

Forthcoming, *Journal of Historical Geography*

The dogs that didn't bark in the Blitz: transpecies and transpersonal emotional geographies on the British home front

Philip Howell, University of Cambridge, **Hilda Kean**, University College London

ABSTRACT

This paper uses a case study of animals in wartime to ask how historical animal geographers might approach the historical geography of emotions. Its substantive focus is the entangled emotional experiences of humans and companion animals during the Second World War on the British home front. Arguing against a focus on the practical and political difficulties of keeping pets, this paper moves away from the preemptive killing of pets during the phoney war of 1939-40 to evidence for the value placed on pets by pet owners, civilians in general and the British state. Drawing principally on Mass-Observation surveys, this paper investigates the complexities of the emotional dynamics of the home front, where affect and emotion between people and individual companion animals were transmitted and amplified. Moreover, it is emphasised that transpecies emotions were portrayed as valuable to wartime morale, and thus became part of governmental calculation. Taking morale as a distinct form of collective affect targeted by the wartime state, we can thus add a more-than-human dimension to historical geographies of emotion. In sum, this paper argues that emotion should be considered as both a transpersonal and a transpecies phenomenon: transpersonal because collectively mediated, and transpecies because of the emotional interactions between people and nonhuman animals.

Keywords: historical animal geography; animals; emotions; Second World War; Blitz; dogs

Introduction

The role of animals in and at war is territory staked out by a number of histories and historical geographies, with a growing interest in the significance of emotional attachments between people and their animal companions in wartime conditions.¹ As Isla Forsyth has recently written, war provides a ‘space through which to explore the complex relations between humans and animals because in war animal lives and relationships can be characterised through extremes of devotion and affection, but also by their utility, abandonment and sacrifice’.² This paper, on relations between humans and nonhuman animals on the British home front during the German bombing campaigns of the Second World War, focuses on the emotional entanglements that existed and developed between animals and humans, but also between animals and the state, elaborating on the importance of animals and emotion for social and political life during wartime.

The substantive argument of this paper should be taken as a partial corrective to popular accounts in which the role of nonhuman animals in wartime is simplified to the point of being traduced.³ The most glaring problem with regard to animals on the British home front in World War II is the widely propagated notion that complaisant pet owners gave up their animals to be euthanised *en masse* during the phoney war of

September 1939, in anticipation of the hardships to come.⁴ What supposedly followed has been called a ‘holocaust of pets’ (in the unfortunate contemporary phrase, later taken up by Angus Calder and Philip Ziegler).⁵ The implication of such precautionary killing of animals is that one of the first casualties of the coming war was the relationship between humans and their animal companions: it is as if ‘devotion and affection’, to recall Forsyth’s alternatives, are abruptly succeeded by ‘utility, abandonment and sacrifice’ at the mere prospect of wartime emergency.⁶ This narrative puts the stress on the practical difficulties of keeping animals on the British home front, and as such it can be ranged with equivalent episodes of anticipatory slaughter, variously justified by the priority of human beings in the apportionment of food, ‘humanitarian’ concern for the animals themselves, or worries about human safety.⁷

It is misleading to suggest only a painful but resigned pragmatism in the civilian killing of pets, however.⁸ Take an example from the history of an illustrious family. The British politician Shirley Williams describes in her autobiography how as a teenager in 1944 she ‘notched up a resentment’ towards her mother, the pacifist Vera Brittain, for killing a little fox terrier puppy who would scream in panic during the air raids:

My mother, sensible in most things, was convinced he might have convulsions and bite little Marian. In vain I begged, pleaded, shouted at her. She would not change her mind. So the terrified puppy was ‘put to sleep’ and I notched up a resentment I had never felt about being [evacuated] to the United States.⁹

What is significant here is not so much Vera's apparent coolness (at least in her daughter's estimation), but rather Shirley's emotionality, itself testament to the central and persistent role of affective relations between human beings and their animals, especially in a time of conflict and crisis. Most former pet owners seem to have paid full justice to the emotional wrench of having to part with their cherished companions, even if they followed advice to dispose of them humanely. But the narrative of the pet massacre is in any case misleading. Most importantly, we should now accept that the euthanising of animals was rather less common than it has been made out to be, and indeed became increasingly rare as the war wore on. This has been recognised by historians, and it worth underlining the fact that it was noted at the time.¹⁰ The best guide to popular attitudes and sentiment that we possess, the wartime Mass-Observation (M-O) surveys, on which much of the rest of this paper relies, decisively concluded that 'Only a relatively small proportion of dogs have been disposed of because wartime conditions made them too much trouble and have still not been replaced'.¹¹ In fact, after an initial wave of killings the British government and people came shortly to accept that animal companions could and should share the hardships of life under wartime bombardment, not just because most killing was unnecessary but also because the presence of animals served the purpose of maintaining morale. Emotional connections to animals – sentimentality, to critics – did not wane with the prospect and reality of war: in important ways they were amplified and authorised. Petkeeping, as we shall argue in the final section of this paper, was quickly enough endorsed as an intrinsic part of everyday life in Britain, even in wartime conditions – especially so, as a contributor to civilian *morale*. Relationships with animals were not insignificant because they were sentimental or otherwise 'emotional': quite the opposite.

By foregrounding the role of wartime emotional relationships between humans and animals this paper also aims to respond to growing calls for more embodied and emotional historical geographies. The ‘vexing question’ of ‘how we might access animal lives in the past’ is further compounded by the difficulties of addressing the matter of emotion, which has tended to be approached by historians from the human perspective.¹² The history of emotions, at least in conventional form, is decidedly anthropocentric, sometimes flatly denying that animals have emotions, or at least asserting that we do not have meaningful access to them historically.¹³ The history of (other) animals’ emotions is rejected outright, for instance, by Jan Plamper in a recent survey.¹⁴ Some animal historians have nevertheless extended the history of emotions to humans’ feelings *about* animals in the past, but attention to animals’ *own* emotional or affective states, and their ‘cross-species intersubjectivity’ remains thin on the ground.¹⁵ Even in a recent collection advertising ‘interspecies interactions’ the focus is firmly on ‘emotional responses directed *towards* animals’.¹⁶ We might accept that nonhuman animals are, just as much as people, ‘emotionally embodied creatures’, but the problem for historians and historical geographers of how to carry out effective research remains daunting.¹⁷ We could be forgiven for thinking that there is no real alternative to an anthropocentric approach, that a cross-species history or geography of emotions is at worst a dead end and at best a one-way street.

What we suggest in this paper, however, using our example of wartime petkeeping, is that we can move from a concentration solely on people’s feelings towards animals, and foreground instead the reciprocal, if asymmetric, emotional entanglement of pet owners with their animal companions, as well as the significance of these animal-

human dynamics for a more-than-human understanding of collective emotional life. We take Peta Tait's work on the twentieth-century circus as exemplary in this regard, for whilst she recognises that 'Animal bodies became enveloped in human emotions', she does not end her analysis there; instead, she argues that circus animals provoked but also performed emotions.¹⁸ With Tait, we argue that sensory perception, affect and emotion are transmitted from species to species, even if animals' own emotions must remain obscure. Like Tait, we 'recognise emotions as being socially communicated, regardless of whether a human can know the embodied emotional feelings (affect) of another with certainty'.¹⁹ Rather than make the history or historical geography of emotions contingent upon human sentiments about animals, therefore, we try in this paper to accept the affective states of other animals insofar as they interact with and amplify human emotions considered in both individual and collective senses. We approach these historical emotional geographies, in short, as both transpecies and transpersonal.

Animals under Mass-Observation

Calls for more embodied and emotional geographies have, as we have noted above, become increasingly common, but for historical geographers they remain a challenging proposition. Jamie Lorimer and Sarah Whatmore, in an otherwise sympathetic investigation, opine that 'the standard methods of historical geography – which search for discursive meaning in assorted texts – are not wholly sufficient – and indeed run the risk of “deadening” the practices being examined'.²⁰ We can reasonably suggest that historical and cultural geographers have already responded to

these challenges: by stressing for instance emotional and affective entanglements with archival material, by developing creative strategies for enlivening or animating otherwise conventional archives, or by simply paying attention to different kinds of archives and enlarging what might count as an archive.²¹ But we may make space for emotion and embodiment even with more ‘standard’ methods. We rely in this paper on a relatively conventional resource, the surveys produced by the British Mass-Observation movement on petkeeping (specifically the problems of keeping dogs) in Britain during the Second World War. For all its familiarity as a written archive, however, the resulting surveys offer us a particularly engaging window on a history of emotions that is transpecies and transpersonal in the terms we have sketched in above.

We do not want to skate over the need to approach Mass-Observation cautiously. Pioneering social science that it was, M-O’s methods are notoriously problematic, for some so much so as to render the results useless.²² As an illustration of its survey methods and questions with regard to the keeping of pets during wartime, and also of its myriad problems, consider the marvellous response of one sarcastic or otherwise playful interviewee (in the M-O shorthand, a Neasden male, approximate age 40, subjectively assessed as from social class B):

[M40B] *Have you got a dog?* – ‘Yes’ – *breed?* – ‘A mongrel of a million mongrels’ – *age?* – ‘I haven’t the faintest idea’ – *name?* ‘Hey, you!’ – *is the dog healthy on wartime diet?* – ‘It couldn’t be healthier – it’s absolutely robust, in fact’ – *affected by air raids?* – ‘Not a bit. Its morale’s pretty good’ – *is dog more or less important to you?* – ‘There’s nothing very important about my dog’.²³

This is a bracing response for anyone who has ever had to carry out or rely on interview research, one that cheerfully pulls apart the pretensions of the survey framers and their team, and which in so doing raises the question whether we can make anything at all of the M-O interviews, regarding the relationship between animals and humans during the war, about what they meant to each other, and, most importantly, about the whole question of animals and civilian morale.²⁴ In their own defence, however, the Mass-Observation team were keenly aware of the difficulties they faced (even if they never had the resources satisfactorily to resolve them), and we might still accept the ‘sheer informational value’ of these qualitative surveys, particularly in the absence of alternatives for transpecies historical perspectives.²⁵ Most importantly, the M-O team leaders maintained that they had, for all the methodological difficulties of the dog questionnaires, generated valuable insights into the practical and emotional aspects of petkeeping under fire, and what the country and its leaders should learn from their observations. Since we agree with their conclusions, it is worth quoting their commentary at some length:

Out of this predominantly utilitarian survey fascinating glimpses of the field of relationships between dogs and humans, the idiosyncracies of dogs and their owners occasionally appear. The dog that ‘just lives on carrots’. The one that ‘dont [sic] like ‘orse flesh. Ever so particular ‘e is. Eats fish’. ... The Oxford woman of 55 with a Shetland sheepdog of 16½ years which has learnt to live on cheese during the war.... The seventy-year-old working class man with a 15-year old Chow called Queenie who tells this story of three years ago:

‘All her pelt was coming off one winter, and my wife said to me “You’ll have to get that dog destroyed, you know. She’s past twelve; its [sic] no good keeping her like that”. “Don’t worry yourself”, I said, “I’ll get her right”. And I did too. Do you know how I did it? With train oil. I rubbed her all over with it, every day and every day, and after a week she was a bit better; and by spring she had lovely new coat like a puppy. You wouldn’t have known her for the same dog. Anything with the coats, I’d say train oil, can’t beat it’.

Sentimental dogdom, heroic dogdom, funny and satirical dogdom have been written about and explored often enough, but little has ever been said about ordinary people and their ordinary dogs. Pets are an integral part of life in this country today; the human-animal relationship is one which has never been effectively studied. We quote these odd incidental notes as a tailpiece and a minute contribution to a vast unwritten literature.²⁶

Pets and petkeeping under fire

The ‘vast unwritten literature’ that the Mass-Observers discerned at the end of the war has, with the passage of time, become far less daunting, and there is now a large and growing body of work directly focused on animal companionship and its history.²⁷

The emotional investment in pets, no longer dismissed as mere sentimentality, is accepted as a significant and distinctive phenomenon of modern society.²⁸ With regard to the Second World War, what is particularly valuable is the fact that the M-O

surveys offer privileged glimpses into the nature of emotional and affective relationships with other species during this national crisis. Again, this is a matter of emotional responses rather than practical necessities. Only a relatively small number of these questionnaire respondents come across as straightforwardly matter-of-fact when it came to pets and petkeeping in a time of war, objecting for instance to the waste of food, and straightforwardly rationalising having animals euthanised, either proleptically or because of the impact of the air raids when they came:

[F40C] I've no patience with these people who pet and coddle their dogs feed them on chicken and champagne and take them to bed with them... I think it's disgraceful the way some monied women feed their dogs – better than the majority of the slum people. Some slum people would be glad to lead a dog's life.²⁹

[M30C] I don't think anyone ought to have a dog in Wartime. To begin with we would have to give up valuable meat rations so that they may be fed & they need far too much attention paid to them. When a country is in great danger it is ridiculous to clutter up the place with pets. They should be looked after by the government or destroyed. That's the only sensible treatment.³⁰

[M25E] I like to see dogs about the place – it makes me happier I think – but I don't think I would really take the responsibility of having one to look after – in any case I think it's a mistake to have a dog in London – & in War it's a mistake to have a dog at all.³¹

Even the antipathy of a small number of self-confessed dog-haters, men and women who lamented the ‘stupidity’ and ‘uselessness’ of animals, particularly in wartime conditions, tells its own emotional tale:

[F30C] I mean, what *is* the sense in keeping a dog – they’re expensive enough to buy and keep but on top of that you have to have a license. Seven and six a year for the honor [sic] of keeping a dog. They’re not like a cat which keeps rats and mice down and costs very little to keep and is cleaner and less nuisance. I’m not adverse [sic] to keeping a cat. But dogs – ugh! Smelly brutes. And I think it’s really worse keeping them during the war.³²

[M50D] I hate dogs they’re always a nuisance. My wife’s got a dog she never leaves alone – always doing something with it, – it hates me because it knows I don’t like him – when I take it out for walks it sulks along the whole time – it’s as fat as any dog I’ve ever seen and it’s lazier than any person – have to do everything for it – it’s so spoilt if you give him his dinner unless you put it right beside him he won’t get up to eat it – he slept through all the raids – at least when we came back from the shelter he was in just the same position – I like sporting dogs myself but this one isn’t sporting at all.³³

In the terms of affect theory, we might say that nonhuman animals become ‘sticky surfaces’ onto which relatively well-defined emotions like hate and disgust and disdain become attached.³⁴

Such responses are far outweighed by those that played down the difficulties faced by dog owners and the dogs themselves, and which played up the emotional value of these pets to their companion humans, even when unpartisan civilians were canvassed. Relationships with pet animals were preeminently emotional rather than utilitarian, and the conditions on the British home front appear to have emphasised these affective relations rather than otherwise. We should not, therefore, let the emphasis on the difficulties of keeping pets in wartime Britain outweigh the repeated testimonies to the emotional advantages of preserving the lives of animal companions on the home front. The Mass-Observation team concluded that the problems faced by pets and owners were consistently overplayed, and in complementary fashion, their analysts simply did not believe that they had encountered any general anti-dog or anti-pet sentiment. They came to the conviction that ‘there is no really strong feeling that dog-keeping is unpatriotic, among the majority’.³⁵ What feeling there was ran indeed in the other direction, as a note from 1941 recorded: ‘I[t] appears that men and women of all classes most certainly do not want to lose their dogs, and that if they were made to, would be very upset’.³⁶ There are many examples of civilians’ arguments for the benefit of pets, even in, especially in, wartime conditions. One young man whose mongrel dog had died some six months previously placed this domestic relationship within the broader context of the mood of the nation. When asked ‘How do you feel about people keeping dogs nowadays?’, he replied ‘I take my hat off to ‘em’:

[M20C] Well, I know dogs are unpopular nowadays. I know, when I had mine some people were down-right rude to me. And it’s grown worse lately. It’s foolish really. Probably dogs do more to uphold morale, among their owners

than anything else. And dogs are doing their bit in the war too. Dog messengers at the front always have done a lot of good in wartime. Surely they've earned the privilege of being allowed to live for all their kind – even if it has to include the duchess' spoilt peke feeding on tongue, chicken, cream and orange juice.³⁷

In views like these dogs are seen as having a profoundly positive effect on the humans with whom they live, and there appears to be a concern that the government and the authorities should not ignore the positive aspects of petkeeping. When subsequently asked if he thought the government approved of dog-keeping or not, this interviewee retorted: 'It certainly does not – but then like all things they haven't given it much thought and won't give it any thought till they've killed every dog in the country and wonder what's gone wrong'.³⁸ If this respondent is at all representative – and the view of the Mass-Observation team was that he was firmly in line with popular sentiment – pets were not seen by the majority as mere objects, unfortunate obstacles in a time of need, or for their own good better off dead: instead, pets were seen as part of the everyday life that the country was trying to preserve at all costs, even whilst under fire.

The willingness to share the dangers of the WWII home front is notable. Although lack of access to food was clearly an important larger argument against keeping pets, along with the specific inability to exercise dogs, the greatest anxiety that dog owners expressed to the M-O researchers concerned the air raids, particularly those of the bombing offensive between September 1940 and May 1941 that came to be named the Blitz.³⁹ Aerial bombing was and is a very deliberate act of war waged on civilian populations, targeting 'ordinary' life and environments: a species of 'affective'

warfare, designed to unsettle, to induce ‘panic’, and to sap civilian morale.⁴⁰ All such ‘terror warfare’ is an act of sensory and emotional violence against bodies, persons and places, as recent accounts of the ‘soundscapes’ of aerial warfare during the Second World War have made clear.⁴¹ But we should recognise that these affects of war were not exclusive to human beings, and that they were capable of being transmitted between animals and people, in a version of the process that Michael Guida has helpfully termed ‘cross-species contagion’.⁴² But whereas Guida considers the emotional resonance of birdsong for British civilians threatened by the German bombs, here we might turn to less comforting affects. Describing the first day of the Blitz, for instance, a London child by the name of Bill wrote:

We’ve been seeing a lot of enemy planes lately, but this time we somehow sensed it was different. In spite of all the noise, there was a feeling of stillness, and believe it or not, a dog howled. Dad said this was a bad sign. Sure enough when the bombers appeared, there were too many to count. ... Although we’ve had a lot of raids it was the first time I really felt the war in my guts. How dare they fly over my country as though they owned it.⁴³

Here it was the lone howl of a dog that provoked the apprehension which preceded the visceral anger. This was worse when the collective terror of urban animals was added to the Blitz’s terrifying soundscapes. Joan Varley, a bank clerk who subsequently went on to join the Women’s Royal Air Force, provided an account of the first night of the London Blitz, recalling that there was a moment of silence after three bombs fell near her home in Streatham, ‘and then there was a most unearthly

wail, which added greatly to the terror of the moment. It was every dog and cat in the houses howling in terror – but they never did it again in any other bombing’.⁴⁴

It is important to underline the shared vulnerability of human and nonhuman animals to such affect. Since all living bodies are vulnerable to the deadly suite of physiological and psychological intensities involved in aerial bombing, the ‘emotional’ ability of both human beings and nonhuman animals to navigate their environments was put to the test during the Blitz.⁴⁵ But there is also an amplifying effect that crosses the species barrier: terror induced in nonhuman animals could be directly transmitted to people – here, in the form of uncertainty and eeriness. So both humans and animals shared in the terror of the Blitz, in ways that reinforced its affects. Bombing’s effects on human animals might be supplemented at some point or at some remove by additional layers of cognitive and cultural meaning, particularly in historical accounts (the words of Bill were written for instance a week after the events he describes), but the immediate emotional affect blurred the boundaries between the human and the nonhuman, imposing ‘creaturely life’ in all its misery (as Picasso’s masterpiece *Guernica* famously depicts).⁴⁶ Indiscriminate aerial bombardment is an affective form of warfare that impacts upon all animals in the same direct ways, a process of ‘place annihilating’ and world-unmaking that reduces people to ‘the shame of animal creatureliness’.⁴⁷

Even under these terrible conditions, however, many British civilians strove to preserve the emotional bonds that animal companionship provides. Rather than give up their dogs, out of concern for more deserving people or on behalf of the suffering animals themselves, most British pet owners bucked the preliminary advice offered

during the phoney war to have them put to sleep.⁴⁸ Thus, many M-O interviewees, even at the height of the Blitz, seem to have made light of the difficulties and dangers they and their pets faced. M-O's survey statistics told them that in London sixty-three percent of respondents said that they were experiencing no difficulties in keeping a dog; half the women they surveyed thought that the dog was more important than before, whilst none suggested that the animal was less important.⁴⁹ But to this bald summary we can add numerous qualitative examples that flesh out the picture with civilians' seemingly phlegmatic attitude towards the bombings, combined with a fulsome appreciation of emotional attachment to their animals. Some interviewees acknowledged the problems they and their animals faced, and the anxieties they felt on behalf of their animals, but with a determination to keep their pets as long as they could, killing being very much the last resort. One man interviewed by Mass-Observation in Euston, having stated that his dog suffered from the air raids, explained his stance thus: 'Yes he whines a bit but we all have to put up with something'.⁵⁰ Even in such characteristically understated responses the strength of the human-animal bond is everywhere apparent, something that is also emphasised by the common use of the conditional mood: 'Yes he minds [the raids] a hell of a lot he mopes for days after, he was terrible during last September. I thought I'd have to have him destroyed, because you can't find homes for dogs these days'.⁵¹ Another respondent sketched out a similar dilemma: 'I think *I'd have* a dog put to sleep unless I knew he was going to a very good home where *he'd* be happy'.⁵²

In contrast to these more anxious interviewees, concerned above all for their animals' welfare but determined to resist putting them to sleep unless they absolutely had to,

others dismissed the difficulties their dogs faced, in language that recalls the ironic or sarcastic responses quoted above, or perhaps a more straightforward sentimentality:

[M40E] – *Do you find your dog has been affected by the War?* – No, I don't think he takes much notice of it, he can't read the papers so he can't know much can he?⁵³

[F30B] This one's no bother at all though – he eats anything and he doesn't worry a bit about the raids. But he's intelligent enough. ... What's your name? (Dog inscribes TIM rather uncertainly in dust). There you are he learnt it in no time. My hubby wanted to teach him but I refused – it's not natural for a dog to do all those tricks. It must make the dog feel an utter fool in front of other dogs. I'm perfectly serious.⁵⁴

These owners are of course speaking for their animals, ventriloquising a resilience or nonchalance that perhaps says more about their emotional states than the animals' themselves. But these dogs (and we have borrowed them for our title) serve an important function here all the same, reminding us that dogs are individuals not automata, and that the affects of bombing should not simply be generalised for nonhuman animals, just as it should not for all human beings. There is no easy dividing line between animal 'affect' and human 'emotion', for instance, and no reason why we should not present these dogs as emotionally embodied individuals in the manner that we perceive individual humans. Some animals seem in fact to have been less affected by the terror of the bombing than their owners, such as the family dog who was lying on his chair in the scullery when a bomb fell a hundred yards

away: though the blast had carpeted the house with dust, bricks and glass, to the shock of his human family, ‘Dodger just shook himself and wagged his tail’.⁵⁵ Not everyone in a community or neighbourhood responds to stress in the same ways, argues Samantha Frost in her conceptualisation of human beings as ‘biocultural creatures’, and the same is surely true for the nonhuman members of the community or neighbourhood.⁵⁶

At least some of these ‘dogs that didn’t bark in the Blitz’ appear to have been remarkably calm individuals. And if the ‘Blitz spirit’ can be presented as ‘the dogged determination ... to keep firmly within the grooves of their normal lives’, we might take this wholly unintended pun as a cue to animate the seemingly human-centred ‘People’s War’.⁵⁷ Furthermore, though these animals were never destined to be presented as individual or collective representatives of the idealised ‘Blitz spirit’, the desire of the British state to preserve morale did in fact come to include a consideration of the feelings of civilians about their pets, if not the feelings of those animals directly. As the final section of this paper shows, the transpecies emotional bonds that are central to petkeeping became, through the affective ‘object-target’ of morale, a distinct concern of the wartime state.⁵⁸

Animals and the wartime state

We have argued that human beings were emotionally involved with their animal companions’ reactions to the wartime bombardment, in ways that reinforce our awareness that petkeeping is always a two-way relationship. More specifically, we

have focused on the concatenation and reverberation of affect and emotion. The relationship between people and their animals implies a process of ‘affective transfer’ between species. We see this amply confirmed by the many homilies to the role of animals in maintaining morale. One middle-aged woman explained to the Mass-Observation interviewers, for instance, that she had obtained her own small dog after the start of the war, precisely to create domestic companionship for herself: ‘I’ve been all alone in the house since my husband went and the children were evacuated – and that dog’s been wonderful company’.⁵⁹ The strength of the cross-species companionship created is also evident in the account of a middle-aged, working-class man who confidently attested to his mongrel’s behaviour: ‘If I ever go out and leave him, he always sits by my chair never stirs or anything, won’t eat or even take a drink not until I come in, then he’s as lively as anything ... they’re good companions, better than human beings I think!’⁶⁰ The slight touch or taint of misanthropy aside, these accounts suggest the vital importance of everyday affective practices to individuals and their families during wartime bombardment. As another interviewee explained to Mass-Observation in 1941, ‘Most of the people around still have their dogs. If you treat them well and bring them up properly they appreciate it and they will never leave you’.⁶¹

In such accounts, companion animals are presented as playing a small but significant role in wartime life, and the recognition of these emotional attachments is one important way in which the more-than-human nature of affect and emotion can be narrated. If trauma can be said to rupture the continuity of being, human beings and their animal companions have recourse to affective practices that constitute what Valerie Walkerdine somewhat inelegantly calls ‘communal beingness’.⁶² It should not

be too much of a stretch to portray this community under stress as both inclusive of and co-constituted by people's pets. Animals, in this perspective, played their part in the civilian response to the affective warfare that the Blitz and the subsequent bombardments represented. This was certainly the view that the directors of the Mass-Observation survey directed to the government. They prefaced their 1941 report by reflecting on the value of the companion dog to the war effort in London and elsewhere:

Dogs, especially mongrels, therefore play a prominent part in British life. And many dog-owners are almost as deeply attached to the dog as to a member of the family. Among those living alone with only a dog, this feeling is more strongly accentuated still.

The dog can therefore be a considerable minor influence on general feeling, and morale – minor in the same sense as, say, astrology. The impact of the war on your dog is likely to have a considerable effect if you are a devoted dog-owner. The effect of air-raids or food shortages on your dog may worry you just as much as the effect of these things on yourself, especially as the dog cannot exactly tell you about it and it is easy to turn your own anxieties and fantasies over on to the dog! Moreover, those wartime pressures forcing people to give up dogs may have a considerable depressive morale effect in leaving them dogless and that much more lonely.⁶³

The report's authors were more characteristically modest in their conclusions ('minor influence' echoes the 'minute contribution' we have noticed earlier), and this modesty

is only exacerbated by the cultural coding or social construction of emotion that is evident here: for the Mass-Observers concluded that it was working people, and (most prominently) women, who were more likely to be the ones speaking up for their pets and the necessity of keeping them, against the utilitarian and practical arguments for the euthanising of animals. For the Mass-Observation team, their work was presented as important because it provided the evidence that ‘morale’ should be strengthened by stressing these emotional bonds extending from humans to other animals: ‘It would seem that the great point to stress in dog propaganda is the emotional, companionship, blitztime moral support angle’; but in forwarding ‘emotion’, they understood that this was to tap into what they saw as ‘feminine’ arguments in particular:

This increased pro-dogism is largely ‘emotional’, mainly based on the feeling of the dog as companion or member of the family – predominantly female feeling. This companionship bond is less among men, who tend to value the dog as an animal (instead of an equal) and as a pal (instead of a relative) ... in times of crisis the women’s bond with the dog tends to become stronger, while the typical man’s bond is not so likely to be much strengthened.

Men, especially better-off men, stress the importance of the dog *as an animal*, pet, ornament, a piece of property or prestige, or appearance. Women of all classes stress the value of the dog as a companion or as a member of the family, putting this easily above all other consideration, though men only put it a bad second. Similarly, men stress the usefulness of a dog, – a point which women make only half as often; and poorer people mention usefulness quite frequently whereas better-off people hardly mention it at all.

Thus it is reasonable to suggest the female point of view is the one to be encouraged in favour of keeping to your dog through thick and thin, whereas men and better-off people, who adopt a more detached attitude in some respects, are likely to be more ready to sacrifice the dog at a certain stage in food shortage or depressed economy.⁶⁴

Emotion, rightly or wrongly, is seen here as a more female or ‘feminine’ concern; wartime emotional responses to animals did not bely the tendency to socially construct emotion as the preserve of particular groups or types of people. But though this contributed to the carefully enunciated modesty with which the Mass-Observation team presented their survey findings, from our interest in the mobilisation of emotion collectively we may consider that emotion and morale, whatever their genealogy and social construction, came to figure as a proper and legitimate concern for the wartime government. We thus accord these surveys and their findings an importance that Mass-Observation may have shied away from in the middle of the war: the role of animal-human emotions in the transpersonal emotional state captured, however imperfectly, by the term morale. This was a vital question, large enough to hove across the bows of the ship of state, and to be considered by a government and civil service concerned with all walks of life: the mobilisation of the concept of the ‘People’s War’, along with the variations such as the ‘Dunkirk spirit’ and ‘Blitz spirit’, revolves around this question of civilian ‘morale’.⁶⁵ To speak of morale takes us to the importance that government policy attributed to these affective or emotional connections between people and their pets – and in this way the emotions of animals and the emotions directed towards animals become more properly ‘historical’. In the

Foucauldian parlance, we might say that petkeeping and its emotional affordances became a recognised part of the wartime state's 'biopolitical' rationale and its 'governmentality'.⁶⁶

What then can we say of the role of animals for morale in this reading of emotion as an affective 'object-target' for government policy?⁶⁷ Despite the emphasis in some of the popular literature, the British government did not argue that all pets should be killed, and indeed British vets, animal charities, even NARPAC (the National Air Raid Precautions Animal Committee), all came to argue against any suggestion of this kind. We might still say that the state was slow in recognising that companion animals played a key role within families, particularly during the phoney war. Things changed markedly after 1939 and the advent of the war itself, however. Although the state was always wary of intervening too closely into family lives, including the sphere of animal-human relationships, reaction to the unnecessary killing of pets was quickly reported as having an adverse effect on wartime morale, with the killing of pets described as at best unwise – and at worst counterproductive. As the much redrafted (and government-vetted) script of Christopher Stone's BBC radio broadcast of October 1939 acknowledged, companion animals helped maintain the morale of the country: 'To destroy a faithful friend when there is no need to do so, is yet another way of letting war creep into your home'.⁶⁸ The theme of many contemporary accounts was rather the overreaction by pet owners in the preventive killing of their animals. One animal magazine noted that 'A number of people who have regretted their hasty decision, have since acquired new pets'.⁶⁹ Another reported on the numbers of people 'who were sorry they had been so easily influenced to kill their faithful friends'.⁷⁰ What was particularly noticeable here was the felt need to

strengthen and even reestablish family units, ‘families’ in this sense embracing animal and human members: ‘In many districts owners showed great concern for missing pets and on several occasions appeals were made to our van driver to keep a look out for certain favourite cats and on no account to destroy them before the owners could collect them and take them to the new home’.⁷¹ Historian Philip Zeigler concluded that ‘By the Spring of 1940 many owners were regretting the holocaust of pets that occurred at the outbreak of war’.⁷²

In retrospect, the state’s understanding of the nature of animal-human families had come to take into account the growing significance of animals in the emotional economy of wartime Britain, and their contribution to the individual and collective affective atmosphere for which morale was the shorthand. We might then consider as part of an analysis of wartime emotions the role animals played, and also the role they were politically represented as playing, for a civilian morale that was never exclusively ‘human’ in scope. It is precisely the importance of transpecies relationships to civilian morale that seems to be what the British government recognised as it rejected the idea that ‘useless’ pets should be eliminated. So, for instance, attempts to reduce the number of dogs by controlling breeding, raising the cost of dog licenses, or other expedients were increasingly labeled as impractical, given the strength of public feeling: ‘Public opinion would be extremely sensitive about any drastic step to reduce the number of dogs’, civil servants advised in early 1942.⁷³ Every suggestion for eliminating or reducing the numbers of dogs, and the burden they presented to the wartime state, was countered, with emotion and sentiment counting for more than instrumental reason. As one of the ministers concerned conceded, ‘The steps we take cannot always be logical. ... We have to take

into account psychological factors'. Concurring with the sentiments of the Mass-Observation survey of a year before, this official answered his own question – whether such draconian actions against pets would help the war effort – with a curt 'I think not'.⁷⁴ Animals – and people's emotional attachments to them – also became part of the concerns of 'government' when questions of evacuation and air raid precautions were concerned. Although the Home Office was refusing to consider evacuation facilities for animals or allowing pets into air raid shelters, the newly-established NARPAC warned against the needless killing of animal companions:

Those who are staying at home should not have their animals destroyed.

Animals are in no greater danger than human beings, and the NARPAC plans ... will ensure that if your animal is hurt it will be quickly treated or put out of its pain if it is too badly hurt to be cured.⁷⁵

The work of NARPAC could hardly be a clearer sign that the British government, at war and in an existential crisis, was moved to recognise the emotional attachments that existed between pets and people. Although Parliament had discussed for decades the treatment of various types of animals it had never before taken stock of the emotional role that companion animals played in the broad affairs of the nation. The war had disrupted this state of affairs, bringing animals and the emotions that were invested in them to the centre of government concerns.

We can argue then that the wartime state quickly and decisively came to recognise these 'psychological' (we might now say 'emotional' or even 'affective') realities: British pet owners would typically rather struggle on and perhaps suffer with their

companion animals, rather than have them summarily killed. All this suggests that both animal owners and the state had reflected critically on the unfortunate events of 1939, the so-called 'holocaust of pets', and came instead to endorse the emotional attachments that linked people to their animals. The animals who had shared food and shelter under adversity with humans for years seemed more closely entwined with human existence than ever. People knew that: so did those who implemented the government's decisions.

Conclusions

This paper has underlined the importance of pets and petkeeping for British society during the Second World War. The practical difficulties of keeping pets during wartime, as well as the political opposition to petkeeping, have been well documented, and rehearsed in the popular narrative of a massacre or holocaust of pets during the period of phoney war. The lives of companion animals appear particularly conditional when ranged alongside the needs of human beings in the 'People's War'. However, although the exigencies of war made the presence of companion animals on the home front both difficult in practice and difficult to defend, their emotional value was obvious not only to most pet owners but also to the British authorities. Although the position of the British government can be portrayed as dismissive or indifferent to the sentiments of pet owners, its understanding of the value of pets for civilians, and indirectly for the war effort, was well developed. The phoney war was marked by an outbreak of precautionary killing, but most owners refused to euthanise their pets, and

as early as the autumn of 1939 the state itself explicitly recognised the emotional value of pets to civilian morale.

Whilst it made petkeeping a problem, then, war amplified the emotional bonds between species. In an earlier paper on the First World War, Philip Howell noted that pet dogs were largely unheralded victims of the British home front, ‘uniquely vulnerable to the revocation of their privileged status as human companions’.⁷⁶ However, with the much greater vulnerability of civilians during the Second World War, not only was the emphasis on the emotional value of companion animals more evident, but the state was also more proactive in recognising the value of that emotion. Beyond the importance of war, we have seen elsewhere that the state ignores the entanglement of human beings and their animal companions at its peril, even if its priorities are anthropocentric. During Hurricane Katrina, for instance, coast guard rescuers reportedly stated to New Orleans residents that they were ‘not in the dog business’, but the subsequent outcry led to the 2006 Pets Evacuation and Transportation Standards Act, not least because of the benefits to human health and public security.⁷⁷ The lesson is that emotional attachments to animals should become part of the calculus of government not despite but because of such times of crisis. In a more general sense, emotions can be recognised as shared, transpersonal and collective – and thus accessible to historians and geographers, as we hope our discussion of civilian morale has made clear. As a contribution not just to emotions history but also to emotional geographies, we hope to have demonstrated that even conventional historical geography can attend profitably to embodied emotions.

But we have also been concerned to argue that such histories and geographies of emotion are transpecies as well as transpersonal. We may struggle to access and articulate the emotions of other animals, whether at the species level or that of the individual animal, but by focussing on the transmission of emotion between humans and nonhumans it is possible to say something about the role of animals' emotional states, even at an historical remove. It is important that we do not restrict emotion to human beings, offering all other animals only modest allowances of 'affect'. Instead, we have reframed emotion as a shared bodily capacity communicable across species boundaries. This was never a one-way relationship: affect and emotion travelled between animals and human beings. To develop an acoustic metaphor, we can think of the reverberations of affect and emotion between particular humans and particular animals. People and their animal companions 'trans/act social spaces of emotion', to adapt Peta Tait's words, and this was no less true when that relationship was tested by war.⁷⁸ Even under the terrible conditions of the Blitz, dogs and other animals suffered alongside their owners, with anxiety and terror transmitted between pets and people, but also providing each other with emotional support at a time of the greatest stress, as both Mass-Observation and the wartime state acknowledged. In these conditions wartime pet owners tended to play down the difficulties they faced, putting emphasis on the value of maintaining their bonds with companion animals on the home front.

To put this in more modish language we can pursue a more-than-human historical geography of emotions, focussing not only on the transpersonal but also transpecies articulations of collective affect. Approaching emotion in this way provides opportunities for historical animal geographers 'to explore the interconnected

imaginative and material dimensions of emotions and to investigate how emotions bind humans and nonhumans together'.⁷⁹

Notes

¹ See for instance P. Howell, The dog fancy at war: breeds, breeding, and Britishness, 1914-1918, *Society and Animals* 21 (2013) 546-567, which advances a complementary argument about the conditional relationship between companion animals and the wartime state. On dogs in the Second World War see R.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 (2013) 1-36. For two recent examples of work that does justice to the emotional relations between people and animals in wartime, see I. Forsyth, A bear's biography: hybrid warfare and the more-than-human battlespace, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 35 (2016) 495-512 and C. Pearson, 'Four-legged *poilus*': French army dogs, emotional practices and the creation of militarized human-dog bonds, 1871-1918, *Journal of Social History* (forthcoming 2018) <https://doi.org/10.1093/jsh/shx090>. To these we can add a forthcoming account of birdsong in British emotional life with special emphasis on a time of war, M. Guida, Surviving twentieth-century modernity: birdsong and emotions in Britain, in: H. Kean and P. Howell (Eds), *The Routledge Companion to Animal-Human History*, Abingdon, forthcoming 2018.

² Forsyth, A bear's biography, 499.

³ The most problematic are those accounts that simply add in nonhuman animals to an otherwise all-too-human history. This is obvious when those animals are conscripted as heroes in the war effort. See, for example, J. Cooper, *Animals in War*, London, 2010. More academic, more illuminating, but still limited, are narratives of animals'

experiences portrayed as essentially parallel to those of humans. See, for instance, J. Gardiner, *The Animals' War: Animals in Wartime from the First World War to the Present Day*, London, 2006.

⁴ For such advice see *Air Raid Precautions Handbook, no. 12: Air Raid Precautions for Animals, London 1939*, City of Westminster Archives Centre, London. The popular history that makes the most of this narrative is C. Campbell, *Bonzo's War: Animals Under Fire, 1939-1945*, London, 2013. For a critical account, see H. Kean, *The Great Cat and Dog Massacre. The Real Story of World War Two's Unknown Tragedy*, Chicago, 2017, and H. Kean, 'The dog and cat massacre of September 1939 and the People's War', *European Review of History: Revue Européenne D'Histoire* 22 (2015) 741-756.

⁵ 'September Holocaust' were the protesting words used in December 1939 by the National Canine Defence League. Note, however, that Calder and Ziegler deploy the phrase long after the fate of European Jewry was revealed. See A. Calder, *The People's War: Britain, 1939-1945*, London, 1992, 34, first published in 1969, and P. Ziegler, *London at War, 1939-1945*, London, 2002, 74, first published in 1995.

⁶ Forsyth, A bear's biography, 499.

⁷ See J.M. Kinder, 'Zoo animals and modern war: captive casualties, patriotic citizens, and good soldiers', in: C. Hediger (Ed.), *Animals and War: Studies of Europe and North America*, Leiden, 2012, 45-75. For comparable concerns about food and petkeeping in the Great War, see Howell, 'The dog fancy at war'.

⁸ Thus Calder, *People's War*, 34, pointedly contrasts the 'hysteria' of August 1914 with the 'absence of hatred and high spirits' that resulted in the massacre of pets during the phoney war.

⁹ S. Williams, *Climbing the Bookshelves: The Autobiography of Shirley Williams*, London, 2010, 65. On Shirley's 'no concern for her own safety' see V. Brittain, *Testament of Experience: An Autobiography of the Years 1925-50*, London, 1980, 329.

¹⁰ This is the argument of Kean, *The Great Cat and Dog Massacre*, 51.

¹¹ *Dogs and Dog-Health in Wartime*, June 1945, Mass-Observation Archive, University of Sussex Special Collections, Brighton, UK (hereafter M-O), SxMOA1/1/10/6/2 2256.

¹² For 'vexing question' see S. Rutherford and S. Wilcox, A meeting place, in: S. Wilcox and S. Rutherford (Eds), *Historical Animal Geographies*, Abingdon, 2018, 4.

¹³ See for instance S.J. Matt and P.N. Stearns (Eds), *Doing Emotions History*, Urbana, 2014. For other notable work on the history of emotions, in chronological order, see W. Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*, Cambridge, 2001; J. Lillequist (Ed.), *The History of Emotions, 1200-1800*, London, 2012; B.H. Rosenwein, *Generations of Feeling: A History of Emotions, 600-1700*, Cambridge, 2015. Rosenwein has reflected most usefully on the methodology of emotions history in B.H. Rosenwein, Worrying about emotions in history, *American Historical Review* 107 (2002) 821-845 and B.H. Rosenwein, Problems and methods in the history of emotions, *Passions in Context* 1 (2010) 1-32.

¹⁴ J. Plamper, *The History of Emotions: An Introduction*, Oxford, 2015. The entanglement of the cultural and the biological is acknowledged, but the dominance of social constructionism is readily apparent. The same might be said for those historians who practice 'emotionology' rather than attempting to recover emotional experience, or those who alternatively forward the entanglement of emotion in the transformative, performative power of language and culture. See P.N. Stearns and C.Z. Stearns,

Emotionology: clarifying the history of emotions and emotional standards, *American Historical Review* 90 (1985) 813-836.

¹⁵ For ‘cross-species intersubjectivity’, see Kirk, In dogs we trust? For an important exception to this neglect of animals’ emotional states, see the guidance provided by É. Baratay, *Le Point de Vue Animal: Une Autre Version de L’Histoire*, Paris, 2012. For an example of his work in English, one that revolves around the reconstruction of animal emotions, see É. Baratay, The giraffe’s journey in France (1826-1827): entering another world, in: C. Wischermann, A. Steinbrecher and P. Howell (Eds), *Animal History in the Modern City: Exploring Liminality*, London, 2018, 91-104.

¹⁶ I. Ben-Ami, Emotions and the sixteenth-century Ottoman carnival of animals, in: S. Cockburn and A. Wells (Eds), *Interspecies Interactions: Animals and Humans Between the Middle Ages and Modernity*, Abingdon, 2018, 17, emphasis added.

¹⁷ R. Leys, The turn to affect: a critique, *Critical Inquiry* 37 (2011) 470. The literature on animals and emotions, from C. Darwin, *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*, London, 1872, is vast, contentious and inconclusive, but it is easier now to argue that many other animals have affective states that are roughly comparable with the emotions we recognise in ourselves. In geography, see this initial exchange on the prospect of an emotional geography: D. Thien, After or beyond feeling? A consideration of affect and emotion in geography, *Area* 37 (2005) 450-454 and B. Anderson and P. Harrison, Questioning affect and emotion, *Area* 38 (2006) 333-335 who pointedly ask ‘Could there be an affectual or emotional geography of animals?’ 334.

¹⁸ P. Tait, *Wild and Dangerous Performances: Animals, Emotions, Circus*, Houndmills, 2011, 1, 3. This can profitably be read alongside S. Nance, *Entertaining Elephants: Animal Agency and the Business of the American Circus*, Baltimore, 2013.

¹⁹ Tait, *Wild and Dangerous Performances*, 4.

²⁰ J. Lorimer and S. Whatmore, After the 'king of beasts': Samuel Baker and the embodied historical geographies of elephant hunting in mid-nineteenth-century Ceylon, *Journal of Historical Geography* 35 (2009) 675.

²¹ See, for example, C. Dwyer and G. Davies, Qualitative methods III: animating archives, artful interventions and online environments, *Progress in Human Geography* 34 (2010) 88-97; J. Lorimer, Moving image methodologies for more-than-human geographies, *Cultural Geographies* 17 (2010) 237-258; S. Mills, Cultural-historical geographies of the archive: fragments, objects and ghosts, *Geography Compass* 7 (2017) 701-717; G. Rose, Practising photography: an archive, a study, some photographs and a researcher, *Journal of Historical Geography* 26 (2000) 555-571. For consideration of the 'animal archive', see E. Benson, Animal writes: historiography, disciplinarity, and the animal trace, in L. Kalof and G.M. Montgomery (Eds), *Making Animal Meaning*, East Lansing, 2011, 3-16.

²² For the work of Mass-Observation, see G. Cross (Ed.), *Worktowners at Blackpool: Mass Observation and Popular Leisure in the 1930s*, Abingdon, 1990; D. Sheridan, B. Street and D. Bloome, *Writing Ourselves: Mass Observation and Literacy Practices*, Cresskill, 2000; J. Taylor, Sex, snobs and swing: a case study of Mass Observation as a source for social history, *Mass Observation Online* (no date) 1-7, available at

www.massobservation.amdigital.co.uk/FurtherResources/Essays/SexSnobsAndSwingACaseStudyOfMassObservationAsASourceForSocialHistory last accessed 16 May 2018. For a robust defence of M-O's methods, see N. Hubble, *Mass-Observation and Everyday Life: Culture, History, Theory*, Houndmills, 2006.

²³ *Dogs in War Time*, August 1941, M-O SxMOA1/2/79/1/D1.

²⁴ One hired investigator, Norah, is on record as stating that she did not mind the housewives survey but preferred to resign rather than ‘do’ dogs: see *Bob Martin Survey on Health of Dogs in War Time*, March 1945, M-O SxMOA1/2/78/1/B.

²⁵ Hubble, *Mass-Observation and Everyday Life*, 10.

²⁶ *Dogs in London*, July 1941, M-O SxMOA1/1/6/7/35; *Dogs and Dog-Health in War Time*, June 1945, M-O SxMOA1/1/10/6/2.

²⁷ See, for instance, P. Howell, *At Home and Astray: The Domestic Dog in Victorian Britain*, Charlottesville, 2015; K. Kete, *The Beast in the Boudoir: Petkeeping in Nineteenth-Century Paris*, Berkeley, 1994; I.H. Tague, *Animal Companions: Pets and Social Change in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, New Haven, 2015. For a recent summary, see P. Howell, When did pets become animals? in: Wilcox and Rutherford, *Historical Animal Geographies*, 13-24.

²⁸ For petkeeping in general, see R. Fox, Animal behaviours, post-human lives: everyday negotiations of the animal–human divide in pet-keeping, *Social and Cultural Geography* 7 (2006) 525-537; E. Power, Furry families: making a human–dog family through home, *Social & Cultural Geography* 9 (2008) 535-555. That this is a complex and ambivalent set of emotions has been influentially argued by the indispensable Y-F. Tuan, *Dominance and Affection: The Making of Pets*, New Haven, 1984.

²⁹ *Provincial Dogs*, August 1941, M-O SxMOA1/1/6/8/27.

³⁰ *Dogs in War Time*, August 1941, M-O SxMOA1/2/79/1/E.

³¹ *Dogs in War Time*, August 1941, M-O SxMOA1/2/79/1/E.

³² *Dogs in London*, July 1941, M-O SxMOA1/1/6/7/35.

³³ *Provincial Dogs*, August 1941, M-O SxMOA1/1/6/8/27.

³⁴ For ‘sticky surfaces’, see S. Ahmed, Affective economies, *Social Text* 22 (2004) 117-139.

³⁵ *Provincial Dogs*, August 1941, M-O SxMOA1/1/6/8/27.

³⁶ *Dogs in War Time*, July 1941, M-O SxMOA1/2/79/1/D1.

³⁷ *Dogs in War Time*, August 1941, M-O SxMOA1/2/79/1/D1.

³⁸ *Dogs in War Time*, August 1941, M-O SxMOA1/2/79/1/D1.

³⁹ Strictly speaking, the Blitz refers to the period between September 1940 and May 1941. However, in popular discourse ‘the Blitz’ tends to cover the whole experience of bombardment in the 1939-1945 war on the home front, and a blitz can be defined as a concentrated air raid with over a hundred German bombers targeting a single conurbation in a single night. See D. Clampin, *Advertising and Propaganda in World War II: Cultural Identity and the Blitz Spirit*, London, 2014, 7. We have followed this latter definition by taking some examples from outside the 1940-1941 period.

⁴⁰ For a definition of morale and a recognition of its significance, see E. Estorick, Morale in contemporary England, *American Journal of Sociology* 47 (1941) 462-471. For the bombing campaigns and their link to total war, see R. Overy, *The Bombing War: Europe 1939–1945*, London, 2013.

⁴¹ G. Moshenka, Moaning Minnie and the doodlebugs: soundscapes of air warfare in Second World War Britain, in: N.J. Saunders and P. Cornish (Eds), *Conflict and the Senses*, Abingdon, 2017, 106-122. For affective resonance, consider J. Panskepp, Affective consciousness: core emotional feelings in animals and humans, *Consciousness and Cognition* 14 (2005) 30-80.

⁴² Guida, Surviving twentieth-century modernity. See also B. Anderson, *Encountering Affect: Capacities, Apparatuses, Conditions*, Farnham, 2014, 66 and C. Nordstrom,

Terror warfare and the medicine of peace, *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 12 (1998) 103-121.

⁴³ Letter to Mervyn from Bill, 15 September 1940, M. Haisman and L.E. Snellgrove, *Dear Merv ... Dear Bill*, Llandysul, 1992, 83. The letter describes the *Luftwaffe* raid of 7 September 1940.

⁴⁴ Quoted in M. Kennedy, Sex, fear and looting: survivors disclose untold stories of the Blitz, *The Guardian*, 5 October 2006, 9.

⁴⁵ Martha Nussbaum argues that emotions shape the landscapes of humans and animals. Citing Seligman's behavioral work on 'helplessness', she recognises the role of emotions in providing a kind of navigation, for 'an animal cannot flourish unless it believes to a certain extent in its own control and mastery': M.C. Nussbaum, *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*, Cambridge, 2001, 137. We acknowledge here our debt to Ben Anderson's discussion of affect defined in terms of bodily capacities, see Anderson, *Encountering Affect*.

⁴⁶ See I. Patterson, *Guernica and Total War*, Cambridge MA, 2007. See also J. Winter, Faces, voices and the shadow of catastrophe, in: E. Schindel and P. Colombo (Eds), *Space and the Memories of Violence: Landscapes of Erasure, Disappearance and Exception*, Houndmills, 2014, 84. T. Adorno, *Minima Moralia: Reflections from Damaged Life*, London, 2005, 54 puts it this way: 'Life has changed into a timeless succession of shocks, interspaced with empty, paralysed intervals'.

⁴⁷ K. Hewitt, Place annihilation: area bombing and the fate of urban places, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 73 (1983) 257-284; A.A. Kuzniar, *Melancholia's Dog: Reflections on our Animal Kinship*, Chicago, 2014, 18. We might consider this as a development of Chris Philo's 'less-than-human geographies': C. Philo, Less-than-human geographies, *Political Geography* 60 (2017) 256-258.

⁴⁸ Kean, *The dog and cat massacre*, 749.

⁴⁹ *Dogs in London*, M-O SxMOA1/1/6/7/35, 804.

⁵⁰ [M40C], *Dogs in War Time*, July 1941, M-O ScMOA1/2/79/1/B.

⁵¹ [M40D], *Dogs in War Time*, July 1941, M-O ScMOA1/2/79/1/B.

⁵² [M50D], *Dogs in War Time*, July 1941, M-O ScMOA1/2/79/1/B, emphasis added.

⁵³ *Dogs in War Time*, July 1941, M-O ScMOA1/2/79/1/B.

⁵⁴ *Dogs in London*, July 1941, M-O SxMOA1/1/6/7/35. These reactions are helpfully suggestive of the role that a specific kind of human affect – that of humour and play – fulfils in wartime. See for instance J-Y. Le Naour, *Laughter and tears in the Great War: the need for laughter/the guilt of humour*, *Journal of European Studies* 31 (2001) 265-275 or S. Swart, ‘The terrible laughter of the Afrikaner’: towards a social history of humor, *Journal of Social History* 42 (2009) 889-917.

⁵⁵ P. Stansky, *The First Day of the Blitz: September 7, 1940*, New Haven, 2007, 46.

⁵⁶ S. Frost, *Biocultural Creatures: Toward a New Theory of the Human*, Durham NC, 2016, 155.

⁵⁷ Clampin, *Advertising and Propaganda*, 225; Kean, *The dog and cat massacre*, 742. Helpfully, Clampin neither dismisses the ‘Blitz spirit’ as mere myth, nor uncritically accepts its invocation of a unified community instilled with the virtues of the national character. For links to the older ideal of ‘carrying on’, see L. Mugglestone, *Rethinking the birth of an expression: keeping calm and ‘carrying on’ in World War One*, *Torch: The Oxford Research Centre in the Humanities* 2 August 2016, available at <http://torch.ox.ac.uk/rethinking-birth-expression-keeping-calm-and-carrying-world-war-one> last accessed 16 May 2018. On the larger themes of the ‘People’s War’, see S.O. Rose, *Which People’s War? National Identity and Citizenship in Wartime Britain*, Oxford, 2003.

⁵⁸ ‘Object-target’ is taken directly from Anderson, *Encountering Affect*, to which we are again indebted.

⁵⁹ [F40C], *Dogs in War Time*, July 1941, M-O SxMOA1/2/79/1/D1.

⁶⁰ [M45D], *Dogs in War Time*, July 1941, M-O SxMOA1/2/79/1/D1.

⁶¹ [M45B], *Survey of Non Dog Owners*, August 1941, M-O SxMOA1/2/79/1/E.

⁶² V. Walkerdine, Communal beingness and affect: an exploration of trauma in an ex-industrial community, *Body and Society* 16 (2010) 91-116.

⁶³ *Dogs in London*, August 1941, M-O SxMOA1/1/6/7/35, 2. By comparison, a ‘significant section of Britons, by the way, thought *first* of their pets’: T. Harrison, *Living Through the Blitz*, Harmondsworth, 1976, 51, emphasis in original.

⁶⁴ *Dogs in London*, August 1941, M-O SxMOA1/1/6/7/35, 4, 12 and 13-14.

⁶⁵ See B. Anderson, Modulating the excess of affect: morale in a state of ‘total war’, in: M. Gregg and G.J. Seigworth (Eds), *The Affect Theory Reader*, Durham NC, 2010, 161-185.

⁶⁶ Foucault’s notions of ‘biopolitics’ and ‘governmentality’ are notoriously anthropocentric, but the extension of these ideas to nonhuman animals is increasingly canvassed. See for instance M. Chrulew, Animals in biopolitical theory: between Agamben and Negri, *New Formations* 76 (2012) 53-67.

⁶⁷ Anderson, *Encountering Affect*.

⁶⁸ The National Archives, Kew, London, UK (hereafter TNA), HO 186/1417.

⁶⁹ The animal welfare societies in war-time, *Animal Pictorial* 3 (1940) 103.

⁷⁰ L. Lind af Hageby, *Bombed Animals ... Rescued Animals ... Animals Saved from Destruction*, London, 1941, 19.

⁷¹ Robert Gower to Herbert Morrison, 14 March 1944, on the work of the RSPCA in London, TNA HO 186/1417.

⁷² Ziegler, *London at War*, 74.

⁷³ B.C. Burt to St John Bodinnar, 20 February 1942, and B.C. Burt to Mr Lundie, 9 May 1942, in TNA MAF 84/61.

⁷⁴ Mr Broadley's response to Burt's proposals, 4 August 1942, TNA MAF 84/61.

⁷⁵ NARPAC, *Wartime Aid for All Animal Owners*, London, 1939, 5.

⁷⁶ Howell, *The dog fancy at war*, 19.

⁷⁷ D. Grimm, How Hurricane Katrina turned pets into people, *BuzzFeed News*, 31 July 2015, https://www.buzzfeed.com/davidhgrimm/how-hurricane-katrina-turned-pets-into-people?utm_term=.eyb75rP448#.ikRQrElxxg last accessed 16 May 2018. See also L.K. Zottarelli, Broken bond: an exploration of human factors associated with companion animal loss during Hurricane Katrina, *Sociological Forum* 25 (2010) 110-122.

⁷⁸ Tait, *Wild and Dangerous Performances*, 5.

⁷⁹ Pearson, 'Four-legged *poilus*', 20.