Proposta de participação no Programa Professor Sênior da Universidade de São Paulo, junto ao Instituto de Estudos Avançados, polo Ribeirão Preto

Mario de Vivo

1. Súmula curricular, Julho, 2017

Informações Gerais

Data de Nascimento: 29 de julho, 1956, em São Paulo, SP, Brasil
Endereço atual: Rua Arnaud Capuzzo 180, apto. 83, Nova Aliança, Ribeirão Preto, SP
Fone: (55) (16) 98184-1111
Email: mdvivo@gmail.com
R.G.: 8.619.746-0, SSP-SP
CPF: 011 285 068 – 58

Graduação e Pós-Graduação

1991 - 1992 : Post Doctoral Fellow, Mammalogy, American Museum of Natural History, AMNH, New York, U.S.A.
1980 – 1988: Doutor em Ciências Biológicas (Zoologia); Instituto de Biociências da Universidade de São Paulo
1975 – 1978: Bacharel e Licenciado em Ciências Biológicas; Universidade de São Paulo

Afiliação profissional e resumo das principais atividades

Trabalhei como docente e pesquisador na Universidade de São Paulo de março de 1982 a abril de 2017. De março de 1982 a dezembro de 1998 no Departamento de Biologia da Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras de Ribeirão Preto, Ribeirão Preto, SP, e de janeiro de 1999 até abril de 2017 no Museu de Zoologia, em São Paulo, SP.

Fui responsável ou co-responsável por disciplinas de Graduação junto do Departamento de Biologia da FFCLRP – USP (Princípios de Zoogeografia, Zoologia de Vertebrados) de 1982 a 1999, bem como responsável pelas aulas sobre mamíferos na disciplina Vertebrados do IB - USP nos anos de 2000 e 2001. Orientei dezenas de Monografias de conclusão de Curso de Bacharelado em Ciências Biológicas, tanto junto ao Departamento de Biologia da FFCLRP quanto do MZUSP.

Fui docente e orientador de programas de Pós-Graduação do Departamento de Biologia da FFCLRP – USP, do Departamento de Zoologia do IB – USP e, nos últimos anos, do Museu de Zoologia da USP; tive a oportunidade de orientar 13 dissertações de Mestrado e 12 teses de Doutorado.

Entre minhas principais funções administrativas destaco ter sido Diretor Técnico do Serviço de Vertebrados do Museu de Zoologia da USP entre 2000 e 2007, bem como Vice-Chefe da Estação Biológica de Boracéia, administrada pelo mesmo MZUSP, em 2000 e 2001.

Interesses em pesquisa

Por formação sou Sistemata especializado em Mamíferos, e como extensão de minha especialização meus interesses sempre foram devotados ao estudo da evolução de grupos de mamíferos, sua especiação e relações ecológico-evolutivas com os grandes biomas sul-americanos e terrestres em geral. A Biogeografia tem sido uma derivação natural de meus estudos, bem como de minha orientação.

Mais recentemente tenho me devotado ao estudo de aspectos da filosofia da Biologia, particularmente no que se refere às questões da história evolutiva, o que tem me levado a estudar como as Ciências Naturais (no caso as Ciências Biológicas) podem se beneficiar das Ciências Humanas (particularmente a História e as Ciências Sociais).

10 principais publicações

de Vivo, M.; A.P. Carmignotto, 2015. Family Sciuridae. Pp.: 1- 44, in *Mammals of South America, Volume 2: Rodents*. James L. Patton and Ulyses F. J. Pardiñas (eds.), University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

de Vivo, M.; L.F. Silveira; F.O. do Nascimento, 2014. Reflexões sobre coleções zoológicas, sua curadoria e a inserção dos Museus na estrutura universitária brasileira. *Arq. Zool.* 45(10): 105-114.

Carmignotto, A.P.; M. de Vivo; A. Langguth, 2012. Mammals of the Cerrado and Caatinga: Distribution Patterns of the Tropical Open Biomes of Central South America. Chapter 14: 307 - 349 in *Bones, Clones, and Biomes: The History and Geography of Recent Neotropical Mammals,* B.D. Patterson e L. Costa (eds.), University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

de Vivo, M. 2008. Mamíferos e mudanças climáticas. Marcos S. Buckeridge. (ed.), *Biologia e Mudanças Climáticas no Brasil.* Editora Rima, São Carlos, Pp.: 207-223.

Iack-Ximenez, G.E., de Vivo, M., Percequillo, A.R. 2005. A new genus for Loncheres grandis Wagner, 1845, with taxonomic comments on other arboreal echimyids (Rodentia, Echimyidae). *Arquivos do Museu Nacional 63*: 89-112.

Marroig, G.; de Vivo, M.; Cheverud, J.M. 2004. Cranial evolution in sakis (Pithecia, Platyrrhini) II: evolutionary processes and morphological integration. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology 17*: 144-155.

de Vivo, M.; Carmignotto, A.P. 2004. Holocene vegetation change and the mammal faunas of South America and Africa. *Journal of Biogeography 31*: 943-957.

de Vivo, M.. 1997. Mammalian evidence of historical ecological change in the Caatinga semiarid vegetation of northeastern Brazil. *J. Comp. Biol. 2*: 65-73.

de Vivo, M. 1996. How many species of mammals are there in Brazil? Taxonomic practice and diversity evaluation. In *Biodiversity in Brazil: a first approach*. Bicudo, C.E.; Menezes, N.A. (eds.), Pp.: 313 - 321. CNPq, São Paulo.

de Vivo, M. 1992. *Taxonomia de Callithrix, Erxleben, 1777 (Callitrichidae, Primates).* Fundação Biodiversitas, Belo Horizonte, 105 pp.

2. Título do Projeto: "Taxonomies of the Mind: The Biological and Cultural Structure of Who We Are"

3. Período: Agosto, 2017 a julho de 2019

4. Resumo e Objetivos: Meu projeto de afiliação ao IEA, Polo Ribeirão Preto, visa escrever um livro que já se encontra em fase de redação, e cuja estrutura e conteúdo de capítulos se encontra na próxima seção desta proposta. Como é possível examinar a partir da leitura de minha súmula curricular acima, trabalhei aproximadamente metade de minha carreira no Departamento de Biologia da Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras de Ribeirão Preto e a outra metade no Museu de Zoologia. Minha carreira, então, sempre foi essencialmente biológica. Entretanto, nos últimos anos venho me interessando por entender a complexidade da interação das chamadas Ciências Naturais e a área de "Humanidades", em suas várias disciplinas, particularmente História e Antropologia Cultural. Assim sendo estou fazendo esta proposta para afiliação na qualidade de Perofessor Sênior junto ao IEA pois é exatamente a característica multidisciplinar desse instituto que acredito ser fundamental para que meu projeto de estudo e publicação tenha sucesso: espero, através da estrutura e missão do IEA estar em contato com

pesquisadores de áreas distintas do conhecimento, o que me permitiria estabelecer um diálogo certamente esclarecedor e aprofundador de meus estudos. Ao mesmo tempo acredito que minha formação biológica pode ser relevante para meus interlocutores.

O projeto em si visa descrever as condições e razões do por quê as Ciências Naturais e as Humanidades têm tanta dificuldade em estabelecer um diálogo que permita o avanço do conhecimento. Como é possível perceber pela leitura da proposta de livro que segue abaixo, minha visão do problema vai além das questões meramente acadêmicas e passa exatamente pela natureza cultural da biologia humana.

Projeto do livro:

The **first chapter** is described below, and it is probably the most crucial for the development of the arguments presented. It deals with our many means and strategies for acquiring knowledge, but these several ways to knowledge can be, for the purpose of this project presentation, be simplified to only two, those belonging to our community context, here called common culture and those belonging to the formal education system. Evidently "education" belongs to a cultural context as much as informal common culture, but the former can be usefully distinguished because it is learning through effort, usually a lot of effort for a considerable number of years, while common culture is learned as a matter of living daily for as long as one lives. Both systems merge in societies and the distinction between what knowledge and beliefs come from each system is most of the time impossible to separate. In fact there is ample literature about these kinds of knowledge and specific terminology associated, but in this preface I will not go beyond this simple point. What I really want to emphasize now is that some scientific knowledge trickles down to the people in general, frequently in a very watered down version and even some slightly incorrect or outdated version through the educational system and popular media, but the net result of this process is that the knowledge produced at the front of research is fully possessed only by a tiny fraction of the population. As there are many branches and subbranches in every scientifc discipline, all scientific knowledge is thus fragmentarily produced and only splinters of this knowledge eventually reaches a wider public. The school system have the tremendous task of imparting this knowledge to its students, but it can only do it through broad generalizations, the more shallow as more basic is the level of schooling or the farthest way from an specific area the content of a school course is. This is something both intuitive and obvious, but what is neither of those things is that all scientific knowledge, with one exception*, is imparted through persons, and these persons must have prestige to do so. These persons are teachers and/or scientists writing textbooks or popularizing pieces. These persons are either prestigious by previous work they have done and publicized and may derive some (or all) of their prestige from the institution they are affiliated to, a school, university, or research center. A person trying to produce and publicize scientific knowledge without the backing of an academic institution faces some, even complete discredit.

This system is actually identical to that of the communal cultural transmission, which relies on figures of authority or prestige to disseminate cultural knowledge. These people are priests, political leaders, music and movie stars, our parents, our peers and many other kinds of persons. In fact each one of us acts as a figure of authority and prestige at a certain level of social organization, and we only fail to disseminate our own beliefs if our authority and prestige is low or inexistent.

If both systems of knowledge dissemination are equal what, if anything, distinguishes them? The distinction must be not in the form, but in the content itself. My first chapter is about exactly this: demonstrating that all knowledge is successful in spreading if backed up by prestigious persons, and that the distinction between the various kinds of knowledge must lit with content, rather than form. This goes against the post-modernist view that all language (form) deals the same message (content).

The **second chapter** must deal with a particular kind of content related at the core of the argument of this study, which are the historical branches of Science. These scientific disciplines, such

as Biological Evolution, Biological Systematics, Geology, Paleontology, and History, to name the most commonly cited, are not the only ones that can use a historical approach. All branches of Science will use its own history as an educational tool, and eventually may even become historically oriented to answer a particular question, but most of the time it is possible to distinguish between historical and non historical disciplines. As all scientific disciplines search for causal explanations for the phenomena they study, those historically oriented will frequently see patterns rooted in the past – how far back in time may vary, but the past is their turf. Those non historical disciplines will offer explanations for phenomena with contemporary or near contemporary causes. In this second chapter it is necessary to look into the very nature of what means to be historical causation and what is not really historical but only old. There is a difference. The chapter will finish by a discussion of what particularity there is in History that makes historically oriented explanations solid or narrations of old events.

The **third chapter** is a continuation of the second in the sense that different scientific branches are compared in order to distinguish how the interplay of historical and contemporary based explanations distinguish them. It is a look into the machinery of these scientific branches, so to speak. It is at this point that we will see how even historical explanations will differ greatly in the meaning and extension of their historicity, and those scientific disciplines that rely mostly on contemporary explanations will differ as well, but much less so.

The **fourth chapter** breaks entirely with the previous chapter to return to the matter of two different levels of analysis: the individual and the collective. It enquiries right at the core of what is to be a social animal, and my emphasis will logically be at the biological level, but it is unavoidable to contrast the biological perspective with those of some disciplines within the humanist field such as the Social Sciences and Cultural Anthropology.

The **fifth chapter** will present the "Hierarchically Organized Group", or the HOG, as the fundamental social level of organization that humans display and that can be modelled through data gathered by Paleontology, Human Evolutionary Biology and History. It is a model of a group with the minimum requirements necessary to be recognized as a social structure, and we will see the HOG in many historical examples, from our distant apeish past through some other historical phases to our own days. I will try to demonstrate that the HOG has never changed in its structure, and all we have done with all our many layers of cultural refinent was to add coats of varnish: the varnish gives a beautiful brilliance to the form, but the form is easily seen through it. I will also try to demonstrate that the structure of the HOG permeates every human institution, everywhere, anytime, simply because we cannot help it. Like tuna will not live in the desert, humans can only act and exist within the HOG. The HOG is our social ecosystem.

The **final chapter** is a vehement defense of neutrality in Science against any form of ideological manipulation. I see ideology, any ideology, as an obstacle to the study of the Universe. The fact that it may be hard to perceive some ideological influences in our own work does not excuse us of being ever alert. This chapter concludes with an attempt to see our entire evolutionary and historical landscape through a non ideological pair of glasses. The picture is neither beautiful or magnificent, but I hope is the closest to reality as I manage to see it. It will be, hopefully, scientific.

Science has this power of making us understand the Universe beyond our short lifespans, beyond our senses, communal traditions and storytelling. Science makes us understand everything even against our common sense, showing us reality as we would not usually be able to see. This is transcendental. But there is this problem with transcendence that we cannot bear too much of it, otherwise we become dreamers lost to the cares of this world. In the actual world to which we wake up everyday, we begin by forgetting most or all of what we have dreamt. As the day progresses towards the next night we experience a variety of emotions or none at all and we act. This is how our societies are organized to function, with each one of us struggling through our worries, integrated to many instances of the functioning communities to which we belong. Humanity evolved to function perfectly

without any understanding or perception of deep time and history other than ou immediate ancestry and descendance. The fact that very early we discovered "history" and "stories" gradually brought us a new understanding that we can no longer live without: many of the causes of phenomena may have to be searched in a past so distant we cannot remember as families or clans or even nations. But our everyday cares keep that understanding far in the background of most people's minds. All around us the "machineries of joy*" keep steaming on, bringing cultural and scientific change at scales higher than those measured by our own lives but we are existentially myopic. We keep busy everyday, and everything around us changes usually in very small daily accretions. Our lives go on; for a time we keep up with everybody else almost effortlessly, than we eventually reach some comfortable spot and we stop struggling out of tiredness or contentment, because there comes a moment when we realize that keeping up with the times is not as easy as it has been. We, then, may believe we have understood what there was to be understood or make our peace with what we do not understand. But if we observe what is going on we also may conclude that the answers we got through a lifetime of effort belong to questions that no one else is asking anymore. They were our questions. We look around and the people we see around us is new, in fact there is a lot of new people, and they want to know something else. Some of us may try to reengage, and chase the answers for the some of those new questions, but it is harder than before and more often than not we fail. So we quietly, with a little resignation and some angst, decide to stay where we are, a few old-timers by our side, hugging to whatever precious notions survived the onslaught of the hordes of new people, until we are no more. By then the new people will have settled down in some comfortable place of their own, only to realize that the newest people are making them feel embarrassingly outdated.

But there it is Science, transcending us all, old and new people. It does not depend on us wishing to keep up with it or not, and it is a social process that keeps going on if conditions are right: it does not hear our pleas to slow down, nor it goes the direction we would like it to. We are but clouds in the atmosphere of Science. Knowledge is produced, purged, refined, stored, reviewed, discarded, and more knowledge is produced. It may go the way of all cultural products of our lives, the new replacing the old for the sake of novelty, or it may be more consequential, profound, meaningful.

Somehow, while I read these lines I wrote I realize they are somewhat obscure, so I will have to let the reader decide if what follows makes sense by reading it. But I would like to stress that this book is much more about the questions it addresses than the answers here provided. In fact, questions are generally more useful than answers because they tend to last longer, given the many errors contained in the answers! However one important thing about Science that every scientist eventually learns is that there is no question we may not ask, and there is no question that, once asked, can remain comfortably unanswered.

5. Justificativa: Este projeto de livro faz parte de minha atuação no sentido de divulgar e debater a ideia de que as muitas especialidades acadêmicas que se desenvolveram e existem como subculturas em si mesmas devem, em última instância, enxergar os muitos pontos de convergência e interesse conjunto. É o que acredito possa ser minha contribuição à uma visão mais universal do conhecimento humano, em oposição à especialização extrema que se torna cada vez mais a norma nas universidades em todo o mundo.

Em termos de metas científicas, além do livro, que é a peça central do esforço, pretendo escrever um artigo ao fim do primeiro ano adiantando uma parte da argumentação final e submetê-lo à revista do IEA para publicação.

6. Impactos: Pretendo trazer essa discussão para debate no campus da USP de Ribeirão Preto, mas minha abordagem é inédita em alguns aspectos, e assim seu impacto só pode ser medido pelo próprio desenvolvimento do debate – ou a ausência deste no caso do desinteresse da comunidade científica. Correndo o risco de parecer excessivamente ambicioso em meus propósitos, acredito firmemente que a incorporação do conhecimento biológico ao escopo teórico das Humanidades é fundamental para as

disciplinas em consideração. Na verdade são as Humanidades que, na ausência de diálogo com as Ciências Naturais, correm o risco de se tornarem obsoletas e com o mesmo valor para o conhecimento humano que o corpo de narrativa teológica. Acredito, assim, que o principal impacto de meu trabalho, se bem sucedido, será – mais uma vez – propor o diálogo com as Humanidades.

7. Áreas do Conhecimento: Filosofia das Ciências Biológicas, Filosofia da Ciência.

8. Plano de Trabalho: A seguir apresento os principais aspectos de minha filiação junto ao IEA, Polo Ribeirão Preto, como imagino que possa se desenvolver.

1. Pesquisa e redação do livro proposto, tanto nas instalações do IEA como nas bilbiotecas relevantes da Universidade.
2. Oferecimento de palestras, em número de ao menos uma por semestre, tanto para a comunidade da USP no campus de Ribeirão Preto quanto para a comunidade em geral, dentro de programas que estou ciente de estarem sendo já desenvolvidos pelo IEA.
3. Publicação de um artigo ao final de meu primeiro ano de filiação diretamente relacionado ao projeto do livro, além de publicações que representam a continuidade de minha linha de pesquisa prévia.

9. Cronograma:

1. Primeiro ano: pesquisa e redação de artigo e livro; ao menos 2 palestras em meios a serem escolhidos conjuntamente com a Coordenação do IEA, Polo Ribeirão Preto.
2. Segundo ano: pesquisa, redação e conclusão do livro proposto; ao menos duas palestras relacionadas ao tema proposto nos mesmos moldes descritos acima.

10. Elaboração de trabalhos científicos: Já descrito acima.

11. Uma Bibliografia: A seguir apresento uma lista selecionada de livros que abrangem os fundamentos dos aspectos principais da pesquisa que ora desenvolvo e pretendo continuar na condição de professor Sênior filiado ao IEA, Polo Ribeirão Preto, USP. Essa bibliografia não representa a totalidade das obras a serem consultadas, pois excluem artigos científicos e numerosos outros livros que tratam de aspectos mais aprofundados ou particulares de temas mais gerais.

Aberth, J. 2011. *Plagues in World History.*Rowman & Littlefield Publ., Inc., Lanham, Boulder, etc.
Arendt, H. 1976. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. A Harvest Book, Harcourt Inc., Orlando, etc.
Aron, R. 2009. *The Opium of the Intelectuals.* Transactions Publishers, New Brunswick and London.
Backhouse, R.; P. Fontaine, 2010. *The History of the Social Sciences Since 1945.* Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, New York, etc.
Barnard, A. 2000. *History and Theory in Anthropology*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, New York, etc.
Barnard, A.; J. Spencer, 2002. *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology.* Routledge, London and New York.
Boesch, C. 2012. *Wild Cultures. A Comparison Between Chimpanzee and Human Cultures.* Cambridge Univ. Press, New York.
Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, New York, etc.
Botelho, A. 2013. *Essencial Sociologia.* Penguin & Cia. das Letras, São Paulo.
Braudel, F. 1980. *On History.* The Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Braudel, F. 1993. *A History of Civilizations.* Penguin Books, New York.
Calhoun, C. 2002. *Dictionary of the Social Sciences.* Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, New York, etc.
Carnap, R. 1995. *An Introduction to the Phylosophy of Science.* Dover Publ., New York.

Chapais, B. 2008. *Primeval Kinship. How Pair-Bonding Gave Birth to Human Society.* Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge and London.
Chomsky, N. 2006. *Language and Mind.* Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.
Cronk, L.; N. Chagnon; W. Irons, 2000. *Adaptation and Human Behavior. An Anthropological Perspective.* Aldine de Gruyter, New York.
Dennett, D.C. 2017. *From Bacteria to Bach and Back. The Evolution of Minds.* W.W. Norton & Co., New York and London.
Diamond, J. 1997. *Guns, Germs and Steel. A Short History of Everybody for the Last 13,000 Years.* Vintage Books, London.
Dupas, G. 2006. *O Mito do Progresso, ou Progresso Como Ideologia.* Editora Unesp, São Paulo.
Durkheim, E.; M. Mauss, 1963. *Primitive Classification.* The Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Eco, U. 2007. *Dall'Albero al Labirinto. Studi Storici sul Segno e l'Interpretazione.* Bompiani, Milano.
Febvre, L. 1970. *La Terre et l'Evolution Humaine.Introduction Geographique à l'Histoire.* Éditions Albin Michel, Paris.
Feyerabend, P. 2010. *Against Method.* Verso, London and New York.
Freud, S. 2010. *Civilization and its Discontents.* W.W. Norton & Co., New York and London.
Fuentes, A. 2009. *Evolution of Human Behavior.* Oxford Univ. Press, New York and Oxford.
Gibbs, Jr., R.W. 2008. *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought.* Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, New York, etc.
Giddens, A.; P.W. Sutton, 2014. *Essential Concepts in Sociology.* Polity Press, Cambridge.
Godfrey-Smith, P. 2003. *Theory and Reality. An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science.* Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.
Godfrey-Smith, P. 2014. *Philosophy of Biology.* Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton and Oxford.
Gray, J. 2002. *Straw Dogs. Thoughts on Humans and other Animals.* Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, New York.
Gray, J. 2013. *The Silence of Animals. On Progress and Other Modern Myths.* Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, New York.
Hawkins, M. 1997. *Social Darwinism in European and American Thought 1860-1945. Nature as Model and Nature as Threath.* Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.
Holland, J.H. 1998. *Emergence, from Chaos to Order.* Basic Books, New York.
Ianni, O. 1972. *Teorias de Estratificação Social. Leituras de Sociologia.* Companhia Editora Nacional, São Paulo.
Kauffman, S.A. 1993. *The Origins of Order. Self-Organizatioon and Selection in Evolution.* Oxford Univ. Press, New York and Oxford.
Kuhn, T.S. 2012. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* The Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.
Lévi-Strauss, C. 1969. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship.* Beacon Press, Boston.
Matson, W. 2011. *Grand Theories and Everyday Beliefs. Science, Philosophy, and their Histories.* Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, New York, etc.
Moore, J.D. 2012. *Visions of Culture. An Introduction to Anthropological Theories and Theorists.* Altamira Press, Lanham, New York, etc.
Nilsson, N.J. 2014. *Understanding Beliefs.* The MIT Press, Cambridge and London.
Nordenskiöld, E. 1935. *The History of Biology.* Tudor Publ. Co., New York.
Pinker, S. 2009. *How the Mind Works.* W.W. Norton and Co., New York and London.
Popper, K. 2002. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery.* Routledge Classics, London and New York.
Popper, K. 2013. *The Open Society and its Enemies.* Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton and Oxford.
Rorty, R. 1991. *Objectivity, Relativism, and Truth. Philosophical Papers, Vol. 1.* Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, New York, etc.
Rosenberg, A. 1980. *Sociobiology and the Preemption of Social Science.* The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore and London.
Rosenberg, A. 2008. *Darwinian Reductionism, or How to Stop Worrying and Love Molecular Biology.* The univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago and New York.
Ruse, M. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Phylosophy of Biology.* Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford and New York.
Russel, E. 2011. *Evolutionary History. Uniting History and Biology to Understand Life on Earth.* Cambridge

Univ. Press, New York.
Sahlins, M. 1976. *The Use and Abuse of Biology. An Anthropological Critique of Sociobiology.* The Univ. of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
Sahlins, M. 2008. *The Western Illusion of Human Nature, with Reflections on the Long History of Hierarchy, Equality, and the Sublimation of Anarchy in the West, and Comparative Notes on other Conceptions of the Human Condition.* Prickly Paradigm Press, Chicago.
Scheidel, W. 2017. *The Great Leveler. Violence and the History of Inequality, From the Stone Age to the Twenty-First Century.* Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton and Oxford.
Shryock, A.; D.L. Smail, 2011. *Deep History. The Architecture of Past and Present.* Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, etc.
Snow, C.P. 2013. *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution.* Cambridge Univ. Press, New York.
Sokal, A. 2008. *Beyond the Hoax. Science, Phylosophy and Culture.* Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, New York, etc.
Trigger, B.G. 2003. *Understanding Early Civilizartions. A Comparative Study.* Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.
Wallerstein, I. 2004. *World-Systems Analysis, an Introduction.* Duke Univ. Press, Durham and London.
Wilson, E.O. 2000. *Sociobiology, The New Synthesis.* The Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge and London.
Witzel, E.J.M. 2012. *The Origins of the World's Mythologies.* Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford and New York.
Zizek, S. 2012. *Mapping Ideology.* Verso, London.