

Mongoose Proj

Matishalin Patel, Michael Cant, and Rufus Johnstone

1 Abstract

Lorem Ipsum

keywords:

intragroup cooperation, intergroup conflict, game theory, social evolution

2 Introduction

Intergroup conflict is thought to be the key driver in the evolution of cooperation. However our understanding of the key evolutionary and ecological drivers of inter group conflict is far from complete. In social mammals both between and within group conflict is variable and seems positively or negatively correlated with between and within group cooperation. This variety of responses shows that a better understanding of the driver of cooperation and conflict are needed to fully explain how within and between group conflict evolves in social mammals.

Previous models have shown that intergroup conflict can favour within group cooperation. However these models often link the payoffs of cooperation and conflict so as to enable a direct synergism between the two. This approach may make sense for some complicated behaviours such as tribal warfare in human societies, but simpler behaviours or those more prevalent

21 in social mammals more generally may not follow this pattern. Specifically,
22 we might expect the opposite to be true — performing well in intergroup
23 encounters makes one less willing or able to cooperate with others or vice
24 versa.

25 Previous work has also focused on non-conditional traits that do not
26 take into account the fact that benefits and costs of intergroup conflict are
27 highly dependent on the internal state of the group and the environment.
28 The economic and political theory literature on war argues that resource
29 inequality drives human conflict but few studies have explored that same
30 logic to the evolution of intergroup conflict in social mammals.

31 In this paper we explicitly model a group structured population where
32 each group varies in number of individuals and in resource quality. Groups
33 engage in Tullock contests where the winner gains one of the losers re-
34 sources. Individuals play conditional strategies of intergroup conflict and
35 cooperation and they are allowed perfect knowledge of their own state but
36 not their opponents. ;findings;

37 **3 Model**

38 In our model we sought to understand the link between resource richness
39 for an cooperative group and their resulting investments into two social
40 traits. The first trait is a cooperative trait modelled as a simple public good
41 which helped all member of the patch to survive for longer (**X**). The sec-
42 ond is a competitive trait modelled as a simple blind bid game the winning
43 group then gaining control of one of the loser's resources (**Y**).

44 We modeled an infinite population consisting of individual patches. A
45 patch is identified by its quality level, $q \in \mathbb{Z} : q \in [1, Q]$, and the number of
46 individuals on the patch, $n \in \mathbb{Z} : n \in [0, N]$. Where the maximum quality, Q ,
47 and maximum group size, N , are predetermined parameters.

48 The distribution of patches in the population can therefore be described

by a $q \times n$ matrix \mathbf{F} with elements $f_{q,n}$. Equally, the evolved strategies of cooperation, \mathbf{X} , and conflict, \mathbf{Y} are matrices which indicate the strategy of individual in state $\{q, n\}$.

To find the stable distribution of patch frequencies we first derived the equations for how frequencies change in the model. We constructed a matrix \mathbf{F}' which describes how demographic processes and between patch interactions affect the frequency of each patch type.

3.1 Environmental transitions

The environment may gain and lose resources naturally through variation in various abiotic and biotic factors that are not controllable by the individuals we model. This represents the natural gain and loss from the environment.

$$E_{q,n} = \sum_{q_1=1}^Q \sum_{q_2=1}^Q t_{q_2,q_1} f_{q_2,n} - t_{q_1,q_2} f_{q_1,n} \quad (1)$$

where, E is the matrix of changes due to environment, \mathbf{T} is a $q \times q$ matrix with entries being this environmental rate of change. In our model we further specified that the matrix \mathbf{T} is a sparse matrix with a subdiagonal where all entries equal to some gain value and a superdiagonal where all values equal to a loss value. This ensures gains and losses happen in step-wise manner and patches may not gain or lose more than one resource at once.

3.2 Natural mortality

Death may occur through natural causes at any time causing a patch to lose members. We modelled both the cooperative and competitive traits as causing a cost to survival. The cooperative trait however offset that cost by reducing overall mortality on the patch based on the average cooperation

level. This gives the matrix M as the changes in frequency due to mortality events:

$$M_{q,n} = \sum_{n=1}^N (n+1)f_{q,n+1}m_{q,n+1} - n f_{q,n}m_{q,n} , \quad (2)$$

where,

$$m_{q,n} = B \exp\left(-n\left(\frac{n x_{q,n}}{n}\right)\right) + \mu_x x_{q,n}^2 + \mu_y y_{q,n}^2 . \quad (3)$$

3.3 Local Births

In patches with at least one individual that are not at the maximum group size N there can be birth events. Which are modelled by matrix B :

$$B_{q,n} = \sum_{q=1}^Q \sum_{n=1}^N -1_{n=1} \quad (4)$$

References

- A Resource Dependence Perspective on Intergroup Conflict: The Synthesis of Two Theories* - McCarthy - 2018 - *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology* - Wiley Online Library (n.d.), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jts5.22>.
- Bowles, S. (2006), 'Group Competition, Reproductive Leveling, and the Evolution of Human Altruism', *Science* **314**(5805), 1569–1572.
- Bowles, S. (2009), 'Did Warfare Among Ancestral Hunter-Gatherers Affect the Evolution of Human Social Behaviors?', *Science* **324**(5932), 1293–1298.
- Bowles, S., Choi, J.-K. and Hopfensitz, A. (2003), 'The co-evolution of in-

- 88 individual behaviors and social institutions', *Journal of Theoretical Biology*
89 **223**(2), 135–147.
- 90 Boyd, R., Gintis, H., Bowles, S. and Richerson, P. J. (2003), 'The evolution
91 of altruistic punishment', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
92 **100**(6), 3531–3535.
- 93 Cant, M. A., Nichols, H. J., Thompson, F. J. and Vitikainen, E. (2016),
94 Banded mongooses: Demography, life history, and social behavior, *in*
95 W. D. Koenig and J. L. Dickinson, eds, 'Cooperative Breeding in Verte-
96 brates', Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 318–337.
- 97 Choi, J.-K. and Bowles, S. (2007), 'The Coevolution of Parochial Altruism
98 and War', *Science* **318**(5850), 636–640.
- 99 *Claire Thesis Chapter* (n.d.).
- 100 Cornwallis, C. K., Botero, C. A., Rubenstein, D. R., Downing, P. A., West,
101 S. A. and Griffin, A. S. (2017), 'Cooperation facilitates the colonization of
102 harsh environments', *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **1**(3).
- 103 De Dreu, C. K. W., Gross, J., Méder, Z., Giffin, M., Prochazkova, E., Krikeb,
104 J. and Columbus, S. (2016), 'In-group defense, out-group aggression, and
105 coordination failures in intergroup conflict', *Proceedings of the National*
106 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **113**(38), 10524–10529.
- 107 Downing, P. A., Griffin, A. S. and Cornwallis, C. K. (2020), 'Group forma-
108 tion and the evolutionary pathway to complex sociality in birds', *Nature*
109 *Ecology & Evolution* **4**(3), 479–486.
- 110 Garfinkel, M. R. and Skaperdas, S. (2006), 'Economics of Conflict: An
111 Overview', *SSRN Electronic Journal* .
- 112 Inzani, E., Marshall, H. H., Thompson, F. J., Kalema-Zikusoka, G., Cant,
113 M. A. and Vitikainen, E. I. K. (2019), 'Spontaneous abortion as a re-

114 sponse to reproductive conflict in the banded mongoose', *Biology Letters*
115 **15**(12), 20190529.

116 Ito, H., Katsumata, Y., Hasegawa, E. and Yoshimura, J. (2017), 'The pro-
117 motion of cooperation by the poor in dynamic chicken games', *Scientific*
118 *Reports* **7**(1), 43377.

119 Johnstone, R. A. and Cant, M. A. (2008), 'Sex Differences in Dispersal
120 and the Evolution of Helping and Harming.', *The American Naturalist*
121 **172**(3), 318–330.

122 Koenig, W. D., Pitelka, F. A., Carmen, W. J., Mumme, R. L. and Stanback,
123 M. T. (1992), 'The Evolution of Delayed Dispersal in Cooperative Breed-
124 ers', *The Quarterly Review of Biology* **67**(2), 111–150.

125 Lehmann, L. (2011), 'The Demographic Benefits of Belligerence and Brav-
126 ery: Defeated Group Repopulation or Victorious Group Size Expansion?',
127 *PLOS ONE* **6**(7), e21437.

128 Lehmann, L. and Feldman, M. W. (2008), 'War and the evolution of belliger-
129 ence and bravery', *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*
130 **275**(1653), 2877–2885.

131 Patel, M., Raymond, B., Bonsall, M. B. and West, S. A. (2019), 'Crystal toxins
132 and the volunteer's dilemma in bacteria', *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*
133 **32**(4), 310–319.

134 Patel, M., West, S. A. and Biernaskie, J. M. (2020), 'Kin discrimination, neg-
135 ative relatedness, and how to distinguish between selfishness and spite',
136 *Evolution Letters* **4**(1), 65–72.

137 Rusch, H. (2014a), 'The evolutionary interplay of intergroup conflict and
138 altruism in humans: A review of parochial altruism theory and prospects
139 for its extension', *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*
140 **281**(1794).

- 141 Rusch, H. (2014*b*), ‘The evolutionary interplay of intergroup conflict and
142 altruism in humans: A review of parochial altruism theory and prospects
143 for its extension’, *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*
144 **281**(1794).
- 145 Sheppard, C. E., Inger, R., Macdonald, R., Barker, S., Jackson, A., Thomp-
146 son, F., Vitikainen, E., Cant, M. A. and Marshall, H. (2018), ‘Intragroup
147 competition predicts individual foraging specialisation in a group-living
148 mammal’.
- 149 *The Impact of Resource Uncertainty and Intergroup Conflict on Harvest-*
150 *ing in the Common-Pool Resource Experiment — SpringerLink* (n.d.),
151 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10640-017-0193-9>.
- 152 Thompson, F. J., Cant, M. A., Marshall, H. H., Vitikainen, E. I. K., Sanderson,
153 J. L., Nichols, H. J., Gilchrist, J. S., Bell, M. B. V., Young, A. J., Hodge,
154 S. J. and Johnstone, R. A. (2017), ‘Explaining negative kin discrimination
155 in a cooperative mammal society’, *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
156 *Sciences* **114**(20), 5207–5212.
- 157 Thompson, F. J., Marshall, H. H., Vitikainen, E. I. K. and Cant, M. A. (2017),
158 ‘Causes and consequences of intergroup conflict in cooperative banded
159 mongooses’.
- 160 Thompson, F. J., Marshall, H. H., Vitikainen, E. I., Young, A. J. and Cant,
161 M. A. (2017), ‘Individual and demographic consequences of mass eviction
162 in cooperative banded mongooses’, *Animal Behaviour* **134**, 103–112.
- 163 Vila, J. C. C., Jones, M. L., Patel, M., Bell, T. and Rosindell, J. (2019), ‘Un-
164 covering the rules of microbial community invasions’, *Nature Ecology &*
165 *Evolution* **3**(8), 1162–1171.