

Police Writing and Radical Modernisation in the Porfiriato and the Conservative Republic (1870s–1910s)

Agustina Carrizo de Reimann

ISBN: 978-1-032-45845-8 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-45847-2 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-37894-5 (ebk)

First published 2025

Introduction

(CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0)

The chapter DOI: [10.4324/9781003378945-1](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003378945-1)

Introduction

In his famous autofiction *Memorias de un Vigilante* (1897), the writer, journalist, and commissioner of the Policía de la Capital, José S. Álvarez, also known by his pseudonym Fray Mocho, observed:

For the police in London, Paris, and New York, equipped with a thousand precious resources, it is not at all strange that they can find a criminal two hours after the crime has been committed: the admirable thing would be if they could do it here. I would like to see these serious policemen, of whom the books do not speak, in this scenario where there are no registers of residents, where the movement of the population is unknown, where the entry and exit of foreigners is a secret for the authorities, where one can be married ten times, have fifteen addresses [...] and all in the greatest secrecy, not only for the authorities but also for the children, the wife, the brothers, and even the neighbours, however curious they may be.¹

Alongside the problems of crime detection, the author describes two fundamental challenges to the maintenance of public order in nineteenth-century Buenos Aires: the precarious state of the police forces and the disorder of national modernisation. The difficulty of following the path of Western modernity has been a constant concern for Latin American politicians, intellectuals, and scholars. Faced with the instability that followed independence, nineteenth-century statesmen and historians such as Bartolomé Mitre and Lucas Alamán distanced themselves from the idealism of the revolution and pointed to the exceptional and incomplete development of Latin American nations.² Similarly, twentieth-century academic accounts have often portrayed Latin American modernity as a chimera, a corrupted mimesis, and a failed experiment.³ In his comprehensive study, *The Birth of the Modern World Society (1815–1830)*, Paul Johnson argues that, as

2 *Introduction*

in the cases of Greece and Spain, the origins of Latin American modernity were “corrupt and flawed.”

Nor did the interventions of the more advanced societies, like Britain, France, and the United States [...] curb the anarchic and destructive tendencies [...]. So the forces of progress spread rapidly in these years, sometimes like manumission, sometimes like a plague.⁴

More recently, Miguel Centeno and Agustín Ferraro have argued that the current weakness of Latin American states stems from the failure of nineteenth-century leaders to generate strong national identities capable of legitimising the political project and to provide the state with an efficient fiscal system and the infrastructural power necessary to manage the territory, its resources, and its inhabitants.⁵ For Peter Waldman, failed statehood and, more generally, the dysfunctionality of modern political cultures in Latin America become evident in the militarisation of Latin American police forces, their tendency to disregard legal norms and abuse power, and their lack of professional culture.⁶

These narratives of Latin American incomplete evolution and failed transplantations adhere, more and less explicitly, to a notion of modernity that is monist and normative. With varying degrees of sophistication, everyday and academic notions tend to define modernity as a break with the past. People, thought, aesthetics, and orders become modern when they produce a rupture with the hierarchical structures, the ritual life, and magical understanding of the traditional world, thereby proposing a new orientation towards the past, present, and future. The opposition between tradition and modernity rests on a series of dichotomies: emotion and reason, inertia and dynamism, myth and history, community and state, and periphery and centre. These pairs account for a hierarchical conception of time, according to which progress emerged and reached its highest form in the West within the projects of Enlightenment, empire, and nation. As Saurabh Dube points out, the idea of Western modernity proposes a version of world history in which groups and societies either surrender to or catch up with modernity.⁷ In the 1970s, Latin American postmodern intellectuals and scholars sought to challenge the centrist imaginary of progress and backwardness by exposing the logic governing the relationship between the “West and the Rest.” First, they argue, Western modernity has claimed for its centres an emancipatory project that is in stark contradiction to the political, economic, and cultural domination that has allowed it to spread throughout the world. Second, the expansion of the modern order postulates a relationship of complementarity between the emitting centres and the peripheries, which are seen as passive recipients with limited chances of true development. Thus, while

“progress” alludes to human fulfilment for the West, it always implies the need to “catch up” for the periphery.⁸

To challenge these Western paradigms, intellectuals and scholars from the periphery have conceptualised modernity as plural, hybrid, marginal, magical, and essentially colonial.⁹ Proponents of the Latin American Modernity/Coloniality research programme have contributed to the conceptual decentring by questioning the European origins and the emancipatory mission of modernisation. According to the decolonial readings, the modern world order did not emerge from intra-European processes, but from the conquest of the Americas and the European control of the Atlantic. Likewise, the novelty of modernity lay not so much in the break with tradition as in the establishment of a model of economic, political, and epistemological domination that was global in scope while excluding a large part of humanity. The Latin American republics failed to expunge the dark side of modernity, that is, the colonial matrix of power that converges the global division of labour with racist hierarchies and the epistemological erasure of the colonised, non-white, non-masculine, non-proprietary Other. With the exception of the Haitian Revolution (1791–1804), Latin American national projects were launched by the descendants of European colonisers who, after gaining political independence, sought to promote a Europeanising model of modernisation driven by internal colonialism.¹⁰

By questioning the sites and chronologies of modernity, the Latin American decolonial approach has sought to recover the contested histories of modernisation and expose the underlying operations of culture and power. However, according to James Sanders, decolonial critique has thus rendered invisible the countermodels of modernity formulated by Latin American popular republicanism between 1840 and 1870. In the decades between independence and the elitist republics of the possible, the Latin American peoples “did not define modernity bound to cultured Europe and its civilisation, but celebrated an imagined modernity located in America, a modernity whose definition was inherently political.”¹¹ According to Sanders, no place in the world was as modern as Latin America, because only the macroregion had embarked so resolutely on the path of democratic republicanism. Conversely, elitist modernisation projects of the late nineteenth century sought to return to the Western path, fetishising the state and outward economic development and embracing scientific racism as rationale for national progress. While Sanders acknowledges that popular resistance continued after 1870, for example through the demands of rural and indigenous communities to maintain their right to land, he claims that the republics of the possible ultimately succeeded in burying “American republican modernity as a vision of the future [...] and as a vision of the past for historians working today.”¹² Similarly, Hilda Sabato notes that

4 *Introduction*

the relationship between “the many and the few,” as defined by the principle of popular sovereignty during the early Latin American republics, came under attack in the last third of the nineteenth century.¹³ In Mexico and Argentina, the governments of Porfirio Díaz and the members of the PAN sought to put an end to the republican experiments by limiting political participation and formulating a new language for the nation. The establishment of a state-led national order was then seen as a key condition for overcoming the disorders of the revolution and promoting material growth and peace. Popular forces did not cease to resist elitist modernisation, but according to Sabato: “[T]he language of class, interest, and race displaced the civic rhetoric that had prevailed in previous decades, while national identity discourse permeated republican patriotism and new forms of political action buried the old.”¹⁴

The book draws on the insights and debates advanced by Latin American decolonial studies and New Political History to explore the contested nature of modernisation during the Porfirian and Conservative republics from the perspective of one of its most erratic agents: the urban police. To this end, modernisation will be used as an analytical category to identify and describe the multiple, overlapping transformations that urban societies underwent in the last decades of the nineteenth century and until the outbreak of the Mexican Revolution and the rise to power of the Antiroquista faction in 1910. Weberian, Simmelian, and Foucauldian theories of cultural and political modernisation, to give a few examples, will serve here as “triggers” to produce a situated and critical reading of Latin American developments.¹⁵ The discourses of modernity, whether Eurocentric, nationalist, emancipatory, or authoritarian, and the dichotomies posed by them will be seen as part of the strategies for enforcing and challenging political and cultural transformations. The choice of Mexico and Argentina is grounded on the traditional historiographical distinction between colonial centres and peripheries and their significance for the consolidation of modern national state in the macroregion. At the same time, the analysis will look into the similarities between the Mexican and Argentinian cases, which, as Tulio Halperín Donghi remarks, are as significant as their differences.¹⁶ Rather than identifying singularities and causalities,¹⁷ the comparison aims to provide a transcontextual framework for the analysis of the multiple ways of doing modernisation in Latin America.

The long isolation and the late establishment of the viceregal capital in the Río de la Plata region in 1776 allowed the leaders of the Revolution to approach the challenges of political reconfiguration in a more self-referential way than their northern counterparts, who sought to reformulate the institutional order within the framework of the Constitution of Cadiz.¹⁸ In both territories, the emerging central governments engaged in

hard-fought negotiations not only with the regional elites but also with the people, who had gained consciousness and influence through their participation in the revolution as armed citizens.¹⁹ According to Aníbal Quijano, elites in the Southern Cone adopted a strategy similar to that of the US in shaping national society, as the emerging states in Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay favoured the violent replacement of indigenous communities with European labour. Instead, Mexico and other countries with large Indigenous populations sought to subordinate local communities to the capitalist, civilised regime of Western modernity.²⁰ As already mentioned, the volatility of political rivalry and popular sovereignty encouraged elites to abandon in the last third of the century the idealism of popular republicanism. The Porfirian and Conservative republics successfully re-established and strengthened ties with Europe and later the US, promoted economic development, improved infrastructure, imposed political stability, and supported the democratisation of consumption. The cost of the *pax porfiriana* and the PAN's "order and peace" was the closure of the political game, the deepening of economic dependency, the growth of social inequality, and the decimation of dissident communities and cultures.

Through the transcontextual analysis of police writing practices during the republics of the possible in Argentina and Mexico, the book seeks to explore three main ideas. The study builds on the premise that the modernisation proposed by the Porfiriato and the Conservative republic was neither incomplete nor total, but radical. It was radical because it unearthed the colonial roots of the project of Western modernity and exposed the paradoxes of modernisation in extreme ways: the authoritarianism of state-sponsored peace, the devastation of economic growth, the unrest of the ideal city, the social inequality underlying socio cultural democratisation, and the illusions of modern rationality. As I will show in the course of the analysis, these disorders were not so much the result of maladaptation or native deficiencies, but of the very statist, utilitarian, and racist *raison de la modernité*. The cultural and communication technique of writing has played a central role in modernisation as a means of large-scale economic and political organisation, the critical accumulation, storage and updating of knowledge, the advancement of science, and the refinement of the arts.²¹ In line with an understanding of modernisation as an irregular and paradoxical process, the interpretation will explore how writing also reproduced and intensified dysfunctional aspects of the political and cultural order at the turn of the century. I will argue that more than a mere technical innovation of state power, police writing became a polyvalent means of enforcing transformations and imagining modernisation where there were no examples to follow. In doing so, police writing opened new channels of communication with both state and society, rendered power

6 *Introduction*

relations invisible, created a professional cultural canon, fed the fascination with anomaly, grounded and contested modern rationality against the fictions of progress.

Given the highly problematic role that Latin American police forces have played and continue to play as the armed wing of authoritarian governments, accomplices of criminal organisations, and autonomous agents of violence, it seems naïve, even irresponsible, to foreground their cultural development. However, if we accept the relationship between political domination and epistemic violence as a major axis of modernity, then police writing practices become an insightful starting point for studying the modes of negotiating modernisation. The collection and management of information, which is both an important and arduous part of police work, has been a central tool of the state penetration of society. Thus, the police constitute a primary site of state knowledge.²² But the police account of society is not construed from a social or epistemic exteriority. Members of the police rarely belong to the political and intellectual elite. Rather, officers are recruited from the lower social sectors they are supposed to control. With this in mind, I take up the proposition of Latin American police studies to approach police officers as subjectivities in transit between the state and the local community, or, in the words of Gregorio Kaminsky, as “inhabitants of an unspeakable citizenship, clandestine civil servants in a state of maximum presence and permanent evanescence.”²³ This heuristic definition is consistent with the reality of the *Policía de la Capital* and the *Gendarmería Municipal*, which, in the period under consideration, functioned both as shelter for penniless men with dubious ambitions and agency of state order. On the conceptual level, it also allows us to interrogate a central common sense of Western modernity, which James Ferguson has described as the “vertical topography of power.” That is, the “mapping of political and social space” that takes for granted the opposition between the state and society.²⁴ By examining the modes of doing modernisation through police writing practices, the book seeks to provide new, critical insights into how modern Latin American states have produced culture and how cultures have produced them.

In the following section, I will outline classical approaches and more recent debates on the formation of the police as agents of the state, national organisation, and modern culture. The overview does not claim to be exhaustive. Instead, the aim is to present and discuss the lines of enquiry that have guided this study, with a focus on Latin American cases and debates. The second section will examine the functions and dysfunctions of writing as a technique of culture and power in the macroregion and will elaborate on the pragmalinguistic method and sources used to analyse police acts of writing. Finally, I will give a brief overview of the chapters in the book.

Chiaroscuro. Defining Modern Police

As Christopher Wilson observes, the police are a highly visible component of modern society, as everyday agents of state authority, as enforcers of the limits of freedom, and as a cultural trope.²⁵ On the streets, in news broadcasts, classic novels, television series, and films, police officers have come to personify the “discreet-discretionary, spectacular-obsolete, respectable-villainous, reckless-fearful”²⁶ heroes and antagonists of modern everyday life. Alongside the fascination with order and crime, the ambivalence of the modern police generates a sense of suspicion and fear. The police profession is seen as tainted by its close ties both to the criminal underworld—a fundamental source of information and human capital—and to those in power. In the words of Egon Bittner:

Because they are posted on the perimeters of order and justice in the hope that their presence will deter the forces of darkness and chaos, because they are meant to spare the rest of the people direct confrontations with the dreadful, perverse, lurid, and dangerous, police officers are perceived to have powers and secrets no one else shares.²⁷

The “crudeness” of the police also stems from the fact that police action is inherently discriminatory in that it always interferes with the interests and targets the identity and practices of someone, usually from the lower strata of society. Thus, even if police do not aim to create political, cultural, and social friction, they tend to magnify it through their practice.²⁸ Contrary to widespread belief, crime prevention plays a subordinate role in police routines. The maintenance of order depends on more mundane tasks such as patrolling, traffic and crowd control, emergency assistance, mediation in domestic disputes, administrative assistance, and data collection. To fulfil their holistic function, police rely on practical knowledge and situational judgement, which most often leads officers to transgress the distinction between public and private, state and non-state orders.²⁹

Over the past six decades, and often in the context of political transitions and police reforms, scholars have addressed the phenomenological complexity of modern police from a variety of perspectives and disciplines. They have also sought to trace the histories of modern police formation beyond the teleology of institutional narratives in order to better understand their role in modern orders. Although they did not always provide clear definitions of the police, Max Weber’s and Emil Durkheim’s sociology of the state, Walter Benjamin’s philosophical critique of violence, and Michel Foucault’s history of modern state rationality have become indispensable starting points for most current research. David Bayley’s well-known typology of national police systems is based on a coercion-centred definition of

8 *Introduction*

the police that draws on the Weberian definition of the state, that is, the characterisation of modern political organisation as founded on a monopoly on the legitimate use of force to achieve and maintain order within a given territory.³⁰ According to Bayley, the police differ from other instruments of modern statehood in that they are required to regulate interpersonal relations by means of coercive sanctions authorised in the name of the community.³¹ Similarly, Bittner considers that the topical unity of the modern police lies in its capacity for physical coercion. The use of force may manifest itself in several ways: persuasion to secure compliance, intimidation, threats, and violence. But it must be seen as legitimate if it is not to become a means of police brutality. Like politicians, police officers must constantly assess how appropriate and how much force is necessary to maintain order.³²

For Jan Terpstra, the Weberian approach to modern police offers a rather one-dimensional, antagonistic understanding of the state-citizen relationship that ignores shared moral, cultural, and political frameworks. The idea of coercion as a key feature of modern police work is also at odds with the idea of good policing, which privileges the use of verbal tactics over violence.³³ By contrast, Durkheim offers positive definition of the relationship between society and political authority, according to which the state is a social institution of discipline that promotes binding values.

Let us see why and how the main function of the State is to liberate the individual personalities. It is solely because, in holding its constituent societies in check, it prevents them from exerting the repressive influences over the individual that they would otherwise exert. So there is nothing inherently tyrannical about State intervention in the different fields of collective life; on the contrary, it has the object and the effect of alleviating tyrannies that do exist.³⁴

Seen in this light, the state provides a solution to the loss of solidarity resulting from the division of labour and individualisation in modern societies. Like Weber, Durkheim points to the issues of police legitimacy. While the German sociologist proposes a normative understanding of police legitimacy based on the rule of law, which can be better achieved from above, Durkheim emphasises the function of shared values, seeing legitimacy as a constantly changing social relationship between state forces and citizens. Through Durkheim's definition of the state and his understanding of crime as a means of moral orientation, policing, and especially crime detection, acquire a symbolic dimension that reveals the values and understandings of good and evil in society.³⁵

In Benjamin's exploration of the relationship of violence to law and justice, the police play a paradigmatic role in exposing law as a means and

manifestation of violent, self-serving domination. The power of the police lies in a “ghostly mixture” that suspends the distinction between two kinds of violence: Law-making violence, aimed at establishing domination; and law-preserving, sanctioned violence, the purpose of which is to secure the existing order. Police are most often called upon to intervene in situations that are legally indeterminate, in which the state reveals itself to be powerless or incapable of imposing order.³⁶ Thus, police discretion appears as a fundamental tool of the state, rather than a cultural or organisational deficit, and the problem of legitimate coercion is not limited to public acceptance or compliance with a legal framework but is inherent to the police function.³⁷

For Foucault, the distinction between the field of police and the field of law unfolds the antinomy between the administrative and the legal order that emerged as a result of the disintegration of medieval configurations, the political rationalisation, and the pastoralisation of sovereignty, that is, the advancement of individualising forms of exerting power. Drawing on French and German treatises of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by Louis Turquet de Mayerne, Nicolas Delamare, and Johann Heinrich Gottlob von Justi, Foucault characterises the police as a technology of power, a fundamental technique of the government of people and things.

Police power must bear “over everything:” it is not however the totality of the state nor of the kingdom as visible and invisible body of the monarch; it is the dust of events, actions, behaviour, opinions—“everything that happens” [...]. And, in order to be exercised, this power had to be given the instrument of permanent, exhaustive, omnipresent surveillance, capable of making all visible, as long as it could itself remain invisible. It had to be like a faceless gaze that transformed the whole social body into a field of perception [...].³⁸

To exercise their interventionist power, the police become instruments of an interstitial metadiscipline that encompasses the disciplinary spaces of society, such as schools, hospitals, and workshops. Their primary purpose is to ensure that:

living, better than just living, coexisting will be effectively useful to the constitution and development of the state’s forces. So with police there is a circle that starts from the state as a power of rational and calculated intervention on individuals and comes back to the state as a growing set of forces, or forces to be developed, passing through the life of individuals, which will now be precious to the state simply as life.³⁹

In contrast to philosophers,⁴⁰ social scientists and historians have adopted Foucault’s conceptualisation of the police as analytical framework for the

study of state forces, particularly with a view to the criminalisation of specific practices and social sectors.⁴¹ As Paolo Napoli notes, Foucault's theory of state rationality is more flexible than the Weberian ideal type. However, the Foucauldian conception runs the risk of generating a meta-physical vision of historical objects. Rather than as internal principle of state rationality, police are better understood as an attempt to respond to practical problems in a circumstantial way. Similarly, any reduction of police to discipline overlooks the fact that police power is comprehensive. It is exercised on the all-encompassing axes of population and territory at a given moment in history.⁴²

To account for the mutable character of the police, Bayley elaborates a comparison of the types of police that developed in Britain, France, Germany, and Italy between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, within the framework of political liberalism and mercantilism. The organisation and practices of the police followed different paths in each country in terms of the functions and responsibilities assigned, the role behaviour, and the professional image. However, in Bayley's view, there are also significant convergences between the national models. The establishment of police systems appears in all cases to be more closely linked to the transformation of political power, prolonged periods of popular resistance to government policies, the creation of new law and order functions, the erosion of traditional social structures, and the transformation of authority relationships within communities, than to "more subterranean social movements" such as population growth, urbanisation, industrialisation, and crime. National police systems also show impressive stability over time, particularly in the face of armed conflict and major social and economic transformations. Finally, similar trends towards the restriction and specialisation of policing tasks can be observed in cases where efficiency principles were applied.⁴³

According to Emsley Clive, the explanatory power of such national types is limited because the classification assumes a high degree of national integration and, more significantly, ignores the persistence of previous social and political structures and regional divergences. For example, the Italian and German cases suggest that even in territories that were aggressively unified and ruled by militaristic and absolutist regimes, the development of the police was not dictated exclusively by the centre, but by negotiations between the central and local governments. Moreover, Bayley's portrayal of the more democratic British police uncritically reproduces the Victorian discourse on the despotic and political continental state forces, which was revived by twentieth-century institutional history with the publication of Charles Reith's *The Police Idea* (1938). As an alternative, Emsley proposes to distinguish three different types of police that have coexisted within national frameworks, based on chains of command, operational responsibility, recruitment, equipment, and practices. The first category

includes forces under the control of central government, such as Robert Peel's Metropolitan Police Service and the Paris police. The second type of police force is local in both its social composition and organisation. The last category refers to the militarised, heavily armed, and barracked police forces under central government, such as the Gendarmerie Nationale and the Royal Irish Constabulary, which policed rural and urban areas, except Dublin, from 1822 to 1922.⁴⁴

As Hélène L'Heuillet notes, many national and sub-national similarities were in fact the result of transnational connections and transfers. By way of example, Sir William Mildmay, an English diplomat living in Paris, pointed in his treatise *The Police of France* (1763) to the advantages of adopting the civilian elements of the French model for the creation of a department responsible for "peace and good order" in British cities. The Dublin government was the first to put the proposal into practice, establishing the Dublin Metropolitan in 1786. Glasgow and several other Scottish towns followed the lead in 1800. The French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars helped to spread the militarised state police model across continental Europe. After the fall of Napoleon, northern and central Italy, the Netherlands, and Prussia created police forces similar to the gendarmerie. The translation of Von Justi's treatise from German into French in the mid-nineteenth century shows that France was also open to outside influences. According to L'Heuillet, the routes of exchange show that European police systems developed on the basis of an international division of labour, with the French model introducing the *raison d'état* and state intelligence, the German police providing statistical rationality and welfare theory, and the British model promoting the ideal of community policing.⁴⁵

Despite its reductionist tendency, the identification of national and regional patterns of police development still offers a productive starting point for long-term histories and, more importantly, for the elaboration of transregional accounts, which are still rare. As in the European case, a critical historical comparison of Latin American police would need to develop a systematic overview open to both sub-national variations and transnational connections. Such an endeavour would also have to face the challenge posed by the heterogeneity of institutional frameworks and the temporal disparity of police professionalisation in the macroregion.⁴⁶ Without attempting to complete such a task, I will give an overview of the main phases and characteristics of the modern Mexican and Argentinian police, focusing on their development in Mexico City and Buenos Aires.

Historians have noted the comparatively small contribution of the Spanish Enlightenment to the development of the *saberes policiales* (police science). Apart from sixteenth-century Spanish doctrinal works such as

Jerónimo Castillo de Bodavilla's *La Política* (1597) and Diego de Saavedra Fajardo's *Empresas Políticas* (1640), most of the treatises published during the reign of Charles III drew on Prussian police science and the French model, which were considered compatible with the Spanish doctrines of enlightened absolutism and regalism. In contrast, Pablo Sánchez León argues that the resemantisation of the concept of *policía* was decisively influenced by Spanish theoretical reflections on political economy, such as the *Bosquejo* (1756) by the Spanish economist and Minister of the Treasury Pedro Rodríguez de Campomanes, who also published the *Proyecto Económico* (1760, 1779) by the economist Bernardo Ward. According to the latter, the *policía* constituted a field of action alongside the law, with the aim of ensuring the order of commercial society through everyday surveillance. The Esquilache Riots that shook Madrid in 1776 overturned the utilitarian-moral rhetoric and introduced a more repressive conception of the police.⁴⁷

Within the frame of the Bourbon reforms, Charles III sought to introduce enlightened *saberes policiales* to the colonies as a means of restoring urban order and reinforcing the link between the Crown and local governments. The Viceroyalty of New Spain, as the most important overseas possession, was involved early in the process of administrative reorganisation. Like Caracas, Bogotá, and Lima, Mexico City followed the Madrid model of police organisation, dividing urban space into eight major quarters and 32 *barrios* (neighbourhoods). The *Ordenanzas* of 1783 appointed five *alcaldes* (mayors) for the Real Sala del Crimen, a *corregidor* (royal magistrate) and two *alcaldes ordinarios* for the administration of the larger neighbourhoods. The smaller neighbourhoods were supervised by unpaid *alcaldes de barrio*, who were elected every six months. They formed the local bureaucratic apparatus and were responsible for the prevention, control, and sanctioning of the urban population.

The main concern of the local authorities was to restore order to Mexico City, which resembled more a crowded labyrinth of dark alleys inhabited by itinerant communities than a economic and political centre of the Spanish empire. According to the *alcalde mayor* Hipólito Villarroel and the *oidor* and *regente* (magistrate) of the Audiencia of Mexico Baltasar Ladrón de Guevara, the viceregal capital suffered from serious ills that the police would help to cure by monitoring urban hygiene, public health, and the circulation of the population.⁴⁸ Moreover, the *alcaldes* were expected to act as “political fathers” of the neighbourhood, promoting education and fighting against drunkenness, nudity, vagrancy, and other vices associated with the popular sectors. They were also required to perform judicial functions, such as conducting summary inquiries and assisting the authorities in the prosecution of criminals. In accordance with their duties, the *alcaldes* had to behave in a prudent, civilised, and industrious manner. For

Villarroel and Ladrón de Guevara, the reputation of the *alcaldes* was a key issue since the selection of people of low birth and improper behaviour would lead to even greater disorder. The appointment of people of colour had also proved to be detrimental, because no “decent person” was willing to recognise their authority. The position of *alcalde* could easily be abused for personal gain. For this reason, Villarroel y Ladrón considered artisans—carpenters, shoemakers, and locksmiths—and merchants to be unsuitable for the office, as they worked in sectors where the manipulation of weights and measures facilitated fraud.⁴⁹

For the historian Regina Hernández Franyuti, the Spanish and Novohispanic enlightened discourses on policing at the end of the century marked a shift from a traditional urban order to an understanding of society as organised by the state through coercive techniques.⁵⁰ Although Diego Pulido Esteva agrees that the police became a fundamental tool of state formation under the Bourbon reforms, he also notes that the police did not yet act as agents of a centralised authority. Indeed, the establishment of the first police forces in New Spain was based on different conceptions of urban order, which regulated the relationship between local government and individual liberty in often contradictory ways. The hybrid police model, which combined elements of the public, vigilant, and omnicompetent police of the viceregal period with features of the repressive liberal police, crime prevention, and government utility, prevailed in Mexico after independence and throughout much of the nineteenth century.⁵¹

In 1825, Puebla created the first force to bear in its name the purpose of modern urban policing: the Police of Order and Security. Unlike the *alcaldes de barrio*, the members of this new unit received a salary, carried weapons, and patrolled on horseback. Two years later, the Federal District adopted the Puebla model, but called the force *Celadores Públicos* and dressed its members in blue uniforms, creating an image that would quickly become paradigmatic. Nevertheless, the “*azules*” would continue to share the task of policing with a variety of armed forces. The establishment of the Second Mexican Empire (1863–1867) delayed the republican project to develop a police force modelled on the Spanish *Guardia Civil* and rural police corps to combat the growing banditry. The imperial government also considered the possibility of establishing an urban police force and a special militarised commission, but along the lines of the Prussian system. However, the minister of war opposed the plan, warning that the Mexicans could never have the level of discipline of their German counterparts and that such a model would therefore only increase the risk of rebellion.⁵² With the restoration of the republic, the legal and administrative regime sanctioned in 1861 was reinstated. The law of March 1867 created the office of the Inspector General of Police, placed it under the authority of the Government of the Federal District, and gave it command of all the

armed police forces, the infantry, the cavalry, and the urban Resguardos Diurnos y Nocturnos (Day and Night Guards). As Jorge Nacif Mina notes, this decree, which also defined police tasks, stipulated for the first time the obligation of the forces to support the political order.⁵³ The administration of the rural police was placed in the hands of the district government, but their operations were long directed by the ministry of war. In 1869, the parliament put the *rurales* under the authority of the *gobernación*. According to José Arturo Yáñez, even though the liberal model of policing adopted in the second half of the nineteenth century was modern in its focus on the defence of public order and private property, this quality was not reflected in its legal and functional structure, let alone in its level of funding and public recognition and by other state agencies.⁵⁴

The implementation of “*buen gobierno y policía*” (good government and police) followed a similar path in the city of Buenos Aires. In 1750, the governor ordered the division of the city into neighbourhoods and the appointment of *alcaldes*, who were responsible for controlling and sanctioning violations of the law, apprehending offenders, and conducting summary proceedings in their *barrios*. After the deposition of Viceroy Baltasar Hidalgo de Cisneros in May 1810, the *alcaldes* were placed under the authority of the Primera Junta. Two years later, the Intendencia General de Alta Policía was created to centralise the command of the local forces. The First Triumvirate issued the *Reglamento Provisional de Policía* in 1812, which ratified the office of the *alcalde* and its attributions and appointed three commissioners as direct subordinates of the intendant. Their jurisdiction was no longer defined by territory, but by function. The first *comisario* was responsible for keeping the streets clean, the second oversaw the police treasury, and the third was responsible for organising the patrols of the *campaña* (the surrounding countryside). The administrative reforms of 1820 created the Departamento General de Policía and put it in charge of the *comisarias seccionales* (police sections), the number of which would grow from four to nine in 1852 and to thirteen in 1856. Police stations were provided with their own buildings and staff. The *alcaldes* were subordinate to the *comisarias* and received a monthly salary. According to Diego Galeano and Osvaldo Barreneche, the first independent governments thus established an institutional model with modern features, such as a centralised command structure, salaried staff, and a troop of uniformed *vigilantes* to patrol the streets.⁵⁵ Thus, police forces accumulated a large number of tasks, which gave them a considerable influence on the lives of the inhabitants and on the political dynamics of Buenos Aires. Until 1850, the Policía de Buenos Aires was officially in charge of the administration of the city, and even after the creation of the municipality of Buenos Aires, it was able to retain much of its influence. The overlapping of authorities and the monitoring of electoral practices also caused friction with the *jueces*

de paz (peace judges), who performed both police and judicial functions in the *campana*.⁵⁶

The brief overviews of the Mexican and Argentinian cases illustrate how, after independence, the hybrid enlightened model of police inherited from the colonial period gradually evolved towards a liberal orientation, as the police lost their civilian and voluntary character as agents of order and decency, became subordinated to the emerging central government and specialised in security. At the same time, urban police retained many of their original attributes, partly due to the indeterminacy of jurisdictions and the impossibility of recruiting adequate personnel, as we will see in the next chapter. While the protection of private and state wealth remained a priority, security enforcement also became a means of political contestation and internal defence. The trend towards militarisation was not a uniform process either over time or across Latin America. Nor was it always carried out through formal measures. While Chilean, Colombian, and Central American police forces were subordinate to the army and centrally organised until well into the twentieth century, police forces in Argentina, Mexico, Brazil, Costa Rica, and Venezuela maintained their functional autonomy, at least formally, even under authoritarian regimes. The militarisation of police professional cultures and the increase in police violence became more consistent in the early twentieth century and gained momentum during military dictatorships throughout the macroregion.⁵⁷

In Mexico, the development of modern police is recorded in collections of government documents, such as José María de Castillo Velasco's *Colección de Bandos* (1869), the *Legislación Mexicana* (1898) by Manuel Dublán and José María Lozano, and the *Documentos de la Memoria del Ayuntamiento de México*. In Argentina, the members of the force were heavily involved in the historicization of the national police and the conditions for their success. Although the extensive accounts by Leopoldo López, Ramón Cortés Conde, Francisco Romay, and Adolfo Rodríguez,⁵⁸ to name the most prominent, are based on documentary sources, they are conditioned by the fact that they were written on behalf of the institution.⁵⁹ By contrast, in the context of the transitions to democracy in the 1980s, Latin American researchers and police reformers focused on the histories and characteristics that had made the forces functional to state terrorism. This time, the diagnoses were written on behalf of the urgent need to purge the forces, as well as to develop legal instruments to protect civil society and the state from police abuse.⁶⁰

In the first decades of the twenty-first century, researchers from different disciplines called for an epistemological break with the teleology of official history and the contemptuous gaze of revisionism. To this end, it was necessary to recover not only the historical but also the socio-analytical

complexity of police identity and community. In the words of Marcelo Sain, this meant accepting that

the police are a complex social institution that tortures and protects; pressures and cares; abuses and helps; corrupts and detains the corrupt; favours crime and the fight against crime; protects criminal activities and disarticulates them; bribes criminals and imprisons them; destabilises and stabilises; takes lives and saves them; kills and dies.⁶¹

The conceptual and methodological renewal received a central impulse from the classical police theories just presented, many of which had been translated and began to circulate widely in Latin American academia at the beginning of current century, and from the new approaches proposed by police culture studies.⁶²

Inspired by new insights into society provided by criminological research, scholars and police reformers in the mid-twentieth century began to question the applicability of existing sociological models for understanding the impact of social change on the way police work is done and thought about. Do police communities constitute distinct cultures? And if so, how do they relate to other state actors and the societies with which police officers interact? To explore these questions, researchers saw the need to develop micro-sociological studies capable of providing situated accounts of the multidimensionality and interconnectedness of police cultures.⁶³ The early debates of the 1960s focused on police discretion, more in terms of its impact on the police practice and image than on the ontological problem posed by Benjamin. In addition to issues of corruption, researchers in the 1980s turned their attention to cultural differences within police communities, particularly regarding gender and ethnicity.⁶⁴ Scholars have tended to define police culture in two different ways. Organisational studies mostly focus on the “Police Culture,” that is, the institutional identities, symbols, values, and ways of organising the legitimate monopoly of violence. This capital-letter concept often builds on an ideal self-image and states a dichotomy between police and civil society. The approach has been criticised for producing a monolithic notion of culture, reproducing normative understandings of police authority, and assuming an internal homogeneity that has little correspondence with the reality of professional communities.⁶⁵ In contrast, researchers of police occupational cultures have sought to recover the meaning of everyday practices, informal rules, and subcultures. Clifford Shearing and Richard Ericson suggest addressing police diversity through the lens of its occupational rationality, that is, the figurative culture that guides police practice and identification. According to this approach, the stories and anecdotes that police officers tell incessantly are fundamental means of giving meaning to their profession. Police

officers' stories and myths function as case studies based on an analogous reasoning that articulate and convey police intuitive wisdom and practical knowledge. Police culture thus manifests as a storybook, as a poetic record of the singular knowledge and lessons acquired in the past, the value of which lies not so much in the precise transmission of information as in the creation of a police sensibility capable of guiding future action. In Sheavring's and Ericson's words, "[p]olice stories function as a searchlight rather than a spotlight, ensuring that they experience reality as a fluid and not a solid. They function as general sense-makers that can be used in myriad settings."⁶⁶

For Peter Waddington, police "stories" provide means of dealing with the breach between what is said and what is done. Through discourses of masculinity, violence, and sacrifice, police "canteen culture" creates a site where officers can generate a collective sense of vocation as palliative for the ambivalences, excesses, and weaknesses that characterise their operational culture. The power and strength evoked by the rhetoric of the canteen is in fact a reflection of the fragility of the police role and the dilemmas that officers face on a daily basis. In addition to the inherent tensions, Janet Chan proposes to incorporate the dialectical relationship between the police and their social environment into theorisations of police culture. In this way, police officers cease to be recipients and become cultural agents, whose personal backgrounds and attitudes also determine the acceptance, negotiation, and violation of institutional and group mandates.⁶⁷

More often than their northern counterparts, Latin American scholars have sought to complement sociological questions with anthropological approaches, philosophical reflections, and historiographical research to explore diverse ways of being and doing police in specific contexts. Disciplinary and regional exchanges have been guided by a number of concerns, including the need to challenge monolithic understandings of police culture and its mechanical subordination to the logic of statehood, to look at what the police do rather than what they should be, and to consider hierarchies and specific areas of intervention as determining factors in analysis.⁶⁸ Moreover, Latin American researchers have proposed a constructive engagement with police opacity. In this regard, the anthropologist Paul Hathazy argues that the degree of police closure should not be seen as an analytical obstacle, but as an important aspect of the object of study that can reveal the strategies of corporate defence, their relationship to the institutional image, and the legitimacy of the forces in society. By integrating police inaccessibility into the investigation, scholars can then address concrete dimensions such as existing doctrines of secrecy, internal tensions over who is authorised to communicate, the degree of operational autonomy, and informal politicisation.⁶⁹ Moreover, the rates of refractoriness

and transparency can produce insights into the relationship between the police, politics, and academia, into social divisions and diversity within professional communities.⁷⁰

The various volumes and dossiers edited by Latin American scholars in the last decades show a strong theoretical and empirical development and a broad interdisciplinary and transnational exchange. At the same time, the publications reveal the uneven role that police history has played in national research agendas. Despite the pioneering work of Laurence Rohlfs (1983), Pedro Santoni (1983), and Jorge Nacif Mina (1986), police studies in Mexico have not reached the level of cohesion and formalisation that the field presents in the South American context. This development is surprising given the fundamental importance of the police institution for the political and cultural history of urban space, which has a long tradition and strong profile in Mexican historiography.⁷¹ According to Diane Davis, the uneven development is the result of the difficult access to sources, the coercive power of the institution, and a widespread assumption about the relationship between the political order and the police. Most clearly in the case of Mexico City, police action and organisation have often been reduced to a “party-state logic,” ignoring both the specificity of local government and the interstitial position of the police between central authority, municipal administration, and urban communities.⁷² The uneven progress of the field has not prevented some researchers from producing original studies on modern police in Mexico. In his numerous articles and contributions to edited volumes, Pulido Esteva has addressed and linked key issues in the historical development of metropolitan police forces, such as the emergence of the modern idea of the police, the social composition of the forces, their relationship with the urban order, the press, and political power from the mid-nineteenth century to the post-revolutionary period. Elisa Speckman Guerra and Pablo Piccato have examined police practices and technologies in relation to the imagination and regulation of crime in the urban context. In the works of Jacinto Barrera Bassols and Claudio Lomnitz, the *Gendarmería Municipal* provides a starting point for looking into the brutality of the Porfirian regime.

In Argentina, the studies published by Sandra Gayol provide insight into the social and cultural profile of the police forces in their formative period. Combining different lines of research on the police, justice, and crime, Barreneche has examined the history of the Buenos Aires police force between the 1930s and the 1970s. In several individual and collective publications, Lila Caimari, Galeano, and Martín Albornoz have elaborated histories of the *Porteño* police and the urban world through the lenses of police subcultures, transnational organised crime, anarchism, the modern press, and contested imaginaries of crime detection. These decentred histories of state forces most often draw on empirical and conceptual

exchanges with studies on the “social issue” and the history of legal institutions and cultures. The work of Mercedes García Ferrari on imported and locally produced identification systems shows the impact of policing practices that are not manifestly violent but have great repressive potential. The anthropologist Mariana Sirimarco has studied how the fundamental dilemmas arising from police work and ambiguous social position of police officers unfold and are worked out through private emotions and institutional performances.

In most of these studies, writing appears as fundamental component of police work and identity: As quality or deficit of recruits, as a means of socialisation, formal education, manipulation, and contestation. The monograph *Escritores, Detectives y Archivistas* (2009) by Galeano is the most comprehensive study to date on the role played by diverse forms of writing in the formation of the modern police force in the Argentinian capital. At the time of publication, the original contribution of the research was twofold: Its subject, police culture in Buenos Aires; and its approach, which considered police work and identity not only in repressive terms, but also in relation to the urban “dangerous classes” and their cultures.⁷³ By analysing the various works written and published by Porteño policemen⁷⁴ at the turn of the century, Galeano shows how members of the force mapped the city and its “tribes” through observation, reading, and writing. The centrality of writing was not reduced to its recording function. In fact, the modern semantics of police revolved for a long time around the production and circulation of texts. In enlightened police treatises, colonial and republican “good government” rulings, modern crime reports, memoirs, and fictions, the police were constantly practiced and thought in association with writing.⁷⁵

The proposed comparative history of police writing practices in Mexico City and Buenos Aires draws on the contributions of Latin American scholarship and engages with its conceptual reflections by adopting police socio-analytic volatility as a defining feature and exploring the ways of doing modern police beyond normative or defamatory discourses. Rather than as (auto)ethnographies of the police or the modern city, the book proposes to approach police writing as a way of doing modernisation, that is, of enforcing and contesting transformations that in the period under review were determined by the elites’ will and the state gaze but were not always coherent. The analysis is guided by a praxeological notion of culture, which approaches reality not so much as an objective fact but as a product of interactions in specific conjunctures. Rather than mental images or discourses, culture as “a way of doing life” encompasses the actions and behaviours through which actors realise relations of power. The social practices producing culture can be regular and discordant, repetitive and creative, strategic and illusory. And the knowledge that underlies them has

different origins and motivations. It can be practical and situational, as well as translocal and abstract.⁷⁶ Police ways of doing modernisation will be analysed in relation to urban popular cultures and the state, understood as a culture-producing political organisation. Rather than being coherent orders in themselves, nested within the larger order of the state, popular, police, and elite cultures will be thought of as connected sites, producing dialogues, silences, and cacophonies. In this way, I aim to show how the diverse practices of police writing performed the rationality but also articulated the formative paradoxes, conflicts, and contingencies of the “modernised city”⁷⁷ in Mexico and Argentina. The transcontextual analysis also intends to stimulate further comparative studies of modern police within and beyond the boundaries of Latin America.

Modern Writing Cultures

In his now classic study on Mexican political organisation in the nineteenth century, Paul Vanderwood notes with surprise how much paperwork rural policemen used to do. Quarterly reports, complaints, budgets, daily orders, procedures, surveillance reports, and office memoranda made up “mountains of voluminous documentation” in the archives of the Mexican state forces.⁷⁸ Apart from the sense disorientation that is typical of archival work, the surprise arises from the fact that the levels of literacy in the Mexican society were rather low in the period under consideration.⁷⁹ While Argentina had higher rates of literacy, in 1902 as much as 20 percent of policemen still affirmed not being able to read and write.⁸⁰ Despite the shortcomings, Mexican and Argentinian policemen wrote. They wrote a great deal and in a wide variety of styles. In addition to the sheer quantity, Galeano points out that police writing differed from other texts in the relationship between the written word and the image. Stamps, emblems, lithographs, and photographs were fundamental elements of the police text.⁸¹

The diversity of police writing practices noted by the historians mirrors a long-discussed phenomenon: the coexistence of different forms of literacy. In line with the dictates of Western modernity, studies long relied on a sharp division between literacy and orality, which assumed an evolutionary understanding of human development and the supremacy of alphabetic systems over oral cultures and ideographic systems. Accordingly, writing was considered a precondition and sign of cultural evolution.⁸² This reasoning ignored the fact that, as Jack Goody points out, most of the communities that have inhabited the planet over the last 2000 years were neither fully literate nor fully oral.⁸³ Writing, understood as the use of signs to convey experience and knowledge, is in fact a universal practice dating back to cave paintings and includes the use of logograms, alphabets, and

syllabaries. In its various forms, the written word has circulated between hypo-alphabetised settings, where communication is largely oral, and literate spaces, where writing is a fundamental technique of power and means of socialisation.⁸⁴

As Peter Stein observes, the nineteenth century represents a turning point in the history of literacy, both in terms of the expansion of alphabetic writing and the textualisation of social interactions and cultural production. Writing underpinned central economic, political, and sociocultural transformations of the period, such as the revolution in agricultural and industrial production, discoveries and inventions in science and technology, the increase in trade and transport through the development of communication networks, the doubling of the population, urbanisation, and the political configuration of national identities and imperialist expansion. Mechanisation allowed for the acceleration of the writing process. Handwriting became more comfortable but also increasingly dependent on technical instruments, leading to a smooth transition to typewriting. The use of the typewriter and the reduction of printing costs facilitated the homogenisation and circulation of writing, giving way in the twentieth century to the mass production and consumption of texts. Concerning the advent of writing as a key tool and quality of modernisation, Stein notes that just as mass literacy facilitated communication and the accumulation of knowledge, it must also have produced a sense of cultural alienation in societies where most members had been orally socialised. The development of hyper-alphabetised cultures had other disruptive effects, such as the loss of idiomatic diversity, the unrestrained accumulation of paper, and the pollution caused by its production.⁸⁵

Even if there is no sharp opposition between literate and oral cultures, literacy and orality are different modes of culture production. By linking language to text, writing opens up a polyphonic conversation and dissolves the fixed and ritualised structures of orality, making communication and knowledge more dynamic. At the same time, writing can promote cultural fossilising and develop to a tool of social exclusion.⁸⁶ In this regard, Plato has Socrates argue that writing, contrary to its promises of wisdom, is a means of recollection rather than memory. Texts convey words but not the meaning intended by the author and remain mute to the questions the reader asks.⁸⁷ The written word also suggests an ideal of definable truths that have an autonomy and permanence quite different from the changing experiences and perceptions of the real. Literacy also eliminates the possibility of forgetting. In culture, structural amnesia fulfils the function of selecting and adapting content to the skills and needs of the community. In contrast, the unlimited accumulation of knowledge made possible by writing exceeds individual comprehension capacities, forcing the community to fragment and distribute the cultural repertoire. The skilful use of the tools of literacy thereby becomes a factor of social differentiation and

22 *Introduction*

power. As Goody and Ian Watt point out, in literate culture, the written word of the expert has a quite different status from the knowledge that emerges from the experience of ordinary life. Modern expert knowledge tends to erase individual experience and the immediate personal context and sets limits to the kinds of relationships that individuals can have with the natural and social world.⁸⁸

The fact that literacy has limits as a technique of knowledge production, communication, and socialisation is not so much a problem as the hegemony it has acquired as a cultural practice. From the dominance of literate culture derive the dysfunctions of writing as a means of cultural, social, and political exclusion and as a source of knowledge unlimited in quantity but restricted in its applicability. It also conceals the fact that forgetting, ignoring, and not knowing are also central mechanisms of cultural negotiation in modern societies.⁸⁹ The analysis of police writing practices tackles the status that literacy enjoys as a tool and image of Western modernity in order to recover the polyvalence that it acquires in its everyday use, as a means of legitimising modern order and expressing its limits, as a field of identification with the norm and appropriation of reality, and as a source of information and non-knowledge. To this end, I draw on the proposal of Roger Chartier, for whom a critical history of literacy requires that discipline and invention be seen not as antagonists but as a pair of interrelated phenomena.

Every textual or typographic arrangement that aims to create control and constraint always secretes tactics that tame or subvert it; conversely, there is no production or cultural practice that does not rely on materials imposed by traditions, authority, or the market that is not subjected to surveillance and censures from those who have power over words and gestures.⁹⁰

In Latin America, the power of writing was grounded on both the racist hierarchy of colonialism and the intercultural spaces that developed in resistance to it. As Ángel Rama noted long ago, the metropolis exercised its power in the macroregion not so much through military control as through the lettered city, that is, a social and institutional constellation in which the written word became the only truth.⁹¹ Through writing, the colonial state administered the territory, while establishing its semiotic hegemony over the Other of European Christian rule.⁹² The power of the colonial text did not lie in the written word alone but in the iconography and rituals that sanctioned the practices of domination. As Joanne Rappaport and Tom Cummins explain,

[L]earning to look at pictorial images within the paradigms of European visual culture, as well as learning to conduct oneself within the architectural

grid of the Spanish-style town, form as much a part of colonial literacy as learning to read the alphabetic text of a catechism.⁹³

Indigenous communities adapted to the asymmetrical logic of interculturality by combining colonial aesthetic and semantic codes with indigenous forms of representation and cognition, including recording devices fashioned from strings known as quipu, textile arts, and sacred geographies. Thus, writing also provided a tool for the colonised to counter alienation. In the lettered city, erudite acts of “counter-writing” such as the works of Diego Muñoz Camargo (1585), Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala (1616), and Inca Garcilaso de la Vega (1723) coexisted with the more mundane indigenous petitions and manuscripts. While the use of the printing press was limited and conferred less authority than the handwritten word, the printed text also became ubiquitous as a document to be read aloud to the community.⁹⁴

While literacy was not widespread in colonial society, it was not uncommon. The growing number of urban schools suggests that the literate population increased during the eighteenth century. In Mexico City, about half the population, including members of the “*castas*,” had some level of literacy. In the countryside, groups of literate inhabitants ensured that the texts of the political, ecclesiastical, and military authorities were circulated and, where necessary, obtained written replies.⁹⁵ The colonial literacy complex did not disappear entirely with independence, passing on its diversity and transculturalism to the republican communities. The Mapuche, Tehuelche, and Ranquel peoples used the literacy skills acquired during the colonial period as a means of diplomacy with the independentist armies and provincial authorities.⁹⁶ What changed was the source of scriptural power. The authority of the text no longer came from the royal quill but from the public hand. As François-Xavier Guerra explains, the crisis of the Spanish monarchy in 1808 unleashed an unprecedented wave of public, iconographic, and written discourses that not only formed a uniquely homogeneous transatlantic cultural text but also outlined the contours of the emerging body politic.⁹⁷

Latin American political leaders recognised early on the need to create a new text for the *patria* (fatherland) and engaged in the writing of historical novels and romances, as well as passionate exchanges in the political press.⁹⁸ Regional conflicts and alliances were negotiated by the force of arms and through pamphlets, *correos violentos*, and *pronunciamientos* (violent letters and proclamations), which in the process acquired a pseudo-legal status and a recognisable style.⁹⁹ In her study of the impact that the promise of enlightenment for all peoples had on the conformation of Latin American republics, Nicola Miller shows how different cultural agents drew on a variety of techniques and aesthetics to formulate

and circulate the texts of republican knowledge. By the middle of the century, the expansion of the book trade had led to the emergence of a new cultural figure who would dominate the scene of the lettered city: the publisher-bookseller.¹⁰⁰ The democratisation and multiplication of forms of reading and writing did not lead to the abandonment of the Eurocentric ideal of literate culture, different and superior to the oral, mythical, local ways of (doing) life.¹⁰¹

In the context of the elitist modernisation that spread across the macroregion from 1870 onwards, the bureaucratically and culturally sanctioned written word became a lever for social mobility, prestige, and access to political power. At the same time, writing gained autonomy as a professional activity, in the field of education and the press, and as an intellectual pursuit. The institutionalisation of writing gave rise to other mythical figures of modern Latin American society: the lawyer and the journalist. The modernised city sought to give a national character to modern culture. The national atheneum was to provide a repertoire for the republics, while at the same time countering the subversion resulting from the increase in literacy and the use of the language by migrants. Rural cultures were then replaced by the popular classes as main target of semiotic and linguistic disciplining and transformed into supplement to the imagination of the nation.¹⁰² As Rama explains, the cultural domestication that the modernised city promoted did not succeed in eradicating orality because the acculturation advanced by modern literacy produced new cleavages. Tango was among the practices that created new spaces between orality and writing.¹⁰³ As we will see throughout the book, the acts of police writing also produced contact zones between the modern state text and such divergent experiences of the modern life.

In accordance with the praxeological approach proposed for the study, the analysis of the texts produced and published by the *Policía de la Capital* and the *Gendarmería Municipal* between 1870 and 1910 will transcend the level of discourse to explore the different ways in which the written word was produced, circulated, and appropriated. To this end, I follow the suggestion of the anthropologist Béatrice Fraenkel to focus the analysis on the “graphic force” of the acts of writing, that is, the specific value that the utterance acquires when it is encoded and transmitted through writing and reading. As Fraenkel explains, “[t]he notion of writing act is a model which enables us to bring together elements normally studied in isolation. It makes possible to theorize the linguistic, graphic, and situational aspects as a totality.”¹⁰⁴ What do we do when we write? And what does writing do to us? To answer these questions, it is necessary to consider not only the linguistic and semantic content that writing conveys and its materiality but also the event that the writing act configures.

The concept of the writing act allows us to address questions of the anthropology and history of writing through a pragmatolinguistic approach.

According to the definition proposed by Jef Verschueren, pragmatics is better defined as a perspective on language rather than a field of linguistic theory, since it is less concerned with language itself than with its use and the connections between linguistic choices and extralinguistic factors in specific contexts. Interdisciplinary pragmatics draws on Ludwig Wittgenstein's language-game theory and the theories of the speech act developed by John Austin and John Searle, which propose a distinction between the meaning of the utterance and the way in which it is used.¹⁰⁵ According to Austin, there are types of utterance that manifest themselves in declarative sentences and, when used in the right circumstances, not only describe social reality but also transform the relations between interlocutors by performing an action. Performative utterances, whether spoken or written, constitute speech acts that acquire their meaning within the total speech situation.¹⁰⁶ The text-context nexus is a central problem of pragmatic analysis. To approach language as a social practice, it is necessary to examine the meaning of the utterance in relation to the intentions of the speakers and the performative verbs and to contextualise the interaction between sender and addressee. The context of a speech act consists of the linguistic "co-text," the situation in its physical sense, the social situation, the background knowledge of the participants, and the channel of communication.¹⁰⁷

From a pragmalinguistic perspective, writing is a medium or channel, and so its study focuses on the technological and material aspects of language use that condition situated linguistic practice.¹⁰⁸ Fraenkel proposes a more complex understanding, which regards writing as a distinction rather than a dimension, by endowing the act of writing with a specific graphic force. To understand how writing performs, it is necessary to examine the values, beliefs, and behaviours associated with writing in the given situation. The anthropological-pragmalinguistic approach therefore requires a methodological pluralism that is empirically oriented but also creates an interpretive instance that links the use of language with the cultural and historical conditions that shape it.¹⁰⁹ Accordingly, the observation of linguistic phenomena is not considered here as an end in itself but as a starting point for interpreting the functions and dysfunctions of police writing in relation to fin-de-siècle modernisation.

The analysis will distinguish three correlated levels or moments of the writing act: The practices of inscription, which can be observed at the linguistic level, that is, the structure, theme, and deixis of the texts. Beyond utterances, inscription is thought to create individual and collective authors who fulfil not only a nominal but also a classificatory function. As Foucault explains, the author's name is used to group, delimit, exclude, and link a series of texts. The name of the author thus points to a certain way of being of the discourse and refers to its status in a given society.¹¹⁰

The sociomaterial function of writing is also defined by the circulation of the written word. By this I mean the movement of texts between different actors and the direct and indirect interactions that this produces. Circulation contributes to the demarcation of a fields of action of the text and thereby enables the association between authors and recipients. As we will see, different literacy levels and reading habits of producers and recipients were a central factor, not so much in terms of whether they could participate in the writing event, but in terms of the room for negotiation they had in it. The production of texts responds to one or more motivations and pursues certain objectives, according to which facts are framed, certain readers are granted access, and others are excluded. These mechanisms constitute the discursive practices through which writers and readers enunciate the plots of reality.

The relationship between writing practices and their specific context will be approached dialectically. In other words, police writing will be considered as a mode of doing modernisation, which in turn was conditioned by the orders and disorders of transformations. In line with Chartier's observation and the development of writing as a cultural technique and mode of socialisation in Latin America, the functions and dysfunctions of writing and its disciplinary and subversive effects will be considered in terms of correlation rather than antagonism.

What did the members of the Gendarmería Municipal and the Policía de la Capital do when they wrote? What did this practice do to them? How did police writing inscribe (within) the dis/orders of Porfirian and Conservative modernisation? Based on these questions, the analysis will examine inscription, circulation, and discursive practices based on the traces they left in paperwork, magazines, and literary writings produced and published by members of the Policía de la Capital and the Gendarmería Municipal. The selection of these three "spaces of police writing"¹¹¹ seeks to link everyday, often anonymous, and collective practices with emerging genres such as modern journalism and the more established formats of the memoir and historical novel. It also attempts to bring together different agents and situations of writing: state agencies, the newsroom, police authors and readers, and the urban audiences. Other genres of police writing, such as official histories, manuals, and scientific writings, will be used to gain further insight into and contextualise police bureaucratic, journalistic, and literary practices. The study originally aimed to examine the writing of the subaltern policemen, vigilantes and gendarmes, many of whom were barely proficient in writing in the period under consideration. The lack of sources and the circulation and concatenation of police writing practices and texts raised instead the need to consider the situational communities created by writing rather than fixed categories of authors and readers. Thus, the closure of police sources provided a stimulus to

consider how access to writing, or the lack thereof, articulated power relations within the forces, with other state agencies, and with urban society.

As mentioned in the previous section, the opacity of police culture is a phenomenon that challenges the researcher politically, analytically, and practically. In the police archives, the problem of access becomes manifest in the negotiations with gatekeepers, the disorder, and the poor condition in which the sources are usually kept. There is a story circulating among researchers about a missing archive of the Buenos Aires police, originally located in Chacabuco Street, which contained reports on the daily activities of the vigilantes and other documents from the Bureau of Investigations at the beginning of the twentieth century. The reason for its disappearance is still unclear.¹¹² The documents that survived and were accessible at least until the start of the pandemic in 2020 were kept at the Centro de Estudios Históricos Policiales “Comisario Inspector Don Francisco L. Romay” at the Museo de la Policía Federal Argentina.¹¹³ Unlike other researchers who were able to consult directly the library donated by the famous commissioner and historian, I could only access the official histories, police magazines, manuals, and memoirs through the assistance of the archivist in charge and, in his absence, the police staff working at the museum. I was told that the impossibility of going through the bookshelves was due to building problems and the lack of classification of the material. Nevertheless, the readings done at the desk of the controversial commissioner Ramón Falcon, surrounded by mannequins in historical uniforms, bore fruit. My research in the Archivo Intermedio of the Archivo General de la Nación was more systematic, but also arduous due to the dispersal of police documents among different government sections.¹¹⁴ The generalist quality of the state forces was even more evident in the case of Mexico City, where there is no accessible historical archive of the police. I searched for traces of the writing practices of the Gendarmería Municipal in the Archivo Histórico de la Ciudad de México, in the Reserved Section of the Hemeroteca Nacional and, with less success, in the Archivo General de la Nación and its collection of newspapers and journals. My archival research in the Mexican capital was brought to an abrupt end by the outbreak of the pandemic. Nevertheless, with the help of colleagues, it was possible to build up a rich and varied corpus of police writings produced during the Porfiriato and the Conservative republic.

Structure of the Book

Building on the theoretical and methodological frameworks outlined above, the exploration of police writing practices and their relationship to fin-de-siècle modernisation will unfold in four chapters. The first chapter will provide an overview of the dynamics of modernisation promoted

by the Díaz and PAN governments, which identified material progress, anchored in the opening up to the international market, as the condition and goal of political, social and cultural reform. In this context, the urban centres became a field of experimentation and a beacon of modernisation. However, the architects of the republics of the possible did not assign much importance to the role that the urban police had to play in this process. With scarce material, human, and symbolic resources, the newly created *Policía de la Capital* and *Gendarmería Municipal* tried to meet the demands of national progress by promoting the professionalisation of forces in various fields. This chapter proposes to identify the intersections and points of friction between precarious police reforms and the dis/orders of *fin-de-siècle* modernisation.

The second chapter focuses on one of the most visible signs of state-led modernisation and police professionalisation: the expansion and complexification of bureaucracy. Taking an anti-statist approach, the analysis of police bureaucratic writing practices will explore the dis/orders of the rational-legal regime, looking at the interrelationship between the high degree of formalisation and the wide circulation of police paperwork with the restriction of individual agency, the fragmentation of information, and the unrestricted proliferation of documentation. Thus, the analysis will contextualise the misuse of police bureaucratic writing within the process of irregular professionalisation and rationalisation fostered by the modern state.

In the third chapter, the analysis of writing practices will characterise and compare the development of police magazines in Mexico City and Buenos Aires, exploring the functions and dysfunctions of police journalistic writing in relation to the rise of the modern press as agent of urban culture. Building on classic sociological interpretations of the process of differentiation and its effects on urban societies, the chapter will determine the place and contributions of the journalistic writing of the *Gendarmería Municipal* and the *Policía de la Capital* in the creation of shared frames of reference for both the police and the modernised city.

The following chapter explores the polyvalence of literary writings authored by policemen, which flourished at the turn of the century, to unravel the intersections between literature, history, and power. To this end, it will examine the interplay between referentiality and fictionality developed through the memoirs written by members of the *Policía de la Capital* and the chronicles of the scandal known as the “Arroyo case,” authored by well-known members of the Porfirian elite and short-term employees of the *Gendarmería Municipal*. The pragamalinguistic analysis thus proposes to read the literary testimonies of the police as both personal and political attempts to make sense of the fictions of progress and its realities.

The conclusion will pull together the threads of interpretation, reconnecting police polygraphy with the dis/orders of state infrastructural power, democratisation, and national culture during the Porfiriato and the Conservative republic. In dialogue with debates on “failed” states and “flawed” modernities in Latin America, their coloniality, and popular countermodels, it will develop an alternative understanding aimed at disrupting the naturalised antinomies between state, culture, and society, above and below, rupture and continuity. In this way, it calls for the possibility of understanding fin-de-siècle modernisation as a process of radical transformation guided by heteronomous premises of progress, implemented with violence, but also producing ruptures in which the subjects of modernity, including policemen, sought to adapt to dis/orders without ceasing to resist them and to imagine a different path of national becoming.

The book documents the complex transformations that took place from the rise of Díaz’s and the PAN governments to their more and less abrupt ends through the experiences and responses of the police forces. With its comparative approach and the discussion of sociological concepts, the analysis is aimed at historians and Latin Americanists interested in gaining new perspectives on this key period of national organisation, exploring the process of police formation in Argentina and Mexico, and critically reviewing the theoretical and conceptual tools that dominate the interpretation of modernity and the ways in which it has been made. The trans-disciplinary methodological approach and the detailed examination of writing practices will be of interest to researchers of written cultures, as well as to advanced students seeking alternative ways of approaching and contextualising sources often used in historiography.

Notes

- 1 I have translated the quotations from Spanish sources as accurately as possible. José S. Álvarez, *Memorias De Un Vigilante* (Biblioteca Virtual Universal, 2003 (Buenos Aires, 1897)), Part XIV.
- 2 Jeremy Adelman, “Spanish-American Leviathan? State Formation in Nineteenth-Century Spanish America. A Review Article,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 40, no. 2 (1998): 391–93.
- 3 For a summary of these tendencies in anglophone World and Atlantic History, see James E. Sanders, *The Vanguard of the Atlantic World: Creating Modernity, Nation, and Democracy in Nineteenth-Century Latin America* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014), 9–10.
- 4 Paul Johnson, *The Birth of the Modern: World Society 1815–1830* (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1991), 701.
- 5 Miguel A. Centeno and Agustín Ferraro, “Republics of the Possible: State Building in Latin America and Spain,” in Centeno; Ferraro, *State and Nation Making in Latin America and Spain: Republics of the Possible*, 3, 6.

- 6 Peter Waldmann, "Introducción," in Waldmann; Abregú, *Justicia en la Calle: Ensayos Sobre la Policía en América Latina*, 23–26.
- 7 Saurabh Dube, "Modernidad," in Szurmuk; Mckee Irwin, *Diccionario De Estudios Culturales Latinoamericanos*, 178.
- 8 Mary L. Pratt, "La Modernidad Desde Las Américas," *Iberoamericana (Iberoamericana. América Latina España Portugal)* 66, no. 193 (2009): 833–34.
- 9 By way of example, see Néstor García Canclini, *Culturas híbridas: Estrategias para entrar y salir de la modernidad* (Mexico: Grijalbo, 1990); Roberto Schwarz, *Misplaced Ideas: Essays on Brazilian Culture*, with the assistance of John Gledson (London: Verso, 1992); Beatriz Sarlo, *Una Modernidad Periférica* (Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Editores, 2020 (1992)); Fernando Coronil, *The Magical State: Nature, Money, and Modernity in Venezuela* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1997).
- 10 See Anibal Quijano, "Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Social Classification," in Moraña, *Coloniality at Large. Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate*, 181–224; Arturo Escobar, "Worlds and Knowledges Otherwise: The Latin American Modernity/Coloniality Research Programm," *Cultural Studies* 21, no. 2–3 (2007): 179–210; Fernando Robles, "Epistemologías De La Modernidad: Entre El Etnocentrismo, El Racionalismo Universalista Y Las Alternativas Latinoamericanas," *Cinta Moebio* 45 (2012): 169–203.
- 11 Sanders, *Vanguard*, 5.
- 12 Sanders, *Vanguard*, 12.
- 13 Hilda Sabato, *Republics of the New World: The Revolutionary Political Experiment in Nineteenth-Century Latin America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2018), 197.
- 14 Sabato, *Republics*, 199.
- 15 Sabato, *Republics*, 159.
- 16 Tulio Halperín Donghi, *El Espejo de la Historia: Problemas Argentinos y Perspectivas Latinoamericanas* (Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Editores, 2019), 143–44.
- 17 Jürgen Kocka, "Comparison and Beyond," *History and Theory* 42, no. 1 (February 2003): 40.
- 18 Agustina Carrizo de Reimann, *Una Historia Densa De La Anarquía Posindependiente: La Violencia Política Desde La Perspectiva Del Pueblo En Armas (Buenos Aires-México, 1820)* (Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana Vervuert, 2019), 192–93.
- 19 See Ivana Frasquet, "El estado armado o la nación en armas: Ejército versus milicia cívica en México, 1821–1823," in Chust; Marchena, *Las armas de la nación. Independencia y ciudadanía en Hispanoamérica (1750–1850)*, 111–135; Hilda Sabato, *Pueblo Y Política: La Construcción De La Argentina Moderna* (Buenos Aires: Capital Intelectual, 2010), 62–79.
- 20 Anibal Quijano, "Colonialidad Del Poder, Eurocentrismo Y América Latina," in Lander, *La Colonialidad Del Saber: Eurocentrismo Y Ciencias Sociales. Perspectivas Latinoamericanas*, 200.
- 21 Peter Stein, *Schriftkultur: Eine Geschichte Des Schreibens Und Lesens* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft (wbg), 2010), 18.
- 22 Diego Palacios Cerezales, "Introducción. Policía, Opacidad Y Ciencias Sociales," *Política y Sociedad* 42, no. 3 (2005): 7–8.
- 23 Gregorio Kaminsky, "Policía, política y filosofía: Apuntes para una crítica de la razón policial," in Galeano; Kaminsky, *Mirada (de) Uniforme*, 413.

- 24 James Ferguson, "Power Topographies," in Nugent; Vincent, *A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics*, 383.
- 25 Christopher P. Wilson, *Cop Knowledge: Police Power and Cultural Narrative in Twentieth-Century America* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 2–3.
- 26 Kaminsky, "Policía," 443.
- 27 Egon Bittner, *Aspects of Police Work* (Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press, 1990), 95.
- 28 Bittner, *Aspects*, 100.
- 29 David Bayley, "The Police and Political Development in Europe," in Tilly, *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*, 349.
- 30 Max Weber, *Wirtschaft Und Gesellschaft: Grundriss Der Verstehenden Soziologie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck Verlag, 2013), 29.
- 31 Bayley, "Police," 328.
- 32 Bittner, *Aspects*, 128.
- 33 Jan Terpstra, "Two Theories on the Police: The Relevance of Max Weber and Emile Durkheim to the Study of the Police," *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice* 39, no. 1 (2011): 3–4.
- 34 Émile Durkheim, *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals* (Glencoe: Free Press, 2000 (1958)), Translated by Cornelia Brookfield, 63.
- 35 Terpstra, "Two," 8–9.
- 36 Walter Benjamin, *Zur Kritik Der Gewalt Und Andere Aufsätze* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 2017), Mit einem Nachwort versehen von Herbert Marcuse, 43–45.
- 37 Palacios Cerezales, "Introducción," 10.
- 38 Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 1995), 213–14.
- 39 Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège De France, 1977–78* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), Edited by Michel Senellart, 327.
- 40 Edgardo Castro, "La Noción De Policía En Los Trabajos De Michel Foucault: Objeto, Límites, Antinomias," *Anuario Colombiano de Historia Social y de la Cultura* 46, no. 2 (2019): 188.
- 41 Lila M. Caimari, "Los Historiadores Y La 'Cuestión Criminal' En América Latina: Notas Para Un Estado De La Cuestión," *Revista de Historia de las Prisiones* 2 (2016): 6.
- 42 Paolo Napoli, "Policía y Sociedad: La Mediación Simbólica del Derecho," in Galeano; Kaminsky, *Mirada (de) Uniforme*, 267.
- 43 Bayley, "Police," 378.
- 44 Clive Emsley, "Los Modelos de la Policía en el Siglo XIX," in Galeano; Kaminsky, *Mirada (de) Uniforme*, 33–43.
- 45 Hélène L'Heuillet, "Genealogía de la Policía," in Galeano; Kaminsky, *Mirada (de) Uniforme*, 251; see also Mark Finnane, "The Origins of 'Modern' Policing," in Knepper; Johansen, *Oxford Handbook of the History of Crime and Criminal Justice*, 456–73.
- 46 Diego Galeano, "En Nombre De La Seguridad: Lecturas Sobre Policía Y Formación Estatal," *Cuestiones de Sociología. Revista de Estudios Sociales*, no. 4 (2007): 114.
- 47 Pablo Sánchez León, "Ordenar la Civilización: Semántica del Concepto de Policía en los Orígenes de la Ilustración Española," *Política y Sociedad* 42, no. 3 (2005): 146–48.

32 Introduction

- 48 Although the *Discurso Sobre la Policía de México* (1788) was published anonymously, historians have attributed it to Ladrón de Guevara, who had carried out preliminary research on the subject for the drafting of the regulations implemented by Viceroy Martín de Mayorga in 1783. Hira de Gortari Rabiela, “La Ciudad De México De Finales Del Siglo XVIII: Un Diagnóstico Desde La ‘Ciencia De La Policía’,” *Historia Contemporánea*, no. 24 (2002): 120.
- 49 Gortari Rabiela, “Ciudad,” 121–24.
- 50 Regina Hernández Franyuti, “Historia Y Significados De La Palabra Policía En El Quehacer Político De La Ciudad De México: Siglo XVI–XIX,” *Uliua. Revista de Historia, Sociedad y Cultura* 3, no. 5 (2009): 11.
- 51 Diego Pulido Esteva, “Policía Del Buen Gobierno a La Seguridad, 1750–1850,” *Historia Mexicana* LX, no. 3 (2011): 1633–36.
- 52 Paul J. Vanderwood, “Genesis of the Rurales: Mexico’s Early Struggle for Public Security,” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 50, no. 2 (1970): 328–32.
- 53 Jorge Nacif Mina, *La Policía En La Historia De La Ciudad De México (1524–1928)* (Mexico: Desarrollo Social Cultural, 1986), 129–31.
- 54 José Arturo Yáñez Romero, *Policía Mexicana: Cultura Política, (In)Seguridad Y Orden Público En El Gobierno Del Distrito Federal, 1821–1876* (México D.F.: Plaza y Valdés, 2001), 11.
- 55 Diego Galeano and Osvaldo Barreneche, “Notas Sobre Las Reformas Policiales En La Argentina, Siglo XIX Y XX,” *Cuadernos de Seguridad*, no. 8 (2008): 82–83.
- 56 Diego Galeano, “La Ley de la Policía: Edictos y Poder Contravencional. Ciudad de Buenos Aires, Siglo XIX,” *Revista Historia y Justicia*, no. 6 (2016): 16–17.
- 57 Galeano, “En,” 117; Diane E. Davis, “Historia de Detectives: Rastreando a la Policía de la Capital en la Historiografía Política de México,” in Rodríguez Kuri; Tamayo Flores Alatorre, *Los Últimos Cien Años, Los Próximos Cien*, 73.
- 58 Instead of long lists in the footnotes, I have chosen to list the works and authors mentioned here in the references.
- 59 Galeano and Barreneche, “Notas,” 77–79.
- 60 The volume edited by Peter Waldmann and Martín Abregú provides an example of police investigations dealing with central issues of the democratic transition in Latin America.
- 61 Marcelo F. Sain, “La Policía En Las Ciencias Sociales: Ensayo Sobre Obstáculos Epistemológicos Para El Estudio De La Institución Policial En El Campo De Las Ciencias Sociales,” in Sirimarco, *Estudiar La Policía*, 33.
- 62 Lila M. Caimari and Diego Galeano, “Introducción,” in Caimari; Galeano, *Policía Y Sociedad En La Argentina: Siglos XIX Y XX*, 20.
- 63 The following publications belong to the classic canon of police culture studies: Michael Banton, *The Policeman in the Community* (London: Tavistock, 1964); Jerome Skolnick, *Justice Without Trial* (New York: Wiley, 1966); Peter Manning, *Police Work. The Social Organisation of Policing* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1977); Robert Reiner, *The Politics of the Police* (Brighton: Wheatsheaf, 1985); Dominique Monjardet, *Ce que fait la police. Sociologie de la force publique* (Paris: La Découverte, 1996).
- 64 Tom Cockcroft, *Police Culture: Themes and Concepts* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 20.

- 65 Rafael Behr, *Polizeikultur: Routinen - Rituale - Reflexionen. Bausteine zu einer Theorie der Praxis der Polizei* (Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2006), 20.
- 66 Clifford D. Shearing and Richard V. Ericson, "Culture as Figurative Action," *The British Journal of Sociology* 42, no. 4 (1991): 489.
- 67 Janet Chan, "Changing Police Culture," *The British Journal of Criminology* 36, no. 1 (1996): 109–34.
- 68 Caimari and Galeano, "Introducción," 23.
- 69 Paul Hathazy, "Los Caminos De La Opacidad: Accesibilidad Y Resistencia En El Estudio De Las Organizaciones Policiales Como Obstáculo Y Dato," in Sirimarco, *Estudiar La Policía*, 167–68.
- 70 See Máximo Sozzo, "Introducción," in Sozzo, *Policía, Violencia, Democracia: Ensayos Sociológicos*, 7–13.
- 71 Diego Pulido Esteva, "Policía Y Ciudad, Indisociablemente: Fragmentos De Una Historia," *Otros Diálogos de El Colegio de México*, no. 9 (2019), n.p.
- 72 Davis, "Historia," 75.
- 73 Diego Galeano, *Escritores, Detectives y Archivistas: La Cultura Policial en Buenos Aires, 1821–1910* (Buenos Aires: Teseo, 2009), 9.
- 74 The use of the masculine form is justified by the fact that women were excluded from the service during the period under consideration.
- 75 Galeano, *Escritores*, 157–58.
- 76 Karl H. Hörning and Julia Reuter, "Doing Culture: Kultur Als Praxis," in Reuter; Hörning, *Doing Culture: Neue Positionen Zum Verhältnis Von Kultur Und Sozialer Praxis*, 4–5; Sven Reichardt, "Praxeologische Geschichtswissenschaft," *Sozial.Geschichte* 22, no. 3 (2007): 53–55.
- 77 Ángel Rama, *La Ciudad Letrada* (Montevideo: Arca, 1998), 61.
- 78 Paul J. Vanderwood, *Desorden Y Progreso: Bandidos, Policías Y Desarrollo Mexicano* (México: Siglo XXI Editores, 1986), 50.
- 79 In the Federal District, 41.69 percent of the population could not read or write in 1895. In 1900, the illiteracy rate was 35.38 percent. Dirección General de Estadísticas, *Estadísticas Sociales Del Porfiriato: 1877–1910* (Mexico: Secretaría de Economía, 1956), 125.
- 80 Sandra Gayol, "Entre Lo Deseable Y Lo Posible: Perfil De La Policía De Buenos Aires En La Segunda Mitad Del Siglo XIX," *Estudios Sociales* 6, no. 10 (1996): 125.
- 81 Galeano, *Escritores*, 50, 158.
- 82 Heinz Schlaffer, "Einleitung," in Goody et al., *Entstehung und Folgen der Schriftkultur*, 11–12.
- 83 Jack Goody, "Funktionen der Schrift in traditionellen Gesellschaften," in Goody et al., *Entstehung und Folgen der Schriftkultur*, 25.
- 84 Stein, *Schriftkultur*, 22.
- 85 Stein, *Schriftkultur*, 278.
- 86 Stein, *Schriftkultur*, 19.
- 87 Plato, *Phaedrus*, with the assistance of Steven Scully (Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company Incorporated, 2003), 65, 275a.
- 88 Jack Goody and Ian P. Watt, "Konsequenzen der Literalität," in Goody et al., *Entstehung und Folgen der Schriftkultur*, 111.
- 89 See Renate Dürr, "Introduction: Practices of Knowing and Ignoring from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century," in Dürr, *Threatened Knowledge: Practices of Knowing and Ignoring from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century*, 13.

34 Introduction

- 90 Roger Chartier, "Texts, Printing, Readings," in Hunt; Biersack, *The New Cultural History*, 173–74.
- 91 Rama, *Ciudad*, 22.
- 92 Juan P. Dabove, "Ciudad Letrada," in Szurmuk; Mckee Irwin, *Diccionario De Estudios Culturales Latinoamericanos*, 57.
- 93 Joanne Rappaport and Tom Cummins, *Beyond the Lettered City: Indigenous Literacies in the Andes* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012), 5.
- 94 Sara Castro-Klaren, "Writing Subalternity. Guaman Poma and Garcilaso, Inca," *Dispositio* 19, no. 46 (1994): 229–44.
- 95 François-Xavier Guerra, "Forms of Communication, Political Spaces, and Cultural Identities in the Creation of Spanish American Nation," in Castro-Klaren; Chasteen, *Beyond Imagined Communities: Reading and Writing the Nation in Nineteenth-Century Latin America*, 10.
- 96 Julio Vezub and Ingrid d. Jong, "El Giro Escritural de la Historiografía Mapuche: Alfabeto y Archivos en las Fronteras: Un Estado de la Cuestión," *Quinto Sol* 23, no. 3 (2019), 8.
- 97 Guerra, "Forms," 15.
- 98 See Doris Sommer, "Irresistible Romance: The Foundational Fictions of Latin America," in Bhabha, *Nation and Narration*, 71–97.
- 99 Will Fowler, "El Pronunciamento Mexicano Del Siglo XIX: Hacia Una Nueva Tipología," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México*, no. 38 (2009): 22.
- 100 Nicola Miller, *Republics of Knowledge: Nations of the Future in Latin America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2020), 75.
- 101 Juan Poblete, "Lectura De La Sociabilidad Y Sociabilidad De La Lectura: La Novela Y Las Costumbres Nacionales En El Siglo XIX," *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana* 26, no. 52 (2000): 30.
- 102 Rama, *Ciudad*, 63–68.
- 103 Rama, *Ciudad*, 77.
- 104 Béatrice Fraenkel, "Writing Acts: When Writing Is Doing," in Barton; Papen, *The Anthropology of Writing*, 42.
- 105 Jef Verschueren, "Introduction: The Pragmatic Perspective," in Verschueren, *Key Notions for Pragmatics*, 4–5.
- 106 According to this theory, three types of speech acts can be distinguished: The locutionary act, which describes the simple act of saying something. The illocutionary act, which refers to the realisation of the immediate purpose of what is said. The illocutionary acts of congratulating, thanking, ordering, promising, betting, etc. cannot be classified as true or false, but as successful or unsuccessful. Finally, perlocutionary acts are the effects or consequences caused by illocutionary acts beyond their immediate purpose and with respect to the receptor. What is achieved by saying or writing something depends on the addressee and may affect his or her beliefs, attitudes, and behaviour. For example, the perlocutionary act of arguing can be persuasive. John L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955, 4–11; Marina Sbisà, "Speech Act Theory," in Verschueren, *Key Notions for Pragmatics*, 232–33.
- 107 Peter Auer, "Context and Contextualisation," in Verschueren, *Key Notions for Pragmatics*, 89–95.
- 108 Stef Slembrouck, "Channel," in Verschueren, *Key Notions for Pragmatics*, 48–49.

- 109 Verschueren, “Introduction,” 18; David Barton and Uta Pape, “What Is Anthropology of Writing?,” in Barton; Pape, *The Anthropology of Writing*, 10.
- 110 Michel Foucault, *Schriften Zur Literatur* (Munich: Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung, 1974), Übersetzt von Karin von Hofer, 16–17.
- 111 Michael Riekenberg, “Schreibende Polizisten: Zur Verschriftlichung Der Polizei in Den Städten Lateinamerikas Im Späteren 19. Jahrhundert,” in Carrizo de Reimann, *Making Modern Police in Latin America: Beiträge Zur Geschichte Der Polizeien Im 19. Und 20. Jahrhundert*, 120.
- 112 Lila M. Caimari, “Escenas Del Archivo Policial,” in Sirimarco, *Estudiar La Policía*, 88.
- 113 The Police Museum was created in 1899 as a training centre during the tenure of Chief of Police Francisco J. Beazley. It was the first in Latin America and the second internationally, after Scotland Yard. It was originally located in the Bureau of Investigations, but soon had to be moved due to lack of space. It moved from a wooden shed on the roof to a room in Charcas Street and finally, in 1966, to its current location on the seventh and eighth floors of Lavalle Street. Since its closure in 2020, it has not reopened its doors to the public due to the non-compliance with certain building regulations.
- 114 Since 2023, it is possible to consult a wide range of sources in the digital archive created by the researchers of the “Crimen y Sociedad” working group of the University of San Andrés (Buenos Aires). “Archivo Interno: Corpus Documental,” Universidad de San Andrés, <https://udesu.edu.ar/crimen-y-sociedad>.