© Heather Shore 2015

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

No portion of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted save with written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence permitting limited copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, Saffron House, 6–10 Kirby Street, London EC1N 8TS.

Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The author has asserted her right to be identified as the author of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published 2015 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN

Palgrave Macmillan in the UK is an imprint of Macmillan Publishers Limited, registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan in the US is a division of St Martin's Press LLC, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Palgrave Macmillan is the global academic imprint of the above companies and has companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN 978–0–230–30404–8

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing processes are expected to conform to the environmental regulations of the country of origin.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Typeset by MPS Limited, Chennai, India.

Contents

1
Introduction

> COURT. Soams is your Name? How long have you gone by that Name?
> ISABELLA EATON. About a 12 Month.
> COURT. I think I have try'd you here by another Name.
> EATON. Very like you might try me, my Lord, and by another Name too; but what if you did, I was Innocent, and my Jury acquitted me. I never came here for my Crimes, but my Passions.[1]

> WILLIAM SHEEN: 'I have known what it is to stand at that bar myself, and have been as lenient to the prisoner as if she had been my own child – I have no doubt you are aware of what I was here for – they think they have a right to rob me – I was never a thief in my life – I feel for the prisoner, but she has robbed my sister four sessions ago'.[2]

> We are not an 'organised' gang and never have been. So far from encouraging feuds and outbursts I have endeavoured in every possible way to keep the warring factions wide apart so that there should be no violent conflicts of any description.[3]

These vignettes remind us that criminals have more than one identity. As the accused, as witnesses, as victims and as members of communities, they contribute to the narratives of crime that were woven around them by magistrates and lawyers, policemen, journalists and other commentators. Isabella Eaton gives evidence at the Old Bailey trial of Jane Murphey alias Macloughlane in December 1732, and in doing

so defends her own right to a voice. In February 1847, William Sheen stands his ground in the courtroom, when he accuses his servant Mary Ryley of taking various items from his lodging house in Whitechapel. In September 1922, Charles 'Darby' Sabini defends his reputation and that of his associates in an interview with the Sunday paper, the *Empire News*. Whilst we can never be sure of the extent to which published words are an accurate reflection of reality, these statements capture fleeting moments of negotiation with respectable society. They demonstrate that the underworld and the upperworld overlapped. As Richard Evans noted in his study of German criminals, 'the boundaries of the underworld were always more fluid than commentators maintained'.[4]

The underworld and the ways in which it has been constructed in different historical periods inform this book. Theoretically, cultural, social and political ideology about criminal subcultures accelerated during the twentieth century.[5] However, in terms of the ties that bind criminals to their communities and to kin, and in the spatial footsteps from where they originate, connections with traditional 'underworlds' remained. Thus, this book is an attempt to think about the changing nature of the language used by police and law enforcers, by journalists and writers, by victims and witnesses and by criminals themselves. It looks at some of the interactions that have shaped the historical construction of the underworld. Regulatory frameworks, criminal law and practice, styles of journalism and popular crime writing have all influenced the way in which the public has come to understand organised crime. This book considers some of these processes over a broad chronological period. That the examples come from the early eighteenth century until the interwar period of the twentieth century is not accidental. It was in the eighteenth century that the idea of a criminal underworld became more coherent and more embedded in popular culture. In a period in which the criminal justice system was being vigorously remade, cultural production, the texts, literatures and narratives through which the underworld was and is narrated, was expanding and becoming more accessible to a wider range of society.

The book ends in the interwar period of the twentieth century.[6] Both criminals and representations of criminals were influenced by external factors in this period, marking it as a significant watershed. Thus concepts of organised crime were much more distinctly influenced by North American representations of gangsters by the early 1930s.[7] Arguably it is in the 1920s and 1930s, and amongst the networks and alliances concerned in converging illegal economies, that the roots of modern organised crime can be found. Whilst considerations of change over time are inevitable, the intention of this book is not to provide a

sequential history or complete survey of the underworld. Rather, key examples and case studies are used to explore a set of themes that have been identified from the press, criminal and police records, and the historically constructed narrative of the underworld.

An important focus of the book is what might be broadly described as crime networks. As Paul Griffiths has noted of early modern London:

> The evident distortions of a constructed 'underworld' or calculated political boundaries do not mean that we should limit criminal communities to a minor role in early modern London. Instead of a parallel criminal universe, we should hunt for the jigsaw pieces that, when put together, show associations or networks of criminals.[8]

Some of those jigsaw pieces are examined in three chapters (3, 5 and 8) which provide detailed studies of individuals and groups of closely connected criminals who became known to the public for parts of their life. For these mainly plebeian Londoners, interactions with the courts could be significantly shaped by the socially constructed representations of the gangs and confederacies to which they were believed to belong. However, the book argues that kinship, ethnic and community networks also structured these connecting criminal lives. Whilst these individuals and groups were not always welcome residents, they were neighbours and did flow in and out of local communities. Moreover, the way in which the press and other crime literatures contributed to the visibility of certain 'noted' individuals is also crucial. This visibility can also be seen in other chapters in this book (2, 4, 6 and 7), which focus on the relationship between criminality and press and courtroom constructions of criminal typologies. Gang crime, informers, hustlers, the swell mob, swindlers, the long firm and fighting gangs are some of the labels used by the press and other authorities to describe forms of criminal activity. These chapters cover longer chronologies, combined with close examination of a smaller group of trials from the Old Bailey. The rest of this introduction outlines the key themes and chapter structure of the book. To start, a brief exploration follows of the use of the word 'underworld' in both contemporary writings and in the more recent work by academics and authors of popular crime histories.

Underworld Terminology

Writers continue to evoke the liminality, marginality and otherness of the underworld to cloak descriptions of criminality in the eighteenth,

nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[9] The terminology of the 'criminal underworld' has become deeply embedded in our cultural psyche: the 'underworld' is presented as a solid entity, a set of behaviours, activities and spaces that exist alongside the upperworld. Indeed, the term has had a profound power in the modernity of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. As a collective way of describing bad behaviour it is compelling; and its imprecision ensures that it remains a key trope in press reportage. The process of how the underworld became embedded in our cultural, social and political language is partly the focus of this book. Despite its prevalence as a noun used to describe collective criminal activity, 'the underworld' was not used consistently until the later nineteenth century. One of the earliest books to refer to the underworld in its title was the work of the pseudonymic George Ellington, who in 1869 published *The Women of New York; or, The Under-world of the Great City ….* This was followed in 1899 by the work of Helen Campbell, also writing about prostitution, in *Darkness and Daylight; or, Lights and Shadows of New York Life.*[10] By the early decades of the twentieth century the use of the term had become fairly common in descriptions and accounts of urban criminal milieux in America and Britain.[11]

An early newspaper reference to the underworld is found in *The Times* in 1864, in an editorial that attempts to explain the 'belief in an underworld of crime and horrors'.[12] According to the writer, this was a 'fanciful idea of metropolitan wickedness'; and that 'the dark chambers of Ainsworth's novels, in which thieves and thief-catchers played their desperate game against each other, no longer exist'.[13] The author saw communities of thieves as something belonging to the past: 'the superior efficiency of our modern police saves us from depredations on a grander scale'. The police were no longer interested in the encouragement of crime and the 'detestable trade of Jonathan Wild is suppressed'. The thieves remained but 'are no longer so gregarious in their habits, that they do not congregate, as they once did, in certain quarters, or meet so regularly at certain "flash houses," but are more dispersed through the whole population, and often carry on honest trade in their spare hours'. This editorial can be read as a moment of mythologisation. The references to Ainsworth's novels and to G. M. W. Reynolds's *Mysteries of London* are significant.[14] Thus, at this mid-Victorian point of time the narrative trope of the underworld was one that was powerfully shaped by the relationship between the press, law enforcement and broader print culture.[15] Yet, these narrative connections originated in the previous century, as the reference to Jonathan Wild suggests. Eighteenth-century

print culture celebrated the criminal, and underwent a significant transformation.[16] Even before this, the concept of alternative deviant worlds can be found in the detailed iconography of pre-modern underworlds. Literary and semi-literary accounts, such as John Awdeley's *Fraternity of Vagabonds* in 1561, and other rogue literature of the Elizabethan and early Stuart period, described an alternative world with a specific language, codes of behaviour and a distinct geography.

The prevalence of published crime literature – the criminal biography written by hack Grub Street writers in the eighteenth century, the social investigations of the nineteenth and the true crime of the twentieth – has led to some reticence on the part of historians in dealing with the underworld paradigm.[17] Exceptions to this include the work of Paul Griffiths and John McMullan on early modern London and Alyson Brown and Stefan Slater's work on the early twentieth century.[18] Richard Evans' work on narratives of the underworld in nineteenth-century Germany provides a useful discursive framework.[19] Other work has focused on cultural production and its role in shaping the representation of criminality. For example, Andrea McKenzie has written on crime print culture in the eighteenth century and authors such as Rosalind Crone and Judith Flanders have written in a similar vein about the nineteenth century.[20] Esther Snell and Richard Ward have explored discourses around criminality in the eighteenth-century press. John Carter Wood and Matt Houlbrook have written about the relationship between crime stories, press representation and mass culture in the interwar period of the twentieth century.[21] Outside these serious studies there exists a parallel popular history of crime. Thus, in a number of popular texts the underworld is described as a real historical and social space.[22] This is most apparent in genre studies of the underworld by true-crime writers such as James Morton and Brian McDonald.[23] The way in which such writers employ evidence and narrate stories about historical organised crime is inherently problematic. Arguably there are processes of mythologising in this history that have been shaped over time by the public demand for crime stories. As Roland Barthes suggested, 'Myth lends itself to history in two ways: by its form, which is only relatively motivated; by its concept, the nature of which is historical'.[24] The late modern mythologising of crime stories mirrors the earlier proliferation of print culture; the particular success of the 'black and red' true-crime genre since the 1980s, specialising in villains' memoirs, resonates with the biographies of highway robbers, footpads and fraudsters.[25] Moreover, the narrative of organised crime has also undergone a process of 'genealogising' by writers who see criminal groups and individuals

such as the Sabinis (Chapter 8) on a continuum; the connections and inheritances (of criminal business, of territory) echoing the predominance of the 'family firm' in later-twentieth-century narratives. Thus the 'racecourse wars' of the interwar period, and the activities of the Sabini family in particular, have been mythologised and genealogised through a number of literary media, including press, police biography, memoirs and novels, as well as true crime writing.

However, the underworld has not only been constructed through contemporary print culture and true crime mythologies. Organised crime networks have been the subject of systematic study by sociologists and criminologists.[26] British organised crime has tended to be seen as a more recent phenomenon.[27] Dick Hobbs notes that in Britain the concept of organised crime has only relatively recently been deployed by political institutions (politicians and senior police officers): 'this shift in perception is a direct consequence of a particular reading of globalization and its attendant attributes, in particular the expansion of illegal economic activity and its cosmopolitan associations'.[28] This approach, Hobbs argues, defines organised crime as a distinctly modern phenomenon that largely ignores the persistent elements of criminal organisation that can be identified in past societies. Historians also have generally seen forms of criminal organisation as culturally and politically constructed. There is no underworld, only elite interpretations of the lives of the poor and working class; a collection of ideas about crime mediated through cultural and legal apparatus. This view is supported by cultural historical approaches which privilege the place of language and discourse. The disentanglement of 'the underworld' from its literary and cultural contexts renders it meaningless; the understanding of criminal organisation that relates it to bureaucracy, structure and hierarchy is essentially unhelpful.

Close reading of historical sources suggests a more flexible and fluid (and arguably disorganised) set of relationships. In the 1980s, criminologist Peter Reuter coined the term 'disorganised' crime, arguing that in reality criminal networks were more diverse and fragmented than the traditional picture had supposed.[29] This is a more useful means of categorising the criminal activity in which some individuals and groups were involved, and is suggested by the fundamentally loose nature of many of the alliances described in this book. Individuals shifted allegiances and groups joined forces in response to a variety of external or internal factors. Whilst alliances could be shaped by the overlapping networks to which people belonged, other forces also engendered commonalities and confederacy. As Chapter 7 will demonstrate, groups

of youths in late-Victorian and Edwardian London formed and re-formed alliances which were often transient and short-lived. What were perceived as gang formations gained a public profile as a result of shifting territorial conflicts. Similar patterns of disorganisation have been identified by Andrew Davies in his study of gangs in interwar Glasgow.[30] Moreover, roles such as fence or informer or thief were flexible rather than occupying a rigid and hierarchical bureaucracy.[31] Indeed gang terminology is inherently tricky. Whilst criminal confederacies and gangs certainly existed historically we need to be aware of the nuances of the language used by contemporaries.[32] For example, the criminologist Simon Hallsworth has written about the problematic way in which definitions of the 'gang' are used in modern assessments of 'gangland Britain'. He notes, 'far from the streets being overrun by "gangs", the most pervasive street collectives appeared to comprise volatile peer groups randomly and erroneously labelled as "gangs" by control agencies'.[33] As the research for this book demonstrated, control agencies, including law enforcers (police, constables, thief-takers and magistrates), the courts, as well as the press, frequently used the term 'gang' to describe a range of collective activities. For example, at different times groups of youths who came together for fighting, hustling or 'holding the street' were often described as belonging to gangs by the police, who tended to see such activity as systematic and collectively organised. When witnesses and police described their knowledge of the gang, it acted as a means of conferring authority on their evidence. But the police identification of gangs (of coiners, of burglars, of thieves) often described loose associations and confederacies between individuals. As we will see in Chapter 6, gangs of coiners were often constituted of members of households, husbands and wives, lodgers and children.

Themes

The reconstruction of criminal lives has been a piecemeal process, reliant on case studies and on the tantalising glimpses of criminal activity that can be identified in the records of the criminal justice system. Whilst these were lives that were frequently lived on the margins and on the periphery, more recent explorations in social and cultural history have sought to understand the ways in which individuals and groups negotiated the criminal justice system and, in some cases, the impact this had on practices on the ground.[34] Key issues include concerns about gangs; practices of informing; relationships between police and criminals; the role of the historical media; the ordering of the parish and of the street; the control

of vice, prostitution and gambling; and the place of criminal and ple-beian agency. Whilst many of these matters inform the chapters that follow, four themes have been identified which will be introduced in more depth here: print culture, public crime, criminal networks and territory. Each chapter illustrates, to a greater or lesser degree, aspects of these themes. Overall they present a portrait of a period during which pressures on growing urban communities, policing and legal practice, and an expanding print culture, mutually reinforced the crime stories that have been told as part of the 'invention' of the underworld from the early eighteenth century.

Print Culture and Public Crime

From the eighteenth century the crossover between literary representa-tion and media coverage increased, marking it as a period in which the underworld was substantially remade.[35] Moreover, as Bob Shoemaker has argued, the explosion of printed literature fundamentally shaped attitudes towards crime.[36] For Shoemaker, despite the expansion of crime coverage in the press during the later eighteenth century, the period between the 1690s and 1770s was 'a golden age of writing about crime, in which crime was a key theme in print culture … and the voices of criminals and their victims could clearly be heard'.[37] The burgeoning print culture found a receptive audience as well as a willing cast. Individual criminals struck bargains with the hack journalists who exploited their desire for immortality, for justice and/or revenge on for-mer confederates, or simply for financial remuneration (for condemned felons, this could be money for their burial and for their families).[38] As the next chapter will demonstrate, the 1720s and 30s were significant decades for the transmission of criminal print cultures. The intensifica-tion of crime reporting in this period may have had a very real impact on criminal justice practices. As Richard Ward has suggested, by the 1740s, 'the increasingly prominent and powerful forces of print cul-ture and public opinion were intimately linked to, and could have a potentially significant impact upon, the administration of law'.[39] The responses of the press and broader print culture to crime 'events', and the way in which they sought to identify and publicise criminal con-federacy, drew on practices honed in previous decades. Thus, from the 1690s there had been a growth of 'crime stories' about particular types of offender, most notably the highway robber. However, these represen-tations owed more to traditional forms of rogue literature that depicted a mobile, sturdy and threatening world of criminals and vagabonds.[40]

Beattie argues in contrast that from the 1720s the Sessions Papers, Ordinaries' Accounts and newspapers, 'introduced more authentic reports of offenders and trials'.[41]

Nevertheless, whilst the eighteenth-century press was suffused with crime news, there was not yet the culture of the crime leader or the moral editorial. In papers like the *Daily Post*, the domestic or London news was often on the front page, but these papers generally only consisted of two sheets and the second sheet often consisted of advertisements and lists of trade prices. However, it did mean that reports about criminals, about the sessions of the Old Bailey or the Guildhall, about executions, were accessible and visible. Moreover, from the 1720s, arguably, the relationship between the magistracy and the press was increasingly intimate. London magistrates at times actively courted the press and, indeed, the press keenly reported on their activities.[42] Other contemporary sources also reflect the importance of the interconnections between the public, the press and the police. William Hogarth's *A Harlot's Progress*, based on events reported in the press in the summer of 1730, was a clever hybrid of print culture, crime story and the public taste for celebrity criminals such as James Dalton and the rapist and seducer, Colonel Charteris.[43] It was the coincidence of broader structural changes linking the press, law enforcement, criminal justice and the public sphere that make the decades from the 1720s so meaningful.

In the eighteenth century, at least up until the 1770s, the proliferation of print culture meant that the most visible and notorious offenders had some sort of public profile. At that point, according to Robert Shoemaker, 'the character of printed literature about crime changed significantly, due to both new financial and official constraints on publication and the shifting cultural preoccupations of readers, as respectable society lost interest in the life experiences of members of the deviant lower classes'.[44] During the early nineteenth century, individual criminals were accorded the infamy of being identified in criminal broadsheets and the popular press, such as *Bell's Life in London, and Sporting Chronicle* (c.1822), and its rival, *Life in London* (1821).[45] The crime broadsheet or broadside industry was most notably associated with Jeremiah Catnach, who ran a very productive business from Monmouth Street in the heart of Seven Dials.[46] The most lucrative subject for the broadsides would shift from highway robbery to bloody murder. Whilst murder had always sold, the shockwave that was sent through the country by the Ratcliff Highway murders in 1811 arguably established a taste for 'bloody' broadsides.[47] The extent to which murder had seeped into nineteenth-century culture is deftly illustrated by Rosalind Crone, who

points to the 'material culture of murder', and manufacture of ephemera celebrating violent crime.[48] Tales of robbers and highwaymen did survive in the form of the 'Newgate novel', which included the work of William Harrison Ainsworth and Edward Bulwer-Lytton, as well as Charles Dickens's *Oliver Twist*.[49] Moreover, Dickens's preoccupation with the workhouse and the environments in which crime thrived were reflected in the emerging genre of social investigation by the mid-nineteenth century, most strongly associated with the *Morning Chronicle* and the 'investigative journalism' pioneered by Henry Mayhew.[50]

Social investigation was driven by a range of interests. On the one hand, authors were motivated by political, reformist and religious sensibilities. For example, James Greenwood wrote a number of investigative accounts that explored the poorest districts of London, with an eye to commentary on social inequality.[51] Reviewing *The Seven Curses of London,* in 1869 the *Era* commented that it, 'lays bare some of the most appalling wounds that are not yet closed up on the body of English society'.[52] On the other hand, Andrew Mearns, a Congregational minister, and author of the reform tract, *The Bitter Cry of Outcast London* (1883), was more typical of a strand of religious writing which contributed to the genre of social investigation during the nineteenth century.[53] Many of these accounts were highly sensational and melodramatic and, indeed, reform (whether politically or spiritually driven) and sensation were not mutually exclusive. The majority of these texts presented general and often very stereotypical accounts of the problem of crime and poverty. The celebration of crime that was often implicit in earlier biographical accounts, and the low-life literature of the early nineteenth century, was largely absent. Nevertheless, the sheer abundance of investigation into crime, the conceptualisation of a 'criminal class', the introduction of more systematic recording and classification of criminals, and the detailed trial reportage to be found in the press, mean that 'career' criminals can be occasionally identified. This can be seen from the reconstruction of William Sheen's life (Chapter 5), and accounts of 'professional' criminals like James Townsend Saward (Chapter 6).

By the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, newspapers would increasingly become the more natural home for social journalism, drawing together the elements of older prescriptive literatures, pamphlets and journals into headlines, editorials and columns regularly reporting the crime problem.[54] One new form of print culture that proliferated by the interwar period was the police biography. The earliest biographies appeared in the late nineteenth century and were closely influenced by the vogue for detective fiction. In particular, the publication of Arthur

Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes stories from the 1880s, helped to grow the market for real-life detective stories.[55] From its earliest incarnations, police biography would be influenced by broader print culture. As Haia Shpayer-Makov has argued, a key function of the memoir was 'to reinforce support for the legal system in the country'. Hence, good 'police' and bad 'villains' were often drawn in very broad brushstrokes. Former police detectives such as Tom Divall (1929), Fred Wensley (1931) and Frederick 'Nutty' Sharpe (1938) draped their accounts of the events with both machismo and close 'knowledge'. Divall, for example, was keen to stress his intimacy with the gangs, 'I had friends among both lots …'.[56] Typically, accounts were subject to institutional or self-aggrandisement. As Sharpe wrote in 1938, 'I don't think that I make any unfair boast when I say that these yellow livered, rotten little bullies and cowards are dead scared of the Flying Squad'.[57]

By the interwar period, the influences on press portrayals of crime, and indeed on police biography, would be shaped by other external cultural influences, what one contemporary newspaper called 'the Chicagoan Complex'.[58] As early as 1922 the *Empire News* was describing the racecourse gang conflicts, discussed here in Chapter 8, as 'resembling the methods of the mafia gangs of Italy and America'.[59] Other contemporary authors wrote the racecourse wars into their narrated lives. The most notorious of the racecourse gangs, the Sabinis, appeared in the posthumously published biography of the nightclub owner Kate Meyrick. She closely echoed contemporary press rhetoric when describing the 'gangsters', noting, 'The West End of London was at this period a regular hotbed of lawlessness; then and for another four years or so Soho suffered a reign of terror'.[60] The evoking of terror and terrorism was common in press constructions of the racecourse wars, and of gang crime more generally.[61] Fiction writers, such as Graham Greene and Peter Cheney, would also help to retrospectively construct the mythology of the racecourse wars.[62] Moreover, such narratives have been recycled into the linear genealogies presented by writers such as McDonald and Morton, as well as the pulp fiction account of Darby Sabini's life, published by former crime correspondent Edward T. Hart.[63] In the merging of literary representation, print culture and criminal lives, the Sabini family were a natural fit. But even in the early 1920s, stereotypes of what Andrew Davies has called 'the Romantic Outlaw' were used to describe Darby Sabini in the press.[64] In the *Empire News*, Sabini was described as, 'A dapper, sturdy-looking little man with the quick, flashing eyes of his race'.[65] Here Darby was cast as 'leading man', in an era in which celebrity was becoming a powerful force.

Public Enemies?

The emergence of the gangster trope in the interwar years of the twentieth century, however, was not unprecedented. The overlapping forces that combined to produce interactions between law enforcement and print culture also contributed to the emergence of a cultural form which focused on the life of the individual criminal (or groups of criminals). With its roots in the highwayman literature of the late seventeenth century, it flourished from the early eighteenth century with the emergence of the 'Grub-Street' milieu and particularly (by the 1720s) with the influence of individuals like Daniel Defoe and the printer, John Applebee, in publicising crime stories.[66] Wild's 'career' can be seen as a significant turning-point for the publicity of crime, not least because Wild himself manipulated his public profile as a way of furthering his influence. The notoriety of Wild, and the short, brutal lives of many of those who were connected to him, would be valuable fodder for the writers of criminal biography. Thus print culture not only reflected public and policing rhetoric on the state of crime in the metropolis, but also identified specific groups or individuals as troublemakers, feeding into a process that enabled the stigmatisation of particular individuals and/or communities. Individuals were visibly and publicly recorded in the proliferation of texts that charted crime and disorder in the metropolis: the *Proceedings of the Old Bailey*, the *Ordinary of Newgate's Account*, the *Select Trials*, the *Newgate Calendar*. These joined with the daily reporting of criminal news to provide both plebeian and elite communities with knowledge of who the 'villainous' were. The press focused attention on those they identified as being key actors in the criminal milieu. At key points, the interrelationship between the incidence of crime, the enforcement of order and the reporting of crime resulted in heightened knowledge and visibility of criminality. Clearly, decisions were made about which crimes were to be reported, and whilst serious violent crime and robbery would always be worthy of column inches, the activities of notorious criminals like Jonathan Wild, Jack Sheppard and Dick Turpin could be followed in minute detail.[67] The case studies provided in this book illustrate the powerful ability of the press to focus the attention of the public upon specific individuals and to reinforce criminal typologies and stereotypes – rather than reflecting the shared experience that may have characterised the lives of Mary Harvey and Isabella Eaton, the Sheen family, the Sabinis and the other women and men of their communities.

Cases like these help us to say something about the relationship between cultural production and legal process, and the way in which it

contributes to the historical construction of criminality. Descriptions of criminal behaviour and criminal types were not just plucked out of thin air; rather they were based on real people who had real experiences in the criminal justice system. Moreover, care needs to be taken with the crime stories told in print culture. Whilst some individuals and groups of offenders were the subject of intense interest; many offenders escaped notice. Indeed, the representations that were generated could be based on a narrow interpretation of real-life events, on a limited number of actual criminals and often on recycled evidence. For example, William Augustus Miles's interviews with juvenile offenders on the *Euryalus* hulk in the 1830s, were recycled in the Select Committee on Gaols and Houses of Correction in 1835, the Constabulary Commission of 1836–39 (for which he was a researcher), and his own book, *Poverty, Mendicity and Crime*, published in 1839. Miles presented the boys' stories as evidence of widespread criminal organisation.[68] Miles's ubiquity at this point, and his status of expert might suggest that evidence from a small number of juvenile boys about a small number of offenders was likely to have been passed around a large number of contemporary commentators and practitioners.[69]

From the early nineteenth century, criminal histories of individuals other than those found guilty of murder were less popular. Without the culminating terror of the noose, narratives of pickpockets, thieves and receivers of stolen goods did not have the same currency as violent criminals whose story arc more often ended up on the gallows. Moreover, even in its early-nineteenth-century incarnations, the *Newgate Calendar* tended to focus mostly on the classic narratives of highwaymen and robbers from the previous century.[70] There were some notorious, non-homicidal criminals who caught the eye of the print media. Probably one of the most visible criminals in early nineteenth century print culture was the London Jewish fence and thief, Isaac 'Ikey' Solomon, a 'career' criminal who was active in London from c. 1810.[71] By the mid-1820s, he was well known to the police, both for his activities as a receiver of stolen goods and as a dealer in stolen bank notes. However, Solomon's fame came largely as a result of a notorious escape from custody in 1827. Joining his separately convicted wife in Van Diemen's Land, Solomon was the subject of a legal battle, culminating in his being shipped back to England to stand trial in 1830. The involvement of the Colonial and Home Office in the case put the seal on his notoriety. Solomon was tried on a number of indictments at the Old Bailey in 1830, after which he was sentenced to transportation for 14 years and returned to Van Diemen's Land in November 1831.[72] Solomon was no ordinary offender. Like the most notorious criminals of the previous century, he had crossed the line

that brought him into public repute. As John Tobias points out, 'Despite the predominance of this period in our criminal history, none of the ordinary criminals of the day, it seems to me, are known by name to the general public'. He cites Solomon as an example of a man 'engaged in ordinary crime'.[73] Yet, it is the exceptional elements of Solomon's public story that allow the historian to trace his progress through both official records and print culture.[74]

In the twentieth century, a similar tendency of the press and other print culture to identify and select particular individuals as 'public' criminals can also be found. Thus Dick Hobbs points out that few might have heard of Billy Hill and Jack 'Spot' Comer (the 'bosses' of the London underworld in the later 1930s and 40s) had they not caught the attention of biographers like Duncan Webb and the pulp fiction writer, Hank Janson.[75] Similarly, there was little or no mention of the McDonald family from South London, until Brian McDonald, the nephew of 'gang-leader' Charles 'Wag' McDonald, published his history and part-memoir, *Elephant Boys: Tales of London and Los Angeles Underworlds*, in 2000.[76] The book drew on 'Uncle Wag's' diaries, which he had conveniently kept. Since then, true crime authors have written the McDonald family firmly into the family tree of gangsterdom. Of course it may be that the McDonalds were actually very good at being criminals, avoided arrest and resisted the temptation to make their mark as visible hard men. Certainly figures like Spot and Hill, and their successors, Ronald and Reginald Kray, could not resist the lure of being 'public' criminals.[77] In 1955 Hill published his immodestly titled, *Boss of Britain's Underworld*. It had been ghost-written by the crime correspondent of the *People*, Duncan Webb. The Kray twins 'invited' John Pearson to write their biography in 1967. Indeed, the powerful pull of criminal celebrity and criminal association should not be underestimated. Thus, when Raphael Samuel interviewed the former criminal Arthur Harding about his life in East London, Harding placed himself firmly in the criminal networks of the early twenties, with references to the Sabinis and to the Jewish bookmaker Edward Emmanuel. Whilst Harding did have a criminal and penal record and most notably gave evidence to a Royal Commission on policing in 1908, his reflections on proximity to the Sabinis may have been aspirational or a reflection of the local mythologies (and press coverage?) that he would have access to as an East End resident.[78]

Criminal Networks: Families, Communities, Workplace

In exploring the individuals and groups who have become the substance of this book, I have found that relationships, networks and

communities fundamentally underpin the crime stories that make up the underworld.[79] Thus, criminal organisation is characterised by the same relationships of exchange and reciprocity that structure everyday society. Moreover, these criminal communities are rarely fixed in their identities. Rather, networks overlap and communities might come together in a fragile and often short-lived way that then defines them as 'criminal' or 'deviant'. Indeed, Matt Neale has cautioned against the use of the term 'criminal networks', describing the circulation of stolen goods in eighteenth-century Bristol as 'myriad social and economic connections that were constantly in flux'.[80] Gangs could represent multiple identities, not just criminal identities. For Peter Linebaugh, the gang represented the meeting of class identities, the apparent rules and conduct of the gang echoed forms of labour organisation.[81] However, this book demonstrates the importance of family and kinship bonds to the connections that made up criminal networks. As Paul Griffiths notes in his account of early modern London between 1550 and 1660, '"Criminals" crossed spatial, residential and work borders all the time'.[82] The exchanges, interactions and 'boundary-hoppings' described by Griffiths for the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, equally work to describe overlapping networks and criminal communities from the early eighteenth century.[83] Accounts of criminals are shaped by alliance and connection. Some alliances are deep-seated, based on family and on deep connections to communities. Thus, Moll Harvey worked mainly with her sister, Isabella Eaton; Sheen's main confederates were his elderly, roguish parents; the Sabinis were brothers; other members of the 'gang' were close neighbours. In all three cases, our protagonists operated in well-defined areas – networks of streets, pubs and lodging houses. Moreover, siblings, husbands and wives, children, parents, neighbours and lovers frequently populated the gangs identified by such gang-busting magistrates as De Veil and the Fieldings in the eighteenth century. For example, the Black Boy Alley Gang, the name used to identify a cluster of individual and associated offenders in the Chick Lane and Field Lane area during the 1740s, were bound as much by territorial and familial alliances as criminal organisation.[84] Criminal activity then needs to be understood in the context of community, and particularly the makeshift economies of the poor that transformed familial, class or ethnic identity into criminal identity. Neighbours and community were also party to the processes that shaped criminal identity. Even in more short-lived and less deep-rooted liaisons and networks, such connections were present.

One of the ways in which individuals and groups interconnected for illegal purposes was through contacts made at work. In the nineteenth

century, when the experience of work and the workplace developed for the working and lower middle-class, confederacies formed through work become more visible in the criminal justice system. Arguably, white-collar crime has long been seen as a form of organised crime. However, it sits problematically in relation to the overlapping criminal communities that are examined in this book. These communities have not only been formed by the illegalities, strategies and economies of those involved in them, but also through the series of interactions with criminal justice, with law enforcement and with print culture. White-collar criminals, for the most part, have historically managed to evade these agents. The term itself is associated with the work of Edwin Sutherland in 1939, used to describe 'a crime committed by a person of respectability and high social status in the course of his occupation', and the limited historical investigations into white-collar crime have concentrated for the most part on company and corporate fraud.[85] Yet, at the Old Bailey, as we see in the account of frauds and long-firm crimes described in Chapter 6, the relationship and networks that framed the crimes were those of financial transaction, the workplace and economic or business partnership. In these often complicated cases, involving multiple defendants, the circles that overlapped were those of clerks, travelling salesmen, shopkeepers, commission agents and managers. It may be that the increasing visibility of these cases in the Old Bailey from the mid-nineteenth century does mark a shift away from the crimes of the overlapping communities of families and neighbours to be found in the earlier period. On the other hand, as John Langbein has shown, similar relationships structured the 'gang' of the corrupt solicitor William Wreathock in the 1730s, whose network was composed of attorneys, clerks and their enforcers.[86] Finally, work, at least in part, contributed to the formation of identity amongst the youth gangs of late-Victorian and Edwardian London, as will be shown in Chapter 7. Thus, the boys and young men involved in street and fighting gangs may have strongly identified with the neighbourhood territory, but they also had shared common ground as manual and semi-skilled workers.

Territory and Crime: Margins, Boundaries and Contested Spaces

Whilst information about criminal lives is inevitably fragmentary, in the case studies presented here we find patterns relating to territory and urban space. Territory has shaped the history of ideas about the

underworld and about criminal organisation. In contrast to late modern society, where organised crime and the underworld are defined through globalised black economies and technologies, criminal communities in the past were strongly tied to urban terrains.[87] Whilst crime networks could operate in provincial towns and rural areas, urban streets and ghettos dominate narratives of the underworld.[88] The clusters of streets that were identified as trouble spots by the authorities and by other 'experts' were predictably economically deprived areas. Moreover, as Clive Emsley has pointed out:

> It is clear that the police stigmatised certain lodging house districts as criminal and, while these were generally the cheapest and poorest, the labelling may have become to some extent self-fulfilling with those who could avoid lodgings in a stigmatised area making every effort to do so.[89]

However, there were other notable features of the streets and street-clusters in the metropolis that became associated with crime. The crime stories told in the chapters that follow frequently take place in contested spaces. The conflicts between Mary Harvey and her neighbours, described in Chapter 3, took place in the vicinity of Hedge Lane, a road in the Haymarket area notoriously associated with prostitution.[90] Areas associated with vice are inherently contested spaces, as Simon Gunn has noted, 'The sexual regulation of public space is indeed one of the most pervasive and least remarked, features of urban modernity'.[91] In Hedge Lane, tensions between 'disorderly' residents and their more respectable neighbours would escalate to the point at which the latter would collude with the constables and the reforming magistracy in order to reclaim their streets. Characteristically, law enforcers and police are at the root of such conflicts over space and territory. Indeed, as Steve Herbert has argued, police officers (and their early modern counterparts) regularly exercise territoriality, seeking to influence social action through the control of space, 'Police efforts to claim sovereignty over the street, however, are always subject to contestation'.[92]

Historically, these battles for street terrain have frequently involved young men. Two chapters in this book deal with the relationship between youth and territory. Whilst most discussions of historical youth gangs date from around the 1870s, as Chapter 3 demonstrates, concerns about gangs of youths surfaced much earlier. Hence, an increasing number of prosecutions involving (mainly) young men described as 'hustling' and 'surrounding' their victims, often in a large

crowd assembled to watch a procession or ceremony, appeared at the Old Bailey in the 1810s and 1820s. Whilst these gangs of young men may have been drawn to the fairs, parades and processions because of the opportunities provided by the assembling of crowds, they were also engaged in a contest about how to use that territory. For the election crowd gathered at the hustings, or the Carolinian crowd coming out in support of the queen, the street was a political space as well as one of disorder or larceny. As cabinet-maker, Henry Cotton described, as he watched the queen passing near Waterloo Place in September 1820, 'My hands were pinioned down by a gang, who hustled me against the carriage, and I felt my watch go from my fob'.[93] According to Old Bailey accounts, when metropolitan streets were claimed for the rituals of procession and public spectacle, 'hustling gangs' took advantage of the opportunity to rob bystanders and spectators. In many of these cases the descriptions of hustling gangs are vague, with often a hazy estimate of the number of people apparently involved. It is impossible to even tell who or how many were involved in the actual commission of crime. Thus descriptions of large groups, claiming street space, characterise these accounts.

Such descriptions of hustling gangs demonstrate the continuing con-stellation of concerns about groups of young men on public streets. Their aggressive group behaviour, their fight for territory on the street, ripple down to the accounts of 'fighting gangs', ruffianism and hooliganism that can be found later in the century. Whilst the gangs of young men described in late-Victorian and Edwardian London may have shared features with the hustling youths of the Regency, there are distinctions. From its earliest appearance in the press, hustling had been strongly associated with the City. As one writer remarked in the *World*, in October 1788, 'To the reproach of the City Police, a most daring set of villains infest the very center of it, especially Fleet-street. Parties of them skulk in Courts; and, on a signal given, they assemble, and proceed to what they call "hustling"'.[94] The City was essentially a contested terrain. As Paul Griffiths notes of early modern London, 'London was a city of overlapping circles and this disarray was a root cause of its tensions. The city map was complicated by crisscrossing jurisdictions. Wards and parishes overlapped, trespasses made explicit in boundary contests'.[95] For the gangs of youths who fought on late-Victorian and Edwardian streets, their terrain had shifted to the margins of the City and the areas that fringed the centre of London. Main thoroughfares that formed boundaries were frequently the site of conflict between young people and other street users. Thus, the group of youths described in Chapter 4,

who paraded along Pentonville Road in November 1820, 'hustling, tripping up, and knocking down every person they met', were contesting the terrain of Pentonville Road in a way very similar to the later groups of roughs, ruffians and hooligans described in Chapter 7.[96] It is perhaps no coincidence that Pentonville Road was a site of conflict. Indeed, the sections of the modern London Inner Ring Road, Marylebone Road, Euston Road, Pentonville Road and City Road, were all part of a terrain used by groups of youths.

The youths charged with the murder of Joseph Rumbold in Regent's Park in May 1888, had been walking and fighting on the Marylebone Road the day before the attack on Rumbold.[97] The fight was apparently the climax of a series of confrontations between the Fitzroy Place Lads and the Lisson Grove Lads. Fitzroy Place was just off Euston Road, near the junction with the Marylebone Road. Lisson Grove was also off Marylebone Road, to the west. These roads, along with Pentonville and City Road to the East, formed part of a major boundary – the New Road, a turnpike road which was opened in 1756. Indeed, for much of the eighteenth century, the New Road was virtually London's northern boundary. By the later nineteenth century, whilst London had spilt over and beyond this boundary it still retained its importance as a key highway.[98] Karen Spierling and Michael Halvorson, commenting on early modern communities, see boundaries as places where those communities intersect: 'it is at the margins or boundaries of these circles, where insider meets outsider, where group identities are tested, shaped, and ultimately accommodated or rejected'.[99] This resonates with the late-Victorian and Edwardian accounts of youth gangs, for whom the street was a place where they meet other youths, workmates, family members and youths from adjacent territories. They also met the police, as Spierling and Halvorson note, 'Conflict at the boundaries of these communities might arise between members of rival groups, but it could also be set off by the tensions inflicted on an individual or group of people caught in the competing demands of different community networks or emerging bureaucratic institutions'.[100]

Boundaries between parishes can be seen as liminal spaces, disputed territories. Arguably, where the boundary was not only between parishes, but between the county and the City, the status and reputation of such areas was even more problematic. Thus, the reputation of the Clerkenwell rookery may have been linked to its specific position on the margins of the City.[101] Confederacies of thieves, robbers, footpads and thief-takers had been historically associated with a tightly delineated set of streets and lanes on the boundaries of the City of London. Black

Boy Alley and Chick Lane, later West Street, Field Lane and Saffron Hill, had long been at the centre of the spatial map of metropolitan crime.[102] Areas such as this were problematic for the authorities. As John Carter Wood notes, 'Some neighbourhoods may have received little protection from the authorities, allowing alternative powers to assert themselves, and there may even be "no-go" areas in which the police are normally absent'.[103] Certainly, the Clerkenwell rookery was not a safe place for law enforcers. In the 1740s it took the increase of rewards by the authorities to encourage thief-takers and constables into the area.[104] By the early nineteenth century, law enforcers still faced considerable danger when they had to venture into the area. John Barnley, a beadle of St Andrew's parish described a visit to Field Lane in evidence given to the 1817 Select Committee on Police, 'I lately went to fetch a thief who had committed a highway robbery: he came out very gently with me, and after I was out of the house, and had gone about an hundred yards, I was surrounded by twenty or thirty people, who had come out of that very house to rescue him…'.[105] The area would finally be wiped out with the development of the Fleet valley and the building of the Farringdon Road in the mid-nineteenth century. Elaine Reynolds has suggested that in parishes that were adjacent to the City traditional informal law enforcement strategies might have been more effective. However, she argues, during the nineteenth century, 'as overcrowding and immigration into the East End increased over the course of the century, this sense of social harmony altered'.[106]

By the 1880s tensions in Whitechapel escalated dramatically and arguments about jurisdiction and territory would become an issue in the police response to the Whitechapel murders.[107] But the reputation of Whitechapel and Spitalfields as urban frontier-towns was apparent long before the 1880s. The Sheen family (Chapter 5) had moved from one marginal space (off Rosemary Lane, close to the Mint and to St Katherine's) to another, when they colonised lodging houses on Wentworth Street. Thus, the street's reputation may have reflected its status both as the boundary between Whitechapel and Spitalfields, and at its west end, with the City. The proximity of such areas to the City was also a reflection of the historical development of the suburban parishes. Areas like Clerkenwell, Whitechapel and Spitalfields had developed as satellites to the City and, with suburban development during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, they would predominately house the poor and manufacturing industry.[108] Moreover, these areas would attract new communities seeking to gain a foothold in the economic and social life of the metropolis. For instance, successive waves

of Italian migrants had come to London throughout the nineteenth century.[109] The earliest settlers were skilled craftsmen who had settled in Holborn; later migrants settled in nearby Clerkenwell. As we will see in Chapters 7 and 8, the contest over urban space shaped the development of territorial conflict in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In Clerkenwell, confrontations between youth street gangs and young men from the Italian community reflected the intricate negotiations of newly shared street space. By the interwar period, the territorial activities of the Sabini family and their associates may have been a legacy. As Wood notes, 'Concepts of spatial belonging are affected by issues including class, sex, age, status, ethnicity and profession, and violence can play a role in all aspects of territoriality: identifying who has the right to be within a particular space, establishing the boundaries of that space and excluding those who do not belong'.[110]

Approaching the Underworld

By using a case study approach and providing snap-shots of deviant cultures and behaviours, this book aims to explore the overlapping communities which were identified by local, cultural and political authorities as constituting the 'underworld'. This process could be described as one of ethnographic 'thick description', in particular in those chapters (3, 5 and 8) concerned with small groups of individuals. Malcolm Gaskill has argued that 'we need to concentrate on smaller contexts of lived experience at the heart of … society: the market-place, work-shop, parish church, courtroom, ale-bench, winter fireside, birthing-chamber and so on'.[111] Similarly, in this book, the minutiae of ordinary life come together with more extraordinary narratives of criminal justice. Peter Burke has noted the problems with such detailed studies of individuals or groups of individuals, 'One might begin with the charge that the micro-historians trivialize history by studying the biographies of unimportant people or the difficulties of small communities'.[112] Yet, as he goes on to argue, the micro-historian should aim to demonstrate the links between small communities and macro-historical trends. Like Richard Evans' collection of micro-histories from nineteenth-century Germany, the narratives constructed from the snapshot records of the lives of Harvey and Eaton, the Sheens and the Sabinis attempt to address bigger questions about social relations, community, policing prosecution practices and print culture.[113] But other methodological problems and issues remain. The first is the issue of recorded plebeian and/or working-class speech. Here, the words of street robbers

and hustlers, fraudsters and hooligans are overwhelmingly mediated through the press, courtroom testimony and the records of law enforcers. Plebeian language is often diluted and restructured and may be far from verbatim. Nevertheless, I would argue that these words are all we have to reconstruct these lives. Moreover, one of the advantages of digital searching has been the ability to probe the record below the more obvious and accessible. Tweaking searches and wildcards often provide minute fragments that add nuance to our histories of individuals. For example, such deep searching found the words attributed to the elderly Sarah Roberts, a neighbour of the Sheens and hugely indignant at the 'mob in the street', who had assembled upon the release of William Sheen. Roberts had gone to see the Lambeth magistrate, Mr Curtis, in order to make a complaint about threats of violence she had received from the Sheens.[114] She told the magistrate, 'he [Sheen] was marching about in his shirt sleeves like any lord …', later in the interview she concluded, 'Ah, ah! He's a bad boy, Sir …', suggesting that her life was in danger if some action was not taken. These words do not come from the Old Bailey, do not even come from a magistrate trial, and the incident was not widely reported. Just because something is not often recorded or repeated does not, of course, make it more authentic. Ultimately all we can do as historians who are interested in plebeian lives is try to piece together the fragments of evidence to create some impression of those lives.

Another arguably problematic feature of this study is the focus on the metropolis (and particularly on the Old Bailey courtroom). I make no apologies for concentrating here on that most dominant of urban spaces, London, which has historically been seen as the home of the underworld.[115] A number of characteristics explain its central importance. As well as its heavily urbanised nature, it also had a busy port, and a highly transient population. During the course of the nineteenth century increasing concerns about immigration, disease and public health would contribute to the process of a marginalisation and segregation of poor communities, producing an 'underworld' which was ever more territorially designated. The social and economic are married to the cultural in the construction of London as a criminogenic environment. Whilst 'underworlds' can exist anywhere, the metropolis, as studies of New York, Paris and Berlin suggest, is the centre of gravity in the paradigmic history of the underworld.[116] Only more recently, with the impact of globalisation and the Internet, has the underworld loosed its moorings from the metropolitan city. Nevertheless, a focus on London, and particularly on the Old Bailey, does have its limitations. Recent work

by Matt Neale has concluded that 'studies which are based on London may have only a limited relevance to helping us understand crime in other English cities'.[117] On the other hand, my intention in this book has not been to provide a model to explain criminal confederacy, but rather to explore the myriad ways in which real lives and real relationships may have both shaped, and been shaped by, contemporary and historical understandings of the underworld.

A social and cultural history – evaluating cultural production alongside archival findings – provides us with a solid empirical basis from which to explore criminal lives. A partial reconstruction of poor lives can be mediated through elite sources. Historians can recapture the words of the criminal and the poor in the rich sources which we have at our disposal: these include the Old Bailey Sessions Papers; the records of the Home Office and Metropolitan Police; records of the Quarter Sessions, the police court and the parish; the investigations carried out on behalf of and the evidence submitted to Select Committees and Royal Commissions; newspaper reports and the writings of Grub Street hacks; the commentaries, memoirs and reports of social investigators, philanthropists, reformers and representatives of the criminal justice system. These writers and authors mediated their 'knowledge' of criminal lives in a variety of print forms in increasing numbers during the period covered by this book. Our ability to dissect criminal lives in forensic detail is in large part due to significant developments in the availability of primary source materials. Most important for this book has been the digitisation of the Old Bailey Proceedings. The work of the project team, and particularly its directors, Tim Hitchcock, Robert Shoemaker and Clive Emsley, has been significant in shaping the way in which historians and other researchers interpret and analyse evidence from the trials.[118] The work on individual criminals that I started on the microfilm copies and completed on the digitised version has substantially expanded. This has enabled me to place individuals, their confederates and other associates within a broader set of interconnecting networks and to produce a much deeper and arguably more meaningful snapshot of their lives.

The chapter that follows explores the relationship between law enforcement and the narratives and networks of criminals in the early eighteenth century. In particular it will look at the decades of the 1720s and 1730s, a period in which the underworld more significantly and substantially became part of the public discourse about crime and deviance. This chapter and the next pinpoint some ways in which the

outlined themes took form during this important period. Chapter 3 focuses on a specific group of criminals and their activities in a short period between the late 1720s and early 1730s. By following Mary Harvey, her sister Isabella Eaton and her confederate Mary Sullivan through their series of interactions with the criminal justice system, themes relating to print culture and to Harvey's reputation as a 'public criminal', to overlapping communities and territorial contests, are explored. Chapter 4 examines the changing language of robbery in the later eighteenth and early nineteenth century, narrowing its focus to the surge in hustling cases to be found from the 1810s as a way of considering how concerns about young men, violence and territorial infringements may have underpinned the surfacing of anxiety about 'new' forms of crime and robbery. Chapter 5 unpicks the life of William Sheen and his family over two decades in the early to mid-nineteenth century. Sheen's public reputation and contemporary notoriety, the connecting narratives of his family and the local community, and the territorial importance of the Wentworth street area are key themes. Chapter 6 considers the evolution of 'modern' ideas about crime, and the contemporary understanding that new forms of criminality were becoming more common, by exploring the patterns of activity and prosecution in crimes broadly described as fraud and swindling. This includes coining, forgery and long-firm frauds, crimes which would be prosecuted in increasing numbers in the Old Bailey from the middle of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, within these cases, the identified themes can still be found: overlapping communities of family, neighbours and colleagues characterise many of these interactions. Moreover, print culture played a significant role in suggesting new forms of organisation to patterns of criminal activity that had long been troubling the authorities. Chapter 7 returns to the consideration of youth, violence and territory in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, by exploring the reporting of street fighting gangs in the Victorian and Edwardian press. It looks in detail at the young men and women who were involved as protagonists, victims and witnesses, the communities to which they belonged and the territories with which they associated. Finally, Chapter 8 will consider the racecourse wars of the interwar period, and particularly focus on the involvement of the Sabini family, returning the book to an exploration of the themes of community, territory and the publicity of crime in a period which is often seen as crucial in the evolution of 'modern' organised crime activity.

Index