Kelly 2000.

What differentiates war from individual-level homicide (e.g. revenge killings) is precisely “social substitutability”, i.e. the concept of “group liability”. This is mostly found in segmented societies [ones with clan organization, descent groups, endogamy, marriage conceived of as exchange between groups etc.], including hunter-gatherers. H-Gs without strong clan organization tend to lack group liability and also group responsibility (i.e. to take revenge), and not to have organized intergroup violence. He also points out that internal war (among culturally similar people who share understandings) is a “war-peace system” i.e. there are ways to make peace as well as make war, and gives examples of the Andaman islanders.

He thinks of collective cognitions: e.g. social recognition of vengeance obligations and of group liability.

From our POV, what this means is that GR is indeed hypothesized to link to warfare, indeed to define warfare. So we need to understand if it is a universal propensity, or if it is linked to certain forms of social organizations, or… Our experiment shows that even in a modern society without extended kin groups or acceptance of the concept of group responsibility for punishment, GR still occurs. That could be because it is “innate”, or because the idea of groups more broadly is still relevant in our societies. (And it might be in unsegmented HGs too, maybe they would practice group reciprocity but just not in the domain of violent conflict.)

Kelly suggests that pop density may play a role in the origin of warfare. We can suggest reverse causality. Warfare allows for greater pop. density.