly, functioning as an automated pressure valve for social tension and political ambition.

Christopher Boehm (1999) synthesized the political dynamics of this fluidity in *Hierarchy in the Forest*, coining the term "reverse dominance hierarchy"[7]. Boehm demonstrated that hunter-gatherers are not passively egalitarian; rather, they are aggressively anti-hierarchical. When individuals exhibiting dark-triad traits—such as narcissism, Machiavellianism, or psychopathy—attempted to assert dominance, the rank-and-file formed deliberate, calculated coalitions to suppress them[9]. The sequence of sanctions was highly structured. The initial response involved ridicule and gossip, leveraging social leveling mechanisms to induce shame. If the behavior persisted, the community escalated to active disobedience, systematically ignoring the self-appointed leader's directives. The ultimate non-lethal sanction was fission: the camp simply abandoned the bully, dissolving the social substrate the individual sought to control by walking away in the night. If exit was geographically or temporarily impossible, or if the tyrant was lethally violent, the community reached a consensus to enact capital punishment[11]. Richard Lee (1979) documented a specific case among the !Kung where a three-time murderer and violent bully was ambushed and executed in broad daylight by a coalition of the entire community, illustrating the lethal extreme of reverse dominance[13]. The ethological record mirrors this; primatologists have recorded analogous reverse dominance executions among chimpanzees, such as the 2011 killing of the alpha male Pimu by a coalition of five subordinate males, and the 2013 execution of the ex-alpha Foudouko[12].

When examining this governance arrangement through a tripartite analytical lens, indigenous foragers frequently conceptualized leaving not as a formalized political act, but as an ecological necessity or a search for better social harmony, thereby masking active political resistance in the language of foraging optimization[13]. However, the archaeological record demonstrates that early Holocene and Pleistocene populations maintained vast, low-density networks with frequent re-aggregation and dispersal, deliberately avoiding permanent spatial confinement even in areas of relative abundance[15]. Modern evolutionary anthropologists infer from these patterns that demographic fluidity was the primary evolutionary mechanism selecting for human prosociality and complex cooperation. Because bullies were consistently abandoned or executed, the inclusive fitness of highly aggressive, domineering males was structurally curtailed, allowing cooperative norms to proliferate[2].

Foraging Band Scale Ledger & Capture Test	**Assessment**

Scale Ledger	**Operated/Worked:** Household (4 to 10 people), Hamlet or Band (30 to 50). Fluidity perfectly matches the cognitive limits of human trust networks. **Failed/Never Tried:** Village (150 to 500), Parish or district (1,500 to 5,000), Town or watershed (15,000 to 50,000), Region or bioregion (0.5 to 5 million), Nation or continent (50 to 500 million), Planet (8 billion). Pure fission fails at scale because uncoordinated mass dispersal requires vast, unoccupied landscapes, which become unavailable as population density increases.
Capture Test	**Takeover Mechanism:** A physically imposing psychopath attempts to monopolize meat distribution or mates through immediate violence. **Historical Cases:** !Kung and Hadza bullies; Chimpanzee alpha takeovers[12]. **Resistance/Reversal:** The "Reverse Dominance" coalition. The group leverages asynchronous coordination to execute the bully via sleep-ambushes or poison arrows, or entirely circumvents the conflict through nighttime physical fission[10].

The Eradication of Exit: Circumscription and Appropriable Grain

The transition to agrarian states represents the systematic dismantling of the exit option. The formation of the state, and the subsequent rise of institutionalized inequality, was historically contingent upon trapping populations geographically, ecologically, and politically.

Robert L. Carneiro's (1970) seminal circumscription theory posited that states arose only where the exit option was physically blocked by impassable geography—such as mountains, deserts, or oceans—or by tightly packed, hostile neighboring tribes[18]. Comparing the coastal valleys of Peru with the Amazon basin, Carneiro argued that the Peruvian valleys were highly circumscribed by the Andes and the Pacific, leaving defeated villages nowhere to flee. This population pressure in a trapped environment forced continuous warfare, conquest, and the

eventual stratification of the Inca state[19]. Conversely, the open expanse of the Amazon allowed defeated groups to simply retreat deeper into the forest, resulting in a landscape dominated by autonomous villages and loose, ephemeral chiefdoms rather than centralized empires[19].
However, modern econometric analysis provides a robust, quantitative correction to Carneiro's purely geographic model and the standard "agricultural productivity" narrative. Joram Mayshar, Omer Moav, Zvika Neeman, and Luigi Pascali (2022), writing in the *Journal of Political Economy*, utilized a dataset of over 1,200 precolonial societies mapped against the Food and Agriculture Organization's (FAO) land-suitability models[21]. Utilizing two-stage least squares (2SLS) regressions to control for reverse causality, they proved that high agricultural yield alone does not generate state hierarchy. The critical variable is the *appropriability* of the staple crop[22].
Populations relying on tubers and roots (such as cassava or yams) achieved high caloric yields and dense populations, yet did not form complex states. Tubers possess roughly 70 percent moisture, making them incredibly heavy and inefficient to transport overland. More importantly, they do not require synchronous harvesting; they can be left safely in the ground and harvested piecemeal. If a tax collector or bandit arrives, farmers can temporarily flee, and their capital remains hidden underground. The exit option remains highly viable[22]. Cereals, conversely—such as wheat, barley, rice, and maize—require synchronous harvesting. The yield is highly visible, easily measurable, storable for years, and extremely energy-dense. Cereals can be effectively confiscated, stored, and transported by an emerging elite[23].
When Neolithic farmers committed their labor to cereal agriculture, their fields and grain silos became fixed capital. The cost of exit shifted from minor social friction to absolute starvation. The elite did not arise benignly to manage agricultural surplus; rather, the biological realities of cereal crops *allowed* elites to extract a surplus without the population possessing a credible threat of flight[22].
Political scientist James C. Scott (2017) expanded on this dynamic in *Against the Grain*, identifying the earliest states, such as Uruk in Mesopotamia, as highly engineered population-containment modules designed primarily to maximize the assessment and extraction of grain[26]. From the perspective of early state administration, human beings were effectively husbanded as livestock. Early legal codes demonstrate a hyper-focus on preventing flight and capturing runaways. Walls surrounding early urban centers were built as much to keep taxpayers and slaves enclosed as they were to keep invaders out[27]. When exit became prohibitively costly due to the loss of fixed agricultural capital, populations were forced into involuntary loyalty, and state power expanded unchecked.
Yet, physical exit was never fully extinguished. The historical record is replete with populations deliberately fleeing into "shatter zones"—remote hills, deep marshes, and arid steppes—becoming what agrarian states pejoratively termed "barbarians." Becoming a barbarian was frequently a conscious political act of exit designed to improve one's diet, autonomy, and lifespan by evading the tax trap of the grain core[26].
Evaluating the early agrarian state reveals a stark divergence between ideology and empirical reality. Early state ideologies, such as those in Sumerian and Egyptian texts, universally claimed that divine providence granted the king the mandate to organize agriculture, protect the weak, and stave off cosmic chaos[26]. However, the skeletal and archaeological records demonstrate a

massive decline in human health, physical stature, and lifespan upon entering early states, accompanied by the first historical appearances of mass slavery, zoonotic plagues, and chronic malnutrition[30]. Modern scholarship infers that the early state was fundamentally an extractive protection racket, made possible solely by the systematic reduction of spatial mobility. State architecture optimized for taxable, storable calories rather than human flourishing or equitable governance[23].

Early Agrarian State Scale Ledger & Capture Test	Assessment
Scale Ledger	**Operated/Worked:** Town or watershed (15,000 to 50,000), Region or bioregion (0.5 to 5 million), Nation or continent (50 to 500 million). Operates effectively wherever high-density, easily appropriated calories can be concentrated and defended. **Failed/Never Tried:** Household (4 to 10 people), Hamlet or band (30 to 50), Village (150 to 500), Planet (8 billion). Fails at lower scales due to the inability to support a non-producing bureaucratic class. Fails in environments where resources are geographically dispersed or un-storable (e.g., deep jungle, tundra) due to the persistent viability of exit.
Capture Test	**Takeover Mechanism:** A Machiavellian faction monopolizes the central granaries, employs professional thugs (the earliest standing militaries), and institutes debt-bondage systems to trap farmers geographically and economically[32]. **Historical Cases:** Mesopotamian city-states; Early dynastic Egypt; Early Chinese dynasties. **Resistance/Reversal:** Collapse generally occurred via systemic ecological failure (soil salinization, zoonotic epidemic) or mass

	defection to the "barbarian" periphery when state coercion outpaced its defensive utility[28].

Institutionalized Exit: Confederacies and Seasonal Fluidity

When human populations grew too large to rely on simple band fission but actively sought to avoid the coercive trap of the autocratic grain state, they engineered sophisticated institutional frameworks. These frameworks deliberately formalized exit, mobility, and the right of refusal into their constitutional structures.

David Graeber and David Wengrow (2021) in *The Dawn of Everything* demonstrate that prehistoric and early historic populations were vastly more politically self-conscious than traditional linear stage-theories of civilization admit[34]. The archaeological and ethnographic records indicate that many societies operated with intense seasonal fluidity. Populations would alternate between highly structured, sometimes authoritarian formations during intensive harvest or mass-hunting periods, and egalitarian, widely dispersed bands during the remainder of the year. Examples range from the monumental builders of Stonehenge to the indigenous populations of the American Northwest and the Inuit[34]. This seasonal dismantling of power structures proves that human beings are deeply capable of consciously designing, adopting, and discarding hierarchical authority based on immediate utility, actively refusing to let temporary administrative authority harden into permanent coercive state power.

As populations transitioned toward more sedentary horticultural models, the institutionalization of exit became highly codified. The Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) Confederacy formalized fission and physical mobility as central mechanisms for maintaining peace and preventing tyranny. The Great Law of Peace maintained political unity among five distinct nations through a sophisticated, overlapping matrix of clan relationships[37]. Crucially, political identity and social safety nets were not strictly tied to local geography. The exogamous, matrilineal clan system dictated that a member of the Wolf Clan in the Seneca nation possessed reciprocal kin obligations and guaranteed hospitality—an exit option—with the Wolf Clan in the Mohawk or Cayuga nations[38].

If a faction within an Iroquois village became tyrannical, or if consensus broke down irreconcilably, the minority faction utilized institutionalized fission. They simply packed up their belongings and relocated, often being adopted into neighboring villages or establishing a completely new settlement[37]. They integrated seamlessly into new locations via the universal clan structure, keeping the transactional cost of exit incredibly low. Leaders, known as Sachems, possessed no coercive police force; their power relied entirely on continuous consensus and rhetorical persuasion. If a Sachem failed to maintain consensus, their constituents utilized the exit option, rendering the leader powerless.

In medieval Europe, the Old Swiss Confederacy (established effectively in 1291) operated as a rigorous defensive alliance explicitly designed to exist without a centralized, coercive state apparatus[40]. It maintained extreme localism and relied on the implicit, continuous threat of exit

(defederation) to check the ambitions of its constituent parts. The *Stanser Verkommnis* (Compact of Stans) of 1481 is a premier historical example of utilizing mediation to prevent the collapse of a confederacy facing catastrophic internal fission[42]. The rural cantons and the increasingly powerful urban cantons (the *Dreizehn Orte*) were on the brink of civil war over the unequal distribution of the spoils from the Burgundian Wars[42]. Through the careful mediation of the hermit Niklaus von Flüe, the cantons negotiated a pact that strictly limited the power of urban centers to dictate terms or extract wealth from rural areas, thereby re-establishing the voluntary nature of the union[45]. Political scientist David Stasavage (2020) highlights that such "early democracies" functioned precisely because the constituent parts possessed a highly credible threat of exit; leaders were bound by strict mandates and could not rule without maintaining deep local consent[47].

The tripartite analysis of these confederacies reveals the mechanisms of conscious political design. Practitioners framed these arrangements in deeply spiritual or mythological terms—such as burying the hatchet beneath the Tree of Peace, or invoking divine providence in the Swiss Alps—to ensure supreme ideological cohesion and cultural buy-in[37]. The historical record shows that these systems successfully prevented the internal consolidation of absolute power and maintained regional stability for centuries, although they frequently projected extreme violence outward through imperialism, such as the devastating Iroquois Mourning Wars or the employment of Swiss mercenaries[37]. Modern scholarship infers that these arrangements were highly sophisticated algorithms for balancing power. By utilizing overlapping jurisdictions and preserving low-cost exit pathways, these confederacies forced consensus and structurally prevented the emergence of a domestic Leviathan[47].

Democratic Confederacy Scale Ledger & Capture Test	**Assessment**
Scale Ledger	**Operated/Worked:** Village (150 to 500), Parish or district (1,500 to 5,000), Town or watershed (15,000 to 50,000), Region or bioregion (0.5 to 5 million). Successfully nested households into trans-national alliances without requiring a monopoly on violence. **Failed/Never Tried:** Household (4 to 10), Hamlet or band (30 to 50), Nation or continent (50 to 500 million), Planet (8 billion). Fails at the household level due to excessive administrative overhead. At massive continental scales, the transaction costs of achieving universal consensus

	become paralyzing, leading to terminal vulnerability against highly centralized, fast-acting external autocratic states.
Capture Test	**Takeover Mechanism:** A charismatic war leader attempts to parlay external military success or localized wealth accumulation into internal coercive political power. **Historical Cases:** King Philip's War; various charismatic prophets in indigenous history attempting to consolidate spiritual and political authority. **Resistance/Reversal:** The "Recall" mechanism (such as Clan Mothers possessing the absolute right to strip Sachems of their titles); the physical fission and relocation of the dissenting population, instantly depriving the would-be tyrant of their power base[37].

The Modern Era: Blocked Exit and Tiebout Sorting

As the planet's population expanded and the modern Westphalian nation-state claimed a total, uninterrupted monopoly on global geography, physical exit into an unadministered frontier became impossible. Exit subsequently underwent two divergent transformations: it was theoretically commodified as a market mechanism in capitalist democracies, and it was violently suppressed by totalitarian regimes.

Albert O. Hirschman's (1970) seminal text, *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*, provides the definitive theoretical framework for understanding organizational decline and political resistance[49]. When a citizen is dissatisfied with a state or institution, they possess two primary active choices. They can utilize *Exit*—leaving the jurisdiction, thereby depriving the state of revenue and human capital, which sends an immediate, unambiguous economic signal. Alternatively, they can utilize *Voice*—protesting, voting, or petitioning to change the system from within. Political scientists William Roberts Clark, Matt Golder, and Sona Golder formalized Hirschman's thesis into the EVL game-theoretic model[51]. Their mathematical model proves a vital political reality: a state will only respond to *Voice* if two distinct conditions are met. First, the citizen must possess a highly credible *Exit* threat. Second, the state must depend on the citizen (e.g., for taxation, military labor, or intellectual capital)[53]. If exit is blocked or geographically too costly, the state can safely ignore voice, forcing the citizen into involuntary *Loyalty* (submission).

The ultimate empirical validation of the EVL model's dark extreme occurred in the German Democratic Republic (GDR). Between the founding of the state in 1949 and 1961, an estimated

2.5 to 3 million East Germans utilized the exit option (*Republikflucht*), fleeing through the open border of West Berlin[54]. This massive demographic hemorrhage devastated the East German economy by draining it of its youngest, most educated, and most productive citizens.
Recognizing that mass exit constituted an existential threat to its survival, the GDR constructed the Berlin Wall on August 13, 1961[56]. The statistical effect was immediate and severe: successful direct escapes plummeted from hundreds of thousands annually to just a few hundred[54]. Between 1961 and 1989, only 40,100 direct escapes were achieved. The state heavily militarized the border with SM-70 booby traps, minefields, and shoot-to-kill orders, resulting in 916 documented deaths across all inner-German borders[57]. To further crush the concept of exit, 71,000 citizens were imprisoned for attempting to flee, and 50,000 individuals were deported to internal exile merely for aiding escapees[56]. By successfully eliminating exit, the GDR forced artificial "loyalty" for nearly three decades. It was only when the external Soviet military guarantee collapsed in 1989 that *Voice* (the Monday demonstrations) and *Exit* (flight through the newly opened borders of Hungary and Czechoslovakia) mutually reinforced each other to shatter the regime.
Conversely, in democratic, capitalist societies, exit was modeled by economist Charles Tiebout (1956) as a highly efficient market mechanism for the allocation of local public goods[58]. Tiebout theorized that "consumer-voters" move fluidly between municipalities—"voting with their feet"—to find the optimal, personalized bundle of property taxes and public services (e.g., schools, police)[60]. Empirical tests of Tiebout sorting, beginning with Wallace Oates in 1969 and expanded by later scholars like Banzhaf and Strumpf, confirm that populations do indeed migrate and property values adjust in direct response to local public goods provision and taxation levels[60].
However, the Tiebout model contains a fatal flaw regarding equity: it heavily commodifies exit. Physical mobility requires significant capital. Therefore, Tiebout sorting inevitably drives extreme wealth segregation[59]. Affluent citizens, possessing high mobility, cluster in exclusive enclaves with high-quality, privatized services, utilizing exclusionary zoning laws to prevent free-riding by lower-income individuals[59]. The poor, lacking the financial capital to execute an exit strategy, remain trapped in failing jurisdictions subject to a downward spiral of diminishing tax bases and deteriorating services.
A tripartite view of the modern state reveals deep contradictions. Modern states universally claim that their borders define a sovereign community of shared destiny, protecting citizens from external threats and providing equitable welfare. The historical record, however, demonstrates that states vigorously prioritize the protection of their tax base over abstract freedoms. Totalitarian states use lethal military force to prevent exit; liberal states use passports, complex border controls, and capital flight restrictions to regulate the exact economic parameters of permitted exit[64]. Modern scholarship infers that exit remains the ultimate bargaining chip in state-citizen relations. The credible threat of capital flight or brain drain forces modern states to moderate their extractive tendencies, but because exit is cheap for capital and expensive for labor, massive structural wealth disparities naturally and inevitably emerge[52].

Modern State & Municipality Scale Ledger & Capture Test	Assessment
Scale Ledger	**Operated/Worked:** Town or watershed (15,000 to 50,000), Region or bioregion (0.5 to 5 million), Nation or continent (50 to 500 million). Functions highly efficiently for capital allocation, macroeconomic logistics, and standardized infrastructure. **Failed/Never Tried:** Household (4 to 10), Hamlet or band (30 to 50), Planet (8 billion). Fails at micro-scales due to the impossibility of formalizing micro-taxation. If a unified planetary state is ever formed, the spatial exit option is physically annihilated, raising the existential risk of an inescapable global tyranny.
Capture Test	**Takeover Mechanism:** A bureaucratic, ideological, or oligarchic faction legally captures the centralized state apparatus, institutes severe capital controls, and militarizes borders to physically prevent tax-base flight. **Historical Cases:** East Germany (GDR), North Korea, various 20th-century autocracies[57]. **Resistance/Reversal:** The proliferation of black markets, the establishment of institutionalized smuggling networks, and eventual systemic economic collapse due to the suppression of accurate price and social signals resulting from the eradication of voice and exit.

What Replaces Exit When Land is Full: Polycentricity and the Commons

In a post-collapse environment, physical land may be nominally abundant, but optimal, highly

defensible resource zones—such as arable river valleys or clean aquifers—will be heavily contested and densely packed. When geographic spatial exit becomes prohibitively dangerous or expensive, governance systems must rely on *polycentricity* and *institutional nesting* to prevent both the tragedy of the commons and autocratic capture.

Nobel Laureate Elinor Ostrom (1990) shattered the dominant Hobbesian assumption that either a coercive, centralized Leviathan or absolute market privatization was necessary to manage shared resources[65]. Through an exhaustive, decades-long meta-analysis of thousands of Common Pool Resource (CPR) systems—including fisheries, forests, and irrigation systems—Ostrom identified eight core design principles that enable communities to self-govern sustainably over long durations[67].

1. **Clearly defined boundaries:** Both the physical boundaries of the shared resource and the specific identity of authorized users are explicitly delineated[70].
2. **Proportional equivalence:** The rules governing the extraction of resources are strictly proportional to the labor, financial, or material costs required to maintain the system[70].
3. **Collective-choice arrangements:** The vast majority of individuals affected by the operational rules can participate directly in modifying those rules[71].
4. **Monitoring:** Monitors, who actively audit CPR conditions and individual user behavior, are directly accountable to the users, or are the users themselves[71].
5. **Graduated sanctions:** Rule violators are subject to sanctions that scale granularly from mild social reprimands to severe fines, and ultimately to banishment (the enforcement of exit upon the violator)[68].
6. **Conflict-resolution mechanisms:** Users have rapid access to low-cost, local arenas to resolve disputes[68].
7. **Minimal recognition of rights to organize:** External, higher-level authorities do not actively challenge the local users' right to devise their own self-governing institutions[71].
8. **Nested enterprises:** For large, complex resources, governance activities (appropriation, provision, monitoring, enforcement) are organized in multiple layers of nested enterprises[65].

Ostrom's eighth principle—nested enterprises—acts as the structural replacement for physical exit. *Polycentric governance* describes a system comprising multiple, overlapping centers of decision-making that operate with considerable autonomy but are bound by an overarching set of systemic rules and conflict-resolution mechanisms[72].

If a citizen in a polycentric system is oppressed by a local irrigation council, they do not need to physically abandon their farm, which would mean financial ruin. Instead, they appeal to the overlapping watershed authority, a horizontal agricultural guild, or a parallel village council[73]. Polycentricity creates *jurisdictional exit* without requiring *geographic exit*.

The efficacy of polycentric, commons-based governance is highly quantifiable. Wai Fung Lam (1998) conducted a rigorous empirical analysis of 150 irrigation systems in Nepal. He discovered that self-governing, farmer-owned systems drastically outperformed centralized, top-down agency-managed systems[74]. Farmer-owned systems achieved an extraordinary head-end crop intensity of 246 percent and a tail-end intensity of 237 percent. In stark

contrast, state-run systems achieved only 208 percent at the head-end and a dismal 182 percent at the tail-end[74]. Local farmers, wielding deep, time-and-place-specific knowledge and holding each other strictly accountable through visible monitoring and graduated sanctions, optimized the resource far more effectively than distant bureaucrats imposing uniform rules[76]. A tripartite analysis of the polycentric commons demonstrates its enduring utility. Local practitioners describe these systems using the language of "traditional ways" or customary law, emphasizing communal harmony, spiritual stewardship of the land, and long-term sustainability[77]. The empirical record shows that these institutions—such as the Swiss alpine meadows or the Spanish *Huertas*—survive for centuries, exhibiting significantly higher resource efficiency and ecological resilience than top-down state control or unmonitored open-access regimes[67]. Modern scholarship infers that polycentricity utilizes deliberate functional redundancy and overlapping authority spheres to create a highly resilient, anti-fragile system that aggressively mitigates the risk of single-point failure or localized autocratic capture[73].

Polycentric Commons Scale Ledger & Capture Test	**Assessment**
Scale Ledger	**Operated/Worked:** Household (4 to 10), Hamlet or band (30 to 50), Village (150 to 500), Parish or district (1,500 to 5,000), Town or watershed (15,000 to 50,000). Highly effective when tightly nested and communication costs remain low[65]. **Failed/Never Tried:** Region or bioregion (0.5 to 5 million), Nation or continent (50 to 500 million), Planet (8 billion). Attempting to scale Ostrom's precise principles to massive global commons (e.g., the atmosphere, deep oceans) currently fails because establishing effective, universally trusted monitoring and sanctioning mechanisms without a global Leviathan remains an unsolved collective action problem[80].
Capture Test	**Takeover Mechanism:** A wealthy or highly charismatic local actor attempts to free-ride on the resource, using their influence to bribe or intimidate the local monitor into ignoring their over-extraction.

	Historical Cases: The collapse of various poorly monitored fisheries; modern regulatory capture in local zoning boards[77]. **Resistance/Reversal:** The strict requirement that monitors be directly accountable to the users (Principle 4), combined with immediate access to low-cost conflict resolution arenas (Principle 6), allows the rank-and-file to instantly challenge, expose, and replace corrupt monitors, isolating the dark-triad actor[71].

The Strongest Case Against Exit and Decentralization

To avoid the romance of the primitive and the naturalistic fallacy—recognizing that "old" does not intrinsically mean "good," and "small" does not inherently mean "fair"—it is vital to engage rigorously with the strongest critiques of fission, mobility, and decentralized commons governance.

1. The Hobbesian Critique (The Price of Anarchy): The most persistent critique argues that minimizing centralized state power and maximizing the exit option leads directly to anarchic, endemic violence. While Pleistocene foragers maintained internal egalitarianism, they existed in an environment with incredibly high rates of violent mortality between groups. Fission frequently escalates minor social friction into deadly inter-group warfare, as splinted groups compete for the same peripheral resources[12]. Thomas Hobbes argued that the Leviathan, regardless of its extractive oppressiveness, provides a monopoly on violence that drastically reduces individual murder rates compared to decentralized tribalism. Furthermore, critics point out that while early states exacted a heavy tax on grain and lifespan, over the long arc of history, states eventually provided the macro-infrastructure, famine relief logistics, and physical security that allowed human populations to explode far beyond the carrying capacity of stateless, mobile peripheries.

2. The Inefficiency of Non-State Complexity (Yoffee's Critique): Norman Yoffee (2005) in *Myths of the Archaic State* delivers a potent critique of neo-evolutionary stage-theories that assume all societal complexity must inevitably culminate in a modern state[33]. However, the implicit warning within Yoffee's framework is that highly decentralized, supposedly "egalitarian" complex societies often leave fragile, ephemeral archaeological footprints precisely because they struggle to permanently marshal the concentrated caloric and labor surpluses necessary to survive. When decentralized, high-exit societies are forced to compete with highly centralized, territorially aggressive neighboring states, the decentralized societies are frequently out-organized, conquered, or absorbed[82].

3. The Inequity of Exit (The Tiebout Critique): As extensively demonstrated by Strumpf and

Banzhaf, when exit is relied upon as the primary mechanism for governance optimization (as in Tiebout sorting), it heavily and disproportionately favors the wealthy[58]. Capital is infinitely more mobile than labor. A governance system built primarily on the threat of exit will naturally degenerate into a system where policies strictly cater to those with the financial means to leave. This dynamic abandons the immobile, impoverished populations to failing, underfunded jurisdictions. Therefore, relying solely on exit without robust internal voice mechanisms guarantees extreme societal inequity[59].

4. The Overestimation of Resistance (Wood's Critique of Scott): While James C. Scott celebrates the resistance of "barbarians" and the subversion of state power, historian Andy Wood cautions that modern scholars frequently overestimate the efficacy and frequency of popular defiance. Wood argues that in many historical instances, deference to the state was not merely a facade masking constant resistance, but a deeply internalized reality. Emphasizing the power of exit and resistance risks romanticizing marginalized groups while ignoring the brutal reality that state coercion was largely highly successful in breaking the will of the governed over generations[84]. Furthermore, Michael Cox's 2010 meta-analysis of Ostrom's work warns that overly rigid adherence to strict boundary definitions (Principle 1) can actually stifle the ad-hoc, flexible cooperation necessary for survival in rapidly changing environments[70].

Conclusions

Summary of Robust Findings

1. Physical mobility and band fission were the primary evolutionary mechanisms that enforced human egalitarianism, suppressing dark-triad dominance through the constant threat of abandonment.
2. The agricultural transition did not generate state hierarchies merely by producing caloric surplus; it created states by binding humans to easily appropriable, storable, and visible capital (cereals), thereby eliminating the viability of exit.
3. Early historical confederacies successfully scaled governance without a central Leviathan by institutionalizing exit via overlapping clan networks and structural vetoes, which prevented localized monopolies on violence.
4. When states achieve a total geographic monopoly, they will routinely utilize extreme, lethal force (e.g., the Berlin Wall) to suppress exit and enforce involuntary loyalty to maintain their tax base.
5. In modern contexts, mobility (Tiebout sorting) acts as a market check on local governance but naturally results in severe wealth segregation because the transaction costs of physical exit remain high.
6. When geographic exit is physically or economically impossible, polycentric governance (based on Ostrom's design principles) provides the only empirically proven alternative, substituting jurisdictional overlap and nested accountability for geographic flight.

Contested or Open Questions

- **The Scaling Limit of Polycentricity:** Can Ostrom's design principles, which rely fundamentally on high-trust, interpersonal monitoring at the local level, be

technologically or structurally scaled to manage bioregional or continental ecological dynamics without ultimately reverting to a coercive central state?

- **Cereals vs. State Capacity:** Did early populations consciously and strategically choose to cultivate cereals to *enable* state formation and military defense, or were they inadvertently trapped by the ecological and caloric convenience of the crop?
- **The Cost of Voice:** In the absolute absence of a credible exit threat, is violent revolution the only mechanism capable of amplifying Voice sufficiently to force structural institutional change upon a dark-triad elite?

Sources to Read in Full

1. Boehm, C. (1999). *Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior*. Harvard University Press.
2. Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Scott, J. C. (2017). *Against the Grain: A Deep History of the Earliest States*. Yale University Press.
4. Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Harvard University Press.
5. Mayshar, J., Moav, O., & Pascali, L. (2022). "The Origin of the State: Land Productivity or Appropriability?" *Journal of Political Economy*, 130(4), 1091-1144.
6. Graeber, D., & Wengrow, D. (2021). *The Dawn of Everything: A New History of Humanity*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
7. Hill, K. R., et al. (2011). "Co-residence patterns in hunter-gatherer societies show unique human social structure." *Science*, 331(6022), 1286-1289.
8. Stasavage, D. (2020). *The Decline and Rise of Democracy: A Global History from Antiquity to Today*. Princeton University Press.

Implementability after the Fall

Minimum Viable Version (No state, no grid, no internet):

- **Household (4 to 10 people):** Requires absolute, culturally enshrined freedom of movement for adult members. If a patriarch or matriarch becomes tyrannical, individuals must possess established, reciprocal social ties to neighboring households to permit immediate, low-friction defection (exit).
- **Village (150 to 500 people):** Requires a dedicated physical meeting place (a council fire or plaza) and a shared calendar to guarantee regular assemblies. The village must strictly institute Ostrom's 8 design principles to manage the local water source and arable land. Rule violators are met with graduated sanctions, escalating from public gossip to reduction of water rations, and ultimately to banishment.
- **District (1,500 to 5,000 people):** Requires basic literacy and physical records (paper or parchment ledgers) to track inter-village resource contributions accurately and to formally monitor the monitors. Governance must be polycentric: an individual belongs to a geographic village, but also to a trans-village horizontal guild or clan. This structure allows a citizen to appeal the decisions of a corrupt village chief by leveraging their secondary guild network.

What it needs to start:
A shared calendar to synchronize regional assemblies; public, immutable physical ledgers for monitoring contributions and preventing free-riding; a designated, neutral meeting space strictly reserved for low-cost conflict resolution; and an absolute cultural taboo against the monopolization of non-perishable, energy-dense staples (cereals) by any single family or faction.
The first failure to expect:
The capture of the monitoring mechanism. A highly charismatic or Machiavellian individual will volunteer to take on the burdensome administrative task of monitoring the village granary or water supply full-time. Slowly, they will begin exempting their allies from graduated sanctions, weaponizing the enforcement rules against their rivals, and effectively closing the exit option by monopolizing the community's survival calories.

Principles

- **The Principle of the Exit Threat:** A governing body will only respond constructively to the voice of its constituents if those constituents possess a credible, economically viable mechanism to leave the jurisdiction.
- **The Principle of Appropriability:** The ease with which a central authority can assess, confiscate, transport, and store a society's primary caloric resource directly correlates to the emergence of coercive hierarchy.
- **The Principle of Reverse Dominance:** In the absence of a formal state monopoly on violence, egalitarianism is not naturally occurring; it requires the active, continuous, and sometimes lethal suppression of dark-triad individuals by a unified coalition of subordinates.
- **The Principle of Polycentric Resilience:** When geographic exit is constrained by spatial or resource limits, tyranny can only be prevented by establishing overlapping, redundant jurisdictions that allow citizens to appeal vertically and horizontally across governance layers.
- **The Principle of Graduated Sanctions:** Governance systems that leap directly from minor warnings to absolute banishment will fracture prematurely; enduring communities require a predictable, highly granular escalation of penalties to correct behavior long before exit becomes necessary.

Works cited

1. No. 82, https://ockenfels.uni-koeln.de/fileadmin/wiso_fak/stawi-ockenfels/pdf/wp_series_download/wp0082.pdf
2. (PDF) Co-residence patterns in hunter-gatherer societies show, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279286429_Co-residence_patterns_in_hunter-gatherer_societies_show_unique_human_social_structure
3. 3 COLONIZATION OF NEW LAND BY HUNTER-GATHERERS, https://www.uwyo.edu/anthropology/_files/docs/Kelly/kelly-2003-colonization-of-new-land-by-hunter-gatherers.pdf

4. from quartz curvature to late holocene mobility at spring cave, western, https://par.nsf.gov/servlets/purl/10342394
5. Focality and Extension in Kinship - OAPEN Library, https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/id/8826d9ed-104d-4e02-aa6a-d1c1fdb999a8/651173.pdf
6. Hunter–gatherer genetics research: Importance and avenues, https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/8DD92BF96D3775644E732F7F2064C677/S2513843X24000070a.pdf/hunter-gatherer-genetics-research-importance-and-avenues.pdf
7. Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior, https://www.goodreads.com/en/book/show/2131522.Hierarchy_in_the_Forest
8. Power in Cultural Evolution and the Spread of Prosocial Norms, https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdf/10.1086/700767
9. 4. Leadership and followership - OSF, https://osf.io/download/r7ekn/
10. The Psychological Evolution of Power: A Short History | by Gil Pignol, https://medium.com/@gp2030/the-psychological-evolution-of-power-a-short-history-fe2c366bc48f
11. Rules, Exceptions and Social Order [Reprint 2020, https://dokumen.pub/rules-exceptions-and-social-order-reprint-2020nbsped-9780520347434.html
12. Targeted conspiratorial killing, human self-domestication and the, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10427284/
13. What Is Politics podcast | The Ted K Archive, https://www.thetedkarchive.com/library/daniel-what-is-politics-podcast
14. Gathered Remains: Essays on Wildness, Domestication, Community, https://dokumen.pub/gathered-remains-essays-on-wildness-domestication-community-and-resistance-9780997201765-0997201762.html
15. CHAPTER 7 ALM ROCKSHELTER LITHIC DEBITAGE ANALYSIS, https://scholarworks.umt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?filename=7&article=1000&context=umpress-oabooks&type=additional
16. Forager Mobility in Constructed Environments, https://www.foragerarchaeology.org/papers/Haas2019.pdf
17. Anthropology: Understanding Humanity | PDF - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/965062658/Full-10
18. (PDF) Robert L. Carneiro The Circumscription Theory A Clarification, https://www.academia.edu/35761986/Robert_L_Carneiro_The_Circumscription_Theory_A_Clarification_Amplification_and_Reformulation_SEH_2_2012
19. A Theory of the Origin of the State, https://mason.gmu.edu/~trustici/archive/ORIGIN.pdf
20. Variable Models for Organization of Earthworking Communities in, https://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1196&context=tipiti
21. The Origin of the State: Land Productivity or Appropriability?, https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/economics/staff/omoav/papers/jpe_print.pdf
22. The Origin of the State: Land Productivity or Appropriability?*, https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/economics/staff/omoav/mmp_15_nov_2020.pdf

23. (PDF) The Origin of the State: Land Productivity or Appropriability?, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/356707920_The_Origin_of_the_State_Land_Productivity_or_Appropriability
24. The Origin of the State: Land Productivity or Appropriability?, https://gwern.net/doc/sociology/2022-mayshar.pdf
25. The Origin of the State: Land Productivity or Appropriability?* | CSEF, https://csef.it/wp-content/uploads/cereals_appropriability_and_hierarchy_feb_2020.pdf
26. Clippings, https://rejuvyesh.com/clippings/
27. Against the Grain: A Deep History of the Earliest States review, https://www.thehindu.com/books/books-reviews/against-the-grain-a-deep-history-of-the-earliest-states-review-taming-the-barbarians/article23401092.ece
28. Art of Not Being Governed, https://we.riseup.net/assets/483599/Scott%2C+James+The+Art+of+Not+Being+Governed.pdf
29. Landscapes and the Political Phenomenology of Ancient Egypt, https://anthro.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/2020-Smith-Phenomenology-of-the-State-J-Egyptian-Hist.pdf
30. Why the first states grew grain — A Study - Aidan Jude, https://aidanjude.vercel.app/study/against-the-grain
31. State-in-Society 2.0: Toward Fourth-Generation Theories of the State, https://yuhuawang.scholars.harvard.edu/file_url/223
32. Homo Domesticus : Une histoire profonde des premiers états., https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/43225814
33. Myths of the Archaic State - Cambridge University Press & Assessment, https://www.cambridge.org/ag/universitypress/subjects/archaeology/archaeology-general-interest/myths-archaic-state-evolution-earliest-cities-states-and-civilizations?format=AR
34. The Dawn of Everything by David Graeber & David Wengrow, https://www.audiobookhub.net/books/the-dawn-of-everything/
35. The Dawn Of Everything Chapter Summary | David Graeber, https://www.bookey.app/book/the-dawn-of-everything
36. On Hierarchies and Humanity: A Review of 'The Dawn Of Everything, https://www.hamptonthink.org/read/on-hierarchies-and-humanity-a-review-of-the-dawn-of-everything-by-david-graeber-and-david-wengrow
37. The Great Law and the Longhouse: A Political History of the Iroquois, https://dokumen.pub/the-great-law-and-the-longhouse-a-political-history-of-the-iroquois-confederacy-0806141239-9780806141237.html
38. The Reinvention of Primitive Society: Transformations of a Myth, https://www.sackett.net/The-Reinvention-of-Primitive-Society.pdf
39. A History of Indigenous Peoples at Saratoga, https://npshistory.com/publications/sara/ser.pdf
40. Overview of Switzerland's Geography and History | PDF - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/978543214/Switzerland-Wikipedia
41. Federalism - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Federalism

42. Burgundian Wars - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Burgundian_Wars
43. Old Swiss Confederacy - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Old_Swiss_Confederacy
44. Switzerland - Alps, Neutrality, Confederation | Britannica, https://www.britannica.com/place/Switzerland/Expansion-and-position-of-power
45. Saint NIKOLAUS VON FLÜE (NICOLAS de FLÜE), père de famille et, http://har22201.blogspot.com/2013/03/saint-nicolas-de-flue.html
46. Historical Dictionary of Switzerland - PDF Free Download - EPDF, https://epdf.pub/historical-dictionary-of-switzerland.html
47. David Stasavage on Early Democracy and its Decline, https://democracyparadox.com/2021/07/20/david-stasavage-on-early-democracy-and-its-decline/
48. Exit, voice, rebellion: favourable factors for the democratisation of work, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00346764.2025.2458845
49. Exit, Voice, and Loyalty Summary of Key Ideas and Review - Blinkist, https://www.blinkist.com/books/exit-voice-and-loyalty-en
50. Exit, Voice, and Loyalty - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Exit,_Voice,_and_Loyalty
51. An Exit, Voice, and Loyalty Model of Politics. - Matt Golder, http://mattgolder.com/files/research/bjps3.pdf
52. INSIGHTS FROM AN EXIT, VOICE, AND LOYALTY GAME, https://publics22.classes.ryansafner.com/readings/Clark-Golder-2012.pdf
53. Chaos, Violence, Dynasty: Politics and Islam in Central Asia, https://dokumen.pub/chaos-violence-dynasty-politics-and-islam-in-central-asia-0822961687-9780822961680.html
54. Republikflucht - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Republikflucht
55. Berlin Wall - dlab @ EPFL, https://dlab.epfl.ch/wikispeedia/wpcd/wp/b/Berlin_Wall.htm
56. The inhuman structure - Bundesregierung.de, https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-en/service/archive/archive/the-inhuman-structure-346284
57. Escape attempts and victims of the inner German border - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Escape_attempts_and_victims_of_the_inner_German_border
58. Assessing the Importance of Tiebout Sorting: Local Heterogeneity, https://users.wfu.edu/strumpks/papers/AER_2003.pdf
59. An Examination of Tiebout Sorting and Residential Segregation, https://cpilj.law.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/2515/2018/10/8.1-An-Examination-of-Tiebout-Sorting-and-Residential-Segregation-Through-a-Racialized-Lens-by-Alexandra-M.-Greene.pdf
60. Measuring the Impact of Taxes and Public Services on Property, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2203.14751
61. Sorting Charles Tiebout: The Construction and Stabilization of, https://www.aeaweb.org/conference/2014/retrieve.php?pdfid=796
62. Empirical Test of Tiebout's Model | PDF | Economic Equilibrium,

https://www.scribd.com/document/972927169/banzhaf
63. The complementarity of Tiebout and Alonso - Eric A. Hanushek, https://hanushek.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/Hanushek%2BYilmaz%202007%20JHE%2016%282%29.pdf
64. SECRET, OADR - National Security Archive, https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB354/4-70%20history%20excerpts.pdf
65. Elinor Ostrom - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elinor_Ostrom
66. Governing as commons or as global public goods: two tales of power, https://scholarlypublications.universiteitleiden.nl/access/item%3A3188916/download
67. Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/365412876_Governing_the_Commons_The_Evolution_of_Institutions_for_Collective_Action
68. Elinor Ostrom and common pool resources, https://rwer.wordpress.com/2019/07/16/elinor-ostrom-and-common-pool-resources/
69. Coevolving Relationships between Political Science and Economics*, https://d-nb.info/1369238045/34
70. Applying Elinor Ostrom's Design Principles to Guide Co ... - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7879991/
71. Prize Lecture by Elinor Ostrom, https://www.nobelprize.org/uploads/2018/06/ostrom_lecture.pdf
72. NESTING, SUBSIDIARITY, AND COMMUNITY-BASED ... - UNE, https://www.une.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/23884/occ-2007-01.pdf
73. BLOCKCHAIN TECHNOLOGY AND POLYCENTRIC GOVERNANCE, https://cadmus.eui.eu/server/api/core/bitstreams/69ad10b2-fe42-59e2-8c7d-567dff4939dc/content
74. Elinor Ostrom Revisiting the Commons: Local Lessons, Global, http://www.plurale-oekonomik-hamburg.de/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/ostrom-et-al.1999.pdf
75. Comparing irrigation agencies in Nepal and Taiwan - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235307731_Designing_institutions_for_irrigation_management_Comparing_irrigation_agencies_in_Nepal_and_Taiwan
76. Governance Anomalies and the Logic of the Commons, https://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstreams/4e5e3361-0705-4573-95dd-6838b854f3b6/download
77. Common-pool resource - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Common-pool_resource
78. Exploring the failure factors of blockchain adopting projects - Frontiers, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/blockchain/articles/10.3389/fbloc.2025.1503595/full
79. Designing Digital Institutions for Participatory Change, https://www.brianckeegan.com/assets/pdf/2019_CSCW_institution.pdf
80. Commons - Oxford Reference,

https://www.oxfordreference.com/viewbydoi/10.1093/acref/9780195108255.013.0079
81. Myths of the Archaic State Reviewed | PDF | Anthropology - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/785296621/Yoffee-et-al-2005
82. Myths of the Archaic State - Cambridge University Press & Assessment, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/myths-of-the-archaic-state/9E8563F12DEF59A92D7E4105D2998CBD
83. Scaling the State: Egypt in the Third Millennium BC, https://journals.uclpress.co.uk/ai/article/2067/galley/12887/view/
84. Papering Over Protest: Contentious Politics and Archival, https://academic.oup.com/past/article/258/1/44/6532405
85. Generalizing the core design principles for the efficacy of groups, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257365714_Generalizing_the_core_design_principles_for_the_efficacy_of_groups