WILDERNESS AND DOMESTICATION IN HUMAN-OTHER-THAN-HUMAN-HUMAN PRIMATE COLLECTIVES

Selvagem e domesticado em coletivos de primatas humanos-diferentes-de-humanos

Paride Bollettin
Doutor em Antropologia pela Universidade de Perúgia (Itália). Professor no Departamento de Antropologia (UFBA), Brasil.
Email: paride_bollettin@msn.com

Áltera, João Pessoa, v.3, n.11, p. 201-226, jul./dez. 2020

ISSN 2447-9837

ABSTRACT:
This paper aims at discussing the frontier between wilderness and domestication in the production and experience of human and non-human primate collectives. It describes three diverse ethnographic cases: populations of humans and other primates in a wildlife and exotic rescue centre in Italy, in a protected park in The Gambia, and in unprotected forests in Brazil. Such a panorama of frontiers between wild and domesticated human-non-human primate collectives allows to observe how these are constantly redefined as flexible interactions in specific lived experiences. Active agency of non-human primates emerges in the described ethnographic examples as one of the main elements in the production of the wild-domesticated-wild frontier. The main thesis is that wilderness and domestication are movements of mutual symbioses producing dynamic networks in which involved actors are reciprocally redefined. Such a frontier, far from defining a static dichotomy, crosses epistemological and ontological borders, constituting a device for the multiplication of the voices in ethnographic descriptions.

KEYWORDS:
Multispecies. Human-non-human primates. Domestication. Wilderness.

RESUMO:
Este artigo visa a discutir a fronteira entre selvagem e domesticado na produção e na experiência de coletivos de primatas humanos e diferente-de-humanos. Três diferentes casos etnográficos são apresentados: populações de humanos e outros primatas em um centro de recuperação de animais silvestres e exóticos na Itália, em um parque protegido no Gambia e uma área não protegida no Brasil. Esse panorama de fronteiras entre coletivos de primatas diferente-de-humanos selvagens e domesticados permite observar como estes são constantemente redefinidos como interações flexíveis em experiências vividas específicas. A agentividade ativa dos primatas outro-que-humanos surge nos exemplos etnográficos descritos enquanto um dos elementos centrais na produção da fronteira selvagem-domesticado. A tese é que "selvagem" e "domesticado" são movimentos de simbiose mútua que produzem redes dinâmicas nas quais os atores envolvidos são reciprocamente redefinidos. Tal fronteira, ao contrário de definir uma dicotomia estática, atravessa margens epistemológicas e ontológicas, constituindo uma ferramenta para a multiplicação das vozes na descrição etnográfica.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE:
Multiespécie. Primatas-humanos-não-humanos. Domesticado. Selvagem.

INTRODUCTION

The concepts of wild and domesticated have been used to describe very different multispecies collective arrangements. These concepts, far from being monolithic keywords, have been the object of controversies and critiques from various disciplinary perspectives. In recent years, growing attention has been dedicated to the epistemological consequences of a revision of these notions (e.g. CASSIDY; MULLIN, 2007; PRĘGOWSKI, 2016; SWANSON *et al.*, 2018; STÉPANOFF; VIGNE, 2019). The Wild-domesticated dichotomy produces an estrangement in the contemporary panorama in which humans are assumed to control "nature", toward what has been defined as "anthropocene" (CRUTZEN; STOERMER, 2000, p. 17). Such idea of control, derived from an objectivized definition of "nature", is the result of an anthropocentric perspective in which the "wild" is assumed to be the untouched, the pristine, or the original quality of the other-than-human. Meanwhile, to "control" is governing and modifying the wild. The first part of this paper discusses how the recent redefinition of such a dichotomy transformed wild and domesticated in heuristic categories and productive tools for the description of shared and shaped worlds in which humans and other-than-humans reciprocally domesticate each other.

In order to deepen how the wild and domesticated can be turned into productive tools for accessing multispecies collectives, the second part of this paper describes human and other-than-human primates. These collectives assume multiple features, from wildlife sanctuaries to touristic environments, from conservation programs to academic researches. Here, three exemplar ethnographic cases will be focused on to illustrate these multiple arrangements. The first case is the "liberation" of a population of laboratory primates in Italy. Their dislocation in a wildlife rescue centre lets to emerge the way in which these other-than-human primates act as political subjects in redefining rhetorical strategies as well as the spatial organization and the human life in the rescue centre. The second case is a protected area in which two species of other-than-human primates live in The Gambia. In this park they actively produce the local economic life by promoting tourism and creating a flagship for the local environmental protection movement, consequently defining multispecies col-

lectives in which the subjects involved exert multiple reciprocal influences. The third case is the collective produced by scientists and other-than-human primates in the northeast of Brazil, in an unprotected area. The promotion of the conservation of this area by scientists is grounded on the presence of critically endangered primate populations. These populations are not only agents in redefining the land destination and the environmental and political strategies of scientists, but they also impact the proper production of the scientific task. In all three cases, these multispecies collectives will be described through the conceptual dichotomy of wild and domesticated, in order to deepen the production of reciprocal influences.

The core thesis of this paper is that such a dichotomy enables us to observe the reciprocal agency of both human and other-than-human primates in movements of mutual influences. In the three cases that will be described, other-than-human primates create new multispecies arrangements that actively influence human life. Furthermore, individuals and populations of other-than-human primates can not be reduced to a passive agentivity, since they perform voluntary actions aimed at "domesticating" humans. The concepts of "wild" and "domesticated" are activated by social actors in their social and ideological strategies. Meanwhile, the active role of other-than-human primates highlights the possible inversion of the dichotomy toward reciprocal effects. In this direction, taking the multispecies agency seriously provides a fruitful tool for crossing epistemological barriers toward a post-human concept in which human and other-than-human primates act on each other. The conclusions will indicate that the theoretical dichotomy of wild and domesticated is recognized, this dichotomy will provide a useful lens for observing human and other-than-human primate collectives and describing multispecies' shared lives.

WILD AND DOMESTICATED AS CONCEPTUAL TOOLS

The concepts of wilderness and domestication have a long history in both social and biological sciences. As reported by Ian Hodder (1993, p. 45), "domestication" is derived from the ancient Indo-European linguistic family, being declined in Latin *domus*, in Greek *domos*, in Sanskrit *damas*, in Slavic *domu*, and so on. This origin makes

clear its association with the concepts of *domus*, domestic, dominant, domain, as well as with dame and tame. Anna Tsing (2018, p. 238-239) observed that, in Hodder's discussion, the domestication process is referred to at the same time as an inter-specific relation and as a social pattern. This process creates a double opposition. It defines women in relation to men's control and defines the wild as an uncontrolled space as opposed to the controlled, domestic one. The consequences of this parallelism are clear, since rhetorical and practical implementations of this dichotomy between wild and domesticated has evident epistemological implications. An example of this is the relative prevalence of women in field primatology associated with a relative minority in academic positions, at least until recent years (HARAWAY, 1984). Such consequences are not limited to the epistemological dimension, regarding the bio-social ensemble of humans and other-than-humans.

The suggestion that the domestication process constitutes a starting point for the implementation of human domination over nature – and the affirmation of a hierarchical society – appears explicitly in diverse disciplines. The Neolithic archaeologists Jacques Cauvin affirms that: "the one called Neolithic Revolution is one of the most critical [turning points]: it concerned the first manipulation of the natural environment by our species, and it lies directly at the origins of our present power" (2002, p. XV).

According to this author, the origin of domestication is related to the separation of ourselves from a wilderness seen as an enemy to be conquered. The idea of a "revolution" reaffirms the emancipation of the human from a supposed imperative government of natural mechanism. As stated by Gordon Childe: "The escape from the impasse of savagery was an economic and scientific revolution that made the participants active partners with nature instead of parasites on nature" (1942, p. 55).

This approach to the domestication process emphasizes the emergence of human agentivity from a primordial status in which humans were subjected to environmental determination. In this sense, it affirms the separation of the human from other species, and considers humans as a unique species able to rearrange the environment for its own purposes.

Human control over nature through domestication has been characterized by

diverse factors. The control of breeding and reproduction has changed the morphology of domesticated species when compared with their wild counterparts, which are represented as the "pure ones" (LESCUREUX, 2018). The neotenic theory, in this sense, supports the separation between the wild original state and the domesticated artificial state, the latter produced by human intervention, with influences also in public policies related with wildlife management. Human control over the wild is consequently related to the objectification of nature. As already discussed by Claude Lévi-Strauss (1962), the Neolithic, with its corollary of the separation between the wild and the domesticated, is a way of conceiving the relation between the human and the natural. Once objectified, the wild is subjected to property (RUSSELL, 2007). Once again, the wild and domesticated dichotomy is seen through the lens of an anthropocentric perspective. If domestication is defined through concepts of control or property, other forms of relations with wildlife and domesticated other-than-humans are marginalized. How is it possible to conceive human and other-than-human collectives when humans have clear control or property over other-than-humans? This question is especially relevant regarding the current emphasis on wildlife conservation, re-wilding policies, and the status of the human – or the post-human – in the anthropocene.

The idea of domestication as stemming from the control of a pristine wilderness is still dominant in the mainstream literature, and is supported by scholars of various disciplines. Clutton-Brock in a milestone book on domestication affirms that domestication "is both a cultural and a biological process and that it can only take place when tamed animals are incorporated into the social structure of the human group and become objects of ownership" (1989, p. 7).

Despite the anthropocentric approach adopted, it is important to remark a core point she highlighted, that is, the impossibility to separate cultural and biological aspects of the wild and domesticated dichotomy. This aspect is extremely relevant for reviewing the proper idea of "control" implied in the discussions about the wild and domesticated dichotomy. Once it is recognized that the social and the biological are inseparable, it becomes possible to review another dichotomy: "successful farmers have social relations with one another, while hunter-gatherers have [an] ecological

relation with hazelnuts" (RICHARDS, 2003, p. 136). It is clear how the revision of the frontier between the wild and the domesticated constitutes a movement engaged concomitantly in rethinking the frontier between humans and other-than-humans, as well as the frontier between domesticating humans and not-domesticating humans. As stated by Latour (1999) in his discussion of domination and hierarchies in human and other-than-human collectives, the separation between the "human" and the "other-than-human" is related with the anthropogenic machine, aimed at separating the "subject" from the "object". To describe, or to map, the social, however, require the recognition of this separation as artificial, and consequently "the impossibility of defining social structures without accounting for the large role played in them by nonhumans" (LATOUR, 1999, p. 212).

The bio-social feature of domestication has called the attention of biologists, anthropologists, archaeologists, and other scholars. Darwin already proposed to observe domestication as "an experiment on a gigantic scale" (2010, p. 3). His distinction between a "methodological selection", based on the voluntary action of humans over other-than-humans, and an "unconscious selection", not human-directed, had a heavy influence on later discussions. The idea of morphological changes in other-than-human populations as a result of human selection, which crosses widely the debates, has been progressively supplanted by an emphasis on the adaptive responses of domesticated species to the anthropized environments (VIGNE, 2015; FRANTZ; LARSON, 2019). In this sense, the frontier between wild and domesticated appears more related to a co-evolutionary process than a human agency on passive other-than-human species. In other words, leaving the comfort zone of the human prerogative of agentivity on an inanimate "nature" toward the recognition of intermingled reciprocal influences implies a redefinition of both concepts of biological evolution and social experience. As proposed by Tim Ingold:

> It requires us to think of humanity not as a fixed and given condition but as a relational achievement. It requires us to think of evolution not as change along lines of descent but as the developmental unfolding of the entire matrix of relations within which forms of life (human and non-human) emerge and are held in place (2013, p. 20).

The recognition of the bio-social dimension of the wild and domesticated dichotomy forces us to open human-exclusive intentionality and agentivity to other-than-humans, which no longer have only instinctual or adaptive responses to the environment.

As alerted by Stépanoff and Vigne (2019, p. 9-10), co-evolution defines a biological relation between beings, while domestication should be observed as a socio-environmental process. In this sense, the dichotomy between wild and domesticated could be described as a tension between two poles of attraction and repulsion in multigenerational sequences of interactions between diverse beings. The extremes, wild and domesticated, assume the form of limits, in a mathematical acceptation, which could never be achieved; however, they are heuristically relevant, since they enable to observe the multiple forms that human and other-than-human collectives assume in their becoming. The notion of co-evolution enables to define the polymorphous morphological and adaptive transformation of species along time. Domestication and wilderness, on the other hand, lets observe the complementarity of the diverse beings in their producing hybrids communities.

The effective realization of these hybrid communities is grounded on the bio-social imbrications of multiple beings. The recognition of these imbrications requires the recognition of the agentivity of other-than-human beings (e.g. KIRKSEY; HELMREICH, 2010; DOOREN; KIRKSEY; MÜNSTER, 2016). Taking seriously other-than-human beings as agents means to recognise their participation in the world-making process (TSING, 2015). A claim for encounters between different subjects emerges (BARUA, 2015). These encounters influence the actualization of the contingent situation in which the different subjects are merged, the resonance between them producing the reciprocal bio-social response to the others' actions. According to Rees, agency can be defined as: "the capacity to contribute to the future; as the ability through action, interaction or deliberate inaction to change the outcome of events" (2017, p. 9). The other-than-human agency, in its polysemy, can be observed as intentionality or akrasia, influencing the development of future interactions between multispecies collectives. In this perspective, the wild and domesticated dichotomy is more of a negotiation of multiple recip-

rocal influences between humans and other-than-humans involved in common collectives than the result of active human actions on passive other-than-humans.

This brief discussion of the wild and domesticated dichotomy indicates toward diverse aspects involved in its production. The transformation from wild to domesticated, once thought of as a linear and progressive process, is diluted in multiple relations of reciprocal influences between humans and other-than-humans. The wild and the domesticated emerge here as modalities of engaging in these relations. In this sense, as relational processes, wild and domesticated are on-going processes constantly actualized by the involved subjects. As such, domestication is associated more with mutualism and co-becoming than with a priori categories defining interspecific influences as control, domination, etc. Thusly, the wild and domesticated dichotomy is an exemplar case for observing human and other-than-human collectives in their continuative reassembling of the bio-social reciprocal engagement. In this panorama, observing how human and other-than-human primates realize these collectives in concrete ethnographic cases will deepen the usefulness of these concepts as tools for accessing other-than-human agentivities as well as for bridging disciplinary gaps.

PRIMATUS SUM, NIHIL PRIMATUM MIHI ALIENUM PUTO

Due to their ambiguous classification in the Western view as alternatively similar and different to humans (CORBEY, 2005), primates constitute a unique example for discussing the multiple ways humans and other-than-humans constitute multispecies collectives. In the public imagination, Goodall, Fossey, and Galdikas contribute to a vision of other-than-human primates living in a "social" environment (MONTGOMERY, 2009). From the 1980s onwards, studies of chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) showed that social factors explain geographical variation in primate behavioural traits, leading to the establishment of "cultural panthropology" (WHITEN *et al.*, 2003). Although personhood in other-than-human primates is avoided in "official" scientific discourse in favour of impersonal description (CANDEA, 2012), they are often popularly described as having emo-

tional, social, and cultural characteristics (REES, 2007; SÁ, 2012). These studies consider primates as not limited by biological or environmental influences, but rather as having a proper intentionality motivating their actions, an agentivity. These images of other-than-human primates are discussed as forms of anthropomorphism, which is intended, here, as the attribution of human features to other-than-human animals (REGAN, 1983). Some scholars defend this possibility as an heuristic toll for the analysis of other-than-human animals' points of view (DE WAAL, 2000), while others suggest it is a metaphorical identification between an "ego" (human-observer) and an "other" (animal-observed), rather than a direct comparison between human and other-than-human animals (MILTON, 2005).

Contemporary primatology recognises other-than-human primates' agentivity, and consequently their "capacity to contribute to the future" (REES, 2017, p. 9). In this direction, growing attention is being devoted to the bio-social contexts of human and other-than-human primate interactions and their reciprocal influences (e.g. LEE, 2010; RILEY *et al.*, 2011; FUENTES, 2012; MCKINNEY; DORE, 2018). This leads to the consideration that human influences on other-than-human primate populations should not be seen as an overwhelming force that leads to the degeneration of populations. Rather, these influences are environmental factors to which these populations respond in their daily contribution to the future. The analysis of these reciprocal influences highlights the other-than-human behavioural plasticity (RILEY *et al.* 2017), and requires inclusive the use of mixed methods of analysis (SETCHELL *et al.*, 2017). Consequently, the recognition of other-than-human primate agentivity in their relations with humans stimulates a double movement. On one hand, it promotes the inclusion of other-than-humans as proper subjects in the multispecies collectives. On the other hand, it forces us to rethink disciplinary borders toward a cross-hybridization. Thinking about the wild and domesticated dichotomy in this perspective will help us to engage in these two movements. In order to do this, some ethnographic case studies can provide useful examples.

THE "LIBERATION" OF AN OTHER-THAN-HUMAN PRIMATE POPULATION

Located in the Tuscany region of Central Italy, the Centro di Recupero Animali Selvatici ed Esotici (Wild and Exotic Animals Rescue Centre) of Semproniano is one of the few structures authorized by the Italian Government to host exogenous animal populations. The Centre, which is a private structure, was created in 1996 from an agreement between the World Wildlife Fund for Nature Italia and the Grosseto Province for the rescue, health care, and reintroduction of wild animals met by public institutions and private citizens. After a few years, the World Wildlife Fund started to develop activities related with wildlife management, including the confiscation of exotic animals from all around Italy, to prevent violence and illegal trafficking of protected species. The Centre hosts approximately five hundred individuals of one hundred species. Many of them are exotic animals confiscated from authorities due to inadequate living conditions or illegal trafficking.

In July 2016, the collaboration between the Centre and the Italian animalist movement Lega Anti Vivisezione (Anti Vivisection League) promoted the introduction of a new colony of sixteen Crab-eating macaques (*Macaca fascicularis*). In July 2017, a second colony of twenty-four individuals of the same species was dislocated to the place. These macaques have been recovered respectively from the University of Modena and the University of Padova laboratories, where they were not used for experiments for several years. The recovering of this colony to the new site was enabled by an agreement between the animalist movement, the universities, and the Centre. Once arrived at the Centre, the *Macaca fascicularis* populations have been hosted in two cages of two hundred square meters each. These cages have been specially built to receive the macaques. They are iron structures covered with steel mesh. Inside the cages, some trees have been planted in order to offer "enrichments" to the macaques. An enclosed area, in which the macaques recover during the night or on rainy days, has been added to each cage, on the opposite side from the road that crosses the Centre. These cages have been constructed in an area that was deforested with this aim. According to local workers, this environmental transformation had consequences on the distribution of native bird species, which moved to other places of the Centre to nest.

The construction of these cages also produced a change in the daily life of the Centre. Before the arrival of the colonies, only three people were employed at the Centre, who took care of the individuals of diverse species. The arrival of the colonies was followed by the arrival of a keeper, specifically dedicated to their care. Since the beginning, the other workers were not allowed to come close to the macaques' cages, with the reason of having a dedicated functionary. This caused discomfort among them, with the consequence of their progressive avoidance of the new arrived worker. They explained that this attitude toward the new worker was due to her character, which was described as arrogant and not open to suggestions or dialogues. On the counterpart, the new arrival explained that she did not want the other workers to approach the macaques since they are not of the Centre, but of the animalist movement, which is her employer. This attrition made the workers circumvent the place where the macaques are hosted and modify their working routine in order to avoid the new worker.

Interestingly, other populations of other-than-human primates, specifically Pig-tailed macaques (*Macaca nemestrina*) and Barbary macaques (*Macaca sylvanus*) are hosted in the Centre. These populations have been rescued from illegal trafficking, and are hosted in separated cages relatively distant from the *Macaca fascicularis*. Their caretakers are the workers that were at the Centre before the arrival of the two populations of *Macaca fascicularis*, and the new keeper does not approach them. The International Union for Conservation of Nature classified *Macaca sylvanus* as "endangered", *Macaca nemestrina* as "vulnerable", and *Macaca fascicularis* as "not threatened". Despite this, the presence of *Macaca fascicularis* at the Centre gained a great media presence due to the massive divulgation of the animalist movement, which did not mention the presence of other macaque populations at the Centre. On their website and in other divulgation materials, the animalist movement utilizes expressions such as "the new life of macaques" and "liberation of the macaques". In this way, they call attention to their efforts of saving these populations from the "inhumane" conditions of laboratories.

The arrival of these populations at the Centre is described in enthusiastic ways by the animalist movement, for example, they emphasise how the animals

now have individual names instead of being identified by a bar code. The attribution of names to the individuals is frequently followed by a description of their individualities: for example, X likes to play in a specific way, Y likes to relax in a specific place, etc. The strategy is to create an emphatic approximation with these other-than-human populations. In backstage conversations, both the owner of the Centre and the President of the animalist movement detailed their plans for a grand opening of the Centre to the public (once they obtain the necessary authorizations). However, when prompted, the owner of the Centre declared that opening to the Centre to the public was not his aim until the arrival of the *Macaca fascicularis* populations. The owner maintained that the possibility for opening the Centre to visitations depended on their capacity to raise sufficient funds from fees and on avocation by the animalist association.

It is evident from this brief description how the introduction of other-than-human populations modified the Centre. As previously discussed, one of the characteristics recognized in the domestication process has been the "domination" of the environment by humans. In this case, it is possible to subvert this opposition, taking into account the impacts that *Macaca fascicularis* had on the Centre. Their arrival modified both the landscape, via the deforestation of a specific area for the construction of their cages, and the social life of human workers, which are now forbidden to visit the place. It is evident that a population of other-than-human primates, which was living in a laboratory, has been able to advocate for it's own agentivity. Recognizing that these populations have not been passive objects of human activities helps demonstrate how the domestication process had worked in two directions. On one hand, humans have moved these populations to a new location and given them names. On the other hand, the *Macaca fascicularis* population has impacted the habits of their caretakers and produced a new bio-social environment to match their needs. In this sense, the two primates, humans and *Macaca fascicularis,* acted on each other, thereby producing a new, constantly-changing shared space.

PRIMATE TOURISM AND INTERSPECIFIC INFLUENCES

The republic of The Gambia is the second smallest country of Africa. Located on the west coast of the continent, it is a tourist destination for an increasing number of visitors, mostly from the north of Europe, due to the country's safety and its widespread use of English (its official language). One of the core tourist areas is the Bijilo Forest Park, which is mostly called Monkey Park, due to the presence of green vervet monkeys (*Chlorocebus sabaeus*) and Red colobus (*Procolobus badius temminckii*). Several bird species also inhabit the park, making it a world-famous bird-watching site. The Bijilo Forest Park was established in 1951 and officially declared as a National Park in 1952. In the 1980s, a partnership with the German Government enabled the park to be improved via the addition of new infrastructure and a fence to secure the perimeter. However, after the end of this partnership, the park suffered a progressive degradation. Nowadays, Bijilo Park offers wildlife tours as well as educational activities for local school children.

The park covers an area of almost fifty-one hectares on the seaside and a significant amount of tourists visit it on daily basis. The success of the park depends on its prime location in the Senegambia region, where there are many hotels for tourists, as well as on the habituation of monkeys to visitors. This constant flux of tourists fuels the local economy, and several sellers wait for visitors at the entrance of the park to sell them nuts to feed the primates. Despite the fact that this practice is officially forbidden, no one acts to avoid this informal commerce, since it constitutes the subsistence economy of various families of the region. Local inhabitants also offer their knowledge of primates to tourists, accompanying them in their visits to the park.

This formal and informal economic life produced by the park makes it a reference not only for tourism but also for local inhabitants. In March 2017, the implementation of a project aimed at building a conference centre in a part of the area mobilized hundreds of people in a protest against the destruction of the park. In the early morning some bulldozers arrived at the place and started to deforest the portion of the area closest to the street. Immediately, a protest ensued involving environmentalists as well as local inhabitants and workers of the tourism industry. The protest was successful,

forcing the Government to change the project and maintain the total area as a National Park. The protesters used the international visibility of the Senegambia region, which host almost twenty thousand tourists per year, to force the protection of the park. Interestingly, one of the core slogans was "Save nature, the monkeys have decided, too". On the 5th of June, World Environment Day, a similar multitude of protesters re-united at the park to promote a trash clean-up operation. According to the participants, it was the first time the people realised a similar clean-up experience.

The limited area of the park, however, is not sufficient for the maintenance of other-than-human primate populations, so they are used to moving to the surrounding hotel gardens to feed. According to primatological studies conducted on these other-than-human primate populations (FORTI, 2017a; 2017b), the two species respond in different ways to living in an anthropogenic environment. The most adaptive species, *Chlorocebus sabaeus*, easily accepts the presence of human visitors inside the park, and they approach humans more frequently. On the other hand, the most elusive species, *Procolobus badius temminckii*, spends more time visiting the neighbouring hotels to search for food. However, this difference should not be reduced to a behavioural attitude or other mechanistic response to human presence. Some *Procolobus badius temminckii* individuals exhibit behavioural patterns more similar to the *Chlorocebus sabaeus* than to their conspecifics. These individuals' behavioural traits highlight the behavioural plasticity mentioned above as a key feature of the domestication process.

This concise portrait highlights how the multispecies collective composed by human and other-than-human primates at the Bijilo Forest Park have influence on the diverse species involved. The other-than-human primate populations define the space as a protected area, but they also actively modify the economic and social life of the region. The tourist destination of the area produces income for the local population. But the other-than-human primate populations also transform human perceptions of the environment as well human "behavioural patterns". Following an attempt to convert the park into a conference centre, other-than-human primates became the flagship for the maintenance of the area and widely changed local inhabitants' attitudes towards environmental protection.

On the other hand, anthropogenic pressure on other-than-human primate populations assumes the form of a reduction of their ranging area and food availability. However, this pressure generated alternative strategies in the two species. *Chlorocebus sabaeus* made explicit an attitude of voluntary engagement with humans, accepting food from them, not escaping, and generally approaching the visitors of the park. *Procolobus badius temminckii*, on the other hand, adopted an alternative strategy of using anthropogenic spaces while avoiding direct contact with humans. The complexity of the possible forms that a multispecies collective can assume is made evident by the presence of individuals crossing the behavioural boundaries between the two species.

These species are described as "wild", in the sense that they are free to move where they please, both officially in Government documents and generally in tourist descriptions on several websites. Notwithstanding, their options are influenced by the massive presence of humans, locals and tourists, forcing them make intentional and unintentional choices concerning how to manage this invasive presence. In this sense, to reduce their behavioural patterns to a passive response means to loose the agentivity that is expressed at both species' and individuals' levels. Assuming that the domestication process is a double way movement, in which involved subjects acts in a reciprocal adaptation, lets to make evident how the wild and domesticated conditions are possible choices. In the panorama of possible interactions between voluntary engage in multispecies collectives and the contrary attempt to avoid such engagement, the condition of being wild or being domesticated appears an arrangement of multiple factors.

CONSERVING THE BIO-SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

In the Northeast coast of the Brazilian State of Bahia, one of the last remnants of mangroves is situated on the estuary of the Itapicuru River, in the municipality of Conde. In this mangroves area, two fishing communities live in the villages of Siribinha and Poças, respectively composed by a total of almost one thousand inhabitants. The north region of Bahia State has been transformed in the last decades by

a massive touristic development. Resorts, hotels and condominiums have occupied a great part of the coastline, affecting the social and environmental panorama, with dislocation of local populations and the degradation of large patches of Mata Atlantica forest. The communities of Siribinha and Poças are situated in a region still not affected by the development of tourism. Consequently, the region maintains the ecosystem composed by mangroves, Mata Atlantica, coconut plantations and sand dunes. The most part of the population dedicate to fishery on the estuary of the river or on the sea. Women usually "fish" crabs in the mangroves. Small *pousadas*, familiar hotels, host the few tourists that visit the area.

The variety and preservation of the environment makes the region an important hotspot for the presence of multiple species living there. The environmental importance of the place has been recognized by the implementation of a *Unidade de Conservação Integral Municipal* (Municipal Integral Conservation Unit) in 2018, which covers the estuary of the Itapicuru River. The high biodiversity of the region, associated with the changing social conditions due to the progressive integration of the communities of Siribinha and Poças in the regional economy, stimulated the implementation of an interdisciplinary project realised by a group of researchers of the Federal University of Bahia. This interdisciplinary group includes scholars of biology, ecology, education, anthropology, and other disciplines. One goal of this project is to build up a dialogue between local environmental knowledge and scientific knowledge in order to stimulate the inclusion of both in local schools. Another objective of the project is the implementation of efficient conservation policies for the preservation of the local ecosystem. The latter objective is thought to be achieved through the implementation of a mosaic of protected areas with diversified legal status, from total conservation areas to limited resources uses. This strategy has been thought in order to permit the maintenance of the local economic uses of the environment while preserving biodiversity.

The place hosts a population of yellow-breasted capuchin monkey, *Sapajus xanthosternos*, which are classified as "critically endangered" by the International Union for Conservation of Nature. This species has been little studied in the "wild", due to its high mobility in the canopy and to its distrust of humans. Interestingly, the

Sapajus xanthosternos population that lives in the region adapted to mangroves and the coconuts plantations, while other populations of the same species have been reported in Mata Atlantica forests. The presence of this species, as well as the recent meeting with a species of parrot that was not previously known to live in the region, was one of the main factors inspiring the project of environmental conservation developed by the researcher in association with the local government.

Despite the scarcity of bibliographical sources available on *Sapajus xanthosternos* indicates toward a little knowledge about the socio-ecology of this species, local inhabitants report continuative encounters with this other-than-human population. Women relate repeatedly of meetings with the other-than-human primates during their "crab fishing" (local definition). During these meetings, the *Sapajus xanthosternos* approach humans without fear, sometime also trying to steal from them the crabs they stocked in the baskets. In other situations, they enter the houses' gardens, eating the fruits from the trees. Moreover, they are used to frequent the local coconut plantations, where they developed a technique to open the coconuts in order to drink the juice inside. According to the local human inhabitants, this is the only source of drinkable water available to the other-than-human population, since the water of the river near the estuary is brackish due the tide.

In order to better understand the socio-ecological life of the *Sapajus xanthosternos* inhabiting the region, a primatologist tried to realize a research aimed at observing their social life, their ecology and their use of coconuts. This scholar reported the main trouble to be the difficulty to find the individuals in the mangroves in order to "habituate" them. The habituation process has been described in primatological literature as the first step through which other-than-human primates accept to be observed by the researchers (HANSON; RILEY, 2018). Despite this considered a "condition", in the sense that other-than-human primate being finally familiarised with the human observer is a prerequisite for realising the behavioural observation, habituation is mostly a process. In primatology, scholars realising fieldwork describe the habituation as a continuative negotiation between individuals, humans and other-than-humans, trying to know each other. Reports such as: "the individual X looked at me curiously" or "the other individual Y displayed aggressively to me", are fre-

quent during the descriptions of their research activities. In order to achieve the final goal of the "habituation", the researchers describe how they were learning along the process which kind of attitudes, moving fast or slow, making noise or being quiet, etc., other-than-human primates were more willing to accept. In this specific case, however, the researcher has not been able to effectively develop a "relation" with the *Sapajus xanthosternos* group. After several attempts, she definitively decided to abdicate from the research project. The core point, in this case, is the strategy adopted to "habituate" such primates. If, as described above, local inhabitants of the region are used to have continuative "social" relation with the *Sapajus xanthosternos*, the disturbance should be found in the "scientific" practice. In this sense, the primatologist lack of recognition of other-than-human primates as subjects, and consequently able to have a proper end effective agentivity, appears to be the core point for the failure of the scientific effort. Not recognizing the *Sapajus xanthosternos* individuals' agentivity had as a result the impossibility to develop reciprocal "habituation", and finally the failure of the scientific attempt.

What emerges from the portrait of the human and other-than-human primates collective in Siribinha and Poças is the presence of a relational web in which the involved subjects manipulate their relations with their "others" in dynamic patterns. *Sapajus xanthosternos* ranging in the Itapicuru estuary are easily identified as living in the "wild", or alternatively in "nature". However, it is not possible to ignore that they are used to have relations with humans, being these competitive or not. In this direction, they actively manage these relations defining specific strategies sensible to the contexts. With local inhabitants they produce diverse relations than with the observer. The last, by the way, appears to have not been "domesticated" along the habituation process, since she did not adapt her human behaviour according to the requirements of the other-than-human partner of the relation. In another direction it is also possible to observe how the presence of *Sapajus xanthosternos* produced a project for the transformation of the area. Despite the project is being formulated in order to include the requirements of all the stakeholders – local human populations, local other-than-human populations, and local government (all populations) –, the fact that the conservation project focuses on the preservation of these oth-

er-than-human primates indicates toward the indirect agency of these in defining the context of the multispecies collective.

MOBILE FRONTIERS BETWEEN WILD AND DOMESTICATED

The examples of human and other-than-human primate collectives described above, offer a diversified panorama of possible relations between the "wild" and the "domesticated". In all the situations, the collectives composed by human and other-than-human primates can be observed as the interaction between diverse agentivities that are expressed in specific actions and influences on reciprocal "others". The "wild" being a supposed pristine condition untouched by humans and the "domesticated" as the objectified condition of other-than-human beings as subjected to human agency give space in all the three cases to a more dynamic and varied panorama.

In the case of the Semproniano Rescue Centre, the *Macaca fascicularis* populations could be easily identified as "domesticated" according to the perspective of "control". They are forced in cages, while rhetorically this is described as "give them freedom from laboratories", their reproduction is managed by humans, as well as their alimentation. However, they demonstrated their agency through the consequences of their arrival at the Centre. They actively transformed the human routine, the landscape, and also the life of other species. In this direction, their presence produced a redefinition of the humans ranging patterns. Moreover, the media campaign activated by the animalist movement focused on *Macaca fascicularis* despite the presence of other-than-human populations classified as more in danger of extinction. This lets to highlight how these populations acted indirectly also in the production of a new idea of the Centre. Until their arrival this was thought exclusively as a Rescue Centre, while after it started to be thought also as a public space, open to visitors.

Also, the populations of *Chlorocebus sabaeus* and *Procolobus badius temminckii* at Bijilo Forest Park offer a picture of ambivalent possible classifications. They are free ranging, and consequently are thought to be free of moving everywhere they would like. However, the Park is merged in a touristic area and surrounded by five stars hotels, consequently limiting their effective choices. In this panorama, both spe-

cies elaborate species-specific strategies to manage their relations with human counterparts. *Cholocebus sabaeus* opted for engaging in closer relations, easily accepting nuts from tourists and approaching them physically. *Procolobus badius temminckii*, differently, decided to use anthropogenic spaces, such as the hotels' gardens, while maintaining a distance from humans. Notwithstanding, some individuals of the latter decided to experiment the "way of life" of the first, as reported by behavioural studies (FORTI, 2017a). In this way, they demonstrated how agency should not be reduced to a species behavioural pattern or automatic response, but rather to a voluntary choice. Moreover, these species influenced, as seen also in the previous case, the space they occupy, avoiding its destruction through the mobilization of local environmentalist groups. Despite the last should be observed as an indirect action, the reference humans did to other-than-human primates clearly demonstrate how these had an active role in the formation of the movement.

Finally, the third example offers a "wild" population of *Sapajus xanthosternos* living in a preserved while unprotected environment. The environment, however, is shared with human populations. The women of the communities of Siribinha and Poças are used to meet them during crab fishing in the mangroves. The other-than-human primates respond to these encounters in diverse ways, highlighting flexibility in their attitude toward humans that cannot be reduced, again, to the instinctual. Moreover, the inability of the researcher trying to study them in the area, to modify her comportment according to their preferences, which caused the failure of the research attempt, did not produced the expected "habituation", demonstrating how their willingness to approach humans is not only related to the presence but rather to the reciprocal "domestication". If these agencies can be observed as voluntary, they also act involuntarily. Their simple presence, as in the previous cases, promotes a redefinition of the area, mobilising diverse human actors in the promotion of strategies for the environmental conservation destination of the area.

As discussed in the beginning of this paper, the "wild" and "domesticated" dichotomy has been historically observed as a progressive transformation of the environment and its other-than-human inhabitants by the human actions. As discussed by Sigaut (1988), the "domestication" process is crossed by diverse plans: the appro-

priation, the familiarization and the utilization. These plans are not necessarily present in every human and other-than-human collective, but they are an epistemological tool for the delimitation of the multispecies processes. In the cases related in this paper, we can observe as the *Macaca fascicularis, Chlorocebus sabaeus*, *Procolobus badius* and *Sapajus xanthosternos* are appropriated, familiarized and utilized in diverse ways. Following in this direction, such examples indicate the necessity to observe a diverse scale of relations between the "species" and the "individuals". *Macaca fascicularis* at Semproniano have been "liberated" as a species in the public discourse of the animalist movement, while the keeper produced relations with "individuals" that are reduced in cages. An example that clearly indicates the necessity to proliferate the agentivities involved in the interspecific relational web. Similar discrepancies between the collective and the individual insertions in the plans appointed by Sigaut could be observed also in the other two described examples.

In this sense, a redefinition of the frontier between "wild" and "domesticated" should be discussed concomitantly with a multilevel description of species' and individuals' relations. This proliferation could let a more dynamic and complex multispecies network to emerge. *Procolobus badius temminckii* individuals showing a *Chlorocebus sabaeus* typical behaviour are a clear example of how the human and other-than-human primates collective is crossed by subjectivities that can not separate the "human" and the "other-than-human" in a dichotomy "subject" and "object". Specific individuals act diversely in the interspecific network. Moreover, this diversity requires to take it seriously, at the risk of the failure of the relation, as in the case of the primatologist unable to make a relation with *Sapajus xanthosternos* effective.

This view gave space to the idea of domestication process as interspecific encounters producing reciprocal influences and common collectives, in which the actors should be accessed as both individuals and species, producing a multiple scale of relations. Additionally, such levels are reciprocal. As humans on other-than-humans, also other-than-humans realize operations that can be described through the modification they produce on the counterpart (SIGAUT, 1994) In the cases presented here, human and other-than-human primates act reciprocally in transforming the bio-social environment they live in. As flagship in media campaign for funds, as touristic attrac-

tions, and as endangered species, other-than-human primates act in social, political, economical ways. Recognizing these agentivities, being voluntary or involuntary, means to accept that the bio-social environment is composed by multiple reciprocal influences, alternatively defining a "wild" or a "domesticated" panorama.

The concepts of "wild" and "domesticated" appear to be useful tools for defining the modalities in which the interspecific encounters are activated. As discussed by Deleuze (1994), the encounter with the otherness has a transformative power. In this direction, to "domesticate" is to define a modality of encounter with the other in which the perspective (VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, 1998) orients the relation. *Macaca fascicularis*, *Chlorocebus sabaeus*, *Procolobus badius* and *Sapajus xanthosternos* show, with their collective and individual agencies, that to observe human and other-than-human collective researchers require mediating between human and other-than-human perspectives. While humans domesticate, impose their perspective of the environment or of a species, other-than-human primates do the opposite movement, imposing their own perspective on the relations.

As poetically expressed by Anna Tsing: "A wheel turns because of its encounter with the surface of the road; spinning in the air it goes nowhere" (2005, p. 5). To domesticate the wild in these human and other-than-human primates collectives appears to be the possibility to affirm the agentivity, to make the wheel turning through the encounter with the other. By assuming that wild and domesticated are relational definitions it is possible to rethink the society as produced by a plethora of multispecies interrelations. The "social" consequently is dislocated toward the interaction, not being a human prerogative, wild and domestication as relational processes define the arrangement of the social as a dynamic interaction. The concerns derived by environmental struggles produced by human impacts on the environment could be seen as a distortion of these interrelations. It means an overwhelming power of a specific perspective in its attempt to "domesticate" – here with the meaning of "control" – the wild constituted by other resisting perspectives. Recognizing other-than-human primates agentivities in multispecies collectives open the possibility to being domesticated, to accept the human wild position toward other-than-humans.

REFERENCES

BARUA, Maan. Encounter. **Environmental Humanities**, Durham, v. 7, n. 1, p. 265-270, 2015.

CANDEA, Matei. Different species, one theory: Reflections on anthropomorphism and anthropological comparison. **Cambridge Anthropology**, New York and Oxford, v. 30, n. 2, p. 118-135, 2012.

CASSIDY, Rebecca; MULLIN, Molly (Ed.). **Where the Wild Things Are Now:** Domestication Reconsidered. Oxford and New York: Berg, 2007.

CAUVIN, Jacques. **The Birth of the Gods and the Origins of Agriculture**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

CHILDE, Gordon. **What Happened in History**. New York: Penguin, 1942.

CLUTTON-BROCK, Juliet. Introduction to domestication. *In:* CLUTTON-BROCK, Juliet. (Ed.). **The walking larder:** Patterns of domestication, pastoralism and predation. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989, p. 7-9.

CORBEY, Raymond. **The metaphysics of apes:** Negotiating the animal-human boundary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

CRUTZEN, Paul; STOERMER, Eugene F. The 'Anthropocene'. **Global Change Newsletter**, Stockholm, v. 41, p. 17-18, May 2000.

DARWIN, Charles. **The Variation of Animals and Plants Under Domestication**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

DE WAAL, Franz. Anthropomorphism and anthropodenial: Consistency in our thinking about humans and other animals. **Philosophical Topics**, Fayetteville, v. 27, n. 1, p. 255-280, 2000.

DELEUZE, Gilles. **Difference and Repetition**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

DOOREN, Thom; KIRKSEY, Eben; MÜNSTER, Ursula. Multispecies Studies Cultivating Arts of Attentiveness. **Environmental Humanities**, Durham, v. 8, n. 1, p. 1-23, 2016.

FORTI, Martina. **Interactions Among Primates**. Time budgets and interspecific relations between Green Vervet Monkeys and Western Red Colobus at Bijilo Forest Ecotourism Park, The Gambia. 2017a. MSc Dissertation (MSc in Primate Conservation), Oxford Brookes University, Oxford.

FORTI, Martina. Time budgets, social behaviour and human impacts among green vervet monkeys and western red colobus at Bijilo Forest Ecotourism Park, The Gambia. **Canopy**, v. 18, n. 1, p. 19-22, 2017b.

FRANTZ, Laurent; LARSON, Greger. A genetic perspective on the domestication continuum. *In:* STÉPANOFF, C.; VIGNE, J-D. (Ed.). **Hybrid Communities:** Biosocial Approaches to Domestication and Other Trans-species Relationships. London and New York: Routledge, 2019, p. 23-37.

FUENTES, Augustin. Ethnoprimatology and the anthropology of the human-primate interface. **Annual Review of Anthropology**, Palo Alto, n. 41, p. 101-117, 2012.

HANSON, Katherine; RILEY, Erin. Beyond Neutrality: the Human-Primate Interface During the Habituation Process. **International Journal of Primatology**, v. 39, n. 5, p. 852-877, 2018.

HARAWAY, Donna. Primatology is Politics by Other Means. **Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association**, n. 2, p. 489-524, 1984.

HODDER, Ian. **The Domestication of Europe:** Structure and Contingency in Neolithic Societies. Oxford: Blackwells, 1993.

INGOLD, Tim. Prospect. *In:* INGOLD, Tim; PALSSON, Gisli (Ed.). **Biosocial Becomings:** Integrating Social and Biological Anthropology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, p.1-21.

KIRKSEY, Eben; HELMREICH, Stefan. The Emergence of Multispecies Ethnography. **Cultural Anthropology**, v. 25, n. 4, p. 545-576, 2010.

LATOUR, Bruno. A Collective of Humans and Nonhumans: Following Daedalus Labyrinth. *In:* **Pandora's Hope**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999, p.174-215.

LEE, Phyllis. Sharing space: Can ethnoprimatology contribute to the survival of nonhuman primates in human-dominated globalized landscapes? **American Journal of Primatology**, n. 72, p. 925–931, 2010.

LÉVI-STRAUSS, Claude. **La Pensée Sauvage**. Paris: Plon, 1962.

LESCUREUX, Nicolas. Beyond wild and domestic. Human complex relationships with dogs, wolves, and wolf-dog hybrids. *In:* STEPANOFF, Charles; VIGNE, Jean-Denis (Ed.). **Hybrid Communities.** Biosocial Approaches to Domestication and Other Trans-species Relationships. London: Routledge, 2018, p.83-98.

MCKINNEY, Tracie; DORE, Kerry. The State of Ethnoprimatology: Its Use and Potential in Today's Primate Research. **International Journal of Primatology**, v. 39, n. 5, p. 730-748, 2018.

MILTON, Kay. Anthropomorphism or egomorphism?. *In:* KNIGHT, John (Ed.). **Animals in person:** Cultural perspectives on human-animal intimacy. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2005, p.255-271.

MONTGOMERY, Sy. **Walking with the Great Apes:** Jane Goodall, Dian Fossey, Biruté Galdikas. White River Junction: Chelsea Green Publishing, 2009.

PRĘGOWSKI, Michal (Ed.). **Companion Animals in Everyday Life:** Situating Human-Animal Engagement within Cultures. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

REES, Amanda. Animal agents? Historiography, theory and the history of science in the Anthropocene. **BJHS: Themes**, Cambridge, v. 2, p. 1-10, 2017.

REES, Amanda. Reflections on the field: Primatology, popular science, and the politics of personhood. **Social Studies of Science**, v. 37, n. 6, p. 881-907, 2007.

REGAN, Tom. **The case for animal rights**. Berkley: University of California Press, 1983.

RICHARDS, Martin. The Neolithic invasion of Europe. **Annual Review of Anthropology**, Palo Alto, v. 32, p. 135-162, 2003.

RILEY, Erin; FUENTES, Augustin; DORE, Kerry. Introduction: Doing ethnoprimatology in the Anthropocene. *In:* DORE, Kerry M.; RILEY, Erin; FUENTES, Agustín (Ed.). **Ethno-**

primatology: A practical guide to research at the human-nonhuman interface. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017, p. 1-6.

RILEY, Erin; WOLFE, Linda; FUENTES, Augustin. Ethnoprimatology: Contextalizing human and nonhuman primate interactions. *In:* CAMPBELL, Christina J. *et al.* (Ed.). **Primates in Perspective**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, p.676-686.

RUSSELL, Nerissa. The Domestication of Anthropology. *In:* CASSIDY, Rebecca; MULLIN, Molly (Ed.). **Where the Wild Things Are Now:** Domestication Reconsidered. Oxford: Berg, 2007, p. 27-48.

SÁ, Guilherme. Outra espécie de companhia. Intersubjetividade entre primatólogos e primatas. **Anuário Antropológico**, Brasília, v. II, n. 2, p. 77-110, 2012.

SETCHELL, Joanna M. *et al.* Biosocial Conservation: Integrating Biological and Ethnographic Methods to Study Human-Primate Interactions. **International Journal of Primatology**, v. 38, 401-426, 2017.

SIGAUT, François. Critique de la notion de domestication. **L'Homme**, Paris, v. 28, n. 108, p. 50-71, 1988.

SIGAUT, François. Technology. *In:* INGOLD, Tim (Org.). **Companion encyclopedia of anthropology:** humanity, culture and social life. London: Routledge, 1994, p. 420-459.

STÉPANOFF, Charles; VIGNE Jean-Denis (Ed.). **Hybrid Communities:** Biosocial Approaches to Domestication and Other Trans-species Relationships. London and New York: Routledge, 2019.

SWANSON, Heater Anne; LIEN, Marianne Elisabeth; WEEN Gro (Ed.). **Domestication gone wild:** Politics and practices of multispecies relations. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2018.

TSING, Anna Lowenhaupt. **Friction:** An Ethnography of Global Connection. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

TSING, Anna Lowenhaupt. **The Mushroom at the End of the World:** On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.

TSING, Anna Lowenhaupt. Nine provocations for the study of domestication. *In:* SWANSON, Heather Anne; lien, Marianne Elisabeth; WEEN, Gro B. (Ed.). **Domestication gone wild:** Politics and practices of multispecies relations. Durham and London: Duke University Press, p. 231-251, 2018.

VIGNE, Jean-Denis. Early Domestication and Farming: What Should We Know or Do for a Better Understanding?. **Anthropozoologica**, Paris, v. 50, n. 2, p. 123-150, 2015.

VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, Eduardo. Cosmological Deixis and Amerindian Perspectivism. **Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute**, London, v. 4, n. 3, p. 469-488, 1998.

WHITEN, Andrew; HORNER, Victoria; MARSHALL-PESCINI, Sarah. Cultural panthropology. **Evolutionary Anthropology**, v. 12, n. 2, p. 92-105, 2003.

Recebido em: 18/03/2020
Aceito para publicação em: 17/12/2020