

7 I agree with the general point made by Vaesen & Houkes (henceforth V&H): we need more fine-
8 grained, quantitative, cross-cultural data regarding human cumulative cultural evolution (CCE),
9 which tracks the effectiveness or efficiency of a socially learned trait over successive generations
10 within cultural lineages. However, I take issue with some of their specific points. V&H seem to
11 set the evidential bar so high for CCE that it is unreachable, and define CCE in ways that do not
12 always match the literature.

13 First, V&H argue that “If cumulateness is to qualify as a general characteristic of human culture
14 (see the quotes in fn. 1), it is not enough to show that *some* human cultural behaviors result
15 from CCE; rather, one must show that *a large fraction* of such behaviors result from CCE.” I
16 do not fully understand what is meant by ‘a general characteristic’, but I do not know of any
17 such claim in the literature. None of the quotes in their footnote make any claims about how
18 much of human culture must be cumulative. They simply assert that human culture exhibits the
19 property of being cumulative in at least some instances. As V&H point out, technology is the
20 best and most often cited example of a domain that is cumulative. Yet much of human culture is
21 clearly non-cumulative. Cultural traits such as pottery decorations, choices of pet breeds and first
22 names exhibit dynamics consistent with neutral drift (Bentley, Hahn, and Shennan 2004; although
23 see Kandler and Crema 2019), which by definition is non-cumulative. Convergence on intuitive,
24 cognitively attractive representations such as blood-letting (Miton, Claidière, and Mercier 2015) is
25 also a common form of non-cumulative cultural evolution. In this, cultural evolution is really no
26 different to genetic evolution, which may sometimes be cumulative, producing complex adaptations
27 such as eyes, but is often characterised by drift. We should not expect more from cultural evolution
28 than we do from genetic evolution.

29 Consequently, to demand that “a proper test” of CCE requires data “that is representative of all
30 of the cultural-evolutionary processes that have taken place in our species” surely sets the bar
31 unnecessarily high. There is no reason to expect that all cultural evolutionary processes in our
32 species should be cumulative, only those in which selection pressures favour increasing effectiveness
33 or efficiency.

34 Second, V&H discount evidence because it comes from WEIRD samples (e.g. dismissing experiments
35 because “all were performed on WEIRD subjects.”). I am all for diversifying samples beyond

36 WEIRD countries (Mesoudi et al. 2015, 2016). But that does not mean we can discount evidence
37 *because* it comes from WEIRD samples. WEIRD people are people too. V&H seem to imply that
38 CCE must be demonstrated in every society world-wide before we can accept it as a valid concept
39 - surely far too high a bar for an idea that emerged in the late 1990s. Most examples of CCE in
40 the literature do indeed involve historical trajectories or samples from WEIRD countries, probably
41 because written historical records are more readily available, and experiments more feasible, in such
42 societies. However, Henrich (2015) and Boyd (2018) provide examples of complex technologies and
43 customs found in hunter-gatherer and other small-scale societies that seem to exceed individual
44 learning and are therefore suggestive of CCE. No doubt future empirical research will provide
45 better evidence across more diverse contexts, but requiring universality seems unreasonable.

46 Third, V&H ignore recent evidence regarding non-human CCE. While many authors have indeed
47 claimed that CCE is unique to humans, others have claimed to have shown CCE in non-human
48 species. Sasaki and Biro (2017) showed how homing pigeons improve the efficiency of their route
49 over successive generations due to repeated social learning. This exactly fits V&H's definition of
50 CCE, requiring "individuals, across generations, [to] gradually improve their behavior, through
51 social transmission of beneficial modifications". By their own definition, then, it has already been
52 demonstrated that CCE is not unique to humans. Mesoudi and Thornton (2018) argued that the
53 concept of CCE should be unpacked: we described the repeated improvement of a socially learned
54 trait as the 'core criteria' for CCE, and identified several 'extended criteria' which may be what
55 distinguish human CCE from that of other species (or at least pigeons).

56 Fourth, V&H do not present any alternatives to CCE for the technological and socio-political
57 complexity that our species has produced. Are such complex traits instead the product of individual
58 learning (e.g. the 'improvisational intelligence' of Pinker (2010))? Or genetically encoded responses
59 'evoked' by different environments (Tooby and Cosmides 1992)? Scientific progress requires testing
60 between alternative explanations.

61 Fifth, V&H criticise experiments for finding that "CCE occurs in some conditions, but not in others".
62 Yet this is not a problem. Models demonstrate how cultural complexity can be lost under various
63 conditions (e.g. small population sizes: Henrich (2004)) or plateau due to learning costs (Mesoudi
64 2011). Contrary to 19th century unilinear social evolutionism, the modern concept of CCE does not

65 predict inevitable and unidirectional cultural change. The accumulation of cultural modifications,
66 just like the accumulation of genetic modifications, is reversible and subject to demographic and
67 other constraints.

68 Finally, the examples V&H provide from the literature are somewhat limited. V&H are correct that
69 Morris (2013) conflates multiple cultural lineages and uses coarse-grained data subject to substantial
70 error. But several other studies exist which track increases in effectiveness or efficiency within
71 specific cultural lineages: Nia et al. (2015) showed that violins gradually improved in acoustic
72 conductance over several centuries; Miu et al. (2018) showed how solutions to maths problems
73 improved within a programming community via successive bouts of copying and innovating; several
74 studies have traced the evolution of increasingly energy-efficient bicycle designs (Lake and Venti
75 2009; Minetti, Pinkerton, and Zamparo 2001; Van Nierop, Blankendaal, and Overbeeke 1997). To
76 return to my initial point: more such evidence is definitely needed, and from more diverse sources
77 and samples. But let's not ignore or dismiss the evidence that does exist, nor make requirements
78 (e.g. that all human culture is cumulative, or that CCE should be unidirectional) that are not
79 warranted by theory.

80 References

- 81 Bentley, R. A., M. W. Hahn, and S. J. Shennan. 2004. “Random Drift and Culture Change.”
82 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 271 (1547): 1443–50.://000222600600002.
- 83 Boyd, Robert. 2018. *A Different Kind of Animal: How Culture Transformed Our Species*. Prince-
84 ton University Press.
- 85 Henrich, Joseph. 2004. “Demography and Cultural Evolution.” *American Antiquity* 69 (2): 197–
86 214.://000221068800001.
- 87 ———. 2015. *The Secret of Our Success*. Princeton University Press.
- 88 Kandler, Anne, and Enrico R. Crema. 2019. “Analysing Cultural Frequency Data: Neutral Theory
89 and Beyond.” In *Handbook of Evolutionary Research in Archaeology*, edited by Anna Marie Prentiss,
90 83–108. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11117-5_5.
- 91 Lake, M. W., and J. Venti. 2009. “Quantitative Analysis of Macroevolutionary Patterning in
92 Technological Evolution: Bicycle Design from 1800 to 2000.” In *Pattern and Process in Cultural*
93 *Evolution*, edited by S. J. Shennan, 2:147. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 94 Mesoudi, Alex. 2011. “Variable Cultural Acquisition Costs Constrain Cumulative Cultural Evolu-
95 tion.” *PLOS One* 6 (3): e18239. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0018239>.
- 96 Mesoudi, Alex, Lei Chang, Sasha R. X. Dall, and Alex Thornton. 2016. “The Evolution of
97 Individual and Cultural Variation in Social Learning.” *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 31 (3):
98 215–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.12.012>.
- 99 Mesoudi, Alex, Lei Chang, Keelin Murray, and Hui Jing Lu. 2015. “Higher Frequency of So-
100 cial Learning in China Than in the West Shows Cultural Variation in the Dynamics of Cul-
101 tural Evolution.” *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 282 (1798): 20142209.
102 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.2209>.
- 103 Mesoudi, Alex, and Alex Thornton. 2018. “What Is Cumulative Cultural Evolution?” *Proceedings*
104 *of the Royal Society B* 285 (1880): 20180712. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.0712>.
- 105 Minetti, Alberto E., John Pinkerton, and Paola Zamparo. 2001. “From Bipedalism to Bicyclism:
106 Evolution in Energetics and Biomechanics of Historic Bicycles.” *Proceedings of the Royal Society*

107 of *London. Series B: Biological Sciences* 268 (1474): 1351–60. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2001.>
108 1662.

109 Miton, Helena, Nicolas Claidière, and Hugo Mercier. 2015. “Universal Cognitive Mechanisms
110 Explain the Cultural Success of Bloodletting.” *Evolution and Human Behavior* 36 (4): 303–12.
111 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2015.01.003>.

112 Miu, Elena, Ned Gulley, Kevin N. Laland, and Luke Rendell. 2018. “Innovation and Cumulative
113 Culture Through Tweaks and Leaps in Online Programming Contests.” *Nature Communications* 9
114 (1): 2321. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04494-0>.

115 Morris, Ian. 2013. *The Measure of Civilization: How Social Development Decides the Fate of*
116 *Nations*. Princeton University Press.

117 Nia, Hadi T., Ankita D. Jain, Yuming Liu, Mohammad-Reza Alam, Roman Barnas, and Nicholas C.
118 Makris. 2015. “The Evolution of Air Resonance Power Efficiency in the Violin and Its Ancestors.”
119 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A* 471 (2175): 20140905. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.>
120 2014.0905.

121 Pinker, Steven. 2010. “The Cognitive Niche.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
122 107: 8993–9.

123 Sasaki, Takao, and Dora Biro. 2017. “Cumulative Culture Can Emerge from Collective Intel-
124 ligence in Animal Groups.” *Nature Communications* 8 (April): 15049. <https://doi.org/10.1038/>
125 [ncomms15049](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15049).

126 Tooby, John, and Leda Cosmides. 1992. “The Psychological Foundations of Culture.” In *The*
127 *Adapted Mind*, edited by Jerome H. Barkow, Leda Cosmides, and John Tooby, 19–136. London:
128 Oxford University Press.

129 Van Nierop, O. A., A. C. M. Blankendaal, and C. J. Overbeeke. 1997. “The Evolution of the
130 Bicycle: A Dynamic Systems Approach.” *Journal of Design History* 10 (3): 253–67. <https://doi.>
131 [org/10.1093/jdh/10.3.253](https://doi.org/10.1093/jdh/10.3.253).