7 Policing the "great towns": Bradford, Leeds and Sheffield to 1856

THE DETAIL EXPLORED in Part 1 made clear that 'rural policing' was an umbrella term covering a range of differing experiences of policing and being policed. Similarly, in Part 2, the complexities lurking under the broad heading of 'urban policing' will be examined. Indeed, such complexities are increased by the differing chronologies of urban forces and by the varied socio-economic and political characteristics of the communities they served. It is convenient to use numerical size – of police forces and policed communities – to distinguish between great, medium-sized and small towns but they are not homogenous categories.

While there was much to be admired about urban life, particularly in cultural and scientific terms, there was also much to be feared. Towns tended to have younger populations, including an above average number of young adult males, who, as new arrivals, were (or were seen to be) more shallow-rooted, and less responsible. In towns, large numbers of poor people were herded together in overcrowded, poorly built and inadequately maintained properties in districts lacking basic public health facilities – conditions that created a breeding ground for crime and immorality. The Irish poor, fleeing the catastrophe in John Bull's Other Island, were particularly, and unfairly, feared and condemned but they were the most visible of internal migrants. Anxieties were compounded by concerns with the corrupting influences of 'the demon drink' and gambling in its many forms. An effective local police force could be a source of considerable civic pride but there was no escaping its primary function of preserving order and maintaining decorum.

10.5920/policedSociety.7

Table 7.1: Population growth in Bradford, Leeds & Sheffield, 1831 -1901 (000s and index, 1861 = 100)

	Bradford	Index	Leeds	Index	Sheffield	Index
1831	44	42	123	59	92	50
1841	67	63	152	73	111	60
1851	104	98	172	83	135	73
1861	106	100	207	100	185	100
1871	147	139	259	125	240	130
1881	194	183	309	149	285	154
1891	266	251	368	178	324	175
1901	280	264	429	207	409	221

Source: B R Mitchell & P Deane, *Abstract of British Historical Statistics*, Cambridge University Press, 1962, pp. 24-7

All three great towns of the West Riding grew significantly during the Victorian period. Bradford's growth was so dramatic that some compared the town with frontier towns in America or Australia. Their economic and social histories were distinctive but in all three existing institutions of governance were found wanting. Fragmentation of responsibility and limited powers restricted their abilities, particularly in Bradford. In all three there was a broadly similar approach through improvement act and incorporation, though the chronologies of change and outcomes varied. Particularly in Leeds 'old' policing arrangements evolved in response to demands for greater security, reducing the contrast between 'old' and 'new' policing but in all three towns improvement dated back at least to the early nineteenth century.

The emergence of the 'new' police

At the turn of the nineteenth century, Bradford was little more than 'a mere cluster of huts,' according to one observer and but one of a number of relatively small towns involved in the worsted trade. [1] By the start of Victoria's reign it had clearly supplanted Halifax as the dominant centre of the trade and, in so doing, becoming, in the words of the *Morning Chronicle*'s special correspondent, 'essentially a new town.'[2] Unsurprisingly, the rapidly-expanding town quickly outgrew its institutions. An improvement act of 1803, applicable to the town centre, was limited in its scope but the Tory-dominated Improvement

Commissioners were unwilling to use fully their powers. Matters reached a critical point in the 1830s. The insanitary state of the town, especially the Irish districts, the poverty of many of its inhabitants, notably handloom weavers, the inability to maintain order in the face of popular protest, be it anti-New Poor Law protesters or 'physical force' Chartists, and the growing, if more mundane, threat of petty crime and immorality –all were laid bare and added to the movement for municipal reform.[3]

Although not unique to Bradford, – nearby Huddersfield was similar – responsibility was shared by various authorities, whose activities were rarely coordinated. The Court Leet of the Lordship of the Manor confirmed two constables annually, the Improvement Commission was responsible for the night watch, numbering just under fifty men by the mid-1840s, and from 1842, the Vestry appointed two paid constables. In addition, from 1817 there was an Association for the Prosecution of Felons. Further, there was outright opposition to the creation of a police force from opposite ends of the political spectrum.[4] The leading Tory, Squire Auty, had played a prominent role in the opposition to the adoption of the Rural Police Acts of 1839/40 and continued to oppose police reform in Bradford, in which he was joined by the town's Radicals. Change was delayed and it was not until 1847 that Bradford became a municipal borough. In November, the newly formed watch committee set out its proposals for a police force with distinct day and night sections, rather than a single, combined force.

The senior officers comprised a chief constable, a superintendent and two inspectors. The watch committee selected as chief constable William Leverett, who had risen through the ranks to become an inspector in an eight-year career with the Liverpool police, in preference to the experienced local man, superintending constable Charles Ingham. From the outset there was disagreement over the appropriate level of salary. A compromise was struck with the salary being £200 for one year only.[5] Not for the last time, expenditure on the police was a source of contention.[6] Four sergeants and forty-eight constables were to be assigned to night duty, two sergeants and ten constables to day duty. There were also two designated detectives. An estimated 700 men applied to join the force. The watch committee looked for men of experience to fill the post of sergeant. Only one of the six appointed was not a serving police officer; two were serving in the Manchester force and one in each of the London, Liverpool and Sheffield forces. Twenty of the

forty-eight-strong existing night watch were appointed as constable, six other men had some police experience but thirty-four newly-appointed constables had none. A further eighteen men were placed on a 'supernumerary list' to fill vacancies promptly. Quantitative change was limited but the watch committee looked to create a force that was qualitatively superior. All recruits, as well as being expected to be literate, were issued with a detailed rule book, containing basic advice and providing a base-line for conduct. General advice – 'never enter a public house or accept liquor from any whomsoever,' and do not 'enter into idle chat with any of the inhabitants' – was combined with more specific guidance – 'behave … with a determined sternness of manner and never allow [drunken and quarrelsome men and 'women of the town'] to gather in crowds.' The watch committee had no illusions about likely popular response to the police. Constables were to disperse potential troublemakers but 'must be cautious how they interfere [because] … the police are *obnoxious* to such persons.'[7] A clear command structure and appropriate guidance and training were necessary elements in creating a more effective force but much depended upon the quality of recruits and that in turn depended in no small measure on wage levels. Sergeants' pay was set at 21s per week and constables' at 17s. This was low compared to the pay of an overseer in the local textile industry, which could average 30s per week.[8] With a new man brought in to lead, a new command structure, and the passing of eighty-nine byelaws, the newly-elected watch committee was determined to break with the minimalist approach of the old improvement commissioners and take a more interventionist stance.

If Bradford was the brash new town, Leeds was 'a more substantial and slower-growing town.'[9] The woollen and allied trades dominated an increasingly diversified local economy. As in Bradford, there was a substantial Irish population, living in some of the town's most insanitary districts but there was a wider problem of overcrowding and inadequate housing associated with the two-roomed, 'House and Chamber,' tenements.[10] Local reformers waxed eloquent on the threats posed by drunkenness and gambling born out of such squalor. Although Chartism took a distinctive and essentially moderate form in Leeds, the very presence of such men heightened the perceived need for an effective, protective police. However, there was a tradition of municipal reform, dating back to the Improvement Act of 1755 with its concern that '*several Burglaries, Robberies, and other Outrages and Disorders have lately been committed. and many more attempted within the said Town, and the Streets,*

Lanes, Alleys, and Passages thereof.'[11] In the early nineteenth century a night watch was created, a chief constable appointed and steps taken to improve supervision. The watchmen provided a 'significant preventive police.'[12] For thirty-four weeks of the year there were twelve inspectors and seventy-one watchmen, falling to seven inspectors and fifty-one watchmen for the remainder of the year. In 1834 the local magistrates conducted a thorough review of the working of the night force to improve efficiency, taking advice from Liverpool and Manchester and bringing in a new superintendent.[13] The focus remained on the city centre and, as a consequence, the fast-growing out-townships fell outside these provisions. The 1835 Municipal Corporations Act was less of a break with the past, particularly in terms of personnel but there was a determination to continue improvements in policing, though closer (and more regular) scrutiny of the police by the watch committee, a revised beat system (1843), the building of additional stations (1852), and an overall increase in numbers.[14] Not all issues were resolved. The size of the force remained a contentious issue, as was the amalgamation of the day and night force but this does not detract from the post-1835 drive to improve overall urban governance in Leeds.

Sheffield was the only West Riding town of comparable size to Leeds. Its prosperity was founded on the transformed steel industry with its wide-ranging cutlery and tools trade based on a plethora of small producers, the 'little mesters.' Mortality rates in the town, notably from respiratory diseases associated with the cutlery trade, were high but there was a wider problem of insanitation in the 'many old, crowded and filthy locations … [with] hundreds of slight and flimsy cottages … and partial and insufficient sewerage.'[15] Many of the poorer elements of Sheffield society, including an Irish community in 'The Crofts,' lived in squalid conditions. As in other towns, there was a concern that social problems were exacerbated by the prevalence of beerhouses. Conservative fears were further heightened by the strength of support for the radical cause in Sheffield.

Police reform in Sheffield dated back to the early nineteenth century. The 1818 Improvement Act covered an area described by a three-quarter-mile radius centred on the parish church, which contained a significant proportion of the population but excluded the expanding out-townships. The act made provision for a large commission, which was responsible for the appointment of 'able-bodied' watchmen, who were responsible for dealing with 'all such

10.5920/policedSociety.7

Malefactors, Disturbers of the King's Peace and all others suspected and disorderly Persons … wandering or misbehaving themselves.' By October 1820 there were eight watchmen in post, rising to fifty by the early 1830s. A plan introduced in 1821 divided the town into fifty beats, confirmed the role of watchmen and was printed and distributed at large. Contrary to reformist expectations, the new arrangements did not provide a defence against disorder but, despite long-running criticism of the commissioners, there was little attempt to improve policing until the mid-1830s. In 1836 a day force was created from men of the night watch.[16] Two years later a detailed watching plan was agreed. There was a general agreement that 'an extended and improved police act' was desirable but there was also a firm view that those outside the boundaries had no claim.[17] Effectively, the out-townships were left to their own devices. Some – notably Nether Hallam and Attercliffe – adopted the 1833 Lighting and Watching Act. By the late-1830s the question of incorporation was centre stage in Sheffield. Policing was a key element in the debate. The 1839/40 Rural Police Acts were seen as a threat to Sheffield's standing. According to the *Sheffield Independent* there was a danger that Sheffield would be put on 'the same footing as Ecclesfield, Penistone, Holmfirth and Delft.'[18] With incorporation in 1843 a borough watch committee was appointed and a 'new' police force established but reflecting the extent of police reform immediately prior to incorporation, the 'old' police were to all intents and purposes, rebadged as the 'new.'

The pathway to police reform took different routes in the three towns, particularly in Bradford. There, the greater pace of demographic and economic growth more quickly swamped existing institutions but the lack of political initiative led to a sharper contrast between 'old' and 'new' policing. In Leeds and Sheffield, there were a series of more gradual adjustments. There were, nonetheless, underlying common concerns – the need to protect ever more valuable but vulnerable property; more so, the need to regulate public spaces in an efficient, civilised and decorous manner; and the need to protect respectable society from petty criminality and immorality. Police reform, not inevitable, even when there was an awareness of the limitations of existing institutions, depended upon the decisions of local elites. More important, there was no guarantee that the 'new,' or not-so-new, police would achieve the aims of reformers. The test would come quite literally in the streets,

10.5920/policedSociety.7

'New' policing before the inspectorate

In the decades before the 1856 County and Borough Police act the watch committees of the three towns exercised considerable influence with comparatively little governmental oversight. Although there was a widely held measure of efficiency of one constable for every thousand people, there was no mechanism for enforcement and the size of police forces reflected local balances struck between the demands of efficiency and economy. Somewhat surprisingly, the statistics published by the government in 1854 show a broad similarity in the police/population ratios in the three towns in 1851. The stability in the size of the force in Sheffield contrasts with both Leeds – where numbers were cut in the late-1840s only to be restored in the early-1850s – and Bradford where police numbers grew dramatically in the early-1850s. Nonetheless, as of 1851 to meet the 1:1000 ratio, there would have had to have been (roughly) a 10 percent increase in numbers in Sheffield, 20 percent in Leeds and 25 percent in Bradford.

Table 7.2: Police and population in Bradford, Leeds & Sheffield, 1848-1853

	Bradford			Leeds			Sheffield		
	Police	Population	Police population ratio	Police	Police population ratio	Ratio	Police	Population	Police population ratio
1848	69			137			122		
1849	69			132			122		
1850	69			134			122		
1851	84	103,786	1:1236	142	172,279	1:1213	122	135,310	1:1109
1852	93			147			122		
1853	111		1:935*	152		1:1133*	134		1:1010*

*Based on unadjusted 1851 census figure

Source: Parliamentary Papers, City and Borough Police, 1854

An important element in the campaign for incorporation had been the need for a effective policing and yet the newly-formed Bradford force could not have appeared at a more difficult time than 1848. At its worst, parts of the city were under Chartist control and the police needed approval to enter them. Nor did it help that there remained vociferous critics of the 'burthen' on ratepayers created by the force.[19] Several influential figures pointed to Leeds and Sheffield 'with their enormous expenditure … and secret watch committees.'[20] Opposition to 'wasteful, extravagant and abominable jobs,' as councillor Rhodes put it, continued.[21] In 1849 councillor Driver sought to reduce the size of the force. 'There was,' he claimed, 'no earthly use for a police force on the present scale.'[22] He failed to carry the day but the force remained unchanged in size until 1851. Numbers increased thereafter, not least because of an extension of the policed area, but the watch committee constantly reminded council members that it was proceeding cautiously. When the watch was extended to parts of Bowling, Manningham and Little Horton, the committee reported approvingly that this had been achieved with the appointment of two extra men, rather than the seven originally thought necessary.[23] That this was achieved by extending the beats of in-post constables was glossed over. Thereafter and despite reassurances that expenditure per constable in Bradford were lower than in Leeds and Sheffield, 'economical' councillors focussed on the question of police pay.[24] A proposal from a divided Watch Committee to reward five men 'of unblemished service' provoked a lengthy debate in council in 1853. The chair of the watch committee, and later mayor, councillor Murgatroyd commissioned a survey of police pay in other northern towns and successfully argued that, not only were the officers underpaid but, more importantly, raising police wages was not squandering ratepayers' money but a means of raising 'the character of the police force' and therefore its efficiency.[25] The reality was less optimistic.

As in other forces, the early years of the Bradford police were characterised by high rates of turnover and indiscipline. In the first quarter of 1849, the chief constable informed the watch committee that three constables had been dismissed and a further thirteen fined – equivalent to approximately one-third of the force. Ill-discipline, especially neglect of duty was a greater problem in the winter months, but even in the summer months roughly one in six constables was disciplined.[26] The problems were predictable. Men were dismissed for drunkenness, insubordination and neglect of duty. And men

10.5920/policedSociety.7

resigned because of the demands of the job and the low levels of remuneration in a booming local economy.[27] The need to improve the 'character' of the force was recognized by many members of the town council but admonitions to appoint men of sound morals and industriousness were easy to make but less easy to implement. In both recruitment and discipline pragmatism trumped perfectionism. The watch committee was generally supportive of the town's police and lenient in its response to disciplinary matters. However, this leniency, and particularly the willingness to re-appoint after recent dismissal, led to public criticism.[28] Challenged about the dismissal and re-appointment of John Binns for drunkenness, the watch committee justified the decision on the grounds that it was his first offence and 'his character as an efficient and steady officer stood high.'[29] Similarly, the re-appointment of PC Laycock shortly after dismissal for drunkenness was justified in terms of his previous excellent character.[30] When councillor Rawson, yet again, drew attention to the 'unjust and dangerous' watch committee practice of re-appointment, he was reassured that in three such cases, they were 'of such a special character' as to warrant reappointment.[31] The situation eased over time but the chief constable's 1856 claim that his force was 'never in a better working order or in a better state of discipline,' while technically correct, glossed over continuing difficulties that reduced its efficiency.[32]

A number of cases involving police violence were seized upon by councillors Pollard and Auty – both well-known opponents of the new police.[33] Ultimately, the officers were told (by the chief constable at the behest of the watch committee) to exercise 'more discretion.' Even when PC Field was found to have 'exceeded due discretion' when beating a woman with his staff, he was merely requested not to do so again![34] Working-class women were in a particularly vulnerable position. Sergeant Lotty and PC Rawnsley, seeking to execute a warrant relating to an offence under the Worsted Act, took Ely Wigglesworth from her bed in the early hours of the morning, even though she was sick, and held her at the police station. The watch committee reviewed the case and concluded that the officers were not at fault as they were following orders from a superior, though it did ask the chief constable to instruct his men to 'use more discretion in the executions of warrants.'[35] Even less fortunate was Lydia Kitchen who complained about the refusal of the police to come to her aid when assaulted by her husband. Patriarchal attitudes and the police belief that domestic questions were not within their

remit triumphed. The watch committee, though not unanimous, concluded that the constable had acted (or more accurately not acted) properly. Further, blaming the victim, they opined that 'the woman with her tongue kept her husband in a state of constant irritation, and that, if she had been quiet herself, the probability was that no disturbance would have taken place.'[36] Only occasionally, as in the case of PC Bolton, accused of assaulting a member of the public with his staff, was there public condemnation. Bolton, according to the mayor, had not shown 'the required good temper and forbearance' but had acted with 'unnecessary cruelty.'[37]

Police violence was a major problem but more widespread were more mundane forms of misconduct – sleeping on night duty, drinking on duty and simple neglect. The failure to act rarely caught the public eye as the unusual case of Edward Hailstone shows. Hailstone was a man of standing in the community, a prominent Bradford solicitor, who was to become deputy lieutenant of the county in 1870.[38] In the summer of 1852, he was incensed by the absence from duty of PC Ashworth, who had spent 'his time in my garden with a female companion.' There was also the question of an alleged theft of garden produce by another constable, Wilkinson. Hailstone, in a letter to the *Bradford Observer*, was further angered by the fact that he had personally taken the fornicating PC Ashworth to the police station, only to find later that he had not been dismissed. The watch committee concluded that the offence was 'not such as to warrant them in discharging the constable … but it [did] require his suspension for one month.'[39] Hailstone found some satisfaction in the example made of the hungry PC Wilkinson, who was dismissed and subsequently fined 20s and costs by the town magistrates, as an example to others, for his nocturnal theft of eight or nine gooseberries and a similar number of pea-pods.[40] Hailstone still felt that 'the duties of the [watch] Committee are not understood by its members, or are performed in a lax manner,' only to be told by the watch committee chair, councillor Murgatroyd, that the committee had acted properly on the evidence available to it. The case was unusual but nonetheless throws light not simple on police misdemeanours but also on the tolerant attitude of the authorities.

A number of these cases also throw light on the relationship between the police, watch committee and the town magistrates. Whereas in Leeds it was common practice for cases to be sent from the watch committee to the magistrates for action, in Bradford it was the reverse but the relationship

10.5920/policedSociety.7

between the watch committee, and senior police figures, and the magistrates was not always cordial. In the summer of 1851, the watch committee set up a sub-committee to consider the 'better preservation of the peace.'[41] The main concerns were 'several cases of violent assault upon the police' and the leniency of the Bradford magistrates, handing out 'fines of a few shillings' that could easily be raised by friends of the defendant. There was also a concern with the leniency with which magistrates dealt with cases of theft from the person by prostitutes in beerhouses.[42] It was feared that magistrates were undermining the police in a central area of their work.

For all the talk of fighting serious crime, a major and constant concern was with the blight of drunkenness and prostitution. The chief constable's reports record in detail the number of prosecutions for various infringements of the licensing laws – selling out of hours, permitting drunk and disorderly behaviour and/or gambling and 'harbouring notoriously bad characters' – problems more strongly associated with widely-condemned beerhouse-keepers. Chief constable Leverett, convinced that 'prostitution [was] more amalgamated and concentrated with drinking facilities,' detailed the number of beerhouses, their location and the number of prostitutes associated with them.[43] An occasional voice was raised in defence of 'beerhouse keepers … [as] a set of injured and ill-used men,' but the bulk of opinion said otherwise.[44] Leverett had no doubt that beerhouse/brothels were in a majority but even those who did not were in 'a poverty-stricken case' and survive only through 'foolish and vicious games and amusements,' including Dart Puffing, Dominoes, Nigger Dancing and Dancing Matches,' which corrupted the young boys found therein.[45] Firm action against beerhouses won approval from some quarters but exacerbated hostility from others.

The continuing scale of drunkenness and the growing number of assaults on the police in the mid-1850s bear witness to the limited impact of the 'new' police and the limited success in winning acceptance, let alone support, from many sections of working-class society, not least the over-policed Irish.[46] As well as small-scale scraps, involving maybe two or three drunken men and a constable or two, there were reports of gangs of fifty or sixty Irishmen congregating to thrash the police.[47] Insensitive or excessive policing provoked a violent response. In the summer of 1848, using a recently passed byelaw to prevent loitering, the police sought to break up a crowd at Sun Bridge, which 'as latterly become customary [were] discussing the state of affairs

in general and of Ireland in particular."[48] A police request to 'move on' was laughed at and the police attempted to arrest the individual concerned. The ensuing meleé gave rise to accusations of police brutality, though an attempted prisoner rescue was thwarted as 'some [unspecified] lovers of order and authority instantly came to the aid of the policemen."[49] For the most part, the police were viewed by many working-class men and women with suspicion. At times they faced not just excessive use of police staffs but also faced 'routine' violence, particularly, but not exclusively, in the Irish districts of the town. Talk of consensual policing rang hollow in such circumstances. As councillor Rudd ruefully noted in 1855 'the police had odium enough to bear' from the ordinary folk of Bradford.[50]

The *Leeds Mercury* greeted the advent of the "new" police in the town with enthusiasm. Under the new system, based on the Met model, it argued that Leeds would be 'regularly watched,' day and night by 'a selection of men of responsibility … [with] habits of sobriety and integrity.'[51] These constables, guided by the *Instructions to the Police Officers of Leeds*, were instructed to be 'active without being offensive.'[52] The new system, the *Mercury* concluded, was 'incomparably better than the old system.' In fact, the contrast between old and new was less dramatic. Nonetheless, the watch committee faced two problems. First, was the question of amalgamating the day and night forces. Initially rejected, it remained a live issue, and provoked intense debate, notably in the mid-1840s. Second, was the question of the size and associated cost of the force, which again led to bitter disputes, as influential critics, from left and right of local politics, wanted to see the numbers greatly reduced, even the force disbanded. Even those who were more supportive of the police were still wary of increasing the rates burden. At the same time, there was also an awareness, especially among senior police figures, that the more men were needed to reduce beats, which were much longer in Leeds – as much as four or five miles and taking as much as an hour and forty-five minutes – than in Manchester, Liverpool and the Met.[53] And then there was the question of policing the expanding out-townships. In both cases, the need to augment the force had to be balanced against the costs involved.

The Leeds force did grow from ninety-five men at its inception to 152 by the early 1850s but the path was far from smooth. Expansion was constrained at best, reversed at worse, as in the mid-1840s. The climax came in 1845 when the force was cut by twenty-seven men – four sergeants, two

10.5920/policedSociety.7

acting sergeants and twenty-one constables.[54] It took seven years for the force to regain its level of 1844. There was a shared concern with economy but it was the Tory councillors who were the most outspoken and persistent critic of what they saw as a bloated and inefficient force. Councillor Jackson's reference to 'imbecile wretches,' who should be culled from the force was extreme but, given the high level of dismissals, there was little doubt, *pacé* the *Leeds Mercury*, that the watch committee continued to struggle to find suitable recruits. In the late-1830s, annual turnover was equivalent to some forty percent of the force. For every man who resigned, a further four were dismissed.[55] Although the situation improved by the mid-1840s, there was a further deterioration in the early 1850s, when turnover was roughly 30 percent of the force.* Unsurprisingly, men were dismissed most commonly for drunkenness, neglect of duty and insubordination while others resigned, most commonly in the first months of service. Dismissals were the tip of a larger problem of discipline, particularly in the late-1830s. The annual total of recorded disciplinary offences was in excess of one hundred in these years but later fell to about fifty.[56]

Despite high rates of turnover, as in the WRCC, there emerged a group of men, serving five years or more, who played an important part in the development of more stable and more efficient forces. In Leeds, between the 1835 and 1855, sixty-four men became long-serving officers.[57] All but two served at least ten years with thirty-five (or 55 per cent) serving between twenty and twenty-nine years. Nine served for over thirty years and one forty. Given the demands of the job for constables in particular, there must be considerable doubt about the physical and mental capabilities of these men in their later years in the force. Only half of these men were pensioned but a significant minority, almost one-third either resigned or were dismissed. Some men were not lost to policing but were promoted elsewhere but others simply left for unspecified 'better' employment elsewhere. More striking, almost half never moved beyond the rank of constable, creating a problem in maintaining morale and efficiency among older men. The creation of long-service classes and the occasional pay increase was a partial, but not wholly successful, response. Prospects were better for men appointed in the 1850s as post-1856 expansion increased opportunities. Even so, those who did move

* See appendix 1

up a rank rarely gained a promotion beyond sergeant. Equally striking, just over half of these men had five or more disciplinary incidents on their record, though again there are signs of improvement among the 1850s-men. Overall, only six men had a clean record. Elsewhere there were predictable incidents of drunkenness (though a distinction was drawn between being drunk and being 'in liquor'), late arrival on duty, and neglect of duty. Occasionally a man was missing from duty only to be found in a beerhouse or a brothel, or simply in a drunken sleep at home. As in Bradford, the career policeman was a flawed individual whose (recorded) indiscretions impacted directly on the way they discharged their duties.

Undoubtedly there were success stories. William Ingham (joined 1833) served for thirty-nine years, rising to the rank of inspector and with no disciplinary incidents recorded to his name. John Merritt (1847) and John Moody (1841) also became inspectors with only a couple of blemishes on their record.[58] John Cliffe (1842), exceptionally, had been dismissed for 'insulting the Watch Committee,' but after 'expressing contrition,' was re-engaged and eventually made inspector. But there were also failures. Daniel Griffin (1855) was another a promising figure but his career ended in ignominy when, as an inspector, he was dismissed for improper conduct. Likewise, among those who achieved one promotion to sergeant, there were several positive careers, notably John Neal (1837), the longest serving officer with forty years to his name when he retired, William Kirby (1855) a detective sergeant, whose only fall from grace was a failure to report a 'strong smell of fire,' and the aptly-named Benjamin Best (1849). However, there also nearly as many who were demoted from the rank of sergeant because of their poor disciplinary record. The career of William Simpson (1855) illustrates the problem facing the watch committee. Although disciplined on three occasions as a constable, he was deemed sufficiently able to be promoted to sergeant in February 1860. During an eleven-year stint sergeant Simpson was disciplined three times for being drunk on duty and twice for falsifying his night returns – the second such offence, combined with drunkenness, saw him demoted in December 1871. Despite being disciplined a further three times for drink-related offences, he was re-appointed sergeant in September 1875. Charitably, Simpson's abilities as a police officer outweighed his disciplinary weaknesses in the eyes of the watch committee. Less charitably, there was no better alternative. For whatever reason, his continued employment (and that

10.5920/policedSociety.7

of men with similarly chequered records) highlight the continuing presence of men, whose flawed characters had a negative impact on their performance, in a force that was often praised in public for its positive contributions to public life.

There were a number of long-serving policemen with good disciplinary records who never achieved promotion and whose only recognition and reward was movement into the good conduct class. Daniel Gregson (1848) was unique in serving twenty-one years with an unblemished disciplinary record. Most constables had a record that ranged from mediocre to barely acceptable. Thomas Pitts (1849) appeared to be an officer of promise, rewarded by the watch committee for 'extraordinary diligence,' yet racked up twenty-one disciplinary incidences for which he was variously cautioned, reprimanded and fined. These were predominantly for neglect of duty and drinking on duty. Similarly, Joseph Porritt (1855) and, lastly, the inaptly-named George Virtue (1844), who was finally dismissed after seventeen years in the force, during which time he was disciplined on twenty-seven occasions for being drunk on duty neglecting his duty or being late. Belatedly demoted from second to third class constable in 1858, his behaviour did not improve and he was eventually dismissed in 1861. It is difficult to see such men as efficient officers. Indeed, the surprise is that they were not dismissed earlier in their careers. Given the reputation of the Leeds Watch Committee for its supervision of the police, their tolerance of ill-disciplined men raises questions about either their judgement or the difficulties they faced in recruiting and training good men.

In welcoming the "new" police, the *Leeds Mercury* saw them as a counter to the 'gambling, drunkenness and dogfights' that were 'favourite pastimes in some parts of town.'[59] Both drunkenness and gambling, not to mention prostitution, were undoubtedly widespread problems in the town centre; less so, dogfighting, which tended to take place in less crowded places such as Hunslet and even Headingly.[60] The balance of police work in the late-1830s was clear. There were approximately 550 felonies reported annually. At the same time, there were a similar number of vagrancy cases and over a thousand for drunk and disorderly behaviour. [61] The importance of beerhouses and 'low' lodging houses as sites of crime and immorality was a continuing theme in the local discourse on crime and the priorities thus set were reflected in the actions of the police. Week after week the local press reported a sorry

catalogue of largely petty crimes committed or planned in the town's numerous beerhouses, though statistics for arrests for drunkenness and vagrancy reveal often sharp year-on-year fluctuations.[62] Equally important, were the ongoing constraints on police action. The sheer number of beerhouses meant that not all could be subjected to close scrutiny – a problem that was exacerbated yearly by the cycle of 'high days and holidays' and the associated short-term upsurge in drinking. In addition, for the individual constable there was the question of how much discretion was the better part of proverbial valour. Policemen were well aware of the physical violence that had been inflicted on some of their colleagues. Problem spots, problem individuals became well known and only tackled with a sufficient force of men. More generally, officers learnt the imprecise science of dealing with drunks and avoiding physical assault. The impact of such early-Victorian 'canteen culture' is impossible to quantify but foolish to ignore.

Notwithstanding these constraints on action, the "new" police represented a significant intrusion into working-class life in Leeds. Charged with maintaining decorum on the streets and lanes, policemen, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, kept beerhouses, casinos and concert halls and their clientele under surveillance. Resources were devoted on perceived problem areas, which almost by definition, were inhabited by poor, unskilled working-classes, especially those from Ireland. Further, even when the *actual* police presence was limited, the *potential* for surveillance and interference remained. Practical policing was in no small measure a confidence trick to disguise the fact that the policeman was regularly outnumbered in his daily work. Occasionally, police authority of challenged; very occasionally it was (albeit briefly) overthrown – history records such events. More often, men and women moved on when requested or followed the advice to go home quietly – history rarely, if ever, records these events.

The immediate impact of the 'new' police was clear. The number of drunk and disorderly prosecutions doubled in 1836 compared with 1835. Overall, the number of people brought before the town's magistrates increased by a third in one year as the number of women prosecuted rose by 70 percent.[63] But police activity, praised by the *Leeds Mercury*, was perceived differently by those on the receiving end of police attention. The arrival of the new police was accompanied by an increased number of assaults upon them.[64] References in the local press highlight the conflict between police and public.

10.5920/policedSociety.7

Many were drunken brawls, individual explosions of anger often directed at individual officers. Nonetheless, beyond the individual officer, the 'bloody Peelers' were unloved and often some more. Disturbances at Vicar's Cross in 1844 pointed to the existence of anti-police sentiment. A proposed meeting, 'to hear the usual addresses on temperance, etc,' was banned by the mayor but went ahead. In the eyes of some councillors such meetings were locations for the spread of 'Infidel and Socialist opinions, and political disputations.'[65] The police intervened to disperse the crowd and maintained a presence there throughout the day. The 'constant collisions with the police' resulted in more trouble than had occurred at earlier meetings. The 'Teetotallers, the Primitive Methodists, and other preachers,' joined Chartist figures, notably Joshua Hobson, in condemning the actions of the police in infringing the right to assemble and the right to free speech.[66] Matters were overtaken by a more serious clash between soldiers and police which resulted in several days of riot.[67] More important than the initial clash between the two – a not unusual occurrence at the time – was the popular response. Alleys, inns and shops were reportedly thronged with respectable people, whose manifestations of sympathy had throughout been on the side of the police.'[68] More worryingly for the authorities was the response of the 'mob' or 'rabble,' as the press continued to characterise working-class action. Initially, 'the whole of the lower classes [in Kirkgate] … turned out into the street and excited the soldiers to acts of violence upon the police officers.'[69] This was followed by more positive actions. The 'rabble … fell upon the police, pelting them with stones and bottles.'[70] Attempts by the police to escape down alleys and lanes were thwarted and civilian attacks on the police took place. Cries of "Down with the police" and "We will murder them all" were reported. The *Leeds Mercury*, often a supporter of the new police, noted that the police were 'vehemently hissed and scoffed at,' while the 'mob' acted ' not … out of love to the soldiers themselves but from some feeling of hatred to the police.'[71] There were references to the 'exasperating petty tyranny' of the police' and to a general hatred born of the 'petty and unmanly tyranny which they [the police] have displayed on many recent occurrences.'[72]

The events of summer 1844 were the product of long-standing resentments and, although the troubles died out relatively quickly, they did not disappear. A number of large-scale prisoner rescues, responding to 'the Irish cry,' was indicative of enduring hostility with that particular section

of the community. Twenty additional officers, with drawn cutlasses were required to thwart a prisoner rescue in Marsh Lane in 1848.[73] Eight years later, two constables were 'besieged' in the Boot and Shoe beerhouse by some two hundred Irish and had to be rescued by twenty of their colleagues armed with staves.[74] Although not all interactions were as combative, policing in many parts of Leeds in the mid-century was confrontational, even coercive, and some way from the Peelite ideal of policing by consent.

Following incorporation in 1842, Sheffield's not-so-new 'new' police date from 1844. Given the town's pathway to incorporation, there was an important element of continuity in terms of both personnel and practice. Thomas Raynor, an experienced officer who had demonstrated his reformist credentials under the old improvement commission, was appointed as head of a force, in theory, of some eighty men, many of whom were carried over from the previous regime. Similarly, the new watch committee contained several experienced men, who had been involved with policing for some years. Police numbers, standing at seventy-one in 1844, were increased significantly in 1845 (forty more men) and to a lesser extent in 1846 (nine more). Thereafter numbers remained stable before being increased in 1853 (an additional twelve) making a total of 134 men. More resources were devoted to night policing, nightwatchmen outnumbered day constables by approximately 3:2. In 1849, for example, there were thirty-nine police constables and sixty-five nightwatchmen, who were supervised by three sergeants and five patrol sergeants as well as three inspectors.[75]

Although not without problems, the Sheffield force experienced fewer difficulties in recruitment and retention than in Leeds or Bradford. 1845 was a year of great numerical change and, as in other towns, and saw considerable churn in the force. Almost 20 per cent of the force had been disciplined, including 7 percent dismissed or ordered to resign.[76] By 1850 these numbers had been halved and by 1846 a mere 6 per cent of men were disciplined. Only two men (or 1 percent of the total) were dismissed. Unsurprising drunkenness was, by far, the most common disciplinary offence. In contrast, neglect of duty and disobedience rarely featured.[77] These figures stand in stark contrast to experiences elsewhere and the question immediately arises: was this the product of low expectations and inadequate supervision, or even of under-reporting/recording? The improvement drive initiated by the new chief constable (Jackson) appointed in 1859 lends support to this view but it

would be misleading to overlook the early determination of the previous chief constable (Raynor) to improve standards. Equally, the watch committee, and more specifically the police sub-committee, played an active role in the management of the town's police force, including the remodelling of the force in 1856/7.[78] However, this determination to maintain or improve standards was underpinned by an awareness that the Sheffield police were still relatively inexperienced and that the churn of dismissals and resignations, even if lower than in Bradford or Leeds, meant that it took years to create a stable force. In 1855 the watch committee, despite its general pride in the town force, conceded that the supervisory arrangements for the night watch were insufficient to ensure that constables resisted the temptation of a free drink or a comfortable break, especially in the harsher winter months. Indeed, there was a growing belief in the mid-1850s that the chief constable Raynor was no longer able to maintain or improve standards of policing.

As in Leeds, the watch committee placed great emphasis on its role in hiring and firing men, in disciplining them, approving promotions and even occasionally commenting on the deployment of men.[79] The watch committee was also concerned with economy and value for money. Sheffield's local politicians were not alone in protecting rate-payers' money but, for the most part, there was agreement about (even pride in) the efficient way in which the town's force was run. Alderman Hall, for example, not only praised the town force but assured fellow councillors that 'the greatest possible economy' had been exercised.[80] But not everyone agreed. Following his election in 1846, the one-time Chartist, Isaac Ironside – supported by other members of the Central Democratic Association – was a constant critic, arguing variously that the size of the force could be diminished and the salary of the chief constable – the 'principal thief taker,' as he described Raynor – reduced.[81] Chartist councillors were not unique to Sheffield – Joshua Hobson in Leeds was another notable example – but Ironside was a particularly outspoken figure, who often questioned the very legitimacy of the new police. However, despite challenging the establishment notably over the treatment of the dismissed constable, George Bakewell, Ironside was often more of a pragmatist, to the extent of defending the police and the difficulty of their job.

The meetings of the watch committee were also an opportunity for members to draw attention to problems of order and decorum in the town. The overall tone had been set at the outset when the newly-appointed watch

committee set out a range of byelaws to regulate behaviour in public places. They proscribed a range of general street nuisances including, brawling, disorderly behaviour, prostitution, dog fights, cock fights and prize fights, and travelling showmen,[82] Over the years a number of concerns were brought to the attention of the police – furious driving by milk-boys and baker-boys, dogs roaming the streets, young men loitering in the streets, gambling – not just on the streets but also in temperance houses! – begging and drunkenness. Between 1835 and 1839 arrests for felonies in Sheffield averaged thirty-one per year. At the same time there were an annual average of 102 vagrants were prosecuted and 1465 men and women for disorderly conduct.[83] A similar picture emerges from post-incorporation police statistics. Raynor's monthly return of crime statistics in April 1844 showed that almost 70 per cent (197 of 288 cases) were drink related.[84] Similarly, assault cases figured large in the statistics, in large part a product of the police attention given to the town's 300 or so beerhouses. Unlike in some towns, the Sheffield police only arrested drunks when they became troublesome. The drunk, even the drunk and incapable, particularly if they were locals, were commonly instructed or helped to go home. Thus, official statistics of arrests significantly understated the police presence in working-class life.

Figures from the chief constable's annual returns of crime statistics give a rough indication of the impact of the police and their 'productivity,' as measured by arrests per constable.** Over an eleven-year period, 1845 – 55, the police made an annual average of 3328 arrests per year, or twenty-nine arrests per constable per year. The number of arrests and the arrests per constable were both higher for the years from 1851 when the size of the force was increased from 109 to 119.[85] Considered another way, the percentage of the town's population arrested by the police rose from 2 percent (1845 – 50) to 3 percent (1851 – 5). These overall figures understate and misrepresent the underlying reality that it was predominantly working-class young men who dominated the crime figures, and for whom the arrest rate exceeded 25 per cent.[86] In the absence of a reliable series of statistics for the pre-incorporation period, it is difficult to assess the impact of the new police. While the old police may have had a slightly better arrest rate (as Williams argues), the

** See appendix 2

fact that there were more new police meant they had a greater overall impact than their predecessors.

The way in which the new police acted was of considerable (but immeasurable) importance. There are scattered references to confrontational attitudes and the excessive use of force by the police in the early 1850s and, in so far as they reflect anti-police sentiment, there was an increase in recorded assaults on the police, from an improbable two in 1846 to sixty-four in 1850.[87] Qualitative evidence points to the unpopularity of the police, especially among certain sections of the population, with more press-reported cases after incorporation than before. Almost every case of assault on the police was linked with popular recreational activity – gambling in the streets, drinking in beerhouses or singing rooms; often they involved a prisoner rescue. Several assaults were minor – one-on-one or two-on one attacks – but others point to a wider communal dislike. Large crowds gathered, throwing 'stones and brickbats,' even using a police staff against its owner. Officers were kicked and hit. In extreme cases, constables were severely injured – a jaw broken and teeth kicked out – and rendered unfit for work.[88] Certain beerhouses, such as the Brown Cow and its singing room, appear on several occasions, – while certain streets were 'unsafe for policemen to venture … unless aided by one or more of his colleagues.'[89] The 'outrageous' behaviour of the Irish,' attempting prisoner rescues at almost every opportunity, was singled out for condemnation in the local press but it is clear from other reports that it was not simply the Irish who were not averse to giving the police a thrashing when the opportunity presented itself.[90] Equally significant were the repeated requests by Raynor for protection for the police and magisterial statements of their determination to do so. Raynor was an experienced officer with many years of service. He felt it necessary, in May 1848 and again in March 1850, to warn of 'the many interferences with the police' and to call for protection for the police.[91] The town magistrates responded not simply with strong verbal support but also by handing out stiff fines – as much as £3, even £5 – in an attempt to deter anti-police violence.[92]

The extent of anti-police sentiment in certain quarters were starkly revealed during the widely-reported anti-police riot in Paradise-square in the summer of 1855. Paradise-square was a well-known venue for mass meetings. John Wesley had addressed large crowds there, as did Chartist leaders in the 1840s while in February 1855 there had been a mass meeting to protest

against Sabbatarian proposals to limit Sunday licensing hours. There were also a number of 'Irish broils' which 'frequently disgrace the neighbourhood.'[93] In late-July 1855, in this 'locality inhabited by a great number of low-conditioned Irish,' a dozen or so police officers were 'stoned and beaten most unmercifully' by a crowd of Irish men and women, 'animated by a desire to annihilate the force,' that numbered about fifty in the earliest reports, rising to over a thousand by the time the police gave evidence at York Assizes in cases of riot and murder.[94] The trouble rose out of an alleged robbery of £72 by two (or more) Irishmen from a local fish-shop owner, an incident to which the police had been called. The situation escalated rapidly and became very serious for the police, one of whom died from his injuries. Three important points stand out. First, the speed with which the riot developed and the size of the crowd (even discounting later police estimates), suggest considerable hostility. Anger, hatred even was close to the surface in this district. One of accused allegedly swore he would 'kill the b----y policeman,' while there were cries of 'd--- the bloody watchman.'[95] Second, the way in which the crowd isolated the police points to a degree of organisation and something more than a simple 'spontaneous' outburst. Third, the scale and nature of police action raises questions about the policing of the Irish. Within a short space of time, about twelve officers and at least two detectives were at the riot. Further, some had infiltrated the crowd in plain clothes – a fact which may have made uniformed men reluctant to use their truncheons.

Not surprisingly, the Paradise-square riot provided ammunition for critics of the town's force and its police commission. The *Sheffield Daily Telegraph* was particularly outspoken. The town was 'inefficiently lighted and watched,' its police inadequate in numbers – 'not one officer to every thousand persons' – resulting in over-long beats and inadequate protection.[96] There were also criticisms that the decision to turn off lights during the summer months added to the difficulties of the police. More generally, the events of late-July 1855 showed in dramatic manner the extent to which Irish communities existed apart, using their own language, gathering and dispersing 'like magic' and hostile to authority. Ironside told the police commission 'you cannot control the Irish … they will beat your policemen.'[97] Overstated maybe but there was an important kernel of truth in his comment.

There were other less spectacular indicators of the problems facing the new police in Sheffield. The persistence of cock- and dog-fights, for example,

10.5920/policedSociety.7

reflected both the strength of older popular leisure activities in the face of respectable condemnation and criminalisation and the practical difficulties facing the police, where the advent of improved communication, facilitated the organisation of such events, hatched in town but often carried out in the remote countryside, out of the reach of the law. More mundanely, large numbers of young men simply loitering on street corners, obstructing the footpath, or gathering on the outskirts of town in gambling schools were able to evade police attention as often as not, and were not deterred when they were brought before the magistrates. Magistrates and police chiefs had a clear perception of an orderly and decorous town but translating this into a reality threw up challenges which they overcame partially at best.

Some conclusions

Looking at the experiences of the three great towns in Yorkshire, a number of preliminary observations can be made. First, obviously but still importantly, experiences varied in terms of timing, the extent of the break with the past and the impact on and response of the local (but especially working-class) community. Second, the watch committees played an important role in improving the quality of their forces, particularly in Sheffield, but also imposed constraints on force size, notably in Leeds. Third, the organisation of the forces became more complex, more bureaucratic over time. As in the WRCC, rule books, conduct registers and the like were all part of the surveillance and discipling of the ordinary constable. Nonetheless, particularly in Bradford and Leeds, but even in Sheffield, police indiscipline was an ongoing problem that impacted on the efficiency and reputation of the police. A policeman seen or reported publicly asleep, more so an inebriated constable ordering around members of the public failed on both counts. Fourth, while the various 'new' police forces were larger and better regulated than their predecessors, they remained relatively light on the ground, not least where boundaries limited watching to town centres and excluded faster growing out-townships. Further, the police were necessarily part of a wider law-enforcement network that included non-police organisations, not to mention ordinary members of the public. Fifth, notwithstanding these limitations, the new police made a significant intrusion into working-class,

particularly at work or at leisure on the streets. Finally, the adoption of Met practices and principles, especially the notion of policing by consent, set out an ideal to aspire to but the nature and scale of popular opposition highlights the challenges to the exercise of police powers and even, in some cases, to the legitimacy of the police themselves.

10.5920/policedSociety.7

Appendix 1: Leeds police statistics

Table App.1.1: Turnover in Leeds Police, 1838/9 - 1853/4

	Dismissals	Dismissals as % of total turnover	Resignations	Resignations as % of total turnover	Total turnover	Force	Turnover as % of force
1838-9	38	78	11	22	49	107	46
1844-5	10	53	9	47	19	142	13
1847-8	13	76	4	24	17	128	13
1850-1	24	59	17	41	41	134	31
1853-4	18	49	19	51	37	152	24

Source: Adapted from D Churchill, 'Crime, Policing and Control in Leeds, c.1830 – 1890,' unpublished PhD, Open University, 2012, p.75

Table App.1.2: Disciplinary incidents in Leeds Police, 1838/9 – 1853/4

	Total disciplinary incidents	Incidents of drunkenness	All drink-related incidents	All drink related incidents as % total	Force	All disciplinary incidents per 100 constables	All drink related incidents per 100 constables
1838-9	123	38	48	39	107	115	45
1844-5	46	25	34	74	142	32	24
1847-8	47	23	27	57	128	37	45
1850-1	68	27	35	52	134	51	26
1853-4	44	14	29	65	152	29	19

Source: Adapted from D Churchill, 'Crime, Policing and Control in Leeds, c.1830 – 1890,' unpublished PhD, Open University, 2012, pp. 87 & 91

Table App.1.3: Career policemen in Leeds, outcomes, 1835 – 1855

	Final	Career	Outcomes*		
	Pension	Resigned	Dismissed	Died	Incomplete
1830s	7	0	1	2	1
1840s	14	5	7	5	1
1850s	13	5	2	5	1
Total	34	10	10	12	3
		Promotions	Final Grade		
	None	Good Conduct PC only	Sergeant only	Inspector or Superintendent	Incomplete
1830s	3	3	4	1	1
1840s	9	8	9	2	1
1850s	3	5	12	2	1
Total	15	16	25	5	3
		Disciplinary	Incidents		
	0	1-4	5-9	10+	Incomplete
1830s	1	4	3	4	1
1840s	4	9	7	7	1
1850s	1	9	7	5	1
Total	6	22	17	16	3

*Including men re-appointed

Source: Leeds Constabulary Register of Constables,
1833 – 1914 and Police Conduct Books

10.5920/policedSociety.7

Appendix 2 Sheffield police statistics

Table App.2.1: Police activity in Sheffield, 1845 -1855

	No. of arrests	Estimated population	Arrests as percentage of population	Police strength	Arrest per constable
1845	2556	120,201	2	109	26
1846	2873	122,593	2	109	25
1847	2680	126,033	2	109	25
1848	3006	127,521	2	109	28
1849	3093	130,059	2	109	28
1850	3187	132,647	2	109	29
1851	3806	135,287	3	119	32
1852	4149	139,591	3	119	35
1853	3864	144,044	3	119	32
1854	4014	148,639	3	119	34
1855	3377	153,380	2	119	28
Average	3328				29

Source: Adapted from Williams, 'Police and crime,' table 8.2, p.214

10.5920/policedSociety.7

Endnotes

1 *Morning Chronicle*, 6 December 1849. Letter XV from 'our special correspondent' was devoted to an account of Halifax and Bradford.

2 For a concise introduction to the economic development of Bradford see, Gary Firth, 'The Bradford Trade in the Nineteenth Century,' in D G Wright & J A Jowitt, eds., *Victorian Bradford*, Bradford, Bradford Metropolitan Council Libraries Division, 1982, pp. 7 - 36

3 For a detailed account of the reform movement see A Elliot, 'The Establishment of Municipal Government in Bradford, 1837 – 57,' unpublished University of Leeds PhD, 1976.

4 *Bradford Observer,* 7 December 1843

5 *Bradford Observer,* 2 December 1847

6 *Bradford Observer,* 23 and 30 December 1847

7 Bradford Watch Committee minutes, 20 December 1847 cited in Elliott, 'Municipal Government in Bradford,' p. 203. Emphasis added.

8 Elliott, 'Municipal Government in Bradford,' p.202.

9 *Morning Chronicle*, 10 December 1849, letter XVI from 'our special correspondent' focussing on Leeds.

10 *Morning Chronicle*, 10 December 1849, letter XVI

11 A Brief History of Leeds Improvement Acts, 1755 to 1842, posted by Leeds Libraries, 13 December 2019 at A Brief History of the Leeds Improvement Acts: 1755 – 1842 – The Secret Library | Leeds Libraries Heritage Blog (secretlibraryleeds.net)

12 D Churchill, 'Crime, Policing and Control in Leeds. C.1830 – 1890,' unpublished Ph.D., Open University, 2012

13 For further details see Churchill 'Crime, Policing and Control,' especially pp. 48-50.

14 For further details see Churchill, 'Crime, Policing and Control,' chapter 1

15 *Morning Chronicle*, 15 February 1850, letter XXXII from 'our special correspondent' focussing on Sheffield

16 C A Williams, 'Police and Crime in Sheffield, 1818 – 1874,' unpublished Ph.D., Sheffield University, 1998, pp.78-9

17 *Sheffield Independent*, 8 September 1838, comments by Messrs Booth and Palfryman (chair).

18 *Sheffield Independent*, 12 December *1840*

19 See the 'great outcry' at proposal by local magistrates to appoint 100 men for seven months during the Chartist troubles. *Bradford Observer*, 1 September 1842

10.5920/policedSociety.7

20 Letter in *Bradford Observer* 2 December 1847.

21 *Bradford Observer*, 4 May 1848 but see also 11 May and 26 October 1848.

22 *Bradford Observer*, 21 June 1849

23 *Bradford Observer*, 19 December 1850

24 *Bradford Observer*, 19 February 18562 for comparative costs

25 *Bradford Observer* 11 November 1852 and 20 January 1853

26 Chief constable's quarterly reports, *Bradford Observer*, 19 April and 18 October 1849

27 Firth, 'Bradford Trade,' pp.7-36

28 *Bradford Observer*, 6 February 1851. The Watch Committee justified their action in terms of the 'excellent character' of the man they had dismissed and re-appointed a week later.

29 *Bradford Observer*, *25* April 1850

30 *Bradford Observer*, 6 February 51

31 *Bradford Observer*, 20 February 1851

32 *Bradford Observer*, 9 October 1856

33 *Bradford Observer*, 23 May, 20 June & 24 October 1850,

34 *Bradford Observer*, 23 May & 20 June 1850

35 *Bradford Observer*, 23 May 1850. Councillor Pollard who raised the matter used it to argue that 'there was a greater number of police than was needed.'

36 *Bradford Observer*, 10 March 1853

37 *Bradford Observer,* 14 April 1853

38 For further details see his obituary in *Bradford Daily Telegraph*, 26 March 1890

39 *Bradford Observer*, 19 August 1852

40 *Bradford Observer*, 12 August 1852

41 *Bradford Observer*, 21 August 1851

42 *Bradford Observer*, 28 August 1851

43 *Bradford Observer*, 9 October 1856. See also his reports in *Bradford Observer*, 28 June 1849, 5 September 1850, 27 October 1853, 19 October 1854 and 22 November 1855.

44 Councillor Lee reported in *Bradford Observer*, 19 June 1851

45 *Bradford Observer*, 19 & 26 April 1849 and 9 October 1856

46 Year on year the Irish were disproportionately represented in the local crime statistics, accounting for about forty percent of those brought before the magistrates.

47 *Bradford Observer*, 21 August 1851. For more routine assaults, involving Irish men and women, see 8 August 1850, 7 August 1851 and 19 February

& 6 May 1852. For assaults by soldiers see 28 February 1851 (an attack on 'bloody Peelers'), and 25 September & 13 November 1851. The former involved an attempted rescue by members of the public.

48 *Bradford Observer*, 3 August 1848

49 *Bradford Observer*, 3 August 1848. See also *Leeds Mercury*, 12 August 1848

50 *Bradford Observer*, 19 August 1855

51 *Leeds Mercury*, 26 March 1837. The *Leeds Times* was equally positive.

52 *Leeds Mercury*, 2 & 16 April 1836. The *Instructions* were also available for 6d and were recommended to members of the public, notably pub landlords and beerhouse keepers, most likely to come into contact with the police.

53 *Leeds Mercury*, 23 February & 5 October 1839

54 *Leeds Mercury*, 12 April 1945

55 Churchill, 'Crime, Policing and Control in Leeds, c.1830 – 1890,' p.75

56 Churchill, 'Crime, Policing and Control,' pp. 87 & 91

57 The following analysis and examples are taken from the Leeds Police Conduct Books accessed via Ancestry.

58 Other examples include Edward Glendenning (1854) and George Greenwood (1853).

59 *Leeds Mercury*, 26 March 1836

60 A request in 1847 for policing to be extended to Hunslet, dogfighting along with other 'outrages and unseemly proceedings' specifically mentioned *Leeds Times*, 15 May 1847.

61 'Condition of the Town of Leeds and its Inhabitants,' *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, vol. 2, 1840, pp.397 -424 at p.414

62 Leeds Police Report, 1852, tables 1 and 4, cited in Churchill, 'Crime, Policing and Control,' p.104

63 'Condition of the Town of Leeds and its Inhabitants,' p.414

64 *Leeds Intelligencer*, 10 September 1836. The paper was an outspoken critic of the new police and was happy to report their unpopularity.

65 *Northern Star*, 20 July 1840

66 *Northern Star*, 29 June and 20 July 1844

67 The Leeds anti-police riot of 1844 was an important element in the highly influential argument of R D Storch, 'The Plague of Blue Locusts: Police Reform and Popular Resistance in Northern England, 1840 – 57,' *International Review of Social History*, xx, 1975, pp.61 -90 at pp. 74-6

68 *Leeds Mercury*, 15 June 1844

69 *Leeds Intelligencer*, 15 June 1844

70 *Leeds Mercury*, 15 June 1844

10.5920/policedSociety.7

71 *Leeds Mercury*, 15 June 1844

72 *Leeds Times*, 15 June 1844. See also 'The Terrible Seventeenth, or the Battle of the Lobsters: A Military Tragedy in Three Acts,' published in the *Leeds Times*, 22 June 1844, which, while taking aim at both sides, referred to the use of 'move on' tactics and the prevalence of physical assaults on innocent bystanders and women.

73 *Leeds Intelligencer*, 14 October 1848. For similar incidents see *Leeds Mercury*, 14 September and 21 December 1850 and 2 February 1856

74 *Leeds Mercury*, 25 November 1856 and *Bradford Observer*, 29 November 1856

75 *Sheffield Independent*, 3 November 1849. In addition, there were four detectives, a warrant officer and assistant warrant officer and Raynor as chief constable.

76 Williams, 'Police and Crime,' p.192

77 Williams, 'Police and Crime,' p.193

78 For further details see William, 'Police and Crime,' pp.135-8

79 As late as January 1856 the watch committee members expressed its concern that men were being appointed without appearing before them. *Sheffield Independent*, 5 January 1856. For concern with promotions see *Sheffield Independent*, 11 January 1851, though it should be noted that opinion was divided on devolving promotions to the chief constable, and for concern with deployment of officers to meetings, see *Sheffield Independent*, 18 January 1851, where again there were differences of opinion as to the role of the watch committee viz a viz the chief constable in such matters. There are also scattered references to the over-zealousness of the watch committee in disciplining men. See *Sheffield Independent*, 13 January 1855 when the fining and demotion of a sergeant led Isaac Ironside to denounce the 'maw-worms, the cants, the teetotallers' of the watch committee. See also the watch committee enquiry into the performance of older nightwatchmen, *Sheffield Independent*, 14 June and 5 July 1851.

80 *Sheffield Independent*, 11 November 1848 and again 12 May 1849

81 For example, *Sheffield Independent*, 11 November 1848

82 For the full details and the discussion of several bye-laws, see *Sheffield Independent*,11 May 1844

83 Williams, 'Police and Crime,' Table 7.1, p.183

84 *Sheffield Independent*, 6 April 1844. In a subsequent report Raynor the number of drink-related offences had risen to 943 in 1846, though falling to 848 a year later. Drunk and disorderly cases predominated, though there remained a sizeable minority categorised as drunk and incapable, and men outnumbered women by 7:1 in 1845 but by 3:1 a year later. *Sheffield Independent*. 13 May 1848

85 Adapted from Williams, 'Police and crime,' table 8.2, p.214

86 On the assumption that the male population in 1851 comprised 49 per cent of the total population, and that men aged 15-19 accounted for 27 per cent of the total population (the national figures for England and Wales in 1851) and that 80 per cent of the population was working class, some 14,319 young working-class men, 27 per cent of their total were arrested in 1851. This rough estimate probably understates the reality. Further, if arrest (conservatively) accounted for three-quarters of all interactions between young working-class men and the police, the figure rises to 36 per cent. Further, the poor Irish were over-policed and over-represented in the figures for assaults, especially on constables, and drunkenness.

87 *Sheffield Independent*, 24 May 1851. The *Sheffield Independent* alone records a higher number of cases heard by the town magistrates in 1846.

88 *Sheffield Independent*, 29 March 1845, 30 May 1846, 30 October 1847, 31 August 1850, 19 July and 25 October 1851, 30 April, 6 August, 1 October & 26 November 1853, and 18 March & 2 December 1854

89 *Sheffield Independent*, 22 September 1849, 29 March 1851, referring specifically to Sim's croft, and 2 June 1855 when Raynor referred to districts in which the police patrolled in twos or threes.

90 *Sheffield Independent*, 2 January 1855 for Irish outrageousness and 6 July 1850, 1 October & 26 November 1853 for other incidents involving the Irish but see also 29 March 1845, 7 June 1845, 30 May 1846, 30 October 1847 for other large-scale assaults or rescues when the Irish were not identified.

91 *Sheffield Independent*, 20 May 1848 and 23 March 1850

92 *Sheffield Independent*, 30 May 1846, 19 July 1851 and 2 December 1854

93 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 23 July 1855

94 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 23 July 1855. The most extensive reporting of the riot, the immediate arrests and the coroner's enquiry is in the *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 23, 24, 25 & 30 July, and 2, 10, 11 August 1855. See also *Sheffield Independent*, 11 August 1855. For the subsequent trials (four men accused of riot and another two of murder) see *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 13 December 1855. The riot was covered extensively in the regional press but also made nationals, such as the *Morning Chronicle*. The quotations in the text are from *Morning Chronicle*, 25 July 1855.

95 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 13 December 1855 (police evidence at York Assizes) and *Sheffield Independent*, 11 August 1855. The latter also reported a member of the crowd shouting 'don't kill the man.'

96 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 24 July 1855

97 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 2 August 1855

10.5920/policedSociety.7