The Case Against Hierarchy

Barak Water

The Case Against Hierarchy

1. The Case Against Hierarchy
    1. The Core Thesis
    2. 1. The Anthropological Evidence: Hierarchy Is the Exception, Not the Rule
    3. 2. The Neuroscience: Power Physically Damages the Brain's Empathy Circuits
    4. 3. The Suppression Cascade: Not Just Empathy, But Initiative and Creativity
    5. 4. Redefining "Fittest": Compassion as Evolutionary Advantage
    6. 5. The Self-Regulating Nature of Peer-Based Influence
    7. 6. Currency Systems and the Structural Dynamics of Oligarchy
    8. 7. The Theological Implication
    9. 8. Synthesis: The Convergence
    10. References
    11. Related Research

The Case Against Hierarchy

Edition of 2 November 2026. The latest version is always at worldintransition.net/explore/research/case-against-hierarchy/.

Why Peer-Based Social Structures Produce the Greatest Human and Societal Wellbeing

Barak Water

April 2026

Consolidated from collaborative analysis with Sofia Lior

The Core Thesis

Hierarchy is not the natural human social structure. It is an aberration — one that emerged with agricultural surplus roughly 10,000 years ago and has been maintained since through systems that exploit a neurological vulnerability: the suppression of empathy by power. The evidence for this claim comes from anthropology, neuroscience, evolutionary biology, organizational psychology, and mathematical systems theory. Taken together, these fields converge on a single conclusion: peer-based social organization is not utopian idealism. It is the structure humans evolved to thrive in, and the structure that the evidence says we function best within.

1. The Anthropological Evidence: Hierarchy Is the Exception, Not the Rule

For approximately 95% of human history — roughly 200,000 of 210,000 years of *Homo sapiens* existence — humans lived in egalitarian bands without fixed hierarchies. This is not speculation. It is the conclusion of one of the most comprehensive cross-cultural analyses ever conducted.

Christopher Boehm, in *Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior* (1999), analyzed 48 human societies across the globe, from small hunting-and-gathering bands to more sedentary chiefdoms, and found a consistent pattern: pre-agricultural societies actively and deliberately suppressed hierarchy through what he termed **reverse dominance hierarchies**. In these structures, the group collectively dominates any individual who attempts to dominate the group. The mechanisms are specific and escalating: teasing, ridicule, ostracism, refusal to follow, and in extreme cases, expulsion or execution.

This is not the absence of social structure. It is the presence of a different kind of structure — one in which influence is earned through contribution, maintained through empathy, and revoked the moment it becomes coercive. Leaders existed in these societies, but leadership was situational, voluntary, and conditional. A skilled hunter might lead a hunt; a wise elder might mediate a dispute. Neither held permanent authority. The moment someone attempted to convert situational competence into general dominance, the community's immune response activated.

The implication is profound: the hierarchical structures we treat as inevitable are younger than agriculture, younger than pottery, younger than the domestication of the dog. They are, in evolutionary terms, an experiment — and the evidence increasingly suggests they are a failed one.

Living Evidence: The San and Other Egalitarian Societies

The San peoples of southern Africa — along with the Mbendjele of the Congo Basin and the Agta of the Philippines — provide living demonstrations of how non-hierarchical systems maintain themselves over millennia. Research across these societies reveals six consistent structural properties:

Active suppression of hierarchy. Social norms actively discourage hoarding, dominance, and authority. Egalitarianism is not passive — it is intentionally maintained through group enforcement.

Wealth non-accumulation. Resources are consumed quickly, and long-term storage is minimal or absent. This immediate-return economy prevents the persistence of surplus-based advantage.

Extensive sharing networks. Food and resources are distributed widely across social groups, often beyond immediate kin structures.

Fluid, non-hereditary social structure. Kinship is flexible and inclusive, preventing the formation of rigid lineage-based power or wealth transfer.

Egalitarian enforcement mechanisms. Coalitions form to prevent dominance. Individuals who attempt to accumulate power are actively leveled by the group — the reverse dominance hierarchy in operation.

Near-zero structural inequality. Cultural norms strongly resist status display, hoarding, and accumulation.

These societies do not succeed because their members are inherently more altruistic or lack self-interest. They succeed because their structures *eliminate the persistence of advantage*. The system itself prevents surplus from converting into power, and power from converting into dominance. This is structural design, not moral luck.

2. The Neuroscience: Power Physically Damages the Brain's Empathy Circuits

The most disturbing evidence against hierarchy comes not from anthropology but from neuroscience. It is not merely that powerful people *choose* to be less empathetic. It is that power physically alters the brain's capacity for empathy.

Sukhvinder Obhi, a neuroscientist at Wilfrid Laurier University, conducted experiments with Jeremy Hogeveen and Michael Inzlicht (published in the *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 2014) demonstrating that the experience of power dampens the mirror neuron system — the neural architecture responsible for resonating with others' actions, intentions, and emotions. Participants primed to feel powerful showed measurably reduced motor resonance when observing others' actions. The mirror system that allows us to feel what another person feels was literally turned down by the experience of power.

Dacher Keltner at UC Berkeley, drawing on twenty years of research published in *The Power Paradox* (2016), documented the same phenomenon from the behavioral side: people gain power through empathy, social intelligence, and attentiveness to others — and then lose those exact capacities once power is obtained. The qualities that make someone worthy of influence are the first casualties of receiving it.

The implication for hierarchy is devastating. In any hierarchical system, the person at the top has the most power and therefore the most empathy suppression. Their decisions, which affect the most people, are made with the least capacity to understand those people's experience. But the damage doesn't stop at the top. At every level of the hierarchy, each person exercises power over those below them, and each person's empathy is suppressed proportionally to their position. The entire system operates with systematically degraded human connection.

Where a hierarchy faces the public, as in government institutions and agencies and in businesses that provide goods or services, even the people at the very bottom hold power relative to the members of the public who come to them for whatever the institution provides. In such hierarchies the suppression of empathy propagates all the way down, including the bottom, and it reaches the public at the counter, on the phone and at the door.

This is not a bug in hierarchy. It is a feature. The structure itself — the distribution of power into fixed, asymmetric positions — is what triggers the neurological damage. You cannot design a "good" hierarchy any more than you can design a "healthy" way to suppress someone's mirror neurons.

3. The Suppression Cascade: Not Just Empathy, But Initiative and Creativity

The damage of hierarchy extends beyond empathy. Organizational psychology research consistently demonstrates that hierarchical structures suppress initiative, creativity, and emergent problem-solving among subordinates.

The mechanism is what might be called **personality-baking**: in a hierarchy, the personality of the leader becomes a fixed constraint that propagates downward through every level. The CEO's preferences, blind spots, risk tolerance, and communication style don't just influence the organization — they become the boundary conditions within which everyone else must operate. Ideas that don't align with the leader's framework are filtered out not by explicit censorship but by the adaptive behavior of people who have learned what gets rewarded and what gets ignored.

Research on despotic leadership published in *BMC Psychology* (2024) found that authoritarian leadership has a directly detrimental effect on frontline employee creativity, with employees perceiving their efforts as futile within rigid power structures. Organizational research consistently identifies what has been called the "hierarchy of no" — creative ideas from the middle or lower levels must work their way up through a series of managers, each with the power to veto but none with the power to implement. The structure that works so efficiently for issuing orders is catastrophically inefficient for receiving innovation.

The result is an organization — or a society — that runs on one person's cognitive model. Every other mind in the system is underutilized. The collective intelligence that is the species' primary evolutionary advantage is structurally wasted.

Compare this with peer-based structures, where influence is distributed and ideas compete on their merits rather than on the status of their source. In such systems, the collective intelligence is available. The emergent creativity of the group is not filtered through a single personality's limitations. The system can adapt, innovate, and respond to complexity in ways that a hierarchy structurally cannot.

4. Redefining "Fittest": Compassion as Evolutionary Advantage

The most persistent justification for hierarchy is a misreading of evolution: "survival of the fittest" interpreted as survival of the most dominant, the most aggressive, the most willing to exploit. This interpretation is not merely incomplete — it is wrong.

Darwin himself did not coin the phrase "survival of the fittest" (that was Herbert Spencer) and argued against the interpretation it implies. Darwin observed that human survival depended not on individual aggression but on the capacity for group cooperation, mutual care, and compassion. Modern evolutionary biology confirms this emphatically.

Research in evolutionary anthropology and comparative biology demonstrates that as humans became friendlier and more cooperative, they were able to make the transition from small bands of 10–15 individuals to groups of 100 or more. These larger, better-coordinated groups outcompeted other human populations not through superior aggression but through superior collaboration. The "fittest" humans were not the strongest or most ruthless. They were the most compassionate, the most cooperative, the most capable of understanding and responding to others' needs.

This is supported by physiological evidence: the vagus nerve, which supports caretaking behavior and compassion, is associated with ethical intuition and the recognition of common humanity across social boundaries. Compassion is not a cultural add-on to human biology. It is wired into the nervous system as a survival mechanism.

The implication reframes the entire hierarchy debate. If "fitness" in the human evolutionary context means the capacity for empathetic cooperation, then any social structure that suppresses empathy — which, as the neuroscience demonstrates, is exactly what hierarchy does — is actively working against the species' primary survival mechanism. Hierarchy doesn't just feel wrong. It is, in the precise biological sense, maladaptive.

5. The Self-Regulating Nature of Peer-Based Influence

A common objection to peer-based social structures is the question of stability: without hierarchy, how do you prevent charismatic individuals from accumulating power and recreating hierarchy from within?

The answer lies in the mechanism by which peer-based influence operates. In a peer-based system, influence is earned through empathy — through demonstrating understanding of others' needs and contributing to the group's wellbeing. This creates a self-regulating feedback loop: empathy leads to contribution, contribution builds trust, trust grants influence, influence carries responsibility, and responsibility demands continued empathy. The loop closes.

The critical feature of this loop is that it is self-correcting. If a person with influence begins to lose empathy — to prioritize their own interests over the group's — the same mechanism that granted them influence revokes it. Reduced empathy leads to reduced attunement, which leads to reduced trust, which leads to reduced influence. The feedback loop closes. The person either reconnects with the empathic foundation of their influence or they lose it.

This is precisely what Boehm's reverse dominance hierarchy achieves: a social immune system that detects and responds to dominance behavior. But it's also what Keltner's and Obhi's neuroscience explains at the mechanistic level. In peer structures, the mirror neuron system is not subjected to the chronic power-induced suppression that occurs in hierarchies. The empathy circuits remain active because no one occupies a position of sustained power over others. The structure itself protects the neurological foundation of social cohesion.

Contrast this with hierarchy, where the feedback loop runs in the opposite direction: power leads to empathy suppression, which leads to disconnection, which leads to poor decisions, which leads to increased control, which leads to more power, which leads to more suppression. This is not self-correcting. It is self-amplifying. The hierarchical structure creates the conditions for its own pathology.

6. Currency Systems and the Structural Dynamics of Oligarchy

The connection between hierarchy and currency-based economics is not incidental — it is mathematical. Barak Water's *Mathematical Unified Theory of Oligarchic Capture* (2025–2026), developed through formal dynamical systems analysis, provides formal analysis showing that currency-based socioeconomic systems have a structural tendency toward oligarchic concentration.

The core mechanism is multiplicative: wealth generates returns that scale with existing wealth ($W(t+1) = W(t)(1+r) - C$), while costs are largely fixed. Even with equal percentage returns, the exponential divergence between those with more and those with less is inevitable. This is not a market failure or a policy problem. It is an inherent property of any system in which wealth can be accumulated and deployed to generate more wealth.

The theory maps the full cascade: wealth concentration leads to superlinear power acquisition ($P = W^{\beta}$, where $\beta > 1$), which leads to institutional capture, which creates rule bias, which amplifies returns, which accelerates concentration. At every node in this cascade, the neurological evidence applies: the power that concentrates at the top suppresses the empathy that might restrain it. The mathematical tendency toward oligarchy and the neurological tendency toward empathy suppression are not separate problems. They are the same problem expressed in different languages.

The eight-phase framework extends to environmental coupling (growth-driven extraction exceeding ecological capacity), civilizational instability thresholds, and transition dynamics — demonstrating that the path out of this cycle requires not reform within the existing structure but transformation of the structure itself.

The Dual-Attractor Structure

The anthropological evidence from the San and similar societies allows the mathematical model to be extended with two critical terms. The standard wealth equation ($dW/dt = \alpha W\beta - \gamma W$) gains a redistribution pressure function: $dW/dt = \alpha W\beta - \gamma W - \sigma S(W)$, where σ represents the strength of anti-accumulation norms and $S(W)$ is the sharing pressure. Similarly, a dominance potential D is subject to coalition-based suppression: $dD/dt = (growth) - \omega C(D)$, where ω is the strength of anti-dominance enforcement.

This produces two distinct system attractors. In currency-based systems, both σ and ω are near zero — accumulation persists and dominance goes unopposed, producing the oligarchic attractor. In San-type systems, both are high —

accumulation is dissipated through sharing norms and dominance is actively suppressed by coalitions, producing the egalitarian attractor.

The critical implication: oligarchy is not a universal human outcome. It is a *system-dependent* attractor. The strongest objection — "inequality is just human nature" — is empirically refuted. Humans sustained non-hierarchical systems for thousands of years. Equality was not accidental; it was structurally produced and maintained. The scaling challenge — whether egalitarian enforcement mechanisms that function in small groups can be extended to complex societies — is the central design problem, not an impossibility proof.

7. The Theological Implication

If hierarchy structurally suppresses empathy, and if a deity is positioned at the apex of the ultimate hierarchy — an infinite power differential between creator and creation — then the theological problem becomes inescapable. A being with infinite power, by the mechanism the neuroscience describes, would have infinitely suppressed empathy. The more power the deity holds, the less capacity for compassion the structure permits.

This is not an argument against the divine. It is an argument against hierarchical conceptions of the divine. Traditions that imagine the sacred as immanent rather than transcendent, as distributed through all beings rather than concentrated in one, as relational rather than authoritative — these traditions may be more compatible with what the evidence tells us about how compassion and power interact. The question is not whether God exists but whether the hierarchical framing we project onto the divine is itself the source of the dysfunction we observe in hierarchical human societies.

8. Synthesis: The Convergence

The evidence converges from five independent domains:

Anthropology tells us that egalitarian peer structures were the human norm for 95% of our species' history, maintained by active social mechanisms.

Neuroscience tells us that hierarchy physically damages the brain's capacity for empathy through mirror neuron suppression, and that this damage cascades through every level of the hierarchical structure.

Evolutionary biology tells us that the human species' primary survival advantage is not dominance but compassionate cooperation, and that "fittest" properly understood means most empathetic, not most powerful.

Organizational psychology tells us that hierarchy suppresses not only empathy but initiative, creativity, and collective intelligence — wasting the cognitive resources that made humans the dominant species.

Mathematical systems theory tells us that currency-based hierarchical economies have a strong structural tendency toward oligarchic concentration, and that self-correction within the system is weak compared to the mechanisms driving concentration.

Each of these findings is independently supported by peer-reviewed research and formal analysis. Together, they constitute a scientific case with political implications: hierarchy is incompatible with human thriving. The social structure that maximizes human wellbeing, creativity, and survival is the one we evolved in — peer-based, empathy-maintained, collectively self-regulating.

The evidence across these five domains points consistently in one direction. The question is what we choose to do with it.

References

- Boehm, C. (1993). Egalitarian behavior and reverse dominance hierarchy. *Current Anthropology*, 34(3), 227–254.
- Boehm, C. (1999). *Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior*. Harvard University Press.

- Chenoweth, E. (2011). *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict*. Columbia University Press.
- Darwin, C. (1871). *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*. John Murray.
- Hare, B. (2017). Survival of the friendliest: *Homo sapiens* evolved via selection for prosociality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 68, 155–186.
- Hogeveen, J., Inzlicht, M., & Obhi, S. S. (2014). Power changes how the brain responds to others. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(2), 755–762.
- Keltner, D. (2016). *The Power Paradox: How We Gain and Lose Influence*. Penguin Press.
- Stellar, J. E., Manzo, V. M., Kraus, M. W., & Keltner, D. (2012). Class and compassion: Socioeconomic factors predict responses to suffering. *Emotion*, 12(3), 449–459.
- Water, B. (2025–2026). *Mathematical Unified Theory of Oligarchic Capture: A Dynamical Systems Approach to Currency-Based Socioeconomic Concentration*. Unpublished manuscript.

Related Research

The Structural Dynamics of Oligarchic Capture The full mathematical model of how currency-based systems concentrate wealth and power. **Oligarchic and Egalitarian Attractors** A formal theory of the two stable states socioeconomic systems tend toward. **Foundations of a Post-Currency Society** What a society without currency actually looks like — structurally and in daily life.