

CHAPTER 7

BREWERS AND SOCIAL COHESION

In this chapter, one of the key issues explored is the social importance of the brewer. An argument has been developed in this thesis that the Victorian pub was an important agency of social cohesion within urban communities experiencing rapid growth. In the second half of the nineteenth century, more than six hundred pubs and beerhouses in Victorian Norwich were supplied in the main by four family firms of brewers who also owned the great majority of these drinking places. A case can therefore be made that these Norwich brewers – Steward and Patteson, Bullard, Youngs, and Morgan – too played a significant part in the transformation that produced, to repeat Thompson’s argument, ‘a social order’ - in Norwich, as elsewhere - ‘at least roughly appropriate to an urban, industrial, capitalist society’. ¹ In the following pages, an analysis of the social and economic relationship linking the licensed drinking places of Victorian Norwich, their publicans, and these brewing family firms will be presented and an argument developed that brewers, as both local councillors and businessmen, had an important role in helping shape the interface between the urban elite and the working-class majority, not least through their control over the drinking places, and that, in effect, the brewers too acted as agents of social cohesion.

The analysis in this chapter begins by teasing out the national context of an expanding population that stimulated brewers to meet rising demand by supplying more beer. This in turn provided the brewers with the opportunity to gain wealth, power and influence. Even

before the Victorian era, the industrialisation of the brewing of beer was already well established in urban centres, if in varying degrees of intensity.² Although traditionally the Industrial Revolution is associated with radical developments in areas such as textiles and iron, and coal-mining and steam power, a case can be made that developments in the manufacture and retailing of beer were also important features of this revolution.

Industrialisation is always linked with urban developments, and urban growth is always associated with a significant expansion of the drinks trade. Fortunes were made from the dramatic increase in commercial brewing that occurred to meet the extraordinary rise in population and its concentration in urban centres. Supply rose to meet demand. The working classes needed the beer that was brewed for sale in the public houses and beerhouses since it provided a vital dietary liquid³ and it helped satisfy their leisure-time needs⁴.

The question has been asked: 'Was the new industrial society, dedicated to hard work and an increasing precision in its labours, being launched on a torrent of beer?'⁵ It still remains a pertinent question but the paradox is more apparent than real for a significant expansion in the brewing industry was an economic necessity if the needs of the urban working class were to be met. The flood tide of population increase in some areas – like London - required a torrent of beer. In other areas where population figures rose, but less dramatically - as in Norwich - there was still a need for a proportionate increase in the production of beer.⁶

Yet the overall figures for per capita beer consumption in England and Wales from 1800 to 1913 indicate a remarkable consistency over time, with the important exception of the 1860s and the 1870s.⁷ Individuals overall were not drinking significantly more, except in

these two decades when the figures for per capita consumption of beer did rise steeply from an annual average of 31.6 gallons in the early-1860s to an annual average of 40.5 gallons in the late-1870s. This increase in consumption is significant and was most likely caused by an increase in purchasing power exceeding the supply of alternative consumer goods for the working classes. Its effect was to produce deep concern in the ranks of the governing elite at Westminster and in the rest of the country and led to the 'Drink question' becoming a national political issue. In a century when beer remained the staple drink of the working classes, the governing classes needed to feel secure that consumption of this legalised drug was under effective control. The consumption figures from 1800 to 1913 indicate that this aim was satisfied, with the important exception of these two decades.

Historians have perhaps been swayed by the figures for the 1860s and 1870s and not stressed sufficiently the overall evenness in these per capita figures. Setting aside these two decades, the range is relatively narrow and this despite acknowledged periods of pressure on living standards between 1815 and 1845 and the impact of 'counter-attractions' after 1880.⁸ The working-class majority in Victorian society remained dependent on a remarkably consistent dosage of its legalised drug, alcohol, through the beer it drank, for over sixty years. As Richard Wilson observed: '... at least before 1914, beer was not toppled from its place in working-class lives'.⁹ The return to normal levels of consumption from the 1880s would have led to an overall reduction in concerns about social control although the Temperance movement remained influential since the 'Drink question' had now become a political issue.

How much beer did Victorian men and women drink? The annual average of per capita consumption from 1800 to 1913 was 32.38 gallons, around five pints a week.¹⁰ However,

Rowntree and Sherwell presented an even more telling analysis of statistics for the end of the Victorian period. They reckoned that the working class comprised three-quarters of the population and consumed two-thirds of all forms of alcohol. They judged that children under fifteen (35 per cent of the population) did not drink alcohol, and women consumed half the quantity of men, and that abstainers accounted for at least three million in 1899. Whatever their limitations, these are the best-informed assumptions we have and are likely to provide broadly accurate parameters of the national picture. On these bases, Rowntree and Sherwell calculated that in 1899 the average annual adult male consumption was 76 gallons of beer (twelve pints a week). Using the same assumptions, these figures were projected backwards by Richard Wilson and he calculated that the figures in 1844 were 72 gallons (eleven pints a week) and that in the peak year of 1876 they were 103 gallons (sixteen pints a week).¹¹ Emphatically, beer was the national drink and brewers became rich and powerful on its profits.

If historians have underplayed the consistency in the per capita consumption figures for beer, they have also neglected to emphasise the fact that urbanisation in itself did not lead to an increase in beer consumption. Urbanisation, as a concomitant of industrialisation and the growth of towns, provided the context for the consumption of beer in the Victorian period – but men and women did not drink more because they were urban dwellers. In 1830, most people still lived in rural areas and the annual averages per capita consumption of beer for England and Wales was 33.8 gallons for the period 1830-34. By the end of the century, when around 80 per cent of the population were living in urban areas, the annual average per capita consumption of beer for England and Wales was still almost unchanged at 34.5 gallons for the period 1895-99.¹² Clearly, the consumption of beer was a cultural

tradition established prior to urbanisation and with respect to the amount drunk remained largely unaltered by that process.

Most significantly, however, the phenomenal rise in population in England and Wales – from 8.9 million in 1801 to 17.9 million in 1851 to 32.5 million in 1901 – did provide what Richard Wilson has called ‘a crucial opening for the brewing industry’.¹³ The London beer trade provided extraordinary opportunities for brewers in the fifty years after 1830 with the eleven leading London brewers reaping the profits from a trebling of their output as the population grew by 150 per cent, a rate twice that achieved in the rest of England and Wales.¹⁴ The Staffordshire town of Burton-upon-Trent in west central England became noted for its breweries. In 1830 Burton-upon-Trent had two leading brewing families, Bass and Allsop, but its seven or eight breweries together only produced 50,000 barrels a year. However, by 1900 the town was established as the ‘capital of brewing’ with twenty-one brewing firms producing a combined output of 3,500,000 barrels, around 10 per cent of U.K. beer production.¹⁵ Production outside London and Burton – always called ‘country brewing’¹⁶ - remained stable in terms of numbers of brewers between 1840 and 1880 and then declined by just under a third in the next twenty years. However, these figures mask the fact that a minority of individual provincial breweries did experience a great increase in output during the Victorian era. In 1834, only about eight provincial breweries were producing more than 40,000 barrels of strong beer a year. By 1884, 137 provincial breweries were brewing between 30,000 and 100,000 barrels a year, and thirty more had achieved an output of over 100,000 barrels.¹⁷ The analysis of Norwich country brewers needs to be made in the context of these national trends.

This analysis also needs to take into account more general developments in the national economy. In the 1870s and 1880s, after a century of rapid growth both for individual firms and the economy as a whole, competition in the manufacturing sector was still strong. Most industries had a multiplicity of what by today's standards would be considered small firms, with the largest 100 firms accounting for less than 10 per cent of the market in contrast to their 40 per cent share a hundred years later. However, as the nineteenth century drew to a close, the impetus to higher concentration became marked in a significant number of industries, including brewing, due in part to changes in the technical basis of production and in the nature of market demand, and in part to changes in the framework of corporate law.¹⁸

Capital needs had already led to the development of partnerships in a number of industries before the mid-century. However, before these could develop further into a more modern form of corporate enterprise institutional changes, both in company law and in stock exchange practice, were necessary. The foundation for these changes were laid between 1844 and 1856 when first joint stock companies and then limited liability companies were sanctioned by law, but it was not until the success of the conversion of the brewers, Guinness, in 1886 that public demand for issues of shares in manufacturing really took off. Between 1885 and 1907 the number of firms in domestic manufacturing and distribution with quotations on the London stock exchange grew from only sixty to almost 600. At the same time, mergers were also becoming more commonplace as part of this trend towards industrial concentration and higher capitalisation.¹⁹

Within brewing, partnerships effectively steered the industry through the remarkable growth period of the 1860s and early-1870s. Such partnerships, particularly in the south

and east of the country, ploughed surplus profits into the acquisition of public houses since these tied houses had a high value as investments and collateral for securing further capital.²⁰ Also, as Richard Wilson has argued, acquisition served ‘both to protect licences and to ensure their own reputation. An estate of good tied houses underlined the good management of a brewery in its widest sense’.²¹ Achieving effective relations with the police and magistrates through such good management was important, not least in the battle against an increasingly significant temperance lobby that had gained a measure of support from the Liberal government between 1868 and 1874 and in particular secured the passing of the unpopular Licensing Act in 1872. In these circumstances, breweries had a special interest in managing their tied public houses well.

In Norwich, the longevity of service of a significant number of publicans indicates the success of the breweries in both their original selection and then the maintenance of an effective business relationship with these key figures in the interface between the urban elite and the working classes.²² The commercial success of the Norwich breweries in establishing chains of tied houses under their ownership and control, and then ensuring publican stability in running them, helped further reinforce the social cohesion that had already been developed through the agencies of the public houses and beerhouses. It would be surprising if these patterns of publican stability and longevity in licence holding were not repeated elsewhere in the country where breweries were developing tighter control over their retail outlets.

With hindsight, the position of the brewer in Victorian society looks, in general, unassailable. Successful partnerships had helped maximise profits during the period of economic growth up to the mid-seventies and continued to serve the needs of the industry

well through a couple of decades of generally steady profitability, albeit at less inflated figures. The conversion of brewery ownership to limited liability status from the mid-eighties then completed the transition to an effective modern form of corporate enterprise. Yet the breweries constantly seem to have felt under threat from the Temperance lobby. The conflict between the Drink interest and those who offered an alternative prescription for social harmony had very deep roots.²³ Gladstone's defeat in 1874 may have been a signal victory for the Drink interest but the brewing insecurities soon returned.²⁴ By 1880, the Liberal party under Gladstone was back in power and its radical, non-conformist, teetotal wing was regarded as an enemy that would seek revenge for its defeat in 1874. A pre-election leading article in the *Licensed Victuallers Gazette* in March 1880 caught the fear of the Drink lobby:

'No doubt at the last General Election (1874) the Conservative party was largely indebted to the publicans, and it is possible that the Liberals, smarting from the idea that they had alienated the Trade, when they are returned to power may attempt a retaliatory measure'.²⁵

Brewers had been sounding the alarms in the face of the 'temperance threat' even as they were experiencing a period of sustained growth before the late-seventies. With the general economic recession that saw beer output decline by some 18 per cent from its peak in 1876 to its trough in 1883, those fears may have appeared more substantial. Yet such anxieties were groundless in the longer-term. The success of the Guinness conversion in 1886 and the return of prosperity paved the way for the solution of these problems and during the years from 1886 to 1900 all the bigger brewery partnerships became limited liability companies. The largest of these raised capital on the stock exchange to modernise their breweries and, critically, further enlarge their estates of tied freehold and leasehold public houses. By 1906, 307 brewery companies were publicly quoted. Inevitably, smaller

partnerships became vulnerable to mergers through which they were incorporated into the larger breweries.²⁶

Brewers had emerged as powerful figures in the Victorian industrial and social world because, above all, they were wealthy. The capital that underpinned their status had been accumulated and protected with diligence and skill, even if the market opportunities provided by an expanding population and a population already dependent on alcohol were not of their making. It might therefore be reasoned that the pinnacle of their power would coincide with the increase in industrial concentration towards the end of the nineteenth century. Since the brewers comprised the elite in an evermore heavily concentrated industry they may therefore have been in a stronger position to shape patterns of consumption and drinking and working class life in general. The idea is tempting, but in practice the reverse seems to have been the case in Norwich – and arguably, by extension, in the rest of the country too. At a time when the four leading Norwich breweries were following the national trend towards heavier concentration through launching themselves as limited liability companies, other developments in Victorian society and politics were serving to limit the degree of power and influence they had undoubtedly wielded previously during the nineteenth century.

The move towards limited liability status made sound financial sense for the Norwich breweries. All four were able to hold their own through the more troubled years in the first decades of the twentieth century. Morgan's, the smallest and therefore perhaps the most vulnerable of the four breweries, was the first to follow the limited liability path, becoming a public company in March 1887, the year after the success of the Guinness flotation.²⁷ The challenge and opportunity was then taken up in quick succession by the other three

breweries from 1895, with family members becoming significant shareholders. In March 1895, Bullard's formed itself into a private limited liability company.²⁸ Steward, Patteson, Finch & Co. were next in July 1895 when the partners converted their business into limited liability form.²⁹ Youngs became a limited liability company in 1897.³⁰ In effect, an important section of the Norwich urban elite – the members of its families who owed their wealth directly to the brewing industry – had further consolidated their family fortunes.

As the brewing families moved towards a new corporate identity, at the same time ensuring that the financial benefits of the shift to limited liability status were kept as much as possible within their own ranks, they seem to have felt less inclined to involve themselves in time-consuming public life. In any event, the generation of those brewing families that had had a strong sense of social responsibility, allied with a sharp instinct for their own business interests, and who had made sense of their lives through participation in local government, was now reaching its end.³¹ These developments were also occurring at a time when the nature of local government itself was undergoing change, leading to a more effective professionalism in response to pressing social problems.³² In addition, the expansion of alternative leisure activities seemed to some to be diminishing the pivotal role of drink in the social world, although within Norwich these 'counter-attractions' still tended to be embedded in the traditional drinking culture.³³ For these reasons, the era of the brewer-politician was coming to an end. The influence of the Norwich brewing families within the urban elite and directly over the working classes through the local government of Norwich was less marked in the new century than it had been during the nineteenth century.

Having briefly outlined the national context of an expanding population and rising demand for beer, and the general developments in the national economy and the evolution of limited liability, the focus of the argument can now shift to concentrate on the role of brewers, as both local councillors and businessmen, in helping shape the interface between the urban elite and the working classes. The heyday of the Norwich brewers in the affairs of local government had indeed lasted for most of Victoria's reign and there were sound business reasons for their involvement, as well as the attractions of civic status and their sense of duty and social responsibility. An expanding market needed oversight and protection. In 1869, a contemporary survey described the brewing business in Norwich as 'greatly extending' and estimated that:

'Messrs. Patteson and Co. produce 100,000 barrels of ale and beer yearly; Messrs. Bullard, 60,000; Messrs. Morgan, 30,000; Messrs. Young and Co., and other brewers, about 40,000. The annual value of their productions is at least £500,000.'³⁴

Even allowing for some inflation in these figures, the four leading Norwich breweries were amongst those contributing to that great increase in output from a minority of provincial breweries that had been noted already.³⁵ The population increase in Norwich that supplied the demand for beer was less dramatic than in some areas but still significant: in 1801, the population of Norwich was around 36,000; in 1851, 68,000; in 1901, 112,000.³⁶

Involvement in local government, to put it crudely, was a sensible business move for brewers giving more control over consumers and consumption.

Two Norwich brewers, in particular, emerged as most significant figures within the urban elite during the Victorian period: Henry Staniforth Patteson and Sir Harry Bullard. Both became mayors of Norwich, Patteson between 1862-63 and Bullard three times, 1878-79, 1879-80, and 1886-1887. The office of mayor could not be undertaken lightly. A substantial private income was needed for maintaining office and to meet the high cost of

entertainment.³⁷ This condition of office posed no problem for either Patteson or Bullard, third and second-generation brewers respectively.

Henry Staniforth Patteson (1816-98) had been born in Norwich, the son of John Staniforth Patteson and the grandson of the founder of the Pockthorpe brewery, John Patteson II. Educated at North Walsham Grammar School and trained in malting between 1836-38 by Messrs. Taylor & Son of Bishop's Stortford, Henry played a key role within the new partnership at Pockthorpe set up in 1838 especially after the death of Peter Finch in 1852. When Timothy Steward died in 1858 he was left, for a time, in sole command.³⁸ For the next forty years, as the brewery continued to prosper, Henry Staniforth Patteson's activity within Norwich public life was various and influential.

Patteson served as sheriff in 1858-59 as well as mayor in 1862-63, and had become a deputy-lieutenant of Norfolk and a magistrate in 1859. In the expanding and lucrative field of insurance, he served as a director of the Norwich Union Fire Society from 1848, as its vice-president from 1874-1877, and finally as its president from 1877 until his death in 1898.³⁹ He was also on the board of the Norwich & London Accident Insurance Association from its formation in 1856 and the General Hailstorm Insurance Society from 1862. Appreciating no doubt to some degree the link between water supply and beer production⁴⁰, he became a director and then chairman of the Norwich Waterworks Co. He was also an enthusiastic member of the Church of England Young Men's Society and his association with the Establishment was completed by his lifelong support for the Conservative party, becoming the leader of the Norwich Conservatives in 1895 on the unexpected death of Colonel Bignold.⁴¹ That same year, the prospectus for the limited liability company formed from the Steward and Patteson partnership revealed that it owned

447 public houses. Of these 136 were in Norwich. With beerhouses and the tied houses of the Swaffham brewery, purchased later in 1895, included, the grand total reached 580.⁴² With each drinking place displaying the company title, there would have been few names of gentlemen better known than that of Patteson in Norwich and the surrounding areas.

Bullard, however, would have been such a name. Harry Bullard (1841-1903) was a son of Richard Bullard (1808-1864), a publican-brewer who had entered the trade in 1837 and launched a brewery at St. Miles Bridge, Coslany.⁴³ Knighted in 1886, Sir Harry Bullard 'was probably the best known of all Norwich citizens of his time'. When he won the Norwich parliamentary seat in 1885 - (before being disqualified on a petition alleging his agent's bribery) – Harry Bullard was described by his local party leader, Colonel Charles Bignold, as:

'... one of the most distinguished of our citizens, one who had filled the highest civic offices and endeared himself to all, both Whigs, and our most distinguished enemies the Radicals.'⁴⁴

He was successfully returned to Parliament in 1890 and 1895 as a Conservative, the party he had joined in November 1872 after leaving the Liberals in protest at the passing of the Licensing Act.⁴⁵ For Harry Bullard, the move to Westminster was a natural extension of his commitment to protect the interest of the family brewery through active involvement in politics, both local and national, as well as local government.

In 1895, when Bullard's became a limited liability company, they controlled 441 public houses all carrying the family name, 121 in Norwich and 320 elsewhere in East Anglia.⁴⁶ Like 'Patteson', the name of 'Bullard' was likely to have penetrated deep into the minds of the working class in Norwich. The Bullard family history had a 'rags to riches' message. Through the brewing and selling of beer, Sir Harry's father, Richard Bullard, had become

socially mobile. Here was tangible evidence that there were escape routes from the working class world of courts and alleys. I have already introduced the argument that the concept of ‘paternalism’ is important in making sense of the Victorian period and provides a valuable insight into what is central to this thesis – the idea of an interface between two broad groupings, the urban elite and the working class, within the polity of Norwich. This is an interface between those who, as leaders of society, had a sense of ‘duty’ to the less fortunate, and those who, as members of a working class referred to as ‘the lower orders’, were expected to show deference to their social ‘superiors’.⁴⁷ The Bullard family story would have carried powerful messages at that interface, bringing a measure of mythic hope and comfort to many of the drinking working classes. Social mobility made possible through the media of brewing and drink could serve as a cohesive force demonstrating the elasticity of ‘the upper orders’ well before the extension of the franchise.

The elder Bullard was born in obscurity in the back streets of the Norwich parish of St. John Maddermarket.⁴⁸ By 1837, he had formed a brewing partnership with James Watts; ten years later it was dissolved, leaving the more enthusiastic Richard Bullard to reap the rewards of an expanding business until his death in 1864. Already, by 1844, he had become a councillor. Here was a man who within the limits of his social origins had done rather well for himself and his family. One obituary in a local newspaper read:

‘The deceased ... sprang from very humble life. By industry and constant application, he ... steadily raised himself to a foremost position amongst the traders of his city. Had he possessed the advantage of a good education, his name would have been more prominent in city affairs, but the sense of his deficiency in this respect kept him back.’⁴⁹

Richard Bullard’s wealth ensured that his son, Harry, did get a good education. By the time of his father’s death, Harry Bullard, in his early twenties, was ready to begin his career as a brewer and public figure that matched and then surpassed that of Patteson.

The human virtues that others praised in Sir Harry Bullard were those associated with his father too. Another obituary in 1864 had observed that Richard Bullard, a Liberal in politics, was never ‘a grinder of the orphans, a despoiler of the widow, a bully to the poor, or a toady to the rich’. Harry Bullard was sent to a private school in East Dereham and then completed his education by learning the wine business at Messrs. J.K. Hooper and Sons in London. He remained a key personality in the various family partnerships from 1864 until the change to limited liability status in 1894, and still dominated the new firm until his death in 1902.⁵⁰ His membership of the urban elite had had less to do with election than adoption; his son wrote:

‘...his (Harry Bullard’s) career having been carefully watched by the council it was considered that my father ought to take part in municipal affairs’.

In 1867, Harry Bullard was returned as a Liberal, like his father, to the town council with another Norwich brewer, A.M.F. Morgan.⁵¹

Once active within this elite, Harry Bullard not only advanced his own standing and that of his firm, but also formed part of the phalanx of brewers in local government and politics intent on defending the interests of Drink against any Temperance attack. It was H.S. Patteson who nominated him as sheriff in 1877, A.M.F. Morgan who seconded the nomination. As sheriff, he addressed the 1878 annual dinner of the Norwich and Norfolk Licensed Victuallers Association at the Norfolk Hotel, speaking of the ‘... generally admirable way in which the licence holders in the City conducted their houses’ and quoting Lord Shaftesbury to the effect that:

‘Brewers and Licensed Victuallers were to be found prominently amongst those who did their best to promote the moral and social improvement of the people.’⁵²

Queen Victoria’s golden jubilee in 1887 coincided with the fiftieth anniversary celebrations of the firm of Bullard’s and was also the occasion for Sir Harry, the brewery,

and the city of Norwich to join together in celebrating his recent knighthood.⁵³ It seems that the brewer and the brewery had become part of the social fabric of the city. By the time of Victoria's death in 1901, Sir Harry's promotion of the family business had developed an international dimension. He was chairman of the Milwaukee and Chicago brewery in the U.S.A. to which he had made five journeys since 1885, and also of Ohlsson's Brewery in South Africa that he had visited three times since 1890.⁵⁴ Drink, public houses, publicans, and brewers too: all played their part as forces helping social cohesion. The Bullard story – from Maddermarket squalor to international fortune – would have been inspirational to many in the working classes and helpful in developing respect for a social order in which such transformations were possible.

In an expanding city like Norwich, the financial management of the four leading breweries was likely to benefit from representation within and access to the significant agencies of civic government. Harry Bullard and Henry Patteson served on various committees in local government as did other members of the main brewing families in Norwich. As we have seen, the brewers were particularly concerned with the linked issues of water supply, sewerage disposal, and public facilities on the one hand, and public order on the other.⁵⁵ Both areas were of importance for brewers intent on protecting their business interests, as well as serving whatever they might define as the public good.

The brewer-politicians were concerned not only with the wider issues of public health and public order but also with the more mundane detail of local government that could effect their businesses and profits. Once the appointment of the Paving, Sewage, Cleansing and Lighting Committee of the Norwich Board of Health had been made in June 1853, the brewing interest was soon apparent. In September of that year, the Committee had received

a letter from the brewers, Youngs, Crawshay, Youngs of King Street: ‘... calling attention to the Pathway in Mariners’ Lane and the want of Gas Lamps’. Such a concern for the environs of their own brewery was understandable and by June of the following year John Youngs himself was a member of the Committee, remaining active as a brewer-councillor for the next three decades.⁵⁶ In 1855, he was one of seven councillors at a special meeting of the committee to consider the London Street development at which ‘Mr. Morgan attended’ - (it is unclear from the minute which member of the brewing family this was) - and secured a favourable compensation deal.⁵⁷ No evidence of hostile competition between the Norwich brewers has emerged in the course of this research; on the contrary, at times as in this instance, there is an indication of mutual assistance. Each brewer in local government represented not only his nominal electorate but also the interests of his own firm – and the interests of the Norwich brewing industry in general.

The case has already been argued that the wider effectiveness of the various committees set up within local government in response to a central government concern about the living conditions of the poor was very limited.⁵⁸ Brewer-councillors, like the other ‘civic fathers’, in practice did little to alleviate fundamentally the urban crisis. They did however tend to get what they wanted from membership of the Council and its Committees. By 1857, John Youngs had been joined on the sub-committee of the Board of Health by Richard Bullard and the two brewers were amongst the nine members of the committee meeting in 1857 that granted Youngs’ application on behalf of his firm for planning permission to bring forward the intended new building line of the estate just purchased by the brewery in King Street so there could be a continuous line with the existing part of the brewery.⁵⁹

In the 1860s, John Youngs was prominent within another sub-committee of the Norwich Board of Health (that is, the Town Council) – the Sanitary Purposes Committee. So too were the brewers Arthur J. Morgan and John B. Morgan who in 1862 comprised half the membership of a sub-committee appointed to consider the question of compulsory vaccination together with the Guardians. At the same meeting when they were appointed, they and the other six councillors present were responsible for the following order:

‘... that the Water Supply of the Drinking Fountains be stopped with the exception of those on the Castle Hill and at the Guildhall on Saturdays’.⁶⁰

No explanation was given. It is tempting to suggest that water as an alternative drink to beer or spirits would not be over-encouraged. Water, however, was a vital part of the brewing process and although the Norwich brewers would have drawn their main supplies from private deep wells, the risk of contamination remained a matter of concern. Arthur Morgan, in calling attention in 1856 to the ‘bad supply of water at Trowse’ and the ‘bad state of the River as far as Lakenham Mills’, was raising an issue for the economic health of the brewing industry as well as the public health of the citizens of Norwich. In 1866, John Youngs was a member of the sub-committee set up to find a solution to the problem of diverting sewerage from the river Wensum.⁶¹ Yet it was to take another generation before such problems began to receive an appropriate and adequately funded response from professional local government officials as opposed to amateurs with vested interests, however well intentioned, like brewer-councillors.

The Council continued their search through the seventies, without success, for a solution to the water, drainage and sewerage problems of Norwich and brewer-councillors were again prominent. John Youngs, Harry Bullard and Arthur Morgan were active in the Sewerage and Irrigation Committee of the Board of Health, set up in 1870. As the Council argued

about the merits and costs of various schemes, there are glimpses in the minutes of the Committee of what it meant to live or run a business in a city with leaking sewers and inadequate drainage. In 1872, the City Surveyor was requested 'to inspect the engine house at Mr. Youngs' brewery and ascertain the cause of the stench there'.⁶² Whatever the outcome of that initiative, elsewhere in the city the Council was failing to cope adequately with the sewerage crisis. So much committee time was spent to so little effect dealing with the relatively trivial issue of the sewerage contamination of Harriet Martineau's well at Trowse.⁶³ At the same time as John Youngs was claiming that Norwich could not be described as negligent in sanitary matters, the city was clearly being overwhelmed by its own detritus.⁶⁴

John Youngs belonged, as did the other gentlemen brewers, to a generation that was resistant to the spending of rates-payers' money on Westminster initiatives, and purblind to the appalling living conditions of the working class. A provincial suspicion of State intervention was not likely to have been particular to Norwich, but its degree of entrenchment and resistance to new perspectives lasted as long as the lifetime of a particular generation of councillors, a significant number of whom were brewers. Harry Bullard was the last in the substantial line of such brewer-councillors in Norwich.⁶⁵ As his spheres of influence widened from 1885 to embrace the politics of Westminster and new overseas brewery concerns, so the perspectives in Norwich civic life were widening. Sir Peter Eade towards the end of his life had been able to see this shift in outlook and conscience within the polity of Norwich.⁶⁶ For the working classes of the city it was a change long overdue. A central argument in this chapter is that the brewers were agents of social cohesion; the public houses that the brewers owned and supplied with drink did help

many of the poor make sense of their lives and living conditions. Yet it was the failure of a generation and more of councillors that included brewers that had contributed to their distress. In the end, the forces working towards social harmony and a ‘social order at least roughly appropriate to an urban, industrial capitalist society’ did succeed, but there were many socially divisive forces to overcome before something approaching equilibrium was reached.⁶⁷

In the sphere of public order, the other main area of local government with which the brewer-councillors concerned themselves, their effectiveness as agents of social cohesion through their measure of control over policing was in the end clear. They were directly concerned with the issue of public order for longer than with public health. Indeed, one generation of brewer-councillors had in part failed to achieve their aims before another generation began from the 1870s to develop the insights that brought them much closer to success.⁶⁸

In direct response to the requirements of the Municipal Corporations Act, the Norwich Police Force had been established in 1836 under the authority of the Watch Committee.⁶⁹ It became one of the most powerful of the Council’s sub-committees. From its inception, the brewer-councillor Peter Finch acted as a dominant influence until his death in 1852, shaping the policing and control of the working classes of Norwich.⁷⁰ It was with Peter Finch as chairman that a meeting of the fifteen-strong Watch Committee agreed in March 1836 to set up a sub-committee ‘... to draw out a scale of fees for apprehensions, and other business’ and it was ‘at Mr. Finch’s house on Monday next at 7 ... Town Clerk to attend’ that this sub-committee of Finch and three others was to meet. Shortly after, the full Watch

Committee decided to meet weekly on Friday.⁷¹ All the urban elite, but perhaps brewers in particular, had vested interests in keeping a constant eye on public order and the maintenance of social cohesion.

This weekly pattern of attendance shaped not only the remaining sixteen years of Peter Finch's life but the lives of other brewer-councillors after him, such as Richard Bullard, Arthur Morgan, John Youngs, and Harry Bullard. It was so important for the brewers to feel they had a measure of control over the people who drank the beer they brewed, the public houses themselves, and the organization responsible for policing drink. This area of public order was probably seen by them as even more vital than their involvement in the issues of public facilities like water supply, sewerage, and drainage, since it could directly affect their retail trade through the endorsement or refusal of licences.⁷² Moreover, the brewers were conscious from the 1830s of what in effect became a war between them and the Temperance cause. Therefore public image and reputation were of increasing importance. The brewers needed to have their finger on the pulse of the new policing and its contact with the drinkers, who the brewers supplied, and the drinking places, most of which they owned. For this complex blend of reasons, the role of the Watch Committee and its Police Force was a vital aspect of the interface between the urban elite and the working class in Norwich, an interface in which brewer-councillors played a key part.

Peter Finch was at the forefront of the Watch Committee's struggle with the problem of drunkenness in its own Police Force.⁷³ He was in the Chair in 1841 on the occasion of the purge of the day police when three were dismissed as inefficient, eight were given warning to be strictly attentive to their duties in future or face discharge, and eight were generally

admonished. Just over half of the day police of thirty-seven men had been found to be inefficient in varying degrees.⁷⁴ Problems of drunkenness may well have been at the roots of the Watch Committee's anxiety. Many in the police were unlikely to have curbed the habits of excessive drinking associated with their class, yet the reluctance at this stage to make explicit the connection between inefficiency and drunkenness may have been due to Peter Finch's desire to protect the good name of beer.

By 1844, Richard Bullard had become a councillor, a regular member of the Watch Committee, and like Peter Finch intent upon not only eliminating drunkenness from the Norwich Police Force but also presenting a favourable image of that Force's sobriety to the 'respectable' classes of Norwich. In 1848, Bullard was one of the five members present at the Watch meeting when it was unanimously resolved:

'... to make application (to the *Norfolk Chronicle*) for the names of the "Town Councillors" who are reported ... as having been heard to charge the Police with having been drunk ... in order that this Committee may give to such members of the Town Council an opportunity of substantiating their charges if well founded'.⁷⁵

The issue came to nothing, but it is indicative of tensions within the urban elite itself over the issue of drink, and serves to highlight the brewers' need to maintain a good image for their product and minimise the adverse consequences of its inebriating nature. The brewing industry was likely to have been one of the earliest market-leaders in business history to make good public relations a matter of policy. Brewer membership of the Town Council and its important sub-committees was one important means to that end. The pervasiveness of the culture of drinking through all ranks in the Norwich Police Force would have been a source of intense frustration to the likes of Peter Finch and Richard Bullard. The idea that brewers had a measure of responsibility for drunkenness in society was gaining increasing currency.⁷⁶

By the mid-1850s, following the death of Peter Finch in 1852, Richard Bullard was joined on the Watch Committee by two other brewers, John Youngs and Arthur Morgan. The public-relations problem they faced within the urban elite is indicated in the deputation of the inhabitants of St. Stephens that attended the Committee in 1856, led by the Rev. Evans:

‘... on the subject of the disorderly and immoral practices which they alleged were allowed to take place in various public houses (in their parish) ... and which the Police neglected their duty in not suppressing’.

They cited in particular the case of the ‘Rose’ public house where music and dancing were allowed to take place on a Sunday evening. After a full investigation, the Committee ruled unanimously that the charge was not proved and neglect of duty by the police was unfounded. After the disaffected St. Stephens’ residents had taken the matter to the full Council, the Chief Constable was later to report that the ‘the magistrates had dismissed the Information against the Rose’. Since the ‘Rose’ was a Bullard public house, this was an issue especially close to the interests of the Bullard family and one they would have been pleased to see resolved in their favour.⁷⁷

The problem of drunkenness within the Norwich Police was reduced from the early 1870s when there was a significant change in the approach of the Committee to its policemen, following the decision to allow moderate drinking of alcohol by police on duty. Since Harry Bullard, John Youngs, and the wine-victualler and public house proprietor Philip Back were present at the meeting of thirteen Watch Committee members when this was agreed, it seems that this new generation of brewers was prepared to think in a radical new way and in so doing take a significant step towards easing the problem that had defeated the Committee for the previous three and a half decades. Less than a handful of cases of inebriate policemen came before the Watch Committee in each year of the remaining three

decades of the Victorian period.⁷⁸ Progress towards a better ordered and more professional police force was clearly being made in these decades, and this in itself can be seen as both a cause and an effect of increasing social cohesion.

Yet whatever the new pragmatism evident in this instance, in other respects there was still resistance to change. Harry Bullard's generation of brewers were as opposed as any before to a weakening of the hierarchical structures in society that demanded deference from those in the 'lower orders'. Bullard was present as a member of the Watch Committee in 1873 that found P.C. Caleb Page guilty of insubordination when he sought the removal of an adverse report on himself from the Occurrence book and then dismissed him from the Force. Bullard was also present more than a decade later in 1886 to accept P.C. John Easton's confession of regret as his price for being made a sergeant.⁷⁹

It was also the case that political developments at the national level, from the election of Gladstone's Liberal ministry (1868-74) through to the end of the Victorian era and beyond, were serving to emphasise such conservatism. When Harry Bullard, his brother Charles, and brother-in-law John Boyce, crossed the chamber floor of Norwich Council in 1872 to join the Conservatives, it was symptomatic of a pressure that was driving most brewers into the ranks of the Conservative Party if they were not there already. The radical wing of the Liberals was so identified with non-conformity, temperance and teetotalism that it had become for almost all brewers a denial of the interests of the brewing family and firm to stay within the Liberal Party.⁸⁰

For brewers of Harry Bullard's generation, the threat posed by temperance and especially teetotalism seemed the more daunting because it had become linked with Liberal doctrines. The last three decades of the Victorian period saw an intensification in the war between the 'Trade' – as those within the drink industry termed themselves – and those in the Temperance movement who saw drink as responsible for poverty and human suffering. This battlefield can be mapped through a study of the *Licensed Victuallers Gazette* that first appeared in July 1872 as a weekly newspaper.⁸¹ In a leading article the following week, the issue of licensing was presented as:

'... now among the foremost social questions of the day, ... aggravated into an undue and unhealthy prominence by being made the "Shibboleth" of a persecuting puritanical minority of meddling legislative Tinkers'.

In 1879, its readers were told:

'We are on the eve of great and important movements affecting the trade ... The value of your property will depend upon your unity, and the strength with which you resist your enemies'.

After the general election of 1900, the leader read:

'The unshaken Tory majority in the House of Commons means that the Trade will not be harassed with vexatious, unjust, and injurious legislative propositions emanating from the Government benches ...'.⁸²

The brewers and the 'Trade' in general on the one hand, and the Temperance movement on the other, had in effect become polarised rivals for the moral high ground in Victorian society.⁸³

Achieving good order within the police force was an essential goal, as part of the brewers' own crusade to win support in this battle with the Temperance movement. It was also a prerequisite for the wider aim of achieving good order and social cohesion throughout society. For Norwich brewers, as for the 'Trade' everywhere, it was a powerful, indeed

conclusive argument to register the progress towards a more sober, more ordered society as each decade passed. Harry Bullard as mayor and Donald Steward as sheriff proudly drew attention to the statistics published in the House of Lords Select Committee *Report on Intemperance* in 1879 that indicated that Norwich had the least per capita drunkenness in the country despite having the most per capita drinking places.⁸⁴ In reality, although drunkenness did become less of a problem in Norwich during the later Victorian period, there were still significant public order and public health issues associated with the consumption of drink that the brewers found difficult to acknowledge.⁸⁵

Even so, more professional approaches to the problems of urban government, combined with improvements in working conditions, were having an ameliorative effect at the close of the Victorian period. The withdrawal of most Norwich brewers from civic life was occurring at a time when such 'progress' in society was being recognised and celebrated.⁸⁶ This improvement may have been due, at least in part, to the fact that they, as amateurs, were no longer so directly involved in local government. However, to make this claim is not to deny the genuineness of the brewing families' concern to be seen as helping in the progress towards a more ordered society. They devoted much time to their civic duties. Such commitment, nevertheless, was not at the expense of ensuring that their businesses were run efficiently and profitably and it is to this area of brewing activity – the efficient management of the firm and the development and control of its retail trade – that the analysis in this chapter now shifts. If they were to be effective agents of social cohesion, acting through the interface of the public house, the brewers needed to be efficient as business enterprises.

This final section of the chapter opens with a study of the already published analysis of the development of Steward and Patteson as an efficient business enterprise presented by Terry Gourvish.⁸⁷ This outline will serve as a link to my own analysis of hitherto neglected archival material relating to the development of the Bullard's brewing firm. It is particularly fortunate that so much material relating to both the early and later management of the Anchor brewery of Bullard's has survived.⁸⁸ My study suggests patterns of growth and effective management for Bullard's that are similar to those for Steward and Patteson.

Gourvish argued that the period 1837-80 was one of growth and consolidation for Steward, Patteson, Finch & Co. The merger with Peter Finch's brewery in 1837 brought around fifty-five more public houses, forty of which were in Norwich, making a total of about 250 retail outlets within the Pockthorpe chain of control. Gourvish estimated that there was around a 70:30 split in the Norwich and Norfolk share of these drinking places. By 1845, the company owned no less than 183 outlets, around a third of the total of 558 recorded for Norwich. Steward, Patteson, Finch & Co. had used this substantial city base to develop a trade out into the hinterland of Norfolk as far as this was viable. Their policy of acquisition and merger was signalled for instance by the purchase of part of the Coltishall brewery and its tied houses in 1841.⁸⁹ However, since beer never improved with travel, prior to the railway age most brewers had to rely upon local distribution networks that naturally limited their market reach. Richard Wilson has suggested that in the pre-railway age it was unlikely that:

'...all the Norwich breweries put together sold more than a few score barrels outside Norfolk and north Suffolk before the 1850s'.⁹⁰

With the coming of the railways, there was the most dramatic expansion in the size and range of the brewery's market. The opening of the Norwich and Yarmouth railway in 1844 seems to have stimulated the lease of twenty-two public houses from the Gorleston brewery and the purchase of a Yarmouth brewery with twenty-five tied houses both in 1845. The Pockthorpe management also responded to these new developments by reorganising the brewery in Norwich and renewing its brewing equipment at the same time as rail links with Cambridge and London were established in 1845. By 1849, the rail link with Ipswich was in place.⁹¹ These changes in the transport infrastructure in the late-1840s widened significantly the brewery's viable distribution network and it is a mark of their business acumen that the opportunity was seized to such effect.

By 1863, the company had established agencies in London, Colchester, Ipswich, and Plymouth, in addition to Yarmouth. Twenty of the public houses leased in Gorleston were purchased in 1866, the Reepham brewery with its fifty pubs was bought in 1878, and there was a steady expansion in the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, including the acquisition of about a dozen outlets in King's Lynn and a similar number in Ipswich. The new partnership of 1863 made Henry Staniforth Patteson the senior managing partner, and Donald and Walter Steward junior managing partners, and this team was able to continue the expansion of the brewery in the favourable market conditions.⁹² Brewers such as Henry Staniforth Patteson and Donald Steward, like Peter Finch in the previous generation, achieved high social standing in part through the profitability of their brewery and their managerial success. Within Norwich, however, without any diminution in the influence of the Steward, Patteson, Finch & Co. brewery, there was actually a contraction of the number of their public houses from 183 in 1845 to 147 in 1867. By 1893, the number had

fallen further to 140.⁹³ Yet the total number of public houses in the Steward & Patteson Ltd. chain in 1897 was 656, with 528 owned and 128 leased.⁹⁴ The split in the share between the city and the rest of the brewery's retail market had been transformed in the previous fifty years.

Gourvish argued that this widening of the retail trade and the acquisition of new property outside Norwich began to stretch the resources of the partners and saw the brewery approaching the limits to further growth, thus bringing about one of the necessary conditions for the move to limited liability in 1895.⁹⁵ The threat of falling demand, as 'counter attractions' developed for the working classes, and anxiety over government restrictions on licensing and higher taxation of the brewing industry combined to concentrate attention on improving both efficiency in production and also beer quality. New brewing plant, and expertise in producing pale ales, filtered bottled beer, and mineral waters as well as traditional products, became essential. The costs in improving standards of comfort in urban drinking places were rising too. In these circumstances, one means by which investment problems could be overcome, as Gourvish concludes, was through acquiring limited liability status and 'raising capital through the issue of debentures'.⁹⁶

Since local competitors facing similar market challenges were responding by taking this path to limited liability public company status, Steward, Patteson, Finch & Co. had little choice but to follow suit. In any event, over the next twenty years, the company's data suggest that the firm more than held its own, although as we have seen the next generation of gentlemen brewers declined the high-profile public role of their Victorian predecessors.⁹⁷

The patterns of growth and effective management for Bullard's during the Victorian period are similar, with the period 1837-1880 clearly one of growth and consolidation, and indeed this pattern seems to continue for Bullard's through to the change to limited liability status in 1895 and beyond. Effective management and business vision in response to market demand and opportunity must have underpinned the remarkable early expansion of the Bullard chain of tied houses. Founded as a publican-brewer partnership between Richard Bullard and James Watt in 1837, within eight years the firm had acquired a remarkable thirty-two tied public houses in Norwich.⁹⁸ From 1843 to 1867, seventy-nine houses were acquired in Norwich, an average of around three a year, together with a further forty-three in Norfolk, most of which were secured in the 1860s.⁹⁹ The peaks of acquisition in the mid-fifties and mid-sixties also coincide with times of considerable investment in brewing equipment.¹⁰⁰ It is clear that a striking entry into the Norwich brewing trade had been consolidated in an equally remarkable fashion. Bullard's had doubled their stock of public houses in a quarter-century, reaching a total that was around half of the Steward, Patteson, Finch & Co. figure of 147 in 1867, and, like them, Bullard's too were beginning to expand into the Norfolk market.¹⁰¹

The profits from the properties already in the chain would have been sufficient for the acquisition of much of the new stock. Although Bullard public houses were bringing in rents that averaged only around £3-£5 a quarter¹⁰², the profit margins from beer sales were substantial enough to enable the firm to finance its own expansion. With brewers' profits averaging between 6s and 9s a barrel, and with a contemporary estimate of Bullard's yearly output of beer standing at 60,000 barrels in 1869, a crude annual profit figure on beer sales alone of at least £18,000 is reached.¹⁰³ Beer production could be very

lucrative, and, in the case of Bullard's, good business acumen and management ensured the expansion of the brewery.

Further corroboration for the value of the business is provided in December 1871.¹⁰⁴ The total value of the ninety-four properties listed, that included not only Norwich, Norfolk and Suffolk public houses but also cottages, land, maltings, and the brewery premises, stands at £101,175. However, since there are only forty-two Norwich public houses on this list, with thirty-six in Norfolk and Suffolk (mostly in Lowestoft), it seems probable that that this list is of free-hold property only and excludes lease-hold or copy-hold premises.¹⁰⁵

As business grew, not only were more properties acquired to increase further the value of the brewery and widen its distribution network but also the brewery itself was modernised and expanded. Important management decisions made by the partners at the Anchor brewery at St. Miles Bridge determined this expansion and are evident in the few pages of a journal kept by an anonymous employee from 1856 to 1894.¹⁰⁶ In 1856, the firm switched to steam power, using an 8 HP engine and a 20 HP boiler, since 'Business (was) increasing so much'; in 1861, another boiler was in operation; in 1863, a 'large Copper' had been purchased to replace the copper that was now 'a deal too small for the Increased trade'; in 1864, a new pump was in use; and in 1865, matching one of the peaks of property acquisition, there was a significant updating of equipment within the brewery with 'a new Refrigerator Circular and a new Hop Press', a new, more powerful, 16 HP main engine, a new pumping engine, and new safety valves to the boiler '... so that they cannot explode ... we have had them in use for nearly thirty years and they have

never failed once'. It seems that some machinery had been in continuous and efficient use for a generation since the founding of the brewery in 1837.

The pages of the journal show that the instalment of new brewing equipment remained a priority from the late sixties through to the early nineties. In 1867, new machines were purchased 'for washing mouldy casks'; in 1868, Harry Bullard laid the first brick of the new, 'larger Boiler House' in response to '... the business increasing very rapidly'; in 1870, 'as the business still keeps on increasing', it was agreed to acquire a 'new Malt Mill' and a 'new Boiler to replace the original 1856 Boiler'. Through the 1870s, there were decisions to acquire 'a new refrigerator', an additional pump and boiler, 'Mill Rolls made of Chilled Steel to reduce wear', 'another large copper ... as the ones in use were not sufficient to carry on the work', yet more pumps, an 'enlargement of the Hop Backs', and another new 8 HP engine. In 1881, 'a new boiler and yeast press' were in operation, and in 1884, most significantly, 'the Artesian Well was bored the depth being 165 ft 6 inches, the outside case being 18 inches and the inside case being 16 inches'. The brewery management was taking no chances with contamination from sewerage and would have learnt lessons from the failures of public schemes over which brewer-councillors had had some responsibility.¹⁰⁷ The pages of the journal continue to record refinement to the plant and its machinery up to 1894 and so, through the eyes of a loyal and proud employee, we have an exceptional record over a generation of the prodigious development of a provincial brewery as it responded effectively through skilful management to market demand. Without such managerial skills, first Richard Bullard and then in particular Harry Bullard would not have gained the degree of wealth, power and influence that enabled them to act as agents of social control and cohesion.

It can be taken as axiomatic that without committed and efficient employees, Bullard's would not have been so successful. By chance, an Office Memoranda for 1858, the earliest of the surviving personal papers, contains an entry that suggests the firm founded by Richard Bullard knew the value of a respected and contented work force. Without a context, the following jotting appears at the top of one page: '... and seem to strengthen the ties of mutual regard which ought to exist between the employer and the employed'.¹⁰⁸ The author was possibly John Briggs, the Chief Clerk, who is recorded in this role in public house letting agreements in 1853. By 1864, with Harry and Charles Bullard and John Boyce, he was one of the executors for the estate of the deceased Richard Bullard and for the next ten years, until his own death in 1874, John Briggs served, if not in name, as a partner in the family business. Herbert Bullard recorded that John Boyce and John Briggs had helped Richard Bullard 'build up the business'. Within the hierarchy of the family firm, John Briggs enjoyed a key position under John Boyce, Richard's son-in-law, and his sons, Harry, Charles, and Fred.¹⁰⁹

Commitment and efficiency were expected at all times from employees and within the office of Bullard's John Briggs would have had high expectations. It is likely that as Chief Clerk he was responsible for the scornful remarks added to the entries on some of the pages of the 1867 Office Diary, part of the set of seven such diaries that have survived and cover the crucial period in licensing legislation, 1867-73.¹¹⁰ These diaries seem to be written by the same hand, an anonymous under-clerk in the Bullard office, who in 1867 certainly considered that he was working to full capacity, even overworking. Between August 24 and September 24, 1867, when the annual licensing meetings were taking place

and had to be prepared for as well as attended, for instance at Norwich and Diss and Lowestoft, the under-clerk noted on a number of occasions that he had been working '2 hours before Breakfast' or 'not home till 10 at night'. Question marks had been added to these notes in blue pencil, probably by John Briggs, culminating in the annotation in purple ink for 21.8.67: 'What about 2 hours spent in drinking Rum and Milk?'¹¹¹ Retail demand for drink was satisfied not only through improving production but also through demanding commitment and diligence from the small workforce. But such loyalty and effort were rewarded through reasonable pay and job security. The handwriting suggests that the under-clerk was still employed in the office in 1874. The principle of 'Mutual regard' is a management technique with a touch of modernity and seems to offer part of the explanation for the remarkable success of Bullard's.

The entries in these seven diaries confirm the image of an effective firm. The under-clerk worked for a family business in which the owners were gentlemen requiring respect and deference but they in their turn felt a responsibility to look after their employees through an occasion like the annual New Year's dinner. A picture of considerable activity emerges which is unsurprising given the increasing size of the Bullard 'empire'. Regular events like Transfer Sessions and the annual Licensing Sessions involved attendance at courts in Norwich and other centres, as well as time spent in preparation in the brewery office, in the clerk's room. Westminster legislation required local action. In 1869, for instance, the Wine and Beerhouse Act that brought the beerhouses under magisterial control led to certificates of character for the beerhouse keepers being written, printed, and delivered by the Bullard management within two days. Family members, it seemed, took part in the personal delivery, the urban elite thus meeting the working class in a direct interface.¹¹²

The general daily work of the office, which involved not only paper work at the desk but journeys within Norwich, and further, was concerned with issues arising from the business relationship between brewer and publican. Chasing debts, attending court cases concerned with disputes over Bullard property, receiving and giving notices to quit, and preparing agreements with new tenants and drawing up notices for endorsements and transfers: all these types of business appear within the pages of the diaries. So too do the activities occasioned by the national moves towards tighter licensing regulation and, in response, the breweries' seeking of firmer control over the drinking places within their 'empires'. The under-clerk's sense of overwork was caused in some measure by days spent thus: 'Drawing long and particular list of houses hired with terms and particulars and when expire ...' (26.9.67); and '... arranging leases and placing them in alphabetical order and arranging sundry papers' (6.11.67); and in the counting room, '... copying list of leases of houses hired by B & S on card', before ending this Saturday work 'In Mr Brigg's Room' (7.12.67).¹¹³ With Gladstone's Liberal election victory in 1868 around the corner, and the forces of Temperance gathering strength, these would have felt like difficult times and one senses Bullard's getting their affairs in full order.

At the end of the Victorian period, the quality of Bullard management and its effective control over its network of retail outlets remained undiminished, as is clear from the pages of the Board Minutes Books that date from the setting up of the limited liability company in 1895.¹¹⁴ Whereas minutes books for Steward & Patteson in the same period generally provide a minimum of detail, concentrating on matters like sales and purchases and share values, the Bullard pages reveal much more about the management of the brewery and the

interactions between its leading members.¹¹⁵ It is striking how few directors there were and how controlling power was still firmly held within the hands of two members of the Bullard family, Sir Harry Bullard and his brother-in-law, John Boyce. The third and only other member of the Board was George Arthur Coller, with Donald George Gaul serving as the company secretary. When, in 1896, Coller sought to challenge the family hegemony, his criticism of the Board meetings as a 'farce' was rejected; remarkably, the minutes contain the record of the incident.¹¹⁶ Even when Sir Harry Bullard was away for several months on American or South African brewing business, as for example in early 1899 for ten weeks for a journey to the Cape, this tiny directorate still effectively controlled the business affairs of the second biggest brewing firm in Norwich.

The range of business covered in the weekly meetings of the Board was full and pressing. Sir Harry Bullard was a manager who concerned himself with the minutiae of the brewery's affairs as well as the major decisions. In 1896, at one meeting before Christmas, it was resolved that he should visit a Bullard house to check on a £25 estimate for building work. During that same meeting, he and George Coller (John Boyce was absent) were confronting such issues as publican bad debts, the crucial appointment of a new brewer, a further expansion of the brewery into mineral water production, the appointment of a builder's clerk, the payment of the company auditor, and the purchase of malt sacks.¹¹⁷ Modern management theory might despair at the failure to delegate but this perhaps obsessive attention to detail meant a degree of personal contact with the publicans of Norwich. Social cohesion was likely to have been stronger as a consequence.

Despite the overload, the brewery's management structure did seem to function well enough. The drive and commitment of men like Sir Harry Bullard, John Boyce, and George Coller, together with the loyalty and dedication of Donald Gaul and those staff below him in the office hierarchy, are likely to be the key reasons. However, the importance of the half-dozen travellers should not be underestimated. They were a vital link between the brewers and their publicans, responsible not only for drink sales but also for the quarterly rent collection. When in 1895 the Board debated whether to discontinue the brewing of XXXX Ale and substitute a lighter and cheaper beer to be known as Amber Ale or AA, the travellers were called together for a Saturday meeting at the brewery and reported in favour of the change.¹¹⁸ In 1896, the Board considered '... the way in which the Company is being represented by Travellers and others ... with a view to appoint Mr Osborne as assistant Traveller ... giving more time to Messrs Wilkins and L'Estrange to seek Free Trade at Yarmouth and the Coast generally and elsewhere'.¹¹⁹ Wilkins and L'Estrange were clearly viewed as gentlemen whose work was important and whose opinions were to be respected. Representing the travellers, they appeared before the Board later that year 'in connection with the county trade' and:

'... complained very seriously of the Mild Beers which in their opinion had been most unsatisfactory for some considerable time and had caused great complaint with customers and loss of trade'.¹²⁰

From then on, the tasting of beers became a regular item on the Board's weekly agenda. Bullard management was responsive to the market.

In conclusion, the brewing industry in Norwich had expanded during the Victorian period to meet the demand for beer from the increasing population of the city, and other areas once the railway network had widened the range of distribution. Norwich brewers became

richer and four breweries emerged to dominate the market – Steward & Patteson, Bullard, Youngs, and Morgan. All four breweries produced family members who served the interest of their business as well as the civic polity by becoming councillors and committee members within the local government of Norwich. Men like Henry Staniforth Patteson and Sir Harry Bullard, M.P. were dominant figures both within the urban elite and at the interface between that elite and the working class of the city. Such brewers served as important agents of social cohesion. Their influence was felt directly through the business of the drink trade and the control they exercised over so many public houses and other retail outlets. It was also felt through the power they wielded in local government over such areas as public facilities and public order. These gentlemen brewers, however, were amateurs with a measure of vested interest; the quality of urban life only began to change significantly for the better when their influence and other like-minded gentlemen of their generation became less pronounced in public life. The future lay with sober professionalism.

Footnotes to Chapter 7

- ¹ See above, pp.26-27.
- ² Leslie Hannah has made the point that even before the industrial revolution, large-scale manufacture of beer was taking place in plants separate from the workers' homes. See Leslie Hannah, *The Rise of the Corporate Economy* (London, 1976), p.10.
- ³ See above, pp.150-155.
- ⁴ See above, pp.75-101.
- ⁵ Richard Wilson asked the question in *British Brewing* as a preface to his revisionist argument that per capita beer consumption trends did not dramatically increase by over half between the 1830s and the 1870s. (pp.29-31) This supposed rise is due to a 'loose interpretation' of the figures in G.B. Wilson's seminal work, *Alcohol and the Nation: a contribution to the study of the liquor problem in the United Kingdom 1800 - 1935* (London, 1940). For the period 1800-29 G.B. Wilson calculated the consumption-per-head figures for *England and Wales* only. Then in 1830 he switched his series to the *United Kingdom* (including Ireland) as a whole. If, instead, calculations are made between 1800 and 1914 solely for *England and Wales*, the great beer drinking centres of the United Kingdom, the figures appear generally stable and high throughout the century with the exception of a sharp increase between the late 1850s and the late 1870s.
- ⁶ See above, pp.45-53.
- ⁷ See below, p.221, Table 7.1.
- ⁸ *British Brewing*, p.29-31.
- ⁹ *British Brewing*, p.29. Excepting the decade of the seventies, the annual averages range for per capita consumption of beer was 7.9 gallons (35.9 - 28.0) over this period of 113 years. This was only just over one pint a week.
- ¹⁰ See above, p.221, Table 7.1.
- ¹¹ Joseph Rowntree and Arthur Sherwell, *The Temperance Problem and Social Reform* (ninth edition, London, 1901), p.6 and p.10, cited in *British Brewing*, p.35.
- ¹² See above, p.221, Table 7.1.
- ¹³ B.R. Mitchell, *Abstract of British Historical Statistics* (Cambridge, 1962), p.6; *British Brewing*, pp.32-33.
- ¹⁴ *British Brewing*, pp.78-79, Table 3.4.
- ¹⁵ *British Brewing*, pp.89-98.
- ¹⁶ *British Brewing*, p.64.
- ¹⁷ *British Brewing*, pp.110-112.
- ¹⁸ Hannah, *Corporate Economy*, pp.12-18.
- ¹⁹ Hannah, *Corporate Economy*, pp.17-20.
- ²⁰ *British Brewing*, pp.251-253.
- ²¹ *British Brewing*, p.254.
- ²² See above, Chapter 4 *passim*.
- ²³ See below, pp.243-244.
- ²⁴ Gladstone had explained his defeat in the 1874 election by claiming that 'We have been brought down in a torrent of gin and beer' - see above, p.22.
- ²⁵ *LVG*, 13 Mar. 1880, p.169.
- ²⁶ *British Brewing*, pp.254-257. Unlike Norwich, the take-over of smaller companies by larger breweries is one of the features of developments in Portsmouth in the period 1880-1902 - see Philip Eley, *Portsmouth Breweries since 1847* (The Portsmouth Papers, No.63, 1994), pp.8-12.

- ²⁷ Morgan's had a nominal capital of £185,000; the ordinary shares in the new company were retained by the partners, but £75,000 of the 6 per cent preference shares were offered to investors – see *Steward & Patteson*, p.67.
- ²⁸ Bullard's had an issue of £360,000 in 4 per cent debentures to supplement a privately-held ordinary capital of £290,000 – see *Steward & Patteson*, p.67.
- ²⁹ Steward and Patteson Limited has an initial nominal capital of £300,000, divided equally into ordinary and 5 per cent preference shares, held privately and divided in more or less the same proportions between family members within the partnership and associates. In addition, debenture stock worth £320,000 was issued of which £280,000 was offered to the public. The controlling families together still held around a quarter of this stock too; persons living within twenty-five miles of the Pockthorpe brewery held around three-quarters of the larger investments. The new limited company was largely a Norwich stake-holding – see *Steward & Patteson*, pp.67, 69-70.
- ³⁰ The documentation for the Youngs conversion does not seem to have survived.
- ³¹ During 1898, the Board of Steward and Patteson Ltd. was reduced from five directors to three by the deaths of Donald Steward and Henry Staniforth Patteson. Donald Steward, described in his obituary in the *Norwich Mercury* as 'being of the Liberal persuasion', was less political than his senior partner, Henry Staniforth Patteson, but did serve as sheriff of Norwich in 1878, the year of the 'great floods', and was chairman of his local parish council at Catton and a director of the Norwich Union Life Society – see *Steward & Patteson*, pp.44, 70.)
- ³² See above, pp.166-168.
- ³³ See above, pp.92-95.
- ³⁴ A.D. Bayne, *A Comprehensive History of Norwich* (Norwich, 1869), pp.615-6. *Steward & Patteson*, p.45, considered that 70,000 barrels for Steward & Patteson would be nearer the mark.
- ³⁵ See above, p.224.
- ³⁶ See above, Fig. Intro.1, p.6.
- ³⁷ Patrick Palgrave-Moore, *The Mayors and Lord Mayors of Norwich 1836-1974* (Norwich, 1978), pp. iii, viii.
- ³⁸ Palgrave-Moore, *Mayors of Norwich*, p.13; *Steward & Patteson*, pp.40-43.
- ³⁹ Palgrave-Moore, *Mayors of Norwich*, p.13.
- ⁴⁰ See above, Chapter 5 *passim*.
- ⁴¹ *Steward & Patteson*, pp.43-44.
- ⁴² *Steward & Patteson*, p.69; also see below, Table 7.2, p.252.
- ⁴³ See below, p.233.
- ⁴⁴ Palgrave-Moore, *Mayors of Norwich*, p.25.
- ⁴⁵ *LVG*, 30 Nov. 1872, p.367.
- ⁴⁶ *Steward & Patteson*, p.67; First Register of Victuallers Licences; Second Register of Victuallers Licences.
- ⁴⁷ See above, p.39.
- ⁴⁸ *Steward & Patteson*, p.17; Herbert H. Bullard, *Sir Harry Bullard, A Record of a Busy Public Life* (Norwich, 1902), p.1. This is a son's biography of his father.
- ⁴⁹ Bullard, *Sir Harry Bullard*, pp.5-7. Also see below, p.236, for Richard Bullard's membership of the Watch Committee.
- ⁵⁰ Bullard, *Sir Harry Bullard*, pp.11-13; NRO, BR1/1 and BR1/2, 'Bullard's Limited Board Minutes Books, 1895-98' and '1898-1902'.
- ⁵¹ Bullard, *Sir Harry Bullard*, p.16. Harry Bullard joined the Conservatives in 1872 – see below, p.243.
- ⁵² Bullard, *Sir Harry Bullard*, pp.21-22.

- ⁵³ Bullard, *Sir Harry Bullard*, pp.86-119.
- ⁵⁴ Bullard, *Sir Harry Bullard*, p.196.
- ⁵⁵ See above, pp.156-167 and pp.185-213.
- ⁵⁶ NRO, N/TC 4/14, 'Paving, Cleansing, Sewerage and Lighting Committee of the Norwich Board of Health Minutes Book', 9 Sept. 1853; 8 June 1854. This John Youngs is John Youngs (junior), the son of John Youngs (senior) who by 1814 had formed a brewing partnership with William Burt that lasted until 1854 when John Youngs (junior) bought out the third William Burt, the grandson, after having joined forces with Charles Crawshay, himself a second-generation Norwich brewer – see John Dent and Jim Livock, *Wensum Lodge: The Story of a House* (Norwich, 1990), p.23.
- ⁵⁷ NRO, N/TC 4/14, 'Paving Committee', 28 May 1855. Morgan was offered £350 for rebuilding the premises and compensating his tenant. He asked for £355 and £50 compensation for his tenant. After some negotiation, he accepted the original offer since the Board would provide premises for his tenant during the re-building and give him £25 in addition.
- ⁵⁸ See above, pp.161-167.
- ⁵⁹ NRO, N/TC 4/15, 'Paving Committee', 10 Sept. 1857.
- ⁶⁰ NRO, N/TC 4/11, 'Sanitary Purposes Committee of the Norwich Board of Health Minutes Book', 21 Nov. 1862.
- ⁶¹ NRO, N/TC 4/12, 'Sanitary Committee', 15 Sept. 1865; 1 June 1866.
- ⁶² NRO, N/TC 4/22, 'Sewerage and Irrigation Committee of the Norwich Board of Health Minutes Book', 3 Jan. 1872.
- ⁶³ See above, p.166.
- ⁶⁴ See above, p.163.
- ⁶⁵ See above, pp.166-167.
- ⁶⁶ See above, p.153.
- ⁶⁷ See above, p.219.
- ⁶⁸ See above, Chapter 6 *passim*.
- ⁶⁹ See above, p.181.
- ⁷⁰ Peter Finch is Peter Finch III (1791-1852), a second-generation Norwich brewer whose father, Peter Finch II (1726-1807) had acquired Nuthall's brewery in St. Mary's Coslany in 1771. When Peter Finch III agreed to merge with Steward, Patteson, and Morse in the 1837 partnership, his family had therefore had the longest connection with the trade. Peter Finch was a traditional Whig who had been active in Norwich politics for some time before Victoria's accession, serving as sheriff in 1825 and mayor in 1827. The merger with Finch brought Steward & Patteson around fifty-five more public houses, forty of which were in Norwich, making a total of about 250 retail outlets tied to the Pockthorpe brewery – see *Steward & Patteson*, pp.33-35 and also below, pp.240-242.
- ⁷¹ NRO, N/TC 7/1, WCM, 4 Mar./14 Mar. 1836.
- ⁷² See above, pp.203-207.
- ⁷³ See above, pp.184-188.
- ⁷⁴ See above, pp.185-186.
- ⁷⁵ NRO, N/TC 7/3, WCM, 30 June 1848; 7 July 1848.
- ⁷⁶ See above, p.187.
- ⁷⁷ NRO, N/TC 7/5, WCM, 25 Jan. 1856; 15 Feb. 1856; NRO, BR3/11, 'Anchor Brewery Schedule 1867'.
- ⁷⁸ See above, pp.197-200.
- ⁷⁹ See above, pp.200, 217, note 47.
- ⁸⁰ See below, pp.265-268; also pp.322, 331-332, 336.

⁸¹ The *Licensed Victuallers Gazette* (6 July 1872) declared that it was ‘... devoted to the Interests of Hotel, Tavern, and Innkeepers, Brewers, Maltsters, and Hop Factors, Distillers, Wine and Spirit Merchants, and all Trades connected therewith’. The Drink interest represented significant numbers of people, from a variety of backgrounds, and would have seen itself as helping social cohesion.

⁸² *LVG*, 13 July 1872; 1 Feb. 1879; 12 Oct. 1900.

⁸³ See above, p.227.

⁸⁴ See above, pp.207, 212.

⁸⁵ See above, pp.212-213.

⁸⁶ *Hawkins* noted a number of pointers towards progress in the previous two decades: ‘Social workers in Norwich, comparing the conditions of the present with twenty years ago are unanimous that there has been a great improvement in the conduct and sobriety of boot operatives ...’ (p.24); ‘... twenty years ago the work of lasting was done entirely by hand ... practically all the finishing was done by the workman in his own home ... (now) there are a dozen firms who have factories equipped ... with decent sanitation, light and ventilation ... with a great impact on the health and efficiency of work people ... (leading to) good work and good citizenship.’ (p.30); ‘In 1898 the Town Council passed a bye-law under the Housing Acts so as to enable them to throw the cost of improvement on the owners (of the courts and yards), and a special Courts and Yards Committee was appointed to enforce the law. Up to the present 232 courts and yards dealt with ... A few of the worst courts closed altogether.’ (p.74)

⁸⁷ *Steward & Patteson*

⁸⁸ *Steward & Patteson*, p.12, acknowledged that, for *Steward & Patteson*, like many firms, ‘... the surviving records are patchy, and there is very little for the years prior to 1880’. Richard Wilson, in *British Brewing*, p.180, noted that ‘... the modern historian of the industry lacks guidance - (on issues of accounting, profitability and management) ... company minutes, often continuous from the 1880s, chiefly record share and property transactions’.

⁸⁹ *Steward & Patteson*, pp.35-39.

⁹⁰ *British Brewing*, p.149.

⁹¹ *Steward & Patteson*, pp.39-40; Frank Meeres, *A History of Norwich* (Chichester, 1998), pp.166-167. *Steward & Patteson*, p.37, noted the ‘vigorous’ response of *Steward & Patteson* in the ‘relatively static market conditions of the mid-nineteenth century’. Given the rise in population in Norwich in the 1840s, the market seems to have been more buoyant than this description suggests, even before the coming of the railways.

⁹² *Steward & Patteson*, pp.43, 47-48.

⁹³ See *Steward & Patteson*, Table 12, p.47. The new figures for 1867 and 1893 derive from my statistical analysis of the First Register of Victuallers Licences.

⁹⁴ *Steward & Patteson*, Table 22, p.78. Also see below, Table 7.2, p.252, for the figures of *Steward & Patteson* public houses and beerhouses ownership in 1895.

⁹⁵ *Steward & Patteson*, pp.47-48.

⁹⁶ *Steward & Patteson*, pp.64-67

⁹⁷ *Steward & Patteson*, pp.72-87.

⁹⁸ NRO, BR3/10, ‘Bullard & Sons, Anchor Brewery: List of public houses c.1845’. The list notes the public house and the publican, by surname.

⁹⁹ See below, Fig. 7.1, p.250, derived from NRO, BR3/11, ‘The Anchor Brewery Norwich: Schedule of agreements with public house tenants, 1843-1867’. This source also provides a list of property showing land tax and poor rate assessments, compiled around 1861.

¹⁰⁰ See below, pp.251, 253.

¹⁰¹ Bullard's were increasing their stock of Norwich public houses in the same period as Steward, Patteson, Finch & Co. was decreasing theirs. I have been unable to establish whether Bullard's purchased any Steward, Patteson, Finch & Co. property in Norwich but it seems likely.

¹⁰² NRO, BR3/11, 'Anchor Schedule'.

¹⁰³ *British Brewing*, p.207; also see above, p.230.

¹⁰⁴ NRO, BR3/15, 'List of Property belonging to Messrs Bullard & Sons, 1871'.

¹⁰⁵ This distinction in terms of types of ownership is also evident in NRO, BR1/146, 'Steward & Patteson Limited Trust Deed, 1895'. See below, Table 7.2, p.252 for the table derived from that source. This table also serves to illustrate the extent of the largest brewery 'empire' based in Norwich.

¹⁰⁶ NRO, MC 1418/1, 'Bullard Brewery and Election Cuttings'.

¹⁰⁷ See above, pp.166-167.

¹⁰⁸ NRO, BR3/1, 'Anchor Brewery Office Memoranda', 20 Jan. 1858.

¹⁰⁹ NRO, BR3/13, 'Miscell., including public house letting agreements, 1853-54'; Bullard, *Sir Harry Bullard*, p.13. Harry, Charles and Fred formed a new partnership on the death of John Briggs in 1874. When Charles died in 1875, John Boyce joined a new partnership with Harry and Fred that lasted until 1894 and the change to limited liability status.

¹¹⁰ NRO, BR3/8-2, 'Office Memoranda, 1867-1873'.

¹¹¹ NRO, BR3/8, 'Office Memoranda, 1867'.

¹¹² NRO, BR3/8, 'Office Memoranda, 1869'.

¹¹³ NRO, BR3/8, 'Office Memoranda, 1867'. It is of course these hours of clerical work that have produced the documentation that has helped underpin the research for this chapter.

¹¹⁴ NRO, BR1/1 and BR1/2, 'Bullard's Limited Board Minutes Books, 1895-1898' and '1898-1902'.

¹¹⁵ NRO, BR1/ 45 and BR1/ 46, 'Steward & Patteson Limited Board Minutes Books, 1895-1898' and '1898-1904'.

¹¹⁶ NRO, BR1/ 1, 'Bullard Minutes', 30 July 1896. The minutes read: 'A letter from Mr G.A. Coller was read (he was absent from the meeting) and regret was expressed that in it the words "If the Board Meetings are not to degenerate into a greater farce than they are at present" were used, and the Chairman and Mr Boyce considered that there was no justification for them, as in their opinion the weekly meetings of Directors had proved most useful, that the business of the Company had been well conducted, and that they saw no reason for making any alteration in the present system of management.'

¹¹⁷ NRO, BR1/1, 'Bullard Minutes', 23 Dec. 1896.

¹¹⁸ NRO, BR1/1, 'Bullard Minutes', 24 Apr./ 1 May 1895.

¹¹⁹ NRO, BR1/1, 'Bullard Minutes', 8 Apr. 1896.

¹²⁰ NRO, BR1/1, 'Bullard Minutes', 24 Oct. 1896.