# 4 The WRCC and the public in the 1850s and 1860s

BY THE TIME of his resignation as chief constable in 1869 Colonel Cobbe had overseen the creation and deployment of the WRCC to the satisfaction of the county magistrates and her majesty's inspector for police. There were eulogistic references to 'the suppression of crime and the maintenance of order' but no mention of the popular reception of this new police force.[1] Cobbe never spelt out in detail his philosophy of policing but he subscribed to the popular (if somewhat naïve) view that the police would gain respect and popular support through the impartial enforcement of the law. The extent to which the WRCC succeeded will be considered, particularly in light of Storch's highly influential article and his references to an initial 'bitter and often violent response' to the new police in the West Riding, followed by 'more or less open warfare.'[2] It will be argued that the initial responses in the late-1850s were more varied and the most serious challenge to the WRCC came later in 1862 in two villages not mentioned by Storch.

The introduction of a uniformed police force across the West Riding in 1857 was undoubtedly a novelty but in many parts of the county this was not an abrupt break with past practices. The superintending constable system, for all its shortcomings, accustomed people, albeit unevenly over the county, to a more intrusive and pro-active form of policing. Nonetheless, the arrival of the newly-formed county constables aroused considerable local interest with a marked upsurge in reporting police matters in 1857 and 1858, with certain papers, notably the *Leeds Examiner*, the *Leeds Time*, and the *Huddersfield Examiner*, all unsympathetic towards the newly-formed WRCC, albeit from different perspectives, and seizing upon examples of popular hostility.

10.5920/policedSociety.4

The arrival of 'raw recruits' gave rise to a 'popular feeling of dislike [of] the county police' in certain quarters according to the *Huddersfield Examiner*.[3] Concerns were expressed at 'paltry' and 'trumpery' charges and 'intermeddling cruelty,' particularly the excessive use of handcuffs.[4] Furthermore, there were assaults upon members of the WRCC across the county from Knaresborough, Keighley and Skipton to Cudworth, Cawthorne and Mirfield, which in some cases involved large and hostile crowds, though Cobbe's quarterly report to the West Riding magistrates in April 1857 showed that the police prosecuted in only five cases.[5] Given the alleged predilection of the police, at least in the early years of the force, to prosecute trivial cases of assault this figure is strikingly low. Certain locations stand out – notably Dewsbury, Rotherham and Barnsley and their environs – as did certain ethnic and occupational groups – the Irish, navvies and miners; but contexts and motives varied. The 200 or so people on Castle Hill, Huddersfield, in June 1858, attacked the police, as they had done before, for interfering in what to them was a legitimate leisure pursuit – cockfighting.[6] An attack on the police in Barnsley in February 1858 was provoked by what was seen as an unwarranted intrusion into a private matter – domestic violence.[7] Other clashes arose out of more obvious criminal activity. The incident which led to PC Walker's loss of two fingers – later produced as evidence in court – was a clash with a band of sheep stealers.[8] A few incidents, such as the fracas in Pontefract in January 1858, were motivated by 'feelings of revenge against the county force.'[9] More generally, there were reports of police being 'knocked down, kicked [and] trampled on,' and limbs being broken as bricks and stones were thrown.[10] But elsewhere the new police were met, if not with open arms, more with a mixture of curiosity, scepticism and indifference than outright hostility.

## A case study: Upper Agbrigg

Although no police division was 'typical,' a detailed case study brings out the complexities of police/public relations in the early years of the WRCC. The extensive reporting of police matters in the *Huddersfield Chronicle*, and to a lesser extent the *Huddersfield Examiner*, makes this possible for the Upper Agbrigg division.[11]

10.5920/policedSociety.4

The first cohort of the new force arrived in January 1857 and was augmented during the following months. The simple fact of a significant increase in police personnel changed local dynamics and threatened the *modus vivendi* between police and policed that had previously developed. The experienced superintendent Heaton and the local magistrates were worried 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' but the threat never materialised.[12] In one isolated incident, James Maud attacked Sergeant Caygill, declaring 'he would drive the police out of Longwood as they were determined to have no policemen there' but there was no support for Maud.[13] There were sporadic 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.[14] 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 previously arrested for drunkenness. The defendants claimed that they were now more determined 'to oppose the authority of "the gentleman in blue" who have been recently stationed in the village,' which 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* which was soon paid shortly after a collection had been made.[15] But, as in Lockwood, there was no concerted anti-police action, though 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.'[16]

The new police were subject to 'annoyance' elsewhere. In Golcar the newly-installed policeman was assaulted, while in Uppermill a crowd rescued a police prisoner; at the Honley Feast there was a serious assault on one of the local policemen while in Crosland Moor, during a stang-riding* protest,

* 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 Common*, London, Penguin, 1993, chapter eight.

10.5920/policedSociety.4

the 'mob made a dead set at the police;' In Kirkheaton police actions led to sporadic trouble but in Slaithwaite the police were criticized merely for doing 'nothing but walk the streets in their smart dresses and clean, spotless shoes.' However, in Kirkburton, somewhat surprisingly given earlier tensions, 'few have proved more favourable to the new county force than the inhabitants of Kirkburton and neighbourhood' while in Meltham the police were welcomed for their success in 'quelling the disorderly rows that have so long been the disgrace of that village.'[17] In many places there was no great love for the new police but there was also a recognition that the police were here to stay. Trivial or mean-spirited prosecutions might damage their reputation and 'tend to aggravate the popular feeling of dislike to the county police' but there was no concerted effort to expel the police. [18]

Nor did attitudes change significantly in the following years. The police continued to be particularly unpopular 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. The most serious took place in 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' and as a consequence 'officers have resigned their duties, not daring to risk their lives in so perilous a district' but this was an isolated and short-lived occurrence.[19] Sporadic violent incidents continued to be found throughout the early and mid-1860s.[20] More often than not they involved drunks and people with a personal grudge against individual policemen. 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 singled out PC Rhodes, telling him "Ov Ow'd thee a grudge an ol pay thee off afore theea goas 'yoat o' this heease.'[21] Overall, however, 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.[22]

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 covered a wide range of activities, many of which minimised and marginalised outright opposition, and some even winning more positive support. 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.[23] Nonetheless, not all routine policing was uncontentious. There was a longstanding consensus among local magistrates and police chiefs that beerhouses in particular, but also village feasts and the like, were major sites of immorality and criminality, which required firm action. As the police became increasingly involved in curbing drinking, gambling and cockfighting, and in ensuring order at customary celebrations the scope for conflict between the police and working-class men and women (and some middle-class people as well) increased. Heaton, whose personal enthusiasm in the early 1850s has already been noted, continued to set the tone and many of his men responded energetically. Beerhouse keepers and publicans were prosecuted for selling liquor out of hours in every village in the division, though 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.[24] But, in rural area, bringing to justice landlords who permitted gambling on their premises was not easy. William Corden, an energetic sergeant, was able to successfully prosecute 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, Corden and 'the [two] constables lifted each other up to get a glimpse into the room through a crevice in the blind.'[25] They then quietly entered the house and arrested the miscreants who were 'tossing' and 'marrying.'** In similar style, PCs Lucas and Wardle arrested gamblers, 'throwing the dart for beer' in the Stafford Arms beerhouse, Kirkheaton, after looking through an ill-fitting blind. [26]

Even more problematic for the police was the widespread practice of '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

** Local dialect for gambling.

meet regularly in a field to play pitch and toss, paying a young boy to stand watch for 3*d*. an hour. After numerous complaints and several unsuccessful attempts, the police, 'in disguise,' finally caught the gamblers unawares and arrested thirteen men.[27] A similar incident in Longwood highlighted not only police difficulties – not helped by naïve tactics that involved men 'dressed in blue slop, so as to imitate weavers as much as possible' and 'one of the officers mounting a donkey' – but also the defiance of the arrested gamblers who 'treated the matter with much levity and said they could easily club up the money.'[28] And these were the more able and active officers. Others were less successful. PC Wardle, for one, tried – not always wholeheartedly – and failed on several occasions to catch Sunday gamblers in Kirkheaton.

Much depended upon the actions of the individual constable. A constable was extremely fortunate not to be assaulted at least once in the course of his normal duties but some men were 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, including two at local feasts. Following one such incident the local magistrates made clear that 'they deprecated on the part of policemen anything like officiousness such as was likely to promote a demonstration against them.'[29] The magistrates' words were warmly received and those charged made it clear their hostility towards Sedgwick. Other members of the force were guilty of dishonesty as well as of using excessive force. 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,' involving 'the unwarrantable use of his staff.'[30] In Stansfield's case this was a one-off incident but there were other officers who were repeatedly reprimanded. One such was PC Thomas Manuel, who had previously served in the Lancashire County Constabulary. A case against Benjamin Garside, a repeat offender well-known to the bench was dismissed by the magistrates with the pithy comment that 'the officer might have been mistaken as to the time he had seen the defendant.'[31] Manuel was an unpopular figure in Lindley – 'the d---d Irish b-----' as he was once described, and widely mistrusted, not least by the magistrates.[32] Matters came to a head in 1860 when he was accused

of imprisoning Joseph Bottomley 'in a damp and loathsome cellar' and in handcuffs for eight hours. The case 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.'[33] The magistrates awarded Bottomley £10, criticised Manuel personally but also observed in open court that, not for the first time, 'the police of the West Riding Constabulary had … made use of their powers in a most excessive manner.'[34] An equally problematic figure was Sergeant Obed Caygill, who came to Upper Agbrigg having been demoted from the rank of inspector because of inefficiency. 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 his superintendent, Heaton.[35] Unsurprisingly, he was the victim of several assaults and there were recurring accusations of his 'cruel, wanton and unnecessary … violence.'[36] Eventually Caygill resigned but damage was not restricted to his personal reputation. Such men – as was to be seen even more dramatically in Honley – could bring the whole force into disrepute and conflict.

But it was possible to be both active and popular. William Corden was active officer, involved in numerous prosecutions for licensing offences and gambling in and around Golcar and Slaithwaite but, unlike Caygill, he was never attacked during his nine-years of service. Indeed, on his departure to become an inspector in Barnsley, Corden was 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'.[37] 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'.[38] 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.[39] Corden was not alone. Sergeant Thomas Greenwood was a similar example of pragmatic policing. Probably because of his prior policing 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 abrasiveness 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, which surrounded some of his fellow officers. 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 Western Great Inn at 'Top o' Stannedge' was located in one of the remoter parts of the division 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 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 risked 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. He 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.

10.5920/policedSociety.4

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.[40] Similarly, one does not know why members of the public came to the assistance of some constables under attack – but they did.[41] 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.[42] Elsewhere, constables appear to have been viewed with something akin to affection. One such example is the long-serving Robert Wardle, first in Berry Brow and finally in Kirkheaton. Wardle was not a highflier 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.*'[43] He 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 unbecoming an officer.' As Heaton explained, Booth 'began to mix with the inhabitants instead of attending to his duty.'[44]

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. The individual and his use of discretion was important in shaping the relationship between police and policed. Overall, there was no Storchian 'open warfare' but there were signs that a new and enduring *modus vivendi* between police and policed was emerging by the late-1860s. 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.[45] 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 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.[46] 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'.[47] Even when people appeared in court there was an ongoing problem of 'hard swearing' or giving false testimony, 'frequently resorted to by witnesses for the purpose of clearing their friends from the charges brought against them by the police.'[48]

The introduction of the WRCC into Upper Agbrigg had been achieved with some difficulty but, after five years, there were encouraging signs that suggested that a *modus vivendi* was being established between the new police and the bulk of the population but this progress was thrown in doubts in 1862. In that year, the two largest popular anti-police protests in the county took place.

10.5920/policedSociety.4

## The Honley anti-police riot, June/July 1862[49]

Honley was a village of some 5 - 6000 people, about four miles from Huddersfield, with a mixed economy, boosted by the advent of the railway in the early 1850s. Farmers and agricultural labourer lived alongside mill-owner and their workers and with weaver/farmers. Old and new technologies in the woollen industry co-existed, while craftsmen and retailers plied their trades. The village had a radical tradition with a Owenite socialist club dating back to the early nineteenth century. In the 1850s Honley was policed by a group of parish constables under a 'head' constable, who faced little popular hostility. Nor was it a particularly troublesome area in the early years of the WRCC. Indeed it was one of a small number of villages who requested a greater police presence. The 1861 census recorded three constables and a sergeant living in the village, the latter having been moved to Honley following demotion from the rank of inspector for 'irregular conduct.' The most significant figure was PC Edward Antrobus who had been transferred to Upper Agbrigg in 1861, serving in Deighton and Farnley Tyas before being posted to Honley. Antrobus and trouble went together. His abrasive approach had led to conflict with locals in both places but this was as nothing compared to the trouble that broke out in Honley. In just over a year, he was responsible for more prosecutions than had been brought by all constables in the village in the four years since the formation of the WRCC but it was the manner in which he went about his work that generated widespread hostility. Officiously moving on small groups of millworkers, hitting young boys, and vindictively pressing for heavy charges and, on a number of occasions lying in court that he was the victim in beerhouse brawls.[50]

Matters came to a head on the evening of Monday 23 June at 6 o'clock.[51] A pre-arranged mass protest was started by the arrival of a well-known local hawker, Johnny Moss, ringing a handbell and calling out: 'Come up, Antrobus! Roll up, Antrobus!'[52] Within minutes a crowd of some 300 people, including children blowing penny whistles, surrounded Antrobus, subjecting him to verbal and physical assaults as he was run out of the village. As he sought refuge in a nearby public house the 'mob' smashed windows and burnt Antrobus and his wife in effigy. This marked the end of the first phase of the Honley riot. Significantly, popular anger was directed solely at one unpopular policeman. Nowhere in the extensive coverage of the events

is there no reference to anger being directed at the other police officers living in the village.

The second phase started the following day when police with warrants for the arrest of ten alleged ring-leaders arrived in Honley. Six men were arrested and taken to Huddersfield after an attempted mass rescue failed. At the same time, a local defence committee was established and money flowed in from all quarters, including 'many of the most respectable inhabitants … [who] subscribed liberally to the defence [fund].'[53] The well-known radical lawyer and vocal critic of the new police, 'Mr Roberts of Manchester' was engaged to defend the arrested men.[54] The local police led by Heaton and supported by chief constable Cobbe took a hard line from the outset with the decision to prosecute on the serious charge of riot, and the accompanying rhetoric of 'wanton outrage' and 'a determined spirit of rebellion and revolt against the authority and control of the police.'[55]

Roberts' flamboyant defence focussed on police 'surveillance, cruelty and tyranny' and highlighted the pettiness and maliciousness of specific police actions.[56] The riot, he argued, was 'the unfortunate result of a perfectly legal resistance' to the excessive and illegal behaviour of the police. The excoriating critique of Antrobus – reinforced by Antrobus's crass evidence – struck a chord with the men and women of Honley who crowded the courtroom. But Roberts was not content with the individual. He stressed the specific shortcomings of Antrobus but represented him as part of a wider police system that was presided over by the 'large swelling pomposity of Mr. Superintendent Heaton' – a comment that provoked loud laughter in the courtroom.[57] He was also aware of magisterial concern with unacceptable actions by the county police and appealed to their paternalistic instincts: 'the people of Honley … relied on the magistrates to protect them from Mr. Heaton and his myrmidons'.[58] The magistrates were not persuaded by the prosecution argument that the events constituted a riot and the matter was treated as a common assault, with relatively lenient punishments in the form of fines ranging from £1 to 5*s* handed down. The decision was well received by those in court and, when the prosecution counsel responded to the punishment with the hyperbolic claim that he would 'recommend the chief constable to let his men be killed off as fast as the mob could kill them', he was greeted with hoots of derision.[59] Although the magistrates had not explicitly accepted Robert's argument that poverty was being penalized,

their decision to treat the case as one of common assault and the levels of fines that they imposed showed they had little sympathy with the actions of Antrobus and his fellow officers.

This was a major rebuff for the police but they compounded their difficulties by issuing new summonses, which strengthened the resolve of the defence committee. More importantly, as the local press pointed out, 'we are no longer dealing with Police-constable *Antrobus* but with Superintendent *Heaton*' who had replaced Antrobus at the centre of the stage. The *Huddersfield Examiner* was unequivocal in its condemnation of the 'vindictiveness… of his actions' and argued that 'had it been Mr Heaton's intention to have proved the truth of the charges brought against the police generally … that of "cruelty to the poor," he could not certainly have accomplished this more effectually than by taking the course he so unwisely adopted.'[60]

The second trial of a further twenty-four men from Honley, charged with aiding abetting the (alleged) rioters, was, if anything, more sensational. It had barely started when, to the amazement of those in court, it was brought to a halt. One can but conjecture that the magistrates were influenced by the breadth and depth of popular opposition. Following discussions and an agreement between the magistrates and the two counsels, Mr Learoyd, the prosecutor, beat a very public retreat, recommending 'the withdrawal of the charges against the defendants on the ground that such a course would serve more than any other to promote the restoration of kindly feeling in the village of Honley.[61] The magistrates issued a statement that stressed their duty to both the police and the people but made clear that 'if a policeman exceeds his duty the Bench, *as in many previous cases*, would discountenance his proceedings.'[62] The matter appeared to be over. The response in the village was unequivocal: 'Honley was "all alive" with such a display of popular feeling as, perhaps, never before manifested in a country village'.[63] And it might have ended there had not Heaton, reportedly 'discouraged' by the magistrates' decision to call off the second trial, come to the decision – politely described at the time as 'very indiscreet' – to prosecute twenty-four boys, aged between ten and twelve, for their part in the riot 'for no other ostensible fault than playing their tin whistles &c at the riot'.[64] The impact in Honley was dramatic. The police decision was seen as vindictive and 'aroused public sympathy for the boys' and, according to the *Huddersfield Chronicle* 'did not abate the strong feeling manifested against the other side [i.e. the police]'.[65] Indeed, according

to the *Huddersfield Examiner*, '[t]he indignation of the entire community was now fairly roused and the sixpences of the poorest joined with the guineas of the rich in attesting the unmistakable unanimity of feeling with which this oppressive supplementary proceeding was regarded.[66] The public protest that took place on the next day (1 July) when the boys were due in court was strikingly high-profile. '[T]he boys walked down to Huddersfield, two and two together, like scholars at a school-feast, accompanied by their mothers, and a host of other women'.[67] For just over an hour, this procession of women, not simply accompanying but protecting their children, made its way from Honley along one of the main roads into Huddersfield through 'crowds of sympathising friends and relatives'.[68] Once again the magistrates decided not to proceed with the charges; once again the people of Honley celebrated.

A large crowd, estimated to be in excess of 3,000, turned out, and in a prominent position was Johnny Moss, on his mule, which had been renamed Antrobus for the occasion! A local band, from nearby Berry Brow, played 'Oh dear, what can the matter be' (and other unnamed 'lively airs') as the 'monster procession' made its way, 'most peaceable and orderly,' through the village. There was a 'thrill of joy through the neighbourhood … [and] demonstrations of joy and welcome'.[69] The celebrations ended at the village cricket ground, where, after some short speeches, there were 'three hearty cheers for Roberts the Defence Advocate and the [Honley] Defence Committee', followed by 'three times three cheers' for Princess Alice's marriage, which had taken place that day. 'Finally, the whole of the large crowd sang the national anthem in good tune and with a violence that made the valley ring again.'[70] Significantly, 'the additional police force in the town [i.e., Honley] did not interfere at all, but wisely let the villagers have their frolic out in their own way.' It was a decision that eased tensions to such an extent that even the police were treated with 'due civility.'[71]

The matter did not end with these celebrations. There was a third phase in which what had started as a popular rising, using 'traditional' forms of protest, was taken up the 'middling sort' in Honley. A week later there was a well-attended meeting at Honley town hall at which it was decided to send a memorial to the chief constable Cobbe, condemning, in general 'the irritating and insulting conduct of police' and specifically the 'indiscreet and injudicious, if not illegal conduct' of PC Antrobus. It concluded that 'the peace of the district [of Honley] cannot be maintained because of the

bitterness of the feeling which is entertained against [PC Antrobus] by the villagers.'[72] However, the signatories, described as '133 manufacturers, merchants, solicitors, tradesmen, &c', made it clear that it was the actions of the police generally, not just Antrobus alone, that was cause for concern. In saying this, they were not suggesting that the police should be removed but rather that the force should act properly.

> If the police of this district will thus try to discharge the duties imposed upon them, they will have the regard and support of all respectable men; but if they transgress proper limits and encroach upon the liberties and privileges of the people, all the prosecutions which may be threatened, cannot prevent that which we fear and deprecate – disorder, riot and crime.[73]

There could be no clearer statement of the desire for a properly policed society, in which laws were upheld but liberties protected. The memorial concluded with a specific request that Antrobus be removed. Cobbe, who had also received a letter from Antrobus asking to be moved, agreed and a new constable took his place. There was no trouble at that year's Honley Feast and the greatest disturbance in the village was caused by a tornado that hit in October.[74] An unpopular policeman had been run out of town but there was no rejection of the police *per se*. Honley was never an unpoliced village but when PC Grant was installed a new working relationship had to be established – and one which reflected the villagers' sense of the legitimate limits of police action. Grant, although not a local man, was an experienced officer, who soon won the support of many of the people in Honley. The number of prosecutions, especially for minor offences, dropped dramatically and such was his success that he was promoted to first-class constable in April 1863 and sergeant in May 1864, at which point he moved to Kirkburton, where he served out the remaining fifteen years of his career. After the tumultuous summer of '62 life in Honley was much quieter. Fewer cases were brought before the local magistrates, though press reporting of foot races and the like suggest no significant change in local behaviour. Unlike Antrobus, the new constable, Grant, won the 'entire approval' of people in the village.[75] It is unlikely that village mores had changed dramatically. Rather, the police had learned to use their discretion in the implementation of the law rather

than pushing it to the limit as had been the case with Antrobus. There was one final twist in the Honley saga, which reflected positively on Grant but also suggested that senior policemen had not properly learnt the lessons of the previous months. In the summer of 1863, the defence committee held its last meeting, a supper 'celebrating the popular triumph over a meddling and over-officious policeman' at the Allied Tavern. The supper would not have taken place had the senior police officers, Colonel Cobbe and Superintendent Heaton, not 'disapproved' of the defence committee's proposal to present '£2 to Police-constable Grant … who had gained the respect and confidence of the inhabitants … [including] the class with whom policemen chiefly come in contact … by his excellent conduct as a police officer'.[76] No reason was given for the refusal but the proposal, as well as the overt praise for Grant, was implicitly a criticism of Cobbe's decision to transfer Antrobus to Honley and Heaton's defence of him as 'a model officer.'

The Honley riot was the largest manifestation of anti-police sentiment in the West Riding since the introduction of the WRCC. Its aftermath revealed considerable hostility to the police but also a desire for a properly policed society. As significant as the troubles of June 1862 was the rapid restoration of order thereafter.

## The Holmfirth anti-police demonstration, July 1862

The anti-police protests in Honley had a traditional flavour – direct action through rough music and burning in effigy – in Holmfirth it took the more modern form of protesting through public debate and petitioning. The 'considerable dissatisfaction … with the manner in which the [new county] police have interfered with the peaceable inhabitants' which 'rendered themselves obnoxious to many' was led more by respectable middle-class men than in Honley.[77]

Holmfirth, a larger village than Honley, was located some six miles south of Huddersfield. It too had a diverse economy, a recent train link and a tradition of radicalism. Unlike Honley it had more of a reputation for criminality, harbouring cock fighters and whisky spinners and the like. The newly-introduced WRCC had met violent opposition in nearby Jackson Bridge and their men were not popular among the beerhouse keepers and their clientele,

10.5920/policedSociety.4

the cockfighters and gamblers of Holmfirth. Notwithstanding, outright opposition to the police was confined to more marginal members of society in the first four years under the new police.[78] Police zeal had been tempered to a significant degree by the attitude of the highly-regarded Inspector Haworth. His departure, in late 1859, removed an important force for conciliation between the police and respectable Holmfirth folk. At a special meeting he had been given a hearty vote of thanks and speakers praised the fact that 'his object … [was] to carry out the law rather than to impose fines … [and he] had frequently cautioned disturbers of the peace instead of taking them before the magistrates.' In particular, he was praised for being 'free from the overbearance and officiousness to which some officers are too prone.'[79]

In the absence of his restraining presence matters began to worsen, with the conduct of certain constables being described as an 'intolerable nuisance.'[80] One of the most assiduous men was Joseph Briers, who had been moved to Holmfirth, having been demoted from sergeant as the result of indiscipline. Briers was a high-profile and unpopular man. In February 1861 he was viciously beaten by a gang of seven men after he had (at the request of the landlord) cleared the Rose and Crown. Their trial caused 'considerable excitement in the district' and, though found guilty and fined £6 and costs each, the money was paid immediately for the men.[81] More interest was aroused by the subsequent trial of Briers for perjury. The case was dismissed but this was 'evidently distasteful to the crowded court who manifested their dissatisfaction by their muted execrations.'[82] Three months later Briers was transferred out of the village but much damage had been done to police/public relations. Briers was not alone. The names of two other men appear repeatedly in the local press: PCs Linas Hancock and John Strange. Both men were outsiders and both were later moved out of Holmfirth and subsequently dismissed. Their careers highlight the difficulty faced by Cobbe and Heaton in recruiting good men. Hancock was serving his second term in the WRCC and never progressed beyond the third class; Strange was marginally more successful, though was demoted to the second class before being transferred.

Matters in Holmfirth finally came to a head in 1862. Working men had borne the brunt of police zeal initially. After two sessions in which there had been no business for the magistrates, their session of May 1862 saw a sharp increase, as the result of 'trivial' cases brought by the police, mainly for allegedly drunk and disorderly behaviour.[83] Within a few weeks the situation

had deteriorated dramatically. The *Huddersfield Chronicle* editorialized about the need for the Holmfirth magistrates to consider other testimony, especially when police evidence was unsupported. Only in this way could 'a proper respect for authority' be restored.[84] Under the heading 'Frivolous Police Charges And Their Results,' a correspondent detailed cases of men being charged with obstruction when making their way home or even standing on private property, which gave rise to 'strong feelings against the police.' The case of Joseph Balmforth, a painter, epitomised the problem. He was charged with 'obstructing the road' as he made his way to his front door, through a crowd of people, including a police officer. The officer testified that Balmforth had taken him by the shoulder and deliberately caused an obstruction and, in the absence of any other witness in court, the magistrate, emphasising the fact that the police evidence was on oath, fined him 1*s* (5p) and costs.[85] Whereas once animosity towards the police had been confined largely to 'rougher' elements, by the summer of 1862 anti-police anger 'now pervades every class in the community'. The nature of many of the cases brought before the local magistrates, the suspicion that a number of police cases were 'imagined or manufactured,' and the willingness of the magistrates to accept uncorroborated police evidence united local sentiment against 'a persecuting force.'[86]

This was the context in which the Rev. T James and twenty or more of the respectable male population of Holmfirth called a meeting to consider what action should be taken in light of 'the glaring encroachments of the police upon the rights and liberties of the peaceable inhabitants of these places.'[87] The organizers seriously underestimated the number of people who wished to attend. As the time for the start of the meeting approached 'the road in front of the [Town] Hall was thronged with countless wearers of blue smocks, the hard working and aggrieved portion of the community who have especially been the subject of the harsh treatment of which they complain.'[88] The initiative was taken by middle-class men who dominated the speech-making. The very visible presence of these middle-class figures, equally aggrieved at police high-handedness, helped direct local anger into the more respectable form of protest of petitioning the authorities. Nonetheless, there was real anger, not least at the stance of the chief constable who had written to the Rev. James claiming, not only that he had received no complaints, but that the police had acquitted themselves well. The first claim was denied by

10.5920/policedSociety.4

some of those present and the second dismissed as 'bosh and nonsense.'[89] There was further anger with the manner in which the village's grievance had been investigated. Cobbe had simply asked the relevant Superintendent, Heaton, to look into matters and he, only interviewing the police involved and, totally ignoring the petitioners, had concluded that nothing was amiss.[90]

Two resolutions were put before the meeting and both were passed unanimously and accompanied by 'triumphant cheers' before being sent to both the chief constable and the Lord Lieutenant of the county. The first was proposed by Alfred Wood, a mill-owner, and seconded by the woollen manufacturer, James Holmes; the second proposed by a local shopkeeper, John Sanderson was seconded by James Schofield, a draper. The first resolution made clear the prevailing mood. Trivial cases had been brought before magistrates sympathetic to the police, which 'excited universal indignation amongst the inhabitants of this neighbourhood.[91] Wood spoke forcefully of the 'petty tyranny which has for some time past been exercised by the police towards the different classes of the community' and bemoaned the fact that 'in Holmfirth the police were not their servants; they were their tyrants'.[92] He was not alone. The speeches were dominated by a rhetoric that stressed the liberties of the English, and their constitutional rights and warned of the threat posed by the police which threatened to reduce the people of Holmfirth to the level of 'the crawling serfs of a Russian or an Austrian despot.'[93] At the same time there were very specific criticisms made of the county police. Despite the cost of maintaining a force, it was seen to fail in its basic responsibility of protecting property and person. Wood damned the police for their incompetence in dealing with the robbery from his mill and for their insulting behaviour to respectable men of the town.[94] There was also sympathy for less respectable victims of police action, including 'unfortunates' [i.e. prostitutes] from whom 'fees' were extracted to avoid prosecution.[95] Yet more serious accusations were made of police manufacturing cases and magistrates accepting false and uncorroborated police evidence, even in the face of contrary evidence from 'respectable' witnesses. Complaints were made about the 'policeman's meddling malady,' their surliness and their 'petty tyranny and pomposity;' and about the paltriness of the cases that the police brought against bystanders on the Victoria Bridge in the centre of the village and even against respectable men trying to enter their own homes! There

was an element of social snobbery from middle-class men who resented being told what to do by men who were deemed their social inferiors, not to mention being 'comers-in.' However, it was clear from the size and the response of the crowd that these criticisms struck a chord among 'the wearers of blue smocks' as well.[96]

There was further anger at the suggestion that there was a conspiracy against the police. As Holmes made clear that 'it is not that we want to do away with the police' but rather, fewer and better policemen. Like Wood, he stressed 'the dictatorial and officious actions of the police' and quoted Roberts's claim at the recent trial of the Honley rioters that the police waged a war against the poor. The situation was not helped by the fact that the new policeman was 'a low-bred stranger with whose antecedents we have no acquaintance' and who acted in a manner that had more in common with 'John Moss's mule'.[97] To compound matters further, and quoting a recently retired policeman, Holmes argued that the police were told from the very top (i.e. Superintendent Heaton) not to be friendly with members of the local community. Despite the undoubted anger on display, the calls for moderation prevailed and, after the second resolution had been passed to resounding cheers, the crowd gave a further three cheers for the Queen and then dispersed quietly – but there was to be one final twist to the events of the day.

Superintendent Heaton had been aware that a mass meeting was scheduled to take place in Holmfirth and that local feelings were running high. Taking advantages of the opportunity afforded by a county force (and the railways) and not wishing for a repeat of the scenes in Honley, he arranged for thirty-six men, from three divisions of the West Riding, to be present under his leadership. Entraining from Huddersfield, they duly arrived in Holmfirth to be greeted more with mirth than anger. The 'most peaceable and orderly' conduct of the meeting (and its aftermath) was beyond reproach and the police had nothing to do and no-one to arrest. However, as a local eyewitness (described as 'a gentleman in whose truthfulness we have entire confidence') told the *Huddersfield Examiner*, the police 'determined to make the best of the unfortunate occurrence by kicking up a shindy of their own.' Presumably in the absence of Heaton, fifteen or so drunken policemen 'sallied forth into the town and neighbourhood and … suffered their usual surly dignity to melt down into swearing, leap frog and other antics much to the amusement of those who saw them.' Having spent much of the early morning of Tuesday

drinking copiously in the Rose & Crown, Holmfirth, four or five policemen then 'perambulated the road from the end of Victoria Street to Upper Mill, rousing many of the peaceable inhabitants from their slumbers at four o'clock in the morning. Two were seen 'performing the donkey's part between the shafts of a cart' while 'oaths and various kinds of ribaldry' were heard as the police roamed through Upper Mill. Perhaps the most amazing aspect of this drunken spree is that it was 11½ miles from Holmfirth to Upper Mill.[98] Matters could scarcely get worse for the reputation of the police – but they did. On the following day,

> [o]n the platform at the Holmfirth station and during their ride to Huddersfield, they [the police] cheered themselves and others, by lustily singing 'Here's to the red, white and blue,' strongly emphasizing the last word, and adding to it occasionally the word Antrobus.[99]

Cobbe's response to the Holmfirth resolutions was not reported but it is striking that by the end of August no cases had been brought by the police before the local magistrates.[100] There were also changes in police personnel in Holmfirth and whereas '[t]he last police acted on the system that if there was not a squabble in the street they would make one,' there were now no such incidents – a change that was 'much the better'.[101] As in Honley, so in Holmfirth a *modus vivendi* was re-established through the restriction of police activities.

## Some conclusions

Standing back from the detail of the two disturbances, question arises about the typicality of Honley and Holmfirth. Both had traditions of liberal and radical politics, though both (Honley in particular) prided themselves on being law-abiding. More generally, there was an ongoing, grumbling hostility that manifested itself in smaller scale attacks on the police in various parts of the area. During the trial of the ringleaders of the Honley riot, the prosecutor, Mr Learoyd, drew attention to how the 'revolt against the authority and control of the police … had pervaded to an alarming extent some of the places surrounding this and neighbouring towns.'[102] This might be dismissed

as courtroom hyperbole but the evidence suggests that there were real problems for the new county police in some areas. The pages of the local press bear witness to continuing animosity towards the police, particularly in Deighton, Lindley, Kirkheaton, Scammonden and Skelmanthorpe.[103] Many public shows of communal disapproval drew strength from traditions, firmly rooted in a pre-industrial, largely rural past, but still seen as relevant in the present. As Roberts had pointed out in the trial of the Honley rioters, 'the law might be in favour of the goaders [but] a goaded people [will] find means of showing their contempt for those who use the law with cruelty.'[104] Nonetheless, it is also the case that the troubles of 1862 were exceptional in their scale but were they atypical or were they major conflagrations in a landscape that was, more generally, liable to experience localised fires of anti-police sentiment? For some contemporaries the answer was clear. The Honley riot was a 'fire [that] only wanted igniting' and Antrobus was the spark. In other words, there was a 'dislike of the police generally' as well as animosity towards Antrobus that came to a head on that Monday in June 1862.[105] But for others, it was the restoration of order in Honley and Holmfirth that was most significant.

There is also the question of the typicality of Antrobus, variously described as 'peculiarly obnoxious' and 'officious and overbearing.' Few. if any, officers had a record of indiscipline to compare with his. Having been found guilty of assault on more than one occasion and (as it later transpired) having been twice dismissed from police forces before he joined the WRCC, he was hardly a typical policeman. But the evidence from Holmfirth points to a wider problem in the force. Although not as officious as Antrobus, PCs Briers, Hancock, Strange and Taylor, as well as the newly-appointed Inspector Parkin, showed a degree of zeal and insensitivity in prosecuting landlords and their clients that brought them into conflict with several inhabitants of Holmfirth.[106] Elsewhere, there were many ordinary men and women who would have recognised Roberts's claim that some members of the police showed 'servility to the rich' and 'cruelty to the working classes'.[107] The magistrates at the trial of the Honley rioters recognised that there was a problem but down played it, optimistically characterising it in terms of a few rotten apples: 'there might be three or four men … that might bring the whole [force] into disrepute'.[108] The events discussed in this chapter reveal the fragility of police/public relations. The implicit contract between police

and public could and did break down, to a great or lesser extent, but it could also be restored, as happened after the most serious breakdowns in Honley and Holmfirth, where there was widespread criticism of bad policing but also a broadly-supported desire for a properly policed society.

The West Riding in the 1860s was a policed society in the sense that there was a permanent policed force that impacted on various aspects of everyday life. But in several places, notably the outlying and difficult to access areas, policing was light-touch; in more places policing was variable in quality because of the men in uniform. While the WRCC as a whole may have been deemed efficient by HMIC, the on-the-ground reality was that it contained many men with limited experience of routine policing and many others whose discipline was questionable. But it also contained men of ability who not simply made policing their career but also did so in a positive manner, albeit more in terms of regulating public spaces rather than fighting serious crime. Much would depend on how the force developed in the coming decades and it is to this we turn in the following chapter.

10.5920/policedSociety.4

## Endnotes

1 See for example *Leeds Mercury*, 4 January 1870. The praise lavished on Cobbe by the county magistrates was widely reported,

2 R Storch, 'The Plague of Blue Locusts: Police Reforms and Popular Resistance in Northern England, 1840–1857", *International Review of Social History*, xx, 1975, 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.

3 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 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.

4 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 14 March, 5 September and 7 November 1857 & 23 October 1858.

5 *Leeds Times*, 11 April 1857

6 *Leeds Intelligencer*, 5 June 1858

7 For example *Barnsley Independent*, 27 February 1858

8 *Leeds Times*, 4 April 1857. The incident took place outside Wombwell in the south of the county.

9 *Leeds Intelligencer*, 2 January 1858

10 *Leeds Intelligencer*, 24 January 1857 and 1 January 1859

11 Though even here there are limitations. Of the twelve villages to which the initial detachments of police were sent, there are no reports of positive or negative responses in the local press for six of them For a more detailed account see Taylor *Beershops, Brothels and Bobbies*, chapters 8 & 9.

12 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 21 November 1857.

13 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 21 November 1857 and *Huddersfield Examiner*, 14 November 1857 for opposition to the policing of 5th November celebrations.

14 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 9 July 1859.

15 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 7 & 14 March 1857. See similar comments after an attack in Kirkheaton, 21 June 1860.

16 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 28 February 1857.

17 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 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.

18 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 30 May 1857. Both local papers stressed the inferiority of the county force in comparison with the town force. *Huddersfield Examiner*, 7 March 1857, 'The glorious county police'. *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 14 March & 7 November 1857.

19 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 5 June 1858.

10.5920/policedSociety.4

20 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 1 December 1860, 21 November 1862, 6 October & 24 November 1866.

21 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 7 April 1860.

22 For local responses, including Honley see *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 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.

23 See also the enforcement of bastardy order, prosecutions for neglect of family, concern for missing children and enforcement of legislation regarding nuisances.

24 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 23 June 1866.

25 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 30 December 1865 & 4 January 1868.

26 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 16 March 1867.

27 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 22 October 1864.

28 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 18 May 1867.

29 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 28 November 1863. For similar earlier incidents see *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 3 October 1857 and 11 September 1858.

30 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 1 December 1860.

31 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 8 August 1857. For other examples of his evidence being dismissed see

32 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 9 January 1858, 2 April, 9 & 20 August 1859 and April 1860

33 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 30 June 1860.

34 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 30 June 1860. Later that year Manuel was again criticised for 'more uncalled interference'. *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 20 October 1860.

35 For examples of his melodramatic style of policing see *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 5 April 1861, 19 February & 19 June 1852

36 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 10 July 1858.

37 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 24 & 27 February 1874.

38 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 1 August 1868.

39 He also enhanced his reputation as an active inspector of nuisances. 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.

40 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 16 June 1860.

41 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 16 June 1860.

42 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 11 November 1865. Dyson had 11 previous convictions for assault, three of which were against the police.

10.5920/policedSociety.4

43 *Leeds Mercury*, 15 January 1859.

44 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 21 May 1864.

45 *Huddersfield Chronicle* 7 Nov. 1857, 10 Jul., & 23 Oct. 1858.

46 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 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. *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 29 Sep. 1860.

47 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 28 May 1864 and *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 16 June 1866.

48 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 8 December 1860.

49 For a fuller account of the Honley riot see Taylor, *Beerhouses*, chapter 8.

50 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 5, 9 & 19 October & 28 December 1861. See also *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 25 January, 3 & 10 May and 14 June 1862.

51 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 28 June 1862.

52 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 28 June 1862.

53 *Leeds Mercury*, 2 July 1862.

54 For details of Roberts's varied career see R. Challinor, *A Radical Lawyer in Victorian England: W. P. Roberts and the Struggle for Workers' Rights*, (1990). Although discussing police action on a number of occasions, C. Frank, *Master and Servant Law: Chartists, Trade Unions, Radical Lawyers and the Magistracy in England, 1840–1865*, Farnham, Tauris, 2010 has a more specific focus. See *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 16 November 1850, 15 August 1857 and 24 March 1860 for examples of Roberts defending workmen charged with embezzling woollen waste under the Worsted Acts. Roberts' condemnation of the 'plague of blue locusts' is cited in Challinor, *Radical Lawyer*, p.81.

55 *Leeds Mercury*, 2 July 1862.

56 *Leeds Mercury*, 30 June 1862.

57 *Leeds Mercury*, 5 July 1862.

58 *Leeds Mercury*, 5 July 1862.

59 *Leeds Mercury*, 30 June 1862.

60 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 28 June 1862.

61 *Leeds Mercury*, 2 July 1862.

62 *Leeds Mercury* 2 July 1862. Italics added.

63 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 5 July 1862.

64 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 5 July 1862.

65 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 5 July 1862.

66 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 28 June 1862.

67 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 5 July 1862.

10.5920/policedSociety.4

68 *Huddersfield Examiner,* 5 July 1862.

69 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 28 June 1862.

70 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 5 July 1862.

71 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 5 July 1862 and *Huddersfield Examiner*, 5 July 1862.

72 *Huddersfield Examiner,* 12 July 1862.

73 *Huddersfield Examiner,* 12 July 1862.

74 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 25 October 1862.

75 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 28 May 1864. Grant may have been helped by the sudden and unfortunate death of his 13-year-old son in the December of 1862, *Huddersfield Chronicle,* 15 March 1879. Antrobus later confessed to having been dismissed from two police forces before joining the West Riding constabulary and having been convicted for assault on more than one occasion, though he had lied about this to gain re-employment as a police officer. *Leeds Mercury*, 22 Oct. 1863.

76 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 29 August 1863. The sum was the difference between the £41 subscribed for the defence of the Honley rioters and the £39 than had actually been spent.

77 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 5 July 1862.

78 There were reports of 'dastardly attacks' on the police in the summer of 1858 which dwindled in number bit never entirely disappeared. *HC*, 5 June 1858 and 1 December 1858, 24 December 1859 & 1 September 1860.

79 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 5 November 1859.

80 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 1 October 1859.

81 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 9 March 1861.

82 *Huddersfield Examiner,* 16 March 1861.

83 *Leeds Mercury*, 5 May 1862. The reasons for this upsurge in police activities are not given.

84 *Huddersfield Chronicle,* 21 June 1862.

85 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 21 June 1862.

86 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 17 August 1861 & 21 June 1862. The paper concluded that 'these cases are almost becoming a nuisance'. The actions of the Holmfirth magistrates contrasted with those of their counterparts in Huddersfield who were more sceptical of the police and openly criticized them on occasion.

87 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 12 July 1862.

88 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 12 July 1862.

89 *Leeds Mercury*, 10 July 1862 & *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 12 July 1862.

90 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 12 July 1862.

10.5920/policedSociety.4

91 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 12 July 1862.

92 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 12 July 1862.

93 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 12 July 1862.

94 Wood claimed that he had informed the police of the likely perpetrators (seen spending freely in town) but that they had failed to prevent the robbers from leaving with the stolen goods from Holmfirth and nearby Brockholes railway stations. *HC*, 12 July 1862.

95 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 12 July 1862.

96 The unity of sentiment in 1862 contrasts with the hostility between Chartists and Anti-Corn Law Leaguers in Holmfirth in the 1840s.

97 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 12 July 1862.

98 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 12 July 1862.

99 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 12 July 1862.

100 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 30 August 1862.

101 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 28 March 1863.

102 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 5 July 1862.

103 Responsibility for the policing of Lindley switched to the Huddersfield borough force following incorporation of the town in 1868. Heaton's claim regarding Skelmanthorpe (*Huddersfield Chronicle*, 12 July 1873) may have been overstated. There were some disturbances involving navvies, briefly staying in the village, but local press coverage reveals far fewer anti-police incidents than in places such as Scammonden or Kirkheaton. Conflict between miners and colliers, on the one hand, and the police on the other, was reported on numerous occasions in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, See for example *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 16 May 1879, 1 & 5 June 1880, 18 October 1888, 20 January 1894.

104 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 5 July 1862.

105 *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 28 June 1862.

106 See for example *Huddersfield Chronicle*, 27 June, 12 September 1857, 12 & 30 October, 13 November 1858, 8 January, 2 April 1859, 21 July, 4 &18 August, 27 October, 10 & 24 November, 8 December 1860, 9 February, 25 May, 22 June, 17 August, 28 September & 26 October 1861.

107 *Leeds Mercury*, 30 June 1862.

108 *Huddersfield Examiner*, 5 July 1862.

10.5920/policedSociety.4