Bucknell University
Bucknell Digital Commons

Honors Theses Student Theses

Spring 2022

Finding Identity in the Intersections: Transnational Feminism and the Non-Human Primate

Kailyn Carr
kpc009@bucknell.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/honors_theses

Part of the Animal Studies Commons

Recommended Citation
Carr, Kailyn, "Finding Identity in the Intersections: Transnational Feminism and the Non-Human Primate" (2022). *Honors Theses*. 602.
https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/honors_theses/602

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses at Bucknell Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Bucknell Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcadmin@bucknell.edu.

FINDING IDENTITY IN THE INTERSECTIONS: TRANSNATIONAL FEMINISMS AND THE NON-HUMAN PRIMATE

by

Kailyn P. Carr

A Senior Thesis Submitted to the Honors Council

For Honors in Literary Studies

April 5, 2022

Approved by:

Advisor: Jeremy Chow

Jeremy Chow , Assistant Professor of English

Co-advisor:

Reggie Gazes, Associate Professor of Psychology and Animal Behavior

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to Professor Jeremy Chow, my thesis advisor, for challenging me to continue growing through my writing and for being my mentor these past few years. Your dedication and passion in your work has inspired me to work harder and smarter over the years. Thank you to Professor Reggie Gazes for giving me the opportunity to work alongside you in the primate lab with the capuchins as well as on this thesis as my second reader. I have appreciated every moment that I have shared with you throughout my college career. Thank you to my family and friends, for their continued support throughout this writing process as well as my college career, you all have helped more than you know. And finally, a special thank you to the capuchin monkeys. It was my work in the lab that inspired this project, and I am forever grateful for the opportunity to work with them. They will forever appreciate our time together and carry their memory with me as I continue my work beyond Bucknell.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.......... v

INTRODUCTION 1

THE DUALITY OF MAN: RECONSTRUCTING THE BINARIES ON THE BORDERLANDS OF FEMINIST AND NON-HUMAN IDENTITY.......... 11

LOOKING FOR THE MONKEY IN THE MIRROR: THE TRANSNATIONAL REFLECTION OF FEMALE PRIMATE IDENTITY 23

THE OTHERED MOTHER: THE ROLE OF MOTHERHOOD WITHIN THE RIGHT TO FEMININITY ACROSS PRIMATE CULTURES 33

A “WHO”, NOT A “WHAT”: A GOODALL ANALYSIS IN EXTENDING THE RIGHT TO PERSONHOOD ACROSS NON-HUMAN PRIMATE IDENTITIES.......... 43

CODA: MY PERSONAL REFLECTIONS AND ONE FINAL GOODBYE 52

WORKS CITED 60

ABSTRACT

This project examines how the conversations among feminism and primatology offers a unique critical lens into how "man" dominates other identities, whether that be woman or non-human primate, specifically within the rigid colonial structures of Western society. Donna Haraway's landmark post-humanist work joins these conversations, especially with her earlier work *Primate Visions* and *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women*. While Haraway has changed the narrative surrounding feminist theory within the biological sciences – what has now become recognized as feminist science and technology studies –, this shift in perspective continues to emphasize Western ideological practices and their attention to primatology. My project first critically analyzes Haraway's feminist retellings surrounding the historical contexts of Western primatology to provide an introductory overview into the theoretical analysis that has shaped the cultural identity of non-human primates. As I shift into my later chapters, I apply Haraway's work transnationally to the critical terms of Reflection, Motherhood, and Personhood as they come to be represented within the narratives of Jane Goodall and Birutė Galdikas. With each critical term targeted as the central theme of each chapter, I critique and analyze how Goodall and Galdikas define themselves within non-Western contexts in order to unpack how intersectional feminist work shapes the way humans identify with other primates in non-Western cultures. By using Haraway as a lens to investigate non-Western texts, I ultimately show that culturally-inclusive language redefines the ways in which feminist ideologies and theoretical practices analyze non-human primates within the diverse academic study of primatology as it begins to construct the necessary framework for bridging the gap between our understandings of both human and animal identity.

INTRODUCTION

> *Narratives of the dominance of man over nature are bolstered by scientific rhetoric to retain the hegemonic position of Western colonizers over third world nations and men over women.*
>
> - S Radhakrishna and D Jamieson, "Liberating Primatology"

The critical terminology that has shaped our understanding of both feminism and primatology has largely been manipulated by the dominating structure of Euro-centric, Western societies. The implicit bias controlling the narrative surrounding primate identity follows the anthropocentric projections that notions of gender are evenly and universally applied to the nonhuman world where the duality of man represents a superior complex that has explicitly influenced the way in which we view the cultural and natural world. As another facet of the gender binary, the patriarchy subjugates women to the same gender-essential framework as non-human primates where masculinity is elevated above femininity within cultural representations of human society. Following Western practices of colonialism, human and animal identities are continuously subjected to boxed off categorization through the social construction of these cultural binaries. Those identities that find themselves "othered" opposite of man within these binaries are deemed inferior in patriarchal society, and thus forced from public spaces where their lives are defined by man's entitled desire for power. Through the academic disciplines of primatology and feminism, this project highlights man's assertion of control over non-human primates and women and presents the countless parallels that connect both of these representations of identity. However, this project utilizes the intersectional studies of feminist science and technology and feminist theory as tools for constructing accurate representations of non-human primate identity. Both women and non-human primates are dominated by man in

different ways that slightly overlap within their respected rights to individual identity, which enforces how necessary it is for this project to highlight the individual struggles that define both primatology and feminism within Western notions of patriarchal culture.

Diverse in its independent points of origin around the world, "Primatology is caught between anthropology and biology, between anthropocentrism and naturalism, between seeing primates as resources for understanding humanity and seeing them as agents worthy of understanding in their own right" (Radhakrishna & Jamieson 2018). This notion that primatology is "caught between" different categorical definitions of academic representation speaks to how non-human primate identity is caught between the Western constructions of animal versus human identity. Environmental scientists Sindhu Radhakrishna and Dale Jamieson define non-human primates as having a "chimeric identity…one that is neither fully human nor fully animal" (2018). The assertion that non-human primates are "almost" human contradicts and breaks down Western representations of humanity as it has come to be separate and dominant over non-human animals. This progressive movement to include non-human primates within their right to individual identity offers primatology to further explore the identity politics associated with a non-human primate's right to personhood, which for the purposes of this project is defined as the condition or quality of being an individual with a given name and ascribed personality traits. While I acknowledge and engage with different definitions of personhood in my last chapter, this representation encompasses the necessary aspects of identity that come to define the ways in which humanity engages with the individual rights to agency outside of legal influence.

Defining rights to personhood in relation to non-human animals has been debated heavily within the last decade, but this debate has recently come to fruition within the last year as

renowned primatologist Dr. Jane Goodall signed off on a letter presented to the Associated Press Stylebook that calls for non-human animals to be given the right to be represented by gender pronouns as a prominent aspect of individual identity (Joint Open Letter 2021). In fact, Goodall herself has been criticized for naming and referring to individual chimpanzees using personal pronouns, "Every place she had written *he* or *she* to describe a chimpanzee had been replaced with *it*, and every *who* had been replaced with *which*" (Joint Open Letter 2021). In the "replacement" of these personal pronouns, Goodall's observations had been shut down, her work dismissed, and her voice silenced because she had chosen to give non-human primates the right to their own individuality. This recount further establishes how Western society prioritizes Haraway's duality of man over women and non-human animals because her editors blatantly disregard the extension of personal pronouns to non-human animals, which makes it easier to belittle Goodall's work as a woman working in the field of primatology. Goodall's continued advocacy for non-human animal personhood remains at the forefront of shifting Western ideologies away from the human-animal divide, giving her access to an intersectional lens with which to engage with feminism and primate identity outside of Western influence.

As the three defining pillars of women in primatology, Jane Goodall, Dian Fossey, and Birutė Galdikas have each revolutionized the ways in which we come to understand non-human primate identity outside of patriarchal limitations. In their 2013 graphic novel *Primates*, Jim Ottaviani and Maris Wick present each of these women's narratives in a way that is accessible to everyone. While this graphic novel easily breaks down scientific rhetoric and presents Goodall, Fossey, and Galdikas as revolutionary primatologists, it also accurately engages with how each of these women were viewed and exploited in their work. This sensationalized narrative capitalizes on their femininity, which overshadows the observational and advocational work

being done by each of these women. Historically, women have been defined by patriarchal society as being closer to nature than men; thus, assumptions were made that "the nurturant nature of women would make them more patient and perceptive in direct observation of animal behavior than men would be" (Arnhart 158). Even if these attributes make women "better" at behavioral observation, the patriarchal structure of Western society demands that these women conform to these assumptions of femininity in order to validate their identities in juxtaposition to their non-human primate counterparts because if they do not, as exemplified later in this project by Dian Fossey, their feminine identity is rejected.

Moreover, the connections being made here within the gendered assumptions attached to these revolutionary women of primatology positions women as well as representations of non-human primates firmly within Western idealizations of patriarchal identity. Looking within the theoretical implications of feminism as it comes to be associated with primatology provides a space for reconstructing the ways in which Western society views, controls, and categorizes women and non-human primates individually within their own rights to identity and personhood respectfully. While seemingly disparate by Western standards, the conversation between primatology and feminism reaffirms their unique positions within diverse fields of study. In feminist science and technology studies, Donna Haraway's post-humanist work joins these conversations within her earlier works *Primate Visions* and *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women*. Her critical application of feminist theory to the study of non-human primates reaches into the boundaries of private spaces and works to deconstruct the binarized narrative that controls patriarchal representations of society. Her attention to how language, critical terminology, and the act of naming stabilizes man's domination over both nature and culture and introduces an intersectional critique into the structures of Western society.

The fluidity with which Haraway approaches the conceptual deconstruction of binaries provides the essential framework for my own theoretical analysis of the critical language associated with non-human primate and feminist identities within and outside of the patriarchy; however, her theoretical application extends as far as the ideological practices reinforced within Western society. By critically engaging with her earlier works *Primate Visions* and *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women*, I outline my own transnational application of feminist theory within the scientific and social-cultural implications of primatology that exist outside of Western contexts. Haraway emphasizes theoretical dualisms and how they function within the West to further reinforce gender and biocultural binaries that push non-human primates into the borderlands of identity. Her work thus moves to challenge these patriarchal notions of control in order to reflect on the cultural necessity of interdisciplinary work between feminism and primatology. In teasing out key terms related to this central argument, I cultivate new theoretical perspectives within the language associated with non-human primate identity as it comes to mirror our own. By targeting the mirror image within Haraway's work, I introduce a psychoanalytic critique into the gendered associations made between the Self and the Other, and how this reflects on the positionality of motherhood within patriarchal society. Specifically, I draw from the theoretical frameworks surrounding orientalism introduced by Edward Said and the narcissistic mirror stage as is separates the "self" of the child from the "othered" mother to inform the way in which Haraway engages with non-human primate identity in relation to the Western duality of man. Additionally, these same implications of oriental and psychoanalytic concepts provided in my own analysis further supports Haraway's engagement with the intersectional importance of identity within the feminist praxis of personhood as it comes to be extended to non-human primates.

In the following chapters, like Haraway, I turn to the praxis of analyzing the thematic

importance of critical terms within the autobiographical narratives of Jane Goodall and Birutė Galdikas as both of these women participate in and critically analyze their Western femininity while in non-Western contexts. It is important for me to note that while Goodall and Galdikas are white, Western female primatologists, I define their work as transnational because they are immersing themselves within transnational representations of culture outside of the patriarchal structures of Western society. In other words, I utilize "transnational" as a term to reflect on the scientific and cultural work these women are doing without the constraints of Western ideology instead of focusing this term around their individual identity as women. Their work informs the intersectionality that transnational studies upholds across the dividing line of human and non-human primate identity, and easily accesses the fluidity with which transnational communities respect non-human individuals. By constructing my own applications of transnationalism within this project, I provide a more in-depth analysis and critique of the narrative structures of Galdikas and Goodall's work as they come to be defined by the central themes of reflection, motherhood, and personhood. With each thematic chapter centered around each of these critical terms, I apply Haraway's theoretical framework to the lives and observations of these two women across transnational representations of identity within and alongside non-human primate societies.

As an extension of Haraway's analysis of the mirror, the first critical term I focus on is reflection. Ethology, the study of animal behavior, hinges on animal models as a reflective tool into understanding humanity's positionality within the natural world. As our closest ancestral relatives, non-human primates occupy the borders between man and animal, acting as a window into looking back in time at the evolutionary history of both human and non-human primates. However, Western practices of primatology have been limited to the study of Old World great

ape species. Through my transnational extension into the global south, I begin this chapter by highlighting a lesser known Western primatologist named Karen B. Strier (Strum & Fedigan 2000) and the narration of her work done with New World monkeys in Brazil. (Here, it is important to note that there has recently been a push in primatology to stop using the terminology “Old World” and “New World”, since these terms are so heavily steeped in a colonial framework. The preferred wording is "catarrhine" and "platyrrhine" primates; however, for the purposes of this project, I continue to use “Old World” and “New World” to exploit the colonial language reflected within Strier’s narrative as it comes to support the limiting structures of Western society.) Strier notes that the importance of New World species expands our understanding of primate societies and accurately reflects the diversity across non-human primate species; thus, expanding and challenging Western perspectives to include representations of primate society. Shifting to the observational studies of Goodall and Galdikas, I closely read how these women reflect on their Western perspectives as they come to be obsolete living alongside their respective great ape species. They both come to realize the startling similarities between themselves and their study species, and this allows them to revise Western assumptions about non-human primate identity and fully come to appreciate the individual identities of each non-human primate that they interact with.

In my next critical chapter, I continue to analyze the use of reflective language as it comes to be associated with the role of motherhood through psychoanalytic theory. The gendered exploitation of the Self from the “othered” mother uniquely places femininity within the private spheres of society while simultaneously essentializing motherhood as the primary role of women within the confining structures of the patriarchy. In my subsequent close reading of Goodall and Galdikas through the lens of motherhood, I unpack the ways in which each of these women

reflect on their Western essentialism of motherhood as they become mothers themselves. In raising their sons alongside non-human primate mothers, Goodall and Galdikas adopt some of the mothering techniques displayed by their primate sisters; the trust established between mothers of different cultures and species allows these women to again better understand the mirror-like quality to their relationship with non-human primates in the field. The distinctions made between non-human and human primate offspring comes to fruition when Goodall and Galdikas separate their sons from their non-human playmates. This separation is key to understanding the simultaneous differences and similarities between human and non-human primates and allows both of these women to further relate to the great apes they study. Additionally, the focus on the essentialism of motherhood within Western contexts informs the ways in which Galdikas and Goodall engage and reaffirm their femininity through their participation in motherhood. Any rejection of motherhood places women, like Dian Fossey, outside of the normative structures of the patriarchy, displacing her femininity and out casting her to the same boundaries as her non-human primate counterparts.

By way of shifting into my final chapter, I define my own representation of personhood as it comes to be ascribed to the non-human primates that Goodall and Galdikas live alongside. As both of these women reflect on their time in the field, they come to recognize the individual identities of each great ape they interact with, and this specifically motivates Goodall to advocate for non-human primate and animal agency within our own human understanding and engagement with personhood. I start by analyzing different legal implications of personhood as it comes to be understood in relation to the accurate legal representation of non-human animal identity within different transnational contexts. This overview illustrates a critical shift in how humanity reflects on identity as it comes to liberate non-human animals within their

intersectional right to personhood. Here, I turn my focus to Goodall's contribution to the 2021 Joint Letter to the Associated Press Stylebook as another implication of personhood by addressing the criticisms it received to center the argument once again around the call for non-human animals to be given the individual right to personal pronouns. At the forefront of this advocacy, Jane Goodall's work with the chimpanzees in Gombe comes to be sensationalized by Western society as media outlets capitalize on her identity as a woman working in the field of primatology. By exploiting femininity within studies of non-human primate behavior, Western ideologies surrounding the divide between human and animal identity moves to overshadow the critical work being done by women like Goodall and Galdikas to challenge man's entitlement over personhood as it comes to be rightfully assigned to non-human primate identities.

By combining and analyzing the scientific and literary languages that shape the definition of primatology in its entirety, this project will begin to construct the necessary framework for bridging the gap between our understandings of both human and animal identity, and it will allow me to reflect back on my own experiences of working alongside non-human primates. As I look back on my work in the primate lab with the capuchin monkeys, I apply my own critical lens to the ways in which I would describe and interact with each capuchin within and outside of the realm of scientific research. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, I had not been able to go back to the lab in over two years – until this semester. Going back to the lab after all these years allowed me to really engage with the critical terms I present in this project, and to better understand the ways in which they have come to define and understand non-human primate identity as a reflection, separate in its individual right to personhood, of humanity. In concluding with my own narrative of engaging with capuchin monkeys for the first time in two years since the beginning of the pandemic, I reflect on the narratives of Goodall and Galdikas, the women

who have pioneered before me, to better structure my own definitions and understandings of identity as they come to be ascribed to human and animal individuals across disciplines. Thus, the identity of the female primate comes to be fully appreciated and established at the intersections of transnational feminism and primatology as we grow out of Western binaries and into an inclusive space that takes othered identities out of the shadows and into the light of day.

THE DUALITY OF MAN: RECONSTRUCTING THE BINARIES ON THE BORDERLANDS OF FEMINIST AND NON-HUMAN IDENTITY

> *The two major axes structuring the potent scientific stories of primatology that are elaborated in these practices are defined by the interacting dualisms, sex/gender and nature/culture…Under the guiding logic of these complex dualisms, western primatology is simian orientalism.*
>
> - Donna Haraway, *Primate Visions*

As one of the founders of the post-humanities, Donna J. Haraway has begun to construct a theoretical approach to how animals and humans interact within the scientific, anthropological, and political realms of understanding. Haraway has contributed to postmodern, technological feminist retellings of scientific discovery and discourse with works such as *Primate Visions* (1989), *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women* (1991), and *When Species Meet* (2008). Her focus on language, family dynamics, and interactions between humans and animals initially drew me to her, and I have grown to appreciate the work that she has done thus far to open up the conversation about feminism in science – now defined as feminist science and technology studies – more specifically feminism within primatology. While Haraway has changed the narrative surrounding feminist theory within the biological sciences, this shift in perspective has primarily been applied to Western ideological practices within the diverse field of primatology. Her work serves as a starting point in pushing for non-human primate agency towards transnational representations of primatology and feminism within and outside of Western influence. Thus, I use Haraway's perspectives to structurally outline my analysis of this transitional thinking. In this chapter, I provide a detailed, analytical, and critical overview of

Haraway's linguistic approach to feminism in Western primatology primarily within her earlier works *Primate Visions* and *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women*. I move to make this chapter a comprehensive introduction to the theoretical background that I apply to later chapters through the transnational lenses of both feminism and primatology. After all, Haraway herself recognizes that "modern feminists have inherited our story in a patriarchal voice. Biology is the science of life, conceived and authored by the word from a father. [Thus,] feminists have inherited knowledge through the paternal line…[and] they either reinterpreted the origin story to get it right the second time, or they rebelliously proclaimed a totally new story" (*Simians* 72). The following analysis of Haraway's theoretical application cultivates a space for new interpretations, new stories, and new perspectives on the representations and lives of both human and non-human primates.

The introduction and maintenance of the socially constructed binaries, or dualisms as Haraway states, within Western culture forces diverse areas of academic discipline to adhere to a regiment that feeds power to a system that works to intrinsically make itself powerful. To break this down further, Haraway acknowledges the ways in which these binarized perspectives within the field of primatology are born from each other, yet they still remain clearly defined and boxed off from each other due to outward male-dominated Western views. During the Age of Enlightenment, the practice of colonialism defined the ways in which Europe, primarily Britain, classified "other" identities through the lenses of race, gender, sexuality, and animality. This categorization positioned colonized bodies outside of Western standards of man, isolating them from each other in order to establish the male-desired need for control over their deemed impurities. This ideological thinking informs how Larry Arnhart claims that Haraway is destroying the basis of feminist theory by attempting to deconstruct the dualities that she studies:

"If there are no human universals that define 'man' and 'woman' but only radically diverse cultural constructions of gender, then 'man' and 'woman' as categories have no general meaning" (158). The claim that these potentially new and inclusive constructions of gender will offer 'no general meaning' to feminist theory is limited and frankly dismissive of Haraway's work. Essentially, Haraway's attempt at revealing how these distorted Western implications of gender exist within the evolutionary study of human and non-human primates alike threatens the structural basis in which feminist theory may reside on. The 'radically diverse cultural constructions of gender' that Arnhart mentions offer a more interactive and fluid perspective for both scientists and anthropologists to think about how the rigid social constructions of gender have concealed and ultimately led to the misinterpretation of the evolutionary history of humans from our non-human primate predecessors. Haraway's central points within both *Primate Visions* and *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women* define primatology as a genre of feminist theory as well as to legitimize feminine roles both in studying and tracing the history of primate evolution. The 'general meanings' that have been attached to the Western views within the study of primatology have inhibited the field from embracing the independent points of origin on which it is built. These so-called meanings produced from the historically male standpoint want the social constructions of the binaries to stay in place, completely separate from each other so as to not reveal how blatantly ignorant Western society has become to the narrowmindedness of 'man', which Haraway criticizes as being positioned within its own linguistic binary.

Here, the duality of man positions 'man as humanity' above other manifestations of life while also positioning 'man as male-identifying individuals' above women within the realm of human identity. Comparisons made between human and non-human primates are thus not equal when the scientific goal is to know 'man's' place in nature. This offers an interactive parallel that

connects academic conversations between feminism and primatology. Haraway writes, "Science is a human construct that came about under a particular set of historical conditions when *men's* domination of nature seemed a positive and worthy goal. Women have recognized more often than men that we are part of nature and that its fate is in the human hands that have not cared for it well" (Haraway *Simians* 80). The gendered dichotomy that presents itself in the acknowledgement of humanity's positionality within nature is telling as to how male-dominated perspectives drove the natural world to the brink of extinction within the Anthropocene. Haraway illustrates that through the liberation of feminism in scientific disciplines, diverse areas of study like primatology can also find a comparative liberation within its scientific and anthropological reflections of the history and function of the female primate by overthrowing "man" within the epistemology of the Anthropocene. For example, there are a couple of diverging hypotheses as to how humans began to shift away from our non-human primate ancestors: the Man the Hunter hypothesis versus the Woman the Gatherer Hypothesis.

The Man the Hunter hypothesis, devised by Darwin, came to be a widely accepted theory by men in the natural sciences at the University of Chicago in 1966 (Arnhart 1992). This hypothesis claimed that the key trait that diverged humanity away from non-human primates was the philosophical concept of homo faber: the use of tools as weapons for hunting and killing large animals by males within the species.

> All of the distinctively human traits – inventiveness, intelligence, language, making and using tools, complex social organizations – were seen as products of hunting, which was largely a male activity. Women and children were apparently passive beings who stayed close to the home base depending on the activity of aggressive males to feed and protect them (Arnhart 160).

In the 1970's, men in primatology began incorporating the Man the Hunter hypothesis into the sociobiological understandings of humanity's place within evolutionary history. Specifically,

E.O. Wilson utilizes this hypothesis within his synthesis of sociobiology to better define the primitive “hunter-gatherer” behaviors that were seen to define man from animal in the early representations of evolutionary theory (1975). To the Western narrative, this theory was a clear-cut explanation as to how ‘man’ dominated the natural world, as well as Western human culture. Specifically, the functionality of gender within “the energetic tasks that individuals must adhere to in order to successfully survive and reproduce had inadvertently led to the historical reference of the ‘gender roles’ that we have ascribed to both animals and humans throughout our cultural and scientific understanding of male and female theoretical value(s)” (Haraway *Simians* 38). However, others like Haraway and feminist anthropologist Sarah Blaffer Hrdy (Arnhart 1992) found discontinuities within the male-biased hunter hypothesis. Suggested in 1971 by Sally Linton, Nancy Tanner, and Adrienne Zihlman (Haraway 1991), the Woman the Gatherer hypothesis claims that the transition from ancestral apes to hominids occurred as women began to use tools to gather plants and small animals to feed themselves and their offspring. It was found that “the use of tools to hunt large animals arose much later as an extension of the technology, social intelligence, and social organization already developed for the collective food gathering” by female individuals in the species (Arnhart 161). It is through this interactive female-dominated perspective that primatology illuminates the nature of women as a repertoire of natural positionalities that resist patriarchal history within the anthropological history of early humans. For generations, male-dominated Western perspectives “set the rules for possible futures in the ‘limited’ sense of showing us a biology created in conditions supposedly favoring aggressive male roles, female dependence, and stable social systems appropriately analyzed with functional concepts” (Haraway *Simians* 39). The limitations that ‘man’ has forced both upon the history and function of women as well as other animals including non-human primates reiterates

Haraway's motivation to rewrite the ways in which Western society views the interacting dualities that men have created. Instead of limiting the historical value of primate evolution to the rigid binaries strengthened and supplied by gendered roles in both human and animal societies, primatology and feminism approach the borderlands between their respective binaries between man and animal, and man and woman. Thus, Haraway's approach and definition of the duality of man reconstructs the borders between primatology and feminism, allowing these disciplines to both interact internally as well as externally with each other.

As Haraway moves into analytically critiquing the borders between the dualities that she identifies, she defines Western views and practices within primatology as 'simian orientalism', which serves to compare different theoretical constructions of colonial control over oriental identities to the study of primates, both human and non-human. As it was analytically introduced by Edward Said in 1978, orientalism has amassed many fluid definitional identities within theoretical practices. For the purposes of this chapter, I include one of Said's definitions that establishes orientalism as "a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the [Eastern] Orient" (11). In other words, the concept of orientalism centers around the ideals that Western society accumulated power and domineering status by controlling the views and consumptions of Eastern culture through the main prospects of colonialism throughout the 18th century. The defining properties of the Self versus the Other has thus allowed Western societies to justify their claims to power over the oriental 'other'. In a sense, it defines man's colonial claims to power over the "othered" identities and bodies of both animals and women, and Haraway hints at this in her construction and recognition of simian orientalism:

> Simian orientalism means that western primatology has been about the construction of the self from the raw material of the other, the appropriation of nature in the production of culture, the ripening of the human from the soil of the animal, the clarity of white from

> the obscurity of color, the issue of man from the body of the woman, the elaboration of gender from the resource of sex… (*Primate Visions* 11).

The intentional inclusion of the family dynamic within her writing draws attention to how the self is born *from* the other. By positioning the self as a product of the other, simian orientalism further constructs the ways in which Western society justifies and celebrates the colonial power of humanity through the culturally dominant identity of white, cisgender men. Therefore, participating in this mode of binarized thinking has given rise to the theoretical practices surrounding race, gender and sexuality, and overall, individual identity, which further reinforces Western colonial structures within oriental analysis. However, Haraway recognizes this thinking within her historical applications of feminist theory within the study of primates, and she challenges it by stating that there is a Western "nervousness about the sex/gender distinction in the history of feminist theory [used] as a way to approach reconstructions of what may count as female and as nature in primatology" (*Primate Visions* 13). There is a sense of discomfort when approaching the borders between the established identity of man and both the identities of woman and animal, which Haraway hints may appear to be less established than the West may think. This limits and confines these identities to the oriental other, where they are taken advantage of and silenced within the Western use of binaries. By approaching the borders of these binaries, Haraway challenges us to theoretically think about and analyze what it means to be *almost* man through the identity of the female primate.

In relation to Haraway's discussion surrounding the borders between feminism and primatology, the concept of the human/animal divide plays a key role in defining the placement of non-human primates *within* the theoretical borders surrounding the study of humanity's evolutionary history. "Monkeys and apes have a privileged relation to nature and culture for Western people: simians occupy the border zones between those potent mythic poles" (Haraway

Primate Visions 1), and this becomes prominent when "especially western people produce stories about primates while simultaneously telling stories about the relations of nature and culture, animal and human, body and mind, origin and future" (Haraway *Primate Visions* 5). It is as if Western primatology allows us to study and observe a transitional shift between these binaries through non-human primates. However, by having the Western narrative control the ways in which we engage with non-human primate identities, this structure simultaneously displaces them below 'man' within the history of primate evolution. Consequently, this method of viewing primatology as a form of storytelling leaves non-human primates voiceless in the state of Western colonialism. The projection of "man's" voice onto these particular non-human voices overshadows and dismisses their right to identity, forcing them to occupy the border between man and animal. Yet Haraway still defines a placement for non-human primates that is 'privileged' in its respective relations to both nature and culture. Non-human primates play a far greater role in the human understanding of the structure and function of both the primate body as well as primate society due to our shared taxonomic and phylogenetic relationships, and this is why Haraway attempts to reconstruct the duality between man and animal. In fact, the overarching study of animal behavior has been built on the premise that the animals being studied along with their subsequent behaviors are models for understanding different facets of human behavior, culture, and society (Fedigan 2000). Arnhart describes this dependence as "a common text – the behavior of animals – to which the interpretations must conform with more or less accuracy, although complete accuracy undistorted by bias is probably unattainable" (159). Essentially, Arnhart describes how natural scientists and anthropologists are able to analyze and observe animal behavior through the limited human perspective, and that bias condemns these animals and their behaviors to anthropomorphism. As non-human primates are our closest

familial relatives, they as well as the human primatologists who study them have been deemed by Haraway as the "servants of science" (*Simians* 84). In other words, this assertion that non-human primates alongside primatologists are "servants" takes the behaviors and social functions of different populations of non-human primates and twists them in order to justify man's place above other animals in nature. Thus, monkeys and apes occupy an apparent border between man and animal as they are still privileged in their genetic proximity to humans, but still viewed as servants to the overall idealization of humanity's placement in nature as well as evolutionary history due to the limited value of this same genetic closeness.

Moreover, Haraway attempts to blur the borders between man and animal by clearing away the Western distortions of non-human primate identity within the realm of primatology and feminism through the use of Lacan's developmental mirror stage to compare primate societies and cultures simultaneously. Within the study of psychoanalytic theory, the mirror has been utilized as a metaphor by Lacan for better understanding the representative relationship between the "Self" and the "Other" as they have come to be understood as disparate entities. This is reminiscent of how Haraway describes the Western binaries between nature/culture and sex/gender as being born or constructed from each other. In fact, Lacan touches on how "the introduction of masculine rule and order is used to separate the self from the other" (2002) to define them as separate entities from each other. Specifically, he is using the masculine structure of language to regulate how a child defines the Self from the gendered Other mother, which I return to in my motherhood chapter. This theoretical approach to how the mirror stage is controlled by the masculine perspective within a gendered society seamlessly parallels with how Western primatology answers to the duality of man in relation to the interpretive quality of non-human primate behavior as it compares to anthropological study of human culture. In other

words, the ways in which humanity utilizes the Western binaries surrounding man/woman and man/animal intrinsically mirrors how the Self becomes defined as an idealized identity separate from the Other with man taking the role of the Self in comparison to both women and animals as the respective Others in their binaries. While the mirror has traditionally allowed for the duality of man to construct a gendered bias within the academic field of primatology, Haraway's work critically engages with the mirror to deconstruct the binarized thinking surrounding Western depictions of humanity over non-human animal identities.

By ascribing animals, especially non-human primates, to a comparative reflection upon humanity, we fail to properly acknowledge how their behaviors have come to define their own individual identities separate from humans. At the same time, however, the concept of the mirror, while important to the overall study of animal behavior, does offer an opportunity to flip the reflective narrative back towards non-human primates to define them within their own right to personhood, which this project returns to in later chapters: "Traditionally associated with lewd meanings, sexual lust, and the unrestrained body, monkeys and apes mirror humans in a complex play of distortions over centuries of western commentary on these troubling doubles" (Haraway *Primate Visions* 11). The 'traditional' narrative surrounding primatology has distorted the ways in which we learn and study from our non-human primate ancestors, and it has consequently shaped the ways in which man has justified their control and power over women as well as non-human primates (and subsequently animals) both in nature and human culture. In *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women*, Haraway uncovers a parallel timeline where the use of primate models followed human social (and feminist) movements throughout the majority of the twentieth century:

> Subsequently, in the 1930s, primate studies of sexual physiology of natural cooperation emerged in arguments about human social therapeutics for social disorder: mostly

> surrounding labor strikes and divorce. By the 1950-60s, primate studies centered on nuclear families and of fathering in the suburbs, and the absence of mothers, appeared in public debates about U.S. social problems. Moving in to the 1970-80s, U.S. public interest in langur bioanthropology centered around questions of domestic violence, reproductive freedom, abortion, parenting, and autonomous women who are not primarily defined in terms of a social (that is, family) group (84-85).

By rooting the ideals surrounding the nuclear family as well as the restriction of reproductive freedom within the evolutionary nature of primates, women, as well as the non-human primate models that were studied, were culturally limited to the controlling nature that defines the duality of man. Haraway uses this as an opportunity to reflect on how primatology exists as a genre of feminist theory as "scientific facts are not discovered by reason to satisfy our desire to know but created by storytelling to satisfy our desire for power" (Arnhart 159). The 'desire for power' stems from the Western distortions of man's placement within both nature and human society, and it allows men to separate themselves from women and animals by reaffirming their social construction of the Western binaries within the natural sciences in the ongoing age of colonialism. Through my analysis and overall understanding of how Haraway describes feminism within the natural sciences and anthropology (specifically within the diverse field of primatology), I infer that women in these fields of primatology and feminism are working to remove man's rigid grasp on the Western interpretations of the mirror image between human and animal. Thus, feminism within primatology allows the mirror to be turned towards constructing an identity for non-human primates within the realm of personhood outside of patriarchal structures, which I explicitly address within later chapters of this project.

Overall, Haraway's approach to defining the language used to distinguish the roles of nature, culture, gender, and identity from the restrictive nature of the Western perspectives within the study of primatology has provided an essential template to creating a new narrative for women, non-human primates, and the quintessential female primate. By acknowledging the

gendered biases that are present within the natural sciences through the presentation of the Man the Hunter versus the Woman the Gatherer debate, Haraway emphasizes how the duality of man controls the narrative surrounding our understanding of human primate evolution. In her attempt to restructure the binaries that have restricted and dominated the ways in which we engage with 'simian orientalism', Haraway theorizes that non-human primates, and by extension feminism within the natural sciences, exist within the border zones between the gendered binaries across the human/animal divide. The fluidity that she attempts to create within these borders allows Haraway to also reexamine Lacan's Western narrative surrounding the developmental theory of the mirror stage by removing the masculine structure of language to define the gendered notions within the prospective construction of non-human primate identity from the realm of personhood. These theoretical markers have given Haraway the agency and authority to begin tracing the interacting dualities within feminism and primatology as well as the intersectional diversity that exists between them. While she focuses on Western perspectives in these fields, she has introduced an interdisciplinary look into how feminist theory can construct a new narrative within its application to the transnational other. The template for a new story has been laid, now it is time to tell these new stories in order to reflect on the transnational representations of feminism and primatology from Haraway's Western theories throughout the rest of this project.

LOOKING FOR THE MONKEY IN THE MIRROR: THE TRANSNATIONAL REFLECTION OF FEMALE PRIMATE IDENTITY

> *Our departure from Eden allows us reflection – reflection on our origins and or relations to other creatures, reflection on good and evil, and, ultimately, reflection on the possibility that we are engineering our own extinction.*
>
> - Birutė Galdikas, *Reflections of Eden*

As the foundational structure that upholds disciplines housed under animal studies, the purpose of animals within the Western studies of natural science to better understand humanity's place within nature hinges on the reflective language and practices in which humans approach non-human animal behavioral models. Haraway herself writes about how "we [as humans] polish an animal mirror to look for ourselves" (*Simians* 21), which coincides directly with how these models are perfected to reflect the facets of human behavior and culture that benefit the male-dominated Western patriarchy. In the male-centered desire for knowing where humans are positioned in relation to both animals and nature, the study of non-human primates comes into hyper-focus as Western (male) primatologists target Old World species and their proposed male-centric social structures. This limiting perspective, which lends itself to the accessibility of study species, closes off and silences other voices within new branches of primatology that are working to shift the ways in which this field of study engages with human culture and society while also providing a representational identity for oppressed voices both human and animal. In this chapter, I examine the ways in which the reflective language surrounding the scientific and anthropological study of non-human primates influences the non-Western public discourses surrounding the intersectional conversation between primatology and feminism. The dominating

Western perspectives consistently study non-human primate species that benefit the patriarchal structures that uphold man's power over both culture and nature. Yet, the work done by female Western primatologists within strictly non-Western regions provides a glimpse into the lives of our primate ancestors solely through the reflective lens that looks far beyond the boundaries set in place by Western practices. Therefore, I dive into the narratives of Jane Goodall and Birutė Galdikas to analyze the language that they ascribe to the non-human primate individuals that they observe in their respective communities. I reference one other narrative from Western primatologist Karen B. Strier doing work in Brazil in order to highlight how the global south, and the scientific contributions coming out of this region, has been overlooked and silenced by the colonial power structure within Western society. The linguistic inclusion of the mirror in the narratives of these women in their respective work within primatology pushes deeper into the borders that man tries to confine both feminism and primatology to, and this transnational analysis will further shift the ways in which Western and non-Western cultures engage with the identities of non-human primates as they come to reflect man's position in the natural and cultural structures of society.

In lesser established non-Western practices of primatology like those in Brazil, the scientific study of non-human primates struggles to stand on its own outside of Western colonial structures due to ignorant practices that limit the diversity within the different branches of primatology. Anthropologists Shirley Strum and Lisa Fedigan highlight the assumption made for most of the late 20th century that "one species society could represent all monkey society, and that monkey society could represent all primate society" (14) where Old World monkeys, with their male-centric social structures, informed the ways in which Western primatology reflected on man's positionality both above nature and women through the patriarchal lens. "Baboons

seemed the *correct* model system for discussions of male-male co-operation, male dominance hierarchies as a form of adaptive social organization and male indispensability in troop defense…" (Haraway *Simians* 95). The Western focus on baboons and other Old World primate species cuts off non-Western regions like Brazil who are newly emerging within the field of primatology. Brazil, being home to the most widely diverse population of New World primate species in the world, has begun to uncover how these New World monkeys connect to the ways in which Western primatology enhances our understanding of primate society and culture from both human and non-human perspectives (Strum & Fedigan 2000). However, Brazilian primatologists face different oppressive structures being outside of the dominating forces of Western power and influence: "Perhaps because all Brazilian primatologists, men and women alike, struggle for recognition, questions of gender have not represented a major concern for Brazilian primatologists as they have for North American and European scientists" (Yamamoto & Alencar qtd. in Strum & Fedigan 188). While Brazil has repeatedly been silenced by the Western need for control over the scientific narrative surrounding our understanding of non-human primate culture as a reflection of our own, this non-Eurocentric region of the world finds itself in a unique position to look past the gendered biases that are entrenched within the justification for the duality of man's power over nature and women. Consequently, this positionality engages primatology once again with the mirror in reflecting on how New World species fit into the primate narrative, which allows the field as a whole to grow more into its diversity through the shifting perspectives of transnational communities within non-Western contexts.

In her narrative entitled "An American Primatologist Abroad in Brazil" from *Primate Encounters*, Karen B. Strier begins the process of shifting our understanding of New World

primates and the importance of their identity as a comprehensive reflection of the primate community through the lens of social structure and behavior. Strier's narrative centers around "how one (female) primatologist, coming from an American anthropologist's perspective on baboons-as-"typical"-primates, was converted, during a seventeen-year period of field research on endangered muriquis in Brazil, to regard New World monkeys as central to understanding the social evolution and behavioral variation within the primate order" (qtd. in Strum & Fedigan 195). The language surrounding Strier's "conversion" from the rigid limiting power of Western society to more inclusive and representative non-Western perspectives informs a sense of de-colonialism that threatens the patriarchal structures that control Western society. Having facets of Western power and control contingent on the dominating practices of colonialism that are still taking place today is something that European and American men pride themselves on. To watch that practice subverted back onto the subjective duality of man through the reflective lens of the mirror serves to reinforce how limited power is within the social constructs of the binary that have been created to control society. Through her work in Brazil, Strier admits that "New World monkeys, with their…more distant ancestry to humans, were often relegated to the status of second-class citizens in comparative analysis of primate behavioral analyses" (qtd. in Strum & Fedigan 196). By classifying New World primates as "second-class citizens" within the study of primatology from a Western perspective invalidates their identity as primates and silences their contributions to our understanding of primate society. Representations of identity outside of the socially constructed binaries repeatedly find themselves along the borders that reflect back on how oppressed groups are othered and silenced by the voice of man; incidentally, this leaves the Western duality of man blind to the shifting lenses growing out of non-Western practices of primatology. "The fact that New World primates resemble apes more closely than other Old

World taxa in their life history…raises additional questions about the potential importance of reproductive biology in comparative models of behavior" (Strier qtd. in Strum & Fedigan 202). The politics surrounding reproduction within both human and non-human culture have vastly impacted the ways in which we engage with female bodies within primatology. Strier's newly converted perspectives in Brazil have revolutionized the ways in which the study of New World species engages with and prioritizes female reproduction and its value in primate society. The representations of the female primate within non-Western branches of primatology reflect on the variety of social structures and behaviors present within the overwhelmingly large primate community, and this diversity in culture shifts the ways in which we value and engage with the positionality of the female within primate society outside of the confining structures of the Western patriarchy.

While both Goodall and Galdikas do work exclusively with Old World monkeys, their narratives, respectfully titled *In the Shadow of Man* and *Reflections of Eden*, communicate the mirror-like quality of the time and work these women put into their interactions with and observations of the individual apes that they are working with. Both of these women have provided the foundational framework that intrinsically reflects back on our own primate identities, and to begin shaping the ways in which we engage with non-human primates on an individual level that allows us to gain a better look into the evolutionary history of all primate species. As I discuss in my critical terms chapter on personhood, the reflective relationship between these women and their respective non-human primate species positions non-human primates within a space to explore the individual and social implications of identity as it comes to be defined through the lens of personhood. However, Galdikas and Goodall needed to remove themselves from Western patriarchal structures in order to fully immerse themselves within the

mirrored individual and social lives of the non-human primate species that they were working with. Without the Western distortions predisposed onto non-human primate identities, these women find themselves clearly reflected and accepted within their respective primate communities. Galdikas admits early in her narrative, “It had taken me more than a decade of living with orangutans, day by day in their great forest home, to understand finally that orangutans are not just simpler versions of ourselves…I had measured orangutans by human standards of sociability and had misunderstood” (16). Galdikas’s ability to self-reflect on her initial observations and comparisons of non-human primates along the patriarchal representations of “human standards” she was taught has influenced the ways in which she was able to separate her Western identity from the orangutans she was living and working with. The projection of Western ideology surrounding man’s superiority has become dependent on the evolutionary separation of human primates from other primate species in order to subject non-human primate identities to the borderlands of Western cultural control over nature. Seeing past these Western principles and assumptions that non-human primates are simpler versions of humans has allowed Galdikas to better comprehend her reflective understanding of how primates as an entire evolutionary phylogeny have grown independently into their complex social lives. Along those same lines, Jane Goodall, through her work done in Gombe, reflects on her own initial narration of her time with the chimpanzees and revises an initial statement of hers to now say, “Chimpanzees are not so much the shadow of man as our mirror, only slightly blurred by the mists of time” (vii). The initial claim that chimpanzees live in “the shadow of man” illustrates how Goodall’s perspective still remained heavily distorted by the Western notions surrounding Haraway’s duality of man. Her attempt at positioning non-human primates in relation to “man” reaffirms how they have been pushed to the borderlands of identity, lacking the individual

agency that will give them the recognition they deserve within the intersectional rights of personhood. Goodall's recognition of this statement, and her following revision places non-human primates on equal footing with humans, defining them as our "mirrors". The more time Goodall spends away from Western, Euro-centric definitions of personhood, which I break down in later chapters, the clearer her perspective becomes in relating non-human primate identity to her own. As she comes to these profound realizations, she simultaneously brings non-human primates out of the shadows of man and into the reflective light of primate personhood. Furthermore, this reference to the title of her first narrative book *In the Shadow of* Man, published in 1971, illustrates how Goodall's own Western perspective has shifted and evolved through her continued work outside of Western contexts. In her initial narration, Goodall's perspective still reflected remnants of the Western ideology surrounding the construction of the binary between the Self and the Other: while she was one of the first to recognize and respect individuality within her chimpanzee community, she still placed the overall group identity of the chimpanzee within the dominating shadow of man. "For all living creatures today only man, with his superior brain, superior intellect, overshadows the chimpanzee. Only man casts his shadow of doom over the freedom of the chimpanzee in the forests with his guns and his spreading settlements and cultivations" (Goodall 3). The superiority that Goodall is feeding into once again invalidates non-human primate positionality compared to man's Western representation of power within the public sphere of culture. It is only after almost two decades of continued work in the field during times of parallel external social and feminist movements that Jane Goodall slightly alters her statement to bring non-human primates out of the shadow of man and into the reflective light that celebrates their individual right to identity within the borders of Western understanding. Thus, the shifting perspectives of both Galdikas and Goodall through their non-

Western regions of study has evolved the ways in which we engage with primates within an equal capacity of reflecting back on individuality through the mirror image provided by primate identity.

In addition to both Galdikas and Goodall's personal reflections on the identities of the non-human primates that they work with, both women evoke reflective language while addressing the integral differences between human and non-human primate species while still respecting their study species' individual right to identity alongside our own. In *Reflections of Eden*, Galdikas writes "Orangutans reflect, to some degree, the innocence we humans left behind in Eden, before our social organization, bipedalism, and toolmaking gave us 'dominion over' the planet. Thus, understanding orangutans gives us a clouded, partial glimpse into what we were before we became fully human" (16). This last sentence is reminiscent of what Goodall wrote, included above: saying that chimpanzees are reflections of ourselves "blurred by the mists of time" (3). These two quotes reflect on a time "before" humanity. Before the Fall of Man. Before the social construction of oppressive binaries and the ideas surrounding the rigid structure of the Western patriarchy. If non-human primates represent a reflective look back into what life was like before the prelapsarian Fall that led to domination and power taking over the cultural stage, then Galdikas and Goodall have found themselves in the unique position of studying the social structures of primate community and identity outside of the oppressive constructs of Western society. By living alongside their respective species, both of these Western women step back in time to construct a bigger appreciation for the individual lives of those who have been consistently silenced and pushed into the shadows of simplicity by the duality of man. They too, as women, draw those connections and reflect specifically on how man dominates Western society to benefit themselves in the never-ending lust for control and power over both women

and nature. As women are viewed as being closer to nature than men, this mirror image is easily more accessible to women outside of the confines of patriarchal human society. By being further removed from the public sphere of Western society, women are positioned closer to non-human primates through their shared inferiority when compared to the duality of man, and this allows women to easily gain access to the reflective relationship that exists between human and non-human primates. Thus, the shifting perspectives within the diverse realm of primatology continue to grow out of the reflective connections made between individuals across different primate species who can relate to the oppressive nature of Western culture.

Here, I continue with Birutė Galdikas's narrative *Reflections of Eden* to further analyze how she personally views the orangutans that she is working with through the reflective lens of the mirror while consistently positioning herself in their minds, bodies, and respective social community. Galdikas claims that "Western culture places a high value on individuality; even babies are believed to have an inherent right to privacy" (312). This assignment of value onto humanity's self-awareness of individuality has allowed Western perspectives to easily shift into the binary of the Self versus the Other where man's individuality "others" the group identity of the female primate without giving them the individual right to agency that they deserve. Galdikas goes on to write, "The distinction between humans and orangutans had begun to blur in my mind. I could rattle off a list of differences. But I had lost that gut feeling of separation, which is an integral part of Western intellectual consciousness. When orangutans are a natural part of the landscape, and your daily companions, it is difficult not to see them as equals" (311). This "gut feeling of separation" that Galdikas references appears to slightly mirror the narrative of Karen Strier and her experience of being converted to the non-Western perspectives of studying the importance of New World monkeys within the discipline of primatology in Brazil. These two

Western women, when attempting to work outside of the Western boundaries of the patriarchy, have shifted their individual lenses within primatology to uncover the reflections that their respective species convey to humanity and our representations of society. They are intellectually aware of the differences between our species, but they, Galdikas especially, acknowledge non-human primate individuality and respect their social community as being equal to our own.

Overall, the shifts in perspective that have already grown out of the work done in primatology by these Western women in non-Western contexts has shaped the ways in which we reflect back on our human ancestry, yet it continues to be vital to acknowledge the history and identity of these non-human primates reflected outside of the limiting bounds of humanity to give them the right individual respect. The global representations of primatology that are not supported by the Western patriarchy fall short of gaining the recognition they deserve within the scientific community, and this further perpetuates the limiting structures put in place to justify a male-dominated society in Western cultures. However, primatologists like Karen Stier working in these non-Western regions are finally putting a spotlight on New World species as foundational models in the diverse understanding of female primate society and culture across a variety of primate species. She, alongside fellow established female primatologists Jane Goodall and Birutė Galdikas have been able to shed the blinding perspectives of Western ideology to begin to fully appreciate the reflective parallels that exist between human and non-human primate species. This transnational work begins to pull non-human primates out of the shadows and into center stage where they are celebrated for their connection to humanity before man dominated the social scene. These reflections are necessary when affording primates the right to individuality within their own respect and identity, which pushes man to take a step back and reevaluate the distribution of power across representations of primate identity.

THE OTHERED MOTHER: THE ROLE OF MOTHERHOOD WITHIN THE RIGHT TO FEMININITY ACROSS PRIMATE CULTURES

> *During the summer of 2009, I met a solemn, beautiful, middle-aged mother with deep brown eyes in Washington State. When she was only an infant, she was taken from her own mother in Africa and forced into a life of confinement…As she became older, she was repeatedly impregnated, and after she gave birth to each of her babies, they were taken from her. They were similarly forced into lives of confinement…This mother's name is Negra. She is a chimpanzee.*
>
> - Hope Ferdowsian, "Compassion without Borders"

The role of motherhood across cultures and species inextricably hinges on the woman or female identifying individual being the primary caretaker to the offspring/children within the social community. While diverse in its cultural presentations within and outside of human standards, the patriarchal structure of Western society exploits and diminishes the experience of the mother in order to gain access to male power through the early implications of psychoanalytic theory. The use of psychoanalysis to justify the sexual differences between men and women by men like Freud, who is said to be the father of psychoanalysis, impedes on a mother's right to her own individuality outside of the heteronormative standards of the Oedipus complex as well as through the narcissistic mirror stage where the Self is differentiated from the "othered" mother. Thus, with the intent to eliminate the misogynistic framework within the realm of psychoanalysis, feminist theorists rewrite the role of the mother to explore the importance of social reproduction outside as well as within the spheres of patriarchal society. In the realm of primatology, the reflections of motherhood through the theoretical lenses of

feminism and psychoanalysis offers a unique perspective into the individual identity of the female primate across the intersecting, transnational identities of human and non-human individuals constructed from the mirrored language I have critically engaged with in my previous chapters. While the essentialism that has been long associated with the critical study of motherhood imposes on feminist revisions of psychoanalysis, which further strengthens Westernized standards of man's power over nature and culture, this chapter pushes past these ideals of essentialism in order to allow the individual identity of the mother across social standards to become liberated in its diversity alongside the scientific and anthropological studies of primatology. This liberation of motherhood allows women to grow out of the realm of domesticity and into the public sphere where they are acknowledged for their right to independence, which references other chapters in this project as this mirrors non-human primates within their right to personhood. Therefore, this chapter targets the thematic importance of motherhood within both *In the Shadow of Man* and *Reflections of Eden* in order to further establish the comparative structures that bridge the gap between simian and human identity. By infusing feminist theory into the narratives of Goodall and Galdikas, I move to analyze motherhood through the lens of primatology as a way to highlight the role of the mother within non-human primate culture. The consequential differences and similarities between species are important to consider within transnational contexts because it highlights the essential aspects of individuality and allows a space for respect and identity to inform the ways in which humanity works alongside non-human animals to cultivate an inclusive right to personhood as I discuss in my final chapter.

The psychoanalysis of the mother has provided the structure in which we come to understand individuality, and the separation of the self from the "othered" mother is key to how

the patriarchy “others” femininity within Western contexts and academic disciplines. In her book titled *Strong Mothers, Weak Wives*, feminist and sociologist Miriam M. Johnson explores two major psychoanalytical implications of the role of the mother within Western binary of the Self versus the Other:

> The first tendency emphasizes infantile dependency needs and the "primary process" thinking in which the mother appears overwhelmingly powerful; the second emphasizes the idea that identity develops from a process of separating the self from the mother, including boys' learning that they are a different gender from the mother. Both these strands of gynocentric (i.e., mother-centered) psychoanalytic theory have been used to explain why men are motivated to denigrate and dominate women, whereas women feel few or no comparable motives toward men (74).

The proposed power of the mother due directly to infant dependency becomes gendered and sexualized in its threat towards man’s own control and desire for power. It is the gendered separation of the son from the mother that allows Western ideologies to infiltrate the Self and repress the mother back into her othered state. The central identity of the mother hinges on this binarized relationship between the Self and the Other, which celebrates male individuality at the expense of repressed femininity. Here, we see the cyclic function of what contemporary feminist psychologist Nancy Chodorow refers to as the social organization of gender where “Men’s location in the public sphere defines society itself as masculine. It gives men power to create an enforce institutions of social control…that both expresses men’s rights in women’s sexual and reproductive capacities…” (15). The patriarchal “right” to a woman’s reproductive body enforces the way in which motherhood is exploited for the betterment of Western society. It also draws immediate focus to the proposed Western standard that heterosexuality (i.e. male desire and sexuality) is *natural* within male-dominated society. The right to individuality through the manifestations of non-male-centric sexuality, desire, and identity is stripped from “othered” groups within the Western understanding of culture, and this directly coincides with how

Western primatology limits their study to male-centric non-human primate societies in order to justify the structure of the patriarchy, especially through the essentialism of motherhood. When critiqued outside of these Western standards, motherhood falls back on the pre-capitalist, pre-industrial importance of kinship within the social community, which allows women to shed the essentialized notions of motherhood and reflect on and rewrite how manifestations of the mother operate within the frameworks of primate societies.

Furthermore, the study of motherhood within the realm of primatology has shifted the ways in which we view non-human primate social communities through the cultural lens of individuality. In other words, motherhood, as it comes to be described in non-human primates, empowers the ways in which primatology comes to better understand the individual positionality of mothers within the social structures of non-human primate society. By adopting the Western ideology surrounding this concept, female primatologists like Jane Goodall and Birutė Galdikas have been able to immerse themselves within their respective non-Western primate communities. In her interactions with one female orangutan that she fostered in her rescue camp, Birutė Galdikas describes motherhood across and within species between human and non-human individuals, which also participated in the implicit use of mirroring that I discuss in previous chapters: "Akmad was mothered by a stranger of another species; now she became a mother to a stranger of her own species" (13). This cyclic relationship within the realm of motherhood establishes a sense of community among the social natures of primate species. The ability for both Galdikas and Akmad to foster individuals (albeit strangers) opens up a space within the primate community to reflect on shared experiences across species. This sense of kinship has been lost in Western practices due directly to Marxist views on production within the age of industrialism – where mothers, and more broadly women, were stripped of their productive value

within the public sphere of society and pushed into the domestic (private) sphere to exclusively participate in reproduction. Comparatively, Jane Goodall, in her earlier observations of maternal primate behavior, marveled at the fact that “a wild chimpanzee mother could lose her fear of humans to the extent of allowing her infant to play with us” (138). The trust established during this interaction invokes the kinship that Western culture disposed of and now inherently lacks. Goodall’s observation of the mother’s loss of fear influences the ways in which she, as a female primate herself, was able to engage with the individual personalities and identities of the chimpanzees she was living alongside. Before either Galdikas or Goodall became mothers themselves, they came to understand how their femininity operates simultaneously within and independently from Western normative structures, which allowed them to better positions themselves as individuals and women within their transnational communities alongside their respective non-human primate species.

Through their observations of simian motherhood, both Goodall and Galdikas were able to draw parallels within the unique realm of motherhood once they too became mothers in the field, and this appreciation and connection allowed both women to adopt certain primate techniques when raising their human sons among the apes they lived with: both with a sense of feminine maternal care as well as with the balance of humanity and wildness within the ape social community. “I watched the chimpanzee mothers coping with their infants with a new perspective. From the start Hugo and I had been impressed with many of their techniques, we made a deliberate resolve to apply some of these to raising our own child” (Goodall 237). At the birth of her son, Grub, Goodall’s perspective on motherhood was able to shift outside of the rigid boundaries of Western society, and this allowed Goodall to open herself up to the feminine perspective of the mother through the lens of primatology outside of Western views and

definitions of humanity. Her observations of the non-human primate mother have come to inform her own sense of motherhood, which further blurs the lines between our primate identities. As Goodall's work pioneered in the efforts to redefine man due to the discovery of chimpanzees using tools, this feminist perspective into the role of the mother outside of the definition of man inserts Goodall further into the narrative of the female primate within the borders of Western understandings of identity. In much the same way, Birutė Galdikas reflects on the relationship she cultivates between her son Binti and the non-human primate infants that reside in her camp: "Just as Akmad trusted me to gently touch her newborn, so I trusted these old friends, my orangutan 'sisters' and 'daughters'" (311). The symbolic identification that Galdikas participates in when naming the orangutans as her "sisters and daughters" gives her access to an entirely new perspective within the realm of primate motherhood. Here, both Galdikas and Goodall find themselves straying away from Western views of motherhood and participating in the transnational experience of femininity outside of the confines of the patriarchy. However, both women came to realize that there were limitations to how far their shared primate motherhood experiences could go within their respective primate communities. Galdikas remarks that "the intensity of Binti's identification with his orangutan playmates and the accuracy of his imitations were amazing, but also alarming. I wanted Binti to get along with other primates, but I didn't want him to become one!" (314); and Goodall notes that "it became increasingly necessary, of course, to temper chimpanzee techniques with our own common sense – after all, we were dealing with a human, not a chimpanzee infant" (237). While there are still so many mirrored similarities within the roles that motherhood takes across species with the female primate, the differences between human and non-human primate development cannot go unnoticed for too long. Yes, both of these women can take and gain aspects of non-human primate motherhood to

implement within their own experiences; however, it is necessary to still note these differences in order to provide everything that the children of both of these species need within their respective lives. In refusing to acknowledge this divide, motherhood is diminished to Western notions of essentialism as it becomes universalized across cultures and species. This separation is important in distinguishing the role of the mother in its individual identity within and outside of Western boundaries to ascertain just how similar and different women are from our non-human primate ancestors as we move temporally through evolutionary history.

While motherhood remains an important thematic element within the narrative of both Goodall and Galdikas, the essentialism that is assigned to motherhood within the realm of femininity in Western society dominates the cultural engagement within both feminism and primatology. This both confines and silences narratives of women in the field of primatology like Dian Fossey who fall outside of the heteronormative structures of the Western patriarchy. It is important to acknowledge how Fossey's identity revolved around her militant and controversial approach to conservation efforts surrounding her study species as well as how her intimidating attitude and passion against poachers eventually cost her her life. These defining attributes of Dian Fossey's personality accurately portray how she navigated or refused to navigate the role of traditional, Western femininity during her transnational work in the field. Included within his chapter "Politics, Gender, and Worldly Primatology: The Goodall-Fossey Nexus", Brian Noble comments on how Western media outlets participated in the "transformation of Dian Fossey from a naturally destined 'mother-to-be' in cultured America, to an ambiguously feminine/ masculine figure in the natured setting of Karisoke" (qtd. in Strum & Fedigan 451). The assumption and insertion that motherhood is "naturally destined" for Western women places additional constraints on Fossey and her representation of femininity. This essentialized view of

both femininity and motherhood is both threatened and challenged by Fossey choosing to not actively participate in motherhood during her time observing gorillas in Eastern Africa. Because of this lack of the American "mother-to-be", Fossey's femininity is further left to ambiguity as she passionately delves deeper into advocating for the lives of the primates she studies. The social constructions of gender upon Fossey's identity thus become fluid as she is described as a figure that is both masculine and feminine in the eyes of Western society. She does not adhere to the essentialized version of the woman/mother; therefore, she is placed within the same ambiguous category that non-human primates occupy within their animal identity. Because she rejects the traditional role of motherhood expected of Western women, Fossey herself is thus rejected from Western ideologies of femininity, causing her to become ambiguously misgendered and essentially dehumanized in the face of Western society. On the other hand, because both Goodall and Galdikas participate in motherhood, their femininity is reaffirmed within their narratives. Galdikas claims, "Seeing orangutan mothers carry their babies nearly all the time, Binti insisted on being carried, too. Like a good Western mother, I tried to resist, but often gave in, especially if a baby orangutan was draped somewhere on my body" (313). The internalized notions of the "good Western mother" provoke Galdikas to reflect back on her human femininity in direct juxtaposition to the non-Western, non-human mother. While she ultimately gives in to her son, thus rejecting the notions of her internal "good Western mother", Galdikas still reaffirms her societal role as a mother within the Western standards of society. Similarly, Goodall reacts to a sick chimpanzee by stating, "I longed to be able to wrap a warm blanket around him and give him a steaming-hot toddy. All I could offer were a few chilly bananas" (77). The internalized position of the Western mother within this situation is heavily emphasized by Goodall's anthropomorphic desire to nurture this chimpanzee as she would a

human child. This essentialized desire to mother places Goodall within the same reaffirming narrative structure as Galdikas. Sure, these two women are allowed to toe the line of transnational representations of femininity within their right to human identity – as long as they still fall within the boundaries of Western practices of motherhood. However, Fossey is not granted this same status as she fully rejects the idealized standards of motherhood forced upon women in Western society, and this costs her her right to her femininity as well as her humanity.

Altogether, the thematic role of the mother within theoretical practices of psychoanalysis as well as within the narratives of Western female primatologists allows us to fully comprehend the ways in which femininity is held to the essentialized standard of male power. The transnational practices and representations of motherhood that were critically analyzed within the narratives of Jane Goodall and Birutė Galdikas expose the ways in which kinship and shared maternal experiences can bring together primate communities as well as contribute to the diversity that presents itself in the differences between individual species' needs within both human and non-human child development. The respect and shifting perspectives of both of these women when they came into their senses of motherhood allowed them to both reflect on and detach from Western views of the essentialized mother, yet they still fall into the trap of affirming their femininity through their internalized Western idealization of motherhood. Any woman who falls outside of the societal expectations of motherhood, like Dian Fossey, threaten the male-dominated structures of the patriarchy and are thus stripped of their individual identity and forced into ambiguity that further "others" them from social constructions of humanity. Therefore, motherhood exists on the border between the individual right to feminine identity and the representation of the Other within the confines of the Western binary. Once those walls are broken down, and motherhood is viewed fully through the transnational lens of primatology, the

fluidity with which society is able to identity with the similarities and differences between us and our non-human primate ancestors will fully open the door to providing non-human primates the right to individual identity within the defining features of personhood.

A "WHO", NOT A "WHAT": A GOODALL ANALYSIS IN EXTENDING THE RIGHT TO PERSONHOOD ACROSS NON-HUMAN PRIMATE IDENTITIES

I was told that my findings and approaches, including giving the chimpanzees names, were wrong. I was also told that surely the realizations that chimpanzees have individuality and emotions were wrong – at the time it was believed that other animals were essentially automatons devoid of complexity and very different from humans. How wrong they all were.

- Dr. Jane Goodall

Before Goodall, non-human primates and animals were firmly objectified for their physical bodies in terms of work labor, lab experimentation, and hunting and killing both for sport and human pleasure. By way of Descartes, the Cartesian division between the subjective and objective perspectives of the mind and the mechanical body "put non-human animals squarely on the side of the bodies, emptied of consciousness, feeling, and awareness" (Dayan qtd. in Gruen 267). It was Goodall, in her first attempts at publication, that pioneered the observational study of the individual, naming her subjects in the chimpanzee community and using gendered pronouns to refer to these different individuals within her writing. This inherent focus on the individual allowed Goodall to cultivate personalized observations on primate personality as well as identity within her study community, which brought her closer both physically and emotionally to each and every chimpanzee that she came into contact with. Her acknowledgement and continued fight for non-human primate individuality has revolutionized the field of primatology, yet many within Western society still struggle to separate non-human primates from their animal identities as they are strictly defined by the socially constructed

binary within the human-animal divide. The right to personhood, defined here as the condition or quality of being an individual with a given name as ascribed personality traits has strictly been reserved as a privilege for white men of high social standing within the cultural borders of Western society. However, Goodall's continued push for non-human animal individuality challenges these binaries that have come to represent Western ideologies that have reinforced the structural integrity of the patriarchy. Therefore, I use this chapter as a way to explore and further cultivate the ways in which Jane Goodall has championed the right to personhood for non-human primates in order to establish respect to animals within their individual identity. I begin by examining the legal and colonial influences that have contributed to how personhood is received within and outside of Western contexts to better illustrate transnational representations of intersectional identities within the disciplines of feminism and primatology. I then continue on to highlight Goodall's earlier work through her narrative *In the Shadow of Man* to inform my own definition and construction of personhood while critiquing the ways in which she has ultimately been sensationalized for her involvement and activism in the fight for animal individuality. Through this critical analysis, I move to apply the Westernized concepts and rights to individuality into the border zones that non-human primates occupy in order to give them a right to their own identity outside of the rigid structures of Western society. By shifting the analytical lens onto primate personhood, I want to break the final barriers between man and animal that I have critically engaged with in my previous chapters and open the study of primatology up for even more diversified recognition outside of Western standards.

While deeply entrenched in the legal structures of a colonial society, the terminology surrounding the concept of personhood extends past the confining structures of Western society and into the different borderlands that inferior identities like women and non-human primates

reside in. In his *Essay on Human Understanding*, John Locke presents how "his inquiries into personhood challenged the philosophy and science that sought to prove human superiority to animals as well as…inferiority among humans" (Dayan qtd. in Gruen 269). While this quote does not directly address the gendered inferiority among humans, I want to focus on this intersection because it also runs parallel to man's superiority over animals: "A century ago, women were legal nonentities, subsumed under their husband's political and legal status" (Chodorow 4). The lack of agency granted to women merely a century ago controls the ways in which Western society perceives femininity still to this day. The assertion that women are more closely associated with nature enforces the notion that nature submits to the domination of man; the capacity of personhood being granted to inferior identities challenges the Western ideology of what nature should represent to humanity, and this intersection between feminine and non-human identity becomes further explored and validated outside of the structures of patriarchy. This exploration of individual rights to personhood has been pursued in the last decade within non-Western regions specifically through case studies that question a non-human primate's right to legal status as a person:

> In 2005 a Brazilian court was asked to grant an order of Habeas Corpus in respect of a chimpanzee, Suica, living in Salvador's Zoo… In the eyes of the law a captive chimpanzee is a legal thing and not a legal person. Granting a Habeas Corpus writ in respect of a thing is a legal impossibility and it was expected that Judge Lucio da Cruz would dismiss the case. Unexpectedly he didn't…Whilst the chimpanzee's untimely death put an end to the case, the case itself brought into the lime-light arguments that have been simmering beneath the surface for years (Rooke 2009).

The argument being made for Suica to have writ of Habeas Corpus extends to the imprisonment of non-human primates and lack of proper living conditions given within the zoos and labs that they inhabit. The investigation into Suica's legal right to personhood was stalled by her death, yet Brazil's dedication to figuring out Suica's legal status within the realm of individual identity

began to properly challenge the Western notions of personhood as it has been idealized towards man's right to humanity. Additionally, Spain and New Zealand have taken steps to extend personhood to great apes by way of protecting them from experimentation in support of the international Great Ape Project, founded by Peter Singer and Paola Cavalieri (2008). These transnational representations of personhood coming into fruition outside of Western influence are working to break down the boundaries placed upon the individual identities of non-human primates, and the intersections that connect "inferior" identities in the eyes of the duality of man shifts the narrative towards the actual work being done to preserve a non-human primate's right to personhood.

Additionally, in March of 2021, Jane Goodall, among many other leading natural scientists and animal rights activists, signed off on a letter to the Associated Press Stylebook advocating for the right to assign gender pronouns to non-human animals:

> The Associated Press Stylebook instructs writers not to apply a personal pronoun to an animal unless their sex has been established, or they have a name. This is too limiting to writers as well as fellow nonhuman animals, most of whom are discussed abstractly and thus their sex is not established. We pay respect to humans whose sex is indeterminate or gender fluid by using *he/she* or the non-binary term *they*. That same courtesy should be extended to all animals, as they are gendered beings (Joint Open Letter 2021).

The primary goal of this letter was to garner respect at the establishment of a sense of individual identity for non-human animals towards their right to defined personhood. However, this letter has received backlash from gender studies experts like Kelsey Lewis for conflating the critical terms gender and sex within its reference to non-human animals as compared to human identities. By supplying that animals are "gendered beings" within the confines of biological sex determination, this joint letter falls into the trap of "callously exploiting a term that has far deeper meaning to people" (Lewis et al. 2021). While I agree with the ways in which the language is being interpreted here, I find that critics are being overly critical in terms of how this

letter portrays gender in comparison to sex as it comes to be ascribed to non-human animal identity. This reaction overshadows the need for language to reflect the individuality that Goodall observes and engages with in Gombe. "We must recognize that every individual nonhuman animal is a 'who,' not a 'what.' I hope that we can advance our standards in this regard globally to refer to animals as individuals, and no longer refer to them as objects…" (Goodall qtd. in Joint Open Letter 2021). In shifting away from objectifying animals, Goodall's discovery of society, self-awareness, and individuality further reflects on the capacity for non-human animals, especially non-human primates, to be understood outside of the rigid binaries constructed by Western society. The transnational influences that have given Goodall the space to fluidly engage with non-human primates has allowed her to fully construct her own representation of the mirror in her observations and narratives surrounding non-human primate society. Her ability to seamlessly live alongside these apes reflects the social similarities between our two primate species, which allows Goodall to gain a better appreciation for the individual personalities she encounters in her observational work outside of Western influences like the patriarchy. Consequently, her continued effort to extend this transnational lens onto other non-human animals and their right to individual identity, emphasized in her support and contributions to the 2021 joint letter to the Associated Press, speaks to the amount of influence Western structures have had on our intersectional understanding of non-human animal identity in juxtaposition to human identity.

Furthermore, I draw attention to the ways in which female primatologists like Goodall have been either sensationalized or hyper-presented to the public through Western media modalities in order to provide a space for criticism to how Western society capitalizes on feminism within areas of scientific animal study to force these identities back into the socially

constructed binaries that they have broken out of. In his critique surrounding the presentation of feminist work being done through the lens of primatology, Brian E. Noble regards "Goodall and Fossey – and so 'women in primatology' as hyper-presented to the public via mainline middle-class [Western] media platforms – are still widely understood as humanist nature-empaths" (qtd. in Strum & Fedigan 456). The specific connection being drawn between women and their heightened capacity for empathy towards others is what Western media companies like National Geographic have capitalized on when selling the individual stories of Goodall and Fossey to the public for general consumption. The fact that this narrative has been consistently assigned to Goodall and Fossey's work further reaffirms the ways in which both of these women are forced to adhere to the Western standards of femininity even within the intensive field work that they are actively choosing to participate in. In a way, their work being done in the capacity for conservation activism is undermined by the fact that Goodall, Fossey, *and* Galdikas are women, and this forces their narratives to consistently be read through the Western perspective of what femininity *should* be through the lens of the patriarchy.

Along these lines, it is important to note that Louis Leakey, the man known for bringing Goodall, Fossey, and Galdikas into the field of primatology, "staunchly believed that women made better observers than men. Women were more perceptive…[and] were also more patient. Finally, he claimed that women did not excite aggressive tendencies in male primates the way men did, however unintentionally" (Galdikas 49). While the media portrays women in primatology as being more emotional and empathetic within their practice, Galdikas's narrative varies slightly in terms of what Leakey constituted as the difference between men and women making observations in the field. The attention drawn to perception and patience within a woman's observation makes them better equipped to identify accurate observations of animal

behavior in the field compared to a man, not necessarily that they are naturally more "empathetic" or "emotional" in their practices. The patriarchal focus on these women's femininity, or lack thereof in reference to Fossey's rejection of motherhood, shifts their narratives away from the revolutionary work being done to study non-human primates on an individualized level, which keeps the identities of these primates from properly being acknowledged within their right to personhood.

Within her narrative work *In the Shadow of Man*, Jane Goodall highlights the importance of individuality within her chimpanzee society as well as revolutionizes and questions the rigidity of the requirements that establish the definitions of man in comparison to both women and non-human primates. One chimpanzee that Goodall focuses on within her narrative is Flo, an older adult female who Goodall observes as the dominant female of the troop: "The adult females of the chimpanzee community are almost always submissive to adult males, and to many of the older adolescent males. But they have their own dominance hierarchy, of which Flo for many years was supreme, respected and even feared by old and young females alike" (Goodall 124). The distinguishing characteristics between male and female chimpanzees that Goodall is able to uncover allows her to further engage with individuals within the primate community. The respect that she observes Flo possessing through her interactions with other female chimps gives Goodall a glimpse into Flo's individual identity within the social structure of this specific chimpanzee culture. Flo's personality becomes recognizable after Goodall repeatedly encounters her in the field, and it is through these observations that Goodall herself forms intimate relationships with the individual apes that she is working with. The intimacy that is cultivated in Goodall's relationship with the Gombe chimpanzees is reflected in her narrative when she remarks, "It was a six month exile [where] I felt utterly remote from Africa and the

chimpanzees and all that I longed for most at that time…what was David Graybeard doing in the meantime? How were Goliath and Flo? What was I missing?" (64). Goodall's attention to individual chimpanzees within Africa is reminiscent of how someone would inquire about old friends that have not been seen over long periods of time. The ease with which she is able to view each of these chimpanzees within the capacity of their own individual identity allows Goodall to participate in the reflective language that I have focused on in previous chapters and to better insert herself into the primate community, to which she is accepted:

> We want to know how Fifi, whom we first knew as a small infant, will look after her own children; whether Flo survives to be a grandmother, and if so how she will react to Fifi's infant; what happens to Flint when his mother finally dies; whether Figan one day may become top-ranking male. In effect, we want to continue observing the chimpanzees for similar reasons to those which impel one to read on to the end of an exciting novel (Goodall 258).

The familial language in which Goodall uses to describe the continuing lives of the chimpanzees in her community allows her narrative to speak to the mirrored image of the family and social relations among, between, and across the divide that separates non-human primates from humans. The fluidity with which Goodall uses this language shapes and validates her understanding of personhood within each individual chimp that she interacts with. By naming each of these chimpanzees across their close familial associations, Goodall seamlessly connects each individual to their positionality in the chimpanzee social structure. Goodall's work has followed Flo over the years through her interactions with other females as well as with her own daughter Fifi as she grows into adulthood. Flo's respected social status is instantly taken into consideration when Goodall inquires after Fifi's own maternal status, and this intuitive recognition of Flo's individual personality shapes the ways in which Goodall will continue to engage with her and her familial relations in the field. Even the comparison to reading on to the end of a novel evokes representations of individual identity and personality within the realm of

personhood, and Goodall's continued fight to break the barriers between man and animal positions non-human primates within their right to identity outside of Western influences.

Altogether, through the transnational representation of personhood, non-human primates gain an equal respect and individual right to identity that will continue to shift and evolve the ways in which we engage with primatology through the theoretical lens of feminism within the natural sciences. As I have discussed in my chapter on motherhood, the inferiority assigned to "othered" identities within the structure of the patriarchy further explores the intersections between feminism and primatology, and highlights the transnational work being done to extend the right to personhood to great apes in regions outside of Western influence. The importance of language and the need for recognition of non-human animal identity is a work in progress, but it is the work that women like Jane Goodall are dedicated to accomplishing. While her early narrative establishes her individual identity among non-human primate society, Goodall's work on primate individuality and personality is somewhat overshadowed by the Western capitalization of her femininity within the field. Despite these odds, Goodall, alongside Galdikas and Fossey, has rewritten what defines man as compared to other non-human animals. These revisions are necessary in continuing to provide the space for non-human primates to be respected and acknowledged within their right to personhood. As Goodall herself asserted – how wrong they are indeed to disregard the work being done to celebrate the individual lives of human and non-human primates as well as transnational contributions to the continual growth in diversity that stands as the foundation of primatology.

CODA: MY PERSONAL REFLECTIONS AND ONE FINAL GOODBYE

Two years is a long time to go without seeing someone, especially if you never got to properly say goodbye. Stepping through the swinging door to the capuchin enclosure for the first time in two years felt like reaching back in time and holding those experiences just a little tighter before finally letting go. This was my chance to finally say goodbye the way I'd wished I could back in March of 2020. Goodbye to the undergraduate research that was full of promise and potential. Goodbye to the university that has fostered my love of animals right alongside my love of literary writing. Goodbye to the capuchin "kiddos" (a term that I come back to later in this section as it comes to address my analysis and definition of personhood) that stole my heart five years ago on Admitted Students Day, the very same capuchins that I have come to admire and appreciate the most within these last couple years of my college career.

That very first tour that I took in the primate lab on Admitted Students Day in April of 2017 reaffirmed why I chose to major in Animal Behavior. Being given the opportunity to conduct hands-on research with non-human primates as an undergraduate promised a fulfilling four years of hard-earned experience that would help me grow closer to my goal of a career in conservation research. I was giddy with excitement as we stepped out of the lab and back onto the shuttle that would take us back across Route 15 to the main part of campus. I pulled on my mom's sleeve and whispered in her ear, "I'm going to work there someday." She took my hand, gave it a squeeze, and proudly laughed at the thought of telling people back home in my small rural town in Northern Pennsylvania that her daughter worked with monkeys when they asked what I was studying in school.

Starting the summer before my sophomore year, I was lucky enough to begin working on a social learning research project with the brown and tufted capuchin monkeys that continued up

until spring break of sophomore year. During that time, I had come to individually recognize and identify each of the monkeys as well as ascribe personality traits to each and every one of them within their social structure. Nemo, the self-proclaimed drama queen, who would deceivingly signal that she liked you through a series of lip smacks, then refuse to cooperate and terrorize the other individuals when it was time for training. Stella, with her tiny frame and delicate features, would come up to the front of one of the compartments in the back room and stick her arm through the holes in the fence to give you a piece of wood chip in hopes of exchanging in for a rewarding treat. And my favorite girl Newton, whose face always reminded me of a sweet little elderly woman, who would sit unproblematically on any of the numerous platforms around the enclosure leisurely eating a monkey chow pellet as we went about our testing procedures. On the last day of summer research, it happened to be Newton's 16th birthday, so once all of our trials were done for the day, we threw Newton a small "Sweet Sixteen" party in the lab. Complete with an extra treat for Newton and a well-versed rendition of "Happy Birthday", everyone in the lab joked about Newton being able to get her driver's license if only she were a person.

If only she were a person. Looking back on experiences like this after the last couple of years outside of the lab carries a new weight to how we humans evaluate a sense of personhood as it comes to define man and as it comes to define non-human primates. After reading the narratives of Jane Goodall and Birutė Galdikas, I find myself in a similar position of reflection; asking myself to reevaluate the ways in which I had engaged with the capuchins both within and outside of the rigors of scientific research.

A lot of the work that I had found myself doing revolved around the well-established differences between human and non-human primates, and the ways in which I individually engaged with the capuchins felt similar to the ways in which a parent was to speak to a child. I

had frequently referred to the capuchins as "the kiddos" when I would tell my friends that I was going into the lab and related them to rambunctious children when they refused to cooperate when we needed them to shift into different compartments. In *Reflections of Eden*, Galdikas consistently refers to herself as a mother figure to the ex-captive orangutans and utilized the maternal lens to analyze the different behaviors that she observed within her adopted orangutan children: "I told myself that I had chosen to take part in their rescue, but perhaps I had merely succumbed to my maternal instincts. Were Akmad and I so different?" (15-16). This reflection on "succumbing" to motherhood in relation to the rescued orangutans speaks to the ideology surrounding the "natural" role of the mother that Galdikas feels pressured into by Western society. However, her ability to critically engage with each orangutan on an individual level through the role of the mother pushes Galdikas outside of Western notions of human versus animal identity as she begins to ponder the similarities between herself and Akmad, the orangutan that Galdikas views as her foster daughter. Once she herself became a mother, Galdikas understood the role of motherhood simultaneously and separately from the non-human primates around her, and I think that this allowed her to finally understand the ways in which identity frames the narrative of non-human primate studies within the realm of personhood. In reflecting back on the maternal language I had used to describe and interact with the capuchins, I find myself mirroring Galdikas in her pressured view of motherhood and how it positions us as women in relation to non-human animals. It is through our willing interactions with non-human primates that blurs the lines between human and animal identity, and how our participation in Western standards surrounding motherhood positions us outside of Western society and into the transnational representations of identity through non-human primate personhood.

Additionally, when casually observing the capuchins in the backroom between testing, I

would reach out my hand for one of the capuchins to hold onto my finger, frequently allowing them to pat my hand or trade me pieces of woodchip for a food reward. This close contact with these monkeys felt intimate, as if we were consciously building a system of trust between individuals where we had a clear understanding of who we were in relation to each other. In a similar fashion, Jane Goodall, in her narrative *In the Shadow of Man*, reflects on the intimacy that comes with holding hands with a chimpanzee by the name of David Graybeard: “The soft pressure of his fingers spoke to me not through my intellect but through a more primitive emotional channel: the barrier of untold centuries which has grown up during the separate evolution of man and chimpanzee was, for a few seconds, broken down” (268). Through the physical contact of their fingers alone, Goodall is able to profoundly state that the barrier separating man and chimpanzee was “broken down”. This homage to non-human primates existing at the border between man and animal speaks volumes to how Goodall has come to appreciate the individuality and social culture that exists within the chimpanzees she studies, and this further supports how motivated she is to further break down the barriers between man and animal to further establish a sense of individual identity for non-human animals alongside primates in efforts of restoring and conserving species in the natural environment. As her research continued, Goodall discontinued the practice of coming into close contact with the chimps in order to observe their natural behaviors outside of human dependence. This shift in practice gave Goodall a glimpse into the reflective relationship between human and ape and prompted her to further respect each individual primate within their own sense of self as they came to be accustomed to her living alongside their community over the next couple of decades.

As I have come to realize throughout the duration of this project, reflection, motherhood, and personhood are steeped within the academic discipline of primatology as it intersects with a

variety of other disciplines such as feminism, anthropology, literary theory, etc. Reflecting on my own experiences in the lab has only made me more aware of the importance and necessity of individual respect as it comes to be allocated across the intersectional boundaries within primatology and feminism when engaging with and criticizing Western definitions of human and non-human identity. Drawing from the narratives of Galdikas and Goodall has provided me with the space to reflect on and critique my own positionality as a woman working with non-human primates. Like these women before me, I started my research by projecting a false sense of motherhood onto the capuchins, and this has further invalidated non-human primates within the boundaries of human and animal identity. By taking a step back, and learning to engage with these individuals with the respect and equal treatment that they deserve within their daily lifestyles, I have come to acknowledge my ignorance and misrepresentation of personhood as it has come to be defined through this project as the right to individual identity through the criteria of having a name and ascribed personality traits, and this project has opened my own eyes to the ways in which non-human primate identities mirror humanity across the expanse of time, giving us a glimpse into where (and potentially even who) human and non-human primates come from evolutionarily.

With these newfound realizations and reflections consciously ruminating within my mind, I entered the primate lab for the first time in over two years. Armed with a face mask, rubber gloves, and two negative rapid COVID tests (these extra precautions are necessary for the primate lab as COVID-19 is as highly contagious and fatal for them as it is for humans), I stepped through the swinging door to the capuchin enclosure for the last time in my college career. As soon as the door squeaked open, I felt four pairs of warm brown eyes looking me over. Small chirps of greeting landed in my ears and I took a few steps forward to get a better

look at the capuchins who had come to see who came in. I had anxiously pondered over whether any of them would remember who I was after not seeing me for so long and with a face half-concealed by a mask on top of that, but as soon as I turned the corner, Nemo was right in the front smacking her lips and running her hands along the fence by way of her usually deceptive greeting. Norman and Nala, the two youngest of the troop, had grown exponentially since I had seen them last: both of them sexually matured and seamlessly blending in with the rest of their cohorts. Moving into the backroom, I spotted Nye in the overhead walkway as he started showing himself off for me, communicating that he was the dominant male of the troop (newly established after the passing of Monet in the spring of 2021). After his friendly display of dominance, I spotted Newton as she slowly walked along one of the platforms, gently sat down, and began munching away on a piece of popcorn. I walked over to where she was sitting and crouched down to meet her eyes. She looked over at me as she continued her snack and seemed unbothered by my presence. I took that as a sign of recognition and happily continued my trek around the enclosure to say hi to everyone.

While I only got to spend about half an hour in the lab with the capuchins due to their (once again) busy research schedule, I could not help but feel as if I had returned back to a place that I had considered home for the first half of my college career. This sense of home paused time and allowed me to further reflect on my relationships with the capuchins then and now. I spent most of that half hour just observing them as they groomed each other and foraged for food, and for the most part, they barely acknowledged my presence. I felt like Goodall and Galdikas, calmly walking through the social community of their very own non-human primate species. The fact that they were comfortable enough to go about their daily routines and social behaviors spoke volumes to how much trust and acceptance had been established between me

and the capuchins. Like Goodall and Galdikas before me, I felt accepted by the capuchins, and this allowed me to organically observe how each of their individual identities informed the ways in which they interacted with each other. I watched as they walked along the ground, swiping away the wood shavings in search of the tastiest pieces of food. The longer I watched, the more I observed one particular behavior that each individual performed as they foraged: once each monkey had swept the wood shavings aside, they would pause as they looked across the floor, folding one hand over the other. The movement felt so "human", and I could not help but feel like Goodall and Galdikas in that moment, watching our non-human primate counterparts as we began to realize the fluidity in which our identities intersect and mirror each other. In seeing the dividing line that has for so long separated man from animal blurred through the non-human primate identity. I shook my head, laughing to myself at how easily I was making these connections.

I could not help but be grateful, in those thirty minutes, for having the opportunity to catch up with each of the capuchins and really begin to properly appreciate the structure of their little primate society. In the last few minutes, I started my final journey around the enclosure, pausing every few seconds to say goodbye to the individual that was in each compartment. I made sure to say goodbye to each of the 17 capuchins living in the lab, regarding each of them by name and spending a few extra seconds committing their faces and personalities to memory. As I pushed the swinging door open in front of me, I looked back one last time, catching Nye's eye before saying goodbye for the last time.

Each of those 17 (18 counting Monet) capuchins holds a special place in my mind and heart, not in the capacity of love, but rather of respect and appreciation. In her narrative *Through a Window*, Goodall perfectly encapsulates this specific type of affection felt for non-human

primates as she writes, “My affection for them is *close to* love. But it is a love for beings who are essentially wild and free…it is a one-sided love, as they do not love me back” (emphasis added, 273). While she refers to her affection as love, I emphasize her assertion that this affection is “close to” love. Goodall’s use of the word love to define her affection exploits the term as it comes to be recognized in proximity to the respect and appreciation that she acknowledges towards these individuals. She recognizes that her affection is one-sided, yet she still defines love as the primary definition of her feelings. This close reading into Goodall’s proximal notions of “love” has allowed me to better define and reflect on my own affection as it comes to be attached to the capuchins that I personally worked with. Throughout these past four years, I have come to reflect heavily on the greater weight that respect and appreciation hold within my relationship with non-human primates through the interdisciplinary lenses of animal behavior and literary studies. The critical engagement of my personal experiences overlaid with the narratives, analyses, and experiences of Haraway, Goodall, and Galdikas has informed the ways in which I have come to better understand, respect, and appreciate non-human primate identities within their own agency through their right to personhood. This project has allowed me to come full circle within my own narrative, and I cannot wait to share how meaningful and necessary it is for perspectives (both Western and transnational) to keep shifting, revising, and unpacking the ways in which our identities intersect, diverge, and ultimately mirror those of our non-human relatives.

WORKS CITED

Arnhart, Larry. "Feminism, Primatology, and Ethical Naturalism." *Politics and the Life Sciences*, vol. 11, no. 2, 1992, pp. 157–170., doi:10.1017/s0730938400015100.

Chodorow, Nancy. "Introduction ." *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender: With a New Preface*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1999, pp. 1-10.

Chodorow, Nancy. "Why Women Mother ." *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender: With a New Preface*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1999, pp. 11–28.

Galdikas, Biruté Marija. *Reflections of Eden: My Years with the Orangutans of Borneo*. Indigo, 1996.

Goodall, Jane. "Conclusion." *Through a Window: Thirty Years with the Chimpanzees of Gombe*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 2020, pp. 268–278.

Goodall, Jane, and Hugo van Lawick. *In the Shadow of Man*. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1988.

Gruen, Lori, and Colin Dayan. "Personhood ." *Critical Terms for Animal Studies*, The University of Chicago Press, 2018, pp. 267–279.

Haraway, Donna Jeanne. *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Science*. Routledge, 1989.

Haraway, Donna Jeanne. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. Routledge, 1991.

Johnson, Miriam M. "Women's Mothering and Male Misogyny." *Strong Mothers, Weak Wives: The Search for Gender Equality*. University of California Press, 1990, pp. 72–96.

"Joint Open Letter to the Associated Press Calling for a Change in Animal Pronouns — Animals

are a Who, Not a What.” Received by Paula Froke, *In Defense of Animals*, 22 Mar. 2021, https://idausa.lattecdn.com/assets/files/assets/uploads/openletterapstylebook.pdf.

Kemmerer, Lisa, and Hope Ferdowsian. “Compassion without Borders .” *Sister Species: Women, Animals and Social Justice*, Univ. of Illinois Press, Urbana, 2011, pp. 97–101.

Lewis, Kelsey. “#FactCheckNeeded: Non-Human Animals Cannot Have a Gender Identity.” *Speaking of Research*, 1 July 2021, speakingofresearch.com/2021/04/14/factcheckneeded-non-human-animals-cannot-have-a-gender-identity/.

Ottaviani, Jim, and Maris Wicks. *Primates*. Square Fish, 2013.

Radhakrishna, Sindhu, and Dale Jamieson. “Liberating Primatology.” *Journal of Biosciences*, vol. 43, no. 1, 2018, pp. 3–8., doi:10.1007/s12038-017-9724-3.

Rooke, Deborah. “Should Apes have ‘Human Rights’?” *Web Journal of Current Legal Issues*, Northumbria University Newcastle, 2009.

Said, Edward. Introduction I. In *Orientalism* (pp. 9–30). Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1978.

Singer, Peter. “ Of Great Apes and Men.” *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 17 July 2008, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2008/jul/18/animalwelfare.animalbehaviour.

Smuts, Barbara. “The Evolutionary Origins of Patriarchy.” *Human Nature*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1995, pp. 1–32., https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02734133.

Strum, Shirley, and Linda Marie Fedigan. *Primate Encounters: Models of Science, Gender, and Society*. University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Wilson, Edward O. *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1975

Wright, Elizabeth. Structural Psychoanalysis: Psyche as Text . In *Psychoanalytic Criticism: Theory in Practice* (pp. 107–132). Routledge, 2002.