Comparative Studies in Society and History 2016;58(2):463–490.
0010-4175/16 © Society for the Comparative Study of Society and History 2016
doi:10.1017/S0010417516000141

Between Instinct and Intelligence: Harnessing Police Dog Agency in Early Twentieth-Century Paris

CHRIS PEARSON

University of Liverpool, UK

INTRODUCTION

In 1907 Clément Vautel in *Le Journal* recounted the story of Spot, a police dog who could sniff out lies, infidelities, and all kinds of human flaws. Alarmed by this "monster," the Parisian police prefect orders Spot to be taken to the pound and shot, thereby fulfilling his duty as a "defender of society."[1] Vautel's article satirized effectively the claims made about the powers of France's new police dogs by journalists, canophiles, and police dog trainers, who all celebrated the important role that well-trained, intelligent, sturdy, and loyal dogs could play in securing France's urban areas from crime and protecting the law-abiding citizen from the omnipresent threats of the modern city. Intense fears of crime dovetailed with police professionalization and new understandings of animal psychology to create the conditions for the emergence of Parisian police dogs. Their abilities became a matter of public debate within the mass print culture of *belle époque*.[2] From front-page splashes to short *fait divers* news items, numerous press reports represented police dogs as emotional and intelligent individuals dedicated to fighting crime and as evidence of changing human-canine relations. In this vein, René Simon argued that using dogs for police work enabled them to fulfil their "social value" as "vigilant defender[s] and

Acknowledgments: This research was made possible by a Small Research Grant from the British Academy. For comments and suggestions, I would like to thank seminar audiences at the Centre for the History of Science, Technology and Medicine at the University of Manchester and in the history departments at the universities of Bristol and Swansea, as well as Chris Millington. Finally, I want to thank Andrew Shryock, David Akin, and the anonymous *CSSH* reviewers for their comments and support.

[1] Clément Vautel, "La vie fantaisiste: chien policier," *Le Journal*, 20 Apr. 1907.

[2] Dominique Kalifa, *Crime et culture au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Perrin, 2005), 257; Gregory Shaya, "The *flâneur*, the *badaud*, and the Making of a Mass Public in France, circa 1869–1910," *American Historical Review* 109, 1 (2004): 41–77. By 1914, *Le Petit Parisien, Le Petit Journal, Le Matin*, and *Le Journal* had a combined circulation of 4.5 million; Robert Gildea, *Children of the Revolution: The French, 1799–1914* (London: Penguin, 2008), 404.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

protector[s] of our security."[3] In particular, Simon and others portrayed them as canine defenses against the much-feared Apache gangs—roaming bands of unemployed youths so-named for their supposed tribal savagery—which bourgeois commentators commonly represented as violent and unreformable obstacles to social order.[4]

Having spent much of the nineteenth century combating stray dogs and the threat of canine-borne rabies, the Paris police force began deploying dogs for specialized police work in the early twentieth century, a time of increased police professionalization and expansion. Under the guidance of dynamic police prefect Louis Lépine, dogs became part of the modern police force, which was integral to the rise of "bourgeois civilization" based on liberalism, capitalism, and the protection of private property.[5] They joined customs and army dogs as creatures mobilized to protect national interests from perceived internal and external threats.[6] But although their introduction was rooted within the particular conditions of *belle époque* France, Parisian police dogs were part of the broader deployment of police dogs in other countries such as Belgium, Britain, Germany, and the United States, which took place through transnational connections and exchanges.

Dogs are reasonably well-represented within the emerging field of animal history, whose practitioners have shown how animals have constituted "human" societies.[7] Historians have examined police dogs to uncover representations of class and dog breeds, as well as the mechanisms of racialized state repression.[8] This article takes a different approach, and deploys police dogs,

[3] René Simon, *Le chien de police, de défense, de secours* (Paris: A. Pedone, 1909), 32.

[4] Kalifa, *Crime et culture*, 47, 66. Robert A. Nye, *Crime, Madness and Politics in Modern France: The Medical Concept of National Decline* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 196.

[5] His-Huey Liang, *The Rise of the Modern Police and the European State System from Metternich to the Second World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002 [1992]), 4; Kalifa, *Crime et culture*, 13. Lépine was prefect from 11 July 1893 to 14 October 1897, and 23 June 1899 to 29 March 1913. On Lépine, see Jean Marc Berlière, *Le préfet Lépine: vers la naissance de la police moderne* (Paris: Denoël, 1993).

[6] "Les chiens auxiliaires de la défense fiscale," *Annales des douanes*, 12, 14 (15 July 1914); Jean-Daniel Lauth, *Etude sur la liaison par chien de guerre* (Paris: R. Chapelot et Cie, 1910).

[7] On dogs and history, see Aaron Herald Skabelund, *Empire of Dogs: Canines, Japan, and the Making of the Modern Imperial World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011); Philip Howell, *At Home and Astray: The Domestic Dog in Victorian Britain* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015); Neil Pemberton and Michael Worboys, *Mad Dogs and Englishmen: Rabies in Britain, 1830–2000* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); Catherine Pinguet, *Les chiens d'Istanbul: des rapports entre l'homme et l'animal de l'antiquité à nos jours* (Saint-Pourçain-sur-Sioule: Bleu Autour, 2008); Sandra Swart and Lance van Sittert, eds., *Canis africanis: A Dog History of Southern Africa* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

[8] Emma Mason, "Dogs, Detectives and the Famous Sherlock Holmes," *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 11, 3 (2008): 289–300; Neil Pemberton, "Bloodhounds as Detectives: Dogs, Slum Stench and Late-Victorian Murder Investigation," *Cultural and Social History* 10, 1 (2013): 69–91; Meg Spratt, "When Police Dogs Attacked: Iconic News Photographs and Construction of History, Mythology and Political Discourse," *American Journalism* 25, 2 (2008): 85–105; Keith Shear,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a neglected aspect of the police history and animal history of France, to explore nonhuman agency, an expanding area of scholarly inquiry across a range of disciplines.[9] I will argue that while "nonhuman agency" is an illuminating and necessary analytical tool, we also need to examine historical actors' conceptualizations of animal abilities to clarify the stakes and complexities of mobilizing purposeful and capable animals, such as police dogs.

Many philosophers and theorists have grappled with questions of agency, which Julia Adams describes as connoting "capacity, power, free will, [and] action."[10] Despite challenges from post-structuralist and other theorists, agency remains a key concern for many historians for whom reason remains a necessary condition of agency since it allows individuals to break free, to greater or lesser extents, of their instincts, emotions, traditions, and social structures.[11] This conflation of agency with reason, and by extension with human levels of intentionality, provides a formidable obstacle to the meaningful integration of nonhumans into historical narratives. In response, animal studies scholars now persuasively ascribe agency to animals. Often drawing on the work of actor-network theorists, principally Bruno Latour, they argue that nonhumans display agency when they make a difference to human activities, societies, and identities. Agency no longer relies on human levels of intentionality or reason, and has instead emerged as a hybrid and relational achievement distributed unevenly between humans and nonhumans.[12] Alongside this decoupling of agency and human reasoning, some animal studies scholars argue that certain animals also have agency because they act with a degree of inten-

"Police Dogs and State Rationality in Early Twentieth-Century South Africa," in Swart and van Sittert, eds., *Canis africanis*, 193–216.

[9] Sarah E. McFarland and Ryan Hediger, eds., *Animals and Agency: An Interdisciplinary Exploration* (Leiden: Brill, 2009). On the history of French policing, see Jean Marc Berlière and René Lévy, *Histoire de polices en France: de l'ancien régime à nos jours* (Paris: Nouveau Monde, 2013); Christian Chevandier, *Policiers dans la ville* (Paris: Gallimard, 2012). On the history of animals in France, see Damien Baldin, *Histoire des animaux domestiques, XIXe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Seuil, 2014); Ghislaine Bouchet, *Le cheval à Paris de 1850 à 1914* (Genève: Libraire Droz, 1993); Kathleen Kete, *The Beast in the Boudoir: Petkeeping in Nineteenth-Century Paris* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

[10] Julia Adams, "1-800-How-Am-I-Driving? Agency in Social Science History," *Social Science History* 35, 1 (2011): 1–17, 3.

[11] Walter Johnson, "On Agency," *Journal of Social History*, 37, 1 (2003): 113–24, 113; David Gary Shaw, "Happy in Our Chains? Agency and Language in the Postmodern Age," *History and Theory*, 40 (2001), 1–9; William H. Sewell, "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation," *American Journal of Sociology* 98, 1 (1992): 1–29, 19.

[12] Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Edwin Sayes, "Actor-Network Theory and Methodology: Just What Does It Mean to Say that Nonhumans Have Agency?" *Social Studies of Science* 44 (2014): 134–49.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tionality.[13] Dogs, for instance, can be agents because they have unwittingly shaped the past *and* because they are capable of skillful and intentional actions.[14]

Uncovering nonhuman agency allows animals to be incorporated actively and non-deterministically into historical narratives.[15] However, "nonhuman agency" can become something of a monolithic concept. With this risk in mind, Susan J. Pearson and Mary Weismantel have called on scholars to ask how nonhuman agency "has been defined historically, and how agentive powers have been constructed and distributed through social formations."[16] Frederick Cooper, meanwhile, has convincingly argued that analytical concepts such as "modernity" and "globalization" can too easily become catch-all and blunt explanatory concepts.[17] There is a danger that "nonhuman agency" will fall into the same trap.

In light of these concerns, this article historicizes nonhuman agency by exploring how human actors in early twentieth-century France conceptualized the diverse abilities of the animals they worked with. I avoid the term "nonhuman agency" throughout, for although journalists, canophiles, and police dog trainers sometimes described police dogs as "agents of the law,"[18] they did not use the terms "agency" or "agents" as scholars use them today. Instead, they discussed police dogs' intelligence, sensory skills, emotions, trainability, and physical strength, which under human guidance would allow them to act in socially-useful ways. They also repeatedly stressed the crucial and transformative experience of the training process: police dogs would emerge through trainers suppressing some canine instincts and nurturing others. Without their guidance, trainers feared that the dogs' aggressive or wayward instincts would dominate. These portrayals of dogs' multiple and contingent capabilities can help us tease out complexities and nuances that are sometimes obscured by "nonhuman agency."

Discussions on Parisian police dogs' abilities reflected and contributed to broader deliberations on animal and human intelligence. The early Third Republic is sometimes treated as a Cartesian moment because some Republicans

[13] Tim Ingold, "The Animal in the Study of Humanity," in Tim Ingold, ed., *What Is an Animal?* (London: Routledge, 1988), 95; Helen Steward, "Animal Agency," *Inquiry* 52, 3 (2009): 217–31, 226.

[14] Chris Pearson "Dogs, History, and Agency," *History and Theory* 52, 4 (2013): 128–45.

[15] Ted Steinberg, "Down to Earth: Nature, Agency, and Power in History," *American Historical Review* 107, 3 (2002): 798–820; David Gary Shaw, "The Torturer's Horse: Agency and Animals in History," *History and Theory* 52, 4 (2013): 146–67; Sandra Swart, *Riding High: Horses, Humans, and History in South Africa* (Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2010).

[16] Susan J. Pearson and Mary Weismantel, "Does 'The Animal' Exist? Toward a Theory of Social Life with Animals," in Dorothee Brantz, ed., *Beastly Natures: Animals, Humans, and the Study of History* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010), 27.

[17] Frederick Cooper, *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 113–49.

[18] "Les chiens, agents de police," *Mon Dimanche*, 18 Mar. 1904.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

celebrated René Descartes' veneration of reason. But it is a mistake to assume that the Cartesian model of the "animal-machine" dominated French thinking about animals, and the discourse on police dogs made little reference to the famous philosopher. This was not so much explicitly anti-Cartesian as it was a by-passing of Cartesian tropes altogether.[19] Discussions of police dogs' abilities had more in common with transnational debates on animal psychology, during which some early twentieth-century psychologists claimed that certain animals, including dogs and apes, possessed intelligence[20] The history of Parisian police dogs suggests that these debates were at times highly politicized and also had a very practical dimension. It also highlights how discussions of animal intelligence were entwined with broader cultural understandings of human intelligence in the post-Darwinian world.[21]

Police dogs emerged at a time of shifting animal-human relations in France as Darwinism, feelings of kinship with pets, concerns over animal welfare, and xenotransplantations all questioned the sense of an unbridgeable divide between humans and animals.[22] The question of intelligence, both human and animal, had become fundamental as influential doctors, psychiatrists, and psychologists increasingly emphasized instinct, heredity, the unconscious, and the environment as scientifically observable explanations for human behavior. These approaches had continued to gain prominence since their initial formulation during the monomania controversies of the 1820s. Amongst these alienists was Théodule Ribot, who believed that free will and reason "were mere abstractions, the subjective aspect of coordinated neurophysiological reaction."[23] Pioneer of crowd psychology Gustave Le Bon similarly played down the role of reason "in the governing of men" in his hugely

[19] F. Azouvi, *Descartes et la France: histoire d'une passion nationale* (Paris: Fayard, 2002), 252–92. On the varied reception of Cartesian views on animals within French history, see George Boas, *The Happy Beast in French Thought of the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Octagon Books, 1966 [1933]); L. Cohen Rosenfield, *From Beast-Machine to Man-Machine: Animal Soul in French Letters from Descartes to La Mettrie* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1941), 205; Elisabeth Wallmann, "On Poets and Insects: Figures of the Human and Figures of the Insect in Pierre Perrin's *Divers insects* (1645)," *French History* 28, 2 (2014): 172–87; Peter Sahlins, "The Beast Within: Animals in the First Xenotransfusion Experiments in France, ca. 1667–68," *Representations* 129 (Winter 2015): 25–55.

[20] Donald A. Dewsbury, "Issues in Comparative Psychology at the Dawn of the 20th Century," *American Psychologist* 55, 7 (2000): 750–53.

[21] In this vein, Edmund Ramsden and Duncan Wilson have convincingly shown that changing notions of animals and suicide drew from and informed psychological understandings of suicide in humans; "The Suicidal Animal: Science and the Nature of Self-Destruction," *Past and Present* 224 (2014): 205–17.

[22] Kete, *Beast in the Boudoir*; Christophe Traïni, *La cause animale 1820–1980: essai de sociologie historique* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2011); Catherine Rémy, "Men Seeking Monkey-Glands": The Controversial Xenotransplantations of Doctor Voronoff (1910–1930)," *French History* 28, 2 (2014): 226–40.

[23] Ruth Harris, *Murders and Madness: Medicine, Law and Society in the Fin-de-Siècle* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 40.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

popular and influential *Psychologie des foules* (1895).[24] Such claims and the search for the biological causes of madness and delinquency increasingly challenged received notions of moral responsibility, human rationality, and free will. They constructed crime and other social problems as diseases to be carefully managed and contained by the medical profession as part of its struggle against national degeneration. This "revolt against rationalism," to borrow Ruth Harris' term, turned criminals into creatures governed by harmful instinctual impulses and socially-destructive unconscious desires.[25] As doctors, psychologists, and psychiatrists animalized women, criminals, alcoholics, the insane, vagabonds, and sexual "deviants" by stripping them of their free will and reason, police dogs were conversely treated as beings whose intelligence and physical prowess could be mobilized to defend civilized society, even if fears about their violent instincts never died away. Police dogs became embroiled in the fraught deliberations over the meanings of instinct and intelligence.

As well as contributing to the wider rethinking of intelligence and human-animal boundaries in *belle époque* France, discussions of canine abilities formed the "agential conditions" within which police dogs operated. As Bob Carter and Nickie Charles argue, the "possibilities for action are conditioned by incorporation into human social relations. Agency is thus always Agency in relation to other Agents and to what those other Agents want to do." Within this relational model of agency, police dogs are "agents in relation to human dominated structures."[26] The police dogs' abilities were both enabled and constrained by the prevailing attitudes toward dogs and the training techniques of the time. The case of Parisian police dogs shows that even when humans want to enhance the abilities of animals (as opposed to seeking actively to subdue them) it is not always possible, not because of animal "resistance" or lack of skill, but rather because of deficiencies in the ways in which humans try to mobilize and harness them.[27] In their desire to de-center humans as the driving force of history by highlighting animals' roles and "resistance," studies of nonhuman agency have arguably downplayed the conditions that structure the possibilities for animals to act, and this article attempts to redress the balance. Having covered some of the theoretical ground, I turn

[24] Gustave Le Bon, *The Crowd* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1997 [1895]), 137–38. On the reception of Le Bon, see Robert A. Nye, *The Origins of Crowd Psychology: Gustave Le Bon and the Crisis of Mass Democracy in the Third Republic* (London: Sage, 1975), 3.

[25] Harris, *Murders and Madness*, 14.

[26] Bob Carter and Nickie Charles, "Animals, Agency and Resistance," *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 43, 3 (2013): 330–31.

[27] For a critique of animal agency as resistance, see Chris Pearson, "Beyond Resistance: Nonhuman Agency for a 'More-Than-Human' World," *European Review of History* 22, 5 (2015): 709–25.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

now to the promotion of Parisian police dogs, before analyzing training techniques and the reception of the dogs on the streets of Paris.

THE EMERGENCE OF PARISIAN POLICE DOGS

By the end of the nineteenth century many Parisians had become obsessed by crime. Fueled by lurid stories in newspapers, magazines, and novels, and following decades of urbanization, worries about criminals stalked the capital. Writers, psychologists, self-defense experts, and others portrayed the city as a dangerous place in which murders, robberies, and assaults could happen almost anywhere.[28] Press reports depicted criminals as mobile, anonymous, and violent, with Apache gangs among the most dangerous and anxiety-provoking. These gangs were first named "Apaches" in the summer of 1900, to denote their supposed savagery, threat to civilization, and refusal to conform to civilized norms. The term "Apache" reflected French fascination with the Wild West and portrayed the gangs as obstacles to social progress and Paris as a wild urban space of hunters (the police) and the hunted (Apaches).[29] A 1907 article in *Le Petit Journal* fretted that the capital was "in the hands of vast criminal organizations": Apache gangs "swarmed" (*pullulent*) within the capital and its outskirts, outnumbering and mocking the police's ability to uphold law and order. The Apache gang member had become "the king of the street" and thrived within the Third Republic's supposedly lax criminal justice system.[30]

How could the law-abiding citizen feel safe in such a fearful atmosphere? Some turned to learning self-defense techniques based on boxing and jiu-jitsu.[31] Others turned to dogs. Previously represented as loyal defenders of the private bourgeois home,[32] dogs were now refashioned by police officials and dog aficionados as allies in the fight against the criminalization of public urban space. They portrayed police dogs as part of a broader improvement in human-canine relations, and some inserted them into the broader narrative of rational progress being forged in Republican France. Paul Cunisset-Carnot, a lawyer, politician, and prolific writer on hunting matters, stated that police

[28] Jean-Marc Berlière, *Le monde des polices en France* (Bruxelles: Editions Complexe, 1996), 53–59; Aaron Freundschuh, "'New Sport' in the Street: Self-Defence, Security and Space in belle époque Paris," *French History* 20, 4 (2006): 424–41, 425; Dominique Kalifa, "Crime Scenes: Criminal Topography and Social Imaginary in Nineteenth-Century Paris," *French Historical Studies* 27 (2004): 175–94, 176; William B. Cohen, *Urban Government and the Rise of the French City: Five Municipalities in the Nineteenth Century* (Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1998), 82–84.

[29] Kalifa, *Crime et culture*, 47, 59, 63.

[30] Ernest Laut, "Le pays des apaches," *Le Petit Journal illustré*, 22 Sept. 1907; Ernest Laut, "Police et criminalité," *Le Petit Journal illustré*, 20 Oct. 1907; Kalifa, *Crime et culture*, 258; Nye, *Crime, Madness and Politics*, 199–200.

[31] Freundschuh, "New Sport"; Louis Singer, *Défendez-vous! le "Self-Defence"* (Dijon: J. Delorme, n.d.).

[32] Jean Robert (Silvio), *Le chien d'appartement et d'utilité* (Paris: Librairie Pairault, 1888), 49; Kete, *Beast in the Boudoir*, 47–48; Baldin, *Histoire des animaux domestiques,* 64–65.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dogs proved that modern scientific curiosity, research, and discoveries now allowed humans to better exploit canine intelligence and capabilities.[33]

Dogs seemingly possessed the necessary physical and mental attributes to become effective police auxiliaries, and even counter some of the nefarious effects of urban life on the human population. In line with biomedical theories that stressed that modern urban life caused individual and national degeneration, social problems such as alcoholism, and crime, and with the Wild West seemingly in mind, René Simon claimed that 95 percent of modern urbanites had lost the physical strength and keen senses possessed by the "ancient Indian tribes," "valiant pioneers," or "hardy hunters." Yet the modern urban dweller was under constant threat from silent yet deadly criminals, such as Apaches, who had, Simon implicitly suggested, retained the savage strength of uncivilized peoples. In some areas, "the bourgeoisie dared not go out at night." Guns and other weapons were illegal, and in any case ineffectual if their owner could not detect the threat in time to use them.

Simon identified dogs as the solution. They had the "muscular suppleness, sensory sharpness, instinctive sense of smell, [and] alert attention" that the French no longer possessed. He believed that once a dog accompanied every pedestrian, then the "bandits'" exploits would diminish.[34] Although some French canophiles fretted about the deterioration of French dog breeds,[35] for Simon dogs seemed immune from the physical and mental degeneration afflicting French society. At a time when middle-class tax payers were demanding that the police focus on securing the street from social disorder and crime, and while influential Republican thinkers such as Alfred Fouillée advanced the right of society to defend itself against hardened, incorrigible criminals,[36] dogs' sense of smell, intelligence, trainability, and physical prowess seemed to offer an effective solution to urban policing. Like police uniforms, police dogs would give policemen greater visibility on the streets and underscore the state's commitment to fighting crime.[37] A 1907 article in *Nos Loisirs* asserted that the dogs' skills, speed, agility, and biting jaws would strike

[33] Paul Cunisset-Carnot, "Préface," in Pierre Saint-Laurent, *Chiens de défense et chiens de garde: races, éducation, dressage* (Bordeaux and Paris: Féret Fils/L. Mulo, 1907), x–xii.

[34] Simon, *Chien de police*, 3–11. On degeneration, see Harris, *Murders and Madness*; Nye, *Crime, Madness and Politics*.

[35] A.-C.-E. Bellier de Villiers, *Le Chien au Chenil: De l'amélioration des race canines du lodgement, du pansage, de la nourriture, de l'exercice et de la condition de l'élève, soins thérapeutiques* (Paris: Pairault et Cie, 1901), 117–18, 242.

[36] Jennifer Davis, "Urban Policing and Its Objects: Comparative Themes in England and France in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century," in Clive Emsley and Barbara Weinberger, eds., *Policing Western Europe: Politics, Professionalism and Public Order, 1850–1940* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1991), 7–8; Nye, *Crime, Madness, and Politics*, 69–70.

[37] Quentin Deluermoz, "Circulations et élaborations d'un mode d'action policier: la police en tenue à Paris, d'une police 'londonienne' au 'modèle parisien' (1850–1914)," *Revue d'Histoire des Sciences Humaines* 19 (2008): 75–90.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"terror" among "wrongdoers," and murder rates might well fall by 90 percent, as they reportedly had in Belgium.[38]

The reference to Belgium highlights how the deployment of police dogs took place within an international promotion of dogs as skilled, capable, and useful police auxiliaries. British police officer William Bolton had boasted of using dogs to hunt down "social vermin" back in the 1870s,[39] but William G. Fitz-Gerald, writing in the American periodical *The Century*, identified "little Belgium" as the main police dog innovator. He reported how Ghent's Police Commissioner E. van Wesemael had deployed Belgian sheep dogs in the 1890s to make up for a lack of manpower. Van Wesemael had harnessed the dog's "sense of smell, its instinct that all was not right, and its remarkable jumping and swimming powers" to great effect. Declining crime rates in Ghent encouraged the spread of police dogs to other cities in Belgium, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Italy, and the United States, as well as to the colonies.[40] In France and elsewhere, dogs provided an animal dimension to the diversification of police powers. They became a key element of the modern state's expanding security apparatus at the century's turn as police officers and dog trainers exchanged knowledge about police dog training, as well as actual dogs, across national borders.[41]

While dogs had been used to track down black fugitives in the South African countryside,[42] in Europe police dogs were overwhelmingly deployed in urban areas. The first dogs arrived in France in 1905 when the police commissioner of Pont-à-Mousson (Meurthe-et-Moselle), inspired by accounts of Belgian and German police dogs and encouraged by the Eastern Canine Society (Société canine de l'est), deployed two to control the town's numerous

[38] "Les chiens policiers," *Nos Loisirs*, June 1907, 683–84. See also "Chien de police," *Le Matin*, 4 Dec. 1908.

[39] William Bolton, *Recollections of a Police Officer Relating to Dogs with Useful Hints as to Their Treatment in Health and Disease: How to Break Your Own Retriever &c., &c.* (Southport: Robert Johnson, 1878), 12.

[40] William G. Fitz-Gerald, "The Dog Police of European Cities," *The Century*, Oct. 1906: 823–31; Samuel G. Chapman, *Police Dogs in America* (Norman: Bureau of Government Research, University of Oklahoma, 1979), 6.

[41] For instance, British dog breeder and trainer Edwin Richardson sent police dogs to India. Edwin H. Richardson, *British War Dogs: Their Training and Psychology* (London: Skeffington & Son, 1920), 38, 229. On policing and the growth of the modern state, see Howard G. Brown, "From Organic Society to Security State: The War on Brigandage in France, 1797–1802," *Journal of Modern History* 69 (1997): 661–95; Gary Kinsman, Dieter K. Buse, and Mercedes Steedman, eds., *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2000); Alfred W. McCoy, *Policing America's Empire: The United States, the Philippines, and the Rise of the Surveillance State* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009); John Merriman, *Police Stories: Building the French State, 1815–1851* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

[42] Shear, "Police Dogs."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"brigands."[43] The next year the Society organized a police dog show in Nancy at which Belgian and German dogs, along with the two from Pont-à-Mousson, were judged on their abilities to find a hidden man, defend their master from a stick-wielding assailant, and jump over obstacles, among other tasks. The display impressed a policeman from Epinal (Vosges) named Lalloué, who then obtained some German Shepherds to train for police work.[44] Meanwhile, Henri Simart, the police commissioner of the Parisian suburb of Neuilly, was inspired by a visit to study police dog training in Ghent. Hoping to better protect his men following the murder of a brigadier named Fleurant, Simart secured approval from Neuilly's Municipal Council in February 1907 to use dogs to "purge" the Bois de Boulogne of "disreputable people."[45]

As Lalloué's and Simart's actions show, local municipal initiatives took precedence over centralized and national programs during the early stages of police dog work in France, replicating the weak centralization of French policing.[46] However, national societies and clubs soon sprang up to encourage the use of police and guard dogs. This took place in conjunction with other developments in urban security, in particular the rise of self-defense clubs. It also emerged from the creation of numerous dog-breeding societies following the 1882 establishment of the French kennel club, called the Central Society for the Improvement of Dog Breeds in France (Société centrale pour l'amélioration des races de chiens en France).[47]

The Police, Game-Keeper and Customs Dog Club (Club du Chien de Police, de Garde-Chasse et de Douanier) brought together members of the Central Society and individual dog breeding societies such as the Saint-Hubert-Club de France, as well as politicians and police officials (including Simart). The Club was founded in Paris on 1 January 1908 and based at the Paris headquarters of the Central Society. Its Committee of Patrons reinforced its links with the French political and social establishment and included figures with political clout such the ministers of the Interior, War, Finances, and Agriculture, and the Parisian police prefect, as well as such luminaries as Madame Heriot, Henri de Rothschild, and the Duchesse d'Uzès. The Club established a

[43] "Emploi des chiens comme auxiliaires de la police à Pont-à-Mousson: rapport du commissaire de police," *Journal des commissaires de police*, Apr. (1907): 116. The recourse to Belgium and Germany, rather than Paris, highlights how French provincial authorities were "curious about urban experiences abroad." Cohen, *Urban Government*, 257.

[44] Saint-Laurent, *Chiens de défense* 9, 53–54; Paul Villers, "Le chien, gardien de la société," *Je sais tout: encyclopédie mondiale illustrée*, vol. 2, July–Dec. 1907, 362–63.

[45] Villers, "Chien," 362–63; Archives de la Préfecture de police (hereafter APP), Paris, 138 W 1, "Mémoire sur la brigade canine: projet de restructuration de la compagnie cynophile" (Paris, Sept. 1994), 2. Newspaper reports portrayed the Bois de Boulogne as a poorly policed and therefore dangerous space plagued by Apaches. "A l'hôtel de ville," *Le Matin*, 16 Dec. 1908.

[46] Berlière, *Monde des polices*, 74–87; Cohen, *Urban Government*, 81.

[47] Freundschuh, "New Sport"; Kete, *Beast in the Boudoir*, 68–69.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

kennel on rue Chevaleret in the thirteenth arrondissement to train dogs for police work,[48] underscoring the increasing institutionalization of police dogs. This matched parallel developments in the promotion, training, and deployment of French army dogs.[49]

The Club's membership made it somewhat elitist. In contrast, the Union of Guard and Police Dog Enthusiasts in France (Réunion des amateurs du chien de défense et de police en France), founded in 1910, portrayed police dog training as a useful "recreational sport" suitable for all and an effective form of self-defense fit for a democratic republic. The Union organized shows in which police dog skills could be judged. Like the dog training manuals I will discuss presently, the Union's shows treated police dogs as sensitive and capable creatures rather than like machines. Judges gave dogs points for their "general attitude" (*allure générale*) and could award up to forty points for such qualities as "love of work, shrewdness, brilliance (*brio*), intelligence, instinct, atavism, will (*volonté*), [and] courage."[50] The shows were frequented by establishment figures, such as President Armand Fallières in 1909, and were the object of enthusiastic press reports.[51] They became showcases for the dogs' multiple abilities and won over at least one *Le Matin* journalist who, already a partial believer in canine intelligence, left one show convinced that dogs possessed "a sense of duty to the highest degree," respect for the law, and a "love of property and a hatred for bandits." The future, he wrote, "belongs to dogs."[52]

There was a slippage between private and public institutions in the emerging police dog world. While intellectuals, journalists, and politicians debated the role of private security organizations in securing the public space of the city for the bourgeoisie,[53] canophiles promoted the use of privately owned guard dogs and publically owned police dogs, sometimes within the same book.[54] This public-private slippage continued once Paris' Municipal Council, following a policing report by municipal councilor Emile Massard, on 30 December 1908 budgeted 8,000 francs to create a police dog service.[55] Although the police prefecture bought seven dogs of its own in

[48] *Status du club de chien de police, de garde-chasse et de douanier* (Sceaux: Imprimerie Charaire, 1908), 1–7; APP 138 W 1, "Historique du club de chien de police," 2. The kennel was later transferred to the eastern Parisian suburb of Charenton.

[49] Lauth, *Etude*.

[50] *Carnet de juge avec nomenclature des penalisations spécifiées dans le programme des epreuves concours de dressage de chiens de défense et de police* (Paris: Imprimerie française, Maison J. Dangon, 1913), 4.

[51] Réunion des amateurs du chien de défense et de police en France, *Bulletin Annuaire*, 1913–1914; Réunion des amateurs du chien de défense et de police en France, *Programme des épreuves des concours de dressage de chiens de défense et de police* (Paris: Imprimerie Française, 1913); "Les chiens de police luttent devant M. Fallières," *Le Matin*, 10 May 1909.

[52] "Chiens detectives," *Le Matin*, 16 Apr. 1907.

[53] Freundschuh, "New Sport," 437–38.

[54] Simon, *Chien de police*.

[55] "Pour se débarrasser des apaches," *Echo de Paris*, 7 Jan. 1907.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1908, six of the other dogs it deployed were privately owned and lodged with individual policemen, twenty-six were hired from the Police, Game-Keeper and Customs Dog Club from June 1909 onward (for an annual charge of 230 francs per dog), and twelve were donated by the writer, philanthropist, and entrepreneur Henri de Rothschild in October 1910.[56] The vast majority of Parisian police dogs were privately trained and owned and, in line with the view that they were most effective in helping police sparsely populated areas, they patrolled Paris' outer arrondissements where open and abandoned land was commonplace.[57]

There were no firm views on what type of dog was best adapted to police work. One journalist asserted that any dog could contribute to "public defense" so long as its training was "sufficiently methodical."[58] Most observers and practitioners, though, treated police dog abilities as dispersed unevenly and argued for particular dogs based on their breed or individual character. This view fitted with existing dog breeding narratives that stressed history, lineage, and hierarchy. The classification, standardization, and promotion of dog breeds during the nineteenth century gave police dog trainers and handlers a range of breeds to consider. In harmony with arguments put forward by noted French dog expert Paul Mégnin and France's increasingly vocal and organized pedigree dog breeders, one observer advised police commissioners that pure breeds were superior to mongrels—training was not everything, and just as good servants could not be found in "vagabond asylums" (*asiles de vagabonds*), dog pounds and refuges were poor places to obtain police dogs.[59] In line with breeders' claims that pure breed dogs were the product of rational selection, expert knowledge, and prestigious ancestry, Robert Gersbach (a German breeder whose police dog training manual was translated into French in 1911) advocated that police forces carefully examine any potential police dog's breed "history and development" and try to locate the breed's "elite subjects." Better still would be to favor the offspring of successful police dogs, since they would have inherited the "moral qualities" of their parents.[60]

Cartesian depictions of animals-machines were largely absent from *belle époque* representations of police dogs: trainers and others overwhelmingly treated them as animals rather than technologies, even if one journalist

[56] APP 138 W 1, "Organisation d'un Service de chiens de police," 23 Sept. 1908; APP 138 W 1, Préfecture de Police, "Minute: chiens de Police," 29 Dec. 1910.

[57] Berlière, *Préfet Lépine*, 14; Kalifa, "Crime Scenes," 182–84, 188–89.

[58] "Les chiens policiers," *Le Journal*, 30 Mar. 1907.

[59] Niluar, "A propos de chiens de police," *Journal des commissaires de police*, May 1907: 144. See also Degoutte, "Conseils pratiques aux propriétaires & éleveurs de chiens de police et de garde," in Robert Gersbach, *Manuel de dressage des chiens de police*, Daniel Elmer, trans. (Lyon: Fournier, 1911), 11. Mégnin's publications helped popularize breed standards in France. *Nos chiens: races, dressage, élevage, hygiène, maladies* (Paris: J-B Baillière et Fils, 1909).

[60] Gersbach, *Manuel de dressage*, 11, 152. On breeding, see Baldin, *Histoire des animaux domestiques*, 116–17; Kete, *Beast in the Boudoir*, 66–75; Ritvo, *Animal Estate*, 82–115.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

described them as a "weapon."[61] While police dog trainers were hardly immune to anthropomorphism, they made serious attempts to know the dogs *as dogs* so as to better harness their abilities. They carefully considered the mental, emotional, and physical attributes of various breeds and, like the racialized classification of humans, they divided dogs into categories and established a hierarchy of their intelligence, abilities, and potential for police work.[62] Here they also echoed the growing, if contested, interest in measuring, assessing, and ranking intelligence, as pioneered in France during the early twentieth century by Alfred Binet.[63] As with period approaches to human intelligence, the police tried to assess canine intelligence on both the group and individual levels. Some stressed particular breeds, such as Lalloué, who identified five main suitable ones: Alsatians, Airedales, Dobermans, and Belgium and French sheep dogs. Each of these had their advantages and disadvantages. Dobermans, for instance, were easy to train but could be hostile to other dogs, whilst Airedales offered policemen a heightened sense of security but were poor at jumping and running long distances. But of all of them, the Alsatian was the "ideal" police dog due to its excellent sense of smell, trainability, loyalty, and "very developed intelligence."[64] Villers, too, identified the Alsatian—or German Shepherd—as the best dog for police work due to its "intelligence," "strength," "agility," and sense of smell.[65] Joseph Couplet also claimed that shepherd dogs were best, due to their history of protecting sheep from wolves.[66] The breed embodied the perfect combination of canine emotional, physical, and cognitive abilities, and had long protected settled and productive human communities from dangerous outsiders.

Other police dog experts were less concerned about breeds and placed greater stress on individual personality. Saint Laurent agreed with the suitability of German Shepherds for police work, but he emphasized that the individual dog's "personal qualities" were more important than its breed, especially since

[61] "Les chiens policiers," *L'Eclair*, 4 Mar. 1907.

[62] Baldin, *Histoire des animaux domestiques*, 115–17; Jacqueline Duvernay-Bolens, "L'Homme zoologique: race et racisme chez les naturalistes de la première moitié du XIXe siècle," *L'Homme* 35, 133 (1995): 9–32.

[63] John Carson, "The Science of Merit and the Merit of Science: Mental Order and Social Order in Early Twentieth-Century France and America," in Shelia Jasanoff, ed., *States of Knowledge: The Co-Production of Science and Social Order* (London: Routledge, 2004), 185; and "Mental Testing in the Early Twentieth Century: Internationalizing the Mental Testing Story," *History of Psychology* 17, 3 (2014): 249–55, 251.

[64] Lalloué, *Chien de guerre*, 15–19.

[65] Villers, "Chien," 367. See also Niluar, "Chiens de police," 143–44; Gersbach, *Manuel de dressage*, 168.

[66] Joseph Couplet, *Le chien de garde de défense et de police: manuel pratique et complet d'élevage et de dressage*, 2d ed. (Bruxelles: J. Lebègue, 1909), 44–51, 78. Gaston de Wael likewise recommended shepherd dogs whose intelligence, "accommodating nature," and "stamina" meant that it was almost as if nature had "prepared" them for human use. *Le chien auxiliaire de la police: manuel de dressage applicable au chien de défense du particulier et au chien du garde-chasse* (Bruxelles: Imprimerie F. Van Buggenhoudt, 1907), 25–39.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dogs of the same breed differed substantially. Rather than belonging to a particular breed, a police dog needed to be "agile," of an "imposing physique," "brave," "wary of strangers," and "attentive," and had to possess an "excessive sense of loyalty towards its master."[67] Breed was not a reliable identifier of a dog's aptitude for police work and so handlers needed to pay close attention to individual dogs. In contrast to the quantifying aspirations of the Binet-Simon human intelligence test, the police dog world required subjective assessments of individual dogs.

The lack of expert consensus on what type was best suited to police work partly explains why French police forces used a variety of dogs. Chance and cost also played a role. The first two police dogs in France—Achate (a bitch) and Argus (a dog)—were mongrels trained in Pont-à-Mousson in 1905. Although the Eastern Canine Society had recommended pure breeds to the town's police commissioner, he had accepted a spontaneous offer of the mongrels rather than seeking funds to buy expensive pedigree dogs.[68] In contrast, Simart used Belgian shepherd dogs in Neuilly, and when the Paris police force obtained ten dogs in 1909, nine of them were German Shepherds (the tenth was a French shepherd dog). These choices were subject to close scrutiny. According to one report, the police force had chosen German Shepherds because they were more aggressive than French dogs and therefore easier to train to attack people. *L'Eleveur belge* believed this to be a mistake; French shepherd dogs were "rustic" and "unpolished" but some, such as Briards, were spirited attackers if the occasion arose. German Shepherds, on the other hand, had an excellent sense of smell but were hesitant to bite, and since the French police wanted dogs for protection they were hardly an "ideal" choice.[69] The divergent views on these dogs' abilities highlight how experts treated canine qualities as diverse and as dependent on both breed and individual histories.

As with breeds, there was no consensus on the desired sex of police dogs. For instance, although male dogs took the top three places at a police dog competition in August 1908, two bitches, Foullette and Mordienne, came in fourth and fifth.[70] And though the names of certain dogs—"Garcon" and "Moustache"—contributed to the police force's culture of masculinity, police units also deployed bitches.[71] Furthermore, female dogs proved themselves effective agents in the field. They included the German Shepherd Lucie, who reportedly used her intelligence and sense of smell to pick out two fugitives from a crowded bar,[72] and Lalloué's celebrated police dog Léni was also a bitch.

[67] Saint-Laurent, *Chiens de défense*, 10, 17, 23.
[68] "Emploi des chiens comme auxiliaires de la police à Pont-à-Mousson," 116–17.
[69] "Les chiens de police à Paris," *L'Eleveur belge*, no. 30 (25 July 1909): 475.
[70] "Championnat des chiens de police," *Le Matin*, 17 Aug. 1908.
[71] Chevandier, *Policiers dans la ville*, 463. The French police continue to use male and female dogs. Richard Marlet, *Profession chien policier* (Lausanne: Favre, 2011), 37.
[72] "Les expériences de Vittel," *La Presse*, 8 Aug. 1907.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rather than sex or breed, what was paramount was a dog's individual capabilities, particularly its intelligence, and its response to training.

TRAINING POLICE DOGS

Police dogs were trained differently from the army and customs dogs that worked on battlefields or in remote rural borderlands, since police dogs had to operate in densely populated urban spaces where innocent citizens might be bitten. Trainers therefore emphasized the importance of adapting dogs to the urban environment, which they depicted as perilous, noisy, and teeming with dangerous criminals. For although dogs from rural breeds already lived in Paris as pets, and helped bring livestock to the capital's markets, police dog experts fretted about how well shepherd dogs used to the calm of the countryside would adapt to the bustle of the city. They therefore advised trainers to introduce their dogs to the hubbub of urban life (including cabarets, pedestrians, and vehicles) from the age of eight months, and expose them to gunshots: Saint Laurent even suggested using a revolver to announce their mealtimes.[73]

Training dogs for a crime-fighting role also necessitated engaging with canine intelligence. Bitter experience had taught the Parisian police to take canine psychology seriously. From 1900, after the drowning of one of their employees, they had deployed Newfoundland dogs to rescue people from the river Seine, but the rescue dogs were not a success and became the subject of numerous critical press reports. In response, the police force asked Director of the Institute of Zoological Psychology Pierre Hachet-Souplet, author of numerous books on animal intelligence and training, to write a report on training river rescue dogs. Like certain other proponents of the emerging field of animal psychology, Hachet-Souplet viewed dogs and other animals, such as parrots,[74] as intelligent creatures whose psychology could be best understood through empirical observation. More sophisticated understandings of animal psychology would, he believed, allow humans to train dogs more effectively and so better secure their obedience. By the time Hachet-Souplet's report came out in 1907, the Parisian police had already abandoned the use of rescue dogs,[75] but it nonetheless highlights how considerations of canine psychology informed the police force's mobilization of dogs.

Now largely identified with experiments on laboratory animals, especially rats, comparative psychology was a heterogeneous discipline in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The first French chair in experimental and comparative psychology was established at the Collège de France in 1888 and the Institut Général Psychologique created a group devoted to

[73] Saint-Laurent, *Chiens de défense,* 49. See also de Wael, *Chien auxiliaire*, 25–39.
[74] "A Thinking Bird," *Star*, issue 7696, 4 May 1903: 2.
[75] Pierre Hachet-Souplet, *Le dressage des chiens sauveteurs* (Paris: Institut général psychologique, 1907); Baldin, *Histoire des animaux domestiques*, 96.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

animal psychology.[76] At stake was the question of whether or not continuities existed between human and animal minds and whether animals possessed language and intelligence. Whilst some psychologists argued that animals were intelligent creatures, others, such as Henri Piéron and Edward Lee Thorndike, dismissed their claims as anthropomorphic and subjective.[77] Police dog trainers were not trained psychologists and they did not explicitly engage with such theories. Yet the question of animal intelligence, which had entered popular culture through stories of pets endowed with incredible abilities such as telepathy, framed their attitudes toward training.[78] In contrast to comparative psychologists, trainers sought to better understand animal minds, not to prove or disprove arguments over the relationship between humans and other animals in the post-Darwinian world, but rather to mobilize better animals so as to more effectively fight crime. This was practical animal psychology tested on the fraught Parisian streets.

To hone their abilities, police dogs were expected to undergo a rigorous training regime, something like the longer and more in-depth training that human policemen received.[79] A host of training manuals laid out programs for police dog training, which their authors claimed would produce effective and able dogs. Like army dog training manuals, police ones asserted that trainers needed to work with canine characteristics in a thorough and logical way.[80] And as in the human educational system in the Third Republic, which alongside providing a universal education offered "advanced training" for future cadres in the *grandes écoles* and other elite institutions, dogs chosen for police dog work would, in theory, receive a level of training that far surpassed that of other working dogs.[81]

[76] Sofie Lachapelle and Jenna Healey, "On Hans, Zou and Others: Wonder Animals and the Question of Animal Intelligence in Early Twentieth-Century France," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 41, 1 (2010): 12–20, 14.

[77] Gregory Radick, *The Simian Tongue: The Long Debate about Animal Language* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 123–58. See also Robert Boakes, *From Darwinism to Behaviourism: Psychology and the Minds of Animals* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Marion Thomas, "Histoire de la psychologie animale: la question de l'intelligence animale en France et aux Etats-Unis au début du XXe siècle," *L'homme et la société*, 167–69 (2009): 223–50; Daniel P. Todes, *Pavlov's Physiology Factory: Experiment, Interpretation, Laboratory Enterprise* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002).

[78] Lachapelle and Healey, "Hans, Zou and Others," 14.

[79] The police force had opened a training school in 1883, and developed new crime detection techniques based on fingerprinting, centralized record-keeping, and photography, and introduced new specialist units such as a river brigade service in 1900. Jean-Marc Berlière, "The Professionalisation of the Police under the Third Republic in France, 1875–1914," in Clive Emsley and Barbara Weinberger, eds., *Policing Western Europe: Politics, Professionalism and Public Order, 1850–1940* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1991), 44–47; Benjamin F. Martin, *Crime and Criminal Justice under the Third Republic* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990), 80–81.

[80] Vicard and Rode, *Chein estafette*, 62–63.

[81] Carson, "Science of Merit," 186.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The manuals presented dogs as intelligent creatures that required a methodical, sensitive, and patient trainer to bring out their best. They were not Cartesian animal-machines, but adaptable and responsive animals that could be trained to perform a range of complex tasks. The Belgian influence was once again apparent with the publication of Joseph Couplet's *Le chien de garde de défense et de police* (1909) and Gaston de Wael's *Le Chien auxiliaire de la Police* (1907). De Wael placed much emphasis on canine intelligence. In his book's preface, veterinary professor Hebrant asserted that dogs are "one of the most intelligent animals" whose "advanced functional development" placed them "at the top of the zoological scale."[82] De Wael similarly noted that the "marvels" of their intelligence were becoming more and more apparent. Drawing on the anti-Cartesian strands contained within the writings of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz (1646–1716), and perhaps unconsciously echoing larger debates about the relationship between instinct and intelligence in non-human animals,[83] de Wael argued that although dogs were often governed spontaneously by instinct, they could nevertheless be trained to act intelligently. Instinct was a property that belonged to a species and could not be developed, only suppressed. Intelligence, on the other hand, was a "faculty" that could be developed in individual animals through training and experience. A dog that was constantly chained up, "whatever its race," would "always remain in a state of stupidity." Once a dog's intelligence had been developed, it would be able to repress those of its instincts that inhibited police work such as chasing cats and fighting other dogs. Canine intelligence was sharpened through training, for although dogs "cannot reason," their capacity to remember events and experiences meant they could associate "ideas in an empirical way." If a dog re-experienced something, it would expect subsequent events to reoccur. Training should therefore develop the dog's ability to "think, which is to say to know, understand, and remember," which would allow it to "reflect" upon what to do in certain situations. The dog would therefore learn to associate finding a "wrongdoer or poacher" with receiving a treat from its owner. It could also develop the ability to calculate and assess danger in particular situations and decide whether or not to attack. De Wael's recognition of canine intelligence placed him in opposition to Descartes. But neither, he pointed out, was he a follower of Montaigne, who "lauds animals to bring down humans." It was, after all, "human intelligence" that enabled "progress" in animals.[84]

[82] Professor Hebrant, "Préface," in Gaston de Wael, *Le chien auxiliaire de la police: manuel de dressage applicable au chien de défense du particulier et au chien du garde-chasse* (Bruxelles: Imprimerie F. Van Buggenhoudt, 1907), 5.

[83] Dewsbury, "Issues," 752.

[84] de Wael, *Chien auxiliaire*, 9–11, 14, 35, 57, 60–61.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Because humans were smarter than canines, police dogs to become effective needed accomplished trainers, just as Rousseau-inspired educators argued that children needed committed and skilled teachers to realize their full potential.[85] Police dog training manuals positioned the individual human-dog relationship as the crucial foundation of any successful training regime. De Wael said that each dog should have its own master.[86] Simon agreed that trainers should only work with one dog in order to develop the "most perfect" understanding of each partner's "will." In such a way, training would take into account the "psychology of each animal," since every dog had a "particular soul," by which he meant a "character, a collection of qualities and flaws which are unique [to the individual dog] and distinguishes him from his peers."[87] Such conceptualizations of animal psychology and subjectivity were rooted in the trainers' *personal* experiences with and observations of dogs. In the debates on animal intelligence, police dog trainers were among those who believed that better knowledge of animal capabilities would spring from personal encounters and observations.[88] This was contrary to later approaches of experimental psychology that sought to remove the intersubjective aspect of human-animal relationships to isolate animal capabilities within the experimental environment.[89]

The training manuals all emphasized that trainers needed patience and "kindness."[90] Lalloué preferred "caresses" to "the whip and violence" since training was an emotional and reciprocal process in which dog and trainer became attuned to each other. A well-trained dog would feel "happy" when it successfully completed a task because it could sense its owner's satisfaction. Furthermore, the trainer had to "love" his dog. Even if a dog failed to achieve the task set, its trainer was to only consider punishment if the dog was disobedient or acted from "bad will" (*mauvaise volonté*).[91] Punishment had to be used sparingly because it could physically harm the dog and damage its character, thereby undermining its suitability for police work. Gersbach warned that violence would create a "slave that seemed obedient" but would never become a "loyal companion" ready to "share danger and sacrifice themselves."[92] The

[85] Zoologist Louis Boutan attempted to apply these educational ideas to apes. Thomas, "Histoire," 233–35.

[86] de Wael, *Chien auxiliaire,* 24.

[87] Simon, *Chien de police*, 29–31. See also Couplet, *Chien de garde*, 91; Lalloué, *Chien de guerre,* 24.

[88] Radick, *Simian Tongue*, 123–58.

[89] Robert G. W. Kirk, "In Dogs We Trust? Intersubjectivity, Response-able Relations, and the Making of Mine Detector Dogs," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 50, 1 (2014): 1–36; Radick, *Simian Tongue*, 201.

[90] de Wael, *Chien auxiliaire*, 10, 56. See also Saint-Laurent, *Chiens de défense*, 25.

[91] Lalloué, *Chien de guerre*, 24, 34. See also Couplet, *Chien de garde*, 93–94. Saint-Laurent, however, argued that the whip could be used "as a last measure" if the dog was "in revolt"; *Chiens de défense*, 29.

[92] Gersbach, *Manuel de dressage*, 24.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

notion that a police dog's obedience to its master needed to come from emotional connection and loyalty, rather than fear, was similar to the bourgeois celebration of the loyal family dog willing to defend the inhabitants of its home. The stress Lalloué and others placed on patience and encouragement also resonated with that of educators who condemned the corporal punishment of children in late nineteenth-century France and insisted that rewards and punishments should be rational, measured, and appropriate. That said, some dog trainers may have ignored the advice issued by Lalloué and his colleagues and resorted to violence anyway, just as some parents did with their children.[93]

Having set out a framework for a productive training relationship, the training manuals laid out a series of tasks that the well-trained police dog should be able to accomplish.[94] The training curriculum started with simple activities such as recall and lying down, sitting, and standing on command, and then moved on to more complex ones such as refusing to take potentially poisoned food from a stranger, barking when hearing a noise, and finding a lost object.[95] The tasks up until this point were pertinent to more than just police dog work, since hunters required their dogs to find and carry objects such as dead game, but they then became more specific. Unlike bloodhounds trained in nineteenth-century Britain and the United States for one particular aspect of police work—detecting criminals through their scent[96]—the police dogs depicted in Francophone training manuals were expected to be all-rounders, and to be able to jump over walls, hedges, and ditches and defend their master. They also needed to be able to pick out an individual from a crowd and disable a fugitive and guard them until their master arrived.[97] According to de Wael, differences between individual dogs influenced how well they adapted to particular exercises. "Energetic and courageous" dogs would take better to defending their master than would "fearful" dogs.[98] When assessing a dog's abilities, therefore, one had to take account of its emotional state as well as its physical and mental attributes.

At the heart of these training manuals one encounters a tension between initiative and obedience. Although trainers stressed the need for patience and kindness, the relations between the dog and its handler were fully hierarchical. According to the Pont-à-Mousson police commissioner, training should produce a police dog that possessed an "absolute [and] passive obedience"

[93] Educators such as Félix Hément argued that children should act through a moral sense of what was right and wrong and not a fear of violence. Colin Heywood, *Growing up in France: From the Ancien Régime to the Third Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 161–65.

[94] Some manuals, however, often offered guidance on the training of both kinds of dogs. Couplet, *Chien de garde*, 123.

[95] Ibid., 96; Lalloué, *Chien de guerre*, 27–34; de Wael, *Chien auxiliaire*, 43–44.

[96] Neil Pemberton, "The Bloodhound's Nose Knows? Dogs and Detection in Anglo-American Culture," *Endeavour* 37, 4 (2013): 196–208.

[97] Lalloué, *Chien de guerre*, 37–40.

[98] de Wael, *Chien auxiliaire*, 51.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that was instantaneous and prevented it from making unprovoked attacks.[99] As such, manuals blended Rousseauian educational methods (kindness, patience, and intelligence) with the aims of more disciplinarian educational theorists and animal psychologists such as Hachet-Souplet, who argued that obedience and automatic responses should characterize trained animals, just as they should soldiers and children.[100]

Crucially, however, the training manuals did allow some space for canine initiative and individuality. They emphasized the importance of maintaining the dogs' fine-tuned sensitivity to their environment. To be an effective police auxiliary, the dog needed above all to be a "scout" (*éclaireur*) that sensed danger through, in particular, its nose and ears, and alerted its master immediately to any threat.[101] Police dogs were expected to adopt an alert and responsive way of being in the world, assessing risks and communicating them to their handler; hardly the actions of automata. Moreover, trainers always represented the dogs as intelligent and emotional animals and, far from seeking to eradicate these qualities, treated them as the foundation of successful police dog work. A Foucauldian reading of police dog training as a disciplinary process designed to create "docile" dogs that were obedient cogs in the state's crime and punishment system would fail to capture the situation.[102]

Police dog training was marked by another tension, between nonviolent means and violent ends. While there was a discourse of sensitive and emotional connection between trainer and dog, in which punishment was used sparingly if at all, French police dogs were expected to be ready to defend their masters and attack assailants on command. In his survey of European police dogs, British dog breeder and police and army dog trainer Edwin H. Richardson identified French ones as the most violent, which he explained by the ferocity of their criminal opponents: "the low, skulking, murderous, Parisian Apache."[103] We catch glimpses of these violent ends within the training manuals. According to Lalloué, the police dog needed to bite anyone immediately on its master's command, even if the dog knew that person well and had previously enjoyed their company.[104] Moreover, the emotional connection between dog and

[99] "Emploi des chiens comme auxiliaires de la police à Pont-à-Mousson," 116–17.

[100] Marion Thomas, "Are Animals just Noisy Machines? Louis Boutan and the Co-Invention of Animal and Child Psychology in the French Third Republic," *Journal of the History of Biology* 38, 3 (2005): 425–60, 441–42; Thomas, "Histoire de la psychologie animale," 233.

[101] Urban space reportedly posed a threat to police dogs; de Wael stressed that police dog handlers needed to know what to do if their dog had been stabbed or shot; *Chien auxiliaire*, 53, 60.

[102] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (London: Penguin, 1991 [1975]). For a contemporary critique of dominance in dog training, see Carri Westgarth, "Why Nobody Will Ever Agree about Dominance in Dogs," *Journal of Veterinary Behavior* 11 (2016): 99–101.

[103] Edwin H. Richardson, *War, Police and Watch Dogs* (London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1910), 23.

[104] Lalloué, *Chien de guerre*, 27.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

human was portrayed as the foundation of canine ferocity. The Pont-à-Mousson police commissioner argued that the dog's natural affection for its master was the basis of its willingness to spring to his defense.[105] Police dog training thereby drew on the nineteenth-century celebration of canine loyalty, love, and obedience and harnessed it to protect policemen through violence.

The manuals dehumanized criminals to justify these violent ends. They made it clear that training exercises should enable police dogs to identify criminal types: humans playing the part of assailants or fugitives in training exercises were encouraged to act and dress like Apaches or other criminals. Cesare Lombroso's and other criminologists' identification of "born criminals," individuals whose psychology and physiology allegedly separated them from law-abiding citizens, and the wider cultural association of Apaches with savagery, provided the context in which the training manuals could legitimate the state-condoned violence embodied in the police dog. The dogs' capacity for violence was treated as a social defense against supposedly pathological and incorrigible criminals, who some French criminologists compared to rabid dogs or other hazardous creatures worthy only of eradication.[106] Training enabled police dogs to become socially useful animals at a time when criminologists turned criminals into dangerous beasts: the violent yet domesticated police dog stood in opposition to the animalized and vicious criminal.

The dehumanization of criminals and the tension between nonviolent means and violent ends within police dog training manuals resembled deeper contradictions within the Third Republic's criminal justice system. Despite being the first long-term democratic regime in French history, Republican tolerance towards criminality and deviance was limited. Although the Republicans liberalized the press and protected the right to free speech in public places, they campaigned against what they saw as public indecency, immoral behavior, and suspect political opinions. In supposedly delinquent areas, such as Montmartre, Republicans banned saucy cabaret posters, censored controversial press reports, and called for the police to monitor behavior in cafes and music halls. Alongside seeking to impose civic and moral standards, Republican politicians introduced draconian punishments for crimes, in collaboration with French criminologists. Driven, too, by post-Commune fears of social unrest and the seeming emergence of a strand of habitual criminals

[105] "Emploi des chiens comme auxiliaires de la police à Pont-à-Mousson," 117.

[106] Laurent Mucchielli, "Criminology, Hygienism, and Eugenics in France, 1870–1914: The Medical Debates on the Elimination of 'Incorrigible' Criminals," in Peter Becker and Richard F. Wetzell, eds., *Criminals and Their Scientists: The History of Criminology in International Perspective* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 211–13. It should be noted that some French criminologists, such as Alexandre Lacassagne, opposed Lombroso's determinism; Nye, *Crime, Madness and Politics*, 191. Rabid dogs have been associated with criminality in France since at least the medieval period. Jolanta N. Komornicka, "Man as Rabid Beast: Criminals into Animals in Late Medieval France," *French History* 28, 2 (2014): 157–71.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

resistant to reform, they promoted solitary confinement in prisons, passed a law in 1885 to transport recidivists to the colonies, increased police surveillance of released prisoners, and retained the death sentence.[107] Police dogs became unwitting enforcers of the Third Republic's often repressive and intolerant criminal justice system.[108]

But we should not assume that dog handlers followed the manuals' prescribed course of action. Dannhoffer, the policeman who trained France's first police dogs in Pont-à-Mousson, did not follow a training manual but claimed to have relied on his love of dogs and advice from dog breeders.[109] Furthermore, trained dogs did not always behave in the ways expected of them. De Wael reported how one police dog he knew of would chase cats during night patrols, catching 106 cats in 1906 alone. It was "useless" to expect too much of this dog. Trained police dogs could also be drawn into fights and the handler needed to make sure that the dog's "instinct" did not override its training. If a dog did get into a "brawl," its handler needed to check that this did not result in the dog losing "any of its qualities."[110] Since training was a process that could be reversed, the handler had to be vigilant to ensure that his dog remained suitable for police work.

Dogs had attributes, such as intelligence, that could be drawn out and developed through training, transforming them into police dogs with increased abilities. But these were seen as contingent qualities, expressing the more general belief that without enlightened human control and companionship dogs would degenerate, as shown by the behavior of strays. As Baron A.-C.-E. Bellier de Villiers argued, "The intelligence and the organism of the dog reflects, to the highest possible degree, the moral and physical conditions of man."[111] Concerns that canine instinct would override intelligence, even under the guidance of skilled human handlers, became even more apparent once the dogs began to patrol Parisian streets.

[107] John Kim Munholland, "Republican Order and Republican Tolerance in Fin-de-Siècle France: Montmartre as a Delinquent Community," in Gabriel P. Weisberg, ed., *Montmartre and the Making of Mass Culture* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2001), 21–22, 30; Alexandre Lacassagne and Étienne Martin, "Anthropologie criminelle," *L'année psychologique* 11 (1904): 446–56; Zachary R. Hagins, "Fashioning the 'Born Criminal' on the Beat: Juridical Photography and the Police municipale in Fin-de-Siècle Paris," *Modern & Contemporary France* 21, 3 (2013): 291–96; Mucchielli, "Criminology, Hygienism, and Eugenics"; Nye, *Crime, Madness and Politics*; Robert Tombs, "Crime and the Security of the State: The 'Dangerous Classes' and Insurrection in Nineteenth-Century Paris," in V.A.C. Gatrell, Bruce Lenman, and Geoffrey Parker, eds., *Crime and the Law: The Social History of Crime in Western Europe since 1500* (London: Europa, 1980), 214–37.

[108] On dogs and state repression, see Robert Tindol, "The Best Friend of Murderers: Guard Dogs and the Nazi Holocaust," in McFarland and Hediger, eds., *Animals and Agency*; McFarland and Hediger, *Animals and War*, 105–22; Aaron Skabelund, "Breeding Racism: The Imperial Battlefields of the 'German' Shepherd," *Society and Animals* 16, 4 (2008): 364–71.

[109] "Emploi des chiens comme auxiliaires de la police à Pont-à-Mousson," 116–17.

[110] de Wael, *Chien auxiliaire*, 57

[111] Bellier de Villiers, *Chien au chenil*, 10.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

POLICE DOGS IN ACTION

Policemen and sympathetic observers claimed that well-trained dogs would act as inexpensive and effective means of combating urban crime. But the Parisian press did not take such claims at face value, and newspaper reports drew police dogs and their abilities into Paris' culture of spectacle, in which the journalists scrutinized and critiqued urban life.[112] Although the press' sensationalized attention mostly centered on human individuals and institutions, it was directed in this instance toward human-nonhuman police dog partnerships.

Many articles reported how dogs helped the police to secure the city. At times it was the dogs' physical strength that made the difference. Whether fighting off attacks on the Paris-Brest postal service, defending Parisians and police officers from Apache attacks, or uncovering couples indulging in acts of public indecency, the press praised the dogs' physical prowess.[113] An article in *Le Matin* singled out Stop, a dog belonging to Brigadier Mitry in Saint-Mandé, an eastern suburb of Paris. Stop's speed, strength, and "fearsome jaws" enabled Mitry to become the "terror of the 'terrors.'"[114] Elsewhere in France, dogs' abilities had reportedly helped reduce crime. In Pont-à-Mousson, the town's police commissioner said police dogs now deterred criminals from attacking officers at night and helped to secure "public tranquility."[115] The dogs and their emboldened masters now seemed more than a match for France's hardened criminals.

Journalists reported that police dogs' threat to Paris' criminals was such that they began to mobilize their own dogs against police ones, as depicted in gory detail on a November 1907 front cover of *Les Faits-divers illustrés*.[116] Criminal gangs also allegedly trained their "Apache-dogs" (*chiens-apaches*) to bring down solitary walkers in Paris' suburbs and disable them until gang members arrived to relieve them of their possessions. As in cases of French customs officials "tussles with smugglers'" dogs, police authorities ordered their men to kill *chiens-apaches*.[117]

[112] Vanessa Schwartz, *Spectacular Realities: Early Mass Culture in Fin-de-Siècle France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

[113] "La malle-poste défendue par les chiens de police," *Le Matin*, 25 Oct. 1908; "La sécurité à Paris," *La Presse*, 18 Apr. 1907; "Les débuts d'un chien policier," *Le Matin*, 19 Nov. 1907. Overseas newspapers also reported on the police dogs' success against Apache gangs. See "Police Dog Puts Whole Apaches Band to Flight," *Call* (San Francisco), 12 June 1910; "Police Dogs: How They Work in Paris," *Examiner* (Launceston, Tasmania), 24 Feb. 1911; "Police Dogs Seize Apache," *Evening Argus* (Owosso, Michigan), 9 Apr. 1914.

[114] "Stop, le chien du brigadier," *Le Matin*, 21 Apr. 1907.

[115] "Emploi des chiens comme auxiliaires de la police à Pont-à-Mousson," 120. See also Villers, "Chien," 363, 366.

[116] "Chiens policiers," *Journal des ouvrages de dames et des arts féminins* (1908): 317; APP DB 41, A.-H. Heym, "Les chiens de police (suite et fin)," *La "vraie police*," 15 Mar. 1902, 10; *Les Faits-divers illustrés*, 28 Nov. 1907.

[117] "Les chiens-apaches à Paris," *L'Eleveur belge*, no. 46, 14 Nov. 1911, 738.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Like the training manuals, the press portrayed police dog abilities as multifaceted: they possessed "remarkable intelligence" as well as physical strength.[118] This was the case with Marcel, a police dog who spotted trouble brewing during a confrontation between a group of young men and two Apaches at Lilas and managed to disable the gang members until a policeman arrived.[119] Sometimes the canine sense of smell made the difference. During a police raid on a bar near Les Halles, two dogs used their "disconcerting" sense of smell to uncover hidden guns, daggers, rubber coshes, and razors. Along with other new police techniques—two members of Bertillon's anthropometric team were also in attendance—the dogs helped capture sixty-one "suspect individuals," including renowned Apache chief Le Chopier.[120] Villiers similarly highlighted the extraordinary ability of dogs to detect criminals. One German sheep dog reportedly tracked down a murderer over "*fifty two kilometres*" after sniffing his cap. Another dog had identified a murderer out of eight hundred factory workers after sniffing the body of a murdered child.[121] Such reports reinforced the narrative that police dogs' multiple abilities provided evidence of animal intelligence which human ingenuity and *savoir-faire* now successfully mobilized.

At other times journalists were more critical of the dogs' abilities and called on the police to explain and justify their use. In March 1907, one of *Le Matin's* reporters paid a visit to Max, a police dog living with Madame Thirouin on rue Nationale. Despite Thirouin's assertion that Max was an "intelligent animal," the reporter concluded that Max was "no psychologist" as the dog mistook him for an "Apache" and began barking and straining on his lead.[122] Despite being trained by one of the foremost police dog trainers in France, Max was unable, at least in this instance, to distinguish between an Apache and a law-abiding citizen, much to *Le Matin's* dismay.

Such concerns about police dogs' competence led to the use of muzzles to supplement training. Although animal protectionists had long debated the ethics of the muzzle, with police dogs it was treated as a necessary precaution to allay public concerns about them biting innocent Parisians. A police dog bite would only be tolerated if permitted by the handler, who had the job of releasing the muzzle, and if directed toward a presumed criminal.[123] The recourse to muzzling underscored doubts about the efficacy of police dog training and the

[118] "Les chiens de police de Neuilly-sur-Seine," *Le Petit Journal*, 27 Feb. 1907.
[119] "Un chien policier arête deux mystérieux malandrins," *Le Matin*, 16 Dec. 1913.
[120] "A travers Paris," *Le Matin*, 7 June 1909.
[121] Villiers, "Chien," 363 (his emphasis).
[122] "Max n'est pas psychologue," *Le Matin*, 30 Dec. 1907.
[123] On muzzling dogs, see Dr Belloli, "La muselière des chiens," *Bulletin de la Société protectrice des animaux*, vol. 8 (1862): 313–16; Maret-Leriche, *A bas la muselière: pétition de messieurs les chiens et leurs maîtres adressée à M. le préfet de police* (Paris: Librairie théâtrale, 1861).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dogs' trustworthiness and intelligence. Despite recognizing that dogs possessed intelligence, many observers feared they could not be relied upon to *always* know the difference between a criminal and an innocent person and that the dogs' instincts would override their intelligence.

Even with the use of muzzles, the risk of police dog bites could not be eradicated entirely. Police officials therefore tried to argue that the benefits of the dogs outweighed the risk of their biting law-abiding citizens.[124] Press reports that stressed the dogs' obedience and the thoroughness of their training may have been partly intended to alleviate fears that they threatened public security. Having witnessed police dogs in training at Neuilly, one journalist reassured readers of *L'Eclair* that training "overcame" the "instinctive brutality of the dog." Trainers only removed the dogs' muzzles when they were in pursuit of a known criminal, and the law abiding citizen therefore had nothing to fear from the police's well-trained canine "weapon."[125] Despite such assurances, fears persisted that training had not completely overcome the dogs' atavistic instinct to bite, stoked by apprehensions that dog bites could lead to rabies. In 1909, a municipal councilor wrote to Lépine to protest the alleged use of dogs against political demonstrators. Similarly, the lawyer of a protester arrested at a 1909 demonstration held in honor of Spanish anarchist Francisco Ferrer at Issy-les-Moulineaux complained about the "savage violence" of the police dogs deployed against demonstrators.[126] The violent potential of the dogs highlights how nineteenth-century public concerns about police violence lingered into the twentieth century and were extended to canines.[127] To some, it seemed clear that police dogs were more likely to undermine public security than protect it.

The concerns that the dogs' abilities and intelligence were contingent and potentially reversible qualities resonated with biomedical fears that base instincts, desires, and impulses could overwhelm human intelligence and morality and lead to individual and collective degeneration. For psychologists such as Ribot, "The nervous system is liable to cumulative functional disequilibrium due to the tendency of the more fixed and stable lower levels to overrun the higher, but more fragile and recently acquired, intellectual and moral capacities."[128] Le Bon famously applied such ideas to the crowd, in which the usually rational man became a slave to his "unconscious personality": "He is no longer himself, but has become an automaton who has ceased to be guided by their will." Moreover, he continued, "By the mere fact that he forms part of an organized crowd, a man descends several rungs in the

[124] Heym, "Chiens de police."
[125] "Chiens policiers."
[126] "Les chiens de Police," *Le Matin*, 24 Oct. 1909; "Tribunaux," *Le Matin*, 12 Nov. 1909.
[127] Deluermoz, "Circulations," 84.
[128] Harris, *Murder and Madness*, 41.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ladder of civilization. Isolated, he may be a cultivated individual; in a crowd, he is a barbarian—that is, a creature acting by instinct."[129] According to these pessimistic perspectives, frightening forces threatened to devour the fragile edifice of civilization that held back the harmful energies unleashed by mass culture and urbanization: even the highly developed rationality and finely tuned restraint of bourgeois males—the supposedly most developed and educated members of society—could be overcome by violence and deviant sexual urges. Likewise, violent impulses could overrun the highly trained and controlled police dog, perhaps the epitome of the domesticated, skillful, and useful animal. The "beast within" had not really been tamed.[130]

CONCLUSION

Parisian police dogs emerged within a particular set of conditions formed by widespread fears of urban crime and insecurity, influential biomedical theories, and new understandings of animal intelligence. During this period of shifting human-animal relations, trainers, handlers, and sympathetic commentators all portrayed the dogs as intelligent, sensitive, loyal, skilled, and physically-imposing creatures that could make a difference to urban security. A series of tensions informed their deployment in Paris, including those between transnational exchanges and the specificity of Parisian urban history; between police dogs as canine manifestations of the modern security state and the portrayal of them as emotionally sensitive individual creatures; and between ideas about instinct and intelligence in both humans and animals.

In early twentieth-century France, dogs appeared to be more intelligent creatures than previously thought and humans less so. But it was believed intelligence in both canines and humans was a quality that could be lost through the re-emergence of primitive instincts and desires. Although intelligent and useful behavior could be cultivated in both animals and humans, both required careful and constant surveillance by *soi-disant* experts such as psychiatrists or dog handlers. And even then, public security could not be guaranteed.[131] This sense of canine intelligence's fragility was profoundly influenced by prevailing biomedical ideas about evolution and degeneration and undermined the claims that police dogs could make cities safer. The dog's ability to act effectively against crime rested on its responsiveness to training and its capacity to control and channel its aggressive instinct, all of which relied on the cultivation of its intelligence.

[129] Le Bon, *Crowd*, 52.

[130] On the long history of the "beast within," see Sahlins, "Beast Within," 38; Joyce. E. Salisbury, *The Beast Within: Animals in the Middle Ages* (New York: Routledge, 1994). On its expression during discussions of rabies and sexuality in nineteenth-century Paris, see Kete, *Beast in the Boudoir*, 97–114.

[131] Harris, *Murders and Madness*, 14.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Police dogs' abilities and their capacity to act were viewed as provisional and brittle. This uncertainty helps explains the muzzling and eventual demise of police dogs in Paris. By 1911, 145 dogs helped police Paris and the Seine *département*,[132] but their number had dropped to forty in 1916 and the Paris police discontinued their use after the First World War. It only reconstituted a limited police dog service in 1950 and it was not until 1965 and the creation of a national training center that police dogs became well established in France.[133] So while police dogs are now a commonplace presence in many cities around the world, the problematic case of their use in Paris shows how the history of this canine arm of modern state power was marked by experimentation and setbacks.

The history of Parisian police dogs also highlights the importance of human ideas and institutions in framing the "agential conditions" of animals that enable and constrain their abilities. It demonstrates that assertions of animal abilities are rarely neutral or transcendent, and helps us to contemplate the political and intellectual backdrop of present-day articulations of nonhuman agency, such as developments in animal cognition research, the rise of animal rights movements, a desire to democratize history through the inclusion of a wider range of actors, and a problematization of the "human subject."[134] The greater recognition of nonhuman agency is a significant and welcome development that better captures the hybrid qualities of history, yet there is a danger that it will crystalize as an undifferentiated and universal concept that glosses over the historically varied ways in which humans have engaged with skillful and socially-meaningful animals. In light of such concerns, the charged history of Parisian police dogs reminds us of the historical specificity of animal abilities and their mobilization.

---

[132] Baldin, *Histoire des animaux domestiques*, 68.

[133] By 1986, the French national police possessed 458 dogs, 315 of which were based in urban areas: APP 138 W 1, "Rapport," 26 Oct. 1917; "Historique du club de chien de police"; Marlet, *Profession chien policier*, 28; APP 138 W 1, Ecole supérieure des inspecteurs de la police nationale, Sous-direction de la formation continue, *Le centre national de formation des unités cynophiles*, 1986, 10.

[134] Susan Hurley and Matthew Nudds, eds., *Rational Animals?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Diane L. Beers, *For the Prevention of Cruelty: The History and Legacy of Animal Rights Activism in the United States* (Athens: Swallow Press and Ohio University Press, 2006); Harriet Ritvo, "Animal Planet," *Environmental History* 9, 2 (2004): 204–20; Jean-Marie Schaeffer, *La fin de l'exception humaine* (Paris: Gallimard, 2007).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Abstract: This article analyzes the introduction of police dogs in early twentieth-century Paris, which formed part of the transnational extension of police powers and their specialization. Within a context of widespread fears of crime and new and contested understandings of animal psychology, police officers, journalists, and canophiles promoted the dogs as inexpensive yet effective agents who could help the police contain the threat posed by criminals. This article responds to a growing number of studies on nonhuman agency by examining how humans in a particular place and time conceptualized and harnessed animal abilities. I argue that while nonhuman agency is an illuminating and important analytical tool, there is a danger that it might become monolithic and static. With these concerns in mind, I show how examining historical actors' conceptualizations of animal abilities takes us closer to the historical stakes and complexities of mobilizing purposeful and capable animals, and provides a better understanding of the constraints within which animals act. Attitudes toward police dogs were entwined with broader discussions of human and animal intelligence. Concerns that dogs' abilities and intelligence were contingent and potentially reversible qualities resembled contemporary biomedical fears that base instincts, desires, and impulses could overwhelm human intelligence and morality, resulting in individual and collective degeneration. To many, it seemed that police dogs' intelligence had not tamed their aggressive instincts, and these worries partly explain the demise of the first wave of police dogs in Paris after World War I.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417516000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press