Homoarchy as a Principle of Sociopolitical Organization

An Introduction

Dmitri M. Bondarenko

Abstract. – Until recently, cultural evolution has been regarded as the teleological move to a greater level of hierarchy. Research based upon the principle of heterarchy – "the relation of elements to one another when they are unranked or when they possess the potential for being ranked in a number of different ways" (Crumley 1995: 3) – changes this understanding. The opposite of heterarchy would be an ordering of the dimensions of society mainly according to a single hierarchical tenet. This organizational principle may be called "homoarchy." Homoarchy and heterarchy represent the most general, universally applicable principles and basic trajectories of sociocultural organization. There are no universal evolutionary stages: cultures can be (generally) heterarchical or homoarchical having an equal level of complexity. Further, a culture could change its basic organizational principle without transition to another complexity level. Alternativity also exists within each of the types. *[Homoarchy, heterarchy, sociopolitical organization, alternativity]*

Dmitri M. Bondarenko, Dr. Phil. and Dr. Sc., both from the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow; Chair of the Department of Cultural Anthropology at the Center for Civilizational and Regional Studies and Senior Researcher at the Institute for African Studies (both at the Russian Academy of Sciences); Professor at the Center of Social Anthropology, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow. – He has conducted fieldwork in Tanzania, Nigeria, and Russia. – He is author of almost 200 publications including 5 monographs. One of his most recent books (with P. M. Roese) is: "A Popular History of Benin. The Rise and Fall of a Mighty Forest Kingdom" (Frankfurt 2003); he is cofounder and coeditor of *Social Evolution and History*. – See also Ref. Cit.

Homoarchy

The term "homoarchy" first came to the author's and his colleague Andrey Korotayev's minds dur-

ing an informal discussion of Carole Crumley's concept of "heterarchy" (1979, 1987, 1995, 2001). Crumley (1995: 3; see also 1979: 144; 1987: 158; 2001: 25) defines heterarchy "as the relation of elements to one another when they are unranked or when they possess the potential for being ranked in a number of different ways," just as heterarchy is defined in biophysics from where the term was imported by Crumley (1987: 156 f.) to social science. Subsequently, we can define homoarchy as "the relation of elements to one another when they are rigidly ranked only in a single way, and thus possess no (or not more than very limited) potential for being unranked or ranked in another or a number of different ways, at least without fundamentally reshaping the whole sociopolitical order." The definition given to distinguish heterarchy from hierarchy in cybernetics is applicable for our purpose as well: "Heterarchy [is the] form of organization resembling a network or fishnet" while "hierarchy [is the] form of organization resembling a pyramid" (*Web Dictionary* n.d).

However, in social science homoarchy must not be identified with hierarchy; likewise heterarchy must not be confused with egalitarianism in the strict meaning of the word (Brumfiel 1995: 129). Hierarchy is an attribute of any social system while, on the other hand, in any society both "vertical" and "horizontal" social links may be observed.[1] This dictum's verity is confirmed explicit-

---

1 Berreman (1981); Smith (1985); Johnson (1989); Ehrenreich et al. (1995: 87–100, 116–120, 125–131); Crumley

ly by quite a number of publications on an impressive variety of specific cultures, based on different kinds of sources: archaeological,[2] written,[3] and firsthand ethnographic sources.[4] Even among so-called "egalitarian" hunter-gatherers (Woodburn 1982) with a strong ethos of equality and a lack of pronounced social stratification (like the Hadza, !Kung, Pygmies, Birhor, Paliayans, Shoshone, and so on) one nevertheless can observe minimal social differentiation, and hence hierarchies and inequality, combined with informal leadership (for recent generalized descriptions and considerations see: Johnson and Earle 2000: 41–89; Artemova 2004: 190–196). As Schweitzer (2000: 129) rightly points out, it is necessary "to break up the general label 'egalitarian' into a continuum of actual constellations of inequality. ... even ardent supporters of 'primitive communism' agree that 'perfect equality' does not exist."[5] On the opposite end of the complexity level's scale even such societies as "archaic states," usually thought of as socially immobile and heavily bureaucratized (Egypt, the Ur III state, the Inca kingdom, and so on), in reality "were both heterarchical *and* hierarchical [homoarchical]" (Marcus and Feinman 1998: 11; emphasis in original). Furthermore, it sometimes seems too difficult to designate a society as "homoarchic" or "heterarchic" even at the most general level of analysis, like in the cases of the late ancient Germans (see, e.g., Gurevich 1999: 45–57) and early medieval "barbarian kingdoms" in which one can observe the monarchy and quite rigid social hierarchy combined with (at least at the beginning) democratic institutions and procedures (like the selection of the king), which were quite significant for the whole sociopolitical system's operation.[6]

So, it seems impossible to measure degrees of homoarchy and heterarchy in a society with mathematical exactness, for example, in per cent. A purely quantitative approach is inapplicable here: the presence of, let's say, five hierarchies in a society as an entity does not make it more heterarchic and less homoarchic in comparison with a society with four hierarchies if in the former one dominant hierarchy exists while it does not in the latter. The pathway to the classification of a society as heterarchic or homoarchic (in either absolute or relative categories) goes through an analysis of it as a whole – as a system of social hierarchies. The aim of this analysis, following the line of thought of systems theory (see, e.g., Hill 1977; Laszlo 1996: 95–126), should be not to count the hierarchies but to understand the way they are related to each other.

Hence, the following question arises when we are studying a particular society: Are the hierarchies that form the given social system ranked (more or less) rigidly or not? Do, let's say, two individuals find themselves ranked toward each other in the same way in any social context or not? For instance, in the exemplary heterarchic society of the Pathans of the Swat valley, described by Fredrik Barth (1959), a man could occupy nonidentical positions in the hierarchies of three intersecting main frameworks of social organization: territorial divisions, castes, and patrilineal descent groups, supplemented by a significant number of free-choice associations based on neighborhood, marriage and affinity, political and economic clientship, and so forth. So, the Swat Pathan X could be superior to his compatriot Y in one social context and inferior or equal in another. On the other hand, before the abolishing of serfdom in 1861 a Russian serf could be regarded by no means as equal (and furthermore superior) to a nobleman, as a soldier cannot but be inferior to an officer.[7] In the meantime, at the level of theory, I cannot but agree with Gary Feinman that though "anthropologists have long discussed a range of social mechanisms that integrate people both through horizontal (more egalitarian) and vertical (more hierarchical) links," only "ongoing comparative investigations should help place these diverse social arrangements in a broader diachronic context" (1996: 189).

(1995); Blanton (1998); Bondarenko and Korotayev (2000); Bondarenko (2004b).

2 E.g., Small (1995); Wailes (1995); Kristiansen (1998: 54–56); Anderson (1999); Kuijt (2000: 312–315); Stein (2001); Scarborough et al. (2003).

3 E.g., Reynolds (1990); Korotayev (1998); Zolotov (1999).

4 E.g., Kelly (1993); Jolly and Mosko (1994); Kammerer (1998); Nangoro (1998: 47 f.).

5 See also, *inter alia*, Dahrendorf (1970); Rousseau (1985); Trigger (1985: 49–51); Gellner (1992); Artemova (2000a, 2000b).

6 See, e.g., Diesner (1966); Claude (1970); Dvoretskaja (1982); Claessen (1985); Sannikov (2003).

7 A regular army may serve as an ideal image of a generally homoarchic society and a real model of such a community. The rigid vertical division of people in the military service by ranks is its all-embracing organizational pivot and a pledge of effective functioning; individuals' positions within the institution are replicas of their standings on the only scale of ranks that determines completely the spheres and limits of their obligations, responsibilities, and rights. At the same moment, informal horizontal ties relate people in the military who are of the same or similar ranks establishing informal secondary hierarchies, for example, by vesting more respect in brave- than in faint-hearted soldiers, in talented rather than in ungifted generals.

Probably, one day it will become possible to make a scale of sociopolitical forms in accordance with the degree and way homoarchy and heterarchy are interrelated within their general frameworks. I am sure this is a task worth pursuing, but also have to confess that at the moment I do not feel able to propose an appropriate criterion or a combination of criteria for such a scaling, though there is no doubt that they should be qualitative rather than formal-quantitative. In any case, the purpose of the present article is much more modest and limited than this task's fulfillment presupposes.

Organizational Principles and Value Systems

Every hierarchy in a society is underpinned by a specific set of values. A society may be considered as homoarchic when there is one value which is central to all the hierarchies and not only integrates but also arranges in a definite pyramidal order all the other, secondary, values and hierarchies they underpin. Under such circumstances this value "encompasses" all the rest and makes the society "holistic" (Dumont 1980, 1986), that is homoarchic, when the whole unequivocally dominates parts as the supreme expression of that all-embracing and all-penetrable value. Although Dumont's vision of ritual purity as the value (or idea) encompassing the holistic society in India as well as in the wider Hindu world is criticized nowadays (Mosko 1994b: 24–50; Quigley 1999, 2002), the validity of his theoretical contribution is nevertheless testified, for example, by the 20th-century totalitarian societies in which the ideas of fascism, communism, Maoism, and so forth clearly did play precisely the role Dumont attributed to that of purity in the case of India. Examples from so-called "traditional" societies may be provided as well: for instance, Benjamin Ray (1991: 206) argues that in clearly homoarchic precolonial Buganda (see, e.g., Godiner 1982; Wrigley 1996) the encompassing "majesty of the Kabakaship [the institution of the supreme ruler – the 'king' – D. B.] was made, not born. The Kabakaship . . . was a cultural creation, not just a political product." As another Africanist, Jan Vansina (1992: 21, 24), generalizes, "tropical African kingdoms . . . were products of an ideology more than of any other force . . . Tropical African kingdoms were truly built in the mind first, and were grounded in faith" (for an analysis from the same standpoint concerning the Ekie kingdom in the southern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo see Kopytoff 1987: 91–99). Even in simple cultures sociopolitical homoarchization could become the case by means of coming to the fore of ideologies based on the encompassing idea of the fundamental division of all society members into those having and not having access to esoteric knowledge and the right to perform activities related to it.[8]

However, the encompassment is not always immediately rooted in the realm of ideas as such; it may well arise from a religiously-ideologically biased conceptualization of preexisting social and political realities, as it happened with the idea of the "conical clan" – *ramage* (i.e., the distance from the senior line of descent, from the common ancestor, being *the* criterion of stratification) in Polynesia.[9] It is noteworthy to point out that among theorists of the chiefdom – the most prominent and, in many concepts, the only possible type of the middle range homoarchic society – the problem of the initial (and even essential) ideological or sociopolitical priority in encompassing all the respective cultures' hierarchies is still very far from a solution and remains a battlefield for anthropologists and archaeologists of different theoretical camps.[10]

In any case, contrary to "holistic" (homoarchic) cultures, when "there is a multiplicity of 'hierarchical' or asymmetrical oppositions, none of which are reducible to any of the others or to a single master opposition or value," the "case immediately departs from the Dumontian formulation" (Mosko 1994a: 214) as the society does not fit the homoarchic (or hierarchic in the Dumontian sense) model. In a (generally) heterarchic society one can expect to find positive evaluation of individualism in intellectual as well as in social life ("ego-focused social systems"; White 1995) related to the emphasis on personal honor and dignity, importance of public opinion, high degree of social mobility, and, at least, numerical prevalence of achieved statuses over ascribed ones. This is typical of not only such paradigmatic examples of heterarchic cultures as ancient *polis* and *civitas*, some late ancient and early medieval European societies, or Western countries from the time of Renaissance on, but also of many other cultures, probably less prominent though not less significant for anthropological theorizing: "egalitarian hunter-gatherers"

---

8 Bern (1979); Artemova (2000b, 2003); Artemova and Korotayev (2003).

9 E.g., Sahlins (1958: xi–xii, 139–180); Firth (1963); Goldman (1970); Claessen (1996); Kirch (1997); Kirch and Green (2001).

10 *Vide stricto* Earle (1997); Kelekna (1998); Beliaev et al. (2001); Carneiro (2002).

(e.g., Gardner 2000); "acephalous complex societies" of mountainous areas like the Himalayas (e.g., Fürer-Haimendorf 1962; Berezkin 1995), some societies in the Caucasus (e.g., Magometov 1978; Aglarov 1988), and so on, of which the most complex ones resemble the sociopolitical model of the Greek *polis* (Korotayev 1995); tribal societies of North America (e.g., Lowie 1935; Hoebel 1960), Eurasia (e.g., Barth 1959; Irons 1975), and Africa (e.g., Evans-Pritchard 1940; Tait 1961); or the sociopolitical organization of Iceland in the "Age of Democracy" from 930 to 1267 (e.g., Hastrup 1985; Byock 1988) that is unclassifiable in categories commonly accepted in anthropology, to mention just a few.

Bruce Trigger (2003: 196 f., 661, 665 f.) postulates that heterarchical relations played a greater role in small city-states than in larger city-states and territorial states. Even if Trigger is correct with respect to what he defines as "early civilizations," his observation that "the smaller the territory, the more heterarchy" is clearly inapplicable to non-state and modern industrial societies. For example, a typical tribe, generally heterarchic,[11] covers a relatively vast territory while a typical chiefdom is both generally homoarchic[12] and territorially more compact than the tribe. As for modern societies, the elaboration of principles of federalism and representative governmental bodies (local and national), joint with the development of means of communication, eliminated the territory size as a significant predictor of a societal type. However, in light of the tendency noticed by Trigger, we may regard early civilizations as cultures in which a very important general feature leading to heterarchy or homoarchy found its most vivid and materially visible expression. This feature is that normally more heterarchy can be observed in societies in which interpersonal face-to-face relations are of primary (or at least great) importance compared to depersonalized and formalized ones.

Organizational Principles and Societal Structure

The idea and term of homoarchy may serve as useful counterparts for those of heterarchy.[13] Besides,

and also very importantly, I believe it is legitimate and even necessary to apply both notions – heterarchy and homoarchy – within a broad framework of social relations and societal structures in general and not only to power relations. If we attempt to characterize a society as a whole, we must recognize that what structuralists call "political system" is only one of a society's integral parts, which is in preindustrial cultures inseparable from, and interpenetrable with, all others (e.g., Skalník 1991). Hence, we should label the society according to its more general feature – the societal type – and this should be so not only with respect to the state but also with respect to any society.

Moreover, this perspective enables us to see a possible key to understand at least the immediate condition for this or that complex society's homoarchic or heterarchic nature. As sociologists point out, "each subsystem of a society is characterized by its own form of stratification: earnings and wealth in the economic sphere; privilege and power in the political system; moral worth and personal trust in religious and family life; and prestige and esteem in the occupational world" (Laumann et al. 1970: 589). Hence, the more the subsystems are interpenetrable, the less the criteria for general social ranking are diversified and applied to particular spheres of social life only. In other words, the more the subsystems are interpenetrable, the higher is the probability that in any social context those being within it will be ranked the same way as in another one on the assumption of the value equally encompassing all the intertwined spheres of society. In this case the establishment of the homoarchic social order can be identified and pinpointed. Thus it is logical that there were more homoarchic than heterarchic archaic (in the Jaspersian sense; Jaspers 1953) complex societies: under the conditions of "mechanic solidarity" (Durkheim 1991) a sufficiently clear separation between social spheres is observed less commonly.

The excessive emphasis on the administrative system actually results, for example, in some scholars confusing the absence of the "king" with the absence of any "hierarchical features" (McIntosh 1999a: 77) or heterarchy with lack of autocracy due to a division of power between the sovereign and collective bodies like councils or secret societies (McIntosh 1999b: 9–16, 23). However, first, true autocracy in this sense is an exceptionally rare case in world history – even most authoritative leaders usually prefer to have some collective bodies, at least as a cloak for their actions (e.g., the Roman Senate during the time of the Princepses); second, the true degree

---

11 See, e.g., Service (1971: 103, 142, 145 f.; 1975: 63–70); Fried (1975).

12 See, e.g., Service (1971: 133–169; 1975: 15 f.); Beliaev et al. (2001).

13 Bondarenko and Crumley (2004); see also Barry III (2004); Cook (2004); Reicher (2004).

of a political system's democracy does not depend on the formal political system too heavily (compare, for example, the USA and the USSR with *de jure* democratic systems of political institutions); and third, in many cases the real democracy or nondemocracy of a political system may be a dependent variable with respect to democracy or nondemocracy of the basic social institutions in preindustrial societies and many contemporary non-Western countries, i.e., first and foremost the family and the community.[14]

Crumley herself clearly ascribes the notion of heterarchy exclusively to the study of the political sphere insisting just on "the addition of the term heterarchy to the vocabulary of *power* relations . . ." (1995: 3; emphasis added). She sees the prerequisite for heterarchic sociopolitical organization in the diversity of sources of power, as far as her concept is concentrated precisely on the society's political subsystem.[15] Discussing the "heterarchic state", Crumley in this respect does not differ from the majority of contemporary more "traditionally" thinking theorists who "argue that the evolution of social complexity needs to be understood first and foremost as a political process" (Earle 1994: 940). Further, she tends to look at the state, more or less exclusively, as a specific form of political organization. Such a glance at the state leads Crumley and her followers to an unreasonable identification of heterarchy with the democratic political regime (Crumley 1995: 3; van der Vliet 2003) what, in my opinion, lowers the heuristic potential of her concept. In his review of one of Crumley's recent publications on heterarchy, Robert Carneiro (2004: 163) asks: "But by introducing this term into the study of political evolution does Crumley really enhance our understanding of the process?" The answer the patriarch of cultural evolutionist studies gives himself is a strong disagreement. However, notwithstanding my own dissatisfaction with some aspects of Crumley's approach, I would still dare to disagree with Carneiro and argue that, in my opinion, the concept of heterarchy is a significant contribution to anthropological theory (to what its growing popularity may testify),[16] even in its present, generally less process- than typology-

shaped form. In the meantime, I hope that broadening its definition and application, first, by coupling it with the concept of homoarchy, and second, by applying the term to the whole scope and variety of relations in society, could increase the concept's validity.

Some Possible Prospects

The legitimate dissatisfaction with the "classical" unilineal typological schemes, like "from band to state" (Service 1971) or "from egalitarian organization to state society" (Fried 1967), that has increased rapidly especially since the second half of the 1980s,[17] has resulted not only in a new turn of rejecting the idea of evolution altogether (see Trigger 2003: 40–42) but also, within evolutionism, in a fair and theoretically prospective shift of researchers' emphasis from viewing societies as isolated entities to now viewing them as elements of wider cultural networks, and in connection with this shift, from metaphysical evolutionary types-stages to dynamic transformation processes. This particular (yet not the only) reason for general discontent with the recently dominant theoretical paradigm was comprehensively resumed by Wenke (1999: 344): "The important point here is that simple categories such as 'bands,' 'tribes,' 'chiefdoms,' and 'states' are static descriptive types that are not of much use in analyzing the origins and functions of the phenomena these labels loosely describe." For the sake of verity, it should be noted that this accusation is not entirely fair with respect to classics of neoevolutionist political anthropology – Service, Fried, and Carneiro with their famous integrative (Service 1971, 1975; Cohen and Service 1978), conflict (Fried 1967, 1970), and circumscription (Carneiro 1970) theories of at least chiefdom and state *origins*, and with regards to some of the younger-generation scholars (e.g., Earle 1997). There are much more reasons to accuse countless other authors for whom simple labeling their statically approached research objects as "chiefdoms," "states," or otherwise did become the initial reason and ultimate end for writing. In any case, I do believe that Carneiro (2000; 2003: 155 f.) is essentially right when he

---

14 Bondarenko and Korotayev (2000, 2004); Korotayev and Bondarenko (2000); Bondarenko (2004b); Barry III (2003).

15 However, Crumley does see power relations (heterarchic and otherwise) not as "a thing in itself" but in their interaction with, and dependence on the social, mental (value system), and ecological milieu, and legitimately builds her concept on these foundations.

16 See, e.g., Ehrenreich et al. (1995); Haggis et al. (2003); Scarborough et al. (2003); Alexeev et al. (2004: 5–17).

17 See, e.g., Mann (1986); Maisels (1987); Upham (1990); Yoffee (1993); Ehrenreich et al. (1995); Price and Feinman (1995); Arnold (1996); McIntosh (ed.) (1999); Bondarenko and Korotayev (eds.) (2000); Claessen (2000); Kradin et al. (2000); Guidi (2002); Trigger (2003); Grinin et al. (2004).

argues that the dichotomy "process *versus* stages" is "false": both are important.[18] The key point here is not that there are neither social types nor that, in fact, there are much more of them than four, but that they cannot be arranged on the "steps" of one "ladder," and that purely typological thinking, especially in the unilineal style, prevents from giving full consideration to those changes which crucially transform a society but do not pull it up to the next step of the notorious types' ladder.

In particular, in my opinion the groundbreaking "dual-processual theory," elaborated in the last decade by Mesoamericanists,[19] is aiming at the same as the heterarchy-homoarchy idea, namely "to account for variation among societies of similar complexity and scale" (Blanton et al. 1996: 1).[20] Note that the dichotomy of homoarchic and heterarchic societies is observable on all levels of social complexity, contradicting Service's, Fried's, and the like's unilineal schemes, allowing us to conclude that the degree of centralization as an aspect of the overall sociocultural hierarchization is an improper criterion for defining an overall developmental level.[21] However, as Elizabeth Brumfiel wrote only a dozen years ago (1995: 130), "the coupling of differentiation and hierarchy is so firm in our minds that it takes tremendous intellectual effort to even imagine what differentiation without hierarchy could be."

The division into homoarchic and heterarchic is possible (and is made – into "despotic" and "egalitarian") even with respect to associations among nonhuman primates,[22] so it may well be rooted in the early prehistory of humankind. Among the simplest cultures known to anthropology – those of nonspecialized hunter-gatherers, the homoarchy-heterarchy division is reflected in the notions of "nonegalitarian" (the Australian Aborigines being the most vivid example) and "egalitarian" (the Hadza, !Kung, and so forth) societies respectively (Woodburn 1982). Significantly, the archaeological and historical-anthropological evidence confirms the deep antiquity of nonegalitarian simple human cultures: for example, the nonegalitarian (Kabo 1986: 21–34) Tasmanians were "maybe the only society that had remained until the beginning of European colonization at the stage of development corresponding to the Advanced Paleolithic" (21), and the prehistoric Australian culture shares basic features with the culture of the Aborigines known to anthropologists (Clark and Piggott 1970: 98–102). We can reasonably conclude from that evidence that nonegalitarianism has been typical of them since the early prehistoric past. At the level of simple agricultural village communities, one of the guiding examples is provided by Burton Pasternak's (1972) study of two Chinese villages on Taiwan which shared common origin. In one of the villages (Chungshe) the homoarchic system of corporate patrilineages eventually developed to a system where one lineage became permanently politically dominant, while in the other village (Tatieh) the development of lineages was early compromised by corporate cross-kin associations resulting in the heterarchic system of nonlocalized agnatic descent groups; each of which could supply the village head.

Furthermore, in the course of history a society can not just change its internal organization from homoarchic to heterarchic or *vice versa*,[23] but not infrequently it does so without a change of the overall level of complexity.[24] Finally, even cultures that share the same overall level of complexity and principle of sociopolitical organization may vary in their concrete forms. For example, there are no grounds to argue that the "early

---

18 In the meantime, I leave aside the problems I have with Carneiro's specific interpretation that I would prefer to refer to as "non-unilinear processes," not as "the process," and as "types" which are not synonymous with "stages."

19 E.g., Blanton (1994); Feinman (1995, 2001); Blanton et al. (1996).

20 Recently Richard Pearson (2001) has made an attempt to employ both of the respective approaches – the heterarchy (but, of course, not the homoarchy-heterarchy division) and network-corporate strategies for a case study, namely that of state formation on the Okinawa islands. Among students of precolonial Africa – another area far from those basing on the evidence from which the heterarchy and dual-processual theories were created (late ancient and early medieval Celts and pre-Columbian Mesoamerica respectively) – the concepts' compatibility was recognized for the first time, as to my knowledge, by Susan McIntosh, though with some important and fair reservations, on the one hand, and without deep elaboration on the point in general, on the other hand (1999b: 14–19). So, I believe, my optimism is substantiated, at least to some extent.

21 See Bondarenko (2000); Bondarenko and Korotayev (2000); Bondarenko et al. (2002).

22 Vehrencamp (1983); Matsumura (1999); Butovskaya (2000); Butovskaya et al. (2000).

23 Crumley (1987: 164 f.; 1995: 4); Berezkin (2000); Beliaev et al. (2001: 380 f.); Bondarenko et al. (2002: 57; 2003: 6 f.).

24 For some of the many examples of the latter case, see Leach (1954); Moscati et al. (1991); Levy (1995); Korotayev (1996); Kowalewski (2000). Remarkably, in the theory of biological evolution the transition from a more to a less hierarchical structure without diminishing of organisms' adaptivity to the environment is not regarded as a sign of degradation or regress (see, e.g., Futuyma 1997).

state," homoarchic by the very definition,[25] was the only possible and known form of preindustrial homoarchic supercomplex society. Alternatives to it were represented, particularly, by systems based on a deeply elaborated rigid cast division (Quigley 1999: 114–169), or on an extension of the kin-based extended-family-community "matrix" up to multiple supracommunal levels (Bondarenko 2001, 2004a, 2005), or on a transformation of a complex chiefdom not into a state but into a "supercomplex chiefdom" (Kradin 2002).

Therefore, it would be completely wrong to argue that, for instance, "the network strategy" leads to heterarchy while "the corporate strategy" gives rise to homoarchic societies or *vice versa*, and, though it is (generally) problematic to dichotomize the strategies to the degree the model creators propose (as, for example, the African evidence reveals; McIntosh 1999b: 17–19),[26] I believe that the two approaches may be productively complementary within the general explanatory framework seeking to propose "a suitable behavioral theory" (Blanton et al. 1996: 1) of the sociocultural types' variability, particularly as both of them concentrate on the dialectics of the individual and the group, and of centralization and decentralization, and attempt "to move beyond a *typology* approach" (White 1995: 119; emphasis in original) which from the 1980s has been more and more opposed to the strategies approach, with favoring the latter (Montmollin 1989: 2). However, in my understanding, "to move beyond" must mean "to incorporate," not "to reject." Hence, I fully agree with one of the dual-processual theory advocates, Paul Wason (e.g., Wason and Baldia 2000), that

"with due caution, a typological approach is still valid" (Wason 1995: 25), although, elaboration on establishing a link between the two approaches is beyond the purposes of the present, generally typological, introductory article and may be considered as a task for the future.

Concluding Remarks

Indeed, this article is generally typological and its main aim is to be just introductory, in strict accordance with its subtitle. It concerns the phenomenon of homoarchy's existence that demands a proper term for its designation rather than the preconditions for, and pathways to and of, homoarchy (or heterarchy), although some of the ideas of these points are dealt with in the article's different sections. The concept of homoarchy might be useful (and the respective term might be theoretically informative) for better understanding the temporally and spatially universal basic principles of social organization that underlie the myriad of its specific forms throughout history. I believe that the present article makes an initial first step, notwithstanding the actual impossibility to make the examples not only much more abundant but also less cryptic and linked to the theoretical points in a more forceful manner than the limited scope of a journal article allows us to do (however, see elsewhere, Bondarenko 2005). In case the very phenomenon is recognized and the term accepted by the anthropological academic community, the problems of conditions for homoarchy's appearance and historical transformations, of its measuring and scaling, of interrelations between the homoarchic and heterarchic principles of social organization, and between them and the network and corporate strategies, as well as many others, will definitely become worth putting on agenda. The necessity of detailed case studies, produced in light of these theoretical ideas, will also come to the fore.

---

25 "The early state is a centralized socio-political organization for the regulation of social relations in a complex, stratified society divided into at least two basic strata, or emergent social classes – viz. the rulers and the ruled –, whose relations are characterized by political dominance of the former and tributary obligations of the latter, legitimized by a common ideology of which reciprocity is the basic principle" (Claessen and Skalník 1978: 640).

26 See also criticism on the model in this respect at the very moment of its presentation by several commentators: Cowgill (1996: 53); Demarest (1996: 56); Kolb (1996: 59). The authors of the dual-processual theory could also be blamed for its dichotomic nature as such, what undoubtedly reduces to two the great variety of real strategies known to history. However, as Ingold (1996: 1 f., 5) rightly points out, dichotomy underlies anthropology as a scientific discipline and inevitably reveals itself in theoretical constructions of even those researchers who consciously strive to avoid it and believe that they have succeeded in it. The author also has not avoided (and did not try to avoid) the approach's dichotomy: the idea of heterarchy–homoarchy is dichotomous to the same degree as the dual-processual theory is.

literature in the institute's and the university's libraries in summer 2003, and to Prof. Michel Izard (Collège de France) and Dr. Alexis Berelowitch (Université de Paris IV) due to whose support I was fortunate to study at the libraries of the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Laboratoire d'Anthropologie Sociale of the Collège de France, and of the Centre d'Études Africaines, École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (Paris, France) from May to June 2005. Last but not least, I am obliged to Prof. Andrey Korotayev at the Russian State University for the Humanities and the Center for Civilizational and Regional Studies (Moscow, Russia) for a discussion of the article's preliminary version, though only I am responsible for all its probable shortcomings.

References Cited

Aglarov, M. A.
1988   Sel'skaja obshchina v Nagornom Dagestane v XVII–nachale XIX v. Issledovanie vzaimootnoshenija form khozjajstva, sotsial'nykh struktur i etnosa [Village Community in Highland Dagestan in the 17th – Early 19th Centuries. A Study of Interaction of Economic Forms, Social Structures and Ethnicity]. Moscow: Nauka.

Alexeev, Igor L., Dmitri D. Beliaev, and **Dmitri M. Bondarenko** (eds.)
2004   Abstracts. Third International Conference "Hierarchy and Power in the History of Civilizations," June 18–21, 2004. Moscow: Center for Civilizational and Regional Studies Press and Institute for African Studies Press.

Anderson, Carl Edlund
1999   Formation and Resolution of Ideological Contrast in the Early History of Scandinavia. Cambridge. [Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic, University of Cambridge] <http//www.carlaz.com/phd/> [January 21, 2004]

Arnold, J. (ed.)
1996   Emergent Complexity. The Evolution of Intermediate Societies. Ann Arbor: International Monographs in Prehistory.

Artemova, Olga Yu.
2000a   Initial Stages of Politogenesis. In: D. M. Bondarenko and A. V. Korotayev (eds.); pp. 54–70.
2000b   Monopolization of Information and Social Inequality. In: N. N. Kradin et al. (eds.); pp. 132–137.
2003   Monopolization of Knowledge, Social Inequality, and Female Status. A Cross-Cultural Study. *Cross-Cultural Research* 37: 62–80.
2004   Okhotniki / sobirateli i teorija pervobytnosti [Hunter-Gatherers and the Theory of Primitive Society]. Moscow: Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology Press.

Artemova, Olga Yu., and **Andrey V. Korotayev**
2003   Monopolization of Information and Female Status. A Cross-Cultural Test. *Cross-Cultural Research* 37: 81–86.

Barry III**, Herbert**
2003   Community Customs Associated with Political Subordination. *Social Evolution and History* 2/1: 116–130.
2004   Heterarchical or Homoarchical Leadership and Kinship in Communities. In: I. L. Alexeev et al. (eds.); pp. 8–9.

Barth, Fredrik
1959   Political Leadership among Swat Pathans. London: The Athlone Press.

Beliaev, Dmitri D., Dmitri M. Bondarenko, and **Andrey V. Korotayev**
2001   Origins and Evolution of Chiefdoms. *Reviews in Anthropology* 30: 373–395.

Berezkin, Yuri E.
1995   Alternative Models of Middle Range Society. "Individualistic" Asia vs. "Collectivistic" America? In: N. N. Kradin and V. A. Lynsha (eds.); pp. 75–83.
2000   Once Again on Horizontal and Vertical Links in Structure of the Middle Range Societies. In: N. N. Kradin et al. (eds.); pp. 220–224.

Bern, John
1979   Ideology and Domination. Toward a Reconstruction of Australian Aboriginal Social Formation. *Oceania* 50: 118–132.

Berreman, Gerard D.
1981   Social Inequality. A Cross-Cultural Analysis. In: G. D. Berreman (ed.), Social Inequality. Comparative and Developmental Approaches; pp. 3–40. New York: Academic Press.

Blanton, Richard E.
1994   Houses and Households. A Comparative Study. New York: Plenum Press.
1998   Beyond Centralization. Steps toward a Theory of Egalitarian Behavior in Archaic States. In: G. M. Feinman and J. Marcus (eds.), Archaic States; pp. 135–172. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Blanton, Richard E., Gary M. Feinman, Stephen A. Kowalewski, and **Peter N. Peregrine**
1996   A Dual-Processual Theory for the Evolution of Mesoamerican Civilization (with Comments and Reply). *Current Anthropology* 37: 1–14.

Bondarenko, Dmitri M.
2000   "Homologous Series" of Social Evolution and Alternatives to the State in World History. In: N. N. Kradin et al. (eds.); pp. 213–219.
2001   Doimperskij Benin. Formirovanie i evoljutsija sistemy sotsial'no-politicheskikh institutov [Pre-Imperial Benin. Formation and Evolution of the Sociopolitical Institutions System]. Moscow: Institute for African Studies Press.
2004a   From Local Communities to Megacommunity. Biniland in the 1st Millennium B. C. – 19th Century A. D. In: L. E. Grinin et al. (eds.); pp. 325–363.
2004b   Sotsial'no-politicheskaja evoljutsija. Ot ravnopolozhennosti tipov obshchiny k al'ternativnosti form nadobshchinnoj organizatsii [Socio-Political Evolution. From Equality of Community Types to Alternativity of Supra-communal Organization Forms]. In: O. E. Nepomnin (ed.), Alaica. Sbornik nauchnykh trudov rossijskikh vostokovedov, podgotovlennyj k 70-letnemu jubileju professora, doktora istoricheskikh nauk L. B. Alaeva [Alaica. Festschrift for the 70th Anniversary of Professor, Doctor of Sciences, L. B. Alaev]; pp. 32–53. Moscow: Vostochnaja literatura.
2005   A Homoarchic Alternative to the Homoarchic State. Benin Kingdom of the 13th–19th Centuries. *Social Evolution and History* 4/2: 18–88.

Bondarenko, Dmitri M., and **Carole L. Crumley**
2004 Alternativity in Cultural History. Heterarchy and Homoarchy as Evolutionary Trajectories. In: I. L. Alexeev et al. (eds.); p. 5.

Bondarenko, Dmitri M., Leonid E. Grinin, and **Andrey V. Korotayev**
2002 Alternative Pathways of Social Evolution. *Social Evolution and History* 1/1: 54−79.

Bondarenko, Dmitri M., and **Andrey V. Korotayev**
2000 Introduction. In: D. M. Bondarenko and A. V. Korotayev (eds.); pp. 5−31.
2004 A Historical-Anthropological Look at Some Sociopolitical Problems of Second and Third World Countries. In: M. Gammer (ed.), Community, Identity, and the State. Comparing Africa, Eurasia, Latin America, and the Middle Eas; pp. 14−41. London: Routledge.

Bondarenko, Dmitri M., Andrey V. Korotayev, and **Nikolay N. Kradin**
2003 Introduction. Social Evolution, Alternatives, and Nomadism. In: N. N. Kradin, D. M. Bondarenko, and T. J. Barfield (eds.), Nomadic Pathways in Social Evolution; pp. 1−24. Moscow: Center for Civilizational and Regional Studies Press.

Bondarenko, Dmitri M., and **Andrey V. Korotayev** (eds.)
2000 Civilizational Models of Politogenesis. Moscow: Center for Civilizational and Regional Studies Press.

Brumfiel, Elizabeth M.
1995 Heterarchy and the Analysis of Complex Societies. Comments. In: R. M. Ehrenreich et al. (eds.); pp. 125−131.

Butovskaya, Marina L.
2000 Biosocial Preconditions for Socio-Political Alternativity. In: D. M. Bondarenko and A. V. Korotayev (eds.); pp. 35−53.

Butovskaya, Marina L., Andrey V. Korotayev, and **Alexander A. Kazankov**
2000 Variabilité des relations sociales chez les primates humains et non humains. À la recherche d'un paradigme general. *Primatologie* 3: 319−363.

Byock, Jesse L.
1988 Medieval Iceland. Society, Sagas, and Power. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Carneiro, Robert L.
1970 A Theory of the Origin of the State. *Science* 169: 733−738.
2000 Processes *vs.* Stages. A False Dichotomy in Tracing the Rise of the State. In: N. N. Kradin et al. (eds.); 52−58.
2002 Was the Chiefdom a Congelation of Ideas? *Social Evolution and History* 1/1: 80−100.
2003 Evolutionism in Cultural Anthropology. A Critical History. Boulder: Westview Press.
2004 Multiple Trajectories in Political Development. Review of Jonathan Haas (ed.), From Leaders to Rulers. *Social Evolution and History* 3/1: 162−175.

Claessen, Henri J. M.
1985 From the Franks to France. The Evolution of a Political Organization. In: H. J. M. Claessen et al. (eds.); pp. 196−218.
1996 Ideology and the Formation of Early States. Data from Polynesia. In: H. J. M. Claessen and J. G. Oosten (eds.), Ideology and the Formation of Early States; pp. 339−358. Leiden: Brill.

2000 Structural Change. Evolution and Evolutionism in Cultural Anthropology. Leiden: Research School CNWS, Leiden University.

Claessen, Henri J. M., and **Peter Skalník**
1978 The Early State. Models and Reality. In: H. J. M. Claessen and P. Skalník (eds.), The Early State; pp. 637−650. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Claessen, Henry J. M., Pieter van de Velde, and **M. Estellie Smith** (eds.)
1985 Development and Decline. The Evolution of Sociopolitical Organization. South Hadley: Bergin and Garvey Publishers.

Clark, Grahame, and **Stuart Piggott**
1970 Prehistoric Societies. London: Penguin Books.

Claude, Dietrich
1970 Geschichte der Westgoten. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag.

Cohen, Ronald, and **Elman R. Service** (eds.)
1978 Origins of the State. The Anthropology of Political Evolution. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.

Cook, Garrett
2004 Heterarchy and Homoarchy in Maya Village Politics. In: I. L. Alexeev et al. (eds.); pp. 9−10.

Cowgill, George L.
1996 Comment. In: R. E. Blanton et al.; pp. 52−53.

Crumley, Carole L.
1979 Three Locational Models. An Epistemological Assessment for Anthropology and Archaeology. In: M. B. Schiffer (ed.), Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory. Vol. 2; pp. 141−173. New York: Academic Press.
1987 A Dialectical Critique of Hierarchy. In: T. C. Patterson and C. Ward Gailey (eds.), Power Relations and State Formation; pp. 155−169. Washington: American Anthropological Association Press.
1995 Heterarchy and the Analysis of Complex Societies. In: R. M. Ehrenreich et al. (eds.); pp. 1−5.
2001 Communication, Holism, and the Evolution of Sociopolitical Complexity. In: J. Haas (ed.); pp. 19−33.

Dahrendorf, Ralf
1970 On the Origin of Inequality among Men. In: E. O. Laumann, P. M. Siegel, and R. W. Hodge (eds.), The Logic of Social Hierarchies; pp. 3−30. Chicago: Markham. [1968]

Demarest, Arthur A.
1996 Comment. In: R. E. Blanton et al.; p. 56.

Diesner, Hans-Joachim
1966 Das Vandalenreich. Aufstieg und Untergang. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag.

Dumont, Louis
1980 Homo Hierarchicus. The Caste System and Its Implications. Transl. by Mark Sainsbury, Louis Dumont, and Basia Gulati. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [1966]
1986 Essays on Individualism. Modern Ideology in Anthropological Perspective. Transl. by C. Howard. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [1983]

Durkheim, Émile
1991   O razdelenii obshchestvennogo truda [On the Division of Labor]. In: É. Durkheim, O razdelenii obshchestvennogo truda. Metod sotsiologii [On the Division of Labor. The Rules of Sociological Method]; pp. 3–390. Moscow: Nauka. [1893]

Dvoretskaja, I. A.
1982   Vozniknovenie rannefeodal'nogo gosudarstva v Severnoj Italii VI–VIII vekov [The Rise of the Early-Feudal State in Northern Italy in the 6th–8th Centuries). Moscow: Moscow State Institute of Education Press.

Earle, Timothy
1994   Political Domination and Social Evolution. In: T. Ingold (ed.), Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology; pp. 940–961. London: Routledge.
1997   How Chiefs Come to Power. The Political Economy in Prehistory. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Ehrenreich, Robert M., Carole L. Crumley, and **Janet E. Levy** (eds.)
1995   Heterarchy and the Analysis of Complex Societies. Washington: American Anthropological Association Press.

Evans-Pritchard, Edward Evan
1940   The Nuer. A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Feinman, Gary M.
1995   The Emergence of Inequality. A Focus on Strategies and Processes. In: T. D. Price and G. M. Feinman (eds.); pp. 255–279.
1996   Chiefdoms and Nonindustrial States. In: D. Levinson and M. Ember (eds.), Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology. Vol. 1; pp. 185–191. New York: Henry Holt.
2001   Mesoamerican Political Complexity. The Corporate-Network Dimension. In: J. Haas (ed.); pp. 151–175.

Firth, Raymond
1963   We, the Tikopia. Kinship in Primitive Polynesia. Boston: Beacon Press. [Abridged edition; orig. 1936]

Fried, Morton H.
1967   The Evolution of Political Society. An Essay in Political Anthropology. New York: Random House.
1970   On the Evolution of Social Stratification and the State. In: E. O. Laumann, P. M. Siegel, and R. W. Hodge (eds.), The Logic of Social Hierarchies; pp. 684–695. Chicago: Markham. [1960]
1975   The Notion of Tribe. Menlo Park: Cummings.

Fürer-Haimendorf, Christoph von
1962   The Apa Tanis and Their Neighbours. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Futuyma, Douglas J.
1997   Evolutionary Biology. Sunderland: Sinauer Associates. [3rd ed.]

Gardner, Peter M.
2000   Bicultural Versatility as a Frontier Adaptation among Paliyan Foragers of South India. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Gellner, Ernest
1992   Marksistskaja Kniga Bytija [The Marxist Book of Genesis]. *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie* 2: 35–51.

Godiner, E. S.
1982   Vozniknovenie i evoljutsija gosudarstva v Bugande [The Rise and Evolution of the State in Buganda]. Moscow: Nauka.

Goldman, Irving
1970   Ancient Polynesian Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Grinin, Leonid E., Robert L. Carneiro, Dmitri M. Bondarenko, Nikolay N. Kradin, and **Andrey V. Korotayev** (eds.)
2004   The Early State. Its Alternatives and Analogues. Volgograd: Uchitel.

Guidi, Alessandro
2002   Modelling the Social Evolution. The State of Art. *Archeologia e Calcolatori* 13: 65–78.

Gurevich, Aron
1999   Drevnie germantsy [The Ancient Germans]. In: A. Gurevich, Izbrannye trudy [Selected Works]. Vol. 1: Drevnie germantsy. Vikingi [The Ancient Germans. The Vikings]; pp. 23–78. Moscow: Universitetskaja kniga. [1985]

Haas, Jonathan (ed.)
2001   From Leaders to Rulers. New York: Kluwer Academic, Plenum Publishers.

Haggis, Donald, Nicola Terrenato, and **Robert Vander Poppen** (eds.)
2003   Current Issues in State Formation. The Mediterranean and Beyond. (An International Colloquium at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, October 17–19, 2003.) <http://www.classics.unc.edu/wgems/index.html> [December 5, 2004]

Hastrup, Kirsten
1985   Culture and History in Medieval Iceland. An Anthropological Analysis of Structure and Change. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hill, James N.
1977   Systems Theory and the Explanation of Change. In: J. N. Hill (ed.), Explanation of Prehistoric Change; pp. 59–103. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Hoebel, Edward Adamson
1960   The Cheyennes. Indians of the Great Plains. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Ingold, Tim
1996   General Introduction. In: T. Ingold (ed.), Key Debates in Anthropology; pp. 1–14. London: Routledge.

Irons, William
1975   The Yomut Turkmen. A Study of Social Organization among a Central Asian Turkic-Speaking Population. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Jaspers, Karl
1953   The Origin and Goal of History. New Haven: Yale University Press. [1949]

Johnson, Allen W., and **Timothy Earle**
2000   The Evolution of Human Societies. From Foraging Group to Agrarian State. Stanford: Stanford University Press. [2nd ed.]

Johnson, Gregory
1989   Dynamics of Southwestern Prehistory. Far Outside – Looking In. In: L. Cordell and G. Gumerman (eds.), Dynamics of Southwest Prehistory; pp. 371–389. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Jolly, Margaret, and **Mark S. Mosko** (eds.)
1994 Transformations of Hierarchy. Structure, History, and Horizon in the Austronesian World. *History and Anthropology* 7 (Special Issue).

Kabo, V. R.
1986 Pervobytnaja dozemledel'cheskaja obshchina [Preagricultural Communalism]. Moscow: Nauka.

Kammerer, Cornelia Ann
1998 Descent, Alliance, and Political Order among Akha. *American Ethnologist* 25: 659–674.

Kelekna, Pita
1998 War and Theocracy. In: E. M. Redmond (ed.), Chiefdoms and Chieftaincy in the Americas; pp. 164–188. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Kelly, Raymond C.
1993 Constructing Inequality. The Fabrication of a Hierarchy of Virtue among the Etoro. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Kirch, Patrick Vinton
1997 The Lapita Peoples. Ancestors of the Oceanic World. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Kirch, Patrick Vinton, and **Roger C. Green**
2001 Hawaiki. Ancestral Polynesia. An Essay in Historical Anthropology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kolb, Michael J.
1996 Comment. In: R. E. Blanton et al.; pp. 59–60.

Kopytoff, Igor (ed.)
1987 The African Frontier. The Reproduction of Traditional African Societies. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Korotayev, Andrey V.
1995 Mountains and Democracy. An Introduction. In: N. N. Kradin and V. A. Lynsha (eds.); pp. 60–74.
1996 Pre-Islamic Yemen. Sociopolitical Organization of the Sabaean Cultural Area in the 2nd and 3rd Centuries A. D. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
1998 Vozhdestva i plemena strany Khashid i Bakil. Obshchie tendentsii i faktory evoljutsii sotsial'no-politicheskikh sistem Severo-Vostochnogo Jemena (X v. do n.e. – XX v. n.e.) [Chiefdoms and Tribes in the Land of Hashid and Bakil. Some Trends of the Evolution of the Political Systems of the Northeast Yemen in the Last Three Millennia]. Moscow: Oriental Institute Press.

Korotayev, Andrey V., and **Dmitri M. Bondarenko**
2000 Polygyny and Democracy. A Cross-Cultural Comparison. *Cross-Cultural Research* 34: 190–208.

Kowalewski, Stephen A.
2000 Cyclical Transformations in North American Prehistory. In: N. N. Kradin et al. (eds.); pp. 177–187.

Kradin, Nikolay N.
2002 Nomadism, Evolution, and World-Systems. Pastoral Societies in Theories of Historical Development. *Journal of World-System Research* 8: 368–388. <http://jwsr.ucr.edu/archive/vol8/number3/pdf/jwsr-v8n3-kradin.pdf> [July 11, 2006]

Kradin, Nikolay N., and **V. A. Lynsha** (eds.)
1995 Alternative Pathways to Early State. Vladivostok: Dal'nauka.

Kradin, Nikolay N., Andrey V. Korotayev, Dmitri M. Bondarenko, Victor de Munck, and **Paul K. Wason** (eds.)
2000 Alternatives of Social Evolution. Vladivostok: Far Eastern Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences Press.

Kristiansen, Kristian
1998 Europe before History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuijt, Ian
2000 Near Eastern Neolithic Research. Directions and Trends. In: I. Kuijt (ed.), Life in Neolithic Farming Communities. Social Organization, Identity, and Differentiation; pp. 311–323. New York: Kluwer Academic, Plenum Publishers.

Laszlo, Ervine
1996 Evolution. The General Theory. Cresskill: Hampton Press.

Laumann, Edward O., Paul M. Siegel, and **Robert W. Hodge**
1970 The Consequences of Stratification. In: E. O. Laumann, P. M. Siegel, and R. W. Hodge (eds.), The Logic of Social Hierarchies; pp. 589–593. Chicago: Markham.

Leach, Edmund R.
1954 Political Systems of Highland Burma. A Study of Kachin Social Structure. London: G. Bell and Sons.

Levy, Janet E.
1995 Heterarchy in Bronze Age Denmark. Settlement Pattern, Gender, and Ritual. In: R. M. Ehrenreich et al. (eds.); pp. 41–53.

Lowie, Robert H.
1935 The Crow Indians. New York: Farrar and Rinehart.

Magometov, A. Kh.
1978 Politicheskoe ustrojstvo u gorskikh narodov v pervoj polovine XIX veka [The Political System of Highland Peoples in the First Half of the 19th Century]. In: A. Kh. Magometov (ed.), Sotsial'nye otnoshenija narodov Severnogo Kavkaza [Social Relations of the North Caucasian Peoples]; pp. 47–64. Ordzhonikidze: North Ossetian State University Press.

Maisels, Charles Keith
1987 Models of Social Evolution. Trajectories from the Neolithic to the State. *Man* (N. S.) 22: 331–359.

Mann, Michael
1986 The Sources of Social Power. Vol. 1: A History of Power from the Beginning to A. D. 1760. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marcus, Joyce, and **Gary M. Feinman**
1998 Introduction. In: G. M. Feinman and J. Marcus (eds.), Archaic States; pp. 3–13. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Matsumura, S.
1999 The Evolution of "Egalitarian" and "Despotic" Social Systems among Macaques. *Primates* 43: 23–31.

McIntosh, Susan Keech
1999a Modeling Political Organization in Large-Scale Settlement Clusters. A Case Study from the Inland Niger Delta. In: S. K. McIntosh (ed.); pp. 66–79.
1999b Pathways to Complexity. An African Perspective. In: S. K. McIntosh (ed.); pp. 1–30.

McIntosh, Susan Keech (ed.)
1999   Beyond Chiefdoms. Pathways to Complexity in Africa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Montmollin, O. de
1989   The Archaeology of Political Structure. Settlement Analysis in a Classic Maya Polity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moscati, Sabatino et al. (eds.)
1991   The Celts. London: Thames and Hudson.

Mosko, Mark S.
1994a   Junior Chiefs and Senior Sorcerers. The Contradictions and Inversions of Mekeo Hierarchy. In: M. Jolly and M. S. Mosko (eds.); pp. 195–222.
1994b   Transformations of Dumont. The Hierarchical, the Sacred, and the Profane in India and Ancient Hawaii. In: M. Jolly and M. S. Mosko (eds.); pp. 19–86.

Nangoro, Benedict N. Ole
1998   "Branding the Land." Maasai Responses to Resource Tenure Insecurity and Social Change. In: F. Horn (ed.), Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights of the Maasai; pp. 15–93. Rovaniemi: Lapland's University Press.

Pasternak, Burton
1972   Kinship and Community in Two Chinese Villages. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Pearson, Richard
2001   Archaeological Perspectives on the Rise of the Okinawan State. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 9: 243–285.

Price, T. Douglas, and **Gary M. Feinman** (eds.)
1995   The Foundations of Social Inequality. New York: Plenum Press.

Quigley, Declan
1999   The Interpretation of Caste. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
2002   Is a Theory of Caste Still Possible? *Social Evolution and History* 1/1: 140–170.

Ray, Benjamin C.
1991   Myth, Ritual, and Kingship in Buganda. New York: Oxford University Press.

Reicher, Dieter
2004   Pyramid and Trapeze Constellations. State-Building Processes and Patterns of Social Control. In: I. L. Alexeev et al. (eds.); pp. 15–16.

Reynolds, Susan
1990   Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900–1300. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Rousseau, Jérôme
1985   The Ideological Prerequisites of Inequality. In: H. J. M. Claessen et al. (eds.); pp. 36–45.

Sahlins, Marshall D.
1958   Social Stratification in Polynesia. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Sannikov, S. V.
2003   Razvitie rannikh form korolevskoj vlasti u germanskikh narodov. Osobennosti politogeneza [The Development of Early Forms of Royal Power among the Germanic Peoples. Specifics of State Formation]. In: G. A. Pikov (ed.), Istorija i sotsiologija gosudarstva [History

and Sociology of the State]; pp. 36–54. Novosibirsk: Novosibirsk State University Press.

Scarborough, Vernon L., Fred Valdez, Jr., and **Nicholas Dunning** (eds.)
2003   Heterarchy, Political Economy, and the Ancient Maya. The Three Rivers Region of the East-Central Yucatán Peninsula. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Schweitzer, Peter P.
2000   Hierarchy and Equality among Hunter-Gatherers of the North Pacific Rim. Toward a Structural History of Social Organization. In: N. N. Kradin et al. (eds.); pp. 123–131.

Service, Elman R.
1971   Primitive Social Organization. An Evolutionary Perspective. New York: Random House. [1962]
1975   Origins of the State and Civilization. The Process of Cultural Evolution. New York: W. W. Norton.

Skalník, Peter
1991   Ponjatie "politicheskaja sistema" v zapadnoj sotsial'noj antropologii [The Notion of "Political System" in Western Social Anthropology]. *Sovetskaja etnografija* 3: 144–146.

Small, David B.
1995   Heterarchical Paths to Evolution. The Role of External Economies. In: R. M. Ehrenreich et al. (eds.); pp. 71–85.

Smith, M. Estellie
1985   An Aspectual Analysis of Polity Formations. In: H. J. M. Claessen et al. (eds.); pp. 97–125.

Stein, Gil
2001   "Who Was King? Who Was Not King?" Social Group Composition and Competition in Early Mesopotamian State Societies. In: J. Haas (ed.); pp. 205–231.

Tait, David
1961   The Konkomba of Northern Ghana. London: Oxford University Press.

Trigger, Bruce G.
1985   Generalized Coercion and Inequality. The Basis of State Power in the Early Civilizations. In: H. J. M. Claessen et al. (eds.); pp. 46–61.
2003   Understanding Early Civilizatons. A Comparative Study. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Upham, Steadman (ed.)
1990   The Evolution of Political Systems. Sociopolitics in Small-Scale Sedentary Societies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van der Vliet, Edward C. L.
2003   Complexity and Heterarcy. The Archaic Greek Polis. (An International Colloquium at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, October 17–19, 2003.) <http://www.classics.unc.edu/wgems/abstract12.html> [December 5, 2004]

Vansina, Jan
1992   Kings in Tropical Africa. In: E. Beumers and H.-J. Koloss (eds.), Kings of Africa. Art and Authority in Central Africa; pp. 19–26. Maastricht: Foundation Kings of Africa.

Vehrencamp, S. L.
1983 A Model for the Evolution of Despotic versus Egalitarian Societies. *Animal Behavior* 31: 667–682.

Wailes, Bernard
1995 A Case Study of Heterarchy in Complex Societies. Early Medieval Ireland and Its Archaeological Implications. In: R. M. Ehrenreich et al. (eds.); pp. 55–69.

Wason, Paul K.
1995 Social Types and the Limits of Typological Thinking in Social Archaeology. In: N. N. Kradin and V. A. Lynsha (eds.); pp. 19–27.

Wason, Paul K., and **Maximilian O. Baldia**
2000 Religion, Communication, and the Genesis of Social Complexity in the European Neolithic. In: N. N. Kradin et al. (eds.); pp. 138–148.

Web Dictionary
n. d. Heterarchy, Hierarchy. In: Web Dictionary of Cybernetics and Systems. <http://pespmc1.vub.ac.be/ASC> [March 22, 2004]

Wenke, Robert J.
1999 Patterns in Prehistory. Humankind's First Three Million Years. New York: Oxford University Press. [4th edition]

White, Joyce C.
1995 Incorporating Heterarchy into Theory on Socio-Political Development. The Case from Southeast Asia. In: R. M. Ehrenreich et al. (eds.); pp. 101–123.

Woodburn, James
1982 Egalitarian Societies. *Man* (N. S.) 17: 431–451.

Wrigley, Christopher
1996 Kingship and State. The Buganda Dynasty. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yoffee, Norman
1993 Too Many Chiefs? (Or, Safe Texts for the '90s). In: N. Yoffee and A. Sherratt (eds.), Archaeological Theory. Who Sets the Agenda?; pp. 60–78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zolotov, V. I.
1999 Gorizontal'nye svjazi sotsial'nykh obshchnostej v srednevekovoj Anglii [Horizontal Links of Social Units in Medieval England]. In: E. V. Kuznetsov (ed.), Problemy anglijskoj i vallijskoj istorii v pozdnee srednevekov'e [Problems of English and Welsh History in the Late Middle Ages]; pp. 63–72. Arzamas: Arzamas State Teaching Institute Press.