

Fall 1961

The K-9 Corps: The Use of Dogs in Police Work

William F. Handy

Marilyn Harrington

David J. Pittman

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

William F. Handy, Marilyn Harrington, David J. Pittman, The K-9 Corps: The Use of Dogs in Police Work, 52 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 328 (1961)

This Criminology is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

POLICE SCIENCE

THE K-9 CORPS: THE USE OF DOGS IN POLICE WORK*

WILLIAM F. HANDY, MARILYN HARRINGTON AND DAVID J. PITTMAN

William F. Handy is a junior Research Assistant at the Social Science Institute, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

Marilyn Harrington is Editorial Consultant for the research projects of the Social Science Institute, Washington University, and is a graduate of Grinnell College.

David J. Pittman, Ph.D., is an Associate Professor of Sociology, Washington University, and Sociological Consultant to the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department. Dr. Pittman has written extensively on criminological studies and in the field of alcohol problems and has served as a lecturer and consultant in the latter field.—EDITOR.

For centuries legends and exploits of the dog, the most successfully domesticated animal known to man, have captured the imagination of writers and poets. Credit has been given to many famous dogs for the most amazing and unusual accomplishments, but accounts of the most interesting and beneficial ways in which dogs have served man are to be found in factual recordings of history. Stories of protection, the greatest way a dog can serve its master, need no embellishment to make heroes of thousands of dogs.

As long ago as a thousand years before Christ, dogs were being used by the armies of Egypt to carry messages and to guard army encampments, and in hieroglyphics many stories are told of the part dogs played in battles. For centuries after, only glimpses of the ways in which dogs afforded protection are recorded, and not until we enter the era of modern history are any complete records to be found. Then, sometime early in the fourteenth century, the French began using them to guard the naval installations and docks at St. Malo—the first known instance of dogs being used for police work.¹ Their work must have been satisfactory, for the dogs continued to perform this task until the year 1770 when their use was discontinued after one of them accidentally killed a young naval officer out after the curfew.²

Dogs were next used in Paris in 1895, when local agents began using a canine corps to control gangs that were creating a police problem.³ The success of the dogs in curbing these gangs led to their use by the Germans in 1896, and it was in Germany that the first scientific and planned development in this field took place, with experiments in breeding, training, and utilization. Through their experiences with dogs in police work, the Germans selected the German Shepherd, or Alsatian, as the breed best suited for the assigned duties, and the Doberman Pinscher as second choice.⁴ In 1920 a school was established at Greenheide, Germany—the first of its kind—for the training of the canine policemen.⁵ Here the dogs were instructed in basic obedience, tracking, and searching. From this school came the plans and criteria for those to come, and much of the training system used today in modern canine corps operations has been taken without change from Greenheide.

DIFFUSION TO THE UNITED STATES

Prior to the establishment of the Greenheide school and the scientific organization of canine corps, the city of Ghent, Belgium, was recognized as the world leader in the use of police dogs, and it was from that city that the use of the dogs spread to America.⁶ The corps in Ghent was started

³ CHARLES F. SLOANE, "Dogs in War, Police Work, and on Patrol," *THE JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINOLOGY, AND POLICE SCIENCE*, 46:385-395, 1955.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 392.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ KELLOGG DURLAND, "New York Police Dogs," *BOSTON EVENING TRANSCRIPT*, October 4, 1911, p. 21.

* Prepared under the auspices of the Social Science Institute, Washington University, and the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department.

¹ "Use of Police Dogs a Fad?" *THE POLICE CHIEF*, 26:12, 1959.

² *Ibid.*, p. 12.

in 1899 with Belgian Sheep Dogs and Wolfhounds, and was the first to train the handler and dog as a team.

In 1907, General Bringham, Police Commissioner of New York City, sent George Wakefield to Ghent to study the canine operations and to return to New York with six trained Belgian Sheep Dogs for operational and breeding purposes.⁷ Thus, the first canine corps in the New World was established, and it met with half success. By 1911, New York had 16 dogs that were used for patrolling in the Long Island residential district in the same manner that dogs were used in Ghent. From 11 P.M. until 7 A.M. the dogs ran loose in the neighborhood assigned to their handlers (officers on the police force), and, upon encountering anyone other than a man in uniform, would knock the stranger to the ground, stand on him, and bark until the handler arrived.

These dogs were trained as puppies to regard a person in a policeman's uniform as friendly and in any other garb as hostile. When the puppies were first kenneled at the police station, only uniformed officers were allowed near them for feeding and exercising purposes. During the second week at the kennel, a man attired in street clothes would enter the room where the dogs were and tease them in various ways. This treatment would continue daily until the dogs showed signs of aggressiveness toward anyone not wearing a uniform. After this conditioning, the dogs were taught to throw a man to the ground by wrapping their front paws around his legs and dragging him down, and then to stand on the prostrate victim and bark until the officer with whom they were working arrived. Then the dogs learned to search old houses, to track, and to chase and capture a fleeing suspect.⁸ This training program as well as operational procedures were adopted without change from Ghent.

The practice of grounding every person who ventured on the streets after 11 in the evening was far from satisfactory, and many innocent citizens were injured. Continual complaints from irate residents often placed the dogs in disfavor with the constantly changing police administration, but despite this, the corps grew. Airedales were tried but rejected in favor of the Sheep Dogs and Wolfhounds. Then, in the early 1920's, a detective was demonstrating to a group of people at a parade how the dogs would attack a man even under gunfire, and to prove his point he drew a revolver

loaded with blanks and began firing at the dog. When the dog tried to attack the detective and was restrained by its handler, another plain-clothes man, seeing what appeared to be a culprit trying to kill a police dog and unaware of the demonstration or that the demonstrator was a fellow police officer, shot and killed the detective. This incident, coupled with the never-ending complaints, resulted in the immediate disbanding of America's first canine corps.

New York was not the only city in the United States to have a canine corps during this period. In 1910 the city of Glen Ridge, New Jersey, purchased two of the Belgian-trained dogs from New York, housed them in a small shed behind the police station, and assigned them to various officers for foot patrols.⁹ The dogs were effective in checking unoccupied houses and in maintaining order during several strikes. Their use was discontinued in 1917 or 1918, however, with the advent of the patrol car and the usual complaints of disgruntled late-evening strollers. The city of Westport, Connecticut, also had a corps similar in origin and operation, but about which no information is available.

Dogs were used in both world wars for policing military installations and for carrying messages in the front lines, and today are used by the United States and other nations to guard missile and air bases. The United States Air Force alone has 5,000 dogs in use today in all parts of the world.¹⁰

MODERN CANINE CORPS

In the middle 1930's, London borrowed the techniques that were used at Greenheide and began training dogs for police work. Years before, constables in London suburbs had taken dogs with them on their rounds, more for companionship than protection, and this anticipated the program adopted by Scotland Yard in 1938.¹¹ The use of dogs had not advanced to any extent by the beginning of World War II, when all trained dogs were transferred to the war effort. During the war the London police did have some dogs which were used to search the debris for victims of the blitz.¹²

The war helped prove the value of the dogs, and in 1946 the London Metropolitan Police began

⁹ Henry G. Lieberknecht, Glen Ridge, New Jersey, Police Department, letter of April 5, 1960.

¹⁰ "Dogs as Policemen—New Answer to Crime," U. S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 47:56-59, December 28, 1959.

¹¹ Sloane, *op. cit.*, p. 393.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 392.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*

using dogs in their regular duties. Six Labrador Retrievers were obtained and a training school established within the department.¹³ The dogs were first used in Hyde Park, a notorious night-time hideout for gangs and most famous for purse snatchings, which averaged 50 per month. The dogs were sent into the park with bobby-handlers, and when within two months the number of purse snatchings dropped to one per month, the canine corps program was expanded. In 1948 the Alsatian, or German Shepherd, was introduced, and after a series of experiments was selected as the dog best suited for the work the corps performed.¹⁴ This breed possessed more excellent qualities to a greater extent than any other breed used. Any dog possessing the right qualities can be used in police work, but the Alsatian is more likely to have these qualities than any other breed.¹⁵

In the experiments conducted by the London police, the Bloodhound, long regarded as a police dog and known for its tracking abilities, proved to be extremely nervous and hard to get back on the track once the scent had faded or was lost. These characteristics, together with the biological gentleness of the dogs that precluded attack-work training, eliminated the Bloodhound as a suitable breed for London police work.¹⁶ The Labrador Retriever, the first dog used in London, is a gun dog by ancestry but has a gentle nature, which impedes attack work. This was found to be its only fault, however, so it placed a close second to the German Shepherd. The Doberman Pinscher showed good tracking tendencies in the experiments, but is a slow-maturing dog, hampering training. Also, this breed has an unpredictable temper and is hard to control when aggravated, affording it an uncertain attack pattern. As a result, it was found that the Doberman Pinscher could not be taught to grab specifically a man's arm instead of just any part of his body, nor could it be taught not to bite, nor to break off an attack when commanded.¹⁷ In contrast, the Alsatian was found to possess qualities equal to the best in other breeds in all the necessary aspects of police work. These dogs are aggressive

¹³ "Notes on the Use of Dogs in the Metropolitan Police Force," London Metropolitan Police Department, no date.

¹⁴ CHARLES G. LEEDHAM, "Dogs That Keep the Peace," READERS DIGEST, 75:119, 1959.

¹⁵ SIR JOHN NOTT-BOWER, "Development and Use of Police Dogs in London," FBI LAW ENFORCEMENT BULLETIN, September, 1955.

¹⁶ "Lancashire Constabulary Dog Section," Lancashire Constabulary, no date.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

and easy to train, have good sight, hearing, and scenting powers, and, most important, have the appearance of police dogs, an asset that is psychologically essential for the purpose of deterrence.¹⁸

The London Metropolitan Police are now using approximately 300 dogs—eight Labrador Retrievers and the rest Alsations.¹⁹ The eight Labradors are the only multi-handled dogs on the force, "multi-handled" denoting a dog that works with more than one handler. Two of them are permanently stationed in Hyde Park, while the other six are used for guard work in the gardens of Buckingham Palace.²⁰ In Great Britain, which is less "motorized" than the United States, the bobby normally lives on his beat, and his dog presents no transportation problem since it is kenneled at the bobby's home. Because this arrangement is inapplicable to both the Park and Buckingham Palace, multi-handling at these locations permits fuller utilization of the dogs and eliminates large transportation costs.²¹ The Labrador Retriever is used in these places because in the experiments it was found to be much more adaptive to multi-handling than the Alsatian.

THE LONDON PLAN

Of the various methods for training and utilizing police dogs in Europe and the United States, the London Plan, as it has come to be known, is the most widely used. The Plan, largely patterned after the training school at Greenheide, is the most comprehensive and effective method of training and using dogs for police work. Adaptations of the Plan are variable from city to city, for such factors as climate, size, and city layout necessitate changes, as do differences in law enforcement agencies using dogs. In the following paragraphs the various techniques of training used in London will be discussed.

To qualify as a handler in London, an officer must like dogs and be able to house, feed, and care for the animal.²² The officer first chooses a dog from among those available—all male Alsations ranging in age from six to 18 months. These dogs, either purchased or donated, are

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ U. S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

²⁰ NOTT-BOWER, *op. cit.*

²¹ Dr. Victor Brannon and Mr. Grant Buby of the Governmental Research Institute, St. Louis, Missouri. Interview of March 24, 1960.

²² "Notes on the Use of Dogs in the Metropolitan Police Force," London Metropolitan Police Department, no date.

isolated for a period of 14 days upon entering the training school for a series of physical and psychological tests to determine their fitness for police work.²³

Because of the shortage of Alsations suitable for police work, the Home Secretary has authorized the Metropolitan Police to import dogs from European countries that have high physical, training, and working standards for Alsations. One source is Bavaria, where the best Alsations now available are bred, averaging greater in size and intelligence than those available in England. When dogs were first imported into England from Germany, most were of the high quality now bred in Bavaria, but as the demand increased, unscientific breeding methods were used to produce the species more rapidly, and the result was its slow degeneration. A committee is now studying the possibility of establishing a breeding center in Great Britain as a source of dogs better suited for police work.²⁴

While the dog is being trained it is kenneled at the training school; not until after graduation does it live at the home of its handler. From then on, the dog and its master are rarely separated, for although the handler is allowed to kennel the dog when he takes his yearly leave, such practice is rare and considered an exception.²⁵

The London Training School for police dogs is recognized today as the world leader in its field, and the criteria for establishing such schools in other cities are usually derived directly or indirectly from the London school. It is located in the London suburb of Keston Kent, and is used only for the initial 14-week training period; all supplementary training is administered in city parks.²⁶ There are four instructors and one inspector at the school, as well as two kennelmen who exercise the dogs and care for those waiting to be trained.²⁷ During the staggered training

²³ "Notes on Metropolitan Police Dogs and Training Establishments," London Metropolitan Police Department, no date.

²⁴ "England to Import Police Dogs," THE POLICE CHIEF, 26:23, 1959, taken from the POLICE CHRONICLE AND CONSTABULARY WORLD.

²⁵ NOTT-BOWER, *op. cit.*

²⁶ Jeremiah O'Connell, St. Louis Chief of Police, Andrew T. Aylward, Major, Commander of Records and Communications, St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department, Dr. Victor Brannon, Director, Governmental Research Institute, "A Report to the St. Louis Board of Police Commissioners on the Use of Dogs as an Aid to Police."

²⁷ "Notes on Metropolitan Police Dogs and Training Establishments," London Metropolitan Police Department, no date.

sessions, each instructor trains a class of six man-dog teams.

The training program is divided into four parts: obedience and familiarization, tracking, attack, and search.²⁸ Each handler trains his own dog under the direction of the instructor.

The obedience and familiarization phase is administered much as it would be for any dog, with particular emphasis on kindness and firmness, and on checking the dog immediately when it acts contrary to command. In this connection, no piece of equipment used in operations is ever used as an implement for punishment, in order to avoid hindering the dog's effectiveness with that particular article.²⁹ When a dog has difficulty with a command, it is returned to one previously mastered and praised for obedience to it; then the more difficult command is taken up again. The most important command the dog learns is "No." A sharp pull on the chain-choke collar accompanied by a firm "No!" is sufficient, and soon the dog learns to respond to the spoken command alone. Occasionally, commands are conveyed by hand or high frequency whistle, although rarely during tours of duty.

The next phase of training is tracking, a technique used when following and apprehending a suspect fleeing the scene of a crime. The dog first becomes accustomed to a harness, and to a 20-foot tracking line which allows greater freedom of movement than an ordinary lead. In tracking, the dog follows the scent left by crushed grass and insects where the man walks, and/or the scent of perspiration left by his shoes. Initially, the dog learns to follow a track ten feet long, laid only a few seconds before. The length and time-lapse are then gradually increased until, by graduation time, the dog can follow tracks over one mile long, laid one and a half hours before.³⁰ In this training phase, the firmness of the tracking surface raises an issue, for on a hard surface a dog must rely solely on the scent of perspiration from the shoes of the man it is following. If there is a rain or strong wind, this scent is destroyed and tracking made impossible. Since London consists

²⁸ "Notes on the Use of Dogs in the Metropolitan Police Force," London Metropolitan Police Department, no date.

²⁹ "Obedience on Lead," London Metropolitan Police Department, no date.

³⁰ Sgt. Walter Zweifel and Sgt. Vernon Ellis of the St. Louis Metropolitan Police, Mobile Reserve, Canine Corps. Interview and tour of the Canine Training Center at Missouri Hills, April 1, 1960.

largely of soft surfaces, hard tracking is not emphasized in the training program. It should be noted that at the time the dog learns to track, it also learns to discover and point out to its handler any articles dropped by the suspect along his trail.

After training in tracking, the dog learns in the attack phase to take action upon encountering the suspect. If the man stops at the sight of the dog, as most men do, the dog learns to hold him at bay and bark until the handler arrives. If the man runs, however, the dog will attack. The two most important things the dog learns in attack training are where to grab and when to let loose.³¹ The dog is taught to grab the right arm or the arm in which a weapon is held, and clamp it between its jaws until the handler arrives. For practice in these techniques, the officers run from each other's dogs after first donning a heavily-padded attack suit, with extra padding on the right arm to protect against injury should the dog clamp too hard or in the wrong place. As training progresses, the men discard the suits and use only arm padding. The dogs are taught to grab for an area of the arm covered by clothing whenever possible, but this cannot be overemphasized, because on duty such training could confuse a dog encountering suspects wearing short-sleeved shirts or no shirt at all.³² The dogs are then trained to attack under gunfire.

In the fourth phase of the training cycle, the dog learns to search buildings, wooded areas, factories, and other settings it may encounter on duty. In this phase the dog learns to search a building room by room and floor by floor, to overcome obstacles by training with hurdles, high jumps, window jumps, crawl boxes, and stairs, and to drag objects. Recently they have been trained to search rubble for victims of disasters.³³ Incidentally, in these activities the dog may function on or off the lead as the handler sees fit.

Each phase of the training program described above is important and each will be utilized in later operations. In addition, the development of an affectionate relationship between the handler and his dog during training is vital to operational effectiveness. Past training experience indicates that the more a dog learns, the easier it becomes for it

to learn still more. In fact, some dogs have become specialists; a remarkable example is a dog in London trained to enter a crowd of people and pick out by scenting any person carrying marijuana.³⁴

Before training begins, the handler is issued such equipment as boots, gloves, coats, coveralls, and other wearing apparel needed in the training program. Upon graduation the team receives a kennel, an ordinary lead, a chain-choke collar, a harness and tracking line, a comb, a brush, and a feed bowl. All this equipment is supplied by the department, as is food for the dog, which consists of one pound of biscuit and one and a half pounds of meat per day.³⁵

In London's canine operations the teams work seven-hour shifts; the handler uses an additional hour for care and grooming of the dog. Before the team begins its tour of duty each day, the handler must check his dog's physical condition and appearance, for he is responsible for the dog's physical condition. A veterinarian employed by the department treats any major ailment.

The use of dogs in London police work has yielded excellent results, according to J. Rymer-Jones, London Police Commissioner. The dogs relieve men for other duties, and have even been known to handle tasks that normally require six men.³⁶ In 1958 the London dogs participated in 1,850 arrests and helped find 36 missing persons. On one occasion, a bobby was overpowered and knocked unconscious by a gang of thugs. Upon regaining consciousness several minutes later, he found that his dog had rounded up and was holding at bay the entire gang, waiting for the bobby to arrest them.³⁷ To date, the London Police Department has experienced no incident in which an innocent person was injured needlessly by a dog.³⁸

With the successful utilization of police dogs in World War II and in London police work, the idea of using canine patrols again spread to the United States. In 1952 the Marshall Field department stores in Chicago acquired dogs for guard duties in their stores and warehouses. These dogs were trained to walk with the night watchmen and flush out prowlers and burglars who had hidden in

³⁴ Dr. Victor Brannon and Mr. Grant Buby, *loc. cit.*

³⁵ "Notes on Metropolitan Police Dogs and Training Establishments," London Metropolitan Police Department, no date.

³⁶ LEEDHAM, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

³⁷ U. S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

³⁸ Dr. Victor Brannon and Mr. Grant Buby, *loc. cit.*

³¹ LEEDHAM, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

³² Sgt. Zweifel and Sgt. Ellis, *loc. cit.*

³³ "Further Tests with Metropolitan Police Dogs," London Metropolitan Police Department, Rescue Advisory Panel, no date.

the buildings after hours.³⁹ The dogs also learned to walk beats alone and to press special alarm buttons on the floor with their paws, signalling to a central control point that all is well. If a dog fails to signal within 15-minute intervals, a guard is dispatched to the scene. In the same year, Macy's acquired several Doberman Pinschers for the same purpose, and since then have had no night burglaries in their stores and warehouses patrolled by the dogs. Only four men have attempted to outsmart the canine guards, and all were caught.⁴⁰ Other industries and businesses have followed these two successful examples, and today police dogs are being used widely to protect stores, factories, warehouses, schools, construction sites, and housing centers.

Before this postwar resurgence of canine patrols in the United States, the use of police dogs had been limited to Bloodhounds used for tracking escaped prisoners, since the last of the early twentieth-century canine corps had disappeared during the 1920's. These Bloodhounds were not police dogs in the sense we are considering them, for they were used only in tracking and not for patrolling or other police activity.⁴¹

THE MODERN CANINE CORPS—FAILURES AND DISSENSIONS

It can be speculated that an increasing crime rate combined with the successful use of dogs in World War II, in London police work, and in American private industry prompted a renewal of interest in canine corps in the United States. In 1954, the city of Dearborn, Michigan, hired an ex-marine dog trainer to acquire and train four German Shepherds for patrol work in that city. Four police officers volunteered and for six months received training as handlers.⁴² The dogs were taught to patrol a beat with an officer, to search out and hold a prowler, burglar, or disorderly person, to search buildings, to disarm a man, to enter a car and hold its occupants, to ride in a scout car, to scale a wall or fence, and to be gentle or vicious on command. After training, each team was assigned a beat from midnight until 8 A.M. After four months without incident, however, the

corps was disbanded. According to a city source, the residential character of Dearborn did not lend itself to the use of police dogs. In May, 1955 the dogs were sold to the city of Portland, Oregon, where the police department had expressed interest in establishing a canine division.⁴³

In addition to the four obtained from Dearborn, Portland added five more German Shepherds and six Doberman Pinschers. Their program was not successful, however, in part because of the change in handlers, but also because the dogs were not fully and properly trained for police work.⁴⁴ For example, they were not trained in tracking but in quartering, as hunting dogs are. As a result, in several incidents the dogs were unable to find men hiding in open fields or in buildings. In addition, one dog attacked a detective who was pulling a suspect from his hiding place under a truck, where the dog had previously failed to find him.

Another factor contributing to the failure of the Portland program was that the city could afford neither the expense of kenneling the dogs at the homes of their handlers nor the cost of transporting the dogs in mobile operations.⁴⁵ Consequently, after a year the program was discontinued. According to Portland police officials, the program might have been a success with more manpower and equipment, but under the existing conditions the dogs were a liability rather than an asset.⁴⁶

In 1956, Baltimore established the first effective municipal canine corps of modern times in the United States. At that time, Deputy Chief of the Los Angeles Metropolitan Police Department, Roger E. Murdock, investigated the possibility of setting up a corps in his city. Murdock concluded⁴⁷ that police dogs do function effectively in certain types of operations, such as after-dark foot patrolling in industrial areas. However, because there are relatively few such areas in Los Angeles, and because of the "motorized" character of its large police force, Murdock felt that the benefits derivable from a canine corps in Los Angeles would

³⁹ Garrison E. Clayton, Inspector, Director of Public Safety, Dearborn, Michigan, Police Department. Letter of March 7, 1960.

⁴⁰ "The Use of Dogs in Police Work," UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS RESEARCH REPORT, March, 1960.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ Roger E. Murdock, "Some Considerations on the Use of Dogs in Metropolitan Police Work," enclosed with letter from Los Angeles Police Department, March 14, 1960.

³⁹ SLOANE, *op. cit.*, p. 394.

⁴⁰ U. S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

⁴¹ LEON F. WHITNEY, "My Thirty Years with Bloodhounds," READERS DIGEST, 63:379, 1953.

⁴² "Dearborn Police Start K-9 Corps," AMERICAN CITY MAGAZINE, 70:35, 1955.

not justify its cost. Consequently, the city decided against establishing a corps.

PROCEDURE FOR ESTABLISHING A CANINE CORPS

When a police department considers using police dogs, it must weigh these factors in arriving at a decision: the costs, the advantages and disadvantages of the program, and the needs of the city.

Costs. Once the decision to establish a canine corps has been made, a city must provide in its budget for the best available training and equipment. The experience of Portland, Oregon, as described above illustrates the consequences of the failure to adequately finance a canine program.

For such a program to be successfully activated, a twofold information campaign should be conducted, one part aimed at the public and the other at police department personnel. By explaining the functions of the corps to the mass media, it is often possible to obtain their assistance in presenting the program to the public. This procedure costs the police agency very little. When the training period is over, it is advisable, even though expensive, to hold public demonstrations. The second part of the information campaign, the intra-department phase, should be designed to acquaint personnel with the canine program and to recruit volunteers for training as handlers. Usually, a brochure describing the program and the advantages of working in it, and setting forth the qualifications for becoming handlers, is the best way of introducing the program to the department. Later, after the program is established, additional brochures specifying situations in which the dogs might be called into action should be distributed periodically.

A department should establish qualifications for handlers before they are selected. In small departments or those with limited manpower, strict requirements will yield few volunteers; thus, qualifications will differ from department to department. There are certain basic qualifications, however, that every department should establish. A handler should be a physically-fit young man, who plans to remain in the department for the work-life expectancy of the dog, for a dog should not be switched from one handler to another. The man must volunteer, he must have the permission of his wife and family, and he must own his own home or have a rental agreement in writing that

permits him to kennel his dog at his home. He should have at least one year of police experience, a good record, and an affection for dogs. If the department cannot provide it, he must have means for transporting his dog to and from work. It is also advisable that he have no other dog at his home. These are basic requirements. Many departments require, in addition, that he have the approval of his neighbors, that he have at least ten more years to work before retirement, that he sign an agreement to remain in the department for a certain period, and that he qualify under various other age and service-length conditions.

The next major cost factor is the initial training of the corps. For the first few handler-dog teams, the department should select a police agency with an established training school and make arrangements with it for the training of these teams. Once the handlers have completed the training program, they should be able to establish a training school within their own department. This is the recommended procedure if the city plans a large corps, with more than five or ten dogs. If, however, the city is small and its need for dogs limited, it may wish never to have more than three or four man-dog teams; such a city will find it financially advantageous to send all its teams to an established school. The charge for training at an established school is usually \$600 for each man-dog team, including the cost of the police dog.

If a large department plans a continued expansion of its corps, a permanent training facility is indicated. The cost of a school building and training grounds can range from \$4,000 to \$50,000, depending on the complexity of the structures and the number of kennels included. These kennels each consist of a fenced-off area, a doghouse, and a tying post. Their location at the training school serves a double purpose: First, it limits the number of persons the dog encounters during training, ensuring its concentration on the handler; second, it provides housing for dogs acquired prior to training, as well as for dogs belonging to other departments that are waiting to begin training. Therefore, enough kennels should be constructed to accommodate the number of teams that can be trained at one time, as well as a few extra for dogs waiting to be trained.

If a department intends to establish its own school, the first team it sends to another city for training generally does not participate later in the operational activities of its own canine corps.

Instead, the handler—usually given the rank of sergeant—becomes the trainer for the new school and uses his dog for demonstration. This man's salary, the team's training expenses, and the cost of the dog's maintenance must, of course, be considered part of the corps' expenses.

Once activated, the corps must obtain additional dogs for training. Although only one-tenth of the dogs presently in use were purchased, few suitable dogs are now being donated. As a consequence, departments will probably have to buy more dogs in the future, at a cost of from \$125 to \$175 each. The most suitable dogs are male German Shepherds, 6 to 24 months old, weighing 75 pounds or more. A dog should be inspected before purchase by both the trainer and the corps' veterinarian. Immediately after purchase, it should be housed at the training school. The work-life expectancy of these dogs is from seven to ten years. A department generally employs a caretaker for its training school, to look after the dogs kenneled there as well as the buildings themselves.

The equipment a department must provide for its canine program during the training stage is of two varieties: the permanent equipment of the training school, and the articles supplied each team. The first category includes attack suits; arm padding; obstacles such as hurdles, steps, ladders, and window jumps; different types of buildings for search training; cleaning equipment; and some medical equipment, especially if the corps' veterinarian is housed at the school. An optional item in this category is the "electrified collar," used, for example, in the St. Louis training program to administer a mild shock if a dog has trouble learning to break off the attack.

Included in the category of equipment supplied each team are two chain-choke collars; a 22-inch leather collar; a tracking line and harness; two five-foot leather leads; one one-foot leather lead; one kennel collar; two feeding pans; one comb; one brush; and a kennel for use at the handler's home. The kennel costs approximately \$60 and the rest of the equipment about \$25. The handler himself should supply his own work clothes, foul weather jacket and cap, three-quarter-length boots, gloves, and raincoat.

The estimated average cost of training one handler-dog team is about \$1,200, the approximate cost of training a rookie policeman. All indications are that those departments following the London Plan of training are enjoying great success. (See

the section, "The London Plan.") The training program advocated by the Army and Air Force, although appropriate to their needs, would require considerable alteration and integration with the London Plan to fit it to the needs of a city police department, since the aims of military and municipal canine programs are different. Our findings indicate that conformance to the London Plan alone yields as good if not better results than the adoption of any military plan of training.

One deviation from the London Plan may be necessary, depending on the city's characteristics, and that is training in hard-surface tracking. As noted above, the London Plan does not emphasize this training, since London has few large areas of hard surface—that is, surface devoid of crushed grass and insects. Hard-surface tracking is taught much the same as other tracking, except that the training takes longer, is more difficult, and requires a greater development of the dog's sense of smell. Classes in this training phase should consist of not more than six teams, to permit more concentrated instruction.

The next cost factor involves field operations. Food, veterinary services, kennels, and working equipment cost an estimated \$200 yearly per dog. Added to this is the cost of equipping police cars—four-door sedans, one for every two teams—with aluminum or wooden compartments in the place of back seats, and with wire mesh to separate the dogs from each other and from their handlers. Wire mesh is also placed over the windows to provide ventilation without allowing people near the dogs when the auto is parked. The vehicles should be painted white, as this reduces summer temperatures inside by 10 or 15 degrees.

Also included in the corps' operational costs should be the salaries of a commanding lieutenant, sergeants who supervise field operations, and additional record-keeping personnel, as well as the cost of office equipment, space for administrative activities, and insurance to cover accidental injury to innocent persons. Other operational costs are overtime pay to handlers for extra duties, and \$20 per year figured as depreciation on the dog. Still another expense covers time lost in supplementary training, usually averaging eight hours per week. In all, the expense of maintaining a dog on duty is estimated at one-half that of maintaining its handler.

Operations. After weighing the financial costs, a department should consider what it will gain from

using police dogs. This consideration is closely linked to the particular crime problems and needs of the city, which should determine how the dogs are used. Canine corps are used most effectively for searching, tracking, crowd control, and crime deterrence. In cities where muggings, purse snatchings, burglaries, and breaking-and-entering are frequent, canine corps are more valuable than in cities where white-collar crime prevails. Cities with large slum and deteriorating areas have more need for dogs than suburban communities, although suburban areas bordering on the central city have used dogs successfully in curbing the city's overflow of crime.

Dogs should be assigned to areas with rising crime rates, to industrial areas containing warehouses and stockyards, to riverfront areas, and to tenement and slum areas. A canine corps is also effective in parks and in the parking lots of public arenas, operas, theatres, and sporting parks. The dogs are most valuable at the time of day the city experiences its greatest crime activity, usually in the late evening and early morning hours. Teams should be rotated between day and night duty for experience in both.

The system of assigning teams to ride two in a car, one leaving the car to patrol a designated area on foot, and the other remaining on call in the car, is considered most successful. The two duties should be alternated between the teams, allowing each equal experience in foot patrolling.

A handler should keep his dog on a leash at all times, releasing it only to search presumably empty buildings, or to chase or attack. A special line allowing the dog more freedom of movement is used for tracking. A muzzle is unnecessary if a dog is properly trained. Only in the line of duty should dogs be taken into public buildings or onto public transportation vehicles.

One regular work-day a week should be set aside for supplementary training under the supervision of one of the regular trainers. The handler should indicate the areas in which his dog most needs training. At this time the dogs are given practice in those duties rarely performed in day-to-day activities.

Wherever used, a police dog affords its handler greater protection and relieves him of the dangerous duties of searching wooded areas, buildings, alleys, and dark, out-of-the-way places. In controlling crowds, it has been estimated that one dog

can do the work of seven officers, either dispersing the people or holding them for arrest. Dogs can be helpful in arresting known "escape artists," in finding lost persons, and in searching disaster areas for victims. They are most celebrated, of course, for their deterrent effect on crime; however, a canine corps must be widely dispersed and have strength enough to deter crime generally, not merely to drive it from one area to another.

Some problems arise in using police dogs if their training is not thorough and complete. Thus, if a dog is trained to attack when its handler is threatened, the handler should be able to command it to break off the attack in the event, for example, the handler is scuffling with a drunk. Similarly, if a dog is taught to attack a person brandishing a weapon, the handler should have such complete control over the dog that he can prevent it from attacking if the team is working with other police officers. Attacking a person threatening its handler or brandishing a weapon is the only type of activity a dog is trained to perform on its own initiative; in all other situations it should act only on the command of its handler.

Dogs are not particularly useful in such functions as traffic patrols or investigation details. Each individual department must decide the phases of police work its dogs will aid most effectively and assign them to the appropriate divisions. It must be remembered that each dog requires at least eight hours a week of its handler's time which would ordinarily be spent in the performance of regular police duties. A department must balance this sacrifice of time against the advantages of using dogs.

CURRENT STATUS OF CANINE CORPS IN THE UNITED STATES

Police agencies cooperating in a survey of the departments currently using police dogs in the United States furnished experience and advice for the section of this report on the "Procedure for Establishing a Canine Corps." See the Appendix for a list of the departments using dogs at the time this study was completed. The information from the survey is on file at the Social Science Institute at Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, and is available on request.

The Future of Canine Corps. From the record of growth in the past four years, it appears probable that more canine corps will be activated in the

United States in the near future. As for existing corps, 16 of the 23 agencies cooperating in this study indicated that their corps definitely would be expanded, 1 was undecided, and only 6 would leave their corps unchanged. None reported plans to discontinue their corps.

From the survey it appears that the public has fully accepted the canine corps. There were only three complaints reported, one not described and the other two stemming from the feeling among Negroes that dogs are used in their areas disproportionately to the need for them. It is probably true that dogs are used in Negro areas more than in white areas, but they are assigned according to the crime rate of an area, not to the color of the people living in it.

This report is intended to indicate the current trends in the use of police dogs, with the aim of furnishing some idea of the costs, equipment, and qualifications involved in establishing a canine corps. A comprehensive bibliography is available at the Social Science Institute.

APPENDIX

List of departments to which questionnaires were sent in the summer of 1960:

1. Albany, Georgia
2. Alexandria, Virginia

3. Atlanta, Georgia
4. Baltimore, Maryland
5. Birmingham, Alabama^a
6. Buffalo, New York
7. Delaware State Police
8. Denver, Colorado
9. Houston, Texas
10. Indianapolis, Indiana
11. Kansas City, Missouri
12. Lancaster, Pennsylvania
13. Miami, Florida^a
14. Minneapolis, Minnesota
15. Newport News, Virginia
16. Philadelphia Park Police
17. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania^b
18. Providence, Rhode Island^c
19. Richmond, Virginia
20. Rochester, New York
21. St. Louis, Missouri
22. St. Louis County Police
23. St. Louis County Park Police^a
24. St. Paul, Minnesota
25. Salt Lake City, Utah
26. Springfield, Missouri
27. Washington, D. C.
28. Wilmington, Delaware

^a Questionnaire returned, indicating dogs not yet in use, but would be soon.

^b Questionnaire returned, but too incomplete to tabulate.

^c Questionnaire not returned.