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6. Times, January 15, 1788, 3b; October 10, 1787, 3b.
7. Thomas Gilbert, A Plan of Police: exhibiting the Causes of the present Increase of the Poor, and proposing A Mode for their future more effectual Relief and Support (London, 1781), 3; Josiah Dornford, Seven Letters to the Lords of the Privy Council on the Police: pointing out the causes of the depravity of the lower orders of the people (London, 1785).

157
15. Martin Wiener sees the origins of this newly "rational" criminal in the early nineteenth century, but one finds a similar criminological vein as early as the 1760s, with Cesare Beccaria's *Of Crimes and Punishments* (1764; first English ed. 1767). See Wiener's *Reconstructing the Criminal: Culture, Law and Policy in England, 1830–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 14–91; Beattie, *Crime and the Courts*, 223. Of course, to those in the eighteenth century who believed that capital punishment was a deterrent, posing the threat of execution would not have been treating the potential criminal any less rationally.
16. For more on prosecutors and their motivations, see D. Hay and F. Snyder, "Using

17. The meaning of efficiency proved to be the focal point on which proponents and opponents of police reforms designed to bring it about often disagreed.


25. Quoted in ibid., 29.


28. See Grytzell, *County of London*. It does seem that the City was entering, at mid-century, a period of transition to a space more dominated by warehouses, shops, and commercial or financial establishments than residences. As far as I know, little research has been done on policing the quite unusual urban context presented by the City once it had made this transition.

29. Nor would I wish to argue that the City’s experience of police reform explains police reform undertaken elsewhere. The City’s unique social geography, which makes it such a useful foil to social change explanations of policing, also makes it of limited applicability to different parts of the country, or for that matter, to Western Europe and the United States. As I discuss later, however, the City’s experiments with policing did influence members of Parliament, who on more than one occasion pointed to City policing as a model for the country to emulate. And precisely because of the City’s absence from the dramatic changes associated with industrialization, the manner in which City residents approached policing may provide different answers to how criminological policy changed.

30. Such a narrative of restricted participation in an ostensibly humanitarian age, and of the darker sides of humanitarian ideals once thought more positive, in a very general sense accords with the tone of Michel Foucault. Imprisonment, he argues, though supposedly a more humane way to punish than execution, torture, whipping, and the like, was in actuality a more insidious and invasive punishment designed to control the mind rather than the body. While my work deals with policing and not punishment, it sheds a similar doubt on police reformers’ sense of improvement and efficiency through more powerful central authorities. (Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* [New York: Random House, 1977]; also, for a perspective more particularly tailored to English history, see Michael Ignatieff, *A Just Measure of Pain: The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution 1750–1850* [New York: Random House, 1978]). But tone and substance are not equivalent means of interpretation; on the declining use of juries in the nineteenth century and the rise of summary judgment—judgment by one or two justices of the peace without jury trial—see Thomas Sweeney, “The Extension and Practice of Summary Jurisdiction in England, c. 1790–1860” (Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge University, 1985); on attempts to weed discretion out of juries in the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries, see Thomas A.


33. Anonymous, *London Protected: or, the City and Liberties Secured. Shewing The Necessity of having a well-regulated and able-bodied Nightly Watch, for the Preservation of the Lives and Fortunes of its Inhabitants in general. With a Method to effect it, By appointing the Trained Bands of this City to do a Nightly Duty* (London: Thomas Legg, 1756).


35. Sidney and Beatrice Webb implied this in *English Local Government, Part Two*, 608–11.


38. This category does not count Bridge Ward Without, otherwise known as Southwark. Throughout the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, City aldermen and the Surrey magistrates grappled at times for control and at times for abdication of responsibility over Southwark. The “twenty-sixth ward” was, in the Corporation’s view, a sinecure for the eldest alderman, who would retire from his own ward to take up office across the river. But one man’s sinecure was a community’s irritation, and the residents of Southwark consistently took the office more seriously than did the Corporation or the sitting alderman, who rarely if ever presided over sessions on that side of the Thames. Due to its size, peculiar history, and contested jurisdiction, Southwark remains outside the scope of this work. See David Johnson, *Southwark and the City* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969); Beattie, *Crime and the Courts*, 25–32. For an insightful survey of City policing a century earlier, see Beattie, *Policing and Punishment*, which approaches the matter in ways that parallel mine.

39. Though anyone could, under the law, charge someone with a crime and take them into custody, only constables actually did so; even watchmen took offenders to the constable on duty to be formally charged.
Each ward had between four and sixteen councilmen, depending on the ward’s size and population. Councilmen acted as leaders within their ward as well as representatives to the Court of Common Council, which was responsible for dealing with issues pertaining to the City as a whole. The Webbs argue both that the power of common councilmen over ward governance had declined during the eighteenth century and that ward government successfully resisted efforts by the Courts of Common Council and Aldermen to unify and reorganize local watching as early as 1763. The Webbs were sympathetic to centralization and were happy to see central authority expanding, local authority weakening, and local government itself as inefficient. This interpretation is mistaken in several ways. As a historical account, the fact that the Court of Common Council tried to increase central power at the expense of local does not indicate local weakness, for such attempts regularly failed through the 1830s. Ward watching remained powerfully regulated in the late eighteenth century and became even more hierarchical, and more aggressively regulated, throughout the early nineteenth century right up to its abolition. Decentralized power does not inherently imply inefficiency, nor does centralization bring efficiency as a matter of course. For how can we explain the resistance to centralization without realizing that many inhabitants felt that their ward government served them better than anything more distant? The Webbs were right, however, in the important recognition that centralization as an impulse existed far earlier than its fruition in the 1820s and 1830s.


42. Old Bailey Sessions Papers, 1784–85, case 208 (hereafter OBSP).

43. OBSP, 1833–34, case 243.

44. Times, August 18, 1788; C.L.R.O., Rep. 193, January 27, 1789, ff. 93–97. The Court often granted freedoms in lieu of payment; actually, it awarded the ability to make someone else free, and this was sold to whoever wanted to buy one. Being free meant that one could legally practice a trade within the City of London; a person became free of the City by patrimony (if one’s father had been free), servitude (apprenticeship), or redemption (buying one’s freedom). The value of a freedom granted in this manner probably fluctuated; in 1795 the Court of Aldermen ordered the chamberlain to sell fifty freedoms to raise money for the City, at a price of 46 s 8 d. each (C.L.R.O., Rep. 199, May 5, 1795, f. 250).


50. As with constables, the traces watchmen leave in court records give descriptive weight to their duties without revealing how often they were used, let alone any evidence of whether or not their responsibilities changed over time. The difficulty arises because some Old Bailey cases are recorded in great detail, while others merely give the
indictment and sentence, leaving out the specific testimonies of people giving evidence.

51. OBSP 1784–85, cases 102, 756.
52. Ibid., cases 445, 799.
55. C.L.R.O., MS 207C/3, Wardmote Papers, Box 3: 1813–53.
56. G.L., MS 2057, Aldersgate Ward: St. Leonard Precinct Minutes. Such titles as Younger and Elder of the Inquest probably designated whether or not the person has served in the office before. They also confirm that in some parts of the City, the same person served simultaneously as constable and inquestman.
57. C.L.R.O., Rep. 194, June 8, 1790, f. 322.
58. Patrick Colquhoun, A Treatise on the Police of the Metropolis; containing a detail of the various crimes and Misdemeanors By which Public and Private Property and Security are, at present, injured and endangered: and suggesting remedies for their prevention, 3d ed. (London: H. Fry, 1796), 209; C.L.R.O., MS 533A, NWC Papers, The Detailed Plan, Prepared by the Sub-Committee and submitted to the Nightly Watch Committee, for the Watch and Police of the City of London, March 24, 1830. While Colquhoun was not notably accurate in counting criminals, he seems to have stated the number of police correctly. For a critical assessment of Colquhoun’s statistical methods, see Schwarz, London in the Age of Industrialisation, 247–248.
59. C.L.R.O., Papers (CA), February 17, 1784.
60. G.L., MS 51/1, Billingsgate Wardmote Minute Book, Vol. 1, December 20, 1809.
63. C.L.R.O., Rep. 188, February 17, 1784, ff. 94–95.
64. Ibid., January 27, 1784, ff. 65–66.
65. Ibid., ff. 66–67.
66. Ibid., f. 65.
67. Ibid., February 17, 1784, ff. 95–96.
68. G.L., MS 9983: “Case—For the Opinion of Mr. Gurney 1817.”
69. C.L.R.O., Rep. 188, February 17, 1784, ff. 93–94.
70. Ruth Paley, “Thief-Takers in London in the Age of the McDaniel Gang, c. 1745–1754,” in Douglas Hay and Francis Snyder, eds., Policing and Prosecution in Britain 1750–1850 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 317. Paley states that while the commonly given cost of a ticket ranged between £12 and £40, her work leads her to conclude that £12 was more likely the high-end price. Since fines for the office of constable alone in City wards ran from £10 to £20 later in the century and through the Napoleonic wars, the commonly given range may be more accurate—for that time. One would expect increases in the price of a Tyburn ticket to follow the amount of a fine for hiring substitutes, and in turn for both to be affected by inflation and the number of people seeking to avoid office.
71. Minutes of the Evidence taken before the Committee appointed by the House of Commons, to Inquire into the State of Mendicity and Vagrancy in the Metropolis and its Neighbourhood . . . to which is added, The Second Report (London: Sherwood, Neely, and
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Jones, 1816), 5 (hereafter 1816 Police Committee). Strangely, the wardmote minute books record no instances of persons submitting Tyburn tickets.

73. G.L., MS 1228/1, Broad Street Ward Inquest, Vol. 1, passim.
74. 1822 Police Committee, 75.
75. C.L.R.O., MS 207C/2, Wardmote Papers, Box 2: 1771–1812. The Wardmotes returned lists of constables, substitutes, and extras to the Court of Aldermen each year: of the forty-four persons holding the office between 1785 and 1796 for whom residence information exists, twenty served in person and twenty-four were substitutes or extras. Of the twenty-four, two lived in the City but outside their ward, and twenty-two resided within or just outside the ward in which they served. The returns come from Farringdon Without (1785), Walbrook (1785), Coleman Street (1795), and Bread Street (1796), the only lists I discovered for the 1780s and 1790s. The Corporation did not systematically gather information about its constables until the 1820s, so any claims about their age, social status, or residence in the earlier part of the period must remain tentative.

76. G.L., MS 9983, "Case—For the Opinion of Mr. Gurney 1817"; G.L., MS 1163/2, Aldgate Wardmote Court Book, Vol. 2; G.L., MS 51/1, Billingsgate Wardmote Minute Books, Vol. 1, December 20, 1809, August 6, 1816. In each case the data here comes from 1808–17, or after much of the wartime inflation. Change in fines is hard to measure because wardmote minutes so rarely mention their payment; I have found only one instance of this, in 1808, when the fine for Aldgate was raised from £17 to £20 per year.

77. A common complaint was that many constables were also publicans and ale-house-keepers, but no evidence of this survives for late eighteenth century City wards (M. D. George, *London Life in the Eighteenth Century* [New York: Capricorn Books, 1965], 301).

79. 1816 Police Committee, 499.
80. *Times*, November 30, 1785. Almost a year later the *Times* recorded a similar case, stating that “the Sheriffs have ordered all the constables to attend in Palace-yard, tomorrow, to prevent any tumults during the execution of the sentence passed upon Aylette, the Attorney, who is then to stand in the pillory for one hour” (*Times*, November 20, 1786).
84. OBSP 1784–85, case 29.
85. *Times*, October 12, 1785.
86. C.L.R.O., MS 207C/3, Wardmote Papers, Box 3: 1813–53.
89. C.L.R.O., Misc. MSS 245.5, NWC 1816–17.
90. Ibid.
91. G.L., MS 51/1, Billingsgate Wardmote Minute Book, Vol. 1, June 5, 1810.

92. Granville Sharp, Proposals and remarks for the improvement of the city-militia, and for watch and ward (London, 1782), 9.

93. Sharp wanted watchmen to work only every sixth night to ensure alertness, and whereas the wage for each watchman would have been a little over 2 shillings per week, the amount paid out by the ward, since it would have had to hire more men, would have been the same as if the same person worked each night. I have not come across evidence of any ward paying 2 s for a night’s work until the 1830s, when a pay scale for Tower ward gives the wage as between 2 and 3 s per night.

94. Sharp, Proposals and remarks, 8–9.

95. Colquhoun, A Treatise on the Functions and Duties of a Constable, passim.


98. Colquhoun, A Treatise on the Functions and Duties of a Constable, passim.

99. The incident is recounted in G.L., MS 1229/3, Broad Street Minute Book, Vol. 3, October 31, 1836; C.L.R.O., MS 562A, Nightly Watch Committee Minutes, 1836–1838, November 4, 1836 (hereafter NWC 1836–38); C.L.R.O., MS 533, NWC Papers, November 4, 1836.

100. G.L., MS 10838, Aldgate Ward Charge Book, July 29, 1837, August 2, 1837.

101. G.L., MS 1229/1, Broad Street Minute Book, Vol. 1, November 23, 1784; MS 2054, Aldersgate Within Common Council Minute Book, October 27, 1834.

102. G.L., MS 2054, Aldersgate Within Common Council Minute Book, February 5, 1833. I have found more detailed examples of interaction between inhabitants and local watch committees in the latter years of my period than in the former, primarily because more records for that time have survived. I have no reason to think that such occurrences did not happen in the 1780s as often as in the 1830s. Of course, some practices noted in the 1830s, such as the use of uniforms or pensions, did not exist at all, or in the same form, in earlier decades.

103. G.L., MS 1229/1, Broad Street Minute Book, Vol. 1, November 30, 1796; G.L., MS 2054, Aldersgate Within Common Council Minute Book, November 6, 1833, January 6, 1834.


about City and ward policing in some ways parallel Reynolds’s work on St. Marylebone and follow some of Paley’s conceptual modeling.

108. C.L.R.O., Jour. 66, October 28, 1773, ff. 52; November 17, 1775, ff. 262–65; Beattie, Crime and the Courts, 554–65. The recorder’s legal opinion of these unauthorized changes was that if a resident refused to pay a rate different from that given in the Watch Act, that person could not be forced to do so by law. This would have acted as an incentive to keep expenditure on the watch down to the amount collectible from inhabitants.

110. Ibid., November 23, 1784.
111. C.L.R.O., Reps. 188, 224, 242, passim.
112. C.L.R.O., Rep. 217, June 24, 1813, ff. 517–20; Misc. MSS. 245.7, “Ward Returns on the state of the Watch, 1822.” It was common practice for a ward to swear in its beadles as extras, perhaps out of convenience, as beadles might have to take charges to the compter or pass vagrants.

113. C.L.R.O., Reps. 206, 224, passim.
114. There were always two operating compters; in 1791 the Corporation moved all the prisoners from the rotting Wood Street building into a new compter in Giltspur Street (C.L.R.O., Rep. 195, March 29, 1791, ff. 192–94). The compters differed from Newgate in that they received all night charges, including vagrants, and at times confined debtors, whereas Newgate held persons awaiting trial as well as convicted felons awaiting their sentence, be it transportation or execution.

115. All charges east of King Street were taken to the Mansion House, and all west were taken to Guildhall. The former was the Lord Mayor’s residence, and the latter served as the center of City government.

116. Since sessions did not usually begin until nine in the morning, persons charged at night were committed to one of the compters until the following day.

117. G.L., MS 3385, “Lord Mayor Clark’s Diary, &c. 1784–1785,” passim. This estimate excludes time spent at the Old Bailey or Guildhall, sitting at Sessions of the Peace, Gaol Delivery or Oyer and Terminer; but only the lord mayor performed these judicial duties in addition to petty sessions.

118. Throughout the eighteenth century, jurisdiction over the marshalmen oscillated between the marshals and the mayor. The marshals wanted the extra assistance, and perhaps patronage, of six subordinate officers; the marshalmen preferred to consider themselves appointees of the mayor and responsive only to him, perhaps because of the prestige or perks attached to that high office. The Court of Common Council gave the last word on this confusion in 1774, when it asserted its own right to elect men to both offices (C.L.R.O., Misc. MSS. 6.20, “Extracts and References relating to Marshals, 1576–1820,” October 28, 1773, March 3, 1774).

119. C.L.R.O., PAR Book 12, “Committee to settle and prepare certain Orders and Regulations, for the Conduct of the Marshals of this City” (report to Common Council), February 12, 1789, 29–34. The 1779 report was recorded along with the additions made a decade later.

120. See Beattie, Crime and the Courts, 50–55. Mediating between criminal and victim was known as “compounding a felony” and, though not exactly the same as thief-taking, induced similar suspicions that City officers were not themselves operating within the law.
123. Fear of the practice, as well as occasional references to its continued vitality, suggests that what changed over time was not the practice itself but public and official attitudes toward it.
124. C.L.R.O., Jour. 74, March 6, 1794, ff. 74b–75b; Jour. 79, March 6, 1800, ff. 81–82. The marshals’ wages are from 1800 and the breakdown of marshalmen’s earnings from 1794. Though no other change in their salaries was noted from 1784, it is possible and even likely that some increase occurred, given the inflation of the war years. Whether this gives the lie to the 1774 ruling or whether the ruling applied only to fees taken from private individuals is not known. In one form or another, the practice of taking fees continued with occasional scandals throughout this period.
125. C.L.R.O., Papers (CC), January 20, 1803.
127. Ibid., Vol. 2, February 29, 1808.
128. Ibid., Vol. 4, September 25–27, 1810.
129. Ibid., Vol. 6, May 11–18, 1812.
130. I cover this issue more fully in Chapter 3.
133. Ibid.
134. 1816 Police Committee, 37–38.
135. Ibid., 26.
136. Anonymous, *Statement and Propositions from the Society for giving Effect to His Majesty’s Proclamation against Vice and Immorality, delivered to the Magistrates, at their Meeting held at the St. Alban’s Tavern, on Wednesday the 5th of May, 1790, In pursuance of a Letter, subscribed by the Duke of Montagu, requesting that Two Magistrates might be deputed from each County to take into Consideration the Vagrant Laws, and the Employment of Prisoners by hard Labour, in Gaols and Houses of Correction; and to bring forward such Plans for the general Reform of the Police as shall be thought advisable* (London: George Stafford, 1790), 11 (hereafter 1790 Proclamation Society).
138. G.L., MS 3700, “Draft of a Brief relating to an affray in The Ship alehouse in Gravel Lane, Houndsditch, 1779.” These three prisoners sawed through bars on the window of the decaying compter and escaped that evening but were later recaptured.
139. C.L.R.O., Jour. 69, April 25, 1785, ff. 241b–43b.
140. Ibid.
141. King’s *Crime, Justice and Discretion* affirms this view of the law, and historians of other periods have done so as well: see Beattie, *Crime and the Courts*, 73; Shoemaker, *Prosecution and Punishment*, 19–52.
142. C.L.R.O., Min., March 12, 1835, 21–22.
143. 1816 Police Committee, 497.
144. S. and B. Webb, *English Local Government, Part Two*, 611. It is not clear how they
arrived at this number, though. If they referred to the number of wards, then there should have been only twenty-five, as Bridge Without should not really count as a ward unto itself. In any case, there were certainly more than twenty-six—in Farringdon Without six different precincts seem to have had somewhat independent control of their own watch: St. Brides, St. Dunstans in the West, Whitefriars, St. Martin Ludgate, St. Sepulchre, and St. Andrew Holborn.
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3. Reynolds, Before the Bobbies, 73–75.
8. Sharp, Proposals and remarks, 4. Sharp was responding to a plan floated by Alderman Turner; see [B. Turner], A Plan for Rendering the Militia of London Useful and Respectable, and for raising an effective and well-regulated Watch, Without subjecting the Citizens to additional Taxes or the Interposition of Parliament (London, 1782).
10. Times, November 9, 1785.
11. Peter Linebaugh claims great importance for the Gordon riots as “a watershed of London class relations” because “for the first time an international proletariat directly attacked the imperial ruling class at its major institutions, and so gave that class a serious fright,” in The London Hanged: Crime and Civil Society in the Eighteenth Century (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1991), 330. Yet, perhaps because other distractions kept City leaders occupied, the riots seemed to have had little discernible long-term impact on police reform there.
15. Times, June 7, 1785.
17. Ibid., December 15, 1784.
19. C.L.R.O., Rep. 190, March 21, 1786, ff. 134–39. Beattie posits that this pressure from the City “focused the administration’s attention on the problem” and forced an answer to the transportation problem (Crime and the Courts, 598–99).
22. Rogers, “Policing the Poor,” 142.
23. Thomas Gilbert, *Plan for the better Relief and Employment of the Poor; for Enforcing and amending the Laws respecting Houses of Correction, and Vagrants; and for Improving the Police of this Country* (London: G. Wilkie, 1781), 1–4.
27. C.L.R.O., Jour. 69, July 9, 1784, ff. 125–27.
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29. C.L.R.O., Jour. 69, June 18, 1785, ff. 253b–55.
30. One could say that the case of Portsoken’s street traders illustrates how even the laboring poor might, on occasion, also come to see the law as the “multiple-use right” articulated by John Brewer, though he exempts the laboring poor from viewing the law in this way. See John Brewer and John Styles, eds., *An Ungovernable People: The English and Their Law in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1983), 17.
31. The dispute was to continue all the way through this period; there are presentments against unlicensed traders almost every year between 1785 and 1840.
33. G.L., MS 3385, “Lord Mayor Clark’s Diary, &c. 1784–1785,” 11. L. J. Hume writes that Clark had known Jeremy Bentham since the 1760s, that Clark also knew Patrick Colquhoun in the 1790s, and even that it was Clark who prompted Colquhoun to introduce himself to Bentham in 1796 (L. J. Hume, *Bentham and Bureaucracy* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981], 276, n.16). Perhaps Clark had ingested the ideas of both men on a centralized preventive police and brought those ideas to his mayoralty.
35. Wilkes was city chamberlain at the time.
36. G.L., MS 3385, “Lord Mayor Clark’s Diary, &c. 1784–1785,” 12; *Morning Chronicle*, November 20, 1784; December 1, 1784.
37. *Morning Chronicle*, December 1, 1784.
38. Ibid.
39. C.L.R.O., PAR Book 12, “Committee to settle and prepare certain Orders and Regulations, for the Conduct of the Marshals of this City” (Report to Common Council), February 12, 1789, 29–34.
40. *Morning Chronicle*, December 1, 1784.
41. Ibid.; *Public Advertizer*, November 19, 1784; *London Chronicle* November 18–20, 1784.
42. *Times*, October 8, 1785.
43. OBSP 1784–85, case 475. It is interesting to note that the woman referred to Forsythe as “a constable,” suggesting either that City leaders made little effort to publicize the new force, or that the Patrole was not viewed as a radically new institution.
44. OBSP 1784–85, cases 534, 688.
45. C.L.R.O., MJR/M 3, Mansion House Justice Room: Minute Books of Proceedings, 3–29 January 1785. I use the phrase “petty sessions” to describe the actions at the Mansion House Justice Room and Guildhall Justice Room, even though they were not known by that label at the time, because the duties of sitting magistrates in the City approximated those of Justices of the Peace in petty sessions elsewhere. (See Norma Landau, The Justices of the Peace, 1679–1760 [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984].) The main function of the City’s petty sessions was to sort through those brought to the compter in the previous evening and determine who would go to trial, who would go directly to Bridewell, and who would be discharged. People also took complaints and accusations to the petty sessions, where the lord mayor or sitting alderman could issue warrants for the arrest of the accused party. The Minute Books, which exist intermittently until the 1810s, record the person charged, the prosecutor, the charge, and the sentence; in the case of warrants it gives all but the sentence and sometimes includes the name of the constable sent to execute the warrant.
49. C.L.R.O., Rep. 196, January 17, 1792, ff. 72–75.
50. C.L.R.O., Jour. 73, July 17, 1792, ff. 170–70b. Radzinowicz notes that in the 1810s assurance companies began insuring against arson, and in the perceived crime wave after the American war they may have tried insuring possible victims against property crime as well (A History of English Criminal Law, Vol. 2: The Clash between Private Initiative and Public Interest in the Enforcement of the Law [London: Stevens and Sons Limited, 1956], 380–83). David Philips writes that prosecution associations “offered their members a degree of mutual insurance against the costs of theft or arson” and that they increased drastically in the 1770s and 1780s, though the explicit mention of assurance companies makes it clear that the committee was not talking about prosecution associations. See Philips, “Good Men to Associate and Bad Men to Conspire: Associations for the Prosecution of Felons in England, 1760–1860,” in Hay and Snyder, eds., Policing and Prosecution, 121–24.
51. C.L.R.O., Jour. 73, November 29, 1792, ff. 228b–29; July 24, 1793, ff. 358b–59.
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2. Emsley, Crime and Society in England, 52–53; Linebaugh, The London Hanged, 427. Emsley suggests that the Treatise’s success proves its popularity—it went through seven printings between 1795 and 1807. Certainly this sales volume says something, but not necessarily that the Treatise defined police reform.
behind holding Colquhoun responsible for reform by influencing opinion is that those reading the Treatise could have had any possible effect on legislation; more likely, in my view, is the possibility that Colquhoun's readers influenced local policy by serving on parish and ward watch committees, on inquest juries, or as zealous constables.

4. Colquhoun, A Treatise on the Functions and Duties of a Constable. King and Noel's "The Origins of "The Problem of Juvenile Delinquency" and Philips's "Good Men to Associate and Bad Men to Conspire" suggest such a change based on evidence of increased prosecutorial activities at this time.
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Notes to Chapter 6

1. Palmer, *Police and Protest*, 10. Palmer deals mainly with the evolution of the Metropolitan Police, so my argument may not seem directly relevant because it is drawn from other sources. But the attitudes, reforms, and policies advocated and enacted in the City suggest that a chronology centered on one particular aspect of police reform (an aspect that in many ways is its culminating stage) can produce a skewed picture.
4. By public justice I mean executions, whippings, pillories, and sessions; I cover this topic in chapter 3.