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Rebellion and Inequality in Archaeology unites articles describing theoretical approaches and discourses as well as investigations with the application of middle-range theories in order to detect social differences and rebellion in specific case studies. While the theoretical remarks integrate critical approaches on concepts about inequalities and social conflicts, the approaches on the identification of inequality and rebellion include studies of Neolithic, Chalcolithic, Bronze Age, Iron Age and modern archaeology.

While the term “rebellion” or even the question of the detection of social “revolution” has only been inquired about in rare circumstances in archaeology, within our attempt a configuration of archaeological archives regarding both inequality and rebellion is envisaged.

In a first effort, Johannes Müller provides a general picture of the development of social inequality and social conflicts in European prehistory. For non-Mediterranean Europe, he draws a kind of wavy-line boom and bust of social differentiation from the Mesolithic to the Iron Age. This contrasts with most evolutionist views that indicate a steady increase of social inequalities from the Palaeolithic to the Iron Age. Within the general empiric observation, a social boom and bust of rebellions plays its role in his diachronic case studies, finalizing periods of stronger social stratification.

In the first block of contributions to this volume: “Inequality and Rebellion: Theoretical Remarks”, four authors specify their systematics and criticism on social events, processes and structures. The philosopher Vesa Arponen introduces the capability approach to the archaeology of inequalities. Inequalities are not generally seen as pure differences in material conditions, but welfare is rather defined as the possibility of individuals and groups of individuals to gain access to resources or doings. Using an archaeological example, the evaluation of the new approach was tested. As in Arponen’s approach, in which the household and the being is of importance, the sociologist Matthias Jung critically introduces Bourdieu’s concept of habitus with respect to social inequality. He develops a straightforward critique on the possibilities to identify the kind of social practice that was described by Habermas for recent societal conditions.

With respect to social “revolutions”, the philosopher Konrad Ott develops aspects of novelty, liberation, violence, agency, scale, scope and narratives within his theoretical approach as a kind of model to categorise social conflicts in relation to history, revolutionary doctrines, spectators and phenomenology. Within such a reflection on “revolution” mainly concerning modern societies, the distinction of triggers also seems to be relevant for the archaeology of rebellion. In a further contribution, Vesa Arponen identifies social conflict in the context of Sen’s capability approach. In his view, particularly the disenfranchisement of certain parts of the population could be a trigger of social upheaval. Subsequently, the archaeologist Reinhard Bernbeck sets the notion of “rebellion” in relation to terms such as evasion and revolution. He argues that rebellion is “a particular type of (mostly unsuccessful) resistance in societies with institutionalized power. No analysis of such kinds of resistance can be complete without an understanding of the specific types of ‘governmentalities’ against which they work” (Bernbeck this volume). In Bernbeck’s view, a reading in between the lines is necessary to observe aspects of “counter-power” in the archaeological record.

In the second section of investigations in this volume “Inequality and Rebellion: The
Archaeological Record", authors of different ideological schools cope with different methods and interpretations from the Neolithic to modern times. Arne Windler presents a quantification of wealth differences in the material representation of individuals in the cemetery of Durankulak (5200–4600 BCE), Bulgaria. The author uses the Gini-Index to display "inequality". Svend Hansen is able to develop a kind of "iconography of inequality" by the identification, e.g., of the "lion" as a more general symbol for kingship (4th and 3rd millennia BCE). In doing so, he can trace power and kingship in the North Caucasus. Moreover, traces of inequality are represented in his view in the differences of figurine design with an increasing display of ornaments on the body, which seem to have become ever more important since the 7th millennium BCE.

Douglas Price and Brigitte Gebauer analyse South Scandinavian Early and Middle Neolithic societies (ca. 4000–2500 BCE) with respect to surplus: “Material wealth is what we commonly think of in terms of land, livestock, slaves, jewellery, and other objects. Relational wealth involves an individual’s place in society in social networks, including the number of connections a person or groups may have. What Smith et al. call embodied wealth involves personal conditions and abilities – health, strength, endurance, intelligence, knowledge, and skills” (Price/Gebauer this volume). If so, “the amount of grave goods in some non-megalithic graves and dolmens and the few select graves placed in the earthen long barrows suggest a strong and public focus on particular individuals” (ibid.). In her essay on megalithic monuments and equality, Maria Wunderlich identifies feasting activities in connection with megalithic monuments and enclosures (3700–2800 BCE). She pinpoints similar patterns in the materiality of ethnographic examples and TRB monumentality with an emphasis on a non-stratified society.

Sławomir Kadow is also able to describe the changes of a place from a domestic site with competing, but balanced families and clans to a cemetery for a Late Neolithic context in Southeastern Poland (ca. 2050 BCE), thus illustrating the destruction of the former structures. On a symbolic level, he could identify the use of Bell Beaker symbolism by a partitioning and later ruling group: “Precisely for that reason, to gain indispensable legitimation for their new moral order, the social movement promoting new ideology made use of symbols and rituals rooted in the old-sanctioned BB tradition” (Kadow this volume).

Matheusz Jaeger is able to disassociate the social structures of the Carpathian Bronze Age from a centre-periphery approach: Assumed Aegean influences were not the trigger of social developments in a periphery, but local and regional developments fostered local adaptations and changes. In her empiric comparison of circum-alpine Bronze Age cemeteries, Mireille David-Elbiali indicates that mainly age or gender aspects characterise social differentiation.

For Bronze Age Caucasia, Sabine Reinhold demonstrates shifts between segmented, communal and cellular organized settlements: “[…] the conceptual sequence of an emerging elite followed by a nearly egalitarian lifestyle visible in the organization of social space in the North Caucasian Late Bronze Age represents a rare case study of a quick succession of an opposing organisation concept” (Reinhold this volume). In principle, she states that social conflict, such as a rebellion, was responsible for the kind of change that is visible in the changing settlement pattern.

In his investigation on Iron Age societies of South-Central Europe, Manuel Fernández-Götz outlines a development towards strongly socially differentiated societies that collapsed at different times for different reasons. While the establishment of Late Hallstatt Fürstensitze or Late La Tène oppida corresponds to climatically favourable phases, the destruction of sites and systems in some regions seems to be connected to social tension. In Late La Tène, a new stage of development is reached: “A combination of factors – including progressive demographic growth, an upsurge in demand by the Mediterranean world and the introduction of new techniques that allowed agricultural and industrial output to be increased – would have led to a rise in ‘social density’ and increased hierarchisation, which could no longer be so easily reduced by resorting to migration as in earlier times” (Fernández-Götz this volume).

While Manuel Fernández-Götz draws a general picture of Iron Age development, Nils
Müller-Scheußel investigates possible aspects of social unrest in the Early Iron Age world.

Finally, Ulrich Müller proceeds with an analysis of the historical archaeology of resistance, integrating written sources and reports into what is observable and what is not observable. Things and materiality of a 18th and 19th-century slave prison and of a 20th-century peace camp are evaluated to detect resistance in action.

Inequality and Rebellion in Archaeology integrates a wide diversity of approaches as well as a joint perspective in detecting events and processes of social hierarchisation and social conflict, and the reasons for such developments. In consequence, archaeology has many possibilities to reconstruct both the diachronic development of social inequality and social resistance.
ABSTRACT

For European prehistory, two models of the development of social inequality can be delineated: one model indicates a tendential increase as opposed to a second, which assumes a wave-shaped increase and decrease of social stratification. In the latter, rebellions and other forms of resistance against social differentiation are identified as one of many practices within societies to prevent social stratification. On the basis of three examples, these social theoretical observations will be discussed and combined to a view about hierarchy and balance in prehistoric societies.

INTRODUCTION

Among the most pressing problems of today’s world is the development of social inequalities (Milanovic 2016; Piketty 2014). Due to the unequal distribution of goods and the unequal access to resources, numerous consequences are experienced, including forms of peaceful and violent resistance against existing conditions as well as increasing mobility between societies that are differently structured—both socially and institutionally. Correspondingly, in recent decades the discussion on inequalities in prehistoric societies has significantly increased not only in European archaeology (e.g. Cardarelli et al. 2017; Earle/Kristiansen 2011; Flannery/Marcus 2012; Hansen/Müller 2010; Kienlin/Zimmermann 2012; Knipper et al. 2015; McGuire/Paynter 1991; Meller et al. 2016; Müller/Bernbeck 1996; Price/Feinman 2010; Price/Feinmann 1995; Vandkilde 2010). In addition to theoretical and methodological discourses on the recognition of “social inequality” in pre-literate societies, it is also a challenge how inequalities can be identified with purely archaeological sources without the corresponding find coherence being superimposed by simple theoretical aspects, which can also have antithetical meanings. Although discourses on social inequality determine the scientific orientation of social archaeology per se, the processes of social development, especially for pre-literate societies, have still not been sufficiently described. On the one hand, individual and singular events are described, while, on the other hand, various factors are identified, which are intended to determine medium and long-term social developments. In fact, external factors are often mentioned in order to explain social change. The last examples of this are the prehistoric “migrations” that have been reconstructed by aDNA analyses, which again illustrate a strong cultural-historical view of change processes due to external population dynamics (Heyd 2017; Kristiansen et al. 2017).

In contrast, it is increasingly apparent that internal changes, even of short-term nature, can be identified particularly in light of improved archaeological field and evaluation methods. While in previous research the aspects of short-term events, resulting from experienced uncertainties due to social inequality, were often not discussed, we can now identify internal social conflicts with the political actors of those affected. Correspondingly, it is possible to address social conflicts, which as rebellions or revolutions either violently or peacefully led to short-term changes with long-term effects. In the following, I will accordingly deal with concepts of social devel-
If one looks at European prehistory before the development of state societies, two different poles of interpretation of the archaeological archives regarding social development can be identified. On the one hand, the assumption of the continual increase of social inequality between Palaeolithic and Iron Age or early medieval societies (e.g. GRÜNERT 1982) and, on the other hand, the assumption of a rather wavy-shaped increase and decrease of social inequality during prehistory without any major discernible social differences until the last pre-Christian centuries (e.g. KNIPPER et al. 2015) (Fig. 1–2). Between these two poles there is, of course, a large range for interpretational possibilities (BOWLES et al. 2010). Moreover, it is conceivable but has not yet been discussed that social differences were especially high in non-state-organised societies and that socially more “equal” relations first arose through the development of pre-state and state regulation mechanisms. Such a concept has rarely been investigated in archaeological and anthropological analyses (in contrast cf. KNAUFT 1991).

Figure 1 represents the model in which increasing social differences are assumed. Among its basic concepts is the assumption that foraging groups are to be considered as socially equal, which, of course, does not exclude inequality due to biological factors or the like. In the framework of a changing economy and demographic increases, successive farming or artisan-oriented societies are interpreted to have been more socially differentiated. In most cases, these social differences are traced back to a non-hereditary exercise of social power during the European Neolithic, to inheritable domination during the Bronze Age and to hegemonially-based domination in the pre-Christian Iron Age. Accordingly, basic concepts have been generated, for example, the discussion in Central Europe about Bronze Age “elites”, who determined the eco-

---

Fig. 1. Model of the increase of social differences in European prehistory: The example of North and South Central Europe. Triggers: 1 establishment of horti- and agricultural practices; 2 copper metallurgy and changes in transport technologies; 3 subcontinental value systems and networks; 4 site agglomeration; 5 iron technology (cf. MÜLLER 2013).

Fig. 2. Model of the wave-shaped increase and decrease of social differences for prehistoric Europe: The example of North and South Central Europe. South Central European social constitutes: 1 Late LBK; 2 Michelsberg formation; 3 Late Neolithic formation; 4 Later Beaker development; 5 Late Hallstatt oppida. North Central Europe constitutes: 1 Early Ertebølle; 2 Early Neolithic TRB; 3 Young Neolithic Corded Ware; 4 Late Neolithic/Nordic Older Bronze Age; 5 Iron Technology (cf. FERNANDEZ-GÖTZ 2017; GRÖNENBORN 2016; MÜLLER 2013; ZIMMERMANN 2012).

---

“Domination” is understood as the institutionalised possibility of authority over persons, animals and other resources.
economic and cultural orientation of societies (Bertemes 2016; Cardarelli 2017; Earle/Kristiansen 2010; Egg/Quast 2009; Harding 2000; Kristiansen/Larsson 2005; Lull et al. 2011; Strahm 2010), or the localization of Late Hallstatt “princes”, who dominated tributary territories like, e.g., a medieval “Personenverbandsstaat”, based on a relationship of dependency between the powerful and the powerless (Biel/Krausse 2003; Egg 1996; Hänsei 1998; Kimmig 1983; Krausse 2010; Steffen 2012; Zürn 1970). In contrast, Late Palaeolithic and Mesolithic groups, as such, are viewed as having a lower level of goods and considered to have been only slightly differentiated (Glorstad 2010; Grön 2003; Grünberg 2000; Klassen 2004; Smith et al. 2010; Klassen 2004, 257–271), whereas Neolithic societies are interpreted as “Big Man” societies of acephalous character or such with an organized, but variable social constitution (Cazzella/Recchia 2017; Klassen et al. 2010; Furholt 2017; Gronenborn 2016; Müller 2011; Parkinson 2006).

The illustrated developmental model evolves from very different ideological directions. We recognize a cultural-historical basis, which supposes, for example, strong social similarity of social conditions for Central Europe between the Iron Age and medieval times simply due to shorter temporal distances (Kimmig 1983). A rather Marxist perspective is recognized, which assumed increasing social differentiation due to an increasing division of labour in light of increasingly complex technologies (Engels 1884; Grünert 1982; Morgan 1877; Spring 1984). Finally, we also deal with a processual-evolutionist concept, which identifies increasing social differentiation from a social-anthropological perspective as a result of the increasing population size of social units and more complex technological development (Fried 1960; Johnson 1982; Service 1962).

Figure 2 depicts the model that assumes more or less similar social development in Europe until first state structures emerge. This model has not yet been discussed in this form, but it is based on different approaches. Empirically, it is assumed that long-term stable social structures are only archaeologically verifiable in very rare cases until La Tène times. In many analyses, it is also presented how social differentiation takes place, but also how this is repeatedly discontinued or interrupted (Eisenhauer 1999a; Fernandez-Götz 2017; Fernandez-Götz/Krausse 2016; Kneisel et al. 2012; Zimmermann 2012). From a social anthropological perspective, many studies emphasize sociologically, for example, that differences in social organization must not necessarily exist between agrarian and foraging societies (Bowles et al. 2010; Shennk et al. 2010). Particularly concerning technology developments or population densities, an increasing number of examples indicate that corresponding areas are not necessarily linked to economic forms or social categories. Larger population densities do not necessarily imply stronger social stratification; even technologies that are based on a division of labour can operate in a social horizontal instead of in a stratifying manner. For Central Europe, there are observations in basic archaeological sources, which, for example, verify the development of intensified social stratification for the Early Chalcolithic Period (Baalberge), the Early Bronze Age (Únětice) or the pre-Christian Iron Age (Late Hallstatt / Early La Tène), which, however, is then discontinued (Fernandez-Götz 2017; Gronenborn 2016; Kneisel 2001; Nakoinz 2013). From these observations, the concept of a wave-shaped movement with stronger and weaker social stratification is developed. The latter model implies transformation processes in which social conflicts, for example, in the form of rebellions, emerge and lead to renewed “social equality”.

ASPECTS OF SOCIAL CONFLICTS

Independent of the original causes of, for example, increasing social stratification, in many historical and recent cases an increase of conflicts can be observed, ultimately leading to rebellions or organized revolutions against existing conditions. In contrast to historical investigations or recent political debates, the concrete reconstruction of social conflicts rarely played a role in the archaeology of pre-liter-
ate societies. As already shown, for a long time this was due to the unsharpness of archaeological sources, which in the meanwhile is no longer relevant due to the improvement of methodology. We now know that respective inner-social disputes can also be verified for prehistoric societies (Arnold 2010; Arponen et al. 2015). A decisive contribution to this development is made by hypotheses, which determine internal instead of external causes as the impetus for changes. Accordingly, destruction horizons, the plunder of goods and the like can be interpreted in light of internal social conflicts.

In principle, we can differentiate between different spatial, temporal and intensity scales:

- The destruction of rich households and their housing within individual settlements indicates local effects of social compensation, which could not be achieved in another way.
- The widespread destruction of weapons or jewellery can point to a regional tendency to ideologically destroy “expendable” or “unwanted” artifacts.
- The destruction of outstanding neighbourhoods in settlement communities indicates planned actions that were accomplished.
- A medium-term, persistent destruction of community facilities or also the discovery of mass graves at certain facilities may indicate spatially broad actions in the framework of social disputes.

Fundamentally, different spatial dimensions of violent processes become clear – from locally restricted to regional or even transregional effective conflicts. The processes of change at the end of the Central European Linear Pottery culture definitely verify that we may not be dealing with singular events but with longer lasting conflicts (Eisenhauer 1999b).

THREE EXAMPLES OF SOCIAL CONFLICTS

Within archaeological archives, as described, numerous findings and finds can be placed in the context of social conflicts – including the framework of rebellions or organised revolutions with social consequences. In the following, three examples from the pre-Christian Iron Age, the Bronze Age and the Neolithic may show how the compilation of evidence with well-developed chronologies enables a corresponding interpretation of short-term events.

Southern German Iron Age: Heuneburg and Magdalenenberg

A relative impressive example is known from the Southern Central European Late Hallstatt period (Arnold 2010; Fernandez-Götz 2017; Krausse/Fernandez-Götz 2012; Kurz 2010) (Fig. 3). In the framework of the development of Southern German/Eastern French oppida, the Heuneburg developed as a large settlement agglomeration on the Upper Danube from about 620 BCE onwards. An upper settlement, which was spatially separated from the rest of the settlement by an elaborate fortification, constituted the political centre of the entire settlement, which developed into a strongly socially differentiated facility, encompassing ca. 100 ha and including a reconstructed population of about 5000 persons. Obviously, the concentration of certain crafts and subsistence goods in the upper settlement bestowed the inhabitants with an increasingly prominent position.

Since with the central Heuneburg settlement area we are dealing with the oldest part of the settlement agglomeration from the end of the 7th century BC, and the remaining so-called outer settlement with inserted but continuing agrarian homestead structures (“Gehöftstrukturen”) developed around this topographically elevated settlement during the first half of the 6th pre-Christian century, it can be assumed that in the centre we are also concentrating on the older, perhaps mythical founder families of the Heuneburg (Kurz
There, houses could be seen as occupied ancestor houses that represent the ritual centre of the further developing lineages in the lower settlement (for the concept “ancestor houses” cf. Gunawan 2000). Obviously, the concentration of economic, political and ritual power among the central families led to a situation in which they spatially distanced themselves from the rest of the population through representative buildings, for example, the seemingly Mediterranean mud brick wall as a visible, inner fortification (i.a. also for a separation from the rest of the settlement) that was connected to a huge representative gateway on dry stone masonry.

The violent events, which have already been described a number of times, occurred around 540/530 BC and destroyed the mud brick wall, i.a., with a large fire. This can be interpreted as a form of inner rebellion. The outer settlement was abandoned and again a more dispersed settlement pattern with individual farms without an obvious linkage to the central settlement of the Heuneburg is discernible. In the central settlement, the re-emergence of a simple settlement structure also occurs with separate instead of common grain storage. In Siegfried Kurz’s interpretation, the descendants of the “inner” families are precisely the actors, who resisted within the clan structures against the developing dominance of the central “acropolis”. An expression of these changes is not only the recurrence of the late Heuneburg settlement with a significantly smaller concentration of demographic and economic power or the return to a typical regional fortification type but also the import of Mediterranean goods, such as wine amphorae or Attic black-figured shards, which obviously represent a new legitimation in a different reference system. The fact that these imported Mediterranean goods represent a generally more equitable reference system is illustrated by their occurrence at contemporaneous non-fortified settlements. The reference to the “ancestors”, which was strongly associated with the ancestor-houses of the central settlement in the beginning phase of the Heuneburg, took place thereafter in large burial mounds above the former outer settlement.

Therefore, we recognize a social rebellion in the Heuneburg at ca. 540/530 BC, which led, on the one hand, to an intra-societal reduction of social power of a specific group within the settlement and, on the other hand, to a disintegration in settlement. In his analysis, Manuel Fernández-Götz specifies how in the intermediate-term particularly such events arguably led to a reduction and finally to the collapse of the Late Hallstatt/Early La Tène social system in the West Hallstatt sphere (Fernández-Götz 2017).

In contexts associated with the instability of social systems, there are also other examples leading from the Late Hallstatt framework, which can be associated with social conflicts. The occurrence of grave robbery can be mentioned, which in the case of representative burial monuments particularly points to the instability of a political system.

Thus, we know the Late Hallstatt large burial mound at Magdalenenber from ca. 620 BC, which measures 120 m in diameter and in-
could be evidence of violent, inner-social changes, which were not necessarily organized but rather also occurred due to rebellions. A motivation for the hoard finds of the Bronze Age is conceivable, for example, like those, which we experienced at the end of the last century under the motto "swords to ploughshares".

For the Early Bronze Age, we could assume, for example, the demolishment of weapons and their ritual deposition in the ground in order to counter an ideology, which manifested itself through warrior ideologies. Associated activities would also have been the expression of social "rebellions" against the established Early Bronze Age social model.

In principle, these various arguments could be combined to a picture of social-historical development, in which the strongly indicated social stratification of Early Bronze Age society led to the Central European Middle Bronze Age as a result of internal social problems, which also included local rebellions. At least in some regions of Central Europe, we recognize processes from about 1600 BC, which display a lower social stratification than had been the case in previous centuries.

Central European Early Bronze Age: Indications of Rebellions?

A comparative destruction of graves – but on a much larger scale – can be determined for the Southeast-Central European Early Bronze Age. For example, numerous robbery shafts at the large burial grounds of Franzhausen, Gemeinlebarn and Jelsovce are observed, which were used for the systematic removal of obvious valuables (Bertemes 1989; Kümmel 2009; Neugebauer 1991; Spatzier 2007). Even though such robbery shafts are understood in the literature as a ritualized part of the transitional rite to death, graves without corresponding shafts verify that we are actually dealing with profane actions.

In the framework of the mentioned interrelationships, it can be assumed that the robberies were a kind of redistribution of goods and thus the instability of a social system is documented. Unfortunately, we do not know of any settlements in the affected area during the Early Bronze Age in which processes of corresponding changes can be investigated with the necessary exactness. Nevertheless, fire events in Eastern Central European fortified settlements, in contrast to the absence of such events in most of the non-fortified settlements, indicate possible differences in the handling of different social groups (Fürmanék/Marková 1999; Jaeger 2016).

In addition, the destruction and thus the demolishment of objects in the ground, especially weapons, do not necessarily have to be interpreted in a ritual sense. Here, too, this could be evidence of violent, inner-social changes, which were not necessarily organized but rather also occurred due to rebellions. A motivation for the hoard finds of the Bronze Age is conceivable, for example, like those, which we experienced at the end of the last century under the motto "swords to ploughshares".

For the Early Bronze Age, we could assume, for example, the demolishment of weapons and their ritual deposition in the ground in order to counter an ideology, which manifested itself through warrior ideologies. Associated activities would also have been the expression of social "rebellions" against the established Early Bronze Age social model.

In principle, these various arguments could be combined to a picture of social-historical development, in which the strongly indicated social stratification of Early Bronze Age society led to the Central European Middle Bronze Age as a result of internal social problems, which also included local rebellions. At least in some regions of Central Europe, we recognize processes from about 1600 BC, which display a lower social stratification than had been the case in previous centuries.

Southeastern Late Neolithic: Okolište

In contrast to the described example, various settlement excavations exist from the Southeastern European Neolithic, which enable the reconstruction of even short-term events in villages. Included is the Late Neolithic settlement of Okolište in Bosnia, which was founded around ca. 5200 BC and reveals households that generated apparent different economic and demographic potentials in the course of developments (Arponen et al. 2015; Hofmann 2013; 2015; Müller et al. 2013a; Müller et al. 2013b) (Fig. 4). The houses of richer households, which exercised an increasing position of power within the large village, were burned down at about 4900 BC. After this event, much is changed in Okolište: the size of the village, which was originally very large for Neolithic conditions with approximately 3500 inhabitants, is reduced to a "Southeastern European standard size" of 100-200 inhabitants. Furthermore, differences be-
tween the households are no longer recognizable and specific functions of Okolište’s centrality within the surrounding settlement landscape are similarly indiscernible. In this respect, in the case of Okolište we can assume that we are dealing with an internal rebellion against increasing social differences and increasing differences in resource management.

In the three mentioned examples, the certitudes and incertitudes in the handling and reconstruction of inner social conflicts become apparent. Nevertheless, the processes, for example, at Heuneburg and Okolište can be compared. In both cases, the development of increasing economic potentials of a group of households within the total population leads to internal social conflicts. Whereas a concentration of activities and political power at certain households is recognisable at Neolithic Okolište, at Heuneburg an entire district – separate from the rest of the settlement – exists, in which crafts and political control are concentrated. In both cases, social conflicts lead to a more dispersed settlement pattern and a reduction of social differences within society.

Prospects: Hierarchy and Balance

At the very least, empirical observations show that the development of social hierarchy is obviously discernible in different prehistoric societies, but that a variety of mechanisms arise in connection with the institutionalisation of corresponding power relations, which can again lead to a disintegration or at least a reduction of respective social differences. This is a process, which was also described and documented for non-industrial societies in ethnographical and social anthropological studies (e.g. Gunawan 2000). Even if we recognize rebellions as one means for the renewed reduction of social conditions, there are also numerous other known possibilities for the reduction of accrued social power. We recognize conditions, in which, on the one hand, the development of hierarchies and, on the other hand, the balance of social differences as counter developments effect and mould societies. For both, it is vital to acquire archaeological backgrounds more intensively or to interpret known archaeological sources in this way.

---

Fig. 4. Social interpretation of Late Neolithic Okolište, Central Bosnia. A huge agglomerated site with many farmsteads develops into a site of farmsteads with social differences (5200–4900 BCE). During this process, the monopolisation of demographic, economic and ritual power in the few households might have triggered an internal rebellion that destroyed the influential "alpha-households". In consequence, the central role of the settlement (expressed e.g. in the fortification of the site) ceases and a dispersed settlement pattern results.
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Social inequality – but in particular also social resistance against corresponding social hierarchies – occupies a prominent position in almost all current societies. In order to continue to advance in the tradition of addressing necessary discourses on these topics in archaeology, two scientific meetings were held in Kiel in 2014 and 2015, specifically: “The Archaeology of Rebellion” and “Social Inequality as a Topic in Archaeology”. The topic of social resistance was discussed for the first time in Europe for prehistoric and protohistoric societies. As a result, it could be clearly determined that the identification of social conflicts and social resistance is successful for many archaeological case studies. Accordingly, the interpretation of numerous archaeological contexts must be seen in a new light.