

Dealing with the devil

An ethnographic study of human-animal relations
and the making of the wild and the domestic

Marianne Steinkjer



Master Thesis

Department of Social Anthropology

University of Oslo

May 2016

Dealing with the devil:

An ethnographic study of human-animal relations and
the making of the wild and the domestic.

Marianne Steinkjer

Master Thesis



© Marianne Steinkjer

2016

Dealing with the devil: An ethnographic study of human-animal relations and the making of the wild and the domestic.

Print: Mail Boxes etc, Oslo

IV

Abstract

In this thesis I will take a dip into the world of multi-species ethnography, and through this explore the relations between humans and Tasmanian devils in captivity. Tasmanian devils are at risk of becoming extinct, due to habitat loss, road kill accidents, but most importantly due to a deadly disease called *Devil Facial Tumor Disease*. To preserve the Tasmanian devils as a "wild" species in captivity there have been enacted practices by animal keepers and volunteers resembling those of domestication, which leads to new ways of interaction with and perception of this species. Based on a five-month fieldwork in Tasmania in 2015, my ethnography is centered around two conservation parks for Tasmanian devils that are partaking in the national breeding program and conservation work of marsupial carnivores.

First, through ethnographic descriptions and with a performative approach I will show how different devils are "created" through practices of interaction, and how a performance of the wild coexists alongside the domestic practices in the captive devil population.

I have looked at specific breeding practices and how practices of feeding, breeding and confinement entangles human and devil lives. I have also explored different ways of enacting care, from close and embodied by animal keepers, to emotional and imagined by tourists, and how different animals make the keepers and volunteers into different types of caregivers. By focusing on the nexus of practices that go into Tasmanian devil conservation, my aim is to use empirical descriptions to argue for networks of relations in a process of becoming and the world in the *making*, in that the world is not fixed, but is made through human and non-human practices.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I will give a special thanks to the amazing staff at the Devil Rescue for helping me with my research and sharing their knowledge with me. Also, thanks to the staff at Tarrabah for letting me share their experiences as well, and thanks to all the volunteers I encountered throughout my fieldwork. And of course, thanks to the young wombats at the Devil Rescue for brightening everyone's day, but not for the pee under my bed at 2am. I hope you will find your place and a nice borrow in the Tasmanian wilderness.

I also want to thank Marianne Lien for helping me with ideas and the preparations for the fieldwork and for being a strong support throughout the writing process. I have always left our conversations and meetings with a new-found confidence and motivation.

Special thanks go to friends and family for your support, and to my co-students for energetic discussions, laughs and mental support when needed.

Last I want to thank Ainar Drews for proofreading my thesis, helping me disentangle some of my complicated thoughts and sentences, and for being there for me through all these years

Table of contents

Abstract	V
Acknowledgements	VII
Table of contents	IX
1 Introduction	1
The devil's advocate	1
Theoretical perspectives and research questions.....	4
Methodological considerations and ethics - contact and engagement	8
Techniques of data collection and position in the field.....	10
Thesis outline	12
2 A guide through the captive wilderness	13
First arrival	13
The devil rescue	15
Devils and their humans	16
Other animals as an afterthought.....	19
Layout and enclosures	20
A day at work at the Devil Rescue	22
Tarrabah as a second field site	27
Captive, wild and Pre-released devils	28
3 Has the devil been tamed? On devils and domestication.....	30
The hard world outside.....	30
Captivity as a way of life.....	34
Born to be wild	38
Interactions that create the devil.....	42
In-between wild and tame	45
The social devil	46
4 Captive breeding to become wild.....	49
Practices in breeding devils.....	50
Predicting the future and worrying about the past	52
Marsupial pouch checking	55
Legislated recommendations or subjective personality?.....	58
The devil on a leash?.....	61

Making marsupial families.....	62
Reproducing relations	63
5 Confinement, care and park economics	65
The devil is in the detail	66
Shielded from the outside world	67
Devils out of place - When confinement fails.....	68
The painful moments of care.....	74
Caring through an imaginary relation	76
Making marsupials matter - adoption practices	78
6 Concluding remarks	81
References	83

1 Introduction

The sound of screams filled the air as the wildlife park's guide led a small crowd of people up to a chest high, black fence, sealing in an area filled with grass, trees and bushes. The small crowd scattered along the fence, leaning forward on the fence where there was a small clearing between the trees and bushes. Everyone looked down at two small, black animals, chasing each other back and forth, soon disappearing in between the tall bushes and reaping on top of a mound. The sun, warm and clear, made sweat run freely, but the screams, snarls, and growls coming from the two animals were enough to send chills down the spine.

The young guide picked up a small bucket, half hidden around the corner, and jumped into a closed-off area slightly higher taller than the ground beside the animal enclosure. He introduced the animals; "This is the Tasmanian devil, it is a wild native species in Tasmanian, and unique to this island". As he opened the lid to his bucket, he apologetically said; "I just have to warn everyone that in this bucket, I have small pieces of raw meat with the fur still attached". He picked up a piece of meat covered with gray fur on top, and tossed it into the enclosure with the devils chasing each other. Even more screams erupted, and the devils started fighting, biting and clawing each other, in order to be the first to eat. The guide hurriedly tossed a second piece of meat, and one of the devils turned around to fetch it. As the guide informed the small crowd about the Tasmanian devil, their life, history, and a threatening disease called *Devil Facial Tumor Disease*, as well as the conservation work and a captive breeding program for the Tasmanian devils, the devils lay on the ground and chewed on meat, fur, and bones, while people watched and took pictures. This was my first encounter with Tasmanian devils, and the people willingly working with this aggressive species.

* * *

The devil's advocate

There is a crisis unfolding on the Tasmanian island, marsupial carnivores are experiencing shrinking population numbers, but none more so than the Tasmanian Devil. This endemic animal is close to extinction, and even with its devilish behavior, humans have reached out in

an effort to save the species' future. This thesis will raise questions concerning human-animal relations, in an effort to explore the interactions and performance that I experienced at two wildlife parks in Tasmania. I will look at the Tasmanian Devils in light of anthropological domestication theory to better understand practices of human interaction with the animals at the wildlife parks "The Devil Rescue" and "Tarrabah"¹, in order to discuss the transformative relations that are created. Tasmanian devils are seen as wild animals by my informants, animal keepers, tourists and the state, but to understand their position and their relations to humans, it is important to take a step back and look at the actual practices of intimacy, feeding and control that can rather point us towards a view of domestication in process. The "Save the Tasmanian devil" program, initiated by the Tasmanian state, employed conservation strategies like breeding in captivity, vaccination trials, and the release of healthy devils into the wild. But why am I focusing on this antipodean animal?

First, I will give a short introduction to the region my studies took place, since nature, animals and conservation have a long and conflicted history in Australia. Tasmania is an Australian Island state, located South of the mainland in the Tasman Sea. This island is known for its pristine nature, landscape variety, its endemic wildlife and its wilderness experience, which are now attracting a lot of tourism. Tasmania is said to be a nature state, where 45 % of its landscape is protected as reserves, national parks and world heritage sites. But the valuation of Tasmania's antipodean nature and animal species has not always been the case. Australia was colonized by the British in the late 18th century, but it was a remote and unfamiliar landscape for the early settlers and ex-convicts (Lien 2007: 106). Through the "project to Britainise the Australian landscape", as Adrian Franklin refers to the period from 1788 until the last quarter of the nineteenth century, European plants and animals of both domestic and wild species were introduced to Australia and Tasmania to make the landscape more familiar (Franklin 1996: 48). At the same time, native Tasmanian animals were hunted, through which some animals became eradicated while others survived. Nowadays, with the new environmental focus, there has been a shift in the view of native animal and plant species towards conservation. The introduced species are often referred to as "invasive species", and

1

"The Devil Rescue" and "Tarrebah" are both anonymized names I have given to the conservation parks. All the people I have interacted with from these wildlife parks have likewise been anonymized.

seen as threatening the native flora and fauna in Australia and Tasmania. There is, as Lien describes; "a relatively recent but significant turn in Tasmanian engagements with the natural environment that involve first and foremost a keen awareness of the distinction between native species and introduced species, a concomitant valuation and facilitation of the former, and a parallel devaluation and eradication of the latter". (Lien 2007: 114)

This shines through in the conservation work of the Tasmanian devils, that were hunted and feared in the early 1900s, but has now become an icon of protection for animal species in Tasmania. This relatively sudden attention directed at the Tasmanian devil conservation efforts, most of all stems from the appearance of a deadly disease that has spread through the wild devil population, called "Devil facial tumor disease", which is exclusively connected to the devils, and does not yet have a vaccine. Its estimated that the wild population had declined with 60% the last 10 years (The IUNC red list of threatened species n.d.). The "*Save the Tasmanian devil*" program was developed by the Australian state to lead national conservation work, in order to prevent a long predicted extinction of the devils. The *save the Tasmanian devil* program make use of different strategies to ensure the devils futures, amongst these is to breed devils in breeding facilities, both on Tasmania and on the Australian mainland, in order to maintain a healthy insurance population in case the devil becomes extinct in the wild.

"*Save the Tasmanian devil* program's insurance strategy aims to build a devil facial tumor disease (DFTD) free population to able to secure the species against a possible extinction event 25-30 years from now and to facilitate its recovery beyond that" (Lees and Andrew 2012), is how the official aims for the captive insurance population are formulated. There is this captive breeding strategy I will explore through my thesis, by focusing my fieldwork on the practices carried out by staff members at two wildlife parks that are participating in the breeding program for Tasmanian devils. I will do this in order to explore what kind of new relations and identity formations this close contact between humans-and devils leads to. The "Tasmanian devil insurance meta-population: 2012 evaluation and strategy review" (Lees and Andrew 2012), clearly states strategies of how to keep Tasmanian devils wild, by encouraging natural behavior and by encouraging enclosures in wildlife parks that mimic the natural landscape of the devils. At the same time the devils are being confined, fed and bred by humans, which is traditionally traits for domesticated animals, and a contrast worth exploring.

The *Save the Tasmanian devil* program is working on release programs as well, where healthy devils are released on islands and in parts of Tasmania where the DFTD isn't present.²

As an ethnographic region, Australia has been an important site for anthropological research reaching back all the way to the first fieldwork conducted by Europeans on Australian aborigines (Spencer and Gillen 1969). Ethnography shows that the Australian Aborigines have had a central place in anthropological theory, but there is, however, also another much studied field in Australia as well, namely the non-human world of animals, plants and materials. This has emerged from the early studies of the Aborigine's dreaming, totemism, and their relations to animals, and shifted later to a recent focus on introduced species that threaten the lives of native Australian flora and fauna (Franklin 2006). The protection efforts of native species that entangle animal and human lives together (Jacobsen 2014, Bird Rose 2008), and studies about the eradication of the invasive and threatening animals also show this (Nyquist 2013). Thus, Animals and nature have for a long time had a central role in the anthropological research in Australia, where managing nature has been a central focus of attention. Here, I will build on the long constituted themes of regional studies, but with a new approach with employing anthropological domestication theory to further explore ethnographic-specific human and animal practices in captivity, that have as a long term goal the conservation of a native species and thus the management of nature.

Theoretical perspectives and research questions

Animals in anthropological study are not a subject, early anthropologists were also interested in how humans live with animals, taking Evans-Pritchard's (1940) research on Nuer society. as example, where according to him we cannot understand Nuer culture without understanding their relationship with their cows. There is a long history in the anthropological

2

There has already been a release of Tasmanian devils on Maria island, devils have been released and successfully bred in the wild. A vaccine trials that started in early 2015, where healthy devils with a newly developed vaccine were released at Narawintapo national park. Other release programs were planned in 2015, where a group of devils from the Devil Rescue were being set free on the Forestier Peninsula in November. <http://www.tassiedevil.com.au/tasdevil.nsf/TheProgram/DF1C161FEB608E6BCA257DB700107BD0?OpenDocument>

field of animal studies, where animals have played an important role, but often different paths and different approaches have been used to understand humans and other non-human worlds. Animals have often been understood as symbols, and have been studied as part of human cosmologies (Douglas 1957), and they are "good to think with" as Levi-Strauss (1962) famously said, referring to humans using animals as totemic categorical systems. Animals have also been studied as utilities, in how people use animals for food or as work animals (Rappaport 1984).

In more recent years, an environmental approach to study animals and nature has often been taken, where humans' use of space, landscape, and nature. One example is the development of national parks, as in St Lucia, South-Africa, as written about by Knut Nustad (2012), or studying native and introduced animal and plant species that originally do not belong, which has been a highlighted focus in Australia (Franklin 2006). With my focus on human-animal relations and its practices in this thesis, the present work may be said to fall under what has been called "multi-species ethnography" (Kirksey and Helmreich 2010). This approach has led to many anthropological studies the past years, where the focus has been on exploring more-than-human worlds, in order to study the relations humans and other non-human animals create with their surroundings, in order to understand other species and materials as actors in networks of relations. Non-human animals are seen as more than just mirrors into human worlds (Mullin 1999), but also social beings as well, as Anna Tsing (2014) argues in "more-than-human sociality". Lien (2015) as well argues that domestication of salmon creates a *becoming together* in human and animals relations.

As Bronislaw Szerszynski states in the introduction to "Nature performed"; "...researchers and theorists have moved towards seeing nature and nature-human relations in terms not of static structures and rules but *activity*." (Szerszynski et. all. 2003: 1). To follow this thought, Jon Henrik Remme writes that "there has been a turn away from pure epistemological questions about people's knowledge or *representations* of the world, to open up for ontological questions about *how* people produce their worlds" (Remme 2013: 8), and through this performance and a focus on practices has been highlighted. In this performative turn, the world is seen as "something that *becomes* through the relations that are performed in practice" (Ween and Flikke 2009). This ethnographic focus on practices can open up the field of social science to explore nature, other non-human animals, and even things and materiality. In this thesis I will build on this by analyzing practices that constitute the new human-devil relations

developed in captivity, by studying different interactions between two groups of devils, practices of breeding devils, and finally the enactment of care at wildlife parks in Tasmania.

With this new focus on humans and non-humans in the anthropological field of study, Actor-Network Theory (ANT) has been used to explain animals as actors and subjects. In the 1980s, Actor-Network theory introduced the term of the actant, in order to study animals and materials, which, as Risan writes, distinguishes itself from the Actor, "in that the actor is an actant equipped with character" (Risan 2003: 20). These characters are often seen to be maximizing, aware or intentional which non-human animals and materials lacked. But, as he continues; "it is, however, also good reason to think that animals are a type of subjects or actors. They are not just doing something, but they are something as well" (Risan 2003: 20). With this understanding of devils as actors and subjects, we can further explore their relations to humans. By taking it a step further, seeing the Tasmanian devils as more than just passive objects used by humans, we are able to take Anna Tsing's proposal of "more-than-human sociality" seriously, and explore the devil's sociality with their surroundings as well (Tsing 2014).

When researching my chosen field of study, and human-animal relations, before I traveled to Tasmania, I was inspired by writings about habituation, such as Matei Candea's (2010) study which explores human-meerkat relations in The Kalahari Desert, and Yuka Suzuki 's (2007) discussion about captive lions being performed as wild in front of tourists. With the present focus on domestication that has been taken up by anthropologists like Molly Mollin and Rebecca Cassidy (2007), but also given the attention about domestication that have been held during several conferences in Norway (Decenter Domestication 2014, and the arctic domestication project at CAS), I wanted to contribute to this field with a case study about relations between human and animals that exist in-between domestic and wild. This came from a wish to be able to discuss these concepts further, and to see human and animal relations as they develop, as well as to investigate how a traditionally wild species that is being bred in captivity, to later repopulate the island of Tasmania, can be *made* through practices.

In the divide between culture and nature, a common narrative is to see nature as opposite to culture, something untamed and untouched, and domestication is seen as something familiar and controlled. Latour (1993) stated in his book "We have never been modern" that there have always only been hybrids between nature and society. Can the same be said about wild and

domestic? I will discuss this throughout this thesis, and will use the devils as an example of an animal that challenges the wild and domestic categories. When I am here referring to domestic, I am not referring to the devils as pets, or even fully tamed animals. Theories about domestication in anthropology emphasize the *relations* between humans and animals, and conventional accounts often paint a picture of total human mastery over the animals at hand, whether this pigs, cows or dogs. The most common definition of domestication in anthropology was established by Juliet Clutton-Brock. She wrote that domestication is "a cultural and biological process [...] that can only take place when tamed animals are incorporated into the social structure of the human group and become objects of ownership". Domesticated animals were here defined as "Bred in captivity for purposes of economic profit to a human community that maintains complete mastery over its breeding organization, of territory and food supply" (1998: 7). By seeing the human-devil relations in light of domestication theory, in practices of feeding, breeding and confinement, we can obtain a greater understanding of human-animal relations in captivity, but can also become able to understand how "the wild" can be performed in these animal-conservation practices.

William Cronon (1996) traces the historical roots of nature-conservation back to an idea of wilderness, arguing that it is inherently fraught with inconsistencies and contradiction. But, as Thomas Jacobsen points out, "by dismissing concepts like wilderness or nature/culture dualisms as inconsistent or even false, this can fail to take seriously how these symbols and imaginaries might really mean something to people, despite their non-coherent character and how they even come to produce realities in themselves" (Jacobsen 2014: 10) As Szerszynski et. al. writes; "Nature can be many different things, from materiality to a process, being performed in causality or evolution. Nature is even a world of meanings and significance" (Szerszynski et. el. 2003: 2). With this in mind it is important to remember that the relations between humans and Tasmanian devils are not fixed, or finished, but in a process of becoming (Lien 2015).

When thinking within actor-network theory, and using performativity as a methodological approach, we can see how relations and networks are produced, maintained, and reproduced in action and everyday practices. I took this approach with me into the field when traveling to Tasmania to study practices in which the devils are made in captivity, and how they are performed as wild in front of visitors.

The main theme of this study is the tension between the devil's apparent position between being seen as wild, living in a mimicked wild nature behind fences, but being entangled in practices that can be discussed as being domestic. This position was already shown in the empirical introductory story with the two fighting devils. As I have already mentioned, my focus is on human-devil relations in captivity. I will look at how different groups of devils are being enacted in performance of daily practices between humans and the animals at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah. I do this to explore how the *right* Tasmanian devil is being made for the *right* environment. But my interest does not just encompass how the devils are made to be wild, or how they are entangled in domestication practices, but also, through ethnographically observations see how devils socialize with humans, and how, then, we can see the world build on sociality that are more-than human (Tsing 2014)

Methodological considerations and ethics - contact and engagement

This thesis is primarily based on fieldwork carried out at two wildlife parks in Tasmania, among the staff members, volunteers and the tourists visiting these two places. I Arrived in Hobart, the main capital in of Tasmania in late January 2015, and from there headed north to stay at the Devil Rescue throughout my fieldwork. I left Tasmania for Norway again in late June 2015, after a 5 month stay.

I got access to the field by contacting the Devil Rescue in order to ask if I could work as a volunteer while conducting an anthropological study of human and animal relations in a wildlife park. I sent e-mails to many of the suitable parks that I had singled out (those that were part of the breeding program for Tasmanian devils, and that were not traditional zoos with exotic animals), and, of course, where I would be able to function as a volunteer. I was of the opinion that working as a volunteer would give me an opportunity to work close with the keepers and other volunteers, as well as the animals. At the same time would I would be able to stay at one place for a longer period of time. The reciprocity of this relation was also a central factor in this strategy, as I in this way could give labor, while I at the same time could get vital firsthand experience with the Tasmanian animals that were so unfamiliar to me. Of the six sites I contacted, two wildlife parks replied negatively, one was unsure, and so I had a short negotiation with this park about my research, but in the end did not reach an agreement, and the last three did not answer. Finally, however, the devil rescue answered, and the park-

staff proved willing to have a long-term, clueless anthropology student trailing after them while asking questions. A month into my field work, I got in contact with Adam, who was working at another wildlife park, and made the decision to expand my research to include the second park too, as a supplement to the first one. I did, however, not spend enough time at the second park to give a full comparison of the parks, but I choose to take these observations in considerations nonetheless, since these two parks had similar approaches to the animal care and husbandry, and many of the staff members at the Devil Rescue had earlier worked at Tarrabah and vice versa.

Having settled into a daily schedule, I let the surroundings and people take charge. I did a participant observation method, with an emphasize on participation where I worked closely with keepers, volunteers and animals at the Devil Rescue 5-6 days a week. The work days was long in the beginning of my fieldwork, where I 4 times a week participated at the latest night tour, starting 9:30. During the day, I took part in activities and work with other volunteers, that included tasks like making food for herbivore animals, cleaning inside the devil and quoll enclosures with a bucket and a thong, cleaning the localities, refreshing the enclosures with branches, and other tasks that the keepers wanted to be done in the park. Not all the work centered around the animals, maintenance of enclosures, animal housing and park facilities was important, also interaction and handling of tourists during the day or in guided tours. As a volunteer at the Devil Rescue, I had access to the different sets of “roles” that were played out in the park, most of all the keepers, volunteers and the animals, but also to some degree to the tourists that would visit the park during the day and evening visitations and guided tours. At the second wildlife park, Tarrabah, I did mostly observation as I did not work as a volunteer at this place, as well as giving a helping hand when needed. I visited once a week the last seven weeks, and therefor do not have as much data collected from this place. However, as earlier argued, I see the observations and conversations I conducted at Tarrabah as vital as it gave a greater insight to the different practices of working with devils, as well as the conservation work as a whole.

During a long term fieldwork, protection of the informants, and the information given is an important procedure for an anthropologist (Madden 2010). The information I present in this thesis do not touch on sensitive information, but after wishes from my informants I have chosen to anonymize the names of places and people I have worked with and talked to, including the staff workers, volunteers and animals at the two wildlife parks. The protection

of my informants, their wishes and for them to see me as an anthropologist to rely on, has been important for me. The Tasmanian network of wildlife parks are relatively small, with in all 7 wildlife parks. Therefore, to be able to get close and comfortable with the informants I agreed to anonymize my collected information from the beginning of my fieldwork. I informed all the people I interacted with during my fieldwork as well, to explain my project and asked for their consent, which all those I interacted with and have written about agreed to. My informants were not only with me through the field work, but also the writing process were I have always been able to ask questions along the way. The finished thesis is also being easy available in a language they understand.

Techniques of data collection and position in the field

What separates my fieldwork from traditional anthropological research is the fact that I have been studying animals in relations to humans, and thus used non-human animals, as well as humans, as my "informants", and the basis of my data collection.

One of my main methods for information gathering was, as already mentioned, participation and self-learned experience in the encounters with the animals, but also casual, or informal, conversations with my informants. I found this method more appealing than formal interviews, since I often worked together with my informants outside, where I could ask questions during the moment of an event, or while we had breaks in the office where I could always ask questions and get long answers. This way of ethnographic "hanging out" combined with a performative approach in the field, was targeted at gathering information for the research project (Ween and Flikke 2009). My aim for the data collection was also to engage in the practices enacted by my informants, and therefore I saw the conversations as sufficient to my studies. This was also possible, I believe, due to the topic of investigation, something my informants felt passionate about, and liked to talk about during their day.

With this heavily participatory approach, I immersed myself into the field, where the anthropologist is at risk of influence the field more (Madden 2010). I did however not see this as a problem, I did not have more influence on the field and its activities than what other volunteers, and I welcomed the close relations and conversations this led to. After a while as a volunteer at the Devil Rescue I received more responsibility, where I delegated the chores for

other volunteers and could help out the keepers with more demanding tasks that require more experience with the animals, which at the same time led to a more intimate understanding of the keepers embodied and close work with the devils and quolls. This active role that I therefore took on, made note taking in the field difficult when working outside with "dirt on my hands". This led me to take notes of special phrases, quotes, and small details in my notebook in the office or in my cabin during lunch. Fuller notes were taken in the evening, after the end of the workday, and before the night tour I was helping out with. When time was short, I held off writing for some days, until I had a day off work, during which I could write the last few days' notes at once. This, of course, makes it difficult to remember exact quotes and situations, which could be a weakness of this way of taking notes (Madden 2010: 122-125).

I positioned myself as a long term volunteer which gave me a detailed insight in the staff members' workdays and personal life. I will, however, focus on the time I spent with my informants during the working day and the specific practices in the relations between them and the animals they cared for. For this reason, my informants spoke more freely, also in the beginning, as personal information was not shared. After I had built closer relations, and also friendships, I accessed more personal information and was welcomed in to my informants' homes. I felt that neither my gender nor my age were of any concern during my fieldwork. I fell right into the normal volunteer group, and most of the keepers I got acquainted with were thus also in my age group. Most of the keepers with the longest experience of working with devils and other Tasmanian animals were male, but there was a rising amount of female keepers that had worked at the park for a couple of years. In this way I had a personal closeness to the field, even though Tasmania is a remote part of the world, the place of my fieldwork can be said to be cultural similar, in the way I fell right in to the usual age-, gender- and education level that other volunteers and keepers possessed. This closeness to the field can be a challenge, as precautions have to be made to obtain the traditional "outside view" in to the field. "Homeblindnes" (Gullestad 1991) could have made me sensitive for aspects of the conservation work. But at the same time, I chose a field site where I could conduct research in a country and at a conservation park where the animals (and to some degree the language) was unfamiliar and new to me. At the same time, I have not volunteered in a wildlife park before, and thus not been familiar husbandry work before the fieldwork. The "home anthropology" discussed by many Norwegian scholars, shows as well that closeness also can be a benefit, as the societies norms and rules are already known, hence I did not need

to spend much time on understanding the society's codes and I had access to the context for my field.

To extend my research I could have made use of structured interviews with representatives from the "save the Tasmanian devil" program, and to extend the study of care-giving to native animals I could have contacted orphan animal caretakers, that foster young animals in their homes. However, as I conducted my research about practices enacted in animal husbandry in captivity, and the specific relations between humans and devils, I have only focused on two wildlife parks in Tasmania.

Thesis outline

In the second chapter of this thesis I will give an introduction to the field site where I conducted my research and its infrastructure, where I will also introduce my informants and their roles, and give an explanation of concepts used in the thesis. Following this, I will focus on interactions that constitute the human-devil relations in captivity. I will in the third chapter describe the different practices performed in interactions with devils in two distinct groups of devils. Here I will discuss how these devils are being conditioned to humans, and how the devils can be entangled in a process of domestication using Clutton-Brock's classical definition to explore how some devils are captive and others can be *made wild* through performing a different set of interactions. In the fourth chapter I will describe specific practices performed by keepers and volunteers at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah. Breeding as both as a typical domestication practice will be discussed, but in the case of the devils, the practices of selecting genetically different breeding pairs can also be seen as keeping the species wild. Here the definition of domestication cited above by Clutton-Brock will be covered and critically discussed in order to explain domestication of Tasmanian devils and their breeding. In chapter 5, I will focus on care-giving performed by the different groups of people at the wildlife parks, and discuss how confinement can be a form of care when working with animals.

2 A guide through the captive wilderness

In this chapter I will give some insight into my field site, its infrastructure and layout. First I will introduce the Devil Rescue, which was my main sight for data collection, and where I spent most of my days as a volunteer. I will then give an introduction to the different people and animals that inhabited the area and that became important for my study, as I regard both human and animals as my informants. After introducing place and informants, I will give a longer description of a day at work at the Devil Rescue, this to paint a picture of the daily practices that is being performed by me and others in the field. In the end I give a description of what I will refer to as different groups of devils, that will become important for further analysis in the next chapter.

First arrival

When I first visited Devil rescue, I was met by a man named Eric in the reception. He welcomed me, and told me to follow him down to the back room, which was a small office with a lot of paperwork hanging on the walls - kinship tree, regulations, husbandry guidelines, timetables for workers and volunteers etc. There were two big whiteboards on the wall, one of the two had all the enclosure of the park sketched out, with names written inside the enclosures' lines. The other had information and notes written down. Two women in their late twenties sat on a bench and worked on a computer when we come down the stairs. Erik said that they were volunteers, and I was greeted with a hi and a smile. Eric sank down in a chair in front of a stationary computer, and had a number of questions about my stay and what I was going to do at the devil rescue. After some explanation, he mentioned that there can be harsh weather on the mountain, and that I would need good clothes. "There will be shitty weather, a lot of rain and maybe snow in your last month", he warned me. As a Norwegian living in a Nordic country and used to bad weather, I thought this would be a simple task, but later learned that the harsh weather in Tasmania's mountains is indeed harsh when working outside all day.

Eric then took me inside the park in order to give me a quick tour of the relatively small wildlife park. The sun and mountain air hit us when we stepped out of the sliding door leading out of what Eric called the information center, a show room with a projector filled with

benches facing the front of the room. The walls were decorated with paintings of Tasmanian devils and an animal I had not seen before. Eric called it a "Quoll". We stood on a platform with a good view over the park, right in front of us was the first enclosure with a devil running around right under the platform, behind the first was some enclosures with roofs visible, and finally the mountain peaks in the far back. It was quiet, though a couple of people were walking in the back, peeking over the chest high black fences with curious expressions. Erik pointed at the left side of the park and said, "that is what we call the 'new side' of the park", and then pointed to the right; "and that is the 'old side'. We clean the enclosures every other day - the volunteers do that". Erik led the way down some stairs to the left of the platform, then followed the gravel pathway to the left. He stopped in front of a man in his early twenties, who had what looked like a small gray rodent stumbling around his feet. Erick stooped and asked how it was going with "Wendy", they both looked down and the young man said that they had been taking a short walk. Erick introduced me, and the man being introduced as Thomas, and told me that he was one of the staff members at the devil rescue. Eric and I left Thomas and Wendy, and Eric explained more about their daily routines, as well as the work the volunteers usually did. We walked past one enclosure where sudden screams erupted into the silence of the park, followed by deep growls. Eric did not seem to notice it and kept walking past the growls and howls inside one of the roofless enclosures. We walked down a pathway with a chain blocking the way, with a sign hanging from it, reading, "staff only". Eric unhooked one end, let me through, followed, then re-hooked the chain. He then led the way to the "keeper center", where he said the food-preparation area was. Two small cabins, a large blue container, and a tin wall made a square with a car in the middle. To one side there were two big white freezers facing each other, with a short pathway in-between. A fridge and a small black freezer were placed beside these and towards the far-end there was a big wooden stump with an ax laying on top. There was a strong smell and there were hundreds of flies swarming around in the keeper center. Eric pointed and said that they did the meat-prep in "that corner", indicating the stump. "It is the keepers who do the meat-prep. The volunteers make the other food". He walked up to one of the cabins, found his keys and unlocked the door. Saying, "Here is your cabin", and he pushed open the door. This was where I was going to stay for five months, with devils' screams coming from behind the cabin and the flies buzzing around its front.

The Devil Rescue

The Devil Rescue is a conservation park, and sanctuary, for Tasmanian marsupial carnivores, and had positioned themselves in an area that highly draws tourists for national park attractions, as most of the wildlife parks in Tasmania are. Their focus was therefore on three endangered species; the Tasmanian devils as well as the Spotted Tailed Quoll (STQ) and the Eastern Quoll (EQ). The Devil Rescue took part in different conservation strategies for their three species, like for example the nation-wide captive breeding program for Tasmanian devils, called the "insurance population". This breeding program was managed by the Zoological and Aquariums Association (ZAA) in coordination with the Tasmanian Governments 'Save the Tasmanian Devil Program' (STTDP). Similarly, they were partaking in breeding programs for both the STQ and EQ. They do this in order to help save these carnivore species from extinction on the Tasmanian island. All three of the mentioned species are threatened in the wild, most of all the Tasmanian as I will explain more thorough in chapter three. The Devil Rescue housed around 33 devils and 30 Quolls during my stay, as well as three 3 young wombats and 4 pademelons which was herbivore animals and free ranging inside the parks perimeter fences. The wombats and pademelons were taken in as road-kill orphans, and taken care of by the experienced staff members.

As a sanctuary, the park's function was to make the lives of the animals residing at the park as natural as possible, thus the park's enclosures mimicked the devil's natural habitat. However, as well as being a breeding facility and a sanctuary for carnivore species, the park was a tourist park, with huge numbers of visitors in the summer months, a number which steadily declined to a couple of visitors a day during the winter months. Hare the aim was to educate the public about these endangered animal species as well as providing a close experience of Tasmanian marsupial carnivores to the paying visitors.

The Devil Rescue had 3 daily guided tours for tourists, led by one of the keepers at work. These day tours were included in the entrance fee to the park. The Devil Rescue had as well what they called "night tours"³ in the evenings, during the summer season the park held two night tours which had to be played for extra. One was starting at 17.30 and the other at 20.30, while in the winter months they did not offer the latest night tour, duo to few visitors. During

3 The night tour had room for 50 visitors, but a spotlighting tour bus came by with proximally 4-50 additionally visitors, thus means that the night tours could have from 80-100 tourist each in the summer months.

these night tours the carnivorous animals were hand-fed by the keepers or the volunteers. This was done in order so that the tourists could have a chance to see the devils and quolls up close, and information about the three species, about their lifecycle, the threats they are facing and about the conservation work to save these species. During the earlier part of my fieldwork, at a time when the later night-tours were still being held, I would help out and feed the Quolls while one of the keepers was guiding and giving information about the animals. Lastly, the Devil Rescue had a third tour offered to a smaller crowd, where food was served to tourists as well as devils. Due to its organization, this tour was more expensive and was offered relatively recent, and thus I did not have the chance to observe one of these tours. However, up until now I have talked a lot about the devils and the measures taken to save this species - but what exactly is a Tasmanian devil?

Devils and their humans

Some people might have some knowledge about this unusual animal through the popular Looney Tunes character Taz, that is depicting an always hungry and short tempered Tasmanian devil. Through this character, the Tasmanian devil got an international attention, but the later years the Tasmanian devils has become known in a different manner; through an unusual and deadly disease that has led to this species endangered status⁴. The Tasmanian devil, or just “devil”, is the biggest marsupial carnivore in Australia, ever since the "Tasmanian tiger" died out in the 1930s. Devils are the size of a small dog, and their fur is black with distinct white marks on their chest and rump. The white markings make for an easy method of differentiating devils from each other, were they can be said to be similar to finger prints for humans.

The devils are famous for their vocal ability and their forceful bite, and of course their often aggressive behavior. The devil's jaw muscles are strong for its body size, an adult devil male may only weigh up to 10-12 kg, but its bite is equivalent to that of a 50-60 kg dog. The females are smaller in size, but they make up for that difference with a feisty attitude. The

4 The devils were listed as Endangered by "the IUCN red list of species" in 2008 (<http://www.iucnredlist.org/details/40540/0>).

devils are nocturnal animals, this means that most of their activity happens during night, and therefore humans can sometimes see wild devils during dusk or dawn.

Devils only live 5-6 years. This makes it crucial to facilitate breeding of devils during the years they are fertile, since their lifespan is short. As marsupials, Tasmanian devils have a highly complex reproductive cycle. They give birth to undeveloped young the size of a grain of rice, then develop externally inside the mother's pouch. Devils are solitary animals, but they are not territorial. All my informants described them as opportunistic animals, meaning that they eat what they can, and when they find it, with little regard as to how they acquire their food, as well as what state it is in (living or long dead). In the wild, most of the encounters devils have with other devils occur when they fight over food. In captivity on the other hand, they are usually placed in small groups, normally within the same age-group, though gender is not an issue outside the breeding season. "It's good to socialize them so that they can put each other in place. They will find out the social order after a couple of encounters" Adam said one day I visited Tarrabah.

There are two species of quoll on the Tasmanian island, are as mentioned the eastern quoll and the spotted tailed quoll. The quolls are the devils nearest relatives, and are also nocturnal carnivore marsupials. But these two species of quoll differ in some important ways, both are smaller than the devils, with EQ being the smallest. The STQ is as well a good climber and hunts its pray from the trees, which is not the case for either the devils nor the EQ. The EQ is more similar to the devil in the way that they don't have great climbing skills, thus live their life on the ground.

The Devil Rescue was a relatively small park, with 4 paid staff members, who I will call "keepers" in this thesis,⁵ and an owner. Erik was an experienced animal keeper and had worked with Tasmanian devils and other Australian animals for 10 years. He was one of the "senior staff" members, and thus had more daily management responsibility and other administrative tasks than the regular staff. Natalie, in her late twenties, was the second senior keeper and had worked at the devil rescue for 5 years and had similar work task as Erik. Erik and Natalie both had a background in biology, and had worked with animals since they finished their degrees. Mia and Thomas, the two regular keepers had both worked at the Devil Rescue for a couple of years. Mia and Thomas held the three guided tours during the day, and the latest night tour during the summer months. For this reason, they alternated using one of

5 This was the title my informants used, along with "staff" or sometimes "devil keeper"

the two cabins owned by the park for overnight stays, this way they didn't need to drive home after a late night's work. Mia was the only non-Tasmanian working at the Devil Rescue, and had moved all the way from Europe, while Thomas was doing his studies while working part time. The final staff member was John, the owner of the park. He had started the devil rescue (10 years ago) with just a couple of devils and some enclosures. He later expanded the park, with more devils, more tourists, and eventually more workers too.

In the second park, Tarrabah, I had one main informant, Adam. He had many years of hands-on experience with Australian animals, and loved to hand-raise animals in his free time.

Many Australian wildlife parks welcome volunteers that work for free in exchange for the opportunity to work close with the animals at the chosen wildlife parks. I will, however, not focus on the volunteer's motives, but give a short insight in the popular phenomena of volunteering. Volunteering is often seen as an altruistic activity where an individual provides services for no financial gain, but as often, especially in the work with animals, there is a valued gain for the people performing this kind of work (Chaisinthop 2014). The Devil Rescue was used to have Australian and international students, as well as backpackers, working as volunteers. The students were usually biology or veterinarian students who either had to do a small research assignment as part of their studies, which they carried out at the park, or were required to attain some practical work experience in their degree. There was a steady amount of volunteers at the Devil Rescue during the summer months, which was the busy season. In the winter months the weather is cold and heavy rainfall, therefore few volunteers and tourists travel to this part of the island. There were usually two or three volunteers at a time. The devil rescue had a minimum limit of three days for being allowed to work as a volunteer, but no limit for how long you could stay. The keepers preferred those that stayed for longer periods, since these volunteers would gain more experience and therefore be able to help with more serious tasks. During my fieldwork there were 15 volunteers working during different time periods at the Devil Rescue. Most of these volunteers were working at the park during the late summer or early autumn months. Most of the volunteers stayed for 3-5 days, which means there was a lot of variation and exchange. Two of the volunteers stayed for a longer period, these two were Victoria from Denmark, who stayed for two weeks, and Emma from the USA, who stayed for 4 weeks. Two other volunteers, Heidi and Rose had also stayed for two weeks, but they were already into their last couple of days of their stay when I started my fieldwork. Four of the volunteers were

backpackers from France, the rest was students, who were either there through an exchange program or who had to work at a wildlife park for "learned experience".

The Devil Rescue was strategically placed at a typical tourist destination in Tasmania, where thousands of tourists visited every year. This means that the Devil Rescue were also populated by tourists throughout the days and most of the evenings. The tourists usually joined one of the three daily guided tours around the park, lasting 45 minutes, and then walked around by themselves. This could take about twenty minutes, and up to a couple of hours. Alternatively, the tourists could pay to be on one of the two guided night tours lasting 90 minutes, where the animals are fed during the tour.

Other animals as an afterthought

There were plenty of other animals besides the Tasmanian devils at the Devil Rescue. As an iconic animal with a rare and mysterious disease, the devils got a lot of the attention from the public, but both of the parks had conservation strategies in place aimed at the STQ and the EQ as well, but these animals were often considered as an afterthought in the case of most people, other than the keepers who cared for them.

In addition to the carnivores in the park, the keepers were experienced with other types of Tasmanian animals as well, and therefore took care of young orphans from the wild, which were brought in from outside the park. During my time at the Devil Rescue, the park had two 8 months' month young common wombats, and one wombat which was a bit older, at 17 months. The older wombat was free ranging in the park, and was going to be set free into the wild when she reached the age at which wombats usually leave their mother in the wild, which usually is around two years of age. Beside the wombats, the Devil Rescue housed 4 pademelons that had come from outside the park, which were being taken care of by the keepers. Pademelons are a small species of kangaroo. The common wombat and the Pademelon are both herbivore animals, and are common animals in the typical Australian wildlife scene.

However, beside all the living animals in the park, there was also a lot of other animals, the dead ones. When keeping and working with carnivore animals, you necessarily need to feed

them their normal diet, which consist of possums, pademelons, wallabies, and sometimes wombats. These dead animals were stored in two big freezers, locked away in bags, with their weight noted on them with marker. These animals come from the wild, and are shot by a hunter and delivered every two weeks. The animals were gutted, but were not prepared in any other way, which means they still had their head, whole body, blood, brain and facial features intact. When the devils were fed, the dead animals were first cut to the right portion-size using an axe, which was done on a big treestump by one of the keepers during the work day, duo to the learned skills needed to do this work effectively.

Layout and enclosures

The main building at the Devil Rescue consisted of a souvenir store, an information center, and an office in between. The souvenir store is the first room you would walk into from the parking lot, where one would have to pay a small fee in order to see the animals and join the daily tours. The walls were covered in t-shirts, sweaters, and jackets with the parks logo on them, and on the shelves there were small miniature animals and other souvenirs. The windows in this room were strategically placed so that the park and the animals inside could not be seen from the inside, and the fences around the park can't could not be seen through either. The devil rescue was dependent on paying visitors, the view was therefore restricted for non-paying costumers. Between the two rooms in which tourists were allowed, there was a small windowless office where the keepers worked with administrative tasks, ate lunch and got some time off from the noise and stress of the other two rooms. The volunteers sometimes occupied this area as well, when there were not too many volunteers at the park at once. Outside the main house was where the park's outdoor areas were situated, here one would have an overview over the park and its two different set of enclosures. At the far end of the park one could see some enclosures enclosed by grid-fencing with roofs, and as a tourist you would be informed that the quolls are located there, while the roofless enclosures were for the devils. Gravel pathways led the way between the enclosures where one could walk around most of the enclosures to see the devils from all angels. Some of the pathways were blocked with chains and a sign, here only keepers and volunteers had access. These pathways lead to the keeper center that I mentioned earlier in this chapter, where food for both herbivore- and carnivore animals was prepared, where waist was thrown out and where tools and

maintenance tools and work happened. This areas of the park were hidden behind tall trees and bushes to conceal the area from visitor's view.

The primary two devil enclosures at the devil rescue were open and flat, without many living trees. There were, however, a couple of huge tree-trunks and some smaller logs laying on the ground with room for devil-made dens. The other enclosures on the other hand, were full of smaller trees in the middle with an open space around the fences, so visitors could have a good view from the outside, but still have the enclosures look natural, as well as giving the devils space to hid and from other devils and tourist if wanted. In the middle of the trees there was usually a human-made den box with a detachable roof. The dens were made from wooden planks, with the roof built so that it was longer than the rest of the box, this way the entrance to the box was covered. Branches cut down from trees outside the park were laid on top of the box and its entrance to shield it from rain and snow. The floor inside the dens were covered with what the keepers called bedding. This was straw and dry grass laid out for the devils to sleep on. When we filled up the den boxes, we often put some handfuls of straw outside the box and the devil would come out and grab it in his or her mouth, and take it inside the den themselves. The water bowl, usually one in each enclosure, was made of stone so that it would be difficult for the devils to flip it over. There were differences between devil enclosures and those for the quolls, visible in both size and the fences. Devils cannot climb, nor jump very well, but they are also top predators and are therefore not potential pray for other animals. For this reason, the devil enclosures can have relatively low fences, where the fence reaches up to a human chest. This allowed closer contact between human and animal, so that visitors did not have to see through bars, glass or fencing.

The quoll enclosures had tall walls made of metal wires complete with a roof. They were completely closed off, this was due to the STQ being good climbers, and the EQ being potential pray for other, bigger animals, and they therefore needed more protection. The quoll enclosures had a lot of smaller logs leaning up against the walls, as well as on top of each other for climbing, so these enclosures utilized design in height more so than the devil enclosures. The quolls enclosures also had big windows in some of the walls, so that the visitors could more easily get a better look inside.

A day at work at the Devil Rescue

To give a more fully understanding of the day to day practices in animal husbandry carried out at the Devil Rescue I will now give an ethnographic insight into a normal day in my field;

After a restless night I made a quick breakfast, and ate it on top of my bed while Wendy, the young orphan wombat, was on one of her wild morning rampages, trying to bite my feet when I walked around. Earlier, she had woken up in the middle of the night and peed under my bed, and as it's impossible to sleep through the strong smell this caused, I had to get up and clean, while the happy wombat sat down to eat some grass by the door. After breakfast, I got dressed, put Wendy in her improvised pouch made of a old sweater, and carried her up to the office. On the way I walked by enclosure 7, 6 and 4, and had a quick look into them while I passed. Jack was out of his den, walking around. I said hi and then made an "Orff" sound, which he would sometimes answers with a similar "Orff" back. He did not answer today. I unlocked the door to the souvenir store, and then opened the door to the parking lot where the two volunteers, Emma with an apple, and Victoria with a smoke in her hand, already waited. Victoria stomped her smoke and they both greeted me with a "good morning", and followed me down to the office, where I hung Wendy's pouch on its hook on the wall.

Victoria grabbed a spray bottle from the small storage room between the souvenir store and the office, said "I'll take the toilets", turned on her heels, and disappeared out the front doors. "I'll take the windows" Emma said, and took the second spray bottle, and went to the visitor center. I dragged the vacuum cleaner with me up the short staircase, and started vacuuming one of the three rooms with carpet floors. When we had finished our morning routines, I made three cups of coffee and one tea, while Emma mixed milk powder for the young animals⁶ and made sure that it was lukewarm before she poured it into a small bottle with a long rubber tit on top. She lifted Wendy up from her pouch, packed her in a towel, and sat down to feed her. Erick arrived shortly after, thanking for tea, and took some sips while he started up the computer. Victoria and I sat down where we could find a free space, with a coffee cup each. We then discussed what we should do that day, consulting the "to do list" Natalie had written down on the white board on the wall, and asked Erik if he had any work he wanted us do this day. He stopped what he was doing, looked at the board, and said that he would come back to

⁶

Australian made milk powder for young animals, both native and domestic husbandry.

that later. We finished up our drinks and went outside to start with the cleaning routines in the enclosures, at the same time Erik went outside to check on the animals, which the keepers did every morning. Victoria, Emma and I walked down to the keeper center. On the way down, we walked by enclosure no. 4, 6 and 7 again, and we all tried spotting some of the devils. Jack was still outside, and Emma and Victoria both greeted him with an "Orff" sound, that he this time answered, making all of us laugh.

We all walked over to the big blue food-storage container to pick up some latex gloves, but then Emma remembered] that we had to feed the non-carnivore animals that free ranged in the park. Victoria and Emma started to cut vegetables (carrots, apples, and pumpkin), while I filled two bowls with wallaby pellets,⁷ and blended it with the vegetables. We all walked over to the other side of the park to pour the food into the feeding tray, a task that did not require three people, but we were all in a chatty mood. When we got back to the keeper's center, we put the bowls back, and each of us picked up one of the three buckets that were leaning on one of the big freezers. Emma picked up the water bucket with a brush inside. This bucket was for cleaning the water bowls, and filling them up with fresh water. Victoria and I took the two waste buckets with each our thongs, meant for meat scraps and droppings. We were going to take care of the "old side" of the park today, which consisted of half the encloses at the Devil Rescue. Victoria walked up to enclosure no. 4, but I said that we should start with no. 7 instead. Mia, one of the keepers, had arrived at work, and she had started the first of the day's three guided tours, and she would soon lead the crowd of tourists to enclosure no. 4, and it would be better if we did not disturb the tour. If we were inside the enclosure during the tour, the devils would be curious about us and we could possibly lead the devils away from the tourist's view. I therefore unlocked the gate to enclosure no. 7 instead, and all three of us hurried inside, and closed the gate behind us. We could not see any of the devils residing here, and started to go about our work. Emma tipped over the water bowl and scrubbed it before she poured in fresh water. Victoria and I walked slowly around the enclosure, trying to spot droppings, as well as meat and bone left-overs from the previous day's dinner. Victoria complained about the droppings, and that she was terrible at spotting them. I laughed and said that it took me a while to learn how to spot them too, and that it was still her first week.

⁷

Special made Australian wallaby pellets. Wallaby is a type of kangaroo, but this kind of pellets is fed to other species also, like pademelons and wombats

Jack was in a bad mood in no. 6. Some days earlier, Natalie and Mia had moved him out of enclosure no. 6, where he had tried to mate with one of the female devils. They stopped this because they were not recommended breeding pairs, he was related to this particular female devil as well. He seemed to take it hard, as the keepers had joked about several times the last days, when he had been cranky towards the keepers and the volunteers. I told the others that they could now start with no. 4, since the group following Mia on the tour had moved on to the stq enclosure further down, and that I could do Jack's enclosure by myself. I checked over the fence and did not see him close by, so I jumped over the fence and changed the water first, and then handed the water bucket back to Emma. Jack came running towards me when I had picked up the waste bucket again, he growled and barked at me, but I blocked his way with the bucket, held it in between me and him, and stomped my foot on the ground, facing towards him. He kept growling, so I stomped my foot again, and pushed him back with the bucket, he then finally backed away. But, he then followed me around inside the enclosure while I cleaned, and tried to attack once more before I finished up and jumped out.

When we came to enclosure no. 1, the tour had finished and the tourists were wandering around on the pathways in-between the devil enclosures. When we unlocked the gate and went in, many of the tourists stopped to watch. Some, two older men and a woman with an American accent, asked if we were going to feed the devils. I stopped to tell them that we were not feeding the animals now, but cleaning up after them, and that the feeding was done during the night tour. The same man asked if it wasn't dangerous to be inside with the devils. At that point the devil William came close to sniff at my bucket, and I said that it's not dangerous if you know how to act, and that we had the buckets to protect us. I smiled and started to look for scraps on the ground, keeping one eye on William, but Victoria had almost finished up in his enclosure, so we then started with the STQ enclosures. The process here was a bit different from the devil's enclosures. Here, there were a bit more acrobatics required, since there were trees and branches to climb over or under, in order to clean in the corners. After the cleaning routine, we had to empty the waste buckets. There were two big containers right outside the keeper center, on the back side of the park. One was for paper, and the big blue metal dumpster was for the smelly waste of animal droppings and, sometimes, rotting flesh.

After the cleaning we had a lunch break, it was a warm and nice autumn day, so we had our lunch break outside the keeper center, sitting on a couple of stumps on the ground. After some food and talk, we went up to the office to ask if Erik and Mia had work they wanted us to do. Mia said that we could clean and re-bait the traps around no. 13, and also bait some extra traps, since they were going to catch and move one of the more difficult devils that day, Pluto, and they would need additional traps for him. "Have you set the traps before?" Mia asked me, and I said no. She said that she could come down and show us how, after we had cleaned the ones that were dirty, as she was going down there anyways to cut meat for the devils and quolls. Victoria, Emma and I went down to no. 13 and collected the traps, one each, and carried them back to the keeper center. We took out the old pieces of meat in the traps, and saved the pins that were needed to hold the trap door open. We hosed the dirty traps down, and laid them in a row on the ground. Mia came down along the back side of the enclosures. She said that she was just going to prepare some small pieces of meat for us to have in the traps. She walked around the freezers, and into the corner where the big tree stump stood, with the axe on top. She opened the small black freezer that was not working properly, and therefore used for de-freezing meat. She took out a piece of what looked like a possum's leg, laid it on top of the stump, and cut it up into 4 small parts with the axe. She handed me the meat, and opened the black freezer again to look for more. She took out a pademelon leg this time, cut up the leg, and came over to where we had placed the clean traps, and laid the meat on the ground. Mia squatted down, took a piece of string, and roughly measured on the trap how long a piece she needed. She cut the string, and started to tie one piece of meat on the one to one end. She pulled the string through the hole in the back of the trap and fastened the other side to a pin that held the trap door open. This way, the devil had to crawl into the tube to get at the piece of meat, and by pulling on it, the pin would be pulled out with it, and the door would clap down. Victoria, Emma and I watched Mia bait and set the first trap, and then we tried it ourselves. We had some problems the first time, but it was quickly learned. We carried the traps to enclosure 14, where Mia jumped in to set up the traps and show us where to put them. She told us that they had to stand secure, so that they wouldn't move, or roll over and hurt the devils. She showed us how to secure them, and tested all the traps before she was satisfied. Mia then had to run up to the office to start the last tour of the day, and Victoria, Emma and I went to place the rest of the traps around no. 13. We tested the traps and made sure that they could not roll over, then walked back to keeper center to clean up the unused pins and strings, and to make "quoll-mix" as well as

food for the pademelons and wombats again. "Quoll-mix" was an additional food for the quolls, beside the meat, and it consisted of eggs, sardines, carrots and apples mixed together with nutrition powder and kelp. We all walked together around the park to distribute the quoll-mix and meat to the quolls that were not going to be fed during the two night tours, using a feeding schedule, which was a laminated paper, that we brought with us in the bucket. The quolls were usually hiding in the bushes or in a den, when one of us unlocked the gate and walked in with the food, but two of the quoll brothers were difficult and were often attracting to us when we tried to feed them. When it was their turn to get their food, Victoria lured them away from the doorway by holding a piece of meat against the metal mesh, while I opened the door and threw in the amount of food listed on the schedule. We avoided any confrontation this time. Back at the keeper center, we put the bucket that had some quoll-mix left in it into the fridge, and walked up to the office to feed Wendy again, and have a cup of coffee before we ended the work day. After Victoria had fed Wendy, she and Emma walked back to their cabins at the nearby camping and cabin park. I stayed at the office until Mia had finish her day and Erik was going to start the first of the night tours, talking and laughing together.

Later in the evening, after diner and some writing, it was once again time to work. Since I stayed in one of the cabins owned by the park, inside the park's fences, I could help with the night tour. Mia had gone up to the office 20 minutes before to open up for visitors that had booked in. I met her in the office, cuddling with Wendy on the floor. She smiled and said hi, then we heard people entering the reception, and she hurried up the short stairs and welcomed them to the Devil Rescue. I sat down with Wendy to play with her until the tour started. Mia started the tour by putting on a short film about devils and quolls. After the film, she told the tourists that she was going to bring out a baby wombat, and asked if everyone could stay in their seats and not make too much noise. She came back to the office and I handed her Wendy. She lifted her up and said, "show time Wendy, you are a star", laugh, and walked out to an excited and happy crowd. I followed her out at this point, and watched everyone get excited by the small wombat. After everyone had petted her on the back and taken a picture with her, Mia handed her to me and I took her into the office and put her back in her pouch. Mia had followed me into the office to get some latex gloves, and gave me some too. We walked out, and Mia introduced me, and said that I was a volunteer that was helping out on the tour. I watched while she jumped into the first enclosure, and talked about devils in

the wild, about the three brothers in that enclosure and about the deadly disease. After that, she moved on to no. 4, where she talked about mating practices and the breeding program. Last of the devils were the two young ones, here she picked up the devils and let everyone pet them carefully on the back. After that, it was the quolls' turn to be fed, Mia now stood on the outside of the enclosure first talking about the STQ and then the EQ, while I went inside the different enclosures and fed the animals there. After the tour I had one last task, and that was to feed the 9 pre-released devils in no. 13. This was done after dark, and often after closing time for the visitors.

Tarrabah as a second field site

During the latter part of my fieldwork, I started to visit Tarrabah once a week to extend my field, and get observational data from other wildlife parks in Tasmania. Tarrabah was an old wildlife parks, and it was a bigger than the devil rescue. Tarrabah was a rescue center for all kinds of wounded native Tasmanian animals, and here they got rehabilitated, and set free again after their recovery. There were long-term inhabitants as well, either because of severe injuries or because the animal was born in captivity. Tarrabah took care of herbivores, like wallabies, wombats and echidna, birds like eagles, frogmouth and geese, and of course the marsupial carnivores, devils, STQ and EQ. Like the Devil Rescue, the park also took part in the breeding program for devils and quolls, and had twice as many devils than the Devil Rescue. During my first visit, I followed my local contact, Adam, around the park, and was introduced to the other staff members and some of the animals.

My main informant at Tarrabah had long dreadlocks and tattooed arms, and spoke with a thick Tasmanian accent. His name was Adam, and had formerly worked at the Devil Rescue, and was friends with the staff members there. At this park I mostly observed, followed one of the keepers around on his daily rounds in the park, and joined the guided tours he led, and once in a while would participate if he needed any help, either by picking up a devil, or by feeding some of the quolls.

Captive, wild and Pre-released devils

In this description of a normal working day at the Devil Rescue, we get a short insight into what I have called the different groups of devils, namely the "Captive devils" and the "pre-release devils" which reside inside the walls of the wildlife park.

The wildlife parks partaking in the devil breeding program in Tasmania and mainland Australia are working to increase the captive devil population in case they go extinct in the wild, and release captive devils to boost the wild population in some areas. This means that there can be said to be three categories of devils, and these were treated differently and talked about in different ways. There were the wild devil that only existed outside the wildlife park's fences. Inside the fences at the Devil Rescue, there were two categories: captive devils and pre-released devils. It was rare to interact with any of the wild devils, or even see them. They were only seen in some instances; running over the road, usually during dusk or dawn, or deceased, as road kill victims. During my time in the field, representatives from the parks and wildlife department in Tasmania came by the devil rescue twice with young devils killed by cars inside the national park, for us to scan them, take pictures and dispose of them. The Devil Rescue scanned and took pictures in case the devil had been tagged⁸. The wild devils were talked about during the guided tours, with explanations about what is seen as wild natural behavior, and the sickness and death caused by DFTD. For many volunteers at the Devil Rescue, the wild devils were those on the outside of the fence, the sick devils, the ones we saw on short films and footage by wildlife cameras hung put up outside the park.

Inside the fences of the Devil Rescue, we had two different sets of devils. I use these terms because different behavior was encouraged both in the devils, as well as in people towards these devils. There was what I call the "captive devils", the devils that are in captivity all their life, but can come from a different environment. Some were born at the Devil Rescue, and had been in captivity for generations. Other came from different wildlife parks with different levels of interaction, and others had been taken in as young from the wild and been "tamed". The other category I call "pre-released devils". This was what the keepers, and save the Tasmanian devil program, called the devils that were kept captive for a short time before they were going to be released into the wild. The Devil Rescue had 9 pre-released devils that were going to be released into the forest of the peninsula in November the same year.

⁸ Captive devils and released devils are tagged with a micro chip to be able to identify the devil. I will describe this practice more closely later in chapter 5.

As we see from the infrastructures laid out in this chapter, there are a coexistence between animals and humans in these two wildlife parks, with different forms of interactions and relations developed through the everyday practices. First off all, we can see relations being performed by humans and different *groups of devils*, and second we see different kinds of relations between devils and different *groups of humans*, in the way interactions keepers, volunteers and tourists have with the animals differs. I will now go further looking at the interactions keepers have with the two groups of devils that inhabited the Devil Rescue. Why was the interactions keepers and volunteers had with captive devils and per-release devils different? How were they different, and what did these interactions do with the devils?

3 Has the devil been tamed? On devils and domestication.

In this chapter I will look at the interactions the animal keepers at the Devil Rescue had with captive devils and pre-release devils as two performed groups. Through ethnographic descriptions, I will highlight the differences in the relationships and how the interactions can make different kinds of devils depending on the conservation aim they are going to fulfill. In this chapter I will describe how, as well as why, new kinds of relations and ways of being together develop between devils and humans. I will here explain why the devils are held in captivity in the first place, and will highlight both the reasons for conservation, but also the context for the entertainment that is provided by the Devil Rescue to its visitors. I will then give ethnographic accounts of the two "groups" of devils at the Devil Rescue, how the interactions and feeding procedures for these groups differed, and how we can see the practices in human-animal relations as a mutual becoming (Lien 2015), by the "making" of wild devils or conditioning of devils to human proximity. I will then discuss how the literature on domestication can help us understand the practices and development of bond between humans and animals, with an anthropological understanding of domestication as a relational aspect, and not biological changes in the body (Clutton Brock 1998, Cassidy and Mullin 2007). As well as explore the different ways the devils are being social with humans (Tsing 2014).

The hard world outside

The first question to answer is, why do we have devils in captivity? As John Knight (2009) argues there has been an increasing demand for making wildlife viewable. He, and other anthropologists, have studied the recent development of ecotourism and forms of volunteer tourism and other new trends through which humans seek out ways to experience the "wilderness", in order to get close to the real nature and its wildlife (Knight 2009: 168). As many anthropologists within the study of human-animal relations have suggested the intimate relations human had with animals have been ruptured by the urbanization trend, which

separates city dwellers from wild and rural nature (Armstrong 2011: 175-176). For this reason, zoos have been a popular way for urban people to get close to and to gaze upon exotic animals. But the new focus of nature and "wilderness" have expanded this demand to look at animals also in the wild by bringing humans to the animals instead of bringing the animals to the city. Tasmania is not an exception from this wish for proximity to wildlife. With its unique nature and landscape, endemic animal species as well as a wide diversity of plants and forest settings and vast areas of national parks and nature reserves, this is often the sole reason for the many tourists' attraction to this island. As Marianne Lien describes after her field work in Tasmania; "Tasmania's alleged remoteness also figures prominently in eco-tourism marketing, in which the island is often promoted as an "unspoilt" and partly "undiscovered" paradise" (Lien 2007: 106). Tourists centers offer tours to get close to the wildlife by traveling to the wildlife's natural habitats, exemplified among others by the whale watching (Peace 2005).

The Tasmanian devil has become a highly iconic animal, and there has evolved a desire for tourists to see this unique and endemic animal in its natural habitat. But because of the devil's elusive behavior and nocturnal habit they are rarely seen in the wild, even by Tasmanians themselves. I myself only saw one wild devil crossing the road in the darkness during my 5 months of fieldwork. This makes it difficult to ensure tourists a close encounter and clear view (Knight 2009: 176-177). This is where the national parks and different forms of conservation parks bridge the divide between the wild animals and the human wish for gaze upon exotic animals (Berger 1980). In the case of the devils and other elusive Tasmanian animals, wildlife parks fulfill a need for human entertainment and the proximity to Tasmanian Devils. But since having animals in captivity does not completely fulfill the desire to see animals in their natural habitat, conservation parks and zoos often create enclosures that are as "natural looking" as possible, to simulate the wilderness outside the fences. At the Devil Rescue there was a heightened focus on nature and the wild, with the park having been built with the intention of simulating a natural devil environment, which was intended for both visitors and for the animals themselves. But why are so many wildlife parks in Tasmania focusing on the Tasmanian devils? The Devil Rescue was founded around the idea of only holding marsupial carnivores, of which the Devil is one of three species in Tasmania, and many other wildlife parks have the Devil as their main attraction. Such great interest in the captivity and breeding of Devils may seem surprising as such, but human desire for seeing

this endemic animal is not the only explanation for the high amount of devils in captivity in Tasmania.

The Tasmanian devils are an endangered species duo of different threats which endanger its long term survival in the wild. Since the colonial age, people have introduced many animal- and plant species that originally do not belong in the Australian environment. These plants and animals are often referred to as "invasive species" by anthropologists like Adrian Franklin (2006). As Franklin writes, these animals were brought from Europa and released in Australia to populate the landscape with more familiar species. The European animals have not developed together with the Australian environment, and some have therefore thrived and grown in huge populations, as they do not have any natural enemies and often out compete native animals on hunting grounds and prey. Animals like cats and foxes are also known to hunt native animal species, and thus the native animals suffer under the threat of extinction. As a consequence, human intervention is seen as vital to save the native species from being driven out by the invasive animals, plant, trees and such (Franklin 2006). Human and devils lives have more recently been entangled duo to the spread of DFTD, and the development of environmental awareness and species protection, especially for native species in Australia and Tasmania, has led to a greater valuation of the threaten species (Lien 2007).

Roadkill is another big issue and a threat to native wildlife in Australia, especially in Tasmania which has a high amount of roadkill accidents per year⁹. Many national parks and wildlife reserves have been established to protect animals from cars, and guidelines for drivers on Tasmanian roads have been developed as a preventative measure. However, most dangerous threat the Tasmanian devils face, is a deadly tumor disease that infect devils' trough bites. Devil Facial Tumor Disease (DFTD) is exclusively a devil disease, and do not occur in other animal species in Tasmania. Because of this deadly disease the population numbers have rapidly declined since its discovery in the 1970, and the "Save the Tasmanian devil program" have since 2005 opened up breeding facilities to breed healthy devils in captivity.

9 Since the release of 39 devils to the Forest of the Peninsula in November, 15 has already suffered from road kill accidents. I was informed by my informants in February that only one of the "pre-release devil" from the Devil Rescue that were released among the 39 devils, has been killed.

Because of invasive animal species, roadkill losses, and the rare and deadly DFTD as I described in the introduction chapter, that is special in the case of the Tasmanian devil, many Australian animal species have been classified as threatened, and many people see it as a need for human protection in order to survive (Lien 2007). There has been a huge turn towards conservation of native species of both animals and plants, and due to DFTD, the devils have been thrust into the spotlight as an icon for conservation in Tasmania. The increased focus on conservation can be seen as a global trend, where many places wildlife that was previously been hunted for fur and other goods, now has reached a critical population size and is subsequently protected by law and the institution of national parks (Bird Rose 2008). With the difficulties surrounding invasive animals threatening the native wildlife, the high amount of roadkill accidents each year and the severity of the devil tumor disease, there are restricted opportunities to conduct conservation management of this species in in the wild. Among the conservation strategies employed by the Tasmanian state and wildlife parks, breeding in captivity has been the most successful to ensure population growth and to have a healthy insurance population in captivity, due to the disease's presence in the wild. For these reasons, most of the conservation work is happening in captivity, until the wild population of devils dies out, or the vaccine trials are proven a success. Because of the extinction of the Tasmanian Tiger, Tasmanian Devils are now the world biggest marsupial carnivore, and with its high mortality, and the rare disease, the Devil has become an icon for nature and conservation on the Tasmanian Island.

As I have now described the reasons for keeping the devils in captivity, are both for conservation management and for tourist attraction, and thus human entertainment. Thus, there were two different, even contradictory needs that where combined at the Devil Rescue. There was both the conservation management of the animals but also the attraction side, where animals needed to be interacted with and to be seen during the day.

I will turn to some ethnographic descriptions of practices in human-devil interactions at the site of my field-study. The devil rescue had two groups of devils that I will describe in detail, with both being part of the conservation strategy but in different ways as I described in chapter two. The first group, the pre-release devils were intended to form the basis of a new population on the disease free area of Forestier Peninsula in the south part of Tasmania in the coming months. The second group, the captive devils, were bred in captivity for long term conservation management, and could therefore be more exposed to humans. The latter group

of devils was not going to join the wild population of devils themselves, but was bred in captivity to be a part of a disease-free insurance population in case the wild devils died out. There were different regulations of engagement with the two groups, which resulted in different interactions between the animals and the humans, and, therefore, different demeanors/behaviors towards humans developed in the two groups of devils.

Captivity as a way of life

The "captive devils", a term not used by my informants but which I will refer to them from now on, were those Tasmanian devils that stayed in captivity all their life. Some stayed at the devil rescue from birth to death, others came from or were sent away to other breeding facilities in Tasmania or Australia. The reason for this exchange of devils between wildlife parks was due to the wildlife park's participation in the breeding program started by the "save the Tasmanian devil" organization as explained in chapter two, and therefore some devils were sent to other parks for breeding to expand the population. Devils could also be added to the wildlife park from the wild, the devils in these cases were isolation for 15 months to ensure that they were not carrying the tumor disease infection.

The Captive devils at the Devil Rescue were interacted with on a daily basis. Most of the devils were hand fed by the keepers every day during tours to make them more visible for the tourists (Knight 2009). For the devils that where not fed during the daily tour were instead fed by the keepers or the long term volunteers earlier in the day without an audience. In this case the meat was ether just thrown in the devil's enclosures or "handed to" to the animals over the fence. As well as being given food by humans every day, keepers and volunteers were inside the captive devils' enclosures every other day to carry out the cleaning routines (see chapter 2). This was something that usually evoked curiosity among the devils and the most confident often followed the volunteers around during their work. Other typical interactions of care were also more commonly performed with the captive devils than the pre-release devils. Such interactions included things like the managing the animal's health, such as checking and cleaning of possible wounds, and the transfer of devils to other enclosures for a scenery change¹⁰. However, the biggest difference between the pre-release and the captive devils was the more or less direct training that included different stages of "taming", starting from only

¹⁰ This was done to avoid stress or boredom for the devil by staying in one place too long.

being able to hand feed the specific animal or to the development of more intimate relationships with the young devils by hand rearing and more handling than other devils. The latter served the purpose to tame the young captive devils enough to be held and petted during guided tours. This process of making the devils used to humans was often referred to as *conditioning* by the keepers, which can be seen as similar to Candea (2010) and Knight's (2009) notion of habituation. Those who study animal domestication generally distinguish between taming and domesticating, as Russell explains "...with taming refers to a relationship between an individual animal and an individual human, while domestication involves populations and successive generations." (Russel 2007: 32). Much of this conditioning was directed towards making the devils at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah become more used to eat meat out of a human's, and thus not shy away when humans entered the enclosure.

Before I arrived at the Devil Rescue a few devils are picked out to be hand raised by the keepers to habituate them from an early stage. These Devils can become friendly and "tame", but mostly towards the people that did the hand rearing of the individual devil. The keepers at The devil rescue often spoke about a fairly tame devil they had, that died 6 months before my arrival. This particular devil could be taken in to the visitor center during a tour, and would simply fall asleep in the keeper's hands. In contrast, other devils could end up becoming a "nightmare" for the keepers. When devils are conditioned to humans they become less frightened and show more of their natural aggressive behavior towards humans, normally reserved for other devils. A devil named Pluto was a good example of hand rearing gone wrong. This particular devil had been taken care of from a young age by humans, but grew up to be a very aggressive devil, to such a degree that volunteers were not allowed to clean his enclosure in fear of severe attack. I will here give two ethnographic descriptions of different practices of training and feeding that yield some insight into the daily activities that connected devils and humans at The Devil Rescue.

The devil rescue had picked out two young devils from this season's litter of devils to condition, their names were being Melody and Casper. The young devils were taught to accept being picked up, held and petted. They eventually came to be calm and quiet in the arms of the keepers, as well as some of the long term volunteers that spent time with them. To condition the Devils, the keepers had to spend more time with the individual devil, with regular interaction, and was "cuddle" with often enough for the devils to grow accustomed to the interaction.

One day Erik took Victoria and me down to the new enclosure where the young devils were placed and asked us to follow him into the enclosure. He closed the gate after himself and bent down to see if the devils were in the first den box. Both of the devils were hiding in the corner on the soft straw they had as bedding. He reached into the den but couldn't get a hold of one. With half his body inside the den, he finally got a grip on the tail of one of the devils, all the while avoiding the sharp teeth of both devils. Erik picked up the screaming devil and said, "aw, that's good, this is Melody. Easier to begin with her". He held her up by the tail and instructed us how to hold her properly by demonstrating on the growling devil. While holding her tail in his right hand, he grabbed Melody under her chest between the front legs with his left hand, lifting up her front and tucking her close to his own chest. She fell silent when Erik stopped moving her. He then let go of her again, keeping a grip around her tail, and handed her to me. I grabbed the tale tail with my right hand and tried to repeat what Erik had just demonstrated. I failed the first time by not grabbing her the right way under the chest and by not putting her up against me fast enough. I let go so I could try again. I did it correctly the next time I tried, and she fell silent in my arms too. With a smile I petted her on the back. Erik continued the instruction by telling me how to hold the tail when you have a devil in your arms, in case the devil attacks, for example by lunging for your face. He then let me give the devil to Victoria and then let her repeat the exercise. When she had successfully placed Melody in her arms, Erik turned away to pick up Melody's brother, the more aggressive one of the two, and had me try the same on him too. I was nervous as the devil complained, screaming and growling a bit more than his sister, but he too fell silent when I finally held him in my arms.

This position, the keepers holding a devil, can be interpreted by others, like tourists, as a sign of affection when shown during a guided tour. But the fact that a few devils tolerating to be petted and interacted with in this way does not automatically lead to an affectionate relationship. As Mia mentioned one day when we talked about the two young devils mentioned above, "they [the devils] are not coming up to you to get curdled with or to be picked up like the wombats do. So it's not like they want to, but they accept it." But then, why are devils being made to accept this close contact with humans? Adam often referred to this more tamed devils and quolls as "educational animals", and used one of the best trained devils and STQ under guided tours so tourist could get a closer look and understanding of the

animals in relation to humans. "They are going to be in captivity all their life, why not give them something to do" was his answer when I asked about the conditioning of the devils. As Knight argues by giving food humans tame the animals, and make it easier with other kinds of interactions (Knight 2009). He further explains that this habituation of animals to humans lessens the flight instincts, and with that makes them more useful for viewing by tourists, since they can get clear view and proximity of the experience (Hediger, 1968: 49, Knight 2009). Some of the definitions of domestication, like the classic definition by Clutton-Brock (1989) highlight control over the animals, in for example breeding and feeding. I will, however, discuss the devils breeding organization in chapter 4, therefore I will now turn to the feeding of the captive devils, to describe practices of feeding organization.

Natalie closed the front door and hung up a sign with the next opening hours. It was early winter and few visitors anyway, and with only one staff member working, we had to shut down the park while preparing the animals food and having time to distribute it before Natalia had to guide the night tour. We walked down to the new keeper center, and Natalie talked about how nice it was to finally have a new (and properly made) food prep area. She told me about the first set up with a huge tree stump in the outer corner of the park with no roof (which can be a challenge in the Tasmanian mountain weather). When we reached the keeper center hidden behind a closed gate and some trees, Natalie found a possum in one of the de-frizing bags on the floor, put it on the tree trunk, lifted the ax over her head and with one precise and skilled swoop cut of a piece of possum leg. "this is really a learned skill" she said with a smile over the piece of possum leg when she throw it down in a big bucket. "It is really difficult in the beginning, but you get used to it after a while". She chopped up a bucked full of different sized pieces of meat and handed me the bucket, while I had taken on some rubber glows. "This large piece is for Pluto, the scatter is for Windi, the medium is for Minni and Olivia, and Fury is on a starve" she said while having a quick last look on the food schedule, and gave it to me.

I took the bucket and wobbled under the weight over to the first enclosure, to Molly. With my gloved hands I picked up the medium piece and looked over the fence and called out Molly's name, she peeked her head out of the den and then hurried towards me when she saw (or more likely smelled) the meat¹¹. She lifted herself and balanced on two legs and I gave her the

11

Tasmanian devils have restricted eye sight, but have a really good nose.

piece directly in her mouth. She fell to her four legs again and run back to her den to consume it in peace. I hurried over to the next enclosure and trowed many small pieces in different directions, and then two eggs that gently landed on the ground without breaking. In the next enclosure Olivia was shy and stayed out of sight, so I throw the meat in and walked over to Pluto. He was already circling near the fence and started barking and growling when he saw me. When I stopped he tried to jump, the little he could, and I trowed the piece farther in to the enclosure, he growled a bit more before he turned and circled around until he found the meat on the ground. When I walked back Olivia was outside and dragging the meat with her, towards her den. I had on many occasions seen the keepers feed this way, by giving, throwing, or putting the meat in trees for the animals to find¹².

In this ethnographic anecdote, we see of the back stage work, the more mechanical labor that has to be done by keepers and volunteers at the Devil Rescue. By using Erving Goffman's notion of front stage and back stage, we can glimpse the performed activities of bonds between human and animals staged in front of tourists and the work that happens behind the scene (Goffman 1969), and thus explore these performances further. I will now describe the interactions with the pre-release devils at the Devil Rescue to be able to compare the set of acceptable interactions between the animals and the humans.

Born to be wild

The pre-released devils were also in captivity during my fieldwork, but through the “save the Tasmanian devil” program they were in November 2015 released to the Forestier Peninsula, an area where the deadly and contagious tumor disease isn't present. For this reason, the keepers wanted these particular devils to have a life in captivity that was as close as possible to the life of the wild devils. The enclosure they inhabited was bigger than the other enclosures, but both looked and were built the same way, with chest high fences and glass windows in a couple of places. This means that it was not the built surroundings that made this group of devils different, but the social aspects that connected them to humans, including

¹²

This is a "Enrichment strategy" mad by many zoo's and conservation parks to ensure the animals health and happiness.

practices of proximity and of feeding. This simulation of the wild life on the other side of the fence presented itself in the way the keepers and volunteers performed this way of life for the devils. The keepers had worked out other different routines for enclosure 13, whose inhabitants did not have as much human interaction as other devils in the park.

Keepers behaved differently towards the pre-released devils, and the volunteers were encouraged to do the same. Tourists were during tours after nightfall also asked not to walk too close to the fence of enclosure 13, and to not take flash photographs if they spotted one of the pre-released devils. The interaction with the pre-released devils was restricted as much as possible, but at a level so that the keepers could still make sure that the devils were healthy and in good condition. The cleaning routines of this enclosure were to only be clean twice every week and they were not hand fed. The feeding happened after dark every night, on the backside of the enclosure. This was done in order to teach the devils to eat at night, since devils are nocturnal animals, and the keepers wanted to teach them not to interact with humans, and so not to see humans as a food source.

Since I rented the cabin at the devil rescue, I had the opportunity to help with the nightly feeding of the 9 pre-released devils, a chore I gladly took part in. I thought this would give me a great opportunity to see "wild" devils and their activities in the right element, since as nocturnal animals, devils are most active after nightfall. Already from the first day at the devil rescue, I get to know this group of wild devils when Mia showed me what to do when feeding them. The following ethnographic anecdote illustrates the point.

Mia smiled at the last couple of people leaving the souvenir store, heading out to the dark parking lot to drive back to one of the hotels located in the mountain national park. She let out a short breath and walked over to the door in order to lock it up for the night after the last guided tour of the day. She looked at me, and said that she was just going to till off (take care of the till?), and that she then would show me how to feed the 9 pre-released devils. Heidi and Rose (two volunteers working at the park) had stayed late to help with the tour, and they asked if they could come and watch too. We waited until Mia was done with the counter. She said that we should bring some flashlights while she was grabbing the big red one that she had used under the tour. I grabbed one of the headlights from a nail on the wall, and Rose did the same. Heidi grabbed a big, black flashlight that was almost out of battery. Heidi grabbed a pair of rubber gloves from a carton box beside the sink in the office, and so did the rest of

us. We all headed out in the dark with the flashlights on, and went down the stairs from the platform outside the visitor center. We all followed Mia to the "meat chest", to get the big bucket of possum and pademelon meat. The bucket was tall, wide, and awkward to carry. We walked the pathway down to the pre-released devils, laughing and talking. When we approached the enclosure, Mia told us to be a bit quiet so as not to teach the devils that human voices mean food. We walked to the backside of the enclosure, as far away from the pathway as we could. Here Mia sat the bucket on the ground, and told us to stop and wait. She jumped over the fence, and Heidi handed her the big bucket of raw meat. Mia took one of the whole pieces of pademelon, and went in-between some of the thin trees, and we could hear some ruffling in the bushes, and deep growling in the dark, but still no visible devils. Mia bent down and hooked the meat on a metal hook on the ground. Heidi spotted a devil lurking in-between the trees close by the meat, and pointed it out for me and Rose. Mia walked towards the fence again, and we could see more of the devils lurking around, afraid to get too close, spinning around and running away when they got too close to Mia. She jumped out of the enclosure, and at the same time one of the devils finally got close to the piece of meat. The devil sniffed it, and then bit into the side of the pademelon and tugged it in one direction. Now more of the devils joined in, and tugged it in other directions as well. When they were not tugging at the piece of meat, they were screaming at each other instead. Two of the devils got too close to each other and began screaming, clashed against each other standing on two legs, and kept screaming. We stood on the other side of the fence, lighting up the scene with flashlights, and watched how the devils interacted with each other, looking for the "right behavior" in the darkness of the night. We stood there for around 10 min, before Mia threw the rest of the meat into the enclosure. At this point, the devils had consumed most of the pademelon, and we could hear crushing of bones. The devils were running around, dragging pieces of meat away from the rest of the group. We stood there for 5 more minutes, and then headed back up to the main building. In this ethnographic example, the making yourself present in the devil's life, as is being done with the captive devils, is replaced with the practice of making yourself invisible.

This observation, from one night's feeding, was an everyday practice, and part of the restricted interactions keepers and volunteers had with the pre-released devils, among other routines like cleaning their enclosures and putting out "bedding" for their dens. To more clearly show how the interactions between keeper and pre-released devils were restricted, it

will be fruitful to explain one atypical case of interaction. Only on one occasion did I observe a close interaction between humans and the pre-released devils. This interaction was a routine health check where the keepers weigh the animals to make sure that the animals were being fed enough, and that they were in good condition. The Devil Rescue also had an available sponsorship deal posted on their Facebook account, and to promote this, the staff wanted to take some pictures of the 9 pre-released devils while they performed the examination.

We had set traps in enclosure 13 the day before. There were only 8 working traps, and 9 devils, so the trapping was going to be done in two sessions. Eric and Thomas had had equipped themselves with burlap sacks, a white bathroom scale, a microchip scanner, and a list with the names and the identifying number for each of the animals in no. 13. They had also brought a list of the devils' names, with drawn outlines of the devil's body with their identifying white markings drawn on the outline, as well as pen and paper to write down the devils' weight. We collected one trap at a time, sat the trap with its devil inside on the scale, and noted the weight. We then placed a burlap sack around the front of the trap and opened the door. Since the devil was afraid and would not move, we had to tip over the trap and "poured" the devil into the bag. After this, we weighed the trap again, in order to subtract this number from the first, to ascertain the devil's weight. We then tried to scan the current devil, in order to see which one of the devils it was. Thomas held the bag closed, and laid it carefully on the ground, and by feeling his way over the surface of the bag with his hands found where the head and the tail pointed. He clenched the bag tighter so there was no room for the devil inside to move, and pointed to a place on top of the bag. "The head is here". Eric, who had been busy with the scanner, bent down and pointed the hand sized scanner at where the neck of the devil was, moved it up and down, then back and forth until it gave a "beep". He straightened, and read the number appearing on the small screen out loud, and I wrote it down. I looked down on the list of numbers that belonged to each devil, and found the correct match. "This is Icicle", I said, and Eric pointed out that she was heavy, and this was good. I placed the pen and paper on the fence and picked up my camera, Eric picking up his camera as well. Thomas moved a bit further into the clearing carrying the bagged devil, so that the picture would have a nice background. He sat down, still clinching the top of the bag closed. Eric and I stood ready to take pictures, in case the devil would run away immediately. However, when Thomas opened the bag, the devil did not move. Thomas rolled the bag off the devil's head in order to reveal the devil's face, and Eric and I had a lot of time to take

pictures. Thomas tried to remove as much of the bag as possible, and even touched the devil, without any movement or sound from her. Then, suddenly, Icicle sprinted away in-between the trees. We had a laugh, and then moved on to the next trapped devil.

Studies of Tasmanian devil behavior suggest that the overall behavior of devils and their behavior in relation with other devils does not differ between wild and captive devils. But as the experience described above shows, this group of devils reacted differently *towards humans* than how the captive devils do. Their relations with humans clearly differ, which in turn alters the devil's behaviors.

Interactions that create the devil

As we have seen with the per-release and the captive devils, there is a set of acceptable interactions for each group that indeed define the characteristic behaviors desired. For these two cases are on one hand intended to "create" a wild devil that will survive on its own in the Tasmanian nature, and on the other hand a good "display" animal that is not afraid of humans and will eat meat out of the keeper's hands. Here display animals are devils that will not be hiding in their den when tourists visit the park. This means that they will walk around in their enclosures during the day, and come to feed in front of a crowd of tourists when they are served meat. I have called this "creating a devil", since both the personality and behaviors the devils exert towards humans were encouraged through the human-animal interactions between the keepers and the devils. In captivity the devils had learned not to fear humans, as they naturally do in the wild, and thus through interactions like cleaning enclosures, picking up devils, moving them, holding them and feeding them, they became the "right" devils for captivity, hence they were often called "good display animals".

Through the human interactions with the animals', different behavioral traits in the two groups of devils evolved. As I have described earlier, literature on wild devils describe them as elusive, timid animals. They are nocturnal, and humans will most likely not interact with one in the wild. This was highlighted under the daily guided tours in all the parks I visited in order to inform people that the aggressive behavior they witnessed between devils themselves in captivity, would not be directed towards humans in the wild. From my observations, my

informants' experience and video evidence, the pre-release devils behaved in a way that was seen as more “natural” by the keepers. They stayed hidden during the day, especially if keepers or volunteers were in their enclosure to clean. A couple of times I could see the pre-release devils in their den boxes when I refilled their bedding-straw, they were however frozen in place and didn't move. This more “natural” behavior was the desired outcome for the interactions my informants had with the pre-release devils, so they could successfully be released in the wild and survive on their own.

Interestingly, the captive devils had other behavioral traits that dominated the interaction they had with humans. The captive devils were more used to humans, and therefore not as timid as the wild devils. Therefore, the more used to humans a devil was, the more aggressive the devil became. Many of these devils were more or less conditioned to human interactions, and their behavior was therefore radically different from the “natural” behavior of a Tasmanian devil. The captive devils were less frightened by human presence, and their behavior towards humans was more akin to that towards other devils. As an example, they approached those that walked into their enclosure instead of running away. “They are curious animals. They approach you to test you out, to see if you stand your ground or run away.”, Mia explained during a night tour when one of the devils tried to snap after her leg. When they were getting hand fed by my informants they sometimes challenge the keeper and snap after their feet, hands or legs. For many devils there were different degrees of this tameness, depending on how much they had been conditioned to humans. As we can see, the devil’s behavior towards humans became more aggressive, or more curious, unflinching and less afraid, when they were conditioned. In contrast, the pre-release devils reacted with fear and would freeze, dictated by their natural defense mechanism¹³ .

The devil’s behavior made it clear to me that the humans' behavior had to change, or adapt, to the way the devils interacted. As I slowly learned the correct way to interact with the captive devils, I observed the keeper’s interactions and the details in their actions, and the for them familiar movements, that were not present in the volunteer’s bodily movements. This "technique of the body", described by Mauss (1934) is here learned by the keepers, and is

13

Freezing defense is a hard-wired defense mechanism that some animals have evolved, this is mostly amongst animals that are normally prey for bigger predators. This is believed to be because motion can trigger the hunting instincts for the predators.

something that takes time and experience to adopt and perform in the correct way. As I learned from day one, these techniques were orientated around the body when interacting with a devil. To be at ease, not to flee, and to act in a "dominant way", were all important cues. But also small movements, like how to raise your foot when a devil comes too close were important. This was done by facing the devil with one side, and with the forward facing toe in the ground twist the foot so the underside of the shoe points towards the devils. By doing this, the keeper has a bigger surface available to stop a bite, and this can often be intimidating to the devil as well. Also, catching a devil's tail takes time to learn, as well as some learned techniques to avoid being bitten, as they can snap after your hands when one tries this. One way to catch a devil, was to slowly, and carefully, bend over the devil and try to grab it from above. Another way was to move the arms fast along the sides of the devil, and simply try to be faster than the snapping jaws. When I observed the volunteers, taking also myself as an example, the volunteers were often more afraid in encounters with the devils, and could easily be a target for attack. But the volunteers for the most part carried what I call a "security blanket", which was one of the waste buckets used during the cleaning routines, or a burlap sack when they were in close interaction with a devil and could use one of these things to block an attack. As Candea writes about volunteers and meerkats at the Kalahari meerkat project in South-Africa, it's not only the animals that are trained to be able to interact closely with humans. As I have already discussed earlier in this thesis with regards to body techniques, the volunteers are also trained in how they need to act in interactions with the animals, and how to respond to the animal's activity and behavior (Candea 2013: 114-115).

When Erik asked me to accompany him and Natalie to catch a devil for the first time, I did not know how to act and poise my body, and without much experience with this type of animal, I did not know how the devil was going to act either. All three of us walked into the small enclosure and spread out to block the pathways for the devil, in case it escaped from its den. Erik and Natalie first tried to catch it in the small human made box in the middle of the enclosure, but the devil soon escaped and was on the run. I stood alone near the fence, and the little devil came sprinting towards me, not in an attack, but to escape the two keepers. I, as an inexperienced volunteer, just nervously jumped back to avoid the devil, while the two keepers fanned out and grabbed the devil's tail while it passed by me.

I did not learn the devil catching movements until some months into my fieldwork, after many attempts and failures. My own experience with body techniques to handle a devil, both on the

ground and in one's arms, shows that this is a learned process, that the volunteers have to be trained in order to be able to handle a devil. The ethnographic encounters with the pre-release devils I have described shows some of the practices in interacting with animals that are soon going to be among their wild counterparts, it shows that the devils were enacted in to different kinds of being, and these practices formed the way the devils responded to the human interaction, and as Anna Tsing (2010) would put it, the two groups of devils formed different ways of socializing with the keepers, volunteers and tourists.

In-between wild and tame

"The wild" and "the domestic" have often been seen as binary oppositions, where the wild is seen as "the wild out there", occupying space that is untouched by human influence (Cassidy 2007:1). While the domesticated is often seen as something familiar, controlled and changed by humans to fulfill their needs. In anthropological literature these concepts points to bigger dichotomies, like nature and culture (Descola 1996). These are of course very broad terms about humans' perception of culture, and meant to describe the opposite of "the man-made", which is seen as nature, and these are terms which many scholars have tried to dissolve, as for example Cassidy (2007). "The idea of wilderness employed by many environmentalists perpetuates distinctions between society and nature, human and animal, domesticated and wild (Cassidy 2007: 1). In the case of the Tasmanian devils, I will argue that there is no clear-cut border for separating these two categories, wild and domestic, in order to describe their relations to humans. At my field site, one group of devils was being "made" wild, and in the same manner, the other group was being "made" domesticated. This enactment of becoming was done in transformative relations through which human and animal where shaping one another (see also Lien 2015: 7). How wild are the wild devils? And to what extent can we even call anything "wild"? What is wild in comparison to that which is "not wild"? If the wild is meant in the same way as wilderness, untouched nature where humans don't have control, then "the wild" can hardly exist at all. Tasmanian devils are seen as a wild species, and even the captive devils were often talked about by the keepers as being wild. The conservation management's aim is to save this "wild species", and it therefore distanced itself from the "domestic". I would argue that this "wild" state is performed by humans as an understanding that the animals have a greater belonging to nature and a lesser belonging to the industrial, human spaces.

But then, what is domestication? And in the case of the devils in Tasmania, how tame can a devil be, given the aggressive behavior that creates a distinct division between humans and devils? The Tasmanian devils are being entangled in human lives in different ways than before the conservation strategies began, and because of the deadly disease's widespread range, one of the most effective strategies is breeding of devils in captivity. The term domestication has been under discussion lately by anthropologists like Molly Mullin, Rebecca Ceassidy and Marianne Lien. As Lien describes, «Domestication is associated with the so-called Neolithic Revolution, which is portrayed as a transformative moment when human beings began to control nature through agricultural and husbandry practices" (Lien 2015: 8). She further explains how domestication is now seen as a mutual process involving both humans and animals, rather than a single moment in history, so that animals can instead move in and out of this category. One of the most cited definitions of domestication was proposed by Juliet Clutton-Brock. Clutton-Brock emphasized human control and the conversion of animals into property. She wrote that domestication is "a cultural and biological process... that can only take place when tamed animals are incorporated into the social structure of the human group and become objects of ownership". Domesticated animals were defined as "Bred in captivity for purposes of economic profit to a human community that maintains complete mastery over its breeding organization, of territory and food supply". (Clutton-Brock 1998: 7). In the case of the devils in captivity at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah, the devils had restricted space created by humans, and their movements between enclosures was determined by the keepers. In addition, the food was provided by humans at specific times during the day, and the size of the portions was carefully prepared by the keepers to ensure the animals' wellbeing. All the animals at The Devil Rescue were identified by name, and most were micro-chipped and, therefore, had an identification number listed in the national studbook for Tasmanian devil-breeding and quoll-breeding.

The social devil

But to what degree can we speak of these animals as being domesticated? Tasmanian devils are even more aggressive towards humans in captivity, because of their familiarity with humans, and thus their lack of fear. The 9 pre-released devils at the Devil Rescue were good indicator that their behavior towards humans differed from that of the captive

devils. Also, this more "fearful" behavior was preferred in the devils that were going to be released, but the more confident and less fearful behavior was preferred in the captive devils. During most of the tours I attended, and in conversations between keepers and tourists, the keepers often spoke about the devils as wild animals. I experienced a couple of instances where a private person wanted to adopt a devil to care for it in his own home, and another where Dr. Mike Archer approached the press in order to promote the idea of saving the Tasmanian devil by keeping them as pets (Mercury 21/11/2015). In both these cases the keepers were bewildered by the idea and shook their heads at the suggestion of keeping devils as pets, and referred to the aggressive behavior they exhibit, even when they have been "tamed". The Tasmanian devils, and to some degree quolls, fall into a gray area between domesticated and wild, but not every one of the individual devils was conditioned to a degree as we can call the practice "taming". This narrow definition of the concept of domestication, or of "the wild out there", does not give an in-depth understanding of the relations that develop between humans and devils). Like Cassidy writes "numerous ethnographies of national parks and other "wild" spaces have shown that that are imbricated within complex national, regional and international spheres of influence" (Cassidy 2007: 1). In the same manner, we could say that this also can be found in the concept of domestication, such that what Donna Haraway calls "degrees of freedom" can occur in domestic relations between humans and animals, and therefore will the total control described by Clutton-Brocks definition will not be accurate enough to describe this process.

The word "habituation" has been used as a more nuanced expression to describe human relations to animals that is not traditionally the same as "domestication". Like I have mentioned earlier, Knight describes how humans use habituation and attraction techniques to get close to wild animals, to lessen their flight instinct, and to make them more viewable. As Matei Candea argues in a study of scientists' relations to meerkats, the meerkats saw the human scientists as part of the natural scenery around them, and behaved towards humans like they would towards other "natural" objects and animals in their world, like cows and trees (Candea 2010). But to go further in this analysis, in the case of the devil, humans are not seen as scenery in the devil's environment, but as something more, but instead as something similar to themselves, and they become more like devils instead (Lindström and Tønnessen 2010). Kari Lindström and Morten Tønnessen writes, semiotic thinking restores subjectivity as a relational connection (2010: 258). The devils are not ignoring the humans, as we can see

in the different observations, there are mutual interactions with intention and reactions from both sides. In one of my personal experiences when feeding a group of devils in front of a small tourist crowd of tourists, Adam expressed the sentiment of becoming a devil. I had not fed a group of devils before, and certainly not in front of a crowd of people. Before I nervously went in to the devils with a whole pademelon in my hand, Adam said with a smile "just hold tight to one of the legs, sit down, and hold the meat in front of you. The devils will not care much about you, just hold tight, and pull the meat like the devils do. *Just be one of them*".

As we see, human-devil interactions create more aggressive devil behavior, since their behavior changed from treating humans as an "other" to include humans as part of their personal worlds. The devils are not domesticated; neither are they fully wild. They inhabit an area in-between, where their relations to humans, and the interactions they are being exposed to, has led to a new way of becoming. The interactions I have described show clear differences in the practices of creating the ideal devil for either a captive life, or for being made a "wild" animal.

I have now looked at how the devils can be tamed and made wild by interacting differently towards the two groups. I will now turn towards the captive devils breeding program to further discuss the domestication discussion, and look at how the captive devils can be performed as wild at the same time as they are being fed, bred and confined by humans.

4 Captive breeding to become wild

As I arrived at the Devil Rescue, one thing became clear during the first days; the importance of devil breeding. One day, when I walked into the small, windowless office, Erik and Natalie stood by the white board that covered one side of the wall. Natalie stood there with a sharpie in her hand, and Eric with a worried look on his face. "Howard and Sansa are doing ok. They have been in the den together the last couple of days, but Brandon and Mary are not doing great, Brandon is only interested in the food". They both looked at the 8 names written in the corner of the board, four male names and four female names, and Erik continued "we will have to move Brandon back today, we can put Lucky in with Mary instead, they are both recommended to breed with her." Natalie nodded, and both headed purposefully out the door, grabbed a couple of burlap bags from under the staircase, and then headed over to Brandon's enclosure. From this example we can see that the breeding season can provoke worry, fear, and stress in the keepers, and many conversations centers around breeding in this period. But why is breeding so important?

The time for breeding, and the birth of new animals, is for many the most important period in the animal husbandry cycle. When working with animals, the continuation of animal husbandry through breeding is the very foundation of this process, either if this are processes in working with the conservation of endangered animals, the breeding of pedigree dogs, or the raising of animals for the food industry, to give just some examples. But what does the breeding of devils reproduce? What kind of understandings of the devils does this lead to? And in what ways are the human-devil relationships being entangled? Within conservation strategies, like in the case of the Tasmanian devils, breeding has been determined as important for the species survival. But, as I will explain, the breeding also becomes important for each wildlife park's survival, since these parks are privately owned, and their economic foundation hails from tourists. This makes it important to have a steady amount of devils in the park for the tourists to see and experience. What is interesting here, is that breeding is also important for domestication, as we can see from the definitions described earlier in this thesis by Clotton-Brock and others. Control over reproduction is central for this classic narrative, which here links "the breeding towards the wild" with domestic practices with regards to the devils and the keepers' everyday life.

In this chapter, I will give an insight into the breeding practices at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah, which were the two field-sites from which I gathered my data and observations, but will focus mostly on the Devil Rescue. I will show how the wildlife parks had to navigate through both external and internal restrictions for the breeding, in as the state, acting through studbook recommendations, restricts individual breeding practices, and how on the other hand, devils themselves can hinder effective breeding in the wildlife parks. I will describe specific breeding practices that were played out during this period, which relational interactions were central, and how distance and proximity become important factors in human-devil relations during this period. The close contact described in chapter 3 becomes important in the context of building relations and to *create the right devil for captivity*, were in this chapter we will see how this physical and emotional contact leads to specific breeding practices at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah.

In the second part of the chapter, I will discuss the importance of genes in breeding "the right devil", and how this is crucial for both the parks' future operation, but also for the devils as a species survival. This practice can be seen as a "wilding" effort to perform the devils as a wild species, and I will show how the "rewilding" process where the devils, both the pre-released and the captive ones, gives them a possible future in the wild. In this chapter, I will focus most of my analyzes analysis on observations and data collection from studying the captive devils. The pre-released devils were not bread at the Devil Rescue, they were merely taken care of during their early months, until they were old enough to be released.

Practices in breeding devils

There are many practices that surround the human-devil relations in the breeding season, including proximity and distance to the animals, separations of the genders, introduction of the "right breeding pairs", to calculations for specific times of mating, birth, when the animals' pouches are ready to be checked, and calculate time-tables for the next round of ovulations that indicate a second chance to breed the devils. Here I will guide the reader through some of the specific practices enacted by the keepers at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah during the breeding season.

The breeding season for the Tasmanian devil starts in Late February and lasts a couple of weeks. Because the devils are marsupials, devil birthing already happens around May/June. Due to my relatively short fieldwork, that took place in the Autumn, I only observed the breeding and birth period of the devil's life cycle. So, this is where my focus will lie as well.

In the wild, devils are solitary animals and don't interact with each other much, except when fighting over food, or for mating partners. In captivity, the devils are put together in small groups. As Adam told me one day at Tarrabah, when we had a walk through the park after a tour; "It's good to socialize them so that they can put each other in place. They will find out their social order after a couple of encounters" he said referring to small, mostly vocal, fights with few injuries. Male and female devils can be put together in groups, females are smaller in size, but make up for this with a more "feisty" attitude, as it was often called. During the breeding season, however, female devils and male devils have to be separated to avoid ending up with unwanted mating pairs. But what is defined as "unwanted" in the conservation practice of breeding Tasmanian devils, and more specifically, which are unwanted mating pairs?

Before the breeding season begins, wildlife parks get a list of "studbook recommendations" that tells the keepers which of the devils can be paired together in order to create the most diverse genetic outcome for the young Tasmanian devils. This is done to avoid inbreeding, and to ensure a healthy Tasmanian devil population in captivity. The studbooks are being used in zoos, farming, and other animal husbandry work places, it and is a breeding registry with important information about the individual animals, like their names, ages, identification numbers, and kin relations. In the case of the devils, the animals are genetically matched with other that have as diverse genetics as possible to reduce the risk of inbreeding in the captive devil insurance population¹⁴. At this point, we can already see a slight difference from what we often see as the "normal" way of breeding domestic animals. Domestic animals are often selectively bred in favor of certain traits or abilities, and thus leads to genetic standardization (Tsing 2012: 144), or a more narrow gene pool.

As Inger Anneberg writes, "there is a strong narrative of domestication that tend to define animals' through idioms of purposeful human mastery and emphasis control as a characteristic feature of the human-animal relationship itself" (Anneberg under review). We can find this

14 More on studbooks for conservation breeding on; <http://www.waza.org/en/site/conservation/international-studbooks>.

strong narrative in Clutton-Brocks definition of domestication also, were according to this definition, "humans" are in control and mastery over the animals (Clutton-Brock 1998). But as we see in the case of the devils, there are, first off all, different groups of "humans", on the one hand there are the state-driven studbooks and on the other hand, we have the wildlife keepers working at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah. Their goals are both overlapping, as both the studbook and the keepers want to conserve the species and save them from extinction, but also slightly in contradiction, since the wildlife parks need more animals to replace the ones that either are either being sent away, or die of old age, and therefore, and therefore the keepers need to breed devils even when the pairs are not recommended. With regards to the studbook for Tasmanian devils, a question of who exactly is in control of the breeding is being raised.

So who is in control of the reproduction of the Tasmanian devils? In practice we have the keepers that are actually breeding the devils. As I will describe, they are the ones to decide when to introduce the devils to each other, they observe the breeding behavior and the mating, and separate the devils in the end, which are all specific practices of breeding Tasmanian devils that are enacted by the wildlife keepers at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah. But it is the Tasmanian government that publishes the studbook recommendations, and is the one that, out from utilizing genetic research, decides which devils the participants in the breeding program should match. There is more than one social unit of control in this picture. Neither Clutton-Brock's definition of domestication, nor other definitions, specifies who the one in control is in this situation, and who is in fact the one doing the domestication. In Vicky Singleton's writing we get an insight in how legislation can, often without intention, stand in the way of efficient care and breeding practices enacted by the caregivers (Singleton 2010). This is somewhat similar to the case of the Tasmanian devils. Another question is; how much control do humans have? I will come back to this, as well as Anneberg's critique of the narrative of purposeful human mastery.

Predicting the future and worrying about the past

Before I dive into deeper the questions about absolute human mastery, the breeding practices themselves need to be explained and accounted for. How is the breeding of devils being played out? What practices entangle humans and devils, and how is this period of breeding being embodied and structured? A couple of months before the beginning of the breeding

season, all the wildlife parks that are partaking in the "Save the Tasmanian devil" breeding program plan which of the devils they are going to breed on site, and which ones they have to send away to other wildlife parks, to breed in other parks in Tasmania or Australia. This is, as mentioned earlier, decided according to the studbook, and its recommendations for the particular season at hand. The studbook had the most to say in whether devils had to be moved, but the individual wildlife parks could choose to keep a particular animal if they have special bonds or relations with this animal. This would be the case if the keepers in a park had conditioned a devil or quoll to be very friendly and tame, for example.

I arrived at my chosen field site in the middle of the execution of plans made before the breeding season started. Most of the devils had been separated into gendered groups, and the ones which were recommended breeding partners had been introduced to each other, using scat and other methods to make the devils familiar with the other one's smell. One of the season's breeding pairs of devils had already staid with each other for a shorter period, and their behavior looked promising, and this evoked excitement in both keepers and the present volunteers alike. During mating season Tasmanian devils exhibit different behavioral traits that are easily detected when you know what to look for. Even without long experience, the volunteers could also watch for such signs if needed. These signs vary from sudden aggressive behavior and fighting amongst the male devils, and submissive, and passive behavior in the females, where they could look dozy. Two of the male devils at Devil Rescue had their first breeding season, and were therefore inexperienced in comparison to the female devils that already had been through one or two seasons before. Female devils had what the keepers often referred to as a feisty attitude, as they are testy and not easy for the inexperienced males to handle. To compensate for this often non-cooperative behavior from the animals, the keepers were careful to look for mating behavior, and moved the four recommended males around, and placed them together with the four recommended females when the males started to show aggression and mating interest, and the females became submissive.

During the breeding season a lot of attention and worry is focused on the mating devils, and observations of their interactions are important to make sure that they do what they are supposed to do. This is in order to have control over what happens between the two devils, to ensure that the mating actually happens, and to watch over their well-being, in case fighting erupts.

It seemed important to the keepers to observe that the devils exhibited the right mating behaviors, both before and during the introduction to their mates. When a male devil and a female devil are introduced and the female is in heat, the female will be more submissive than usual, and the male devil will then scruff the female, biting her in the neck, and will then drag her to a den. The female will already have chosen a den where she wants to raise her young, and she will be leading him this way. The male then mates with her, and will be den-guarding her for 7 days. In the introduction to this chapter I described Erik and Natalie's worry about Brandon's effort in the breeding enclosure, and they decided to swap him out with his brother. Following this ethnographic event, we have already glimpsed some of the predicaments faced, and decisions made, by the keepers at the Devil Rescue. Following this ethnographic event further will give an insight into the moving of the devils, the observations and the daily practices that constitute an attempt to ensure a successful breeding.

Erik and Natalie went into enclosure no. 9, while Victoria, one of the volunteers, and I stood outside, ready to jump in if needed. Erik and Natalie quickly located the devil Brandon in one of the den boxes that had a detachable roof. They quickly, and effectively caught his tail, and swiftly "bagged" him, their term for putting the devil in a burlap sack. We then all walked over to enclosure no. 1, in order to get the devil Lucky to replace Brandon which now lay in the burlap sack that hang over Erik's shoulder. Natalie had decided to get another male devil and put him in with the female next door to enclosure no. 9, while we were on the short walk. They released Brandon, and picked up Lucky, which was an easy task, since both brothers were relatively curious and unafraid of humans. When we were back at enclosure no. 9, Erik let Lucky out of the bag and asked me to observe his behavior while he, Natalie, and Victoria went to get the other male devil. I, given my inexperience with Tasmanian animals asked, "what should I look for?". "Just see if he does anything with Mary, or if he is only interested in the food". I looked at the male devil running around and sniffing the air, and once in a while snarl and bark amongst the trees. He did not approach the female hiding in her den, if it was because he was not interested, or because he had not figured out that she was close by, I did not know. Erik and the other two came back, Natalie with a burlap sack over her shoulder, with the second devil inside. The devil I had observed still seemed to care more about the half eaten possum between the trees. I told this to Eric, and he shrugged his shoulders and said that we would keep an eye on him for the rest of the day, to see if his behavior would change.

When and how long the two devils were going to stay together was decided upon the devil's behavior in the first encounter with its mate, that was monitored by the keepers, and sometimes the volunteers as well. Here the keepers closely observe the devils' behavior during the day, in order to make sure that the right behavior is being played out between the male and the female, as in showing interest, dragging her around, or if they stay together in the den box. As shown above, if the male devil does not show any interest in the female, or if the female is not submissive and thus chases off the male devil, the male devil can be moved back to another enclosure again. If this happens, the male devil is either replaced with another male devil, if there are any other recommended breeding options for the female, or the keepers wait a few days to see if the devil's behavior changes. This observation and engagement to ensure mating between them the devils happened on a regular basis.

As we see, beside moving around the devils, there was much time spent on observation and on calculating the dates for the next stage in the series of tasks that had to be carried out, besides the other daily tasks done by the keepers, like handling tourists, preparing food, and feeding it to the hungry devils. Anticipating the days of the first mating, separation of the pairs, birth, and for pouch checking (and thus for the next breeding cycle if the first failed) were the most important stages that needed to be calculated, and the dates were then written on the white board inside the office for everyone to keep in mind.

Marsupial pouch checking

Birth takes place around 21 days after mating, and the pouch can be checked after around 40 days to see if there are any joey's in the female devils' pouch. If there aren't, the female devil will ovulate again, and the keepers will have a new chance to breed her, but it is said that there is less of a chance the second time for a successful mating¹⁵. The pouch checking is also an intimate interaction between keeper and devil, one with potential danger and frustration for both devil and keeper. When the keepers at the Devil Rescue check the pouch of a female devil potentially with devil pups, one keeper lifts the devil up and holds her by the tail while a second keeper, using a head flashlight, attempts to look for young devils the size of a

15 The chance for the female devil to successfully mate and give birth lessens after the first ovulation. She can ovulate several times, but as many experienced devil keepers informed me, the chances for joey's after the first try lessens.

fingernail latched onto one of the four teats. All this is done while also trying to avoid the snapping teeth of the angry female devil. At Devil Rescue a lot of emotions were displayed by the keepers during this year's pouch checking. They hadn't had any devil pups born in the park for the last two years, which made the keepers nervous. "We haven't had any young devils for some years now. It is stressful and disappointing when we check the pouches", Erik said after the first devil we checked this season, with a disappointing result. I asked why the devils hadn't given birth the last years. "It can be for different reasons. Stress, a lot of noise, or just inexperience in the recommended devils". He continued saying, "I really hope Eden has pups, she has had all the right signs, and she has fattened up lately".

The pouch check is a stressful affair, as I witnessed several times during my fieldwork. This stress comes from both the risk and struggle from actually checking the pouch of a non-anesthetized devil, but can also be caused by the possible feelings of disappointment over finding an empty pouch. This empty pouch is a hard hit for the keepers, that who are personally invested in the particular devils and the continuity of the wildlife park.

The first time I observed one of the pouch checking's was in early May, and that day all four of that year's recommended breeding devils were going to be checked. After the other volunteers and I had done performed the morning routines, cleaning toilets, vacuuming the floors, polishing windows, and feeding the wombats, Erik came storming into the office during our coffee break, and declared that they were going to check the pouches that day. The volunteers got excited, but Erik was clearly stressed. He said that we could start with the routines in the park (cleaning the enclosures), but that he would come and get us after the 10.30 guided tour, so that we could help if needed. We smiled, and during the routine work we talked about how exciting it was going to be to observe the pouch checking.

Erik told the other volunteers to get some burlap bags, and handed me the big red flashlight from the office. He then walked towards enclosure no 9, where Ebony was being kept. He leaned on the fence while waiting for the others to arrive, and said, "I think we are starting with her [Ebony]. She is the most likely to have pups. And the most difficult to check". Ebony was an incredibly feisty devil, so the keepers wanted to start with her in case it would take longer than expected. Mia, the second keeper, came up to the fence with the volunteers trailing after her. She and Erik jumped over the fence, and into the enclosure, where Ebony started to growl and bark at them. Erik looked at me and said, "you don't always need to wait for permission, just jump in". I then realized that I was going to participate in the pouch

check, and not just observe with the other volunteers. I jumped in, and waited in the back, while Erik and Mia tried to grab Ebony's tail. This happened fast, and Ebony was screaming, snapped and tried to resist the handling. Erik first tried to grab her under her chest, and hold her up against his stomach and chest. He sat down on a big stump near the fence, while Mia put on a head flashlight. Mia told me to light up the pouch for her, and showed me where to point the light. Mia hadn't done any pouch checks before, so this was her first time as well. Earlier that day, Erik had explained what to look for, and what the young devils would look like. While Erik held onto the fighting devil in his arms, Mia bent down and started to open the pouch to look inside. The entrance was covered in fur and skin flaps, so this was difficult. She managed to find two of the teats, but no young devils in sight yet. She had some problems looking through all the obstacles, and Ebony started fighting even more. Erik then stood up, and held Ebony's tail with her head pointed downwards, and Mia sat down on her knees and tried again. I followed, and tried my best to light the way, and make it easier to look. Mia had to be careful now, because Ebony could now claw and snap after her hands while she looked through the pouch. She found the third and fourth teat, and there was nothing there either. Erik looked sad, and put Ebony back on the ground. She ran straight into her den when Erik let her loose. We jumped out of the enclosure and walked straight to the next enclosure to see if we got something there.

In the above, we can see that physical proximity provides an important tool in the human-devil relations during the breeding season. Proximity is shown in the close physical contact between keeper and devil in the ethnographic descriptions throughout this thesis, exemplified in moving devils between enclosures, feeding, practices of conditioning and other kinds of interactions. However, here it becomes clear that another type of proximity becomes important, and that is the emotional proximity both used and expressed by the keepers during this season. I will come back to this emotional proximity in chapter 5, in order to highlight other ways of expressing this proximity.

Maybe surprisingly, the close physical contact was to some degree downplayed during this season, and creating distance received more attention than before. It became clear that distance as a practice was enacted by the keepers to give the devils opportunity to be alone, and to not be disturbed in their mating. This showed itself in the way that keepers at both the Devil Rescue closed off the part of the park where the mating devils were housed. Volunteers was instructed to be silent in close vicinity to these enclosures, and cleaning routines were

postponed in order to give the devils privacy. These changes were enacted because different kinds of disturbances can reduce the chance of the devils having a successful breeding season. Use of distance was much enacted by the keepers in order to ensure that the devils were undisturbed during the mating, and that they had the opportunity to breed in as natural a way as possible. This was an intended strategy meant to give the devils room to act out the right breeding behavior, and to make it easier not to disturb the mating, since this can have a negative effect on the devils. Parts of the park were closed off for tourists, as to avoid noise around the breeding enclosures, and were still closed after the mating as well, so that the potential mothers could give birth undisturbed.

Legislated recommendations or subjective personality?

In this section I will explain the decisions surrounding what was seen as "wanted", and "unwanted" breeding at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah, or rather, the most wanted outcome for a breeding season. Because of the devils' short lifespan, to miss out on a season of reproduction, which means that no young devils are born, can be critical when viewed in relation to both internal expansion, and also in light of the conservation work of the species as a whole. As mentioned earlier, the breeding pair is decided upon by consulting a governmental studbook, in order to maintain the highest possible genetic variation in the captive population; or at least it is intended to work in this way. But as Erik explained one day during a coffee break, "The personality of the devils doesn't always fit with the studbook recommendations", he explains further that some devils are more aggressive than others, "if the female is more aggressive than the male, the male can be chased off and won't be able to breed with her". Here, in this context, when he was talking about "personality" Erik referred to the individual devil's different sets of behavior. Some devils were more aggressive, others more curious, and yet others more timid. The Devil Rescue had been following the recommended breeding pairs, but breeding "the right genes" could be risky for the individual wildlife parks, and not always be a secure tactic to ensure the birth of young devils to safeguard further visitation. If the devils' personalities and experience are not compatible with each other, the wildlife park can end up with no young devils as future residents. "Some parks have been breeding devils outside the recommended pairings, which we haven't done" Erik explained. By breeding devils outside the studbook recommendations, the other parks would

at least end up with some young devils that would either be released on a case-by-case basis, or in order to have some permanent residents in the park. This practice is used to ensure that there will be devils in the park, even if this means that they don't have the right genes, and the devils therefore can't be entered into the studbook for later pairing in the breeding program.

As I mentioned in the introductory chapter of this thesis, following the writings of Latour about animals and materials as more than just objects, Tasmanian devils, alongside other animals, can be seen as actants. In the earlier example in which devils exhibit different behavior towards each other, and towards humans, the devils can also be seen as subjects, they *are* something, besides just *doing* things (Risan 2003: 20). As Risan writes about the cows he studied in Norway; "Autonomous individuality is not something that exists *inside* bodies in itself. It is something that is created by specific social, technical, and material relations, which one uses to imbue a body with individuality. (Risan 2003: 20, my own translation). Risan later explains how the cow's personality became more important and distinct, after transforming the former "stall based cowshed" (båsfjøs) into an "open functioning cowshed" (løsdriftfjøs). He writes that the personality occurred as a phenomenon, and as mentioned in the citation above, was created through the specific social relations between cow and farmer, and this process could be initiated by both the animal and the human in question. In the case with the devils, the keeper's attention is often directed towards these personality traits, by observing *how the devils act* towards each other, and towards humans. This gives an indication on how, and if, they will be able to mate with the partner as recommended by the Studbook.

The devil's behaviors are in this instance important to the keepers, as their interpretations can ensure that the mating can will be successful. In the wildlife parks, the individual animal is being cared for, and discussed on the basis of their personality, which is observed and interpreted by the keepers. This was practiced at both the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah, where the devil's personality and doings were an everyday topic. Especially during the breeding season, when close observation was vital for the devils' health and well-being in case something went wrong. "You can easily see which devils fit together, and the studbook recommendations do not always work out", Adam said one day, when I was visiting Tarrabah for one of the observational visits. We were taking care of the feeding for some of the devil enclosures and were pushing a wheelbarrow ahead of us, full of dead pademelon. He tossed a whole pademelon into one of the enclosures, and pointed at the two devils inside. "They are

recommended to breed, but he [the devil] has never had a successful breeding before. We will probably put a new male in with her soon”. “Will he be one of the recommended devils to breed with her?” I asked, he shook his head. “No, but he has been fathering children the last two years. He knows what he's doing”. We can here see that successful breeding is important for the wildlife parks even when the devils devil pairings are not recommended by the government studbook. All devils are not on the list of recommended breeding every year. Tim, the owner of Tarrabah, on day stated when I asked around about the breeding pattern, that if you don't breed a devil during its first season, this devil will most likely not breed successfully for the rest of its short life.

What we see here is a plan versus reality in the making, and how keepers navigate between regulations and the best outcome for a breeding season. There are, as I have described above, three outcomes for the breeding season that range from the best outcome to the least wanted. First of these, the most desirable outcome, is a successful breeding between the recommended breeding pairs, but this outcome can be unpredictable. Here the keepers' predictions of success through intimate knowledge of the devil's personalities and behaviors can be in contrast with the studbook recommendations, which do not take this knowledge into account. The second most desirable outcome would be to breed outside the recommended devil pairings, in order to ensure new devils that can help expand the captive population later, even though these devils can't be registered in the national breeding program. The third, and most undesirable outcome is then no successful breeding, if the recommended devils fail to produce young. As we see in this discussion about personality or recommendations, where the personalities of the devils and the official recommendations may be in conflict, the keepers have to work with different obstacle in mind in their attempt to breed the devils, both to ensure genetic variety by using the studbook recommended pairings, but also to ensure the future of the park, and an increase in the devil populations in captivity, by breeding outside the recommended genetic pairings.

The Australian state, as demonstrated by the studbook recommendations, is in this instance not considering individual personalities or interactions that the devils may have, which may influence if the devils mate or fight each other off. For the conservation work, the recommendations are purely based on the genetics of the devils to ensure genetic variety and to avoid inbreeding and similarity in the captive population. The “Save the Tasmanian devil” program is more directed towards the Tasmanian devil as a species, where its genes are

important for the species' survival in the big picture. We see here, then, that the devils "exist" on two levels, and mean different things to different people. There are the individual devils in the wildlife parks, that develop close relations to keepers, volunteers, are being used to educate visitors about the species, and are to a degree bred without being part of release programs themselves, as we can see from the ethnographic observations from both the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah. But the Tasmanian devil is also an abstract entity, a species that has to be saved from a deadly disease, and thus, from extinction. The devils in wildlife parks therefore represent the whole species, both wild and those in captivity.

The devil on a leash?

As we see in Anneberg's chapter in the text "Farm animals in a welfare state - commercial pigs in Denmark", even in the case of traditionally domesticated, and industrialized pigs in the meat-industry in Denmark, the farmers can feel a lack of control over their own pigs due to state legislation (Anneberg under review). We can see the same lack of control in the case of the park keepers, embodied by the studbook recommendations in the Tasmanian devil breeding program. Here the keepers stand in-between the push from legislation and the reality of the devils' personalities. But in this case, as opposed to Anneberg's example, the lack of control does not only stem from the different social actors in the legislation. Due to the way the Tasmanian devil breeding are practiced in Tasmanian wildlife parks, the devils as actors themselves can choose not to cooperate with the keepers.

A second question about control, besides the question *who* is in control asked earlier, arises from the devils' sometimes difficult personalities and unwillingness to breed at the Devil Rescue. Can breeding be fully controlled as Clutton-Brock suggests with her emphasis on human mastery over domestic animals? As we see in Anneberg's example, pigs being bred in Scandinavian society are subject to a greater degree of control than is the case for the devils in Tasmania. The pigs are artificially inseminated to reproduce, and thus the pigs' own control over their reproduction disappears, and more active control is being enacted by the farmer (Anneberg under review). In the case of the Tasmanian devils, the animals are being placed together and are left to perform the mating process by themselves. There is not as much control enacted by the keepers specifically in the mating, other than choosing the partners that

are supposed to breed. The devils, as we see in the ethnographic examples earlier in this chapter, can *choose* not to cooperate with the keepers.

As we see in the case of the devil breeding, people do not have *complete mastery* over the breeding in its whole. The mating partners are chosen using the studbook recommendations, and the keepers put the devils together, but this is where the definition falls short. It assumes the animals' cooperation in breeding, that they keep to their confinement, that they eat the meat that is given. Donna Haraway's notion about "degrees of freedom" gives a good understanding of the devil's choice to not cooperate, and thus not fully controlled by humans. Haraway writes about Lab animals and states that "Indeed, they have many degrees of freedom in more mundane sense, including the inability of experiments to work if animals and other organisms do not cooperate" (Haraway 2008: 73). I understand this in the way that animals, as actors, *can act* and *do respond* to interaction and situations. The devils we see that they are not always cooperating with the keepers in the breeding, and the chosen partners. Haraway continues with; "something outside calculation can still happen" (Haraway 2008:73), and as it becomes "degrees of freedom" for the devils, it, therefore, also can be understood as a *lack control* for humans and thus, not human mastery.

Making marsupial families

The captive breeding of the Tasmanian devil also reproduce family relations, as is an obvious fact when reproducing. But interestingly, these family relations are not as important for the animals themselves as it is for the humans involved. These family relations are, as earlier explained important for the studbook to be able to breed what they see as favorable outcome, but the family relations become important both for the keepers and for the guided tours for the tourists visiting the park. During my fieldwork's data collection, it became clear that the devil's genealogy became relevant for the individual parks in the close bonds developed between humans and devils which I discussed in the previous chapter. In the office at the Devil Rescue there is kinship trees drawn on sheets and hung on the wall to keep personal track of the devil's familial bonds beside using the studbook. The work of systematize these

kinship trees was done by one of the keepers, and they were regularly updated when the animals was genetically tested¹⁶.

As well as highlighting the devils "families", they were also referred to in terms that made it easy for tourists to relate to these unusual and aggressive animals. The devils are often talked about and presented to the tourists in kinship terms, or other relatable terms. The tree devils that was housed in the first enclosure, no. 1 early on in my fieldwork, was brothers from a last years breeding season, and was still housed together. They were always introduced as the tree brothers, even though they looked rather different. Two of the devils was similar, both in size and in the white markings on the chest and back, but the third one was smaller and completely black without any white markings. This made them a great example of the possible different fathers from the same breeding season. Family relations was written down each year, but since the devils that reproduced the year before are not always recommended to breed the next year, these kinship trees do not always last for several generations.

Tarrabah has the longest devil's kinship three in in Tasmanian wildlife parks, hung up on the wall in the reception of the park. At the Devil Rescue familial bonds are being made a point during the guided tours with tourists, where devils are introduced as "the three brothers" or "the girls" to indicate their relatedness, which again can be related to tourists, or humans generally to see bonds in animals, that don't necessarily are of importance for the animals themselves.

Reproducing relations

As I asked in the introduction of this chapter; what does the breeding of devils reproduce beside the obvious outcome, which is the young animals? First off all, the wildlife parks are crucial dependent on devils for the parks sustainability and the keepers place of work. Since the Devil Rescue are also a tourist attraction, and thus get its main economical income from visitors, they need a steady amount of devils to ensure visitation. The future of the Tasmanian devil population is also dependent on the captive breeding. As mentioned in chapter one, the captive devils are in the breeding program to ensure a healthy population in captivity that can

16 Female devils can store sperm from multiply male devils in one season. This means that one female devil can give birth to pups genetically related to different male devils at once.

be released into the wild in the future, if the percent wild devils die out. Because of the devil's short lifespan, each breeding season becomes highly important for the keepers in terms of conservation and a personal investment in the further of the workplace. But it also reproduces a possible wild population of devils in the future of the Tasmanian wilderness. The captive devils are not wild themselves, but their offspring and later genetic family have the possibility to become wild devils.

Then again comes the question about what is wild. Is it genes, right behavior and the fact that they don't have fences? Are then the devils held in captivity still wild after releasing? As Lien show in "Aquaculture and the domestication of a fish" (2015), how we can see and understand the differences in wild salmon and farmed salmon. Here genetic differences between the wild and the "previous captive" salmon that is seen as negative to be blended. But in the devils' case wildlife parks breed devils with genetic variety to ensure wild Tasmanian devils. These devils are being bred to be wild on a later stage. This example with the devils can demonstrate that the divide we make between wild and domestic are a construction of our imagines, which in practice are being crossed again and again.

5 Confinement, care and park economics

In earlier chapters, I spent quite some time explaining the relationships between keepers and devils which in effect “create” the different kinds of devils, where the wild and the domesticated are being enacted through performance of everyday practices. In contrast, in this chapter I will focus on the care-practices that are being carried out by the keepers, volunteers and tourists, and how these differ in the three groups of people, and further how they differ in their relations to the animals. But also, how the groups of people here, are created in to different kinds of care-givers by the animals at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah. As Law and Lien establish in "animal architectures", through animal welfare and due to the growth of animal studies, it is nowadays more common to see animals as actors, by recognizing the sentience of animals (Law and Lien 2013). Care is thus both of theoretical and empirical importance. I will show how care and animal welfare was highly considered in all daily practices at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah, and theoretically, and the theoretical study of care as well as animal welfare studies have helped develop a better understanding of other non-humans wellbeing and suffering (Haraway 2008, Lien 2015).

As I will show in this chapter, care can be both close and embodied, with attention to details in health and suffering, but care can also be mechanical labor, practiced in routine work, and can even be expressed through confinement. First, I will give an insight into the daily routines of feeding, cleaning and maintenance that are all, in my view, ways for the keepers and volunteers to protect and care for the animals. I will then discuss the entanglement of care and confinement at the Devil Rescue, and how confinement can be seen as care for the animals wellbeing, as Kristian Bjørkdahl and Tone Druglitrø (2016) argues for in "Animal housing and human-animal relations". Further, I will highlight the close and embodied care that is enacted by the keepers and the volunteers, and how care is performed differently between species, but as actors, devils also react and engage with the care-givers, which have the possibility to fulfill different rolls of being a care-giver for the keepers and volunteers. In the end I will discuss how the tourists practice care, and how the animals are being made relatable for tourists, so that they can develop an emotional connection to the residence animals.

The devil is in the detail

The routine check happens in the morning when the first keeper arrives at work. Natalie came in to the office and took Wendy out of her pouch and put her on the floor, she did this in order to take Wendy with us on the morning walk around the park to get some exercise. We both walked out into the clear morning sun, and Wendy followed close by at Natalie's feet. We walked up to Jack's enclosure, and Natalie leaned on the fence and had a short look inside and observed the devil that was scratching himself with his hind leg. We moved on to the rest of the enclosures and Natalie looked into all of them to see if everything was as it should be, and what kind of work she could put the volunteers up to this day. This check was especially important in the breeding pens, to see if anything unusual was happening, or if everything was going as it should between the devils. When we came down to the STQ, Natalie said that it looked like Drusella and Siri (two female STQ), might need some new branches to replace the old, dead ones, which were used to climb on or as a hiding place for the animals. When we all got back to the office, Natalie sat down by a desk and started writing down notes in a notebook laying open. On the top of the page, she wrote down the date and how the weather was outside, this was followed by an account of what she saw and did that morning. This was something done every day by all the staff members to keep track of the everyday-happenings in the park.

First off all, both the keepers and volunteers are performing care through labor, the difference is that the keepers get paid, and being full time staff, they therefore also have a more intimate relationship to the animals at the Devil Rescue. Second, As Lien describes, in the careful attention to the farmed salmon's condition and health in everyday routines, care is more than just affectionate love given (Lien 2015). Care also entails the attention given to the animals themselves, attention to the animal housing, and to the daily routines that ensure continued health and well maintained enclosures. As Singleton writes, caring for, in her case, cattle on the farm is a demanding series of daily routines accompanied by considerable knowledge specific to this farm, its land and these cattle are enacted, in here case, by farmers with their cows in the everyday practices (Singleton 2010: 237). The same is the case with the Tasmanian devils, where at the Devil Rescue, care was to check the conditions of the animals in the morning, it was the extra food given to an old and stumbling devil to "give them something extra", it was the maintenance work done in heavy rain to make sure that the enclosures did not overflow, care was embodied in the restriction created by the perimeter

fence, keeping DFTD away from the captive devils, and in the daily cleaning of the enclosures.

These routines varied from season to season. Difficulties sometimes arose with the harsh mountain weather in Tasmania, where cold weather snow and heavy rainfall could cause situations where the animals needed extra attention and care. With heavy rainfall the drains needed to be checked and opened up for the enclosures to not overflow the enclosures, and bedding-straw needed to be replaced and filled up for the animals to be warm and comfortable. In the winter it was important to check if the animals had enough warm bedding and were not freezing. As we already got a small peek at here, is attention to animal housing is of importance for the animal care at the Devil Rescue, so I will now turn to discuss animal housing and confinement practices that I observed at the wildlife parks in Tasmania.

Shielded from the outside world

It is perhaps generally not a common thing to see confinement as care. This is especially the case in wildlife conservation in which case legislation and animal freedom fighters work against bad treatment of animals kept in small cages, which is often what is made painfully visible in the public media. But confinement can also be a form of care, and care can be confinement as well. As Bjørkdahl and Druglitrø write "the politics of animal housing should not start from the a priori conclusion that all animal housing in itself is bad", he continues that animal housing "must be seen as nodes of human-animal interaction, which implicate various versions of care and management" (Bjørkdahl and Druglitrø 2016: 7). Confinement does not automatically mean small cages, and as I already have mentioned in the introductory chapter, the devils are being protected from the deadly tumor disease in captivity, where the fences shield them from the threatening disease outside. As Bjørkdahl and Druglitrø establish, welfare, care, and animal housing goes go hand in hand in human-animal relations. Care and confinement in domestication practices are therefore closely connected. This is clearly seen in much of the care performed in the case of the Tasmanian devil, as I will show with ethnographic observations of practice in care giving, and how confinement and structural design in wildlife parks' control these practices. For the devils to be closed off from the disease outside the walls is also a form of care, where they are able to live healthy lives without being in danger of contracting the deadly disease.

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, ANT and the "material-semiotic approach" emphasizes how all things have the potential to produce effects and outcomes, thus these objects or technologies are always inscribed with meaning (Bjørkdahl and Druglitrø 2016: 6).

As the many insightful articles in the new book; "Animal housing and Human animal relations" show, animal housing often constitutes the human-animal relations, and the proximity or distance it creates. These practices in housing animals, according to Bjørkdahl and Druglitrø, manage *how* the animals at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah interact with humans, and *who* they interact with. As I described in chapter two, the devil and quoll enclosures contained one or several humans made human-made den-boxes, depending on the size of the enclosure, that were shielded with natural bushes or with cut down branches laid over them. Animal-made dens could also sometimes be found in the enclosures, where holes in the ground were dug up. This housing practice varied between wildlife parks, but this practice at the Devil Rescue made it easy for the devils to choose to hide from the visitors' view if needed. The fences also restricted human proximity in different ways. Keepers and volunteers could walk freely into the animal enclosures, while the tourists were not allowed inside. As mentioned in chapter two, there were also differences in the quoll and devil enclosures, quoll enclosures were completely closed off, while the devils only had fences that reached chest-high. This could give tourists a feeling of getting closer to the devils, as they did not have roofing or tall fences surrounding their enclosures.

Devils out of place - When confinement fails

But what happens when the animal housing fails, and the animals somehow manage to breach the barrier, and cross the borders that are not meant to be crossed? Animal housing can in some instances be of vital importance for both animal care and human welfare. As in the case with the Tasmanian devil, the perimeter fence is made to keep, amongst other things, sick devils infected with the tumor disease away from the healthy devils in captivity. This means that if this outer fence is no longer intact, the devils' health can be in danger.

Wynifred, the "teenage" wombat free-ranging in the park, was a clever escapee at several times during my fieldwork, which unfortunately left a big hole in the perimeter fence. She was not old enough to be released into the wild, but she still longed for the greener grass on

the other side. A hole in the fence could potentially lead to contagious devils, infected with DFTD, coming inside the park and would therefore be a problem for the security measures at the Devil Rescue. During one of the times Wynifred escaped, we found a hole in the fence behind the dumpsters, right beside the keepers center. The keepers automatically reacted and set the volunteers to bait the traps and set them up inside the park in case some of the “wrong” devils had managed to crawl under the fence and in to the devil sanctuary. Because of the DFTD, it was important for the facility to uphold the secure and disease free area so that the captive devils would stay healthy. Furthermore, earlier that month some game trail ¹⁷ cameras hung up outside the fences at the Devil Rescue had captured an infected devil walking past, ¹⁸ which) made it even more crucial that we made sure that no devils had entered the park, since we now had proof that there were contagious devils right outside the park.

Later that day, I asked Erik if any stray devils had gotten inside the park before. He told me that last year a young devil had gotten in through one of the gates. They had caught him with a trap and released him outside again. Here we can see a clear distinction between the "right", healthy devils staying inside their assigned space, and the "wrong", diseased devils outside their rightful place, which is on the outside of the perimeter fence. Inside the park the wild devils would become "matter out of place" as Mary Douglas would say (Douglas 1959). Not only are wild devils on the wrong side of the perimeter fence “out of place”, but also captive devils in the park can be out of place when they for some reason manage to escape from their respective enclosures. After I asked Erik about wild devils coming inside the park, he said that the traps we had already set in the park (tree of them placed around enclosure 13), were put out for the pre-released devils in case they escaped from the enclosures. This was because the pre-released devils were quite young when the Devil Rescue received them, and therefore, still at an age where they could climb trees and onto stumps. The wildlife cameras that had been put up in enclosure 13 showed a couple of instances in which the young devils had climbed on top of the fence, but had luckily jumped down again on the right side.

Embodied practices and emotional care

¹⁷

The Devil Rescue used trail cameras, bit motion detection, to observe and record devil behavior inside and outside the park as part of research programs for Tasmanian devils.

¹⁸

DFTD is clearly visible in its later stages of the disease, where large sized tumors grow in the devils face and neck.

In addition to the daily routines and practices in animal housing, there is close and direct care given by the keepers and volunteers at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah. This is the care as I will describe here, close and embodied care given even to a carnivorous and aggressive species as the Tasmanian devil. Annemarie Mole, Ingunn Moser and Jannette Pols write in the introduction to "Care in practice: on tinkering in clinics, homes and farms" in the following; "care practices move us away from rationalist versions of the human being. For rather than insisting on cognitive operations, they involve embodied practices. Rather than requiring impartial judgments and firm decisions, they demand attuned attentiveness and adaptive tinkering" (Mol et. al. 2010: 15). As I understand it, care in itself is dependent on embodied practices, especially in husbandry care where the objects of care cannot speak, and therefore they cannot depend on verbal communication. All these embodied practices unfold within the everyday care I outlined above, where "good care" depends on the attention given to the daily routines and the knowledge about the park and its animals (Singleton 2010). As I will show, this care is performed a bit different in the care given to the devils and care given to the wombats, which I will use as an example.

I will now draw on some differences between wombat- and devil-care, in order to highlight the differences between these embodied practices of care-giving. In the second chapter I introduced the orphan wombats at the Devil Rescue that are being taken care of by the keepers and volunteers. These animals can be released when old enough to look after themselves, even after having been raised by humans. This usually happens when they are around 2 years of age. Before this, they develop close bonds with the staff and volunteers at the Devil Rescue. The two young wombat, Wendy and Lilly, were dependent on being fed and taken home at night as well as being cared for and cuddled with during the day. The wombats had to be hand fed with milk from a bottle 3 times a day, every day, a job that the volunteers often did, and they were too young to stay outside at night and were therefore taken home with the keepers or the long-term volunteers at night. The care given to wombats was more intimate than that given to the devils. Close relations develop between keepers and wombats, but these relationships also had to end when the wombats were released when they got old enough to live on their own. The wombat care was also a practice that differed from the care that Tarrabah performed for their wombats, as Tarrabah had more wombats and a bigger park, they did not take the wombats home at night, instead the wombats stayed together in one enclosure instead.

Helene and Rose were two volunteers from a university in Sidney, who had to attain some work practice in a wildlife park during their veterinary study, and were therefore volunteering at the Devil Rescue for two weeks. During my first day as a volunteer at the Devil Rescue they showed me how to make milk for the young devils and the wombats. The 7 month old devils were drinking milk from a bowl, but the wombats of the same age still needed to be fed with a bottle. This was due to Wombats usually being dependent on their mother for a longer period of time than young devils are.

My first practice in making milk and feeding it to the wombats took place in the morning at my first day as a volunteer. Rose, Helene and I walked inside the food prep-area, and into the food container outside my cabin at the keeper's center. Rose put on the kettle while Helene went out to the spring to fetch some cold water with a measuring cup. Rose explained how the water was supposed to be lukewarm for the young marsupials, but that I had to make sure that it was not too hot either so that they would not get burned. Using 3 scoops of milk powder, a special milk mix for animals, we mixed it with the water using a wooden stick, and poured half of the cup in a bottle for Wendy, and the rest in a drinking bowl for the two hungry devils. We then walked up towards the office and on the way Rose unlocked the gate to the young devil's enclosure and placed the bowl on the grass, close by the den box where they were hiding. Wendy was hanging inside a cloth pouch on the wall when we walked into the office. Helene took her out of the pouch and placed her on the gray carpet floor, where the wombat sat down on her backside and scratched herself with one of her hind legs. Rose laughed and remarked how cute she was. She picked up a slightly smelly towel that she laid over the wombat, picked her up and then rolled her up in the towel, like a human baby. I sat down on the bench in one end of the office and Rose handed Wendy to me and told me how to hold her, and to make sure that she did not drink too fast, the milk could then go into her lungs and she would choke. I started to feed her while Helene and Rose sat down with a coffee each, looking at the wombat slowly drinking the milk.

In this short ethnographic instance, we get an idea of how the wombats form a closer relationship with the keepers and volunteers than the devils, in the way humans are able to give more intimate and loving care for this type of animal. As young, the wombats were not put in enclosures, they stayed in the office, either sleeping in a pouch on the wall or played with on the office floor. When they grew old enough they free-ranged in the park, and could approach keepers as well as tourists to get attention and a pet on the head. The embodied

practices clearly differed between these two species because of their behavior and their differing ability to interact closely with humans. Care interactions with the wombats can evoke a nursing relation, due to the wombats need to be fed by bottle, and possible a more fulfilling relation of care for those that seek this experience with animals as a volunteer. The embodied care practices therefore happen a bit differently between humans and devils than between humans and wombats. With the devils there is a physical aspect to the care too, where for example injuries and wounds the devils may have, are treated as well as possible, but it involves a greater risk for humans of getting hurt and thus more cautious physical handling. Still it involves embodied care, as I will show in this next section.

Later in the same day as I recounted earlier, after the first guided tour was over, Erik noticed that the devil Howard had a large open wound on his back, probably from a fight between him and one of the other dominant devils. Erik and Natalie talked about Howard when I entered the office, and because there were few visitors at that moment, decided that they would have a closer look at the wound on Howard's back right away. Erik grabbed the wound disinfectant and handed it to me, "are you coming with us?", I nodded, and followed them out onto the platform outside the visitor center, and down the stairs to enclosure number four. Natalie jumped over the fence and into the enclosure, where 3 of the park's male devils stayed for the moment. She had a quick walk through the open areas, then bent over and looked into the different dens. She found Howard in the one dens closest to the feeding area. She called to Erik, "he's here", and Erik jumped over the fence too. I stood on the other side observing while they tried to get Howard out of his hiding place. Natalie tried to poke a stick into one end of the den so that Erik could grab Howard's tail and drag him out. They managed this without any problems, and I handed Natalie the disinfectant. They had a closer look at the wound while Erik was holding him upside down from the tail, and concluded that the devil would be fine with just some cleaning now and then. They then proceeded to pour some of the liquid over the wound and then put him down on the ground again. I asked what they would do if the wound was too serious for just treating it with the disinfectant. Erik explained that they would then have to contact the veterinary in the closest town, and perhaps drive Howard down to the clinic to get him checked. "But they usually manage just fine, it's not often that we have any serious injuries. The fighting is often over before that. But we always check and make sure that the wounds heal and don't get infected".

What we can learn from these embodied practices of animal care, is first of all that they look different with regards to the species that is being cared for. With regard to the wombats, humans are able to have more direct contact, as the wombat is dependent on the keepers and longtime volunteers for a longer period of time than the devils. But the devils can be interacted closely with as well; if hand reared from an early age, as discussed in chapter 3. The second lesson from these embodied practices is that these ethnographic encounters show that care for marsupial animals is a learned practice. These practices of care have to be learned, and thus the volunteers had to learn the specific practices in care for the different animal species. The volunteers at the Devil Rescue go through a learning process where they learn body movements and behavior that is important in encounters with this type of aggressive animal, in order to be able to perform the right form of care. The third lesson is that these ethnographic moments shows how the animals make keepers and volunteers in to *different kinds of care-givers*. With this I mean that these two species of animals I describe fulfill different expectations and roles for being a keeper or a volunteer. Whit wombats a close, loving and nursing care are embodied, from the wombat's needs and responses of affection. While work with the devils can be physical close and embodied, this care express itself more through an emotional care, an idea of "saving the species". Also, given the devils aggressive behavior, risk and excitement is involved in the form of care given to these animals at the Devil Rescue.

Also, care can be enacted for animals of the same species in different ways, but still be what Mole et. al. calles "good care" (2010). When we look at the different interactions keepers have with captive and pre-released devils in chapter 3, the care is also here performed differently, depending on their degree of close contact with humans, and the conservation aim at hand. As Risan conveys with an example of care performed in different ways at cow farms in Norway, where on one farm the farmer distanced himself from the cows, and the cows became timid wards humans, but could "free-range" over a bigger area, while on the other farm the cows were raised in small stalls but with close contact, interaction and care from humans (Risan 2003: 62). Risan shows with his example that care can be performed differently, but that both ways can still be seen as "good care".

The painful moments of care

Legislation for the wildlife parks partaking in the breeding strategy and conservation work with Tasmanian devils was, as mentioned in chapter 2, created by the Australian zoo and Aquarium association (AZAA). As members of this association, the wildlife parks had to measure up to a set standard regarding storage of food, animal care etc., and had a yearly visitation by a veterinarian to check up on the conditions in the park, and to ensure that the Devil Rescue upheld the regulations set by the AZAA.

These regulations include having to keep track of the animals and having to microchip them and further, it is required to register them with an identification number, a name and their genetic kinship relations. As Singleton (2010) writes about in "Control or care?", this chipping, or tagging as she refers to it, is a form of practice in animal care to keep track of the animals. The Tasmanian devils have to be chipped with identification numbers to be included in the breeding organization. Chipping is a potentially painful, but necessary, process that they had to go through when relatively young. The chipping, as the keepers called it, is the procedure of a small microchip that is being pressed under the animal's skin in at the neck with using a thick needle. The chip has a registration number stored on it that can be read-out by a small detector to make sure that the animal in question is in fact the right animal, if non-technological identification isn't sufficient¹⁹. The day we were going to chip the youngest animals started as any other day, with routine work and preparing food for the herbivore animals. But then the chipping work started, and the keepers wanted to be as efficient as possible.

Erik and Thomas went inside the enclosure where the other volunteers and I cleaned at the moment. We dropped whatever we had in our hands to observe the chipping. Thomas grabbed one of the devils, believing this devil to be Melody, because of her not being very aggressive. He bagged her, and while Eric prepared the needle with the chip, placing it in the small tube, Thomas laid the sack on the ground and opened up the end in order to find the head and the tail. He then grabbed the tail again, and removed the bag from most of the devil, so that only the head was burrowed in the sack. He pressed the devils body down to avoid movements, and Erik pulled up the skin in the neck to find the right spot to place the needle. He then shoved the needle in under the devil's skin while Thomas made sure that she kept still on the ground.

¹⁹ Tasmanian devils can be identified by its white markings on the chest and rump, which is different for all devils.

Unfortunately, When Erik removed the needle, the chip was still attached to the tip of the needle. Erik was swearing, and opened another bag with a new chip and registration number. He placed the chip in the tube again, and the second time he stuck the needle in, he made sure to hold the skin around the entrance of the needle hole closed, so that the chip would stay in place under the skin. Finally, Erik took the scanner from his back pocket and scanned the chip and read the identification number successfully.

Erik and Thomas' practice of tagging the animals at the Devil Rescue look violent, the devil tries to resist the unusual treatment. How is this a form of care-giving? As we see, the Erik and Thomas want to get through with this process as fast as possible. This process was uncomfortable for both parts, the devils and the humans. The keepers mentioned several times that it looks painful, and mentioned the thickness of the needle, especially when they had to do it twice on Casper. As Haraway made clear in "when species meet" (2008), care also includes suffering. This shared suffering Haraway writes about, is not direct physical suffering experienced by humans, but humans can share the suffering the animals go through in compassion and empathy for the animals. To be able to protect these animals, and for the long term care for the devil, the parks' functions and the conservation and its breeding system, this is a *necessary process*, and thus, a form for care. As Lien writes, the anesthetic given to the salmon on a conveyor belt was necessary for vaccinating the fish, and thus ensure their health in for the future time in the tanks (Lien 2015). In the same vain, the devils went through similar necessary process of physical suffering to be incorporated in the breeding system. To share the devils suffering, and thus enacting care, "would be to do the work of paying attention and making sure that the suffering is minimal, necessary, and consequential" (Haraway 2008: 82).

Care can involve risk for the caretakers when working with aggressive animals. When working with aggressive animals, injuries can occur frequently, also in humans. To be bitten is a somewhat regular happening, that can occur several times per month at the park. The bite of a Tasmanian devil is, as I explained in chapter 2, the strongest bite in the animal kingdom relative to the animal's size. This of course hurts the keepers, and can happen during hand feeding, during the close-contact maintenance of a wound, or in other instances where the keeper needs to be in an enclosure with the animals. "Sharing Pain promises disclosure, promises becoming" (Haraway 2008: 84).

Caring through an imaginary relation

The animal care-practices I have dealt with concerns the animal keeper's relations to the animals they take care of. This is the most visible, "hands-on" concern for the animals wellbeing, and, as we have seen, develop affection and love in the relationship. So the question I want to ask now are; can tourists practice care for the animals at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah? The tourist does not have access to the same close proximity to the devils as the keepers do. This, however, do not mean that tourist do not care *about* the animals, and thus do not care *for* them. The Devil Rescue and Tarrabah are both conservation parks, aiming on saving Tasmanian devils as a species by protecting them in captivity, and breeding a healthy population. Both of the parks are as well tourist parks, founded by paying visitors. In this, I see the payment as a form of care, since this contributes to the wildlife arks further conservation work. But what kind of payment is involved? The tourists can contribute to the Devil Rescue in two ways; by visit, and joining the guided tours and by souvenirs, and by adoption. Both closely relate to feelings of affect and to an emotional type of care, since the tourists do not have access to the close proximity to the animals as the keepers and volunteers have. But what does it take to make people care?

Both of these ways for tourists to care are staged by the wildlife parks, in how the access to the devils are being orchestrated by more and more access the more a tourist is paying. The embodied proximity is thus an attractive quality of the encounter, an "scarce commodity", that tourists willingly pay for. Closer proximity can be attained trough guided tours with higher intimacy between keeper, tourist and animals²⁰. From Nothing, or at least rarely in the wild, to, at the Devil Rescue tourist could pay for a regular visit, where they could join on of the day tours or self-guide through the park. The tourists pay an entry fee of 18 Australian dollars for adults to access the park, and the guided tours during the normal opening hours are included in the price. The night tours cost extra, and last longer and include more intimate encounter with the animals, as I described with an ethnographic account in chapter 2. As described, the keepers will feed the devils in the night tours, which make the devils and quolls are more visible, and the keeper will often pick up one of the younger devils, or a devil that has been tamed since their youth. Then there is a special guided tour named "dine with the

20 Here the Devil Rescue and Tharraba differed slightly, Tarrabha did not offer night tours, and therefore fed their animals during the day tours, which was included in the entry fee.

devil", with higher costs and fewer spots than on the night tour. The latter was more intimate tour and included closer proximity to the devils, where tourist could get served food and drinks while keepers fed the animals. The closest you can come, without applying for a job, are thus to become a volunteer. But this kind of economical care is not a matter of money transference, but a care through unpaid labor. As we see, the guided tours were an important place for keepers to educate the general public about devil's lifestyle and about the current threats, but also a place where tourists could develop affection for the animals, where the animals mattered for the visitors. In this, food also became important for the staged proximity and the emotional connection felt by the tourists, by the way "giving of food to others can take on strong nurturing associations... food exchanges develop and express bonds of solidarity and alliance and are often parallel to exchanges of sociality" (Knight 2005: 232).

But the tourists obtain an illusory experience of a harmonic proximity. Keepers educate and inform tourists about the habits of the animals and their often aggressive behavior, which are visible as well for the tourists during the feeding sessions. But some things are still being concealed, especially when injuries happen between keeper and devils. As I discussed in chapter 3, devils become more aggressive with humans the more they are being conditioned, they act more in the way they do with other devils. In this new relation, humans have the potentiality to be bitten, especially when hand feeding devils. There were instances where the keepers were bitten during a guided tour and tried to hide it, so that the tourists would not notice. When this happened the keepers often covered up the devil's aggressive side, emphasized the "good" features of the devils throughout the guided tour, and downplayed their more aggressive tendencies. Here, again, are the front-stage and back-stage phenomenon visible in the practices performed by the keepers (Goffman 1969). The devils are performed as less aggressive in front of tourists, and injuries are downplayed and hidden by keepers, and volunteers as well. This small, but painful interaction is not often seen nor experienced by tourists, and thus a harmonic affection in the relation is being seen. Keepers mostly do not hide the fact that devils are aggressive, and often remind people that they can bite if they are not careful.

Making marsupials matter - adoption practices

As I have mentioned in an ethnographic observation in chapter 4, feelings of familiarity and, therefore, enactment of closeness was performed through the act of interpreting the animal's behavior and conveyed this from the keepers to the visitors and the volunteers. From this we can see that the devils are being related to the visitors, as well as the tourists tries to relate, as the tourists are trying to relate to the animals themselves. The Devil Rescue has an adoption program aimed at visitors, and keepers thus make the animals matter to the people in a deeper sense, and facilitate an emotional bond for those that do not have access to the same proximity and interactions as the keepers and volunteers have access to, often in addition to the experience of a guided tour.

The adoption of the animals at the Devil Rescue was a popular way for the tourists to engage in the wildlife park's conservation efforts, and creates the possibility to show care and connection to the particular animal of your own chose residing in the wildlife park. Through the adoption program visitors could "adopt" an animal, and thus pay 50 dollars and receive an adoption card with a picture of the particular devil with its name on it. The adoption lasted for a year when private tourists adopted a devil. The Devil Rescue also had what they called cooperative Corporate Sponsorship, which meant that a corporation or business could adopt a devil for 300 dollars, and thus give a name to a young devil. Adoption then becomes a way for the tourists to feel closer to the animals in the park. The keepers called it an adoption, but it was not an adoption as we think of it in the regular sense, where the adopter takes the adoptive child or animal with them home to be its guardians. During the adoption time, the person adopting an animal would receive updates through the Devil Rescue Facebook page and get updates over email in a "magazine" made by the Devil Rescue. This constitutes an economic support for the park as a whole, but this practice can be seen as something more as than just an economic practice of care. Emotional care can be felt by the tourists for the devil's trough intimate guided tours were the tourists get a close contact, to be able to touch and be interactive with the animals, but also through the adoption program that the Devil Rescue provides to its visitors or online followers.

The folder lying on the counter was filled with pictures of the devils and quolls in the park, with a short description of the individual devil or quoll given beneath its picture. The keepers knew the animals well, and especially the devils develop different personalities that the keepers easily catch up on when they see and interact with them every day. In this adoption

folder is an anthropomorphized description of the animals as experience by the keepers in every-day situations, but often written in a nicer way than what they would express verbally "behind-the-scenes" in the office. For example, Pluto was the most aggressive animal in the park and what they all described as "full on". In the adoption folder he was described as "willful and independent and the boss of everyone ". Because of this, and the fact that he is an "good display animal", he was often adopted since people found this cute in the written text. Thomas told me while sitting on the floor in the office and sorting out new pictures for the adoption cards, that they had recently expanded the adoption to include every animal in the park, and that earlier they had only had a few available for adoption. This was because they had to update the adoption folder relatively often; when they got new animals sent from other parks, if they had new young devils born, or if some animals died of old age, remove them from the folder. I sat down and looked through the pictures. Even though I had been at the Devil Rescue for a couple of months already, I could not recognize all the animals in the photos. I often asked who was pictured and held the picture up to Thomas, automatically said the names. But when I came to the quolls, he became a bit uncertain. "the tree sisters are difficult to tell apart. I will just have to use one of the pictures and guess the name. And they don't have that much personality either, I will just have to write something"

The devils most often adopted were those presented on the guided tours, those that had been seen and experienced by the tourists. A way for the tourists to keep in touch with the animals, and follow their development and changes was to use the park's Facebook page, where pictures and information was regularly posted, also possible, was to sign up for the parks' newspaper that is sent out every semester. This imagined relation are made both through the proximity gained through guided tours and the adoption program, which indicate that those who pay can gain a relation to the animals, but not a two-way relation as the keepers and volunteers experience, it is only the receiver of this relation that get indirect care by being paid for.

These imagined relations, and close emotional care can also be developed through the way Tasmanian devils has been made in to a conservation cause, through public education, media coverage and popular TV-shows. A popular TV-series in Australia was made about the release of Tasmanian devils on Maria island, named "Devil Island" (360 Degree Films, 2013), and through this series, media updates and, of course, close guided tours the devils have increased in popularity. In the same manner as fans of the popular TV-program "Meerkat

Manor" in Candea's writing, got attached to the meerkats, some attachment could also be experienced in the case of the devils, through the way they were talked about and familiarized to the visitors.

As I asked earlier; what does it take to make people care? As I have shown, both physical and emotional proximity are important to make tourists care for an animal or a cause, thus the affective response is necessary for the continuous conservation that is dependent on economic support from visitors that join the different guided tours and adopt the animals in the wildlife park. Here, we see that the different groups of people at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah have different relations to the animals depending on their close proximity and experience with the devils and wombats. Also, the different animal species that occur at the devils Rescue ultimately make the keepers and volunteers to different kinds of caregivers, where the needs and the correct way to handle the animals, but also the animal's response and acts, differ and thus fulfill different meanings to the role as caregiver.

6 Concluding remarks

This study has revolved around relations between humans and animals at two wildlife parks in Tasmania. I have in this thesis gone through different practices involved in the human-devil relations that are enacted at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah. Through ethnographic accounts I have described how the Tasmanian Devils' relations to humans differ from other animal species, and how different "groups" of devils are treated and interacted with in different ways, according to the conversational aim they are meant to fulfill, and how therefore the devils in these groups themselves interact differently in social interactions with humans. What does this focus on multi-species sociality show us? - and to return to the question I started out with; how are the different devils *made* in captivity? What kind of practices are enacted to create the "tourist devil", or the "wild" devil that can make it on its own in the Tasmanian wilderness?

In the individual chapters of this thesis, I have been looking at interactions between keepers and groups of devils in chapter 3, I have discussed breeding practices at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah in chapter 4, and explored how care is being enacted in different ways by keepers, volunteers and tourists in chapter 5. First of all, what all these chapters demonstrate, with and performative approach to my field of study, are the specific practices in human-animal relations that are distinctive for the Tasmanian devils at the Devil Rescue and Tarrabah. Human and devil lives have in recent times been entangled due to the spread of DFTD, and the development of environmental awareness and species protection initiatives, especially for the case of native species in Australia and Tasmania. These relations are based on emotional bonds and feelings of a purposeful work, but also based on physical proximity and embodied care, which the latter have been at the focus of my study. I have demonstrated how devils *are being made* through different practices of intimacy. We can see this in the way keepers at the Devil Rescue construct different kinds of devils through their interactions with the devils, where conditioning is used to transform the devils into "good display animals" or "educational animals", or where distance is used to create wild devils that will be released, and will have to make it on their own in the Tasmanian nature, without being fed and cared for on the outside.

Secondly, I have been discussing the Tasmanian devils' apparent position between wild and domesticated at the Devils Rescue and at Tarrabah. The devils are being performed as wild in different ways, in for example speech, how devils are talked about during guided tours, through National information sites and tv-programs, as well as through the breeding of genetically "wild" devils, and finally through the release programs aimed at repopulating the Tasmanian island with healthy devils. At the same time, the practices in human-devil relations that occur in captivity resemble the practices enacted in relations between humans and domesticated animals. The devils are being controlled in some ways, they are being fed, bred and confined by humans, which are traditionally seen as practices of domestication. I have, however, also discussed how the classical definition of domestication fails to distinguish who is undertaking the domesticating when legislation and the caretakers have different opinions on care-giving, how control is enacted by the keepers, and the lack of control that can occur in the Tasmanian devil husbandry practices.

The discussed ways of controlling animals, and enacting human management on nature, can lead to new kinds of relations and identity formations in the close contact between humans and devils that are created through the conservation work. Devils are performed as wild in their captive state, and given the long term conservational goal to repopulate the island with the devils from the "insurance population", will these devils released in the future still be wild animals? Will new ideas and a new understanding surrounding the devils take form through a deconstruction of the wild/domestic dualism, or will nature and wilderness remain as symbols and imaginaries that have great meaning to people and their comprehension of native Australian species as "belonging to the nature"? In the end, the example with the devils can demonstrate that the divide we make between wild and domestic are imagined construction, which in practice are being crossed again and again.

This opportunity for close proximity to a relatively high amount of captive devils is a relatively new development in Tasmania. Tasmanian devils have been in captivity for a long time, and have been bred in captivity as long, but the breeding program created by "Save the Tasmanian devil" was not established until 2005, and has therefore not been active for too long. An opportunity to further multidisciplinary work arises here, as well as an opportunity to further research on human-animal relations, how this these processes affect the animals, how these domestic practices change animal behavior, and lastly, if the performing practices of "making wild devils" have an effect on the further generations devils.

References

Anneberg, I. Under review. Farm animals in a welfare state - commercial pigs in Denmark. In H. Swannson, M. E. Lien, G. B. Ween (eds.) *Desentering domestication; exploring the otherwise*.

Berger, J. 1980. Why look at animals. In J. Berger, *About looking*. 1980. pp. 1-26. Pantheon Books, New York.

Bjørkdahl, K and Druglitrø, T. 2016. Animal housing/Housing animals: Nodes of politics, practices and human-animal relations. In K. Bjørkdahl, T. Druglitrø (ed.), *Animal housing and human-animal relations: politics, practices and infrastructures*. pp. 1-14. Routledge.

Candea, M. 2010. "I fell in love with Carlos the meerkat": Engagement and detachment in human-animal relations. In *American ethnologist* 37(2). pp. 241-258. ScienceDirect (Elsevier B.V.)

Candea, M. 2013. Habituating Meerkats and redescrbing animal behaviour science. In *Theory, Culture & society* 30 (7-8). pp. 105-128. Sage

Cassidy, R. 2007. Introduction: Domestication reconsidered. In R. Cassidy & M. Mullin (eds.), *Where the wild things are now: domestication reconsidered*. pp 1-25. Oxford international publishers Ltd.

Cassidy, R. & Mullin, M. 2007. *Where the wild things are now: domestication reconsidered*. Oxford international publishers Ltd.

Chaisinthop, N. 2014. Volunteering, Dana , and the Cultivation of 'Good People' in Thailand. In *Anthropological Forum*, 24 (4), pp. 396-411. Routledge.

Clutton-Brock, J. 1998. *The walking larder: Patterns of domestication, pastoralism and predation*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Cronon, W. 1996. The Trouble with Wilderness, or Getting Back to the Wrong Nature. In William Cronon (ed.) *Uncommon Ground; Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*. pp. 69–113. New York: W.W. Norton.

Rose, D. B. 2008. Love in the time of extinctions. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 19. pp. 81-84. 10.1111/j.1835-9310.2008.tb00112.x

Descola, P, and Palsson, G. (eds.) 1992. *Nature and Society*. London: Routledge.

Douglas, M. 1957. Animals in Lele religious symbolism. In *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, 27(1), pp. 46-58

Evans-Pritchard, E. E. 1940. *The Nuer. A description of the models of livelihood and political institutions of a Nilotic people*. Oxford university press.

Franklin, A. 2006. *Animal nation: The true story of animals and Australia*. UNSW press.

Goffman, E. 1969. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. London: penguin.

Gullestad, M. 1991. Studiet av egen samtidskultur som utfordring. In *Norsk antropologisk tidsskrift* 2(1), pp. 3-9.

Haraway, D. J. 2008. *When species meet*. University of Minnesota Press.

Jacobsen, Thomas Sebastian Stolp. 2014. *Saving turtles; rehabilitating practices and enactments: The entangled lives of sea turtles and people in a turtle conservation organisation in far northern Queensland, Australia*. (Master thesis, University of Oslo). T.B.S. Jacobsen, Oslo.

Knight, J. 2009. Making wildlife viewable: habituation and attraction. In *Society and Animals* 17(2), pp. 167-184. Brill.

Kirksey, E. & Helmreich, S. 2010. The emergence of multispecies ethnography. I *Cultural anthropology*, 25 (4). pp. 545–576. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1360.2010.01069.x

Levi-Strauss, C. 2002 [1962]. Kategorier, elementer, arter, tall" In C. Lévi-Strauss, *Den ville tanke*. pp. 160-184. Oslo: Spartacus.

Latour, Bruno. 1993. *We have never been modern*. Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York.

Law, J. and Lien, M. E. 2013. Animal architectures. In P. Harvey, E. Casella, G. Evans, H. Knox, C. McLean, E. Silva, N. Thoburn, and K Woodward (eds.), *Objects and Materials: A Routledge Companion*. pp. 329-337. London: Routledge.

Lees, C and Andrew, P. 2012. Tasmanian devil insurance meta-population: 2012 evaluation and strategy review. *IUCN/SSC Conservation breeding specialist group*. Apple Valley, MN.

Lien, M. E. 2007. Weeding Tasmanian bush: Biomigration and Landscape imagery. In

M. E. Lien and M. Melhuus (eds.) *Holding worlds together: Ethnographies of knowing and belonging*. pp. 103-120. Berghahn Books.

Lien, M. E. 2015. *Becoming salmon. Aquaculture and the domestication of a fish*. University of California press.

Lindström, K. and Tønnessen, M. 2010. Introduction to the Special Issue Semiotics of Perception Being in the World of the Living—Semiotic Perspectives. In *Biosemiotics*, 3. pp. 257-261.

Madden, R. 2010. *Being ethnographic: a guide through the theory and practices of ethnography*. Sage publications Ltd.

Mauss, M. 1973, [1934] "Techniques of the Body" in *Economy and Society*, 2 (1), pp. 70-88

Mather, Anne. 2015. Forget Fido, this guy's a real pet. *Mercury*. (Internett). 21. november 2015. From: <http://www.themercury.com.au/news/tasmania/forget-fido-this-guys-a-real-pet/news-story/76afa46c496f975265b32209efc21b03>. Lest: 7. December 2015.

Mol, A., Moser, I., & Pols, J. 2010. Care: putting practice into theory. In A. Mol, M. Ingunn, J. Pols (eds): *Care in practice: On tinkering in clinics, homes and farms*. pp. 7-26. Trensript Verlag: Bielefeld.

Mullin, M. 1999. Mirrors and windows: sociocultural studies of human-animal relationships. In *Annual review anthropology*, 281 (1). pp. 201-224.

Nustad, K. 2012. Natur, representasjon og performativitet i St Lucia, Sør-Afrika. I *Norsk antropologisk tidsskrift*, 23 (3-4). pp. 249-260. Universitetsforlaget

Nyquist, J. R. 2013. *Making and breaking the invasive Cane Toad : community engagement and interspecies entanglements in the Kimberley, Australia*. (Master Thesis, University of Oslo). J. R. Nyquist, Oslo.

Peace, Adrian. 2005. Loving leviathan: the discourse of whale-watching in Australian ecotourism. In ed. Knight, John, *Animals in person: cultural perspectives on human-animal intimacies*. pp. 191-210. Berg, Oxford International Publishers Ltd.

Rappaport, R. 1984. *Pigs for the ancestors : ritual in the ecology of a New Guinea people*. Waveland Press, Long Grove, IL.

Remme, J. H. Z. 2013. Den ontologiske vendingen i antropologien. In *Norsk antropologisk tidsskrift*, 24 (1), pp. 6-25. Universitetsforlaget

Risan, L. C. 2003. *Hva er ei ku? Norsk rødt fe som teknovitenskap og naturkultur*. Unipub AS, Oslo.

Rose, D. B. 2008. Love in the time of extinctions. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 19. pp. 81-84. 10.1111/j.1835-9310.2008.tb00112.x

Russel, N. 2007. Domestication of Anthropology. In R. Cassidy & M. Mullin (eds.), *Where the wild things are now. Domestication reconsidered*. pp. 27-48. Oxford international publishers Ltd.

Singleton, V. 2010. Good farming: Control or care? In In A. Mol, M. Ingunn, J. Pols (eds): *Care in practice: On tinkering in clinics, homes and farms*. pp. 235-256. Trensript Verlag: Bielefeld.

Spencer, W. B. and Gillen, F. J. 1969 (1899). *The Native tribes of central australia*.
Oosterhout: Antropological publications.

Suzuki, Y. 2007. Putting the Lion out at night: domestication and the taming of the wild. In R. Cassidy & M. Mullin (eds.), *Where the wild things are now. Domestication reconsidered*.
Oxford international publishers Ltd.

Szerszynski, B., Heim, W., & Waterton, C. 2003. Introduction. In B. Szerszynski, W. Heim & C. Waterton (eds.), *Nature performed: Environment, culture and performance*. pp. 1-14.
Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

The IUNC red list of threatened species. N.D. From:
<http://www.iucnredlist.org/details/40540/0>

Tsing, Anna. 2012. Unruly edges: mushrooms as companion species. In *Environmental Humanities* 1, pp. 141-154.

Tsing, A. 2014. More-than-human sociality: a call for critical description. I K. Hastrup (ed.)
Anthropology and nature. pp. 27-42. Routledge.

Ween, G. B. & Flikke, R. 2009. Naturen som praksiser; natur i nyere norsk antropologi. In
Norsk antropologisk tidsskrift, 20 (1), pp. 6-15. Universitetsforlaget.

360 Degree Films. 2013. *Devil Island* [TV-series]. From:
<http://www.abc.net.au/tv/programs/devil-island/>