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ABSTRACT

“HITCHED HORSE, MILKED COW, KILLED PIG”: PRAGMATIC STEWARDSHIP AND THE PARADOX OF HUMAN/ANIMAL RELATIONSHIPS IN SOUTHERN ONTARIO, 1900-1920

Katharine Anderson
University of Guelph, 2014

Advisor: Dr. Susan Nance

This thesis is an investigation of the relationship between Southern Ontario farmers and three different animal species raised on early twentieth century mixed family farms. Between 1900 and 1920, many non-rural Ontarians romanticized rural communities as harmonious and pastoral; a place where farmers had sentimental relationships with their animals. At the same time, Southern Ontario experienced an increase in government initiatives by the Canadian Department of Agriculture, particularly during the First World War. These efforts encouraged farmers to regard their animals as machines that should be manipulated for maximum efficiency and output, in order to support the war and for Canada’s food industry to become competitive on international markets. Southern Ontario farmers existed in between these two paradoxical expectations of early twentieth century modernity. They adopted a pragmatic stewardship over their livestock that was neither overly sentimental nor altogether removed from regarding their animals as living beings with agency.
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Introduction

This thesis examines the complex, varying and paradoxical relationships between early twentieth century rural Southern Ontario farmers and their primary animals for subsistence on the mixed family farm: horses, cattle and pigs. Southern Ontario between 1900 and 1920 was a period in which many non-rural Ontarians idealized and romanticized rural living as harmonious and pastoral; a place where farmers had sentimental, nurturing and even amusing relationships with their animals. At the same time, Southern Ontario was the site of an increase in government initiatives from the Canadian Department of Agriculture (CDA) and the Canada Food Board (CFB), particularly during the First World War. The CDA encouraged farmers and breeders to regard their animals primarily as producers that should be manipulated for maximum efficiency, output, and profit in order for Canada’s food industry to become competitive on international markets, feed the growing urban population, and supply the war effort overseas. After the start of the war, the CDA and CFB marketed to farmers that increasing livestock production was both patriotic and “Canada’s opportunity” for significant commercial development in the livestock industry.¹ Those government efforts sped the transition toward modern meat and non-meat animal products in Canada.²

¹ The Canadian Department of Agriculture’s publications and the Canada Food Board’s posters and publications during the First World War repeated this phrase, “Canada’s opportunity”, with variations such as “Canada’s Pork Opportunity”, “Canada’s Beef Opportunity”, “Canada’s Egg Opportunity”, etc.
² For this thesis, “modern meat” refers to the production of animals for meat and non-meat food products that is mechanized, industrialized, and centralized, away from small-scale family farms and toward large-scale factory farming, where animals become units of mass production and are no longer recognized as individual organisms. “Modern meat” primarily refers to the changes in animal production and the food industry in North America following the Second World War. See Roger Horowitz, Putting Meat on the American Table: Taste, Technology, Transformation (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2006); Gail Eisnitz, Slaughterhouse: The Shocking Story of Greed, Neglect, and Inhumane Treatment Inside the U.S. Meat Industry (New York: Prometheus Books, 1997); Ian MacLachlan, Kill and Chill: Restructuring Canada’s Beef Commodity Chain (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001). Authors have also used “modern meat” in reference to the breeding and genetic manipulation of animals to become more efficient food producers which intensified throughout the twentieth century. See Orville Schell, Modern Meat (New York: Random House, 1984); Susan Schrepfer and Philip Scranton, ed., Industrializing Organisms: Introducing Evolutionary History (New York: Routledge, 2004); Roger Horowitz and Warren Belasco, ed., Food Chains: From Farmyard to Shopping Cart (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2009); Alan...
Southern Ontario farmers existed in between these two unattainable expectations of early twentieth century modernity. Based on the testimonies in farmer’s diaries, oral histories, and memoirs, we find that these farmers and their families adopted more pragmatic and negotiated relationships with their different animals on the farm. These relationships were neither overly sentimental, nor were they altogether removed from recognizing their animals as living, individual organisms with agency. This means that they recognized that their animals had enough self-awareness to be actors or agents in their own lives, a determining factor in how farmers managed their relationships with these living creatures. Day to day animal husbandry required farmers to feed, house, care for and handle their animals while also treating their livestock that would be bought, sold, killed and butchered. Each farmer negotiated his level of attachment to the animals according to his own personality, and the practice of using or valuing different species of animals as labour, meat, or non-meat products, all of which were necessary for the family’s subsistence on the farm. Undergirding the ideas of stewardship and husbandry among farmers was a long-established cultural system by which European North Americans had dominion over animals, and classified how they should be used and valued for human benefit.

While farmers’ relationships were subjective and varied, they more readily adopted closer attachments with horses than with other farm animals. Longer lifespans on the farm, and a primary utility as labour rather than meat, meant that many rural people regarded horses as a sort of working farm pet, or member of the farm team. Interdependence existed between the horse

---


As will be discussed further, this refers to the long history of animal domestication, dating back 15,000 years to pre-historic cultures, when humans first domesticated wild animals for food and/or labour based on the animals’ physiology, behavioural traits, and abilities to successfully adapt to living in human environments. See J.D. Vigne, J. Peters, and D. Helmer, ed., *First Steps of Animal Domestication: New archeological approaches* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2005). Human dominion over animals refers to Christian religious tradition, asserting mankind’s superiority as well as responsibility over the animal kingdom as written in the Book of Genesis.
and the farmer, and a partnered relationship developed. Cattle were a dual purpose species for the production of meat and non-meat products, and were a source of pride and income for farmers. Farmers formed fluctuating and ambiguous relationships with these animals, as dairy and breeding cattle had longer lifespans than beef cattle raised for immediate slaughter and sale. Farming families worked closely and carefully with dairy cows for the production of milk, increasing the level of attachment. Farmers were the furthest detached from their pigs, raised solely for meat, bacon, and lard. They interacted with their pigs on a daily basis, but formed anonymous, impersonal relationships. Pigs reached market weight very quickly, decreasing their lifespan on the farm.

The scale between attachment and detachment varied as farmers neither regarded their animals in this period purely as commodities, nor as permanent members of the family. Rather, they were stewards over their livestock, responsible for their care and capable of attachment, but pragmatic towards the needs of the farm, the family, as well as the long-established purpose of the animals in maintaining those fundamental and financial needs. In between the sentimentalization and commodification of farm animals, rural Southern Ontario farmers in the early twentieth century engaged in pragmatic stewardship over their livestock, whereby each farmer negotiated his attachments based on the particular use and value of the animal, as well as the farmer’s own personality.

This study is a micro-history that pays close attention to a small group of farmers who left recordings of their daily interactions with their animals, revealing the variations in the relationships they formed with three different animal species. It does not attempt to represent the countless perspectives of all farmers from Southern Ontario in the early twentieth century. Like other illiterate, marginalized groups in history, animals are unable to leave their own written
records for historians to analyse. The diarists and testimonies chosen for this study left notable traces of the animals’ existence on the farm, at times forming fragmented narratives of the animals’ lives. Although the perspective of the farmer can never be completely overlooked, this study demonstrates how aspects of the animals’ own personalities and agency were revealed in the farmers’ reflections. This evidence seems to demonstrate that perhaps farmers had the unique perspectives they did because they were able to recognize that their livestock exercised agency, both in moments of resistance to the conditions of their environment and in pursuing their own interests in ways that helped the farmer. This recognition is what drove farmers to develop a pragmatic stewardship, allowing agency to both human and nonhuman animal, while negotiating their degree of attachment with each living being and animal species.

**Historiography: Looking at Animals in Canadian History**

As Peter Burke explains in *What is Cultural History?*, since the 1970s, cultural history, and history “from the bottom up”, has involved new approaches for historical analysis and placed greater emphasis on previously marginalized humans, such as women, children, and racial minorities. More recently, cultural historians have started considering the significance of non-humans within human societies, including domesticated farm animals, wildlife, and the environment. Historical examinations of animals within the last fifteen years, primarily in the British and American contexts, have started to shift away from the animal as a secondary component in historical and rural analysis, towards a central focus on the animal as an important subject for inquiry within human societies. Canadian historical scholarship has only started to

---

5 Peter Burke, *What is Cultural History?* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004). Burke examines new approaches in cultural history, including post-colonial and feminist theories that emerged after the 1960s, when third world countries began gaining independence from European colonialists, raising awareness in historical work away from the “grand narrative of western civilization” toward a consideration of “the other”, neglected groups such as women, gay and lesbians, the physically and mentally challenged, and racial minorities. New approaches have included micro-history and close examinations of material culture in order to evaluate smaller communities and marginalized peoples not recognized within larger political and economic grand narratives.
move in this direction. Understandably, humans have primarily focused on themselves as historical subjects. In order for animals to be considered for historical study, animals first needed to be perceived to matter. Therefore, late twentieth century philosophical theories and texts that raised new questions about the moral and ethical consideration of non-humans inspired subsequent historical work on this subject.

New philosophical works drove the Animal Liberation Movement of the 1970s and called for a revaluation of the way humans perceive and use animals. Major writers from this period included Rosalind and Stanley Godlovitch, Peter Singer, and Richard Ryder.\(^6\) Ryder was the first to coin the term “speciesism” to deliberately parallel discrimination towards animals as similar to other forms of human discrimination, such as racism, ageism, and sexism.\(^7\) These authors advocated for the existence of animal sentience and the ability of animals to feel both pain and pleasure as the basis for their moral consideration.\(^8\) There were several factors behind the emergence of this body of work from the 1970s: the challenging of colonialism, sexism, and racism pushing the boundaries of moral consideration to include non-humans; new scientific evidence that humans shared intellectual and perceptual similarities with high intelligence apes; the development of behavioural sciences that linked animal and human behaviour; and environmental and ecological awareness movements.\(^9\) Contemporary philosophical attitudes toward non-human animals as worthy of moral consideration have therefore inspired examinations of animal as historical subjects.


\(^7\) For example, Richard Ryder explains this term and its origins in “Speciesism in the Laboratory”, in *In Defense of Animals: The Second Wave*, ed. Peter Singer (Malden, MA: Blackwell 2006), 89.


\(^9\) Harlan Miller, *Ethics and Animals* (New Jersey: Humana Press, 1983); Richard Ryder also discusses this in “Speciesism in the Laboratory”, 87.
Successful new scholarship on the role of livestock in human societies considers animals as living beings, placing them at the centre of the historical study. This includes Robert Malcolmson and Stephanos Mastoris’ *The English Pig*. They adopted a specific context, examining the role of the pig in English society throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Their study is important for its recognition of both literal pig for economics and family subsistence, as well as the imagined pig that existed within cultural representations of the period.\(^\text{10}\) Reaktion Books has published a series of similar works, such as Elaine Walker’s *Horse*, Hannah Velten’s *Cow* and *Milk*, as well as Brett Mizelle’s *Pig*.\(^\text{11}\) These are quite broad histories of human relationships with livestock, but cover the multifaceted roles animals perform in human societies and imagination. American historians Joel Tarr and Clay McShane’s *The Horse in the City* and Ann Greene’s *Horses at Work* examine the more specific context of the extraordinary exploitation of horses in urban-American industrial society. They scrutinize the complex, paradoxical relationships between humans and horses, perceived as “living machines” or biological components of the mechanical system that defined the inner workings of the city.\(^\text{12}\) In the rural Canadian context, Margaret Derry has examined the breeding culture and histories of farmers with horses and cattle in three major works.\(^\text{13}\) While extremely thorough accounts of development of horse and cattle breeds in Ontario and Canada’s, Derry’s histories are perhaps less critical of human use of animals and downplay the importance of cultural conceptions of livestock in society, compared to the British and American histories.

---

Urban Canadian social anthropologists have examined the role of the animal in the city as living machines. Annabelle Sabloff observed this concept in her theoretical discussion, *Reordering the Natural World: Humans and Animals in the City*.¹⁴ Her work analyses the city of Toronto as a contemporary case study of the dynamic and varying human/animal relationships that exist in urban centres. She specifically uses metaphor as a tool to examine the different ways animals are perceived within the city, from pets as members of human families, to farm animals and wildlife as bronzed, lifeless and muted sculptures; the epitome of human control over the natural world. Her work is a contemporary social anthropology rather than historical look at the relationship between humans and animals in Canada.

Most historical examinations of animals in the Canadian context have focused on the role of wildlife instead of livestock, due to the symbolic connections to Canadian nationalism. George Colpitts’ *Game in the Garden* considers the relationship between wildlife, Native peoples, European settlers, and the Canadian government.¹⁵ Tina Loo’s *State of Nature* is more critical in its analysis, exploring later twentieth century developments and the often contradictory nature of human efforts to preserve animals and wildlife. She represents how the constructed boundary between ‘domesticated’ and ‘wild’ animals was both liminal and ironic.¹⁶ Loo demonstrates that human relations with wild animals were historically contingent, but an equivalent study on Canadian livestock in rural histories is needed.

Most Canadian rural histories have regarded domesticated animals, such as horses, pigs, sheep, cattle, and chickens, as secondary figures within their human economic, social, or gender

---

histories. These animals are merely components of the farm, essential to livelihood, but not considered as significant as the human actors. Gender studies in rural Canadian history, while focusing on how rural women contributed to the family farm, have provided insight into the relationship between women and dairy cattle. American historian Mary Neth, and Canadian historians Marjorie Cohen and Charlotte Van de Vorst identified that prior to twentieth-century industrialization, farm women had long been responsible for dairy cattle and milk production.\(^\text{17}\) Cohen in particular has emphasised this connection, having analysed the important role of women in dairying as contributing to surplus profits on the farm, along with Ontario’s larger economic development. While she details some aspects of the relationship between the women and cattle, the cattle primarily remain secondary figures in the study.\(^\text{18}\)

Among the most critical examinations of human use of animals have been the historical and sociological examinations of the American and Canadian meat industry, tracing the growth of modern meat in the twentieth century. In the Canadian context, Ian McLachlan has documented Canada’s beef industry throughout the twentieth century in *Kill and Chill*.\(^\text{19}\) McLachlan’s work is primarily an economic geography and history, focusing on the continuities and changes to beef raising in Canada.\(^\text{20}\) His work is an important starting point for how the raising of animals for meat in Canada has transformed into an industrial practice, but the American studies have been more successful in progressing this discussion towards how humans have manipulated animals into industrial commodities.


\(^\text{20}\) Ibid, 17.
Roger Horowitz, Warren Belasco, Susan R. Schrepfer, and Philip Scranton are among the most notable American historians who have examined the developing meat industry and transformation to modern meat throughout the twentieth century. Horowitz considers meat as material culture to analyze changing consumption and production patterns. He separates meat completely from the once living animal, which appears a deliberate strategy for his study, in order to critically examine how modern consumers separate the “animal” from their “meat”. His examination demonstrates that cultural representations by producers promoted industrialization as positive and progressive, as it allowed for more meat production at more reasonable prices.

Belasco and Horowitz’s *Food Chains*, as well as Schrepfer and Scranton’s *Industrializing Organisms* are edited compilations that examine the breeding histories of individual animal species in the early twentieth century to meet demands for taste preferences and greater production efficiency. These are among the most important works on twentieth century human perceptions and uses of animals. They establish critical connections between the animal, the animal product, human social, economic, and cultural values, and how humans engage in the process of manipulating animals increasingly at the expense and neglect of animal welfare.

While rural Canadian history trails behind the American and British histories, sociologies, and philosophies, recent scholarship shows that the study of animals in history is moving away from the centrality of humans, towards greater consideration of animals as primary subjects of historical analysis. Canadian rural historians can expand on recent studies by adopting an interdisciplinary approach. Macro and micro historical methods, through oral

---


22 It is important to note that not all animal historians or researchers of the meat industry in North America are necessarily animal activists or vegetarians. Horowitz states in his introduction to *Putting Meat on the American Table* that he is a meat eater, but he is also aware of the environmental problems and inhumane treatment of animals in the modern meat industry, which has contributed to his interest in the history of American food production.

histories, diaries, and a variety of cultural texts and representations, could be used by historians to better understand the role animals have played in human communities in rural Canada.

**Methodology: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Human/Animal Relationships**

This investigation adopts a new, interdisciplinary approach for studying the role of animals in history and human/animal relationships. To understand the nuances in farmers relationships with their animals, this study applies contemporary sociological and cultural anthropological studies on the symbiotic nature of human/animal interaction to the primary source material from early twentieth century rural Ontario. Relevant scholars include Douglas Harper, Donald Stull, Michael J. Broadway, Rhoda Wilkie, Jocelyne Porcher, Tiphaine Schmitt, Joanna Latimer, and Lynda Birke.24 These studies involved interviewing farmers to establish and understand the variations in relationships they form with their livestock. Specifically, this investigation utilizes Wilkie’s framework of analysis for examining the levels of attachment and detachment between farmers and different species of animals to aid in the interpretation of the historical sources.

Wilkie argues that four different levels of attachment and detachment exist between farmers and their animals: attached attachment, concerned attachment, concerned detachment, and detached detachment. Concerned detachment means that farmers handle their animals with care, but do not see them as individuals, rather as part of commercial production. Concerned attachment is more personal: there is more contact between the farmer and the animal, and the

---

farmer begins to see the animal as an individual. Attached attachment means that the animal is regarded almost as a pet and given clear preferential treatment. Finally, detached detachment is the most common among contemporary industrial farmers who deal with their animals from a distance and therefore regard them exclusively as commodities.25

This thesis therefore considers Wilkie’s framework of analysis to investigate the relationship between rural Southern Ontario farmers and their horses, cattle, and pigs during the early twentieth century. Chapter One examines the relationship between the horse and the farmer, an example of attached attachment or concerned attachment, depending on the individual farmer, due to the daily work partnership between the human and animal, the interdependence of the relationship, and the longevity of the horse on the farm. Chapter Two examines farmers’ relationships with cattle, which depending on the farmer, fell between concerned attachment and concerned detachment. Milking dairy cattle involved a daily interaction between the farmer and the animal, but depending on the farmer’s personality and pride for the animal, this relationship varied in terms of the level of attachment. It is the most ambiguous human/animal relationship examined in this study. Chapter Three looks at the farmer/pig relationship, an example of concerned detachment. Swine had the shortest lifespans on the farm, raised for the purpose to produce meat quickly, which meant that despite the daily interaction, farmers regarded pigs more so as commodities. However, as stated, farmers’ daily handling of their pigs allowed for moments of recognition of animal agency and self-direction on the farm. This thesis therefore also considers contemporary animal behaviour science to understand the natural behaviours of these three species of animal which Southern Ontario farmers noticed and recorded in their

diaries. Each chapter examines these relationships in contrast to the government sources, examples of detached detachment, as they represented all farm animals, regardless of species, as commodities and biological machines. As well, each chapter looks at the farmer/animal relationship in contrast to cultural representations, exaggerated examples of attached attachment due to the over sentimentalized depictions of farm families and their animals.

**Primary Sources: Government Documents**

This investigation incorporates government documents from the Canada Department of Agriculture and Canada Food Board in order to assess how the Canadian government viewed animals, and the ideal relationship between farmers and their livestock as raising more efficient producers of quality food to benefit the Canadian economy, war effort, and Canada’s food exports. The CDA published a series of bulletins and pamphlets between 1900 and 1920 to advise farmers on how to treat, breed, and raise quality animals. These bulletins placed an overarching emphasis on producing and raising quantity and quality animals, particularly for Canada to become a leading exporter of meat and dairy to Great Britain. After the start of the war, the publications of the CDA placed further emphasis on production for the war effort, with pamphlets and books such as “Patriotism and Production: Agricultural War Book” from 1915.\(^{26}\) According to Adam Crerar, the provincial division of the Department of Agriculture distributed 100,000 pamphlets throughout rural Ontario in 1917 alone.\(^{27}\) The goal presented in these publications was for farmers to produce “more than usual”, and for farmers to do their share for Great Britain, with the aim to produce more surpluses each year.\(^ {28}\) Therefore, a shift occurred in

---

\(^{26}\) *Patriotism and Production, “More than Usual”: Agricultural War Book* (Ottawa: Department of Agriculture, January 1915).


the CDA’s publications after 1914, encouraging farmers to recognize the enormous opportunities available for livestock production in Canada because of the economic turmoil in war-riken European countries, which had previously been the primary exporters of meat and dairy to Great Britain.29

The Canadian government created the Office of the Food Controller on June 16, 1917, responsible for overseeing all food production in Canada for the war effort. This department became the Canada Food Board on February 11, 1918. 30 The objective of the CFB regarding food control was “to supply the maximum exportable foodstuffs to our Empire and the Allies during the war.”31 The first report of the CFB stated that 1918 was the year in which “food as a war factor was proved to be only less mighty than were ammunitions.”32 Therefore, the CFB immediately began a propaganda campaign after its formation, using war posters, rural newspapers, pamphlets, and literature to encourage Canadian farmers to increase their food production for the war effort, primarily eggs, pork, beef, butter, and wheat.33 During this period, approximately two-thirds of rural Ontarians had subscriptions to an agricultural newspaper, and therefore the efforts of the CFB and CDA would have reached many literate rural farmers.34 Interestingly, the goals of the CFB were twofold: for farmers to produce more meat, dairy, and

29 The CDA bulletins frequently discuss Denmark and Ireland as supplying Great Britain with meat and animal products.
32 Ibid. During the First World War, the United States Food Administration (USFA) under Herbert Hoover also published similar propaganda war posters, encouraging people and farmers to produce more for the war, as well as to save their meat, wheat, and dairy for the soldiers overseas. See Tanfer Emin Tunc, “Less Sugar, More Warships: Food as American Propaganda in the First World War,” *War in History* 19, no. 2 (2012): 193-216.
33 *Report of the Canada Food Board*, 61-62. The CDA and CFB placed high demands on poultry and egg farmers during this period to increase production. The breeding of chickens to become more efficient egg layers and meat birds was another significant agricultural shift in the twentieth century; however, the relationship between farmers and their chickens, turkeys, and other fowl requires further investigation.
34 Adam Crerar, “Writing Across the Rural-Urban Divide: The Case of Peter McArthur, 1909-1924,” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 41, no. 2 (Spring 2007): 125. In Crerar’s discussion of rural reading, newspapers, and literature, he emphasises how rural people were not illiterate country folk, but rather, “culturally engaged farming people who played a role in shaping their image.”
eggs for the war effort, while also encouraging Canadians to eat more fish and vegetarian meals to save the meat and animal produce to feed the soldiers overseas. The CFB and CDA, while encouraging farmers to regard animals as biological machines, romanticized the efforts of farmers on the homefront as equivalent to military duty.

The individuals employed by the CDA to write livestock reports and bulletins were animal science academics, and therefore similarities existed between the perspectives of animals from the CDA as well as individual animal husbandry publications. Books and articles written by animal scientists from the period, such as veterinarians and professors of animal husbandry, also informed this thesis. This includes articles from Ontario Agricultural College (OAC) Review and the trade magazine the Farmer’s Advocate. This magazine was an ambivalent publication, and its mandate required editors to represent and cater to the successes, pride, and concerns of farmers for their animals, but also to reflect the CDA’s initiatives for livestock producers to focus on meat qualities and yields that would make Canadian food production competitive with the United States and British markets.

Publications from British and American efforts in animal husbandry between 1900 and 1920 are also relevant to this study. These sources demonstrate the similarities between the Canadian, American, and British livestock industries regarding their perspectives of animals as food producers. An examination of British and American sources also establishes Canada’s position within the global markets in the early twentieth century. Overall, these sources further demonstrate how animal husbandry academics regarded raising animals as units that could be manipulated for maximum efficiency, output, and profits. At times, however, these sources

---

35 The CFB and CDA also published cookbooks to assist Canadian women to prepare meals without meat, in order to save Canada’s meat and animal products for the soldiers during the First World War.
contradicted themselves, as they recognized aspects of farming culture requiring recognition of the animal as a living being, in order for the production to remain successful.

**Primary Sources: Cultural Representations**

The primary sources utilized for this investigation to establish the romanticized cultural representations of human/farm animal relationships in rural southern Ontario are the anecdotal stories by Peter McArthur and commercial photographs by Reuben Sallows. McArthur, raised on a farm in Ekhfrid Township, Ontario, straddled the line between rural and urban living. After a short period studying at the University of Toronto, McArthur lived a primarily urban life as a writer in both New York and England. In the summer of 1908, McArthur moved with his wife and five children back to his family home. Between 1909 and 1924, McArthur wrote for the *Globe* and *Farmer’s Advocate* anecdotal stories of his experiences on the farm. According to Adam Crerar, McArthur was “fundamentally a diarist of rural life, who followed the daily and especially the seasonal routines of the farm.” However, McArthur’s stories differed from the other diarists analysed for this investigation in that there was a conscious, pre-meditated motivation behind his writing, with a target audience of both urban and rural readers. Also, McArthur was an author who farmed, rather than a farmer who recorded his day-to-day living. He did not need to farm for his subsistence, and instead chose this as a preferred way of life.

While McArthur recognized through his own experiences how animals were central to the course of a farmer’s day, his anecdotal stories were often amusing, rhetorical accounts of human/animal relationships. He anthropomorphized the animals in his stories, creating notable and relatable characters his viewers could follow weekly. While anthropomorphizing his

---

37 Ibid, 114.
38 Ibid, 115.
39 Ibid, 115-16.
animals, he often represented them as belligerent creatures that sought to outsmart him. He did not deny their role as food producers and often expressed his dislike for some of his animals, which for his readers seemed to make these characters all the more humorous, loveable and captivating. Crerar argues this rhetorical, self-deprecating style of writing about his interactions with animals was to win sympathy with his farming audience, as well as to enhance the reputation of rural living among his urban readers. McArthur’s agrarian romanticism appealed to nostalgic, anti-modernists, or urbanites who had grown up on farms. Crerar defines anti-modernism from this period as a “search for authenticity in the modern world”, in which answers were found in idealizing the past, where humans had more wholesome relationships with the natural world.

This romanticized past is more particularly evident in Reuben Sallows’ photographs of rural life in Ontario. Sallows was a commercial photographer from Goderich, Ontario, during the early twentieth century. When photographing farmers with their animals, he often staged his scenes in order to create a sentimental image that appealed to his urban audiences. He exaggerated the relationships between farmers, women, and children with their animals to create a harmonious representation of rural life. Animal husbandry based on Sallows’ photographs appeared to be a human/animal utopia, where children hand-fed baby animals and rural people wore their best attire while working, handling, and petting their livestock. While there are some images by Sallows that are a more realistic portrayal of early twentieth century rural living, primarily his work represented farm life that was meant to be appealing, sentimental, and

40 Crerar, “Writing Across the Rural-Urban Divide”, 116. Crerar uses the example of McArthur’s discussion of cows and how they often wander off as though thinking deep thoughts. McArthur pleaded to his farm readers to send him information on how to keep them together in the field.
41 Ibid, 122; 123.
42 Ibid.
nostalgic. Urban consumers of Sallows’ work could have purchased his romantic images in the form of photographic prints, postcards, magazines, stereoscopic images, or even magic lantern slide shows.\textsuperscript{44}

Ironically, these portrayals of overly sentimental attachments to animals actually served the purposes of the CDA and CFB during the war to inspire urban movement to the countryside and increase food production. Although the images of rural life presented by McArthur and Sallows seem far removed from the perspectives of animals by the CDA, these sentimental representations helped the agricultural production campaigns of the First World War. Lynn Campbell argues that the parties interested in promoting rural Ontario, such as the Canadian government’s Departments of Agriculture and Immigration, as well as the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk Railway, overly influenced Sallows’ work. His photographs therefore “represent as much what these clients wanted Ontario to be seen as and not necessarily what it was.”\textsuperscript{45} In other words, an idealized representation served to encourage migration to farming communities, which would benefit Canada’s food industry and production for the war effort.

Similarly, McArthur’s romanticized stories of ‘life on the farm’ influenced a patriotic ‘back-to-the-land’ movement during the First World War.\textsuperscript{46} McArthur’s endearing animal stories inspired some urbanites to raise their own pig or spend their summer working on a farm.\textsuperscript{47} Crerar argues that what is even more striking was how McArthur’s work influenced rural communities. McArthur believed that difficulty with animals, or any farming practices, could be allocated by improved farming methods and practices.\textsuperscript{48}
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to modernize farming, and Crerar observes how Canadian government officials exploited McArthur’s work and influence on farmers by “demonstrating the latest innovations in agricultural technique on his farm and enjoying the subsequent coverage in the *Globe* and the *Advocate.*”49 At the same time, McArthur also understood the skepticism by Ontario farmers towards new scientific methods, and often critiqued the government in a tongue-and-cheek manner, with statements like “I issued more bulletins than the Department of Agriculture, and I am afraid they were more widely read.”50 McArthur did not hesitate to vocalize his concerns when he viewed the demands by the CDA as impractical, especially during the First World War when farmers attempted to produce enough food for the war effort while the Canadian government simultaneously recruited farm boys to fight overseas.51 While farmers wanted to aid the war effort and produce enough food, some also resisted the push toward modern methods of how to raise, breed, and work their animals. McArthur’s writings, concurrently with Sallows’ photographs, therefore serve as a tool to understand this paradoxical position for farmers and human/animal relationships during the early twentieth century.

**Primary Sources: Farmer’s Diaries, Oral Histories, and Memoirs**

The Waterloo Region Museum, Dufferin County Museum, and University of Guelph McLaughlin Archives provided the farmer’s diaries utilized for this investigation. This included ten diaries in total from male farmers who recorded their daily farm routines in the counties of Perth, Dufferin, Waterloo, Wellington, and Norfolk. While 1900 to 1920 is the period of focus for this study, two of the diarists wrote prior to 1900. They are included in this paper due to the
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relevance of their recordings about their interactions with livestock. While nine of the diarists resided in rural areas, Gordon Christian Eby is the exception. Eby was a market gardener who lived on the outskirts of the city of Kitchener in Waterloo County. He sold his produce in the city, but also raised livestock for his family’s needs. His detailed diary is highly relevant as it reveals how modernization influenced Eby more than the other diarists, due to his proximity to the developing urban centre.

The diaries range in terms of duration based on the individual personalities of the farmers. While five of the diarists wrote over the span of approximately two to three years, John Spence from Amaranth Township, Dufferin County, wrote detailed entries for 66 years, from 1904 to 1970. While all the diarists are relevant to this study, Spence’s recordings are essential due to his unique detail and emotion in his anecdotal writing. Farmers primarily kept account-book style diaries in this period, which refers to daily recordings that were short, to the point, and approximately one or two lines on the page. An account-book diary was a useful record of the most important information of the day, rather than an emotional reflection commonly associated with contemporary diary writing. Typically a farmer’s daily entry concerned one to two brief words to describe the weather, work done on the farm, monetary figures of expenses and profits, as well as important social events or visits from family and the local community. When analyzing diary sources, it is also important to assess what the farmer did not record in his diary. For example, when considering the relationship between the farmer and his animals, it is important to recognize that certain daily occurrences with horses and livestock were simply too commonplace for some farmers to mention. However, depending on the personality of the
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53 Carter, 54. For example, as Carter explains, Emma Chadwick’s diary had gaps in her writing. This actually meant a very critical event occurred, such as a sick child, as it preoccupied all of her time, preventing her from writing.
farmer, others like John Spence and Gordon Eby chose to more frequently write down these minute details. Often it was within these seemingly haphazard remarks by the farmers where traces of their animals’ agency and personalities emerged.

For the farmers examined in this investigation, the important events of the day they recorded involving their animals usually included buying and selling livestock, as well as transporting, feeding, cleaning, and handling the animals. For Southern Ontario farmers on mixed farming practices, growing crops and raising livestock worked in tandem, as this provided their own source of food, feed for the animals, as well as an income selling any surplus produce. For example, farmers who raised dairy cattle used milk by-products to feed their pigs. Some recorded events were of course specific to a certain animal depending on the species and use of the animal, such as milking the cow, getting the horse shod, or killing the pig.54

Although the Spence and Eby diaries provide a wealth of information to supplement the briefer recordings by the other diarists, oral history interviews and memoirs were also utilized to provide additional details regarding the relationship between farmers and their animals, as well as the perspectives of farm women in the early twentieth century. This investigation examined two oral histories from women who grew up on Ontario farms, as well as surveyed three published memoirs. It is important to note that oral history and memoir sources have to be examined critically, as unlike the diaries they are records of events that occurred well after the fact. Memories are fallible, and therefore the information in these sources may not be as accurate due to altered or forgotten details. The memoirs in particular are premeditated recordings of ‘life on farm’, intended for publication. However, these sources are useful to this investigation for a variety of reasons. The authors were young children in the early twentieth century, and therefore

54 Getting the horse “shod” meant the farmer took the horse to the local farrier to nail new horseshoes to the horse’s hooves.
their memories are representations of children’s perspectives on the farm as opposed to adults. As will be discussed, children often had both sentimental and confusing relationships with animals on the farm, as their knowledge of how to adopt pragmatic stewardship was a learned behaviour. These sources provide more detailed accounts of routine events that are frequently mentioned in the diary sources, but not elaborated on, such as what occurred on butchering day. These sources are supplementary to the information derived from the diaries examined for this study.

From the diary, oral history, and memoir sources, a clearer understanding of early twentieth century animal husbandry emerges. The pragmatic stewardship farmers adopted to raise their animals involved a negotiation of their relationships with the needs of their families, subsistence and income. They formed connections with their animals that at times allowed for recognition of their animals as living creatures with agency, while simultaneously creating emotional barriers that prevented them from getting too close to animals raised for slaughter or sale. This thesis organizes the paradoxes of human/animal relationships in the early twentieth century using two main spectrums throughout three chapters. The first spectrum focuses on the farmers themselves, and the variations between the relationships they formed with their horses, cattle and pigs, using Wilkie’s framework of analysis to inform the nature of these diverging human/animal interactions. Each chapter examines a different animal species. The second spectrum looks at the larger paradox of animals in human society in early twentieth century Ontario, with farmers at the centre of this paradigm, in between cultural works that sentimentalized human/animal relationships, and government efforts to transform living beings into commodities, and for maximum production value.
While Wilkie’s framework provides an understanding of human/animal relationships in the early twentieth century, this study aims to push these concepts further. Wilkie, and other sociologists who have utilized this framework, have interviewed farmers raising one species of animal on specialized farming practices. The nature of modern farming means that in order to remain competitive, farms in contemporary Ontario need to specialize in one area of agriculture, whether that is pork, dairy, poultry, etc. While small-scale family and hobby farms still exist in Ontario, the mixed farm is primarily a manifestation of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. So how did Southern Ontario farmers, who raised a variety of animal species for different reasons and human use, negotiate these relationships in conjunction with the demands to modernize their farming practices? It is evident that many farmers were hesitant toward the modern developments proposed by the CDA during this period. However, it was in the first decades of twentieth century where the rhetoric and movement surrounding a new, modern system of farming emerged, and large scale, industrial, specialized farming began transforming small-scale, community-oriented mixed farming practices. Ironically, the paradox of modern farming in North America is that as humans have created increasingly greater distances between themselves and the animals raised for food, the need for idealized portraits of humans living harmoniously with living beings becomes an even greater necessity.
Chapter 1: “Hitched Horse”: Partnered Relationships with the Work Animal

For early twentieth century Southern Ontario farmers, so much depended on their horses. A farmer’s horse was vital for transportation to and from nearby towns and markets, pulling farm equipment, plowing fields, or performing numerous tasks where power, mobility, and strength was a necessity on the farm. Horses had longevity as work rather than food animals, which enabled farmers to develop sympathetic partnerships with their horses. From an analysis of farmers’ diaries, and Rhoda Wilkie’s sociological framework of human/animal relationships, it is evident farmers formed concerned attachments, and attached attachments with their work horses. Concerned attachment meant the farmer recognized his horse as an individual, while attached attachment went further, and the horse became almost a pet or family member. These relationships were due to the daily partnering that made the horse part of the ‘farm team’ of labourers. These were animals farmers potentially knew, worked with, and handled for twenty to thirty years. Southern Ontario farmers named their horses, recognizing them as individuals, whereas they more easily converted their beef cattle and pigs into commodities and profit. This pragmatic stewardship meant that farmers placed a greater economic and less sympathetic value on livestock raised for meat and non-meat food products, with short lifespans on the farm. Horses existed in the same cultural value as dogs and companion animals during the Edwardian period, and had more opportunity to exist on the farm for a significant period as work animals, which provided for the development of concerned and attached attachments between the human and animal.
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54 Doug Butler, *Principles of Horseshoeing II, Revised Edition* (Missouri: French / Bray Inc., 1985), 56. According to Butler, Professor of Animal Science, Northwest Missouri State University, most horses live to between the ages of 25 and 30. However, this is a contemporary source, and work horses on rural Southern Ontario farms between 1900 and 1920 likely had slightly shorter lifespans.
At the same time, it was during the nineteenth and early twentieth century when horses became ‘mechanized’. The Canadian Department of Agriculture (CDA), animal scientists, veterinarians, and animal husbandry guides from Canada, the United States, and Britain, represented and promoted horses in this period as biological machines. The CDA portrayed horse-breeding as the act of perfecting horses into more powerful locomotives and engines. Furthermore, the two major wars Canada entered during early twentieth century, the Boer War and First World War, initiated the CDA’s encouragement of farmers to produce and send quality horses overseas, simultaneously with the Canada Food Board’s (CFB) push for farmers to work their horses for the increased production of food.

Meanwhile, animal historians who have examined the role of horses in North American society recognize how the literature genre and romantic cultural representations of horses in the nineteenth century and early twentieth century led to the recognition of these ‘machines’ as also living creatures with personalities and character. Margaret Derry, Ann Greene, Joel Tarr and Clay McShane credit Anna Sewell’s publication of *Black Beauty* from 1877 as having significantly impacted sympathetic and sentimental cultural perceptions of horses. They argue that anthropomorphistic animals, such as *Black Beauty*, became a staple of children’s literature in the nineteenth century and were represented as cultural reflections of humans.56 Derry states that public sympathy for horses owed a lot to *Black Beauty*, in which Sewell argued the industrial age had made people forget that horses were living things.57 However, Greene states that despite
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Sewell’s efforts to represent horses as sentient beings, horses nevertheless remained mechanized in this period.58

In the context of Southern Ontario, the romantic rural landscape photographs by Reuben Sallows simultaneously demonstrated the sentimental horse / farmer bond while portraying the horse as the biomechanical component of a complex piece of farm machinery. He captured this paradoxical state of horses in the Edwardian period. Peter McArthur’s lively stories anthropomorphised the personalities of his horses on the farm, creating likeable and amusing characters for his rural and urban audiences, but unlike Sewell, McArthur did not use anthropomorphism as a tool for promoting animal welfare, but rather for promoting rural living in Ontario.

Modernity in Canada saw people driven to simultaneously mechanize and romanticize horses in the early twentieth century. Southern Ontario farmers existed at the centre of this dichotomy. This chapter aims to reveal the farmer/horse relationship using the diary sources to understand their daily interaction. While these farmers bonded with their horses, and recognized these animals as individuals, they remained pragmatic in their stewardship. Some farmers maintained their horses on the farm long after they had outlived their usefulness, but when necessary, the needs of the family farm undermined any attachments, as farmers worked their horses as hard as they required, and sold their animals if they were no longer financially viable to care for and feed.

While the perspective of the farmer cannot be completely removed from the diary sources, their entries not only reveal their attachments, but also aspects of their horses’ personalities and agency on the farm. This partnered relationship enabled farmers to notice and
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record their horses’ productive or counterproductive behaviours, which either proved beneficial or consequently created more work for the farmer. Horses had the innate ability to bond and work with humans as intelligent and trainable animals. While other farm animals, such as pigs, are also highly intelligent, farmers depended on the abilities of their horses to perform the daily tasks essential to the successful operation of the family farm. This reliability outweighed the negative aspects of their behaviour and self-direction, making them the ideal work partner and farm labourer.59

Domestication and the North American Horsemeat Taboo

Horses were perfect animals for human domestication, as they had a tolerance for other species, herding instincts, and humans could breed and manipulate them for their specific needs and purposes.60 Humans first domesticated horses approximately 6000 years ago, not only for pulling, carrying, and transporting, but also for meat, leather, and manure.61 McShane and Tarr argue the European horse survived particularly because “it found an ecological niche as a partner for humans.”62 The human / horse relationship was symbiotic, because while human populations significantly benefited and prospered from horses, the horse survived as a species, with a significant population boom, because of human intervention.63

Along with providing humans with basic survival needs, horses developed a symbolic importance in human history as representative of social status and class in Western society.64

During the middle ages in Europe, however, human consumption of horsemeat was also very

59 Greene, 22. “In human terms, the horse is just smart enough to be a perfect worker who can follow directions without taking too much initiative.”
60 McShane and Tarr, 1.
61 Pita Kelenka, The Horse in Human History (Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 2.
62 McShane and Tarr, 1.
63 Ibid.
64 Ibid, 8. The authors observe how Western artists frequently painted nobility and generals riding their horses.
common, and this practice continued into the twentieth century. In Britain, the noble status of horses otherwise developed into a cultural horsemeat taboo. The English particularly perceived horses as noble beings, and “too close to humans to eat.” Linda Kalof argues that the human act of riding horses was an intimate experience involving close contact between the human and animal, not experienced with cattle and pigs. Medieval England’s cultural representations of horses were therefore anthropomorphized to appear more human-like than livestock slaughtered for food. Horses in early-modern England existed on one side of a conceptual boundary, with cattle and pigs on the other, regarding which animals were and were not acceptable for human consumption. Clear knowledge and recognition of the living animal in the meat was therefore important, as otherwise tabooed horsemeat could easily be mistaken for the other, acceptable forms of animal flesh.

British colonization in North America therefore led to domestication of the horse in Canada and the United States as mirroring English practices. McShane and Tarr observe that most Americans in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries followed the English taboo and avoided consuming horsemeat. Those Americans who did eat horsemeat were primarily immigrants from European countries where this practice was more common. However,
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69 McShane and Tarr, 29. German “pork shops” in New York City in the 1950s sold horsemeat; the consumption of this meat increased due to food rationing during the Second World War.
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rendering plants in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries processed dead work horses into a variety of products for human use. This included horsehair in upholstery, cushions, and plaster; glue and gelatin from boiled hooves; combs and knives from leg bones; and soap and candles from horse fat. Horsemeat otherwise became food for pets or other domesticated carnivores.\textsuperscript{71}

Therefore, in nineteenth century North America, horses were a powerful source of energy, technology, and rendered into commodities, but they were not meat for human consumption. The North American horsemeat taboo solidified the place of horses in society as separate and distinct from livestock; as work and companion animals, rather than food animals. This contributed to the romanticized cultural value of horses, as sentimental consumers did not have to face the crisis of eating an animal species they considered beloved. However, it was also through the process of domestication that by the nineteenth century, North Americans also transformed horses into mechanized vehicles.

**The Horse: A Biological Machine**

Historian Ann Greene argues that in mid-nineteenth century North America, advancements in disciplines such as biology, chemistry and physics blurred the line between what was organic and what was mechanical.\textsuperscript{72} Expanding knowledge about horses was therefore directly linked to technology. Horses were an integral part of industrial society, whose power and abilities were carefully studied by engineers, agricultural academics, and veterinarians.\textsuperscript{73} Anthropologist Pita Kelenka compares how mechanical knowledge of horses in the early twentieth century directly inspired engineers when crafting new machines.\textsuperscript{74} According to Susan Jones, veterinarians and academics in the nineteenth and early twentieth century regarded horses
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as ‘living engines’ or machines that were slowly being replaced by mechanized vehicles between the 1890s and 1940s. McShane and Tarr state that the mechanization of the horse in the nineteenth century involved both human biological interventions such as breeding and castrating, as well as the mechanical attachments of harnesses, horseshoes, and vehicles.

Carl W. Gay, Professor of Animal Husbandry at the University of Minnesota, wrote his first edition to *Productive Horse Husbandry* in 1914, and explicitly titled the first chapter of his book, “The Horse – A Machine.” This chapter outlined his perspective of the horse as a mechanical tool, explaining, “A horse’s usefulness depends upon his power of locomotion. A clear conception of his simple mechanical features affords the best means of measuring his serviceability.” In his preface, Gay emphasised that it was his purpose to regard the horse, and breeding of horses, as an industry. The production and marketing of horses could be organized as a business, thereby generating more profit for the breeders and farmers involved. The book intended to not only to help farmers raise their animals, but to do so as an efficient production. This description of horse breeding and raising reveals the perspective from animal science academics in the early twentieth century that the horse was a bio-mechanical tool that could be bred, altered, and manipulated for maximum efficiency.

It is important to recognize that these academics also came from farming backgrounds and culture. While animal husbandry guides from Canada, Britain, and the United States supported the creation of a more profitable farming industry, occasionally these sources recognized farming culture, and the sympathetic relationships that could develop between farmers and their animals. Charles S. Plumb, a Professor of Animal Husbandry at the College of
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Agriculture, Ohio State University, specifically recognized the culture of British farmers as being “a lover of animals, and expresses a common inherited sentiment. This disposition on the part of a people, develops the finer, more sympathetic qualities, and broadens and strengthens character”.\(^7^9\) In other words, caring for animals positively improved human character. Plumb’s overall focus was on the commercial value of the American livestock industry, and he identified the domesticated animal as “a machine for changing coarse into fine material.”\(^8^0\) This referred to how grains and grass, after being fed to animals, are converted into valuable high priced products such as meat, butter, and labour. Plumb’s focus on the production of animals for commercial success contradicted his brief statement on sentimentality. However, this ambivalence may demonstrate the negotiation by animal scientists and academics to rationalize conflicting attitudes toward horses in the early twentieth century.

While Plumb suggested that human sentiment towards animals was a positive character trait, veterinary historian Susan Jones argues that an “unsentimental professional ethos” existed in this period regarding how farmers and veterinarians needed to handle and perceive livestock and horses.\(^8^1\) Jones states that brutal treatments veterinarians sometimes needed to perform on farm animals, such as burning, blistering, or surgeries without anesthesia, did not leave space for sentimental attachments to their animal patients.\(^8^2\) Since horses in the early twentieth century had a practical purpose for labour, their representation by animal scientists as machines went hand-in-hand with their economic value as a commercial investment for farmers. For some farmers in rural Southern Ontario, however, the horse as an economic investment had to be negotiated with their particular attachments, during a period when expanding export markets and the Canadian
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military created new demands for horse breeders and farmers in the pursuit of perfected, quality horses.

**Perfecting Horses in Early Twentieth Century Ontario**

According to *The Livestock Industry in Canada*, there were 650,000 horses on rural Ontario farms in 1901. This number increased to 776,000 by 1916, but declined gradually following the Second World War due to farmers replacing their horses with tractors. By 1961, there were only 89,000 horses on Ontario farms.\(^{83}\) Between 1900 and 1920, some farmers used steam-powered tractors and stationary engines, but these preceded the more popular gasoline tractor. In 1921, there were 7,161 tractors on Ontario farms, which increased to 18,993 by 1931.\(^{84}\) Therefore, during the Edwardian period in Southern Ontario, farmers conducted their transportation and work in the fields primarily with the assistance of horses.

During this period, the Canadian Department of Agriculture and agricultural experts encouraged rural farmers and breeders to perfect their horses through breeding and cater to off-farm markets. The CDA’s publications informed farmers to observe “horse markets of the world”, as they regarded the breeding of quality horses for off-farm markets a highly profitable venture.\(^{85}\) In 1911, the Livestock Commissioner J.G. Rutherford emphasized in *Horse Breeding and Rearing of Colts* that “a man who successfully devotes his attention to the production of a first class animal is seldom found complaining for want of a customer.”\(^{86}\) The document encouraged every farmer who owned a mare to “draw a mental picture of the horse he wants to get from her,” taking into consideration her size, shape and breeding before selecting the sire.\(^{87}\)
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Once determined, the pamphlet recommended farmers always use a pure-bred sire, as the risk of breeding a horse of an “inferior type” was lessened.88

To ensure that buyers of purebred, quality horses were knowledgeable of the animal’s superior breeding, animal husbandry guides and farm magazines from this period also emphasised proper naming and pedigree as essential for farmers and breeders. An article from the OAC Review from 1923, “The Naming of Pure-bred Animals” by R. Kinchsular, explained the reasons, importance, pride, process, and enjoyment involved in naming purebred horses and cattle.89 The article referred to workhorses, racehorses, and show horses, and how the improper naming of a purebred animal decreased its monetary value. Kinchsular argued that farmers who informally named a purebred horse was a disgrace, stating, “To give a colt of high breeding a common garden variety name is like saying ‘Hello Mac!’ to the Prince of Wales upon meeting him.”90 For example, ‘Baron’s Pride’, a Clydesdale from Scotland, sired many sons that maintained the name ‘Baron’, such as ‘Baron Buchlyvie’ and ‘Royal Baron’. The name Baron became one of the most famous breeds of Clydesdales in Scotland, and recognition of the name and breeding thereby increased the horse’s monetary value.91

The ‘garden variety name’ referred to the common, ordinary names farmers gave their work horses, who were not necessarily purebred. While academics encouraged farmers to cater to off-farm markets, the type of horse farmers sought and bred to perform heavy work on the farm was what Margaret Derry identifies as a good ‘chunk’ horse.92 This was a general-purpose horse that was not necessarily a specific breed, but rather a desired weight and size.93 Therefore,
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many farmers evaluated their horses based more on consideration of ‘type’ rather than ‘breed’. The problem with this type of horse was that it only appealed to North American farmers, and did not fit any off-farm markets, even though farmers attempted to sell these horses regardless of their breeding. According to Derry, North American chunks became scorned in Britain, and nicknamed the ‘no-purpose’ horse.\footnote{Derry, \textit{Horses in Society}, 82.} Agricultural experts in this period argued that farmers should not be breeding chunk horses at all, but rather encouraged them to consider breeding horses suitable for other markets, as they determined that “any horse could serve on the farm.”\footnote{Ibid, 88.}

For the Southern Ontario farmers examined in this study, while some participated in local livestock shows and fairs, and took pride in the breeding of their animals, they primarily focused on purchasing and breeding horses capable of performing the work necessary on the farm. Horses that aided the essential production of food on the farm were more important to these farmers than breeding animals that met the demands of Canada’s globalized commodification of horses. These farmers did not record the names of their animals in their diaries according to proper pedigree, but rather referred to their horses using common, personal names, a necessary component of their working relationship. With the start of the Boer War and more particularly the First World War, the CDA’s publications shifted regarding the issue of pedigree, stating that this was of secondary importance when breeding military horses. Consideration of the horse’s type, size, activity, and endurance was more essential for the animals bred for the Canadian military.

\textbf{War Horse: Ontario Farmers and the Canadian Military Horse}

During the First World War, the Canadian Department of Agriculture placed two pressures on Ontario farmers regarding their horses: to increase the production of military horses...
sent overseas and to increase the work performed by farm horses for greater wartime food production. For farmers, this meant venturing into a speculative horse breeding business outside the familiarity of Ontario markets. According to Derry, Canadian farmers had been affected by Britain’s purchasing of horses since the establishment of the British Remount Department in 1887, which began this off-farm market for Canadian horse breeders. During the Boer War in South Africa, the CDA recognized the importance of horses in “modern conditions of warfare” and published a special bulletin on war horse production in 1909 titled, *The Breeding in Canada of Horses for Army Use*. In this bulletin, J.G. Rutherford argued that mounted soldiers had the advantage of moving more quickly and efficiently than soldiers on foot, making the horse an important and essential component for the war in South Africa. Therefore, the publication emphasised that breeding horses for the British Remount would likely prove a profitable venture. This publication also outlined to breeders the ideal criteria required for artillery, cavalry, and infantry horses. Again, in the case of military horses, pedigree was secondary to size, endurance, and activity. For example, the publication noted that although the purebred Hackney horse named Cassandra (Figure 1.1) won first prize in the category of Artillery Horse at the Toronto horse show in 1908, it was not necessary for war horses to be of this particular breed, or even purebred, so long as they met the criteria for size and strength.
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By the First World War, the British Remount and CDA further emphasized to Canadian breeders and farmers that breeding and selling quality military horses for the war was a profitable opportunity. However, Derry argues that Canadian farmers tended to be pragmatic toward the Remount. They regarded this market as a chance to sell horses that were not able to pull heavy equipment on the farm, but could still be ridden and utilized by the military.\textsuperscript{99} While the British Remount remained strict in its ideals for cavalry, artillery, and infantry horses, “animals turned down at one point got accepted at another.”\textsuperscript{100} A primary reason the Remount purchased horses they otherwise considered unfit was due to the high depletion of horses during the First World War. Due to this high demand, William Motherwell, Minister of Agriculture in
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Saskatchewan, recognized how the extraordinary slaughter of horses on the battlefield provided a profitable venture for Canadian breeders in the CDA’s publication *Patriotism and Production: ‘More than Usual’* from 1915:

> With the terrible slaughter of horses attendant on military operations, and the tendency to smaller farms, the way points to the breeding of more horses, even though prices have sagged. We shall then be placing ourselves in a position to reap benefits that will arise from the future demand for horses as providing in the wisest way for our own future farm power requirements.\(^{101}\)

In other words, participating in the market for horses during the war would have positive long-term benefits for the Canadian horse breeders. *Patriotism and Production*, under the heading ‘Items of Interest’, further identified that the average life expectancy of an artillery horse in Europe in 1915 was thirty days, while a cavalry horse was seven days.\(^{102}\) Overall, more than one million horses and mules played a role in combat, pulling guns, field hospitals, and ambulance during the First World War, of which less than one-tenth survived.\(^{103}\) The perspective toward horses used in war by the CDA in these wartime publications reiterates the idea that these animals were machines, equivalent to the other pieces of valuable, necessary, but expendable vehicles in modern warfare.

Memoir sources by Canadian soldiers who fought overseas in the First World War provide a different perspective of their interactions with horses. James Robert Johnston, who was a logger and farm labourer from New Brunswick prior to 1914, recorded in his memoir “Memories of The Great War” his experiences with the horses he encountered as a soldier.
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\(^{101}\) Quote from Hon. W.R. Motherwell, Minister of Agriculture, Saskatchewan, in *Patriotism and Production: ‘More than Usual’*, *Agricultural War Book* (Ottawa: Canada Department of Agriculture, 1915), 10. The sagging prices referred to how the average price of farm horses dropped in the years before and during the First World War. For example, the average price of farm horses in Ontario dropped from $139.79 per head in 1911 to $138.64 in 1913 according to this publication.

\(^{102}\) *Patriotism and Production*, 73.

\(^{103}\) Kelenka, 404.
overseas.\textsuperscript{104} Johnston was a horse driver for the Canadian Machine Gun Corp in Europe starting in 1917, a position he regarded as “one of my lucky breaks in the army.”\textsuperscript{105} Working closely with a team of horses, Johnston reflected on the considerable amount of suffering the horses endured:

Very little has been said about the horses and mules that were used and what they suffered is beyond description…If it seems sometimes that my emotions are overruling my sounder judgment, it only shows in a small way how man and horse can become attached to one another under rugged circumstances.\textsuperscript{106}

Working in close proximity with these animals, Johnston explained how he formed a “mutual attachment” to his team of horses, named Split Ear and Tuppence.\textsuperscript{107} The perspective by Johnston reveals a sense of shared suffering between the soldiers and horses used during the war. Daily interaction and parallel experiences enabled soldiers such as Johnston to see horses as individuals, and recognize the animals’ suffering as similar to the devastation endured by the human soldiers. He credited the intelligence of his saddle horse in helping him survive, writing, “I believe my saddle horse knew more than I did, and it is one of the reasons I lasted as long as I did. He took care of me.”\textsuperscript{108} This relationship relates to the shared work partnership between farmers and their horses. Johnston described this as a mutual attachment, but it resembles Wilkie’s concept of attached attachment. For Johnston, working daily with his horses he recognized their individuality, personalities, agency, and ability to experience suffering, which enabled him to see them as sentient beings, rather than expendable machines.

On the home front, both human and non-human labourers had an essential role aiding the wartime demands for food production. As Adam Crerar explains, the significance of food during the First World War in Canada “meant that agricultural labour became idealized as a duty akin to

\textsuperscript{105} Ibid, 36.
\textsuperscript{106} Ibid, 54.
\textsuperscript{107} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid.
military service.”  

Crerar observes that Ontario farmers were not pacifists, and believed in increasing food surpluses for the war effort. Their primary concern was the conscription of their sons, which they argued undermined efforts to produce enough food. 

Prior to 1918, under the Military Service Act, farmers could apply for exemption from service due to their occupation, as “producing food was of national importance.” However, Prime Minister Borden passed an Order-in-Council in April 1918 that cancelled all exemptions. The work of young men on the farm was vital for agricultural production, and Crerar states that the demands and tips offered by the CDA to help farmers achieve food surpluses felt “impractical and patronizing” to rural Ontarians, without the labour of young men required to meet these goals. 

With the labour crisis in agrarian Ontario, the Canada Food Board initiated a propaganda campaign to recruit “Soldiers of the Soil” in 1918, encouraging young urban boys to spend their summer volunteering at farms. The CFB printed a propaganda poster (Figure 1.2) which featured a farmer with a team of three horses. The farmer, riding a white horse, pointed to a hazy image of young men fighting overseas, as the Canadian government called upon urban boys to do “their bit” for the war by volunteering on farms and taking over responsibilities of enlisted farm boys. The poster romanticized the bond between the human and animals, as well as portrayed the horses as symbols of agrarianism; the main vehicles of power Canadian farmers used to increase food production. Interestingly, the central horse performed the role of the recruiting agent in this poster, as the only figure directly confronting and challenging the viewer. These efforts were successful, as 18,000 to 19,000 high school boys, about 70 percent of enrolled male students in 
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110 Ibid, 243.
111 Amy J. Shaw, Crisis of Conscience: Conscientious Objection in Canada during the First World War (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2009), 42.
Ontario, signed up to be “Soldiers of the Soil” and volunteered on nearby farms during their summer.\(^{113}\) The value of horses in this poster otherwise contradicted the CDA’s demand that farmers needed to breed horses for the Canadian military overseas. Here, horses were romanticized farm workers and companions necessary for food production, while overseas the horse became expendable pieces of machinery.

Ontario farmers wanted to help the war effort, but the demands by the CDA and CFB regarding the production of food and horses were unrealistic and contradictory. Producing more food could not happen without the aid of both human and horse labourers. Selling horses that were no longer useful for the farmer was more beneficial to producing enough food for themselves and the war than mass producing animals which met the specific criteria outlined by the CDA. While some of the diarists, such as John Spence, recorded their awareness of the war in Europe and how it affected their communities, the diary entries by these farmers regarding the work performed with their horses primarily remained consistent with entries prior to the start of the war. The relationships and attachments the farmers developed with their horses had to be negotiated as they deemed which animals were no longer economically feasible to keep for the farm.

The Partnered Farmer/Horse Relationship: Concerned and Attached Attachment

While the CDA represented horses and horse breeding as serving the nation during the First World War, for farmers, their horses served the family farm. Although farmers bought and sold their horses for a dollar amount, what is absent from the diary sources is the patriotic fervor and commodity–based pride surrounding the ideal breeding of horses that is evident in the CDA’s publications. The realities of daily handling and care of the animals, combined with the personalities of both the farmer and horse, along with the longevity of the relationship, shaped farmers’ perspectives and attachments with their non-human labourers.

There are limitations to the diaries regarding a complete understanding the farmer/horse relationship, and reading between the lines is necessary. When the farmers recorded going into town, or plowing the field, his horse or teams of horses went with him. Horses were the means that made travelling for farmers possible. Farmers shaped their day’s work around the stamina, strength, and abilities of their horses.\textsuperscript{114} However, not all the diarists recorded these details, as they were often too commonplace. Events the diarists more frequently noted included horse births, deaths, illness, specific care for the animal, and accidents. These moments were more extraordinary to the daily routines on the farm, and reveal that farmers formed complex relationships with their horses that had to balance between affection and ownership. They recognized their horses as individuals, but also understood their own role as the dominant figures and stewards over their animals. They were responsible for the health, wellbeing, and care of their horses, but also had a sense of entitlement to the work the animals as hard as needed for the farm’s productivity. These farmers formed sympathetic work partnerships with their horses from

their daily interaction, but horses remained the economic property and investment of the farmer, who pragmatically negotiated his attachments with the needs of the farm.

The routine shoeing of horses was one essential component of farmers’ care for their work animals (Figure 1.3). Ephraim S. Cressman, a Mennonite farmer from Breslau, Ontario wrote the third week of January, 1905, “To blacksmith shop – got Tom shod.”115 The following month, in the second week of February, Cressman recorded “to blacksmith – Dexter shod (10 cents).” He returned again to the blacksmith for shoeing in the first week of April, recording “To blacksmith shop – shoeing (30 cents).” While the horseshoe reflects a mechanical component of the horse, shoeing a work horse every six to eight weeks is an essential part of the wellbeing of these work animals.116 Over time, constant movement over uneven, hard surfaces wears down the metal shoes, which can damage the horses’ hooves. For Cressman, regularly shoeing his horses meant taking responsibility for their welfare while maintaining the productivity of his animals.

Caring for horses was particularly traumatic when an animal was sick, dying, or when a female horse foaled. Jock Hyde, a farmer from Amulree, Ontario, wrote briefly on 4 January, 1914, “Florence foaled.”117 Toby Barrett from Woodhouse Township recorded on 16 May, 1915,
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115 Ephriam S. Cressman, Transcribed Diary of a Mennonite Farmer, Breslau, Waterloo Township, 1905-1907. Waterloo Region Museum Diary Collection. Cressman frequently recorded his trips to the local blacksmith and harness shop, for various reasons other than shoeing, including general repairs to items such as his wheelbarrow.
116 Butler, 3. This is particularly essential for work horses, as the constant movement wears down their shoes.
“Ginger has new colt”.\textsuperscript{118} The death of a newborn was also a common occurrence. John Spence noted on 30 May, 1904, “Topsy has a colt & we had quite a time of getting it to stand up and suc[k].”\textsuperscript{119} This likely referred to the colt’s ability to nurse from his mother, in which Spence and his brother David attempted to assist the process. The following day, Spence continued, “The young colt has a sore leg, swelled at the knee David and I sat up to attend to him. It rained all night.” On 1 June, Spence wrote, “The young colt is about dead. It rained all day and all night.”

A new foal potentially lived and worked on the farm for over twenty years, so his or her survival was an economic investment for the farmer. As stewards over their animals, these farmers were also responsible for the breeding, birth, lives and wellbeing of their horses. The combined economic and emotional investment in the lives of their horses is likely why John and David Spence gallantly stayed up with the sick colt through the night.

With the successful birth of a colt, farmers had to begin training and breaking the animal to become a productive worker on the farm. Jock Hyde recorded on both 11 and 14 of January, 1913, “Bob breaking colts”, then wrote on 16 January, “Bob choring and leading colts”. This meant his son Bob’s efforts to break the new colts was a success, as he could then lead and train them to perform the necessary farm work. The horse could not become a productive worker unless able to follow the commands and direction of the human farmer. However, the horse / farmer relationship was also symbiotic; as the horse learned to follow human instructions, farmers equally needed to understand the temperament of their horses. As anthrozoologist Lynda Birke explains, horse trainers learn how to ‘speak horse’ in order for the human/animal

\textsuperscript{118} Barrett Family Diaries, Regional History Collection, University of Guelph Archives, XR1 MS A447.
partnership to succeed.\textsuperscript{120} John Spence recognized an aspect of his colt’s personality riding the animal for the first time on 6 January, 1913, “I saddled the big colt for the first. She is very quiet.” This behaviour would have been beneficial for him, as horses primarily communicate silently through body language that farmers and trainers need to learn, but auditory noises like roaring, squealing or snorting can mean the horse is angry, complaining, or senses danger.\textsuperscript{121} The quiet temperament of Spence’s colt likely meant the horse was comfortable with him, making training the animal easier, and allowing the cooperative work partnership to develop.

The partnered relationships between Southern Ontario farmers and their horses reflected Wilkie’s concepts of concerned and attached attachment. The farmers recognized their horses as individuals, and some regarded these work partners almost like members of their community and families. The essential role of horses to the everyday lives of farmers, and the subsequent bond that formed between the human and animal, meant that some of the diarists not only recorded the deaths of their own horses, but also noted when their neighbours’ horses died. Henry Kollman, a farmer from Amulree, Ontario, wrote “Ed’s mare died in Stratford” on 4 January, 1913.\textsuperscript{122} Similarly, Toby Barrett recorded on 11 June, 1916, “Mr. Fleming’s horse ‘Prinee’ breaks leg and has to be shot.” As work animals traveling with the farmer, it is likely farmers got to know each other’s horses. The sympathetic partnership farmers developed for their horses, along with their essential role to rural communities, meant neighbours were empathetic when hearing news of horse deaths. Farmers also euthanized each other’s sick horses. John Spence recorded on 19 November, 1904 “In the afternoon I went over to Tamsley’s & shot their old brock horse.” Toby

\textsuperscript{121} Anahi Zlotnik, \textit{Neighs and Whispers: A study of contact and communication with horses} (Nottingham: Nottingham University Press, 2012), 17, 18. Snorting can mean that the horse is curious about unknown objects and strangers, or if they are feeling good when playing.
\textsuperscript{122} Henry Kollman, Diary of a Farmer, near Amurlee, Perth County, Ontario, 1913-1914. Waterloo Region Museum Diary Collection.
Barrett similarly recorded on 21 June, 1916, “Joe Fields shoots Jack Martin’s horse suffering with tetanus.” This seemed a reciprocal act of compassion by farmers in rural communities to put down each other’s horses, if their attached attachments made this task too difficult.123

This sympathetic culture of farmers’ relationships with their horses is evident in how some trade companies in Southern Ontario marketed their horse products and farm equipment. Advertisements from the *Farmers Advocate* catered to both the economics of a healthy horse, and the sentimental culture of farmers’ attachments to their horses, by advertising the proper care of the animal as being ‘humane’. This advertisement by the Whipple Horse Collar Company in Hamilton titled “The Humane Horse Collar”, from the *Farmers Advocate* on 6 January, 1910, represented a balance between sentimental, ‘humane’ treatment of horses and the economic pragmatism of a healthy horse (Figure 1.4). The advertisement first stated that, “It is absolutely essential from a monetary standpoint that the horse should be kept well and busy.” The ad then listed how the collar was a humane investment for farmers stating, “NO pressure on the top of the neck. NO hot sweat pads to chafe the horse. NO choking on going up the hill. NO sweenied horses, and NO sore shoulders or neck with THE HUMANE HORSE COLLAR.”124 The company did not label this item as the ‘economic’ or ‘productive’ horse harness, but rather chose the word humane in order to appeal to farmers concerned about the welfare of their animals. This

---


124 Sweenied referred to when the horse pulled a muscle due to the strain of pulling heavy equipment.
item designed by Whipple Horse Collar Company in Hamilton, Ontario, and was evidently a popular purchase for farmers, claiming that 60,000 had sold in the United States in 1909.

While the diarists formed sympathetic partnerships with their horses, these animals still remained the property and subordinate of the farmer for the purpose of labour. They cared about the humane treatment of their horses and wellbeing of sick animals, but the partnership was not egalitarian, as the farmer was the dominant figure in the work relationship. John Spence is the one diarist who recorded in detail which specific horses he worked in his reflective daily entries. Spence wrote on 3 May 1904, “Papa & David hitched Flossie to the single plow with Topsy & worked her all day. I ran the double plow. 74° in the shade at noon.” Spence identified four
other individuals in this entry: Papa, David, Topsy and Flossie. The horses Topsy and Flossie were as much a part of the farm team as the human workers. The partnering of the humans and animals in the field was a shared experience of the work and labour. However, Spence still specified how he had worked his horses all day, in unseasonably hot weather. The human was the dominant figure in this relationship, and while Spence had affection for his horses, and recognized them as individuals, there is also a sense of entitlement to work his animals as hard as needed despite the heat.

As living beings, horses had limitations in terms of the amount of work they were able to perform. Horses get tired, sick, injured, and of course eventually die. Gasoline tractors were an available mechanical alternative to horses in the early twentieth century, but farmers were slow to adopt this technology, and did not begin significantly replace their horses until the 1930s and 1940s. For some farmers, this was because of their familiarity and partnerships with their animals. There is evidence in the diary sources of farmers who were interested in the new technology, as Toby Barrett recorded on 4 September 1917, “Frank goes to Exhibition and returns ‘tractor minded’”. Douglas Harper and Susan Jones have both examined how even well-off farmers hesitated to replace their horses with tractors due to their attachments. Jones examined how, in order to persuade well-off farmers to buy their equipment, tractor advertisements in the 1920s and 1930s critically questioned farmers, asking, “Have you placed a sentimental value on your horses out of proportion to the work they are able to perform?” Instead of catering to farmers’ attachments to their horses, tractor advertisements in the 1920s and 1930s portrayed the farmer/horse relationship as anti-modern and backwards.

Advertisements for modern tractors and the ‘humane horse collar’, though contradictory, coexisted because farmers did not mutually agree on how to regard these animals. The individual
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personalities and interests of farmers contributed to their attachment to horses, or determined whether they placed greater value on modern methods of productive farming. As Harper noticed in his oral history interviews with New York State farmers, some described keeping their horses long after adopting tractors due to emotional attachments. Among the farmers he interviewed, the bond one farmer had for his horses was so strong that he refused to send his dead horses for slaughter as fox meat, and buried them instead.\textsuperscript{126} Harper also noted other farmers could not even recall the transition from horse to tractor.\textsuperscript{127} Some regarded replacing their horses as inconsequential, and did not remember when or to whom they had sold their horses.\textsuperscript{128}

For the diarists, their relationships with horses primarily varied between concerned attachment and attached attachment, but sometimes they raised horses that had a predominant economic value. While Ephraim Cressman developed a concerned attachment for his driving horses Tom and Dexter, other horses he bought and sold for profit. In the fourth week of March, 1905, Cressman wrote how he “took black mare to Berlin, sold for $170.” In the same week, following this sale, Cressman “bought a driver mare 4 years old, $150.” This buying and selling of his horses resulted in a $20 profit for Cressman, and is an example of economic pragmatism regarding the stewardship of his animals. Cressman named his work horses Tom and Dexter, he did not name the two horses he sold, and instead identified them by physical descriptors. Farmers’ pragmatic stewardship determined whether they provided their horses with names, or avoided the emotional investment of naming animals they intended to sell for profit.

**Personal Names for Work Horses on the Farm**

Almost all the diarists examined for this investigation show evidence of having named some, if not most, of their horses. For the horses that remained on the farm as work animals, it

\textsuperscript{126} Harper, 50.  
\textsuperscript{127} Ibid, 55.  
\textsuperscript{128} Ibid.
was important for farmers to establish verbal and nonverbal communication, and therefore calling the horse by his or her name, and the horse recognizing this name, was an integral part of their partnered relationship. It also demonstrates the intellectual abilities of horses. Horses can learn to recognize approximately 300 words of human vocabulary.\(^{129}\) Although their physiology makes it impossible to verbally communicate like humans, they have the ability to comprehend and learn a great deal of commands and direction from humans, including their name and other verbal and non-verbal orders.\(^{130}\) At the same time, the farmer naming his horses also signified the creation of an emotional bond. Margo DeMello argues that once we name an animal, it becomes part of our social world. The name not only allows for an emotional attachment to form, but the animal then gains a history, in which humans reminisce about the animal even long after he or she has died.\(^{131}\) Mary T. Phillips argues that the human act of giving a proper name to an animal determines the type of relationship and degree of attachment formed between the human and animal, and equates proper names with human characteristics such as having biography, personality, and uniqueness.\(^{132}\)

In the case of Southern Ontario, longer lifespans of horses compared to livestock raised for meat allowed for both the emotional investment of giving the horse a name, as well as the practical investment in establishing their working relationship. The diarists more haphazardly named their cattle, and did not show evidence of having named their meat animals, such as pigs,

\(^{129}\) Zlotnik, 125. She references Dr. Marthe Kiley Worthington for her studies on horses and humans vocabulary.
\(^{130}\) Ibid.
\(^{132}\) Mary T. Phillips, “Proper Names and the Social Construction of Biography: The Case of Laboratory Animals,” *Qualitative Sociology* 17 no. 2 (1994): 121. These characteristics are all essential for humans when identifying another living being as an individual. In the case of naming laboratory animals, Phillips explains how researchers interviewed for the study were resistant to naming the animals used in science experiments, particularly the animals that would be killed. She explained that “many researchers sought to distance themselves emotionally from animals they were about to kill. They saw a direct connection between naming animals and developing emotional ties to them.” In other words, it was too emotionally demanding for the scientists to name and thereby become attached to animals that they would kill following their experiments.
chickens, and turkeys. Edward Stoltz, a German Mennonite Farmer from Mannheim, Ontario, revealed this variation in naming different species of animals on the farm when he carried on his father, August Stoltz’s account book diary in 1898. On 14 February 1898, he recorded, “This day rented farm from Father (Aug Stoltz) County of Waterloo consisting of One Hundred acres @ Two Hundred & Fifty Dollars per Annum. 8 subject to the conditions agreed upon. Same day bought following stock and implements.” In his list of items bought from his father, he identified the horses purchased as follows: “Grey Horse (Jim); Grey Mare (Dolly); Bay Mare (Dolly); Yearling Colt (Pearl).” He bought the four horses for 215 dollars. In terms of cattle, while Edward recorded names for some of these animals, there was greater ambiguity than with the horses. He wrote, “cow x calves (Flowy?); cow (Daisy); cow (Lady); Jersey Heifer; Two Yearling Heifers; Two Heifer Calves; Yearling Steer.” The total for the cattle came to 216 dollars. Stoltz also purchased two pigs from his father for 35 dollars, which he identified as “old brood sow” and “young sow,” and not by name. This list is an indicator of the different relationships this farmer established with his animals, based on how he named them. From the names provided, Stoltz had a partnered, attached relationship to his horses, a more ambiguous relationship with his cattle, and an impersonal detachment to his pigs.

In Jock Hyde’s diary, there was a similar relationship between the animal species named and not named based on their longevity and purpose on the farm. The transcribed copy of Hyde’s diary listed all the animals on his farm in the year 1914. While the sheep, pigs, hens, and turkeys, all animals for the purpose of meat consumption, were numbered in terms of quantity, the horses and cattle were both named as well as numbered. Hyde owned approximately 12 horses in 1914, among which he named: Tot, Polly, Mat, Florence, Geordie, Tom, Lee, Hazel, Fly, Annie, Roy.

133 August Stoltz, Account Diary of a German Mennonite Farmer, Mannheim, Ontario, 1888-1898. Waterloo Region Museum Diary Collection. Final entry likely written by Stoltz’ son, Edward, but could have also been the eldest son, Jacob.
and Pearl. Based on the concept by DeMello that giving a name to an animal creates an emotional bond, these diary entries suggest that the farmers wisely named their horses, which had longer lives on the farm, compared to the animals that would be killed within a short period.

John Spence described in greater detail the process involved in naming their work horses, recording the day in which he and his brother David named their new colts: “Wed. Jan 8th 1913, 8 ° above in morning. 12° at noon. 0° zero at night. Blowing hard. Tied the two big colts in the front stall of the horse stable. We call Floss’ one Lucy, and old “Squinch’s” one – Topsy. I went for the mail on Topsy.” The names of the colts are particularly noteworthy due to events recorded in previous entries with two other horses also named Topsy and Lucy. In 1904, Spence recorded the day his neighbour, Jed Philips, came to put down the family’s old horse, Lucy. Spence recorded on 3 December 1904, “Jed Philips came up & shot old Lucy. She was at least 24 years old.” This entry demonstrates the attached attachment between Spence and his horse, Lucy. Identifying how old the horse was suggests Phillips’ concept of biography, as Spence revealed her age in the entry similar to an obituary or reflection of her life on the farm. Spence was 19 years of age in 1904, meaning he had possibly grown up with Lucy. He did not shoot Lucy himself, but rather employed his neighbour to kill her. Most importantly, Lucy was twenty four years old, which means she had long outlived her usefulness on the farm. According to animal scientist Doug Butler, horses are most useful between the ages of 5 and 15, and therefore the Spence family maintained Lucy on the farm even though she had outlived her prime years as a work horse because of their attached attachment.134

In 1912, the family’s financial circumstances changed, and maintaining retired horses was no longer economically feasible. Spence’s father sold the other old horse, Topsy, on 12 September, 1912, as Spence wrote, “Papa took old Topsy down to the fair and took stuff to

134 Butler, 56.
Earle…Papa sold Topsy for $30.00, the only bid he got.” The old horse had outlived her usefulness on the farm, and in this instance, the only practical option was to sell her. Arguably, the Spence family naming their new colts in 1913 Lucy and Topsy could indicate a lack of recognition of their individuality, repeating the names of the horses as if units rather than individuals. However, the biographical details and evidence of remorse from losing the two the animals suggests a desire to name the colts in memory of the other horses. In the case of Topsy, this pragmatic stewardship required a negotiation between the Spence family’s attachment to the animal and the financial needs of the family farm. Due to the family’s financial situation in 1912 compared to 1904, it was more practical to sell a horse that was no longer useful, and only worth $30.00 at market, regardless of their sympathetic, attached attachment.

Overall, the farmers examined for this study were less concerned with breed, pedigree and producing quality horses as outlined by the CDA, and more focused on having healthy horses that were able to perform the work needed on the farm. While they were proud of their horses, selling some at market or showing them at fairs, the patriotic purebred breeding based on the CDA’s ideals of perfected horses was not as fundamental an aspect of their day to day interaction with their horses. This group of farmers therefore willingly gave their work horses ‘common garden variety names’. Naming horses according to pedigree as described in animal husbandry guides was a commodity-based pride in the animal, which otherwise reflected the animal’s success via human intervention of profitable breeding. The act by farmers to give their horses common names indicates an attachment and partnership with the animal, as well as the farmer’s recognition of the horse’s individuality. The uniqueness of this relationship in comparison to the value farmers placed on their livestock is particularly evident when examining how the diarists ambiguously named their cattle, and never named their pigs. The sympathetic
partnerships farmers developed for their horses was a result of their role as farm workers, the daily intimate interactions between the human and animal, their natural abilities to follow human direction, as well as the romantic cultural value of horses in the early twentieth century.

**Horse Agency, Self-Direction and Anthropomorphism**

There are moments when the diarists revealed how their horses interacted with the farmer, as well as their surroundings that are spontaneous and more revealing of animal agency and self-direction. To be sure, reports of horse behaviour were filtered through the farmers’ experiences and their interpretation of the horse’s behaviour. However, they do show how horses acted on the conditions of their experience to change their environments, and how farmers contended with that self-direction.

As stated, horse personality at times worked in the farmers’ favour, such as Spence’s quiet colt, but many of the diarists recorded instances when their horse’s self-direction was counterproductive. Primarily, this included when horses ran away. Jock Hyde recorded briefly on 15 September 1914, “Indian woman here & horse ran away.” He did not specify whether the horse belonged to himself or the Native woman, or whether it returned, but this appeared to be a common incident experienced by other farmers. Toby Barrett recorded the exciting event on 29 June 1916, when “Barwell’s horse ran across railway bridge ahead of train.” John Spence was more detailed in his discussion of ‘run away’ horses, and recorded on 22 September 1913:

> Threshed home barn. Finished about 3 pm. Two tank water from Budd’s Creek & a lot from well. Bother making old horse work. 8 hands. Ackie White moved the engine & started to move the machine when his team [of horses] ran away out the back lane to the jog. Victor Phillips caught them, no harm done. Barnhardt moved machine to his barn.

This incident occurred during what was likely a threshing bee, whereby the noise of the machine caused the horses to bolt. (They were also evidently using an older horse that had outlived its usefulness on the farm, but may have been maintained due to personal attachments). For horses,
their primary survival instinct is their quick, high-speed flight, which is why runaway horses were a common occurrence when frightened by sudden movement or noise.\textsuperscript{135} For the diarists, these incidents by their horses were noteworthy, exciting, and cumbersome events, but Spence demonstrated in his recording that he understood why the animals acted this way, how to handle this behaviour, and most importantly, that they returned with no harm having come to them or any of the farmers.

Rural author Peter McArthur wrote about similar experiences with his horses, but focused on these particular moments of counterproductive behaviours to create a plethora of amusing, anthropomorphized anecdotes to entertain both his rural and urban readers. In \textit{The Red Cow and Her Friends}, his four chapters on horses were not in reference to when their work and behaviour in the field went smoothly, but rather when the horses decided to exert stubborn and rebellious behaviour. In his chapter titled, “Dolly’s Day Off”, McArthur recorded the colourful tale when his horse Dolly broke free from the farm and ran away with her two foals. The dramatic chase that ensued went as follows:

I whistled coaxingly and they stopped to look back. At this critical point a man with a horse and buggy turned the corner and started south. At once the three truants started after him, Dolly in the lead, with her tail in the air. I watched until they were almost a mile away, and then harnessed the other horse, conscripted a boy into active service and started in pursuit of the runaways. By the time we reached the road they were nowhere in sight, having turned a corner about a mile away. The chase was now on in earnest.\textsuperscript{136}

This story, seven pages in total, emphasised the cunning ability of McArthur’s horses, as well as the author’s own wounded pride in having been outsmarted by the animals, resulting in a very humorous chapter. To a degree, McArthur’s writing reflected rural life as described by the diarists; both sources recognized or responded to the strength, capabilities, and self-direction of their horses from their everyday interactions with the animals. However, McArthur’s

\textsuperscript{135} Zlotnik, 99.
\textsuperscript{136} Peter McArthur, \textit{The Red Cow and Her Friends} (New York: John Lane Company, 1919), 149.
exaggerations and anthropomorphised characters made his accounts highly entertaining to his readers, shaping in particular how urban audiences perceived rural living.

McArthur used anthropomorphism in his farm animal tales to create humour, in contrast to literature where anthropomorphism became a tool for gaining sympathy for nonhuman animals. This not only included Anna Sewell’s *Black Beauty* but also Canadian author Margaret Marshall Saunders’ *Beautiful Joe*, published in 1894. Saunders told the autobiographical tale of her dog who she rescued from an abusive owner. Both the stories of Black Beauty and Beautiful Joe were purposefully written in first person from the ‘animal’s perspective’, as interpreted by the authors, to garner more sympathy with the reader, who was then better able to experience what the animal sees and feels. The cruelty toward animals presented in both stories were not exaggerations, but rather portrayals of how some horses and dogs, including Beautiful Joe, were worked to death or beaten by their owners in North America during the nineteenth century. Therefore, how these writers used anthropomorphism differed significantly from McArthur’s humour. Saunders and Sewell used it as a tool to “open thy mouth for the dumb,” or speak for the animal.  

For Peter McArthur, his anthropomorphic animal tales never denied the purpose of his food and work animals, nor intended to promote their welfare. McArthur infantilized his horses when describing them as ‘truants’, and while he depicted the animals as cunning creatures with self-direction, he also reinforced in his stories the dominant position of humans within the farmer/horse relationship. As an essential component of stewardship, the childlike horses required human governance. Consequently, normal horse behaviour as interpreted by McArthur became a lighthearted, humorous depiction of everyday life on the rural farm. As an advocate for

---

the ‘back to the land’ movement, McArthur related stories about his horses not to raise awareness about animal cruelty, but rather to make rural life appealing, and potentially encourage urbanites to adopt farming.

The anthropomorphic representations of horses and dogs in Sewell and Saunders’ works were otherwise influential toward the rising sympathy for animals classified as pets or human companions in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. During this period, North American and British societies increasingly segregated horses, dogs, and cats into a distinct cultural paradigm, separate from livestock raised for meat and non-meat food products. Canadian theologian, philosopher and painter Thomas Mower Martin wrote in his exegesis *The Difference Between Men and Animals* from 1916 that, for many, horses, cats and dogs were members of the family. He wrote, “there are many people especially those who have favourite dogs, cats, and horses, and in some cases birds, that they are fond of; and hope to meet again in the other or future life.”138 In other words, some pet owners and farmers believed their companion animals had souls, although Martin’s exegesis argued that this was not the case, as it was the existence of a soul that placed humans in the superior position of stewards over animals.139 He also credited that horses and dogs wanted to obey, please and receive approval from their owners, which also contributed to their value as human companions.140 The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals noted in this period that a paradox existed between the sympathetic, humane advocacy for horses, dogs, and cats, compared to livestock raised for meat. John Galsworthy, a member of the RSPCA, wrote in 1912, “We should never stand the horses and dogs and cats we
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139 Ibid. Martin argued that, “Animals are created and born to be forms of use to man by a general influx of life from the spiritual world which makes them to correspond with the degree of man’s natural mind…Animals therefore have no spiritual mind,” 2.
140 Ibid, 17.
make such pets of killed when their time comes in the manner in which we kill our sheep and pigs.” The society noticed that as cultural sympathy for companion animals increased, livestock sent to abattoirs were often treated inhumanely with unnecessary suffering, as documented in publications such as Upton Sinclair’s *The Jungle*, his social commentary of the Chicago stockyards from 1906. In the context of Southern Ontario, these two contradictory expectations of modernity, sentimental attachments to animals versus the role of animals as commodities and increasingly more profitable producers, simultaneously coexisted. When examining Reuben Sallows’ photographs, the paradoxical position of horses in Canadian society is evident. He romanticized horses as rural pets while demonstrating their role as mechanical vehicles on the farm.

**Reuben Sallows’ Mechanical-Sentimental Farmer/Horse Relationship**

Agricultural historian Lynn Campbell argues that Reuben Sallows’ photographs of rural Ontario in the early twentieth century only rarely captured the “true essence” of the people and life he represented. Sallows staged many of his photographs of farmers with their horses, and while his photographs romanticized this relationship to appeal to Edwardian sensibilities, they also demonstrated the many mechanical and laborious tasks performed by horses on the farm, primarily while harnessed and working in the fields. For example, his photograph “Petting the Horse”, from 1904 (Figure 1.5) demonstrates an idealistic, sentimental relationship between the farmer and his horse, as well as the horse as a bio-mechanical tool. The placement of the dog and

---


the farmer’s act of ‘petting’ emphasized the value of the horse as similar to a pet. At the same time, the horses remained harnessed to the plow and a component of the machinery.

Similarly, in the photograph titled “The Pause that Refreshes: 4 O’clock Tea” from 1906 (Figure 1.6), Sallows staged a scene whereby the farmer shared a moment of rest and refreshment in the field with his horses. The photo included a young girl, likely the farmer’s daughter, serving her father tea, while the horses also paused to eat hay, participating in the shared snack break. Interestingly, while Sallows staged these photos to achieve a sentimental response from viewers, in the majority of Sallows’ photographs, the horse did not escape mechanization. His photographs reflected the conflicting dualism regarding perceptions of horses in the early twentieth century. These images represent both goals of modernity, as the horses simultaneously performed their practical and sentimental functions.
The photographs of farmers working their horses in the field made for a very romantic rural landscape, one that significantly appealed to Edwardian taste, making Sallows a very successful commercial photographer (Figure 1.7). As is evident in the image “Boy with Horse and Foal”, from ca. 1920 (Figure 1.8), featuring children with animals was also a very appealing and sentimental image. While this photograph featured a young boy watching a foal nurse from her mother, Sallows more frequently captured this scene of women and children with cattle and pigs. Although Sallows’ photographs of farmers and their horses were romanticized portrayals of rural life, these images were closer to capturing the ‘true essence’ of that complex relationship in comparison to the far-fetched representations of farm families with meat producing animals. This is ironic considering the relationship farmers had with their cattle and pigs was far more detached than the one they had with their horses. What is evident from these images by Reuben Sallows is the paradox that existed in the early twentieth century regarding human/farm animal relationships; the more detached the relationship between the farmer and the animal was, the more feminized, sentimental and characterized these representations by Sallows became.

Figure 1.7: Reuben Sallows, “Ploughing a Field”, 1907. www.sallowsgallery.ca. This was a common scene captured by Sallows featuring the farmer driving his team of horses, with the fields receding into the background, which made for a very romantic landscape.
Conclusion

Southern Ontario farmers’ relationship with their horses in the early twentieth century was situated between a dichotomy of the horse as a machine and as an overly sentimental, anthropomorphized being. Farmers recognized that their horses were economic investments as sources of power and mobility, but they also formed concerned and attached attachments with these animals that they had to negotiate based on the needs of the family and farm. These attachments were possible because horses were work animals, and part of a partnered relationship with the farmer rather than raised and slaughtered for meat or non-meat food products. Their longevity and shared experiences allowed farmers to recognize their horses more clearly as individuals, who they addressed and identified using common, personal names. The natural abilities of horses meant they responded well to human direction, and existed in the same cultural category as companion animals in the early twentieth century.

Once tractors and automobiles replaced horses on farms, an overabundance of horses meant that they became recreationally used in North America, for activities such as riding,
driving, racing, showing, and use on hobby farms. Therefore, the value humans placed on horses shifted even more toward sentimental attachments to this non-human animal species. This shift did not occur with meat and food animals such as cattle and pigs. Instead, the increasingly detached relationships early twentieth century farmers had with their non-meat, and more particularly meat producing animals, became augmented by the mid twentieth century with industrialized farming and the shift toward modern meat and animal products in Canada.

---

\(^{144}\) Derry, *Horses in Society*, 240.
Chapter 2: “Milked Cow; Killed Heifer”: Ambiguous Relationships with the Dual Purpose Animal

Chapter One established that farmers formed sympathetic, partnered relationships with their horses, animals used for labour on the farm, with a growing sentimental cultural value in North American society. Farmers formed varying relationships toward different animal species on the farm based on whether they raised that species for labour, meat, or non-meat food products. This chapter addresses farmers’ relationships with their cattle, adding further complexity to this investigation. Variation between farmers’ attitudes to their animals based on species was not the only factor involved in the changing nature of these human/animal relationships. Depending on the purpose of raising cattle for meat, non-meat food products, or both, farmers formed ambivalent relationships with different breeds of the same animal species.

The early twentieth century Southern Ontario farmers examined for this investigation formed mixed farming practices with a combination of livestock and agriculture. Entries from the farmers’ diaries reveal that they owned cattle they raised for beef, dairy, or both. During this period, many Canadian farmers still had dual-purpose cattle, whereby they used animals bred to be sufficient producers of both beef and dairy. Southern Ontario farmers’ relationships with their cattle were therefore fluctuating and more ambiguous than their relationship with horses and pigs. As dual purpose animals, used for meat, non-meat food products, as well as breeding, the diary evidence suggests that these animals had either long or short lifespans depending on how the farmer raised, bred, or used them on the farm. While farmers formed concerned attachments for some of their cattle, identifying them as individuals with names, others were anonymously bought, sold, and slaughtered as needed.

Contemporary sociological studies on human/farm animal relationships show why this ambivalence many have been present. These studies reveal how the specific use and breed of
cattle on a farm, either for dairy or beef, can affect the nature of the relationship between the farmer and the animal. A recent study examining Swedish, French, and Dutch organic farmers and their livestock revealed that these farmers formed varying relationships with their cattle depending on if they raised the animals for beef or for dairy.\footnote{Bettina Bock et al., “Farmers’ Relationship with Different Animals: The Importance of Getting Close to the Animal,” \textit{International Journal of Sociology of Food and Agriculture} 15 no. 3 (December 2007): 108-125. This study was not conducted with individuals working on industrial farming practices. The farmers interviewed, although professionals operating specialized farming practices, worked farms not much larger than the ones established by early twentieth century Southern Ontario farmers. This similarity in small-scale farming makes the study a useful tool for comparison.} Using Rhoda Wilkie’s sociological framework, they determined that beef and veal farmers primarily formed a concerned detachment with their cattle, recognizing them as requiring proper care, but overall regarding them as tools used for production and not as individuals.\footnote{Ibid, 109. In other cases, the farmers formed a detached detachment with their beef and veal calves. Sometimes they had too many calves on the farm and only treated a calf as an individual if the calf became ill and needed special treatment. In other cases, farmers deliberately kept their beef animals at an emotional distance so as to avoid forming emotional bonds for their own security, clearly understanding the role of the animal on the farm as a meat producer.} For farmers with dairy cattle, they primarily formed a concerned attachment with these animals and in some cases a closer emotional bond. The farmers formed a more personal relationship because of daily contact with their dairy cows when milking and the animals’ longer lifespans on the farm.\footnote{Ibid, 112. For some farmers studied, they even formed attached attachments with their animals, as they argued that developing an emotional bond was an important aspect of the physical contact with the cow during milking.}

In the context of late nineteenth and early twentieth century Canada, Southern Ontario farmers again faced two contrasting pressures and unattainable functions of modernity regarding their relationships with cattle: the commercial versus sentimental value of this animal species. Agricultural experts in North America advocated for the specialization of cattle breeds. These advocates argued dual purpose cattle were becoming inefficient for Canada’s farms. The Canadian Department of Agriculture (CDA) encouraged farmers to breed and raise specialized cattle instead of dual-purpose, so as to create animals that were more efficient producers of either dairy or beef products. Along with the push for specialization, the CDA and Canada Food Board
pressured farmers to increase the production of beef and dairy products during the First World War to send overseas to Britain. For dairy farmers, this meant moving towards larger and more systematized farming practices by recording yields from their cows and correlating their respective profits. This assessment would help farmers identify which characteristics and cattle breeds most efficiently produced milk and milk products. Furthermore, the labour shortage on farms during the First World War produced difficulties for dairy farmers, with less assistance from hired hands and farm boys for milking. Therefore, it was during the First World War when the CDA initially proposed to Canadian farmers to replace human labour with milking machines.\textsuperscript{148}

Meanwhile, cultural representations romanticized the relationship between farmers and their cattle, particularly exaggerating gendered human-animal relationships for sentimental commercial appeal. Reuben Sallows’ photographs of rural women and cattle exaggerated women’s role in dairying to create a sentimental, feminine attachment between Ontario’s pretty ‘dairy maids’ and dairy cows. This was a very popular image during the Edwardian period, and Sallows staged these photographs in order to feature women wearing attractive clothing in loving embraces with their cows, as if family pets. While historically women in North America and Europe have been important contributors to dairying on small-scale farms, Sallows’ focus on Edwardian sentimentality did not reflect the role of men in dairying and the changes occurring to the dairy industry from small-scale farms to male dominated, capitalistic ventures.\textsuperscript{149} In contrast, Sallows’ photographed men by focusing on the pride farmers had for their beef cattle and bulls, presenting a paternalistic, masculine relationship reflective of the Western ranching culture of

\textsuperscript{148} Canadian farmers did not start readily adopting milking machines until the mid-twentieth century, after the Second World War. Interestingly, during the Second World War the Canadian Department of Agriculture again promoted to farmers that switching to milking machines would help deal with human labour shortages from the war.\textsuperscript{149} Marjorie Cohen, \textit{Women’s Work, Markets, and Economic Development in Nineteenth Century Ontario} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), 94.
The way in which Sallows depicted men and women with cattle demonstrated the ambivalence of this human/animal relationship, and the prevailing idea from the early twentieth century that sentimental relationships and emotional bonds with animals was a feminine rather than masculine characteristic.

While Peter McArthur’s writings also romanticized human/farm animal relationships, his humorous anecdotes were more grounded in a realistic representation of rural life, and more similar to how the Southern Ontario farmers identified their cattle’s agency and self-direction. McArthur evidently favoured his cattle as a source for humorous writing, interpreting their activity with elaborated anecdotes of bovine behaviour. McArthur established humor with anthropomorphism, as his cattle seemed either engaged in outsmarting the farmer or thinking profound thoughts. In contrast, he also derived humour from ultimately proving the necessity of human stewardship over animals due to their being innocent, ‘dumb’ creatures. While McArthur viewed his cattle as individuals with colourful personalities, his anthropomorphism was not intended to promote their welfare or deny their role on the farm as producers of meat and non-meat products. McArthur’s animal stories seemed to be in the centre of these paradoxical ways in which North American society viewed human/cattle relationships, reflecting both the romanticized cultural representations and advocating for the improvement and growth of rural living in Ontario.
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150 The beef industry and ranching culture of western Canada has been thoroughly examined by Ian MacLachlan, *Kill and Chill: Restructuring Canada’s Beef Commodity Chain* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001); Edward Brado, *Cattle Kingdom: Ranching in Early Alberta* (Surrey: Heritage House, 2004); Sarah Carter, Bill Yeo, and Simon Evans, *Cowboys, Ranchers and the Cattle Business: Cross-border perspectives on ranching history* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2000).

151 Susan Jones, *Valuing Animals: Veterinarians and Their Patients in Modern America* (John Hopkins University Press, 2003), 13. British and American veterinarians in the early twentieth century linked femininity with animals valued emotionally, such as dogs, rather than animals valued economically. Therefore, Sallows’ representation of women and dairy cows is ironic, as he presents them as similar to pets while they had a clear economic purpose as producers of milk.
When analysing the cultural representations, government documents, and diary sources, this chapter utilizes the terms ‘ambiguous’ and ‘ambivalent’ to identify farmer’s relationships with their cattle for multiple reasons. Exploring the paradoxes regarding human representations of cattle in the Edwardian period, this chapter is a bridge in the spectrum from attachment to detachment between Southern Ontario farmers and their animals in the early twentieth century, with cattle at the centre of this transition. Based on Rhoda Wilkie’s sociological framework, these farmers showed evidence of having both concerned attachment and concerned detachment for their different cattle breeds. Their relationships with dairy cattle, and in some cases beef cattle chosen for breeding and showing, primarily reflected a concerned attachment, in which the farmers demonstrated a more personal working relationship with their cows. This included daily physical contact with the cows during milking and identifying their cows as individuals with names. These were animals that potentially lived for over a decade on the farm. Beef cattle, particularly males, did not have long lifespans on the farm, ranging from twenty to thirty months, unless they were used for breeding.\(^{152}\) Therefore farmers pragmatically formed a concerned detachment for these animals, taking care of the animals they raised for slaughter, while avoiding regarding them as individuals. It is important to note for this chapter that regardless of whether farmers raise their cattle for beef or dairy, all breeds of cattle are eventually slaughtered for their meat and hides; the only difference is the amount of time decided by the farmer between birth and death, or bought and sold.\(^{153}\)

\(^{152}\) J.B. Spencer, *Beef Raising in Canada*, Dominion of Canada, Department of Agriculture, Branch of the Livestock Commissioner, Ottawa, Bulletin no. 13 (May 1915), 48. “Most finished beeves marketed by up-to-date Ontario feeders are from 20 to 30 months old and weigh from 1,200 to 1,400 pounds. These weights suit the market and gains made up to the ages given are economically put on.”

\(^{153}\) This chapter will briefly discuss the difference between farmers choosing when an animal goes to slaughter, a controlled decision to maximize profits from the animal, versus the sense of loss when an animal dies unexpectedly.
While this chapter discusses how farmers related to the cattle they raised for either beef, dairy or dual-purpose, the primary focus is on the development of dairying in Ontario. This priority is because of the enormous boom in the dairy industry in Ontario between 1900 and 1920 due to the increase in specialized breeding of dairy cattle, while beef raising became centralized in the western provinces of Canada.

**Domesticating Cattle: Perfecting Breeds in Britain and North America**

Early human civilizations in the Near East domesticated cattle approximately 9000 years ago for their meat, hides, and horns. Archeological evidence suggests that as early as 6000 years ago, humans started maintaining female cows past their slaughtering age for their milk.\(^{154}\) This gave humans a huge survival advantage when plant foods became scarce in areas such as Africa and the Middle East, and was a more efficient method of converting vegetable-based proteins into animal proteins than raising the cattle for meat.\(^{155}\) The benefits of milk as a nutritious food source led early civilizations, such as the Ancient Egyptians and Hindus, to worship the milk from cattle as a symbol of survival, replenishment, and fertility.\(^{156}\) Not unlike the North American horsemeat taboo, the spiritual significance of milk led to the Hindu ban against eating or harming cattle.\(^{157}\) In the western world, however, humans primarily raised cattle for their milk and labour without reverence, and therefore slaughtered the animals for their meat and hides when they became too old for either job.\(^{158}\) Early modern European diets relied heavily on milk and milk products, such as butter and cheese, which were particularly developed and championed by the Dutch, followed by the British who brought their cattle and dairy practices to

\(^{155}\) Ibid, 15.
\(^{158}\) MacLachlan, 40.
North America. However, by the mid-eighteenth century, during Britain’s agricultural revolution, the value of cattle for labour changed as horses replaced oxen as draft animals, and demands for tender meat established a market for raising cattle specifically for their beef qualities.

Throughout the nineteenth century, North American breeders imported a variety of cattle breeds and types from Britain for the production of beef and dairy. According to Ian MacLachlan, pedigreed purebred cattle breeds first emerged in Great Britain in the mid-nineteenth century, but were not registered in Canada until the 1880s. Prior to the twentieth century, although cattle breeders in North America aimed to increase the performance of their cattle through selective breeding, “no breeder would have bred a cow for just one purpose.” The most common breed of cattle on Canadian farms into the twentieth century was the Shorthorn due to being of quality beef type, but still a good supplier of milk and milk products. By 1913, Shorthorns were the “most popular breed of cattle in the world” because of their duality. In 1915, the CDA’s publication Beef Raising in Canada primarily advocated for the superior quality of purebred breeds of beef-type cattle for meat production, but recognized that for the average farmer in Canada, dual-purpose animals were often the most suitable to their conditions and needs. For some progressive agriculturalists, however, the dual-purpose was a “no-class” animal.
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159 Valenze, 85.
160 MacLachlan, 40.
161 Ibid, 41.
163 Spencer, Beef Raising in Canada, 19.
164 Ibid. Other breeds of dual-purpose cattle on Canadian farms included the Red-Polled and Devon.
165 Ibid, 35. The publication posed the question, “why give this variety [dual-purpose] of cows, which some would have us believe are no-class, the prominence and attention suggested in the above heading [establishing a commercial herd of general purpose cows]?” The reason explained was twofold: due to the suitability of the dual
As purebred cattle became more common in Canada during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, agricultural experts and the CDA emphasised to farmers the benefits of specialized cattle breeding. The goal was to perfect cattle as either producers of milk or beef rather than both. Progressive agriculturalists argued dual-purpose cattle were simply inefficient; unprofitable producers of poor quality beef and dairy. For example, Governor William Hoard of Wisconsin, a popular speaker for the dairy industry in North America who began the first dairy school at the University of Wisconsin, was an outspoken advocate for specialized dairy practices. He argued that cows needed to be bred as distinctly for their purpose as pigs or horses, and that dual-purpose cattle for meat and dairy would not remain favourable or profitable for progressive dairy farmers. Profitable dairy breeds promoted in Canada during the early twentieth century were the Jersey, Holstein, Guernsey, and Ayrshire, while beef breeds included the Aberdeen-Angus, Hereford, and Galloway.

The key to successful cattle breeding according to agricultural experts was careful attention to pedigree, record keeping, and recognition of the ideal physical qualities of beef versus dairy breeds. Publications from the CDA emphasized that farmers who systematized their dairy production and kept careful records of the quantities specific cows produced would see a rise in profits, arguing, “It is impossible to tell profitable from the unprofitable cows in the herd unless you have individual records of the milk and fat produced…It will show you the unprofitable cow, the ‘boarder’. You cannot get rid of her too quickly.” This statement implied that that unprofitable cow was merely a ‘freeloader’ to farmers. A profitable dairy cow
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166 Peter Lewington, *Canada’s Holsteins* (Markham: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1983), 37.
167 E.S. Archibald, Dominion Animal Husbandman, *Profits from Dairy Cows*, (Dominion of Canada Department of Agriculture, Experimental Farms, 1919). This document also discussed methods of feeding calves and cows for the most profitable returns.
‘deserving’ of her place on the farm needed to give more than 5,000 pounds of milk with 3.5% of fat each year. As animal scientists argued purebred dairy animals were surpassing these levels as the highest milk producers of any other class of farm animal. As discussed in Chapter One, pedigree rules for raising purebred cattle required following the names and registry numbers of animal ancestry, like the milking shorthorn ‘Priceless Princess’, who produced 8,505 pounds of milk after her first calf. For farmers assessing what to look for when breeding their cattle, animal husbandry manuals listed the physical qualities profitable milking cows possessed. Charles Plumb argued in his 1919 manual Judging Farm Animals that the dairy cow as a “milking machine” required most importantly careful examination of the udder and milk veins, which needed to be large, long, tortuous and branching. According to these academics, the dairy cow needed to be a modern production unit; a biological machine that was able to produce profits through selective breeding and a systematized analysis of milk yields.

The specialization of cattle breeds between 1900 and 1921 created a boom for Ontario’s dairy industry. Although the number of dairy cattle in Ontario did not increase dramatically, the amount of milk produced per cow nearly doubled. In 1901, according to the Agricultural Census, there were 924,000 dairy cows in Ontario, which only increased to 947,000 in 1921. However, the average amount of milk produced per cow per year during this time increased from 1,319 L to 2,159 L. The transition to modern dairying as a highly mechanized industry is reflective in the breeding of cattle into ‘turbo-cows’, that produced “ever increasing amounts of milk.”
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168 Archibald, Profits from Dairy Cows.
169 Frank D. Gardner, Farming for Profit, Livestock and Dairy Farming: A non-technical manual for the successful breeding care, and management of farm animals, the dairy herd, and the essentials of dairy production (Chicago: The John C. Winston Company, 1918), 111.
170 Ibid; Beef Raising in Canada, 32.
173 Orland, 167.
well, the implementation of mechanical devices for milking changed the way in which farmers handled their animals, and increased the number of cows milked at one time with less human labour. This modernization of dairying in Ontario primarily unfolded by the mid twentieth century, but the Canadian Department of Agriculture first proposed these progressive ideas to farmers during the production demands of the First World War.

‘Keep Britain’s Butter Plate Full’: Canada’s Wartime Production of Dairy

During the First World War, the Canadian Department of Agriculture and Canada Food Board advocated for the specialized breeding of quality dairy cattle, and the increased production of milk products to send overseas to Great Britain. The 1915 publication *Patriotism and Production* advocated that Canada’s food production needed to extend further than just wheat to include meat and non-meat food products from farm animals, stating, “Great Britain asks us for more than wheat – she asks for oats and beef and dairy products also. If we sacrifice these for wheat, we shall not be doing our fully duty to the Empire and shall be injuring ourselves as well.”\(^{174}\) The Canadian government regarded the farming of cattle for meat and dairy products as an issue of “great national importance”, and equated patriotism on

the part of the farmers with increasing the production of animal based foods.  

In 1917, the Canada Food Board’s poster propaganda campaign pushed for Canadian farmers to patriotically produce more meat and dairy to send to Britain. “Canada’s Opportunity” and “Canada Must Do Better” were the common slogans the CFB adopted to encourage farmers toward progressive methods of dairy production. The CFB’s 1918 poster “Canada’s Butter Opportunity” implored Canadian farmers to “keep Britain’s butter plate full”, by comparing a series of four butter plates with figures delineating the amount of butter Britain bought prior to the war, Britain’s shortage during the war, how much Canada sold twelve years prior, and what Canada sold in 1916 (Figure 2.1). The lowest quantity and smallest morsel of butter was of course Canada’s exports to Britain from 1916, and the CFB pleaded “CANADA must do better!” These comparisons were a strategic propaganda tactic that attempted to instill guilt in Canadian farmers to achieve the desired production goals.  

Again, wartime publications like *Patriotism and Production* insisted that it was through the “judicious selection” of cattle breeds, and careful record keeping, that Canadian farmers would increase their dairy yields. The CDA argued these increases were “not only a financial necessity” but also the “patriotic duty of every dairy farmer”. As discussed in Chapter One, while Canadian farmers wanted to aid in the war effort, the demands by the CFB and CDA were often impractical for farmers. With the 1917 conscription of farm boys, some farmers faced the dilemma of not having enough labourers to aid in milking their cows, and meet the production demands.
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175 *Patriotism and Production*, 107.
176 Tanfer Emin Tunc, “Less Sugar, More Warships: Food as American Propaganda in the First World War,” *War in History* 19 no. 2 (2012): 214. In the United States during the First World War, Herbert Hoover initiated a number of food propaganda campaigns that effectively played the emotions, sentiment, and guilt of the American people. His efforts to get Americans to ration their food for the war effort were very successful, as food consumption decreased by 15 percent. This further demonstrates the effectiveness of using guilt as a persuasive tool in wartime propaganda campaigns, which the Canada Food Board evidently adopted for its poster campaign.
177 *Patriotism and Production*, 79.
178 E.S. Archibald, “The Dairy Cow”, Ottawa, Dominion Experimental Farms, Canada Department of Agriculture, 1917.
To address these concerns, the CDA introduced the milking machine during the First World War. For early twentieth century rural Ontario farmers, milking involved physical contact with their dairy cows which, depending on the number of cows per farm, required assistance from members of the family and hired hands. In 1917, due to the significant labour shortages on farms, the Dominion Experimental Farms branch of the CDA published the pamphlet, *The Milking Machine: A Partial Solution of the Labour Problem*. The CDA recognized that many farmers were apprehensive about milking machines, because of a preference for milking by hand and their concern that milking machines would injure their cows. Even into the mid-twentieth century when milking machines became more common in rural Ontario, concerns by farmers to adopt mechanical milking had to do with long established rumours that they caused mastitis, bacterial infections, or would draw blood from the cows. This pamphlet therefore emphasized that the machine, when properly adjusted to the cow, would not injure the teats or udder “any more than the average farm hand”. The pamphlet attempted in many ways to demean the work of farm hands in order to promote the new product. The target group were farmers with at least a dozen cows, who typically required assistance from other labourers or farm hands for milking. The publication advocated that machines were superior to labourers, as “unlike that hired man they are always there, ready to work.” The argument was that farmers would not only save
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180 Gwendoline P. Clarke described these fears in her memoir, *Chronicles of Ginger Farm: Daily Life on a Small Canadian Farm during Times of Great Global Change, 1929-1962* (Toronto: Bastian Publishing Services Ltd., 2009), 309. She identified how the family in Milton, Ontario, decided to adopt a milking machine, viewing themselves as one of the few dairy farms in Ontario that had not adopted the technology. Although apprehensive, she described how they did eventually notice an increase in milking production without harm toward the cows.

181 *The Milking Machine*, 1917. The pamphlet portrayed them as incompetent, careless, and overall subpar compared to machines.

182 Ibid.
money spent on farm hands, but increase profits and yields by enabling one person to milk far more cows than they would physically be able to do by hand.\textsuperscript{183}

While farmers did not readily adopt milking machines during the First World War due to their apprehensions, preference for familiar methods, and the financial investment required, between the 1920s and 1950s, the increased use of milking machines accompanied the industrialization and modernization of the dairy industry in Canada. Interestingly, during the Second World War, the CDA again encouraged rural Canadians, who had not already done so, to adopt milking machines to deal with labour shortages. In a special pamphlet from 1941, as part of the “War Time Production Series”, the Canadian government advertised these machines with the same patriotic speech, proposing farmers to ask themselves, “Am I justified in producing less milk when there is such urgent need for increased production?”\textsuperscript{184} The pamphlet also boasted how “a well-grown boy or girl can milk 20 cows per hour with a machine, and with far less effort than a good hand-milker expends in milking 7 to 9 cows by hand in the same length of time.”\textsuperscript{185} By mid-century, milking machines were no longer limited to CDA’s Experimental Farms, but quite common on many Ontario dairy practices. In 1966, 74 percent of Ontario dairy farmers used milking machines.\textsuperscript{186} Modern dairying for Canadian farmers by the mid to late twentieth century meant milking more cows at one time, and therefore interacting less with their individual animals during the milking process. For Southern Ontario farmers in the early twentieth century, while some invested in mechanized methods for dairying, they did not have the means or inclination to adopt milking machines during its experimental stage. This group of farmers otherwise milked their small number of dairy cattle by hand on a routine basis.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{183} The Milking Machine, 1917.
\textsuperscript{184} J.G. Gardiner, The Milking Machine, Ottawa, Agricultural Supplies Board, War-Time Production Series, 1941.
\textsuperscript{185} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{186} White et al., The Livestock Industry in Ontario, 3-29.
\end{flushright}
Ambiguity in the Farmer/Cattle Relationship: Concerned Attachment and Concerned Detachment

For Southern Ontario farmers with one or more dairy cow, milking was a routine event after the birth of a calf, typically performed twice daily, as the first chore of the day and in the evening. However, while the diarists demonstrated evidence of owning dairy cattle, most of the farmers examined for this study did not actually record in their diaries having milked their cows as part of their daily completed chores. Likely, this was due to the regularity of the task. John Spence alluded to his routine during an event when he was unable to attend to his cows on 19 October 1913: “Started snowing at about 10pm. Did not milk cows in evening.”187 This entry by Spence reveals that he tended to milk his cows late in the evening as one of the last chores of the day, and that for Spence the event was more remarkable when external factors disrupted regular milking times, which were optimal for the health and comfort of the cows. Hannah Velte observes how, since the domestication of cattle in early civilizations, the primary obstacle for humans has been to actually milk the animals successfully. For cows to release their milk, this depends on the ‘milk-ejection reflex’ to stimulate flow.188 Historically, farmers have attempted to aid the comfort of their cows and inspire flow by using regular milking times, familiarity with the person milking, and even singing to the cow.189

Agricultural experts in the early twentieth century recognized this aspect of dairying and farming culture, noting how “the dairy cow is more sensitive to her treatment than any other of the productive animals.”190 Frank Gardner, a Professor of Agronomy at Pennsylvania State College, argued in his 1918 manual Farming for Profit: Livestock and Dairy Farming that dairy
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cattle should be handled gently, because any loud noises or disturbances would affect the milking process. He clearly stated, “A cow should never be struck or mistreated, nor should she be talked to in a loud voice.” 191 The 1917 CDA publication on milking machines also recognized how older cows on farms would have already established comfort and familiarity with the farmer, and likely would not ‘let their milk down’ when attached to a mechanical device. Therefore the machine “was a device best suited for young heifers, who take to it like duck on water.” 192 For farmers milking by hand, the careful treatment of their cows, the establishment of a working relationship, and the creation of a comfortable environment was essential to the production of milk, and therefore acknowledged by agricultural experts in husbandry guides. This meant that farmers were caregivers to their cattle, rather just the technicians of the biomechanical ‘milking machines’.

Gordon Eby is the only diarist who frequently recorded his milking routine, but was also the most progressive farmer examined for this study. His writing revealed that he was primarily responsible for milking the family’s cattle in the morning, with help from his brother Jake, who milked in the evening. Eby explicitly described this routine in an entry on 15 December 1913: “Got up at 7 oclock, milked etc….Jake had bin [sic] butchering at Erdmans across the road from his place , so he didn’t come home to milk, I milked & separated the milk, then wrote this. ready for bed at 1:45 a.m. in the morning.” 193 The following day, Gordon was up again at 7:00 am for milking. Eby, who lived on the outskirts of Berlin (now Kitchener) was more directly influenced and inspired by the changing technology surrounding him in the city, compared to the other
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193 Gordon Christian Eby, in ‘Of course I was only an onlooker for I can’t dance’: the 1911-1919 Diary of Gordon Christian Eby, Mennonite Farmer, ed. by Paul Tiessen and Anne Eby Millar (Waterloo: MLR Editions, 2007). As will be discussed, butchering an animal was an extremely labour intensive job, which explains why Jake was unable to come home early enough to milk.
diarists. His close proximity to urban markets explains his interest in expanding and improving his dairy production. Eby described in multiple entries his interest in purchasing an electric cream separator from the De Laval Company. In careful detail, he calculated the benefits of this technology for the family’s sale of butter on 21 January, 1913:

Got up at 7 o’clock, don chores, talked to Mother about the advantages of the De La Vallee electric cream separator Have figured out if one costs $130.00 last 15 years till wore out, to keep up interest at 4 per cent pay for electric power and have the machine paid for inside of 15 years when it would be wore out it would cost us 5¢ per day at the most, this is the estimate one year interest $5.20 power $1.80 for it runs one hour for ½¢, payment on machine $9.00 a year At present we get 6 lb. of butter week, the De Le Vall people claim with a separator we would get 8 or a gain of 2 lb selling at 30¢ a lb. would be a gain of 25¢ a week over up keep expense besides the convenience, I think we will get one in the summer when the cows get fresh.194

The reason Eby was able to purchase an electric cream separator on 11 June, 1913 was because his family installed electric wiring in May 1912, only two years after Waterloo County first received hydroelectricity from Niagara Falls.195 In contrast, Guelph farmer George Holmwood did not record having “electric light turned on first time” until after the war, on 27 December 1919.196 The slower arrival of electricity to the more rural and isolated areas of Southern Ontario obviously impacted farmers’ abilities to adopt more progressive methods of farming, which explains Eby’s ability to purchase items like the De Laval Electric Cream Separator, his close attention to recording his milking routines, and profits from the production of milk.

Another key event in the production of milk the diarists more frequently recorded was when a cow calved. For example, Jock Hyde identified that his cows, Frolic and Violy, both
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calved in 1913, followed by Jean, Ethel, and Mabel in 1914. John Spence wrote on 3 May 1918, “the white-faced 6 year old cow has a spotted calf.” A new calf was extremely important for these farmers, as it meant potentially another producer of milk, or the animal would be sold for profit. For example, Ephriam S. Cressman recorded a profit from selling his cow during the second week of January, 1907: “sold cow to C. Goetz at Breslau = $35.50.” Furthermore, dairy cows cannot produce milk until they give birth to a calf, and therefore the process of milking began shortly after weaning the calf from the mother.

There were also complications involved with the birth of a calf on the farm. The agency of the animals and relative freedom of movement when out to pasture, coupled with the surrounding natural environment, meant that occasional cattle wandered to inconvenient places for the farmer during calving. In Jock Hyde’s diary, he identified the nearby swamp as a popular place for his cattle to migrate when calving, recording in August 1914, “Ethel calfed in swamp” and “Alice calfed in swamp.” He also recorded that his son Dave went “hunting” for one of the calves in the swamp. Recent animal behaviour studies on cow restlessness during calving reveal an increased desire to “walk about” when nearing birth, which may explain why Hyde’s cows found their way to the nearby swamp. Other complications occurred during the delivery of calves when the farmer was present. In Harry Barrett’s memoir, he explained his role as a child on the farm, whose small arms assisted with calf and lamb deliveries by reaching into the womb of the animal to determine whether the baby was breached, or why it was having trouble being delivered. Barrett wrote that “there is little else more gratifying” than the successful delivery of a
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calf or lamb after experiencing severe complications. Sometimes the farmer had to deliver a still born calf, as Harry’s father, Toby Barrett, recorded on 27 September, 1917, “Elgitha has dead calf.”

In Bock’s contemporary study, many of the farmers interviewed demonstrated an earnest interest in the care and welfare of their animals, from recognition of their role as producers as well as living beings. The gallant measures taken by Jock Hyde and the Barrett family to save their cattle while calving was in part to ensure the survival of an economic investment, but also a sincere concern for their wellbeing. Whether the diarists had a concerned attachment or concerned detachment for their cattle is otherwise evident in how they named their animals. As discussed in Chapter One, naming an animal on the farm had practical merit, but was also an indicator that the farmer recognized the animal as an individual, and even suggested signs of a closer attachment. This group of farmers, however, developed haphazard, inconsistent and ambiguous methods for naming their cattle, at times identifying them as individuals with personal names, while in other cases referring to them by physical descriptors, or merely as ‘cow’, ‘steer’, or ‘heifer’. According to Deborah Valenze, even on contemporary dairy farms, she argues that naming dairy cattle has economic and practical value, stating, “Cows that have names give more milk than cows without names.” In other words, a cow with a name indicates a closer relationship with the farmer, which aids the cow’s comfortable rapport with the human, thus creating more milk production. The way in which Southern Ontario farmers named and identified their cattle shows ambiguity and contradiction in the human/animal relationship, but
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also the pragmatic stewardship of the farmer raising a species of animal simultaneously for profit, meat, or dairy.

The method adopted by the diarists to identify their cattle in their written recordings very much depended on the individual farmer. As discussed, John Spence named his horses, forming personal relationships and even emotional attachments with some as working partners. However, he identified his cattle only by physical descriptors, such as “black cow and red one each have a calf.” This distinguished the animals from each other, but does not indicate an attachment equivalent to the bond he established with his horses. Although Gordon Eby routinely recorded milking his cows, he did not show evidence of naming his animals, including his horses. His only detail when referencing his cows was by association to their age and breed, such as “the old Jersey”. This may have been a result of Eby’s more progressive, urban-oriented way of farming, or even his personality as he attempted to distance himself from the traditional practices of his rural Pennsylvania-Mennonite upbringing. Jock Hyde otherwise named all his cows individually, identifying them as follows: Frolic, Violy, Black, Lightfoot, Peg, Queen, Mabel, Ethel, Gipsy, Tibbie, Alice, Blackey, Florence, Jessie, Jean, Rainbow, Daisy, and Blackbird. Similarly, Toby Barrett named his cows Charlotte, Mully, and Elgitha. For Hyde and Barrett, using personal names allowed them to individually identify their cows, as well as possibly build their working relationship with animals they maintained on the farm as milk producers.

In the diary of George Holmwood diary, a farmer from Guelph, Ontario, Holmwood named the beef cows he maintained on the farm for breeding. Sometimes, the chosen names

---

204 John Spence, 18 July 1913.
205 The only reference in Eby’s diary to a named horse was on 12 February 1913: “The old horse “Tom” on the sewer farm property, which Ed used down there died last night.”
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directly related to the neighbour intending to purchase the animal when finished, as evident from Holmwood’s entry on 27 March 1889: “sold Spencer cow to Spencer $30.” However, the animals Holmwood intended to keep for his farm he gave more personal names, such as Boss cow, Daisy cow, Beauty cow, Rosy cow, and Cate cow. These animals maintained longevity on the farm as producers of other beef cattle. He kept some of their offspring for breeding, but others remained anonymous as he sold or slaughtered them for beef. For example, he recorded on 21 January 1912, “kill heifer Mr. Johnson and Will help.” Holmwood was a member of his local beef ring, recording on 21 November 1904, “commence to plough again beef ring meeting here at night.” A beef ring was an important and effective cooperative arrangement in rural Ontario that the Farmer’s Advocate defined as the “unions of farmers united for the purpose of supplying themselves with fresh beef during the summer months.”

Each week in the summer, a farmer supplied one animal for slaughter, and the members involved divided the carcass amongst themselves, rotating who received the different cuts of beef. For example, on 20 June 1904 Holmwood wrote, “took heifer to Alderson for beef ring.” Alderson was likely the designated butcher for the beef ring, and Holmwood recorded that his dressed heifer produced 453 pounds of beef.

Holmwood’s active involvement in raising cattle for beef is also reflected in how he bred his animals. He likely attempted to raise purebred, quality cattle as he participated in local stock shows in Guelph. On 11 December 1906, Holmwood wrote “took Bill steer to show got fifth prize.” To achieve this level of quality in his cattle, Holmwood frequently took his cows to
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different bulls at his neighbours’ farms. For example, he wrote 27 March 1890, “took Daisy cow to Dawsons Bull.” He shortened this in later entries to just identifying which farmer he took his cow to for breeding, such as on 24 June 1902, “Beauty heifer to Blyths.” The following entry by Holmwood involving the same cow was usually to note that she calved. Holmwood wrote, “Beauty heifer calved” on 23 March 1903, nine months following her visit to Blyth’s farm.

Holmwood had a particular pride for Beauty cow and Boss cow due to their longevity on the farm, and number of times he bred these animals. He first mentioned Boss Cow in 1890 and Beauty cow in 1894. He maintained some of their offspring for breeding, and followed the rules of pedigree by giving the calves the same family names, identifying the younger animals as “Beauty heifer” and “Boss heifer”. Since he continued the same names, it is at times difficult to accurately trace the narrative of the original cows. For example, his last reference to Beauty cow was noting that she calved, on 28 April 1920, and due to his consistent naming, she may not have been the original animal. However, Holmwood did note that he “sold old Boss $15” on 24 August 1910. Based on his first recording of Boss in 1890, and his reference to the animal as being ‘old’, it is possible this is the same cow, who therefore lived on the farm for about twenty years. Boss cow would no longer have been able to produce offspring, which meant regardless of any attachment to her, he pragmatically sold an animal that was no longer economically feasible for the farm.

Holmwood’s relationships with the cattle he maintained for breeding were not equivalent to the animals he sold and butchered. Demonstrating pragmatic stewardship of his cattle, Holmwood named the animals with longer lifespans, whereas the young beef animals remained anonymous. While he identified in his diary named animals who had accidently died or had been
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sold, he never associated a name with an animal he slaughtered. As stated, he wrote ‘killed heifer’ when he recorded slaughtering one of his cattle, rather than writing, ‘killed Cate cow’. For Holmwood, breeding cattle like Boss were individuals, and his diary revealed a fragmented narrative of their longevity and existence on the farm. This concerned attachment is in contrast to the concerned detachment with the anonymous cattle he bred, sold, and slaughtered. For the farmers who raised dairy cattle, they too had to be pragmatic. Gordon Eby wrote 20 August, 1912, “milked the old jersey cow for the last time as Jake is going to take her to pasture… we are going to fatten and butcher her this winter as she is getting too old.”

When it was no longer a financially viable option to maintain a dairy cow due to her age, these farmers either sold or butchered their old milking cows. It is interesting to note that while Eby butchered their old Jersey cow for beef, Holmwood chose to sell old Boss, which may have been unwillingness to slaughter an animal he had known and proudly bred for twenty years.

While agricultural experts advocated the importance of pedigree when naming purebred cattle to follow family lines when breeding, they did not suggest farmers use informal, personal names. For the purpose of identification, Frank Gardner recommended marking and numbering dairy animals with tags or tattoos. Although academics recognized the necessity of care required by farmers for dairy cattle, this was with the intention of allowing the animal machines to be the best possible producers. Farmers in the early twentieth century handled their cattle with care, even forming concerned attachments for the ones that maintained longevity on the farm. On contemporary dairy farms, Deborah Valenze states that empathetic relationships still exist. For example, in modern day Wisconsin, dairy farmers have their own motto for
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handling dairy cattle: “Speak to a cow as you would a lady.” In other words, many farmers still regard the establishment of a comfortable, working relationship, whereby the cow has familiarity with the people who work with her, as necessary in the production of milk. In the early twentieth century, although farmers cared for the wellbeing of their cattle, empathetic relationships with animals had a reputation for being a non-masculine characteristic. Farmers had to straddle this dichotomy between the CDA’s push for dairy cows as milking machines, their own established methods of persuading their cows through a caregiver relationship, along with broader cultural imagery that sentimentalized human/animal relationships.

“The Dairymaid”: Gendered Cultural Representations of the Farmer/Cow Relationship

Romanticized cultural representations of rural Ontario emphasized and exaggerated sentimentality for dairy cattle by focusing on women’s relationships with the animals, rather than men’s. An examination of Reuben Sallows’ photographs, taken at face value, would imply dairy cows never had contact with male farmers, only their pretty wives and daughters. Of course, as the diary entries reveal, male members of the rural household had an active role in milking and dairying in the early twentieth century. These photographs of farm women with dairy cows did not demonstrate the amount of labour involved, or the changes to dairying from small-scale production performed by women, to a more male dominated, capitalistic venture. He exaggerated the relationship between women and dairy cows in his photographs to create an overly sentimental and often highly inaccurate representation of their interaction, romanticizing and idealizing rural life in Southern Ontario.
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Sallows featured a common scene, whereby pretty young girls in their finest clothing either fed or pet dairy cows. In “Lady and a Cow”, a young girl poses in a loving embrace with a milking cow (Figure 2.2). Sallows presented the cow in this image as a pet on the farm, rather than an economic producer. In other images, he featured women in the act of feeding the cows or calves. Some of these photographs he produced for humorous effect, such as in “Say Please” from 1904, where a young girl hid the feed behind her back, teasing the Holstein (Figure 2.3).

Sallows also positioned women with just the milk products and technology, such as in his “The Dairy Maid” photographs from 1907 and 1911 (Figure 2.4 and 2.5). The well-dressed young girls smile for the camera as they pour the milk into the cream separator. Lynn Campbell identified the extreme inaccuracies of these photographs. Cream separating was a chore women did not perform in their best clothes, nor was the task completed outdoors. Cream separators needed to be indoors, on a flat surface, in order to work properly.\(^{216}\) Sallows clearly wanted to include the tree blossoms in the background to enhance the visual aesthetics of the scene. Campbell states that to his contemporary audience,

the incongruities of Sallows’ ‘pretty pictures’ would have been obvious, but the images were nonetheless appealing to Edwardian taste for their sentimental and picturesque qualities.\(^{217}\)

The concept of Sallows’ ‘dairy maid’ was an exaggeration of the role women in dairying historically in Europe and North America. Deborah Valenze states that in eighteenth century England, women in rural areas were expected to be responsible for milking and dairying as part of the gendered division of labour.\(^{218}\) The job of the dairymaid in Europe was often a distinct, skilled, full-time job for young women, recruited to complete the dairying tasks on farms.\(^{219}\) In terms of nineteenth and early twentieth century Ontario, Marjorie Cohen argues that prior to the 1870s, women on small-scale farms, with one or two dairy cows, were the primary members of the economic unit responsible for milking and dairy production.\(^{220}\) However, women’s role in dairying gradually declined as the industry became a more specialized, male-dominated and capitalistic endeavour for farmers.\(^{221}\) Even just one or two cows created an enormous amount of labour and responsibility for women. Cohen
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observes how this was back-aching work that involved a multiplicity of tasks from milking the cows, to separating cream, and churning butter. The family consumed much of the produce, and any surplus was either sold for income or bartered for other goods. Although this was a feminized farm chore, Canada did not have ‘dairymaids’ like in Europe, as in addition to dairying, women on rural Ontario farms performed plenty of other important tasks for the farm economy, such as raising poultry and growing fruits and vegetables. The growth in markets and larger-scale dairy practices meant the small-scale dairy production women were able to manage was steadily being eliminated. Again, Sallows’ photographs neglected these realities of the dairy industry as they focused on the exaggerated nostalgia for sentimental feminine relationships.

In contrast to Sallows’ sympathetic images, some oral history testimonies from rural women who grew up on Southern Ontario farms in the early twentieth century depicted a more antagonistic relationship with their dairy cattle and milk production. While Sallows featured young girls in loving embraces with their cows, some farm women had a dislike of dairying and fear of the strength and unpredictability of their cows. Helen Demerling from Kurtzville, Huron County, Ontario, discussed her relationship with dairy cattle as a child, relating how she was frightened of these animals when milking: “When the men would be busy in the fields, mother and I did look after the chickens, and we did milk the cows. I of course was always afraid of the animals, and I would start at the first cow and milk her and let her out and go to the next one, because I wasn’t going to be kicked by two.” Helen had to adopt a specific strategy when handling the family’s dairy cattle, recognizing the power and agency of the animals, and
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therefore working with one individual cow at a time helped her to manage this fear. In other cases, it was not just the animal but the milk produce itself that some women developed distaste for. In an oral history testimony from Alma Egerde Bowman, she recalled helping her mother milk their herd of seven cows on their farm in New Dundee, Ontario. The family consumed their products, as well as sold excess milk, butter, and cheese at the local market in Galt. For Alma, the result was a permanent, lifelong dislike for milk due to the enormous surplus quantities produced and consumed by the family. While these accounts were not true for all farm women, it demonstrates a reality of women’s relationships with dairy cattle that Sallows’ avoided in his idealistic portraits of the rural farm. Urban viewers would hardly be eager to adopt rural living with images of women being kicked by cows or disgusted by milk.

Sallows’ romanticized representations were likely influenced by socio-cultural gender constructions in the early twentieth century, which viewed sentimentality with animals as a female rather than male emotion. As Susan Jones examined with the veterinary profession in America, the “unsentimental professional ethos” for animals valued economically was similar to the CDA’s presentation of dairy cattle as milking machines. Jones states that surgical procedures such as castrations and dehorning did not allow for the development of sympathetic relationships. Male veterinarians in this period argued women did not belong in this rugged barnyard, as it threatened the loss of their ‘delicacy of feeling’. This is ironic considering the active involvement of farm women with their dairy cattle in rural Canada prior to the specialization of the industry, but the association created severe obstacles and restrictions for
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women attempting to enter veterinary institutions in the twentieth century. Femininity was therefore linked with animals valued emotionally, namely companion animals. Sallows’ overly sentimental representations of women with dairy cows, animals that had an economic value, can therefore be explained by the nostalgic, re-imagining of the historical role of women in dairying; a romantic woman/cow relationship that by the early twentieth century was part of the cultural imagination of human/animal relationships, yet a marker of non-masculine, unprofessional, and unscientific relationships with livestock.

When Sallows’ photographed men with their cattle, he otherwise presented them in proud poses with their beef animals (Figure 2.6 and 2.7). From the development of the beef industry in Western Canada, came culturally constructed images of masculine ‘cowboys’ who defended the honour of the ranch, while ‘wrangling’ cattle. Cultural representations in Ontario of the relationship between male breeders and farmers with their cattle similarly displayed their pride and dominance over animals, rather than feminine sentimentality. In “Showing Aberdeen Angus” from 1922, Sallows featured a farmer showing his impressive, purebred Angus bull. This image exemplifies human mastery of animals, superior breeding in the production of quality beef cattle, and perhaps a prize winning animal from a local livestock show. The Ontario Provincial
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Winter Fair, held annually in Guelph, traditionally ended with a parade of champions from the livestock competition. The final animals in the parade were the ones most valued by the farming community, the prize winning steers, who were making their last public display before becoming beef.²³⁰ Ontario farmers who focused on specializing cattle breeds entered their animals into local stock shows or fairs. The prize winning animals were often featured proudly in agricultural journals such as the *Farmers Advocate*. From the diary sources, male farmers were evidently active in both dairy and beef production. However, Sallows approached his photographs with a goal, to appeal to the public taste of both his rural and urban audiences, and for the promotion of rural living. His creation of rural Ontario therefore presented human/animal relationships that best fit the cultural molds of the early twentieth century.

“Cows are Deep”: Animal Agency, Humour and Anthropomorphism

While Reuben Sallows focused on sentimental relationships between farm women and their dairy cows, Peter McArthur adopted humorous interpretations of his cattle’s behaviour to cater to his urban and rural readers. His writing is crucial to understanding the paradoxical state of human / cattle relationships in the early twentieth century. The farm essays he published in the *Globe* and *Farmers Advocate* whimsically described his cows as cunning, philosophical, deep

²³⁰ Sonya Marion Goldberg, *The Meeting of the City and the Country: The Ontario Provincial Winter Fair, 1900-1940* (Master’s Thesis, University of Guelph, 2000), 106. Goldberg states that the heavy draft horses and prize winning steers were the most valued by the community, and hence paraded last.
thinkers based on the everyday behaviours he observed. Like the diarists, McArthur identified the self-direction of his animals that were often frustrating and counter-productive for the farmer. For example, John Spence noted on 31 December, 1917, “About 10° last night and this morning 4° about at noon. Creek in slash is frozen solid so carried water to cattle & colts after trying all forenoon to get them to the spring.” Here, Spence revealed the reluctance of his animals to move in the cold weather, and therefore he had to take on extra work carrying water to them. While McArthur’s descriptions are comparative, his anthropomorphized interpretations made ordinary cow behaviour quite humorous. This minimized how animal agency could simultaneously be both a benefit and potential headache for farmers.

In his 1915 publication *In Pastures Green*, one anecdote described his frustrated observations of his cattle stopping abruptly when he tried to herd them through the gate in his field. McArthur’s analysis was as follows:

> Cows are deep. They think thoughts that are beyond the poets… Cows certainly think, but only when they have the proper environment… But it is not enough to have a cow see a gate to start her thinking. You must try to drive her through it. In fact, I am not sure that one lone cow would start thinking even in a gate. You must have a herd of them and it usually works out in about this way… As soon as the boss gets into the gate where none of the others can pass her a great idea will strike her and she will stop to chew her cud and think it over. If you are in a hurry you will probably start yelling at her, but it will do no good. Nothing can interrupt her profound thoughts…

Here, McArthur’s humour derived from attributing mistaken meaning to cattle behaviour, but another reason for his detailed “psychoanalysis” of cow behaviour was to comment on popular wildlife writers Ernest Thompson Seton and Charles Roberts. McArthur wrote “Cows are Deep” in part as satirical reference to these nature writers, who anthropomorphized and romanticized wild animals, portraying them heroically and as deep thinkers. McArthur believed that this was “undue” anthropomorphism in Seton and Robert’s stories, as they could never know
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wildlife creatures the same way McArthur knew his farm animals.\textsuperscript{233} Scholars of McArthur, such as Alec Lucas, consider “Cows are Deep” to be one of his most humorous essays because of the clever use of satire and the hilarity humans find in personifying non-humans.\textsuperscript{234}

Margo DeMello has examined why the anthropomorphism of animals creates so much amusement for humans. When humans describe an animal’s self-direction in a similar manner to human behaviour, but with recognition of the creature still being non-human, this creates a sense of ridiculousness. DeMello states that “much of human culture – especially recent culture – is built on the assumption that humans are not like animals; we may attribute human thoughts, words, or behaviour to nonhuman animals, but humans are unique and apart from the animal world.”\textsuperscript{235} Therefore the combination of the animal behaviour juxtaposed with a human interpretation of this behaviour produces a hilarious scene. For McArthur, he created humour in his writing by describing animal activity that other farmers would recognize, but ultimately instilled his own thoughts and explanations to form absurdities, such as philosophical cattle paused for reflection at a gate. Not surprising, McArthur often named his cattle based on the behaviour he observed, such as “Fenceviewer I” and “Fenceviewer II”.

In other anecdotes, McArthur created humour when changing his mind about the animal’s profundity, and emphasized how his cattle were not as intelligent as he originally thought. In one instance, he described how his cow Beans, the granddaughter of Fenceviewer, swallowed a rubber ball, which became lodged in her throat. McArthur explained that she must have mistaken the ball for an apple or food, so he attempted, to no avail, to remove the
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\textsuperscript{235} DeMello, 32. DeMello discusses how in contemporary society, the recent phenomena of internet memes with animals involves the juxtaposition of an animal image with a written human interpretation of the behaviour. For added humour, this often involves incorrect grammar and spelling, the implication being that if the animal knew how to speak, it would not be able to fully grasp human language, similar to a child.
impediment. However, after all his struggles, Beans then swallowed an entire corn cob “as
dessert to the rubber ball.”\footnote{Peter McArthur, \textit{The Red Cow and Her Friends} (New York: John Lane Company, 1919), 39.} In order for the humour to succeed in McArthur’s stories,
fundamentally the non-human animals need to remain childish, ‘dumb animals’, and for the
human to remain the superior, intelligent figure in the relationship.\footnote{See Franz de Waal, \textit{The Ape and the Sushi Master: Cultural Reflections of a Primatologist} (London: Penguin Books, 2001). De Waal explains this phenomenon with chimpanzees trained to perform tea parties in zoos during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He provided the example of during the 1920s at the London Zoo, how the workers trained a group of young chimpanzees to have a tea party. However, the apes performed the tea party so well that their behaviour and etiquette became frighteningly too human. The humour was lost when the apes performed the tea party perfectly. Therefore, the trainers taught them how to misbehave, and the humour was regained.} Primatologist Franz de
Waal observed that “by allowing animals to mock us we let them make even greater fools of
themselves, which permits us to laugh away any doubts we might harbour about ourselves.”\footnote{Ibid, 4.}
The doubt de Waal referred to is the idea that humans have supremacy over animals and nature,
and that we are unique in the animal kingdom. This has been essential to human self-definition
and justification of stewardship, domestication, and use of animals.

The Southern Ontario farmers related similar situations whereby their cattle interacted
with man-made elements on the farm, but the consequences were more devastating than the
stories by McArthur. John Spence recorded on 24 April 1904, “The hurley heifer that we brought
down yesterday hung herself with her chain last night. None of us went to church or league.” The
following day, they dragged the heifer’s body to the bush, but Spence did not record what they
did with her after. This event seemed a gruesome disruption for the family, and an unfortunate
consequence of raising cattle in human environments. For Peter McArthur, his anthropomorphic
animal tales were humorous stories of his cattle; he did not discuss the more disturbing realities
of raising livestock in the same manner as the diarists. However, McArthur also did not deny
the purpose of his food animals, was an advocate for improved farming methods, and producing
more food for the war effort. On numerous occasions in *The Red Cow*, he described his philosophical cows as “over half a ton of muscular beef”, and reflected on ways of getting his cows to produce more milk. Still, he did not identify in *The Red Cow* when his cattle died, or when he sent them to slaughter. They were individual characters in his stories; his animals formed a likeable cast that McArthur’s readers followed weekly in the *Globe* and the *Farmer’s Advocate*. McArthur had to balance economic realities of the farm with his goal to inspire movement back to rural living, while catering to the tastes of his urban and rural audiences. In a sense, McArthur’s cows exemplified the many paradoxical perspectives and roles humans constructed for these animals in the early twentieth century.

**Conclusion**

As demonstrated in the publications by the Canadian Department of Agriculture, farmers’ recordings of their animals and the cultural representations of cows, human relationships with beef and dairy cattle in early twentieth century Ontario were both ambiguous and contradictory. Dairy cows were simultaneously machines that humans were transforming into ‘turbo cows’, superior and efficient producers of milk due to systematized breeding, while also romanticized as feminine pets and companion animals. Cattle were both philosophical thinkers, and anonymous pounds of muscular beef. They were magnificent, prize winning specimens, sources of pride for farming communities, and dumb, innocent creatures with humorous personalities and individual character.
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239 McArthur, “Country Recruits”, *Globe*, January 30, 1915. McArthur supported the production of food by Canadian farmers for the war. However, as discussed in Chapter One, he noted the impracticality imposed by the Canadian Department of Agriculture of increasing food production while sending Canada’s young farm boys to war. He believed that farmer’s sons should stay on the farm, and that their contribution to the increased production of food should be regarded as being equally patriotic to those boys who served overseas.

For Southern Ontario farmers, dairy and beef cattle fulfilled their economic role as producers of meat and non-meat products. As the diary sources revealed, the relationship farmers established with their cattle was pragmatic depending on their own personality, and the specific purpose they raised their cattle to perform. Based on Rhoda Wilkie’s framework, farmers in the early twentieth century formed a range of relationships with their cattle, from concerned attachment to concerned detachment, depending on how they raised the animals, and for what purpose. Some farmers simultaneously viewed their cattle as individuals, naming the animals they milked and bred, providing them with longevity on the farm, while keeping those raised for meat or sale at a safe, anonymous emotional distance.

The origins of modern meat and dairying practices in Canada developed from the progressive ideas of the early twentieth century and First World War. During this transition to contemporary dairying, the milking machine became the milking robot by the late twentieth century, as the relationship between farmers and their dairy cows became increasingly more distant. In the United States, there are some industrial dairy farms that Douglas Harper identifies as “megadairies”, due the large number of cows, between eight hundred and one thousand, milked three times a day to maximize efficiency. Contemporary dairy farms in Ontario are not quite as large, although some have up to five hundred cows. From selective breeding, Ontario dairy cows in 2003 produced over five times more milk than in 1900. Interestingly, the farming culture from the early twentieth century that advocated farmers have a gentle demeanour with their dairy cows still exists depending on the individual farmer. Evidently

---

241 Jocelyne Porcher, “Dairy Cows: Workers in the Shadows?” Society and Animals 20 (2012), 42. The milking robot is an automated, computerized version of the milking machine which allows cows to be milking 24 hours a day. The role of the human is surveillance and maintenance of the machine.
243 The Livestock industry in Ontario, 3-2.
244 Ibid, 3-3. The average production per cow, per year in litres in 2003 was 6885 L. This is compared to 1901, when the average cow produced 1300L.
some farmers have resisted the devaluing of their role as caregivers of their dairy cows. Some still attempt to name all of their dairy cattle instead of just numbering and tattooing, even though they do not milk by hand and may have over one hundred cows on their farm.  

Harper identified the complicated nature of the large, factory farmed dairying practices compared to small-scale farms, which he calls “craft farms”, in regards to humans raising living beings for food:

These attitudes towards cows, based on a deep knowledge and affinity for the beasts, was typical of the craft farms and missing from the factory farms. As is the case in any process of production, with increased quantity there is less individual attention for any single unit in the production process. Since these “production units” are animals, this becomes a qualitatively different issue than the matter of making widgets.  

The fundamental problem with using animals in the production of food is that as they become de-individualized, commoditised units, they still remain sentient beings, but this fact becomes overlooked because of economic and consumer demands. As with the early twentieth century practices, how farmers view and relate to their animals is something they have to negotiate for themselves, in relation to economic pressures to produce enough to sustain their farms and families. Therefore, as Chapter Three discusses, the relationship Southern Ontario farmers established with their pigs, animals raised solely for meat, had to be far more detached and unsympathetic than their relationships with horses and cattle.  
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245 Harper, 258. Harper noted his surprise by this fact, and found it bizarre and extraordinary that some dairy farmers still attempt to name all of their milking cows. This becomes difficult as cattle herds grow. However, he also noted it is more intimate than the numbered tattoos on the ears of cows on the larger, industrial farms.  
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Chapter 3: “Killed Pig”: Impersonal Relationships with the Meat Producing Animal

The relationship between humans and pigs is the most paradoxical of the human/animal relationships discussed in this thesis. Humans have simultaneously regarded pigs as intelligent beings, capable of adapting to a multitude of habitats and living conditions, while criticizing them for being slovenly, gluttonous and unclean creatures. Malcolmson and Mastoris state that in eighteenth century England animal husbandry guides described the pig as “loathsome but necessary” creatures. However, humans have also created a tension between cultural constructions of the pig as a loveable creature, and the reality that pigs are bred and raised for the purpose of human consumption. Animal historian Brett Mizelle argues that humans have constructed an imagined difference between what is ‘pig’ versus ‘pork’, which allows us to separate mentally the pig that is eaten as being separate and distinct from the pig that is loved. However, according to Jocelyne Porcher, any connection that farmers form with the literal pigs he or she raises from birth must be undone by butchering day.

This chapter examines the furthest detached human/animal relationship of the three animals examined for Southern Ontario farmers in the early twentieth century: their relationship with pigs, the meat producing animal. This relationship reflects Rhoda Wilkie’s concept of concerned detachment, whereby the farmer handled the animals with care, but did not see them as individuals, rather as part of commercial production. Unlike dairy cattle and horses, farmers used their pigs solely for meat or lard, which meant shorter lifespans on the farm and less emotional investment by the farmer in the relationship. Farmers rarely, if ever, named these animals and more easily converted their pigs into monetary figures as food and profit. However,

daily interaction between the human and pigs allowed farmers to experience moments where they recognized their pigs as creatures with self-direction, agency, and personality. This is unique compared to specialized, large-scale hog farming that emerged in the mid to late twentieth century. As Wilkie demonstrates, the human/animal relationship of detached detachment occurs in industrial farming practices, whereby fewer farmers handle larger numbers over shorter periods of time. The Southern Ontario farmers examined for this study were still able to experience and witness pig behaviour and agency because they managed small-scale farms, and worked closely with their animals on a daily basis.

Agricultural developments in bacon production during the first decades of the twentieth century led to the growth of modern meat and industrial hog farming in Canada. During this period, the Canadian Department of Agriculture and Canada Food Board advocated for the intensification of bacon and pork production for Canadian farmers, especially during the First World War. The CDA sought Canada’s pork industry to be competitive on international markets by increasing exports to Britain, promoting the increase in quality and quantity production of bacon hogs. As previously demonstrated with horses and cattle, this expectation of modernity coexisted with the popularity of sentimental images during the Edwardian period in Ontario. Idealized cultural representations of pigs portrayed the animals interacting lovingly with adorable children on the farm. Reuben Sallows’ photographs emphasised a particular sentimental attachment between pigs, women and children. Meanwhile, Peter McArthur anthropomorphized his pigs in his writing, providing them with names and plenty of colourful personality, while simultaneously expressing his profound dislike for these animals and their ‘piggish’ behaviours.

Ontario farmers, who raised pigs from birth to slaughter, either for market or their own consumption, interacted with these animals on a daily basis. In doing so, they adopted pragmatic
stewardship in their relationships with creatures they regarded more so as commodities, keeping this relationship impersonal and detached, but also at times recognizing their pigs as living beings with agency. Compared to their interactions with horses and cattle, farmers’ relationship with their pigs most closely resembled the agricultural / commodity ideal presented to farmers by the CDA. The cultural representations of pigs demonstrate the paradoxical position of these animals in human society in the early twentieth century. Ironically the more sentimental the presentation of the human/animal relationship, the more distant the relationship was in reality. Mizelle argues that as the industrialization and commodification of farm animals increases, the need to maintain an image of these creatures contentedly being raised for human consumption becomes more and more necessary. \(^{251}\)

**Human Domestication of the Pig**

According to Mizelle, the domestication of the wild boar was only partially the result of human intervention. He assigns agency to the animal regarding the establishment of pig domestication and argues that the formation of this domestic relationship originated in a sense from wild boars choosing domestication for their own benefit, as they found living in proximity to humans had particular rewards until slaughtering day. \(^{252}\) These rewards included their ability to consume the foods humans ate and discarded. Furthermore, these animals did not need to be herded, although they were willing to move if necessary, while enjoying the company their own species as well as other animals. \(^{253}\) For humans, pigs had qualities that made them particularly ideal for domestication. The ability of hogs to store fat and energy made them a valuable food

\(^{251}\) Mizelle, 153.
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\(^{253}\) Ibid, 16
source that could feed themselves with grass, foliage, insects, or whatever was available.\textsuperscript{254} As highly malleable creatures, there are numerous ways by which humans can and have raised pigs for the production of meat, whether free-range, sty-reared, urban, or since the mid twentieth century, industrial agriculture.\textsuperscript{255} In regards to meat preservation, before home refrigeration, pork could be cured with salt rather than just eaten fresh, and therefore was a more practical option than beef for rural families.\textsuperscript{256} Considering this “mutual self-interest”, Mizelle states human domestication of the boar could therefore be regarded as a “treaty between consenting intelligent parties.”\textsuperscript{257} By the early twentieth century, this relationship was not as egalitarian. As the diary sources will demonstrate, Southern Ontario farmers were the dominant figure in the human/animal relationship; their pigs were not free to go, resulting in the animals at times resisting the conditions of their environment, breaking their pens, and wandering away from the farm.

Zooarcheologist Umberto Albarella argues that pigs are therefore “victims of their own success”.\textsuperscript{258} While pigs have significantly shaped the course of human societies for 9,000 years as an essential supplier of food, subsistence, trade, capital, and culture, humans have likewise shaped, transformed, and bred pigs for their specific needs as a result of domestication.\textsuperscript{259} The domesticated pig did not have the wild boar’s spots or stripes necessary for camouflage, but rather developed long bodies with shorter legs and floppy ears, as alertness and survival in the wild was no longer required in domestication. Specialized breeding developed in the western

\textsuperscript{255} Mizelle, 15.
\textsuperscript{256} Roger Horowitz, \textit{Putting Meat on the American Table: Taste, Technology, Transformation} (Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press, 2006), 44.
\textsuperscript{257} Mizelle, 16.
\textsuperscript{258} Albarella, 1.
\textsuperscript{259} Mizelle, 7-9.
world during the eighteenth century as English farmers bred indigenous pigs with imported Chinese breeds, domesticated long before European pigs, in order to develop a smaller animal that would grow quickly, and be ready for market sooner. In Canada and the United States, it was during the late nineteenth and into the mid twentieth century that farmers focused on transforming traditional thick, fat lard hogs into the increasingly more profitable lean, bacon type hogs.  

Swine Breeds in Early Twentieth Century North America

According to a recent study, “The Livestock Industry in Ontario, 1900-2000”, in 1901 Ontario produced approximately 1,562,696 hogs. This number increased to 1,887,451 by 1911, but dropped following the First World War to 1,417,705 in 1921. However, the number of pork producers increased from 121,349 in 1911 to 138,945 by 1921, demonstrating an increase in the specialization of hog farming. Lard hogs were more commonly bred in North America in the early twentieth century, but the bacon type hog was the most promoted breed of swine in Ontario and Canada. The most common breed types were the Yorkshire, Tamworth, Berkshire, and Chester White, the former two being the most suitable for bacon production. To a lesser extent, Canadian farmers also raised the Poland-China, Duroc-Jersey, and Hampshire breeds, which were more suitable for lard production.

The United States differed from Canada in its emphasis in hog production during this period. The Poland-China and Duroc-Jersey breeds were the most popular in the Corn Belt of the United States.
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260 The changing of animals such as the lard hog, high in fat, into a lean meat producing hog, has been referred to by Edmund Russell as “macrobiotechnology”. Humans have shaped organisms to meet human needs, which Russell argues is done at two levels: macrobiotechnology, which refers to the whole organism, and microbiotechnology, at the cellular level. See Edmund Russell, “Introduction: The Garden in the Machine: Toward an Evolutionary History of Technology,” in Industrializing Organisms: Introduction Evolutionary History, ed. Susan R. Schrepfer and Philip Scranton (New York: Routledge, 2004), 1-16.
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United States, and farmers used them to produce lard instead of bacon. It was during the
nineteenth century when American farmers, with surplus corn, imported breeds of hog from
England and developed distinct types of swine, the most common breeds being the Chester
White, Berkshire, Hampshire, and Poland China.\footnote{Anderson, 30.} American farmers in the Corn Belt during
this period followed the rhythm of their animals and corn harvests, raising and feeding their pigs
fatty cuts of pork from lard hogs by curing the meat with brine or smoke. Nineteenth century
cookbooks gave this cured pork “an inferior place on the meat hierarchy,” to be used as a side
dish or flavouring rather than as a main course.\footnote{Horowitz, 45.} It was not until after the Second World War,
when vegetable oils replaced lard and a growing urban population in the United States
increasingly consumed more beef and chicken that the pork industry intensified its focus on
producing a lean-meat hog that would better appeal to consumers. During the 1950s and 1960s
the American pork industry, led by pork packers, began rigorous efforts to transform lard hogs to
lean meat.\footnote{Anderson, 31. American pig farmers and breeders in the 1950s found it was actually more cost effective to
produce meat hogs rather than traditional lard hogs, as less feed was required to raise leaner animals.} Canadian production of lean bacon hogs was therefore ahead of American efforts in
the early twentieth century.

According to the CDA’s publication from August 1914, \textit{Swine Husbandry in Canada},
until swine producers adopted the bacon type hog, “Canadian pork producers possessed a very
indifferent reputation.”\footnote{Swine Husbandry in Canada, 7.} The CDA’s bulletins on swine-raising recognized how Canada was not
able to compete with the United States in terms of producing “thick, fat hogs.” Alternatively, American academics of animal husbandry fully recognized the Canadian advancements in bacon production as surpassing the United States in the first two decades of the twentieth century. For example, Carl W. Gay acknowledged in his 1916 publication, *The Breeds of Livestock* how the Yorkshire and Tamworth had made “wonderful progress” in Canada, while having “scarcely obtained a standing” in the United States. Furthermore, Gay explained how Guelph’s Provincial Winter Fair, held annually in Guelph, Ontario, had the “largest exhibit of bacon carcasses of any show in existence,” with the Yorkshire breed of swine always taking the first prize.

With this emphasis on the production of quality bacon hogs in Ontario and Canada, the CDA therefore increasingly sought to meet the demand for bacon on international markets, by expanding bacon exports to England in the first two decades of the twentieth century. Canada’s primary competition was Ireland and Denmark. In fact, it was Danish researchers who first used scientific techniques to test for hog gain and efficiency when converting feed to body mass, and developed the Danish Landrace breed with a high lean-to-body mass ratio. Denmark was therefore the benchmark in which Canadian pork production in the early twentieth century aimed to surpass through the creation of an ideal bacon-type hog.

**The Creation of the “Ideal Bacon-Type Hog” in Canada**

Swine husbandry bulletins by the CDA during the early twentieth century deconstructed the body of the pig to describe how each individual part should be formed for the creation of an ideal bacon-type hog.
ideal bacon-type hog. Two of these bulletins, *Bacon Production for the British Market* from 1907 and *Swine Husbandry in Canada* from 1914, each presented clear, calculated conversions of pigs into profit to place Canadian pork on international markets:

Hogs, like other classes of live stock, must be judged, first from the standpoint of the market, and secondly from their adaptability to yield profitable returns for food consumed. Form, condition, and weight largely determine the appreciation of the market, while on constitution, nervous temperament and feeding qualities, depend the thrift or ability to convert the maximum of large quantities of food into a valuable marketable product.  

In other words, the goal of the CDA for swine production was not just quantity, but also quality. In order for the pig to be suitable for prime bacon, farmers needed to raise a “smooth, trim, evenly developed pig, of great length, fair depth, and moderate thickness.” For the individual components of the animal, producing an ideal form included consideration of the head, such as snout, ears, eyes, jowl, and neck; fore quarters, consisting of shoulders, breast, and forelegs; the body, comprised of the back, loin, side, heart-girth, and hind flank; and finally, the hind quarters, made up of the rump, ham, and hind legs. The final consideration was the overall “quality”, which was a more general term “somewhat hard to define”, which implied that the whole appearance denoted good breeding of the animal. Consideration of all components in their ideal form meant that a pig that was suitable for market and prime bacon.

The following images (Figure 3.1 and 3.2) from *Swine Husbandry in Canada* demonstrates the direct conversion of the pig into profit, with images of living animals juxtaposed with their corresponding forms as slabs and cuts of meat. The purpose was to present the differences between good quality and poor quality pigs as both living things and meat. The document compared a triad of live pigs, in the categories of unfinished, too fat, and ideal, with corresponding examples of cuts from the carcasses. Ideal bacon hogs did not require a long life
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Figure 3.1: Corresponding images of three sides from an unfinished hog, ideal hog, and too fat hog. This comparison allowed farmers to see how the ideal living bacon hog converted into meat, and consequently profit. J.B. Spencer, *Swine Husbandry in Canada* no. 17 (Ottawa, Department of Agriculture, August 1, 1914), 12.
Figure 3.2: Three images of live bacon type hogs that were unfinished, too fat, and ideal, with discussions of their weight and how they were raised. J.B. Spencer, *Swine Husbandry in Canada* no. 17 (Ottawa, Department of Agriculture, August 1, 1914), 11.
on the farm to achieve their perfect weight for market. It took approximately six to eight months for an ideal hog to weigh between 180 to 200 lbs., making him ready for slaughter. These hogs were ideal, or “finished”, because they had had sufficient exercise and healthful food that enabled rapid growth and a short finishing period. An animal’s finishing period referred to the very critical fattening process just prior to market or slaughter.

Sows were more unique in that they potentially had longer lifespans on the farm, depending on the number of litters they were able to produce. Their monetary value for farmers was by being “good mothers to large litters,” and their ability to birth many healthy piglets. These animals were not suitable for bacon because often they were either unfinished, or “too heavy to yield sides suitable for the bacon trade.” However, the CDA recognized how often farmers included sows that had reared one or more litters among shipments of bacon hogs, which they regarded as a serious injury to the bacon industry. To address this problem, the CDA raised the following question regarding sows: “What is to be done with the animals that have outlived their profitable usefulness in the breeding herd?” They concluded that it was not in the best interest of the bacon industry to turn sows off as bacon hogs, but they recognized the value of this animal as a producer of pigs and other pork products: “While the gains made by such an animal have cost high per hundredweight, it should be remembered that she has given many times over as a mother.” The paradox here was that the sow existed as a commodity, as well as a mother. Although identifying the sow as a ‘she’ rather than ‘it’, this publication reiterated the importance of the sow as a mother in the production of more bacon, or piglets. For Southern Ontario farmers, while some maintained their horses on the farm even after the animals had
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outlived their usefulness due to sentimental attachments, this was not the case with sows. Farmers’ impersonal detachments to their pigs meant butchering or selling old sows for meat was their only option for these animals, regardless of poor meat quality.

According to the CDA, the main problem for the bacon industry in the early twentieth century were farmers who sent unsuitable hogs to market, as this affected the reputation of Canadian pork. According to the bulletins, the “most objectionable” were the unfinished animals. These were hogs that were good bacon type, but had not been sufficiently fattened, weighing only 125 to 150 pounds.\(^{281}\) For some farmers, because of the comparatively high price of grain, the concern was that finishing their hogs would prove unprofitable or unaffordable.\(^{282}\) However, the CDA emphasised that the “unfinished hog [was] a serious menace to the bacon industry.”\(^{283}\) These bulletins pressured farmers to achieve this ideal in quality production, emphasizing that farmers who failed to do so were damaging the industry:

> To the extent that Canadian hog raisers comply with these conditions they do their part towards building up a very desirable and valuable trade with Great Britain and other countries looking for bacon of high quality; on the other hand, those who persist in raising hogs spasmodically or of poor type and disposing of them either too fat or too thin, are very effectively damaging the industry that is doing so much for the prosperity of Canadian agriculture.\(^{284}\)

Within the seven year span between the publications of these two bulletins, *Swine Husbandry in Canada* indicated that while Canada had begun to establish itself as a quality bacon producer on the international market, in 1913 and 1914 bacon exports had declined in quantity. The bulletin recognized a decline in exports to Great Britain since the previous 1907 publication, but equated this to an increase in bacon consumption within Canada rather than
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necessarily a poor standing on the British market.\textsuperscript{285} However, following the start of the First World War, the CDA’s emphasis that farmers increase bacon production for British export intensified, creating propaganda campaigns that represented the production of quality hogs as a farmer’s patriotic duty for the war effort.

**Bacon Production in Canada during the First World War**

While the publications by the CDA prior to the First World War emphasized bacon exports to Britain, this increased after the start of the war. Pressure by the Canadian government on farmers involved the propaganda campaign introduced by the Canada Food Board. This poster (Figure 3.3) titled, “Canada’s Pork Opportunity” from ca. 1918, again reiterated that wartime food production was a patriotic, profitable opportunity for both farmers and Canada’s pork industry. In this poster, a smiling Royal Canadian Mounted Police officer handed a small pig, labelled “Canada sells only 130,304,947 lbs.” to an elderly British diplomat, offering money in exchange for the pork. A much larger pig labelled “Britain buys 1,261,082,032 lbs.” was placed at diplomat’s side. The tagline, directed at Canadian farmers from Britain, stated, “We’re glad to have it, Canada, but we need ten times more.” In other words, this poster emphasized to farmers that while they had been performing their duties exporting some pork to Britain during the war, they were still behind other countries, likely Denmark and Ireland. Furthermore, the demand for Canadian bacon during the war in Britain was substantial, and therefore the CFB portrayed producing more pork as a profitable, patriotic opportunity not to be missed by Canada’s farmers.

\textsuperscript{285} *Swine Husbandry in Canada*, 54.
This poster placed unrealistic demands on farmers to raise and produce more hogs than they could manage. For Southern Ontario farmers, meeting these demands would have meant investing in more stock, and transitioning from mixed practices to specialized hog farming. However, some agricultural experts recognized that investing in too much stock could compromise the quality of the animals. In the 1915 wartime publication *Patriotism and Production*, some academic contributors recognized how farmers needed to increase their hog production, but to do so gradually. The bulletin warned farmers that they needed to be wary of having too much stock in relation to how much feed they could produce, as the risk was producing unfinished hogs that would damage Canada’s reputation.  

Investing in the proper housing, fences, and of course feeding and watering was first necessary. Therefore, William Motherwell, Saskatchewan’s Minister of Agriculture, argued it was the duty of every Canadian farmer to invest in at least “some stock” to aid in the
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286 H.S.Arkell, Assistant Live Stock Commissioner, “The Live Stock Situation”, in *Patriotism and Production: More than Usual*, Agricultural War Book (Ottawa: Canada Department of Agriculture, 1915), 58. “The shortness of feed together with the sharp rise in the price of grain following the outbreak of the war forced very large numbers of unfinished and immature pigs on the market. As a result, particularly for this class of stock, prices dropped to a comparatively low level. The result was a demoralization of the whole industry.”
production of pork for the war.\textsuperscript{287} It is evident from the farmers examined for this investigation that each maintained a few pigs as part of their mixed farming practice, but did not always meet the demands for quality production.

\textbf{The Farmer/Pig Relationship: Concerned Detachment}

Southern Ontario farmers with mixed farming practices raised pigs for their own consumption or market between short periods of six to eight months. The diarists’ recordings about their pigs demonstrated the constant ebb and flow of the livestock, meat, and profits from the hogs. Unlike how these farmers named their horses and occasionally cattle, they did not refer to their pigs by personal names. If the diarists recorded descriptive detail about their pigs, it usually concerned their size or age, such as ‘fat sow’ or ‘young pig’. For example, John Spence recorded in his diary on Dominion Day, 1 July 1904, “…We hauled 19 loads of manure on to the corner field, moved the pigs into it from the one south of the barn and let the old sows and youngest pigs out…”\textsuperscript{288} These brief terms, such as ‘old’ and ‘youngest’, are the only descriptive remarks used by this group of farmers to identify their pigs. The lack of names was because of their impersonal detachment to animals raised solely for meat. With short lifespans on the farm for the purpose of slaughter, farmers did not invest in furthering an emotional bond with their pigs by giving them personal names. Because of the vague references, it is difficult to know from the diaries how many pigs they maintained at a given time, unless specifically recorded. The number of pigs on the farm varied depending on their circumstances, as Jock Hyde recorded having nineteen pigs on his well-established mixed farm in 1914.\textsuperscript{289} This was compared to Edward Stoltz, who only had two sows when he first rented his father August Stoltz’ farm in
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1898. He referred to these animals as “Old Brood Sow” and “Young Sow”, and purchased them for 25 and 10 dollars respectively.  

Instead of naming their pigs, the diarists calculated these animals into weight and profit when transporting hogs to the nearest town or market. One of the purposes farmers had in maintaining their diaries was to keep track in an account-book style of produce, profits, and expenses. For example, Ephiram S. Cressman wrote in the first week of January 1907, “to Breslau with 5 hogs (sold at $6.10 cwt - $60.40).” Similarly, John Spence recorded on 9 January 1918, “Papa took the 3 biggest pigs to Shelburne = 650 lbs. at $17.50 = $113.75. Cleaned pigpens, moved sow, made gaps for manure road, etc.” Spence wrote down this conversion using an equal sign, calculating the total weight of the animals and corresponding money received for them. The total weight of 650 pounds for three pigs meant that each pig was slightly over the ‘ideal weight’ of finished bacon hogs, meaning Spence had raised hogs that the CDA would have considered too fat for market.

The above entry by Spence also reveals how, apart from transporting and selling, farmers interacted with their pigs on a daily basis as they conducted routine chores. Moving their pigs around the farm from their pens to the barnyard for exercise on a daily basis was common. However, John Spence primarily recorded this regular movement of his pigs in special circumstances, such as during bad weather or when he penned his pigs to fatten. Spence wrote
on 21 October 1913, “Cold & blowing. Got sows in, one in corner pen & the other in center box stall.” In terms of preparing the necessary housing for their pigs, this required a few days of work from the farmers. The following diary entries from Jock Hyde in September 1913 revealed the amount of work and assistance necessary for building adequate housing for his pigs: “16 Tues Sept. 1913 Dave, Charlie, & I finished hole and filled up pig house floor & filled tank; 17 Wed. Sept 1913 Charlie, B & I put cistern in new pig pen; 26 Friday Sept 1913 D.B., Charlie, and I made pig pen wall; 29 Monday Sept 1913 Charlie, Malcolm, Bob, & I cementing pig pens.”

These farmers had a concerned detachment for their pigs; they cared for their animals and routinely looked after their feeding, housing, water, exercise, and safety, but for the purpose of converting them to meat or a monetary figure. The diarists did not name their pigs they raised from birth to slaughter, as pragmatic stewardship of animals raised for slaughter meant avoiding emotional bonds and attachments was necessary. The nature of how they raised and closely interacted with their animals, however, meant for moments when they recognized and recorded the agency and behaviour of their pigs.

“Piggish Instincts”, Personality, Agency, and Behaviours

In the diary entries, there are moments that reveal the behaviour of the pigs, how they interacted with each other, as well as their surroundings, revealing agency in their brief existence on the farm. As naturally omnivorous animals, the original exploratory eating behaviours of pigs involved a large range area that they actively searched for food. This behaviour included rooting, sniffing, and chewing their surroundings. For domesticated pigs, restrictive food intake during their fattening period increases their desire to root, while other times rooting is simply

confined quarters. This is in contrast to contemporary industrial farming and the confinement of sows in gestation crates, which is currently a debated animal welfare issue.

novelty or the pig’s inquisitive exploration of his surroundings. Since the environment of a pigpen is rather monotonous, pigs that actively rooted and explored their pens out of hunger or boredom created difficulties for Southern Ontario farmers when the animals damaged their enclosure. John Spence wrote on 20 November 1917, “Snow to whiten ground last night. Misty sort of haze…Cleaned pigpens, weighed pigs, weaned young pigs, and made a door to replace the one the pigs tore to bits between the two east pens.” Spence’s daily interaction with his pigs included regular cleaning of their pens, weighing them to see if they were approaching ideal size, as well as weaning piglets from their mother. He had ample opportunity to observe the pigs’ behaviour and interaction with their surroundings, such as tearing the pen door “to bits”, which subsequently resulted in more work for Spence.

Other moments when farmers discovered their pigs had broken through their pens, they subsequently had difficulty discovering their pigs’ whereabouts on the farm property. Jock Hyde wrote on 1 October 1914, “helping Kate a.m. & to swamp & found 5 little pigs...” While this information is fragmented, it is likely Hyde’s pregnant sow broke out of her pen and, like the cattle on his farm, found her way to the nearby swamp to give birth. The following week, on 12 October 1914, Thanksgiving Monday, Hyde recorded, “Churning & peeling & coring apples & tending little pigs. White sow sick. Little pigs nearly dead.” The birth in the chilled swamp must have been traumatic for the sow and her piglets, and portended for their loss to the farmer. Such farm accidents and deaths were a reality farmers tolerated but tried to minimize. As discussed with horses and cattle, these farmers were stewards over their animals and attempted to maintain the safety of their pigs during their brief time on the farm. The agency of these animals occasionally undermined these attempts. John Spence had a similar experience of his pigs.

disappearing from the farm, and recorded on 12 August 1913, “Hunted for stray pigs. Hoed turnips. Papa went to Shelburne in p.m. Pigs turned up in evening.” In this instance, Spence’s pigs went missing, and although he spent a good part of his day searching for them, he did not find them and continued with his chores; the pigs eventually returned to the farm on their own volition. One of the realities of animal husbandry these farmers faced was that despite their efforts, gates, and fences, they were never in complete control of their animals who at times exercised their own agency and motivation on the farm.

The behaviour of their pigs likely caused these farmers ample frustration, although they did not record these feelings directly. Peter McArthur otherwise vocalized these frustrated sentiments in his writings about pig behaviour, which created humour in his animal stories. While McArthur was more colourful in his descriptions than the diarists, he similarly experienced the destruction of pens with his pig Clementine, explaining how she “broke out of her pen this morning, and as the children are at school she is allowed to roam at will.”

McArthur observed the purpose of Clementine’s escape was in search of more food, “hustling for apples in the orchard and for heads of oats around the oat stack.” McArthur frequently recorded his dislike for his pigs because of their behaviour, which was likely a contributing factor to the impersonal detachments the Southern Ontario farmers formed for these animals.

As previously noted, the diarists did not give their pigs personal names, as this would have signified a more sympathetic attachment. However, the pigs on Peter McArthur’s farm all had names. They were individual characters in his stories, with colourful personalities. McArthur wrote in *The Red Cow and her Friends* how his children named their sow Beatrice, a name in which McArthur comically viewed as inappropriate for a pig:
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The children have named her Beatrice, though I can’t figure out just why. Beatrice suggests to me something slim and gracile rather than two hundred pounds of hump-backed and enterprising pork. They couldn’t have picked up the name from anything they have heard me calling her since her arrival on the farm. I have called her many names, but I am quite certain that none of them sounded anything like Beatrice.\textsuperscript{297}

This passage demonstrates McArthur’s dislike for Beatrice, as well as recognition of the purpose of having her on the farm for the production of pork. This also indicated that McArthur viewed naming pigs as childish and unnecessary, similar to the diarists. However, as a prominent character frequently featured in his stories, Beatrice required an identity. His relationship with Beatrice became further complicated once she had piglets, and he was forced to negotiate his dislike for the older sow with his sentiment for the adorable young animals. McArthur decided that pigs can be regarded with sentiment when they are young, but not when they are old, which is necessary in order to be able to slaughter and consume them:

Pigs are only lovable when they are small and plump and roly-poly. Our love for them does not endure. If it were not so we would not have the heart to slaughter our pigs and turn them into necessary bacon. By the time they are full-grown they have developed their piggish instincts to such an intolerable degree that we are glad to be rid of them...I protest that at the present time I view the little pigs with tenderness and affection, but when they are finally fattened I shall have no compunctions about loading them into a car and shipping them to Toronto – the place where every good Ontario pig goes when he dies.\textsuperscript{298}

Again, the “piggish instincts”, such as rooting, chewing, and sniffing for food, McArthur presented as a negative attribute to raising hogs, but these destructive behaviours did not emerge until they were older. He provided an explanation regarding how the human value for the same animal, not just the same animal species as seen with cattle, could be transitory. As young and adorable piglets, McArthur agreed they could be sentimentally valued. However, once they grew into full sized pigs, and their “piggish” natural behaviours developed, then the affection for them disappears, and farmers have no problem breaking the bonds previously formed. The natural
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behaviours and agency of pigs seemed to contribute to their commoditization on Southern Ontario farms.

Ironically, while McArthur vocalized his dislike for Beatrice because of her “piggish” behaviours, his urban readers grew so attached to the colourful personalities of the sow and her family that they wanted to ‘keep-a-pig’ of their own to aid in the war effort. Adam Crerar explains how Peter McArthur’s whimsical story telling of his pigs inspired some of his urban readers to adopt and raise their own pigs during the First World War, as part of their patriotic duty. This ‘keep-a-pig’ campaign occurred in both Canada and the United States, whereby urban citizens adopted small-scale animal husbandry practices in their backyards. Crerar identified one instance when a clergyman from Little Current, Ontario, wrote to McArthur in May 1918 that the “author’s charming farm animal stories had completely won over his wife and daughters… ‘Beatrice and her lovable family have so captivated the ladies of this household that we’ve ‘simply got to keep a pig’.” McArthur’s portrayal of Beatrice reflected the tension between the reality of raising pigs as pork and profit for the war, and the imagined cultural representation of pigs as loveable and spirited anthropomorphic characters with ‘piggish’ personalities. Beatrice’s antics and cute family captivated urban readers, who even wrote complaints to McArthur regarding how he treated and portrayed her in his stories. To McArthur, Beatrice was a ‘loathsome creature’ whose departure to the slaughterhouse he greatly anticipated. One reader complained that McArthur was “doing injury to the ‘keep-a-pig’ campaign by expatiating [Beatrice’s] undesirable qualities.” However, McArthur recognized this tension in his writings. He never denied his dislike for Beatrice or her specific purpose on
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the farm as ‘enterprising pork’, while simultaneously maintaining her appeal to urban readers by emphasizing her piggish behaviour and mischievous character on the farm. He provided an example regarding how his youngest son had established an idea of ‘piggishness’ prior to the family even raising hogs, saying to his father, “I guess folks call pigs pigs because they are so piggish.” In other words, a paradox existed regarding how the urban readers who adored Beatrice raised pigs for the war effort based on these colourful characterizations. While the CDA and CFB clearly represented pigs as commodities or things that required an increase in quality production, it was the anthropomorphic idea of a loveable and mischievous ‘pig’ that inspired these urban readers to do their part for the agricultural campaigns of the First World War.

As previously discussed, a sow’s mothering ability was a quality emphasized by the CDA and also loved by McArthur’s fans of Beatrice. The CDA however referred to this in terms of the sow’s physical capability of giving birth to large and healthy litters. John Spence otherwise noticed a different mothering quality in the red sow owned by his brother David. He recorded on 17 August 1919, “David’s red sow has ‘adopted’ 4 of the new batch of pigs.” Spence wrote adopted is in quotation marks, so as to not fully attribute this human act of benevolence onto the sow. However, there is definite recognition here of the sow’s nurturing nature, as in this case the piglets were not her own, and Spence interpreted the behaviour in reflection of the human ability to love and care for children that have been adopted. The farmers’ recognition of the pigs’ agency and personality are rare throughout the diaries, but nevertheless important in how the method of mixed farming allowed farmers to recognize elements of pig behaviour that became increasingly obsolete with modern, industrial farming. Again, these moments when the farmer
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recognized the personality and individuality of his pigs, or as Porcher argues revealed a human/animal bond, had to be undone on butchering day.

“Killing Pigs” and “Butchering the Hog”

In the winter months of December and January, Southern Ontario farmers frequently recorded butchering either their own pigs, or helping their neighbours with killing and butchering. The seasonal timing for butchering was essential, as killing pigs during the start of winter meant the cured meat would keep into spring.\footnote{Malcolmson and Mastoris, 90.} This was a labour intensive day involving help from community members, as most of the diarists recorded receiving or giving assistance to at least one other neighbour on butchering day. Ephriam S. Cressman in January 1905 recorded, “Butchering – had W. Clemens to help.” Edwin Kemkes from Waterloo wrote twice in January 1914, “Killing pigs at Arthur’s.”\footnote{Edwin Kemkes, Diary of a Farmer, Branchton, Ontario, 1914-1916. Waterloo Region Museum diary collection.} While this was an event that involved breaking any connections formed with the animal, it created bonds between community members. This included both the physical help, as well as borrowing equipment. John Spence wrote on 16 December 1904, “W.J. Hamilton came & borrowed the big soap kettle & oil-barrel for pig killing.”\footnote{Spence’s neighbour W.J. Hamilton was likely using this equipment to make lard and soap on butchering day from the pig fat.} The task of killing and butchering pigs was so intensive that it often took more than one day. John Spence wrote over two days in December 1913, “Thu. Dec. 11 1913 Got in load or two of wood. Killed pigs in p.m.; Fri. Dec 12. 1913 Cut up pig carcasses.” What is absent from the diaries, however, are details regarding the killing and butchering process, which the oral history and memoir sources reveal.

Harry Barrett explained that as a child, his father allowed him to attend killing events. He wrote, “When our hogs were ready for slaughter…I was permitted to go with Dad to the old
farm, where everything was in readiness to kill five hogs for our own use." The Barretts had help from other men in the community, including Wilbur Ryerse, the community’s experienced butcher. Barrett explained that while one of the men present held “the first victim on its back, forefeet held tight”, Wilbur inserted his butcher’s knife into the throat of the hog, above the breast bone, cutting the carotid arteries. The same process is evident in the Sallows photograph “Holding down the Hog” (Figure 3.4). Harry described this method as “humane slaughter”, because the pig quickly bled to death “before any pain registered, or even panic on the pig’s part.” As will be discussed, Barrett also witnessed inhumane slaughtering of pigs as a child.

Figure 3.4: Reuben Sallows, “Holding Down the Hog” (Date Unknown). The Reuben Sallows Digital Library, www.sallowsgallery.ca. Although Sallows frequently staged his photographs to the extent of creating inaccurate, romanticized representations of rural life, this image demonstrates the technique, difficulties, and number of labourers required to kill a hog as described in the memoir and oral history sources.

Helen Demerling in her oral history testimony remembered the complicated process of butchering the hog and the roles of all the family members who came to assist. She explained that butchering day was a “big affair”, in which many relatives would be asked in. Her father
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was the local butcher, and after he and the other men present killed the pigs, usually one or two, they boiled the animals in hot water in a large barrel so the hair could be scraped off. Then they hung the pigs on a tripod and removed the organs, or as Demerling stated, “Let’s just say they took the insides out” (Figure 3.5). The pigs hung on the tripod until cold, and then the men brought them into the family’s summer kitchen to butcher the different cuts of meat. This included cutting off the hams, hawks, ribs, and tenderloin. Instead of pork chops, the men severed the backbone, which would be cooked in sauerkraut. The remaining meat was not wasted and ground for sausage. Demerling explained that the men prepared the pork sausage “in a huge grinder that was mixed in the wash tub, which was of course sterilized.” The remaining meat from the head of the pig was also used by the family, and “any meat that wasn’t used in the sausage, pork sausage, was used for head cheese.” As an essential component of stewardship and raising animals for food, this family would not have wasted any parts of the animal. These hogs were economically valued, which meant each part had to be used to maximize the use and investment in the animal.

While the men butchered and prepared pork sausage, the women had the job of scraping the pig intestines for sausage casings. What was unique about their preparation was that the women incorporated knitting needles into this process. First, the women poured water through the intestines, turning them inside out, and scraping them with a knife on a board. Afterwards,
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they “would take two knitting needles and tie them quite tightly [with thread] at one end so they would stay very firmly together, and these casings were all put through these knitting needles, until they were as fine and as so you could see through them.” Demerling reflected on this method for cleaning casings, and observed how the sausage casings produced by pork packers were likely similar, although prepared in a much different way. For Helen Demerling’s family, this gendered organization and division of labour, with the inclusion of many relatives, was how they completed the important and difficult task of butchering a hog. This contrasts with the sentimental representations of women as discussed in Chapter Two. Farm women were not overly sentimental towards animals, but rather pragmatic towards the needs of the family farm. All the members of the family needed to assist with butchering day due to the intensity of work involved in butchering an animal for food.

The photograph by Reuben Sallows, titled “Butchering the Hog,” (Figure 3.5) matches the descriptions by Demerling and Barrett. This image shows how the farmers hung the pig and removed its internal organs. The man on the right is holding the pig’s bladder, and inflating it for children to use as a football. This photo demonstrates the deconstruction of the pig into a commodity. Here, the viewer can see how the physical components of a pig were being visibly transformed into a product. Although the bodies of horses were also transformed into products when sent to rending plants, on the farm, this task was more easily and frequently performed with pigs and beef cattle.

Gordon Eby recorded a moment in his diary that demonstrates how farmers viewed the butchering of their hogs in comparison to performing this same task on their companion animals:

Ben & Ezra were here for dinner Dad teased them said he wanted to butcher their dogs, so they took the dogs home in the forenoon, at noon when Dad teased Ben again, Ben said, first butcher your own dogs, before you butcher other peoples dogs, we all had a laugh, at the good answer Ben had. Jake helped to wash at home forenoons, After dinner I helped Dad
The possibility of the family butchering Ben and Ezra’s dogs was merely an amusing joke, due to the ridiculousness of slaughtering a companion animal for meat. However, Eby nonchalantly described butchering their pig. The weight and sex of the pig indicates she was an older sow, who therefore would have had a slightly longer life on the farm for a pig, but regardless of this time spent alive on the farm, her value to the family was unquestionably established as a meat producer. While Gordon referred to both animals as property in this entry (‘our pig’ versus ‘Ben and Ezra’s dogs’), the accepted cultural difference and value between the roles of meat and companion animals on the rural Ontario farm is evident. Knowing the difference between which animals were and were not acceptable to kill was a learned behaviour, and for some rural children, this was a confusing and paradoxical lesson to learn growing up on a farm.

**Children, Pigs, and Butchering Day**

Malcolmson and Mastoris state that the anthropomorphism of animals in cultural representations, attributing human behaviours and characteristics to the pig, particularly infused the perception of children and shaped their ideas and fondness for the animal. Contemporary studies on children’s relationship with animals explain how children can form very close, sympathetic relationships with animals. However, this relationship is complex, as psychologists have examined how when children interact with and view animals, they can sympathize with the animal, as well as torment or perform acts of cruelty. This subject has recently been explored by scholars Gene Myers and Frank R. Ascione. Meyers explains that, for children, the agency of the animal is important to forming an empathetic attachment as they recognize that the animal,
like themselves, can initiate action. Also, children can easily form relationships with symbolic animals, such as stuffed toys or animated characters.

The oral history and memoir sources reveal details of the relationship between children and the pigs killed by the farmers on butchering day, which indicates that children formed both attached relationships and sensitivity to the animals, but also detachment to the act of butchering. The testimonies by Helen Demerling and Harry Barrett reveal that as children they were uncomfortable with the act of “killing the pig”. It is important to note that both testimonies are reflections from childhood, and therefore well after-the-fact, regarding how they and other children reacted toward the slaughtering of the animals. Demerling discussed how although the children were involved in the busy events of butchering day, if squeamish, they would not watch the farmers actually kill the animal. Instead those children would go upstairs in the house until the workers completed the killing. She explained how “the relatives would be asked in, and of course the pigs were, usually two, and they would be brought in from the barn, and the children of course would usually run into the bedroom and cover their ears so they wouldn’t hear the squealing of the pigs.” These children were therefore disturbed by the act of killing, and removed themselves from this event, but would actively participate and assist in the butchering that followed, once the animal was no longer living. As part of the learned behaviour, children were able to see the pig as pork after its death, although the act of killing the animal was still a moment where they empathized with the dying creature.

As a child of six, Harry Barrett experienced a traumatic incident when an elderly neighbour, named Davy Lampkin, attempted to kill one of the pigs they had raised from birth, and whom Barrett regarded as pets. When Davy placed his gun to the head of the pig, Barrett started to view the pig in a different way- as remarkably human in its facial features. He
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explained that “[the pig] looked at me in such a trusting fashion, the fact suddenly registered that pigs eyes and eyelids really are identical in structure to our own, and he took on an almost human dimension in my mind, one that had not occurred before.”\textsuperscript{317} This description of the eyes of pigs is remarkably different than the one presented in \textit{Swine Husbandry in Canada}. According to the bulletin, the eye of the pig, depending on its temperament, could either be sunken and dull, wild and flashing, or bright and placid, but it did not discuss the eyes as humanlike.\textsuperscript{318} To Harry Barrett however, anthropomorphizing pigs as a child was not difficult. He further explained that they looked at him and Davy in a friendly manner and approached them calmly before Davy shot, hitting one pig in the ear instead of head, causing chaos and screams from the animals. This event significantly traumatized Barrett, who experienced subsequent nightmares as a child. In his nightmares, Barrett saw himself in place of the pig, with Davy Lampkin pointing his .38 Smith and Wesson revolver directly at him. He vividly described this vision, stating, “I seemed to be able to see right inside the ominous black barrel to the rounded nose of the grey leaden bullet just waiting for me there. I had come bolt upright, screaming just in time to save myself from instant death.”\textsuperscript{319} Barrett’s experience demonstrates empathy with the animal, and his ability as a child to place himself in the metaphorical hooves of the pig.

In contrast to this experience, Barrett also discussed the morbid fascination he and his friends had over the deconstruction of the animal’s body, once the animal was no longer living. In particular, children waited for the removal of the bladder because it “served as an excellent football.”\textsuperscript{320} The Reuben Sallows photograph (Figure 3.5) featured a man inflating the pig’s
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bladder, which Barrett described as having a “grey-white translucent appearance.”

Barrett related how when the local butcher Wilbur Ryerse was a child, he became knowledgeable of all the cuts of meat from attending butchering events. Wilbur taught other children his age what the different cuts were, and practiced on smaller animals, such as rats and mice. Children also had to learn which animals were appropriate for slaughter, and the correct moment for killing animals. For example, George Holmwood recorded in his diary on 5 July 1889, “finished plough for rape Gibbie raking hay good boy Georgie bad he killed a duck X”. Whether the duck was wild or domesticated, regardless, Georgie killed an animal at an inappropriate moment, according to Holmwood. It is possible young Georgie had confusion regarding the rules of animal stewardship, and learning the correct methods and timing when killing and butchering an animal would have been an essential component to his upbringing on the farm.

Children raised on Southern Ontario farmers were therefore taught to view pigs both as living creatures, as well as objects that could be deconstructed for human use. Their sensitivity to pigs was dependent upon their regard and attachment to the animal as a pet, as well as the degree of familiarity with the acts of butchering and killing the animal. Popular cultural images in the Edwardian period of human/animal relationships otherwise emphasised the sentimentality of children towards pigs, primarily adorable piglets. These images rarely demonstrated children’s involvement in the more gruesome act of butchering animals. Reuben Sallows often featured cute baby animals with children. For example, the image below, “Little Boy Bottle Feeding Piglet” from 1920 is a typical example of this image, whereby a small child, inappropriately
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dressed in his nicest attire, hand fed a small piglet (Figure 3.6).

![Figure 3.6: Reuben Sallows, “Little Boy Bottle Feeding Piglet”, 1920. The Reuben Sallows Digital Library, www.sallowsgallery.ca.](image)

This sentimental image also applied to women. Like the milk maids tending lovingly to their cows, Sallows captured images of women hand feeding their pigs. An excellent example is “Feeding Pig” from 1906, where a young woman tenderly hand-fed the smallest pig in a litter, while surrounded by the sow and other piglets (Figure 3.7). Again, these images were clearly staged by Sallows to appeal to his audience, presenting an idyllic pastoral image of rural life that was meant to attract urban attention to the countryside.

![Figure 3.7: Reuben Sallows, “Feeding Pig,” 1906. The Reuben Sallows Digital Library, www.sallowsgallery.ca.](image)
In keeping with the sentimental theme of children’s love for animals, Sallows also exaggerated the sensitivity of children to the act of killing animals. In the photograph “Killing the Turkey” from 1912, Sallows deliberately placed a small girl in the scene, shielding her eyes from the event (Figure 3.8). This was clearly staged, as Helen Demerling explained, children were more likely to be absent from the scene if killing the animal disturbed them.

Figure 3.8: Reuben Sallows, “Killing the Turkey”, 1912. The Reuben Sallows Digital Library, www.sallowsgallery.ca.

Lynn Campbell discussed the staging of this photo as being not only an emphasis on the sentimentality of children for animals, but also as a “sight gag”. These were carefully staged photographs which formed a visible joke. Sallows released the photograph during the First World War with the caption “Turkey and the Allies.”323 The carefully chosen title was intended to add to humour the photograph, in this case ‘turkey’s ally’ being the sentimental little girl. Peter McArthur also added humour regarding his contribution to the war effort, which was his anticipation for turning Beatrice into patriotic bacon. The conclusion to McArthur’s chapter on pigs in The Red Cow and Her Friends went as follows:

---

Beatrice has also made a couple of sudden raids on the border of flowers beside the lawn, and managed to get a few bulbs—whereat much lamentation. Really, it will be a relief when she finally goes into retirement in a pen to prepare her for doing her bit on some Allied breakfast table. But her family is still at the lovable stage.\textsuperscript{324}

While McArthur jokingly anticipated Beatrice’s departure to the slaughterhouse to become bacon for the war effort, he never actually recorded this event in \textit{The Red Cow and Her Friends}. Some of his readers, both children and adults, may have found this too distressing (Figure 3.9).

In the early twentieth century, the process of slaughtering a hog in rural Ontario was extremely labour intensive, but largely nonindustrial and unspecialized.\textsuperscript{325} Farmers had the assistance of their neighbours to successfully slaughter their own pigs on their farms, while some shipped their animals to nearby slaughterhouses or abattoirs. As Harry Barrett explained, hogs from Woodhouse Township could be shipped to either the Hamilton or Toronto Stock Yards, and many hogs eventually “found their way” to the Schneider’s Plant in Kitchener.\textsuperscript{326}

\textbf{Figure 3.97: Sketch of a Smiling Pig from Peter McArthur’s \textit{The Red Cow and Her Friends} (New York: John Lane Company, 1919), 116.}
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Conclusion

Southern Ontario farmers’ relationships with their pigs were impersonal and detached as they raised these meat-producing animals for short periods on the farm. They did not invest in giving the animals’ names, but rather recorded buying and selling their pigs in a similar manner to other farm commodities. Raising pigs into commodities seemed a learned behaviour for farmers, but caused confusion in their childhood when they empathized with the living animals. Children had to learn the socio-cultural norms regarding which species of animals were or were not suitable for killing, as well as the proper time and techniques for slaughter. Although adorable as piglets, the natural behaviours of pigs seemed to contribute to the concerned detachment farmers developed for these animals, whose agency often caused destruction of property and more work for the farmer. Because of the nature of their mixed farming practices, smaller numbers of hogs raised for meat meant farmers experienced moments witnessing the ‘piggish’ personality, agency and behaviours of their meat producing animals, which altered as hog farming became an intensified, industrial process.

The early twentieth century initiatives by the CDA and CFB promoted a growth in both quantity and quality of bacon hogs in Canada. These enterprises led to the development of modern meat in Canada, with large scale industrial farming and genetically ‘improved’ hog breeding. In 2008, advancements to Brandon, Manitoba’s state-of-the-art hog processing plant, owned by Maple Leaf Foods, enabled its 2,350 employees to slaughter 4.5 million hogs per year.\(^{327}\) The relationships formed between the workers and animals in these spaces reflect Wilkie’s concept of detached detachment, as the animals are transformed completely into units of mass production. Although small scale practices still exist in Canada, hog mega-barns, also

known as Intensive Livestock Operations, dominate the market, forcing many family farms out of business. The hogs produced in these operations need to be uniform and predictable, with all variables as controlled as possible. This leaves less room for ‘piggish’ behaviours, especially for sows confined to farrowing crates; they are not permitted to socialize or root as their lives need to be structured to accommodate the control of production.

As Brett Mizelle observes, paradoxically the more pigs that are produced globally, the less we see of them. Perhaps this is the reason humans continue to imagine the loveable pig, whether in the form of Babe, Olivia, or Miss Piggy. Idealized conceptions of human/animal relationships, similar to the creations by Reuben Sallows in the early twentieth century, continue to provide the much needed counterbalance, or disguise, to the often discomforting twenty-first century reality that the mass production of sentient, intelligent beings satisfies our taste for Canadian bacon.
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**Pragmatic Consumerism: Human/Farm Animal Relationships into the Twenty-First Century**

This investigation’s application of contemporary sociological work on human/animal relationships to a historical context is part of a new interdisciplinary approach to animal studies that is still in its infancy. Interdisciplinary research is growing as a tool for better understanding the role of animals as historical actors, as well as defining the complexities of human relationships with non-human beings. These approaches include utilizing not only rural sociology, but also animal behaviour science, cultural anthropology, and anthrozoology.\(^{332}\) For studying animals in historical settings, historians only have traces to work with and therefore interdisciplinary approaches can provide a means toward a more complete comprehension of the lives of animals historically.

For this investigation, Rhoda Wilkie’s sociological method provided a framework for analysing and understanding human/farm animal relationships in early twentieth century Southern Ontario. By examining the animal trace via recordings from the farmers’ diaries, along with the application of Wilkie’s method, variations in the relationships farmers formed with different animal species can be more clearly defined and understood. This thesis pushed Wilkie’s framework further, as compared to contemporary studies, the early twentieth century as a context for evaluation is unique due to the nature of the mixed family farm. The relationships between these farmers and their animals did not enter into Wilkie’s concept of detached detachment. This phenomenon exists in modern industrial farming, where human contact with the individual animal is often so far removed that the production transforms animals from living beings into masses of numbers and units. Wilkie’s work involved interviews with farmers on specialized

practices, whereby they negotiated relationships with only one animal species. On mixed farming practices, Southern Ontario farmers had the task of simultaneously forming a variety of relationships with many different species of non-human animals. They had to adapt their relationships with animals based on whether they raised that species for meat, non-meat food products, or labour. They adopted pragmatic stewardship of their animals, negotiating their attachments and relationships based on how they used the animals, the cultural and historical values that had long defined the purpose of the animal, the farmer’s personality, and the longevity of the animal on the farm. Farmers’ negotiation of each human/animal relationship would have been a learned behaviour and an essential component of growing up on a mixed farm.

Farmers developed partnered relationships with their horses, animals raised as workers and labourers. These ranged from attached attachment to concerned attachment. Fundamentally, farmers recognized these animals as individuals, participating in the practical and emotional investment of giving their horses informal, personal names. With cattle, these relationships naturally became more ambiguous because of their dual purpose. The farmers were more likely to form a concerned attachment for the dairy and breeding cattle they worked with for longer periods of time on the farm. The beef cattle raised specifically for meat fell into the same category as pigs, as farmers’ relationships with the meat-producing animal were anonymous and impersonal. They formed a concerned detachment with their pigs and beef cattle, raising the animals with care, but avoiding recognition of the animals as individuals. They kept these animals at an emotional distance, raising them for market, sale, or slaughter in a short period on the farm. However, the nature of pragmatic stewardship on the early twentieth century mixed farm meant that farmers experienced moments where animal agency or personality confronted
them. These behaviours either aided the farmer and improved the attachment, as with horses, or negated the farmer’s attempts to control these living beings, creating greater detachment, as with pigs. The farmers did not exaggerate their accounts of animal behaviour, but rather the self-direction of the living beings they raised became part of the daily reflections these farmers observed as they interacted with their livestock.

Early twentieth century Southern Ontario acts as an effective case study of the many ways humans simultaneously form contradictory relationships and values for different species, as well as at times the same animal species. From the government documents, although occasionally demonstrating recognition of the caregiving aspects of farming culture, it is evident they emphasized the transformation of animals into more efficient machines. Animals needed to become units that formed part of production; a biological technology that could be molded and manipulated for the mechanical, fast-paced farming of food, meat and non-meat products. In stark contradiction, farm animals also fulfilled a sentimental, idealistic imagining of rural life. Horses, though biological machines, also fell into the same category as dogs, cats, and pets in the early twentieth century, whereby it was culturally accepted that humans were capable of affection for these animals. Dairy cattle needed to be carefully handled by farmers, while increasingly bred to be the best possible biomechanical producers of milk. At the same time, they were also romanticized as feminine pets based on nostalgia for women’s involvement in dairy production. Adorable piglets that made loving companions for children were also anonymous, belligerent animals that needed to be transformed into quality producers of bacon and pork. The role of pigs for the Canadian economy was to reach their market weight as efficiently as possible for slaughter and human consumption.
For farmers, the slaughter and death of their animals was ideally under their control. There was a time and a place for when an animal was to be slaughtered or sold, and farmers decided when an animal’s time was up. From the animal trace recorded in the diaries, animal agency and self-direction on the farm meant that farmers were not always in control of the animals’ daily movement, as well as deaths. Accidental deaths were not only a lost investment, but this undermined the efforts of farmers as stewards and caregivers of their animals. Farmers had a time, place, and method regarding when, how, and what species of animal needed to be killed or slaughtered. When George Holmwood’s son killed a duck, this was an inappropriate and wrong occasion to kill an animal. In Gordon Eby’s diary, slaughtering dogs was seen as farcical and ridiculous compared to the slaughter of their pigs. In Harry Barrett’s memoir, he viewed the shooting of a pig as an inhumane method for killing these animals, while cutting the carotid artery was humane. The negotiation of when and how to kill animals was as much a part of farmers’ pragmatic stewardship as the relationships they formed with the living animal.

As the development of modern meat in Canada increased throughout the twentieth century, so did the need for greater control of food animals. However, a reality of mass producing living beings as widgets in industrial farming practices, via the same high speed production as inanimate objects, is that as precision and uniformity becomes increasingly more critical, this control over killing the animal is not always possible. For example, industrial turkey and poultry hatcheries in contemporary Ontario kill young male birds by gassing, as they are not as valuable as females to the industry. Salthaven Wildlife Rehabilitation Centre in Mount Brydges, Ontario, receives bags of these dead birds from a local hatchery to feed rehabilitated carnivores, such as foxes. In June 2012, a worker at the centre unexpectedly found a live chick among the bag of dead male birds. The worker rescued the turkey and raised him for two
months, giving him the name Plucky, before taking him to live at the Cedar Row Farm Sanctuary outside of Stratford. A problem with many rescued farm animals is that due to the advancements in biotechnology and genetic breeding throughout the twentieth century, they grow to their desired weight and size very quickly for maximum efficiency. If they live longer than their market weight, often their bodies are not strong enough to handle their size. Plucky died at the Cedar Row Sanctuary in October 2013. He lived a total of fourteen months, surpassing his market age by eight to nine months. While Plucky’s survival story and personality as a curious, social bird, has been applauded and documented by the Toronto Star, he stands out in the commercial production of livestock as a unique individual. Apart from those that have a distinguished their place at farm sanctuaries, or in some other fashion, the turkeys, pigs, cattle and livestock raised on industrial farms for meat and non-meat products fundamentally remain anonymous units.

Many Canadians in the twenty-first century are increasingly removed and disconnected from the sources of their food. For some, not knowing can be preferred, as the distance allows for a contented consumption of the animal product. When the hidden production of animals within industrial farms becomes public, in many cases, outrage ensues. Along with news articles documenting stories like Plucky, documentaries have recently emerged demonstrating horrific cases of animal abuse at industrial farms. For example, a recent W5 report aired undercover footage from a Manitoba hog farm, owned by the Puratone Corporation that supplies pork for Maple Leaf Foods. This footage was extremely disturbing, revealing images of hogs with open sores, confining crates, and piglets euthanized by being slammed against concrete.

---

Recognition of food animals as living beings that experience suffering for our appetites can create a moral dilemma for many humans. Some Canadians choose to deal with these problems by purchasing their meat and non-meat animal products locally from smaller, organic farms. Some choose to avoid animal products altogether. However, for some North Americans, ignorance or apathy regarding where our modern meat and non-meat animal products come from, while simultaneously reimagining the sentimental human/animal relationship, consequently becomes the pragmatic consumer choice.

Despite this growth in the industrial farming of animals, humans still have the want and need to be humanitarians, and be compassionate toward animals. Our confusion surrounds the fact that animals fulfill so many paradoxical human needs and requirements. Animals provide us with food, clothing, entertainment, and companionship, as well as humour and sentiment within our cultural imagination. Philosopher Gary Francione defines the human struggle to make sense of the conflicting ways we value animals as our “moral schizophrenia.” We are just not sure how to look at animals, how to understand our relationships with them, or how to treat them. Whether they are sentient beings that deserve rights, our property that we can do with as we please, with or without concern for their welfare, or whether they are members of our families, are questions that humans are still trying to negotiate into the twenty-first century.

---

335 Susan Jones, 154. Jones states that this was a fundamental role of veterinarians in the twentieth century, as they fronted the movement to help North Americans balance their use of animals for food with their humanitarian needs with the growth of pet ownership and companion animals.
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