

Agentic processes in cultural evolution: Relevance to Anthropocene sustainability

Peter J. Richerson
Department of Environmental Science and Policy
University of California—Davis
pjricherson@ucdavis.edu

Robert T. Boyd
School of Human Evolution and Social Change
Institute of Human Origins
Arizona State University
robert.boyd.1@asu.edu

Charles Efferson
Faculty of Business and Economics
University of Lausanne
Charles.Efferson@unil.ch

Abstract: Humans have evolved culturally and perhaps genetically to be unsustainable. We exhibit a deep and consistent pattern of short-term resource exploitation behaviors and institutions. We distinguish agentic and naturally selective forces in cultural evolution. Agentic forces are quite important compared to the blind forces (random variation and natural selection) in cultural evolution and gene-culture coevolution. We need to use the agentic policy-making processes to evade the impact of blind natural selection. We argue that agentic forces became important during our Pleistocene history and into the Anthropocene present. Human creativity in the form of deliberate innovations and the deliberate selective diffusion of technical and social advances drove this process forward for a long time before planetary limits became a serious issue. We review models with multiple positive feedbacks that roughly fit this observed pattern. Policy changes in the case of large-scale existential threats like climate change are made by political and diplomatic agents grasping and moving levers of institutional power in order to avoid the operation of blind natural selection and agentic forces driven by narrow or short-term goals.

Revised draft 6,364 main text words

Intended for: Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B themed issue on Evolution and Sustainability: Gathering the Threads for an Anthropocene Synthesis, Peter Søgaard Jørgensen, Timothy Waring & Vanessa P. Weinberger, guest editors

I. Introduction

The purpose of this contribution is two-fold. First, we want to explain how cumulative cultural evolution generated the Anthropocene. For the first time in the history of the Earth, a single species has transformed the biogeochemistry the planet in the space of a few millennia. Second, on the mitigation side, we want to understand how the basic processes of cultural evolution map onto the applied policy sciences of sustainability. How might the basic science of cultural evolution contribute to the practical problem of ending the destructive tendencies of the Anthropocene? Our basic argument is that cumulative cultural evolution has introduced a novel anthropogenic destabilizing element into the dynamics of the global ecosystem and that controlling this instability requires deliberate institutional reform. The critical contribution of cultural evolutionary theory is an understanding of these dynamics and their artificial stabilization.

II. An outline of the processes of cultural evolution and gene-culture coevolution

Any evolutionary process has elements of continuity and transformation. Transformative processes are often conceived of as forces that perturb continuity of species and cultures. Some of these forces are non-agentic in the sense they “just happen” and others are agentic in the sense that decisions of the organisms involved play an active role. Darwin built the *Origin of Species* around this distinction. Natural selection was the non-agentic outcome of variant organisms living out their lives in a particular environment under which some variants survived better or reproduced more successfully than other variants. Using the agentic process of artificial selection plant and animal breeders caused dramatic changes in many domesticated lineages in Victorian England. Natural theologians had assumed that all evolution required agency and nominated God as the Supreme Breeder. Darwin argued that natural selection could generate adaptations without agency, but he recognized that in some circumstances, like mate choice sexual selection, organisms did select some variants over others, and that these were especially important in current human evolution (1).

From an applied perspective, the distinction between agentic and non-agentic forces is fundamentally important. Waring et al. (2) introduced a multi-level *selection* framework for sustainability analysis. This terminology, to our taste, does not sufficiently emphasize the distinction between agentic and not-agentic forces. In general, policy-making is about using human choice, particularly collective choice, to change individual behavior and institutions so as to avoid the effects of non-agentic natural selection. Cultural group selection in the form of violent conflict resulting in conquest and forced assimilation of conquered populations has been an important force in human history (3). Although political elites often choose to make war, the outcome of violent conflicts has a strong element of non-agentic natural selection. In the aftermath of the bloody World Wars in the first half of the 20th century policy makers innovated institutions such as the League of Nations and the United Nations to try to avoid wars and mitigate their harms, with some, but far from complete, success. Similarly with threats to sustainability, policy makers are using collective agency to devise international organizations to mitigate things like anthropogenic climate change, for example the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, with some, but so far inadequate, success. Policy-makers want to deploy specific forms of *artificial* selection to try to avoid the worst effects of *natural* selection.

Non-agentic forces

Random processes affect genetic and cultural evolution. In the case of culture, memories are fallible and learners may not correctly understand their models. Cultural “mutation” rates are fairly high in many domains, perhaps one of the reasons that cultural evolution is faster than genetic evolution (4). In small populations, genetic or cultural variant frequencies can vary from time to time due to random sampling errors. In some situations, some cultural models may have outsized influence, shrinking effective size of the population. Even deleterious variants can increase in frequency by chance in small populations.

Any kind of heritable variation can be subject to natural selection. There is nothing special about genes in this regard. For example, Polynesian explorers undertook long, hazardous voyages to discover uninhabited islands in the Pacific to colonize. It is entirely plausible that voyagers using better boat designs or commanding better navigational techniques would more often survive these journeys, living to pass on the superior variants relative to those using inferior variants (5).

B. Agentic forces

In the case of cultural evolution, learning and creativity become forces of cultural evolution. The behavioral variants that one person discovers or invents can be passed on to others. Unlike genetic mutations these changes are not necessarily random with respect to fitness or other measures of function. Higher cultural than genetic mutation rates can be tolerated to the extent that they are better than random.

Social learners are also more or less discriminating adopters of variants they observe in their cultural models (6). Social learners use many strategies for biasing their social learning to increase their chances of acquiring functional variants (7). The simplest of these is trying out two or more variants and using the one with the highest payoff. If payoffs are hard to evaluate the social learner can use rules of thumb like adopting to most common local variant or adopting the recommendations of an expert.

Darwin (8) invoked tribal scale group selection in “primordial times” as having favored prosocial dispositions like sympathy and patriotism. Richards (9) argues that Darwin build a plausible theory of progressive reform based up these ancient dispositions. These is, in other words, an element of prosociality in post-primordial agentic evolutionary forces. For example, Cultural agents can also exert social selection on others by selecting individuals with one cultural (or genetic) variant rather than others as partners. In selecting a team for a cooperative venture, a team leader will usually select team-mates who are cooperative and skilled and expel those who prove troublesome or inept. A successful skilled and cooperative team will tend to produce higher payoffs that in turn boost the cultural influence of the skilled and cooperative relative to the inept and troublesome. Similarly, voters in democratic systems seem often to favor prosocial candidates and propositions rather that self-interested ones (10).

Michael Tomasello (11) gives a good evolutionary account of the origins of human collective agency. The agentic forces are rooted in ancient decision-making abilities of organisms. Reinforcement based learning is widespread (12). Mate choice, partner choice, food choice and the like are similarly widespread. Choices can be collective. Humans use language to formalize rules and to persuade others of the desirability or undesirability of alternate rules, leading to our unusual capacity for collective decision-making to shape the evolution of institutions.

III. The evolution of the Anthropocene

Recently, our species has come to have major effects on the Earth's geochemistry and geophysics (13). For example, industrial production has approximately doubled the Earth's fixed nitrogen income (14). Crutzen argued that these impacts are leaving traces in the geological record that will be easily detectable far into the future. As such, the human dominated Epoch of geological history should be recognized with a geological term—he proposed the "Anthropocene." Human use of large-scale fire to manage vegetation in semi-arid areas goes back tens of thousands of years as does the record of hunting impacts on the fauna (15). On the other hand, industrialization, population increase, and fossil fuel exploitation in the last couple of centuries has dramatically increased our influence on Earth processes, leading Crutzen to propose this period as the beginning of the Anthropocene.

The Anthropocene is late in human evolution. Our genus *Homo* goes back about 2.5 million years and our species *Homo sapiens* about 3 hundred thousand years old (16). For most of that time humans have been rather ordinary, even rare, organisms (17). Why is the Anthropocene such a recent phenomenon? The answer, we believe, lies in the dynamics of cumulative cultural evolution (CCE) (18). Under some circumstances, the processes of cultural evolution and gene-culture coevolution can lead to a situation where cultural sophistication can grow hyper-exponentially. The requirements for CCE seem to be, on the cognitive side, the ability to replicate culture accurately via high fidelity, selective imitation and teaching, and, on the population side, large interconnected social networks. If the fidelity of cultural transmission is too low, individuals have to spend too much time and effort reconstructing their phenotypes using individual learning, limiting the size and complexity of their cultural repertoires. If social networks are too small, social learners are exposed to only a few cultural variants and superior innovations cannot spread quickly. They are also at risk of being lost by chance. Cumulative cultural evolution typically results in larger cultural repertoires and more complex artifacts and institutions, but the master criterion is greater utility not size and complexity *per se* (19, 20). General introductions to cumulative cultural evolution include (21, 22, 23, 24, 25).

It is common to think of the history of humans as a gradual, relatively steady progress in our cognitive and cultural sophistication (26). However, our actual evolutionary history seems to have been more complex. For example, around 50-70,000 years ago (50-70 kya), well after our physical form was very similar to ours and our cultures fairly complex, our numbers were still quite small (27, 28). Such anomalies suggest that we should compete the progressive account with ones that account for human evolution as a response to environmental changes.

A. The Pleistocene environment and the evolution of cumulative cultural evolution

There were dramatic changes in the Earth's environment during our evolutionary history (29). The Cenozoic was characterized by a complex pattern of cooling, drying, and increasing variability of the environment caused by seafloor spreading rearranging the drifting continents to isolate the poles from warm ocean currents. The cooling of the polar regions generated a strong pole to equator temperature gradient that powered increasing climate variation. In the late Miocene, the African bipedal apes that became our ancestors evolved as deciduous forests, savannas and deserts expanded and the great apes' wet forest habitats contracted. This climate trend eventually culminated in the Pleistocene ice ages that featured unstable ice-covered polar regions and alternating glacial-interglacial climate fluctuations (30). Beginning about 2.6 million years ago, the ice began to fluctuate mainly on the 41 thousand-year (41 ky) rhythm of the tilt of the Earth's axis. Geologists mark this as the beginning of the Pleistocene Epoch. Early

members of our genus *Homo* evolved from the Pliocene bipedal Australopithecines around the beginning of the Pleistocene. A million years ago, the dominant glacial-interglacial pattern shifted to a 100 ky cycle tuned by the ellipticity of the Earth's orbit. Larger brained and culturally more sophisticated species of *Homo* evolved in this period, but there is no evidence that they became even common until the very end of the Pleistocene (31).

Superimposed on the relatively low frequency glacial-interglacial pattern were higher frequency millennial and submillennial scale variations, first resolved in the 1990s in Greenland ice cores going back in the last interglacial over 100 thousand years ago (32). Subsequent high-resolution cores have pushed the record of the high frequency events back as much as 800 ky (33, 34). These data suggest that the high frequency variation has been increasing over time.

The millennial and submillennial scale variation is particularly interesting in the context of human evolution (35). The time scales over which costly capacities for individual learning and social learning seem, from theoretical considerations, to stretch from generational and subgenerational to millennial time scales. Variation at the orbital variation scales (21, 41, and 100 ky) were likely met with genetic evolution and niche chasing via range changes. Cumulative cultural evolution in humans is faster than genetic evolution (4) and thus better able to track millennia and submillennial scale variation. The pattern of increase in cultural sophistication and brain size increase is similar to the pattern of increase in millennial scale variation over the last 4-800 ky. Thus, it is easy to imagine on theoretical and empirical grounds that human capacity for cumulative culture evolved as a response to the increasing amount of high amplitude climate variation in the Pleistocene. This hypothesis will be further tested as the high-resolution climate and paleo-ecological records are recovered back deeper into the Pleistocene and Pliocene (36).

Evolution in response to the externally imposed climate variation cannot be the whole story because, as important as culture, even cumulative culture, is in many species, the huge dependence of humans on culture is a distinct outlier (37). The high metabolic cost of large brains and the need for extended developmental period to make them useful, slows the reproductive rate of large-brained species like our great ape cousins, whose maximum population growth rates are very low (38). Humans evaded ape limitations on brain size by the expedient of cooperative breeding. Humans use kinship and friendship to mobilize males and pre- and post-reproductive females to provision mothers and their dependent offspring (39, 40), substantially shortening our inter-birth intervals compared to other apes. As a consequence, our species has the potential for substantial rates of population growth if resources are plentiful.

The economic basis of the cooperative breeding system is technology fueled subsistence systems that use tools and other technological practices such as cooking to exploit extracted and hunted resources often using cooperation on a more or less large scale (41, 42). The great apes have two conspicuous preadaptations that put them on the edge of sustaining cumulative culture evolution. These include large brains and large social groups (43). Large brains appear to be necessary to manage the cognitive demands of cumulative culture. Large social groups provide the personnel for cooperative activities and act to facilitate innovation, the conservation of cultural complexity and the rapid diffusion of advantageous innovations due to biased horizontal and oblique cultural transmission (44, 45). Chimpanzee mothers dominate the social transmission to their offspring, limiting chimpanzee's ability to use a large social network as a basis for selecting and diffusing superior cultural variants (46). The

evolution of specialized economic roles for males would be difficult until males began to be social fathers and mentors to their younger male relatives and friends (47). The evolution of cooperation in humans was arguably augmented by cumulative culture itself because cultural variation can support group level selection in a way that is difficult to imagine for genetic variation (48).

The Australopithecines added to this mixture free hands that were becoming specialized for the human power grip that is essential for such activities as pounding and knapping stone to make tools. The biomechanics of hands are well understood (49). Stone cutting tools that can be made with human, but not other primate hands, are especially important because they are powerful machine tools that can be used to shape wood, cut fibrous material, and shape skins to make a large number of other tools (50). Hands and the tools they make and use are fundamental to our exploitation of diverse culture-based socio-technological niches (51).

Thus, we have a two-part hypothesis to explain the origin of the human cumulative cultural adaptation. One part is the increasing millennial and submillennial scale climate variation that favors adaptation by learning and social learning. The other part is the ape and Australopithecine preadaptations of large societies and hands that could be specialized for toolmaking, uncompromised by the use of the forelimbs for locomotion. The large economic payoffs to using tools to acquire difficult resources and deploying cooperation for subsistence practices meant that only humans could take massive advantage of the cultural niche (52). A number of authors over the years have proposed that these preadaptations set up a positive feedback cycle that led to modern *Homo sapiens* (e.g. 53). However, the progressive increase in brain size and cultural sophistication in most of the Pleistocene does not look like a positive feedback process. The pace of progress seems more or less linear and to have been paced by the ongoing increase in high frequency climate variation (35). The increasing overhead costs of large brains seems to have damped any positive feedback runaway process for a couple of million years. As Anatomically Modern humans expanded their range out of Africa perhaps 70 kya, mitochondrial DNA coalescence time data suggest populations were still very small, although numbers would shortly begin to increase (28). The cognitive and social preadaptations necessary for cumulative cultural evolution seem to have existed for tens of millennial before the Anthropocene runaway began in earnest.

B. Latest Pleistocene: Hinge of the Anthropocene

Anatomically Modern Human populations seem to have begun a steady increase about 50 kya, with rather different patterns in different continents and subcontinents of Eurasia (27, 54). This change in human demography is coincident with the *H. sapiens* expansion out of Africa to fairly shortly become the only living human species. Possibly, a fortuitous mutation in a gene influencing human creativity sparked a sustained increase the rate of cultural innovation (55). A major problem with this explanation is that our sister species, the Neanderthals, also seem to display signs of a cultural acceleration late in their evolutionary history more or less coincident with the acceleration in *H. sapiens* (56). There is also a plausible environmental explanation for the increased rate of cultural cumulation beginning around 50 kya. The last half of the last ice age had the highest rate of millennial scale variation so far observed in the paleoclimate record (33, 34). Such an increase in high frequency climate variation plausibly gave highly cultural large brained humans a decisive advantage over their minimally cultural top carnivore predators. The resulting increase in human population would increase rates of cultural innovation (57, 58). Humans finally seem to have become dominant carnivores leading, among other things, to a major

megafaunal extinction event (59) first in Eurasia and Australia, then in the New World after humans reached it perhaps 15 kya.

C. The Holocene and the evolution of agriculture

The high frequency climate variation characteristic of ice ages ameliorated rather abruptly after 11,700 years ago. The Earth also became, on average, warmer and wetter, and the concentration of CO₂ in the atmosphere increased. These factors were conducive to the development of agriculture and, more generally, to plant intensive subsistence systems (60). Agriculture is a highly significant innovation because it replaces the predator-prey relationship to the species humans subsist upon with a mutualistic one. Cumulative culture tends to create human super-predators that collapse exploited species, as the end Pleistocene megafaunal extinctions illustrate, whereas cumulative cultural evolution tends to fuel the explosive growth farming subsistence ecosystems (Efferson et al., this issue; (61, 62). It is sometimes said that the origin of agriculture produced an immediate demographic transition but recent quantitative evidence suggests a different picture. The population growth rates of early Fertile Crescent farmers were very similar to the growth rates of Western North American hunter-gatherers fairly deep into the Holocene (63). In the Holocene, both farmers and hunter-gatherers were slowly evolving more plant rich subsistence systems and the explosive potential of the farming mutualism is hard to detect empirically until the middle Holocene. The curve of global human population increase has a pronounced hockey stick pattern with a long tail of quite slow, but slowly accelerating, growth that conspicuously explodes in an accelerating fashion approaching the present (64). In the last couple of centuries, the modern demographic transition has progressively reduced population after population to replacement, even below replacement, fertility but rising consumption per capita has meant that human pressure on other species and on ecosystem services like climate has continued to increase at a rapid rate.

The hockey stick pattern can be approximated by fairly simple coupled differential equation models that introduce multiple positive feedbacks (64). In Genet et al.'s (62) model, a growing human population increases the rate of cultural cumulation on the argument that larger populations will have more innovators (44). Culture also cumulates exponentially in their models on the argument that many innovations are recombinations of existing innovations so the larger the stock of techniques and designs the easier innovation becomes. The more complex models introduced by Efferson et al. (in this issue) exhibit a wide range of behavior depending on parameter values and initial conditions. Notably, the commonest stable state is a "post human" equilibrium in which humans and their culture disappear. The "natural" models of humans with cumulative culture constructed so far, at least, are inherently unstable. Sustainable human systems would seem to require large-scale adaptive management to be sustainable.

The coupled differential equation models are deterministic but they do incorporate an agentic innovation process in the sense that humans are motivated to innovate by resource shortfalls and to adopt the innovations of others. They are blind to the large-scale problems generated by runaway cumulative cultural evolution and lack the element of group-level strategic decision-making that is likely where solutions to the problems of the Anthropocene are to be found. They are models of business-as-usual in the jargon of IPCC Reports.

IV. Application of cultural evolution to the problem of sustainability: Limitations and prospects

The concepts and methods of evolution constitute one of the most important synthetic principles in the science of living things (25). As such, it may seem as if evolution should play a central role in the applied science of sustainability. In the sense of basic science, this ambitious claim is, we think, warranted. We submit our foregoing cumulative cultural evolution explanation for the Anthropocene as evidence for this fundamental role. However, as an applied science it has limitations as well as promise. We believe that applied cultural evolutionists need to think strategically about exactly where they can make useful applied contributions, where they either have no useful advice, or where other disciplines have a comparative advantage.

A useful analogy is evolutionary medicine (65), where advocates have had trouble convincing the medical establishment of its utility (66, 67). In evolutionists' terms, many questions of practical medical treatment involve proximal causes while evolution deals mainly with ultimate causes. Proximal causes involve the way physiological, anatomical and behavioral mechanisms accomplish ultimate functions related to survival and reproduction (68). Typically, proximal mechanisms are only loosely constrained ultimate imperatives. An extreme example is symbolic behaviors like language or sexually selected displays. Language has vital communication functions without which human life as we know it is not possible. Yet, to a first approximation, all 7,000 of the world's languages serve these essential functions equally well using highly diverse vocabularies and syntaxes. Even in much more constrained domains the variation in proximate factors is considerable. For example, drug development is heavily dependent on model organisms, especially the mouse. But candidate drugs that work well in mice often fail in human clinical trials. Mice are very convenient (cheap) models of humans. They are fairly closely related to us. But the genetics and physiology of mice are appreciably different from that of humans so they are far from perfect models (69). Humans are not genetically very variable, yet the database on clinically relevant human variation is quite large (70). Human cultural variation is at least an order of magnitude larger than our genetic variation (71), much of that is most likely not a result of identifiable ultimate factors (72).

Most of the applied social sciences, like most of medical science, operates on the basis of what we think of as a naïve functionalist model. Society, like the body, can be analogized to a machine that not infrequently malfunctions. Applied science consists of identifying the usually proximal cause of malfunction and repairing it. Applied history, economics, political science, sociology and anthropology mostly follow the naïve functionalist approach to problems and, in their willingness to deal with proximate causes of problems, they have a comparative advantage over evolutionists. For example, if you want to convince a skeptical audience of the utility of a proposed solution to a problem, you are better off consulting the ancient art/science of rhetoric (persuasion) than evolutionary theory. Where evolutionists do have a comparative advantage is in issues where population dynamics are important. The recent Covid-19 pandemic highlighted, on the one hand, proximal biology, as in the rapid development of vaccines, had a vital role to play. On the other hand, epidemiology (models of ecological and evolutionary dynamics of disease) was useful to predict the course of the pandemic and the evolution of the virus. For example, the evolution of the relative avirulence of successive strains of SARS-CoV-2 is well predicted by epidemiological theory (73, PW Ewald personal communication). The virus should evolve to be about as lethal as the seasonal flu, as successive strains actually have.

We encourage human ecologists and cultural evolutionists interested in applications to sustainability and similar real-world problems to think of their subject as the cultural branch of epidemiology. The distinctive contribution of applied cultural evolution is also likely to mostly lie in the dynamic tools that evolutionists can bring to problems. On the theoretical side, recursion equations and coupled differential equations are conceptually and mathematically closely related to epidemiological models. The idea that elements of culture (memes) can spread like biological pathogens was introduced by Dawkins (74). Richerson and Boyd (75) used evolutionary game theory to model evolution in a situation where cultural variation could favor or disfavor genetic fitness to varying degrees. Several cultural-evolutionary processes can lead to pathological cultural elements evolving. For example, group selection on culture can lead to large scale cooperation in human societies with high payoffs to participating individuals. At the same time, selection on genes tends to operate on smaller scale, giving rise to selfish motivations. Much of the political drama in human societies pits public virtue against private vice. Boyd and Richerson (76) showed how prestige biased cultural transmission might give rise to pathological runaway cultural evolution. These models might be applicable to understanding the growth the QAnon political conspiracy theory and similar ideological extremisms, some of which vex efforts to address sustainability issues. The subdivision of humans into ethnicities, classes, castes, religions, economic organizations and the like can give rise to conflicts, sometimes quite debilitating ones. Peter Turchin (77) has used coupled differential equation models of class-stratified societies to understand the rise and fall of political discord. Efferson et al. (this volume) introduce a model that blends elements of ecology, economics and cultural evolution. These models fit roughly fit the empirical data. They are perhaps alarming in that they have no stable equilibrium with humans present in the system. Turchin's and Efferson's models are deterministic, lack policy level feedback control, and have alarming future trajectories. To the extent that such small-minded robotic models fit the data they suggest that policy-makers need to innovate control strategies to counter the instability inherent in cumulative cultural evolution.

In principle, any institutional innovation designed to promote sustainability can generate both individual and collective forms of behavior change. Some people will fall under the immediate sway of the new institution and the incentives it creates, and some of these people may change behavior as a result. This kind of behavior change constitutes the direct effect of the intervention. Once people start to change behavior in this way, indirect effects may also occur as people learn new ways of thinking and behaving from each other, and endogenous cultural evolution takes over. Depending on the details, for example, conformity and coordination incentives may lead to socially beneficial changes in behavior that are consistent with, but far outstrip the original ambitions of the institutional innovation. The smart social planner designs institutions that maximize direct effects, and she implements institutional change in a way that also maximizes indirect effects. The idea that the well-intentioned social planner can recruit cultural evolutionary processes to promote beneficial changes in behavior, has generated enormous interest as a way to support conservation and mitigate climate change (78, 79, 80, 81, 82). A key challenge, however, is that ordinary forms of heterogeneity can dramatically affect how well this works (83, 84). Imagine, for example, that everyone is a conformist, but they also vary in terms of their preferences. This mundane scenario creates a fundamental but poorly understood trade-off. An institutional innovation that focuses on those amenable to sustainable choices would maximize the direct effect but minimize the indirect effect. If instead, the innovation focuses on those resistant to sustainable choices, it will minimize the direct effect but maximize the indirect effect conditional on the

direct effect that does occur (85). Maximizing the total effect requires the social planner to manage the trade-off these two countervailing forces induce.

On the empirical side, evolutionists bring useful tools to study short term and long-term dynamic processes. Laboratory microcosms can be used sort term cultural evolution (86), including asking ambitious questions (87). In especially favorable circumstances a rather detailed understanding of real-world evolution is possible (88). With sufficient resources, sophisticated field experiments can be used to test the efficacy of cultural evolution-based interventions (89). Evolutionary game theory has been applied to the study of cross-cultural variation in cooperative performance of different societies (90, 91), suggesting that they might be used to diagnose the institutional strength of organizations in applied contexts. The development of historical databases promises to greatly improve causal analysis of medium and long term cultural evolutionary phenomena (92). Similarly, large scale multi-wave survey research provides data on cultural changes. From an applied point of view, rates of cultural evolution are obviously critical to policy debates. If favorable cultural trends are rapid relative to the magnitude of a problem we might be justified in avoiding costly or risky policy changes. For example, China's draconian one-child policy was unnecessary because the Chinese demographic transition was already rather advanced when it was instituted. More generally the demographic transition has substantially defused the population bomb that worried previous generations of activists (93). On the other hand, if they are slow and unfavorable relative to the magnitude of the problem, measures to increase the rate and direction of cultural change may need to be taken. For example, climate sensitive strategic public and private investments in wind, solar, and battery technology have been dramatically successful, to the point that decarbonizing the energy system now seems possible. However, the mass demand for affluent consumption patterns on the part of the long-time affluent and on the part of some large, rapidly growing, formerly poor societies suggests that heavy pressure on planetary limits will continue even if rapid decarbonization does succeed. The drive behind pro-affluence policies based on simply increasing GDP/capita is arguably pathological on its own terms, the burden in places on environmental resources aside (94).

A full working out of the cultural epidemiology idea is beyond the scope of this essay, but two foundational points are worth mentioning. First, narrowing the primary ambition of applied cultural evolution to our most distinctive set of tools avoids giving the impression of disciplinary imperialism that is off-putting to those in our sister disciplines that may have a better grasp of answers to many applied questions than we do. Inevitably, applied (and basic!) scientific problems demand an expedient and eclectic mix of expertise across a range of fields. We have a contribution to make but so do "they." Second, we have spoken glibly of good and bad cultural variation here. Of course, one person's cultural pathology is often another's true belief. Applied science should have a self-conscious ethical dimension (95). Applied science usually results in a case for changing human behavior or retaining current practice in the face of proposals for change. Some applied science advice, like recommending the aforementioned vaccine in the face of the pandemic, seem ethically rather simple but proved controversial in some quarters. Applied science often requires ethical sensitivity and, sometimes, moral courage.

V. Institutional evolution by agentic processes

An extremely important form of cumulative cultural evolution from the point of view of achieving sustainable economic systems is the agentic evolution of institutions. Institutions are generally defined

as culturally transmitted systems of rules that organize human social life (96). Since even the simplest known human societies are governed by institutions like kinship and marriage, the evolutionary roots of institutions are probably 50 ky old, if not far older (97). Institutions evolve by both agentic and non-agentic processes. Again, even simple societies have deliberative political institutions that lead to the evolution of rather sophisticated collective behavior (98, 99). But non-agentic processes also play an important role, even in complex societies. Institutions play a strong role in determining the outcome of intergroup competition and so group level selection plays a strong role in, for example, the success and failure of competing modern corporations and churches (48). The dominant pattern of institutional evolution in the Holocene has been the evolution of ever more complex institutional systems, culminating in the modern bureaucratic states organizing many millions of people (100) and agentic forces have played a very large role in these trends. We have even engineered non-trivial global institutions and organizations based on these institutions, for example the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

The global scale commons problems presented by anthropogenic climate change, the biodiversity crisis, weapons of mass destruction, inequality, and the like would seem to require us to mobilize collective agency to create institutional solutions to solve the large-scale dilemmas of cooperation they present. In a science-fiction world, interplanetary competition might solve such problems by group selection, if at a terrible cost to the competitive losers. As it is, we are presumably on our own. Individual agency is of real value, even in the face of global problems. We can change our own behavior but the dilemma of cooperation, exemplified on the laboratory scale by the Prisoners Dilemma and Public Goods Games, requires *collective* agency. The dynamics of cultural change by collective agency are not as well studied by cultural evolutionists as change due to individual agency. We inherit suboptimal institutions, such as the powerful, competitive, modern nation state, from a time when global scale commons problems were less extreme. 20th century failures to solve international security issues in the face of industrialized warfare and the development of weapons of mass destruction stimulated hard thinking and non-negligible innovative action on that collective problem. The problem of environmental sustainability doubles down on the need for effective large-scale collective action if we are to evade the costs of failing to solve the climate change and biodiversity problems.

The mechanisms by which institutions evolve by collective action has received much scholarly attention (101, 102, 103), mostly by economic historians and political scientists. A toy power-weighted-majority-vote model of political process by which institutional change happens summarizes much of this literature. Imagine a policy arena which is governed by an existing institution or set of institutions. Entrepreneurial individuals or small groups propose changes to the existing rules for some mixture of self-interested and public interested motivations. They attempt to recruit a larger party to support their proposed innovation using advocacy and persuasion. Conservatives defend the existing arrangement for a similar mix of motives. Usually the costs and benefits of existing arrangements are better known than those of the proposed innovation. Human and physical capital have been largely shaped by existing institutions and change will generate transition costs. In spite of this inertia, many people may come to favor the innovation, often because some process like cumulative technological evolution is changing the cost-benefit calculation fairly decisively in favor of the innovation. If all were equal participants in the political process, a simple majority vote would decide the adoption or not of the innovation. In practice, the power and influence of the actors in the political system is never perfectly egalitarian and, in many systems, the formal franchise may be quite narrow, down to a single individual in the case of

tyrannies. This model helps explain why institutional innovation is often punctuational with much change concentrated in the short spans of time. Even if underlying individual attitudes are changing gradually and smoothly, institutions will not change until innovators reach the threshold of commanding the balance of political power. Gay marriage rather suddenly became possible when a majority of voters and the elite alike came to favor it. Polling suggests that a majority of citizens support action on climate change (104) but the political power of the fossil fuel industry and its supporters remains sufficient to block more than incremental action. Nevertheless, a fierce attempt to attack its legitimacy and power is ongoing and making headway (105). Paul Sabatier's Advocacy Coalition/Policy Learning framework is an explicitly evolutionary approach elaborating the toy model, and Ostrom's Institutional Analysis and Development framework is more naïve-functionalist, but both lead to practical guidance for action (106) that should be as applicable to sustainability as to other policy domains.

V. Conclusions

The cultural evolutionary/gene-culture coevolution framework provides a reasonably clear and complete set of hypotheses to explain the advance of the Anthropocene as a process. Most of these hypotheses are contested to be sure and not all uncertainties are resolved.

The process cumulative culture generated the technologies and social organizations that caused humans to become a geological force unfolded in a non-linear but more or less monotonic way from about 50 kya onwards. A formal geological definition of the beginning of the Anthropocene could be based at the earliest on the onset of the megafaunal extinctions around 40 kya at the earliest or by the appearance of diverse and easily detectable industrial waste products in sedimentary deposits around 50 ya at the latest. There is an inevitable arbitrariness in periodizing a continuous process.

The toy model of institutional evolution, and the large body of work on institutional evolution by political scientists, historians, and other social scientists that it is based upon, should help shape a strategy for cultural evolutionists to contribute to the applied science of sustainability and other areas of policy making. It seems us that the comparative advantage of the evolutionary sciences lies in their conception of human societies as culturally evolving systems operating in a dynamic environment. Evolutionary causes are iteratively extended in time, leading to lags, overshoots, coevolutionary responses, sensitivity to initial conditions and similar complex temporal patterns that evolutionists are better equipped to understand than other scientists. A simple lesson based on these considerations is that applied scientists working in the policy arena to be successful must engage for the long haul. Attempts by scientists to have impacts on the policy process with one-shot injections of expert opinion are hardly ever successful (106).

VI. Literature cited

1. Richerson PJ, Boyd R. The Darwinian theory of cultural evolution and gene-culture coevolution. In: Bell MA, Futuyma DJ, Eanes WF, Levinton JS, editors. *Evolution Since Darwin: The First 150 years*. Sunderland MA: Sinauer; 2010.
2. Waring TM, Kline Ann M, Brooks JS, Goff SH, Gowdy J, Janssen MA, et al. A multilevel evolutionary framework for sustainability analysis. *Ecology and Society*. 2015;20(2).
3. Turchin P. *Ultrasociety: How 10,000 years of war made humans the greatest cooperators on earth*: Smashwords Edition; 2015.

4. Perreault C. The pace of cultural evolution. *PLOS ONE*. 2012;7(9):e45150.
5. Rogers DS, Ehrlich PR. Natural selection and cultural rates of change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2008;105(9):3416-20.
6. Kendal RL, Boogert NJ, Rendell L, Laland KN, Webster M, Jones PL. Social Learning Strategies: Bridge-Building between Fields. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2018;22(7):651-65.
7. Henrich J, McElreath R. The evolution of cultural evolution. *Evolutionary Anthropology*. 2003;12:123-35.
8. Darwin C. *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*. New York: American Home Library; 1874.
9. Richards RJ. The moral foundation of the idea of evolutionary progress: Darwin, Spencer, and the Neo-Darwinians. In: Nitecki MH, editor. *Evolutionary Progress*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1988. p. 129-48.
10. Mansbridge JJ. *Beyond Self-Interest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1990. xiii, 402 p.
11. Tomasello M. *The Evolution of Agency: Behavioral Organization from Lizards to Humans*: MIT Press; 2022.
12. Baum WM. *Understanding Behaviorism: Behavior, Culture, and Evolution*. Third ed. Malden, MA: John Wiley; 2017. xviii + 293 p.
13. Crutzen PJ. Geology of mankind. *Nature*. 2002;415(6867):23.
14. Vitousek PM, Aber J, Howarth RW, Likens GE, Matson PA, Schindler DW, et al. Human alteration of the global nitrogen cycle: Causes and consequences. *Issues in Ecology*. 1997;1:2-15.
15. Flannery T. *The Future Eaters: An Ecological History of the Australasian Lands and People*: Grove Press; 2002.
16. Hublin J-J, Ben-Ncer A, Bailey SE, Freidline SE, Neubauer S, Skinner MM, et al. New fossils from Jebel Irhoud, Morocco and the pan-African origin of *Homo sapiens*. *Nature*. 2017;546(7657):289-92.
17. Li H, Durbin R. Inference of human population history from individual whole-genome sequences. *Nature*. 2011;475(7357):493-6.
18. Derex M, Mesoudi A. Cumulative cultural evolution within evolving population structures. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2020;24(8):654-67.
19. Perry SE, Carter A, Foster JG, Nöbel S, Smolla M. What makes inventions become traditions? *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 2022;51:419-36.
20. Gruber T, Chimento M, Aplin LM, Biro D. Efficiency fosters cumulative culture across species. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2022;377(1843):20200308.
21. Newson L, Richerson P. *A Story of Us: A New Look at Human Evolution*. New York: Oxford University Press; 2021. ix + 316 p.
22. Boyd R, Silk JB. *How Humans Evolved*: WW Norton; 2018.
23. Laland KN. *Darwin's Unfinished Symphony: How Culture Made the Human Mind*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 2017.
24. Henrich J. *The Secret of Our Success: How Culture Is Driving Human Evolution, Domesticating Our Species, and Making Us Smarter*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 2016. xvi + 445 p.

25. Mesoudi A. *Cultural Evolution: How Darwinian Theory Can Explain Human Culture & Synthesize the Social Sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2011. xv + 264 p.
26. Klein RG. *The Human Career: Human Biological and Cultural Origins*. 2nd ed. Chicago IL: University of Chicago; 2009. xxx + 988 p.
27. Atkinson QD, Gray RD, Drummond AJ. mtDNA variation predicts population size in humans and reveals a major southern Asian chapter in human prehistory. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*. 2008;25(2):468-74.
28. Zeng TC, Aw AJ, Feldman MW. Cultural hitchhiking and competition between patrilineal kin groups explain the post-Neolithic Y-chromosome bottleneck. *Nature Communications*. 2018;9(1):2077.
29. Zachos J, Pagani M, Sloan L, Thomas E, Billups K. Trends, rhythms, and aberrations in global climate 65 Ma to present. *Science*. 2001;292(5517):686-93.
30. Opdyke ND. Mammalian migration and climate over the last seven million years. In: Vrba ES, Denton GH, Partridge TC, Burckle LH, editors. *Paleoclimate and Evolution, With Emphasis on Human Origins*. New Haven: Yale University Press; 1995. p. 109-14.
31. Churchill SE. *Thin on the Ground: Neandertal Biology, Archeology and Ecology*: John Wiley & Sons; 2014.
32. Johnsen, S, B, H.B, Clausen, W, et al. Irregular glacial interstadials recorded in a new Greenland ice core. *Nature* 359:311-3131992.
33. Martrat B, Grimalt JO, Shackleton NJ, de Abreu L, Hutterli MA, Stocker TF. Four climate cycles of recurring deep and surface water destabilizations on the Iberian margin. *Science*. 2007;317(5837):502-7.
34. Louergue L, Schilt A, Spahni R, Masson-Delmotte V, Blunier T, Lemieux B, et al. Orbital and millennial-scale features of atmospheric CH₄ over the past 800,000 years. *Nature*. 2008;453(7193):383-6.
35. Richerson PJ, Boyd R. Rethinking paleoanthropology: A world queerer than we supposed In: Hatfield G, Pittman H, editors. *Evolution of Mind, Brain, and Culture*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology; 2013. p. 263-302.
36. Sanchez Goñi MF. *Pollen: A Key Tool for Understanding Climate, Vegetation, and Human Evolution*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2022. p. 1-40.
37. Whiten A. The psychological reach of culture in animals' lives. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. 2021;30(3):211-7.
38. Heldstab SA, Isler K, Graber SM, Schuppli C, van Schaik CP. The economics of brain size evolution in vertebrates. *Current Biology*. 2022;32(12):R697-R708.
39. Burkart JM, Hrdy SB, Van Schaik CP. Cooperative breeding and human cognitive evolution. *Evolutionary Anthropology*. 2009;18:175-86.
40. Hrdy SB. *Mothers and Others: The Evolutionary Origins of Mutual Understanding*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press; 2009. V + 422 p.
41. Hill K, Barton M, Hurtado AM. The emergence of human uniqueness: Characters underlying behavioral modernity. *Evolutionary Anthropology*. 2009;18:174-87.
42. Boyd R, Richerson PJ. Large-scale cooperation in small-scale foraging societies. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews*. 2022;31(4):175-98.

43. Street SE, Navarrete AF, Reader SM, Laland KN. Coevolution of cultural intelligence, extended life history, sociality, and brain size in primates. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2017;114(30):7908-14.
44. Henrich J. Demography and cultural evolution: Why adaptive cultural processes produced maladaptive losses in Tasmania. *American Antiquity*. 2004;69(2):197-214.
45. Kline MA, Boyd R. Population size predicts technological complexity in Oceania. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*. 2010;277:2559-64.
46. Lonsdorf EV. What is the role of mothers in the acquisition of termite-fishing behaviors in wild chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii*)? *Animal Cognition*. 2006;9(1):36-46.
47. Chapais B. *Primeval Kinship: How Pair-Bonding Gave Birth to Human Society*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press; 2008. xv + 349 p.
48. Richerson P, Baldini R, Bell A, Demps K, Frost K, Hillis V, et al. Cultural group selection plays an essential role in explaining human cooperation: A sketch of the evidence, together with commentaries and authors' response. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. 2016;39(e 30):1-68.
49. Williams-Hatala EM, Hatala KG, Gordon M, Key A, Kasper M, Kivell TL. The manual pressures of stone tool behaviors and their implications for the evolution of the human hand. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 2018;119:14-26.
50. Domínguez-Rodrigo M, Serrallonga J, Juan-Tresserras J, Alcalá L, Luque L. Woodworking activities by early humans: a plant residue analysis on Acheulian stone tools from Peninj (Tanzania). *Journal of Human Evolution*. 2001;40(4):289-99.
51. Boyd R, Richerson PJ, Henrich J. The cultural niche: Why social learning is essential for human adaptation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2011;108(Supplement 2):10918-25.
52. Richerson PJ, Gavrilets S, de Waal FB. Modern theories of human evolution foreshadowed by Darwin's *Descent of Man*. *Science*. 2021;372(6544).
53. Washburn SL. Speculations on the interrelations of the history of tools and biological evolution. *Human Biology*. 1959;31(1):21-31.
54. Henn BM, Cavalli-Sforza LL, Feldman MW. The great human expansion. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2012;109(44):17758-64.
55. Klein R. Archaeology and the evolution of human behavior. *Evolutionary Anthropology*. 2000;9(1):17-36.
56. Zilhão J. Tar adhesives, Neandertals, and the tyranny of the discontinuous mind. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2019;116(44):21966-8.
57. Richerson PJ, Boyd R, Bettinger RL. Cultural innovations and demographic change. *Human Biology*. 2009;81(2-3):211-35.
58. Powell A, Shennan S, Thomas MG. Late Pleistocene demography and the appearance of modern human behavior. *Science*. 2009;324:1298-301.
59. Turvey ST, Crees JJ. . Extinction in the Anthropocene . *Current Biology*. 2019;29(19):R982-R6.
60. Richerson PJ, Boyd R, Bettinger RL. Was agriculture impossible during the Pleistocene but mandatory during the Holocene? A climate change hypothesis. *American Antiquity*. 2001;66(3):387-411.

61. Efferson C. Prey-producing predators: The ecology of human intensification. *Nonlinear Dynamics, Psychology, and Life Sciences*. 2008(12):55-74.
62. Genet R, Davidson C, Richerson P, Efferson C. *Dynamic Models of Human Systems* <https://learn.culturalevolutionsociety.org/>: Cultural Evolution Society; 2021 [
63. Zahid HJ, Robinson E, Kelly RL. Agriculture, population growth, and statistical analysis of the radiocarbon record. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2016;113(4):931-5.
64. Korotayev A, Malkov A, Khalitourina D. *Introduction to Social Macrodynamics: Compact Macromodels of the World System Growth*. Moscow: Editorial URSS; 2006. 128 p.
65. Nesse RM, Williams GC. *Why We Get Sick: The New Science of Darwinian Medicine*. 1st ed. New York: Times Books; 1995. xi, 291 p.
66. Cournoyea M. Ancestral assumptions and the clinical uncertainty of evolutionary medicine. *56(1)*, 36-52. *Perspectives in biology and medicine*,. 2013;55(1):36-52.
67. Hochberg ME. Addressing challenges in evolutionary medicine: three priorities. *Frontiers in Science*. 2023;1.
68. Laland KN, Sterelny K, Odling-Smee J, Hoppitt W, Uller T. Cause and effect in biology revisited: Is Mayr's proximate-ultimate dichotomy still useful? *Science*. 2011;334(6062):1512-6.
69. Gawrylewski A. The trouble with animal models. *The Scientist*. 2007;21(July):44-51.
70. Landrum MJ, Lee JM, Benson M, Brown GR, Chao C, Chitipiralla S, et al. ClinVar: improving access to variant interpretations and supporting evidence. *Nucleic Acids Research*. 2018;46(D1):D1062-D7.
71. Bell AV, Richerson PJ, McElreath R. Culture rather than genes provides greater scope for the evolution of large-scale human prosociality. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*. 2009;106(42):17671-4.
72. Boyd R, Richerson PJ. How microevolutionary processes give rise to history. In: Nitecki MH, Nitecki DV, editors. *History and Evolution*. Albany: State University of New York Press; 1992. p. 179-209.
73. Walther BA, Ewald PW. Pathogen survival in the external environment and the evolution of virulence. *Biological Reviews*. 2004;79(4):849-69.
74. Dawkins R. *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1976. xii, 224 p.
75. Richerson PJ, Boyd R. A dual inheritance model of the human evolutionary process I: Basic postulates and a simple model. *Journal of Social Biological Structures*. 1978;1:127-54.
76. Boyd R, Richerson PJ. *Culture and the Evolutionary Process*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1985. viii, 331 p.
77. Turchin P. *Ages of Discord: A Structural-Demographic Analysis of American History*. Beresta Books: Chaplin, CT; 2016. xiii + 274 p.
78. Constantino SM, Sparkman G, Kraft-Todd GT, Bicchieri C, Centola D, Shell-Duncan B, et al. *Scaling Up Change: A Critical Review and Practical Guide to Harnessing Social Norms for Climate Action*. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*. 2022;23(2):50-97.
79. Farmer JD, Hepburn C, Ives MC, Hale T, Wetzter T, Mealy P, et al. Sensitive intervention points in the post-carbon transition. *Science*. 2019;364(6436):132-4.

80. Nyborg K, Anderies JM, Dannenberg A, Lindahl T, Schill C, Schlüter M, et al. Social norms as solutions. *Science*. 2016;354(6308):42-3.
81. Otto IM, Donges JF, Cremades R, Bhowmik A, Hewitt RJ, Lucht W, et al. Social tipping dynamics for stabilizing Earth's climate by 2050. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2020;117(5):2354-65.
82. Travers H, Walsh J, Vogt S, Clements T, Milner-Gulland EJ. Delivering behavioural change at scale: What conservation can learn from other fields. *Biological Conservation*. 2021;257:109092.
83. Efferson C, Vogt S, Fehr E. The promise and the peril of using social influence to reverse harmful traditions. *Nature Human Behaviour*. 2020;4(1):55-68.
84. Ehret S, Constantino SM, Weber EU, Efferson C, Vogt S. Group identities can undermine social tipping after intervention. *Nature Human Behaviour*. 2022;6(12):1669-79.
85. Efferson C, Vogt S, von Flüe L. Activating cultural evolution for good when people differ from each other. In: Kendal J, editor. *Oxford Handbook of Cultural Evolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2023. p. TBD.
86. Mesoudi A. An experimental comparison of human social learning strategies: payoff-biased social learning is adaptive but underused. *Evolution and Human Behavior*. 2011;32(5):334-42.
87. Insko CA, Gilmore R, Drenan S, Lipsitz A, Moehle D, Thibaut J. Trade versus expropriation in open groups: A comparison of two type of social power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1983;44:977-99.
88. Miu E, Gulley N, Laland KN, Rendell L. Innovation and cumulative culture through tweaks and leaps in online programming contests. *Nature Communications*. 2018;9:2321.
89. Vogt S, Mohammed Zaid NA, El Fadil Ahmed H, Fehr E, Efferson C. Changing cultural attitudes towards female genital cutting. *Nature*. 2016;538(7626):506-9.
90. Henrich J, Boyd R, Bowles S, Camerer C, Fehr E, Gintis H. *Foundations of Human Sociality: Economic Experiments and Ethnographic Evidence from Fifteen Small-Scale Societies*. xix + 451 ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2004.
91. Herrmann B, Thöni C, Gächter S. Antisocial punishment across societies. *Science*. 2008;319:1362-7.
92. Francois P, Manning J, Whitehouse H, Brennan R, Currie T, Feeney K, et al. A macroscope for global history-Seshat global history databank: a methodological overview. *Digital Humanities Quarterly*. 2016.
93. Newson L, Richerson PJ. Why do people become modern: A Darwinian mechanism. *Population and Development Review*. 2009;35(1):117-58.
94. Easterlin RA, O'Connor KJ. The Easterlin paradox. *Handbook of Labor, Human Resources and Population Economics*: Springer; 2022. p. 1-25.
95. Marlin R. *Propaganda and the Ethics of Persuasion*: Broadview press; 2013.
96. Currie TE, Turchin P, Bednar J, Richerson PJ, Schwesinger G, Steinmo S, et al. Evolution of institutions and organizations. In: Wilson DS, Kirman A, editors. *Complexity and Evolution: Toward a New Synthesis for Economics*. Strungmann Reports, vol. 19. Cambridge MA: MIT Press; 2016. p. 201-36.

97. Migliano AB, Vinicius L. Hunter-gatherer sociality and the origins of human normative thinking. In: Richerson PJ, Bednar J, Currie TE, Gavrillets S, Wallis JJ, editors. *Organizational Complexity and Institutional Dynamics: Cultural Evolution Society*; In press.
98. Hämäläinen P. *The Comanche Empire*. New Haven: Yale University Press; 2008.
99. Wiessner P, Tumu A. *Historical Vines: Enga Networks of Exchange, Ritual, and Warfare in Papua New Guinea*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press; 1998. xvii, 494 p.
100. Richerson PJ, Bednar J, Currie TE, Gavrillets S, Wallis JJ, editors. *Organizational Complexity and Institutional Dynamics: Cultural Evolution Society*; In press.
101. Ostrom E. Do institutions for collective action evolve? *Journal of Bioeconomics*. 2014;16(1):3-30.
102. Richerson PJ, Henrich J. Tribal social instincts and the cultural evolution of institutions to solve collective action problems. *Cliodynamics: the Journal of Theoretical and Mathematical History*. 2012;3:38-80.
103. Weible CM, Sabatier PA. *Theories of the Policy Process*: Westview Press; 2017.
104. Bell J, Poushter J, Fagan M, Huang C. In response to climate change, citizens in advanced economies are willing to alter how they live and work. *Pew Research Center*. 2021;2850.
105. van Asselt H, Green F. COP26 and the dynamics of anti-fossil fuel norms. *WIREs Climate Change*. 2022:e816.
106. Weible CM, Heikkila T, deLeon P, Sabatier PA. Understanding and influencing the policy process. *Policy Sciences*. 2012;45(1):1-21.