

# Nonhuman citizens on trial: The ecological politics of a beaver reintroduction

**Sarah L Crowley, Steve Hinchliffe  
and Robbie A McDonald**

University of Exeter, UK

Environment and Planning A

0(0) 1–21

© The Author(s) 2017

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/0308518X17705133

journals.sagepub.com/home/epn



## Abstract

Wildlife reintroductions can unsettle social and ecological norms, and are often controversial. In this paper, we examine the recent (re)introduction of Eurasian beavers to England, to analyse responses to an unauthorised release of a formerly resident species. Although the statutory response to the introduction was to attempt to reassert ecological and political order by recapturing the beavers, this action was strongly opposed by a diverse collective, united and made powerful by a common goal: to protect England's 'new' nonhuman residents. We show how this clash of state resolve and public dissent produced an uneasy compromise in the form of a formal, licensed 'beaver reintroduction trial', in which the new beaver residents have been allowed to remain, but under surveillance. We propose that although the trial is unorthodox and risky, there is an opportunity for it to be treated as a 'wild experiment' through which a more open-ended, experimental approach to co-inhabiting with wildlife might be attempted.

## Keywords

Environmental conflict, Eurasian beaver, political ecology, United Kingdom, wildlife reintroduction

## Introduction

In winter 2013, unusual signs of wildlife activity appeared along the River Otter in Devon, England: pencil-sharpened tree-stumps and gnawed vegetation. Curiosity aroused, local people set up camera traps to identify the culprit, and in so doing catalysed a series of events with far-reaching implications for ecological politics in the United Kingdom. The camera traps revealed that at least three Eurasian beavers (*Castor fiber*) were inhabiting the river. These large, herbivorous, water-dwelling rodents were historically resident across Britain,<sup>1</sup> but were hunted to extinction several hundred years ago. The discovery of free-living beavers in Devon was, therefore, a significant national event.

Here, we follow the story of Devon's beavers as they are discovered, draw attention, inspire debate, and make themselves residents of the River Otter. In telling this story

---

### Corresponding author:

Sarah L Crowley, Environment and Sustainability Institute, University of Exeter, Penryn Campus, Penryn, Cornwall TR10 9FE, UK.

Email: s.crowley@exeter.ac.uk

we aim, first, to consider how people responded to and negotiated about beavers and their reintroduction, while recognising the roles beavers play in shaping their own story. Second, we aim to examine British environmental politics as a series of practices and tensions that emerge in relation to specific events and circumstances. In other words, we consider how beaver reintroduction has been, and is being, done in Britain. We are therefore pursuing a relational, vitalist political ecology in which ‘humans and animals inhabit a lively earth, with and against the grain of political design’ (Barua, 2014a: 916; see also Hinchliffe and Whatmore, 2006). In situating the work in this way, we are operating at a confluence of several streams of social research, including political ecologies of wildlife management and conflict (Barua, 2014a, 2014b; Collard, 2012; Rikoon, 2006); (more-than) human geographies of conservation (Adams et al., 2014; Hinchliffe, 2008; Hodgetts, 2017; Lorimer, 2015); and studies of environmental ‘knowledge controversies’ (Maye et al., 2014; Robbins, 2006; Whatmore, 2009). Our focus on environmental controversies enables us to examine not only how conservation is organised and done, but also how and why it is contested, and how subsequent disputes might be generative of novel forms of conservation practice and public engagement. This work also contributes, more specifically, to the growing literature on species reintroductions, which to date has mostly been produced from within conservation science. Although increasingly attentive to the ‘social dimensions’ of reintroduction initiatives, this work is often oriented towards assessing (and sometimes influencing) human attitudes towards them, and the ‘social feasibility’ of potential projects. Comparatively little work, however, has offered detailed social scientific analyses of the processes and practices of species reintroductions. Our research therefore also aims to inform conservation science, by illuminating and exploring the contextualised socio-political complexity and implications of a wildlife reintroduction.

This case study was conducted as part of a larger project investigating how introduced wildlife is received and managed in the United Kingdom. Studies of acute environmental disputes are often conducted retrospectively, but we followed this story from an early stage. Our research methods were therefore influenced by the shifting dynamics of events as they unfolded. We gathered and analysed print and online media sources and documents published by civil society organisations and the UK Government (including its agencies and public bodies). We also analysed anonymised written responses to public consultations administered by the Devon Wildlife Trust (DWT, a regional environmental NGO associated with a national federation of Wildlife Trusts) and Natural England (a statutory nature conservation agency). We interviewed ten key informants between June 2014 and March 2015, and the lead author additionally attended consultation meetings and undertook field observations in Devon. Our inductive analysis began with a detailed chronicling of events, based on close reading of, and triangulation between, sources. We then placed beavers at the centre of our analysis, ‘tracking’ (Barua, 2014a; Dempsey, 2010) their appearance and representation through events. We considered the beavers’ history and interactions on the River Otter, and how different human actors responded to their presence, portrayed their meaning to others, and influenced their prospects. We interpreted both discursive and material practices, drawing on contemporary social theory to build explanations as to how and why this story developed as it did (Yin, 2014).

We found that the presence of beavers prompted efforts (on behalf of the Government and its agencies) to reassert ecological and political order through recapturing the Devon animals. These efforts were challenged, however, by key actors and interested publics who rejected the casting of beavers as illegal, out of place, and as a biological threat (Buller, 2008). Instead, they made political and material moves to protect beavers on the grounds that they ‘belonged here’: as community members, wild lives and British/European natives.

This multi-pronged challenge to an established British model of wildlife conservation and management produced tensions that have been alleviated, to some extent, by an uneasy compromise in the form of the ‘River Otter Beaver Trial’ (ROBT). The ROBT is a retrospectively licensed socio-ecological experiment that aims to monitor the movements, interactions and effects of the Devon beavers. The ROBT’s development and implementation, we suggest, constitutes a series of regulating practices that attempt to rein in, order, legitimise, and make compliant the political and ecological messiness produced by this ‘unauthorised’ reintroduction. Yet despite its rationalisation, or perhaps shielded by it, the ROBT allows the newly reconstituted community of the River Otter catchment space to breathe, and time to negotiate. We therefore propose that, although it does not necessarily serve as a good model for future species reintroductions, the ROBT could nevertheless present an opportunity to attempt a looser, more experimental approach to co-inhabiting with wildlife.

### **Background: Retrieving beavers**

The exact timeframe of the beaver’s disappearance from Britain is unclear,<sup>2</sup> but the species was extirpated at some point in the past several hundred years, primarily by hunting. Beaver populations across continental Europe had also significantly declined, but conservation efforts have since enabled their widespread recovery (Halley et al., 2012). Now classified as of ‘Least Concern’ by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), beavers nonetheless retain status as European Protected Species under the 1992 Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC). The same Directive instructs EU member states to consider reintroducing extirpated native species, and over the past twenty years there have been multiple attempts to reintroduce beavers to Britain.

The beaver’s promotion as a reintroduction candidate stems from increased scientific understanding of their role in producing and maintaining diverse wetland ecosystems (Macdonald et al., 1995). This has led to the beaver’s characterisation as the ‘quintessential’ (Caro, 2010: 144) ‘ecosystem engineer’ (organisms that demonstrably modify the structure of their habitats: Wright et al., 2002). Beaver engineering (e.g. dam construction, tree felling) can increase landscape heterogeneity and species richness, and beavers are considered, by some, a useful ally in riparian ecosystem restoration. More recently, beaver reintroduction has emerged as an important component of the European ‘rewilding’ movement (Arts et al., 2015). Rewilding is a multi-faceted conservation approach that attempts to restore historical ecosystems and species (Corlett, 2016), especially those believed to be lost ‘keystone’ species, the restoration of which is expected/hoped to affect change at multiple trophic and systemic levels (Seddon et al., 2014). Though the meaning and value of the keystone species concept remains unsettled in ecological and conservation sciences (Caro, 2010), in rewilding discourses it is normally employed to refer to top predators (e.g. wolves *Canis lupus*, lynx *Lynx spp.*) or herbivorous engineers, like beavers, acclaimed for their ability to re-establish past ecological processes since altered or halted by human activities. Furthermore, a recent paradigm shift in water management has seen increasing interest and investment in catchment-scale approaches (Mathieu et al., 2016), in which beavers could play an important role (Törnblom et al., 2011). A second line of argument for reintroduction contends that humans have a moral obligation to re-establish formerly native species, and particularly those – like beavers – whose extirpation from Britain was due to human activity (Arts et al., 2012).

Following extensive negotiation and planning, the Scottish Beaver Trial (a closely monitored, Government-authorised reintroduction project) proceeded in the remote

region of Knapdale from 2009 to 2014.<sup>3</sup> Meanwhile, in England and Wales, despite the backing of the European Directive and positive feasibility studies (Gurnell et al., 2008; Jones et al., 2012), by 2014 no reintroduction trial had progressed beyond initial planning. Beavers are considered ‘not ordinarily resident’ in the UK (Section 14 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981), so their release from captivity requires a licence from the relevant statutory nature conservation organisation.<sup>4</sup> Applications are assessed with regard to IUCN guidelines which until recently recommended that reintroduction projects should be ‘fully understood, accepted and supported by local communities’ (IUCN/SSC, 1998: 9).<sup>5</sup> However, full support had not been forthcoming in relation to English and Welsh reintroductions,<sup>6</sup> indicating that the desire to reintroduce beavers was not shared by all.

While in 21st-century British society beavers are no longer considered hunting and trade resources, an attitude persists that their reintroduction should primarily be based on their potential instrumental value:

The fact that [beavers] existed here x-hundred years ago, does that create . . . some kind of species imperative that they must exist here now? . . . Are they . . . needed, useful, efficient, effective within our landscape? (interview with representative, agricultural organisation)

There are also concerns about the potential for beaver dams to cause flooding, and disrupt the movement of migratory salmonid fish; although beaver engineering is generally considered positive for ‘ecosystem restoration’, it will inevitably produce hydrological and ecological disturbances, not all of which will be welcomed.<sup>7</sup> Farmers and landowners, in particular, have questioned the place of beavers in modern, productive landscapes:

What do we want them for? I can’t see any benefit for farming . . . but I can see an awful lot of hassle. (farmer, consultation meeting)

‘Hassle’, here, refers to the potential difficulties of managing beavers and their activities, and particularly socio-political challenges. Several chronic struggles surrounding wildlife management persist in Britain, particularly concerning culling badgers (*Meles meles*) (discussed later), but also hunting with dogs (May, 2016) and raptor persecution (Thirgood et al., 2000). Given the strong potential for conflict about beaver management, and the persistence of current (often bitter) disputes and sensitivities, it is unsurprising that successive governments have avoided committing to a stance on reintroducing beavers. Meanwhile, however, at least one unsanctioned beaver population has established itself in Britain:

You have a population of several hundred animals on the [River] Tay now . . . but . . . it wasn’t something that was an official project, it wasn’t something that went through a process . . . It just happened. (interview with conservation professional)

Stories about Britain’s ‘surprise’ beaver populations are colourfully illustrated with tales of ‘beaver bombers’ (Werth, 2014), vigilante conservationists surreptitiously rewilding the country to bypass the bureaucracy of formal introduction processes:

You can’t stop people doing this. I’ve heard . . . people say, ‘For every one beaver they take, we’re going to put ten back’. (proponent of Welsh Beaver Project, quoted by Werth, 2014)

Although such people were never identified to us, we nevertheless encountered frustration and impatience among proponents of beaver reintroduction. While formal projects require substantial investment, are subject to drawn-out negotiations, and are potentially thwarted, unauthorised reintroductions have proved difficult for government authorities to detect and reverse. An initial attempt at rehoming a beaver from the illegally introduced River Tay

population ended abruptly when the rehomed animal died of septicaemia (BBC, 2011). The Scottish Government subsequently and at least temporarily abandoned attempts to remove the population. Even without covert releases, growing enthusiasm for beaver reintroduction has inspired interested parties to import and breed animals in captivity, both for research and as a tourist attraction. However, beavers can dig and utilise water-courses very effectively, and escapes are not uncommon.

Beavers, then, have once again been ‘made present’ (Hinchliffe, 2008) in Britain through a collection of exercises in retrieval, both conceptual and physical. Advances in ecological sciences have enabled contemporary researchers to understand the roles beavers play in ecosystems, and archival/archaeological research has confirmed their historical presence in Britain. Concurrently, paradigm shifts in environmentalist thinking and environmental management implicate beavers as potentially desirable components of future British landscapes. These scientific and ideological reconfigurations of the beaver and its place in Britain have been accompanied by physical movements of live beavers ‘back’ into the country. Beavers have therefore been conceptually resurrected and physically re-placed in the British landscape. Whether Devon’s beavers were intentional releases or escapees remains uncertain. Regardless, one or more individuals arrived and survived on the River Otter, living there for months and possibly years before their presence was widely publicised in 2014.

## Capturing beavers

The River Otter is tightly enclosed by productive agricultural land, towns and villages, and miles of riverside public footpath, so it was perhaps inevitable that its new inhabitants would eventually be discovered. In late 2013, a dairy farmer whose land abuts the river noticed unusual damage to his riparian trees. He consulted a local retired environmental scientist who set up a trail camera and, shortly thereafter, captured the distinctive image of a beaver. The discovery was excitedly shared with journalists and the compelling photographic proof attracted national media attention. Later images showed three beavers; they appeared to be breeding. This produced a second wave of press interest and drew the attention of the UK Government’s Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), who began internal investigations within days of reports being released.<sup>8</sup>

Defra had two major concerns. First, it was suspected that the beavers’ presence could be due to an intentional, illegal release. Ministers feared that ignoring the situation would set a precedent of inaction and demonstrate tacit acceptance of unsanctioned wildlife releases: ‘turning a blind eye could suggest... that Defra would also turn a blind eye to further breaches of the law.’ (Defra, 2014: 1). Second, as the beavers’ origin was unknown, there was a risk they could harbour the intestinal parasite *Echinococcus multilocularis* (EM). This zoonotic pathogen is not established in the UK, but is endemic in mainland Europe and notably in Bavaria, from where many captive beavers in Britain originate. Indeed, the only recent case of EM infection in Britain was identified *post-mortem* in an imported beaver that died in captivity in Devon in 2010 (Barlow et al., 2011). Should this parasite be established ‘in the wild’ in Britain it would both constitute a significant public health risk (EM causes the frequently fatal disease alveolar echinococcosis in humans) and lead the country to lose its ‘Officially EM free’ status, with associated travel and trade implications. To investigate, staff from the Government’s Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency (AHVLA) visited the site where the beavers had been seen, but reported that the landowners, a dairy farming family, were reluctant to see them recaptured (Defra, 2014).

Unable to ignore the developing situation, Defra was nevertheless restricted by limited powers of access under existing wildlife legislation. The only statutory instrument that would



allow Government agents compulsory access to capture the beavers was the Zoonoses (Monitoring) (England) Regulations 2007.<sup>9</sup> As EM is a zoonotic parasite, this legislation could be exercised to grant the AHVLA access to private land, trap the beavers and assess them for signs of EM infection. However, the Government would then have custody of an unknown number of live, captive beavers. If they were healthy, there would be little justification for euthanising them, but equally, they could not be re-released without a licence. The AHVLA could have applied for such a licence, but this would have done little to address the Government's concerns about precedent. Defra therefore concluded that the beavers should be captured and assessed on the grounds that they posed a public health risk and then (if healthy) 're-homed' in captivity.

However, Defra's chosen path became increasingly muddled. In May a national newspaper published a provocative article entitled, 'After the badger cull, is Defra planning to kill Devon's beavers?' (Merrill, 2014a). Defra responded with a denial (and lethal control was not an option under serious consideration), but cautiously suggested that, 'beavers have not been an established part of our wildlife for the last 500 years. Our landscape and habitats have changed since then and we need to assess the impact they could have' (Merrill, 2014a). This less than explicit response, which raised neither of the Government's primary concerns (disease and precedent), may have only confused the issue: later reports interpreted the statement to mean that Defra considered beavers an 'invasive, non-native species' (e.g. Merrill, 2014b; Morris, 2014). Although Defra did not use the terminology of invasive species, their response mirrored their precautionary approach to non-native species introductions,<sup>10</sup> and their reticence to accept beavers as 'native' wildlife was apparent. Public and press interest in the beavers' future was gaining momentum, and finding an institution with both the facilities and fortitude to take Devon's 'wild' beavers into captivity was unlikely to be easy. Nevertheless, capture remained the only option that ticked all political and legal boxes: condemning illegal activity, mitigating the public health risk, and avoiding a problematic precedent. In June, a Defra minister confirmed in parliament that 'we intend to recapture and rehome the wild beavers in Devon' (HC Deb 24 June 2014 c330w).

Defra's response, we suggest, comprised practical and classificatory efforts to (re)capture and contain Devon's transgressive beavers. Foucault (2007) argues that a key function of the state is to reduce environmental irregularities and insecurities through intervention. In Britain, wildlife is regularly subject to scrutiny and management 'by interference' (Adams, 2003), including from the state: government-led or sanctioned wildlife management is practised for economic protection (e.g. deer control on the public forest estate), conservation (e.g. eradicating introduced species) and disease control (e.g. badger culls). In British law and landscapes, beavers are assumed absent, and the discovery of their physical presence consequently provoked reactive efforts by Government to re-order and normalise the situation. First, and despite uncertainties surrounding their origins, the Devon beavers were cast as products of unauthorised human intervention, and their presence therefore both unnatural and illegitimate. Second, the beavers' ambiguous legal status – protected in continental Europe, but perhaps not in Britain – was evaded in favour of a stated, resolute focus on the 'bio-threat' (Barker, 2010; Buller, 2008) that these imported individuals might pose, which required elimination. In a concerted effort to police and re-secure the geographic/political borders of Britain as an EM-free zone, Defra mobilised AHVLA staff as 'boundary agents' (Collard, 2012) and prepared to enforce zoonotic disease regulations. Finally, Defra determined to physically capture and remove the beavers, in a clear demonstration of authority, reassertion of order, and means of 'biosecuring' (Hinchliffe and Bingham, 2008)

the human population against zoonotic disease. Yet, as Adrian Peace neatly summarises:

there is little that is inevitable or inexorable about the way in which institutions of the modern state extend their power over environments and populations that are considered ‘out of order’ or ‘out of alignment’ with legislation or regulations... It is more likely... that the processes of governing environments from a distance will prove uneven, uncertain and unpredictable because of the countervailing forces that can intervene and disrupt in a multiplicity of ways. (Peace, 2009: 70)

## Protecting beavers

Peace found that, by presenting ‘a persuasive, plausible and rival discourse’ (2009: 70), ‘grassroots’ activists can stall government plans to manage unruly wildlife. Indeed, in this case we find that power did not flow smoothly from central Government to the River Otter, dictating the acceptable terms of beaver presence and punishing transgressive behaviour. However, whereas Peace identified a single countervailing force of (organised) activists, we found that opposition to the beavers’ removal gained power through multiple practices of resistance, including alliances between diverse publics, and between species. Furthermore, there was no single rival discourse, but a number of alternate narratives, not all in complete concordance but, importantly, all contesting the claims and proposals Defra put forward. Rather than responding to beaver presence as a threat or risk to be controlled, it was argued that beavers belonged on the River Otter, and in Britain, and that their residence should therefore be protected.

In this section, we consider three vignettes of activity that capture some (though certainly not all) of the ways Defra’s decision was challenged. First, we follow an individual campaigner whose personal encounters with beavers inspired his efforts to recruit east Devon residents to support and protect ‘their’ beavers from harm. We then turn to the implementation of ‘beaver patrols’ on the River Otter, and explore how opposing the beavers’ recapture became a new focal point for existing struggles surrounding wildlife management in the UK. Finally, we look at the political work of environmental charity Friends of the Earth, who enrolled the news media and judicial system to openly challenge the orderings and actions of central Government and promote the Devon beavers as ambassadors of both their species and a nascent rewilding movement. Throughout, we consider how arguments surrounding beaver protection resonate with Lavau’s (2011) typology of ‘natural belonging’. Lavau identifies three ways in which fish might be conceptualised as ‘belonging’ in Australian rivers: indigeneity, wildness, and ecological functionality. She maps these features across three (ideal) types of human citizenship: that which is inherited by ancestry (cf. species indigeneity), given by birth-right (cf. wildness, whereby wild-born fish can claim naturalness, as a person born in a nation-state can claim citizenship), or gained through induction (based on integration or ‘naturalisation’ through residency). In drawing links between this typology of ‘natural belonging’ and human responses to beaver presence, we recognise that the familiar socio-legal configurations of human citizenship outlined by Lavau can themselves be problematic. ‘Citizen’ is not a neutral term, and is imbued with troubling history (MacGregor, 2006). Our reference to these different citizenships is not, therefore, intended to endorse certain political configurations of human citizenship, nor to suggest that these can be directly or neatly applied to nonhuman belonging. Nevertheless, the terminology and typology is useful for our analysis. The existing, multifaceted concept of human citizenship provides a helpful, if imperfect, framework through which we can examine the multiplicity of ways people respond to new nonhuman arrivals.

It enables movement beyond simple ideas about species presence and absence to consider other ways nonhumans might be politically conceptualised (Barker, 2010; Lavau, 2011). Furthermore, the categorical and terminological overlap reflects real, persistent entanglements and parallels between discourses surrounding introduced species and those applying to human citizenship, nationalism, and immigration (Crowley, 2014; Franklin, 2006; Martin and Trigger, 2015).<sup>11</sup>

The retired environmental scientist who first photographed the beavers had, in the intervening months, spent much time observing them. He had attuned himself to their habits and signs, and could differentiate between individuals ('learning to be affected': Latour, 2004; see also Hinchliffe et al., 2005; Lorimer, 2008). He became an impromptu guide for beaver-spotters walking along the river, but emphasised that his interest and expertise was focused on the River Otter population, and one family group in particular: 'my knowledge and experience is really these beavers here' (retired environmental scientist, during interview). It was also 'these beavers here' he was most interested in protecting. He was instrumental in drumming up community support for the beavers by distributing leaflets and posters, writing for the local newspaper, and encouraging people to sign petitions and/or write to MPs. He encouraged people to think of beavers as valuable components of the local environment and community:

I was taking responsibility and I wanted people to take responsibility... [if] you approach people here and say... have you seen our beavers yet? What do you think about them coming and taking away our beavers?... I think sometimes people [will] pick up on that. (retired environmental scientist, during interview)

He cared deeply about the beavers' future, and wanted others to feel the same way. While this sense of personal, affective attachment perhaps did not develop in the wider community to the same extent, many catchment residents did embrace the beavers as belonging within, or at least belonging *to*, their community. Comments such as 'we are extremely privileged to have them here', 'it's a treat to have them', and '[we] DO want beavers in our waters' indicate a sense of pride that the beavers had settled in the Otter catchment (unless otherwise stated, all quotes in this section are from written consultation responses). Campaigners were also confident that the beavers provided 'many benefits' (Ottery St Mary Town Council, 2014) to the community, both as welcome new residents and as economic assets providing ecotourism and business opportunities.

Through their inconspicuous, undisruptive activities the beavers appeared to have integrated smoothly, thus far, into their new suburban/agricultural landscape. This was important for their acceptance as benign additions to the socio-ecological community, particularly in terms of the dairy farmers on whose land they established territory. That beavers had been present for some time with insignificant impacts led the landowners to conclude that they posed little threat to their agricultural operation. Here, then, we find evidence of belonging through induction whereby the beavers – though newcomers – were not received as out of place on the River Otter. Rather, through their inoffensive and (for some) exciting, propitious presence, they became accepted and protected by many catchment residents as 'our own'.

Shortly after Defra announced its intention to recapture the beavers, a concerned group (including, but not restricted to catchment residents) set up so-called 'beaver patrols': rostered walks to look for AHVLA agents or the traps they intended to set. Initially aimed at preventing Defra from attempting a covert recapture operation, the group later planned to continue patrols indefinitely, to guard against 'anyone trying to kill them.'<sup>12</sup> Compared with the retiree and town councillors who rallied community support around 'their' beavers, this mode of protection was less vocal but more direct, and prepared to



intervene in any material efforts to remove the beavers. There were links between these patrols and existing groups of animal protection activists involved in hunt sabotage and equivalent ‘badger patrols’ deployed to disrupt Government badger culls. These connections indicate a second driver for contesting the beavers’ capture.

Wildlife management conflicts never take place in a social (or environmental) vacuum, and political ecologists have elsewhere identified how particular wildlife management issues become flashpoints for chronic or recurrent sociopolitical tensions (e.g. Bhattacharyya and Larson, 2014; Peterson *et al.*, 2002; Rikoon, 2006). This dispute, though ostensibly about the Devon beavers’ future, was also inextricably entangled with existing societal frictions surrounding wildlife management in Britain. A key influence has been chronic socio-political tensions surrounding the governance and control of bovine tuberculosis (bTB) in the UK, and specifically how this endemic infection might be managed in both cattle and Eurasian badgers, a wildlife host of bTB and a protected species. Defra’s 2013 implementation of trial badger culls made the Department extremely unpopular with concerned publics who claimed that ‘the science’ surrounding the efficacy of culling had been ignored in favour of political appeasement of the farming community (Maye *et al.*, 2014). Accordingly, when the beavers were threatened with capture, this was received by some as further evidence of an unsympathetic, partisan Government:

Defra cannot be trusted with [the beavers’] welfare, in view of their total deception over the badgers...

To me this is just another example of...Defra surrendering to a small but powerful group of lobbyists who take the view that beavers, just like the badgers...are somehow bad for the environment and therefore should be removed.

Meanwhile, cattle farmers and their representatives have been supportive of badger control (though not necessarily Defra’s approach), leading to accusations that agricultural communities are ‘anti-badger’ and indeed, anti-wildlife. As beavers received no explicit protection under English law, consultees questioned whether people could legally ‘go out and cull them’, and whether wildlife organisations would be putting in ‘security measures’ to protect them.<sup>13</sup> It is worth reiterating that, legally protected or not, beavers had apparently been living on the River Otter for some time. As one farmer commented: ‘Yes, they’re not protected [but] I’m sure if they’d been a problem to a few of the landowners we wouldn’t be discussing them here today anyway!’ (consultation meeting). Nevertheless, there was palpable concern that wild beavers would quickly become targets for persecution.

Reciprocal distrust was evident from members of the agricultural community, some of whom asserted that ‘the public’ would be unable to countenance any management intervention for beavers, now or in future. Farmers and agricultural landowners expressed equal dissatisfaction with Defra’s ability to respond fairly and effectively to the issue: ‘I think...if we run into a problem it will be exactly the same problem as badgers – the public will run it’ (agricultural landowner, consultation meeting). Residual discontent about existing wildlife management problems (and their proposed solutions) therefore had some bearing on reactive movements to protect beavers, which became the temporary focus of a lengthy, multidimensional struggle to protect ‘wildlife’, generally, from malevolent forces deemed to threaten it. In this case, these were a government believed to be uncompassionate and incompetent, and a farming community cast as homogeneously trigger-happy.

Unlike badgers, beavers are not an iconic British species, steeped in cultural associations (see Cassidy, 2012). Nevertheless, they are considered ‘natural’, partly due to their British/

European heritage (below), and partly because they have no definitive origin in captivity and can therefore be protected as wild life: ‘our precious wild creatures deserve our protection’. Indeed, that the beavers’ presence must originate in human activity was often overlooked: ‘there is no current proof they have been “released” so why not treat them as a natural species?’ As a ‘natural species’, beavers were enrolled into larger constructions of British wildlife as something that should be shielded from persecution and/or management.

Freedom from captivity was also deemed worth protecting. In some cases, this extended to sheltering beavers from any interaction with humans, which was deemed ‘interference’ or intrusion into wild lives. This stark form of protectionism also inspired concerns that publicity surrounding the case would increase visitor numbers to the area and disturb the beavers. A repeated refrain was that they should simply be ‘left alone’. Regardless of integration or origin, beavers were argued to belong ‘in the wild’, a privilege gained by being present (if not necessarily born) outside captivity. Should the beavers be recaptured, then, their freedom, naturalness, and wildness would be diminished. This idea resonates with Lavau’s (2011) conception of wildness, equated with naturalness, as a ‘birth-right’ to be protected. These forms of protectionism are therefore bound up with rights-based belonging: the idea that an organism born (or reborn) into a certain community – wild, in this example – can claim certain rights. Consequently, we find activists discursively and actively protecting the beavers’ right to ‘remain’ wild.

A third version of natural belonging, Lavau (2011) proposes, is ‘indigeneity’, a concept as messy in relation to wildlife as it is in the human politics of colonialism and immigration (Barker, 2010; Head and Muir, 2004; Mulcock and Trigger, 2008). Nevertheless, persons might claim citizenship to a nation-state ‘on the basis of country of descent, the right to belong being inherited through familial connections to place’ (Lavau, 2011: 53). This form of belonging was applied to beavers by, among others, environmental charity Friends of the Earth (FoE) who mounted a vocal campaign against Defra’s proposals in autumn 2014: ‘the Government should be taking steps to protect and expand the range of key native species like the beaver – not removing them from our rivers’ (Friends of the Earth, 2014a). FoE enrolled an enthusiastic mainstream media in a series of publicity exercises that channelled both existing, ‘broad but shallow’ (Gurnell et al., 2008) public support for beaver reintroduction, and burgeoning dissatisfaction with Defra’s politically fractious wildlife management activities. They drew attention to weaknesses in Defra’s case<sup>14</sup> and amplified uncertainty surrounding the beavers’ legal status, questioning the legality of Defra’s strategy and initiating formal legal proceedings against Natural England (on the grounds that their decision to grant the AHVLA a capture licence was unlawful). FoE also channelled the surge of public concern about the case towards individual political action at a national scale. For example, they encouraged people to sign online petitions and around 10,000 ‘e-signatures’ protesting the recapture were sent to Government ministers (Friends of the Earth, 2015).

A frequent claim from consultees and commentators was that the Devon beavers should be protected because they are ‘not an alien species but a native species reintroduced’, or – less carefully worded – ‘not immigrant beavers from overseas’. The individuals in question are, of course, not ‘British’ by genetic heritage nor probably, in the original adults’ case, by birth. But in nonhuman terms, nativeness is less related to nationality or familial ancestry than to evolutionary history and ‘natural’ range. A key point for FoE’s campaign was that ‘Britain form[s] part of the natural range of beavers . . . [and] . . . they should be covered by EU laws governing protected species’ (Friends of the Earth, 2014b). FoE argued that the beaver’s place in Britain was no less pertinent than their place in Eurasia, and specifically the political-economic unit of the EU. Presenting the beavers as *European* citizens enabled FoE to endorse, in their campaign, the legal protection that extends (sometimes

awkwardly) from European directives to member state regulations.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, this story might have unfolded very differently had the Devon beavers been suspected or identified as the (clearly not native, but ecologically broadly similar) North American species (*Castor canadensis*).

Responding to FoE's public challenge, Defra maintained that regardless of legal status, the beavers still presented a disease risk (drawing on their continental connections in a different way). Unlike FoE's argument, however, concentrating on the beavers' potential to harbour disease frames them not as a species (native or otherwise), but as heterogeneous and therefore risky individuals: because the beavers could have been imported, they could not be deemed wholly safe. Defra similarly countered FoE's claim that Britain forms part of the beaver's natural range by reiterating that 'beavers have not been an established part of our wildlife for the last 500 years' ('Defra spokesperson', quoted by BBC, 2014). Here, again, Defra did not frame beavers as a native species, with inherited belonging, but as an unknown, diverse collective who might not be uniformly predictable in their behaviours, movements, and interactions.

Defra's approach, while risk-averse, allows that beavers might not behave as expected. Elsewhere, however, Devon's beavers became fully abstracted from their corporeal selves, emerging in discourses of protection as 'The Beaver', a unitary body of predictable, archetypal specimens that can be understood, translocated, and promoted. Devon's beavers are assumed to encompass and embody The Beaver's characteristics, but the key driver of the campaign here is to ensure that 'The Beaver' persists in Britain, not to protect individual beavers. Indeed, for some, Devon's beavers were expendable, provided the species remained: 'I would have no complaint about the beavers being trapped or killed – with the proviso that they were then replaced with a disease-free population' (Monbiot, 2014).<sup>16</sup> This distinction is relevant because the practices of protecting archetypes can materially differ from those of protecting embodied beavers. Rather than patrolling rivers, or encouraging compassion for individuals, protecting The Beaver involves contesting legal classifications and 'educating' people about the species and its value.<sup>17</sup>

Devon's beavers, then, became both emissaries for their species and ambassadors for rewilding more generally: 'please ensure that the beavers are left in peace and allowed to continue to prove the enormous benefits of rewilding' (written consultation response). The use of 'continue to prove', here, is interesting. We have shown above how beaver activities on the River Otter affected how humans responded to their presence: their interactions with catchment residents made them unobjectionable (the dairy farmer), 'delightful' (beaver-spotters) and companionable (the retired scientist). Here, we find the converse: the construction and protection of a positive Beaver archetype affected how the Devon beavers' presence, behaviour and 'work' were interpreted. For instance, consultees noted that the beavers had been seen eating Himalayan balsam *Impatiens glandulifera* (a notorious riparian invasive plant). This was inferred to be 'another' environmental benefit they would have. Similarly, some claimed to have seen more fish since the beavers' arrival, implying their presence was the cause. An existing – in this example positive – beaver archetype therefore mediates human expectations of, and responses to, the physical presence of beavers.

Protecting beavers involved a multiplicity of practices including riverside patrols, signing petitions, writing to ministers, engaging the press, mobilising the judicial system, and indeed, developing a reintroduction trial (below). It was not just environmentalists, welfare campaigners, rights activists, east Devon residents, conservation organisations, or any other discernible group who moved to protect beavers, but a collective with a (loosely) common goal. This movement, perhaps strengthened more by 'weak ties' connecting groups than by any internal unity (Diani and Mische, 2015; Granovetter, 1973),

nevertheless became large and powerful enough to both drown out opposing voices and sustain a high level of pressure on the Government.

## **Regulating beavers**

When the beavers were first discovered, the Devon Wildlife Trust (DWT) was soon approached for press statements, and took what they considered to be a 'pragmatic' stance on the issue. Quick to condemn unlicensed releases, they nevertheless suggested that the River Otter population could provide an 'opportunity' to study the behaviour, ecology and impacts of beavers in an English landscape. The DWT developed an alternative to Defra's capture plan: a formalised, licenced 'English beaver trial' on the River Otter. This would involve the beavers being recaptured, tested for EM, and – if healthy – re-released as part of a monitoring project. The DWT made concerted efforts to maintain positive relationships and follow relevant reintroduction guidelines as far as possible, given the unusual circumstances. They held a consultation, acknowledged the disease risk and (unlike FoE and many other campaigners) supported the Government's decision to recapture the beavers. Indeed, their project depended on this, in order for the beavers to be genetically profiled and ear-tagged.

When the DWT submitted a licence application, responsibility for the final decision about the beavers' future was transferred from Defra ministers to Natural England. They set up a second consultation, inviting responses online and holding two further 'stakeholder' meetings,<sup>18</sup> before granting a licence for the River Otter Beaver Trial to proceed in January 2015. The DWT leads the project at the head of a consortium including Natural England and the Environment Agency, an ecological consultancy, a Devonian landholding estate, and the University of Exeter (in a research capacity<sup>19</sup>). By April 2015, five beavers had been trapped, screened, declared free of EM and certain other contagious diseases, ear-tagged, and re-released as part of a five-year trial.<sup>20</sup>

Beaver advocates were quick to claim victory, and to some degree the Government could be said to have capitulated to public and lobbyist pressure. However, though driven by the DWT, the trial was established with the assistance of both Natural England and the AHVLA, by this time restructured as the Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA). Defra's response to the Devon case was, as discussed above, an attempt to manage unauthorised presences and re-establish boundaries. The DWT's proposal, though not Defra's first choice, nevertheless enabled the situation to be 'reined-in' without wholly resorting to unpopular, authoritarian measures. The ROBT's development and approval might therefore be understood as a series of regulating practices that enabled the Government to retain some sense of authority, order and control over unruly events and actors.

First, the repeat consultation by Natural England was an effort to improve the democratic and procedural legitimacy of the ROBT (at least on paper), by affirming that beaver reintroduction was supported by a majority of consulted publics.<sup>21</sup> This meant the trial could be framed as a response to public demand, rather than the service of vested interests. Second, the Government's overarching responsibility for public health meant that once raised, the risk posed by EM could not then be dismissed. Consequently, one stipulation of the trial's licence was that the beavers must be confirmed as healthy before release. Testing took place despite a lack of concern among consultees about the health risk, and active opposition from some quarters (EM screening includes an invasive endoscopic procedure). Third, the ROBT's licence came with the caveat that it would serve as 'the' English beaver trial, and no such lenience should be expected if other populations appeared before its conclusion. This condition constitutes a (shaky) effort to avoid further releases.

Finally, although not made captive, Devon's beavers have been counted, tagged and – most importantly – are under surveillance. They are no longer illegal strangers but registered, accounted-for citizens-on-trial. The trial is time-limited, and includes options for the beavers to be removed should they create 'unacceptable' impacts. It acts, then, as a visa for beavers, and their right to reside (wild) may be revoked at any time. Should Devon's beavers prove 'good citizens', and their presence evaluated as net beneficial (for humans) and/or manageable, they could earn the right to remain. Lavau (2011) concluded her discussion of introduced fish species in an Australian river with the question: 'what might a citizenship test for fish look like?' (p. 60). While we cannot answer her directly, the ROBT looks very much like a citizenship test for beavers.

These practices – consulting, licensing, testing, tagging, and monitoring – draw disruptive beavers and their human protectors back towards structured, permitted, institutionally managed and centrally-endorsed order. Or at least, these practices enable the ROBT and its participants to *appear* appropriately regulated. In the following section, we suggest that despite these orderings, the ROBT retains some of its unruly legacy, and discuss the implications of this for the future of beavers in Britain.

### **The River Otter Beaver Trial: A wild experiment?**

Although the ROBT is presented as under and in control, in practice it is closer to a model of conservation Lorimer and Dreissen (2014) term a 'wild experiment'. Unlike traditional scientific experiments – controlled procedures to test a hypothesis – wild experiments are more comparable with field science, where control is limited, knowledge is inductive and tied to specific places and ecologies, and open to surprises.

Wild experiments take place in the 'wild', or the 'immanent and indeterminate world of humans and nonhumans' (Lorimer, 2015: 105), and the ROBT is now committed to playing out in the 'wild' of east Devon. Although in print the project will run for five years, and is reversible, in practice this reintroduction is likely to be permanent. Unless the beavers cause obvious, extensive damage, it will be at least as politically challenging to remove them after five years as it was to remove them after a few months, and likely more so. In 'taking on' this controversial reintroduction, the DWT and partners therefore open themselves to both criticism and institutional risk. The ROBT in this sense constitutes an interesting model of conservation practice, which cannot claim to be a 'secluded' ecological experiment (like the Scottish Beaver Trial arguably was), but is required to engage with diverse publics and its specific social-ecological context: it is thoroughly enmeshed in politics and place.

Drawing on Rheinberger (1997), Lorimer (2015) argues that well-designed experiments are not just about confirming expectations, but are also able to generate or detect difference. Wild experiments are therefore characterised by designs that remain open to uncertainty, contingency and intervention, including by nonhumans (Hinchliffe, 2008; Hinchliffe et al., 2005). Much like the Oostvaardersplassen rewilding project Lorimer and Dreissen (2014) use as an illustrative case, the ROBT submits to traditional conservation practices by having a formal licence and strategy. However, the strategy involves minimal planned, active management,<sup>22</sup> and its primary objectives – to monitor beaver activities – are largely observational. Correspondingly, its success criteria are modest. Provided the beavers survive and don't cause 'significant', well-evidenced damage to the local economy, ecosystems, or community support (and preferably demonstrate quantifiable 'positive contribution[s]' to the same) the trial will be deemed a success. The consortium is expected to publish reports and evidence from its scientific work, but not to confirm or refute specific predictions. As for the contribution and potential intervention of nonhumans,



the Devon beaver population's centrality to the project makes them, to some degree, 'colleagues in the process of producing knowledge' (Hinchliffe et al., 2005: 563), though their tenuous status renders them closer to workers on probation than respected peers (and they are under pressure to 'prove' themselves). However, as a key point of the project is to watch and learn, the beavers are largely permitted to inhabit the River Otter as they choose.

The debate about beaver reintroduction is affiliated with, but not exemplary of, an environmental 'knowledge controversy' (Whatmore, 2009) in which scientific/expert evidence (often translated into policy) becomes subject to public dispute: the badger/cattle/bTB debate is a clearer example of such a controversy (Maye et al., 2014). Scientific and experiential knowledges about beavers were both deployed and subsequently contested throughout this debate, but equally important were differences in how people conceptualise and envision the historical, present and future place of beavers in the British countryside (see also Buller, 2008). Nevertheless, the Government's approach to beaver reintroduction parallels that traditionally employed to tackle knowledge controversies: gather information/evidence and assemble 'stakeholders' to receive and act on it (Born and Barry, 2010). However, external evaluation and arbitration (i.e. reviews and feasibility studies), and stalled attempts at trials, produced stagnation rather than decisions. This case therefore indicates limitations with this approach (which reflects international guidance on species reintroductions; IUCN/SSC, 2013), not least in that it assumes that controversy and conflict are fundamentally undesirable. Yet social research examining environmental controversies suggests that these might equally be understood as generative events, which serve to engage interested and affected publics with complex problems (Marres, 2005; Whatmore, 2009).

In contrast, and importantly, the political approach of a wild experiment is not one of science determining the facts, and then handing them over to the domain of politics to be weighed up and decided on (see Latour, 2009). Instead, it builds on Callon et al.'s (2009) proposals for deliberative democracy, and resonates with Stengers' (2005) 'cosmopolitics', in which political collectives emerge in relation to issues (rather than being assembled and enumerated in advance) and engage in high-quality, public dialogue about how to proceed. Though the ROBT does not yet wholly fulfil these criteria, there is potential for it to do so. In addition to its scientific monitoring, the ROBT is designed to test and experiment with human responses to beaver activities in a novel socio-ecology. To paraphrase Defra, Britain's landscapes and living communities have changed since beavers last inhabited them, and will continue to change. The ROBT's objectives therefore include developing an 'effective management process', to mitigate the frictions produced when human and beaver environmental projects misalign. The consortium is also producing a 'beaver management' strategy outlining how valuable landscape features might be protected, and problematic beaver engineering modified/removed. This continues the British tradition of interventionist wildlife management, but enables flexibility and adaptability in the form and scale of interventions. It differs, therefore, from the customary, often reactive approach of simply removing any wildlife that becomes a nuisance. Management flexibility means the future of beavers need not be reduced to either 'present' or 'absent', and provides an opportunity to move away from problematic concepts of citizenship that rely on it being either inherited or 'earned' by meeting given requirements. Instead, wild experiments retain the possibility of ongoing negotiations, and multiple futures (Callon et al., 2009) for beavers where, for example, they might inhabit one river undisturbed; live, subject to management, in another; and remain absent from a third.

There are, however, risks involved with an experiment like this, the most challenging of which might be the disconcerting openness of the ROBT as it stands. Experiments and trials, one might argue, should produce results at the end, upon which decisions can be made. Wild experiments, however, are more about ‘staying with the trouble’ (Haraway, 2010) than reaching neat conclusions. The key risks of the ROBT, then, are related to foreclosure: restricting the potential for difference and multiple futures, and the loss of opportunities for on-going negotiations among our newly emergent political collective. Using the Devon beavers as a ‘test case’ could result in decision-makers foreclosing opportunities to recognise and respond to differences between individuals, populations and places (Hinchliffe et al., 2005). The ROBT is ideal for trialling beaver reintroduction to the River Otter, but is unlikely to be replicable in, or generalisable to, the rest of England, or Britain. Nevertheless ‘future decisions... on the release of beavers will in large part be informed by the results of this trial’ (Natural England, 2015). The future of The Beaver in Britain, then, is somewhat contingent on the small Devon population who – despite having previously been acknowledged as a heterogeneous collective – are expected to either embody the positive archetype championed by their proponents, or aid beaver-sceptics in disrupting and discrediting this archetype.<sup>23</sup> Neither is likely to be a fair prediction of exactly how beaver–human relationships will unfold in diverse rivers, regions, and socio-ecologies.

Second, the controversy surrounding the ROBT has left residual tensions between its proponents and opponents, which may limit opportunities for inclusive dialogue. Opponents believe the ROBT’s approval has been too hasty, that it is an irreversible catalyst, and that management structures and legal arrangements should have been agreed before it began. Indeed, concerns expressed by the agricultural community have centred on the beavers’ unsettled legal status, and fears they might soon receive blanket, high-level protection that would limit management options. Frustrated by legal restrictions on badger management, some worry that, should beavers receive similar protections there would be ‘no legal means of controlling problem populations’ (written consultation response).<sup>24</sup> This fear is not unfounded. The Scottish Government’s 2016 decision to recognise beavers as ‘ordinarily resident’ in Scotland has obvious significance to their status in contiguous England and Wales. Beavers could feasibly gain legal protection during the ROBT, rendering its ‘exit strategy’, and potentially even its management measures, subject to legal contestation. Given these uncertainties, it is unsurprising that some, though not necessarily against beaver reintroduction in principle, distrust the ROBT as there are ‘too many ifs and buts’ (agricultural landowner, consultation meeting).

The DWT, while acknowledging the issues associated with their post hoc project design, have retained their pragmatic/opportunistic approach: ‘we are where we are... things seldom happen to plan, but you often make the most progress when suddenly a situation is forced upon you’ (DWT spokesperson, consultation meeting). They stress that the beavers were present irrespective of whether their trial proceeded, and that at least the ROBT provides a five-year grace period to plan longer-term legal and structural arrangements regarding beaver management. Optimistically speaking, then, and provided it can develop constructive, inclusive deliberation processes, the ROBT could provide both beaver and human inhabitants – of Devon, and Britain more broadly – with some breathing room, to decide where we go from here.

This is not to suggest that the way beavers have been reintroduced to Devon is desirable. There is a great deal to be said for careful, inclusive deliberation and planning before any significant environmental project, and illegal releases are dismissive of both due process and the interests of communities (human and nonhuman) whose welfare and futures might be at

stake. What this case does highlight, however, is that ignoring or continually deferring decision-making to avoid political tension or controversy is itself a decision, and a risky one. Despite its best efforts, the Government has not been able to reverse or fully contain the flow of events that have effectively resulted in the beaver's reintroduction to England. The presence and temporary residency of Devon's beavers has, at least, forced both the state and its human citizens to face the tricky question of beaver reintroduction in all its difficulty and complexity.

There is an opportunity here, in that the ROBT's most important role might *not* be the recording and forecasting of beaver activity for governments to make definitive decisions about how The Beaver should be received (i.e. desirable or not? protected or not?). If we conceive of the ROBT as a wild experiment, it provides a different sort of opportunity, i.e. to trial ways of negotiating, in practice, among humans and nonhumans with diverse interests, vulnerabilities and capabilities. The Trial also provides opportunities for contextualised knowledge about Devon's beavers to be co-produced with the engaged public that has formed around the issue (Marres, 2005). The most valuable products of this explicitly political reintroduction may therefore be the methods developed and experience gained in (i) assessing and managing problems, and (ii) finding ways to include affected and interested publics. Rather than being a citizenship test for beavers, which they can only pass or fail, the ROBT might be better approached as a trial of wild experiments: the building of political collectives around a common concern, and careful, inclusive negotiation about the composition and future(s) of our shared environments.

### **Acknowledgements**

We are grateful to the Devon Wildlife Trust and Natural England for access to their consultation events and anonymised written submissions, and to all our participants for their time and contributions. We would also like to thank two anonymous reviewers whose constructive comments helped strengthen this manuscript.

### **Declaration of conflicting interests**

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **Funding**

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: SLC was supported by a scholarship from the University of Exeter.

### **Notes**

1. The distinction between geographical Great Britain (England, Wales and Scotland) and the United Kingdom (UK: the political unit of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) is significant because beaver reintroductions to the devolved administrations of England, Scotland or Wales have implications for the contiguous nations in terms of possible cross-border expansion.
2. Beavers in Scotland may have persisted until the 16th-century, but the last beaver record in Wales was in 1188. In England, recent archaeological evidence indicates beaver presence in the 14th-century, but one bounty record refers to a beaver as late as the eighteenth.
3. The trial has now produced its final report (Jones and Campbell-Palmer, 2014). At the time of writing the Scottish Government had not made a formal decision regarding the beavers' longer-term

future, however, in November 2016 the Scottish Government granted beavers 'ordinarily resident' status (this development is discussed in the final section).

4. Environmental governance is devolved in the UK: Natural Resources Wales, Scottish Natural Heritage, and Natural England are responsible for wildlife licences in Wales, Scotland and England respectively.
5. The revised guidelines (IUCN/SSC, 2013) are notably less strict in their requirements for political support.
6. At least one attempt at a formal pilot project in England had failed, reportedly due to opposition from concerned landowners.
7. Notably, north American beavers (*Castor canadensis*) introduced to Tierra del Fuego have had dramatic but diverse effects at multiple scales (Anderson and Rosemond, 2007; Henn et al., 2016). Even within the native range, however, the strength and form of beaver impacts varies between sites (Rosell et al., 2005).
8. Records of individual beavers, including on the River Otter, have been reported with no Government reaction. Indeed, Defra did not respond to the first sighting in January 2014; their investigations began only when breeding was suspected.
9. The introduction of the Infrastructure Act 2015 has since changed the situation, granting Government agencies powers of access to private land in order to remove 'non-native, invasive species' and those not considered ordinarily resident, including Eurasian beavers.
10. In line with guidance from the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Non-native Species Strategy for Great Britain follows a hierarchical, three-step response to species introductions: prevent them; rapidly remove new arrivals; or, where eradication is no longer possible, control established populations.
11. As the citations here indicate, this is particularly apparent in post-colonial nations. Franklin (2006), for example, argues that native species in Australia are governed as a 'natural citizenry', and introduced species as 'illegal immigrants'. Barker (2010) discusses how native nature is central to the formation of political space and 'biosecure' citizenship in New Zealand. These overlaps also appear in Britain, however: Coates (2013) demonstrates how discourses surrounding species introduced from North America are entangled with sentiments about American citizens, visitors and immigrants.
12. This quote from the 'Save the Free Beavers of England' Facebook page ([www.facebook.com/groups/savethebeaver](http://www.facebook.com/groups/savethebeaver)), posted by page administrator (pseudonym 'Castor Anglicus') on 24 March 2015.
13. Both quotes from participants of Natural England's public consultation meeting (January 2015).
14. Particularly, the health risk argument Defra had come to rely on. FoE discovered, and publicised, that a Defra representative had attended a meeting with Public Health England, who were 'not convinced that the 3 Devon beavers necessarily represent a significant increase in overall risk' (Defra, 2014, [email 4 June]).
15. The legal question of whether beavers in England should receive protection under European law remains unresolved: the case was withdrawn. Although beavers are a protected species under Annexes II and IV of the European Habitats Directive, directives are translated, rather than directly transposed, into the laws of EU member states. European protected species 'ordinarily resident' in Britain (e.g. the dormouse *Muscardinus avellanarius*) are listed, in England and Wales, on Schedule 2 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. Eurasian beavers are *not* listed in these Regulations, but as they are supposed to apply to 'species of animals listed in Annex IV(a) to the Habitats Directive which have a natural range which includes any area in Great Britain' (Part 3, Regulation 40), the species' exclusion could be subject to challenge. In any case, however, the UK's more recent decision to leave the European Union means all laws based on European Directives could be subject to revision.
16. George Monbiot is an influential environmental commentator and activist who regularly writes for national newspaper *The Guardian*, and in 2013 published a book, *Feral*, about rewilding.
17. Whereas FoE chose the former, the Devon Wildlife Trust, in their campaign, focused on the latter, bringing informational posters and beaver experts to consultations and publicity events to share their understanding of what 'The Beaver' is and does.

18. One meeting involved an invited group of River Otter catchment landowners. The second was public and followed a format similar to that previously held by the DWT, including presentations about the proposed trial. At the landowner meeting, representatives from landowning and agricultural organisations also spoke, on behalf of their memberships.
19. The authors are not part of the research team leading the scientific monitoring of the ROBT. The findings of this work have, however, been shared with the associated ROBT Science and Evidence Forum, which the lead author now attends.
20. An APHA survey identified nine beavers on the River Otter in early 2015, but disease testing was only required for four adults; kits born in England were assumed free from EM.
21. A summary of Natural England's written consultation indicates a high level of support from individual respondents (84% in support, n = 119). Certainly many supportive individuals and organisations attended public meetings. However, despite efforts by both Natural England and the DWT to engage key landowners and farmers in the Otter catchment (those most likely to be directly affected by beaver activity during the trial) many did not engage with consultation exercises. Those who did contribute often expressed concerns about the trial.
22. Excepting the planned introduction of two further pairs of beavers to improve the population's genetic diversity.
23. There are actually two beaver projects under the DWT's auspices. Since 2011 the DWT has managed the 'Devon beaver project', a more traditional experiment with a pair of captive beavers, investigating their effects on biodiversity and hydrology. Distinct from the ROBT in location, purpose and scale, the project's existence nevertheless enabled the DWT to demonstrate (in their licence application) experience with beavers. Its findings could also inform decision-making.
24. There are also claims from the agricultural community that the blanket protection of badgers and their setts has caused a large population expansion, and an associated increase in badger-to-cattle bTB infections (Maye et al., 2014).

## References

- Adams WM (2003) When nature won't stay still: Conservation, equilibrium and control. In: Adams WM and Mulligan M (eds) *Decolonizing Nature: Strategies for Conservation in a Post-Colonial Era*. London: Earthscan, pp. 220–246.
- Adams WM, Hodge ID and Sandbrook L (2014) New spaces for nature: The re-territorialisation of biodiversity conservation under neoliberalism in the UK. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 39(4): 574–588.
- Anderson CB and Rosemond AD (2007) Ecosystem engineering by invasive exotic beavers reduces in-stream diversity and enhances ecosystem function in Cape Horn, Chile. *Oecologia* 154(1): 141–153.
- Arts K, Fischer A and van der Wal R (2012) Common stories of reintroduction: A discourse analysis of documents supporting animal reintroductions to Scotland. *Land Use Policy* 29(4): 911–920.
- Arts K, Fischer A and van der Wal R (2015) Boundaries of the wolf and the wild: A conceptual examination of the relationship between rewilding and animal reintroduction. *Restoration Ecology* 24: 27–34.
- Barker K (2010) Biosecure citizenship: Politicising symbiotic associations and the construction of biological threat. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 35(3): 350–363.
- Barlow AM, Gottstein B and Mueller N (2011) *Echinococcus multilocularis* in an imported captive European beaver (*Castor fiber*) in Great Britain. *Veterinary Record* 169: 369.
- Barua M (2014a) Bio-geo-graphy: Landscape, dwelling, and the political ecology of human–elephant relations. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 32(5): 915–934.
- Barua M (2014b) Volatile ecologies: Towards a material politics of human–animal relations. *Environment and Planning A* 46(6): 1462–1478.
- BBC (2011) 'Tay beaver' died at Edinburgh Zoo due to septic shock. *BBC News (Online)*. Available at: [www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-tayside-central-13048929](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-tayside-central-13048929)



- BBC (2014) Legal fight begins to save family of beavers in Devon. *BBC News (Online)*. Available at: [www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-devon-29754247](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-devon-29754247)
- Bhattacharyya J and Larson BMH (2014) The need for indigenous voices in discourse about introduced species: Insights from controversy over wild horses. *Environmental Values* 23(663): 1–26.
- Born G and Barry A (2010) Art-science. *Journal of Cultural Economy* 3(1): 103–119.
- Buller H (2008) Safe from the wolf: Biosecurity, biodiversity, and competing philosophies of nature. *Environment and Planning A* 40(7): 1583–1597.
- Callon M, Lascoumes P and Barthe Y (2009) *Acting in an Uncertain World: An Essay on Technical Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Caro T (2010) *Conservation by Proxy*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Cassidy A (2012) Vermin, victims and disease: UK framings of badgers in and beyond the bovine TB controversy. *Sociologia Ruralis* 52(2): 192–214.
- Coates P (2013) Over here: American animals in Britain. In: Rotherham ID and Lambert RA (eds) *Invasive and Introduced Plants and Animals*. Routledge: Abingdon, pp. 39–54.
- Collard RC (2012) Cougar-human entanglements and the biopolitical un/making of safe space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 30(1): 23–42.
- Corlett RT (2016) Restoration, reintroduction, and rewilding in a changing world. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 31(6): 453–462.
- Crowley SL (2014) Camels out of place and time: The dromedary in Australia. *Anthrozoös* 27(2): 191–203.
- Defra (2014) Internal and external communications about beavers in England [Environmental Information Release], 7 October. Available at: [www.gov.uk/government/publications/internal-and-external-communications-about-beavers-in-england](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/internal-and-external-communications-about-beavers-in-england)
- Dempsey J (2010) Tracking grizzly bears in British Columbia's environmental politics. *Environment and Planning A* 42(5): 1138–1156.
- Diani M and Mische A (2015) Network approaches and social movements. In: Della Porta D and Diani M (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Social Movements*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 306–325.
- Foucault M (2007) *Security, Territory, Population*. Harvard: Springer.
- Franklin A (2006) *Animal Nation*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
- Friends of the Earth (2014a) Pressure grows to save Devon's beavers. [News] 24 June. Available at: [www.foe.co.uk/news/pressure-grows-save-devons-beavers](http://www.foe.co.uk/news/pressure-grows-save-devons-beavers)
- Friends of the Earth (2014b) Govt plans to capture Devon beavers may be unlawful, warns Friends of the Earth. [Press Release] 24 September. Available at: [www.foe.co.uk/resource/press\\_releases/govt-plans-capture-devon-beavers-may-be-unlawful-warns-friends-earth](http://www.foe.co.uk/resource/press_releases/govt-plans-capture-devon-beavers-may-be-unlawful-warns-friends-earth)
- Friends of the Earth (2015) Victory for Devon Beavers. [Press Release] 28 January. Available at: [www.foe.co.uk/resource/press\\_releases/victory-devon-beavers\\_28012015](http://www.foe.co.uk/resource/press_releases/victory-devon-beavers_28012015)
- Granovetter MS (1973) The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 78(6): 1360–1380.
- Gurnell J, Gurnell AM, Demeritt D, et al. (2008) The feasibility and acceptability of reintroducing the European beaver to England. Natural England. Available at: [https://phantasmcs.com/files/528\\_ptes\\_ne\\_feasibility\\_report\\_2009.pdf](https://phantasmcs.com/files/528_ptes_ne_feasibility_report_2009.pdf)
- Halley DJ, Rosell F and Saveljev A (2012) Population and distribution of Eurasian beaver (*Castor fiber*). *Baltic Forestry* 18(1): 168–175.
- Haraway D (2010) When species meet: Staying with the trouble. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28(1): 53–55.
- Head L and Muir P (2004) Nativeness, invasiveness and nation in Australian Plants. *Geographical Review* 94(April): 199–217.
- Henn JJ, Anderson CB and Martínez Pastur G (2016) Landscape-level impact and habitat factors associated with invasive beaver distribution in Tierra del Fuego. *Biological Invasions* 18(6): 1679–1688.
- Hinchliffe S (2008) Reconstituting nature conservation: Towards a careful political ecology. *Geoforum* 39(1): 88–97.

- Hinchliffe S and Bingham N (2008) Securing life: The emerging practices of biosecurity. *Environment and Planning A* 40(7): 1534–1551.
- Hinchliffe S, Kearnes MB, Degen M, et al. (2005) Urban wild things: A cosmopolitical experiment. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 23(5): 643–658.
- Hinchliffe S and Whatmore S (2006) Living cities: Towards a politics of conviviality. *Science as Culture* 15(2): 123–138.
- Hodgetts T (2017) Wildlife conservation, multiple biopolitics and animal subjectification: Three mammals' tales. *Geoforum* 79: 17–25.
- IUCN/SSC (2013) Guidelines for Reintroductions and Other Conservation Translocations. Version 1.0. IUCN Species Survival Commission, Gland, Switzerland.
- IUCN/SSC Reintroduction Specialist Group (1998) IUCN Guidelines for Re-introductions. IUCN Species Survival Commission, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- Jones S and Campbell-Palmer R (2014) *The Scottish Beaver Trial: The Story of Britain's First Licensed Release into the Wild*. UK: Scottish Wildlife Trust and Royal Zoological Society of Scotland.
- Jones AC, Halley DJ, Gow D, et al. (2012) *Welsh Beaver Assessment Initiative Report: An Investigation into the Feasibility of Reintroducing the European Beaver (Castor fiber) to Wales*. UK: Wildlife Trusts Wales.
- Latour B (2004) How to talk about the body? The normative dimension of science studies. *Body & Society* 10(2–3): 205–229.
- Latour B (2009) *Politics of Nature*. Chicago: Harvard University Press.
- Lavau S (2011) The nature/s of belonging: Performing an authentic Australian river. *Ethnos* 76(1): 41–64.
- Lorimer J (2008) Counting corncrakes: The affective science of the UK corncrake census. *Social Studies of Science* 38(3): 377–405.
- Lorimer J (2015) *Wildlife in the Anthropocene: Conservation after Nature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lorimer J and Driessen C (2014) Experiments with the wild at the Oostvaardersplassen. *ECOS* 35(3/4): 44–52.
- Macdonald DW, Tattersall FH, Brown ED, et al. (1995) Reintroducing the European beaver to Britain: Nostalgic meddling or restoring biodiversity? *Mammal Review* 25(4): 161–200.
- MacGregor S (2006) No sustainability without justice: A feminist critique of environmental citizenship. In: Dobson A and Bell D (eds) *Environmental Citizenship*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 101–126.
- Marres N (2005) Issues spark a public into being. In: Latour B and Weibel P (eds) *Making Things Public*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 208–217.
- Martin RJ and Trigger DS (2015) Negotiating belonging: Plants, people, and indigeneity in northern Australia. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 21: 276–295.
- Mathieu L, Tinch R and Provins A (2016) Catchment management in England and Wales: The role of arguments for ecosystems and their services. *Biodiversity Conservation*. DOI: 10.1007/s10531-016-1176-9.
- May AN (2016) *The Fox-Hunting Controversy, 1781–2004: Class and Cruelty*. Vancouver: Routledge.
- Maye D, Enticott G, Naylor R, et al. (2014) Animal disease and narratives of nature: Farmers' reactions to the neoliberal governance of bovine Tuberculosis. *Journal of Rural Studies* 36: 401–410.
- Merrill J (2014a) After the badger cull, is Defra planning to kill Devon's beavers? *The Independent*, 20 May. Available at: [www.independent.co.uk/environment/after-the-badger-cull-is-defra-planning-to-kill-devons-beavers-9405767.html](http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/after-the-badger-cull-is-defra-planning-to-kill-devons-beavers-9405767.html)
- Merrill J (2014b) Government plans to capture 'wild' Devon beavers unlawful, says Friends of the Earth. *The Independent*, 24 September. Available at: [www.independent.co.uk/environment/government-plans-to-capture-wild-devon-beavers-unlawful-says-friends-of-the-earth-9754024.html](http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/government-plans-to-capture-wild-devon-beavers-unlawful-says-friends-of-the-earth-9754024.html)
- Monbiot G (2014) Stop the control freaks who want to capture England's wild beavers. *The Guardian*, 4 July. Available at: [www.theguardian.com/environment/georgemonbiot/2014/jul/04/stop-control-freaks-capture-englands-wild-beavers](http://www.theguardian.com/environment/georgemonbiot/2014/jul/04/stop-control-freaks-capture-englands-wild-beavers)

- Morris S (2014) Battle to stop capture of England's first wild beavers in 500 years. *The Guardian*, 16 July. Available at: [www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/jul/16/battle-stop-capture-englands-first-wild-beavers](http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/jul/16/battle-stop-capture-englands-first-wild-beavers)
- Mulcock J and Trigger DS (2008) Ecology and identity: A comparative perspective on the negotiation of 'nativeness'. In: Wylie D (ed.) *Toxic Belonging? Identity and Ecology in Southern Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 178–198.
- Natural England (2015) Natural England approves trial release of beavers. [Gov.uk News Story], 28 January (updated 15 February). Available at: [www.gov.uk/government/news/natural-england-approves-trial-release-of-beavers](http://www.gov.uk/government/news/natural-england-approves-trial-release-of-beavers)
- Ottery St Mary Town Council (2014) Minutes of the Meeting of the Ottery St Mary Town Council. 1 September, Item 14/09/16.
- Peace A (2009) Ponies out of place? Wild animals, wilderness and environmental governance. *Anthropological Forum* 19(1): 53–72.
- Peterson MN, Peterson TR, Peterson MJ, et al. (2002) Cultural conflict and the endangered Florida Key deer. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 66(4): 947–968.
- Rheinberger HJ (1997) *Toward a History of Epistemic Things: Synthesizing Proteins in the Test Tube*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rikoon JS (2006) Wild horses and the political ecology of nature restoration in the Missouri Ozarks. *Geoforum* 37(2): 200–211.
- Robbins P (2006) The politics of barstool biology: Environmental knowledge and power in greater Northern Yellowstone. *Geoforum* 37(2): 185–199.
- Rosell F, Bozsér O, Collen P, et al. (2005) Ecological impact of beavers *Castor fiber* and *Castor canadensis* and their ability to modify ecosystems. *Mammal Review* 35(3–4): 248–276.
- Seddon PJ, Griffiths CJ, Soorae PS, et al. (2014) Reversing defaunation: Restoring species in a changing world. *Science* 345(6195): 406–412.
- Stengers I (2005) The cosmopolitical proposal. In: Latour B and Weibel P (eds) *Making Things Public*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 994–1003.
- Thirgood S, Redpath S, Newton I, et al. (2000) Raptors and red grouse: Conservation conflicts and management solutions. *Conservation Biology* 14(1): 95–104.
- Törnblom JO, Angelstam P, Hartman GÖ, et al. (2011) Toward a research agenda for water policy implementation: Knowledge about beaver (*Castor fiber*) as a tool for water management with a catchment perspective. *Baltic Forestry* 17(1): 154–161.
- Werth C (2014) Beavers are mysteriously back in Britain – But not entirely welcome. *National Geographic (Online)*. Available at: <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2014/08/140804-beavers-science-environment-britain-extinct-animals/>
- Whatmore SJ (2009) Mapping knowledge controversies: Science, democracy and the redistribution of expertise. *Progress in Human Geography* 33(5): 587–598.
- Wright JP, Jones CG and Flecker AS (2002) An ecosystem engineer, the beaver, increases species richness at the landscape scale. *Oecologia* 132(1): 96–101.
- Yin RK (2014) *Case Study Research*. London: Sage.