2021

The Human Search for a Sense of Wholeness

Ross R. Maxwell

The Human Search for a Sense of Wholeness

Ross R. Maxwell
2019

How can we characterize a civilization? From an economic point of view, a civilization consists of a system of interacting fulltime interdependent specialized occupations. From a cultural point of view, on the other hand, a civilization consists of what Ben Nelson, the late president of the International Society for the Comparative Study of Civilizations (1971-1977), called a civilizational complex, a structure that developed from the blending of multiple cultures.

This paper proposes that individuals in full-time specialized occupations, plus the patterns and processes they form, are the medium out of which civilizations grow. The basic processes that organized the initial civilizations remain active today. The major features of civilizations have included:

- TRADE with **cities** as trade networks create focal points for exchange between economic specialties. Trade works best when both sides agree that an exchange is balanced.

- HIERARCHY organizes a **state** with specialized occupations of unbalanced one way, top-down, power relationships: king, officer, soldier, weights-and-measures checker, etc.

- CULTURE connects individuals and groups into a **society** with help from elders, priests, teachers, intellectuals, artists, etc., able to distinguish what Lee Snyder called "proper" knowledge from "smart" knowledge. Ben Nelson's *Civilizational Complex* provides a civilization its sense of identity.

This paper addresses ten different major approaches that have been employed to describe the nature of civilization.

Approach 1 – Progress

I attended a session on defining civilization at the 1996 ISCSC annual meeting at the California Polytechnic Institute, Pomona. Most everyone provided their definition, except for scientist Ralph Brauer who instead thought the basic question, "What is civilization?" to be potentially misleading. Such a question tends to view phenomena as objects. He thought a better approach, used by many scientists, would be to view civilization as a process.

To me viewing civilization as a process helps us escape from what social scientists call 'reification' — referring to an immaterial thing as an object, or attributing material reality to analytic or abstract concepts. As I see it, civilization as on-going processes is active today.

Approach 2 - Transformation from generalist to specialized occupations

I propose that on-going civilization processes are related to the growth in numbers and types of fulltime interdependent specialized occupations. Evidence suggests that back in the Ice Age, before the development of agriculture, most humans lived in small nomadic hunter-gatherer bands. In these small egalitarian bands people functioned as generalists with any division of labor by age and sex.

The development of agriculture supported larger populations with permanent settled villages and towns. Larger populations made possible more specialization. I propose that civilization is linked to a simple mundane fact: the growth in numbers and types of specialized occupations in a complex division of labor.

Approach 3 - Cooperative systems: trade networks and cities, plus hierarchies and states

Key features of civilization, cities and states, co-evolve with new types of specialists. A city is a location where distances are short enough that specialists can easily interact and trade with each other, and so a finer division of labor is possible. Also, a city combined with its close hinterland has a large enough population to support the rarer specialists. As Adam Smith pointed out, specialists increase productivity and collectively increase the size of the economy.

A state is a hierarchical structure capable of dealing with internal problems and external threats with its own types of specialists, such as king, officer, full-time soldier, weights & measures checker, etc.

Approach 4 - Cooperation and trust

Specialists are inherently interdependent within the larger system Such systems are most effective when specialists cooperate. However, in order for people to fully cooperate, they need to trust each other.

Multi-celled organisms with specialized cells provide an analogy to civilization. A key distinction is that cooperation and 'trust' between specialized cells derives from all their identical genomes. In contrast, humans do not share a genome, so interaction is enhanced by a set of supporting cultural traits.

As I see it, a cooperative system includes a system of cooperating individuals with trust-enhancing cultural traits. This suggests that cooperation and trust are key dimensions for understanding of civilization.

Approach 5 - Growth of hierarchy

The larger the population, the greater the possible number and types of specialists. On the other hand, the greater the possibility of opportunism.   A deliberate cheater knows that the other party may not find it worth the time, effort or cost to bring a case to the community, or to court.   Also, the larger the population, the greater the chance that opportunism may not be detected.   Finally, the natural reluctance to behave opportunistically tends to weaken with group size.

Consequently, as settlement sizes grow, informal social controls may no longer be effective, so a more hierarchical approach may be needed. One approach is to create new types of hierarchical specialists such as priest or chief to coordinate management. Their bottom-up power could be given consensually by the people, as Christian, Brown and Benjamin argue in their book, *Big History: Between Nothing and Everything* (McGraw Hill Education: New York, 2014). Thus:

- In Mesopotamia, as the population grew larger, the initial temple-run economies of the cities may have been able to minimize opportunism. By the time of Hammurabi and full civilization, the state had stepped in to reduce opportunism, for example, by standardizing weights and measures.[1]
- As urbanization increases, new roles are needed by the society, whether they are permanent or part time. Examples include soldiers, judges, temple maintainers, and building inspectors.
- A state is a hierarchically organized region with an institutionalized power structure able to coerce as well and often also receiving popular consent.
- If there is danger of warfare with other cities or marauding nomads, a larger settlement is easier to defend. It is also more likely to have soldiers with experienced officers.[2]

---

[1] Much of Hammurabi's Code dealt with economic transactions, for example, setting the wages for an ox cart and driver or the fee for a surgeon. Also, liability was established for a builder if a house collapses, a boat builder whose boat is not tight (leaks), or a careless sailor who wrecks a boat, damaging the goods, etc. Unlike villages that cannot effectively defend themselves in case of war or marauding nomads, towns possibly and cities most likely have a large enough population to fully man the city walls as necessary for defense.

[2] E. 0. Wilson, in The Social Conquest of Earth, argues that very large ant nest sizes with specialists are needed for a nest to defend.

The density and interaction between urban peoples can create problems. A town or city is also a place where solutions can be discovered.[3] From an interdependent specialist point of view, an urban center is a location where they can interact and rub shoulders. This opens the possibility for innovation and new types of specialists, both economic and non-economic.[4]

Approach 6 - Jane Jacobs - Moral Analysis

A moral analysis of specialists in civilizations was started by Jane Jacobs in *Systems of Survival: Dialog on the Moral Foundations of Commerce and Politics* (1992).[5] Following her paradigm shifting *Life and Death of Great American Cities* (1961), she researched the economic history of cities. Among other things, she compiled lists by occupation of behavior 'extolled as admirable,' 'expected or proper,' or 'deemed scandalous, disgraceful.'

She found many virtues valued by all occupations; these included Responsibility, Capacity to resist harmful temptations, Compassion, Courage, Common sense, Foresight, Judgment, Perseverance, Energy, Patience, Wisdom, and what she called Cooperation, the master virtue.

She also found two lists of work-world virtues that were unique to particular occupations. The one set were those from the commercial world of trade (see Exhibit 1), and the other set, following Plato, she called the Guardians, whose role was to defend and protect territory and society (see Exhibit 2). She puzzled over these two lists and finally realized that they represented two fundamental systems of survival: to trade or to take. Trading is how people survive in a commercial world. Taking is what animals and hunter-gatherers do. It is also how Guardians subsist, by taking: taxes, tithes, booty, etc.

In my conversations with her I asked whether there was a third system of survival, to share. She agreed, but she said that in the modem world sharing is very weak compared to the power of the market or the power of the state, so it can be effectively ignored.

---

[3] In 2010, the world's 40 largest mega-regions, which are home to some 18 percent of the world's population, produce two-thirds of global economic output and nearly nine in ten new patented innovations. See "How the Crash Will Reshape America", *Atlantic Monthly*, March 2009.

[4] To world historian William H. McNeill, the big picture has been the human ability to adapt to different ecosystems, using intelligence, tools and cooperation. As I see it, an urban environment is where new relationships, new problems, new dilemmas/trade-offs, and new possibilities first occur. That is, an urban situation can be viewed as a new type of ecosystem offering new opportunities for innovation—both economic and non-economic.

[5] See Jane Jacobs, *Systems of Survival: Dialog on the moral foundations of Commerce and Politics,* (New York: Vintage Books, 1992).

Approach 7 - Moral analysis extension

I have extended the analysis by Jane Jacobs in three ways.

(1) I added sharing as a third system of survival with its own set of moral traits, since back in the hunting-gathering era, sharing was key for group survival. (Appendix A proposes a sharing community moral syndrome for nomadic hunter-gatherer bands, plus the equality moral syndrome needed to counter the danger of Alpha males.)

(2) Instead of seeing cooperation as "the master virtue" common to all moral syndromes, I saw that what is meant by cooperation changes in different contexts. Thus, three systems of survival provide three fundamentally different contexts.

- **Community** involves ordinary, non-specialized (generalist) people, who as members of a community, cooperate to maintain their community. This is the primary type of cooperation in nomadic hunter-gatherer bands, where maintaining a sharing community is essential for survival.
- **Trade** involves economic specialists, who cooperate to fulfill a trade agreement. Cooperation is two-way and reciprocal.
- **Hierarchy** involves cooperation between specialized roles – superiors and subordinates. Cooperation is one-way, with subordinates cooperating with orders, rules, and procedures set by their superiors.

(3) I recognized that the three types of cooperation are organized as distinct operative systems, each with its own supporting moral traits that enhance the trust people need to cooperate. The first two are the Trading Cooperative System and the Guardian Hierarchy Cooperative system.

The Trading Cooperative System - For effective trading, the transaction costs associated with opportunism are greatly reduced if the trading parties trust each other. Exhibit 1 lists the moral traits unique to trading as a cooperative system. These traits support:

- Trust needed to maintain trading relationships,
- Flexibility and inventiveness needed to find and produce what the other party wants, and
- Discipline needed to effectively acquire, use and maintain resources and capital.

Jane Jacobs called these moral traits the Commercial Moral Syndrome.

Exhibit 1 – The Moral Traits of Trading Cooperative Systems (Two-way Cooperation Supports Trading Relationships)

<u>Building trust in trading relationships:</u>
- *Come to voluntary agreements;*
- *Shun force;*
- *Respect contracts;*
- *Be honest;*
- *Collaborate easily with strangers and aliens; and*
- *Be optimistic.*

<u>Finding and producing what others want:</u>
- *Be open to inventiveness and novelty;*
- *Promote comfort and convenience;*
- *Use initiative and enterprise;*
- *Dissent for the sake of the task; and*
- *Compete.*

<u>Disciplined use of resources and working capital:</u>
- *Be industrious;*
- *Be efficient;*
- *Be thrifty; and*
- *Invest for productive purposes.*

Source: The Commercial Moral Syndrome moral traits from Jane Jacobs, *Systems of Survival*

The Guardian Hierarchy Cooperative System - In a civilization, guardian hierarchies are necessary to protect society and territory.   Unlike trade, where cooperation has a two-way reciprocal nature, in a hierarchy cooperation is inherently one way. Subordinates cooperate with superiors by following directives, rules and laws.

Moreover, in order for a hierarchical organization such as an army or a bureaucracy to function effectively, the superiors need to trust that their orders and procedures will be cooperatively obeyed without constant supervision. In terms of this paper all these non-economic Guardian roles are types of specialists.   Exhibit 2 lists the unique moral traits supportive of a Guardian Hierarchical Cooperative System, namely those traits that:

- make a person an effective guardian,
- build trust that subordinates will perform duties without constant supervision, and
- protect and enhance the guardian hierarchy itself.

**Exhibit 2 – The Moral Traits of Guardian Hierarchy Cooperative System
(Supports hierarchical organizations that protect territory and society.
Cooperation is one-way only and subordinates cooperate with superiors.)**

<u>To be effective as a guardian, one must:</u>
- *Shun trading;*
- *Be obedient and disciplined;*
- *Exert prowess;*
- *Show fortitude;*
- *Be fatalistic;*
- *Deceive for the sake of the task; and*
- *Take vengeance.*

<u>Building trust that subordinates will perform without constant
supervision:</u>
- *Be obedient and disciplined;*
- *Respect hierarchy;*
- *Be loyal;*
- *Be exclusive;*
- *Treasure honor; and*
- *Adhere to tradition.*

<u>Enhancing hierarchy:</u>
- *Respect hierarchy;*
- *Be loyal;*
- *Be exclusive;*
- *Take vengeance;*
- *Make rich use of leisure;*
- *Be ostentatious; and*
- *Dispense largesse.*

Source: The Guardian Moral Syndrome moral traits from Jane Jacobs, *Systems of Survival*

Approach 8 - Incompatible cooperative/moral systems

Exhibits 1 and 2 show the unique moral traits associated with two basic cooperative systems. The unique moral traits of each system, however, are not just different, but in most cases incompatible.

For the small bands of the hunter-gatherer era, sharing was the critical survival factor during hard times. It made life easier during all times. In contrast the other two cooperative systems are antithetical to sharing.

An Alpha male able to dominate — to form a hierarchy — can take more than his fair share.   Also, the immediate direct reciprocity required for effective trading is antithetical to the time-delayed indirect reciprocity associated with a sharing community. Sharing comes with community membership. In contrast, with trade there is no guarantee of a second future trade. The other trading party may not be ready to trade or may have found a better deal elsewhere.

During the nomadic band era, the importance of the egalitarian sharing/ moral community was made easier in that the trading and guardian hierarchy cooperative systems functioned, at best, only part time, if at all. Also, for hunter gatherers, incompatibilities could be resolved by a band or individual using only one cooperative system at a time. For example, the Kalahari Desert San, Ju/ ' hoansi, would only share and not trade within their small cluster of sharing bands, but could trade with outsiders.[6]

During the civilization era, guardian hierarchies and trading became fulltime phenomena, with their incompatibilities existing simultaneously.   The primary resolution was for individuals to specialize — either as an economic specialist or by serving a role within a guardian hierarchy.

It is possible to blend systems, but at a price. For example, a tyrant using hierarchical power to organize and control trade for his own benefit, hurts the economy of the country as a whole.[7]

Conflicts Between Moral Systems

Jane Jacobs' analysis of the differences between the two lists of moral traits shown below, in Exhibit 3, led to a major discovery, the Law of Intractable Systemic Corruption. What might be called a 'virtue' in one moral system becomes a 'vice' when applied in the other moral system.

A 'virtue' is shorthand for any action, attitude or value that enhances the trust, cooperation or effectiveness of a cooperative system, while a 'vice' is something that harms this system.

Thus, in the trading cooperative system it is a virtue to make a profitable trade. For a guardian, however, trading is inherently corrupting, leading to neglect of duty if caught taking a bribe. On the other hand, a guardian may at times need to use force in order to protect society from internal or external threat, whereas a trader cannot use force if he wants to establish the trust needed for a long-term and voluntary trading relationship.

---

[6] See Elizabeth Marshall Thomas, *The Old Way: A Story of the First People* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006).

[7] Several years ago, an Egyptian reporter was thrown into jail for even speculating on how wealthy President Hosni Mubarak might be.

The intractableness of these types of corruption derives from the basic differences between the Trading and Hierarchical Guardian Cooperative Systems. The Mafia is an example of corruption caused by mixing moral traits. They keep good books, call themselves businessmen, but are in fact parasites because they use force.

Exhibit 3 compares the moral traits associated with the Guardian and Trading cooperative systems. Whereas the Sharing/Moral Community traits are based on personal relationships within a small community, both larger scale Guardian and Trading cooperative systems have an impersonal or instrumental quality.

In a hunter-gatherer band a would-be Alpha is a particular person. His attempt to dominate, to form hierarchical relationships, is between him and the others. Likewise, a moral community's response, creating a reverse dominance hierarchy, is to pull him back into the group as an equal with others in the community.

In contrast, a guardian hierarchy has an impersonal quality. For example, a soldier has to obey his officer, but if that officer is replaced by another, the obedience relationship remains. Also, in the trading world, trades are constrained by impersonal market forces.

All the Trading System traits listed are different from those of the Sharing/Moral Community, while some Guardian traits are similar.[8] These include Adhere to tradition and Make a rich use of leisure, and, importantly, those traits are associated with identifying potential enemies and protecting society.

Guardians use their role as protectors of society to take the moral high ground relative to the traders. This can be seen in many of the early civilizations, where occupations were ranked: at the top guardians, whether military or religious, next farmers, then craftsmen and at the bottom merchants.

Fulltime Guardian and Trading cooperative systems required members to split off from the Sharing Community. As I read the evidence, there was significant resistance to separating from the sharing and egalitarian ethos. Witness the early Mesopotamian redistributive temple economies that allowed for the development of a complex economy with significant division of labor while maintaining a form of sharing. Also, war leaders were temporary.

---

[8] Notice that a few trading system traits are extensions in spirit of the Sharing Community: fair trade with *Share Fairly* and shun force with *Avoid Strife*.

However, a major transformation occurred in early Sumerian Civilization, when the temporary war leader, the king, using his loyal retinue of enemy soldiers he had captured (but not killed, so they were in his debt), refused at the end of the emergency to relinquish his hierarchical power and his kingship became permanent.[9]

The moral power of the egalitarian / sharing ethos of the hunter-gather era had suppressed those hierarchical impulses we had inherited from our primate ancestors. However, during the transition era, the re-emergence of hierarchical forms and growing wealth generated by trade at some point overcame this moral power. The genie, as it were, was released from the bottle, allowing unequal social classes to emerge.

Exhibit 3
Guardian and Trading Cooperative Systems: Comparing Incompatible Moral Traits

GUARDIAN	TRADE
Supports hierarchical organizations that protect territory and society.	**Supports trade: two-way reciprocal exchanges.**
Shun trading.	*Come to voluntary agreements.*
Exert prowess.	*Shun force.*
Take vengeance.	*Be honest.*
Be loyal.	*Be open to inventiveness and novelty.*
Deceive for the sake of the task.	*Use initiative and enterprise.*
Treasure honor.	*Dissent for the sake of the task.*
Adhere to tradition.	*Collaborate easily with strangers and aliens.*
Be obedient and disciplined.	*Respect contracts.*
Be exclusive.	*Compete.*
Show fortitude.	*Be industrious.*
Respect hierarchy.	*Be efficient and thrifty.*
Make rich use of leisure.	*Invest for productive purposes.*
Be ostentatious.	*Promote comfort and convenience.*
Dispense largesse.	*Be optimistic.*

The two lists of moral traits in *Systems of Survival* were reordered into sets of incompatible opposites via telephone conversation with Jane Jacobs, 6/4/1996.

---

[9] See Cotterell, Arthur, Ed., *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Civilizations*, (New York: Mayflower Books, 1980), 76-77.

Approach 9 - Symbiosis Between Cooperative/Moral Systems

The three cooperative/moral systems presented above are in a symbiotic relationship. None of them can do it alone. Attempts by one to do another's job will run a foul of the Law of Intractable Systemic Corruption. For example, in the Soviet Union, the government, as guardians, attempted to run the economy, with disastrous results. Although their sharing ideology gave license for a command economy, the bureaucrats did not know how to be traders. The hierarchical tools at their command: rules and regulations, fiat, setting production goals (or else), all run counter to the mutuality and inventiveness needed for effective trading.

Consequently, such bureaucratic guardian organizations can provide neither the incentives needed for hard work nor the creative initiative required for an effective trading system.

Approach 10 - Various ISCSC approaches to the nature of civilization

Macro-culture pulls a civilization together:

I. Cultural Core: Civilization as macro-culture
Benjamin Nelson (President, ISCSC, 1971 – 1977) and the Cultural Core of civilizations + civilization as a macro-culture:

Civilizations are composed of "the governing cultural heritages of 2 + n societies, territories [or] areas which generally enjoy or have enjoyed a certain proximity" [and language] to each other.

Furthermore, what gives a civilization its sense of identity is the existence of a set of shared **Civilizational Complexes**, such as religious commitments, patterns of reciprocities, legal concepts and processes, taken-for-granted structures of consciousness, intellectual categories and modes of logic. Sometimes Prof. Nelson referred to these cultural phenomena as the 'directive structures' that shape human thought and action.

Civilizations require specialists: teachers, priests, other religious leaders and supporting personnel.

- David Richardson considers worldviews as defining civilizations.
- Lee Snyder emphasizes the cultural system as central to civilizations.

Connectedness criteria

David Wilkinson, however, defines civilization using a connectedness criterion, not a cultural criterion, as "a city-state, cities-state, or tightly linked politico- military network of such states that are not a part of a larger such network." He considers civilizations as world systems.

Wilkinson introduces the idea of "Central Civilization" or "Central World System." He argues this emerged about 1500 BCE with the integration of the Mesopotamian and Egyptian civilizations, and then engulfed the Aegean civilization in 560 BC; Indian civilization in 1000; the New World after the Age of Discovery; and finally the Far Eastern civilizations in 1850. This idea has been followed and developed by other scholars. The states of such civilization(s) need specialists, spies, and advisors who are knowledgeable about other powers.

II. Definition of Civilization: Civilization-level phenomena consists of those aspects and forms associated with, created by, and/ or supportive of a medium of fulltime interdependent specialists. Aspects and forms include cities, states, trade networks, roads, infrastructure, social classes, monumental architecture, and writing.

Civilization, as Brauer argued, is an on-going process, still active today, with new social, political, cultural and economic forms coordinating, connecting and monitoring new types of specialists.

In particular with globalization, urban areas are of increasing importance, such as the current dominate pair of New York and London. (See Peter J. Taylor's work, *Extraordinary Cities: Millennia of Moral Syndromes, World Systems and City/State relations*, (Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK. 2013.)

The ubiquity of specialization in civilizations leads to a definition:

> ***Civilization-level phenomena consist of those aspects and forms associated with, created by, or supportive of a medium of fulltime interdependent specialists.***

In the definition: "*aspects and forms"* is a deliberately neutral phrase referring to any feature of human existence from technology to consciousness.

> • 'Aspects and forms' are associated with, created by, and supportive of fulltime interdependent specialists. This addresses cities, states, roads, infrastructure, social classes, monumental architecture, and writing, all ofwhich archeologists have used to identify a civilization. 'Aspects and forms' also include trade networks, cooperative systems, and worldviews.

These have existed prior to civilization during the hunter- gatherer era, but were transformed as more and more specialists emerged, and as specialist-enhanced and specialist-supportive systems developed.

- 'Fulltime' refers to the primary way a specialized person makes a living. In civilization, cooperative systems themselves become specialized. Out of the original small-scale personal-level egalitarian and sharing cooperative systems of nomadic hunter-gatherers have emerged the larger-scale impersonal and instrumental trading and hierarchical control cooperative systems of civilization.

III.   The Quest for Wholeness

Gashes and interactions between the different cooperative systems within a civilization point to the need for some type of cultural 'glue' able to hold the different systems together, such as a religion, macro culture, worldview, Ben Nelson's Civilizational Complex, and Spengler's Prime Symbol.

Interestingly, Joseph Campbell combined the economic and the cultural approaches to a definition of civilization. He suggested a linkage between specialization and this geometric organization within a closed field.

> [In] the camps of hunters the community was constituted of a group of practically equivalent individuals, each in adequate control of the whole inheritance... [whereas] in the larger, more differentiated communities that developed when agriculture and stock breeding had made for a settled, more richly articulated social structure, adulthood consisted in acquiring, first a certain special art or skill, and then, the ability to support or sustain the resultant tension- a psychological and sociological tension - between oneself (as merely a fraction of the whole) and others of totally different training, powers, and ideals, who constituted the other necessary organs of the body social.

> The problem of existing as a mere fraction instead of as a whole imposes certain stresses on the psyche which no primitive hunter ever had to endure, and consequently the symbols giving structure and support to the … hunter's psychological balance were radically different from those that rose with the … High Neolithic [settlements].

In other words, Campbell suggested a relationship between the art style of a people and their need for symbolic wholeness. The arrival of geometrically organized art occurs not with the beginning of agriculture and settled villages, as such, but later with the beginning of towns, when true full-time specialization was taking place. This suggests that the organized geometric art provided a sense of wholeness and completeness for these specialists, who were not complete in and of themselves.

This prompts a conjecture:

> ***Civilizational worldviews, in order to counter the psycho-social force of separation created by specialization, will include, in some form or other a sense of wholeness, of being connected to a whole.***

Are there other "sense of wholeness" phenomena that help individuals to accept their non-completeness? Perhaps the modern self emerged with Rembrandt and the American ideas of revolution and democracy. Or does our sense of wholeness go back to the Roman idea of immortality, a culture where everyone worked together so that Rome became immortal? Is wealth related to symbolic immortality and not a sense of wholeness? If economic specialists are in fact the medium from which civilizations grow, the future of the comparative study of civilizations is indeed awaiting additional steps toward the definition of civilization and of worldview.

APPENDIX A

Nomadic Hunter-Gatherer Cooperative Systems Moral Analysis

The era when humans (and our close ancestors) lived as generalists in small nomadic bands extends hundreds of thousands of years very deep into pre-history. Before about 10,000 years ago, most humans still lived in small bands. In such groups the raising of the next generation depended on the survival of the band itself. A group, whose members share and provide mutual aid, becomes a community.[10] [11]

Within such a community, cooperation is indirect, with no set time to return a favor; this is also called *indirect reciprocity*. If I provide aid to you today, I trust that that you, or possibly someone else within the community, will provide aid to me on a future date, as yet unspecified.

Trust is in the community itself as a cooperative system. Moral traits such as *Share fairly, Avoid strife,* and *Seek harmony* help to establish and maintain a living and mutually supportive community.

---

[10] There are many definitions of community, but for these early small societies, I follow, Ferdinand Tonnies's distinction between community (Gemeinschaft) and society (Gesellschaft). He defined community as a 'condition' in which individuals remain "attached despite all division, in contrast to society in which people remain separate despite all unifying forces."

[11] Two excellent works on the development of community are S. Keller, *Community: Pursuing the Dream, Living the Reality*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), p. 266 quoting T. Bender, *Community and Social Change in America* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1985), p. 17.)

Moral community - The political anthropologist Christopher Boehm has researched the politics of hierarchical great apes and of egalitarian human societies, both tribal, and hunter-gatherer bands. He has focused on the problem of Alpha males, who would dominate a group and take more than their share of females and resources.[12] He found for small human groups that the dominated-upon 'rank and file' could form a coalition able to reverse the Alpha's hierarchical domination.   He calls this a reverse dominance hierarchy.

Collectively, such a coalition has the strength to counter an alpha male, even if that person is very powerful and dangerous. Paradoxically, this strength uses the same intuitive hierarchical sense of domination versus deference that we inherited from our ape ancestors that an alpha uses. Leveling the alpha male brings everyone to the same level. That is to say that the hierarchical relationships that the alpha had created become 'squashed,' creating a sense of equality. Thus, a sense of equality emerges out of our ability to form hierarchical relationships. The result is an egalitarian ethos. This is maintained by what Boehm calls a moral community.

The result is an egalitarian society. While families within the band may be structured hierarchically, the heads of families within the community are equal. This egalitarian ethos includes moral traits: Consensus decision making, Avoidance of competition, and Seeking prestige through skill and reputation.[13]

Hunter-gatherer bands are aware that a more successful hunter, providing more than his share for the group, may want to convert his prestige into an alpha position and dominate the band.

Consequently, band members are on the lookout for a would-be alpha, and t h e y do their best to maintain the egalitarian ethos — using gossip, jokes, humor, shaming, and if that does not work, then shunning, ostracism, and banishment. If that still does not work, then they may secretly assemble to assassinate a dominating alpha.

In small bands, people quietly talking among themselves can form a coalition able to overthrow an alpha male. However, the larger the society, the harder it is for people to trust each other sufficiently to form a reverse dominance hierarchy.

---

[12] Boehm, Christopher, Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1999.)

[13] I would note that quid pro quo reciprocity between two people does not support a sharing community. For example, what happens if one of two hunters through luck or skill brings back more game, how do they manage the bookkeeping of who owes whom, and for how long a period do you maintain such a reckoning? It is simpler for a hunter to bring the meat back to the community, where it is shared around.

Boehm speculates that regardless of lethal weapons, 'the people' could have tipped the scales in favor of themselves rather than an alpha male.

Nevertheless, even in a powerful dictatorial state, there is always a potential threat of a popular uprising, especially in a time of famine or serous downturn of the economy.

A modern democracy is a form of a reverse dominance hierarchy, where the people elect their leaders, and a free press helps provide the necessary communication. Increasingly, we have witnessed the internet as a form of connecting communities.

Sharing Community - Sharing works best if it is voluntary, and since sharing is bidirectional, it is easier if both those who provide and those who receive perceive themselves as equal. An egalitarian society, therefore, helps support a sharing community. A hunter brings meat back not to individuals but to the community, where it is shared around. This means that not only is each person guaranteed some meat, but it also reduces a fear of not belonging and so potentially starving. In a time of serious scarcity, a sharing community stands a better chance of surviving and of not breaking down into nuclear families — a situation where some families may survive but possibly not all.

Thus, as I see it, a hunter-gatherer band consists of two coterminous communities: a **sharing community,** where mutual aid improves survival for all, and a **moral community** that forms the egalitarian ethos needed for sharing. Both are needed. They support each other.

Exhibit A-1 shows those moral traits associated with a sharing community / moral community. Notice that:

- Dissension is countered by Seeking harmony and Avoiding strife.
- Jealousy — creating greed and possessiveness — is countered by Share fairly, Be egalitarian.
- Laziness and lack of cooperation is countered by gossiping and shaming, and if this does not work by shunning or banishment.
- Attempts to dominate are countered by *Consensus decision-making* and by an egalitarian ethos.

Another way to avoid one person dominating the group, is for leadership positions to be only part-time. Although effective defense, war, and group hunts may have required a leader with sufficient hierarchical command to direct others, these leaders were only part-time.

Exhibit A1 - Nomadic Hunter-Gatherer Moral Traits for Sharing Community/Moral Community

Maintain Sharing Community:
- *Share to promote community.*
- *Share fairly.*
- *Seek harmony.*
- *Deceive for the sake of harmony* (OK to tell white lies).
- *Avoid strife.*
- *Be egalitarian.*
- *Gossip about and shame those not pulling their weight.*

Maintain Moral Community:
- *Shun* a *person seeking power.*
- *Be egalitarian.*
- *Consensus decision making.*
- *Share fairly.*
- *Seek harmony.*
- *Avoid competition.*
- *Deceive for the sake of harmony* (OK to tell white lies).
- *Avoid strife.*
- *Seek prestige through skill and reputation.*

Group/Outsider Relations:
- *Distrust strangers.*
- *Group Solidarity.*
- *Loyalty to group.*
- *Strong in-group/out-group sense.*
- *Adhere to tradition.*
- *Show fortitude.*
- *Be fatalistic.*
- *Community is sacred.*

Personal relations inside band and within cluster of bands:
- *Promote personal connections by gifts.*

References

Boehm, Christopher (1999) *Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Campbell, Joseph (1969) *The Flight of the Wild Gander: Explorations in the Mythological Dimension.* New York: Viking. Pages 141 – 144.

Christian, David; Brown, Cynthia; and Benjamin Craig. *Big History: Between Nothing and Everything.* (McGraw Hill Education: New York, 2014). Page 121.

Geyl, Pieter, Arnold Toynbee, and Pitirim Sorokin (1949) *The Pattern of the Past: Can We Determine it?* Boston: The Beacon Press.

Jacobs, Jane (1992) *Systems of Survival: Dialog on the moral foundations of Commerceand Politics.* New York: Vintage Books.

Keller, Suzanne (2003) *Community: Pursuing the Dream, Living the Reality.* Princeton:Princeton University Press.

Thomas, Elizabeth Marshall (2006) *The Old Way: A Story of the First People.* New York:Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

McGaughey, William (2000) *Five Epochs of Civilization: World History as Emerging in Five Civilizations.* Minneapolis: Thistlerose.

Mithen, Steven (2003) *After the Ice: A Global Human History: 20,000 to 5,000 BC,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Quigley, Carroll (1961) *The Evolution of Civilizations: An Introduction to Historical Analysis.* New York: McMillan.

Rose, David C. (2011) *The Moral Foundation of Economic Behavior.* New York: Oxford University Press. Page 44.

Sanderson, Stephen K. Editor (1995) *Civilization and World Systems: Studying World-Historical Change.* Walnut Creek CA: Altamira Press.

Snyder, Lee Daniel (1999) *Macro History: A Theoretical Approach to Comparative World History.* Edwin Mellen Press, Lewiston, NY. Pages 376-389.

Taylor, Peter J. (2013) *Extraordinary Cities: Millennia of Moral Syndromes, World Systems and City/State Relations.* Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Thomas, Elizabeth Marshall (2006) *The Old Way: A Story of the First People,* New York:Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Wilson, Edward O. (2012) *The Social Conquest of Earth.* New York: Live Right Publishing.