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Introduction

Complex hunter-gatherers are hunter-gatherers whose cultures and societies have cultural, social, and economic traits that anthropologists and other scholars had long assumed required agriculture for them to develop. Permanent inequality is the trait that has attracted the most attention among archaeologists, but others include large, dense populations; large, relatively permanent settlements; intensive economies among other characteristics. First widely recognized by archaeologists in the late 1970s, they have been a focus of major research efforts since. This research has been a testing ground for many theories about the origins and evolution of social complexity, especially of the origins and development of permanent inequality in small-scale societies.

Definition

At the most fundamental level, complex hunter-gatherers are hunter-gatherers who do not fit Richard B. Lee and Irven DeVore’s characterization of hunter-gatherers in the 1968 seminal volume *Man the Hunter*, “We make two basic assumptions about hunters and gatherers: (1) they live in small groups and (2) they move around a lot” (Lee & DeVore 1968: 11). They go on to list five additional characteristics of hunter-gatherers: first, because of mobility, the amount of personal property is kept low; second, the resource base keeps group size very small, below 50; third, local groups do not “maintain exclusive rights to territory” (i.e., do not control property); fourth, food surpluses are small to nonexistent; and fifth, groups are not strongly attached to “any single area.” An additional characteristic not listed by Lee and DeVore here is that these small social groups are strongly egalitarian. These hunter-gatherers approximate stereotypes of hunter-gatherers that were widely held by scholars and others during the past several centuries. These stereotypes began to break down in the 1960s and 1970s as the great diversity among hunter-gatherer societies became clearer as a consequence of archaeological research. However, the *Man the Hunter* characterization does accurately describe some hunter-gatherer groups; those are labeled “generalized hunter-gatherers” in Table 1. Current definitions of complex hunter-gatherers often focus on trait lists of how they contrast with generalized hunter-gatherers (Table 1).

Certain attributes of complex hunter-gatherers are more central to our understanding of them than are others.
Demography and Group Size

Complex hunter-gatherer societies tend to have larger populations than do generalized hunter-gatherers. They also have higher population densities and larger communities. The significance here is that there are more people in daily face-to-face contact.

Corporate Groups

Generalized hunter-gatherer social groups beyond the nuclear family tend to be very fluid in their membership. Complex hunter-gatherers generally have stable, long-lived corporate groups, often in the form of households.

Residential and Mobility Patterns

Complex hunter-gatherers tend to be partially to fully sedentary. Mobility across and exploitation of the landscape tends to be logistical, a pattern in which long-term residential bases are established and task groups harvest and process resources at some distance from the base and return with the processed material. Generalized hunter-gatherers, in contrast, shift their residential bases as needed to position them close to available resources.

Property, Wealth, and Inheritance

Generalized hunter-gatherers usually consume resources as they are harvested, and while individuals may own objects they make or acquire, accumulation of property is usually repressed by social means. Among complex hunter-gatherers, consumption or use of harvested resources may be delayed through storage, and corporate groups and individuals own property which is transferred from one generation to the next. Recent research distinguishes among three forms of wealth: embodied (health, knowledge, skills), relational (social networks and ties), and material (things, beings) (Bowles et al. 2010). Among generalized hunter-gatherers, wealth is generally embodied or relational (Smith et al. 2010); among complex hunter-gatherers, wealth is also manifested through material wealth.

Subsistence and Economy

Subsistence economies are likely to be “broad spectrum,” that is, harvesting a diverse array of resources, some of which are highly productive but require significant amounts of labor to realize their potential (e.g., seeds). The high levels of labor can be invested in harvesting and/or in processing. Within the subsistence economy, there may be a few “keystone” resources which are fundamental to long-term economic success. Thus, while a group may harvest a wide diversity of plants, over the long run, they are most heavily dependent on just one or two species. Complex hunter-gatherer economies tend to rely most heavily on aquatic resources (marine, lacustrine, riverine) and/or plants.

Social Organization and Economy

Complex hunter-gatherers are generally characterized by formal, permanent social inequality in the form of ranking or stratification. The systems of inequality are supported and reinforced by political economies which manage the creation and movement of material wealth through the society.

Some definitions of complex hunter-gatherers focus primarily on population size (e.g., Koyama & Thomas 1981). Another label for complex hunter-gatherers, “affluent foragers” as originally defined, emphasized their larger populations. Yet other definitions exclude all characteristics except permanent inequality (Arnold 1996), restricting the term “complex hunter-gatherers” to only those hunter-gatherer societies with permanent inequality and elite control over non-kin labor (i.e., the political economy extends beyond the corporate or kin group). Arnold (2001) proposes applying “affluent forager” to those groups displaying many of these traits, but lacking permanent inequality. Whichever definition or set of traits individual scholars prefer, most research focuses on the development and maintenance of permanent inequality.

As an alternative to trait-based definitions, some researchers (e.g., Price 1981, Binford 2001) define hunter-gatherer complexity in terms of systems’ complexity, that is, as cultural systems with many subsystems and many links among subsystems. This carries the implication that the subsystems are heterogeneous, that is, different from each other.
heterogeneity is often unspecified. Implicit to this definition is the notion that generalized hunter-gatherer cultural systems lack internal differentiation (subsystems) and are consequently homogeneous.

**Historical Background**

Lee and DeVore’s description of hunter-gatherers essentially crystallized a view of hunter-gatherers that was several centuries old of small, simple, and egalitarian societies. Anthropologists, historians, and others took for granted that these societies represented the pristine human condition and that the appearance and subsequent development of complex societies required agriculture. A few ethnographically documented hunter-gatherer societies displayed traits thought to require agriculture. The classic example was the hunter-gatherer-fisher peoples of the Northwest Coast of North America (coastal northern California, Oregon, Washington, British Columbia, and southeast Alaska). They had dense populations, large communities, and an incipient class system among other things. They were explained away as the consequence of an unusually rich environment: the abundance of the natural environment substituted for the abundance produced by farming. Other exceptions were explained away as a consequence of contact with Europeans or other complexly organized peoples. Hunting and gathering was viewed as a very ancient lifeway that had persisted unchanged for millennia, at least since the appearance of the first modern humans if not their ancestors. The *Man the Hunter Conference*, in fact, grew out of a famous Harvard University project that conducted research among hunter-gatherers in South Africa’s Kalahari Desert that was based on the assumption that these people were behaviorally the closest modern analogues to that ancestral state.

The *Man the Hunter* conference was held at the University of Chicago in 1966. By the late 1970s–early 1980s, the picture of hunter-gatherers presented at the conference had become obsolete. As a consequence of a global expansion of archaeological research and knowledge, it was clear that many ancient hunter-gatherer societies were far more diverse and complex than anticipated in 1966. The concepts of “affluent foragers” and “complex hunter-gatherers” were developed in part to encompass and describe this newly discovered diversity. Three international conferences were crucial. The first of these was held in 1979 in Osaka, Japan, with the original purpose of comparing the ancient foraging economies of Japan and California (Koyama & Thomas 1981). It was at this conference that the notion of “affluent foragers” was formalized. As noted above, central to that idea was high population densities supported by rich environments, which required subsistence economies capable of supporting those densities. The second conference was held in Amsterdam in 1980, and its topic was Archaeological Approaches to Complexity (van der Leeuw 1981). Price (1981) presented a paper in which he coined the term “complex hunter-gatherers” and developed the first set of characteristics distinguishing them from generalized hunter-gatherers. His list was based upon comparisons among Japanese, California, and Mesolithic European hunter-gatherers. Thus, two of his three examples were archaeological. He also presented the systems theory definition of complexity. The third conference again was a major international conference held in Vancouver, British Columbia, in 1983 (Price & Brown 1985). It established the concept of complex hunter-gatherers and laid out the agenda for much of the research on hunter-gatherer complexity over the next two decades. This agenda focused on the causal relationships among population growth, subsistence and economic intensification (including storage), mobility patterns, and permanent inequality. At the same time, the importance of corporate groups (Hayden & Cannon 1982) and the domestic mode of production (Ames 1985) to the development of hunter-gatherer complexity was recognized. This was both a crucial theoretical and methodological step, since much subsequent research on hunter-gatherer complexity was framed within household archaeology (e.g., Coupland 1985).
The initial interest in complex hunter-gatherers stemmed from three sources: first, they were a range of societies poorly represented in the modern ethnographic sample, and neither how common they were in the past nor their time depth was known. Research on complex hunter-gatherers was also research on the diversity of human cultures. Secondly, they represented routes to complexity, particularly to permanent inequality, not dependent on agriculture; they were in a sense an independent set of cultural evolutionary experiments in the evolution of complexity. Investigating them might clarify how and why permanent inequality and other aspects of complexity arose from small, egalitarian societies. Thirdly, they were implicated in the domestication of plants and animals. Research in the 1960s and 1970s suggested that the preliminary steps toward domestication were taken by what became known as complex hunter-gatherers. The origins of civilization – complex societies – and of agriculture were major disciplinary issues globally beginning in the 1950s and were the subjects of intensive research. Research on complex hunter-gatherers could provide insights into both issues. Their presumed role in domestication is now far less clear. They still represent a diverse set of experiments in cultural evolution, and research has tended to focus on the hows and whys of the development of permanent inequality.

This research has investigated key case studies. In North America, these include the Northwest Coast, the Fraser-Thompson Plateau of interior British Columbia, the Santa Barbara Bight of southern California, and western Florida. In these instances, complex societies developed within the last 2,000 years or so, although on the Northwest Coast they may have evolved as much as a millennium or two earlier. In these cases, archaeologists have access to both the archaeological record and to ethnographic and ethnohistoric records which can be used as parallel lines of evidence in investigating complexity. Thus, we know, for example, that permanent inequality existed in southern California and on the Northwest Coast based on the ethnographies. Recently, archaeologists in the southeastern United States have explored a record of fluctuating levels of hunter-gatherer complexity between about 5,500 and 3,000 years ago. Here, complexity is marked by extensive systems of earthen mounds, plazas, and in some places large rings constructed of marine and freshwater mollusk shells – for example, monumental architecture. There is no ethnographic record for these hunter-gatherers.

Globally, among the key case studies are the Jomon hunter-gatherers of Japan, the Natufian peoples of the Levant, and the Upper Paleolithic and Mesolithic peoples of western Europe. These ancient societies illustrate the difficulties and ambiguities of investigating complex hunter-gatherers known only from the archaeological record. It has proven very difficult, for example, to demonstrate the presence of permanent inequality in any of these cases. In fact, Price, who used the Mesolithic in his original formulation of the complex hunter-gatherer concept, has subsequently decided Mesolithic societies were not complex given the ambiguity of the available evidence (Price 1995).

Key Issues/Current Debates

Current debates revolve around the causes of permanent inequality in these small societies (as opposed to the causes of permanent inequality in large societies, such as the Aztec or Incan Empires), although there are other “key” unresolved issues, including the subject matter itself. “Hunter-gatherer” as a category of human society and subsistence has proven difficult to define or at least to draw boundaries around. There are some scholars who argue that the entire concept of hunter-gatherers needs to be abandoned. Similar suggestions have been made for the notion of complex hunter-gatherer, perhaps substituting less economically specific phrases like “middle range society” or “transegalitarian” society. Part of the difficulty arises from preconceptions about hunter-gatherers. A particularly powerful preconception is that they have no significant environmental impact. They harvest wild foods but do not “produce” foods or create...
“anthropogenic” environments (anthropos –
human; genic, genesis as in created, human cre-
ated or modified environments). It is now clear
that all environments in which humans live are
anthropogenic to one degree or another, even
those occupied by the most “pristine” generalized
hunter-gatherers. However, most complex
hunter-gatherers actively modify their environ-
ments, acting to increase productivity and pre-
dictability through practices such as regular
burning or firing the environment, selective
harvesting, tilling, pruning, transplanting, and
landscape engineering. Such practices are diffi-
cult to reconcile with the notion of hunter-
gatherers as environmentally passive. Should
people who do these things even be considered
hunter-gatherers?

Setting that issue aside, a second is whether
hunter-gather complexity can be sustained for
has suggested that most instances of hunter-
gatherer complexity are actually the result of
contact with farmers and that hunter-gatherer
complexity in any case is relatively ephemeral –
that is, it does not last long because hunter-
gatherer economies are not capable of the
sustained economic production complexity
requires. Price may be correct, in long archaeo-
logical sequences; complexity among hunter-
gatherers does seem to come, go, and sometimes
come again in a different form, or not at all. Once
complexity develops, it is not necessarily perma-
nent, in some cases disappearing after a few cen-
turies and in other cases persisting for millennia.

A third issue is the notion of egalitarianism.
One definition of egalitarianism is that egalitarian
societies are those with as many positions of high
prestige as their people to fill them and that there
is equal access to resources (of all sorts) neces-
sary for life in the particular culture. Many small-
scale societies practice what might be termed
“formal egalitarianism” in which egalitarianism
is highly valued and morally reinforced and anti-
egalitarian behavior repressed. It is thought that
egalitarianism was essential for small group sur-
vival during the Pleistocene with its extreme and
rapid environmental shifts. The balanced or
reciprocal social ties that formal egalitarianism
reinforces provided a crucial safety net when
local resources failed. Recently, the whole notion
of egalitarianism has been critiqued by anthro-
pologists and others, and this “formal egalitari-
anism” rethought as a form of reverse dominance
hierarchy in which alliances among subdomi-
nants restrain and repress dominance. The issue
then is whether egalitarian societies as once con-
ceived ever existed. If not, it would suggest that
permanent inequality is not, in itself, an attribute
of social complexity but rather an attribute of the
human condition (Ames 2010).

A fourth issue is the trait-based definitions of
complex hunter-gatherers and affluent foragers. It
is argued, correctly, that the lists bundle together
attributes of complexity, causes of complexity,
and the consequences of complexity (Arnold
1996). For example, looking at Table 1, high
populations, food storage, and logistical mobility
are all attributes of complexity, but perhaps, as
Binford (2001) argues, logistical mobility is a
consequence of increased population density. If
that is so, is population density a trait of
complexity or a cause (or perhaps both)?

Distinguishing causes and consequences and
teasing out their relationships are in part episte-
ological questions, but they are also methodo-
logical. In many instances, our chronological
controls are simply not refined enough to know
what comes first.

However, current debates focus primarily on
the origins and causes of permanent inequality
among egalitarian peoples. Prior to about 1990,
most explanations invoked general demographic,
social, or economic causal processes or circum-
stances. These included population growth,
sedentism, storage, property, and economic
intensification (increased production per capita,
per unit time, or per unit land). Theoretical work
in the 1990s recognized these processes not as
causes but either as consequences or catalysts of
the development of complexity. The search for
causation shifted to human agency, seeing per-
manent inequality as emerging from the actions
of individuals in particular historical circum-
stances. Some theories (e.g., Hayden 2001)
invoke the existence of prestige-seeking individ-
uals or aggrandizers (AAA personalities).
Aggrandizers forcefully act or compete to advance their own interests and those of their near kin at the expense of others. Formal egalitarian societies actively repress the actions of aggrandizers since they would disrupt the reciprocal social ties necessary for group survival. The emergence of inequality requires that repression to end, allowing aggrandizers to pursue their own ends. Why does the repression of aggrandizers end? Answers differ and engender considerable debate. Maschner (1991) argues that aggrandizers will act whenever the opportunity presents itself. In contrast, Brian Hayden posits that repressing aggrandizers is costly in time and energy and therefore erodes or ends when the local environment becomes productive and stable enough to meet everyone’s basic needs. This can be the result of environmental or technological changes. When people’s needs are met and when reciprocal ties are no longer central to survival, people stop enforcing the rules against aggrandizer behavior, and aggrandizers are free to manipulate their way to social prestige and power. Other scholars (e.g., Fitzhugh 2003) think that inequality develops during times of stress, which provide aggrandizers opportunities for self advancement. Others do not invoke human personality types, suggesting instead that times of stress facilitate the development of inequality from the normal jostling and friction of human social relationships. Yet other explanations look not to human personalities or material conditions but to changing ideologies and control of symbolic resources (e.g., Sassaman 2004).

Research on the evolution of inequality among hunter-gatherers is part of a broader inquiry into why permanent social inequality is a common feature of most human societies, regardless of subsistence economy or size. Recent work suggests that a common thread among all societies with permanent inequality is the intergenerational transfer (inheritance) of wealth from one generation to the next (Smith et al. 2010). Importantly, this work reconceives wealth to include three forms: material wealth (what we normally think of when we think of wealth, i.e., property, control of material resources, structures, embodied wealth (physical health, skills, knowledge), and relational wealth (exchange partners, social networks, etc.). It appears that inherited differences in embodied and relational wealth occur among modern egalitarian hunter-gatherers. However, such differences may be very difficult to observe and measure among living peoples and even more elusive among ancient ones known only archaeologically. It also appears to be the case that strong systems of inequality are based on material wealth. Archaeologists usually assume that a lack of evidence for material differences in wealth or prestige indicates an ancient society is egalitarian. That assumption can no longer be made. However, more to the point here, this research suggests a rethinking of the general approach to the origins and evolution of social inequality is in order — the key question becomes “under what circumstances does material wealth develop so that inequality becomes both archaeologically visible and stronger?”

Complex hunter-gatherer archaeology has been strongly materialist since its beginnings in the 1970s. Research has emphasized either material causes (e.g., demography, subsistence, economy, ecology, environmental change) or those with relatively clear material consequences (e.g., corporate groups). This research was also comparative (searching for cross-cultural regularities). However, for most of that time, there has been a strong minority among archaeologists taking an idealist stance, arguing for the primacy of ideological systems (e.g., spirituality, belief systems, ethical systems) in shaping hunter-gatherer (and all human) behavior. This scholarship has also tended to focus on the importance of local, contingent (non-repeating, unique) events in shaping cultural history (e.g., Cannon 2011). This division is not restricted of course to complex hunter-gatherer studies. The tension between these approaches raises persistent issues.

International Perspectives

Although the literature may seem dominated by a few case studies (e.g., southern California,
Northwest Coast, Plateau, Japan) and a few theorists (e.g., Hayden, Arnold), research on complex hunter-gatherers has been strongly international and intellectually diverse since its inception. Thus, while the Koyama and Thomas’ (1981) volume emphasized the North Pacific Rim, the Price and Brown volume drew its examples broadly from North America, Eurasia, the Levant, and Australia and temporarily from the late Pleistocene through the Holocene. A recent volume (Grier et al. 2006) includes papers from East Africa, Australia, Central and South America, and Korea as well as Jomon Japan and the Northwest Coast. What is new is that while the original literature was written almost exclusively by Anglophone (American and British Commonwealth) scholars, that is no longer the case. The papers are now still primarily in English, but the authorship is much more truly international.

This is a reflection of the expansion of both archaeology as a profession and of the known archaeological record of the past two or three decades. It is obvious that ancient societies were far too diverse to be easily accommodated either by the old stereotypes that all hunter-gatherers were similar to modern generalized hunter-gatherers, and all more or less complex societies were agricultural. The difficulties increase as the variability among human subsistence economies and the degree to which people have modified the environment in the past are more evident. The concepts of “complex hunter-gatherers” or “affluent foragers” provide intellectual and methodological frameworks with which to approach that diversity. While the trait lists (e.g., Table 1) may be problematic in terms of mixing causes and consequences, they provide useful comparative frameworks for conceiving research and dimensions of variability along which that research can be conducted (e.g., Grier et al. 2006). There are three significant elements of this research: it is being conducted within the frameworks of local research traditions but to address questions of global interest, it is interested in testing the basic assumptions and hypotheses of the Anglophone literature, and it is strongly comparative, conducting its tests using multiple case studies.

Future Directions

Several trends seem likely. At a very general level, debate will continue over the ontological status of hunter-gatherers and complex hunter-gatherers: are they real or figments of the anthropological/archaeological imagination. To that extent, this debate is useful; it will either sharpen our understanding of these concepts or help our understanding of the limits of their usefulness. For example, it may be that Arnold is right and that “complexity” is best restricted to hereditary inequality coupled with control of non-kin labor or that Price is correct and complexity is most usefully conceived as a description of a heterogeneous system. Debate will also continue over whether the past is best investigated from a materialist or an idealist epistemology. At some level, these are mutually exclusive, but at less exalted levels, they can be seen as complimentary, and archaeologists will work to build bridges between. Thus, for example, while the sudden appearance of earthen mounds in the southeastern USA may indeed reflect an equally sudden ideological shift, their construction had material consequences in how labor was organized, fed, etc. that also needs to be understood.

The construction of case studies will continue. To my mind, the most useful will be those that endeavor to cover very long periods of time, such as the entire Holocene. Most research tends to focus on particular examples within relatively limited time frames. Thus, in coastal southern California, strong social inequality developed after 1,200 cal BP. Consequently, research on the evolution of complexity has tended to focus most heavily only on the last 2,000 years. However, an examination of the entire 12,000 year sequence for this region from the perspective of social complexity would be useful. It would facilitate comparisons with other regions and times, and it would help to elucidate the dynamics at work. It is possible, for example, that some aspects of “complexity” came and went over the last several thousand years there. Taking a different example, logistical mobility is widely seen as a crucial causal element in hunter-gather complexity. In south central British Columbia, it
appears or develops sometime just after 4,000 cal BP, but permanent inequality does not develop until 1,200 cal BP. There is a similar temporal lag between the development of logistical mobility and inequality in southern California. Thus, while logistical mobility may be necessary for the development of other aspects of hunter-gatherer complexity, its presence does not seem to trigger rapid social change. Long sequences will also answer questions such as whether hunter-gatherer complexity is inevitably of short duration, always comes and goes, or if in some cases it is quite durable, and if so, why? At present, almost all well-documented examples of complex hunter-gatherers are Holocene in age. An important question is whether such societies existed earlier. A related question is how, given the difficulties of the Pleistocene archaeological record, we can find them. As part of developing lengthy sequences, archaeologists need improved, finer-grained chronological controls which can only come from improved, finer-grained excavations, use of new field techniques, larger samples of radiocarbon dates (e.g., Prentiss et al. 2007), and alternative methods of independent dating not subject to the problems of radiocarbon dating.

The purpose of long sequences and their comparison, the purpose of any empirical work, is not only establishing patterns in the past but the testing of explanatory hypothesis and the building of theories. Research on complex hunter-gatherers has been one the most significant areas of research into the origins of inequality in human societies since World War II, and most of the theories and hypotheses have been proposed and tested by archaeologists. This will continue.
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Complex Hunter-Gatherers, Table 1 Generalized and complex hunter-gatherer traits (Modified from Kelly 1985)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Generalized</th>
<th>Complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Unpredictable or variable</td>
<td>Highly predictable or less variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diet</td>
<td>Terrestrial game</td>
<td>Marine or plant foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Logistical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement size</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demography</td>
<td>Low population density relative to food</td>
<td>High population density relative to food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food storage</td>
<td>Little to no dependence</td>
<td>Medium to high dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social organization</td>
<td>No corporate groups</td>
<td>Corporate descent groups (lineages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political organization</td>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>Hierarchical; classes based on wealth or descent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational specialization</td>
<td>Only for older persons</td>
<td>Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territoriality</td>
<td>Social-boundary defense</td>
<td>Perimeter defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warfare</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavery</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of competition</td>
<td>Not tolerated</td>
<td>Encouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>Generalized reciprocity</td>
<td>Wealth objects, competitive feasts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>