10.5920/beerhouses.08

The Early Years of the West Riding County Constabulary

NOTWITHSTANDING ANY SUCCESS achieved by Heaton and his trusted parochial and paid constables, the national debate about policing had moved on in the mid-1850s and the superintending constable system had been found wanting.[1] Locally there remained doubts about the desirability of a county force. The *Chronicle* was concerned with the cost implications but a more principled opposition was mounted by the *Examiner*. In late 1855 it argued that 'there is still no reason for the introduction of the rural [county] police … [as] every township has the remedy in its own hand', namely to appoint a paid constable.[2] In language echoing the fears expressed in the debates about the Metropolitan police in the 1820s, it saw a rural police as a step towards 'espionage' and 'an approximation to the hateful interference of foreign despotisms'.[3] Three months later, the language became more forceful. Opposition to the first police bill was part of 'a continual struggle on the part of the people against the unjust, arbitrary and tyrannical proceedings of government'.[4] If passed the bill would lead to 'a vast spy system under the cloak of the defence of property … [and] confidence … would be destroyed and results similar to those consequent upon the police systems of the continent would be experienced in this country'.[5] The *Examiner* maintained a critical stance to the new police after the passing of the (second) bill but in many respects its fears were ill-founded. The new force that took responsibility for the policing of Upper Agbrigg was too small and too inefficient to create and enforce 'a vast spy system'. Its approach was largely pragmatic and, though there were significant outbreaks of anti-police sentiment in

10.5920/beerhouses.08

Honley and Holmfirth in 1862, these were exceptional. But first it is necessary to consider the basic characteristics of the local division of the WRCC.[6]

The passing of the County and Borough Police Act meant that from January 1857 the West Riding would have a county-wide police force. Parochial constables were not abolished immediately but the balance of responsibility for policing shifted decisively to the paid officers of the WRCC under its new chief constable, Lieutenant-Colonel Cobbe. Cobbe had an engineering and military background, which led (initially at least) to a dependence upon the experienced former Chief Constable of Lancashire, now Inspector of Constabulary, Colonel Woodford.[7] In his first report, Woodford praised Cobbe for selecting men 'with care and discrimination' and was confident that they showed 'promise of early efficiency … many having served with credit in other police forces'.[8] Sadly for Cobbe, Woodford's judgment was not wholly sound and, in the short-term at least, his confidence somewhat misplaced.

The WRCC was a large force, numbering just under 500 officers and men at inception and rising to over 650 by the late 1860s. The area for which it was responsible was considerable (over 1,600,000 acres) and the population (over 800,000) relatively large. As a consequence, both the police/population and police/acreage ratios were considerably higher than in Huddersfield. At the end of the period under consideration there was one policeman for every 2,235 acres and one for every 1,334 people; but these figures mask some important variations between the well-populated villages, such as Honley, Holmfirth, Kirkburton, Kirkheaton, Marsden and Meltham, and their outlying districts in which the population was well scattered. As a consequence, the police were more heavily outnumbered in the villages than the average figure might suggest and, therefore, had limited resources for the more remote areas. Furthermore, the police were also more scattered. Unlike the Huddersfield force, concentrated in a relatively small geographical area, the men of the WRCC were far more isolated from one another: a fact, easily overlooked, that had a major impact on the policing of a largely rural area. As Superintendent Heaton noted 'in the case of a disturbance, they [county policemen] could not rap the lamp-post and have a man come to their assistance immediately … officers in these isolated districts had a difficult and dangerous duty to perform'.[9]

10.5920/beerhouses.08

Twenty-one police districts, based on the county's petty sessional districts, were established, each with its own superintendent. In 1857, of the twenty-one divisions in the WRCC, eighteen were headed by men who had been superintending constables in previous years.[10] Cobbe relied heavily upon these men in setting up the new force. Heaton, for example, was specifically charged with the initial training of the recently-appointed constables, several of whom came from other forces, before they went out to their various stations in the Upper Agbrigg division. His extensive experience and local knowledge and his continuing active role ensured that there was no significant departure in terms of the priorities and practices of policing.

At the next level in the police hierarchy, inspectors, Cobbe looked outside the county. Of fifty-nine inspectors appointed in the first three years of the force, fifty-three (almost 90 per cent) already had police experience in other forces. The tactic was far from successful as almost half of these men either resigned, were dismissed or demoted.[11] In Upper Agbrigg the experience was of short tenures and some unsatisfactory appointments. With Heaton residing in Huddersfield at the County Court, the first inspector, thirty-five-year-old Thomas Parkin, was stationed at Holmfirth. Born in Sheffield, Parkin had served in the Blackburn borough force for over five years and a further five years in the Lancashire County Constabulary. He was one of the more promising appointments, so much so that in June 1858 he was recalled to headquarters in Wakefield and subsequently became a superintendent. His replacement was Joseph Haworth. A Lancastrian, aged forty, Howarth had served for fifteen years including just over one year in the Manchester City Police when he was appointed as a sergeant in the WRCC in April 1857. He was promoted inspector in October 1857 and moved to Upper Agbrigg in June 1858, becoming a first-class inspector in November 1859 when he was transferred to the Ainstie division. During his brief time at Holmfirth he did much to foster good relations between the new police and the people of Holmfirth. His successor, Seth Parker, was another ex-Lancashire County Constabulary man and altogether a flintier character. His aggressive action against local beerhouses was an important factor in precipitating the mass protests of 1862 (discussed in chapter nine) which led to his transfer out of the district.[12] His successor, William Airton, born in Skipton but having served briefly in the Met, did much to restore relations in the mid- and late-1860s and it is no

10.5920/beerhouses.08

coincidence that his work as inspector of nuisances and particularly his actions during the cattle plague won him local support. Of the two other inspectors who served in Upper Agbrigg there is little to say. Airton's successor, the successful career policeman, Walter Nunn, who had worked his way up from constable to inspector, moved to Upper Agbrigg in January 1868 but died shortly afterwards. Samuel Hockaday was promoted to inspector and transferred to Upper Agbrigg in July 1868 but was forced to resign six months later. In view of the importance of the position in the police hierarchy, and the need for good leadership at a time when many of the rank and file officers were inexperienced, the combination of brief tenure of office and poor performance (by some though not all inspectors) meant that this level of management was weak and added to the problem of creating an efficient and effective force.

In the lower ranks were several men from outside the county, including some from the longer-established Lancashire County Constabulary, but 69 per cent were born in Yorkshire. Almost half of the men recruited to the force as a whole had some previous policing experience. Recruits were drawn from a broad socio-economic spectrum but, unsurprisingly, almost a quarter of the men were from the textile trades. Labourers, however, were the largest occupational category in the police records. It is not clear whether overall the men of the WRCC conformed to 'the image of rural class relationships' that Steedman claims was commonplace across the country in the early years of the new county forces.[13] Like most forces, the WRCC experienced a high turnover rate. Around 40 per cent of early recruits left within a year (rising to over 50 per cent after two years). In the nearby and earlier-founded Lancashire County Constabulary, the percentages were almost identical. In the Buckinghamshire force the figures were 47 per cent and 62 per cent respectively for the year 1857, falling to 38 per cent and 61 per cent a decade later, and in Staffordshire 46 per cent and 72 per cent in 1856, falling to 43 per cent and 66 per cent a decade later.[14] Half of the early recruits to the WRCC resigned and another quarter were dismissed. Nonetheless, about a fifth served for sufficient time to retire on a pension, of whom some 40 were promoted to the rank of inspector. The percentage of resignations was higher in Lancashire (59 per cent for the period 1845–70), though the figure for dismissals was the same.[15]

10.5920/beerhouses.08

The main concern in this chapter is the Upper Agbrigg division from its establishment in 1857 to 1868 when its numbers were reduced as a consequence of the creation of the enlarged borough of Huddersfield. During this period 259 men served in Upper Agbrigg (two on two occasions, having left and then been re-appointed). 32 per cent gave their occupation as labourer (or farm labourer) and comprised the largest group in the force. Some 22 per cent of men were from a variety of textile trades (clothiers, spinners, weavers and wool-combers) and 26 per cent from a variety of trades (literally butchers, bakers and tallow chandlers but also cabinet makers and shoemakers). The remainder were drawn from various backgrounds, including gamekeepers and grooms, clerks and one teacher. There were also four men for whom 'no trade' was entered into the record. Almost two-third of recruits were in their twenties on appointment and one-third in their thirties. Eight experienced men were in their forties and one in his fifties; surprisingly there is one nineteen-year old recruit. Married men outnumbered single by a ratio of three to two and of these married men only a quarter had no family.[16] Cobbe placed particular value on married men, seeing them as more stable figures at a time when turnover rates were high. In addition, to prevent officers 'going native', he believed in recruiting (or deploying) men from outside the division in which they would be operating. Few men were recruited from the Huddersfield area, although almost half of the recruits were born in the West Riding and a further 20 per cent elsewhere in Yorkshire. Of the remainder, 10 per cent were from Lancashire, 10 per cent from other northern English counties, 7 per cent from the rest of England and 6 per cent from other parts of the United Kingdom; the bulk from Ireland, but one man had been born in Bombay.

Given Cobbe's preference for men of experience, especially in the earliest years of the WRCC, it is not surprising to find that 137 men (52 per cent of the total) had previous police or military experience. Surprisingly, only ten of these had served in the Lancashire County Constabulary – almost exactly the same number who had been paid or parochial officers under the previous superintending regime. Previous police experience had been gained most commonly in the northern city forces – Manchester, Bradford, Leeds and Liverpool. There were a few men (five in all) with experience of the Met – the same number as had served in Halifax – but there is little evidence to suggest that there was a flood of men from the Huddersfield force,

10.5920/beerhouses.08

attracted (as Cobbe claimed) by higher wages: only two men who had served in Huddersfield were appointed to the Upper Agbrigg division.[17] On closer examination, this previous police experience was less than impressive, some men having served only weeks, even days, before leaving. In total, 30 per cent of men with previous experience had served less than one year. However, more than half had been in a force for between one and four years and only 16 per cent had served for more than five years.

The lengths of service and career outcomes for the policemen of Upper Agbrigg are summarised in tables 8.1 and 8.2 below. Table 8.1 distinguishes between the time policemen served in Upper Agbrigg and their overall length of service in the WRCC, thereby taking into account transfers within the force. There was clearly a high turnover of men – half served less than one year in the WRCC and only 14 per cent for more than five years. However, this obscures the divisional experience. In Upper Agbrigg almost three in five men served for less than a year and a mere one in twenty recruits went on to serve in the district for more than five years.

Table 8.1: Upper Agbrigg: length of service, 1857-68

	CAREERS IN UPPER AGBRIGG	CAREERS IN WRCC
Less than 1 year	*59%*	*50%*
One year but less than 5	*36%*	*36%*
5 years and above	*5%*	*14%*
	100%	*100%*

Source: West Riding Police Records, Examination Books

The figures, as they stand, do not take into account prior experience with the WRCC before transfer to Upper Agbrigg. Making this adjustment increases the percentage of men serving over five years by 3-4 percentage points, and reduces the percentage of men serving less than one year by 4-5 percentage points. (The figure for those serving more than one but less than five years increases by one percentage point.) Nonetheless, the figures remain stark: over a half of recruits left within the first year and only a small percentage became long-serving men.

10.5920/beerhouses.08

Table 8.2: Upper Agbrigg: career outcomes, 1857-68

	COMPLETED CAREERS	ALL MEN
Resigned	*37%*	*30%*
Dismissed	*29%*	*24%*
Transferred	*32%*	*26%*
Dies or killed	*2%*	*2%*
In service 1868	*n.a.*	*18%*
	100%	*100%*

Source: As for Table 8.1

The inclusion of the 'In service' category in table 8.2 explains the differences between the two columns of figures. The high percentage of resignations and dismissals is not significantly out of line with experiences in other county forces in their early years, if anything it is marginally better than many. However, the importance of transfers should be stressed. A significant number of men ended their police careers in Upper Agbrigg because they were transferred elsewhere. The reasons for such transfers were varied. In some cases it was due to a promotion, in others to a demotion. Whatever the reason, transfers added to the high rates of turnover and to the problem of acquiring knowledge of a particular area. There were unresolved tensions in the recruitment and deployment strategies adopted in the WRCC. There was a trade-off between the desire to have men independent of the district they policed and the need for local knowledge; similarly, there was a tension between the stability brought by married officers and the disruption they and their families faced through repeated transfers.

In view of the emphasis on the introduction of the new police in the district, the experience of the first cohort of recruits (the men appointed in December 1856 and January 1857) has been analysed separately and is summarised in Tables 8.3 and 8.4.

Of the twelve men with previous police experience, four came from the superintending constable system, including Thomas Heaton. The rest had served with local police forces (Halifax, Oldham and Leeds). By far the most experienced man was Abraham Sedgwick, who had served eleven years in the Huddersfield force. Only one

10.5920/beerhouses.08

other man came close to this, John Ward, a Leeds-born man who had served seven years in the Met. In total there were only seven men (excluding Heaton) who had more than three years' police experience when they were sent to Upper Agbrigg. Three-quarters of the new men had no previous police experience. In addition, the overwhelming majority came from outside the division and would have had little or no local knowledge. This presented a daunting task for Heaton, whose responsibility it was to train these men. In view of their inexperience, it is unsurprising to find that almost two-thirds had left by the end of 1857. Not all of these were inexperienced men. Earnshaw, the long-serving Holmfirth constable, was dismissed after five months and Ward retired after nine months.[18]

Table 8.3: Upper Agbrigg 1st Police Cohort: previous police experience and place of birth

	PREVIOUS	EXPERIENCE		
Army		*Police*		*% Police experience*
	Less than 1 year	*1 year but less than 5*	*5 years and over*	
2	*2*	*5*	*5*	*25*
	PLACE	OF BIRTH	*(as %)*	
Upper Agbrigg	*Other West Riding*	*Other Yorkshire*	*North-west England*	*All others*
10	*44*	*25*	*15*	*6*

Source: As for Table 8.1

Table 8.4: Upper Agbrigg 1st Police Cohort: length of service and career outcomes

LENGTH OF SERVICE	NUMBER		CAREER OUTCOME	NUMBER	
Less than 1 year	*30*	*61%*	*Resigned*	*18*	*37%*
1 year but less than 5	*12*	*24%*	*Dismissed*	*13*	*27%*
5 years but less than 10	*4*	*8%*	*Died*	*2*	*4%*
10 and above	*3*	*6%*	*Transferred*	*12*	*24%*
			In service	*4*	*8%*

Source: As for Table 8.1

10.5920/beerhouses.08

It is worth noting that six of the thirty men who served for less than a year were transferred out of Upper Agbrigg. Overall, the figures for the first cohort, while not significantly out of line with those for all men serving in Upper Agbrigg, bring out clearly the scale of the problems facing Heaton. Few men had meaningful previous police experience, large numbers left within a short period of time and, consequently, few acquired experience and became long-serving officers in the district. There was a further logistical difference, which was both a blessing and a curse for Heaton. As superintending constable, he had about a dozen reliable men with whom he could work; as newly-appointed superintendent of the Upper Agbrigg division of the WRCC, he had (at any one time) over forty men under his command, many of whom were not efficient constables, and the core of reliable men at his disposal was probably little higher than it had been before 1856. The problem of recruiting and retaining good men remained unsolved a decade later. Even the Inspector of Constabulary, prone to putting a favourable gloss on matters where possible, noted in 1866 'the difficulty of procuring properly-qualified men for service in the police [which had been] so recently aggravated by the high rates of wages now paid for labour'. Indeed, he felt there was 'a danger of the service [in the county] becoming seriously impaired'.[19] Thus, one of the most striking similarities between the 'old' policing of the early 1850s and the new policing of the late-1850s and early-1860s in the West Riding of Yorkshire was the number of relatively ill-educated, ill-disciplined and often incompetent men charged with the responsibility of policing

Table 8.5: Upper Agbrigg: length of service 1868

LENGTH OF SERVICE	UPPER AGBRIGG ONLY		UPPER AGBRIGG & PREVIOUS WRCC EXPERIENCE	
	Number	*%*	*Number*	*%*
Less than 1 year	*5*	*10*	*3*	*6*
1 year but less than 5	*16*	*33*	*14*	*29*
5 years but less than 10	*18*	*38*	*16*	*33*
10 or more	*9*	*19*	*15*	*31*
Totals	*48*	*100%*	*48*	*99%*

Source: As for Table 8.1

10.5920/beerhouses.08

their local community. Only gradually did matters improve but by the late-1860s there had been some significant developments, as Table 8.5 shows. The percentage of inexperienced men (serving less than a year) was appreciably lower while the numbers with five or more years' experience had increased significantly. Even though experience did not automatically ensure efficiency, this was a stronger force than a decade previous.

The arrival of county constables aroused considerable local interest. The regional press, notably the *Leeds Examiner* and the *Leeds Time*, both unsympathetic towards the newly-formed WRCC, seized upon examples of popular hostility in various parts of the county, including the Huddersfield district. Notwithstanding the experience of more intrusive policing before 1857, the arrival of the 'raw recruits' of the WRCC gave rise to a 'popular feeling of dislike [of] the county police' in certain quarters.[20] Concerns were expressed at 'paltry' and 'trumpery' charges and 'intermeddling cruelty', particularly the excessive use of handcuffs.[21] Robert Storch concluded from evidence such as this and drawn from various parts of the West Riding, that 'the imposition of a modern, uniformed police [in 1857] called forth a bitter and often violent response … [but] … once the police were successfully entrenched the open warfare of initial contact was replaced by a state that one may characterize as armed truce', albeit one that could be broken and 'more or less open warfare' resumed.[22] In fact, a detailed examination of the local (Huddersfield) press reveals a more complex picture in Upper Agbrigg which points to somewhat different conclusions both in the short- and longer-term.

The first detachment of the new force had arrived in Huddersfield in January 1857 to meet Heaton for training before being sent out to various nearby villages. From the strengthening of the police presence it was hoped that 'the numerous depredations in the out-townships will thereby be held in salutary check'.[23] Such optimism overlooked the inexperienced nature of the new force. Furthermore, the simple fact of a significant increase in police personnel threatened the *modus vivendi* between police and policed that had developed in the previous decade. Initially, there was no dramatic increase in the volume of anti-police activity in 1857, particularly taking into account the sharp increase in police numbers. Further, and more importantly, much of the reported anti-police behaviour was of a highly localised nature and the *overall* popular response was less

10.5920/beerhouses.08

hostile than previously suggested. The local response was mixed and there is little evidence that there was any attempt to drive out the 'new' police. There was magisterial concern that 'in Longwood and other places a number of lawless characters had determined in every possible way to interfere with the police, with the view of driving them out'.[24] However, there is little direct evidence of such intent. In an isolated incident in Longwood, James Maud attacked Sergeant Caygill, declaring 'he would drive the police out of Longwood as they were determined to have no policemen there' but no support materialised.[25] There were clashes with the new police on a number of occasions in the old trouble-spot of Lindley, where in 1859 according to Heaton, 'the police [were] shockingly treated', though there were also positive comments about the behaviour of the new police in the village. There was continuing hostility in Deighton, another problematic area for the old parish constables.[26] There was open hostility here to the newly-arrived county police officers, PCs Firth and Ward, who were the victims of a savage attack in March 1857 by two men they had previously arrested for drunkenness. The claim by the defendants that they were now more determined 'to oppose the authority of "the gentleman in blue" who have been recently stationed in the village' led the Huddersfield bench to make 'a marked example' and imposed a fine and costs that amounted to the considerable sum of £13-8*s*-6*d* (£13-42½). The *Chronicle,* in an editorial, praised the magistrates for their 'signal example of severity … imperatively called for against such brutality and lawlessness' but overlooked the significance of the fact that the fine was paid shortly after a collection had been made.[27] Heaton conceded that 'there were a number of lads and men in the villages who took it upon themselves to do all they could to annoy the police.[28] The 'annoyance' took various forms. In Golcar the newly-installed policeman was assaulted, while in Upper Mill a crowd rescued a prisoner from the police; at the Honley Feast there was a serious assault on one of the local policeman while in Crosland Moor, during a stang-riding* protest, the 'mob made a dead set at

* Stang riding was a form of 'rough music' that is, a cacophonous and mocking ritual directed at individuals who transgressed community norms of morality. A representation of the offending individual(s), astride a long pole, or stang, was carried on men's shoulders, while a crowd beat pots and pans, cheered and even threw mud and other unpleasant substances. For more detail see E P Thompson, *Custom in Commo*n, London, Penguin, 1993, chapter eight.

10.5920/beerhouses.08

the police', but in Slaithwaite the police were criticized merely for doing 'nothing but walk the streets in their smart dresses and clean, spotless shoes'. In Kirkheaton sporadic trouble continued but in Kirkburton, somewhat surprisingly, it was claimed that 'few have proved more favourable to the new county force than the inhabitants of Kirkburton and neighbourhood' while in Meltham they were welcomed for their success in 'quelling the disorderly rows that have so long been the disgrace of that village'.[29] In other parts of the district no popular response – positive or negative – can be found in the pages of the local press.[30] The *Examiner* was (unsurprisingly) more critical of the new county police. There had been no love lost between the paper and Heaton as superintending constable and less as the new superintendent of the Upper Agbrigg division.[31] More generally, it focused on the inferiority of the county police and their preoccupation with trivial cases – the latter charge also made by the *Chronicle*.[32]

Nor did attitudes change significantly in the following years. The police continued to be unpopular particularly in Lindley, in 'the semi-civilized neighbourhood of Kirkheaton' and 'among the ruthless-looking desperadoes … [from] the wild region around Scammonden'. Their attempts to curb out-of-hours drinking and suppress cockfighting in and around Kirkburton and Holmfirth also provoked a number of violent responses. Around Jackson Bridge in the summer of 1858 the police were subjected to Saturday-night attacks by 'parties secreted on the way side, in readiness with stones, bludgeons etc'. As a consequence 'officers have resigned their duties, not daring to risk their lives in so perilous a district' but this was an exceptional and short-lived occurrence.[33] Violent incidents are scattered through the district throughout the 1860s. Four men were charged with assaulting PC Stansfield in Golcar; in Paddock ten men were arrested for stoning the police; PC Redman was attacked by three men at Lockwood Feast; and PC Long was attacked outside the *Cavalry Arms* in Birchincliffe, where one of his assailants called out: 'Come up here you ------, and I'll kill you.'[34] Undoubtedly there were those who held personal grudges against individual policemen. When Henry Sanderson, better known as 'Red Harry' was arrested in Holmfirth for assaulting two constables who had served him with a warrant for non-payment of rates, he told PC Rhodes ''Ov Ow'd thee a grudge an ol pay thee off afore theea goas 'yoat o' this heease'.[35] Certain places remained hostile to the police

10.5920/beerhouses.08

but in many of the out-townships there was a general if begrudging acceptance of the new county police; while in some villages, such as Honley, the demands were for more, rather than less, police action.[36]

Assaults on the police made good copy but to focus solely on manifestations of anti-police sentiment would be to paint a misleading picture. Police work – in Upper Agbrigg as much as in Huddersfield itself – covered a wide range of activities, many of which minimised and marginalised outright opposition, even winning more positive support. The crime-fighting activities of the county force rarely encompassed major crimes. Indictable offences were infrequent in Upper Agbrigg. In the late 1860s just under ten percent of all the recorded crime fell into this category and over fifty per cent of these were simple larcenies. The most frequent summary offences were begging and vagrancy (about a quarter of the total), assaults (about a fifth of the total) and then drunkenness. In the late 1860s there were as many arrests for 'family' offences (disobeying bastardy orders and neglect of family) as for common assaults. Many of these offences were largely uncontentious, the police themselves acting in response to and on behalf of victims, but were less commonly reported than more spectacular incidents. Further, certain police actions appeared positive to many Victorians, irrespective of class. In hindsight the vagrants of Victorian Britain appear more as pathetic figures, often undeserving losers in a socio-economic order that offered little protection for the unskilled and misfortunate but, at the time, such footloose, wandering people were seen as a major threat to settled society. In this sense, the police were working very much with the grain of contemporary beliefs (or prejudices) and thus their role as protectors against a threatening 'other' was seen as necessary for the wider good of society. The police also took on responsibilities as inspectors of nuisances – though this could bring them into conflict with certain propertied individuals – and, in the mid-1860s agricultural crisis, enforced regulations under the Contagious Diseases Acts that were designed to protect the wider economy of rural Britain from the threat of rinderpest, pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease. Police work also extended to 'welfare' activities, such as the easily-caricatured concern for lost or abandoned children.

Nonetheless, not all routine policing was uncontentious. Concerns with order and decorum, not confined to the urban middle classes, gave rise to conflict as traditional activities and events

10.5920/beerhouses.08

were subject to greater scrutiny. As the police became increasingly involved in curbing drinking, gambling and cockfighting, and in ensuring order at customary celebrations, such as local feasts, the scope for conflict between police and many working-class men and women (and some middle-class people as well) increased. And it was not simply a matter of inculcating new notions of order and decorum. There was an unchallenged consensus among local senior police officers and magistrates that beerhouses were a major and ongoing source of criminality and that annual village feasts provided a site for immorality and an opportunity for criminality. The police, it was argued, had a central role to play in curbing such licentious and illegal behaviour that threatened respectable, civilized society. Heaton, whose personal enthusiasm in the early 1850s has already been noted, continued to set the tone as superintendent and many of his men responded energetically. Beerhouse keepers and publicans were prosecuted for selling liquor out of hours in every village in the district though, as in Huddersfield certain men were regular attenders at the local courts. Increasingly the emphasis was on the 'crusade' against gambling, which was seen to be particularly pernicious.[37] But, in rural districts, bringing to justice landlords who permitted gambling on their premises was not easy. William Corden, an energetic sergeant, was able to prosecute successfully John Whiteley, an innkeeper from Scammonden, but only with some difficulty. With two other men, he hid himself near the inn, and 'having placed a ladder against an upstairs window … heard one of the men say "we'll play for another quart"'. On another occasion, also in Scammonden, 'the constables [Corden and two PCs] lifted each other up to get a glimpse into the room through a crevice in the blind'.[38] They then quietly entered the house and arrested the miscreants who were 'tossing' and 'marrying' each other, that is gambling together. In similar style PCs Lucas and Wardle arrested gamblers who had been 'throwing the dart' for beer' at the *Stafford Arms* beerhouse in Kirkheaton, after looking through an ill-fitting blind.[39] More problematic, but common in the more outlying districts, was 'lakin' for brass' [playing for money] in fields and bye-ways. Such events were well organised. In Lockwood between thirty and forty young men would meet regularly in a field to play pitch and toss, paying a young boy to stand watch for 3*d*. (1p) an hour. After numerous complaints and several unsuccessful attempts, the police finally managed to arrest thirteen men. The police had

10.5920/beerhouses.08

gone in 'disguise' (that is, in plain clothes) and had hidden behind the 'Standing stones' above Lockwood reservoir, waiting for an opportunity to catch the gamblers unawares. Eventually the watch left his position and the arrests were made.[40] Even more dramatic was the arrest of gamblers near Nettleton Hill, Longwood, coordinated by Sergeant Corden. On three previous Sundays the police had tried and failed but eventually their perseverance paid off. The police 'were dressed in blue slop, so as to imitate weavers as much as possible' but seeing a look-out, Corden advised his men to 'back off the moor'. The first attempt to capture the gamblers involved 'one of the officers mounting a donkey'. Quite what he was meant to do is unclear but he 'succeeded in coming within sixty yards of the spot where the men were playing 'shake cap'**, but the watch whistled a warning and the police retreated. The gamblers brazenly continued, which provoked Corden to order direct action. Several of the 'boys in blue slops' advanced along the footpath and asked the watch 'if the hounds were out'. Failing to recognise that the would-be gamblers were in fact officers of the law, the unsuspecting watch allowed the disguised police to proceed, having generously told them that the dogs were lower down the hill. Seven men were arrested and fined but they 'treated the matter with much levity, and said they could easily club up the money'.[41] Others were less successful. PC Wardle, of whom more later, tried and failed on several occasions to catch Sunday gamblers in Kirkheaton.

While undoubtedly police (and magisterial) priorities brought the police into conflict with men and women who felt that their legitimate pastimes were being criminalized, much depended upon the actions of the individual constable. A constable was very fortunate not to be assaulted at least once in the course of his normal duties but some men were more (often much more) unpopular than others. The experienced Abraham Sedgwick was one such man. When in the Huddersfield force he had been attacked on at least six occasions. As a sergeant in the WRCC he was subject to a number of serious attacks. Such was the beating he received at the Bath Hotel, Lockwood, during Honley Feast that he had to take time off work; a year later, this time at Meltham Feast, he was the victim of another

** A variant of pitch and toss in which half-pennies were put in a cap and the participants took it in turn to shake them out and won any coins that came down 'heads'.

10.5920/beerhouses.08

brutal assault. Then a few days later he, and two other officers, were attacked by a crowd of 200 people. There were cries of 'Go into him' and 'Punch him well' as Sedgwick was 'thrown down, kicked and ill-used'. Again, he was rendered unfit for duty and confined to bed for several days.[42] It is difficult to get to the bottom of these events but a later incident is more illuminating. In late November 1863 Sergeant Sedgwick was moving on a crowd of men at 12.30 a.m. when they turned on him. Arrests were made and the case heard before the town magistrates but this time there was a counter claim of police violence. This in itself was not unprecedented but the magistrates made it clear that 'they deprecated on the part of policemen anything like officiousness such as was likely to promote a demonstration against them'.[43] This was not the only time that the magistrates criticised police behaviour. Indeed, on a number of occasions they made clear that in their opinion the police had used excessive force. Equally telling was the response in the courtroom. The magistrates' words were warmly received and those charged made it clear their hostility towards Sedgwick.

Sedgwick, a close friend of Heaton was, as far as one can judge, zealous, albeit to the point of officiousness, but other members of the force were guilty of dishonesty as well as of using excessive force. The local magistrates were outspoken on a number of occasions. Four men were charged with attacking the police in a brawl outside the *Junction Inn,* Golcar, but when the evidence had been heard the magistrates were scathing. The police 'case had miserably failed and … the officers and the defendants ought to change places'. PC Stansfield, they continued, was responsible for 'one of the grossest assaults, in the unwarrantable use of the staff' heard in court.[44] In Stansfield's case this appears to have been a one-off incident but there were other officers who were reprimanded on more than one occasion. One such was PC Thomas Manuel, who came to the WRCC after serving three years in the army and four-and-a-half years in the Lancashire County Constabulary. He served in Upper Agbrigg from 1857 to 1862 before he was transferred to another division. Soon after his arrival he arrested James Garside, accusing him of being drunk and disorderly at midnight in Lindley. Garside had an alibi and openly accused Manuel of lying. The case was dismissed but the magistrate, in a somewhat tongue in cheek manner, observed that 'the officer might have been mistaken as to the time he had seen the defendant'. [45] Manuel soon became an

10.5920/beerhouses.08

unpopular figure in Lindley – 'the d----d Irish b-----' in the words of (the unrelated) Benjamin Garside, whom Manuel had arrested on a previous occasion.[46] In the summer of 1859 he was assaulted on three separate occasions and again in 1860. Manuel's unpopularity was borne out by the severity of the beatings he received. The *Chronicle*, aware of his reputation for unreliable evidence, noted 'the most convincing part of the evidence was the exhibition of a plastered nose which [Manuel] stated had been severely injured by the defendant throwing a stone at him'.[47] This time the magistrates believed him but in at least one previous case they so doubted Manuel's evidence that the case was dismissed.[48] Matters came to a head in the following year. The *Chronicle,* under the heading 'Cruel Treatment Of A Prisoner By A Policeman: Important Case', reported on the charge of cruelty brought against PC Manuel, who had kept Joseph Bottomley prisoner 'in a damp and loathsome cellar' and in handcuffs for eight hours. Bottomley's case was made by none other than 'Mr. Roberts of Manchester', the well-known scourge of the new police. The case had aroused considerable attention locally and 'it was unmistakably evident that the sympathies of the majority of those present were on the side of the plaintiff'.[49] Manuel denied that he had been removed from Lindley because of his violence but the magistrates were unconvinced and awarded £10 to Bottomley. More significantly, one told the open court that it was not for the first time he had had occasion to say in Court … that the police of the West Riding Constabulary had … made use of their powers in a most excessive manner'.[50]

An equally problematic figure was Sergeant Obed Caygill, who came to Upper Agbrigg having been demoted from the rank of inspector because of inefficiency. Although another Lancastrian, he had served nine years in the Bradford force. A long-standing teetotaller, Caygill was the epitome of Storch's 'domestic missionary'. The zeal with which he prosecuted innkeepers and beerhouse keepers, gamblers and 'nude' racers matched that of Heaton. As melodramatic in style as his superintendent, he dashed into a beerhouse in Scammonden, explaining that 'his suspicions were aroused by the mistress "swelling past him" through a dark passage towards the door of an inner room, at which she gave a peculiar knock'.[51] He followed, forced open the door and found eleven men playing cards. Even more dramatic was his arrest for gambling at the *Wool Pack Inn*, Deighton. Passing the inn between two and three in the

10.5920/beerhouses.08

morning, 'significant words and sounds greeted his ears – "hearts", "diamonds", "clubs" etc. were the words occasionally attuned; the chink of money relieved the monotony, and a shuffling as of cards filled up the interval'.[52] Unwilling to act alone, he obtained the assistance of another constable and

> together they set stealthily to work and removed the shutters; they next quietly opened the window, drew aside the curtain, and then contemplated the puzzled countenances of the party within, who until the change of scene was complete had been unaware of the pantomime part taken by the two blue-coated actors.[53]

In another case that gained local notoriety he and PC Manuel staked out the *Globe Inn* at Slaithwaite. At 10.30 p.m. they saw some thirty men 'drunk and creating a great noise'; returning at eleven-forty p.m. not only were they singing but also cursing and swearing. Unfortunately, the men concerned were members of the Slaithwaite hunt and had been attending their hunt supper. Such was the social standing of the men involved that the case was withdrawn. Caygill's unpopularity extended beyond the Slaithwaite hunt. He was the victim of several assaults and there were recurring accusations of his 'cruel, wanton and unnecessary … violence'.[54] And yet there appeared to be a positive end to an otherwise negative career. On the 13th of December 1862 the *Chronicle* reported on a presentation to Sergeant Obed Caygill at Linthwaite of a silver watch and a 'massive' silver chain, 'subscribed for by the inhabitants of that locality [as a] tribute to the high character and consistent discharge of duty which has marked Sergeant Caygill's residence in that locality.' In a reference to the Honley riot (discussed in chapter nine) the report saw 'the event [as] a pleasing contrast to what had transpired recently … and proves that there are men in the Force whose deserving conduct is deemed worthy of special recognition by the inhabitants amongst whom they are stationed'.[55] There was only one problem: the report had been made up by Caygill himself. He was required to resign.

William Corden was another active officer, involved in numerous prosecutions for licensing offences, gambling and the like in and around Golcar and Slaithwaite but, unlike Caygill, he was never attacked during his nine-years of service, notwithstanding the fact that he was as much involved in 'domestic missionary' policing as Caygill. Nonetheless, on his departure to become an inspector in Barnsley,

10.5920/beerhouses.08

Corden was (genuinely) presented with a watch inscribed by 'a number of friends at Golcar' and at a presentation made at the *Rose & Crown Hotel*, Golcar Hill, he was praised for his 'straightforward and upright conduct' and 'a private life without blemish'.[56] It is not without significance that he was active as inspector of nuisances for Golcar and played an active role in enforcing the cattle plague regulations in 1866.[57] In a telling aside, a report on the fifth annual bowling match at Slaithwaite Bath Spa noted that 'Police-sergeant Corden [was] frequently applauded during the play'.[58] Here was living proof that involvement in community life need not involve 'going native' but, to the contrary, could strengthen the standing of the police.

Corden was not alone in winning support through his positive contribution to local life, both on and off duty. Sergeant Thomas Greenwood was a similar example of pragmatic policing. Greenwood had already served over five years in the police (mainly in Halifax) before joining the WRCC as a sergeant in late 1858. Probably because of his experience he was stationed at Slaithwaite and was responsible for policing in one of the more difficult areas. He had a reputation as 'an active officer' and was praised for his vigilance in a number of major cases (including horse theft and arson) but, like most officers, spent much of his time dealing with more banal incidents of out-of-hours drinking, gambling and clothes-line thefts – although his arrests had none of the flamboyance of Caygill's – and on a number of occasions, responded to requests from landlords or landladies to deal with obstreperous customers. His career was not without incident (he was attacked on a number of occasions) or blemish (he was criticised by magistrates for exceeding his duty in a poaching case) but he did not attract the opprobrium, let alone hatred, that surrounded some of his fellow officers. Quite why this was the case is not easy to explain from the limited evidence available but his handling of an out-of-hours drinking offence in 1864 provides some insight. The *Great Western Inn* at 'Top o'Stannedge' was located in one of the more remote parts of the district above Marsden. For many years the landlady was Hannah Rhodes, who was known for her cavalier attitude towards licensing hours. Affectionately known as 'Mother Rhodes' (in the 1850s) and 'Nanny Rhodes' (in the 1860s), her hospitality made the *Great Western Inn* a popular destination for day-trippers from Huddersfield, Sunday-school outings and even the occasional wedding party, but she was a serial offender with regard to the licensing laws. From a police perspective the problem

10.5920/beerhouses.08

was twofold. First, there was the question of resource allocation. There were enough public houses and beerhouses in Marsden and Slaithwaite to occupy the time of the police without worrying about Stannedge but the police could not totally ignore persistent flouting of the law. Second, any police action against a popular figure carried the risk of being counterproductive. When Greenwood acted in the summer of 1864 he proceeded with considerable tact. The evidence was clear-cut: over twenty people were drinking out of hours on Sunday afternoon when he visited but he made great play of his reluctance to take action – he told the court that he was 'personally unwilling to get the old lady into trouble [but was] compelled by duty to report what he saw' – and also stressed the generosity of 'Nanny Rhodes' – I have 'reason to believe that Nanny's accommodating disposition induces her occasionally to offer house-room to parties "turned out" at proper time on Sunday afternoon from the public houses in Marsden and the valley below,' he explained. As Greenwood well knew this was a fiction but it had the effect of defusing a potential problematic situation. Further, his general approach, as much reactive as proactive, also helped minimise hostility. In addition, he was another officer who took on wider responsibilities, for example as inspector of nuisances, which strengthened the welfare role of the police. Greenwood was not a paragon of virtue, nor could he avoid conflict, especially when breaking up prize fights, as he did on at least two occasions, but his career demonstrates that it was possible to be an active officer without antagonising large swathes of the local population. Unlike certain of his fellow-officers he was able to minimise and even marginalise opposition to police work, aspects of which inevitably impinged on popular leisure activities.

Sergeants such as Corden and Greenwood were important, not least in the example they set, in establishing the presence of the newly-formed WRCC. However, more important were the ordinary constables who were responsible for the bulk of interactions between the police and the public. Unfortunately, most of these interactions went unrecorded, and even where there is some evidence it is often so fragmentary that it is difficult to reconstruct a picture of the manner in which the new police went about their daily business. It is impossible to say how many constables were 'inoffensive and civil' like Constable Reuben Redmond.[59] Similarly, one does not know why members of the public came to the assistance of constables

10.5920/beerhouses.08

under attack – but they did. When Redmond was attacked by two men in the *Swan Inn*, Lockwood members of the public came to his aid, even taking him into a private house to await treatment.[60] Similarly when Constable William Holmes was attacked by the belligerent William Dyson, alias 'Bull Head', outside the *Star Inn*, Slaithwaite, three men helped him arrest his assailant.[61] Elsewhere, constables appear to have been viewed with something akin to affection. One such example is Robert Wardle, who served first in Berry Brow and finally in Kirkheaton in a career which lasted from the mid-1850s to the mid-1880s. Wardle was not a high flier but he soon established himself as a well-liked and respected figure, having 'a high character for vigilance and activity, although he was *neither a harsh nor a meddling officer*'.[62] However, soon after his appointment, his career almost ended in tragedy. Investigating suspicious noises in the wood above the *Grove Inn*, Steps Mill, he was set upon by two men who threw him over a wall into a quarry. He fell some twenty-five feet, landing on stones and fracturing his right thigh and elbow. Fortuitously, his groans were heard by two workmen returning home on the old turnpike road below. The viciousness of the attack appears to have won him sympathy.[63] It was not the last time he was assaulted. Called to the assistance of Constable Antrobus during the Honley riot, he was stoned by the angry crowd of villagers. On two other occasions he was violently attacked but both resulted from his intervention in cases of domestic violence.[64] However, for much of his long and unspectacular career, Wardle was 'a steady and efficient officer' but not one to assert himself in the manner of a Corden or a Greenwood. Although he made the occasional arrest for gaming in local beerhouses, many of his arrests were for careless driving, hawking without a license, sleeping rough or obstruction of the highway. He was known locally as 'Robert', a policeman who liked a drink, but one who tended to 'live and let live', exemplified by his somewhat dilatory approach to gambling in Kirkheaton. In that sense, his success came via low-intensity policing in which rigorous enforcement of the law was traded off against tolerance of the police. If Wardle struck an acceptable balance (and he was not criticised by his superiors for his inefficiency), not all men did. Exemplifying the fears that Colonel Cobbe had expressed from the outset, Constable William Booth was charged by Superintendent Heaton for neglect of duty, his conduct being 'very improper and

10.5920/beerhouses.08

unbecoming an officer.' As Heaton explained, Booth 'began to mix with the inhabitants instead of attending to his duty'.[65]

It would be simplistic to see the development of policing simply in terms of 'good cops' and 'bad cops'. Broader socio-economic inequalities, gender and class assumptions, the class orientation of the law and courts and the general expectations of the police created a context in which the individual constable operated and imposed constraints on his actions. Equally important were the practical realities of policing in a rural district characterised by scattered habitations and harsh landscapes. Nevertheless, the individual and his use of discretion was important and could have a critical impact on the relationship between police and policed, as will become even more apparent when the events of summer 1862 in Honley and Holmfirth are considered. Overall there was no Storchian 'open warfare', but there were signs that a new and enduring *modus vivendi* between police and policed was emerging, though yet to be fully established. Incidents of police violence still occurred but less often in the mid- to late-1860s; concerns remained about 'bad judgment' by the police but, again, fewer as time passed. The excessive use of handcuffs and other restraints on men and particularly on women as they were marched or carried by cart to the county police station in Huddersfield aroused popular anger in the late-1850s, less so in the late-1860s, not least because of the opening of new stations (or police houses with cells) that reduced the need to move the arrested long distances through the streets.[66] In broad terms, the police were becoming more disciplined but also more aware of the limits of their power in practice. They were also developing priorities that fitted better with popular concerns (most notably dealing with beggars and vagrants) and extending their role beyond narrow crime-fighting to broader 'welfare' concerns but, while progress was made towards a workable and working policed society, unresolved problems remained. There were still incidents of the police being openly insulted in the streets, their windows smashed and even their gardens vandalised. [67] More worryingly, there was also clear evidence of an unwillingness to cooperate with the police. As Heaton recognised, there was 'a great reluctance manifested by people to come forward to give evidence along with the police'.[68] Even when people appeared in court there was an ongoing problem of 'hardswearing' or giving false testimony, 'frequently resorted to by witnesses for the purpose of clearing their friends from the charges brought against

10.5920/beerhouses.08

them by the police'.[69] Further, notwithstanding the progress made in the early years of the WRCC, the relationship between police and public remained relatively shallow-rooted and fragile as the events in Honley and Holmfirth in 1862 were to demonstrate. These were the most serious challenges to the legitimacy of the WRCC that took place in the first generation of new policing, but before considering these events in detail it is necessary to conclude this chapter with a brief consideration of the relationship between the WRCC and the Huddersfield borough police force.

County and Borough: Conflict and Cooperation

The distinction between the Upper Agbrigg division of the county force and the borough force of Huddersfield might have made sense in administrative and legal terms but not in terms of practical policing. Many of the prize fights and dogfights that took place on Castle Hill were planned in the beerhouses of Castlegate, while highway robbers in Lindley fled for shelter in the pubs of Upperhead Row, and yet the writ of the town police ended at the boundary laid down by the Improvement Act and county officers, likewise, reached the end of their jurisdiction where borough and county met.

The relationship between borough and county at the highest level was tense. Prior to 1856 the situation had been complicated by the fact that the superintending constable for Upper Agbrigg was partly paid for by the rate-payers of Huddersfield and he could be called upon to assist within the 1848 boundaries. There was recurring concern that town constables were helping out 'over the boundary'. As late as 1855 there was confusion as to the relationship. Superintendent Thomas believed he 'was sworn in to act within a certain number of miles under Superintendent Heaton' but was told by the clerk to the Improvement Commissioners that 'Heaton could not call upon him [Thomas] to act without that boundary; yet Superintendent Heaton might be called upon to serve within the improvement limits for his emoluments partly arose from the payments of the ratepayers within those limits'.[70] The Improvement Commissioners had consistently defended jealously their force, most notably during the debates on the police bills in the mid-1850s. Although they were successful in retaining the independence of the borough force in the debates of 1855, the situation was not resolved. Indeed, matters worsened in the aftermath of the 1856 act when

10.5920/beerhouses.08

Colonel Cobbe made it known that he wished to see the Huddersfield police incorporated into the county force. Cobbe's ambitions were effectively thwarted by Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for the Northern Division who made it clear that he viewed the borough force as efficient and better able to offer protection to person and property than the county force. Nonetheless, minor territorial infringements continued to give rise to angry exchanges on more than one occasion. In August 1859 Cobbe, acting on a report from Heaton, complained of irregularities by the town police, notably Inspector Townend, who had sent men to investigate a robbery even though he knew well that the crime had been committed at Birkby swimming baths, outside the Improvement Commission boundary. Pedantically the Commissioners defended their police action on the grounds that the thief had fled into the town and that both victim and perpetrator lived within the HIC limits! Having asserted the correctness of their position, the commissioners expressed a wish that the two forces worked together 'harmoniously'.[71] Niggles continued. In September 1860 there was a spat over the attendance of three county officers at the opening of St. Thomas's church in Longroyd Bridge within the Huddersfield limits. Cobbe stressed that the two men were not present as officers on duty but as private individuals – and then complained, in tit-for-tat fashion, that two town officers had acted outside the limits. A tetchy exchange of letters did nothing to 'prevent misunderstanding' that both sides professed to want.[72] Thereafter, tensions diminished somewhat, but there was a further testy exchange of letters in early 1865 over the question of compensation for injured policemen, and matters were not helped by the fact that at incorporation an enlarged Huddersfield meant that police numbers in Upper Agbrigg were reduced as responsibility for places such as Lindley and Paddock changed hands. Relations were further soured by the arcane financial arrangements for the payment of county officers operating outside the HIC limits but within the township of Huddersfield. There was a sense of grievance that certain rate-payers were paying twice over because the payment towards the upkeep of the county officers came via the poor rates which were charged on the whole town, irrespective of the HIC limits. The issue festered on, becoming part of the argument for incorporation in 1862 and reappearing again in 1865.[73] Only after incorporation in 1868 was the matter resolved.

10.5920/beerhouses.08

Relations between officers were somewhat different. From his appointment in 1848 Heaton had worked closely with the town constables, Sedgwick and Townend. Notwithstanding public spats over jurisdiction, there are several examples of town and county cooperating in a variety of way as criminals crossed police jurisdictions. As Heaton made clear because 'our districts are so closely connected and interwoven together it is indispensably necessary we [the police] should cooperate'.[74] Very rarely, there was not simply cooperation but coordination, organised from the top down. The policing of the 1865 election demonstrated that the two forces could work effectively together with no threat to their separate existence. The two superintendents worked well together, so much so that the town Watch Committee resolved to thank both Hannan and Heaton

> for the very efficient arrangements made by them for the preservation of the Peace during the Elections and for the manner in which they conducted themselves and directed the men under their command amid circumstances of great difficulty and danger.[75]

There was a double irony to the 'most excellent feeling [which] now exists … between the County and Borough Police'.[76] In the short run, the handling of the election (including the evidence given to the subsequent parliamentary enquiry into allegations of bribery and corruption) played an important part in the downfall of Hannan. In the longer term, incorporation would render redundant any belated *rapprochement* between the Improvement Commissioners and Colonel Cobbe.

Endnotes

1 S H Palmer, *Police and Protest in England and Ireland, 1789–1850,* Cambridge University Press, 1990, chapter twelve.
2 *HEx,* 17 November 1855.
3 *Ibid*.
4 *HEx*, 16 February 1856. The paper was quite explicit in condemning the concentration of power, as it saw it, in the hands of the Secretary of State.
5 *Ibid*.
6 Much of this chapter is based on an analysis of the careers of the men who served in Upper Agbrigg from 1856 to 1868 as chronicled in Examination Books of the West Riding Police, housed at West Yorkshire Archive Service, Wakefield but also available online via Ancestry.

10.5920/beerhouses.08

7 There were 65 applicants for the job, of whom twenty-four were army officers, five naval officers and five serving officers in other police forces.
8 Reports of Inspectors of Constabulary to Secretary of State, 1856/7, *Parliamentary Papers,* 1857/8 (20), p.39.
9 *HC*, 27 December 1862 and 17 September 1864.
10 There was a similar reliance on superintending constables in the newly-founded North Yorkshire County Constabulary. P Bramham. 'Parish Constables or Police Officers? The development of a county force in the West Riding', *Regional and Local Studies*, 1987, pp.68–80, is incorrect in stating that Cobbe refused to appoint previous superintending constables (p.72).
11 Bramham, 'Parish Constables', p.72.
12 Parker's subsequent career was chequered. In early 1869 he was promoted to the rank of superintendent, only to be demoted two years later for misconduct.
13 C Steedman, *Policing the Victorian Community: the Formation of English Provincial Police Forces, 1856–1880,* London, Routledge, Kegan & Paul, 1984, p.70.
14 W J Lowe, ''The Lancashire Constabulary 1845–1870: the Social and Occupational Function of a Victorian Police Force', *Criminal Justice History,* vol. 4, 1983, p.55 and Steedman, *Policing the Victorian Community*, pp.93 & 94.
15 Lowe, 'Lancashire Constabulary', p.57. Steedman's figures for the Buckinghamshire and Staffordshire forces are not directly comparable. Her figures relate to individual years and are sub-divided according to length of service of recruits in each year. Steedman, *Policing the Victorian Community,* pp.95–6.
16 There were a small number of widowers who have been included in with married men. Almost 60 per cent of married men had families of one to three children but 17 per cent had four or more.
17 The police background is quite diverse. There were men who had served in the county forces of Devon, Gloucester, Hampshire and Somerset as well as nearby Lincolnshire; and men from Roxborough, Sidmouth and the Irish Constabulary. There were, of course, Huddersfield-born men in other divisions of the WRCC.
18 Earnshaw's dismissal remains a mystery. The WRCC record simply notes his dismissal, giving no reason. Local press coverage shows that Earnshaw continued much as before in the months January to May 1857 (arrests for licensing offences, obstruction and gambling but one minor and one major theft case) at which point he is never mentioned again in either the local or regional press.
19 Reports of Inspectors of Constabulary to Secretary of State, 1865/6, *Parliamentary Papers,* 1867 (14), p.81. The maximum wage paid to a WRCC constable remained at 21s (£1.05) a week from 1858 to 1866 when it rose to 22*s* 2*d* (£1-12). The Lancashire County force, which had paid its men at the same level as the WRCC in the late-1850s and early-1860s began offering more (24*s* 6*d* or £1-22½)) from 1865.

10.5920/beerhouses.08

20 *HEx,* 7 & 14 March and 30 May 1857. R. Storch, 'The Policeman as Domestic Missionary', *Journal of Social History,* 9, 1976 at pp.482 & 487 misleadingly refers to 'unpoliced areas' around Huddersfield.
21 *HC,* 14 March, 5 September and 7 November 1857 & 23 October 1858.
22 R. Storch, 'The Plague of Blue Locusts: Police Reforms and Popular Resistance in Northern England, 1840–1857',' *Int. Rev. Soc. Hist.,* xx, 61–90, at p.87. The example of 'resumed open warfare' quoted by Storch related to Lees, near Oldham, during the exceptional circumstances of the cotton famine. There are no references to the events in Honley and Holmfirth in 1862.
23 *HC*, 10 January 1857.
24 *HC*, 21 November 1857.
25 *HC,* 21 November 1857 and *HEx,* 14 November 1857 for opposition to the policing of 5th November celebrations.
26 *HC*, 9 July 1859.
27 *HC*, 7 & 14 March 1857. See similar comments after an attack in Kirkheaton, 21 June 1860.
28 *HEx*, 28 February, 1857.
29 *HEx*, 3 January, 7 & 28 February, 14 March, 13 June 1857 and *HC*, 17, 24 & 31 Jan., 7 February, 7 & 14 Mar., 4 & 11 Apr., 6 June, 4 Jul, 3 Oct., & 7 Nov. 1857.
30 The initial detachment (January 1857) was distributed across twelve villages. In half of these there are no reports of positive or negative responses to the new police in the local press.
31 *HEx*, 30 May 1857. Heaton's decision to prefer a charge against a man who had claimed to have beaten the police (the charge of drunk and disorderly behaviour brought by Heaton had been dismissed) was condemned as 'petty and malicious'. The *Examiner* shrewdly observed that a single action such as this would damage the reputation of the police and 'tend to aggravate the popular feeling of dislike to the county police'.
32 *HEx*, 7 March 1857, 'The glorious county police'. *HC*, 14 March & 7 November 1857.
33 *HC*, 5 June 1858.
34 *HC*, 1 December 1860, 21 November 1862, 6 October & 24 November 1866.
35 *HC*, 7 April 1860.
36 For local responses, including Honley see *HC*, 9 Jan., 3 Apr., 1 May, & 10 Jul. 1859, 16 Jun., 21 Jul., 1 Sep., 22 Oct., 1 Dec. 1860, 2 Feb., 16 Mar., 25 May, 23 Nov. 1861.
37 *HC*, 23 June 1866.
38 *HC*, 30 December 1865 & 4 January 1868.
39 *HC*, 16 March 1867.
40 *HC*, 22 October 1864.
41 *HC*, 18 May 1867.
42 *HC*, 3 October 1857 and 11 September 1858.
43 *HC*, 28 November 1863.
44 *HC*, 1 December 1860.
45 *HC*, 8 August 1857. James Garside, a handloom weaver in his late thirties, was hardly a paragon of virtue, appearing in the magistrates' court on a number of occasions for offences including poaching, assaulting the police and failing to support his wife and six children.

10.5920/beerhouses.08

46 *HC*, 9 January 1858. Benjamin Garside, another handloom weaver in his late-thirties, was another who dabbled in criminal activities, not least the Castle Hill cockfight discussed in chapter ten.
47 *HC*, 28 April 1860.
48 *HC*, 2 April, 9 July and 20 August 1859.
49 *HC*, 30 June 1860.
50 *Ibid*, 30 June 1860. Later that year Manuel was again criticised for 'more uncalled interference'. *HC*, 20 October 1860.
51 *HC*, 6 April 1861.
52 *HC*, 19 February 1862.
53 *HC*, 19 June 1862.
54 *HC*, 10 July 1858.
55 *HC*, 13 December 1862.
56 *HC*, 24 & 27 February 1874.
57 Sergeant John Turner is another example of a man who played a very active role as inspector of nuisances, in his case, to the Newsome Local Board as well as enforcing cattle plague regulations in 1866/7.
58 *HC*, 1 August 1868.
59 *HC*, 16 June 1860.
60 *Ibid*.
61 *HC*, 11 November 1865. Dyson had eleven previous convictions for assault, three of which were against the police.
62 *LM*, 15 January 1859.
63 *HC*, 8 January 1859.
64 *HC*, 25 January 1864 & 15 August 1868.
65 *HC*, 21 May 1864.
66 *HC*, 7 Nov. 1857, 10 Jul., & 23 Oct. 1858.
67 *HC*, 7 Apr. 1860. See also 16 Apr., 24 Dec. 1859, & 3 Nov. 1860. The Golcar police constable had his celery uprooted in 1860, just before the annual village feast. *HC*, 29 Sep. 1860.
68 *HEx*, 28 May 1864 and *HC*, 16 June 1866.
69 *HC*, 8 December 1860.
70 *HC*, 6 January 1855.
71 Watch Committee Minutes, KMT 18/2/3/14/1, 29 August 1859.
72 Watch Committee Minutes, KMT 18/2/2/2, 5 September 1860.
73 *HC*, 14 March 1857, 6 August 1859, 10 March & 8 December 1860, 14 June 1862 & 5 August 1865.
74 *HEx*, 9 June 1855. Heaton also made reference to the frequency with which he had cooperated with John Thomas of the borough force.
75 Watch Committee Minutes, KMT 18/2/3/14/2, 24 July 1865.
76 *Ibid*.