NO-09 Temporary societies: pirate ships, mining camps and expeditions

The collapse of state authority and industrial supply chains forces human populations into immediate, high-stakes coordination problems. When individuals who do not know each other are thrust into environments of extreme resource scarcity, high volatility, and non-existent legal infrastructure, they must spontaneously generate systems to allocate wealth, mitigate violence, and constrain abusive leadership. By examining the historical record of temporary societies—early eighteenth-century pirate ships, mid-nineteenth-century Californian mining camps, nineteenth-century whaling ventures, extreme polar and mountaineering expeditions, and modern refugee camps—a robust empirical foundation emerges for understanding the bootstrap mechanics of self-governance.

This analysis dissects how quickly rules form in the absence of a state, what cultural and legal frameworks these temporary societies borrow from their origins, how they handle internal bullies and demagogues, and how long these arrangements survive before succumbing to external pressure or internal capture. For each governance model, the historical narrative is separated from the empirical record and modern scholarly inference. Furthermore, every arrangement is subjected to a strict scale ledger to determine its viability across population densities, alongside a capture test to evaluate its resilience against individuals exhibiting dark-triad traits such as narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy.

1. The Piratical Enterprise of the Golden Age (1716–1726)

During the Golden Age of Piracy, an estimated 1,000 to 2,000 pirates operated across the Caribbean Sea, the Atlantic coast of the Americas and Africa, and the Indian Ocean[1]. While the Royal Navy employed an average of 13,000 men annually during this period, the pirate population represented a massive, heavily armed stateless society operating entirely outside formal admiralty law[1]. A typical merchant vessel of the era carried only 13 to 17 men, but pirate crews averaged 80 men, with companies of 150 to 200 being highly common[1]. In extreme cases, crews reached 300 men, such as Blackbeard's company aboard the *Queen Anne's Revenge*, or even 508 men operating across a four-ship squadron under the command of Bartholomew Roberts[1].

Governance Mechanisms and the Quartermaster Check

To govern these floating societies, pirates engineered a sophisticated constitutional framework known as the "articles." These documents functioned as a fast-formed social contract that defined universal suffrage, strict behavioral regulations, and a highly egalitarian distribution of wealth[3]. Surviving verbatim records, such as the eleven articles of Bartholomew Roberts (1721), the eight articles of George Lowther, and the nine articles of John Phillips, illustrate the uniformity of this governance[5].

The defining feature of piratical governance was the strict separation of executive and

administrative power to solve the principal-agent problem[2]. On legitimate merchant vessels, absentee capitalist owners granted captains dictatorial power, leading to rampant abuse, withheld wages, and miserable working conditions[1]. Pirates circumvented this by democratically electing their captains and restricting their absolute, autocratic authority solely to times of battle[2]. At all other times, administrative power—including the allocation of rations, the distribution of plunder, and the adjudication of minor disputes—was vested in the quartermaster, who was also democratically elected and served as a direct structural check on the captain[2].

Economic incentives were heavily aligned. Plunder was distributed via a fractional "lay" or share system. Under Roberts's articles, the captain and quartermaster received two shares, the master, boatswain, and gunner received one and a half, other officers one and a quarter, and the common sailors one share[2]. The articles also established a sophisticated workers' compensation system. If a pirate lost a limb or was crippled in service, he was paid 800 dollars (pieces of eight) out of the public stock; lesser injuries were compensated proportionately[4]. Behavioral controls were equally strict: gambling for money was outlawed, lights were extinguished at eight o'clock, and smuggling women or boys aboard was punishable by death[4].

Narrative, Record, and Scholarly Inference

The participants themselves often articulated their governance as a righteous rejection of the tyranny of the merchant fleet and the draconian discipline of the Royal Navy, claiming to operate a fraternity of free men[1].

However, the historical record demonstrates that this franchise was not always voluntary. Trial depositions from the 1723 Cape Coast Castle trial of Roberts's crew reveal that men were frequently compelled to sign the articles under the threat of violence. Witnesses such as George Fenn testified that a pistol was laid upon the table to force signatures, and the court treated the failure to sign the articles as notable evidence of a sailor's innocence in piracy charges[5]. Furthermore, the pirate record is replete with horrific violence inflicted upon merchant captives, contradicting the narrative of enlightened rebellion[3].

Modern scholarship, most notably Peter Leeson's *The Invisible Hook* (2009), infers that piratical democracy did not stem from progressive ideology, but from rational economic self-interest[1]. Because pirates were criminals, they could not rely on state courts to enforce contracts or protect them from abusive captains. Therefore, they rationally designed the quartermaster system and equal shares to ensure seamless cooperation and prevent internal friction from disrupting their raids[3]. The racial tolerance observed on some pirate ships—where escaped slaves were integrated into the crew—was similarly a function of the economic necessity to maximize combat power rather than an ideological commitment to equality[2].

The Strongest Case Against Piratical Governance

The strongest academic case against romanticizing pirate governance centers on its complete lack of economic productivity and its inherent violence. Critics point out that piracy is a parasitic system; it produces no public good and relies entirely on the expropriation of wealth generated by legitimate markets[1]. Furthermore, scholars such as B.R. Burg in *Sodomy and the Pirate Tradition* (1983/1995) have controversially argued that pirate societies were radical sexual

utopias defined by *matelotage* (same-sex civil unions)[8]. This view is heavily criticized by mainstream historians like Hans Turley, who counter that evidence for institutionalized piratical sodomy is almost non-existent and that projecting modern progressive paradigms onto violent, transient criminal syndicates distorts the historical reality[11].

Viability and Capture Dynamics

Scale Level	Population	Viability Assessment
Household	4 to 10	**Operated and worked.** Functioned efficiently as the core unit for prize crews and small raiding boats.
Hamlet / Band	30 to 50	**Operated and worked.** The optimal size for a fast, single-masted pirate sloop, allowing for rapid consensus and agility.
Village	150 to 500	**Operated with friction.** Fleets such as Roberts's 508-man squadron required immense daily caloric intake, leading to severe supply constraints and inevitable division into smaller flotillas[1].
Parish / District	1,500 to 5,000	**Failed.** A purely parasitic society cannot scale beyond a few hundred individuals without capturing a land-based agricultural and logistical base, which pirates failed to hold against state navies.
Town to Planet	15,000+	**Never tried.**

Capture Element	Analysis
Dark-Triad Vulnerability	A highly psychopathic or Machiavellian individual could capture the crew by delivering extraordinary financial returns, effectively buying loyalty and sidelining the quartermaster's checks and balances.
Historical Examples	Captains like Charles Vane and Edward Low exhibited severe psychopathy, torturing captives and terrorizing their own men. Blackbeard leveraged highly theatrical psychological manipulation to build an unchallenged cult of personality[1].
Resistance Features	The primary resistance mechanism was universal armament and the legal right to mutiny. Because every pirate was armed, a sadist could not maintain a monopoly on violence. If a captain jeopardized the crew's survival or profits, the crew simply voted to depose or maroon him[3].

2. Californian Mining Camps (1848–1852)

The discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill in January 1848 triggered one of the most rapid and massive demographic shifts in history. The population of California exploded from approximately 50,000 in 1848 to 89,000 in 1849, peaking at 220,000 in 1852[12]. This influx occurred in a complete legal vacuum. The territory had just been acquired from Mexico via the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and the United States Congress had not yet established civilian government, courts, police, or federal mining laws[14].

Governance Mechanisms and Property Rights

Facing a chaotic race for a highly valuable and depletable resource, prospectors spontaneously formed mining districts to assign and protect property rights. Whenever 20 to 30 miners congregated in a new area, they called mass meetings to draft local codes[13]. These rules universally adopted the principle of first-possession (prior appropriation) but heavily regulated the size and maintenance of claims to prevent monopolies.

For example, the codes of Jackass Gulch, organized in the autumn of 1848, initially restricted claims to ten feet square due to the extreme richness of the surface placer deposits[16]. By 1851, as the richest surface gold was exhausted, the rules were amended. The 1851 code permitted one claim of 100 feet square by virtue of occupation[16]. To prevent absentee speculation, the code mandated that any five-day absence from the claim during the wet season (when water

was sufficient for washing) resulted in the immediate forfeiture of the property, unless justified by sickness[16]. Additionally, miners were required to cut a boundary ditch one foot wide and one foot deep within three days of location, and fines for destroying claim notices ranged from five to fifty dollars[16].

Dispute resolution was handled directly by the community. Conflicts were referred to a standing committee of five miners acting as arbitrators, or to an *ad hoc* "miners-jury" summoned to hear evidence and issue binding, unappealable verdicts[13].

Narrative, Record, and Scholarly Inference

The miners themselves explicitly linked their actions to American political traditions, frequently stating in their preambles that the camps "shall be governed by American principles"[16]. They viewed their codes as the ultimate expression of Jacksonian democracy and the natural extension of midwestern agrarian land-distribution norms, where public lands were allocated based on priority of settlement and active improvement[12].

The historical record, however, reveals a starkly different reality. The camps were profoundly xenophobic, violent, and unstable. The rules were systematically weaponized by the white American majority to expropriate the claims of Chinese, Mexican, and indigenous miners[18]. When the state legislature eventually formed, it codified this discrimination via the Foreign Miners' Tax of 1850, which explicitly targeted non-white prospectors to force them off lucrative claims[18].

Modern scholarship offers competing inferences regarding the nature of these spontaneous rules. Writing in the tradition of Harold Demsetz, economist John Umbeck (1977, 1981) theorized that these codes were a direct response to the threat of violence. Because all miners were heavily armed, property rights emerged as an equilibrium of mutual deterrence to avoid the lethal costs of constant physical conflict[12]. Conversely, legal scholars Andrea McDowell (2004) and economists Richard Zerbe and Leigh Anderson (2001) argued that the rules were less about guns and more about cultural norms and spontaneous coordination. McDowell suggested miners operated behind a "Rawlsian veil of ignorance"—knowing they might be a claim-holder today but a claim-jumper tomorrow, they designed balanced rules[14]. Historians Karen Clay and Gavin Wright (2005) bridge this gap, demonstrating that the codes were not perfect enforcers of secure property rights, but rather pragmatic, temporary mechanisms to manage access and reduce rent dissipation in a high-turnover environment[14].

The Strongest Case Against Spontaneous Mining Governance

The strongest critique against the mining camp model is the naturalistic fallacy—the assumption that because an order is spontaneous and decentralized, it is inherently just. Critics, supported by historical evidence, argue that without the structural constraints of formal constitutional law, localized democracy inevitably devolves into the tyranny of the majority.

The tragic lynching of Josefa Segovia provides the starkest evidence of this failure. On July 5, 1851, in the town of Downieville, a drunken American miner named Joe Cannon assaulted the 22-year-old Mexican woman and broke down her door. When she defended herself with a knife and killed him, the camp's decentralized governance mechanism instantly mutated into mob rule[23]. A mob of 2,000 men convened a completely extralegal two-hour kangaroo court,

violently beat Segovia's defense attorney, banished the doctor who attempted to intervene, and lynched her from the Jersey Bridge over the Yuba River[23]. The mining camp's justice system was exposed as a vehicle for racialized violence rather than equitable arbitration[27].

Viability and Capture Dynamics

Scale Level	Population	Viability Assessment
Household	4 to 10	**Operated and worked.** The core unit of a mining partnership, effectively pooling labor and capital for deep claims.
Hamlet / Band	30 to 50	**Operated and worked.** The ideal size for initial claim boundary definitions and informal mutual recognition of property[13].
Village	150 to 500	**Operated with friction.** Required formal written codes, standing committees, and specific abandonment parameters (e.g., Jackass Gulch) to function[16].
Parish / District	1,500 to 5,000	**Failed.** At this scale (e.g., Downieville with 3,000 people), informal juries were entirely incapable of handling complex disputes or capital crimes, instantly devolving into mob violence and lynch law[24].
Town to Planet	15,000+	**Never tried.** The system was a temporary stopgap superseded by statutory state law.

Capture Element	Analysis
Dark-Triad Vulnerability	Highly susceptible to demagoguery. A Machiavellian orator could easily bypass the standing committees by inciting the prejudices of the armed populace, replacing arbitration with mob violence.
Historical Examples	The Downieville mob of 1851 that lynched Josefa Segovia was whipped into a frenzy by local demagogues who explicitly framed the extralegal hanging as an act of democratic will[23].
Resistance Features	The only feature that successfully reversed this capture was the eventual arrival of the formal state—specifically a professionalized appellate judiciary that broke the local monopoly on violence and enforced due process independent of local majority sentiment.

3. Whaling Ventures and the Custom of the Sea

The American whaling industry of the nineteenth century operated under conditions of extreme hazard. Voyages routinely lasted three to four years, exploring the most remote oceans on Earth to hunt a highly valuable, highly dangerous, and highly fugitive resource[28]. Like pirates and gold rush miners, whalers operated far beyond the immediate reach of state enforcement and were required to generate autonomous governance to align incentives and prevent resource conflict.

Governance Mechanisms and the Lay System

The internal governance of a whaling venture was structured entirely around the "lay" system. Instead of receiving a fixed wage, every member of the crew—from the captain down to the lowest cabin boy—was compensated with a predetermined fractional share of the voyage's net proceeds[29]. This system directly tied the personal economic survival of the crew to the absolute success of the expedition, solving the problem of labor shirking in an environment where constant supervision was impossible.

Externally, whaling ships competing in crowded fishing grounds needed a fast-formed mechanism to assign property rights over migratory whales. As detailed by legal scholar Robert Ellickson (1991), whalemen spontaneously engineered the "fast-fish, loose-fish" custom. Under this globally recognized norm, a whale actively attached to a ship's boat by a harpoon line (a fast-fish) was the exclusive property of that ship. If the line broke and the whale escaped, it

became a loose-fish, entirely fair game for any other ship to capture[30]. This binary, easily verifiable rule drastically reduced the transaction costs of adjudication and prevented violent clashes between heavily armed vessels on the open ocean.

Narrative, Record, and Scholarly Inference

Whalemen narrated their world as a strict meritocracy governed by the sacred customs of the sea. They viewed the lay system as the ultimate expression of shared risk and reward, and the fast-fish rule as an unassailable law of nature.

The historical record reveals the darker reality of the lay system. Unscrupulous managing agents often manipulated the accounting. Because crews had to purchase their specialized clothing and tobacco from the ship's "slop chest" at highly inflated prices, a mediocre voyage often resulted in ordinary seamen returning home after three years owing money to the ship's owners[29].

Modern scholarship, particularly Eric Hilt's (2006) empirical analysis of 874 whaling voyages originating from 22 different ports, demonstrates exactly why the lay and partnership system was necessary[29]. Hilt identifies that in the 1830s, several whaling ventures attempted to organize as formal, state-chartered corporations rather than traditional partnerships. The result was catastrophic for productivity. By diluting the ownership stakes of the managing agents and separating ownership from direct control, the corporate form destroyed the requisite incentives for risk-taking and effort[29]. The corporate managers, lacking the intense personal financial exposure of the traditional agents, failed to adequately provision the ships or hire the best captains, proving that diffuse corporate governance cannot bootstrap success in extreme-risk environments.

The Strongest Case Against Whaling Governance

The strongest critique of whaling ship governance is that, unlike pirate ships, it lacked any structural check on executive tyranny. Because whaling ships operated as legitimate enterprises under maritime law, the captain possessed absolute, dictatorial authority, and there was no democratically elected quartermaster to curb his abuses. Critics argue that this unmitigated hierarchy created a pressure cooker that inevitably invited violent, psychopathic capture.

Viability and Capture Dynamics

Scale Level	Population	Viability Assessment
Household	4 to 10	**Operated and worked.** The operational size of a single whaleboat crew, perfectly aligning risk and reward during the hunt.
Hamlet / Band	30 to 50	**Operated and worked.**

		The size of a standard whaling ship crew. The lay system functioned optimally to maintain discipline and effort over multi-year voyages[29].
Village	150 to 500	**Failed.** Attempts to scale into corporate whaling fleets failed because the incentive structure could not survive the transition to diffuse corporate governance, leading to massive drops in productivity[29].
Parish to Planet	1,500+	**Never tried.**

Capture Element	Analysis
Dark-Triad Vulnerability	The absolute legal authority of the captain, combined with the lack of a quartermaster, meant a psychopathic individual could seize control through sheer violence, as mutiny was legally punishable by death.
Historical Examples	The 1824 mutiny on the U.S. whaler *Globe*. Harpooner Samuel Comstock, exhibiting extreme psychopathic and narcissistic traits, brutally murdered the captain and officers while they slept, intending to establish his own personal kingdom on a Pacific island[34].
Resistance Features	The only resistance to such capture was vigilante counter-violence. Comstock's rule was only ended when he was subsequently murdered by his own co-conspirators[34], demonstrating the fragility of governance

	reliant solely on a monopoly of force.

4. Extreme Expeditions: Antarctica and Everest

Expeditions represent temporary societies operating under the highest physical and biological stressors on the planet. They offer critical data on how governance rules mutate when the primary objective shifts from economic gain to bare biological survival.

Governance Mechanisms and Escalation

Historically, polar and mountaineering expeditions relied on rigid, quasi-naval hierarchies. However, deep historical analysis shows that the most successful leaders in extreme crises abandon rigid autocracy for distributed, skill-based leadership.

During Ernest Shackleton's *Nimrod* expedition in 1909, the rigid hierarchy was suspended by empirical reality. On January 9, 1909, at 88º 23' S—precisely 97 geographic miles (111.5 statute miles) from the South Pole—Shackleton calculated that continuing would result in starvation. He abandoned his life's ambition, famously telling his wife he preferred to be a "live donkey than a dead lion," and executed a ruthless retreat[36]. During the later 1914–1917 Imperial Trans-Antarctic Expedition, when the *Endurance* was crushed by ice, ship's carpenter Harry McNish staged a brief mutiny, arguing that naval articles no longer applied because the ship was gone[37]. Shackleton did not execute McNish; instead, he absorbed the friction, leveraged McNish's indispensable carpentry skills to rebuild the *James Caird* lifeboat, and maintained group cohesion through extreme psychological egalitarianism (assigning himself the worst chores)[36].

Conversely, the 1996 Mount Everest disaster, which resulted in the deaths of eight climbers across three teams on May 10, illustrates the fatal breakdown of commercial expedition governance[39]. The commercial teams—Adventure Consultants led by Rob Hall and Mountain Madness led by Scott Fischer—relied entirely on centralized decision-making centered on the lead guides[39].

Narrative, Record, and Scholarly Inference

The narratives surrounding the 1996 Everest disaster are famously contradictory. Journalist Jon Krakauer (1997) blamed Mountain Madness guide Anatoli Boukreev for climbing without supplemental oxygen and descending ahead of his clients, arguing this violated the fundamental duty of a guide[41]. Boukreev (1997) countered that his speed and acclimatization allowed him to rest at Camp IV and subsequently launch the only successful solo rescue efforts in the middle of the blizzard[39].

The empirical record shows a total systemic failure to enforce the pre-determined 2:00 PM turnaround time[39]. Delays at the fixed lines and the sheer volume of climbers (47 across three teams) created lethal bottlenecks[39].

Modern scholarship in organizational behavior interprets the Everest disaster as a textbook case of the "escalation of commitment" (the sunk cost fallacy) combined with the catastrophic failure of centralized leadership[43]. Clients surrendered their agency to the guides[40]. When Hall and Fischer became incapacitated by hypoxia and the storm, the hierarchical governance

structure evaporated entirely[39]. Survival was only achieved by those who spontaneously reverted to distributed, decentralized leadership—such as guide Neal Beidleman organizing the descent of the stranded climbers—proving that rigid hierarchy fails when the central node collapses[39].

The Strongest Case Against Centralized Expedition Governance

The strongest critique of centralized expedition governance is that it actively suppresses the survival instincts and critical thinking of the followers. When authority is vested entirely in a charismatic or commercially incentivized leader, the group loses its ability to process negative environmental feedback, leading directly to fatal outcomes.

Viability and Capture Dynamics

Scale Level	Population	Viability Assessment
Household	4 to 10	**Operated and worked.** The Shackleton model: nimble, skill-based, with distributed leadership taking over when biological limits are reached.
Hamlet / Band	30 to 50	**Operated with severe friction.** As seen on Everest in 1996, 47 people created lethal logistical bottlenecks at fixed lines, and centralized leadership could not track the status of all members[39].
Village to Planet	150+	**Failed / Never tried.** Biologically impossible to sustain in extreme environments without massive, industrial supply chains.

Capture Element	Analysis
Dark-Triad Vulnerability	Vulnerable to narcissistic capture. A leader

	prioritizing personal glory, commercial reputation, or media attention will override established structural safety checks (such as turnaround times) to achieve the goal.
Historical Examples	Rob Hall nursing his client Doug Hansen to the summit long after the 2:00 PM turnaround time, resulting in both of their deaths[41]. The commercial pressure of having Krakauer (a journalist) on the team implicitly captured Hall's risk assessment[40].
Resistance Features	The only effective resistance is the enforcement of pre-committed "tripwires" (rules that execute automatically regardless of human desire, such as dropping gear and turning around at a specific hour) enforced by a distributed command structure where subordinates possess the authority to veto the leader.

5. Refugee Camps: Dadaab, Kakuma, and Zaatari

Modern refugee camps are designed as temporary humanitarian holding areas, but due to protracted geopolitical crises, they routinely calcify into semi-permanent settlements. Kenya's Kakuma and Dadaab camps host hundreds of thousands of people (with Kakuma peaking near 200,000)[45]. Similarly, Jordan's Zaatari camp operates on the scale of a small city[46].

Governance Mechanisms and Spatial Discipline

Governance in these mega-camps is a constant collision between the top-down spatial discipline imposed by host states and international agencies (like UNHCR), and the bottom-up, fast-formed governance of the refugees themselves[48].

To manage massive populations, agencies impose grid-like spatial structures. Dadaab and Kakuma are divided into Zones (e.g., Zone 1 has 12 blocks, Zone 2 has 15 blocks), with each block housing 500 to 1,000 refugees[48]. UNHCR mandates comprehensive "camp constitutions" that require the democratic election of block leaders, zonal chairpersons, and sectoral committees[48]. These constitutions strictly govern elections, permitting campaigning only during daytime hours and banning large public debates to prevent rioting[48].

However, the reality on the ground is a hybrid governance model. Refugees rapidly organize along ethnic and tribal lines. In Dadaab and Kakuma, Somali refugees rely heavily on the *maslaha* (traditional dispute resolution by clan elders) to manage daily conflicts and allocate informal resources[48]. In Zaatari, Syrian refugees rejected the rigid UNHCR architecture, rapidly dismantling official tents to build an expansive informal market network known as the

"Champs-Élysées," establishing their own informal property rights and commercial governance entirely separate from the official aid rationing system[46].

Narrative, Record, and Scholarly Inference

UNHCR and host states narrate the implementation of camp constitutions as a benevolent effort to empower refugees and instill democratic norms in stateless populations[48].

The historical record exposes this as largely a fiction. Refugees routinely bypass the formal block-leader systems for critical disputes, deferring instead to traditional ethnic hierarchies. The formal electoral system is highly stunted; in Dadaab, no camp-wide chairperson has been elected or appointed since the constitution's adoption in 2011, halting democratic representation at the zonal level[48].

Modern scholarship, particularly the work of anthropologist Bram Jansen (2011, 2018), infers that these camps are not self-identified communities, but "accidental cities"[51]. Jansen and others argue that spatial design (blocks and zones) functions primarily as a mechanism of discipline, control, and securitization by the host state, which views the refugees as a potential terror threat[48]. The formal constitutions serve primarily to delegitimize traditional authorities and make the population legally legible to NGOs, while the actual, functional governance remains deeply informal and identity-based[48].

The Strongest Case Against Camp Governance

The strongest critique of refugee camp governance is that it is a facade for perpetual containment. Critics argue that the pseudo-democratic structures imposed by NGOs offer the illusion of self-governance while entirely stripping refugees of actual political agency and freedom of movement, creating a permanent underclass trapped in a bureaucratic limbo.

Viability and Capture Dynamics

Scale Level	Population	Viability Assessment
Household to Village	4 to 500	**Operated and worked.** Functioned highly effectively through traditional kinship structures and customary law (e.g., *maslaha*), providing deep social cohesion[48].
Parish to Town	1,500 to 50,000	**Operated with severe friction.** Required the uneasy, hybrid overlap of formal NGO logistical grids and informal ethnic

		networks to prevent total systemic collapse[48].
Region	0.5M to 5M	**Failed.** Extralegal refugee governance cannot scale to regional sovereignty without triggering violent suppression by the host nation state, which aggressively securitizes the refugees as an existential threat[49].
Nation to Planet	50M+	**Never tried.**

Capture Element	Analysis
Dark-Triad Vulnerability	Control over the narrow bottlenecks of aid distribution allows Machiavellian block leaders to capture the micro-economy of the camp, extracting rents and hoarding critical caloric resources.
Historical Examples	In the early years of Kakuma and Dadaab, the initial influx of refugees saw specific ethnic sub-administrations quickly monopolize specific blocks, leveraging their numerical superiority to control rationing systems and systematically marginalize minority refugee groups[48].
Resistance Features	Resistance is provided by a dual-check system: the overlay of international aid agencies acting as external, (ideally) incorruptible auditors, and the nested traditional hierarchies where elder councils check the abuses of individual, low-level block leaders[48].

10-Line Summary of Robust Findings

Temporary societies bootstrap governance in a matter of days by explicitly borrowing and pragmatically modifying the legal and cultural frameworks of their home societies. The most robust early agreement among strangers is always a strict mathematical algorithm for distributing economic yields—such as lays, shares, and claim limits—designed to immediately align individual incentives with group survival. Spontaneous, stateless governance reliably functions up to the Village scale (150–500 people) but routinely collapses into mob rule or requires external state intervention at the Parish scale (1,500+). Decentralized democracies in a legal vacuum are highly vulnerable to demagoguery and xenophobic violence, completely refuting the romance of primitive egalitarianism. While absolute hierarchical command is biologically necessary in acute expeditionary crises, it becomes lethal if captured by narcissistic leadership exhibiting the escalation of commitment. Separating executive tactical power from administrative logistical power, as pioneered by the pirate quartermaster, is a highly effective anti-capture mechanism. Attempting to shift from direct-stake partnerships to diffuse corporate structures in extreme-risk environments actively destroys productivity, effort, and compliance. Property rights in vacuums emerge not from philosophical idealism, but as blunt, pragmatic tools to minimize the violent dissipation of resource rents. Finally, top-down constitutions imposed on stateless populations are consistently bypassed in favor of localized, identity-based dispute resolution, proving that the ultimate failure mode of temporary societies is their inability to sustain long-term supply chains and appellate legal structures without a monopoly on violence.

Contested or Open Questions

The primary contested question remains the exact catalyst of spontaneous property rights: do they emerge strictly from the mutual deterrence of lethal violence (as Umbeck argues regarding the miners), or from an innate human drive toward cooperative cultural equilibrium and fairness (as McDowell suggests)? Furthermore, at exactly what population density does informal, identity-based dispute resolution (like the Somali *maslaha*) lose its efficacy to process inter-group conflict, thereby necessitating a formal, blind, and professionalized judiciary? Finally, it remains an open question whether modern decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs) can successfully mimic the pirate and whaling "lay" systems via algorithmic smart contracts without suffering the catastrophic productivity drops that plagued nineteenth-century whaling corporations.

Sources to Read in Full

The foundational text for the rational-choice analysis of temporary criminal societies is Peter T. Leeson's *The Invisible Hook: The Hidden Economics of Pirates* (2009), which exhaustively details the economic necessity of the quartermaster system. To understand the emergence of property rights through the threat of violence, John Umbeck's *A Theory of Property Rights: With Application to the California Gold Rush* (1981) is essential, though it must be immediately counterbalanced by Karen Clay and Gavin Wright's *Order Without Law? Property Rights During the California Gold Rush* (2005), which details the violent limitations and racial weaponization of these camps. Eric Hilt's empirical masterpiece, *Incentives in Corporations: Evidence from the American Whaling Industry* (2006), provides the definitive data on why corporate structures fail

in extreme-risk environments. Finally, Bram Jansen's *Kakuma Refugee Camp: Humanitarian Urbanism in Kenya's Accidental City* (2018) serves as the definitive ethnography of fast-formed, hybrid governance under extreme modern constraints.

Implementability after the Fall

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

- **Household (4 to 10 people):** Requires a purely skill-based, distributed leadership model derived from the Shackleton survival paradigm.
  - *What it needs to start:* A shared calendar to meticulously track resource burn rates, a physical ledger of caloric supplies, and a pre-committed set of "tripwires" (e.g., if rations fall below X, we automatically execute protocol Y, completely bypassing debate).
  - *First failure to expect:* Paralysis through endless consensus-seeking, or immediate capture by the loudest, most narcissistic voice during a moment of acute environmental panic.
- **Village (300 people):** Requires the Pirate/Whaling "Articles and Lays" partnership system.
  - *What it needs to start:* Basic literacy to draft and physically sign a founding constitution, a central meeting space for universal suffrage voting, a ledger standardizing injury compensation, and the immediate election of a Quartermaster to handle logistics separately from the tactical leader.
  - *First failure to expect:* The "slop chest" failure, where a string of poor harvests leaves the majority of the village heavily indebted to the few individuals who control the seed capital, precipitating violent internal revolt.
- **District (3,000 people):** Requires a modified Mining Camp / Refugee Zone system.
  - *What it needs to start:* A physical registry mapping property claim boundaries, a standing committee of elders representing diverse sub-factions to act as an appellate court, and strict limits on absentee land ownership (forfeiture after absence).
  - *First failure to expect:* The Downieville failure. Without a professionalized, neutral appellate mechanism that possesses a legitimate monopoly on force, a charismatic demagogue will inevitably whip a local dispute into a mob frenzy to execute an unpopular outsider without due process.

Principles

1. **The Principal-Agent Principle:** Separating administrative control over resource allocation from executive tactical command prevents tyrannical capture and maximizes continuous group cooperation.
2. **The Incentive Alignment Principle:** Group productivity and survival drastically increase when every member's compensation is a fractional share of the total net yield rather than a guaranteed, fixed wage.
3. **The Spontaneous Property Principle:** In a legal vacuum, groups will rapidly engineer arbitrary, easily verifiable property boundaries solely to minimize the violent dissipation of resource rents.
4. **The Escalation Principle:** Rigid hierarchical command structures in extreme

environments will catastrophically fail if the leader prioritizes reputational sunk costs over empirical, negative environmental data.

5. **The Proximity of Justice Principle:** Decentralized, informal justice systems scale effectively only up to the point where all actors are known to each other; beyond this threshold, they reliably degenerate into exclusionary mob violence.

This is for informational purposes only. For medical advice or diagnosis, consult a professional.

Works cited

1. The Invisible Hook: The Hidden Economics of Pirates 9781400829866, https://dokumen.pub/the-invisible-hook-the-hidden-economics-of-pirates-9781400829866.html
2. THE INVISIBLE HOOK: THE LAW AND ECONOMICS OF PIRATE, https://www.peterleeson.com/The_Invisible_Hook.pdf
3. Peter Leeson on Pirates and the Invisible Hook - Econlib, https://www.econtalk.org/leeson-on-pirates-and-the-invisible-hook/
4. Bartholomew Roberts - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bartholomew_Roberts
5. Pirate Articles - Sailing the Black Flag, https://sailingtheblackflag.com/themes/pirate-articles/
6. The pirate quartermaster | The Golden Age of Piracy, https://waynesavage.com/the-pirate-quartermaster/
7. The Invisible Hook: what pirates can teach us about economics, https://forklog.com/en/the-invisible-hook-what-pirates-can-teach-us-about-economics/
8. Our Flag Means Death and Queer Utopias at Sea, https://globalmaritimehistory.com/our-flag-means-death-and-queer-utopias-at-sea/
9. Sexual Hegemony - Clarity Flowers, https://clarity.flowers/wiki/sexual_hegemony.html
10. Heart and Soul - VU Research Portal, https://research.vu.nl/files/512663384/reyesdissertationelectronicversion2%20-%206aa13f29c85b1.pdf
11. TIL that pirates and buccaneers sometimes engaged in "matelotage, https://www.reddit.com/r/todayilearned/comments/1g1cvmf/til_that_pirates_and_buccaneers_sometimes_engaged/
12. Order Without Law? Property Rights During the California Gold Rush, https://www.sfu.ca/~allen/gold2.pdf
13. The Assignment of Property Rights on the Western Frontier: Lessons, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-economic-history/article/assignment-of-property-rights-on-the-western-frontier-lessons-for-contemporary-environmental-and-resource-policy/AAFDB435B03B2B2AB4DC2D3422E2BFCB
14. Law without the State | Journal of Law and Courts | Cambridge Core, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-law-and-courts/article/law-without-the-state/9BD5F7440993DEB62F38BA2F8C146C99

15. Hernando de Soto, the Lone Prospector and the Formalization of, https://environs.law.ucdavis.edu/sites/g/files/dgvnsk15356/files/media/documents/ENV-43-1-Articles-Wieland.pdf
16. Land laws of mining districts, http://www.jeffersonminingdistrict.com/mining-law/Land_laws_of_mining_districts.pdf
17. Geological and Social Anatomy of Mines | PDF - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/7404676/v23c15
18. California Gold Rush - New World Encyclopedia, https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/California_Gold_Rush
19. Gold Rush Legacy: American Minerals and the ... - Amazon S3, https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/pstorage-cmu-348901238291901/11900918/file.pdf?X-Amz-Algorithm=AWS4-HMAC-SHA256&X-Amz-Credential=AKIAI266R7V6O36O5JUA/20260528/eu-west-1/s3/aws4_request&X-Amz-Date=20260528T110007Z&X-Amz-Expires=86400&X-Amz-SignedHeaders=host&X-Amz-Signature=92cdb43f2b7a1086440f47dd8c90f2b48236bc4762b2f0ab0101821e368799fb
20. Complex Systems of Property: Change and Resilience After a, https://academic.oup.com/ajcl/article/71/1/1/7223276
21. LESSONS FOR CONTEMPORARY ENVIRONMENTAL AND, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w12598/w12598.pdf
22. Gold Rush Legacy: American Minerals and the Knowledge Economy, https://www.lincolninst.edu/app/uploads/legacy-files/pubfiles/gold-rush-legacy-minerals-knowledge-economy_0.pdf
23. What Happened With The First Woman Ever Hanged in ... - YouTube, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OdGN0XOg3Gc
24. June 2019 - Yuba Trails and Tales, http://yubatreadhead.blogspot.com/2019/06/
25. New 'Land of Gold' Film Digs Deep Into California's Troubled Gold, https://www.kqed.org/news/12011929/new-land-of-gold-film-digs-deep-into-californias-troubled-gold-rush-origins
26. Causal and Contributing Factors in Lynching Women, https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2550&context=etd
27. Lynching of Mexicans in the U.S. (1848-1928) | PDF - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/311617447/American-Lynching
28. Foundation (I) - Law and Economics of Possession, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/law-and-economics-of-possession/foundation/56FC4AB2CD71F2E3E5F4CB32A27DCA7C
29. Evidence from the American Whaling Industry - NBER, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w10403/w10403.pdf
30. The Oxford Handbook of Law and Economics 9780199684267, https://dokumen.pub/the-oxford-handbook-of-law-and-economics-9780199684267-9780199684205-9780199684250-9780198803737-019968426x-i-5576609.html
31. Queues in Law, https://ilr.law.uiowa.edu/sites/ilr.law.uiowa.edu/files/2023-01/Perry-Zarsky.pdf
32. Exploring the Concept of “Ownership” in Natural Resource Planning,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/241356140_Exploring_the_Concept_of_Ownership_in_Natural_Resource_Planning
33. The Legal Form of Enterprise - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/415020166_The_Legal_Form_of_Enterprise
34. Mutiny - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mutiny
35. In the Heart of the Sea: The Tragedy of the Whaleship Essex, https://beta.alruya.edu.kw/fileman/asp_net/In%20the%20Heart%20of%20the%20Sea_%20The%20Tragedy%20of%20the%20Whaleship%20Essex%20(%20PDFDrive%20).pdf
36. journal - THE JAMES CAIRD SOCIETY, https://jamescairdsociety.com/wp-content/uploads/No4.pdf
37. A Joournal 2020.indb - Federation of Local History Societies, https://localhistory.ie/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Journal-20-10-2020-_compressed-1.pdf
38. Wikipedia:Featured article candidates/Featured log/November 2008, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Featured_article_candidates/Featured_log/November_2008
39. (PDF) The Everest Disaster A case study on leadership and decision, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/241688568_The_Everest_Disaster_A_case_study_on_leadership_and_decision-making_2010_by_Sam_Young_Kara_Healey_and_Vanessa_Neame
40. The 1996 Everest Disaster and Decision-Making Essay - IvyPanda, https://ivypanda.com/essays/the-1996-everest-disaster-and-decision-making/
41. Why does Jon Krakauer dislike Anatoli Boukreev so much?, https://kenanddot.wordpress.com/2007/03/06/why-does-jon-krakauer-dislike-anatoli-boukreev-so-much/
42. Into Thin Air vs The Climb: 1996 Everest Accounts, https://globalsummitguide.com/1996-everest-into-thin-air-vs-the-climb/
43. Trapped by the entrepreneurial mindset - Effectuation.org, https://effectuation.org/hubfs/Journal%20Articles/2017/06/Trapped-by-the-entrepreneurial-mindset-Opportunity-seeking-and-escalation-of-commitment-in-the-Mount-Everest-disaster-1.pdf?hsLang=en
44. The 1996 Mount Everest Disaster: Causes and Death, https://himalayantrekkers.com/blog/1996-mount-everest-disaster
45. “Yes” In My Backyard? The Economics of Refugees and Their Social, https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/308011482417763778/pdf/111303-WP-Kakuma-Report-Yes-in-my-backyard-December-2016-PUBLIC.pdf
46. Urbanization in Refugee Camps in the Middle East - ASCE Library, https://ascelibrary.org/doi/10.1061/JUPDDM.UPENG-5169
47. Planning a Sustainable Settlement Solution for Syrian Refugees in, https://publications.rwth-aachen.de/record/772906/files/772906.pdf
48. “EVERYTHING BELONGS TO THE AGENCIES”, https://refugeeledresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/Working-paper-10-Mohamed-Hassan-FULL-REPORT.pdf

49. (PDF) Refugee securitization and the challenges of formal integration, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388039278_Refugee_securitization_and_the_challenges_of_formal_integration_case_of_Somali_refugees_in_Kenya_and_Ethiopia
50. Refugee Economies, https://mcrg.ac.in/RLS_Migration/Reading_List/Module_D/8.Betts,%20Alexander_%20Bloom,%20Louise_%20Kaplan,%20Josiah%20David_%20Omata,%20Naohiko-Refugee%20economiesforced%20displacement%20and%20development%20(2017).pdf
51. Precarious Labour - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/414556559_Precarious_Labour
52. Refugee Camps - WUR eDepot, https://edepot.wur.nl/333659