

Cooperation and cumulative culture

Juan Segurola

Core question

How did human groups become able to preserve, combine and extend useful knowledge beyond what any one individual could discover alone?

Historical and evolutionary context

A foundation for many later transformations in the architecture of human knowledge was the development of social systems in which people could learn from one another, accumulate modifications across generations and turn information acquired by one individual into a resource for others. Social learning is not uniquely human, and recent work cautions against treating cumulative culture itself as an exclusively human property. What is striking in humans is the scale, breadth and open-endedness of cultural variation, together with the ability to transmit know-how through overlapping networks, modify inherited practices and build on results that no single individual could have generated from scratch.

This transition had no single date and no single inventor. It emerged through biological evolution, social organisation, childhood learning, imitation, teaching, participation, language and material practice. The archaeological record preserves only some of its products. Much of the relevant process was behavioural and left no direct fossil trace.

What could communities know before this transition?

Individual animals can learn from trial and error and many species learn socially. Chimpanzees, for example, can acquire complex solutions from knowledgeable group members that they fail to invent independently. This matters because it shows that the evolutionary roots of social learning precede humans. The key historical problem is therefore not how culture appeared from nothing, but how human populations came to support unusually broad and extensible systems of cultural inheritance.

Without reliable social transmission, locally discovered solutions are fragile. They disappear when innovators die, move or fail to reproduce the behaviour. Knowledge remains bounded by the cognitive and temporal limits of individuals.

What changed?

Human communities increasingly became distributed systems of memory and problem solving. Individuals could specialize, learn selectively from others, preserve successful practices and modify inherited techniques. Ethnographic studies of hunter-gatherer social networks show that knowledge can circulate through networks wider than the household, linking camps and kin groups. Such structures increase the number of potential models from whom a learner can acquire skills and reduce the risk that useful information is lost locally.

Experimental work also shows that cumulative improvement does not depend on a single mechanism such as exact imitation. Teaching can help, but people can also improve artefacts by inspecting outcomes, inferring causal structure and choosing whom or what to copy. The distinctive human pattern appears to involve a flexible combination of social learning, individual innovation, causal reasoning, cooperation and intentional information sharing.

Why could this capability emerge?

Several mutually reinforcing conditions probably mattered: prolonged childhood, intense social dependence, cooperative foraging and childcare, repeated interaction, high tolerance for social learning, and eventually language and explicit teaching. None should be treated as a single cause. The important point for PIO is architectural: human knowledge became increasingly **distributed across people and generations**.

That distribution changes what a population can know. A group can preserve a technology even if no member understands every historical step that produced it. Later generations inherit not only answers but also partially structured problem spaces: which materials are promising, which seasons matter, which places are dangerous, which procedures tend to work and which failures to avoid.

What later forms of knowledge did it enable?

This social substrate underlies every later PIO transition. Stone-tool traditions, controlled fire, clothing, navigation, plant processing, animal management and symbolic systems all depend on some capacity to preserve and transmit behaviour. Later institutions such as schools, workshops, laboratories, journals and databases are not replacements for this basic process; they are increasingly formalized extensions of it.

New limits and risks

Social learning can preserve errors as well as successes. Conformity, prestige bias and authority can stabilize ineffective or harmful practices. Cultural transmission can also be unequal: some knowledge may be restricted by age, sex, status, lineage or political control. Accumulation is therefore not automatically progressive. Knowledge can be lost, fragmented or deliberately withheld.

What changed in the architecture of human knowledge?

The decisive shift was from **knowledge as an individual achievement** toward **knowledge as a population-level inheritance system**. Human communities could now maintain solutions across lifetimes, recombine them and explore a space of possibilities far larger than any one person could test.

This did not make later history inevitable. It created a new capacity: the possibility that what one generation learned could become the starting point, rather than the ceiling, for the next.

Loss, exclusion and uncertainty

The deep history of cooperation is reconstructed indirectly from comparative cognition, ethnography, archaeology and evolutionary modelling. Modern hunter-gatherer societies are not fossils of the Pleistocene and should not be used as direct replicas of ancestral conditions. Likewise, archaeological visibility is biased toward durable materials; many early cooperative practices would leave little or no trace.

Dependency map

- INDIRECT → PIO-002 Stone tools and cumulative design
- DIRECT → PIO-003 Controlled fire, cooking and shared learning
- DIRECT → PIO-004 Language, symbols and shared abstraction
- INDIRECT → all later PIO entries that depend on cumulative transmission

References

1. Morgan, T. J. H. & Feldman, M. W. Human culture is uniquely open-ended rather than uniquely cumulative. *Nature Human Behaviour* 9, 28–42 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-02035-y>
2. Migliano, A. B. et al. Characterization of hunter-gatherer networks and implications for cumulative culture. *Nature Human Behaviour* 1, 0043 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-016-0043>
3. van Leeuwen, E. J. C. et al. Chimpanzees use social information to acquire a skill they fail to innovate. *Nature Human Behaviour* 8, 891–902 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-01836-5>
4. Zwirner, E. & Thornton, A. Cognitive requirements of cumulative culture: teaching is useful but not essential. *Scientific Reports* 5, 16781 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep16781>