

# New frontiers in the study of human cultural and genetic evolution

Cody T Ross<sup>1</sup> and Peter J Richerson<sup>2,3,4</sup>



In this review, we discuss the dynamic linkages between culture and the genetic evolution of the human species. We begin by briefly describing the framework of gene-culture coevolutionary (or dual-inheritance) models for human evolutionary change. Until recently, the literature on gene-culture coevolution was composed primarily of mathematical models and formalized theory describing the complex dynamics underlying human behavior, adaptation, and technological evolution, but had little empirical support concerning genetics. The rapid progress in the fields of molecular genetics and genomics, however, is now providing the kinds of data needed to produce rich empirical support for gene-culture coevolutionary models. We briefly outline how theoretical and methodological progress in genome sciences has provided ways for the strength of selection on genes to be evaluated, and then outline how evidence of selection on several key genes can be directly linked to human cultural practices. We then describe some exciting new directions in the empirical study of gene-culture coevolution, and conclude with a discussion of the role of gene-culture evolutionary models in the future integration of medical, biological, and social sciences.

## Addresses

<sup>1</sup> Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis, United States

<sup>2</sup> Department of Environmental Science and Policy, University of California, Davis, United States

<sup>3</sup> Graduate Group in Ecology, University of California, Davis, United States

<sup>4</sup> Institute of Archaeology, University College London, United Kingdom

Corresponding author: Richerson, Peter J ([pjricherson@ucdavis.edu](mailto:pjricherson@ucdavis.edu))

Current Opinion in Genetics & Development 2014, 29:103–109

This review comes from a themed issue on **Genetics of human origin**

Edited by **Aida Andes** and **Katja Nowick**

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gde.2014.08.014>

0959-437X/© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## Cultural and genetic evolution: a dual inheritance system

In the 1930s and 1940s, the modern evolutionary synthesis formally integrated genetics and Darwinian evolution (selection, mutation, drift, migration, and recombination)

into a unified paradigm describing biological change [1–4]. While the modern evolutionary synthesis remains the paradigm across fields in non-human biology, it was recognized by the early 1980s that the modern evolutionary synthesis could only provide a partial account of human evolution [5]. Mathematically formalized theories linking cultural and genetic inheritance systems were developed in the 1970s and 1980s [6], and these bodies of work serve as the grounding for dual-inheritance, or gene-culture coevolutionary (GCC) models of human social, behavioral, and biological evolution.

Culture has many definitions, but for the purposes of GCC models, we consider culture to be all of the information that individuals acquire from others by a variety of social learning processes including teaching and imitation [6]. The fidelity of cultural transmission is often sufficiently high for culture to act as an inheritance system [7]; however, cultural traditions also change with time, making culture a system of descent with modification.

As in the genetic inheritance system, there are several important forces that can lead to cultural evolution, such as random errors in teaching or acquiring items of culture (akin to mutation), statistical effects in small populations (akin to drift), and the effect of using different cultural variants on an individual's survival and reproduction (akin to natural selection) [8]. Several other forces driving cultural evolution are fairly distinctive from the forces of genetic evolution, and derive from the fact that culture can be transmitted through social networks [9,10\*] in ways that are much more complex than gene transmission (either vertical or horizontal) in genetic systems.

Cultural agents can often evaluate and choose from a wide array of cultural variants present in their social networks. The choice between variants may be random, or may be non-random; non-random choice of cultural variants may be driven by the relative performance of the cultural variants (direct bias), the frequency in which the cultural variants are used (frequency bias), the status of the individuals using the cultural variants (prestige bias), or other biasing forces [11]. Humans also generate new cultural variants by other non-random processes such as individual learning, and recombination of existing ideas or techniques. Field evidence on evolutionary rates shows that they can be much faster for cultural evolution compared with genetic evolution, due to the fact that biases and non-random innovation can create strong directional forces in cultural evolution in addition to natural selection; also, new

ideas and techniques can spread rapidly through social networks, often making the cultural analog of the generation very short [10<sup>\*</sup>,12,13,14<sup>\*</sup>].

Culture evolution can lead to the creation of novel culturally constructed environments which exert selective pressures on genes; these changes may select for phenotypic plasticity (e.g. general language processing, without fixed representations [15]), increase selection pressures on specific genetic variants at a given locus (e.g. lighter skin pigmentation in high latitudes [16]), or reduce selection pressures on variants at a given locus (e.g. a reduced importance of functional bitter taste receptor genes in humans with cultural knowledge of plant toxicity [17]). The cultural and genetic systems are linked; culture places selective pressures on genes, via natural and social selection in culturally influenced environments, and genes place selective pressures on culture, via the genetic components of bias forces and individual learning mechanisms. **Figure 1** displays a graphical representation of the linkages between the cultural inheritance system, the genetic inheritance system, and the environment.

Below, we outline how progress in molecular genetics and genomics is beginning to provide the empirical data needed to move the GCC framework from mathematical formalism into empirically grounded science, with several case studies linking cultural practices with selection on genes [8].

### Quantitative evidence for selection on genes

Recent advances in large-scale and whole-genome sequencing of modern humans [26], extinct archaic hominins [27,28], and non-human primates [29–31], have provided researchers with the data needed to investigate which genes

were evolving under various kinds of selection regimes, in various time periods of human evolutionary history [32,33<sup>\*\*</sup>,34<sup>\*\*</sup>]. Evidence of selection includes synonymous to non-synonymous mutation ratios [32], reduction in genetic diversity [32], a high-frequency of derived alleles [32], cross population differences in allele frequencies [32] and cross population extended haplotype homozygosity [35], long haplotypes [32], direct estimation from subfossil DNA [36<sup>\*</sup>], increased genetic diversity [37,38], and other genetic signatures [33<sup>\*\*</sup>,34<sup>\*\*</sup>]. Exomics may provide even more useful tools for identifying selection on genes underlying specific protein sequences [39].

### Human cultural practices as key drivers of human genetic evolution


#### Agriculture, disease, and genes

Many human genes found to be under selection are immune system related [32]. Of particular importance to GCC models of human evolution is evidence of selection in genes related to auto-immune disease (for instance, type-1 diabetes, Celiac, ulcerative colitis, and Crohn's disease) [40,41], to malarial resistance [33<sup>\*\*</sup>,37,42–44], and to resistance to other infectious diseases (plague, smallpox) [45]. The rise of these diseases is intricately interwoven with culturally evolved adaptations concerning agriculture, animal domestication, and city-level social organization [45–47].

#### Animal husbandry, pastoralism, and genes

Observations of strong, recent selection on a lactase regulatory gene [48,49] provide some of the first population-genetics-based evidence that a selective advantage based on additional nutrition from dairy explains lactase persistence in Europeans. This finding is extended with

**Figure 1**



A simplified graphical sketch of one complete generation of a coevolving environment-gene-culture system. **(a)** The tendency of environment to persist and vary outside of human phenotypic control. **(b)** The tendency of culture to persist (e.g. in durable form like text, artistic productions, and tools) and even vary (e.g. algorithmically controlled stock trading [18,19]) outside of direct human phenotypic control. **(c)** The effects of environment on phenotype (e.g. natural selection on genes [3], phenotypically embodied culture [6], and epigenetic modifications [20]). **(d)** The effects of culture on phenotype (e.g. enculturation [6], as biased by genetic, environmental and earlier acquired cultural factors). **(e)** Genetic [21] and epigenetic [20,22] transmission, and their influence on ontogeny. **(f)** Durable effects of humans on their environments (sometimes referred to as niche construction [23,24]). **(g)** The formation of cultural variants (e.g. older individuals may teach younger individuals traditions that were previously taught to them, as well as new traditions created through their own individual learning and invention [25]). This process is affected by experience and by natural selection on cultural variation. **(h)** The genetic transmission of naturally and culturally selected genotypes and modified epigenetic variants. *Note:* phenotype at time  $f(t)$  is constrained to fall after  $Genes(t)$  and before  $Genes(t + \Delta t)$ .  $\Delta t$  is often taken to be the biological generation of an individual for modeling and notational convenience; in reality, evolutionary processes are continuous in time. Culture and environment, especially, can change appreciably in less than one biological generation.

computational modeling linking spatially resolved genetic and cultural data to infer the history of the coevolution of lactase and dairying in Europe [50].

Other studies have found evidence of selection for lactase persistence in African populations [51,52]; however, lactase persistence appears to have evolved through independent mutations in European and African populations [53], due to convergent socio-ecological circumstances and culturally evolved practices concerning animal husbandry.

### Clothing, fire, migration, and genes

Culturally evolved adaptations to temperate and polar climates — such as clothing, shelter, and fire — allowed humans to occupy high latitudes. Consequently, the new ecology placed strong selection pressure on human genes, such as the genes responsible for pigmentation [54,55], presumably due to the importance of photo-catalyzed vitamin D synthesis [56,57], or folate regulation [16], although the exact mechanisms through which ecological pressures drove selection on pigmentation-linked genes is still an area of active debate [36].

These same cultural innovations allowed humans to thrive in high altitude environments that in turn placed strong selection pressures on hypoxia-related genetic variants [58,59]. In an interesting parallel to the convergent evolution of lactase persistence, Tibetan and Andean populations evolved largely unique suites of genetic variants to solve the same ecological problem concerning hypoxia [60], although in the high altitude case the functional convergence is not nearly so similar as in adult lactase persistence.

### From evidence of selection to evidence of gene-culture coevolution

A considerable number of genes seem to have been under positive selection in humans according to genome-wide scans looking for selective sweeps and other evidence of selection in the human lineage [61]. Most likely, many more interesting cases of gene-culture coevolution will come to light. Human genes that differ from ancestral ones like *FOXP2* and *ASPM* are expressed in brains, testes, and the olfactory system. For all the excitement these genes have generated, our interpretations are handicapped by the complexity of the genetic and cultural systems and by the difficulty in discovering the exact functions of the derived alleles [62]. The study of interactions between culture and epigenetic regulatory circuits is another embryonic area that is likely to prove quite exciting in the future [63].

### New frontiers in the study of human cultural and genetic evolution

Exciting new areas of research in gene-cultural coevolutionary systems will investigate the roles that long-standing

cultural practices *themselves* have on the evolution of important genetic variants. Below, we give two examples of emerging topics linking cultural practices and genetic evolution.

### Cannibalism, Kuru, and genes

Prion diseases — such as Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, and Kuru — are invariably fatal, transmissible, neurodegenerative conditions, driven by a self-propagating conformational isomer of a normal neuronal glycoprotein (PrP), which refolds existing PrP into a non-functional variant [64].

Kuru became known to the Western scientific community in the 1950s when indigenous areas of the Eastern Highlands of Papua New Guinea came under Australian control [64,65]. It was a common cultural practice in some New Guinea communities (especially in the Fore) for adult women and children to consume the brains of deceased relatives at mortuary feasts [64]. Local oral histories collected at the time Kuru was first discovered suggested that the practice of endocannibalism was not ancient among the Fore, but rather began only in the late 1800s [64,66,67]. The Kuru epidemic imposed severe morbidity and mortality on the Fore, and some villages were almost devoid of young adult women [64].

A coding polymorphism in PrP has a substantial effect on survival times and disease progression of Kuru-infected individual, where homozygotes of either allele have onset times of approximately 19 years, while the onset time in heterozygotes is normally over 30 years [64,68]. If infection with Kuru occurs as a child, then the reproductive window for infected homozygotes may be almost non-existent, while infected heterozygotes have more than a decade of asymptomatic reproductive life.

Differential mortality driven by cannibalistically transmitted protein created strong enough selection pressures for signatures of genetic adaptation to be recorded less than 100 years after the origins of the cultural practice of mortuary feasts [64,65]. Notably, out of 30 Fore women over the age of 50 who participated in mortuary rituals, 23 were heterozygotes, while the unexposed Fore population appears to be in Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium [64]. Thus, Kuru in the Fore imposed exceptionally strong balancing selection on PrP variants.

### Distance running, pain tolerance, sexual selection, and genes

At the 1968 summer Olympics, Kipchoge Keino won gold in the 1500 m race, despite competing with a gull bladder infection. Since Keino's rise to fame, a small group of Kenyans — the Kalenjin (0.0005 percent of the world's population) — has produced an outstanding number of long-distance runners that have dominated world-class distance running, winning over 40 percent of international

competitions [69,70]. The dominance of one small ethnic group in world-class running has led many researchers to search for explanations based on demographic characteristics [71], food, vitamin, and macro-nutrient availability [72,73], bioenergetics [74], local cultural history (local importance of long distance running, and a cultural history of cattle raiding) [75], hope for material and social capital [76], local ecology [77], and genetic differences [78].

It is possible that genetic differences related to bioenergetic pathways are responsible for differences in running performance, and that these adaptations are influenced by local ecology and cultural history. However, several studies of candidate genes related to bioenergetic pathways failed to find distinctions between Kenyans in terms of running ability [78,79].

The lack of any definitive biological explanations led researchers to delve more deeply into cultural factors that might be responsible for distance running performance. Notably, the Kalenjin undergo circumcision as a coming of age ritual [69]. These circumcisions are performed without anesthetics, and the participants are required to show no outwards signs of weakness or pain (no grimaces, no cries), or face being branded as cowards for life and being outcasted from the marriageable population [69]. Such cultural practices have the potential to place intense selection pressure on genes for pain tolerance. It has been suggested that one reason the Kalenjin dominate in distance running is not due to genetic (bioenergetic) dispositions for increased running ability *per se*, but rather an increased genetic disposition for pain tolerance, which allows Kalenjins to push through the pain associated with high-levels of continuous physical exertion.

To the best of our knowledge, no studies have thoroughly investigated if there are structured genetic differences related to pain tolerance between circumcising Kalenjins and non-circumcising populations in Kenya. However, one study on ethnicity-based differences in response to propofol-fentanyl anesthesia has shown that the time from discontinuation of anesthesia infusion to eye opening was  $18.8 \pm 7.1$  min in Kenyans vs.  $11.6 \pm 4.5$  min in Caucasians ( $P < 0.01$ ), and time to response to verbal commands was  $16.8 \pm 8$  min in Kenyans vs.  $9.9 \pm 4.5$  min in Caucasians ( $P < 0.01$ ) [80]. Other studies have shown that time to eye opening after fentanyl-based analgesia is related to genetic variants in the  $\mu$ -Opioid Receptor Gene, with AA variants at OPRM1 118 (SNP rs1799971) taking longer to awaken [81]. AA variants also show higher pain tolerance in experimental settings [81,82]. In sum, these data point to the strong possibility that there may be structured genetic differences relating to pain tolerance between Kenyans and Caucasians.

More carefully directed studies may be able to test if there are structured differences in genes related to pain

tolerance between Kalenjins and non-circumcising populations in Kenya. If such studies find evidence of structured differences between Kenyan subpopulations, they will provide testament to the importance of sexual selection and cultural practices in producing selection pressures on the human genome.

## Looking back, looking forward on the integration of the biological and social sciences

### The dark clouds of history

Despite the many attempts of the discipline of genetics as a whole to explain that the relatively slight genetic differences between human populations provide no basis for invidious discrimination among peoples, a small number of biologists and evolutionists have produced work that might give aid and comfort to racists [e.g. see 83,84]. In the shadows of such actions, great caution and precision is needed in communicating scientific knowledge in such a way as to minimize misunderstandings that might insight racism or discrimination [85\*\*]. In response to scientific publications that were either directly racist, or served maintain a racist social structure, there was an enormous push-back among socio-cultural anthropologists to reject any essentializing genetic explanations for inter-group differences, as if describing genetic differences between populations automatically justified the evils of discrimination, racism, and eugenics.

We argue that this sensitivity to genetic explanation, though understandable given its historical and cultural context, was fueled in large part by logical fallacies [is-ought, appeal to nature, etc.] on the part of social scientists. A more useful and more ethical critique might have been waged against the assertion that 'genetic differences justify differential treatment,' rather than the assertion that 'genetic differences exist.' Furthermore, we note that the essentialist ideas that frequently underpin vicious ethnocentric ideologies are as likely to be based on cultural differences as genetic difference. Thus, rejection of genetic difference is not necessarily a rejection of the belief structures actually underpin racism, ethnocentrism, and discrimination.

We are, however, in agreement with much of the socio-cultural anthropological critique of excessively gene and environment centered accounts of human evolution. Like many socio-cultural anthropologists, we argue that human behavior is heavily influenced by culture in the short run; to this, we add that culture plays a large role in our genetic evolution in the long run.

### Gene-culture coevolutionary theory as integrative bridge linking social theory and genetic science

Gene-culture coevolutionary models of human evolution provide a more holistic and nuanced understanding of the ways in which culture and biology interact. GCC models



honor some of the most important critiques of excessively gene-centered accounts of human evolution from socio-cultural anthropology — namely that culture itself is a unique inheritance system, and one that radically alters human biological evolution to such an extent that the human genome itself can be partly viewed as cultural creation. However, GCC models avoid the unrealistic denial of genetic factors that is present in some early socio-cultural critiques of human evolutionary biology, which served to stigmatize medical and scientific research to the detriment of human health and knowledge.

GCC theory is a rapidly growing interdisciplinary field — one that is drawing an increasing amount of empirical support [86••]. It is our hope that GCC models can serve as bridges linking socio-cultural theory and genetic sciences in a way that unites the strengths and partial truths that each perspective offers. In doing so, GCC theory may provide frameworks for knowledge that avoid naïve biological and ecological essentialism, while advancing scientific and medical knowledge related to human genetics.

## References and recommended reading

Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, have been highlighted as:

- of special interest
- of outstanding interest

1. Dobzhansky TG: *Genetics and the Origin of Species*. Columbia University Press; 1937.
2. Mayr E: *Systematics and the Origin of Species: From the Viewpoint of a Zoologist*. Harvard University Press; 1942.
3. Fisher RA: *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection: A Complete Variorum Edition*. Oxford University Press; 1999.
4. Haldane JBS: *The Causes of Evolution*. Princeton University Press; 1990.
5. Cavalli Sforza LL, Feldman M: *Cultural Transmission and Evolution: A Quantitative Approach*. Princeton University Press; 1981.
6. Boyd R, Richerson PJ: *Culture and the Evolutionary Process*. The University of Chicago Press; 1985.
7. Henrich J, Boyd R: **On modeling cognition and culture**. *J Cogn Cult* 2002, **2**:87-112.
8. Richerson PJ, Boyd R, Henrich J: **Gene-culture coevolution in the age of genomics**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2010, **107**: 8985-8992.
9. Findlay CS, Hansell RI, Lumsden CJ: **Behavioral evolution and biocultural games: oblique and horizontal cultural transmission**. *J Theor Biol* 1989, **137**:245-269.
10. Henrich J, Broesch J: **On the nature of cultural transmission networks: evidence from Fijian villages for adaptive learning biases**. *Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci* 2011, **366**:1139-1148.
- The author reviews arguments that natural selection has favored the emergence of psychological biases for learning that consequentially generate cultural adaptations. They then use network analysis and field data from three cultural domains — fishing, yam horticulture, and medicinal plant use — to show that Fijian villagers are biased to learn from others perceived as more successful/knowledgeable.
11. Ross CT, Richerson P, Rogers D: **Mechanisms of cultural change and the transition to sustainability**. *Handbook of Global Environmental Pollution: Global Environmental Change*, SpringerReference. 2013 [www.springerreference.com](http://www.springerreference.com).
12. Rogers EM: *Diffusion of Innovations*. Simon and Schuster; 2010.
13. Richerson PJ, Boyd R: *Not by Genes Alone: How Culture Transformed Human Evolution*. University of Chicago Press; 2008.
14. Perreault C: **The pace of cultural evolution**. *PLoS ONE* 2012, **7**:e45150.
- The author compares rates of change in human technologies and animal morphologies, and finds that rate of cultural evolution is faster than biological evolution, even when the generation time of species is controlled for. The author argues that culture allows humans to evolve over short time scales, which are normally accessible only to species with short life histories.
15. Azumagakitō T, Suzuki R, Arita T: **Cyclic behavior in gene-culture coevolution mediated by phenotypic plasticity in language**. *Advances in Artificial Life, ECAL*. 2013:617-624.
16. Rees JL, Harding RM: **Understanding the evolution of human pigmentation: recent contributions from population genetics**. *J Invest Dermatol* 2011, **132**:846-853.
17. Wang X, Thomas SD, Zhang J: **Relaxation of selective constraint and loss of function in the evolution of human bitter taste receptor genes**. *Hum Mol Genet* 2004, **13**:2671-2678.
18. Wen Q, Yang Z, Song Y, Jia P: **Automatic stock decision support system based on box theory and SVM algorithm**. *Expert Syst Appl* 2010, **37**:1015-1022.
19. Kazem A, Sharifi E, Hussain FK, Saberi M, Hussain OK: **Support vector regression with chaos-based firefly algorithm for stock market price forecasting**. *Appl Soft Comput* 2013, **13**:947-958.
20. Cortijo S, Wardenaar R, Colomé-Tatché M, Gilly A, Etcheverry M, Labadie K, Caillieux E, Aury J-M, Wincker P, Roudier F *et al.*: **Mapping the epigenetic basis of complex traits**. *Science* 2014, **343**:1145-1148.
21. Stern C: **Genetics and ontogeny**. *Am Nat* 1936, **70**:29-35.
22. Long HK, Sims D, Heger A, Blackledge NP, Kutter C, Wright ML, Grützner F, Odom DT, Patient R, Ponting CP *et al.*: **Epigenetic conservation at gene regulatory elements revealed by non-methylated DNA profiling in seven vertebrates**. *Elife* 2013, **2**:e00348.
23. Laland KN, Odling-Smee J, Feldman MW: **Niche construction, biological evolution, and cultural change**. *Behav Brain Sci* 2000, **23**:131-146.
24. Odling-Smee FJ, Laland KN, Feldman MW: *Niche Construction: The Neglected Process in Evolution*. Princeton University Press; 2003.
25. Kline MA, Boyd R, Henrich J: **Teaching and the life history of cultural transmission in Fijian villages**. *Hum Nat* 2013, **24**:351-374.
26. Lander ES, Linton LM, Birren B, Nusbaum C, Zody MC, Baldwin J, Devon K, Dewar K, Doyle M, FitzHugh W *et al.*: **Initial sequencing and analysis of the human genome**. *Nature* 2001, **409**:860-921.
27. Green RE, Krause J, Briggs AW, Maricic T, Stenzel U, Kircher M, Patterson N, Li H, Zhai W, Fritz MH-Y *et al.*: **A draft sequence of the neandertal genome**. *Science* 2010, **328**:710-722.
28. Meyer M, Kircher M, Gansauge M-T, Li H, Racimo F, Mallick S, Schraiber JG, Jay F, Prüfer K, de Filippo C *et al.*: **A high-coverage genome sequence from an Archaic Denisovan individual**. *Science* 2012, **338**:222-226.
29. Mikkelsen TS, Hillier LW, Eichler EE, Zody MC, Jaffe DB, Yang S-P, Enard W, Hellmann I, Lindblad-Toh K, Altheide TK *et al.*: **Initial sequence of the chimpanzee genome and comparison with the human genome**. *Nature* 2005, **437**:69-87.
30. Kanthaswamy S, Ng J, Ross CT, Trask JS, Smith DG, Buffalo VS, Fass JN, Lin D: **Identifying human-rhesus macaque gene orthologs using heterospecific SNP probes**. *Genomics* 2013, **101**:30-37.
31. Locke DP, Hillier LW, Warren WC, Worley KC, Nazareth LV, Muzny DM, Yang S-P, Wang Z, Chinwalla AT, Minx P *et al.*: **Comparative and demographic analysis of orangutan genomes**. *Nature* 2011, **469**:529-533.

32. Sabeti P, Schaffner S, Fry B, Lohmueller J, Varilly P, Shamovsky O, Palma A, Mikkelsen T, Altshuler D, Lander E: **Positive natural selection in the human lineage.** *Science* 2006, **312**:1614-1620.
33. Fu W, Akey JM: **Selection and adaptation in the human genome.** *Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet* 2013, **14**:467-489.  
The authors outline how the maturation of next-generation sequencing technology has provided massive amounts of data and broadened our understanding of human evolution, while simultaneously unveiling many new questions about the nature of genetic evolution. Such new questions investigate the importance of adaptive regulatory evolution, the absence of pervasive selective sweeps, and the roles that standing variation and polygenic adaptation play in human evolution.
34. Lachance J, Tishkoff SA: **Population genomics of human adaptation.** *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst* 2013, **44**:123-143.  
The authors investigate patterns of human genetic change, focusing to a large extent on how culturally facilitated movement into new environments, as well as changes in technology, including plant and animal domestication, resulted in local adaptation to diverse environments. They find, on a genome-wide scale, that immune-related genes, as well as genes linked to fertility, have been targets of positive selection.
35. Sabeti PC, Varilly P, Fry B, Lohmueller J, Hostetter E, Cotsapas C, Xie X, Byrne EH, McCarroll SA, Gaudet R *et al.*: **Genome-wide detection and characterization of positive selection in human populations.** *Nature* 2007, **449**:913-918.
36. Wilde S, Timpson A, Kirsanow K, Kaiser E, Kayser M, Unterländer M, Hollfelder N, Potekhina ID, Schier W, Thomas MG *et al.*: **Direct evidence for positive selection of skin, hair, and eye pigmentation in Europeans during the last 5,000 y.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2014, **111**:4832-4837.  
The authors use modern and ancient DNA samples and computer simulation to present estimates of selection acting on functional alleles in three key genes known to be involved in human pigmentation pathways — HERC2, SLC45A2, and TYR. Their results provide estimates of selection of 2–10% per generation. Their results illustrate direct evidence (via the use of ancient DNA) of strong selection driving changes toward lighter hair, eye, and skin pigmentation in European populations over the last 5000 years.
37. Verrelli BC, McDonald JH, Argyropoulos G, Destro-Bisol G, Froment A, Drousiotou A, Lefranc G, Helal AN, Loiselet J, Tishkoff SA: **Evidence for balancing selection from nucleotide sequence analyses of human G6PD.** *Am J Hum Genet* 2002, **71**:1112-1128.
38. Leffler EM, Gao Z, Pfeifer S, Ségurel L, Auton A, Venn O, Bowden R, Bontrop R, Wall JD, Sella G *et al.*: **Multiple instances of ancient balancing selection shared between humans and chimpanzees.** *Science* 2013, **339**:1578-1582.
39. Tennesen JA, O'Connor TD, Bamshad MJ, Akey JM: **The promise and limitations of population exomics for human evolution studies.** *Genome Biol* 2011, **12**:1-7.
40. Fumagalli M, Sironi M, Pozzoli U, Ferrer-Admetlla A, Pattini L, Nielsen R: **Signatures of environmental genetic adaptation pinpoint pathogens as the main selective pressure through human evolution.** *PLoS Genet* 2011, **7**:e1002355.
41. Ogura Y, Bonen DK, Inohara N, Nicolae DL, Chen FF, Ramos R, Britton H, Moran T, Karaliuskas R, Duerr RH *et al.*: **A frameshift mutation in NOD2 associated with susceptibility to Crohn's disease.** *Nature* 2001, **411**:603-606.
42. Tishkoff SA, Varkonyi R, Cahinhinan N, Abbes S, Argyropoulos G, Destro-Bisol G, Drousiotou A, Dangerfield B, Lefranc G, Loiselet J *et al.*: **Haplotype diversity and linkage disequilibrium at human G6PD: recent origin of alleles that confer malarial resistance.** *Science* 2001, **293**:455-462.
43. Hamblin MT, Thompson EE, Di Rienzo A: **Complex signatures of natural selection at the Duffy blood group locus.** *Am J Hum Genet* 2002, **70**:369-383.
44. Saunders MA, Hammer MF, Nachman MW: **Nucleotide variability at G6PD and the signature of malarial selection in humans.** *Genetics* 2002, **162**:1849-1861.
45. Galvani AP, Slatkin M: **Evaluating plague and smallpox as historical selective pressures for the CCR5-Δ32 HIV-resistance allele.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2003, **100**:15276-15279.
46. Thomas MB, Godfray HCJ, Read AF, van den Berg H, Tabashnik BE, van Lenteren JC, Waage JK, Takken W: **Lessons from agriculture for the sustainable management of malaria vectors.** *PLoS Med* 2012, **9**:e1001262.
47. Wiesenfeld SL: **Sickle-cell trait in human biological and cultural evolution: development of agriculture causing increased malaria is bound to gene-pool changes causing malaria reduction.** *Science* 1967, **157**:1134-1140.
48. Bersaglieri T, Sabeti PC, Patterson N, Vanderploeg T, Schaffner SF, Drake JA, Rhodes M, Reich DE, Hirschhorn JN: **Genetic signatures of strong recent positive selection at the lactase gene.** *Am J Hum Genet* 2004, **74**:1111-1120.
49. Poulter M, Hollox E, Harvey C, Mulcare C, Peuhkuri K, Kajander K, Sarner M, Korpela R, Swallow D: **The causal element for the lactase persistence/non-persistence polymorphism is located in a 1 Mb region of linkage disequilibrium in Europeans.** *Ann Hum Genet* 2003, **67**:298-311.
50. Itan Y, Powell A, Beaumont MA, Burger J, Thomas MG: **The origins of lactase persistence in Europe.** *PLoS Comput Biol* 2009, **5**:e1000491.
51. Jones BL, Raga TO, Liebert A, Zmarz P, Bekele E, Danielsen ET, Olsen AK, Bradman N, Troelsen JT, Swallow DM: **Diversity of lactase persistence alleles in Ethiopia: signature of a soft selective sweep.** *Am J Hum Genet* 2013, **93**:538-544.
52. Ferreira Z, Hurlle B, Rocha J, Seixas S: **Differing evolutionary histories of WFDC8 (short-term balancing) in Europeans and SPINT4 (incomplete selective sweep) in Africans.** *Mol Biol Evol* 2011, **28**:2811-2822.
53. Tishkoff SA, Reed FA, Ranciaro A, Voight BF, Babbitt CC, Silverman JS, Powell K, Mortensen HM, Hirbo JB, Osman M *et al.*: **Convergent adaptation of human lactase persistence in Africa and Europe.** *Nat Genet* 2006, **39**:31-40.
54. Lamason RL, Mohideen M-AP, Mest JR, Wong AC, Norton HL, Aros MC, Jurynec MJ, Mao X, Humphreville VR, Humbert JE *et al.*: **SLC24A5, a putative cation exchanger, affects pigmentation in zebrafish and humans.** *Science* 2005, **310**:1782-1786.
55. Sturm RA, Duffy DL: **Human pigmentation genes under environmental selection.** *Genome Biol* 2012, **13**:1-15.  
The authors review results from several genome-wide association and comparative genomic studies which have established the roles of multiple loci and polymorphisms in affecting human skin, hair and eye color. The authors address the role that environmental variation plays in driving selection on these genes.
56. Kuan V, Martineau AR, Griffiths CJ, Hyppönen E, Walton R: **DHCR7 mutations linked to higher vitamin D status allowed early human migration to northern latitudes.** *BMC Evol Biol* 2013, **13**:1-10.  
The authors show that the DHCR7 haplotype underwent a selective sweep in Northeast Asia. Their results suggest that variation in DHCR7, rather than CYP2R1 or GC, is the principle adaptation affecting vitamin D metabolism in recent evolutionary history, which helped early humans to migrate to areas further from the equator without suffering Vitamin D deficiency.
57. Jablonski NG, Chaplin G: **Human skin pigmentation as an adaptation to UV radiation.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2010, **107**:8962-8968.
58. Bigham AW, Mao X, Mei R, Brutsaert T, Wilson MJ, Julian CG, Parra EJ, Akey JM, Moore LG, Shriver MD: **Identifying positive selection candidate loci for high-altitude adaptation in Andean populations.** *Hum Genomics* 2009, **4**:79-90.
59. Peng Y, Yang Z, Zhang H, Cui C, Qi X, Luo X, Tao X, Wu T, Chen H, Shi H *et al.*: **Genetic variations in Tibetan populations and high-altitude adaptation at the Himalayas.** *Mol Biol Evol* 2011, **28**:1075-1081.  
The authors performed an analysis of genome-wide sequence variation in Tibetans, in order to investigate if there was evidence of selection on genes linked to hypoxia. They found strong signals of selection in two hypoxia-related genes, EPAS1 and EGLN1. Tibetans show high divergence from the non-Tibetan lowlanders (Han Chinese and Japanese) at these loci.

60. Bigham A, Bauchet M, Pinto D, Mao X, Akey JM, Mei R, Scherer SW, Julian CG, Wilson MJ, Herráez DL *et al.*: **Identifying signatures of natural selection in Tibetan and Andean populations using dense genome scan data.** *PLoS Genet* 2010, **6**:e1001116.
61. Pritchard JK, Pickrell JK, Coop G: **The genetics of human adaptation: hard sweeps, soft sweeps, and polygenic adaptation.** *Curr Biol* 2010, **20**:R208-R215.
62. Pääbo S: **The human condition – a molecular approach.** *Cell* 2014, **157**:216-226.
63. Slavich GM, Cole SW: **The emerging field of human social genomics.** *Clin Psychol Sci* 2013 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2167702613478594>.
64. Mead S, Stumpf MP, Whitfield J, Beck JA, Poulter M, Campbell T, Uphill JB, Goldstein D, Alpers M, Fisher EM *et al.*: **Balancing selection at the prion protein gene consistent with prehistoric Kurulike epidemics.** *Science* 2003, **300**:640-643.
65. Collinge J, Whitfield J, McKintosh E, Beck J, Mead S, Thomas DJ, Alpers MP: **Kuru in the 21st century – an acquired human prion disease with very long incubation periods.** *Lancet* 2006, **367**:2068-2074.
66. Lindenbaum S: *Kuru Sorcery: Disease and Danger in the New Guinea Highlands.* Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing Company; 1979.
67. Alpers MP: **The epidemiology of Kuru: monitoring the epidemic from its peak to its end.** *Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci* 2008, **363**:3707-3713.
68. Cervenáková L, Goldfarb LG, Garruto R, Lee H-S, Gajdusek DC, Brown P: **Phenotype-genotype studies in Kuru: implications for new variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1998, **95**:13239-13241.
69. Manners J: **Kenya's running tribe.** *Sports Hist* 1997, **17**:14-27.
70. Pitsiladis YP, Onywera VO, Geogiades E, O'Connell W, Boit MK: **The dominance of Kenyans in distance running.** *Equine Comp Exerc Physiol* 2004, **1**:285-291.
71. Onywera VO, Scott RA, Boit MK, Pitsiladis YP: **Demographic characteristics of elite Kenyan endurance runners.** *J Sports Sci* 2006, **24**:415-422.
72. Onywera V, Kiplamai F, Boit M, Pitsiladis Y: **Food and macronutrient intake of elite Kenyan distance runners.** *Int J Sport Nutr Exerc Metab* 2004, **14**:709-719.
73. Christensen DL, Jakobsen J, Friis H: **Vitamin and mineral intake of twelve adolescent male Kalenjin runners in western Kenya.** *East Afr Med J* 2005, **82**:637-642.
74. Tam E, Rossi H, Moia C, Berardelli C, Rosa G, Capelli C, Ferretti G: **Energetics of running in top-level marathon runners from Kenya.** *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2012, **112**:3797-3806.
75. Christensen DL, Damkjaer S: **Traditional and modern running culture among the Kalenjin of Kenya: a historical and anthropological perspective.** *Anthropol Sport Hum Mov Biocult Perspect* 2010:187-212.
76. Jarvie G, Sikes M: **Running as a resource of hope? Voices from Eldoret.** *Rev Afr Polit Econ* 2012, **39**:629-644.
77. Larsen HB, Nolan T, Borch C, Søndergaard H: **Training response of adolescent Kenyan town and village boys to endurance running.** *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2005, **15**:48-57.
78. Tucker R, Santos-Concejero J, Collins M: **The genetic basis for elite running performance.** *Br J Sports Med* 2013, **47**:545-549.
79. Ash GI, Scott RA, Deason M, Dawson TA, Wolde B, Bekele Z, Tekla S, Pitsiladis YP: **No association between ACE gene variation and endurance athlete status in Ethiopians.** *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2011, **43**:590-597.
80. Ortolani O, Conti A, Ngumi Z, Texeira L, Olang P, Amani I, Medrado V: **Ethnic differences in propofol and fentanyl response: a comparison among Caucasians, Kenyan Africans and Brazilians.** *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 2004, **21**:314-319.
81. Wu WD, Wang Y, Fang YM, Zhou HY: **Polymorphism of the  $\mu$ -opioid receptor gene (OPRM1 118A>G) affects fentanyl-induced analgesia during anesthesia and recovery.** *Mol Diagn Ther* 2009, **13**:331-337.
82. Tan E, Lim E, Teo Y, Lim Y, Law H, Sia AT *et al.*: **Ethnicity and OPRM1 variant independently predict pain perception and patient-controlled analgesia usage for post-operative pain.** *Mol Pain* 2009, **5**:1-8.
83. Rushton JP: *Race, Evolution, and Behavior: A Life History Perspective.* 1995.
84. MacDonald K: *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism.* AuthorHouse; 2003.
85. Vitti JJ, Cho MK, Tishkoff SA, Sabeti PC: **Human evolutionary genomics: ethical and interpretive issues.** *Trends Genet* 2012, **28**:137-145.
86. Richerson PJ, Christiansen MH: *Cultural Evolution: Society, Technology, Language, and Religion.* MIT Press; 2013.

The authors address the ways in which evolutionary and genetic considerations have been misused to support discriminatory policies and actions. The authors discuss the foundations and future directions of human evolutionary genetics and genomics, paying special attention to the ways in which the interpretation of otherwise good science can go awry. They offer advice to researchers that they hope will prevent misunderstandings and misapplication of their work by the general public.

This volume unites the perspectives of an interdisciplinary team of leading researchers in theoretical biology, developmental and cognitive psychology, linguistics, anthropology, sociology, religious studies, history, and economics in order to explore the central role of cultural evolution in different aspects of human endeavor. The contributors take as their guiding principle the idea that cultural evolutionary theory can provide an important integrating function across the various disciplines of the human sciences, much like organic evolutionary theory does for biology. The benefits of adopting a cultural evolutionary perspective are demonstrated by contributions on social systems, technology, language, and religion.