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Colin Allen

Greg Radick’s *The Simian Tongue* is a superb book. But because it is in the nature of academic reviewing to find something to prod the author about, I will focus on one of his featured conclusions. Near the beginning of his final chapter he writes, “So twice, following two quite different paths, history generated the primate playback experiment” (366). Near the end of the chapter, he comes back to this theme, writing, “the book has sought to explain how the primate playback experiment, as publicly important science, came to be invented when it was, how it came to disappear when it did, and how it came to be reinvented when it was” (378–379). Eight decades after Richard Garner was thwarted in his plan to take a phonograph to Gabon, Robert Seyfarth and Dorothy Cheney went to Kenya to study vervet monkeys with recording equipment in tow. It is true that their plans overlapped insofar as these entailed recording the vocalizations of their simian subjects and playing them back in order to observe the primates’ responses. But in what sense were these two expeditions aimed at carrying out the same experiment? Indeed, to what extent is there such a thing as the primate playback experiment?

Garner’s 1893 activities at the fringes of the St. Anne’s mission are shrouded in mystery and controversy. Radick is sympathetic to Garner’s defense against the explicit charges of fraud that were leveled against him. But regardless of whether he left bills unpaid or fired his rifle at gorillas, the fact is that Garner managed to do little by way of producing actual scientific results. Conwy Lloyd Morgan, whom Radick portrays as eagerly awaiting Garner’s return from the Congo, eventually came to regard Garner as, Radick writes, “a tender-minded amateur” (86). For Morgan, who in the 1890s was at the forefront of rejecting George Romanes’s anecdotal approach and urging the adoption of more rigorous experimental methods among comparative psychologists, the disappointment must have been acute. So, what went wrong? Did Garner have a good idea for an experiment, but poor execution? Or was he a rank amateur even in the business of experimental design?

Radick’s discussion of Garner’s methods does not fully enlighten. In the section of chapter three titled “A Closer Look at Garner’s Experiment and Theoretical Programme”, there is a page-long description by a journalist who observed Garner at work in New York’s Central Park Zoo in 1891, mostly detailing the difficulties of positioning the phonograph’s horn so as to get a clear recording of the monkeys (a term that in the writings of the day seems sometimes also to refer to apes). Radick also describes Garner’s interactions with freshly arrived contingent of rhesus macaques: “When Garner recorded the local word for ‘salutations’ and repeated it to the new monkeys, their excited response showed, he believed that the word was their word too” (99). Did Garner attempt any experimental controls to support this belief? Since this was their first experience with the playback, would other sounds have produced the
same degree of excitement? We will never know. Contrast this with the long excerpt of
the letter from Seyfarth and Cheney sent to their postdoctoral advisor Peter Marler in
late 1977, where controls for playback experiments are explicitly discussed (350).
Furthermore, the Kenyan experiments were undertaken against a backdrop of
information about the functional significance of various calls made by vervet monkeys
that had been gathered in the field by Marler’s former student, Thomas Struhsaker.
Where Garner’s ‘experiments’ seem rather like a fishing expedition, Cheney and
Seyfarth designed their experiments with specific questions in mind.

Undoubtedly Radick is right that the conditions and equipment available to Seyfarth and
Cheney were a major factor in the success of their experiments. The nineteenth century
phonograph made successful recording and playback difficult enough in a major
metropolitan zoo and was practically doomed to fail in a cage on the edge of the forest
in Africa. Directional microphones, and speakers small enough to be hidden in the
bushes, along with a greater understanding of the role that distance plays in different
communicative interactions (338), all favored the efforts in the late 1970s. But still, I
think we should not ignore the development of the controlled experiment under natural
or naturalistic conditions as a kind of technological development that also separates
Garner from the ethologists of the late twentieth Century.

There’s a distinction here between experimental technique and experimental design.
Garner had a very clever idea, to use recording equipment to capture and then measure
the responses of animals to their own vocalizations. But even had the equipment been
up to standards of the transistor age, it is far from clear that he would have known what
to do with it. In discussing influences on Marler, Radick refers to J. Bruce Falls’s work
on playback experiments in the 1960s with captive birds and artificially modified songs
as “a kind of acoustic updating of what Lack had done with a stuffed robin and
Tinbergen with cardboard hawks” (303). And although Marler, Seyfarth, and Cheney
eschewed the use of synthesized vocalizations in their field work, they were
nevertheless the beneficiaries of the Tinbergenian development of an experimental
tradition in ethology. By the 1960s, there were ideas in the air about what to do with
playbacks, of which Garner could not be a beneficiary. And in the three decades since
the initial success of Marler, Cheney, and Seyfarth, the field playback technique has
been widely copied for many different experiments upon a wide range of primate and
non-primate subjects. Not one playback experiment, but many.

“We have seen”, Radick writes in his final paragraph, “what the experiment-guided
exploration of the meaning of primate vocalizations meant for Garner, his
contemporaries, and his successors, with these meanings recuperated through
reconstruction of contexts from Darwin to Chomsky (and Chimpsky), down to the vervet
research of Marler, Cheney, and Seyfarth” (380). He continues, “The primate playback
that in Garner’s hands revealed evolution’s hierarchies undermined them in Marler’s,
Cheney’s, and Seyfarth’s hands” (ibid.). Well, yes, they drew very different lessons, but
from what? Not from the same experiments, I would argue—nor even may it be
accurate to describe Garner’s work as “experiment-guided explorations”. And while it
may seem churlish to ask for more from such a rich book as Radick has provided, I
would like to urge future historians and philosophers of ethology to give experiments and their multiple roles the kind of attention that has been afforded to other disciplines by historians and philosophers of experimentation.