



Nesting Paternalism. Patterns of the Paternalistic Behaviour from Neolithization and the Modern Age

Veselin Mitrović · Milica Mitrović

Received: 14 April 2022 / Accepted: 23 August 2022

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer-Verlag GmbH Deutschland, ein Teil von Springer Nature 2022

Abstract Paternalism can appear with other forms of social actions toward others and ourselves, a set of activities we comprehend as a part of paternalistic behaviour. We question the hypothesis that some social groups value benefits provided by leading authorities more than their autonomy. Resulting historical and sociological findings are supposed to inform the philosophical discussion on paternalism by broadening the topic's scope.

Firstly, we compared archaeological remains from the Early Neolithic (9700-6250 years B.C.), characterized by the appearance of prominent leaders with qualities of modern paternalistic leadership. They both indicate behaviour accompanied by a family atmosphere in the workplace. Our second data set was obtained through sociological research conducted from the Enquete on the Serbian national sample.

A diachronic perspective revealed similar relations between leaders and subordinates. Certain groups with narrowed decision-making autonomy begin to think paternalistically, even though there is a fine line between paternalism, protectionism, and authoritarianism. The main differences between paternalism and other related concepts (authoritarianism, protectionism, collectivism) are the grade and type of subjects' consent about the action for their good. Stronger collectivistic and authoritarian attitudes enable nesting paternalism, i.e., gradual acceptance of the paternalistic culture. In this process, an individual sacrifices autonomy for social benefits and integration into the cultural milieu. Nesting paternalism parallels the "nesting dolls." It denotes collateral patronizing behaviors enclosed in another, such

Veselin Mitrović (✉)

Institute of Social Sciences, Institute of national significance for the Republic of Serbia, Kraljice Natalije 45, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia
E-Mail: vmitrovic@idn.org.rs

Milica Mitrović

Archaeological Collection, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Čika Ljubina 18-20, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia



as paternalism, protectionism, and authoritarianism. One of the main derivatives of such paternalism is anti-paternalism, which consists of patronizing acts to prevent paternalism.

Keywords Paternalism · Anti-paternalism · Protectionism · Authoritarianism · Neolithization · Leadership

1 Introduction and defining the problem

In modern societies, respect for autonomy, nonmaleficence, beneficence, and justice are often considered the most critical principles in human action toward oneself and others (Beauchamp and Childress 2019). Still, answering what is best for one's own good became part of a decision puzzle. Is it just a personal feeling or knowledge about betterment, or is it a social and cultural derivative of the image of wellbeing? From an individual perspective, no one, especially not the state, knows better than each competent adult citizen themselves (Childress 2015; Mill 1869). Moreover, authors like Grill (2011) emphasize that competent adult individuals should not be treated as a child. Deciding for others primarily concentrates on Public Health,¹ surrogate decisions, and patients' competence (Buchanan and Brock 1990).

However, competence and the right to interfere with the autonomy of others are not exclusively related to the early or late age of one's life. Issues of blocked self-deciding and doing are evident beyond the medical sphere and related to social and economic reasons. Dworkin (2020) defines paternalism as an interference of a state or an individual with another person (*or a group-our emphasis*) against their will. It is defended or motivated by a claim that the person interfered with will be better off or protected from harm.

Conditions accompanied this definition are suggested as an analysis of *X acts paternalistically towards Y by doing (omitting) Z* (Dworkin 2020):

1. *Z* (or its omission) interferes with the liberty or autonomy of *Y*.
2. *X* does so without the consent of *Y*.
3. *X* does so only because *X* believes *Z* will improve the welfare of *Y* (where this includes preventing his welfare from diminishing) or in some way promote the interests, values, or good of *Y*.

These conditions are essential for differentiating our cases of patronizing actions, namely protectionism and authoritarianism, that appear together with paternalism, whether latent or manifested.

Paternalism arises concerning restrictions by the law, such as anti-drug and anti-smoking legislation, the compulsory wearing of seat belts, and in medical contexts where physicians withhold relevant information concerning a patient's condition. However, there are legislations such as food and drug standards and controls and weights and measures regulations, which produce benefits for all without being

¹ Please see more about Patronizing Public Health Policies in: Briefing note National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy (2018).

paternalistic. Such regulations seem like protectionism, which shares the idea of benefits for the subjects with paternalism. Theorizing about paternalism raises questions about how persons should be treated when less than entirely rational.

Our main aim is to detect reasons for paternalism by investigating relations between diminished autonomy (for various reasons) and the freedom to act in one's own best interest. Presented historical and sociological findings are supposed to inform the philosophical discussion on paternalism by broadening the topic's scope and adding a more layered background, including drawing our philosophical conclusions based on it.

The central hypothesis is that some social groups value benefits provided by leading authorities more than their autonomy. A reason behind this could be the wanting-liking system². As Camerer (2006, 2008) notes, benevolent agents (or governments) aware of the gap between what individuals want and what they like are then allowed to act paternalistically without risk. "The core idea is simple: if there are separate systems for recording liking, expressing wanting, and for learning to want what the brain likes, then paternalism could be justified if the wanting system produces choices that are not later liked and if a paternalistic correction produces choices that are unwanted by an agent but will be liked by her, or that are wanted but not liked, and if the correction does not cause other harms (or much harm to rational agents)." (Camerer 2006, 92). Possibility for justifying (Behavioural) Paternalism, Salvat (2014) see in similar tensions between unconscious wanting and the subrational liking system.³

For example, smokers resent restrictions, such as not smoking on airplanes. Nevertheless, smokers also realize that they are better off for these restrictions. This example is an obvious case of post justification in the frame of nesting paternalism and works exchangeable with another collateral process-protectionism. We will go back to these exchangeable processes and give other medical examples in part on medical paternalism

When we talk about paternalism, the question arises when it appears. Looking back on the past, we do not have to relate only to written records but also to archaeological material remains. Therefore, it is surprising that the Neolithic studies of the origin of human society and complex social relationships fail to consider it. Neolithization was a time of significant changes in people's lives considering the habitation (both natural and architectural), economy, ways of food and resources procurement, and the appearance of new forms in social and psychological domains. Here, for the first time, we examine the possibilities of looking into the past with no written evidence to detect the beginnings of paternalism and its characteristics.

Scholars agree that reciprocity and solidarity, nurtured by kinship and religion, kept individuals functioning together in hunter-gatherer communities and that set-

² Liking is a conscious state of the brain, meaning that an individual is aware of external stimuli or processes within himself. Wanting is a subconscious state, meaning that processes in the brain occur automatically and without a person noticing. Subconsciousness is where most of the work in our mind gets done: automatic skills, information processing, intuition and dreaming are all examples of unconscious events. Neuroscientists even believe that 95% of our cognitive activities happen in the unconscious mind. See Neurofied. Brain and Behaviour Consultancy (n.d.).

³ See more about wanting-liking mechanism in Winkelman and Berridge (2003).



ting gave rise to other glueing forces that enabled people to live in overcrowded villages. Examining the archaeological evidence from the Neolithization, c. 9-5th millennium B.C. (before Christ) against qualities of contemporary paternalistic leadership allowed us to suggest and claim that paternalism was one of the new forms of interpersonal relations.

However, paternalism as a concept could appear with other forms of social actions toward other persons and ourselves, a set of activities we comprehended as a part of paternalistic behaviour. A gradual acceptance of paternalistic patterns is a crawling patronizing culture and nesting paternalism. In this process, an individual sacrifices autonomy for social benefits and integration into the cultural milieu. Moreover, nesting paternalism is recognized and accepted by both powerful and powerless parties, i.e., paternalizing and the parties being paternalized. We detect this process in different historical contexts, from prehistoric to modern times, and in different systems of society (social, economic, political, and medical).

The second derivate of this patronizing culture is anti-paternalism, which involves a paternalistic act to prevent paternalism. It could prevent urgent assistance to vulnerable/marginal groups to preserve their autonomy. Such action is framed with a kind of passivity of the powerful in cases where they can and sometimes must act, but they do not. Anti-paternalism could easily justify that passivity and will be discussed further in the section on social, economic, and political paternalism.

Our analysis of various actions in the past and present reveals similar relations between leaders and subordinates (or followers) from different time perspectives. We characterize the relations as combined experiences of paternalism-protectionism, paternalism-collectivism, and paternalism-authoritarianism. The main differences between paternalism and other related concepts (authoritarianism, protectionism, collectivism) are the grade and type of subjects' consent about the action for their good. Paternalism and authoritarianism can assume applying the authorities' decisions without the subject's agreement, but in the first case, this action must produce benefits for the subject, while this outcome is not necessary for the second case. On the other hand, protectionism and paternalism share the idea of the subject's wellbeing, but protectionism involves the subject's consent for patronizing action, while paternalism does not. The essential concept in this paper for understanding paternalism is collectivism. Such a cultural setting welcomes paternalism manifested in various forms, some of which we will examine.

Moreover, we discuss whether the given definition of paternalism includes or excludes specific cases or states containing a paternalistic approach (e.g., "against their will," individuals being not entirely rational, exclusively individuals but not groups and the like). The results show that vulnerable or powerless groups begin to think paternalistically, even though there is a fine line between paternalism, protectionism, and authoritarianism. Moreover, once the gap left by one's diminished autonomy is closed with paternalistic thinking, this creates a certain emptiness and dependency within social relations. Employing apathy and "state altruism" (Mitrović 2016), a Nanny State maintains and actively generates groups dependent on state-issued benefits, primarily distributed through corrupt state officials.

2 Dimension 1: Neolithization - An era of emerging leaders.

In order to discuss the historical roots and qualities of paternalism, we compare data from the Neolithization with the characteristics of modern paternalism.

We begin by introducing the historical context and then acknowledging the features of the present paternalistic leadership that we aim to detect in the past. Our analysis of the material from the relevant archaeological literature reveals the probable period of the emergence of paternalism.

Neolithization roughly implies the transition from a mobile to a sedentary lifestyle, from a collector to a producer economy. Gordon Childe (1936) characterized this change as a Neolithic revolution considering the novelties that appear in material culture. Today, it is clear that there are no sharp boundaries between the two periods and that innovations have occurred over many years and independently in different parts of the world. While social complexity can be associated with hunting and gathering communities in the preceding Epipaleolithic/Mesolithic, what characterizes the Neolithic is the appearance of prominent leaders.

Admittedly, it is impossible to discover a past individual's aspirations, thoughts, desires, and inner psychological states and claim paternalism existed. Its usual philosophical definition does not leave room for archaeological contribution to the topic. However, multivocality and contrasting views on paternalism prompted research in diverse scientific disciplines. Its practical and behavioural implications leave material traces, thus enabling us to consider archaeological evidence in terms of paternalism. Namely, we discuss different types of past leadership as manifesting paternalistic aspects. The emergence of leadership and hierarchies in the early Neolithic has been a topic of continuous interest ever since the 1970s when scholars explained the neolithization in socio-political terms⁴ (Bender 1978; Hayden 1992; Kuijt 2002a; Price and Bar-Yosef 2010; Dietrich et al. 2017).

Paternalistic leadership, described by Aycan (2006, 449), is a behaviour accompanied by a family atmosphere in the workplace. The leader fosters close and individualized relationships with employees even beyond the work domain. He attends important events (e.g., wedding and funeral ceremonies, graduations, and like) of his subordinates and provides them help and assistance if necessary. In turn, the leader expects loyalty and commitment from subordinates while maintaining authority by promoting status differences. On the other hand, employees behave to show loyalty and deference. They consider the workplace as a family, willingly accepting the leader's authority. Being emotionally bonded with the paternalistic leader, they protect him from criticisms inside and outside the company. Their engagement in non-work domains involves helping the leader in his personal life if needed.

It is worth emphasizing that paternalistic leadership is a practical construct and does not necessarily involve the statement 'against their will (of subordinates),' unlike the paternalism definition debated in philosophy. Cultural bias imposes *a priori* negative attitude in the perception and reception of paternalism in individualistic cultures. However, it is expected, acceptable and desirable in collectivistic cultures,

⁴ Interestingly, it is also the era of renewing the general debate on paternalism in social sciences and humanities.



at least in the organizational environment. As Aycan (2006, 450) states: “In collectivistic cultures where there is high conformity, more responsibility-taking for others, and more interdependence, paternalism is viewed positively. In contrast, in individualistic societies where autonomy, self-reliance, and self-determination are of pivotal importance, paternalism is undesirable”. Ancient paternalism bears positive connotations since our analyzed period witnesses collectivistic communities and emerging societies. Our sample of material remains from the past limits and directs the research to paternalistic leadership, which is, therefore, partially at odds with the more individualistically framed current extensive philosophical debate on paternalism.

2.1 Study material: Review of the archaeological data

To answer whether we can portray Neolithic leadership and culture as paternalistic, we considered the area of the Near East, precisely the Levant and Eastern Anatolia. The period we are dealing with includes the pre-Neolithic culture Natufian and the early Neolithic culture Pre-Pottery Neolithic (PPN) with several subphases (PPNA, PPNB, and PPNC) which we consider as separate cases. Next, we refer to behavioural manifestations of paternalistic leadership and look for them in prehistoric remains.

The Near East, known as the Fertile Crescent because it is a Neolithic hotspot, is one of the best-explored areas for the period in question. In archaeological terms, it comprises the Levant, from the southeast and central Anatolia in the north to southern Sinai in the south, and from the Mediterranean east to the Saudi Arabian Desert, together with the region of Anatolia. Several cultural phases cover a few millennia of the earliest Neolithic manifestations (Table 1).

2.1.1 Pre-Neolithic hunter-gatherers

Material remains from 12800-10300 years B.P. are marked as the Natufian culture of complex hunter-gatherers with an initial social hierarchy. They lived in base camps with architecture and burial grounds, indicating a certain degree of sedentism,

Table 1 Chronological framework of the neolithization of the Near East. (After Twiss 2008, 425, Table 2; and cultural characteristics as described in the text)

Period	Radiocarbon B.P./before present	Years cal B.C./calibrated before Christ	Cultural trends
PPNA	10200-9400	9700–8500	egalitarian, but inequality emerging
PPNB	–	–	public architecture: communal organization of labour
MPPNB	9500-8300	8500–7250	large settlements, long-distance trade, limited craft specialization ~ divide populations economically, skull cult
LPPNB	8300-7900	7250–6700	food production intensified, storage
PPNC	7900-6000?	6600–6250	population disaggregation and material simplification

and smaller, the so-called satellite sites of various functions (Price and Bar-Yosef 2010; Belfer-Cohen and Bar-Yosef 2002, 21). Natufian hunter-gatherers adapted their habits to different environmental settings to exploit various resources. Gradually, they specialized subsistence strategies in an exhaustive collection of cereals, acorns, and lentils with gazelle hunting, thus provoking inevitable stress on used species. It happened along with the aggregation of the population, which provoked intensive social interactions. The spatial distribution of different ornaments, mainly as beads and pendants, reveals group identity and territoriality (Belfer-Cohen and Bar-Yosef 2002, 23-25). However, the late Natufian sites are similar in size and scarcity of remains, indicating a more mobile way of life.

2.1.2 Case 1: PPNA

Finds from the Pre-Pottery Neolithic A (10200-9400 BP/9700-8500 cal B.C.) indicate a culture of farmers who behave as hunters. Cultivating crops and animals enabled people to live settled and continue hunting and collecting wild fruits and seeds. Villages grew up to 10 times larger than in the previous Natufian period, covering 1.5 to 2.5 hectares with 300–400 inhabitants. Settlement characteristics, like irregular layouts, open house plans, generally accessible outdoor cooking and activity areas together with simple burials without grave goods reflect egalitarian social and economic life inherited from the Epipaleolithic (Twiss 2008, 426). Oval and rounded dwelling structures had mud-brick walls erected on stone foundations. The public constructions which served as silos were raised among the domestic ones. The well-known is the tower of Jericho, sometimes interpreted as a symbol for guarding the identity of the social unit (Price and Bar-Yosef 2010; 153, Belfer-Cohen and Bar-Yosef 2002, 29). Food remains and material culture indicate that feasting activities took place but not regularly as an established practice (Twiss 2008, 428).

2.1.3 Case 2: PPNB (Middle PPNB)

During PPNB (9500-8300 BP/8300-7200 cal B.C.), villages occupied up to 5 ha. People lived in rectangular houses with compartments covering 20-30 square meters. The economic bases were domesticated plants and animals, demanding coordinated actions also needed for the erection of public structures. Moreover, public rituals, indicated by exceptional buildings and sites, open spaces, and large plaster statues suitable for public display, gathered the community. A certain degree of craft specialization and burial characteristics, such as secondary burials⁵, together with the diversity of grave goods and their absence in a certain number, enable us to account for the existence of social and economic stratification. Architectural remains demonstrate the presence of private storage facilities in houses and that houses closer to

⁵ Secondary burial is a practice of exhumation of human remains after a certain period of time after a funeral ceremony and their reburial. They are often organized to enable larger group of people to attend the event, not just kin and household members. In Neolithic periods of the Near East it often includes special treatment of the cranial remains, see more in Kuijt (2002b).



public buildings and squares are larger and equipped with more exotic furniture, which is another indicator of social inequality (Twiss 2008; 426, Price and Bar-Yosef 2010, 155-157).

Symbolic culture promoted egalitarian values, still permitting differentiation between households and kin-group lines within the community. Widely accepted social codes forbade the consolidation of this competition into some form of hereditary power, authority, or status during this period. Community leaders developed and maintained a series of complex social controls, materially reflected through ritual, funeral, and architectural practices, emphasizing affiliation and affinity at the household and community level (Kuijt 2002b, 158-159). During PPNB, cult (ritual) objects appeared en masse. Especially numerous were female figurines, possibly demonstrating a change in traditional gender roles. Architecture and cult objects, together with burials, infer complex social communication and structure (Simmons 2002, 222). Price and Bar-Yosef (2010, 159) assert that evidence for organized communal labour and hierarchy are not enough to portray PPNB societies as chiefdoms.

Changes from simple social structures of hunter-gatherers to a stratified organization, more complex, necessary for the daily functioning of village life, have taken place over several thousand years from Natufian to sedentary life in the PPNB. Although some researchers believe that the degree of egalitarian organization remained, the earlier methods of maintaining social control were no longer viable. More significant population aggregation required more elaborate social cohesion and control. There must have been a relatively efficient organizational structure with some centralized authority to enable the prosperity and development of settlements that probably contained several thousand inhabitants (Simmons 2002, 220-221). The number and context of archaeological finds related to food preparation, display, and consumption, indicate a widespread practice of large-scale collective feasting, often associated with ritual or funerary events (Twiss 2008, 428-431).

2.1.4 Case 3: Late PPNB

The Late Pre-Pottery Neolithic B (LPPNB 8300-7900 BP/7250-6700 cal B.C.) settlements covered around 10 ha, densely populated with large houses with decorated interiors and even floors. The agricultural production intensified, craft specialization became more nuanced, and economic strategies diversified at inter and intrasite levels. Communal labour is invested in social integration (Twiss 2008, 426). Public spaces and buildings which appear in more significant numbers served for various rituals and ceremonies. Analysis of the mortuary practice from the site Kfar Ha-Horesh encompassed grave goods and constructions and the age and sex data of the deceased. The results revealed burials of individuals of both ascribed and achieved status (Price and Bar-Yosef 2010, 158). The LPPNB finds altogether imply more elaborated social complexity.

2.1.5 Case 4: PPNC

Pre-Pottery Neolithic C (7900-7500 BP/6600-6250 cal B.C.) bears evidence of striking population disaggregation and material simplification. People abandoned large



towns and moved to small hamlets. Subsistence and economy were even more dependent on domesticates. Material culture demonstrates a decline in the standardization of lithic tools and poorer investment in houses construction which are smaller in size. However, houses had even more compartments indicating a greater need for private space. The practice of erecting public structures persisted, although non-domestic buildings have not been reported. There is explicit evidence for extensive storage but no traces of large-scale feasts. Mortuary remains emphasized social differentiation while displaying wealth and status symbols was not common practice (Twiss 2008, 426, 432-434). Despite documented sudden and dramatic shifts, there are no remains that would indicate the existence of violence, both within and between settlements (Simmons 2002, 223).

2.2 Pre-Pottery Neolithic indicators of paternalistic leaders

Compared to paternalistic leadership characteristics, the archeological evidence reveals the possibility of paternalistic authorities in prehistory (Table 2).

Table 2 Archaeological indicators of paternalistic leadership. (Archaeological remains of the PPN period presented regarding data from Twiss (2008) and Kuijt (2002b))

Characteristics of paternalistic leadership	Archaeological manifestations	Pre-Pottery Neolithic remains			
		Case 1: PPNA	Case 2: MPPNB	Case 3: LPPNB	Case 4: PPNC
Family atmosphere	Domestic activities (e.g., cooking) in open spaces	+	+	+ ↘	+ ↘
Close relationships;	<i>Public rituals</i>				
Getting involved in the non-work domain	- Secondary burials – common ancestor	–, only skull removal	+	+	+
	- Items visible from a distance	–	+	–	–
	- Ritual/ceremonial buildings	–	+	+ ↗	–
	- Special ritual sites	–	+	–	–
	<i>Feasts</i>	+	+ ↗	+ →	+ ↘
Expecting loyalty	The public architecture – large structures	Tower of Jericho	+ ↗	+ ↗	+ ↘
Maintaining authority	<i>Display of status, i.e., prestige items</i>				
	- A large amount of luxurious/traded items	Unequal quantities at different sites	+, equal distribution	+ ↗	–
	- Display facilities (niches in house walls)	–	+	–	–
	- Commemorative representations of feasts	few zomorphic figurines	Many figurines and trophy bones	+ ↘	↘ few

+ presence

– absence

→ the trend regarding preceding period: ↗ raise and ↘ fall in number



To begin with, let us review paternalistic leadership features (as described by Aycan 2006) and relate them to relevant discoveries from the past. The family atmosphere in the workplace is comparable with ancient domestic activities taking place in open spaces, reflecting sharing and joint participation between multiple households (production units). People shared hearths and cooking utensils in yards between houses. Public rituals and feasts might reflect a leader's engagement in the non-work domain and his close relationships with followers. Archaeological evidence on public rituals is (1) secondary burials. The presence of community members in different stages of burying and reburying human remains reflects their respect for a common ancestor. (2) display of items (large statues and other symbols) visible from a distance. (3) special public buildings and ritual sites. They bear little or no traces of daily domestic activities but are well distinguished from the surrounding context and well equipped with unusual/special/symbolic items. Unlike the private rituals, indicated by small figurines found predominantly inside the houses and intended for family usage, the public rituals brought people together. Monumental sacral architecture and sculpture were helping the audience see the same and evolve feelings of togetherness in the cult performance and later reminding them of special events of joint actions. Household heads, who were also cult practitioners, organized large-scale feasts for numerous attendees. Feasting had many roles within the community. Firstly, it emphasized the ritual and ceremonial events, enhancing an atmosphere of collectivity among participants through sharing food. Consuming the same food draws boundaries around the group, making it sacred and family-like. The term *consubstantial community* (Obeyesekere 2005) denotes creating the identity of a collective individual through the consumption of a consecrated substance. Feasts were unique scenes for leaders to show off and boost with their wealth and abundance. That performance bears a specific political connotation, giving the organizer power over the other elders in competition for supremacy. The aim with underlying exploitative motives is to attract more followers and expand the household. In turn, leaders expected loyalty and readiness from subordinates to contribute when necessary. Public architecture, like large structures of diverse function (wells, silos, etc.), are evidence of communal work under authority's supervision. Display of status, i.e., prestige items, is a feature of leaders maintaining authority. Prehistoric physical indicators of that behaviour are large amounts of luxurious/traded items, display facilities (niches in house walls) for placing precious things, and commemorative representations of feasts (usually animal figurines or other items).

Although all of our cases unveil evidence of paternalistic leaders, they differ in nature and extent. There is a sporadic indication of paternalistic leadership during the PPNA period. In contrast, the archaeological remains indicate that the subsequent PPNB period was indeed an age of paternalistic leaders. Widespread public rituals and feasts and settlement layouts demonstrate a solid social integration and affinity toward the sense of community, i.e., family atmosphere and close interpersonal relationships. On the other hand, the leader would maintain authority by reaffirming his status when displaying luxury (imported, exotic) items and ensuring co-members participation in communal activities. During the Late PPNB and especially PPNC, there was a decline in archaeological indicators for paternalistic leaders. The PPNC findings indicate the collapse of organized settlements with prominent leaders.

Archaeologists cannot reconstruct or scientifically prove a single event paternalistically framed based on material remains. However, we analyzed finds that indicate events (feasts, funerals, ritual, and ceremonial customs), relationships (authorities, household leaders, subordinates/followers, etc.), and behaviours (showing off wealth, building public structures...) within communities that altogether reveal paternalistic atmosphere from the past.

3 Dimension 2: Nesting Paternalism in modern society

Our second data set was obtained through sociological research conducted from the Enquete on the Serbian national sample.⁶ Consequently, we created dimensions and cases based on the chosen responses. The dimension found in the past and present data is diminished autonomy in various life situations. A decrease in autonomous decision-making is gradual and observable in diverse contexts, from “Apathetic society” (Mitrović 2015a) to changes in the way of life (from nomadic to settled). General features of the apathetic society are the absence of anticipation and will to do something good for oneself in one or two subsequent years. The two catalysts of the interaction in the apathetic society are actions and the potential for disappointment. A context like that presents a fertile soil for nesting paternalism.

3.1 Case 1. Medical paternalism: “Nobody asked me,” and “Doctors know what is best for me.”

This case begins with the response of a patient involved in the In Vitro Fertilization (IVF)⁷ procedure. IVF is a form of assisted reproductive technology (ART) which helps a woman become pregnant by applying special medical techniques. It is mainly employed when other, less expensive approaches fail. Here we give a practical example of problematic parts of the definition of paternalism presented in “against their will” and “individuals being not entirely rational.” We questioned ten fully autonomous and rational patients⁸ about the course of the procedure and their agreement with the number of implanted embryos. Patient P2 answered, “Nobody asked me.” Patient P8 concluded that doctors know what is best for patients, so they did not need to inform her about the steps of the medical procedures. The same sentences describe the medical staff’s paternalistic behaviour in eight out of

⁶ Database of The Institute for Sociological Research of the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade. The project No. 17095 of the Serbian Ministry of Science, Technology and Education: “Challenges of new social integration: concepts and actors” [Izazovi nove društvene integracije: koncepti i akteri].

⁷ See more at National Library of Medicine ([n.d.](#)).

⁸ In Serbian, being pregnant can also be said as “being in another state”, which may confuse this part of the definition in such cases. During the interview, a few participants said that they had behaved strangely during the pregnancy. They thought that such behavior was a consequence of the hormonal activities during the gravidity. The point is how women can see themselves as fully autonomous if they are treated as irrational when they are pregnant and irrationality is deemed to be incompatible with being autonomous?

Accepting such a view by medical experts or specific authorities would be one more instance of women being stereotyped as irrational. See relevant research in V. Mitrović (2016, p59:p.63).



ten cases. These would be straightforward examples of Medical Paternalism when the medical staff performs a procedure or treatment on the patients without asking or informing them about it.

The subsequent analysis of the second part of the answers challenges the paternalism definition. After negating the informed consent (“Nobody asked me”), the patient continued with the self-justified paternalistic response: “..., and considering my constitution; I thought three (early embryos, *author note*) were already more than enough.” Both examples demonstrate that the subject post-justified patronizing actions, consequently opposing the paternalism definition of “against their will.” Patients and their relatives often post justified doctors’ paternalistic decisions. One of the reasons for patronizing medical behaviour on this occasion could be an assumed patient’s post-justification, resulting in the medical staff’s assumption that it is not a case of paternalism at all (Gert and Culver 1976, 52).

Nevertheless, it is certainly worth considering what happens in the broader social context if aberrations of autonomy of this kind appear in a specific medical procedure. In the subsequent cases, we will challenge other parts of the philosophical definition of paternalism, e.g., exclusively individuals but not groups and the like, and try to make visible indefinite and common features of paternalism, protectionism, and authoritarianism.

3.2 Case 2: Social, Economic and Political Paternalism: Obedience and false autonomy

Two extreme behaviours, overcare and carelessness, denote paternalism in life’s social and political spheres. A manifestation of the first is the participants’ approval of protectionism. A high ratio (80%) of them favor the protectionist statement that “Everyone has everything they need when the state is strong.” Therefore, social acceptance of quasi-paternalistic measures is not surprising. A collective perspective in the economic sphere of life reveals such an attitude. About 85% of participants consent that the state must prefer domestic firms over foreign companies, and more than 75% think Serbia needs to restrict imports of foreign products. Such patronizing sentiment speaks about the potential justification of paternalism as a concept in general.

Several factors could contribute to the emergence of carelessness. One of them is apathy among various social groups. Relevant indicators of an apathetic society are carelessness toward a weaker member in a family circle and weaker groups in general (Mitrović 2015b). This apathy and carelessness have the same origins but in different grades among groups in the frame of the same society. The vulnerable groups are apathetic due to low socio-economic status, most visible in the miserable living conditions and consequently the absence of anticipation leading to a carelessness toward elders and the weaker member of their group and consequently decreasing their solidarity and protective capacities.

From the perspective of the patronizing part, carelessness could be justified as a reaction to overcare and comprehended as anti-paternalism and presented as invalidating the reason or even duty to act (Grill 2010). In other words, the groups in power used Anti-paternalism to justify this carelessness because it attempts to

depict it as respecting the autonomy of weaker and apathetic groups, thereby camouflaging the immoral omission of helping them. This is why, instead, paternalistic action would be called for to help the weaker groups promote their autonomy or even enable them to make autonomous decisions in the first place.

The power of elites does not lay only in the fact that they may conduct their will with or without the consent of the majority, but rather it is their power not to take action when they are morally and often legally supposed to do (Mitrović 2015a).

Those cases alert the possibility of acting paternalistically to prevent a “paternalistic way of thinking.” Anti-paternalism could appear to avoid urgent assistance to vulnerable/marginal groups to preserve their autonomy. This situation leads to a vicious circle in which the disappointing potential of a group suppresses their autonomous actions to do something good for themselves.

From the economic perspective, protectionist measures for some parts of the domestic industry would be harmful to consumers, and they would pay higher prices due to the restricted import of foreign products. However, this relation is more complex. Overcare for one in non-collectivistic settings can produce a feeling of carelessness for another member of society. The more balanced approach, including care for both parties, requests paternalistic leadership, e.g., measures like subsidies for some branches of industry (cf. Lawrence and Litan 1987). This case represents borderline authoritarianism.

Nevertheless, in collectivistic settings, such actions are part of solidarity. In this context, solidarity also means reciprocity which is the main difference from altruism, which understands a grade of sacrificing own for another wellbeing.

So individuals favouring protectionism (subsidies) could be opposite to, yet evoking, paternalistic management described in our historical dimension.

In family and personal relations, paternalism can have many forms. The relationship between parents and children can be coloured with pseudo-paternalism, which overlaps with socialization and oriented authoritarian modelling. Most parents (70%) confirm that “The most important thing for children is to teach them obedience.” Half of them completely agree with this statement. Compatible with the last is a high percentage of participants (60%) who share an opinion that “interests of the community (state, business, family, city) are consistently above the interests of the individual.” There is nothing wrong with these statements from the collectivistic perspective. Moreover, some authors related such sentiment as an attribute of the community rather than society (Tönnies, 1988).

Nevertheless, social relations are complex. Relevant studies show that usual stereotypes of collectivistic or individualistic cultures are not applicable as general patterns. Oyserman and colleagues’ (2002) research demonstrated that American society was more collectivistic than Japan. In our sample, collectivistic sentiment overlaps hard individualism, reflected in a high acceptance ratio (about 60%) of the statement that an “Individual should rely only on himself and not on the state.” Such brutal individualism may arise from the tension on the margin of the two opposite value systems, individualistic and collectivistic. Our previous example of protectionism carries the potential of one-sided disappointment, displayed in a desperate mode of untrust in a state, or even worse, a society. The disbelief of that kind can lead to the self-abandonment of civil rights. We emphasize that disappointment decreases



the action potential of the group in an apathetic society; furthermore, civil passivity candidates a group to be paternalized despite the internal belief of remaining autonomous.

However, the state should guarantee certain rights besides obligations. Those rights and benefits are not acts of paternalism on their own. On the contrary, civil obligations are often getting protective and patronizing forms. Hence, the last attitude of the participants reflects their diminished autonomy, leaving a person in the false sentiment of the autonomous yet paternalized citizen.

The class perspective could help explain how socially justified obligations could become paternalism in one specific context (e.g., an apathetic society). Namely, a large portion of the participants (74%) agreed that the “Government should levy higher taxes on the rich and subsidize the poor.” Similarly, 70% approve that “The unemployed need to receive more help from the state.” Finally, almost a total (90% of participants) acceptance of the state’s potential minimal guarantee of living standard sets the imaginary boundary of nesting paternalism. Following our description of the last concept as a gradual acceptance of patronizing measures, diminished autonomy, or a continued state of powerlessness due to Nanny state practices might, indeed, lead to these people ultimately being more prone to being paternalized as well, now without their (explicit or implicit) consent. In such cases, the majority of the sample *nolens-volens* define members of one group as the subjects of paternalization (1) without questioning the diminished (autonomous) action potential of that group and (2) petrifying them in the icons of miserable survival. Such groups become dependent on help distributed through corrupted state officials (Zack 2009).

4 Discussion and conclusion

Our results thus far raise the question of whether paternalistic thinking leads to an authoritarian society and paternalism. We will discuss it from a diachronic perspective.

As Aycan (2006, 451-452) states, “The paternalistic leader assumes that he has superiority over his subordinate with respect to key competencies (knowledge, skills, and experience) as well as moral standards. ...[his] status is ascribed by the virtue of his position, age and experience, and therefore his power and authority is legitimated”. Archaeologists’ understandings of leadership in PPN correspond to those statements. While scholars debate about the nature and domain of duties and authorities of the emerging Neolithic leaders, we demonstrated the possibility that, at least for MPPNB, they had been in a paternalistic manner. Most scholars consent that material remains do not indicate the existence of centralized leadership, such as hereditary power. The coexistence of differences between individuals, households, and communities with egalitarianism is visible for PPNB and common in most social systems. On the other hand, there must have been a certain degree of communal leadership for regulatory roles, such as organizing work according to the agrarian calendar. Cult or civic leaders or household elders could have held those positions (Kuijt 2002c; 313-314, Simmons 2007, 167).



According to socio-anthropological research, two varieties of leaders' typical behaviour are described (Benz et al. 2019). Some leaders act as a 'strong hand' who protects and guides a group, expecting unquestioning loyalty. In the material sense, this kind of leadership is recognized by unequal wealth distribution within the community. The group is homogenous with mechanisms developing its identity to separate it from "the strangers." The other leaders maintain their status as *primi inter pares* respected by their peers for exhibiting excellent social skills, e.g., coordinating various interests. The economic wealth is more equally shared within the community led in this manner. The group is rather heterogenous; however, "...social processes of imitation and popularization can lead to a rather homogeneous appearance" (Benz et al. 2019, 2). As our case-study archaeological remains seemingly show properties of both types of community, we turn to quantitative analysis of LPPNB remains from the Levantine site of Ba'ja done by Benz et colleagues (2019). They demonstrated that the community was more inclined to the collectivistic ethos. In an environment characterized in that manner, paternalistic behaviour would be a valued individual skill and a valuable tool for leaders in social negotiations. Our results show similar behaviour in modern communities' social and economic life. However, why and how did this happen in the past?

There was a principle of mechanical solidarity in the earlier hunter-gatherer communities without clear task differentiation. Skilled hunters had the essential task of

		BEHAVIOURAL OCCURRENCE	
		Superior: <i>care</i> <i>Communal rituals</i>	Superior: control <i>Accumulation – redistribution</i>
		Subordinate: loyalty - Public works/deference	Subordinate: conformity /dependency
MOTIVATION	Superior: Benevolence <i>Feasts</i>	benevolent paternalism <i>PPNA?</i>	authoritative approach
	Subordinate: Respect <i>Communal rituals</i>		
	Superior: Exploitation <i>Accumulation, storage</i>	exploitative paternalism <i>PPNB</i>	authoritarian approach <i>LPPNB</i>
	Subordinate: Expectation of rewards <i>Feasts / avoidance of punishment</i>		

Fig. 1 Types of management /leadership styles. ((Published in Aycan 2006, 456, Figure 1) with archaeological indicators and periods (in italic) as described in the text)



providing and distributing meat food⁹, for which they were praised, reflecting a certain kind of protectionism. They obtained a special status within the community, turning them into leaders later in the PPN period with keeping egalitarian values. Clues indicating the existence of Paternalism in PPNA are still poor (see Table 2, Fig. 1). During the Early and Middle PPNB, the mode of production was a household unit (Twiss 2008), whose manager behaved paternalistically, as our research suggested, according to fulfilled criteria of paternalistic leadership. Task differentiation among household members enabled an appropriate setting for nesting paternalism. The leader's task was to care for the community, which in turn obeyed his demands – approvals and prohibitions (in earlier times, a taboo had that regulatory role of determining what an individual must and should not do). As the unique case is impossible to distinguish in an archaeological sample, we interpreted that public rituals and feasts most prominently demark the authority's care for followers, and the monumental public architecture is the evidence of communal organized labour imposed by the same authority. Feasts and mortuary customs events were unique scenes for leaders' performances in demonstrating care for their subordinates, but at the same time, feasts were specific battlefields where household heads boasted of their wealth in competing with each other. They attracted more supporters, resulting in larger households, i.e., extended family as a socio-economic unit in the LPPNB.

An increase in public structures, ceremonial buildings, and luxury items may indicate a need for more effective organizing and more conspicuous leadership. Major changes took place considering cooking activities. Food preparation was a public event between housing units, but it was altered to a private activity in this period. Findings of cooking and consuming diverse foods in broader community gatherings were not numerous; instead, there is extensive evidence for large-scale food production and accumulation (Twiss 2008, 431-432). Supposedly, leaders had the power to make decisions about manipulating food resources. In that case, a decrease in the number of communal consumption events and increased supervised food storage and redistribution indicate the leaders' inclination towards a more authoritarian approach in LPPNB and later (see Fig. 1).

The flourishing periods of MPPNB and LPPNB ended with the depopulation of large settlements in PPNC. A scarcity of resources, provoked by deteriorating climatic conditions and human overexploitation, led people to turn to a more nomadic way of life and inhabit small villages. Human mismanagement played a significant role in this shift. Because of the overcrowding of settlements, a need for influential organizations, meaning more powerful leaders, had arisen. However, while leaders were competing, more people chose to retain more egalitarian systems and abandon that trajectory of their earlier lifestyle (Simmons 2002, 223, 2007, 189). In other words, people refused to show the dependence on their leaders that is expected in the LPPNB authoritarian management. This prehistoric long-duration sequence of events (paternalistic leaders possibly in PPNA, surely and especially in MPPNB, authoritarian managers in LPPNB, and final collapse in PPNC) confirms that pater-

⁹ Collected food (like plants, berries, mollusks...) provided the same amount of calories, but the game was appreciated also for fat, fur, difficult procurement.

nalistic leadership is not sustainable, “an organization will find itself fighting against its culture to thrive” (Aycaan 2006).

It seems that higher rates of collectivistic and authoritarian attitudes opened a space for nesting paternalism. At the socio-political level, a change is represented by more than half the sample approving the thinking that “Serbia had always done better when a capable leader was in power who took responsibility for making the most important decisions.” Consistent with the last is the statement, “The state must have a strong leader whom parliament or elections would not constrain.” To better understand the crawling potential of nesting paternalism, we consider an even ratio of disagreement to those statements missing in previous cases.

A relatively significant group rejects being paternalized, like in the past in neolithization. An interruption in the emergence of a global paternalistic culture is perceivable from a time perspective. In general, it consists of the picture of the group who refuses to settle en masse because of the psycho-social side effects.

Similarly, it is recently expressed as a prevalence of the paternalistic pattern (65% against 22%) framed with the statement, “Without a leader, every nation is like a headless man.” Consistent with the last is the attitude representing paternalistic behaviour patterns (70%, absolute 50%) that “we need more respect for authority in the future.”

Those cases alert to nesting paternalism, i.e., the gradual acceptance of paternalistic patterns. In this process, an individual sacrifices autonomy for social benefits and integration into the cultural milieu. The second derivate is anti-paternalism, which acts paternalistically to prevent paternalism.

Anti-paternalism is used to camouflage the powerful parties’ carelessness and lack of (the morally required) support of vulnerable and marginal groups, including avoiding promoting or reviving their autonomy. It could prevent urgent assistance to vulnerable/marginal groups to preserve their autonomy.

In Table 3, we summarized cases of nesting paternalism. Paternalism appears in all spheres of life, and authoritarianism in the family and political domain. The protectionist mindset in the social and economic domains could be interpreted as a similar paternalistic sentiment. However, preserving economic autonomy and self-sufficiency is deeply rooted and probably unconscious resistance to paternalistic culture. The same scenario we encountered in past communities.

We want to stress that an apathetic society resulting from a pandemic, crisis, or various slow disasters with vulnerable groups is fertile ground for the observed forms of paternalism. Causes are present in a specific group or sphere of life, e.g., diminished autonomy in a particular procedure or a distinct social group.

Table 3 Cases of nesting paternalism

Forms	Cases			
	Medical	Family	Social and economic	Political
Paternalism	+	↘	↘	↘
Protectionism			+	
Authoritarianism		+		+

+ presence

↘ decreasing trend regarding Authoritarianism/Protectionism



Motives for paternalism could be found in a transformation of paternalistic or similar (authoritarianism and protectionism) behaviour which begins with diminished autonomy. Both parties recognized it, powerless and those in power in diverse life situations, from medical procedures and socialization to social, economic, and political systems. In collectivistic settings, the specter of some motives ranges from hard individualism to equal welfare distribution (Arneson 1989), e.g., subsidizing and guaranteed incomes. Such catalysts of (quasi) paternalistic actions can be detected in the indicators of authoritarianism or protectionism on both sides in the social and political dimensions of everyday lives. Disappointed persons or groups display their motto of brute individualism. At the same time, they abdicate their civil rights and stay just as the subjects of the social obligations and restrictions, which are often very patronizing. In the same disappointment and apathetic groups, action potential (volens-nolens) is endangered by miserable survival. Aside from declarative abdication of “state help” (civil rights and social welfare) and mere surviving, there are also different motives such as distributive and social justice.

Nevertheless, an increase in apathy and decreased autonomy and duty to do something good for themselves is followed by different motives that are part of protectionism and authoritarianism. Those motives are not strictly actions regarding another’s wellbeing. There are also welcomed subsidies that may become a permanent part of some mere survival, whether we speak about surviving of an individual, group, or branch.

Those needs and requests are recognized from some authorities’ side as well. Such context generates morally required paternalistic interventions. However, it could lead to anti-paternalism (by the powerful), which is a poor excuse not to do what is morally required.

Ultimately, the paternalistic actions called for always need to aim not only for the others’ wellbeing but also for promoting their autonomy.

Acknowledgements We would like to thank Reviewers for all their valuable comments and suggestions and also we sincerely appreciate Michael Kühler’s time and effort invested in carefully reviewing the manuscript. Their committed engagement helped us in improving the quality of the manuscript. This paper was written as part of the 2022 Research Program of the Institute of Social Sciences and the Faculty of Philosophy-University of Belgrade, with the support of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

Conflict of interest V. Mitrović and M. Mitrović declare that they have no competing interests.

References

- Arneson, J. Richard. 1989. Paternalism, Utility and Fairness. *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 43(170): 409-437.
- Aycan, Zeynep. 2006. Paternalism. Towards Conceptual Refinement and Operationalization. In *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology. International and Cultural Psychology*, eds. Uichol Kim, Kuo-Shu Yang, Kwang-Kuo Hwang, 445-466. Boston, MA: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-28662-4_20
- Beauchamp, Tom L. and James F. Childress. 2019. *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. 8th ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Belfer-Cohen, Anna and Ofer Bar-Yosef. 2002. Early sedentism in the Near East. A bumpy ride to village life. In *Life in Neolithic farming communities – Social organization, identity and differentiation*, ed. Ian Kuijt, 19-37. Boston, MA: Springer.

- Bender, Barbara. 1978. Gatherer-hunter to a farmer: A social perspective. *World Archaeology* 10(2): 204-222.
- Benz, Marion, Julia Gresky, Denis Štefanisko, Hala Alarashi, Corina Knipper, Christoph Purschwitz, Joachim Bauer, and Hans Georg K. Gebel. 2019. Burying power: New insights into incipient leadership in the Late Pre-Pottery Neolithic from an outstanding burial at Ba'ja, southern Jordan. *PLoS ONE* 14(8): e0221171. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0221171>
- Briefing note National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy. 2018. How Can We (and Why Should We) Analyze the Ethics of Paternalistic Policies in Public Health?
- Buchanan, Allen E. and Dan W. Brock. 1990. *Deciding for Others: The Ethics of Surrogate Decision Making*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139171946>
- Camerer, Colin F. 2006. Wanting, Liking, and Learning: Neuroscience and Paternalism. *The University of Chicago Law Review* 73: 87-110.
- Camerer, Colin F. 2008. The Case of Mindful Economics. In *The Foundations of Positive and Normative Economics: A Handbook*, eds. Andrew Caplin and Andrew Schotter. New York, USA: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Childe, Vere Gordon. 1936. *Man makes himself*. London: Watts & Company
- Childress, James F. 2015. Moral considerations: Bases and limits for public health interventions. In *Essentials of public health ethics*, eds. Ruth Gaare Bernheim, James F. Childress, Alan Melnick, and Richard J. Bonnie, 21-42. Burlington: Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- Dietrich, Oliver, Jens Notroff, and Klaus Schmidt. 2017. Feasting, Social Complexity, and the Emergence of the Early Neolithic of Upper Mesopotamia: A View from Göbekli Tepe. In *Feast, famine or fighting? Multiple pathways to social complexity*, eds. Richard J. Chacon and Ruben G. Mendoza, 91-132. Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-48402-0_5
- Dworkin, Gerald. 2020. Paternalism. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/paternalism/> First published Wed Nov 6, 2002; substantive revision Wed Sep 9, 2020. Accessed on September 22, 2019.
- Gert, Bernard and Charles M. Culver. 1976. Paternalistic Behaviour. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 6(1): 45-57
- Grill, Kalle. 2010. Anti-Paternalism and Invalidation of Reasons. *Public Reason* 2(2): 3-20.
- Grill, Kalle. 2011. Paternalism. In *Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics*, Second Edition, ed. Ruth Chadwick, 359-369. Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-373932-2.00184-8>
- Hayden, Brian. 1992. Models of domestication. In *Transitions to agriculture in prehistory*, eds. Anne B. Gebauer and T. Douglas Price, 11-19. Madison, Wisconsin: Prehistory Press.
- Kuijt, Ian (ed.). 2002a. *Life in Neolithic farming communities – Social organization, identity and differentiation*. Boston, MA: Springer.
- Kuijt, Ian. 2002b. Keeping the peace. Ritual, skull caching and community integration in the Levantine Neolithic. In *Life in Neolithic farming communities – Social organization, identity and differentiation*, ed. Ian Kuijt, 137-164. Boston, MA: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-47166-3_6
- Kuijt, Ian. 2002c. Near Eastern Neolithic research. Directions and trends. In *Life in Neolithic farming communities – Social organization, identity and differentiation*, ed. Ian Kuijt, 311-322. Boston, MA: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-47166-3_13
- Lawrence, Robert Z. and Robert E. Litan. 1987. Why protectionism doesn't Pay. *Harvard business review*. <https://hbr.org/1987/05/why-protectionism-doesnt-pay> Accessed on August 19, 2021
- Mill, J. S. 1869. *On liberty* (4th Edition). London: Longman, Roberts & Green Co.
- Mitrović, Veselin. 2015a. *Apathetic Society*. Belgrade: Čigoja publishing and Institute for sociological research (*Bežvoljno društvo*). Beograd: Čigoja štampa i Institut za sociološka istraživanja).
- Mitrović, Veselin. 2015b. Resilience: detecting vulnerability in marginal groups. *Disaster Prevention and Management* 24(2): 185-200. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DPM-05-2014-0096>
- Mitrović, Veselin. 2016. Parents' religious and secular perspectives on IVF planning in Serbia. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies* 15(43): 48-81.
- National Library of Medicine. <https://medlineplus.gov/ency/article/007279.htm>
- Neurofied. Brain and Behaviour Consultancy. <https://neurofied.com/difference-wanting-liking/>
- Obeyesekere, Gananath. 2005. *Cannibal talk. The man-eating myth and human sacrifice in the South seas*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
- Oyserman, Daphna, Heather M. Coon, and Markus Kemmelmeier. 2002. Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin* 128: 3-72. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.1.3>
- Price, T. Douglas and Ofer Bar-Yosef. 2010. Traces of Inequality at the Origins of Agriculture in the Ancient Near East. In *Pathways to Power. New Perspectives on the Emergence of Social Inequality*,



- eds. T. Douglas Price and Gary M. Feinman, 147-168. New York, NY: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-6300-0_6
- Salvat, Christophe. 2014. Behavioural Paternalism. *Revue de Philosophie Economique / Review of Economic Philosophy* 15(2): 109-130.
- Simmons, Allan H. 2007. *The Neolithic revolution in the Near East. Transforming the human landscape*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press
- Simons, Allan H. 2002. Villages on the edge. Regional settlement change and the end of the Levantine Pre-Pottery Neolithic. In *Life in Neolithic farming communities – Social organization, identity and differentiation*, ed. Ian Kuijt, 211-230. Boston, MA: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-47166-3_9
- Tönnies, Ferdinand. 1988 (1887). *Community and Society (Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft)*. Oxfordshire: Routledge.
- Twiss, Katheryn C. 2008. Transformations in an early agricultural society: Feasting in the southern Levantine Pre-Pottery Neolithic. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 27: 418-442. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaa.2008.06.002>
- Winkelman, Piotr and Ken Berridge. 2003. Irrational Wanting and Subrational Liking: How rudimentary motivational and affective processes shape preferences and choices. *Political Psychology* 24(3): 657-680.
- Zack, Naomi. 2009. *Ethics for Disaster*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Springer Nature oder sein Lizenzgeber hält die ausschließlichen Nutzungsrechte an diesem Artikel kraft eines Verlagsvertrags mit dem/den Autor*in(nen) oder anderen Rechteinhaber*in(nen); die Selbstarchivierung der akzeptierten Manuskriptversion dieses Artikels durch Autor*in(nen) unterliegt ausschließlich den Bedingungen dieses Verlagsvertrags und dem geltenden Recht.