ENUMERATION AND CODING CONTENTIOUS GATHERINGS IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY BRITAIN

Charles Tilly and R.A. Schweitzer
University of Michigan


CRSO Working Paper #210

Copies available through:
Center for Research on Social Organization
University of Michigan
330 Packard Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
ENUMERATION AND CODING CONTENTIOUS GATHERINGS
IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY BRITAIN

Charles Tilly and R.A. Schweitzer
University of Michigan
February 1980
ENUMERATION AND CODING CONTENTIOUS GATHERINGS
IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY BRITAIN

Charles Tilly and R.A. Schweitzer
University of Michigan

This report supersedes Tilly and Schweitzer,
"Contentious Gatherings in Great Britain,
1828-1834: Provisional Plans for
Enumeration and Coding". CRSO Working
Paper 163 (January 1977, revised version
September 1977).

CRSO Working Paper #210
Copies available through:
Center for Research on
Social Organization
University of Michigan
330 Packard Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
# Contents

Introduction .................................................. 1.

Events to be Enumerated ..................................... 14.

Definitions and Rules of Thumb .............................. 15.

Boundaries of Contentious Gatherings ...................... 23.

General Agenda for Coding ................................. 24.

1. Event Section ............................................. 26.

2. Formation Section ....................................... 31.

3. Action-Phases Section ..................................... 43.

4. Source Section ........................................... 52.

5. Comment Section ......................................... 54.

6. Information Section ....................................... 56.

Contentious Gatherings in February, 1828 .................. 58.

Contentious Gatherings in October, 1830 ................... 60.

 Coversheets and Newspaper Account for
 Three Events in 1828 ........................................ 63.

Selected List of Papers from the
 Study of Social Change and Col-
 lective Action ............................................... 69.

# List of Figures

1. A sketch of the Theoretical Agenda ...................... 6.

2. Hypothetical distribution of governmental repression as
   a function of the scale of the contentious gatherings
   also the power of the actor ................................ 9.

3. Localized sketch of conditions for action of a run-of-
   the-mill contender ........................................ 13.
Great Britain Study Briefing Papers


Introduction*

For some time, our group has been studying patterns of conflict in western European countries over the last few centuries. In very general terms, we have been trying to learn how large-scale changes such as industrialization and statemaking affect the capacity and propensity for collective action of different segments of the populations affected by those changes. In our view, conflict is simply one aspect of collective action: to varying degrees, the pursuit of common goals of one group hampers the pursuit of common goals by other groups. We have been concentrating our attention on relatively visible forms of conflict in hopes of keeping the research manageable, yet of shedding light on the alteration of a wide range of collective action in the course of large-scale social change.

Up to the present, our most substantial analyses have dealt with strikes and with collective violence in Italy, Germany and, especially, France for varying intervals between 1830 and 1968. In those cases, we have generally attempted a uniform, comprehensive enumeration and description of events meeting our criteria in the entire country over some substantial block of time. That included, for example, an analysis of the roughly 36,000 individual strikes reported in the French Statistique des Grèves from 1890 through 1935. In those countries, we have also undertaken detailed studies of some particular events, period, places and/or populations -- for in-

*We are grateful to the many people who have worked and advised on this project over the past four years. Their names would fill this whole page. Special thanks are given to: John Boyd, Chris Lord & Debbie McKesson. The National Science Foundation is supporting the research described herein.
stance, a close look at the Parisian insurrection of June, 1848. In some of those cases we have examined forms of collective action other than strikes and violent encounters; they include such efforts as an attempt to trace the emergence of the demonstration as a form of action. Finally, some members of the group have studied similar phenomena in North America, Scandinavia and Great Britain.

Our newest large effort is a study of conflicts in Great Britain from 1828 through 1834. We have several different incentives for undertaking the new analysis. First, our analyses of violent events in Italy, Germany and France appeared to confirm our supposition that the violence was on the whole the by-product of the intervention of further interested parties in actions which were not intrinsically violent and which occurred frequently without significant violence. In particular, we were interested in the frequency with which the violence began with the intervention of troops, police and other specialized repressive forces. Since the only nonviolent events of which we had made large, systematic enumerations for some of the same periods and places were strikes, however, we did not have the evidence to look closely at that relationship between nonviolent and violent collective actions.

Second, it seemed worth making a sustained comparison between patterns of conflict in nineteenth-century Britain and those we had found on the Continent. Students of modern Europe often think of nineteenth-century Britain's experience as a kind of success story -- at least in "avoiding" the revolutions which occurred in France, Germany, Italy and elsewhere. A close study of conflicts in Britain should give us the means to rethink that question. More important, it should provide firmer ground for choosing among obvious alternative explanations of the differences between Britain and the continent: that Britain had fewer of the kinds of people who made
nineteenth-century revolutions and rebellions, that the most likely rebels had fewer grievances, that repression was more effective in Britain, and so on.

Our original hope was to examine the changing patterns of conflict in Britain throughout the nineteenth century. With a wide range of non-violent events to consider, however, that would have required an enormous effort -- many times the already formidable effort per year in our studies of France and Germany. After some preliminary enumerations in scattered years from the end of the eighteenth century to the end of the nineteenth, we narrowed our attention to 1828-1834. That period recommends itself for several reasons. First, it was a time of major movements, conflicts and collective actions: Catholic Emancipation, Reform agitation, industrial conflict, the attack on select vestries, and the great agrarian rebellions of 1830. Second, there exist excellent historical studies of some of the period's conflicts -- for example, Captain Swing, by E.J. Hobsbawm and George Rudé -- with which we can compare our own results. Third, we have some reason to believe that the period acted as an historical pivot in the same way that the revolutions of 1848 did in France and Germany: marking, and perhaps producing, a shift from reactive to proactive, from "backward-looking" to "forward-looking" collective action on the part of ordinary people.

In that period, we are attempting to enumerate, describe and analyze a large share of all the "contentious gatherings" which occurred in England, Scotland and Wales. Roughly speaking, a contentious gathering is an occasion in which ten or more persons outside the government gather in the same place and make a visible claim which, if realized, would affect the interests of some specific person(s) or group(s) outside their own number. In principle, these gatherings include just about all the events covered
in our earlier enumerations of strikes and collective violence. They also include a great many other events: femonstrations, petition meetings, delegations, group poaching, and plenty of others. Drawing the boundaries both generously and consistently has been a delicate and laborious task.

After doing a trial enumeration and summary coding of some events from 1830, we did a preliminary scanning of thirty randomly selected ten-day blocks from the entire six-year period, then proceeded to enumerate systematically from the beginning of 1828. We find the events via a complete issue-by-issue reading of the Morning Chronicle, the Times, Gentlemen's Magazine, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Mirror of Parliament, Votes and Proceeding of the House of Commons and the Annual Register. As the events are enumerated, we look for more information about them in the papers of the Home Office (of which we have built up substantial selections via photocopy and microfilm), in other periodicals, and in secondary historical works. The file for the six-year period will describe on the order of 12,000 events. At the end of 1979, we had completed all of the source reading, and had assembled events for the years of 1828, 29, 30 and the first quarter of 1831.

We are also slowly making plans for the collection of data on the populations and areas "at risk" to contentious gatherings. The units of observation will certainly include all counties of England, Scotland and Wales. They will probably include complete sets of hundreds of parishes within selected counties. If possible, they will also include particular populations of potential actors -- for example, the handloom weavers of Lancashire and the agricultural laborers of Leicestershire. Ultimately the choice of units and of kinds of data concerning those units will result from a compromise between the arguments we are seeking to test and the costs of getting the relevant evidence.
Figure 1 provides a simplified sketch of this study's theoretical agenda. It states the problem as the short-run explanation of the extent of a single actor's collective action. Here are the definitions of the elements:

**interests**: the shared advantages or disadvantages likely to accrue to the population in question as a consequence of various possible interactions with other populations.

**organization**: the extent of common identity and unifying structure among the individuals in the population.

**mobilization**: the extent of resources under the collective control of the actor.

**power**: the extent to which the outcomes of the actor's interactions with other actors favor its interests over those of the others.

**repression**: the costs of collective action to the actor resulting from interaction with other groups. Facilitation consists of other groups' provision of incentives to act.

**opportunity/threat**: the extent to which other groups are either a) vulnerable to new claims which would, if successful, enhance the actor's realization of its interests or b) threatening to make claims which would, if successful, reduce the actor's realization of its interests.

**contentious gathering**: the extent of a contender's joint action in pursuit of common ends.

Figure 1 states the broad argument that the actor's current level of col-
Figure 1. A Sketch of the Theoretical Agenda

ORGANIZATION

INTEREST

MOBILIZATION

REPRESSION/FACILITATION

OPPORTUNITY/THREAT

POWER

CONTENTIOUS GATHERING
lective action is mainly a function of its mobilization level, of the combination of opportunities and threats it faces, and of its power position. It states, among other things, that interest does not translate directly into collective action, but operates through its effect on group organization, mobilization, and subjection to repression and facilitation, as well as being filtered through the current configuration of opportunity and threat. All this may be obvious. But it breaks with a large part of the social science literature on "collective behavior", "protest" and "disorder". A major task in our study of Great Britain is to specify, refine and model these relationships.

Figure 2 presents a simple hypothesis concerning the usual distribution of governmental repression, facilitation and toleration (toleration = the absence of either repression or facilitation) as a function of the scale of collective action and the power of the group involved. It says that very weak groups have a range of smaller-scale actions open to them, will find themselves repressed if they exceed a certain scale, and never receive governmental facilitation for their collective action. Somewhat more powerful groups, according to this hypothesis, will be repressed for almost any collective action beyond a very small scale, but will still receive no facilitation. Beyond some critical point in group power, the extent of facilitation for smaller-scale actions increases as the extent of repression for large-scale actions declines. At the extreme, the group is the government or controls the government; there, all its collective actions are facilitated and none repressed. Two tasks of the study of Great Britain are to determine whether something like this general set of relationships does obtain, and to state how it varies with the current organization or political position of the government.

We are particularly interested in exploring a series of related prob-
lems which are hidden in Figure 2:

1. What determines the extent to which governments repress or facilitate a given category of contentious gatherings? Even if the diagram is correct in suggesting that the scale of the action is inversely related to its acceptability, other factors clearly matter. In most countries, we witness the legalization of the strike during the nineteenth century, but generally much later than the legalization of electoral gatherings of similar or larger size.

2. To what extent, and under what conditions, does the toleration or facilitation of a given type of action by a particular group diminish the likelihood that other groups will be punished for that same type of action? It appears, for example, that the British government's toleration of the Catholic Association during the 1820s made it easier for other non-Catholic groups to form associations and use them politically.

3. Is it true, as it seems to be, that for any particular period and set of interacting populations, the forms of contentious gatherings tend to fall into a few relatively well-defined routines -- what we might call a repertoire of contentious gatherings? The repertoire of European workers in the nineteenth century, for example, commonly included the blacklist, the turnout of a single shop, the petitioning of authorities, the threat to destroy equipment and a few other forms of action, but not the sit-down strike, the demonstration, and so on. If so why? If so, how and why does the repertoire change?
Figure 2:
4. Is it not true that governmental repression and facilitation play a major part in the choice among forms of action which are in the repertoire? European nineteenth-century governments appear to have had some short-run success in channeling working-class collective action away from attempts to control production decisions and toward attempts to control consumption -- for example, by tolerating Friendly Societies and repressing trade unions. How strong is that channeling effect?

Figure 3 is somewhat more complex than the previous two. It sums up some ideas about the conditions in which a run-of-the-mill contender for power is likely to carry on contentious gatherings. The diagram as a whole relates the collective goods produced as a result of the contender's action to the resources expended in the action. A run-of-the-mill contender has two bands of interest: a) in not falling below the 0 line: in not receiving collective bads; b) in a narrowly-defined set of collective goods; recognition of a union; let us say, or the abolition of slavery. As a consequence of the contender's current power position, there is a schedule of returns from different levels of contentious gathering. That schedule takes on an S-shape on the hypotheses that: 1) small amounts of action bring punishment; 2) the rate of return increases beyond some crucial minimum as other groups yield to pressure; but 3) beyond some further point the group's acquisition of collective goods begins to threaten the interests of other groups sufficiently for them to organize a concerted resistance.

The current state of opportunity and threat limits which portions of the curve of probably return are actually available. The contender's current level of mobilization limits the amount of resources the contender...
can actually expend. In this hypothetical case, the curve of probable returns crosses the two bands of the contender's defined interest. Furthermore, the current positions of opportunity, threat and mobilization make those interest areas available. Therefore two ranges of action are likely: a lower-level action to forestall collective bads; a higher-level action to acquire collective goods. By lowering the opportunity line, raising the threat line, reducing the mobilization level, or depressing the curve of probable returns, we can define situations in which we would expect only defensive action, or no action at all.

It is a long way from these simple, abstract models to the complex, concrete contentious gatherings of Britain in 1830. The arguments and queries we have laid out here mainly concern a single actor; the events we observe, on the other hand, are often complex interactions among several groups. The arguments tend to assume that we can observe the full range of a given actor's contentious gathering, and observe it continuously. In fact, the best our study of Britain can do is to portray the actor's appearances in a series of contentious gatherings. The arguments center on groups, but the observations deal with events, and only some of the relevant events.

We have two ways to bridge the gap. One is to shift the observations toward groups. The other is to shift the models toward events. It should be possible to identify or to develop models which deal with the effects of mobilization, repression and group organization, yet apply to contentious gatherings. It should be possible to give strategic interaction a larger and more explicit place than it occupies in simple arguments. It should be possible to deal more effectively with changes in the forms and distributions of collective action as functions of industrialization, urbanization, statemaking and the expansion of capitalism.
Our concrete research program, then, begins with the enumeration of contentious gatherings which occurred in Great Britain from 1828 through 1834. We enumerate all contentious gatherings reported in any of seven standard periodicals. Having enumerated them, we seek additional evidence about the events, about the settings in which they occurred, and about the people involved. The additional evidence comes from the same periodicals, from other periodicals, from published historical works, from government reports such as censuses or parliamentary inquiries, and from British archives. We code the evidence, and build files suitable for computer-assisted analysis. We then undertake two major sorts of analyses: 1) attempts to describe and explain the broad patterns of variation in different types of contentious gatherings from time to time, place to place and group to group; 2) efforts to specify, refine, revise and test the line of argument sketched earlier in this paper. In the process, we hope to create new and better models of contention.

The remainder of this paper describes some of the research procedures. Its four sections are: 1) a summary of rules and routines for identifying relevant events, and assembling dossiers concerning them for coding; 2) a general agenda for coding; 3) illustrative material from the enumeration of events in February 1828; 4) a selected list of papers from the research group as a whole. We have written the descriptions of procedures as if we were instructing you, the reader, in the actual task of enumerating and coding contentious gatherings.
Figure 3:
IDEALIZED SKETCH OF CONDITIONS FOR ACTION OF A RUN-OF-THE-MILL CONTENDER.
EVENTS TO BE ENUMERATED

The events are "contentious gatherings" (CGs), occasions in which ten or more persons outside the government gather in the same place and make a visible claim which, if realized, would affect the interests of some specific person(s) or group(s) outside their own number. Most CGs in our period fall into one or more of the following categories: 1) collective violence, 2) meetings, 3) demonstrations, 4) parades, 5) assemblies, 6) rallies, 7) celebrations, 8) delegations, 9) strikes, 10) union activities. More precisely, the events included are all occasions:

1. reported in the London Times, Morning Chronicle, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Annual Register, Gentlemen's Magazine, The Votes and Proceedings of The House of Commons and/or The Mirror of Parliament;
2. occurring in England, Scotland or Wales;
3. beginning on any date from 1 January 1828 through 31 December 1834;
4. in which ten or more persons outside the government;
   a. gather in the same place,
   b. make a visible claim which, if realized, would affect the interests of some specific person(s) or groups(s) outside their own number.

Terms which therefore require working definitions:

reported
outside the government
going
occurring
gather
in England, Scotland, Wales
same place
beginning
visible claim affecting interests
persons
specific person(s) or groups(s)
DEFINITIONS AND RULES OF THUMB

Reported. Any mention in any context. If, for example, an M.P. lays on the table a petition "from a numerous meeting in Oldham" which conforms to all our other criteria, that meeting enters the sample. In parliamentary debates, mentions of meetings do not need numerical information to be included. For example, if Mirror of Parliament reports a meeting of parishioners at Preston to petition Parliament, but makes no mention of how many people attended the meeting, we will assume provisionally that at least ten people took part.

Occurring in England, Scotland or Wales. Ten or more people must have gathered within the political boundaries (including territorial waters) of England, Scotland or Wales. If any part of the action occurs within those boundaries, the entire event falls into the sample.

We have five basic ways of determining whether ten or more people took part:

1. the account(s) report a specific or approximate number of participants: twelve, about a hundred, and so on;
2. the account lists ten or more particular individuals who took part;
3. the account uses one of the following words to describe the formation in question:
   - affray
   - crowd
   - general body
   - riot
   - assembly
   - demonstration
   - mob
   - riotous assemblage
   - body
   - disturbance
   - multitude
   - throng
   - brawl
   - gang
   - numerous
   - tumultous assembly
   - concourse
   - gathering
   - rally
4. the action is entirely inconsistent with the participation of fewer than ten people; e.g. a group of people "overwhelm" a platoon of guards at the gate of the palace, a group of people "fill" a square, and so on;
5. the action is a non-routine general assembly of some population which we can reasonably presume to have at least 1,000 members within the place in question; e.g. "all the parishioners", the Spitalfields weavers". We take the word "deputation" to mean at least two persons; if five or more deputations gather into a single formation, we again presume that at least ten people took part. For information about the size of towns or parishes, we use the 1831 census returns.

IF NONE OF THESE CONDITIONS APPLIES, WE ORDINARILY ELIMINATE THE EVENT.

Beginning on any date from 1 January 1828 through 31 December 1834. The event begins at the first point at which at least ten of the people who eventually make the visible claim are gathered without further dispersal before they make the claim. The day begins at midnight.

1. Use exact date when given.

2. Use period calendar to assign the exact date if the day of the week is given and there is no reason to believe the date could be off by a week or more. For example, the account might report "Tuesday" or "Tuesday last".

3. If it is unclear that the article is giving you an exact date (for example, the article is from another newspaper), then assign the date using the calendar and use one of the approximate dating tags, WITHIN: 1 week, 2 weeks, 1 month, 2 months, 3 months. Even if you know the event occurred within 2 days of the date, write it up as w/in one week, as this is the smallest approximation our data set has.

4. When no clear date is given for Parliamentary debates events, assign a month, the same month as the newspaper edition in which the report appears -- unless it's the first day of that month, in which case you should use the preceding month. Then date the day 00, fill in the year and the sequence number, and add "approximately within three months". A mention of a meeting in an April 16th London Times would therefore read as follows:

828-04-00-01 app. w/in 3 months.
Also number the log page in the same manner. The 00 page should come at the end of the month. This same procedure should be followed for events reported without dates in Hansard's and Mirror of Parliament.

If an event is reported in a London paper and takes place in or near London, "yesterday" or a day given is close enough to be the calendar date assigned. No comment card need be filled out, and no approximate date need be assigned.

Persons. Any human being who can reasonably be presumed to have intentionally participated in the making of a claim.

Outside the government. When officers are acting in the capacity given them by their offices and no group of ten or more non-officers is acting with them, we exclude the action. If ten or more officers act together but on their own responsibility, we include their action.

Among the sets of people commonly named in discussions on English governments in the nineteenth century, we are actually distinguishing three categories: officers, public committees, and citizenry.

ALDERMEN  HORSE GUARDS  PAYMASTERS
BAILIFFS  JUDGES  POLICE
BEADLES  JUSTICES  POLICE CONSTABLES
BOROUGHREEVES  JUSTICES OF THE PEACE PRIVY COUNCILORS
BURGESSES  LORDS LIEUTENANT  SCHOOLBOARDS
CHURCHWARDENS  MAGISTRATES  SHERIFFS
COMMON COUNCILORS  MAYORS  SCOTCH GUARDS
CONSTABLES  MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT SPECIAL CONSTABLES
CORONERS  MILITARY*  SURVEYORS
DIRECTORS OF THE POOR  MILITIA  TOWN COUNCILORS
GRAND JURIES  MINISTERS  YEOMANRY
GUARDIANS OF THE POOR  OVERSEERS OF THE POOR
and others of essentially similar position.
As public committees we are considering:

- IMPROVEMENT COMMISSIONS
- SELECT VESTRIES
- LIVERIES
- TOWN MEETINGS
- POLICE COMMISSIONS
- VESTRIES [BOTH SELECT AND OPEN]

and other essentially similar organizations.

*Military: Cavalry, Infantry, Dragoons, Hussars, Marines, Blues, Greys.

As segments of the citizenry we are considering:

- FREEHOLDERS
- LANDOWNERS
- PARISIONERS
- HOUSEHOLDERS
- LEYPAYERS
- RATEPAYERS
- INHABITANTS
- OCCUPIERS
- TITHEPAYERS

and essentially similar collections of people.

One day we may well want to analyze the actions of public committees, of segments of the citizenry, and of other groups (such as members of particular crafts, associations, age-sex groups or families) separately. For the present, the crucial distinction separates officers from all the rest. Officers often appear as parties in contentious gatherings involving public committees, segments of the citizenry and/or other groups. But the only circumstances under which their concerted action qualifies by itself is when they take part in a group of ten or more persons who, on their own responsibility, assemble to make a publicly visible claim, demand or complaint.

AS CITIZENS WE ARE CONSIDERING EVERYONE ELSE.

Gather same place. Ten or more persons, meeting or assembling, or any of the key words used on page 15 to define a gathering.
Place is defined as:

1. COUNTY: any of the eighty-seven counties of Great Britain;

2. TOWN: any location that is listed as a city, borough, or town in the 1831 topographical directory;

3. PARISH: any place listed in the topographical directory or census as being a parish;

4. SPECIFIC LOCATION: any smaller units used to describe the location of the event -- church name, field, ward, building name, street, hundred, division, etc.

Visible claims affecting the interests of some other specific persons or groups

At one time or another, we use the following words to describe what we're after:

- aspirations
- dissatisfactions
- claims
- grievances
- complaints
- interests
- demands

Some of these words, such as "demands", clearly have an object outside the group. Others, like "dissatisfactions", do not necessarily have outside objects; one can easily be dissatisfied with oneself. We want to concentrate on actions which do have a target outside the acting groups. Let's talk about claims and objects of claims. We are trying to build a sample of gatherings in which, or by which, people articulate claims on actors outside their own group.

What sorts of claims? Basically, any expectation which would, if realized, require the other actor to expend valued resources: labor-power, information, and so on. What sorts of actors? Basically, any other set of real people. That excludes a group's claim on itself. It excludes a group's claims on supernatural or imaginary beings. It does not, however, exclude claims on an imaginary "power structure", if the group identifies some real people with that structure.
Nor does it exclude claims on real people in their capacities as self-declared agents of supernatural beings or imaginary groups: priests, soothsayers, charlatans, members of invented conspiracies. It does not exclude claims on real people present at the same gathering, so long as there is a we/they separation between actors and objects which is not simply an internal division of the acting groups and which is more durable than the gathering itself. In fact, "any other set of real people" does not exclude any individual anywhere, just so long as there is a gathering in which 10+ people articulate claims on that individual.

When describing the possible content of such claims, we enumerate:

1. petitioning or addressing or memorializing local or national governments (such as found in V&P and Hansards);
2. opposition to government policy, form of government, or particular agents of it;
3. support for government (cheering the king or other governmental official acting in official capacity);
4. support for an enemy of government;
5. control of local government or institution (vestry, colleges);
6. other claims, such as economic issues; for example, taxes, food prices, rent, discussion of complaints about wages, hours, or conditions of work; religious issues, such as petitioning against a new church, anti-tithe statements, disputes over church pastorship, etc.
7. In general, any group articulating a sentiment (jeering, cheering, booing, etc.) toward a government official acting in his/her capacity constitutes a claim.
Here are some rules of thumb for identification of qualifying and non-qualifying claims:

1. In the absence of contradictory information, collective violence constitutes *prima facie* evidence of a claim. If ten or more persons act together to attack, damage, or forcibly seize a person or object, that is provisional evidence of a claim. The word "riot" is used to describe 10 or more people only; it is not conclusive evidence of violence.

2. Even if the ultimate aim of the activity is the making of some sort of claim, purely organizational efforts do not qualify in themselves. For example, the creation of a local Reform Association does not in itself constitute a claim. If, on the other hand, ten or more people who are organizing any association state a qualifying claim as they do so, that claim counts.

3. Benefit suppers, balls, expositions, and the like do not qualify in themselves, regardless of the cause for which they are conducted. If, however, we acquire further evidence of the making of a claim (e.g. a claim-making proclamation by the organizers of a benefit, or a widely cheered claim-making speech in the course of the event), that event qualifies in the same way any other gathering qualifies.

4. A speech by a single person which states a claim, articulates a grievance or makes a demand constitutes evidence of a collective claim under any of these conditions:
   
   a. the group formally adopts the speaker's view by petition, resolution, or memorial;
   
   b. the reporter explicitly imputes approval of the claim to the participants in the gathering;
   
   c. the group manifestly voices an opinion by cheering, jeering, or other vocal display.
5. If a meeting and/or gathering includes two or more factions, at least one of which has ten or more participants, claims made by one of the factions on another qualify if the issues and divisions in question extend beyond the particular gathering and the particular set of participants. For example, when Henry Hunt and his supporters show up at a parish vestry meeting and challenge the powers of the local elite to control the election of new vestry officers, the division extends beyond that meeting, so the claim qualifies. This must be a durable claim.

6. Explicit support for government, or denial of support to government, qualifies. It can take the form of support for institutions (Parliament, the present government, the constitution) or of support for specific officers of government in their capacity as officers: the aldermen, bailiffs, town councilers, yeomanry, and so on, listed earlier. It can take the form of deliberate denial of support for these institutions or officers. The officers must currently hold office; for example, a celebrating banquet for a member-elect of Parliament (a member who has not yet been sworn in) does not qualify in itself. Evidence of such support or denial includes: a) participation in events, including celebrations and festivities, whose commonly understood purpose is the display of support, e.g. Lord Mayor's Day parade; b) the reporter's imputation of support or rejection; c) articulation of a sentiment through cheering, jeering, and so on; however, a simple toast (e.g. "to the king") does not qualify in itself, even if participants cheer. We now have two alternate ways of determining support of government: 1) when 10+ people visibly state a claim on an institution or individual (commending a present M.P. for his capability in office); 2) cheering or other similar expressions of support during special celebrations (e.g. during a proclamation of the
king) when the object of the support is present. Such things as illuminations or the proclamation of the king do not qualify if the object of the claim is not present at the time of the event.

7. Gatherings explicitly conducted to support or condemn an action of government state qualifying claims if the participants themselves articulate sentiments by passing resolutions, cheering speeches, etc.

8. Simple expressions of support or rejection do not qualify if the objects are: a) non-governmental institutions or officers in Britain or elsewhere; b) governmental institutions or officers outside of Britain. If a gathering makes further claims on either of these categories of objects, however, the claims qualify. Remember, someone must expend resources somewhere. For example, a banquet in honor of the deposed king of Spain would not qualify unless the participants directly stated the demand that he be reinstated.

9. Court Crowds: articulated sentiment for or against an official acting within an official capacity qualifies an event. A verdict decided by a jury (non-officials) would disqualify the event, while articulated sentiment towards a decision handed down by a judge (official) qualifies.

10. Elections: most common electioneering activities do NOT qualify as contentious gatherings. We treat elections and electoral meetings in essentially the same way as special celebrations (Lord Mayor's Day, etc.): Cheering or display of symbols (flags, banners) of support for a candidate does not qualify unless a) the candidate is an incumbent officeholder running for reelection, and b) the candidate is present. Candidates holding any office other than the one they are running for are considered to be private citizens (i.e. acting outside their official capacity). The same rules apply to hissing, jeering and other displays of opposition. If 10+ people take further steps, such as resolving to send a delegation on behalf of an absent incumbent, the event qualifies. If, during an election activity, 10+ people make a claim which would qualify under our general rules -- for example, couple their support for a candidate with explicit demands for reform -- then the event qualifies.
11. Wardmotes: wardmotes are meetings of parishioners. More often than not, a wardmote is held to elect local officials. In addition to our rule of thumb for elections, a wardmote qualifies as a CG if the meeting resolves thanks to an official.

12. In strikes, etc.: when a meeting answers a wage offer (claim), they are making a claim that if realized would expend resources.

GENERAL AGENDA FOR CODING

After the microfilm readers have enumerated coversheets for events in the newspapers and other sources, the photocopies of those events are produced. Added to the dossier are such items as identification numbers, place name information, major issue, and starting date. Qualifying and non-qualifying events are separated and the qualifying events are arranged in chronological order by date of occurrence. The non-qualifying (NQ's) articles are refiled by source to allow a review at a later date for background materials to add to the qualifying events. The next step has coding editors enumerating "Formations", groups involved in the events that are the makers or receivers of claims, and "Action Phases" the actions that are claim related and give a rough outline of the progress of the event. After the event is enumerated and checked twice it is then coded. Our coding is not the typical numeric form. Rather we use a combination of english words and numbers. The only numbers we use are items that are numbers to begin with. We never reduce worlds into number catagories. The event or dossier that is being coded consists of:
1) a coversheet containing summary information and an identification number. Each year of data is color coded for easier handling and storage. 1828 is green, 29 is blue, 30 yellow and 31 red. 2) Formation enumeration forms. 3) Action phase enumeration forms. 4) All coversheets and articles that we have that pertain to that contentious gathering. 5) Any notes and comments that the people assembling or enumerating had dealing with the event.

Below is listed the questionnaire we use in the preparation of the machine-readable description of each contentious gathering. The record for a single event contains the following sections:

1. EVENT: a summary of the whole gathering, includes identification number and other control information.

2. FORMATION: one set per formation noted as participating in the event.

3. ACTION PHASES: one unit per claim related action in the event.

4. SOURCE: one unit per source used in coding the event.

5. COMMENT: one unit per comment, each keyed to the specific location of the comment.

6. INFORMATION: any general comments about the event as a whole.
Placed here is the summary information covering the event as a whole. The data is obtained by asking the following questions:

GREAT BRITAIN STUDY CODING INSTRUCTIONS CODE L, QUESTIONNAIRE
Revised 6-78 RAS

EVENT SECTION "E" (green section) E 1

CG ID#

spaces 1-3 last three digits of year: 828, 829 ... = 1828, 1829 ...

4-5 month: 01 = January, 12 = December, 00 = unknown

6-7 day of month: 01-31, 00 = unknown

8-9 sequence number: 01-99 = number assigned to the event in the log for this particular date. The log book is a chronological list of all enumerated events. There is a separate volume for each year.

How Date is Assigned
The date is our best estimate of the day on which the contentious gathering began. The event begins at the first point at which at least ten of the people who eventually make the visible claim which qualifies the event are gathered without further dispersal before they make the claim. The day begins at midnight. If, for example, a group of eleven workers gather in front of their employer's house at 11 p.m. on 27 August and remain there until they begin to shout demands at 1 a.m. on 28 August, the contentious gathering begins on 27 August. If it is the first event enumerated on that date, and the year is 1829, the ID number is 829 08 27 01.

Search the account(s) to see if an exact starting date is reported or strongly implied. If not, use the following rules of thumb:

If the source is a daily newspaper, use the day prior to the newspaper's date of publication, and make a judgment as to how many weeks earlier the event could have occurred: within one week, within two weeks, and so on. For example: 829 03 18 01 w/in one week.

If the source is a weekly, monthly or annual periodical, estimate the starting date as the date of publication. A weekly should be marked within that week, a monthly within that month, and the annual should have within three months, at the most. The annual could have a shorter approximate date than three months.

If the source is a Parliamentary debate, assign the year and month of the debate, and state the day of the month as 00. In the absence of further information concerning the recency of the event, estimate the number of weeks as 13, that is about three months.

The editor will assign an ID number to each event and enter it in the log. If you discover that the assigned starting date is incorrect or dubious, return the event file to the editor with a note explaining your objection.

Day of Event
Circle the box that corresponds to the correct day of the week on which the CG began.
Accuracy of Starting Date
Your choices are: a) exact (or default on computer); or b) approximate within either 1 week, 2 weeks, or 1, 2, or 3 months. The editor will make a provisional determination of the starting date's accuracy and note it on the coder coversheet. You will circle the appropriate computer code that corresponds to his/her determination. If you disagree with the editor's judgment of the date's accuracy, bring it to the attention of your supervisor. When entering the event in the computer, simply enter the appropriate computer code which has been circled, e.g. /1, /2, or default for exact.

Date Event Ends
If the event is 1 day or shorter in length, circle "same=default"; if it is longer than one day, circle the box which corresponds to the appropriate computer code for the end date. If an exact terminus date for the event is known, enter that date in the box provided.

Duration, or Number of Calendar Days
One day or less = 01. An event which begins, for example, at 11:00 p.m. and carries over into the next day = 02. Do not confuse duration with person-days. Duration means the number of calendar days over which the CG occurred, not the number of 24-hour periods.

General Event Type
The editor should have this information listed on the coder coversheet; circle the appropriate computer code which corresponds to the type of CG.

Type of Event
This information will appear on the front of the coder coversheet; enter the number which corresponds to the type of event in the box provided, e.g. /14.

Major Issue or Claim
This pertains to the event as a whole, for example: reform, Catholic emancipation, poaching, etc. If all formations present take similar positions toward the issue, record that position, e.g. "Catholic emancipation, pro". If the formations are clearly divided over the issue, record that, e.g. "Catholic emancipation, pro/con". Remember that there are only forty units of space in the computer to hold this information, so don't go over that length. List issue first, then stance, e.g. "reform, pro".

Number of Locations
Enter the total number of locations in the box provided. Note that in some cases the total number of locations does not always appear on the coder coversheet, so read the account carefully. (Location = 1) county, 2) town, 3) parish, 4) specific location.)

Location
List here all places where the action occurs. Include specific places, listed in the following order: 1) county, 2) city or town, 3) parish, 4) specific location (inn, street location, etc.). If at all possible, enter the code for the county beside the name of the county and differentiate county from town, town from parish, e.g. C=York, East Riding (/40), T=Beverley, P=not specified, L=Town Hall.

Grid Numbers
Leave blank.
Sources
Circle the abbreviations which correspond to all the different sources that reported the event. The coder coversheet will give you that information.

Total Participants
If an exact number is given in the account, use it. Use the three categories of low, high, best guess. For example, if the account notes 400 people present, write that figure in all three boxes. If, however, the account says "around 300" or "surpassing 150", you might set some reasonable low and high estimate, then write the specific number mentioned in the article as the best guess. Be sure to circle the box in the How Determined section below that indicates how the figures were determined. If the only information given in the account is vague (e.g. "very numerous meeting"), do not attempt to guess specific numbers. Instead, circle the box /3 = QWO (qualifying word only).

Person-Days/Person-Hours
Person-days are the number of 24-hour periods the event lasted times the number of persons present during each 24-hour day: e.g. a 3-day event in which 200 people were involved = 600 person-days; or if 200 people participated in one 24-hour period and 100 the next 2 days (24-hour periods), then the total would be: 1 x 200 + 2 x 100 = 400 person-days.

Person-hours sums up the time that persons who are physically present at the CG spend in the course of the event. Persons who are not physically present during the CG contribute no person-hours to the total. In the absence of better information, calculate person-hours for a given formation by multiplying:

\[
\text{estimated \# of persons in this formation} \times \frac{\text{estimated duration of this formation's participation}}{} = \text{estimated person-hours}
\]

In the absence of better information, calculate a conservative margin of error:

\[
\frac{\text{highest plausible estimate of person-hours} - \text{lowest plausible estimate of person-hours}}{2} = \text{margin of error}
\]

If, for example, you are coding a formation which you estimate to include 200 to 300 people (250 + 50) whose participation you estimate as lasting 2 to 4 hours (3 + 1), you calculate: 250 persons x 3 hours = 750 person-hours;

\[
= \frac{300 \times 4 = 1,200 \text{ person-hours}}{2} = 400 \text{ person-hours margin of error}
\]

Often your information will allow you to be more precise. For instance, you may have clear indications that of about 250 formation members, roughly 50 participated for 3 hours and the other 200 for less than 1 hour. A plausible summary will then run:

\[
(50 \times 3) + (200 \times 1) = 350 \text{ person-hours. Margin of error} = 100 \text{ person-hours.}
\]
Use whatever temporal information is in the account (for instance, a report that states the gathering took place "in the evening") to set rough limits on duration; where the basis for the estimate is slim, simply assign a large margin of error. If there is no reasonable way to estimate duration and/or participants, however, do not hesitate to check "impossible to judge". (For instance, if Parliament is a formation which figures in, the exact number of members who actually participated will usually be impossible to determine.)

Notes: 1) if the event lasted for less than one calendar day, the estimate of person-days would be 00; 2) any part of an hour expended by a person should be counted as 1 full person-hour.

Arrested, Wounded and Killed
These sections are provided to make note of any consequences of the CG. If the account(s) denote any of these activities as occurring, write the correct numbers in the boxes and add a margin of error. If the event is a violent gathering, yet no woundings or arrests, etc. are specifically mentioned or numbers are impossible to judge, check "impossible to judge". If the account gives no information about arrests, woundings, killings, etc., and the event is not a violent gathering, enter double zeroes in the boxes provided.

Assembler-Coder, etc.
Transcribe the assembler's name and date from the coder coversheet. Bobbi= RASl, Chris=CMLl, John=JRBl. Enter your 4-part ID number (consisting of your three initials and an assigned number) and today's date in the box provided. Leave blank the two boxes for check coder and enterer.

Total Number of Formations
Count the number of formations enumerated on the enclosed form #77-1 and enter it in the box.

Number of Formations Participating Directly in the Event
This number is derived by subtracting the absent formations enumerated from the total number of formations above. The number on this line should reflect all formations which were physically present within the time limits of the event. (Bystanders who make no claims but who are still physically present should be included in this section; other enumerated formations which are not present, e.g. Parliament, are not included here.)
### GREAT BRITAIN STUDY

#### EVENT SECTION

**GBS**

**Accuracy of starting date:**
- **Exact:** Default = 1Wk
- **Same:** Date event ends:
  - **Default:** Date: Date event ends:
  - **Guess**

**Duration:**
- **Guess** 1Wk
- **Guess** 2Wks
- **Guess** 1Mo
- **Guess** 2Mos
- **Guess** 3Mos

**General event type:**
- **Violence**
- **Meeting**
- **Gathering**
- **Delegation**
- **Other**

**Type of Event:**
- **Major issue, or claim:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Locations:</th>
<th>Location information</th>
<th>Grid numbers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** MC, LT, GM, AR, HPD, MOP, Other

**Total participants:**
- **Low**
- **High**
- **Best Guess**

**How determined:**
- **ITJ**
- **#s in report**
- **words in report**
- **QWO**
- **Other**

**# of person-days:**
- **Estimate**
- **Margin of error**
- **default = ITJ**

**# of person-hours:**
- **Estimate**
- **Margin of error**
- **default = ITJ**

**Arrests during event:**
- **Margin of error**
- **default = ITJ**

**Wounded: Total**
- **Margin of error**
- **default = ITJ**

**Killed: Total**
- **Margin of error**
- **default = ITJ**

**Assembler**
- **Date**
- **Coder**
- **Date**

**Check coder**
- **Date**
- **Enterer**
- **Date**

**Total # form. enumerated**
- **# of form. participating directly in the event**

**Section completed**
- **E**
- **F**
- **S**
- **C**
- **I** (Circle for coded, √ for entered)
One of the first tasks in enumerating an event is to identify how many formations were active during the confines of the contentious gathering (CG). This could include actors who are only active before or after the CG, or even actors who are not present at the event. The following approach should facilitate the process of enumeration:

1. read over the article(s) to familiarize yourself with the actors taking part in the event;
2. underline in red pencil any changes in personnel or changes in the claims or sentiments articulated by the actors;
3. make note of any government official(s) who are present and if the collective group articulates a sentiment towards that official(s).

**FORMATION ONE, FORMATION TWO**

There must be at least two formations for every CG. The first formation will always be the group of ten or more persons who articulated a claim: the group that qualified the event in the first place. The second formation will always be the object of the first formation's claim. This information will be indicated on the assembly half-sheet.

**EXAMPLE: MOB ATTACKS MR. SMITH**

Formation 01 = MOB (10 or more persons)
Formation 02 = MR. SMITH (the object of their claim)
the claim = violence

The object of the claim does not have to be present during the CG, as, for example, Parliament. (If any formation is not present during the CG, this should be indicated on the formation sheet by circling the appropriate "relationship to CG.")

Enter the names of the first two formations on the GBS Formation Enumeration Sheet in the 24 spaces provided. If the name extends beyond these 24
spaces, write an abbreviation, and write the complete name of the formation in the box below.

SUBSEQUENT FORMATIONS

Subsequent formations are identified in the account as being somehow apart from the first two formations because they include at least one of the following characteristics:

1. They are identified in the account as being a distinctly different person, or body of people, than the first two formations, and they make a distinctly different claim from other formations.

2. They, as a subset of one formation, start or stop making a claim at a distinctly different point in time from the others; i.e. persons who are arrested during an event will cease to act collectively with the group and become a separate formation.

3. They, as the subset of one formation, start or stop being the object of a claim at a distinctly different point in time from the others.

4. However similar to other formations, they are geographically separated from the others.

5. They are the object of another formation's claim.

A common example of subsequent formations is:

MOB ATTACKS MR. SMITH (formations 01, 02)

CONSTABLES (03) appear and arrest some of 01. Those arrested will become a new formation because of no. 2 and no. 5 above. They stop making a claim at a distinctly different point in time, and they become the object of another formation's claim. Persons arrested after a CG (usually specified in the account) do not become separate formations, because the group has ceased to act anyway.

Subsequent formations may:

1. be less than ten persons;

2. overlap with formations 01 or 02 (if this is the case, please indicate any overlapping formation numbers in the boxes provided in order to facilitate coding);

3. be a subset of formation 01 or 02 (as in "some of 01 arrested" example above).
OFFICIALS

Officials should be enumerated as separate formations if one of the following characteristic is stated in the account:

1. the official is chairing a meeting and a formal resolution of thanks is adopted by the meeting

2. the official is cheered, booed, hissed or applauded during the CG.

(NOTE: If the majority of the group cheer the official and some members hiss him those persons hissing will become a separate formation since the claim they are stating is distinctly different from that of the first formation.)

Bystanders (optional)

After subdividing formations there will often be a set of persons that does not fit the claim-object pattern described above. In many cases people present acted only as spectators or bystanders. These formations are optional. If you think their presence is significant you may choose to enumerate them as a separate formation. You should circle the "bystander" code (/4) under relationship to CG to indicate to the coders this group's relationship to the event.

(NOTE: Some accounts of violent events indicate that in a scuffle "some bystanders were wounded". In this case the bystanders are no longer an optional formation. Those who were wounded have become the object of a claim and must be included as a separate formation.

SPECIAL NOTES

MEETINGS

Most meetings will have only two or three formations: the group meeting, the group which is the object of their claim and perhaps an Official as Chairman. Internal divisions of opinion such as some members of the group opposing the stance of other members of the group will only become a separate formation if the opposing group makes a claim which extends beyond the meeting, such as
adopting a counter resolution. Rhetorical flourishes by single actors do not qualify as separate formations!

Requisitionists who request an official to convene a meeting before the CG are an optional formation. But if the official refuses to convene the requested meeting you are strongly urged to include this action in your enumeration. (The Requisitionists will be a separate formation active before the CG unless you have information that there is at least a 10% overlap with the group that meets. The Official will be a separate formation who is active before the CG.)

ELECTIONS...

Are some of the most difficult events to enumerate. Please try to limit the formations using the following guidelines:

1. all incumbent officials running for re-election are separate formations -- if they are the object of a claim, i.e. cheered, applauded, or hissed and they are present at the CG.

2. all other candidates are optional (and usually should not be included as separate formations) even if they are elected during the account of the event. They are still not officials because they have not yet been sworn into office.

3. Officials running for an office other than the position they currently hold, i.e. aldermen running for M.P. will not be enumerated as separate formations since they are not incumbents.

4. a group which hisses an incumbent official during the election account will be enumerated as a separate formation if the majority of the electors articulate some sentiment of support for the official. (The hissers become a separate formation because they articulate a distinctly different claim than that of the first formation.)

COMMITTEE

Committees ordinarily will not become a separate formation, unless they make a claim that is distinctly different from the rest of the meeting. The only case in which a committee will count as a separate formation is:
1) if it disagrees with the rest of the meeting in a durable fashion (i.e. walks out, refuses to do what it is charged with, passes counter-resolutions, etc.); or 2) if it is charged with doing something distinctly different.

A committee or deputation which is appointed at a meeting to present a petition or an address will be an optional separate formation which is active after the CG.

OTHER FORMATIONS

When the object of a claim is not a person, i.e. a law, or property, then the formation name will be the group or person enforcing the law, or the person who owns the property.

Some events will indicate that an action occurred for which a specific actor is not named. The most common example is "some of the mob were arrested". In this example you will need a formation to arrest part of the mob. We use "someone" as the name of this formation, even though you suspect that "someone" is a constable or group of officers, the account does not name them.

When you have completed the enumeration of the formation make sure you have indicated each formations relationship to the CG. (This will facilitate the coding of the event.) The codes are as follows:

1 Participants making a claim
2 Participants object of a claim
3 Participants, both making and receiving claims
4 Spectator, bystander
5 Object of a claim not present
6 Object of a claim, some participating, some not present
7 Involved in action before or after CG only
8 Involved in action before or after CG only: Comment
99 Other, comment included

( NOTE: If you encounter any problematic enumerations which are not anticipated in the rules, consult an assembly supervisor and another enumerator for the proper method to be used in its enumeration. Keep a written record in your codebook of any decisions made regarding these enumerations, so that a continuous updating of the enumeration instructions can be maintained.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMATION NAME (Subject)</th>
<th>CLAIM</th>
<th>FORMATION NAME (Object of claim)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVIEWED BY: 1) ___________ Date ___________ , 2) ___________ Date ___________.

GBS FORMATIONS ENUMERATION FORM: 77-1, Rev. 9-77, 9-79, PAF&RAS
FORMATION SECTION "F" (blue section)

One section (3 pages) must be completed for each formation listed on the "Formation Enumeration Sheet 77-1" included with the event. Begin by entering your coder ID number in the top box.

Total Number of Formations
List in this box the sum total of all formations listed on form 77-1. This will also be the total number of formation sections you will complete.

CG ID #
Fill in the 9-digit ID number located on the top of the coder coversheet form 76-3.

Number of Formation
Enter the ID number of this formation in the box provided.

Summary Name of this Formation
Enter the name of this formation from form 77-1 in the 24 spaces provided. If you must abbreviate, enter the entire formation name under Names Given to this Formation in Account. For persons, list last name first, then given name. Use no commas or punctuation.

Overlapping Formation Numbers
If any of this formation's members were part of another formation at any time, enter in the boxes the ID numbers of the other formations.

Relationship to CG
This answer can be derived from reviewing the articles and the Formation and Action Phase enumeration forms, which list the makers of claims and the objects of those claims. Below is a complete list of all the possible relationships. If a particular relationship is not one of those listed, make a comment (see Section C) and contact your supervisor.
1. participants, making a claim
2. participants, object of a claim
3. participants, both making and receiving claims
4. spectator, bystander
5. object of a claim, not present
6. object of a claim, some participating, some not present
7. involved in action before or after CG only; no comment
8. involved in action before or after CG only; comment included
9. other; comment included

Names
If the account(s) give this formation any other names than the one used for the summary name, list them in the boxes provided. For a one-person formation, include all names given to this formation in this section, e.g. if the summary name of this formation is the Mayor, his proper name will appear in this section as well as in the following section, Individual Names. If the summary name for this formation is Williams John Mr, include his name in this section and in the following section as well.
Individual Names
If the account(s) give names of single actors within the formation whether they be given names like "John Boyd" or descriptive names like "the evil bossman", enter them in the boxes provided. The proper name of a formation composed of a single individual should appear in this section, even if it appeared in the line above and/or as the summary name for the formation. In a regular formation, individual names and additional qualifying information should be recorded on this line in the following manner: last name first, @ sign, first name, @ sign, and additional information e.g. Boyd@John@evil bossman. Omit articles such as a, an, or the.

Normal Residence
After reading the account(s), you will have determined whether the residence for this formation is either: impossible to judge, local (that is, a single specific town or parish), or multiple. Circle the appropriate code which corresponds to your determination, then proceed to the appropriate L or X boxes. If the account gives information on the place of residence for this formation, fill in the corresponding boxes: County, Town, Parish, and/or Detailed Place. If any of your determinations are guesses, circle the appropriate letters under "Guesses". Again, don't be afraid to use "Impossible to Judge" if no information is given. (Note: Parliament is always "Impossible to Judge".) If the account(s) state that the members of this formation are inhabitants of more than one town or parish, your determination of this formation's residence will be "X" or multiple. Circle the "X" box on the first line, then proceed to the "X: Multiple residences" box and enter the text from the account, e.g. "inhabitants of Mary le Bonne and St Lukes Parishes". (Again, do not use punctuation marks.)

Numerical/Geographical Extent
Here we want words given in the account that give us some indication of the size of this formation: such things as "filled the square" or "many hundreds". If none appears, check the "none=default" box. If you have a one-person formation, enter the appropriate word denoting the formation, such as "one name", "someone", or "Mr Williams" in box #1 of this item.

Specific Number
Here simply answer the questions yes or no, and circle the appropriate response. Separate multiple reports by means of a semi-colon (;). If you have a one-person formation, circle /2 and write "one person" or "one name" in the box provided.

Estimate of People
These boxes are designed to help us get a set of numbers that describes the numerical content of the formation. If exact numbers are given, then fill in all the boxes with the same number. If there are differing accounts of numbers, use them. If making an educated guess, try to balance the figures. If no numbers are given in the account, skip to the next section and circle "Impossible to Judge" or "Default".

How Determined
Here simply indicate how you arrived at the figures used above, or indicate that the number is "Impossible to Judge". If you have a one-person formation, circle "/2=words in text", and write "one name" in the space provided.
Person-Days/Person-Hours
Person-days are the number of 24-hour periods persons were active in the CG times the number of participants present during each 24-hour period; e.g. a 3-day event in which 200 people were involved equals 600 person-days; or if 200 people participated in one 24-hour period and 100 the next two days (24-hour periods), the total would be: 1 x 200 + 2 x 200 or 400 person-days. If the event lasted for less than 24 hours, even if the event extended over two calendar days, the estimate of person-days will be 00.

The estimate of person-hours is the estimated number of hours in which the formation participated multiplied by the estimated number of people in the formation. When you are unable to determine either the number of 24-hour days, hours, or people, enter "NA" in the boxes provided. If Parliament. is one of the formations listed, it usually is an object of a claim. It expends no person days or hours because it is not present, so enter "00 in the boxes.

Note: Any part of an hour expended by a person counts as a full person-hour.

Source of Estimate
Indicate how you made the person-days/hours estimate by circling the appropriate code in this section Circle /O only if you have NA or 00 in the boxes above. Circle "/3=Dates in text make it clear less than one day" if you have some indication in the account that the event began and ended on the same day.

Consequences: Arrested, Wounded, Killed
If the account(s) give specific numbers for each of these categories, enter those numbers in the boxes provided, and under "basis of estimate" circle "/1=In Text". If the account(s) tell us that some members of this formation were arrested, wounded, or killed but do not specify numbers, circle "NA= ITJ", and under "basis of estimate" circle "/1=In Text". Some events may be violent and the account may not specify that anyone was wounded or arrested but their description of the action would give you reason to believe that someone must have been wounded (e.g. "stones were thrown"). If this occurs, you would then enter "NA" and circle "ITJ", and under "basis of evidence" circle "/2=In Text, comment included", and in the space provided write the text that led you to conclude that someone must have been wounded, i.e. "stones were thrown".
Formation Section: Fill our one 3 page section per formation. Page F-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coder</th>
<th>CG ID#</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Total # of formations: [ ]

Number of this formation: [ ]

Summary name of formation: [ ]

Does this formation overlap with any other formation(s) in the same event?

Yes: Which ones? Give formations #s: [ ]

What is the relationship between this formation and the Contentious Gathering?

1/ Participants, making a claim
2/ Participants, object of a claim
3/ Participants, both making and receiving claims
4/ Spectator, bystander
5/ Object of a claim, not present
6/ Object of a claim, some participating, some not present
7/ Involved in action before or after CG only, no comment
8/ Involved in action before or after CG only, comment: [ ]
9/ Other, comment: [ ]

Names given to this formation in account(s): [ ] None = Default

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the account(s) list any individual names of formation members, list them: last name first, @ sign, first, @ sign, then all other information, title, etc.

None = Default

List continued on next page
Individual names mentioned in account(s): 9 (continued)

15
16
17
18
19

If more than 24 names are given in the account, use another page and check here □

Normal residence of this formation: □ Local □ Multiple Locations Default = ITJ

Local:

C = County

T = Town

P = Parish

L = Detailed place

Guesses: C T P L

X: Multiple residences (list)

Words in account(s) describing numerical and/or geographic extent of this formation: 19

□ None = Default

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Do the accounts report a specific number (approximate or exact) for this formation?

□/0 = No information (or Default)

□/1 = Yes, no comment

□/2 = Yes, comment included

□/3 = Yes, conflicting reports, no comment

□/4 = Yes, conflicting reports, comment included:
Your estimate of the number of people in this formation: 22

Low [ ] High [ ] Best Guess [ ]

How determined:

1/0 or default = impossible to judge
1/1 = Numbers in text
1/2 = Words in text, comment: [ ]
1/99 = Other, comment: [ ]

Your estimate of the number of person-days for this formation: 27
("00" = less than one day, default or 1/0 = impossible to judge)

Your estimate of the number of person-hours for this formation: [ ]

Source of your estimate:

1/0 or default = impossible to judge 1/1 = Numbers in text
1/2 = Words in text (list): [ ]
1/3 = Dates in text make it clear less than one day
1/99 = Other (comment): [ ]

(For Parliament or Formation not present, type 1/99 and state not present)

How many members of this formation were

Arrested: [ ] NA = ITJ (default)

Basis of estimate:

1/1 = In text, no comment
1/2 = In text with comment: [ ]
1/3 = Inferred, no comment
1/4 = Inferred comment included: [ ]

Wounded: [ ] NA = ITJ (default)

Basis of estimate:

1/1 = In text, no comment
1/2 = In text with comment: [ ]
1/3 = Inferred, no comment
1/4 = Inferred comment included: [ ]

Killed: [ ] NA = ITJ (default)

Basis of estimate:

1/1 = In text, no comment
1/2 = In text with comment: [ ]
1/3 = Inferred, no comment
1/4 = Inferred comment included: [ ]
GBS ENUMERATION INSTRUCTIONS: ACTION PHASES

Loosely speaking, the action phases add up to a narrative of the contentious gathering from the perspective of someone interested in groups making and receiving claims. The enumeration of formations and action phases depend on each other and must be consistent with each other.

Read the accounts with the following general rules in mind. The red underlinings you used in deciding how many formations were involved in the CG should indicate (in general) the basic action phases.

GENERAL RULES

A new action phase begins whenever any formation

1. begins to make a claim (i.e. cheering, hissing, violence, resolutions, etc.)

2. begins a new response to a claim

3. visibly ceases a response to a claim

4. visibly ceases to make a claim

5. changes locations

6. changes personnel (i.e. a new group appears, a formation increases in size, etc.)

Action phases may occur before or after the contentious gathering. This gives you a chance to record preparations and background information involving the basic formations. Some before action phases are required. If the account mentions any of the following activity you must include these actions in your enumeration:

1. a public advertisement or notice which publicizes the meeting

2. the act of requisitioning an official to convene a meeting, even if he refuses to do so. (For formation enumeration: the requisitionists will be the same as the formation which holds the meeting, unless the account specifies that they are not the same group. The official, if he complies with the requisition, will be present in the chair, or active during the CG; if he refuses the request, he will be enumerated as a separate formation active before the CG.)

3. trial reports: we want to know the outcome of violent activity. You need to include any mention of a trial after the CG and the verdict and sentence, if it is given in the report. This should be done in one action phase. (05 [official] try 03 [group arrested])
Before completing the Action Phase Enumeration form, please make sure you have checked all the accounts carefully for information about activity that occurred before or after the CG which should be enumerated.

1. ACTION PHASE NUMBERS

Start each form by filling in the event I.D. number, your coder I.D. and today's date. The first action phase will be numbered 0101 (usually). Four numbers are assigned to each action phase. The first numbers indicate chronological sequence and the second two numbers refer to the order of the action within a chronological period. The numbers help to clarify the narrative of the action. In most cases the action phase numbers will be assigned in chronological order as in the following example:

0101 01 notify B "...a public notice..."
0201 01 meet D "...inhabitants...meeting..."

Often the account will specify that some actions occurred simultaneously, that is, two formations acted in different ways at the same time. In such cases proper use of the Action Phase numbers will tell this. EXAMPLE:

0701 02 arrive D "the king arrived in the street..."
0702 01 cheer 02 D "...on his appearance he was loudly cheered by the populace..."

The first two numbers are the same because the account specifies that the action occurred at the same (or nearly the same) time. The second two numbers are assigned to distinguish one description of an action from another within the same chronological period. (In some cases the account will specify three simultaneous actions. In that case the third action phase will be 0703, using the above example: 0703 03 hiss 02 "...on his appearance...a body of weavers hissed..."

If the account specifies that some action occurred over a sustained period, or that some action occurred at an unidentified point in time you will use 00 for the first two numbers and assign an order number according to the place of this particular 00 action phase within the whole enumeration, e.g.
if this is the first 00 action phase, its action phase number will be 0001, if
it is the second, it will be 0002.

**EXAMPLE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0101</td>
<td>01 stone 02</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>&quot;...mob stoned the magistrate...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0201</td>
<td>01, 03 riot</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>&quot;...a riot ensued...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0301</td>
<td>04 arrive</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>&quot;...constables arrived...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>01, 03 wound 05</td>
<td>&quot;Some spectators were wounded in the scuffle...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **SUBJECT FORMATION NUMBERS**

These formation numbers correspond to the actors who make the claim
within that action phase.

3. **ACTION VERB**

This word should be taken from the text of the account if possible;
"The poachers attacked the gameskeepers..." the action verb should be ATTACK.
Always use the present tense, infinitive form of the verb, i.e. attacked
will be ATTACK. (There is a list of acceptable verbs which you should con-
sult if you have any questions about the proper spelling, etc.) If there
is no appropriate verb in the text use one that best sums up the action. In
this case you must indicate that your verb is not taken directly from the
text by placing a # sign immediately before the word in one of the eight boxes
provided. Always try to use a verb from the text if possible.

Every event must have a beginning, and an end, such as "...inhabitants
met at 8 o'clock..." the action verb here will be: 01 MEET. In some cases
this action phase will have to be inferred, i.e. the presence of a crowd that
cheers the king will have an initial action phase like: 01 #GATHER "...the
crowd...filled the streets..." If an account of a meeting does not indicate
that the meeting ended such as "they drank until a late hour" use #END to de-
note the termination of the CG. This holds true for any event for which you
do not have a specified termination in the account. Every account must have
a beginning and an end, and action phases which denote those activities.
For some action phases the verb from the account will not fit within the spaces provided. Check the list of acceptable verbs for the proper abbreviation. If one is not available devise your own, keeping in mind that you have only 8 spaces and that the verb should still be recognizable.

4. OBJECT FORMATION NUMBERS

Enter the number of the formation which is the object of the claim in that action phase. Sometimes you will have a verb or an action which does not have an object, in that case leave the object space blank.

5. TEXT

Here write in the text from the account which described the action you are enumerating. Try to eliminate all but the most pertinent text using ellipses (...) where you have deleted irrelevant words from the account.

EXAMPLE: "the poachers, who were a very rowdy group, attacked the games-keepers in a most malicious manner..." To save space in the computer, the only necessary detail is: "the poachers...attacked the gameskeepers..."

You should also include in this section any information about time or duration which is given in the account, i.e. "the inhabitants gathered at 8 o'clock..." or "manufacturers met in the evening..."

If the action phase you are enumerating is an inferred end you should write in the box for detail: (END), that is, if there is no other indication of the CG ending in the account.

6. WHEN

Here circle either B (before), D (during), or A (after) for when the action phase occurred relative to the CG.

ACTION PHASES SPECIAL NOTES

Meetings: do not enumerate every account of cheering at a meeting, unless that action represents a qualifying claim, i.e. different officials, who are present, are cheered or hissed by the group. Rhetorical flourishes made by
a member of a formation do not warrant separate action phases. Simple toasts do not qualify as separate action phases, e.g. "a toast to the King (huzzah)", even if those toasts are for officials. The sentiments usually expressed in a toast similarly should not be enumerated.

Resolutions will have only one action phase unless each resolution states a different claim and/or a different object of a claim. The action verb will be "resolve" and the text will indicate the stance taken toward the object of the claim. A separate action phase should be written for each resolution that specifies a different claim or a different object of a claim. EXAMPLE: a meeting which resolves opposition to Parliament's increase in taxation will be written as follows:

01 RESOLVE 02 (Parliament), Text: "Resolution... opposing... an increase in taxes..."

The same meeting may pass a resolution of support for an M.P. who holds their views e.g. 01 RESOLVE 03 (Mr. Hobhouse, M.P.) Text: "Resolution... supporting Mr. Hobhouse's bill..."

Elections. Do not list every nomination speech or acceptance speech at elections. You need only enumerate the appearance of the candidate (if he is an official running for re-election) and the sentiment articulated by the electors.

For the actual polling and election, write one action phase: 01 ELECT 02

For a multi-day election, enumerate each day as if it were a separate CG. That is, each day should have a beginning (01 GATHER), a claim for that day (01 CHEER 02), and an end (01, 02 LEAVE). For the first action phase of each day include in the Text section which day you are enumerating, i.e. 0901, 01 COLLECT Text: 3rd day, (8-24) "the voters collected in the square..."

NOTE: You should also enumerate all other claims made by groups or others that are durable, that is, they express a sentiment which extends beyond the election.
When the event is ready to be coded the enumerations of the Action Phases stand as is. That is they are not recoded but are placed in the event file and left for the enterer to enter them into the computer files at the same time all the other coded materials are entered.

Below is a short example of how Action Phases were recorded for event # 828-01-28-03, the "Fusileers Brawl". The formations consist of 01 Fusileers, 02 George Wiltshire, 03 Someone (the person who sent for the constable), 04 Constable and 05 Soldier (the one who was arrested).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMATION NAME (Subject)</th>
<th>CLAIM</th>
<th>FORMATION NAME (Object of claim)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 Fusileers</td>
<td>ATTACK</td>
<td>02 Wiltshire, George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap #'s: 05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 99</td>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 Someone</td>
<td>CALL FOR</td>
<td>04 Constable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 99</td>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>05 Soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 99</td>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 99</td>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 99</td>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 99</td>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 99</td>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlap #'s:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 99</td>
<td>Relationship to CG:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVIEWED BY: 1) AXAI Date 1/15/80, 2) Date ________.
GREAT BRITAIN STUDY

CODING INSTRUCTIONS

SOURCE SECTION "S" (pink section)

Each reader coversheet must have a source section completed detailing its contents.

Begin by placing your coder ID number and the CG ID number in the first two boxes. Then indicate:

Source Name
Circle the appropriate computer code which corresponds to the source you are working from.

Location
Enter the date of publication of the newspaper or periodical in the boxes. Then enter the page number and column number of articles used in the spaces provided. Circle the code which corresponds to the location in the column where the article begins e.g. /1=Top. If a volume number is required (GM, AR, HPD, MOP), fill it in.

Type of Report
Circle the code that best describes the type of report. Eyewitness reports are those that specify that the writer was present at the event, as opposed to a more common, narrative article. HPDs and MOPs are always Parliamentary reports. If the article is from a newspaper other than the main LT/MC, note it in the box provided.

Note: This form is designed to code two sources. Follow the same steps to code any other of the standard six sources in the section marked "Second Source". If more than two sources are present, use another sheet and fill out the #__________of__________ line at the top of the page. If any problems arise, see your supervisor.

Additional Materials
This section is to be used for noting any other materials that pertain to this CG (Home Office Papers, Public Record Office materials, books, dissertations, and the like). If any of these are noted as referring to this CG consult your supervisor for entry instructions.
**FIRST SOURCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Source:</th>
<th>1 = MC</th>
<th>2 = LT</th>
<th>3 = GM</th>
<th>4 = AR</th>
<th>5 = HPD</th>
<th>6 = MOP</th>
<th>7 = Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locations: Date</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Column</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where:</td>
<td>1 = Top</td>
<td>2 = Middle</td>
<td>3 = Bottom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Report:</th>
<th>1 = Editorial/letter in newspaper</th>
<th>2 = Advertisement or notice</th>
<th>3 = Eyewitness report</th>
<th>4 = Another newspaper's account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume Number</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECOND SOURCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Source:</th>
<th>1 = MC</th>
<th>2 = LT</th>
<th>3 = GM</th>
<th>4 = AR</th>
<th>5 = HPD</th>
<th>6 = MOP</th>
<th>7 = Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locations: Date</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Column</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where:</td>
<td>1 = Top</td>
<td>2 = Middle</td>
<td>3 = Bottom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Report:</th>
<th>1 = Editorial/letter in newspaper</th>
<th>2 = Advertisement or notice</th>
<th>3 = Eyewitness report</th>
<th>4 = Another newspaper's account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume Number</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional materials that pertain to this event, specifically or in general:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Dissertation</th>
<th>None = Default</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 = Background paper: list title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Book: list title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 = Other: list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 = Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 = None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: None
GREAT BRITAIN STUDY

COMMENT SECTION "C" (buff section) C1

Enter CG ID and coder ID.

Each box is designed to hold one comment. The small boxes at the top of each larger box are to locate the section the comment is referring to. The section letter is to locate which part of the questionnaire your comment is in: E = Event, F = Formation, etc. The item box is the more specific part you are coding, EXAMPLE: "Type of Event" or "Duration".

If the comment is in the Formation section, then give us the formation number you are commenting about in the next box. If it is in a specific source that requires a comment, list that source in the next box. The same holds true for place and action phases sequence numbers.

Note: If you use more than one comment sheet, fill out the # ________ of _________ space at the top of the form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Section P, C-1</th>
<th>1 of ___</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>None = Default Throughout</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) LOCATION OF COMMENT</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Formation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Action Phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2) LOCATION OF COMMENT</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Formation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Action Phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3) LOCATION OF COMMENT</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Formation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Action Phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4) LOCATION OF COMMENT</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Formation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Action Phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INFORMATION ON CODING SECTION "I" (salmon section)

Begin by entering your coder ID number and CG ID number in the first two boxes. Then write in boxes provided:

1. Your name, first and last

2. Date coded, MMDDYY

3. "General notes on coding of this event": Write here any general comments about your coding of this event. If the event was difficult to understand or to code, note that and tell why and what was difficult. If a section or formation, etc. didn't make sense, note that to us also. These comments will be entered into the coded record for this event to make it easier to understand in the years to come. Please keep your comments concise and clear. If you have nothing to say, write an "X" in the box, and it will be entered as a default or no-comment when put into the computer.

4. If you are not the coder but only the enterer of the data, please give your ID number and date entered.

STOP!!! Next section for checkcoders only.

Checkcoding instructions. Write:

5. Your name, first and last

6. Your coder ID number: three initials plus number;

7. General comments on the checkcoding, scores if available, ease of reading, etc., plus date checkcoded.
General notes on coding of this event:

Enterer ID if different from coder: Date Entered

Check coder name Check coder ID

Date

General notes on check coding:
### Contentious Gatherings Enumerated in February 1828

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of CG</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>Weymouth</td>
<td>02-02</td>
<td>parliamentary election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>02-02</td>
<td>protection of victualler trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>02-04</td>
<td>application to repeal test and corporation acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>02-04</td>
<td>petition king about political favors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathering/crowd</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>02-05</td>
<td>election to parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathering/crowd</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>02-05</td>
<td>election local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathering/crowd</td>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>02-06</td>
<td>election to parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>02-06</td>
<td>police informer, Anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parade</td>
<td>Weymouth</td>
<td>02-07</td>
<td>pre-election activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>02-07</td>
<td>church rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence</td>
<td>Newbury</td>
<td>02-07</td>
<td>poaching informer, Anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstration</td>
<td>Weymouth</td>
<td>02-09</td>
<td>election, day #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>02-10</td>
<td>tax on carts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathering/crowd</td>
<td>Weymouth</td>
<td>02-11</td>
<td>election, day #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathering/mob</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>02-13</td>
<td>informer, Anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathering/crowd</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>02-13</td>
<td>country elections, day #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>Queensborough</td>
<td>02-13</td>
<td>fishing riches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>02-15</td>
<td>non-licensed sellers, Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathering</td>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>02-15</td>
<td>election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence</td>
<td>Atherstone</td>
<td>02-16</td>
<td>poaching affray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>02-18</td>
<td>corn laws, Anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathering/crowd</td>
<td>Weymouth</td>
<td>02-18</td>
<td>election victory celebration, day #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>Marylabonne</td>
<td>02-20</td>
<td>parish rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathering</td>
<td>Weymouth</td>
<td>02-20</td>
<td>post-election activities, day #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>02-25</td>
<td>mob attacks watchman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence</td>
<td>Scarborough</td>
<td>02-28</td>
<td>smuggling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence</td>
<td>Bethnal Green</td>
<td>02-28</td>
<td>riot over poor rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of CG</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>February, no fixed date</td>
<td>test and corporation acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>February, no fixed date</td>
<td>test and corporation acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>Honiton</td>
<td>February, no fixed date</td>
<td>test and corporation acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>February, no fixed date</td>
<td>test and corporation acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>February, no fixed date</td>
<td>stamp duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>February, no fixed date</td>
<td>test and corporation acts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 141 more petited metting regarding the test and corporated acts in February not listed because of their Repitiveness.
CONTENTIOUS GATHERINGS ENUMERATED IN
OCTOBER 1830

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CG</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ISSUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Surfleet</td>
<td>10-01</td>
<td>Constables anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>10-01</td>
<td>New Police anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Hougham</td>
<td>10-01</td>
<td>Machine Breaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-03</td>
<td>Police anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>10-04</td>
<td>Réform pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>10-04</td>
<td>Slavery anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>10-04</td>
<td>Government pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>New Police anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>Suppression of press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>King pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Ewell</td>
<td>10-07</td>
<td>Machine Breaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-07</td>
<td>New Police anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>10-08</td>
<td>Malt tax anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>10-09</td>
<td>Reform pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>10-09</td>
<td>Machine breaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-10</td>
<td>New Police anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-10</td>
<td>New Police anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-10</td>
<td>New Police anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>New Police anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>French revolution pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Depford</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>Repairs to dockyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>Reform pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>Smuggling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Slavery anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Window taxes anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF CG</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>Slavery anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>Gentleman anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>New Police anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>New Police anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>New Police anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Brigge</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>Slavery anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Wisbeach</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>Reform pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>French revolution pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Stratford</td>
<td>10-18</td>
<td>Truck system anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>Support MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>Belgium revolution pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>New Police anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>Slavery anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>New Police/Taxes anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Lavington</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Slavery anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-21</td>
<td>New Police anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-21</td>
<td>New Police anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>10-21</td>
<td>Slavery anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
<td>10-22</td>
<td>King &amp; Queen pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-22</td>
<td>Select versry anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>10-23</td>
<td>Malt tax anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Sandwich</td>
<td>10-23</td>
<td>Machine breaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td>Cobhamhall</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>Lord anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>Earl of Exeter anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td>Stockbury</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>Farmers anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>New Police anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF CG</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>Taxes anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>Workers anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Queenborough</td>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>Government anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>Select vestry anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-26</td>
<td>Duke of Wellington anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-26</td>
<td>Shoemakers anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td>Lenham</td>
<td>10-26</td>
<td>Wage claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Wingham</td>
<td>10-26</td>
<td>Machine Breaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>10-26</td>
<td>Slavery anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>10-27</td>
<td>Royalty: pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>10-27</td>
<td>Pro MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Shaftsbury</td>
<td>10-27</td>
<td>Slavery anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Kelso</td>
<td>10-27</td>
<td>Slavery anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-28</td>
<td>King &amp; Queen pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Hollingbourn</td>
<td>10-28</td>
<td>Wage demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Warminster</td>
<td>10-29</td>
<td>Slavery anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Bensteads</td>
<td>10-30</td>
<td>Work stoppage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-31</td>
<td>Beadle anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10-31</td>
<td>New Police anti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Today's date 07-03-1979

GREAT BRITAIN STUDY COVERSHEETS

| First Line: Weymouth |

GENERAL DESCRIPTION: CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY (see memo #6)

(1) VIOLENCE ( )
   property damage ( ), seizure of property, spaces or persons ( ), personal injury ( ), threat of any of the above ( ).

(2) MEETINGS ( )
   ( ) Election ( ) support for enemy of government
   ( ) Vestry ( ) control of local government/institution
   ( ) Livery ( ) other grievances and dissatisfaction
   ( ) Dinner ( ) opposition to other peoples or groups
   ( ) Political club/party ( ) objectives unclear
   ( ) with petition, address, etc. ( ) notices, requests (for future meetings)
   ( ) opposition to government ( ) other (list)

(3-8) GATHERINGS
   demonstrations ( ), parade ( ), assemblies, crowds, mobs (circle one) ( ), gatherings ( ), rallies ( ), special celebrations ( ),
   other (list)

(9) DELEGATIONS, DEPUTATIONS ( )

(10) LABOR ACTIVITIES ( )
   strike, turnout ( ), lockout ( ), combination or union mention ( ), threats to stop work ( ), work stoppages ( ), return to work ( ),
   deputations of workers ( ).

(11) LEGAL ACTIONS ( )
   arrests ( ), examinations ( ), pretrial info. ( ), trials/court actions ( ), sentences, executions, etc. ( ). Be sure to check the appropriate areas above
   that pertain to the action that brought about the arrest or trial.

Objective of action ELECTION

Participants FRIENDS OF MR. SUGDEN

Number LARGE CONCOURSE Leaders MR. SUGDEN

Date Feb. 7, 1828. Today. Duration (if known)
   Yesterday, last week, a few days ago one day or less, a few days, more

Location AT THE GATE, Weymouth
   Specific place, inn, field, etc. village or town/city parish

COMMENTS ON BACK? ( ) 4-76, Rev. 4-77 Bobbi/CML

   county
WEYMOUTH, FRIDAY, FEB. 8.

Mr. Sugden made his public entry into this town yesterday afternoon. About five o'clock, a large concourse of his friends and adherents assembled at the triumphal gate (less than a quarter of a mile hence), where they awaited his arrival amid the clang of military music. When the carriage drove up, the horses were taken from it; and "See the conquering Hero comes" was struck up by the hand & chorused by the multitude. Just as the array was setting forth, some purple tights illuminated the scene, which, by throwing their glare on the congregated masses around, and casting sable gleams on the bosom of the bay on the right, produced a coup d'oeil equally pleasing and romantic. The carriage was driven through the town amid the shouts and acclamations of the purple party; although these were partially interrupted by the unwelcome bray of the "Blues," who were not a little assisted on the occasion by the shrill treble of the females, and the tiny voices of the children, who are all devoted Blues. The assemblage stopped at Luce's Hotel, where Mr. Sugden alighted, and mounted the coach-box to address the people. "I promised to be here," said the Learned Gentleman, "and here I am. [Loud applause]. I will give up to no Blue in devotion to the inhabitants of this town. For whose welfare I feel the strongest attachment! If, indeed, a love for the people, and a regard for their rights, are the characteristics of a True Blue man, I at once allow myself to be one [burst of applause]. Go it, little fellow!" I trust, by your exertions, that I shall be completely successful in the approaching contest; but, whatever may be the result of it, you may rely on my sacred promise, that I shall not quit the field until the last freethinker has been polled [continued applause]. "Hussars for the game little chap!" Accept of my warmest thanks for the cordial welcome you have given me this evening [the cheers which followed the conclusion of this brief address were quite deafening]. Mr. Sugden afterwards, amidst a profusion of well wishes, with difficulty effected an entrance into the hotel.

In reference to a paragraph from the Insolvent Debtors' Court in The Morning Chronicle of Friday, we are informed that there is no person of the name of Ogston holding the situation of Writer to the East India Company.

On Saturday an inquisition was held at the Neg's Head, Bethnal Green, on the body of a well-dressed man, name unknown, apparently about twenty-three years of age. It appeared from the evidence that on the day before (Friday) the body of the deceased was dragged out of the Regent's Canal, near Hon- ner's Hall, Bethnal Green. Nothing was found on his person but a silk pocket handkerchief, with the initials J.R. marked on it. No one had appeared to own the body nor was there any clue to discover who the deceased was. A Verdict of Found Drowned was recorded.

On Thursday night the residence of Mr. Culhane, No. 4, Sydney-place, Stamford-hill, was burglariously entered. The thieves reaped a rich harvest, and made their escape with a
**GREAT BRITAIN STUDY COVERSHEETS**

**Today's date 6 - 29 1979**

**First Line: A VERY NUMEROUS MEETING**

**GENERAL DESCRIPTION: CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY (see memo #6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) VIOLENCE ( )</th>
<th>property damage ( ), seizure of property, spaces or persons ( ), personal injury ( ), threat of any of the above ( ).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (2) MEETINGS (✓ ) | ( ) support for enemy of government  
( ) control of local government/institution  
( ) other grievances and dissatisfaction  
( ) opposition to other peoples or groups  
( ) objectives unclear  
( ) notices, requests (for future meetings)  
( ) other (list) |
| (3-8) GATHERINGS | demonstrations ( ), parade ( ), assemblies, crowds, mobs (circle one) ( ), gatherings ( ), rallies ( ), special celebrations ( ), other (list) |
| (9) DELEGATIONS, DEPUTATIONS ( ) |
| (10) LABOR ACTIVITIES ( ) | strike, turnout ( ), lockout ( ), combination or union mention ( ), threats to stop work ( ), work stoppages ( ), return to work ( ), deputations of workers ( ). |
| (11) LEGAL ACTIONS ( ) | arrests ( ), examinations ( ), pretrial info. ( ), trials/court actions ( ), sentences, executions, etc. ( ). Be sure to check the appropriate areas above that pertain to the action that brought about the arrest or trial. |

**Objective of action**  
INTERFERENCE IN THEIR TRADE  

**Participants**  
Licensed Victuallers  

**Number**  
Numerous  

**Leaders**  
Charles Gleason  

**Date**  
02.15.1828  

**Duration (if known)**  
one day or less, a few days, more  

**Location**  
London Tavern, London  

**Specific place, inn, field, etc.**  
Village or town/city  

**Counties**  
Middlesex  

**Comments on back? (✓)**  
4-76, Rev. 4-77 Bobbi/CML
NOTICE is hereby given, That a SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING of the PROPRIETORS of SHARES of and in the IMPERIAL GAS AND COKE COMPANY will be held at the Old London Tavern, Bishopsgate-street, in the City of London, on Thursday, the 18th day of February, at Twelve o'clock at Noon, for the Election of a Director of the said Company, in the place of James Stubbs, Esq., appointed Deputy Governor; and of a Auditor, in the place of James H. Mahon, who has resigned.

By order.
BARTHOLOMEW MAYEHW, Clerk of the Company.

A very numerous MEETING of LICENSED VICTUALLERS, held at the London Tavern, on Friday, the 15th day of February, 1829.

CHARLES PLEADEN, Esq., having been called to the Chair.
It is the opinion of the Meeting that the privileges and business of the Licensed Victuallers have for a long time past been grossly interfered with a d injured by various persons opening and conducting houses of entertainment without a License, and that the law is one of the most important and necessary for the public welfare.

That it is the opinion of this Meeting that the Legislature, in enacting and enforcing the Foreign Wine License, has expressly prohibited unlicensed persons from allowing any excisable articles to be consumed upon their premises.

That it is the opinion of this Meeting that no individual can open or conduct any house of entertainment without a License from the Magistrate so to do.

That it is the opinion of this Meeting that under the sanction which the license gives to the houses of Licensed Victuallers, the greater part of this Meeting give large premiums and pay high rent for the houses they occupy, which will cease to be of any value to other persons of a similar magnitude, if persons can conduct houses of entertainment without the license of the Magistrates.

That this Meeting, viewing with satisfaction the proceedings that have already taken place under the supervision of the Committee, require to support the proceedings of the Committee in such a way as may be deemed most expedient; and that the Committee have the power to add the names of the persons to form four District Committees, as soon as they find it advisable so to do.

That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the Treasurer Committee for their past services, and that they be requested to act in those capacities.

Also, that the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Charles Pleadon, Esq., for his useful and valuable attention to the business of the Association, and for his excellent conduct as Chairman on this occasion.

HOPE LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY, No. 6, New Bridge-street, London. Rt. Andrew's square, Edinburgh, and No. 12, Westmorland-street, Dublin.

ROBERT WILLIAMS, Esq., M.P. Chairman.
JOHN RAMSBOTTOM, Esq., M.P. Deputy Chairman.

ASSURANCE LIVES may be effected by this Company upon the most advantageous Terms to the Assured—and Two-thirds of its Profits are divided amongst Assureds Septennially.

WILLIAM BURY, Actuary.

CITY OF DUBLIN TONTINE—The Subscribers to the Life Annuitants granted by the Corporation of the City of Dublin, on the 1st day of June, 1763, who are to be paid their interest in London, may receive HAY YEAR'S ANNUITY, due 31st day of December last, by applying at the Banking-house of Mr. James Muddler and Co. London-street, or by sending their orders by the Post Office, or by being the hour of Ten o'clock to the Subscribers to bring their Bonds and Certificates of the Life of the Nominees. It is requested, that in case of death notice may be given as above, for the future benefit and regulation of each Class.
**GENERAL DESCRIPTION: CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY (see memo #6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case (dschweitzer)</th>
<th>Palm</th>
<th>Guest</th>
<th>Reiss</th>
<th>Mehlman</th>
<th>Ripley</th>
<th>Bloomingdale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**BRITAIN STUDY COVERSHEET**

**Today's date** 7/1/1977

**LONDON TIMES**

Page 3 column 5

**MORNING CHRONICLE**

Date 02.14.1977 day 7A

**GENERAL DESCRIPTION:**

1. **VIOLENCE (✓)**
   - property damage ( ), seizure of property, spaces or persons ( ), personal injury (✓), threat of any of the above ( ).

2. **MEETINGS (✓)**
   - Election ( ), Vestry ( ), Livery ( ), Dinner ( ), Political club/party ( ), with petition, address, etc. ( ), opposition to government ( ), support for government ( ).
   - support for enemy of government ( ), control of local government/institution ( ), other grievances and dissatisfactions ( ), opposition to other peoples or groups ( ), objectives unclear ( ), notices, requests (for future meetings) ( ), other (list) ( ).

3-8. **GATHERINGS**
   - demonstrations ( ), parade ( ), assemblies, crowds, mobs (circle one) (✓), gatherings ( ), rallies ( ), special celebrations ( ), other (list) ( ).

9. **DELEGATIONS, DEPUTATIONS ( )**

10. **LABOR ACTIVITIES ( )**
    - strike, turnout ( ), lockout ( ), combination or union mention ( ), threats to stop work ( ), work stoppages ( ), return to work ( ), deputations of workers ( ).

11. **LEGAL ACTIONS (✓)**
    - arrests ( ), examinations (✓), pretrial info. ( ), trials/court actions ( ), sentences, executions, etc. ( ). Be sure to check the appropriate areas above that pertain to the action that brought about the arrest or trial.

Objective of action INJURY INFORMER.

Participants mob

Number 10 Leaders NA

Date Weds 02.06.1978 Duration (if known) one day or less, a few days, more

Location UNION HALL, London, NA

Specific place, inn, field, etc. village or town/city parish

Comments on back? ( ) 4-76, Rev. 4-77 Bobbi/CML

County Middlesex
HATTON-GARDEN.—A respectable looking man, named Shukman, was summoned by the Overseers of St. Pancras, for refusing to maintain his wife, the daughter of Lady Perrott. It appeared that about four years ago, Mr. Sheridan met the lady to whom he was married, at Cheltenham, where she was engaged as a dressmaker, and was in consequence separated. They lived happily together for two years, when Mr. Sheridan having unanswerable proof of his wife’s infidelity, separated from her, taking with him his two children. He stated that his wife was a very dissipated woman, and the fruits of her illiberal intercourses are two children, a boy and a girl, both of whom she had deserted.

The defendant was ordered to pay six shillings a week to his wife, but he said he should appeal to the Sessions.

UNION HALL.—Johnson, the Informer, in Danger—Yesterday being the day appointed for the hearing of the summons issued against the licensed victuallers, whose cases were to have been entered on Wednesday last, but were postponed in consequence of the absence of the Informer, who subsequently laid fresh summons against the defendants, upon representing to the Magistrates that he was fearful of personal violence towards him by the mob that assembled in front of the office on that occasion. At twelve o’clock yesterday, five or six of the restatals of the former occasion, accompanied by a deputation of persons, attempted to catch a glimpse of the Informer. One of the deputation having arrived, and Johnson not making his appearance, it was intimated that he did not intend to appear, but that he would only attend in case of a larger number of persons being present. Shortly after, however, Johnson made his appearance, apparently unharrassed under this threat of danger and alarm. He said, that he had been shamefully treated by the mob, "I was thrown down (and) into the mud, and when down, I was kicked in a most cowardly manner, and the mob of the mob's face was nowhere to be seen by me.

Roots, the father of the plaintiff, deposed as follows:—I was present, when Mr. Stanley examined the wound; but when he came down stairs, he told me that my son would be safe for life, and that I should be well informed as to the matter. The wound was in the hand, and the thumb had been severed. The limb was saved, and the wound was dressed every day. The thumb has been perfectly saved, and there is a great quantity of matter, which has been kept off by the dressings.

The plaintiff did not go to Hampstead, but was carried the return to town on the injured hand, and a bandage was applied to it accordingly. The wound was dressed every day. The thumb has been perfectly saved, and there is a great quantity of matter, which has been kept off by the dressings.

I was present, when Mr. Stanley examined the wound; but when he came down stairs, he told me that my son would be safe for life, and that I should be well informed as to the matter. The wound was in the hand, and the thumb had been severed. The limb was saved, and the wound was dressed every day. The thumb has been perfectly saved, and there is a great quantity of matter, which has been kept off by the dressings.

Mr. Stanley, in his examination of the wound, said that the thumb was saved, and that there was a great quantity of matter, which had been kept off by the dressings.
This list is incomplete, but it includes all the reports which still have any importance. * means extra copies were available on 31 August 1979; these Working Papers are available at cost: 50 cents plus one cent per page ($0.70 cents for a 29-page paper, etc.). Out-of-print Working Papers and other papers for which originals are available can be photocopied at a cost of roughly five cents per page. Request copies of these papers, the list of CRSO Working Papers, or further information about Center activities from: Center for Research on Social Organization, 330 Packard Street, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48109.
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