

Beats and Streets

THE CONSTABLE 'IS responsible for the security of life and property within his Beat, and for the preservation of the peace and general good order, during the time he is on Duty'.¹ Although these words were directed to newly-appointed Metropolitan policemen, they summed up a widely held view of the purpose of the new police. Furthermore, there was a commonly-held belief that 'it was indispensably necessary that he should make himself perfectly acquainted with all the parts of his Beat ... with the streets, thoroughfares, courts, and houses ... and the inhabitants of each house'.² The beat constable, in theory, was the enforcer, as well as the embodiment, of order and decorum in public places: his presence a deterrent to the would-be criminal and a reassurance to law-abiding citizens or those otherwise in need of help. The reality was somewhat different.

Unfortunately, given the centrality accorded to working the beat, there is very little evidence relating to the layouts and lengths of beats in Huddersfield. The Improvement Commissioners inherited a system of night-watching based on eight beats. No formal records existed and the commissioners were forced to rely upon the memories of older watchmen. The general view was that six beats were 'so extensive and the labour so heavy' that they could not be worked 'in the ordinary execution of duty' in less than two and a half hours. The proposed augmentation of the force had the effect of reducing the time per beat to under two hours. In addition, there were three constables on day duty.³ By late 1853 there were a total of fourteen beats, six of which required ninety minutes to work, two

seventy-five minutes and the remaining six one hour. It was agreed to reorganise the beats and appoint additional men so that the time for each beat would be no more than one hour.⁴ The details of the beats are not recorded and there is little in the minutes of the commissioners to suggest that this was a matter of concern. By the time of the first annual inspection under the County & Borough Constabulary Act, there were sixteen beats but Colonel Woodford recommended an extension to eighteen. A compromise appears to have been struck for in February 1858 three beats (numbers 7, 8 and 9) were made into four. There was some minor tinkering with the daytime arrangements a year later when an additional constable was appointed for day duty on Tuesday (market day) who was responsible for the Market Place, New Street, Buxton Road and Cloth Hall Street only.⁵ Little seems to have changed in the next decade including Withers' reorganization in 1868. On the eve of incorporation, Huddersfield was policed by fifteen night constables and four day constables, the latter operating a two shift system.

Huddersfield policemen were expected to live, as well as work, within the boundaries specified in the Improvement Act and, with the sole exception of Abraham Chadwick, who continued to live in Paddock, all did so. They were scattered throughout the area. In 1851 Superintendent John Thomas lived at 6 Swine Market, alongside shoemakers, fishmongers, an innkeeper and two publicans. PCs Graham and Hollingrake lived in Clay's Yard, off Thomas Street. PC Beevers lived in Upperhead Row amongst weavers and cloth-dressers, an upholsterer and a French polisher, while Sergeant Mellor lived in Dock Street alongside dressmakers, mule-spinners, a tailor and a boat-builder as well as some hawkers. PC Wilson was the only officer to live in Castlegate. A decade later, the pattern was very similar. The town's policemen were to be found in mixed but largely respectable areas from Spring Street and Grove Street to Prospect Street and Outcote Bank; from Princess Street to Manchester Road. They lived in the communities they policed but whether or not they were a part of those communities is a different matter.

The absence of detail relating to specific beats creates a major problem in the analysis of the realities of police work in the first generation of new policing in the town. However, by focussing on certain areas of the town, it is possible to give some indication of the nature of police work and how it changed over time. Before this is done some general observations need to be made. First, the

Huddersfield police were in a relatively favourable position – in terms of both acreage per constable and population per constable – in comparison with the police in other urban centres and, even more so, in comparison with the county force. Second, the types of problems facing the police were to be found across the town, though they were more heavily concentrated in certain districts, notably those in and around Castlegate and Upperhead Row. However, thirdly, the policing of such areas, precisely because of their problematic nature, was seen as the true test of the local force. It is no coincidence that when Superintendent Beaumont was under attack from members of the Improvement Commission one of the most telling criticisms was that he was unfamiliar with Castlegate and the problems it posed to order in the town. Lastly, while the focus in this chapter is on problems and responses, it must be stressed that there were times when beat work was uneventful and mundane. Checking doors and windows to ensure that they were secure was tedious. Indeed, it was in no small measure the boredom factor that drove the town's night constables to snatch a nap or otherwise absent themselves from duty.

Conquering Castlegate?

In the 1820s Castlegate was 'one of the most respectable parts of the town' so much so that 'to get a house in some parts of the Old Post Office Yard [people] had to get a character from their employer or a churchman of the parish'.⁶ By the late 1840s this was most certainly not the case. In October 1848 the *Leeds Mercury* painted a grim picture of a street, barely 200 yards long, that boasted thirteen beerhouses and two public houses. From ten o'clock in the morning 'drinking and gaming were indulged in all day long and far into the night ... rows and riots were constant ... robberies were frequent ... and it was dangerous to enter ... after night fall'. If that was not bad enough 'the "Stews and bagnios" on the premises' of several beerhouses ensured 'the continued assembly of lewd and disorderly characters'.⁷ And over it all ruled John Sutcliffe, the self-styled 'King of Castlegate'.⁸ Here indeed was a challenge for the town's new police.

Castlegate ran from the confluence of King Street and Kirkgate at Shorehead to Lowerhead Row (and thence Old Leeds Road). The area encompassed two other streets (Quay Street and Dock Street) and was joined by Denton Lane. In addition, there were numerous



yards on either side of the main thoroughfare, of which Boulder's Yard and Post Office Yard (both to be found between Castlegate and Kirkgate) were perhaps the most notorious.⁹ Racial and class stereotyping gave rise to crude simplification: Castlegate became a dystopia of criminality and Irishness! The reality was more complex. The Irish (including children born in Great Britain of Irish-born parents) were only a small percentage of the town's population, though there were heavy concentrations, for example in Windsor Court, and many followed poorly-paid and highly precarious occupations; but not all Irishmen and women were unskilled labourers or hawkers of pots and pans.¹⁰ Similarly, while there were many public houses and beerhouses in the area, many were known to the authorities to be 'respectably' run. It was a relatively small number of high-profile beerhouses (and their proprietors) reported in the local and regional press that created such a negative impression. Furthermore, there was a wider mix of occupations than popular prejudice allowed. There were craftsmen and shopkeepers who clearly met contemporary criteria of 'respectability' and whose reputations were, once again,

Castlegate district
1851

acknowledged by police and magistrates. However, there were also a large number who struggled to earn a sufficient income to provide themselves and their families with decent shelter and adequate food and clothing. Those in declining trades, such as handloom weavers, lived in pitiable conditions. Unskilled workers were similarly poorly-paid and often irregularly employed. Even the minority of skilled artisans could find themselves facing penury if there was a sustained downturn in trade. Precariousness and poverty were an enduring reality and it is not surprising to find that there was a grey economy, at best just legal, more often clearly illegal, whereby people sought to sustain themselves. And there were a few (again, well publicised) individuals who, often behind a façade of legality, made a living out of crime both petty and serious. To talk of them as a criminal class would be to exaggerate both their number and their coherence as a distinct grouping, but criminal men and women were undoubtedly part of the socio-economic mix of Castlegate. Major robberies as well as petty thefts were a perennial problem for the police. However, it is also the case that a considerable amount of police time was taken up with the enforcement of a code of behaviour that was at odds with the customs and mores of many inhabitants of Castlegate (and, indeed, other parts of town) in the mid-nineteenth century. Respectability was a complex set of values and cannot be attributed simply to one social class, but it was the working classes who most heavily felt the imposition of 'order and decorum' in public places. Restrictions on licensing hours, prohibitions on various forms of gambling and the criminalization of certain traditional sports were sources of friction and conflict.

For many contemporary observers the problems posed by Castlegate could be summed up in three words: beerhouses, brothels and brutality. These were the most spectacular manifestations of disorder and presented the police with the severest problems but there was much more to the policing of Castlegate – much that went largely unnoticed and under-reported but which constituted an important element in the complex relationship between police and policed. Furthermore, much of this activity was more facilitative, even cooperative, than coercive. Ensuring the free and safe flow of traffic is but one example. Carters taking an extended lunch-time drink in one of Castlegate's many beerhouses may well have objected to police interference but for tradesmen needing access to shops or warehouses the removal of unattended carts was to be welcomed.

Similarly, attempts to limit 'furious driving', while irksome to drivers of privately-owned omnibuses in particular, were welcomed by people who had seen, even experienced, horrific accidents as out-of-control vehicles scythed down adults and children whose misfortune it was to be in their path.¹¹ The police were a resource to be called upon not only in cases of street accidents. Handling sudden deaths or suicides was another important, if unspectacular, facet of day-to-day policing. These cases throw light on the often harsh circumstances in which the poor lived. When the police were called to Dock Street in March 1854 they found the dead body of five-year-old Mary Booth, who had fallen into the fire while her mother was at work as a cleaner. Although unmarried and with four illegitimate children, the 'much care worn' mother was praised for 'her untiring industry', though, cruelly, this very industry had led to the circumstances in which the child died. Later the same year, the police were called to an incident and found the body of Sarah Morris, a twenty-eight-year-old but 'who looked fully 50'. She had given birth prematurely, following a fall at home after an afternoon drinking spree, only to die the next morning.¹²

In a similar vein, working with other individuals and agencies to prosecute shopkeepers and beerhouse keepers for selling short measures offered a degree of protection to ordinary customers; likewise the periodic prosecutions for the sale of unfit meat.¹³ When the butcher William Hayley was prosecuted (not for the first time) in 1860 the magistrates explicitly saw his actions as 'the more to be reprehended ... [as] it was a case essentially affecting the poor'.¹⁴ Such prosecutions need to be put into perspective. Food adulteration cases were infrequent, penalties limited and reappearances in court suggest limited deterrent effect.¹⁵ Nonetheless, it provided an example, however limited, of protective policing. The same could be said about prosecutions for passing counterfeit coin. Many of the victims were shopkeepers or beerhouse proprietors, not all of whom would have been, in other respects, sympathetic to the police. It is difficult to estimate the precise scale of this problem but it is clear that 'coining' was a recurrent and often well-organised and large-scale problem, whose victims included shopkeepers and publicans as well as ordinary members of the public.¹⁶

One final aspect of the welfare role of the police remains to be considered. Overcrowding and insanitation were major causes for concern for the Improvement Commissioners and in attempting to

tackle the problems they looked to the police, not least because of the widely-made association between physical squalor, immorality and criminality. Nowhere were these problems more acute than in the unlicensed lodging houses in and around Castlegate. The *Leeds Mercury* referred to Windsor Court as ‘a locality notorious for filth fever and contagion’ while the *Chronicle* bemoaned the ‘immense numbers ... crammed into ill-ventilated and confined cellars and rooms, without any regard to sex, or other necessary requirements of civilization’ and the resultant ‘fever, disease, wretchedness and immorality’ among the largely Irish population of Post Office Yard.¹⁷ The largest and most notorious lodging house was that owned by Edward Dickinson in Castlegate. Following legislation passed in 1853 requiring the licensing of lodging houses, the police started a series of inspections. Inspector Sedgwick’s night-time visit revealed a total of thirty-eight people sleeping in the eight rooms – including ‘a lobby tenanted by nine men in eight beds’ – in the house owned by Dickenson. Matters could have been worse: five beds were unoccupied.¹⁸ He was not alone. Mary Moran was another fined under the lodging house act. In May 1855 her cellar dwelling in Castlegate, described as being ‘in a state of extreme filth’, was found to have two beds and a ‘shakedown’. The first bed contained a man and a woman, the second two men, while the ‘shakedown’ was occupied by Moran herself and two prostitutes, one of whom ‘danced nudely round the wretched dwelling’.¹⁹ Despite the building of a Model Lodging House and regular attempts to enforce licensing, the problem remained. In 1866 the commissioners were still complaining of the ‘filthy condition’ and ‘disgraceful state’ of unregistered lodging houses in Castlegate.²⁰ Concern was not restricted to questions of public health. Lodging houses, not without reason, were seen as hotbeds of immorality and crime and subjected to close police scrutiny.

While the full range of police activities must be recognised, it remains the case that much police time was given over to a relatively small number of issues which were also more confrontational. Given contemporary beliefs that drinking, gambling and criminality were intimately linked, it is unsurprising to find that the town’s magistrates and police were much exercised by breaches of the licensing laws.²¹ Many of the offences were relatively minor – the sale of a jug of beer after 11 p.m. or during hours of divine service on Sunday – but not all.²² Large numbers of men ‘marrying’ (that is, gambling) for ale,

not maintaining an orderly house and harbouring known thieves and prostitutes were matters of greater concern. Furthermore, there were certain beerhouses – the *Talbot*, the *Butchers' Arms*, the *Blue Bell* and the *Theatre Tavern* – and certain keepers – James Cayford, John Tierney, Nick Hannigan and the Dearnleys – that crop up in the records time and again.²³

Three problems in particular stand out – theft, prostitution and interpersonal violence. For many men a trip to Huddersfield was not complete without a visit to the drinking establishments of Castlegate. On numerous occasions, men, young and old, found themselves relieved of money and other personal possessions by the women they met there. A typical case involved a farmer from Emley Moor, who 'had come to have a little enjoyment at the fair, when his fancy led him into Castlegate' where he espied Martha Heaton, 'a nymph of the *pavé* [who] commenced "cuddling" him, and at the same time placing her hand in his pocket'. The light-fingered Heaton 'abstracted' and made off with three sovereigns, four half-sovereigns and 27s (£1-35) in silver. Only later did the police arrest her.²⁴ Such incidents were commonplace. The *Chronicle* reported three such cases on one day in March 1851. In the first, Martha Heaton (again) robbed a man who had 'come down to Huddersfield' to celebrate his holiday. After a lengthy session in the *Labour in Vain* beerhouse in King Street, he ended up in Dearnley's beerhouse in Castlegate where he was robbed in the backyard. Another 'young country greenhorn' went on 'a spree' on Thursday morning, fell asleep in the *Butchers' Arms* beerhouse and was duly robbed by persons unknown. Finally, while playing 'chokey' in James Shaw's beerhouse in Castlegate, Labron Longley, a local weaver, took off his coat only to have it stolen and pawned in nearby Drake's pawnshop.²⁵ Nor was it just the young and inexperienced who succumbed. William Kaye, a seventy-five-year-old labourer from Elland, was robbed in John Ashton's beerhouse in Castlegate in 1854 but found little sympathy from the town's magistrates. Admitting that he had visited the beerhouse on at least five occasions and had come to Huddersfield specifically for 'a spree' there, his case was dismissed and the magistrates advised him 'to keep better company in future'.²⁶ This was not an isolated case. The magistrates dismissed a number of theft charges, stating explicitly on one occasion that 'if persons would go into these places they must take the consequences'.²⁷

Of greater concern to the commissioners was the problem of prostitution.²⁸ Many of the cases brought before the town magistrates involved keeping a disorderly house. In some cases, this meant permitting prostitutes to gather in a public house or beerhouse; in others it involved permitting prostitutes to work from or in the premises. In 1851 Thomas Binns, the landlord of the *Tavern Theatre* was prosecuted for keeping a disorderly house. According to Inspector Brier's evidence there were 'a number of men intoxicated and noisy and some six females, two of whom he knew to be common prostitutes, three of the females being busily engaged dancing to the enchanting strains of a 'hurdy gurdy'.²⁹ Some cases were truly shocking. When Jacob Senior, the keeper of the *Unicorn* public house was prosecuted for failing to keep proper order, Superintendent Heaton informed the court that he had seen 'a woman ... excessively drunk, with her limbs rigid and nude and a man taking improper liberties with her' and this in the afternoon.³⁰ There was, however, a more serious and more persistent and unresolved problem – that of the beerhouse-brothel and what now would be termed human trafficking. In the 1840s the most notorious figure in town was John Sutcliffe, whose beerhouse in Castlegate had 'long been known as the rendezvous for thieves and prostitutes of the lowest grade'.³¹ In addition, in its yard were 'barracks' in which several women lived and worked. Also known as the Jonathan Wilde of Castlegate, he appeared untouchable but changes in policing in the late-1840s, notably the appointment of a superintending constable for the Huddersfield district, led to his demise.³² Using the powers of the 1848 Improvement Act, the commissioners ensured that 'Old Sut's' barracks were torn down in the summer of 1850.³³ Although a spectacular success, Sutcliffe's demise did not mark the end of the problem, though official concern fluctuated. In 1856, following a spate of prosecutions of beerhouse keepers, the magistrates made clear their determination 'to put down such scenes of vice and immorality' that had been made public.³⁴ In a long editorial the *Chronicle* asked rhetorically:

Who is there that knows anything of the real status of the Beerhouses in and near to Castlegate but must know that the keepers of the greater portion of them harbour the vilest characters and permit practices of the deepest profligacy and vice?³⁵

Of particular concern was ‘the habit of decoying young girls’ and taking substantial portions of the money they earned from prostitution.³⁶ Giving evidence in a case involving Elizabeth Lockwood, the landlady of the *Griffin*, described as ‘about the best of the low class of beerhouse’, Inspector Townend informed the magistrates of the sorry tale of Anne Shepherd. Engaged as a servant, she was expected to be a prostitute but with the promise of ‘plenty of money’. In fact, her ‘every halfpenny’ was paid over to Mrs. Lockwood but worse, after a mere four months, she was dismissed and sent to the Huddersfield Workhouse in ‘such a horribly diseased state’.³⁷ Lockwood was fined but taking effective action was far from easy. In 1861 John Smith, a Castlegate beerhouse keeper, was brought to court. Two witnesses – young women aged eighteen and twenty – ‘brought from the cells to give evidence’ told of the way in which Smith ‘and his wife had been in the habit of hiring girls as domestic servants, and then asking them to prostitute themselves.’³⁸ Smith’s defence counsel argued that the witnesses were unreliable, not least because ‘they had previously been girls of bad reputation and ... took no steps to leave the place when they discovered the true character of the situation’.³⁹ In the absence of corroborative evidence the case was dismissed.

Much depended upon the determination of the superintendent of police and the new man, William Hannan, proved to be a crucial figure. The successful prosecution of the ‘notorious beerhouse keeper’, Richard ‘Big [sometimes Long] Dick’ Ramsden in October 1863 was a clear indication of Hannan’s determination to enforce the 1830 Beer Act (William IV c.64), which made provision for the withdrawal of a licence for a third offence under the act. The first prosecution ‘for an offence against the tenour [*sic*] of his licence’ was unproblematic. Not so the second. Ramsden’s defence argued that this offence was not ‘a second offence’ in the meaning of the law, not being identical to the first. Hannan argued that this was a misreading of the act and the local magistrates accepted his argument and found Ramsden guilty. Hannan was not content with this and wrote to the editor of the *Justice of the Peace* for an opinion on the question. The reply upheld the stance taken by Hannan and the local magistrates. Duly fortified Hannan sought – and obtained – a third prosecution under the act. This time Ramsden appealed against his convictions to the magistrates sitting in quarter sessions. Hannan’s groundwork stood him in good stead and the conviction was upheld.⁴⁰

Although the success was welcome, Hannan had no illusions about the scale of the problem and the limited progress that had been made. In his annual report for the year 1863/4 he informed the Watch Committee that of eighty-four beerhouses in the town, sixty-four were effectively brothels with an average of three girls working in each. He wrote:

No language can describe the debasing immorality of the keepers of these houses. Their victims are sought up in our and neighbouring towns and selected principally from the ranks of the poorer classes, under the pretence of hiring them as servants, when their object is to procure them for the purpose of prostitution.⁴¹

Complaints continued to be made to the Watch Committee regarding 'the character of many of the low beerhouses ... especially those in the neighbourhood of Castlegate' but matters did not come to a head until December 1864/January 1865.⁴² Working closely with the Improvement Commissioners, Hannan put together the case against two married couples, the Hopwoods and Smiths, both Castlegate beerhouse keepers. This time the prosecution was made under the 1752 Disorderly Houses Act.⁴³ Subsequently the case was taken over by the poor law overseers as the costs of the case were to be met out of the poor rates.⁴⁴ The details of the case created a sensation. Although only two beerhouses were involved – the *Brown Cow* and the *Butchers' Arms* – it was claimed that there were at least eight beerhouse-brothels in the town, making Huddersfield 'the brothel of the West Riding'.⁴⁵ The details of the specific case created a sensation in court. It transpired that Hopwood had taken advantage of the distressed state of the cotton trade in Lancashire (the so-called Cotton Famine) to inveigle girls to come to Huddersfield, ostensibly as servants but in fact as prostitutes whose 'immoral earnings' paid for their board and keep. Defence attempts to delay the trial were rejected when the magistrates were informed that 'attempts had already been made to tamper with the girls upon whose evidence the prosecution were in part relying for proof'.⁴⁶ Such was the graphic evidence of the first witness, Harriet Perry, an eighteen-year-old from Ashton-under-Lyne, that William Hopwood changed his 'not guilty' plea to 'guilty' and threw himself on the mercy of the court, which sentenced him to eighteen months' hard labour. Notwithstanding evidence from the Hopwood trial that one of the young women, entrapped in Ashton

and brought to Huddersfield by Hopwood, had been given to the Smiths, the recently-married couple pleaded 'not guilty'. Smith was also sentenced to eighteen months' hard labour while his wife, better known in town as 'Butter Moll', received fifteen months' hard labour – sentences that 'greatly astounded' the prisoners.⁴⁷ The magistrates were scathing in their condemnation and expressed the hope that the heavy punishments handed out in this high-profile trial would act as a deterrent to those 'systematically using and employing [their house] for the lowest purposes of immorality'.⁴⁸ So too did the Improvement Commissioners and the superintendent of police, but the decision not to follow a similar course of action for another beerhouse-brothel case in June 1865 'to save expense' was not a good omen. Even more disheartening was the fact that in the same month Mrs Hopwood, who had been too ill to stand trial in January, was charged with permitting disorderly persons, including 'women [who] were "unfortunates" [prostitutes] and one [who] was a returned convict', in the *Brown Cow* beerhouse.⁴⁹ Worse still, in February 1866, while the Smiths were still serving their 'deterrent' sentence, the stand-in keeper of the *Butchers' Arms*, Benjamin Hirst, was found guilty of harbouring prostitutes.⁵⁰ A month later when a local prostitute, Mary Garner, was arrested she informed the police of the continuing practice of bringing in girls 'from other towns ... and kept in decoy houses solely for the purpose of prostitution.'⁵¹ As Hannan's annual reports bear witness, he was all too well aware of the limited effect of successful prosecutions.

As well as having a reputation for immorality, Castlegate was also known for its violence, much of it associated with its 'low' beerhouses. Drunken brawls were commonplace and could be sparked by trivial incidents. Festival times (not simply Christmas, New Year and Easter) saw an increase in interpersonal violence as did more private celebrations at weddings or wakes. Men seeking to prove themselves came from outside town – navvies working near Skelmanthorpe, youths from Holmfirth – taking on the locals in Castlegate; but there was an underlying level of violence that shocked the more respectable members of Huddersfield society.⁵² There were fights between the English and Irish, not to mention factional fights among the latter. More generally, men assaulted women, often savagely; less often women attacked men. The precise scale of interpersonal violence is impossible to establish as much went unreported. Many working-class men expected to settle their differences with their fists and not look to the courts. Similarly,

they expected to discipline wives, children and servants and did so with little comment, let alone interference. To a degree (again unmeasurable) the police were happy not to interfere as long as disturbances did not threaten to escalate. Intervention was risky. Irish factionalism turned to solidarity in the face of police action, and likewise domestic discord could turn to cooperation when an interfering constable appeared. And then there was outright hostility to the police, most clearly (but not exclusively) seen among certain sections of the Irish community in places like Post Office Yard and Windsor Court. Large-scale disturbances were a recurring, though not commonplace, feature of Castlegate life. In May 1848 the unfortunate Reuben Megson, a night-watchman subsequently appointed to the new Huddersfield force, was the first man to a riotous scene in Castlegate. He was 'immediately knocked down and his skull broken with a constable's staff which had been taken from [another watchman]' and he was also kicked and bitten in the attack.⁵³ In April 1852, as shopkeepers shuttered their windows and closed their shops to protect their property, the police were forced to intervene in 'a violent row' between the English and Irish. With difficulty 'and after great labour', the police led by Superintendent Thomas 'quelled the disturbance and [took] the ringleaders into custody' but not before the English crowd had smashed the windows and doors of the Irish residents of Windsor Court.⁵⁴ A decade later similar problems beset the area. Superintendent Hannan was so concerned by 'the very disturbed state of Castlegate', especially on Sundays, that he drafted in extra police to maintain order.⁵⁵ Smaller-scale disturbances were more common but still carried real risks for the police. Time and again policemen found themselves faced with angry crowds as they tried to effect an arrest. It is difficult to determine whether the situation deteriorated over time or whether there was less tolerance of violence in the late 1860s compared with the early 1850s, but Hannan was in no doubt that 'the police had experienced great difficulty in doing their duty in Castlegate' so much so that he was 'obliged to send the officers there in couples'.⁵⁶ Interpreting these incidences of anti-police violence is not entirely straight forward. Men such as the Gillerlane brothers, Dan and Thomas, or Richard Ramsden, were well-known violent men who used their fists freely with ordinary men and women and had no love of the police. However, they were atypical Castlegate figures. Equally, it could be argued that assaults committed during an arrest

for drunk and disorderly behaviour did not necessarily involve or imply anti-police sentiment.⁵⁷ However, not all of the evidence can be explained in this way. The large crowds that quickly gathered, throwing mud, stone and tiles at the police as they attempted to rescue prisoners, indicate a significant degree of hostility. Equally telling were the repeated incidents of members of the public refusing to come to the assistance of the police or refusing to give them information. Following an incident in which Sergeant Townend was physically and verbally abused while attempting to arrest two disorderly women, the *Chronicle* ruefully noted the ‘disposition on the part of many of the low and disorderly characters in the town to annoy and abuse the police ... in every conceivable manner while in the execution of their duty’.⁵⁸ Communal collections to pay fines were a further sign of hostility to the law and its enforcers. More strikingly, those suspected of assisting the police faced communal revenge. Michael Kelly, a fourteen-year-old living in Windsor Court was accused of being a ‘Bobby’s spy’ and was duly stoned and beaten.⁵⁹ Even respectable members of the community were loath to assist (or be known to have assisted) the police. A Catholic priest, who had called the police to deal with a fight among Irish navvies, made his position very clear. He went about Castlegate ‘doing a great deal of good [but] if he gave evidence it would probably have an injurious effect afterwards’.⁶⁰

The Castlegate area posed persistent and major problems for the police. In that sense, it was never conquered, never wholly civilized, but, importantly, neither was it unpoliced. There were times when hostile mobs had to be quelled by the police force acting *en masse*; there were times when policemen patrolled the area in pairs but there was always a police presence. The fact that both Sergeant Mellor and PC Wilson lived there for several years is significant. There was a greater degree of tolerance and even cooperation between the police and the inhabitants of Castlegate than the lurid tales of large-scale attacks and prisoner rescues would suggest. In that sense, the threat of Castlegate was contained and a compromise struck between police and policed.

Upperhead Row: Something Old, Something New?

Although Castlegate remained a problem area with a reputation for immorality and criminality, its standing was challenged by those

'dens of iniquity ... the *Argyle* and *Cambridge Arms* music saloons ... [where] greater immorality is perpetrated than at any of the low houses of Castlegate' in the opinion of Superintendent Hannan in 1864.⁶¹ This reflected a growing awareness that there were newer problem areas emerging in the town. Upperhead Row was one such hot-spot, while certain adjoining streets, most especially Manchester Street and Swallow Street, acquired a notoriety that began to match that of Castlegate. Two facts may help to explain this. The first was the growing concentration of Irish in and around Swallow Street, which gave rise to concerns about drunkenness, immorality and crime. This could be seen as a relocation of an older problem but it took a distinctive and virulent form in the shape of the 'Irish Small Gang' that came to prominence in the mid and late-1860s. The second was the emergence of new forms of popular leisure, the singing saloon and the music-hall. Again, this took a particularly distinctive form: the *Cambridge Arms* on Upperhead Row.

Like Castlegate, Upperhead Row had once been a respectable part of town, though the presence of Lockwood's mill attracted working-class men and women to the area. Nonetheless, Schofield,

Upperhead Row
District



looking back from the late-nineteenth century to the 1820s, spoke of Swallow Street as 'a very good street ... inhabited by very respectable people'.⁶² By the 1850s and 1860s this had changed. Although still socially mixed, there was a preponderance of working-class men and women, many of whom, not least in the Irish communities in Swallow Street and the courts, such as Connor's Yard that ran off it, were semi-skilled or unskilled. Barker's Yard and Cherry Tree Alley were 'in the most filthy state [being] chiefly inhabited by the worst description of Irish'. In the latter were thirty-two families 'in the most abject state of uncleanness'.⁶³

As in Castlegate, overcrowding and insanitation were major problems. Large families, crammed into small houses or unregistered lodging houses and with access to very basic facilities, faced a range of diseases from the commonplace, such as typhus, to the dramatic, such as cholera. Many families faced insecurity of employment and often chronic poverty. For some, small-scale crime offered a means of survival and there was the temporary escape offered by the beerhouse and the new singing saloons. Many of the policing problems experienced in and around Upperhead Row were similar to those discussed in relation to Castlegate and need not be revisited here.

The poor relations between Irish communities and the 'new' police have been well documented and Huddersfield, despite having a relatively small and dispersed Irish community, shared this problem.⁶⁴ In 1847 Sedgwick was badly kicked in a 'lawless and outrageous attack' by many Irish men and women living in Manchester Street and Granby Street.⁶⁵ The newly-formed police faced problems from the outset. In 1850, for example, the prosecution of several Irish people in Upperhead Row for lodging house offences led to a 'determination to be revenged upon the police force for having brought them before the magistrates'.⁶⁶ Within days the police on night duty were stoned by angry crowds. Sporadic assaults upon the police in the area were a feature of the 1850s but the frequency and scale of the attacks appears to have intensified in the early and mid-1860s. In January 1862 PC Sykes was 'very badly used [during] a disturbance in Swallow Street ... [he was] knocked down, struck in the face, dragged by the hair of his head by the cowardly crowd'.⁶⁷ Worse was to follow in November 1864. Joseph Carney had stripped to the waist in the street and called upon anyone to fight him. PC Nutton told him to go home but when Carney refused, abusing him with 'filthy and threatening language', Nutton arrested him.

This precipitated a major incident. Carney resisted furiously and, as Nutton and other constables dragged him towards the lock-up, a crowd, estimated to be in the hundreds, 'rushed on the constables and rescued the prisoner from them'. Eventually, Carney was arrested along with two other men who had been in the forefront of the rescue.⁶⁸ Difficult relations were exacerbated by rumours circulating in town – vigorously denied by Superintendent Hannan – that the police were operating a spy system.⁶⁹

Such was the context from which emerged the Irish Small Gang, which terrorised parts of the town for the next decade. The precise size of 'this vicious fraternity' is unclear and almost certainly fluctuated over time. The gang probably comprised twelve to fifteen members most of the time and at its core were the Carney brothers (James, Joseph and Patrick), the Wood brothers (John and Michael) and the M'Cabe brothers (James and John).⁷⁰ This was more than a juvenile gang, though undoubtedly some members were in their teens.⁷¹ The M'Cabes were in their late teens and at least two of the Carneys in their twenties when first they came to the attention of the police. Much of their activity appeared as nothing more than sheer vandalism. There were various incidents in which they smashed up beerhouses, 'throwing glasses and pitchers around to a dangerous extent'.⁷² On other occasions they viciously robbed members of the public, usually as they left local beerhouses such as the *Wheatsheaf* on Upperhead Row or the *Cambridge Arms*.⁷³ Superintendent Hannan spoke of the gang 'going about the town assaulting people in the most disgraceful manner', attacking people when the police were not around and leaving town to escape arrest.⁷⁴ However, it is also evident that there was a strong sense of territorial identity. Gang members came overwhelmingly from the streets around Upperhead Row and much of their disruptive and criminal activity was directed at pubs and beerhouses at 'the bottom of town', including Castlegate. In March 1865, for example, the Small Gang wreaked considerable damage in two Castlegate beerhouses. In the second incident the unfortunate Hezekiah Taylor was assaulted (along with his wife and father-in-law) and robbed of £3-10s (£3.50) and a watch guard.⁷⁵ In another incident that strongly suggested territorial rivalry, John M'Cabe attacked Peter Gillerlane, a member of a family well-known to the police, in Castlegate itself.

There was a further distinctive element to the Irish Small Gang's activities that would have transcended territorial or factional rivalries

– overt hostility to the police. Reporting on the trial of some gang members in January 1865, the *Chronicle* informed its readers that ‘members of this gang had bound themselves by oath to stone the police’.⁷⁶ This they most certainly did on a number of occasions and, once at least, members of the gang took to the roof of a house, smashing it with a hammer and throwing ‘broken slates at the [police] officers and other persons’.⁷⁷ In other incidents members of the police force were victims of ‘mob’ attacks, particularly when arrests were being attempted. Perhaps the most notorious incident took place in April 1867 when PCs Ireton and Standish went to arrest John M’Cabe at his home in Upperhead Row. As soon as the police appeared M’Cabe’s mother, already armed with a knife, called on eight or nine members of the gang, who then ‘kicked and maltreated the officers and ultimately threw them downstairs’. The two constables, amazingly still holding on to John M’Cabe, ‘were then dragged and kicked across the street and thrown into a cellar’. An estimated crowd of 100 gathered: some kicked and punched the officers and one set a dog on them. Eventually, police reinforcements ensured that the M’Cabes, mother and son, were finally brought to the cells.⁷⁸ And this was not the last incident involving John M’Cabe. In January 1870 he was brought before the local magistrates charged, for the thirteenth time, with assaulting the police. At Bradford Quarter Sessions four months later he was sentenced to seven years’ penal servitude.⁷⁹ This was a major blow but their depredations continued into the early 1870s when Superintendent Withers, of the enlarged borough force, ‘evinced a skill, a patience and a judgement which were beyond praise and the consequence was, in the course of time he completely destroyed the gang’.⁸⁰

There can be no doubt as to the bitter animosity shown by members of the Irish Small Gang to the police over almost a decade. This was the most virulent outbreak of anti-police sentiment in Huddersfield. Unlike other outbursts in the town (and elsewhere) this was – at times quite literally – a running battle with the police that lasted not days, or even weeks (as was the case in well-known incidents in Leeds and Colne in the 1840s) but for months and years.⁸¹ Clearly there was a significant portion of the town’s population, predominantly but not exclusively Irish, that viewed the police as an alien and threatening force. However, there is a peculiar, personal dimension to the M’Cabes ongoing battle with the forces of law and order. In 1847, the very year in which John M’Cabe was born,

his father Michael M'Cabe had been accused of being involved in a particularly gruesome triple murder in nearby Mirfield. M'Cabe and his fellow accused, Patrick Reid, was found guilty and sentenced to death. The case attracted nationwide attention when Reid confessed to being solely responsible for the murder. M'Cabe, however, was not released. In circumstances that remain unclear his death penalty was commuted to transportation for life because of 'evidence' that had come to light after the trial and that was never tested in court. In the 1851 census Mary M'Cabe (living with her sister in Upperhead Row with two small sons, James and John), was returned as 'lodger – convict's wife'. Michael M'Cabe was released – after a campaign supported by none other than Seymour Digby – and returned to his family in Huddersfield. Little is known of his subsequent life, except that he and his wife were arrested for assaulting the police in the late-1850s, shortly before his death. His wife and sons continued their battle with the police in the next decade. The penury that the wife and two boys endured in the early 1850s is likely to have had a profound effect on their view of the criminal justice system in general and the police in particular. However, while the M'Cabe experience was unusual in its intensity, it was by no means unique. Given the well-documented over-representation of the Irish in Victorian crime statistics, there would have been many others who felt that they were victims of a system that equated being Irish with criminality. It is hardly surprising that anti-police sentiments remained strong in these communities for many years.

If tensions between immigrant communities and the police were a well-established feature of Victorian Britain, it was also the case that popular leisure activities were another source and site of conflict. Old pastimes were declining – few dogfights took place in the town in the 1860s – but the new could still be problematic. Pigeon flying and foot-racing drew large crowds that blocked thoroughfares and encouraged gambling. Beerhouses remained a source of concern, for polite society and the police alike, but the new forms of popular entertainment were often little better. Despite the harshness of life for many working-class people in the mid-nineteenth century, some had money to spend on the music saloons and music halls that began to develop. Much attention has been focused on developments in London and the larger cities, such as Manchester and Leeds, but it was not only in the cities that these new forms of entertainment were to be found. Great claims were made for the new forms of

entertainment. Speaking positively of the *Cambridge Arms* in 1863, Mr. Learoyd, representing the proprietor, Mr. Allen Hoyle, was disparaging about ‘the lowest beerhouses [and] the lowest class of entertainment resorted to’ whereas ‘nothing was so well calculated to draw people from these low and vitiated amusements, and thereby to prevent vice and immorality, as furnishing them with amusement of a higher character in the shape of good theatrical representations’.⁸² The reality was somewhat different.

Under Hoyle’s proprietorship, the *Cambridge* enjoyed a chequered history for just over a decade from the late 1850s to the late 1860s. He invested several thousand pounds in expanding his establishment in the late 1860s when it could boast an auditorium that held around 1,000 people. In 1858 Hoyle had taken over the *Black Swan*, renaming it the *Cambridge Arms Music Saloon* and advertising it as a ‘Temple of Harmony’, complete with a ‘first-class pianoforte’ to be played by ‘the eminent pianist’ Mr. Wilson, a man known for his performances in both Glasgow and Sunderland.⁸³ According to *Era* in August 1865 ‘a most agreeable hour may be spent at this [the *Cambridge*] the only place of amusement open in Huddersfield’. Throughout the 1860s the *Cambridge* offered a range of entertainments. Singers, dancers and comics (of varying descriptions but many Irish) were the mainstay while ‘Negro entertainments’ were a regular feature. Gymnasts and trapeze artists, such as ‘The Great Pedanto! The Daring Pedanto’ from America were to be found along with performing animals but ‘The Sensation of 1867’ was to be ‘Madame Conrade and her Celebrated Troupe of Females Artistes ... in their Grand Entertainment of Poetic Groupings [and] Classical Statuary’. Despite the positive comments in *Era*, the *Cambridge* had a reputation locally as ‘a den of iniquity’ and Hoyle appeared in the local magistrates’ court on several occasions, facing charges associated with selling alcohol outside licensing hours and permitting gambling and prostitution on his premises.⁸⁴ The presence of an onsite dram-shop added to its attractions but Superintendent Hannan was shocked by the numbers of juveniles drinking there and committing petty thefts.⁸⁵

Matters came to a head in 1869. In March of that year Hoyle announced the forthcoming appearance of the seemingly innocuous Mr. & Mrs. White, ‘Negro Comedians, Vocalists, Instrumentalists and Dancers’. Their act was to be Hoyle’s downfall. Two of the local police visited the *Cambridge* and gave a detailed account of the evening’s entertainment. The nub of the matter was that, in one

scene, involving a 'ticket of leave man' and another person, Hoyle was effectively staging an unlicensed play. Despite a spirited claim by Hoyle's defence that it was not clear whether 'the performance or conversation could be called a drama, tragedy, comedy, opera or pantomime', the magistrates found in favour of the police case and fined Hoyle £5. *Era* was sufficiently concerned to run a short piece under the heading: How Far Does The Theatrical Licence Extend? It was clearly worried that a £5 fine had been imposed simply 'for permitting the mere conversation jargon so common with Niggers to take place on his boards without a licence'. Hoyle appealed to the magistrates at quarter sessions in the October. The police stressed the immoral nature of the 'performances' at the *Cambridge*. Detective Walter Paxman recounted how he had visited on several occasions 'and had seen, more than twice, as many as six or seven prostitutes and five or six thieves present'.⁸⁶ Furthermore, he 'had witnessed the performers making indecent signs on the stage and [had] heard indecent songs'. Worse, according to fellow officer, Inspector James Whelan, 'one of the performers was a woman in male costume [who] went amongst the audience and asked the visitors to stand treat'. The magistrates saw no reason to overturn the decision of the local magistrates in Huddersfield. The *Cambridge* was now denounced as 'the greatest curse in the town'.⁸⁷ By the time of his appeal Hoyle had suffered a second, more serious blow. After thirteen years his licence was not renewed at the annual Brewster Sessions in August 1869. The Town Clerk objected to the renewal of Hoyle's licence, citing his prosecutions for permitting gambling and prostitution and his most recent prosecution for 'permitting stage plays of an immoral character, without a licence'.⁸⁸ The magistrates upheld the Town Clerk's objection. By December 1869 the fixtures and fittings were sold.⁸⁹ Hoyle himself was soon declared bankrupt and, in an ironic final twist, the *Cambridge* itself was put up for sale and purchased by the teetotallers of Huddersfield, who renamed it the *British Workman*, but as an alternative and uplifting venue for the working men of Huddersfield it was a very short-lived venture.

Conclusion: Problems and Priorities

Although attention has been focussed on two specific areas, many of the problems to be found in Castlegate or around Upperhead Row were to be found elsewhere in the town. Back Buxton Road,

with its drunken brawls between men and women and the presence of several squalid brothels, acquired a reputation for ‘the disgraceful and heathenish manner in which the inhabitants are in the habit of conducting themselves’.⁹⁰ The *Gypsy Queen* beerhouse in Old Street, especially when ‘Slasher’ Wilson was the licensee, was one of the worst in town; little better were the nearby *Dog Inn* and the optimistically-named *El Dorado*. Equally problematic was Kirkgate.

The problems discussed in this chapter are interesting and important in their own right, particularly as they relate both to contemporary perceptions of criminals and criminality and to contemporary priorities in terms of crime control. The almost unchallenged belief that drinking and gambling led to petty crime and thence to serious crime ensured that much police time was devoted to the surveillance of public houses and, even more so, beerhouses. However, the prosecution of beerhouse-brothels owed much to the determination of individuals such as Superintendents Heaton and Hannan. This chapter has provided further insight into the day-to-day realities of policing, but necessarily from a police perspective. To gain further insight into the society which generated these problems we need to look next at the men and women who found themselves before the magistrates in the 1850s and 1860s.

Endnotes

- 1 *General Regulations, Instructions and Orders for the government and guidance of the Metropolitan Police Force*, London, 1851, p.49.
- 2 *Ibid.*
- 3 HIC Minutes, KMT 18/ 2/2/1, 3 November 1848.
- 4 HIC Minutes, KMT 18/ 2/3/13/1, 21 November 1853.
- 5 Watch Committee Minutes, KMT 18/2/3/13/1, 28 December 1858.
- 6 E J Law, *Huddersfield in the 1820s*, Huddersfield Local History Society, 2009, p.36.
- 7 *LM*, 14 August 1848.
- 8 This is discussed further in chapter six.
- 9 L Browning & R K Senior, *The Old Yards of Huddersfield*, Huddersfield Civic Society, 2nd edition, 2004.
- 10 The 1851 census returns show that 53 per cent of the inhabitants of Castlegate were born in Huddersfield or the immediate surrounding district. A further 23 per cent were born in other parts of Yorkshire. 14 per cent were born in Ireland.
- 11 For examples see *HC*, 24 & 31 May 1851, 2 July & 6 August 1853, *HEx*, 1 May 1852 and *LM*, 8 November 1858. Children were particularly vulnerable in a variety of ways. For death due to fire-burns (*HC*, 25 March 1854 & 2 November 1867), drowning (*HC*, 13 July 1867) and overdose of Godfrey’s Cordial (*HC*, 10 February 1866).

- 12 *HC*, 25 March and 22 July 1854. Following her death, Morris's husband had to be kept in the police cells to ensure that he was sober for the inquest.
- 13 See for example *HC*, 7 February & 9 December 1854, 5 July 1856, 17 July 1858 & 9 July 1859.
- 14 *HC*, 8 December 1860. For other examples see 20 December 1851, 21 February 1857, 8 October 1859 & 11 January 1862. Hayley was not the only repeat offender. Another Castlegate butcher, Francis Senior, was prosecuted on a number of occasions.
- 15 J Burnett, *Plenty and Want: A Social History of Food in England from 1815 to the Present Day*, London, Routledge, 1989, esp. chapter ten.
- 16 See for example *LM*, 2 December 1848, *HC*, 16 October 1852, 15 April 1854 & 14 July 1866.
- 17 *LM*, 16 June 1849 and *HC*, 10 August 1850. See also the description of 'Castlegate and the courts and alleys branching out of it' where 'masses of people were crowded indiscriminately into lodging houses and rooms which possessed neither size, light nor air'. *LM*, 1 March 1851.
- 18 *HC*, 22 April 1854.
- 19 *HC*, 26 May 1855. Moran was again fined 5s (25p) for keeping an unregistered lodging house, 13 September 1856.
- 20 *HC*, 8 September & 8 December 1866.
- 21 *HEx*, 22 April 1854. For details of changes to licensing legislation see *B Harrison, Drink & the Victorians*, Keele University Press, 1994, esp. chapter fifteen.
- 22 Most cases were clear-cut but some appeared petty-minded. Thomas Binns, the landlord of the *Theatre Tavern*, also owned a small shop. He was seen during the hours of divine service by Inspector Thomas and charged accordingly. The magistrates fined him 5s (and costs) for selling mint drops to a little girl. *HC*, 7 June 1851.
- 23 Examples in the *HC* court reports include the *Talbot*, 24 August 1850, 26 April & 19 July 1851, 21 May, 20 August & 22 October 1853; the *Butchers' Arms* 22 February, 15 March, 2 August & 13 December 1851 and 7 February 1852; the *Blue Bell*, 24 May 1851 & 22 May 1852; the *Theatre Tavern*, 7 June & 6 September 1851. James Cayford, 26 April & 19 July, 1851, 21 May, 20 August & 22 October 1853 and 25 November 1855; John Tierney, 21 February, 1 May & 18 September 1852, 17 September 1853, 18 August 1855, and 4 & 11 February 1865; Nick Hannigan, 14 June & 11 December 1851 and 16 October 1842; and the Dearnleys, 15 March 1851, 31 January 1852, 8 January 1853, 11 March, 17 June, 12 August & 25 November 1854; 20 June 1857, 8 May 1858, 5 October 1861 & 12 December 1863.
- 24 *HC*, 17 May 1852. On occasion considerable sums were stolen. A Wyke cattle dealer was robbed of £84-10s (£84-50), *HC*, 9 June 1855.
- 25 *HC*, 15 March 1851.
- 26 *HC*, 23 September 1854. He was not alone in being rebuked. Joshua Stringer, robbed in the *All Nations* beerhouse by a local prostitute, was told by the magistrates that 'he ought not to go to such disreputable places', 30 January 1858 while 'an elderly gentleman' (whom the press let remain anonymous), who had come to Huddersfield from Ossett not only had his

- case dismissed but was described by the magistrates as ‘a remarkably stupid old man’. 16 October 1858.
- 27 *HC*, 18 August 1855.
- 28 See chapter six for a more detailed discussion.
- 29 *HC*, 6 September 1851. See also 25 January, 19 July, 2 August & 22 November 1851, 9 October 1852. See also *LM*, 2 September & 14 October 1848.
- 30 *HC*, 10 February 1855.
- 31 *LM*, 4 November 1848.
- 32 Townend and Sedgwick attempted to bring him to court but with limited success. Initially Heaton fared little better, achieving a successful prosecution in July 1848 but a modest fine of 5s (25p). *LM*, 15 July 1848. Heaton’s career as superintending constable is discussed in detail in Part 2, especially chapter seven.
- 33 *LM*, 8 June 1850.
- 34 *HC*, 19 July 1856.
- 35 *HC*, 21 February 1857.
- 36 *HC*, 24 January 1857 and 10 September 1859. *HEX*, 22 & 29 November 1862 & 10 December 1864.
- 37 *HC*, 29 November 1862.
- 38 *HC*, 26 July 1861.
- 39 *HC*, 26 July 1861.
- 40 *HC*, 24 October 1863.
- 41 Annual Report, 1863/4, September 1864 reported in *HC*, 4 February 1865.
- 42 *HEX*, 3 & 10 December 1864 & *HC*, 7 January 1865.
- 43 25Geo.II, c.36 An Act for the Better Preventing Thefts and Robberies and for Regulating Places of Public Entertainment, and Punishing Persons Keeping Disorderly Houses.
- 44 This was under legislation passed in 1818 during the reign of George III.
- 45 *HC*, 10 December 1864.
- 46 *HC*, 7 January 1865.
- 47 *Ibid.*
- 48 *Ibid.*
- 49 *HC*, 24 June 1865. See also *HEX*, 6 May 1865.
- 50 *HC*, 3 February 1866.
- 51 *HC*, 24 March 1866 and *HEX*, 24 March 1866.
- 52 *HEX*, 19 August 1865.
- 53 *LM*, 22 May 1847. Among three men sent for trial at York was John Sutcliffe, who was found not guilty.
- 54 *HC*, 17 April 1852.
- 55 *HC*, 27 August 1864.
- 56 *HC*, 27 April 1867 and for examples of ‘routine’ anti-police violence, see 26 April & 8 November 1851, 21 February & 11 December 1852, 4 November 1854, 19 February 1858, 31 January & 12 December 1863, & 23 April 1864.
- 57 Similarly, when Mary Curtis smashed the windows in PC Wilson’s house in Castlegate, she did so to be sent to prison. The magistrates obliged and she was sent to the Wakefield House of Correction for fourteen days. *HC*, 26 March 1853.
- 58 *HC*, 1 January 1853.
- 59 *HC*, 25 April 1857.

- 60 *HC*, 26 August 1865.
- 61 *HC*, 3 September 1864.
- 62 Cited in Law, *Huddersfield in the 1820s*, p.10.
- 63 *LM*, 8 August 1846.
- 64 See for example, R Swift, 'Another Stafford Street Row', *Immigrants and Minorities*, 3, 1984, pp.5–29, and D Taylor, 'Policing and the community: late-twentieth century myths and late-nineteenth century realities' in K Laybourn, ed., *Social Conditions, Status and Community*, Stroud, Sutton, 1997.
- 65 *LM*, 13 November 1847. See also *B.Obs*, 11 November 1847.
- 66 *HC*, 10 August and 21 September 1850. See also *HEX*, 23 September 1854. In a large crowd 'someone spoke a few words in Irish' and an attempted rescue ensued.
- 67 *HC*, 4 January 1862.
- 68 *HC*, 19 November 1864. The three men were each fined 5s (25p) and costs, making totals of 14s (70p), 15s (75p) and 16s (80p). In default they received one month's imprisonment. For other incidents in Upperhead Row and Manchester Street see 27 March & 20 November 1851, 31 July 1852, 29 July 1854, 28 July 1855, 30 March 1861, 9 April, 7 May & 11 July 1863, 1 October & 17 December 1864, 5 August 1865 & 20 July 1865.
- 69 *HC*, 26 November 1864.
- 70 21 members have been identified in the mid and late-1860s from the local press reports with a further likely 3 members, not all of whom would have been involved at the same time.
- 71 The local press also reported a Junior Irish Small Gang and a Girls Small Gang who emulated M'Cabe's gang, but details are very scant.
- 72 *HC*, 7 January 1865.
- 73 *HC*, 14 January & 14 October 1865 and *HEX*, 1 April 1865.
- 74 *HEX*, 14 October 1865.
- 75 *HC*, 4 & 25 March 1865, *HEX*, 24 June 1865, & *LM*, 3 March 1865.
- 76 *HC*, 14 January 1865. See also *HEX*, 16 September 1865.
- 77 *HC*, 31 December 1864. See also *HEX*, 14 October 1865 for another rooftop incident. For other stoning incidents see *HC*, 14 January & 16 September 1865.
- 78 *HC*, 6 April 1867.
- 79 *HC*, 15 January and 28 May 1870. The assault took place in Spread Eagle Yard where detective inspector White had confronted five men and three women.
- 80 *HC*, 14 November 1874. The words are those of Alderman Mellor at a Town Council meeting debating (and agreeing to) an increase in Withers' salary. The details cannot be explored here but it is worthy of note that Superintendent Hannan had struggled to bring gang members to justice because of the unwillingness of members of the public to provide information or give evidence in court, particularly while the M'Cabe brothers were on the scene.
- 81 The most spectacular outburst was in Honley in 1862. See chapter nine.
- 82 *HC*, 10 October 1863.
- 83 *HC*, 25 July 1858.

- 84 *HC*, 3 & 10 September and 26 November 1864.
- 85 *HC*, 9 December 1865 and 4 August, 22 & 29 September 1866. The problem was not unique to Huddersfield. Similar comments were made by the chief constables of Bradford and Leeds.
- 86 *LM*, 23 October 1869, though the Huddersfield detective is wrongly named as 'Pazman'.
- 87 Letter to *HC*, 4 September 1869.
- 88 *HC*, 28 August 1869.
- 89 *HC*, 11 & 18 December 1869.
- 90 *HC*, 26 July 1862. See also 25 July 1864, 18 March, 5 August & 4 November 1865 and 26 May & 2 June 1866.