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**Abstract:** Each behavioral science discipline focuses on distinct aspects of behaviour resulting in partial, conflicting, and incompatible models across the behavioural sciences. Interdisciplinary approaches seem to confuse rather than simplify the problem. Thus, we need to explore the integrating principles, which incorporate the primary area of interest from several behavioural science disciplines to resolve the crisis, achieve the explanatory goal and increase theoretical predictability. Power is pivotal in society and is key to understanding the inner dynamics of history and evolutionary behavior. The concept of power is perhaps the most fundamental in the field of political science. I define; politics is the natural act of giving response to an external stimulus. The response is in the form of power; it is the stimulus to other individuals making a behavioral chain reaction. I generalized three interrelated principles of politics. Those principles describe how politics works, while simultaneously unifying the vertically and horizontally fragmented behavioral sciences from the power perspective, which is compatible with the evolutionary process.

1. **Introduction**

In the late 19th and 20th centuries, human behaviour was horizontally segmented into different disciplines for academic purposes. Each discipline concentrated on distinct aspects of human behaviour (Lipset 1969, p. viii) and propounded different and incompatible theories. For example, evolutionary psychology, according to Tooby and Cosmides (2007), started with the same objections – to the mutual incompatibility of models across the behavioral sciences and their inconsistency with evolutionary biology (p. 42). Some behavioral scientists, such as Gintis (2007), were well aware of the interrelated and interdependent nature between various behavioral science disciplines and the theoretical problem arising out of the fragmentation of the behavioral science, and accordingly, attempted to unify them. Those who opposed the unification may flatly reject the idea to maintain academic status quo (Clarke 2007, p. 22), or may argue that interdisciplinary courtship and subsequent development of various sub-disciplines would resolve the crisis (see Lipset 1969, pp. xii-xvi). The important question is how to unify various sub-disciplines into a single unified theory. In my opinion, such partial and makeshift unification confuses rather than simplifies the behavioral science.

Social sciences still lag far behind the natural sciences in establishing laws. There are many arguments purporting to show that social scientific laws are neither possible nor practicable. Most often, these claims are made in terms of the complexity of the subject matter with which social scientists must contend (Lundberg 1938). Whereas, Kincaid (1990) rejected those arguments against social laws by saying, “Thus physics essentially involves ceteris paribus laws-both with unspecified and unactualized qualifications. Unless we are prepared to jettison large parts of physics, we cannot reject social laws simply because they hold only ceteris paribus” (p.70). On the other hand, political realism also believes politics, like society in general, is governed by objective laws that are rooted in human nature (Morgenthau 1997, p. 4). Is it a hopeless task to attempt to discover some ceteris paribus laws, law-like statements, or principles of behavior? The principles not only capable of explaining and predicting the behavioural process, but also theoretically unify the behavioural sciences horizontally as well as vertically and horizontally fragmented behavioral sciences from the power perspective, which is compatible with the evolutionary process.

---

1 Behavioral science is the systematic analysis and investigation of the behavior of the living organism; according to Gintis (2007), the behavioral sciences encompass economics, biology, anthropology, sociology, psychology, and political science, as well as their subdisciplines, including neuroscience, archaeology, and paleontology, and to a lesser extent, such related disciplines as history, legal studies, and philosophy (1). Here, I am focusing on the behavior of humans, animals, plants, and microorganisms.

2 We must remember that there is no established subfield unifying political science and anthropology according to Cohen (1969, p. 30).

3 “Law” is a descriptive principle of nature that holds in all circumstances covered by the wording of the law [see “laws” in Daintith and Martin (1984) 2006]. Lundberg (1938) defined Law is a generalized and verifiable statement, within measurable degrees of accuracy, of how certain events occur under stated conditions (189).
2. Unification from a Political Perspective

Power is pivotal in society. According to Lasswell and Kaplan, “Political science, as an empirical discipline, [as] the study of the shaping and sharing of power,” and “a political act [as] one performed in power perspectives” (Lasswell and Kaplan 1950, pp. xiv, 240). Robson (1954) also reaches a similar conclusion saying, “The ‘focus of interest’ of the political scientist is clear and unambiguous, it centres on the struggle to gain or retain power, to exercise power or influence over others, or to resist that exercise” (p. 18). As an attempt to unify the behavioral sciences with a political perspective, I propound, politics is the natural act of giving response to an external stimulus. The response is in the form of power; it is the stimulus to other individuals making a behavioral chain reaction between the stimulus and the response [see “chaining” in Skinner (1957) 2005, p. 224; see Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1970, pp. 156-161]. In other words, the response of one individual supports the response of the other and this situation is called reciprocal conditioning. Each person’s behavior is a reinforcing stimulus for another individual. In this paper, I am focusing on individual power rather than collective power, and I generalized three basic and interrelated principles of politics. These principles will describe how politics works and at the same time theoretically unify the behavioral sciences. I use descriptive methodology to test the validity of the principles. The first section of this paper expounds on the first principle of politics, the second section on the second principle, and so on and so forth.

Political scientists are familiar with various elements of power. However, they focus their attention particularly upon those elements of power concerning governmental and inter-governmental political processes. For example, the application of functional elements of power by policy makers of a

---

4 Horizontal unification is the theoretical integration of various social science disciplines; vertical unification means establishing a theoretical relationship between the science of behavior of higher species, such as humans (social science), with the science of behavior of lower species, i.e., behavioral zoology and ethology consistent with the evolutionary process.

5 According to Dahl [(1957) 2007], power is a relationship where the [A] has power over [B] to the extent that he can get [B] to do something that [B] would not otherwise do (pp. 202-203). In this paper, power is the relationship where an individual or group has the ability to control and regulate the behavior of their opponent or opponents, particularly to extract something that may include food, wealth, territory, idea, action, appreciation, discipline, etc. in the direction of the former’s own end and/or has the ability to prevent others from doing so against their wishes by displaying, threatening, or exercising one or more functional elements of power. Power may be classified into different forms based upon the element of power used for regulating the one’s behavior and the way of exercising it i.e., force, persuasion, coercion, manipulation etc. For example, a gun may be used to directly regulate the behavior of one’s opponent by threatening to kill them, or indirectly by protecting one’s ally from their enemy; on the other hand information, a smile, polite gesture, and the word “please” could be used to manipulate or to persuade their opponents.

In this paper “opponent” means a living or non-living thing that is against another individual in the struggle for food, safety, and/or goal attainment: every organism, except self, are the opponents in one area or another.

The functional element of power may be an idea, action, thing etc. that is used in the form of stimulus to control and regulate the behavior of their respective opponents; those elements of power that are not exercised by the individual or that are not effective are not functional.

6 “The term reinforcement is typically used to refer to this process with the label reward reserved for increases in instrumental responding and punishment for decreases in instrumental responding” (Dunham 1977, 98).

7 Political resource is the term for the elements of power.
state to regulate the behavior of another state is not a new concept in international politics.\textsuperscript{8}
Domestically, we know, many interest groups usually rely on various lobbying methods to influence the
government on different issues (see “lobbyists” McLean and McMillan 1996/2006; Rivera 2012). On the
other hand, election officials of many countries are struggling to minimize the role of money and muscle
power in the electoral process.\textsuperscript{9}

Dahl (1997) shows the possibility of using wealth to gain influence or to achieve success in
business. If the former is political then what is the latter? Categorization of power based on the variation
in motivation (pp. 35-36) is not theoretically justifiable. My argument is that business personnel exercise
various elements of power to control and regulate the behavior of their employees (i.e., hire and fire, 
salary, bonus, incentive etc.), customers (i.e., advertisements, efficiency, quality products, consumer
friendly, lowering prices etc.), and sometimes government with regards to various economic policies.
Why does a business executive want to achieve success? According to Marx and Engels (1888, 44),
“The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole
bourgeoisie.” This may be an exaggeration; however, we must not overlook the role of wealth in our
society as well our struggle with democracy.

\subsection{2.1.1. Exercising Functional Elements of Power by Different Individual Organisms}

The viruses, the simplest living being capable of independent metabolism, know how to break and
neutralize a cell defense mechanism by exercising various elements of power (Kanamaru et al. 2002;
Katze, He, and Gale 2002; Pitha 2004). Competition for place, light, or food is universal amongst plants
[Braun-Blanquet (1932) 1972, p. 11]. According to Darwin [(1859) 1872, in the struggle for survival,
“…the more vigorous plants gradually kill the less vigorous, though fully grown plants…” (p.55). Each
and every individual has their own species-specific receptor (see McFarland 1985, pp. 187-205) and
exercises a wide variety of species-specific elements of power such as teeth, claws, jaws, horn, sting,
venom etc., by brain or equivalent,\textsuperscript{10} to regulate the behavior of their opponents for food, safety, and/or
goal attainment [see Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1970, pp. 274-280; Maurice and Burton(1977) 1979, pp. 64, 73,
100-102; Huffman 1997; Huffman 2003].\textsuperscript{11} Even a human baby knows how to regulate the behavior
of their mother by exercising the power of voice [see Skinner (?) 2005, p. 313].

Some organism, on the other hand, produce various elements of power but they have no motor
organs, such as muscles, to exercise those elements of power against their opponents. For example,
“Plants have evolved an elegant armory of defense systems against attack by insect herbivores and
microbial pathogens. They synthesize a wide variety of compounds, including wall substances, toxic
proteins and peptides, enzymes, and secondary metabolites. Some are constitutively produced, whereas
others are induced by wounding or microbial attack” [Srivastava (2002) 2005, p. 253].\textsuperscript{12} Some other
plants use chemicals as an element of power to regulate the behavior of other species; they deploy them
to guard against their enemies (Gill 2009; Heil et al. 1997); even an elephant, the largest land animal,
fails to bypass their defenses (see Goheen and Palmer 2010).

\begin{footnotes}
\item[8] As an example, see how various elements of power are exercised in international politics (Morgenthau
1997, pp. 72-77).
\item[9] For example, the Model Code of Conduct issued, from time to time, by the Election Commission of India.
Available at: \url{http://eci.nic.in/eci_main1/modelcodeofconduct_noticies.aspx}.
\item[10] Among the higher species, the nervous system is responsible for controlling behavior and, to a certain
extent, for controlling the animal’s internal environment and this control is exercised by commands to
muscles and glands (McFarland 1985, 170) but not so among the lower organism such a protozoa,
coeleterates, hydra, arthropods, etc. (see pp. 174-180). Some research finding suggested plants “can think
and remember” and “react” to information contained in light (Gill 2010). In the cell, the “nucleus”
functions as the control centre of the cell [see “nucleus” in Daintith and Martin (1984) 2006].
\item[11] Some species use extra elements of power i.e., stick, antibiotic, gun etc. [e.g. see “tool use and tool
making” the Jane Goodall Institute (?)]
\end{footnotes}
In the struggle for survival, we cannot underestimate the role of the individual cell (Goldring et al. 2006), first line of defense mechanism (Boyton and Openshaw 2002; Yenugu et al. 2003), and/or the ability of the host to detect invasion by pathogen aggressors and activate the defense mechanism to eliminate the infection (Goldring et al. 2006; Jones and Dangl 2006; Pitha 2004). We can say, individual power, overall attack, and defense capability in relation to their opponents is the key determinant of establishing relative power in a habitat; the relative power determines the behavior and habits, including food habits, of a particular individual. Otherwise, the power is neutralized or counteracted by hiding and/or running from the power horizon of the predator, by adaptive strategies [see e.g. McFarland 1985, pp. 94-99; Maurice and Burton (1977) 1979, pp. 95-98] and/or by producing more offspring to save the species from extinction [Darwin (1859) 1872, pp. 53-55]. Other survival strategies will be discussed as part of the second principle.

Sexual selection played an important part in the history of the organic world. In lower divisions of the animal kingdom, sexual selection seems to have done nothing [Darwin (1859) 1872, 915]. “Sexual selection depends on the success of certain individuals over others of the same sex, in relation to the propagation of the species” (916). Either males, females, or both exercise species-specific elements of power (i.e., physical, voice, pheromone, smile, beauty, wealth, etc.) to outwit and outsmart their competitors and to win the heart and mind of their opponent sex [Bermant and Sachs 1973, p. 199; Bright 1984, pp. 72-76; Darwin (1859) 1872, pp. 726-735, 818; Low 1979, pp. 463-470] and choose the best among the contenders [see Bright 1984, p. 85; Darwin (1859) 1872, pp. 705, 917; Todd et al. 2007]. Therefore, an individual organism either exercises species-specific elements of power, through the brain or equivalent, and/or produces elements of power as a deterrent or attractant for food, sex, safety, and/or goal attainment.

2.1.2. Regulative Capability (RC)

The elements of power exercised by an individual or group of individuals to regulate the behavior of their opponents to achieve an end are the stimulus to those individuals. RC of a particular heterogeneous stimulus does not always remain constant in space and time. For example, domestic and

---

13 The ability to discriminate and generalize [see “discrimination” and “stimulus generalization” in Colman (2001) 2005] may be different from one species to another. There is little controversy with regard to the higher species. There is also no room for doubt as much evidence can be found to prove that the lower species have, to some degree, a sense of relative power. For example, the flying plankton knows their own power position in relation to predator fish (see BBC Science and Environment 2012); moreover, even the lowest animals, such as amoeba, can differentiate aversive stimulus from others and has an absolute sense of relative power between them (Jennings 2006, pp. 6-17).

14 As an example, see how gulls habitually respond to different type of opponents (McFarland 1985, p. 82). In learning theory, “habit” is a learned behavioral response associated with a particular situation, especially a response that has been subject to reinforcement or a conditioned response [see “habit” in Colman (2001) 2005]. The behavior of all animals, from protists to humans, is guided by its consequences (Staddon and Niv 2008) and operant behavior is “controlled” by its consequences in the form of reinforcements (Staddon and Cerutti 2003, 116). When reinforcement is no longer forthcoming, a response becomes less and less frequent in what is called “operant extinction” [Skinner (?) 2005, 69].

15 See the evolutionary arms race and coevolution between predator and prey (Williams, Brodie, Jr. and Brodie III 2003; Science Daily 2008).

16 For example, the pronghorn is the second fastest land mammal in the world, after the cheetah. They can run at more than 53 miles (86 kilometers) an hour, leaving pursuing coyotes and bobcats in the dust (National Geographic 2013) and to know how Animal Camouflage Works (see Harris 2013, pp. 1-4).

17 While the rules of engagement have evolved among some species (McFarland 1985, p. 105) this is not the case for many other [Darwin (1859) 1872, p. 818].

18 RC may positively associate with frequency of application and beyond a certain point the RC may decreases as regulation increased, at some point falls to zero; reaching maximum regulation and further increase in frequency may cause the RC to become negative and/or counterproductive. In other words, the
Corporal punishment is also an example of repressive measures. It is a direct exercise of the physical element of power to regulate the behavior of their children to achieve their ends. The ends might be different from one parent to another, but most of the parents may not want their children to be associated with undesirable behavior while administering corporal punishment. However, ten of the eleven meta-analyses conducted by Gershoff (2002) indicated parental corporal punishment is associated with undesirable behaviors and experiences. It was associated with only one desirable behavior, namely, increased immediate compliance. The corporal punishment may be a very effective means for securing a short-term goal i.e., immediate compliance but the studies found that corporal punishment is associated with a decrease in children’s moral internalization, negatively affecting long-term compliance (Gershoff 2002, p. 550).

Parents’ use of corporal punishment is significantly associated with the risk of abusing their children. Gershoff’s (2002) findings support the notion that corporal punishment and physical abuse are two points along a continuum, such that if corporal punishment is administered too severely or too frequently, it crosses the line into physical abuse (p. 553). My argument is that if the RC of the corporal punishment remains constant or increases with the application of the physical element of power, it is less likely to cross over into physical abuse. Because corporal punishment is used most often when parents are angry (see Gershoff 2002, p. 557), parents are more likely to use corporal punishment when children display escalated disobedience after being reprimanded (see p. 556).

Children sometimes exercise physical elements of power against their parents in the form of elicited aggression or operant aggression (See Gershoff 2002, p. 554). Obviously, this negative reinforcement is likely to have a certain deterrent effect. Children aged 4 and 15 may not have the same capacity for retaliatory response. As the findings suggested, parents tend to view corporal punishment as most appropriate for children of preschool age and least appropriate for infants and for children aged 5 years and older. As a result, the parents’ reports of using negative elements of power are negatively related to the age of children, with rates of corporal punishment dropping off steeply as children progress into

functional element of power may turn into a non-functional element of power with increased application. Various reinforcement schedules may elicit different response rates from an organism. For example, according to Skinner [(?) 2005], “intermittent reinforcement,” contrary to “continuous reinforcement,” is widely used for obtaining more responses out of an organism in return for a given number of reinforcements (pp. 99-106). The same stimulus may have derived different RC from different people, reflecting different preferences or individual circumstances.


20 However, inconsistent with laboratory research findings on learning (see Gershoff 2002, p. 541) and the general consensus on corporal punishment (p. 549), two of the five individual studies found corporal punishment to be linked with decreased compliance, and two of the remaining three studies found small, negative associations between parental corporal punishment and immediate compliance (pp. 549-550).

21 Corporal punishment is usually combined with other discipline techniques i.e., reasoning, threats, time-out, withdrawal of privileges, etc. (Gershoff 2002, 553). An increase in the frequency and severity of corporal punishment may be an indication of the failure of the other techniques. It has the potential to initiate coercive cycles of parent and child behavior. According to the coercion theory, aversive behaviors tend to elicit aversive reactions from others; moreover, aggressive behavior is governed by its consequences (see 556).

international politics involve a struggle for power (Morgenthau 1997, p. 39) and application of various functional elements of power is an inevitable consequence. The Russian Revolution and the establishment of the communist regime, and Hungary’s independence from the grip of communism are examples of declining RC of repressive measures in domestic and international affairs.
adolescence (Gershoff 2002, p. 557). Furthermore, the children of high school age have greater independence (see p. 550). I acknowledge that the retaliatory power may not be the only factor affecting the change in the relationship. We need further research to find out the role of other elements of power i.e., locomotive power, organizational skill, and mental capacity; regarding the latter, this is not only in relation to exercising those elements of power but also for exercising behavioral and ideational elements of power against their parents, possibly to justify their action and/or refute those of their opponents in the struggle.

Sex may be an object of struggle and it can be used as an element of power (McFarland 1985, pp. 141-142). For humans, marriages are usually begun with honeymoon and end, among many couple, by divorce, separation, desertion, and other evidences of disharmony or lack of cohesion, which came to light particularly in the courts, in social work, and in marriage clinic (MacIver and Page (1950) 1998, p. 268). According to research, the average couple gives up on romance just two years, six months, and 25 days into a marriage. In the first few months of marriage, various elements of power are exercised to regulate the behaviour of the opponent sex at a higher frequency compared with a decade later. Another research finding suggests intolerance – that is, boredom – becomes the greatest threat to couples staying together (see Neustatter 2011). The behaviors are said to follow the law of effect (Thorndike 1911, p. 244). Love or friendship is simply the mutual tendency of two individuals to positively reinforce each other, where the reinforcement may or may not be sexual [Skinner (?) 2005, p. 310]. Thus, the degeneration of a relationship between a husband and wife must be caused by a lack of mutual reinforcement, and diminution of reinforcement or a conditioned reinforcement [see “Conditioned Reinforcers” Skinner (?) 2005, pp. 76-81] demonstrates the declining RC.

2.1.3. Innovation

The struggle for power and/or elements power is inevitable for survival, sex, and/or goal attainment, and the process of natural or sexual selection will determine an individual’s advantage over

22 Locomotive power may be used to flee from their parent (subject to relative speed of parent and child, and the relative speeds change with age) to avoid corporal punishment, at least temporarily, as pain typically provokes a motivation to escape the painful stimulus (cited in Gershoff 2002, 554). Such a strategy may aggravate the situation as the parent may hit the child more severely latter; conversely, it may be help the child to avoid parental punishment, as the parent’s post-stimulus state (anger) had a chance to die down and slowly return to the baseline state according to the opponent process theory of motivation (Solomon and Corbit 1978, p. 17).

23 The child may seek the support of one parent to fight against the other by exercising various elements of power for their safety, security, and goal attainment; children between the ages of 5 and 15 will have differing skill levels in this regard.

24 The US Census Report (2002) suggests nearly everyone marries and half of recent marriages have ended in divorce (Kreider and Fields 2001); other divorce statistics suggest on average, marriages end after 11 years (see Neustatter 2011).

25 For example, 83 percent of couples often held hands while out, compared with just 38 percent after a decade of marriage. Partners would cuddle more than eight times a day before their first wedding anniversary compared with five times or less after ten years of marriage. Husbands give up trying to be tidy and two thirds of the women polled said they no longer made an effort to dress up and look nice for their spouse. This research was conducted on 5,000 couples who had been married for over a decade; it revealed that more than half of the respondents felt undervalued (Daily Mail Reporter 2008).

26 It also has the potential to initiate a coercive cycle between husband and wife. For example, the failure of a response to be reinforced leads not only to operant extinction but also to a reaction commonly spoken of as frustration or rage [Skinner (?) 2005, 69]. This may not be true in all cases (Parker-Pope 2010), as various reinforcement schedules could help increase RC of a stimulus and prevent degeneration of the relationship.

27 For example, the world produced 72,440,449 million US dollars worth of goods and services in 2012 [World Bank 2013], and for other elements of power [see Table 4.2 and 4.3 Barlow 1987, p. 100; Darwin
their opponents [see “the natural and sexual selection contrast” Darwin (1859) 1872, p. 583]. It is estimated that each of us has about a three in four chance of carrying a new mutation in a functional gene [Jones (1992) 1994, p. 269]. Based on fossil records, we can say the Homo sapiens took millions of years to evolve from Homo habilis [Stringer (1992) 1994, pp. 241-251] and we cannot alter or reverse the process of evolution. The point is that we, the most intelligent species, do not have the ability to control our own course of evolution to change our phenotype,\(^{28}\) to change the power relationship in our favor even though surgeons can partially modify some physical characteristics so an individual can gain advantage over their opponents.\(^{29}\)

Innovation of new elements of power (by creating them from available means), modification of old elements of power, or import of new elements of power from other populations, and exercising those newly innovated elements of power or exercising old elements of power in new way are the result from the struggle for power. Each individual also has the important option of changing the power relationship directly by exercising the new elements of power (see e.g. Bright 1984, p. 102) or by exchanging them with other elements of power. The struggle may continue between the protagonists of the new and the old (e.g. Low 1979, p. 467). We may not pay proper attention but a struggle for life is constantly going on amongst the words and grammatical forms in each language. The survival or preservation of certain favoured words in the struggle for existence is natural selection [Darwin (1859)1872, p. 466]. Like natural selection, novel forms of behaviour are selected or discarded through reinforcement [Skinner (?) 2005, 430].

2.2. The Second Principle

Conspecific struggle is extreme among some animals [e.g. Darwin (1859) 1872, p. 818; Maurice and Burton (1977) 1979, p. 271; McFarland 1985, pp. 105, 113-114]; however, some animals usually interact for a short period and depart (e.g., association of male and female during the breeding season), whereas many other animals habituate to associate for longer and/or for life. I am propounding the second principle of politics to answer how and why gregarious behavioral habits have evolved, despite internal conflict, from solitary behavior. Why and how do various modes of grouping that together comprise the complex pattern of the social structure evolved? That is, *The external pressure compels an individual to unite and associate with others against their opponent; internal conflict and disagreement between the members of a group leads either to the breakdown of the association, or bifurcation or multiplication of the association into a number of sub-associations within association, or the formation of separate associations.*

2.2.1. Supporting Evidences

Eibl-Eibesfeldt (1970) classifies animal groups into three categories based on the established relationship i.e., aggregations, anonymous groups, and individualized groups (pp. 350-362). There is no doubt that such relationships have evolved as a result of external pressure for their mutual advantage.\(^{30}\) For example, myxobacteria, such as *Myxococcus Xanthus*, combine to engage in mass attacks against

---

28 Phenotype are those observable physical characteristics, which result from interaction between the genes it possesses (genotype) and the environment, valued in the struggle for survival, sex, and/or goal attainment, such as physical weapons of offense and means of defense, locomotion, and means of attraction, i.e., teeth, claws, jaws, horn, limb, sting, venom, feather, pheromone, voice etc.

29 For example, 9.2 million cosmetic procedures were performed in the United States alone in 2011 to increase the power of beauty (American Society for Aesthetic Plastic Surgery 2012). The male African clawed toad (*Xenopus laevis*) develops special nuptial pads on his forelimbs, during the breeding season, as an effect of testosterone hormone (McFarland 1985, p. 184). This does not mean that the clawed toad has ability to change their phenotype at their will to outwit and outsmart all their opponents.

30 This does not mean that all species will gain advantage through the formation of a group (Treisman 1975).
their opponents, which are overwhelmed by force of numbers (see Shimkets 1990; Dworkin 1996). Many pathogenic bacteria of humans collectively exercise their element of power against the human immune soldiers once they have reached high enough numbers to have a better chance of withstanding the immune response. Controlling the expression of virulence determinants in concert with cell population density is significant for survival; according to Williamset al. (2000), the host is overwhelmed before a defense response can be fully initiated. On the other hand, *O. asellus* and *Porcellio scaber* combine to fight against climatic pressure for survival; also, guppies from high-predation sites school more tightly and in greater numbers than guppies from low-predation sites (Magurran et al. 1995). Magurran and Pitchers (1987) have examined anti-predator behavior in two different populations of minnows (*Phoxinus phoxinus*): Dorset minnows (those from high-predation areas) are found to swim around in larger groups than Gwynedd minnows (those from low-predation areas). Dorset minnows also seem to have more stable groups and once a predator is added to the protocol, both minnows populations dramatically increase their group sizes. The principal benefits of flocking are safety in numbers, as common and multiple eyes can provide a valuable early warning system. Although large groups may attract predators, they may also reduce per capita predation pressures through increased group vigilance, dilution, confusion, and selfish-herd mechanisms (Hamilton 1971; Lazarus 1979; Pulliam 1973).

According to Darwin [(1859) 1872], “…with all animals, sympathy is directed solely towards the members of the same community, and therefore towards known, and more or less beloved members, but not to all the individuals of the same species” (pp. 478-479). Despite internal conflict, rabbits stamp loudly on the ground with their hind-feet as a danger signal and many birds, and some mammals post sentinels (p. 474). Muskoxen, of the Arctic tundra, band together in a protective phalanx or karre when they are threatened by wolves, their common enemy [Maurice and Burton (1977) 1979, p. 92]. “Bull bison in N. America, when there is danger, drive the cows and calves into the middle of the herd, whilst they defend the outside” [Darwin (1859) 1872, 474], and some predators combine especially against their prey to change the balance of power in their favor [Darwin (1859) 1872, pp. 474-475; McFarland 1985, pp. 136-137).

### 2.2.1. Conspecific Struggle and the Evolution of Friends and/or Alliance Partners

If two or more individual powers combine to form a group, the combining power, because of internal conflict over resources, establishes some norms of the power relationship: for example, a pecking order or dominance hierarchy are prominent among many species of birds and mammals. Adult dominant

---

31 *O. asellus* and *Porcellio scaber* aggregate more at the lower relative humidity (RH) of 45% than at 60%, when the temperature is kept at a constant 22°C; both the species aggregate significantly more at 20°C than at 10°C, when the RH is allowed to fluctuate (Hassall et al. 2010). “In some way, the animal has to be selective, to response to those events that are important and to ignore others. The term for this phenomenon is stimulus filtering, the idea being that, at various stages in the causal chain between stimulus and response, certain stimuli are filtered out and do not influence the animal’s behavior” (McFarland 1985, 210-211). We can say O. asellus and Porcellio scaber filtered out internal conflict over food, space, etc. against the external common pressure and disperse when the pressure decrease.

32 For further details about how shoaling behavior is developed after hatching, [see: Maurice and Burton (1977) 1979, p. 225; Magurran (1986) 2006].

33 Dominance hierarchy is a form of animal social structure in which a linear or nearly linear ranking exists, with each animal dominant over those below it and submissive to those above it in the hierarchy (see “Dominance hierarchy” Encyclopedia of Britannica Online. Accessed April 11, 2013. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/168630/dominance-hierarchy.

2012). Fighting is not the only means for establishing dominant order for example animals may use play to establish stable social relationships and test their place in the existing social structure of a group (see Bekoff 1972). “Once the rank had been settled, fighting are rare and usually a brief threat by a high-ranking animal is sufficient to keep a lower-ranking one in its place” (Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1970, p. 351). In human societies, we experience class, caste [see “class and caste” MacIver and Page (1950) 1998, pp.
male has a sovereign power over his subjects and the responsibility to defend his territory and citizens against their external enemies (Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1970, pp. 306, 351-352, 360); this is technically the principles of a state.\textsuperscript{35} Opposition is usually formed among many animal groups (Quiatt and Reynolds 1993, p. 222).\textsuperscript{36} Regarding humans, we acknowledge that various pressure groups and political parties have been formed as an individuals’ alliance against their opponents in the struggle for power [see “Political party” Encyclopædia Britannica Online (2013); Abbott 1919]. Political science scholar and students are familiar with the strategy of alliance and counter alliance against political opponents to draw the balance of power in their favor in domestic and international politics (e.g. Morgenthau 1997, pp. 189-192, 201-213). However, most of us, if not all, have paid little attention to those alliances and counter alliances among multimale groups other than Homo sapiens. There is no doubt that it is an important strategy against more powerful opponents, as a means of pursuing a goal or satisfying their sexual drive. For example, unrelated male baboons may form coalitions for their mutual protection or to help their allies defend an oestrous female against a more dominant one. Regarding our nearest relative, the chimpanzee: studies have found that a low ranking males support second-ranking friends against their top ranking opponents, permitting the second-ranking friend to become the dominant individual and in return, the low-ranking ally to gain access to receptive females [Dunbar (1992) 1994a, p. 147]. Low-ranking Japanese monkeys usually seek the friendship of high-ranking Japanese monkeys by assisting them during the conflict. Among the free-living rhesus monkeys, the rank of a male does not only depend on his physical strength but also on his ability to form friendships with others. If a baboon secures the friendship of a high-ranking animal, he raises his status in relation to his opponents (Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1970, pp. 354-355).

2.2.1.2. Origin of Family Relationships

Even though there is no strict consensus among social scientists as to what constitutes a family (Emlen 1995, pp. 8092-8093) there is no doubt that the relationship between father and mother, mother and offspring, father and offspring, and between siblings has evolved primarily against external pressure despite internal conflict.\textsuperscript{37} Generally, males and females cooperate for reproduction purposes and depart (Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1970, p. 334), whereas others stay together for longer if not for life. Sexual union on a permanent or semi-permanent basis has become an established norm in human society [MacIver and Page (1950) 1998, pp. 238-242]. Both the male and the female have mutual advantage over their respective opponents by associating with each other. For example, low-ranking male baboons often try to establish special friendships with particular females; these relationships involve intense grooming and persist over many years. The male baboons provide support for his female and for her offspring whenever they are attacked by other members of the group; in return, the male is usually granted privileged access to the female when she comes into oestrus. High-ranking males often try to usurp this privilege, but are seldom successful because the female refuses to cooperate [Dunbar (1992) 1994b, p. 152]. The male may not achieve his reproductive goal against other male competitors without the support of the female; by associating with the male, the female gains advantage in the struggle for food, safety, etc. against her opponents. When a low-ranking jackdaw female mates with a high-ranking male,

\textsuperscript{34} Sticklebacks shoal only outside the breeding season because of internal conflict [Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1970, p. 342; Maurice and Burton (1977) 1979, p. 225].

\textsuperscript{35} This is because it possesses all the required elements i.e., population, territory, government, and sovereignty [see “state” McLean and McMillan (1996) 2006].

\textsuperscript{36} Very complex political relationships may evolve from one-male organization due to external pressure, population growth, or internal conflict over limited resources [e.g. Dunbar (1992) 1994b, p. 152]. The resources may be an idea, position, space, sex, or any other element of power that is an object of struggle among individuals.

\textsuperscript{37} Examples include conflict between father and mother, parents and offspring (see Maestripieri 2002), and between siblings.
her position in the hierarchy is elevated and she changes her behavior accordingly (Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1970, p. 354).

“Among fishes the most common pattern is no parental care. If there is parental care, it is usually provided by one parent only, and consists of protecting the eggs and fry from predators and removing parasites and waste products of respiration. It does not include the provision of food…” (McFarland 1985, p. 131).38 Mouthbrooders are an excellent example of the association between parents and young against external pressure (Maurice and Burton 1979, p. 155). The males among the externally fertilize species usually care for the young against their enemies but this is not the case among mammals (McFarland 1985, pp. 131-132). Some scholars suggest that care for an offspring among some mammals by a male is often a consequence of its long-term relationship with its mother (Quiatt and Reynolds 1993, p. 221);39,40 it is evident how male baboons care for younger baboons by associating with their mother.

Sibling rivalry or siblicide is common phenomenon among many species (Wahaj et al. 2007, p. 974). Prey size is strongly implicated as a factor in sibling competition (Burd, Govedich and Bateson 2006); the intensity of sibling rivalry among the spotted hyena may vary according to changes in feeding competition (Wahaj et al. 2007, p. 983). However, external pressure may compel them to cooperate with their siblings (Packer and Pusey 1982; Quiatt and Reynolds 1993, p. 223; Chagnon 1979, p. 96). If a mother chimpanzee dies, older siblings often adopt their orphaned brothers and sisters despite sibling rivalry with the baby chimpanzee on account of losing their mother’s attention [See the Jane Goodall Institute (?)]. There is considerable evidence that proves that family relationships have evolved within the parameter of the second principle; due to limited space in this paper, I am unable to discuss this in further detail.

2.2.1.3. Clan, Tribe, and Nation

“Social anthropologists have almost without exception regarded kinship systems as the most basic of all social structures in human societies” (Quiatt and Reynolds 1993, 212). Anthropologists generally agree that kinship is based on the relationship between individuals and groups to the model of biological relationships between parents and children, between siblings, and between marital partners. We can say, from the evolutionary perspective, “kinship” is an outgrown family, and undoubtedly such relationships have evolved and maintained primarily against external pressure. For instance, we can identify kinship cooperative behavior in primates where members of a kin support each other to deal with external pressure (pp. 214-215). “When lineages come into competition with each other we can expect to find lineage solidarity, and when groups come into conflict we can expect lineage differences to be swamped in favour of corporate group action” (p. 233). Differing from other primates, chimpanzees, which share 98.6% of our genes, are patrilineal [pp. 220-221; see “Taxonomy & Genetics” the Jane Goodall Institute of Canada (?b)]; usually they are brothers, half-brothers, or fathers and sons, and while they can be ranked in a dominance hierarchy, they jointly defend their boundaries [Richard (1992) 1994, pp. 152-153]. Chimpanzees sometimes chase and kill members of opponent groups while enagaged in conflict [Turner (1992) 1994, p. 148]; in spite of bitter inter-clan rivalaries, females usually migrate from their clan of origin to other clans [Richard (1992) 1994, pp. 152-153].

Individual struggles for power within a group can turn into inter-kinship struggles in many primates; inter-clan and inter-village struggles are a common political phenomenon seen among tribal groups. For

39 Breeding males will invest less in offspring as their certainty of paternity decreases (see table 1 in Emlen 1995, 8095). In other words, males take less interest in infants whom they could not have sired (Quiatt and Reynolds 1993, p. 221).
40 External pressure has resulted in evolution from egg-laying (oviparity) to the bringing forth of live young (viviparity) (see Shine 2002 who discusses the role of cold climatic pressure in this process). Unfortunately I do not have enough space to discuss this topic further.
example, the clan is the unit of blood revenge among the Naga tribes of Manipur.\textsuperscript{41} The feuds of clan with clan were as sanguinary and as frequent as feuds between whole villages [cited in Hodson (1911) 1996, p. 73] and the head-hunting among the Nagas was associated with the blood feud (p. 115). As a result, inter-clan and inter-village conflict among the Kabui Naga tribe had been so intense that no sense of tribal solidarity has developed: moreover, they acknowledge no tribal head either in matters of religion or in secular affairs (p. 81).

Internal conflict is a serious problem among the Yanomamö Indian. Hundreds of different fights and village fissions or relocations have been reported (Chagnon 1979, p. 87); fissions are not simple events (pp. 91-92), as when a village grows in size, tensions within the group mount, and internal friction and fighting increases (pp. 95-96). My argument is that clans have evolved primarily against external pressure and the group may split, due to internal conflict and disagreement, into smaller groups (e.g., sub-clan or lineage) and the smaller groups may evolve into an independent clan [see How the Khasi clan grew out of the Khasi family Gurdon (1907) 1981, pp. 63-65; see also Hodson (1911) 1996, pp. 83-84].\textsuperscript{42,43} The clan may also possibly be eliminated or amalgamated in the struggle against their opponents.\textsuperscript{44} For example, the Marrings possess two divisions, Saibu, the elder and Marring the younger, which do not intermarry, and each of these division has been further subdivided into seven exogamous clans; two of these clans have now disappeared [Hodson (1911) 1996, p. 75]. The Meitei’s Khāba, and Angānba clans have been amalgamated into one clan (p. 72). I see no other explanation for this other than intra-specific and inter-specific struggle for power [see Hodson (1908) 2007, pp. 73-74].

External pressure has far-reaching implications on inter-village tribal politics. Alliances and counter alliances are the available options. Among the Yanomamö, “Inter-village alliance is far more significant for members of smaller villages who are more vulnerable targets of raids from larger villages and less capable of mounting an effective, long-term pattern of retaliatory raiding” (Chagnon 1979, 93). Because of external pressure, they usually rely on friendly ties with their neighbors (p. 92). Among the Nagas, “The political supremacy of one village over the small weak neighbours has for a time assisted the development of the sense of tribal unity, but never for long. As political units they have at the best shown themselves capable of only very feeble attempts at concerted and united action against a common foe” [Hodson (1911) 1996, p. 74].

2.2.1.3.1. The Power Relationship and Its Implications

Blitz (1999) concludes that among the Mississippian societies, the internal factionalism and external warfare are certainly implicated in historical accounts of the chiefdom fission-fusion process. The village council of elders was the collective supreme body among the Zeliangrong Naga tribes: an individual, a family, a lineage, or a clan was not in a position to dominant the other particularly in general administration or in the administration of justice (see Kamei 2004, pp. 325, 328-330). While the power relationship changed among the constituent unit in Meitei community, the Ningthouja clan permanently subdued all the other groups after a prolonged struggle and established a Meitei kingdom in

\textsuperscript{41} In the State of Manipur, there are more than 30 indigenous tribes, which are broadly categorize into Naga and Kuki, inhabiting the hill territory beside the Meitei who reside in the valley [see Hodson (1908) 2007, pp. 1-2; Hodson (1911) 1996, pp. 1-5; Manipur “At a Glance”, June 3, 2013, retrieved from http://manipur.gov.in/?page_id=3507]. The interesting point is that three different types of political institutions flourished side by side within a small area totaling 8000 square miles.

\textsuperscript{42} The Meiteis (Meitheis) are composed of seven clans: Ningthouja (Ningthaja) consists of 115 sub-groups called Yumnäks or lineage, 17 in the Khābangānba clan. The question is how and why so many lineages evolved. On the other hand, the Khuman (Kumuls) and Luwang (Luang}s) clans are in some remote manner connected, with the result being they do not intermarry [Hodson (1908) 2007, p. 73]. The Mao group situated at Liyai have four clans; they are grouped together in pairs and forbid inter-marriage [Hodson (1911) 1996, p. 73]. Moreover, we cannot rule out their common origin.

\textsuperscript{43} Family break up has also been reported among animals (Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1970, p. 361).

\textsuperscript{44} Here the opponent refers not only to humans but also other living organisms including pathogenic microorganism such as \textit{Vibrio cholerae} (causes cholera) and \textit{Yersinia pestis} (causes plague).
Manipur by the middle of 15th century (Kabui 1985, pp. 72-78; Khelchandra Singh 1985, pp. 36-45; Singh 1985, pp. 79-96). Previous tribal or clan based political institutions were not very effective in dealing with the changes, according to the span of control principles. Feudal and feudal-like political systems are based on hierarchical mechanisms, by which the behaviour of large populations across a territory is controlled and regulated. Unfortunately, I do not have enough space to illustrate how feudal and feudal-like political systems have evolved among the Meiteis (see Hodson (1908) 2007, pp. 58-72, 85-87; Kamei 2012, pp. 44-62) and other societies based on tribal political systems.

Similarly, the conditions that transformed feudalism into our modern state-systems is also a consequence of the perennial struggle for power between various groups [MacIver and Page (1950) 1998, pp. 381-382], for example, the Barons were unified and took up arms against the atrocities of King John. The power relationship changed in favor of the Barons forcing them to sign Magna Carta on 15th June 1215. According to Woolf (2005), this is considered to be an important charter in the history of democracy; the charter subsequently evolved into a powerful assembly that could defy the king and even legitimize regime change (Dodd 2011). Finally, despite internal conflict, we must not forget that nations remain largest community bound by community sentiment and comprehensive solidarity [MacIver and Page (1950) 1998, pp. 296-297].

2.3. The Third Principle
Discussion, negotiation, and the subsequent signing of various bilateral agreements and the implementation of those agreements are within the preview of political science. There are many instances of third power intervention, adjudication, arbitration, or mediation in international politics that facilitate a peaceful ending to conflict (see e.g. Carter 2014; Bercovitch 1986). Domestically, many countries successfully prevent and/or resolve serious internal conflict by enacting, implementing, and/or adjudicating rules (i.e., constitution, fundamental right and duties, civil, criminal, and other laws). However, we don’t find any such elaborate written rules and structural support mechanism (i.e., legislature, executive, and/or judiciary) among primitive tribes or groups of our non-human ancestors. How they have managed and possibly resolved conflict is an important question from the evolutionary perspective. MacIver and Page [(1950) 1998] argue, “Every individual is the offspring of a social relationship, itself determined by pre-established mores” (p. 46). The mores are the regulator of behavior (pp. 19-20) and such regulative principles of society were the standards set up by a group for the control of the conduct of its members, in relation to one another and to the group as a whole and exerting pressure upon individual and group to conform to the norms (pp. 138-139). The question is how and why variety of such social control mechanisms had evolved from a solitary microorganism; they are not the result of intelligent contrivance, or foreseeing designs. The answer is: If two or more individual powers combine and/or interact because of external pressure, individual motives for sex, and/or goal attainment, the interacting power, on the basis of the power relationship, establishes some norms of conflict management and/or conflict resolution. Here, I am emphasizing the distribution of resources and the manner in which elements of power are exercised to explain these complex subjects.

45 We cannot ignore the role of external pressure not only in the integration process, but also in maintaining the association (see Khelchandra Singh 1985, p. 39).
46 The concept of "span of control" refers to the number of subordinates controlled directly by a superior. An individual have finite amounts of time, energy, and attention therefore decrease in effectiveness as their span of control exceeds the optimal level (“Span of Control” Inc. available at: http://www.inc.com/encyclopedia/span-of-control.html).
47 There is not adequate space to further discuss these changes, which resulted from changing power relationships.
48 “To study social control we must seek out the ways in which society patterns and regulates individual behavior and, at the same time, the ways in which patterned and standardized behavior in turn serves to maintain the social organization” [MacIver and Page (1950) 1998, p. 137].
49 In this paper, the norms of conflict management are considered those measures that prevent destructive conflicts bilaterally between the first and the second powers engaged in the conflict. Conflict resolution is
2.3.1.1. Distribution of Resources

Animals, including Homo sapiens, rarely fight without any cause and the distribution of resource is always an important bone of contention. As a part of conflict management or/and conflict resolution, various rules regarding the distribution of resources have evolved. For example, Khasis who draws the first blood and the second man who scores a hit the game get larger shares of the flesh than the others do [Gurdon (1907) 1981, 48]. Among the Naga tribe, the person who joins in the chase is entitled to a special share, which is less than the portion appropriated to the man who actually killed; among the Kabui Naga, the head is reserved for those who draw first blood [Hodson (1911) 1996, p. 58]. My argument is that such rules are not a natural right but have evolved based on established power relationships as part of conflict management or/and conflict resolution and have altered according to changing power relationships. For example, a Khul-lākpa (village chief) is more powerful in comparison to other individuals in the Naga village; therefore, no one can prevent this individual from appropriating customary rights to a portion of all game and to royalties on catches of fish [see Hodson (1911) 1996, p. 58].

Among many species, “might is right” forms the norm of distribution of resources to prevent further conflict among the superior and subordinate power. For example, when assembled at carcasses, Namib Desert spotted hyaenas show linear dominance hierarchies. Adult females outrank adult males and usually feed one at a time or with their dependent offspring. Lower-ranking individuals eventually gain access to large carcasses but are excluded from smaller ones (Tilson and Hamilton III. 1984). In similar struggles, low-ranking dogs often do not react to high-ranking dogs (Cafazzo et al. 2010, pp. 451, 453), as they would have to fight to maintain the existing rules of conflict management or to establish new ones. Subordinates are usually seen exercising positive elements of power, such as food-begging behavior against their superior, however the manner in which the element of power is exercised does not compel the superior. We cannot rule out the evolution of moral principle, the strategy may not be always successful in terms of imposing customary obligations on their superior (see Meat Sharing and Mating Behaviour Mitani and Watts 2001).

Older female macaques dominate younger ones (Quiatt and Reynolds 1993, p. 242); higher-ranking members of a social group gain priority over access to food. Among many species, the dominance relationships are influenced by age (Cafazzo et al. 2010). Age is a deciding factor in male dominance hierarchies among chimpanzees. Among the Tangkhul Naga tribes, primogeniture, the distribution of resources according to an age-based hierarchy, is the most widely accepted rule of succession to village office and distribution of other resources [see Hodson (1911) 1996, pp. 102-103]. However, in some societies, rules of succession to power and property among siblings contrast with age-based hierarchies. Hodson [(1911)1996] suggested, “…the custom of giving the youngest son the lion’s share may be associated with the custom of making provision for the others as they grow to maturity and marry” (p. 105). I am not totally refuting the claim; my argument is that the youngest power possibly considered regulation or intervention by a third power to resolve a conflict by enacting new rules of conflict management, by modifying old rules of conflict management, or by adjudication, arbitration, and/or mediation based on existing norms.

The subordinate is better off conceding to the rights of their superior rather than to be killed, receive an injury, and/or remain an outcast.

Physical fitness, aggressiveness, fighting skills, ability to form coalitions, intelligence, and other personality traits are important factors in determining social status among male chimpanzees; however, according to the Jane Goodall Institute [see “Dominance Hierarchies & Mating” the Jane Goodall Institute of Canada (?a)], age is a deciding factor in male dominance hierarchies..

Among the Lushai Kukis, the post of the village chief passes from father to the youngest son (Gangte 2003, p. 126). Among the Kabui tribe, the youngest son receives the largest share in comparison to the other sons [Hodson (1911) 1996, p. 104; for other examples, see Gurdon (1907) 1981, pp. 82-85].
manages to obtain the office and/or the lion’s share with their own power, and/or with the third power intervention, like wolves, where, especially when food is scarce, parents both dominate older offspring and restrict their food intake in favor of pups (Mech 1999). Amongst baboons, the mother intervenes in favor of the younger daughters against the elders, resulting in the eldest sister ranking the lowest and the youngest sister ranking the highest [Richard (1992) 1994, pp. 152-153]. In Among rhesus monkeys, if the oldest sister succeeds in outranking her mother, she prevents her younger sisters from outranking her (Quiatt and Reynolds 1993, p. 242). In fact, father becomes a person of secondary importance in the Tangkhul Naga house when his son marries and his parents are obliged to leave their house [Hodson (1911) 1996, pp.100-101]. In such relationships, the father may not be able to regulate the behavior of his elder son in favor of the younger; this may be the reason why primogeniture, the distribution of resources according to an age-based hierarchy, is the most widely accepted rule of succession to village office and distribution of other resources. I am not able to discuss the evolutionary process any further on account of space limitations.

While perennial struggles and counter struggles continue over the distribution of resources [e.g. Hodson (1911) 1996, p. 103], old customary practices may be modified and new ones formed as a result of the changing power relationships. For example, there is a story where two village chief or khullakpas were created as a part of conflict management and conflict resolution (see pp. 79-80). Distribution of office according to an age-based hierarchy were once the established norms of conflict resolution among the Meitei’s ruling family, for example, the king’s eldest son held the post of Jurbaj (prime minister), the next son held the post of senapati (defense minister), the subsequent son became the Kotwal (head of the police) and so on [Hodson (1908) 2007, p. 59]. After the reign of Churairombra (p. 78), there has been no absolute rule of royal succession. Implicating the rules of primogeniture couldn’t be maintained and the new one could not be form. Therefore, the most powerful individual from the royal family ruled.

2.3.1.2. Mode of Exercising the Elements of Power

Individuals of different species exercise various elements of power for food, sex, safety, and/or goal attainment. In fact, as a part of the conflict management and conflict resolution process among many species, some elements of power and the manner in which it is exercised are regulated i.e., some elements of power are prevented or restricted while others are encouraged and/or prescribed through various reinforcements. For example, chimpanzees chase and kill members of other groups when they are in conflict [Turner (1992) 1994, p. 148]. Dr. Goodall reported a four-year territory war between two groups of chimpanzees that ended with one group killing all members of the other chimpanzee group; however, it should be noted that aggression is quite rare within chimpanzee groups. Most disputes within a community can be solved by threats rather than actual attacks [see “Warfare and Violence” the Jane Goodall Institute of Canada (?a)] and most interactions is to reinforce affiliative bonds [Richard (1992) 1994, pp. 152-153]. Among the Nagas, the men who brought back the head of a woman or child belonging to a hostile village were positively reinforced [see Hodson (1911) 1996, p. 114], as the a result, the most successful warrior became the most influential man in the village (cited in p. 80). Moreover, customary laws prevented an individual from exercising physical or other elements of power aiming to kill or injure a member of his own group. This may have been due to mutual sympathy among

53 The youngest son may take the lion’s share by force; he may exercise negative elements of power or he may compel his elder brothers to voluntarily transfer the lion’s share to him by exercising positive elements of power i.e., politeness, good conduct etc.

54 Females were not in a position to do so against their powerful male opponents [see Hodson (1911) 1996, pp. 103-104] without the help of a third power (the role of “State power” in “the evolution of the Married women’s property rights in Wisconsin” see Cleary 1994-1995).

55 Hodson [(1908) 2007] says, “The one fact that stands out most clearly is that the Raja must belong to the Ningthaja or royal clan; but beyond that I can see no more than—” (pp. 82-83).
the members and/or because of negative reinforcement (customary laws); murder within the clan was rare among the Naga tribes [Hodson (1911) 1996, p. 106].

Exercising economic elements of power, such as offering a bride price, and reciprocal exercises of positive elements of power to regulate the behavior of their opponents have become the established norms in human societies; moreover, active enforcement mechanisms have evolved over time, such as reward, punishment, and reputation building [see Hodson (1911) 1996, pp. 89-92; Melis and Semmann 2010]. We can trace such behavior back to the male chimpanzees where they hunt to obtain meat, a high-quality food item that is used to develop and maintain social relationships with other males (Mitani and Watts 2001). We cannot undervalue the behavioral mode of conflict management. For example, it has become an established norm for chimpanzees to bow low to the ground whenever the dominant male approaches, as a means of acknowledging his dominance (Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1970, p. 354). “The marine iguana submits by prostrating itself before the winner, who then ceases fighting but waits in a threat position until the vanquished retreats from the area” (p. 125). A slightly crouching posture, flattened ears, and a wagging tail are the behavioral characteristics of domestic dog for conflict management, and aggressive conflicts are rare in formal dominance relationship. Both humans and wolf pups are disciplined by older family members (see Cafazzo et al. 2010).

Male scorpion flies are physically more powerful than the female but he may not be able to achieve his sexual goal by exercising the physical element of power. This may be the reason why “gifts for sex” are the evolutionary stable strategy to prevent conflict between the male and the female; while at the same time achieving their reproductive goals even though the male benefits from a successful forced mating (see McFarland 1985, pp. 141-142). Inter-sex and intra-sex conflict over sex has become a serious problem in human societies and it may escalate into a full-blown conflict between natal groups; for example, women are the major cause of conflict among Yanomamö Indians (Chagnon 1979, pp. 87, 95, 106). By focusing on the choice, it will not only prevent inter-sex conflict, but it will also help to reduce intra-sex conflict by diverting their attention to winning the hearts and minds of the opponent sex. Therefore, exercising various elements of power is inevitable to regulate the behavior of their opponent sex before and/or after marriage to establish and/or to maintain a sexual relationship against their competitors; this has become customary among adult humans. Among the Naga tribes, for instance, marriages were usually arranged by the young people themselves based on affection [Hodson (1911) 1996, p. 87]. Exercising positive elements of power such as dress, coiffure, tattooing, ornaments etc. has become the established norm to attracting a partner [Hodson (1911) 1996, pp. 21-35]. For example, the women are fond of ornaments and they wear many till they are married (cited in p. 34) and no young man could find a wife for himself until he had taken a head and thereby won the right of the warrior’s kilt, or of the necklace of bears’ tusks and the wristlets of cowries (cited in p. 121). The fear of the dire vengeance from the third power, such as the bride’s natal group, resulted in the evolution and maintenance of such a tradition to prevent conflict (see e.g., p. 90). While Yanomamö Indians have failed to establish such norms as the primary mode of conflict management and conflict resolution, physical strength and organizational support continue to be a part of the struggle (see Chagnon 1979, p. 107).

2.3.2. Conflict Resolution with Reference to Sexual Politics

56 Fashion [see “fashion” MacIver and Page (1950) 1998, pp. 181-182] is a way of exercising elements of power to regulate the behavior of their opponents [see e.g., “the power of voice and beauty in sexual selection” Darwin (1859) 1872, pp. 875-890; “Sexual Selection and Human Ornamentation” in Low 1979, pp. 462-487]. In some societies, the way of exercising some elements of power has been regulated by the interest of the dominant groups and strict rules have ensured their continued dominance [see e.g., Hodson (1908) 2007, pp. 15-16]. Humans are not the only species who are bound by fashion; for example, bowers of Australia and New Zealand may not be able to get mate without building an elaborate structure (bowers) made of vegetation and mud, which they need to decorate with bright shells or flowers (Bermant and Sachs 1973, p. 206).
Conflict over sex is a natural process among sexual species. In mammals, the main evolutionary trend has been for males to mate with many females (McFarland 1985, p. 132). For example, the alpha male may monopolized all the sexual resources i.e., females within his group by excluding all other adult males (e.g., Quiatt and Reynolds 1993, p. 222); such rules may be challenged and a new ones formed with the assistance of a third power [e.g., Dunbar (1992) 1994a, p. 147]. According to a research, sexually related aggression will increase, in many avian and mammalian, because incest restrictions do not apply to replacement mates and the aggression will be reduced because incestuous mating will be avoided and pairings will be exogamous (See Table 1. serial no. 8 and 5 Emlen 1995, p. 8093). Marriage outside the clan is strictly enforced among many societies, [as an example see Hodson (1911) 1996, p. 89]. “In the smaller Yanomamö Indian villages, the incest taboos and kinship obligations are such that sexual trysting is greatly reduced, and a relatively high level of trust among male co-residents prevails” (Chagnon 1979, 96); whereas in other villages, often the chiefs break the incest prohibitions, leading to jealousies, resentment, and competition (see pp.105-106). I cannot say exactly how polyandry [see Murdock (1957) 2009] has evolved but I can suggest that it is a special mechanism of distributing the object of struggle to reduce the seriousness of conflict between the competitors, especially closely related ones.

Some sociologists suggest that, “Wives are generally a sign of wealth, which brings a man prestige in the community…” (Coser et al. 1983, p. 282). The Nagas are usually monogamous; this practice seems to be maintained due to pressure from a third power [see Hodson (1911) 1996, p. 94]. Pressure from the parents of the first wife, the general public, and clan members in particular, is significant.57 While the power relationship drastically changed in favor of the king among the Meitei, there was no third power to prevent King Devindro from amassing ninety-six wives during a three month period [Hodson (1908) 2007, p. 76].

Marriage normally marks the beginning of a family. According to MacIver and Page [(1950) 1998], sex, reproduction, and economic factors are the three important conditions for the development and growth of a definite family pattern (p. 246) but such conditions could be fulfilled without a marriage ceremony. Among the Nagas, intercourse between the sexes is free so long as the girl is unmarried [cited in Hodson (1911) 1996, p. 87], however, after marriage, customary laws are strictly enforced to prevent adultery (p. 107). This indicates the significance of the marriage ceremony in conflict management and conflict resolution. On the other hand, the degeneration of the relationship between husband and wife is inevitable subject to declining RC of the elements of power and the way it is exercised; consequently, divorce may be the end result. It may be a cause of conflict between the two groups if there is no mutual consent. Therefore, various divorce rules have evolved based on the power relationship between the males and the females of various groups to regulate the behavior as a means of preventing serious conflict [see e.g., Hodson (1911) 1996, pp. 97-98; Hodson (1908) 2007, p. 91].58

2.3.3 The Dominance Hierarchy, Conflict Management, and Conflict Resolution

We have seen the power relationship play an important role in the process of conflict management. The powerful individual sets the rules for the subordinates, and with active third power intervention, such rules have been modified or replaced. We have no doubt that the dominance hierarchy is strongly implicated in conflict management and conflict resolution: based on the power relationships, different individuals may play a different role in the family, clan, village, or other groups in the process of conflict resolution and conflict management. We can hardly find third power adjudication, arbitration, or

---

57 As the severance of the woman from her clan of origin is not complete, as the duty of revenge, should she be hurt, is with the clan of origin [Hodson (1911) 1996, p. 71]. A single mistake from the husband’s side may escalate into inter-clan conflict, placing the entire clan into jeopardy; therefore, the public is less likely to encourage polygamy.

58 Here, the power relationship is not only about the relationship between the male and the female; rather, it also takes into account their respective friends, relatives, clan, or any other third power that offers help and support to either side during the conflict, and has ability to either negatively or positively influence the decision to divorce.
mediation upon existing norms which aim to resolve conflict between the two conflicting parties among the lower species. However, I have some information suggesting that herds of female African buffalos voted to resolve a disagreement (BBC Wildlife 2012). The position of the adult dominant individual is the center of power in animal groups, and among some higher species such as a position is used to settle conflict between their subjects. For example, when low-ranking animals fight, one of them may flee to the proximity of a high-ranking one; accordingly, the high-ranking will take sides with the one that has fled to him and chase away the pursuer (cited in Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1970, p. 360). Among gorillas, silver-blacked male settles disputes between the females (p. 361) while dominant animals may interfere to break up the fighting as a means of maintaining group cohesion (p. 351).

In a matriarchal family, power is usually concentrated in the hands of the matriarch [MacIver and Page (1950) 1998, pp. 247-248; Gurdon (1907) 1981, pp. 63, 82-85]; while in a patriarchal family, the patriarch is the center of power. As the head of the family, the patriarch plays an important and decisive role in rule making, rule enforcement, and rule adjudication in his family; according to MacIver and Page [(1950) 1998, pp. 248-249], his power over his children, young or adult, was often almost unlimited. Such family relationship and its associated mores change according to change power relationship between the members of the family (see 250-267). Among the Zelangrong Naga tribes, power is not concentrated in a particular family, clan, or group. Therefore, a democratic village council acts as the court of justice even though the village chief (khullakpa) is the head of the village [Kamei 2004, pp. 325-326, 328; see also Hodson (1911) 1996, pp. 109-113] this is not the case for the Kuki tribes (Gangte 2003, p. 125).59

Conflict usually arises between two or more individual powers due to a failure to find a mutually or conditionally agreeable way to manage and/or resolve the conflict. The norms of conflict management and conflict resolution evolve based upon power relationships.60 Through the constant reinforcement and indoctrination, the norms are habituated [see MacIver and Page (1950) 1998, pp. 144-146]. Perennial struggles and counter struggles for power are constant within groups and between groups, as a means of maintaining the status quo,61 to replace one power position by another within the established norms, or to form new norms. For example, as discussed earlier (in section 2.2.2) unrelated male baboons and chimpanzees united to challenge their top ranking opponents to change the established sex related norms. In addition, the Barons united to take up arms against the atrocities of King John to establish new democratic norms [see also MacIver and Page (1950) 1998, pp. 197-200].

3. Conclusion

This paper presents a theoretical framework for the unification of the vertically as well as horizontally fragmented behavioral sciences. My argument is that an individual organism is a power and has a centrifugal effect due to conflict over food, sex, safety, and/or goal attainment, however, external pressure compels them to unite; as a result, altruistic behaviors have evolved against external forces. Various behavioral norms with regards to settling conflict between the members of an association have evolved according to changing power relationships. Without a mechanism to settle internal conflict between members, the association would disintegrate into smaller groups. Language is an important element of power to regulate the behavior of one’s opponents. Writing in a foreign language is a difficult

59 Due to space limitations, I am unable to delve deeper into the evolutionary process regarding dispute resolution from tribal to democratic communities with changing power relationship.

60 In human societies, for example, MacIver and Page [(1950) 1998] classify social codes into associational codes, communal codes, moral codes, and legal codes (pp. 140-141). Many of such regulations are framed according to the interests of the dominant groups or classes and are resisted by other groups; violation of the codes result in sanctions, and each type of code has its own form of sanction (pp. 138-139; for the pressure of public opinion see pp. 205-206).

61 For further details about how dominant groups, authorities, and institutions pressure individuals to maintain the status quo in human groups, [see MacIver and Page (1950) 1998, pp. 201-202].

62 Examples include the struggle for the dominant position in a group and the circulation of elites within established norms.
job; I acknowledge my limitation especially in regards to word choice, syntax, and its effect on how I express my ideas. I also think that many more questions remain unanswered. Due to space limitations, I am unable to go into further detail about the evolutionary process of a nation, state, government, and a myriad of other associations or interest groups.

I acknowledge the role of third power, the concept of super natural power, and the role of religious philosophy in the evolution of conflict management and conflict resolution. On the other hand, I have not explored the causal relationship between desires for novel stimulation, RC, mental states, and way of exercising elements of power. Due to limited space, writing about the relationship between habits and external pressure has not been possible. Acknowledging interrelationship, I agree unification is not complete without a grand bio-behavioral theory establishing the evolutionary theoretical relationship between genes, phenotype, and behavior. All these issues require further research as a means of completing the unification process.
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