

Noble Horse and Lazy Pig

Frank Westerman and Yvonne Kroonenberg in Quest of Domestic Animals

Lucie Sedláčková

Abstract

This chapter analyses the narratives constructed by two popular Dutch writers who undertook travels in search of rarely seen domestic animals: *Dier, bovendier* (2010; trans. *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse*, 2012) by Frank Westerman and *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt* (2009; Everything but the squeal is used) by Yvonne Kroonenberg. It investigates how domestic animals – Lipizzaner horses and Dutch farm pigs respectively – are represented and how their selective breeding and (mis)use are argued – both for, and against. The analysis utilises the framework of human-animal studies, including concepts from related domains (e.g., social psychology), such as animal welfare, animal rights, inherent value, animal labour, the erasure of animals, speciesism, carnism, cognitive dissonance, and the meat paradox.

Keywords: Animal rights, animal labour, speciesism, carnism, Lipizzaner horses, pigs

Today, in the era of extensive tourism, it is no longer difficult (or indeed particularly exclusive) to observe or even touch an elephant or other species of charismatic megafauna. In contrast, many other animals – those quite common in the lives of people until recently – have been erased from the everyday experience of the majority of contemporary Western urban humans. Therefore, even domestic animals have become interesting quest objects.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, two popular Dutch writers undertook travels in search of rarely seen domestic animals. However, their journeys had different motivations and aims. Between the years 2007 and 2009, the journalist and non-fiction writer Frank Westerman embarked on a quest across Central Europe (the former Habsburg monarchy), which was subsequently described in his travel book *Dier, bovendier* (2010, translated in English as *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse*, 2012). Westerman uses his examination of the history of the Lipizzaner horse as the backdrop for his reflections on the modern history of mankind. At approximately the same time, the psychologist and writer Yvonne Kroonenberg travelled through the Netherlands to give an up-to-date, prosaic, and, where possible, realistic

account of the situation of twelve million Dutch pigs in her book *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt: Biografie van een varken* (Everything but the squeal is used: Biography of a pig, 2009).¹

These two works were chosen as they focus on two radically different kinds of domestic animals. One is a unique breed of individuals with a highly regarded pedigree, the other an enormous mass of anonymous livestock used as a food industry resource. This chapter investigates how domestic animals – Lipizzaner horses and Dutch farm pigs – are represented and how their selective breeding and (mis)use are argued, both for and against. To what extent and on what grounds are they anthropomorphised or objectified by the narrators and their guides? Considering the different status of these two animals, are there corresponding differences in the representations? As neither text is a travel narrative in the traditional sense as characterised by Leane, it will be important to consider, not only the specific aims of their two narrators, but also to explore the role played by the animals themselves. In answering these questions, it will be useful to examine the discourses that are employed by the narrators and their guides. The analysis will also utilise the framework of human-animal studies, including concepts from related domains (e.g., social psychology), such as animal welfare, animal rights, inherent value, animal labour, the erasure of animals, speciesism, carnism, cognitive dissonance, and the meat paradox.

Travels, narrators, and guides

The books analysed do not only focus on domesticated animals with a different status; they also differ significantly in genre and form. To what extent, then, can these two books be considered ‘typical’ or ‘traditional’ travel narratives? In general, Frank Westerman is a recognised travel writer. Indeed, by the time he started to work on *Dier, bovendier*, he had already amassed significant travel experience thanks to his work as a newspaper correspondent. Yet his decision to make a book about horses had a personal motivation. As he recalls in the book, when he was a young boy, in the area of Assen, he got to know a Lipizzaner and became fascinated by the breed. He spent two and a half years travelling for, and working on, his book. During this period he also drew from his earlier experiences – his study (agricultural engineering at the University of Wageningen), and his work (in Russia and the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s). According to Tim Youngs, it is practically impossible to agree upon a clear definition of travel writing, although there are some widely accepted prerequisites: The travels actually took place, and the author/narrator stays as an outsider in the visited places.² Using such metrics, Westerman complies both with the criterion that the author must have travelled to

the places they describe and, as a narrator, Westerman maintains a 'visitor' status: He stays a (cultural) outsider in his account.

As Youngs points out, travel writers 'draw on the techniques of fiction to tell their stories. Plot, characterisation, and dialogue all play their part'.³ All of these can be found in Westerman's book, which reads like a novel, including its non-linear narrative. The book is a fusion of the narrator's recollections, excursions to Central-European destinations and archives, records of interviews with experts, descriptions of artefacts (such as paintings and movies) related to Lipizzaners, and sketches of scientific research in the fields of genetics, selective breeding, evolution, etc. In view of these traits, the book can best be characterised as a travelogue, which allows 'for a non-chronological or episodic (re)arrangement of memory'.⁴

Yvonne Kroonenberg is a less typical travel writer than Westerman.⁵ She became popular in the 1990s thanks to her humorous columns and stories thematising partnership and marriage. Additionally, she wrote a series of children's books, with girls and horses as the main characters. The reason she started to travel in search of Dutch pigs was that she had become one of the ambassadors of the Dutch pig welfare organisation Varkens in Nood (Pigs in need) in 2002. Although the account in *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt* does not carry the features of a typical travel narrative, it complies with the two basic criteria: Kroonenberg really undertook the travels and, although she does not cross the borders of her mother country, she remains an outsider in the settings she visits. Kroonenberg's account approaches travel journalism, as it resembles a series of travel reportages in combination with interviews. However, Kroonenberg does not present herself as a traveller in the book; she is more a writer of places.

Neither Westerman nor Kroonenberg produce a travel narrative in the traditional sense.⁶ Whilst their books do not present exotic or extraordinary places, they do offer original personal perspectives that foreground the narrator. As suggested above, Westerman's book resembles a mosaic, the common thread being the history of the Lipizzaner breed, from its origins in the village of Lipica (present-day Slovenia) in 1580 to the present day, with the horses now scattered throughout Europe and elsewhere. Westerman concentrates on the movement, transfer, or even escape of the horses across Europe, often as a direct result of political situations and/or military conflicts. Both human political history and the development of scientific knowledge are always present and often come to the foreground. His stories focus on several hundred unique horses, who were quite often considered more valuable than any human and therefore protected at any cost. Apart from his recollections, the narrator physically traces the horses through Central Europe. He starts in Vienna, where the Lipizzaner mecca, the Spanish Riding School, is based, and goes on to Lipica, to the archives of the Lipizzan stud farm at Piber (Austria), and to two present-day Czech towns: Hostouň, which was instrumental

in the rescue of Lipizzaners during the Second World War; and Brno, which is linked to the founder of modern genetics, Gregor Johann Mendel (1822-1884). In the final section he finds himself in the town of Lipik, where, after a controversial and long-standing evacuation/abduction to Serbia, the return of Croatian Lipizzaners is celebrated.

Whilst Westerman travelled to more distant places, Kroonenberg went to harder to reach places, even if sometimes only several of kilometres away. She chose a very simple and straightforward method of operation: In each chapter she describes a single place, and the places are, for the most part, arranged according to the life cycle of a Dutch farm pig. Thus, she starts with an excursion to a boar farm specialised in the production of sperm, goes on to explore the farrowing barn, and so on. She finishes the cycle by visiting two well-known Dutch slaughterhouses. She also shows the parallel worlds of the grower pigs,⁷ the factory farm, in contrast (in the subsequent chapter) to an organic farm. Kroonenberg also visits the headquarters of the Albert Heijn supermarket chain. There are also several extra excursions, set apart from the pig's life cycle, for example, a trip to the Binnenhof in The Hague, where she speaks to several Members of the Dutch Parliament. The text comes to a climax in the chapter entitled 'The Paradise', which describes a pig sanctuary. The places that Kroonenberg visits are scattered across different provinces throughout the Netherlands, from Groningen to Limburg.

The assertion that Kroonenberg and Westerman remain cultural outsiders during their travels is supported by the fact that personal guides are present in both of their accounts. First, there are those who accompany them during their travels. Kroonenberg is provided with an expert-assistant, Leontien, who has been fighting for animal welfare for a longer period and is equipped with more experience and knowledge. Westerman embraces the help of a few insiders from Central Europe who provide him with information or take him to places that are more difficult for an outsider to reach. These insiders take the form of horse experts, such as the Viennese Hans Brabenetz, who takes him on excursion to Lipica, and interpreters who help him to communicate in situations in which he does not speak the language of those he is meeting.

Second, there are those 'real' insiders who deal professionally with pig farming and horse breeding, who act as the real source of information, in addition to the personal experiences and the 'reading list' of the narrators. In addition, both Kroonenberg and Westerman rely on the information of 'eyewitnesses', who supply information that has previously been kept from the public. These are very important guides since they can shed light on the 'legitimate' discourse of the professionals. It is important to realise that in both books, apart from the narrators' voices, the reader is confronted with several, sometimes contradictory



A Lipizzaner at the Spanish Riding School, Vienna. Photograph: Wurliburli, Pixabay.

discourses. This applies especially to Kroonenberg's narrative. Whilst Westerman's book gives the overall impression he was welcome at all the premises he chose to visit, Kroonenberg states she was not always welcome. She was sometimes refused access, and some of the professionals about whom she wrote were displeased, either with the way she depicts the farm in question, or how she interprets the visit in her book.⁸

Movement is one of the basic elements of any travel narrative. However, this does not necessarily mean that there is a correlation between the dynamism of the story and the activity of the narrator. Overall, Westerman's book is full of motion, not only because of the Lipizzaners it depicts, but also because his travels give a more dynamic impression. Moreover, Westerman chose a diachronic point of view. Kroonenberg's book, by comparison, could be considered more static. She chose a synchronic point of view: Her book describes pig husbandry at a given moment (around 2008) and changes towards better welfare are only wishful thinking. Apart from a pig transport in which she takes part, the life of a farm pig is a static one: Most pigs inhabit so little space they can hardly walk, or even turn around. However, it is Kroonenberg who takes up a more dynamic role. Westerman may be a detective, but he does not intervene, remaining instead faithful to his role of observer. Kroonenberg is a modest traveller, but has a clear mission: She wants to expose the reality behind the walls of factory farms and slaughterhouses. She is a fervent debater and her struggle takes part mainly on the level of discourse.

Noble horse

First, we will focus on the role of Lipizzaners in Westerman's story. To what extent is the book a quest for the horses themselves and to what extent for the history of selective breeding? Does the narrator represent selective breeding in a positive or negative way, and how does he justify it? We will explore the representations of horses as given by Westerman in the light of the concepts from the field of animal rights, especially that of animal labour.

Westerman chose Lipizzaners as the main motif of his book because of their uniqueness, and that of their history.⁹ In Dutch, the book is called *Dier, bovendier* and the prefix '*boven-*' here clearly refers to Friedrich Nietzsche's concept of '*Übermensch*'.¹⁰ In the English translation, this reference is omitted, due to its association with the Nazi ideology of '*Übermenschen*' and '*Untermenschen*' – superior and inferior races – as the anglophone public is more sensitive to direct references to Nazism and the Holocaust.¹¹ In English, an alternative title, *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse*, is used. Hence, the principal reference is not linked to the Second World War and Nazism, but to another topic that is frequently explored in the book: that of genetics (and possibly also eugenics, of which, more later, as the word 'perfect' refers to selective breeding). The title is challenging, not least as Gregor Mendel had nothing to do with horses: He experimented on pea plants. Mendel's intriguing story is one of Westerman's starting points from which to investigate the scientific and pseudo-scientific debates on *nature versus nurture* that have raged throughout the twentieth century.

Westerman gives numerous examples of animals, plants, and humans who have been subjected to experiments by the adherents of both Mendelism (i.e., the belief in *nature* – genetics) and Lamarckism (i.e., the belief in *nurture* – adaptation to the environment). Although all of the experiments that attempted to perfect humans (which were not only limited to dictatorial regimes such as the Third Reich and Stalinist Soviet Union) are now generally recognised as despicable, the selective breeding of animals is accepted as a matter of fact, or, as in the case of the Lipizzaner, is looked upon with the highest admiration and respect. All full-blooded Lipizzaners get a pedigree, a lofty name, and corresponding treatment, to the point that they can be seen as aristocrats amongst other horses/animals. Indeed, in Westerman's book, they are described as noble, elegant, refined, graceful, or sublime. This kind of discourse is borrowed from his guides and the texts that Westerman paraphrases in the book, but he also uses it himself, for instance when he describes Lipizzaners in a painting:

Whether those horses were saddled and decked out with braids in their mane or whether they posed completely 'naked', the impression was always one of elegance and refinement, the horse as the epitome of grace. A haughty stallion captured in the midst of a controlled levade was civilization incarnate – the acme of what human culture could produce.¹²

In the above quote, the horses are anthropomorphised by using aesthetic features relevant to humans, but at the same time they are objectified: The horses are represented as a (cultural) product. Moreover, the border between the artefact and the portrayed animal is blurred. This paradox occurs several times: Westerman writes about the ‘human content’ of a Lipizzaner,¹³ and the presenter of the performance for tourists at the Spanish Riding School even calls these horses “human beings like us” [...] without irony.¹⁴ At the same time, however, Westerman sees the Lipizzaners as a ‘human creation’, by which he objectifies them.¹⁵

Westerman's story shows that the Lipizzaners are and were primarily a valuable form of property – i.e., an object: They can be used as a gift, as prey in warfare, a valuable investment, or the realisation of an ambition. Their lives were even considered more valuable than that of humans. The highly regarded US General Patton risked human lives to rescue Lipizzaners at the end of the Second World War, who would have otherwise fallen into Russian hands (despite being allies, the Russians were considered barbaric in their treatment of horses, and would probably kill and eat them). This episode also clearly shows that not everyone recognises the 'nobleness' of Lipizzaners – it is only a form of cultural agreement.

Generally, the position held by horses is very specific. They are not primarily production animals like cows and pigs, nor are they typically companion animals with whom humans share their homes. Indeed, a horse may be anything: companion or vehicle, instrument of sport or food, equine therapist or lab animal. What is it then that makes Lipizzaners more 'noble' than other horses and domestic animals? In the manuals for breeders, this is defined quite precisely: Every feature of the Lipizzaner is strictly and clearly prescribed. It is a list of features defining the animal's exterior: its measurements, form, and colour. This means that, in practice, the 'nobility' of the unique horse can be quite easily quantified.

Thus, it is a human agreement that makes one animal more valuable than another – something that goes against their *inherent value*. The idea of inherent value was conceptualised and defined by Tom Regan, one of the founders of contemporary animal ethics, in the ground-breaking work *The Case for Animal Rights* (1983).¹⁶ Regan based his theory on Kant's 'deontology', but raised objections to his concept of 'subject-of-a-life', which was limited only to human beings.¹⁷ According to Regan, not every human is a rational, autonomous being, for example, new-born babies and those with a serious mental handicap. Conversely, adult mammals can certainly have their own interests, emotions, recollections, and expectations – in short, a self-consciousness. Their own life matters to them, meaning they are all subjects-of-a-life. All such lives have an inherent value and this carries with it moral consequences that can be seen as a basis for animal rights.¹⁸ Animals with an inherent value are called *moral patients* (as opposed to *moral agents*, i.e., adult people) as they possess rights, but not duties. Consequently, Regan argues that



Lipizzaners at the Spanish Riding School, Vienna. Photograph: Peter Oertel, Unsplash.com.

animals are not to be killed for food, hunted, trapped, or experimented on. There is no doubt that these human activities do harm to animals, who are today generally considered to be *sentient beings*.

There are, however, other uses to which animals may be put, which may not harm them physically, but which are still incompatible with the natural interests of the animal itself and may cause harm in other ways. In his book, Westerman talks much about the history of the Lipizzaner and its lineage. He cites some extraordinary events from the twentieth-century history linked to them or talks about artefacts that depict them. He also describes Lipizzaner training (as done by his Dutch friend Piet Bakker), and a performance for tourists in the Viennese Spanish Riding School. Westerman is able to describe both in detail, as he is not only personally fascinated by them, but he is also familiar with the techniques and terminology of dressage. However, what does the real life of the Lipizzaner, or for that matter any other 'noble' horse, actually look like? To this question, Westerman does not provide a clear answer.

In reality, that 'everyday life' hardly meets the natural needs and interests of the horse, as Natalie Corinne Hansen, a literature and feminist studies scholar specialised in human-horse relations, shows. In her article, she describes the everyday

life of a fictive horse, Damien, 'a high-priced six-year-old dressage horse from a prized lineage':

He will spend 20-22 hours a day in his 14 x 14 foot stall for the next 10 to 15 years of his performance and active breeding career. During the other two to four hours a day, he will take part in highly programmed training exercises designed to develop his strength, stamina, and skill at producing the movements required of dressage horses. The bars of his stall prevent him from making direct contact with the horses in adjacent stalls, but he is able to lean his head into the barn aisle to greet the human team who appears like clockwork at dawn to start the day.¹⁹

The Lipizzaners' main 'purpose' is to perform in classical dressage (apart from other 'functions', such as carriage horses). This means that they work hard for the entertainment of people, whilst being forced to behave and move in a way unnatural to other (domestic and free-living) animals. It becomes clear in Westerman's book that he is a great admirer of classical dressage, yet he admits that it is 'in truth an unnatural activity'.²⁰ However, neither he, nor the guides and professionals in his book give a moment's thought to the ethical consequences of the use of animals for human entertainment. This raises inevitable questions regarding the justness of dressage in particular, and animal labour more generally.

Lipizzaners and other purebred horses are, for the greatest part, used in the entertainment industry (including sports). Today, many areas, such as horse racing and circus acts, have become problematic, both for animal welfare activists and animal rights activists. Animal welfare activists tend to be most concerned about injuries, cruel treatment, discomfort, and/or stress, whilst animal rights activists categorically refuse any kind of use of animals, as non-humans are not given the chance to express consent or dissent. Both groups have expressed concerns about the (ab)use of animals in circus acts, which has resulted in bans being placed on the use of (at least some) animals in circuses in numerous countries worldwide.²¹ Interestingly, in many countries, including the Netherlands, this ban applies only to so-called wild animals. Nonetheless, it seems that the circus of the future will be animal-free, as some countries have already banned animal circuses completely.²²

Westerman is fascinated by classical dressage, which is presented, both by him and his guides, as a noble activity. However, the question here is why he fails to mention that Lipizzaners are used in circuses as well, or in (travelling) performances akin to circus acts (i.e., touring shows). A possible explanation might be that this form of entertainment, devoid of connotations of 'nobleness', reveals more about the human abuse of animals. Indeed, if animal circus acts are perceived as increasingly contemptible, more questions will surely arise over the use of animals for human entertainment (including classical dressage) more generally.

These issues are linked to the question of animal labour. As Lipizzaners (and lots of other horses) are primarily bred and kept for entertainment and making profit, they must be seen as working animals. However, as Charlotte E. Blattner, Kendra Coulter, and Will Kymlicka suggest in *Animal Labour* (2020): 'For many people, the idea that animals are workers is incomprehensible, since labour is seen as a distinctly human activity or practice.'²³ Following the animal turn in the humanities and social sciences, the question has already arisen if animals should be seen as engaged in work.²⁴ Indeed, several concrete examples prove that it is already possible to do so. In general, dogs and horses (police and military dogs and horses, and therapy animals) are recognised as workers more easily than other sorts of animals. Nevertheless, even if animals are recognised as workers, this does not imply they would no longer be seen as objects and instruments. This point is explicitly addressed by Blattner, Coulter, and Kymlicka, when they shed light on a thus far little-known topic within the domain of animal studies:

A quick look at existing practices would suggest that recognizing animals as workers can coexist quite comfortably with their instrumentalization. In fact, there is a long history of factory farms, labs, and circuses describing animals as willing partners and workers. The vivisection industry in particular is known for these kinds of euphemisms [...]. Any realistic approach to animal labour needs to recognize this danger. [...] The idea of animal labour risks being used as further justification for industries that objectify animals, rather than prompting changes that would treat animals as subjects who have their own experiences, desires, and relationships, and a right to live according to them.²⁵

The problem, as described above, lies in the human discourse. When an animal is called a 'partner', the relationship is perceived as more amenable, and thus easy to accept. In the following passage, Westerman describes how his friend Piet trains his Lipizzaner, called Nobila:

I tell Piet that I have never seen him on a horse's back, and ask why it is he opted for the long reins.

'It's more equal this way,' Piet answers. 'There's no other interaction between man and animal that comes this close to the ideal of two equal partners.'

Unlike Primula in his day, Nobila wears a snaffle, a bit without a shank. Physically, therefore, Piet can only hold him in check with the soft noseband to which the reins are attached. Without an iron shank at the corners of the mouth, which rests on the stretch of exposed jawbone between the front and back teeth, the animal is harder to handle. But it also gives him a more autonomous air. Within classical dressage, which is in truth an unnatural activity, Piet strives for a maximum of naturalness. He has come to use the crop

like a conductor's baton. 'I advise young riders to use a birch switch. A birch switch breaks as soon as you lose your self-control.'²⁶

Piet's discourse shows that noble expressions ('interaction between man and animal', 'ideal', and 'equal partners') still do not mean the horse is treated as a subject, or an agent. The use of instruments such as the reins, the snaffle, and the crop makes it impossible to imagine such an interaction would be acceptable if the roles were reversed. There is a clear division of roles: the power in human hands and the subjugation of the non-human. The horse is never treated as a real partner: There is an 'autonomous air', but that does not mean he is autonomous; he is not an agent, as he is not given the chance to leave the partnership or give consent to collaboration.²⁷ The work of animals may be seen as morally justifiable when saving the lives of others or improving the welfare of humans and non-humans, but the moral justification of animal work that is done merely for entertainment and the profit of humans remains profoundly doubtful. Westerman's book shows that the Lipizzaners were 'made' by humans in order to do this kind of work perfectly. This is a widespread justification of the exploitation of domesticated animals: They were made (i.e., selectively bred) to meet human needs. Alasdair Cochrane, a political scientist who specialises in animal rights, states:

To an extent, these claims are right: domesticated animals have been selectively bred over centuries in order to possess traits and perform tasks that serve human ends. In this way, these traits and tasks are in some way 'essential' to these animals. However, that does not mean that the use and development of these traits and tasks are good for the animals themselves.²⁸

This surely applies to the Lipizzaner breed, which has been the subject of prolonged and intense selective breeding. If the same were to be applied to humans – a process known as eugenics – it would be considered abhorrent and perverse. Westerman is clear about the contemptibility of eugenics when applied to humans, however, he does not take a clear moral stance towards the way in which horses are treated, used, and objectified by humans. As stated above, Westerman usually adheres to his stance of the neutral observer, yet occasionally, he does reveal his fears regarding how far the modern science of eugenics and DNA modification might go when applied to people – even in the democratic world. He does not believe that globalisation will put an end to discrimination amongst people, resulting in the rise of a 'cosmopolitan human', or a 'uniform human'.²⁹ Indeed, he shows that even contemporary research can be found to be discriminating, even racist, if the differences between different ethnic groups are measured.



A pig in the Dutch farming industry.
 Photograph: Varkens in Nood
 (www.varkensinnood.nl).

So how can we justify that eugenics (i.e., selective breeding), when applied to non-human animals, is not discriminatory? Does it not discriminate a certain species if it is selectively bred in order to be used for human entertainment, or in order to accelerate muscle growth (for the production of meat)? Eugenics, a term reserved for humans, is commonly considered a racist and discrimina-

tory practice, whereas selective breeding – the term being reserved for plants and (mostly domestic) animals – is a flourishing branch of science.³⁰ Westerman's book is, in reality, a mosaic of both, albeit one in which he never raises the question of our speciesism towards animals. Speciesism – discrimination based on biological species – refers to the idea that humans consider themselves automatically superior to all non-humans, whilst at the same time not considering animals equal to one another. This discrimination is based on numerous criteria (a horse is more popular than a pig, a bee is more popular than a wasp).³¹

Lazy pig

Speciesism forms the bedrock upon which animal husbandry is built. The title of Kroonenberg's book is inspired by the aphorism 'everything but the squeal is used', which she heard from one of her professional guides – the PR manager of a leading Dutch abattoir and meat-processing company.³² It comes from the typical discourse of the pork industry (not only in the Netherlands).³³ The sentiment expressed in the well-known soundbite can be traced back to Upton Sinclair's 1905 novel *The Jungle*. Nothing gets wasted: All parts of the dead body of a pig are used for human benefit. In other words, it stresses the efficiency of the whole process. In the following section, we will focus on the representation of the pig in Kroonenberg's book and on the use of different discourses, especially that of her professional guides. We will investigate how she responds to them and how she employs other discourses – those of the animal welfare movement, or possibly, of the animal rights movement.

As stated above, Kroonenberg collaborated with the Dutch organisation Varkens in Nood. According to their website, their vision is a future without intensive farming, with people living instead on plant-based diets. In their quest, Varkens in Nood adopts a step-by-step approach, trying to reveal and eliminate the abuse of pigs under the current conditions. Although they are in fact a vegan organisation, they represent the approach of a 'slow transition'.³⁴

Many animals become erased from our consciousness. For example, as most pigs are kept indoors, in a very real sense they become physically eliminated from our lives. That is probably the reason Kroonenberg pays significant attention to the description of the setting and the functioning of the enterprises visited. She represents the farms and slaughterhouses as a series of sterile, sombre, and oppressive places. The outdoor enterprises (an organic farm and a sanctuary) provide contrast, receiving an unambiguously positive connotation in the book. The only time that Kroonenberg really physically travels in the book is when riding with a pig transport from a farm to a slaughterhouse. In doing so, she really follows the 'travels' of a Dutch pig.³⁵ For pigs, unlike for humans, travelling is an incredibly stressful affair and is usually kept firmly behind closed (transporter) doors – a point clearly represented in the book. Indeed, outsiders are not often welcomed as witnesses of the transports. The same applies to other parts of the pork industry. Although situated in or near our environs, it is less accessible to outsiders than a tropical jungle.

Westerman's main focus was selective breeding. In the case of Lipizzaners, he presented it almost as an artform. By contrast, Kroonenberg considers selective breeding in a solely negative light (when applied to pigs) and calls it literally 'messing with food and genes': The animals are in fact degenerate and malformed.³⁶ Awareness of such problems leads to widespread concern over animal welfare.³⁷ However, realising its growing ill repute in the public eye, the pork industry has developed its own discourse. For instance, when Kroonenberg asks how long the boars live, her professional guide answers that fifty percent of the population is replaced every year.³⁸ As Arran Stibbe states, the 'discourse of the pork industry can be characterized as scientific and technical'.³⁹ The pork production industry takes the form of 'a huge animate being whose life depends on making a profit, with pigs rendered collectively vital but individually dispensable cells making up this larger being'.⁴⁰ Another common discursive technique employed is to create 'confusion between living animals and meat'.⁴¹ This can be illustrated by the statement of one of Kroonenberg's guides at a slaughterhouse: "We transform animals in meat products, [...] and the quality of that product depends on our treatment of the animals. We take the responsibility."⁴² This 'responsibility' is for the product, not for the living being, however, it can be read in two ways. Kroonenberg reveals how the pork industry uses terms that objectify or eliminate living beings.

Kroonenberg travels to Dutch pig farms because she wants to contribute to the improvement of the living conditions of the animals. There are several recurring motifs in her disputes with the professionals, which can be considered the most burning wrongs against which she fights. The arguments for and against both the castration of boars and tail docking without anaesthesia run as a common thread through her disputes.⁴³ Her opponents tend to blame others. If they do not improve the conditions for the pigs, they claim it is only because they are *forced* to do it a certain way. The most frequently used mantra is that they do not want to castrate the male pigs, but it is necessary because 'the market' / 'the customers' / 'the Germans', etc., demand it (in order to prevent boar taint).⁴⁴ The main obstacles to improving welfare are economic. Whereas Westerman's book focuses mainly on recent (human) history, a significant portion of Kroonenberg's book is concerned with economics, specifically, the economic considerations concerning the effectivity of the pork industry. All of the farmers and managers think in numbers – amounts, kilograms, prices – and every cent counts. Kroonenberg, however, tries to empathise with the pig – to see and appreciate the individual before her. For instance, in the same way that we are used to perceiving our pets, she asks whether they have names. However, in the pork industry, they have only numbers. Thus, thinking in (huge) numbers, is another technique used to erase the individual animal from discourse.

In the Netherlands, many farmers, managers, and workers in the pork industry have religious leanings (traditional voters of the Christian Democratic Appeal [CDA], or other Christian parties). Kroonenberg and her assistant are received by a farmer in the reception room of his farrow-to-finish farm:

It is strikingly clean here. Only a fly is circling above the table. The farmer takes a swatter and smacks it.

He is a member of the Christian Union, as he told me.

'Thou shalt not kill,' I say.

'Oh really?' he laughs, 'if I do nothing against them, there will be clouds of flies within no time. But I don't use any poison.'⁴⁵

For the farmer, dogmatic notions like the superiority of humans above animals are a matter of fact. Kroonenberg takes a neutral, a-religious stance, although sometimes she is also critical and ironic. She shows that this farmer constantly oscillates between his personal beliefs and economic considerations:

Pig farmers are always looking for methods to make their pigs more profitable. This farmer once tried to wean piglets earlier than at four weeks of age. But the experiment failed because the sow did not react well to it. The uterus was not healed sufficiently for another pregnancy. I look at him disapprovingly while he tells me that.

'If you believe in God, shouldn't you show a bit more respect for the Creation?'

'I have mainly respect for the Creator,' he replies.⁴⁶

For the religious farmer, it is, for example, intolerable that sows are slaughtered whilst pregnant, as it is considered an 'abortus provocatus'. According to their belief, it is seen as a kind of murder. However, that does not apply to the killing of the mother herself, nor to young piglets who are weaker than the others and thus given no extra nutrition or veterinary support. The same farmer who considers abortus provocatus intolerable, states, without any doubt, that it is pointless to help the weak and ill piglets, and he kills them easily by hitting their heads against a hard surface.⁴⁷ As justification, he states that 'in nature, they die as well', although his farming has, in all other aspects, nothing to do with nature.

Kroonenberg usually (albeit sometimes inconsistently) discerns these kinds of discourses (eliminating living beings, blaming others, using technical terms and numbers instead of referring to the animals themselves, and religious dogmas) and regularly warns about, or reacts to, them. Yet Kroonenberg is not a categorical opponent of killing pigs for meat. When visiting an organic farm, she is satisfied with the assurance that the pigs are slaughtered in small numbers at a nearby abattoir. However, 'organic slaughterhouses' simply do not exist. Thus, whilst the organic pigs may live a bit longer than their non-organic cousins, it is still a fraction of their expected life expectancy (which is up to fifteen years). When visiting a large-scale slaughterhouse, Kroonenberg is assured by her guide (a PR manager) that "'the slaughter proceeds in the most humane way," [...] "we had it checked by the University of Bristol"'.⁴⁸ Whilst she disputes at some length the ways in which the pigs are paralysed during slaughter, she does not problematise the term 'humane slaughter' itself. Humane slaughter is a legal term (which stipulates that the animal must be rendered unconscious before being killed), but if we transcend the limits of speciesism, then it is an oxymoron, a contradiction in terms. 'Humane' is supposed to mean 'kind', 'compassionate', 'sympathetic', but you would not speak of humane 'murder'/'killing', when applied to people. The word 'slaughter', which is reserved for animals, acquires a different expressivity when used to refer to people. Jill Jepson, an American scholar in anthropological linguistics, investigated attitudes to killing animals through a linguistic lens, 'slaughter' being one of the items in her corpus. Jepson states that the terms that are used for killing humans acquire connotations of compassion and mercy when used for killing animals. Conversely, terms used for killing animals (such as 'slaughter') acquire a connotation of brutality, when applied to humans. She concludes that her findings 'reflect assumptions about the human "right" to take animals' lives while serving to ameliorate the negative feelings such killings evoke'.⁴⁹

Most of the farmers Kroonenberg visits do have at least a basic notion of ethology and acknowledge that pigs are social, clean, clever, and curious animals.⁵⁰

Thus, they do not stick to the traditional picture of a filthy, stupid, untidy, etc., pig.⁵¹ However, this does not mean they see them as subjects. Indeed, even if they do try to see the world through pigs' eyes, they tend to patronise them: "A pig lives in the present. The life is as it is. Pigs don't dream about a future."⁵² Additionally, some farmers still employ stereotypical images of pigs in their discourse, for example, their laziness. Unsurprisingly, Kroonenberg contests such prejudice, not least because the natural behaviour of a pig is very different: 'In nature, pigs are not lazy. In nature, they root all day long in search of food and they travel huge distances.'⁵³

Pigs have been selectively bred to such an extent that they are extremely susceptible to disease. A result of this increased susceptibility is that they are usually no longer allowed to venture outside. Thus, the pig has been effectively erased from the countryside – far more so than other forms of livestock. In fact, Kroonenberg sees pigs outside on only three occasions: in a transport to the slaughterhouse; at an organic farm; and at a pig sanctuary, which is also the only place where pigs can spend the rest of their lives without being killed. Although Kroonenberg considers the sanctuary to be a perfect place, she does not claim that all pigs deserve such a life and does not explain how to make an ethical choice between those pigs who deserve to live such a life and those who will end up as bacon. As she states in her afterword, she hopes that her book will make people 'meat-fearing', in the same way the pious are God-fearing. Furthermore, she states that it is difficult for the average customer to make responsible choices if he or she is always bombarded by bargain offers. Indeed, she admits that it is also difficult for her: 'I am a housewife. It took me years before I stopped buying the cheap stuff and started – if I happen to buy meat – putting the expensive organic products in my shopping cart.'⁵⁴

So, why does she still buy pork? Can she not live without it? She describes in her book how extremely difficult it is to change the conditions in factory farming systematically. She supports a flexitarian diet (primarily vegetarian diet with the occasional inclusion of meat) and organic farming. However, she cannot be so naïve to believe organic farming would be able to provide pork (and meat in general) for the ever-growing population. She presents in her book clear data about the influence of meat consumption on the loss of nature and on the increase of greenhouse gases. However, she does not use this environmental discourse when arguing with the professionals, concentrating instead on animal welfare. As the linguist and discourse specialist Guy Cook demonstrates in his article on the current polarised standpoints towards animals, animal welfare has become part of mainstream establishment discourse as now even the farming industry itself makes use of welfare arguments.⁵⁵ However, as set out below, animal welfare discourse is itself not free from speciesism and carnism.

(In)edible animals: The problem of carnism

Kroonenberg wants to make people 'meat-fearing' – in common parlance one might use the expression 'flexitarian'. Yet Kroonenberg is still a 'carnist'. Carnism is a term coined by the social psychologist Melanie Joy, meaning the belief that, in a certain culture, some animals are considered edible or usable (e.g., for leather or fur). It is a conviction that eating certain animals is normal, natural, and necessary, otherwise known as 'the myth of the three Ns' (or the three Ns of justification).⁵⁶ According to Joy, most people believe (1) that eating meat is normal because it is a part of socially constructed norms; (2) that it is natural because people have eaten it for at least two million years; and (3) that it is necessary in order to survive and to stay in good health. These three myths are supported by the illusion of free will (the belief that we are completely free to eat whatever we want).⁵⁷

Kroonenberg represents eating pork and using pig products as normal and natural. She does not promote a strict plant-based diet. According to her, vegetarians have no idea that pig ingredients are 'necessary' for a whole range of products. She is influenced here by a scientist, Hans Hopster from the Animal Sciences Group, who tells her 'something remarkable, an economic fact, which will truly confuse vegetarians: the profit made by slaughterhouses is not so much generated by sausage, ham and pork chops. The big money is earned in the division that does not produce any meat. Gelatine and pig bristles, those are the really profitable products! Thus, by eating tofu, you will not save any pigs.'⁵⁸

It is probable that the final remark about tofu is Kroonenberg's, illustrating that she is being ironic and sceptical about the possibility of replacing industrial meat production with plant-based products which, in fact, could be easier and faster than her slow struggle for improving the conditions in factory farming. Kroonenberg illustrates her stance citing a long list of products with 'pig ingredients' (soap, antifreeze, collagen, brushes, etc.). However, she does not mention that these products can be replaced by animal-free alternatives in the same way meat protein can be replaced with plant-based protein. Her remark about confused vegetarians 'eating tofu' seems to be based on the assumption that vegetarians and vegans are ignorant and ill-informed about the products they buy when, in reality, there are several labels that guarantee the product is vegetarian- or vegan-friendly, not only in the case of meat substitutes, but also clothing, shoes, cosmetics, etc. Kroonenberg is also ironically critical about the plant-based meat alternatives available in the supermarket: 'I know those [vegetarian] products. They are called a veggie patty or broccoli burger. They contain a bit of soy and three peas and cost as much as a beef steak.'⁵⁹

Kroonenberg suggests that replacing meat products by tofu and plant-based burgers is a blind alley. In her discourse, her ironic tone towards vegetarian

possibilities can be read as an alibi for maintaining the livestock industry. Whilst Kroonenberg is somewhat sceptical about replacing meat by plant-based products in her 2009 book, by the time of writing (2021), it has become generally accepted that plant-based products are on the rise and investors now believe in their ever-growing potential.⁶⁰ Nowadays, the shift from meat to protein alternatives is mainly seen as understanding the relationship between our food choices and natural resources.⁶¹ Care for water, land, and the climate turns out to be a stronger argument for abstaining from meat than the animal welfare discourse employed by Kroonenberg.

The eating of horse meat reveals even more about the double standards some hold regarding the consumption of animals. Both in the United Kingdom and the United States, horses are considered inedible, their consumption either considered a cultural taboo or banned in law. In the Low Countries, horse meat is available, although lots of people avoid it.⁶² Westerman states in his book that after he started to visit the riding school, horse meat became inedible for him: 'Although I never for a moment considered becoming a vegetarian, I stopped eating smoked horse meat.'⁶³ This is the only time he mentions his food preferences. Thus, he continues to exhibit both carnism and speciesism: He has transferred his positive experience with a small number of horses to all members of the species, but not to other grazing animals, all mammals, or indeed to all other 'edible' animals. He does not go any deeper into his food preferences, as he would probably end up with a meat-related cognitive dissonance. According to the social psychologist Hank Rothberger, it is an ambivalence manifested 'in the frequent misalignment between expressed attitudes and behavior toward animals. Numerous studies show that while individuals want farmed animals to be humanely treated, they simultaneously eat meat derived almost entirely from factory farms documented for their abysmal treatment of animals [...]. That individuals love animals and wish them no harm yet simultaneously eat them has been termed the *meat paradox*'.⁶⁴

In Westerman's book, we can find another illustrative instance of the double standards people employ towards animals. In the final chapter, the rescue of Croatian Lipizzaners is celebrated. During the war they were 'evacuated' by a casino boss to Serbia, and lived in atrocious conditions, together with forty dogs. Eyewitnesses described hungry dogs attacking and eating the Lipizzaners, a shocking image: 'With his own eyes, Mato Čačić had seen dogs gnawing on the jawbone of a Lipizzaner.'⁶⁵ When the remaining horses are safe and well back home, the rescue by a youth organisation is celebrated by a festive meal: Chicken bouillon in a huge silver soup tureen is served, with lamb as the main course. 'During the main course – a leg of lamb so tender that the meat falls steaming from the bone – the tone of the conversation changes.'⁶⁶ After discussing the atrocious misfortunes of Lipizzaners being devoured by starving dogs, those in attendance start a lively conversation

with the mayor. Any resultant cognitive dissonance between the discussion of the horses and the dogs, and the meal now set before them is (automatically) avoided by using very different language. On the one hand, bestial expressions such as ‘gnawing on the jawbone’, ‘strips of intestine’, ‘muzzles dripped blood’, ‘work like jackals’, and ‘circling their prey’ are used if horses are eaten by dogs. On the other hand, cultivated culinary expressions like ‘bouillon’, ‘silver tureen’, ‘tender’, and ‘steaming’ are used when other (edible) animals are eaten by humans. Even though little lambs may be considered even cuter than foals, according to the cultural norm, they fall into the category of ‘edible’, and it is the practice (slaughtering made invisible), ritual use (lamb as a festive meal, not necessarily linked to religion), and discourse that helps to avoid the cognitive dissonance for present-day Westerners.

Conclusion

According to Leane’s classification, domestic animals in travel narratives have typically played the role of either an instrument of travel, or a companion, whereas the quest objects were typically wild animals.⁶⁷ This chapter began from the assertion that in the West, animals are erased, both physically and mentally, from our collective consciousness. This can be said even about domesticated animals (apart from pets) who used to be an integral part of people’s everyday lives. Thus, it was challenging to explore the possibilities of representation that emerge if the quest objects are domestic animals.

Frank Westerman and Yvonne Kroonenberg started their travels and wrote their books with substantially different aims, although both were motivated by their fascination for a certain animal species (the horse, and the pig, respectively). Yet, neither account is a typical travel narrative in the traditional sense. As shown above, the style is adapted to their aims.

Westerman writes a travelogue, a more literary narrative, combining personal and adapted life stories with scientific treatises. Westerman’s attitude is that of an observer who uses the motif of selective breeding as a means to illustrate the twentieth-century history of humans and several scientific topics, some of which bear no relation to the horse. He does not transcend the limits of speciesism and portrays the (Lipizzaner) horse as a ‘human creation’, an artefact, a precious property, without asking about his or her animal self. Lipizzaners were chosen for the book as a superior animal, but in fact, only their owners emerge as in a way superior, thanks to their scarcity and wealth. In the same way as Westerman followed the traces of the Lipizzaners, who were moved from one place to another, sold, stolen, rescued, or used as gifts, he could have followed precious works of art or technical inventions. Although he obviously warns against eugenics – and its

lying at the base of racism and discrimination – he does not ask the same questions relating to non-humans, i.e., selective breeding, carried out purely for the benefit of humans. Furthermore, he does not ask any questions about the moral justification of breeding the horses for entertainment and of contemporary animal labour.

Kroonenberg, to the contrary, chose a more prosaic style and gave her story a form resembling a series of journalistic travel reportages. She started her travels as an enthusiastic activist, in order to plead for a better treatment of pigs in the Dutch farming industry. She became a member of the animal welfare movement, and in her book, she attempts to persuade her reading public to adopt a flexitarian approach – i.e., to make them buy less meat and prefer organic products. She does not oppose carnism *per se* and uses mainstream establishment discourse in her book as she adapts to her mainstream reading public. As shown above, she does not present vegetarianism and veganism as realistic options.⁶⁸

However, Kroonenberg's quest, following the life cycle of a conventional Dutch pig, is caught in a vicious circle of arguments and pseudo-arguments, one blaming the other. Every improvement she suggests is argued against and most discussions end up in a cognitive cul-de-sac – as seen in animal husbandry, and in factory farming in particular, animals always remain inferior to the interests of humans. If the whole system of industrial farming is wrong, then it makes little sense to try to improve it. For example, once pigs have been created who are extremely susceptible to diseases, the only option is to keep them indoors. Although Kroonenberg briefly mentions the environmental impact of industrial farming in her book, she does not foresee the strength of climate-change discourse (as it manifests itself later) and she does not use these scientific and objective arguments in her disputes with the farmers and politicians. Her account shows that many animal welfare arguments have become empty clichés within mainstream discourse (think here of 'humane slaughter'), which is based on human exceptionalism. It must be added that some improvements have been achieved since Kroonenberg published her book, but the welfare organisation Varkens in Nood still lists no less than 120 areas of concern in the pig farming industry.⁶⁹

If carnism and speciesism are not transcended, there is no way out. For the time being, the 'superior' horse and the 'inferior' pig are both primarily considered as human creations and treated accordingly. Even if these two domestic animals play the role of quest objects in the narratives, they have not lost their instrumental role: They are represented both by the guides and the narrators as instruments for the production of entertainment and meat, respectively.⁷⁰

Notes

- ¹ As this book has not been translated into English, all subsequent quotations are translated by the author of this text.
- ² Youngs, *The Cambridge Introduction to Travel Writing*, 5-7.
- ³ Youngs, *The Cambridge Introduction to Travel Writing*, 4.
- ⁴ Cooke, 'Inner Journeys: Travel Writing as Life Writing', 22.
- ⁵ In her later career, Kroonenberg did, however, publish a more 'typical' travel narrative: *God in Amerika* (2016).
- ⁶ Westerman's book fits better in the author's oeuvre, which consists of highly valued and often translated non-fiction works combining the features of a travelogue, essay, and scientific treatise, with personal impressions. Conversely, Kroonenberg's book differs significantly from the rest of her oeuvre: It is evident it was 'made to order'. It is closely linked to the situation in the Netherlands at a given point in time, and it carries some of the (often negatively connotated) features of a pamphlet. This may also be the reason this book is not suitable for translation.
- ⁷ The term 'grower pig' refers to any pig between weaning and sale, or transfer to the breeding herd, sold for slaughter or killed for rations.
- ⁸ There is a certain discrepancy in her method of operation. On the one hand, Kroonenberg takes on the role of an activist, whilst on the other, she proceeds in cooperation with those she wants to portray as wrongdoers. It must be clear to her from the beginning that she can never get to see the greatest wrongs of the meat industry.
- ⁹ All subsequent references to Westerman, *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse* include locations, not page numbers, in a Kindle edition.
- ¹⁰ Interestingly, Westerman cites the Dutchman Herman Bernelot Moens, who proposed the 'crossing of a Negro male with a female chimpanzee' in 1905, in order to create a 'higher type of human, the Übermensch, [...] who looks down upon contemporary humanity as we do upon the ape-man'. Westerman, *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse*, 1594.
- ¹¹ English publishers employ so-called sensitivity readers in order to discover sections in manuscripts that could be offensive for a part of the reading public. See, for instance, the comment of the translator M. Hutchinson about him not translating a joke about Hitler in a Dutch novel. Bouman, 'Hoofdpersoon Jas heet ook in het Engels gewoon Jas'. Most of the foreign translators/publishers avoid direct reference to the Nazi ideology (English, German, Spanish, Croatian, Hungarian). Only the Czech and Slovenian translations are literal. In some other languages (Italian, Polish, Slovak), the title is not a literal translation, but still with a reference to the Aryan ideology: *Pura razza bianca*; *Czysta biała rasa*; *Čistá biela rasa*. (Information on the translations has been taken from the database of the Dutch Foundation for Literature.)
- ¹² Westerman, *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse*, 3484-3485.
- ¹³ Westerman, *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse*, 730.
- ¹⁴ Westerman, *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse*, 430.
- ¹⁵ Westerman, *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse*, 577.
- ¹⁶ According to Verdonk, Regan is the Immanuel Kant of animal rights. Although he is generally considered one of the founders of animal rights, he is also criticised by the representatives of the emerging field of posthumanism because he does not transcend the limits of anthropocentrism and the Enlightenment. Verdonk, *Dierenrechten*, 70. Verdonk states, however, that this new perspective does not give clear answers to many ethical questions surrounding human-animal relations. Verdonk, *Dierenrechten*, 74-77.

- ¹⁷ Regan, *The Case for Animal Rights*, xvii.
- ¹⁸ The theory was further built upon by Gary Francione, as only mammals were mentioned by Regan. In the meantime, other animals have been granted rights, too, on grounds of sentience. Verdonk, *Dierenrechten*, 73. This chapter will not address the proceeding discussions, since it concentrates on only two mammals – horses and pigs.
- ¹⁹ Hansen, 'Dressage', 132.
- ²⁰ Westerman, *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse*, 746.
- ²¹ Most European countries have already banned using wild animals in circus acts. Four Paws International, 'Bans on Circuses', www.four-paws.us/campaigns-topics/topics/wild-animals/world-wide-circus-bans, last accessed 19 June 2021.
- ²² In Europe: Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cyprus, Greece, and Malta (situation in 2021).
- ²³ Blattner, Coulter & Kymlicka, *Animal Labour*, 1.
- ²⁴ Blattner, Coulter & Kymlicka, *Animal Labour*, 2.
- ²⁵ Blattner, Coulter & Kymlicka, *Animal Labour*, 9-10.
- ²⁶ Westerman, *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse*, 741-748.
- ²⁷ 'If animals do have broad interests in self-determination, then the basic principle that workers cannot be forced to work, and are free to enter and exit work, must also apply to them.' Blattner, 'Animal Labour', 99.
- ²⁸ Cochrane, 'Good Work for Animals', 52.
- ²⁹ Westerman, *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse*, 3511, 3513.
- ³⁰ In some languages, the terminology for selective breeding carries a positive connotation by using words such as the Dutch 'veredelen' (i.e., to 'ennoble').
- ³¹ The term was introduced in 1970 by Richard Ryder, in a leaflet later reprinted in Ryder, 'Speciesism Again'.
- ³² All subsequent references to Kroonenberg, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt* include locations, not page numbers, in a Kindle edition.
- ³³ For more information on the discourse of the pork industry, see the chapter 'As Charming as a Pig' in Stibbe, *Animals Erased*.
- ³⁴ *Varkens in Nood*, 'Missie en visie', www.varkensinnood.nl/missie-en-visie, last accessed 4 June 2021.
- ³⁵ Most of the Dutch farm pigs described in the book are Dutch Landrace (Landras) pigs.
- ³⁶ Kroonenberg, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt*, 358: 'Geknoei met voeding en genen'.
- ³⁷ Cook, "A Pig Is a Person", 589.
- ³⁸ Kroonenberg, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt*, 147.
- ³⁹ Stibbe, *Animals Erased*, 40.
- ⁴⁰ Stibbe, *Animals Erased*, 41.
- ⁴¹ Stibbe, *Animals Erased*, 46.
- ⁴² Kroonenberg, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt*, 1166-1168: "Wij transformeren dieren tot vleesproducten, [...] en de kwaliteit van dat product is afhankelijk van hoe wij omgaan met die dieren. Die verantwoordelijkheid nemen wij."
- ⁴³ Kroonenberg's book describes the situation in 2008. Since 2009, male pigs are no longer castrated without anaesthesia in the Netherlands.
- ⁴⁴ Kroonenberg, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt*, 169-180.
- ⁴⁵ Kroonenberg, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt*, 403-407: 'Het is hier opvallend schoon. Alleen een vlieg maakt rondjes boven de tafel. De boer pakt een vliegenmepper en slaat hem dood. Hij is lid van de ChristenUnie, heb ik mij laten vertellen. "Gij zult niet doden," zeg ik.

- “O nee?” lacht hij, “als ik niks tegen die vliegen doe, heb je hier binnen de kortste keren wolken vliegen. Maar ik gebruik geen gif.”
- ⁴⁶ Kroonenberg, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt*, 458-462: ‘Varkensboeren zijn altijd op zoek naar middelen om meer winst uit varkens te halen. Deze boer heeft ooit geprobeerd de biggen eerder te spenen dan na vier weken. Maar dat experiment mislukte, omdat de zeug er niet goed op reageerde. De baarmoeder is dan nog niet voldoende hersteld om een volgende zwangerschap te volbrengen. Ik kijk hem afkeurend aan als hij dat vertelt.
- “Als u in God gelooft, zou u dan niet wat meer respect voor de schepping aan de dag leggen?”
- “Ik heb vooral respect voor de Schepper,” antwoordt hij.’
- ⁴⁷ Stibbe explains that in the pork industry discourse, such common techniques are labelled with euphemisms such as ‘humane euthanasia’. Stibbe, *Animals Erased*, 45.
- ⁴⁸ Kroonenberg, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt*, 1211-1212: “Hier wordt op de meest humane manier geslacht,” [...], “we hebben het laten controleren door de Universiteit van Bristol.”
- ⁴⁹ Jepson, ‘A Linguistic Analysis of Discourse on the Killing of Nonhuman Animals’, 127.
- ⁵⁰ The places where pigs are probably treated in the worst way are not described in the book, as Kroonenberg was not welcome there, as she states. Kroonenberg, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt*, 144.
- ⁵¹ Stibbe analyses the image of ‘pig’ in general discourse in the United Kingdom. Stibbe, *Animals Erased*, 35-40. The mostly negative and pejorative expressions he lists can also be found in Dutch and other European languages.
- ⁵² Kroonenberg, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt*, 308-309: “Een varken leeft in het heden. Het leven is zoals het is. Varkens dromen niet van een toekomst.”
- ⁵³ Kroonenberg, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt*, 380-381: ‘In de natuur zijn varkens niet lui. Daar zijn ze de hele dag aan het scharrelen om aan de kost te komen en leggen ze grote afstanden af.’
- ⁵⁴ Kroonenberg, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt*, 1332-1333: ‘Ik ben huisvrouw. Het heeft mij jaren gekost om de goedkope troep te laten liggen en – als ik al vlees koop – de dure biologische producten in mijn winkelwagen te leggen.’
- ⁵⁵ Cook, “A Pig Is a Person”, 594.
- ⁵⁶ Joy, *Why We Love Dogs, Eat Pigs and Wear Cows*, 96-113.
- ⁵⁷ Joy, *Why We Love Dogs, Eat Pigs and Wear Cows*, 96-113.
- ⁵⁸ Kroonenberg, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt*, 635-638: ‘[...] iets opmerkelijks, een economisch feit waar vegetariërs erg van in verwarring zullen raken: de winst die slachterijen maken, komt niet eens zozeer uit de worst, de ham en de karbonades. Het grote geld wordt vooral verdiend in de divisie die géén vlees produceert. Gelatine, varkenshaar, dat zijn pas winstgevende producten! Met tofu eten, red je dus geen varkens.’
- ⁵⁹ Kroonenberg, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt*, 1272-1273: ‘Ik ken die [vegetarische] producten. Ze heten groenteschijf of broccoliburger. Er zit een beetje soja in en drie doperwtten en ze kosten net zoveel als een biefstuk.’
- ⁶⁰ Nieuwenhuize, ‘2030’.
- ⁶¹ Marquis, ‘Plant-Based Foods Are Our Future and Entrepreneurs Are Helping Us Make the Shift’.
- ⁶² Nowadays, the Dutch prefer not to knowingly eat horse meat. Apart from a couple of specialties, supermarkets do not offer products with horse meat. However, Dutch people still consume it regularly, unaware, or as if unaware, in snack bars, pubs, and restaurants (in meatballs, ragout snacks, etc.). See, e.g., Pesie, ‘Nederlanders onbewust grootconsumenten van Argentijns paardenvlees’.
- ⁶³ Westerman, *Brother Mendel’s Perfect Horse*, 214. (Avoiding smoked horse meat does not mean he did not eat horse meat in other products, such as meatballs. See previous note.)
- ⁶⁴ Rothberger, ‘Meat-related Cognitive Dissonance’, 1.

- ⁶⁵ Westerman, *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse*, 3655. Other examples: 'Bukinac fed the cadavers to his dogs, that gnawed on strips of intestine until their muzzles dripped blood.' Westerman, *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse*, 3808. 'The dogs only moved in on [horses] that were too exhausted to stand upright. They went to work like jackals, circling their prey first and then attacking from behind. "First they would eat the juiciest parts, the anus and the vagina, where the meat is softest."' Westerman, *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse*, 3819-3821.
- ⁶⁶ Westerman, *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse*, 3674.
- ⁶⁷ Leane, 'Animals', 306-307.
- ⁶⁸ Although she mentions 'strict and partial vegetarians', by which she probably means lacto-ovo vegetarians and flexitarians, she does not mention vegans at all (even though the term was coined as early as in 1944). Kroonenberg, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt*, 1122.
- ⁶⁹ Varkens in Nood, 'Misstanden in de varkenshouderij', www.varkensinnood.nl/misstanden, last accessed 19 June 2021.
- ⁷⁰ This work was supported by the European Regional Development Fund project 'Creativity and Adaptability as Conditions of the Success of Europe in an Interrelated World' (reg. no.: CZ.02.1.01/0.0/0.0/16_019/0000734).

Bibliography

- Blattner, Charlotte E., 'Animal Labour: Toward a Prohibition of Forced Labour and a Right to Freely Choose One's Work', in: Charlotte E. Blattner, Kendra Coulter & Will Kymlicka (eds.), *Animal Labour: A New Frontier of Interspecies Justice?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 91-115.
- Blattner, Charlotte E., Kendra Coulter, & Will Kymlicka, *Animal Labour: A New Frontier of Interspecies Justice?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020).
- Bouman, Hans, 'Hoofdpersoon Jas heet ook in het Engels gewoon Jas', in: *De Volkskrant*, 21 August 2020.
- Cochrane, Alasdair, 'Good Work for Animals', in: Charlotte E. Blattner, Kendra Coulter, & Will Kymlicka (eds.), *Animal Labour: A New Frontier of Interspecies Justice?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 48-64.
- Cook, Guy, "A Pig Is a Person" or "You Can Love a Fox And Hunt It": Innovation and Tradition in the Discursive Representation of Animals', in: *Discourse & Society* 26 (2015), 587-607.
- Cooke, Simon, 'Inner Journeys: Travel Writing as Life Writing', in: Carl Thompson (ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Travel Writing* (London: Routledge, 2015), 15-24.
- Hansen, Natalie Corinne, 'Dressage: Training the Equine Body', in: Matthew Chrulew & Dinesh Joseph Wadiwel (eds.), *Foucault and Animals* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 132-160.
- Jepson, Jill, 'A Linguistic Analysis of Discourse on the Killing of Nonhuman Animals', in: *Society and Animals* 16 (2008), 127-148.
- Joy, Melanie, *Why We Love Dogs, Eat Pigs and Wear Cows: An Introduction to Carnism* (San Francisco: Conari Press, 2011).
- Kroonenberg, Yvonne, *Alleen de knor wordt niet gebruikt: Biografie van een varken* (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Contact, 2009). Kindle edition.
- Leane, Elizabeth, 'Animals', in: Alasdair Pettinger & Tim Youngs (eds.), *The Routledge Research Companion to Travel Writing* (London: Routledge, 2020), 305-317.
- Marquis, Christopher, 'Plant-Based Products Are Our Future and Entrepreneurs Are Helping Us Make the Shift', in: *Forbes*, 2 March 2021.
- Nieuwenhuize, Rianne, '2030: Wereld staat bol van de plantaardige voeding', in: *Foodbusiness*, 16 August 2021.

- Pesie, Sarah, 'Nederlanders onbewust grootconsumenten van Argentijns paardenvlees', in: *Dier en Recht*, 29 December 2020.
- Regan, Tom, *The Case for Animal Rights* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).
- Rothberger, Hank, 'Meat-related Cognitive Dissonance: A Conceptual Framework for Understanding How Meat Eaters Reduce Negative Arousal from Eating Animals', in: *Appetite* 146 (2020), 1-16.
- Ryder, Roger D., 'Speciesism Again: The Original Leaflet', in: *Critical Society* 2 (2010), 1-2.
- Sinclair, Upton, *The Jungle* (Project Gutenberg Etext, 1994).
- Stibbe, Arran, *Animals Erased: Discourse, Ecology, and Reconnection with the Natural World* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 2012).
- Verdonk, Dirk-Jan, *Dierenrechten* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2016).
- Westerman, Frank, *Brother Mendel's Perfect Horse: Man and Beast in an Age of Human Warfare*. Trans. by Sam Garrett (London: Harvill Secker, 2012). Kindle edition.
- Youngs, Tim, *The Cambridge Introduction to Travel Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

