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Abstract
Over the course of the twentieth century, the number of productive nonhuman animals (livestock and poultry) in Australian cities declined dramatically. This decline resulted—at least in part—from an imaginative geography, in which productive animals were deemed inappropriate occupants of urban spaces. A class-based prioritization of amenity, privacy, order, and the protection of real property values—as well as a gender order within which animal-keeping was not recognized as a legitimate economic activity for women—shaped this imaginative geography of animals that found its most critical expression in local government regulations. However, there were different imaginative geographies among women and men—mostly those from the working class—whose emotional and economic relationships with productive animals led them to advocate for those animals as legitimate and desirable urban inhabitants.
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Introduction
Nineteenth-century Australian cities were teeming with nonhuman animal life: Horses ruled the streets by day; rats, the wharves by night. Dairy cattle roamed the suburbs, and foxes prowled around backyard poultry coops. The hordes of resident animals provided the human residents of cities with much of their milk and egg requirements—less of their meat—as well as hides, glue, tallow, and fertilizer. They were an important component of transport systems, occasional disease vectors, and generators of dust and noise. When the livestock of the Perth and Fremantle Magisterial districts were counted in 1891, they included more than 28 372 fowls, 4192 ducks, 252 geese, and 237 turkeys. In 1895, even in the more densely populated Sydney metropolitan police district, there resided 7192 sheep, 1154 goats, 5560 swine, 7318 dairy cows, and 16 922 horses. By the late twentieth century, however, few of these productive animals remained.
Delamere's Dairy and the Dynamics of Decline

In accounting for, and exploring the dynamics of, this decline, I want to start with a story from Perth, an isolated city on the west coast of Australia. Perth had been a sleepy backwater until the 1890s when the discovery of gold saw the human population more than quadruple, reaching 67,431 in 1901. My story begins around 1905 when one Thomas Delamere put down a deposit on a nice suburban bushland lot on Cambridge Street, named after the English University, but at Delamere's end a lonely road extending to the outer limits of suburban development. Delamere saw the place as ideal for a dairy, being located near both the Jolimont Swamps, that would provide water, year-round feed for cattle, and a road that would connect him to customers in Perth. In the next few decades, the population of Perth increased. By 1921, the small city and its spreading, low-density suburbs were home to 154,873 people—mostly housed in detached, single-family cottages or bungalows on generous-sized lots close to train or tram routes. This suburban settlement soon extended to the vicinity of Delamere’s dairy, and that’s when trouble started. In 1928, B. Caporn, secretary of the Wembley Park Progress Association, sent a letter—not for the first time—to the Perth City Council. He wrote that

Residents of the west end of this district are viewing with alarm the approaching summer & the relationship it bears to the discomfort of the household & the wife in particular, through the dust nuisance caused by the dairy herd in Cambridge St.

Chief Health Inspector Higgs responded that Council officers had observed the operation of the dairy and had found all such complaints unfounded. He concluded that “The law will not allow us to refuse a license for this or any Dairy on this Complaint.” The Council with—one senses—a touch of frustration, instructed Higgs to look harder. He did and still found nothing of which to complain. Caporn was informed of the outcome.

There the matter seemed to rest until 1931, when Caporn again wrote to the Council, flatly stating that “The progress of the district will be retarded until such time as this dairy is removed.” Higgs remained firm, reiterating his earlier opinion that there was no nuisance and that Delamere was entitled to a license under the law. Unimpressed, the Progress Association engaged Northmore, Hale, Davy & Leake, Solicitors, to review the Inspector’s ruling; however, they concurred with it entirely. Caporn pressed the Council to take the matter further, asserting that “Members feel that the position cannot be left at this, and have such an eyesore in their midst forever and a day.” The Council, faced with the indisputable legality of the dairy, yet clearly sympathetic to the Progress
Association’s position, agreed to take the matter to the Minister for Health, asking him to “introduce an amendment to the Health Act..., to give the Council power to order the removal of any dairy whenever they deem it advisable to do so.” The Minister was responsive, introducing the amendment into the Legislative Council in 1932. In the vigorous debate that ensued, dairies were characterized variously as a “menace to health,” a pest (or menace to amenity), and an impediment to the development of “progressive” residential districts where property values are preserved and rates are paid. In the end, however, the amendment was defeated by one vote, primarily as the question of compensation could not be resolved. Chief Inspector Higgs, asked to comment on the matter in October 1932, concluded that

So far as I have been able to discover the only real reason why the people of Wembley desire the closing of this dairy is that the buildings etc are not in keeping with the more modern houses erected in the vicinity of same.

Five years later, 35 signatories to a petition presented to Council were still expressing their dissatisfaction with the dairy’s location “in the centre of a very large and progressive suburb... surrounded by villa residences.”

Still hoping to get rid of Delamere and his 60 or so cows, the Council looked to town-planning legislation but found to their great disappointment that pre-existing uses were allowed. They asked the Milk Board to deny Delamere a license, but their request was refused. They had Delamere’s dairy valued with a view to resumption but could not afford to buy the land, let alone compensate him for his loss of business. They thought a “word in his ear” might do some good, but Delamere held firm. Meanwhile, individual residents complained of trampled gardens, noise, and manure on the roads. In 1944, the Wembley branch of the Australian Labor Party (ALP) wrote to add its voice to those opposing the dairy (an interesting development given that in other contexts the ALP lobbied on behalf of cow keepers (Keely, 1991); in 1945, the conservative Leederville-Wembley Returned Services League also lodged a complaint. In 1947, when the file ends, Delamere was still there, though it was not long before he retired and the dairy was sold.

Archived local government files are filled with similar stories of conflict over suburban productive animals, though Delamere’s is exceptional in its longevity. Mostly, Councils were able to rely on a growing body of by-laws in support of their demands that animal keepers control, dispose of, or pay fees for, their animals within a matter of days. The decline of productive animals in Australian cities and suburbs over the twentieth century had multiple causes, including women’s increasing participation in the paid workforce (leaving them less time...
or—in some cases—need to care for livestock at home. Also significant was the development of refrigeration and transport technologies that made it more viable for commercial dairies to be located away from cities—though, as Atkins (1977) has shown for the city of London, the transition from local to railway milk was by no means a straightforward or uncontested one. However, local government by-laws that prohibited, limited, or charged fees for the licensing of animals appear to have been a significant factor in their decline. How, then, are we to understand these by-laws? And what can the historical sources arising from their creation and enforcement tell us about relationships between people and animals in twentieth-century Australian suburbs?

**Critical Perspectives**

Wolch and Emel (1995) have identified some established, critical perspectives that might be deployed in accounting for animal exclusions and absences. One of these involves a view of urbanization as a process aligned with culture over nature that “aims at a human distanciation from nonhumans via bricks and mortar, concrete and asphalt, zoning and regulation.” (Wolch & Emel, 1995, p. 632). Similarly, Philo (1995, p. 677), looking at nineteenth-century London, has identified a range of discourses associated with what he calls an “antianimal agenda” that over time saw animals such as pigs and cattle encoded as “impure, polluting, disruptive, and discomforting occupants of city spaces” and, therefore, excluded. Philo (p. 666) also argues that, in seeking to explain the exclusion of livestock from cities, we must consider the effects of the “long-term splitting apart of the urban and the rural as distinctive entities conceptually associated with particular human activities and attributes [the industrial and civilized city, the agricultural and barbarian countryside].” This split, he suggests, has led to the envisioning of animals in a binary way, with some (such as dogs and cats) valued as elements of the urban world and others (such as cows and pigs) consigned to the “rural,” thus deemed out-of-place in the city.

Although these approaches hold considerable explanatory power in relation to the promulgation of by-laws and attempts to otherwise control or exclude productive animals, they tend to imply a generalized human interest in achieving distance from, and control over, animals that does not account for conflict over the keeping of livestock, evident in the story of Delamere’s dairy and others like it. Although some in positions of power wanted productive animals banished to rural farms, many suburban residents and workers saw them as appropriate occupants of urban spaces and wanted them to stay. These divergent views on animals in suburbia involved conflicting imaginative geographies: a phrase that Philo and Wilbert (2000) borrow from Said (1978) to describe the mental mapping of animals in space, based on understandings of the characteristics of animals and
their desirable proximity to humans. In twentieth-century Australian cities, imaginative geographies of productive animals were shaped by a range of factors, not least of which were class location and gender.

In 1917, as Sir Arthur Stanley, the Governor of Victoria, was enjoying fresh milk and eggs from the cattle and poultry at Government House in Malvern, Mrs. Mitchell of suburban South Fremantle was writing to her local Council to complain that "A Mrs Smith about 4 houses above me owns several goats which jump my front fence and destroy [sic.] everything." Clearly, in the first decades of the twentieth century, animals were kept by—or on behalf of—people from all social classes. However, right up to the 1970s, the keeping of productive animals was predominantly a working-class pursuit. The bulk of the early twentieth-century correspondence relating to productive animals that is now preserved in Council archives involves working-class animal keepers. One of the earliest sources of quantitative data on suburban animal keeping, the 1941 Melbourne University Social Survey, suggests that households with a breadwinner in an unskilled, working-class occupation were almost twice as likely to keep animals or poultry as were middle-class households. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that we find a range of class-based interests and values coming into conflict over animal keeping.

Historical studies of urban livestock in other English-speaking contexts also point to class as a relevant factor in the persistence of urban productive animals. For example, livestock were less subject to regulation and thus remained for much longer in the poorer parts and outskirts of British cities (Atkins, 1977). Attempts to regulate livestock in New York City prior to the 1850s were also contested along class (and ethnic) lines (Tremante, 2000). In Brooklyn, such conflicts were settled more by economic forces than by social consensus, as dairying was pushed out by rising land values and the decline of the distillery industry from which much animal feed was drawn—though Tremante argues that "Victorian standards of propriety" were also central to the process of exclusion. In Australian cities, dominated by low-density suburban settlement that was at least potentially accommodating of livestock, conflict over livestock continued well into the twentieth century.

**Shaping the Suburban Landscape**

In Australia, there appear to have been four areas in which the keeping of productive animals fell foul of the middle class, who were able to exercise their influence—at local government level and beyond—to regulate, and often banish altogether, the four-legged and feathered denizens of suburban dairies and working-class backyards.
Wandering stock were doubtless a nuisance to gardeners such as Mr. Dunn, a resident of the elevated part of East Perth, who wrote to his Council in 1911 to complain that

there are cows roaming about this neighbourhood daily causing a great deal of annoyance, by stretching their necks over the fences and breaking off ornamental trees & creepers which in My case have taken about 4 yrs to rear & which have cost a good deal of money & labor [sic] to bring to their present state of perfection.8

However, the capacity of animals to trample gardens, damage or destroy newly planted trees (especially street trees), and generate dust and manure took on an added layer of significance from the early years of the twentieth century, as an increasingly influential technical and managerial middle class put forward determinist arguments for the improvement of urban environments. The same sensibilities that sought slum clearance and playgrounds for city children saw steps taken to exclude large animals. Indeed, Minimum Allotments (1912, p. iv) explicitly associated goat-keeping with “the slum mode of living.” In the context of the belief that the quality of the landscape shaped the character of those who lived in it, animals’ impact on that landscape was seen not only as a costly nuisance to gardeners but also as a potential threat to human health and morality. Reform-oriented, middle-class residents therefore attempted to ensure that the landscape was shaped according to their desires and expectations, rather than the apparently chaotic activities of goats and cows.

Privacy, Order, and Amenity

Relatedly, animal keeping challenged dominant, middle-class expectations regarding privacy and order. In the middle-class suburban ideal, which had roots in the late eighteenth-century evangelical revival, homes were to be private places. In Australia, this was reflected in the preference for single-family, detached housing, with fencing on three (or often four) sides of the property. Where animals, or their sounds and smells, crossed property boundaries, this actual or perceived privacy was invaded. Large animals, who required more room and were more liable to escape and stray onto nearby properties, therefore became problematic, as did poultry in the higher-density areas.

The efficacy of zoning, as a tool for the production and maintenance of discrete, homogeneous, controllable communities (Huxley, 1994)—in this case private, modern, residential ones—was also threatened by productive animals. Wandering animals at least potentially threatened the privacy of suburban lots.
In addition, as commercial operations, dairies disrupted the middle-class attempt to create suburbs that were homogeneously private, if not completely feminized, “havens” from the world of work. As we have seen, zoning was able to prevent establishment of dairies in residential areas; however, in inter-war Perth at least, it could not eliminate pre-existing, non-conforming uses—a source of some frustration for the Council.

Finally, “pleasant” environments devoid of dusty dairies and ruinous goats protected property values, which interested land owners generally and Municipal Councillors as both land owners and rate collectors. The promulgation of by-laws controlling or excluding certain kinds of animal therefore goes beyond legitimate concerns for public health—as Inspector Higgs’ comments would suggest. Although animals could play a role in the transmission of disease, particularly where they were poorly fed or housed, on the whole their presence posed little threat to human health. Rather, as I have shown, regulation primarily reflected a middle-class understanding of productive animals as unruly, destructive, and therefore incompatible with their vision of suburbs as pleasant, private, and orderly places.

**Goats and Gender Roles**

In some conflicts over productive animals, gender appears to have been a significant factor. In Perth, around the time of World War I, complaints about wandering goats damaging street trees and gardens became reasonably common. Almost all complaints involved a female goat keeper. As it is unlikely that men were better at restraining their goats than were women, this suggests that goat-keeping was a highly feminized activity in suburban areas. Local councils across Australia appear to have taken complaints about goats very seriously. In 1905, for example, the ranger at Oakleigh, in outer suburban Melbourne, was instructed to shoot geese and goats at large in the town (Keely, 1991); A memo from the Fremantle Town Clerk to the Health Inspector in 1916 issued similar instructions. Later correspondence, however, reveals that, in practice, the Inspector in Fremantle issued warnings instead, as it was “difficult to get anyone to shoot goats”—a reflection perhaps on prevailing urban sensibilities and the animals’ ambiguous status as both food-producers and companion animals. Complainants were instead advised that maintaining their fences would be their best defense.

The Perth City Council took a different approach, attempting in 1918 to reduce goat numbers by charging a license fee of 5 shillings a head. Several goat keepers—most of whom were women—protested. They argued that their goats
were securely yarded or tethered and, moreover, that goat keeping was the only means by which they could reliably acquire, keep without refrigeration, and—perhaps most critically—afford sufficient fresh milk for their children. In a petition sent to the Council by a local goat keeper, Mrs. Phillips, the fee was characterized as a “manifest injustice… to infant life, seeing that most people would have to dispose of their goats because of their inability to pay the fee.” However, there was no legitimate place for subsistence food production in official views of social welfare. Following the 1907 “Harvester” judgment of Justice Higgins of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, the welfare of Australian families was to be secured through the mechanism of a “family wage” for males. Unfortunately, this system did not provide for all: Women were deemed “dependents” and thus not eligible for the “family wage,” and not all men had full-time jobs. Council, however, was indifferent to this fact, apparently believing that male breadwinners should provide for their families and that goats should remain in the country. As a strategy to reduce the number of goats kept, the license fee appears to have been effective: In 1916, the Statistical Register recorded 541 goats in the city; by 1929, there were only 174.

**Intensified Efforts**

In the 1950s and 1960s, in the context of an economic boom and burgeoning consumer culture, attempts to remove large animals from suburban areas intensified. The rhetoric of “progress” and “modernity”—already present in the conflict over Delamere’s dairy—became increasingly prominent. In 1959, Hepworth, the Perth Road Board member for Scarborough, attempted to have the keeping of horses prohibited within 100 feet of a dwelling instead of the 20 feet allowed at that time because, “keeping horses ought to be discouraged in a modern community” (p. 2). Hepworth’s bid for change was unsuccessful; yet, only three years later, the Western Australian Health Department produced model by-laws that not only greatly increased allowable distances between large animals and dwellings but also specified minimum requirements for poultry housing and a 5-shilling registration fee for poultry keepers. Commissioner of Public Health Davidson said of the changes:

> It is thought that the expense of making poultry pens comply with the new by-laws will discourage people from keeping poultry in their backyards… A second reason is the noise nuisance. Local authorities may want to specify areas where poultry may not be kept so there will be no disturbance. (“Registration for poultry, pigeons,” 1963, p. 1)
These model by-laws were clearly developed with the intent of reducing the number of suburban horses and poultry, in line with a vision of orderly, quiet, and (importantly) “modern” suburbs. As Huxley (1985) has pointed out, by limiting or discouraging production on suburban lots, they also supported the consumerist trend toward meeting household needs through purchase rather than self supply (although it should be remembered that, throughout this period, fruit and vegetable production remained popular). People living in Perth at this time recall that from the mid-1960s there was a decline in the number of poultry kept. Council regulations, in the context of decreasing block sizes, were identified as a critical factor by L. Brown, N. Fitzpatrick, and T. Blakers (personal communication, January 14, 1999) and by McNamara (1998). One resident got rid of his fowls because the distances between fences, buildings, and poultry enclosures specified in the new by-laws meant that he would have had to put “an enclosure in the middle of the yard!” (C. Wilson, personal communication, September 22, 1998).

Wilson regretted the restrictions, but many actively resisted them: the Perth goat keepers, with little success; Delamere, to good effect. In 1938, cow keepers in the outer Melbourne suburb of Oakleigh also mobilized in opposition to an announcement by the local Council that it intended to prohibit cows in most of the city. The president of the Oakleigh State Electoral Council of the ALP, Mr. J. Creed, objected to the change because it would mean that instead of relying on their own cows for their milk, cow keepers and their families—an estimated 250 people—“would be thrown on to the dairymen, who in turn is at the mercy of the Milk board” (Keely, 1991, pp.103, 104). When the Oakleigh Council met on July 8, a large crowd of cow keepers turned out to protest against the by-law, and the motion was defeated. The Council and cow keepers must have watched each other warily because, when the issue appeared on subsequent agendas, crowds of cow keepers turned out in protest—along with police to keep order. By the end of the year, the by-law was applied in only a small part of the City; it would be 1952 before cows were excluded entirely.

**Explaining Resistance to Exclusion of Productive Animals**

What motivated these suburban residents to resist attempts at exclusion of productive animals? Did they do so for purely economic reasons? Or is there historical evidence of “pro-animal agendas” that has been overlooked? In the case of Delamere’s dairy, the voice of Delamere is absent from the flurries of correspondence that whirled around Council, legal, and parliamentary offices, though it would be reasonable to assume that his motivations were principally—or at least partly—commercial. But even in commercial dairies, attitudes to animals appear to have been not strictly instrumental: For example, at Kinsella’s dairy (located
near Delamere’s), all the cows were given names like Daisy, Rose, Magpie, and Strawberry; the young Irish cowherds called them to milk in order (Putt, 1991).

What, then, of the many non-commercial keepers of productive animals who resisted their exclusion from the suburbs? For some, the animals were a productive sideline that could supplement male wages or help to make up for their absence. Small-scale, unlicensed sale of milk was illegal but probably quite common, and self-provisioning could help to reduce food expenses. At a time when state income support was virtually non-existent, some low-income suburban residents were quite reliant on their animals: Certainly, in response to the imposition of the goat licensing fee in 1918, several Perth housewives argued that they relied on their goats to provide sufficient milk for their families. By 1925, some economically marginal Perth households were still struggling to hold on to their goats. Their number included one Mrs. Thomas, who wrote to the Council:

Re registering white goat of which must be paid by monday [sic]. I am a pensioner and my son being out of work I find it very hard to get along and I would like to ask you to allow me a little time to pay. I will send it along as soon as I can.15

In a rare display of forbearance, she was given three weeks to find the money. Men, too, could be reliant on their animals to make ends meet: When Mr J. Foley’s cow was impounded in Fremantle in 1914, he told the Council:

I feel sure it is not your desire to penalise a man for trying to provide pure food for a family of 7 depending solely on his earnings... I venture to think that from a local Health point of view that the family Cow should be encouraged in the suburbs and not penalized.”16

Like the female goat keepers, though with more success, Foley argued for fee-free animal keeping on the grounds of family responsibilities and health: His fees were refunded in full. Here, productive animals formed part of economic survival strategies centered around the home; they were therefore imagined as legitimate occupants of that domestic sphere, proximate to the humans with whom they existed—to some degree—in interdependent relationships.

In 1922, Foley’s cows were still being impounded; in writing once again to request a refund of pound fees, he portrayed cows as an appropriate part of the physical and moral landscape of the suburbs:

As you are aware there is [sic] a few Ratepayers in the suburbs still try and keep a cow or two for their own use and nature provides at certain seasons luxuriant feed and I think from a thrifty point of view these should be encouraged instead of been [sic] penalized although they may be in the minority. They are certainly producers.17
Such animals also, of course, had an important place in urban ecologies as sources of manure for gardening and recyclers of surplus grass and organic wastes. Many commercial dairy operations sold manure or used it for growing vegetables on site; stables were another important source of manure for urban gardens. Although some suburban residents—including opponents of Delamere’s dairy—complained about animals leaving manure on the roads, others would wait—shovel in hand—for delivery horses to pass and eagerly gather any “deposits” for the garden. T. White (personal communication, July 20, 1999) remembers that in the Melbourne suburb of Fairfield, as late as the 1940s, “People used to be really savage if they’d miss out on the droppings of the horse.” In an inversion of conventional, middle-class visions of the clean and efficient urban modernity, from which productive animals were to be excluded, productive animals are understood here as having a valuable role to play in opportunistic, local resource conversion.

However, relationships with productive animals were by no means all tied up with ecological opportunism or economic value. Though rarely captured in the documentary sources, there is some evidence of other satisfactions gained from such relationships—from the human side at least. Take Frances Warren’s family, who moved to Vermont, on the outskirts of Melbourne, in 1922. Frances’ father was on a basic wage, with four children and his wife’s father to support. On their large block, the family had fruit trees, berries, passionfruit, vegetables, poultry, bees, and a cow. They made ends meet by being largely self-sufficient in food. As well as being an economic activity, food production was an important part of the family’s involvement in community life: They shared the vegetable harvest with neighbors and gave milk to Frances’ aunt, who lived nearby and whose husband was out of work. However, their involvement with food-producing animals was also an emotional one. F. Warren (personal communication, July 12, 1999) recalls: “My Mother did the chooks, she loved her chooks and she’d go down and cackle with them . . . that was a great joy for her.” Similarly, Hungerford (1983), in his semi-autobiographical short stories, includes a description of his family’s house-cow as a friend and family member: “She’d been our cow most of my childhood, and we loved her nearly as much as we loved each other, I reckon” (p. 108). When Rinderpest was detected in suburban Bassendean in 1923, local people tried to hide their goats and cattle and wept when they were taken, shot, and burned (Carter, 1986, pp. 122, 123). The devotion of Chinese market gardeners to their horses was legendary. So whereas food-producing animals could be of significant economic importance for some suburban residents, the relationships between them were not purely—or always—determined by economic factors. Some keepers of productive animals understood them not just as resources but as conscious, interactive beings who were part of the complex
networks of emotional ties that also bound family members and pets together and, therefore, appropriate occupants of suburban domestic sites.

Conclusion

In twentieth-century Australian suburbs, patterns of interaction between people and productive animals were shaped by class location, gender identity, discourses of modernity, and the characteristics of the animals themselves. Certainly, there were those who sought to exclude such animals; in fact, they prevailed. However, it is important to acknowledge that there were also many people who—for various reasons—sought to retain productive animals around their suburban homes, who protected; cared for; and even loved them (although of course not all the animals were well treated). Productive animals may therefore be said to have occupied diverse positions within the imaginative geographies of the human residents of Australian cities, contingent on understandings—produced through discourses of class and (in particular) gender—of the domestic sphere, modernity, and the animals themselves, These informed efforts to exclude the animals from urban spaces, as well as resistance to those attempted exclusions. Today, about 5% of metropolitan households in Australia keep fowls, and it may be that the recent renaissance in home food production (Gaynor, 2006) is challenging and refiguring imaginative geographies in some quarters. Still, however, very few metropolitan households keep larger productive animals: Live cows and goats remain, for the middle-class majority, a satisfyingly picturesque distance from suburban homes—and dinner tables.

Notes

1. This paper draws on some material which is included in Andrea Gaynor (2006). Harvest of the suburbs: An environmental history of growing food in Australian cities. Crawley: University of Western Australia Press. It builds upon arguments presented there.

2. Requests for reprints should be sent to Andrea Gaynor, History M208, The University of Western Australia, 35 Stirling Highway, Crawley, WA 6009, AUSTRALIA. E-mail agaynor@arts.uwa.edu.au

3. Statistical Register of the Colony of Western Australia 1892; Statistical Register of New South Wales 1895. By way of comparison, in 1891 the human population of Perth and Fremantle Magisterial Districts was 16,694; and the population of the Sydney metropolitan area in 1895 was approximately 408,500 (both figures exclusive of at least part of the Indigenous population).

4. Here I use ‘productive animals’ as a shorthand to refer to animals (including birds) who produce goods or services valued by humans, including transport, meat, milk, and eggs. The term is undeniably problematic, for example because companion animals might be seen as rendering the service of companionship, and humans need not be the only species whose use of animal ‘products’
and 'services' could be acknowledged. Nonetheless, the term avoids the obvious difficulty with the use of the alternative, 'farm animals'.

5. The prodigious correspondence generated during this conflict is preserved at State Records Office of Western Australia (hereafter SROWA), Perth City Council, Acc 3054, Correspondence Files, no.300, 1953, Dairies—complaints re. 1925-1947.


7. In the survey sample encoded for Graeme Davison and John Lack at the University of Melbourne in 1980-81, 16% of all unskilled working class households, 12% of skilled working class households and 9% of middle class households were recorded as keeping poultry. Many thanks to John Lack for providing me with the codebook and flat files enabling analysis of this data.

8. SROWA, Perth City Council, Acc 3054, Correspondence Files, no.265, 1911, Stock straying in streets, letter from H.C. Dunn to Town Clerk, 12 November 1911.

9. Of course, this was a masculine myth, as much work—paid and unpaid—was done by women in the home.

10. See for example SROWA, Fremantle Municipal Council, Acc 1377, no.60, 1908, Goats; SROWA, Perth City Council, Acc 3054, Correspondence Files, no.123, 1918, Goats—licensing of.

11. SROWA, Fremantle Municipal Council, Acc 2790, no.20, 1913, Stray animals etc.


13. SROWA, Perth City Council, Acc 3054, Correspondence Files, no.123, 1918, Goats—licensing of; Petition from Mrs. J Phillips, on behalf of East Victoria Park residents to H.W. Bevilacqua, Esq, No. 8 Ward, City Council Chambers, Perth.


15. SROWA, Perth City Council, Acc 3054, Correspondence Files, no.123, 1918, Goats—licensing of, Letter to Town Clerk Bold from Mrs. Alma Thomas of Mt Hawthorn, 21 February 1925.

16. SROWA, Fremantle Municipal Council, Acc 2790, no.20, 1913, Stray animals etc., Letter from J Foley to the Mayor and Councillors [sic] Fremantle, 16 November 1914
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