

# The Guildford Guy Riots (1842–1865)

by GAVIN MORGAN

The bonfire night celebrations in Victorian Guildford were a far cry from those familiar to Guildfordians today. The events connected with this night were known as the Guy Riots and resulted in a serious breakdown of law and order. An account of a typical scene on November 5th was written by Henry Peak in his *Recollections and Activities as Mayor of Guildford*. He recalled how on November 5th 1851 he came across a huge crowd assembled round a bonfire outside Holy Trinity church in the High Street. Some of the crowd were letting off enormous fireworks which soared into the sky and sometimes entered the upstairs windows of houses. The leaders of the assembly were known as the Guys and they disguised themselves by wearing fantastic costumes. Each time the bonfire burnt down they led the crowd to the home of an inhabitant, tore down the fence in front of his house, carried it back to the High Street and threw it on the bonfire.<sup>1</sup> Guildfordians had been celebrating November 5th in this way for many years by 1851 but in succeeding years the festivities developed into riots. Battles took place between the mob and the police. Instead of just fences and gates being thrown on the bonfire larger items such as carts were burnt. The Guys used November 5th as an excuse to carry out acts of terrorism on unpopular citizens. It was not until the 1860s that the town authorities took determined steps to put down the riots.

The scenes described by Peak were not peculiar to Guildford. R D Storch has shown that similar incidents took place in towns all over southern England. The demonstrations in these towns had their own characteristics but the basic theme of celebrations involving a large number of townspeople, centred on a bonfire in a fixed spot and led by a disguised gang like the Guys could be found in many places.<sup>2</sup>

How did the situation described by Peak develop? Storch has put forward some general explanations. Most 18th century incorporated towns held official celebrations on November 5th. Gradually fear, first of fire and then public order when the French wars began, made the authorities and upper classes wary of patronising celebrations. As the Fifth became an excuse for attacking local figures this withdrawal became permanent. Since the upper classes no longer organised the celebrations bonfire gangs, like the Guys Society, were formed to take their place. Demonstrations frequently became riotous, with prolonged struggles with the magistrates and the police. Attempts to stop the riots evoked violence and threats.<sup>3</sup>

There is not enough evidence to prove that Guildford fits this explanation but it is likely that it did. It seems the Mayor patronised November 5th in the early 18th century. In 1704 and 1706 the Mayor's accounts had an entry for 'wine on Gunpowder Treason'. By the late 18th century, however, the Town Corporation had become wary of patronising the celebrations. It is not known whether this was through fear of fire or of disturbances. The authorities forbade the use of fireworks on November 5th in 1776, 1795, 1799, 1800, 1802, 1803, 1807, 1809, from 1812 to 1815 (these were all years during which the country was at war), in 1828 and 1829. The authorities did not, however, succeed in stamping out the use of fireworks. In 1803 someone pushed a firework through the Mayor's window. In 1827 great damage was done by men letting off fireworks. Although fireworks were forbidden on November 5th, they were permitted on certain occasions up to 1805 to celebrate victories and treaties in the Napoleonic Wars. After 1805, however, although the celebrations on these occasions took place, fireworks were not permitted. Hence it is possible, though not certain, that the permanent withdrawal of patronage by the upper classes that Storch talks about occurred in Guildford around the turn of the 19th century. It is not known when the Guys Society was formed nor when the celebrations first took the form described by Peak.<sup>4</sup>

By the second quarter of the 19th century, the bonfire was usually outside Holy Trinity church. The identities of the Guys are hard to discover. One Guildfordian said that most came from the 'rougher parts of the population'.<sup>5</sup> Four Guys were arrested in 1865. At least three were in their twenties. Two were painters, one a cooper and one a coachsmith's labourer.<sup>6</sup> Some Guys were sons of well-to-do tradesmen<sup>7</sup> but in general it would seem that they were young and from the artisan and labouring classes. Those who formed the crowds of spectators came from a wide cross-section of society. Reference can be found to women, children, old men, young men, tradesmen and labourers, but the gentry do not seem to have taken part.<sup>8</sup>

In the period 1842–1852, the level of violence was not increasing from year to year. The damage done was only a few broken windows and stolen fences. It does not seem from the accounts in the newspapers that fences were taken from specific people who were unpopular and even if they were, the deliberate attacks on unpopular citizens that occurred in later years had not yet begun. In 1843, 1844 and 1845 references were made in the *Sussex Advertiser* to a subscription raised by the mob and intended to be used to pay for the damage done.<sup>9</sup> This makes the celebrations look as if they were meant to be just good fun and the writings of some inhabitants seem to confirm this view. John Mason, a native of the town, remembered that 'Guildford boys were born with the uncontrollable habit of celebrating Guy Fawkes Day in the way that their fathers had done. To non-Guildfordians this savoured of insubordination – the newspapers, in some cases, even calling the proceedings riotous! This was not intended when I took part in it – it simply meant keeping up an old custom handed down for generations.'<sup>10</sup> P W Jacob, the Mayor who eventually put down the riots, remembered that 'Up to 1863 [the last year of the riots] there were many people, even some of wealth and influence, who thought that the November 5th ought to be observed and who rather than give up the old custom were willing to put up with – to connive at – a certain amount of riot, mischief and damage to property.'<sup>11</sup>

Today it is perhaps hard to believe that such damage to property could be part of celebrations. Riots and destruction are usually associated with protest. People in the mid-19th century however, thought otherwise. In 1867 the *Surrey Advertiser* when speaking of November 5th in Godalming stated that the evening 'passed off very calmly in our town as far as regards the proceedings of the people, although the number of fireworks fired in the town was fully equal to previous years. There was no attempt at riot or wilful mischief, and every precaution had been taken by the authorities by employing a body of special constables in addition to the police to maintain as much order as possible.' Apart from a couple of people who were injured the paper claimed that the evening 'passed off without any noteworthy incidents.' But the events described by the paper would seem to us well worthy of note. From 6pm to 8pm a crowd paraded the town discharging fireworks. At around 8pm more young men arrived and from then until midnight the discharges were almost continuous. A crowd round the George Inn disappeared in a cloud of smoke in what the paper described as 'mimic warfare'. During the evening one or two tar barrels were lit and dragged through the town.<sup>12</sup>

An event at St Catherine's Hill fair held each year in October gives another illustration of the types of people who lived in Guildford at this time. At one time the fair became infested with gangs of Thimble Riggers (swindlers) to the annoyance of the people of Guildford. Instead, however, of complaining to the authorities and leaving it to them to take action, the inhabitants took the matter into their own hands, gathered a force and in a vicious battle resulting in injuries on both sides, they drove the Thimble Riggers across the river.<sup>13</sup> Hence in the 19th century behaviour that would be regarded as riotous today was accepted as boisterous fun and the events of each November 5th may simply have been boisterous celebrations.

One last feature of this period, 1842–1852 was the inactivity of the town authorities. It has been seen that the attempts made by the authorities to stop the use of fireworks down to 1827 were unsuccessful. In the fourteen or fifteen years preceding 1843 no-one was arrested for using fireworks.<sup>14</sup> The police did try to stop the demonstrations in 1843 and some people were arrested

but in the following year the police offered no opposition to the Guys. In 1846 the police tried to prevent fences from being taken, but between 1844 and 1852 no direct attempt was made to stop the bonfires.<sup>15</sup>

The attitude of the authorities can be seen in a letter written by the Mayor to the Home Office in 1852. In the letter he said that the riots had received the anxious attention of his predecessor but that at present the law was not sufficient for him to prevent the nuisance. He wrote, 'sometimes public meetings have been held to take measures for putting down the fireworks and bonfires and many of the inhabitants have been made Special Constables but who on interfering were overpowered by the mob. At other years prosecution has been undertaken but the offenders generally escape punishment. Just before the last November 5th some discussion took place between some of the borough magistrates and the Chief Constable of Surrey . . . as to the propriety of taking precautionary measures but it was concluded that no great force could be spared from the towns and places of the county there was no chance of successfully opposing the mob . . . I much fear that with such local powers as small boroughs now have, the nuisance cannot be put down.'<sup>16</sup>

This would suggest perhaps that the authorities were apathetic. In theory the law was sufficient to enable them to put down the demonstrations. As will be seen, the Mayor who put down the riots after 1863 used facilities that were available in 1852. The town had four main weapons that it could use against rioters. Firstly, there was the Borough Police Force formed in 1836. In 1853 it consisted of only three policemen but that number could have been increased as it was in 1863. Secondly the inhabitants could be enrolled as Special Constables. Thirdly, police from the County Constabulary could be drafted in (they were, however, often needed in towns without a police force on November 5th). Finally, if all else failed the army could be called in.<sup>17</sup> The events of the years following 1863 proved that these instruments were adequate for putting down the riots.

In practice, however, the situation was not as simple as it might seem. It is possible that even if the Corporation had not been apathetic, it would still have been inactive. It was all very well the Home Office saying, as it did, that the riots should be suppressed. Police and soldiers could stop the demonstrations one year but what about the next year? In the past attempts to stop the celebrations one year had brought greater violence the next. In 1827 considerable damage was done by fireworks and a number of people were arrested. The authorities planned to patrol the town and stop the use of fireworks in 1828 but the mob were determined not to be defeated, they plotted to turn out the gas supply to the street lamps. The town would be plunged into darkness and the mob would be able to riot.<sup>18</sup>

Storch argues that middle class support of the celebrations delayed the suppression of the attendant riots. Not until the middle classes withdrew their support could the disturbances be stopped.<sup>19</sup> It would seem that this was true in Guildford. In 1852 the Borough Coroner said the main problem was that at present 'too many persons of respectable position were found to approve of the practice'. Their approval, he claimed, hampered the authorities. Often when Special Constables were summoned to help the police, many failed to turn up. Those people who were charged for taking part in the demonstrations were not successfully punished. In 1843 and 1847 a subscription was taken to pay for the fines of the men charged. 'We want', said the coroner, 'the impulse of a cojoint action between the inhabitants and the authorities. At present the magistrates of the borough can do nothing. They can't go and seize 100 men disguised with blackened faces or otherwise. The only force at their command is three policemen.'<sup>20</sup>

It seems probable then that the celebrations were, until 1852, supported (or at least not actively opposed) by many in the town, and it is possible that men on the Town Council also thought the celebrations were a good custom.

In 1852 a clergyman, the Reverend Henry Shrubbs, was among the Guys' victims. He complained to the Home Office which responded by writing to the Mayor asking him to explain

the situation.<sup>21</sup> The Mayor replied in the letter already quoted that the law did not provide him with enough powers to put down the disturbances.<sup>22</sup> The Home Office replied that the Mayor should have asked it for advice before November 5th and that if the civil police were not enough then the army should be called in 'as such a forcible defiance of the law year after year ought no longer to have been permitted.'<sup>23</sup> That year also a boy was killed in an accident playing with fireworks, and the inquest jury called 'upon the public authorities to suppress such illegal proceedings.'<sup>24</sup>

During the next five years (1853–1857), the authorities tried to suppress the demonstrations. The fact that the Home Office was now aware of the situation in Guildford seems to have prompted the authorities into taking action, for attempts, more determined than ever before, were made to put down the riots. The army was not summoned in 1853 but the three borough policemen were supplemented by 300 Special Constables.<sup>25</sup> The town applied to the Home Office for fifty Metropolitan policemen to lead the inexperienced Special Constables. It seems that only ten were sent but on November 7th a letter was sent to the Home Office to inform it that 'perfect order was maintained' on November 5th.<sup>26</sup>

The Corporation's problems however were far from over. The rioters reacted against these attempts to put down their celebrations. In 1854 they visited the homes of certain principal inhabitants and smashed their windows. Eventually the Riot Act had to be read.<sup>27</sup> In 1855, 1856 and 1857 the authorities took steps to put down the riots and these resulted in clashes between the mob and the police. In 1855 the police and Special Constables paraded the town on November 5th. Fireworks were let off but there were no major disturbances. Only one man was arrested and was fined heavily as an example, no doubt.<sup>28</sup> The lack of rioting in this year may suggest that the behaviour of the mob on bonfire night related not just to the events of the previous November 5th but to factors that occurred at other times during the year.

For whatever reason, in 1856 the mob decided to take on the police. A bonfire was lit outside Holy Trinity church but the police soon put it out. Another fire was then lit outside the Star Inn on the corner of Quarry street and, once again, the police easily put it out. A third bonfire was lit on the town bridge but when police went to put it out the mob resisted and there was a battle on the bridge.<sup>29</sup>

In 1857 an event occurred which brought about another change in the policy of the Town Council. The mob lit a bonfire by St Nicholas church, near the town bridge. When the police arrived upon the scene they were assailed with stones. They called for reinforcements (about forty policemen) who went down Quarry street, across the river and down the Portsmouth road to the top of Mount street. They then charged the mob. In the *melée* that followed a number of people (including old men and children) were injured. One man died the next day.<sup>30</sup>

It is not clear at the moment why this incident occurred, but what was important was that it proved to be a great source of embarrassment to the police and the authorities. The *West Surrey Times* had a field day describing the police as rogues beating up innocent people.<sup>31</sup> Instead of representing the forces of law and order fighting against anarchy, the police and the authorities appeared the aggressors. It is quite probable that it was for this reason that the police were nowhere to be seen in 1858.<sup>32</sup>

From 1858 to 1862 the Town Council took no steps to prevent the celebrations and the town was left at the mercy of the Guys. The nature of the riots reverted to that described by Henry Peak in 1851. The Guys arrived and lit a bonfire in the High street to the delight of the assembled crowd of spectators. Each time the bonfire burnt down, the crowd marched off to plunder the town for firewood. The damage done to property, however, was more serious than in 1851. A contemporary said in 1866, 'If these meetings had been going on for 9 or 10 years it was exceedingly discreditable to somebody. The riot had become more riotous, the tumult more tumultuous, the attacks on individuals more violent and mischievous.'<sup>33</sup> Whereas in earlier years only fences had been taken and a few fireworks had gone through windows, now the houses of

unpopular inhabitants were visited and fireworks deliberately thrown through their windows.<sup>34</sup>

The situation should not, however, be seen as a continuing state of open war between the Guys and the authorities and unpopular inhabitants. A comparison between the years 1859 and 1861 demonstrates that this was not so. In 1859 fireworks were deliberately thrown through the windows of certain inhabitants. Two policemen were found and assaulted. They escaped and were followed to the police station where the Guys challenged the police to come out and fight.<sup>35</sup> In 1861, however, the *West Surrey Times* said about November 5th, 'We understand that the leaders amongst the movement upon this occasion had determined to do as little damage as possible, to wreak no vengeance upon anyone however unpopular and to discountenance anything approaching to malicious or even wanton mischief.' The mob still took fences but they were selective. For example they nearly took a paling from the home of Mr R.J. Sheperd in the London road but were deterred by the cry amongst their ranks of, 'Good man'.<sup>36</sup> Again, it would seem that the demonstrations were just celebrations that were getting increasingly out of hand.

In 1862 however, one Mark Dowlen wrote to the Home Office and complained of the disturbances.<sup>37</sup> The Home Office wrote back to the Mayor asking for a comment. The Major replied by saying, as in 1852, that he did not have sufficient powers to stop the riots: 'The Constabulary Force of the Borough is utterly inadequate to put them down and on former occasions the County Constabulary and members of the Metropolitan Police have been employed to render them aid in putting them down but all these arrangements have failed and then the disturbances could only have been stopped by calling in the Military which would necessarily have led to Bloodshed.'<sup>38</sup> Nonetheless, this pressure was one factor in persuading the authorities in Guildford to adopt a repressive policy. A second factor was the Guys' seeming extension of their area of authority. In March 1863 there were celebrations all over England for the Prince of Wales' wedding. Most towns had bonfires as part of their celebrations. Guildford had a procession, a dinner for the elderly, and poor children, athletic sports and fireworks, but no bonfires. The Guys decided to put this right. They came out and lit a bonfire in the High street.<sup>39</sup> The fact that the Guys had come out on an occasion other than November 5th alarmed many townsfolk. A third nail was hammered in the Guys' coffin in October at the St Catherine's Hill fair. According to the Chief Constable of Surrey there was a tradition that on the Sunday preceding the fair the villagers occupied themselves by throwing chestnuts at each other. It was usually a harmless affair but this year it got out of hand and several passers-by were pelted with chestnuts.<sup>40</sup> News of the incident reached the *Times* newspaper which presented a much more violent picture of the scene.<sup>41</sup> The *Times* also censured the authorities; 'The whole blame for the outbreaks must be laid on the local authorities and the police. The fault is theirs for all allowing the mob to get such head.' The paper then went on to mention the Guy Riots. 'We believe, indeed, that the town has for some time past been the scene of similar disgraceful outbreaks on the 5th of November; but this only shows that the authorities have for some time past been disgracefully lax; . . . we cannot conceive of any excuse sufficient to exonerate the authorities. They have ample powers to put down any such breaches of the peace.'<sup>42</sup>

Between the publication of this article (September 30th 1863) and November 5th, five letters are known to have been written complaining about the situation. This was quite a large number of complaints compared to previous years. Two letters were sent to the *Times*<sup>43</sup> and three to the Home Office of which one was published in the *Times* and another was mentioned in the *West Surrey Times*.<sup>44</sup>

The letter from the Home Office in 1862, the demonstrations in March and the publicity in the autumn made the authorities take action. This was the beginning of the end of the riots. On October 14th 1863 the Mayor wrote to the Home Office saying that he was determined to stop these riots.<sup>45</sup> A large number of Special Constables were enrolled. Some troops were stationed outside the town.<sup>46</sup> November 5th passed fairly quietly. The Town Council knew, however, that as soon as the troops pulled out Guys would strike, and it was hoped that the troops could be kept

until the town had organised resistance.<sup>47</sup> The Home Office could not give the town enough time and the troops were taken away.<sup>48</sup> Sure enough the Guys came out. They threw a brick through the window of Mr Weales' shop (one of the magistrates who called in the troops) and raided the ex-Mayor's house.<sup>49</sup> They nearly killed a policeman when they dumped him on the bonfire.<sup>50</sup>

The Town Council remained determined to put down the riots. Mr PW Jacob, a respected citizen of the town, was invited to become Mayor until the riots were stopped. The Police Commissioner resigned and was replaced by JH Law.<sup>51</sup> The size of the police force was increased by six and the police were armed with cutlasses.<sup>52</sup> A good indication of the determination of the Town Council can be seen by the amount of money they spent on the police. From 1851 to 1863 it never exceeded £500 per annum. In the year ending August 4th 1864, however, £958 10s 7d was spent.<sup>53</sup>

In 1864 and 1865 November 5th passed quietly.<sup>54</sup> On Boxing Day 1865, however, there was the last and most serious riot. In the evening a crowd entered the town and assaulted a policeman, seriously injuring him. More police came to the scene, engaged the mob and arrested four men.<sup>55</sup> One was given three months' hard labour while the rest received twelve months.<sup>56</sup> Confidence was restored in the authorities and witnesses came forward and identified some of the ringleaders of the Guys.<sup>57</sup> After 1865 the troubles on November 5th ceased.<sup>58</sup>

The moves to put down the riots marked a dramatic change in the attitudes of the authorities but there had also been a change in the attitudes of the inhabitants. Writing in 1868, PW Jacob said that up to 1863 many people, including some of wealth and influence had supported the behaviour of Guys. After the trouble of 1863, 'when a number of misguided men came out suddenly, not for a lark, not for anything that could possibly be called fun, or amusement, but to do as much mischief as possible; when they attacked and greatly damaged the houses of two men, who so far from being the objects of hatred and dislike, were greatly respected both for their private character and good which they have been doing in the town for many years that those persons felt they could no longer countenance men who were guilty of such abominable outrage and instead of thwarting and opposing the efforts of the magistrates to put down the riots were rather inclined to assist them.'<sup>59</sup>

It may be that fear limited the number of complaints made before 1863. Mark Dowlen finished his letter to the Home Office in 1862 by saying 'I must ask you as a favour you will not let my name be known to the authorities here or my house will not be safe from attack by the mob.'<sup>60</sup> Possibly the inhabitants thought, until 1863, that their complaints would have no effect on the authorities but that they might put their property in danger. In 1863 when the article in the *Times* put pressure on the authorities to take action, the inhabitants probably thought it wise to voice their complaints and thereby keep the pressure up.

After 1863, although the Guys still came out, the terrorism ceased. Many people, it seems, felt that the riots were a problem solved rather than a reflection of the need for a larger police force to maintain law and order generally. In 1865 on November 1st the Guys lit a bonfire in the High Street but fled when the police came. The Mayor, PW Jacob, took this to be a sign that the Guys had still not been crushed and that given the slightest opportunity they would create a riot. He therefore argued that the police force should continue at its present strength. However, the councillors appear to have disagreed with this line of reasoning and wanted the police force to be reduced within three months. They said that too much money was being spent on the police and claimed that the electorate felt the same. If eight policemen could not stop the riots then sixteen would not and the extra eight men would be a waste of money.<sup>61</sup>

After 1865 there were no more riots. The stern measures of the authorities probably deterred people. It is also possible that there were many people in the town who sympathised with the Guys or enjoyed the bonfire and took part in the spectacle, but who were not directly involved with the damage done to property. There were also probably many who would not riot on their own but who would follow the lead given by the Guys. Hence while there were riots people

would follow the Guys, but once the Guys had been crushed the town was quieter. Changes in society may have been a factor in making sure that the riots did not occur again once they had been suppressed. It has been shown elsewhere that the introduction of the police, regular hours in the factories and the work of the Working Mens' Institutes were making society more disciplined.<sup>62</sup> The *Surrey Advertiser* suggested that the working men of Guildford were now more mindful of the self-respect that was expected of them in the progressive days of the 1860s. As a result, it said, they turned a deaf ear to those who called for disturbances. The paper said that these working men thought that the riots in 1863 were disgraceful and that it was wicked that some townsmen had to pay £163 for damaged caused that year.<sup>63</sup> Storch also points out that the campaign to suppress the riots unfolded just as Guildford was experiencing a building boom which attracted outsiders who had shallow roots in the area and opposed the riots.<sup>64</sup> The Guys had lost the support that had once enabled them to operate.

## NOTES

*Abbreviations used in the text*

Green	Green, J.K, 1952 'Fireworks, bonfires, illuminations and the Guy Riots', reprinted by permission of the <i>Surrey Times</i> in <i>Sidelights on Guildford History</i> (undated).
Mason	Mason, J, 1897 <i>Guildford</i> , Guildford Library, Surrey Room
Peak	Peak, H, manuscript <i>Recollections and activities as Mayor of Guildford, vol D</i> , Guildford Library, Surrey Room
Storch	Storch, R D, 1982 'Please to Remember the Fifth of November': conflict, solidarity and public order in southern England, 1815–1900', in Storch, R D (ed) <i>Popular culture and custom in 19th century England</i>
<i>The Keep</i>	<i>The Keep, the quarterly magazine of the Guildford Institute</i> , October, 1912 and January, 1913. Guildford Library, Surrey Room

- 1 Peak, 272–5
- 2 Storch, 71–5
- 3 *ibid*, 71–2
- 4 Green, 1–2
- 5 *The Keep*, January, 1913 'Superintendent Law's Story', 2
- 6 Green, 6
- 7 Peak, 276
- 8 *West Surrey Times*, 7th November 1863, and the following specific references: *West Surrey Times*, 5th November 1855 (labourer's), 8th November 1856 (young men and tradesmen), 14th November 1857 (old men); *The Keep*, October, 1912 'The golden age', 3
- 9 *Sussex Advertiser*, 21st November 1843, 12th November 1844, 11th November 1845
- 10 Mason, 69
- 11 Guildford Institute, Scrapbook E: 'Archaeology, Topography 1880–1920s', part 1, 100: 'Extracts from the Surrey Advertiser of Years Ago – March 21st 1868'
- 12 *Surrey Advertiser*, 8th November 1867
- 13 Mason, 16. Note: a thimble rigger's victim bet that a pea was under one of the three thimble-shaped containers, manipulated by sleight of hand.
- 14 *Sussex Advertiser*, 21st November 1843
- 15 *ibid*, 21st November 1843, 12th November 1844, 10th November 1846
- 16 PRO HO 45/5128/N: letter, Mayor of Guildford to Secretary of State, 12th November 1852
- 17 Mather, F C, 1959 *Public order in the age of the Chartists*

- 18 Green, 2
- 19 Storch, 85
- 20 *Sussex Advertiser*, 16th November 1852
- 21 PRO HO 45/5128/N: letter, the Rev H Shrubbs to Home Office, 8th November 1852
- 22 PRO HO 45/5128/N: letter, Mayor of Guildford to Home Office, 12th November 1852
- 23 PRO HO 45/5128/N: letter, Home Office to Mayor of Guildford, 22nd November 1852
- 24 *Sussex Advertiser*, 16th November 1852
- 25 PRO HO 45/5128/N: letter, Town Clerk, Guildford to Home Office, 25th October 1853
- 26 PRO HO 45/5128/N: letter, Town Clerk, Guildford to Home Office, 7th November 1853
- 27 *Sussex Advertiser*, 7th November 1854
- 28 *West Surrey Times*, 10th November 1855
- 29 *ibid*, 8th November 1856
- 30 *ibid*, 7th November 1857, 14th November 1857
- 31 *ibid*, 7th, 14th November 1857
- 32 *ibid*, 6th November 1858
- 33 Green, 5
- 34 *West Surrey Times*, 12th November 1859, 10th November 1860, 6th November 1861, 8th November 1862
- 35 *ibid*, 12th November 1859
- 36 *ibid*, 6th November 1861
- 37 PRO HO 45/7324: letter, Mark Dowlen to Home Office, 6th November 1862
- 38 PRO HO 45/7443: letter, Mayor of Guildford to Home Office, 19th November 1862
- 39 *West Surrey Times*, 14th March 1963
- 40 PRO HO 45/7442: letter, Chief Constable of Surrey to Home Office, 30th September 1863
- 41 *The Times*, 29th September 1863, page 10, column 6
- 42 *ibid*, 30th September 1863, page 9, column 6
- 43 *ibid*, 2nd October 1863, page 9, column 6; 3rd October 1863, page 12, column 1
- 44 PRO HO 45/7443: letters, H Browne and P F J Browne to Home Office, 5th October 1863; *The Times*, 13th October 1863, page 4, column 6, quoting H Browne's letter; *West Surrey Times*, 17th October 1863, mentioning letter from three old ladies to Home Office
- 45 PRO HO 45/7443: letter, Mayor of Guildford to Home Office, 14th October 1863
- 46 *West Surrey Times*, 14th November 1863
- 47 PRO HO 45/7443: letter, Mayor of Guildford to Home Office, 14th November 1863
- 48 PRO HO 45/7443: notes at end of letter, Mayor of Guildford to Home Office, 14th November 1863; letters Horseguards to Home Office 13th November 1863 and Horseguards to Under Secretary of Home Department, 19th November 1863
- 49 *West Surrey Times*, 28th November 1863
- 50 Green, 4
- 51 *ibid*, 5
- 52 *Op cit* in note 5, 3
- 53 GMR BR/CM/1/2: Guildford Borough Council minutes
- 54 *Surrey Advertiser*, 18th November 1864, 11th November 1865
- 55 *ibid*, 30th December 1865
- 56 Green, 5
- 57 Chamberlin, E R, 1982 *Guildford*, 179
- 58 Storch, 92
- 59 *Op cit* in note 11
- 60 PRO HO 45/7324: letter, Mark Dowlen to Home Office, 6th November 1862
- 61 *Surrey Advertiser*, 11th November 1865
- 62 Thompson, F M L, 1981 Social control in Victorian Britain, *Economic Hist Rev*, 2nd ser, 34 (2)
- 63 *Surrey Advertiser*, 18th November 1864
- 64 Storch, 91