

Some Counter-Currents of Migration: London and the South in the Mid-Nineteenth Century

W.A. ARMSTRONG

I

The power of London to attract immigrants has impressed medieval and modern historians alike. According to Keene, approximately one in eighty Englishmen lived there in 1100, rising to one in fifty, two hundred years later.¹ Patten stresses that before the Industrial Revolution London was the predominant destination of all migrants² and in an important study focusing on the years 1650–1750, Wrigley has estimated that as many as one-sixth of the population of England must at some stage in their lives have lived in the capital.³ It is true, from about 1700 rates of population growth in the provincial ports and the new manufacturing towns were accelerating to the point where, in many cases, they outstripped those of London.⁴ But the absolute increases of London's population continued to dwarf those of other towns and its attractions remained unimpaired. Writing of the period 1800–50, Redford was concerned primarily with population growth in the northern towns, but acknowledged that the attractive force of the capital was felt in every part of the United Kingdom, especially in the south and south-east.⁵ Shannon's calculations, first published in the 1930s, suggested that London drew in about a third of a million migrants in the 1840s, a number which fell slightly in the following decade but recovered to reach 331,000 in the 1860s and nearly half a million in the 1870s.⁶ More recently, Baines has confirmed that London remained the most important single destination of migrants in the second half of the nineteenth century, because it had the greatest range of occupational opportunities and shows the largest expansion in commercial and domestic services.⁷

Yet, the flow of human resources was by no means uni-directional. Ravenstein, a pioneering student of migration who has been aptly described as 'to migration studies what Malthus is to demography',⁸ was well aware that for every main current of migration, there existed a counter-current. Indeed, he announced this as one of a series of 'laws' of migration. In 1881, according to the census, 1,164,071

migrants from the country resided in London, but 584,700 natives of London were enumerated in other parts of England and Wales, although over one-half of these were 'carried no further by the counter-currents than one of the five metropolitan counties.'⁹ Writing at about the same time, Llewellyn Smith likewise took an interest in this question: he cited the same, 1881 figures and noted that emigrant Londoners showed a tendency to congregate in the larger urban centres of population rather than in the smaller towns or rural districts.¹⁰ In his turn, Shannon tended to link out-migration with suburbanization: impressed by the fact that the south-eastern counties loomed so large in their destinations, he concluded that 'in general London gently overflowed its banks into the surrounding counties . . . Londoners were not long-distant (sic) migrants'.¹¹ Recently, Baines has shown that native-born Londoners figured disproportionately in the numbers who left Britain to live and work overseas, to the tune of 420,000 through the years 1861-1900; while the aggregate number of those leaving London for other parts of England and Wales was more than twice this figure, at nearly one million (982,000).¹²

The aim of this article is to examine the counter-currents in more detail than has been attempted previously. On the basis of the 1851 census, the dispersal of the London-born across southern England is traced, as is their presence in the principal towns. Next, their distribution across the twenty-six registration districts of extra-metropolitan Kent will be considered. These stages in the analysis rely entirely upon the published census volumes and the conclusions are necessarily aggregative. But in the third stage, by way of illustration, the case of Canterbury is discussed using the census enumerators' books, with their data on individual persons and households. This approach allows some issues to be explored in more detail and, as well, yields flesh and blood to supplement the bones of a mainly statistical analysis. The use of census data for these purposes is subject to two limitations which, though familiar enough, should perhaps be reiterated. First, perfect accuracy in the recording of individuals' birth places cannot be assumed, nor should it be expected.¹³ Secondly, it is not possible to trace the successive moves of a given individual, for only his (or her) birth place and present place of residence is stated in the source: hence, the census returns can be used only for the study of 'lifetime' patterns of migration.¹⁴ Despite these problems the censuses remain the primary source for the study of migratory processes in the nineteenth century, and the conclusions drawn should prove to be of particular interest to historians of the southern region.

II

From the published census volumes, the aggregate numbers of in- and out-migrants to and from London can be ascertained, for each of sixteen southern counties.¹⁵ Together they accounted for 59.8 per cent of all London's immigrants from England and Wales, and received 60.1 per cent of the capital's emigrants – or at least, of those who were enumerated in England and Wales. Some account needs to be taken of variations in county sizes, which ranged from 143,655 in the case of Buckinghamshire to 485,021 for the extra-metropolitan Kent. Table 1 sets out the relevant information and for ease of exposition, the sixteen counties are divided into three groups, on the basis of their aggregated recorded exchange of population with London (column F).

The table presents few surprises. All sixteen counties lost population to London on a net basis (column C), although the extent to which this was so was variable, as can be seen from column G. In the first group – the counties of major interaction – extra-metropolitan Middlesex and Surrey came nearest to matching their losses to London with equivalent gains, and Kent, Essex and Hertfordshire succeeded in attracting one Londoner for every three to four leaving for London. In view of the distance involved, Wiltshire is the surprising member of this group: its total population exchange with London was higher than expected, although overwhelmingly dominated by out-migration. The second group comprises counties with a rather lower level of population exchange with London: most received one Londoner for every three to five 'exported'. In this group Sussex is an interesting exception with its unusually low ratio of losses to gains, due probably to the influence of Brighton.¹⁶ The final group comprises counties which are generally more distant, the ratio of aggregate exchange to population falling as low as 0.03 in the case of Cornwall. In general, the ratio of losses to gains in this group tends towards the high side, although none reached the level recorded for Wiltshire.

Still relying on the printed volumes, the next step in the analysis is to home in on the towns. Information is given in the form of birth-place data for seventeen towns within these counties, ranging in size from 6,394 (Dorchester) to 137,328 (Bristol).¹⁷ In the aggregate, these towns accounted for 12.9 per cent of the population of the sixteen counties, and for 17.6 per cent of the London-born. Altogether, 4.28 per cent of the southern urban population, defined in these terms, was born in London, and (by disaggregation) this implies a figure of 2.95 per cent for the residual areas of the sixteen counties.

Quite clearly, Llewellyn Smith was correct in supposing that the provincial towns would exert a greater pull on the London-born than could the more rural areas, and it is not difficult to suggest why this was so. Except for those born in London but transplanted early in life, the formative educational and working experiences of Londoners would be unlikely to mark them out as suitable for employment in agriculture and in any case the low wages prevailing in that sector would have been unattractive. Rather, we should expect migrant Londoners to have gravitated towards the artisan or shop-keeping trades and the professions, which were largely although not exclusively urban-based.

More interest attaches, perhaps, to the extent to which the attractions of these provincial towns to Londoners were influenced by factors of size and distance, and these are examined with the aid of some simple rank-order and product-moment correlation coefficients.¹⁸ However, more than one yardstick may be taken into account; there is the size of the town in question, the absolute size of the contingent of London-born, or the percentage of the town population which this represents. This is well-illustrated by the case of Bristol, which was easily the largest of the sixteen towns but second (to Brighton) in terms of the size of the London-born group and as low as fourteenth if this is expressed as a percentage of the total Bristol population. If the absolute sizes of the London-born clusters are preferred and related to town sizes, the rank order correlation coefficient which emerges is as high as $r_s=0.96$, where a value of 1.00 would imply perfect correspondence. However, this falls away markedly when *percentages* born in London are related to town sizes; in this case $r_s=0.56$, where the critical value for presuming a relationship with 95 per cent certainty, on seventeen cases, is $r_s=0.48$. The product-moment correlation coefficient probes a little more deeply by taking account of actual variations in the data, rather than just rank ordering. Using this measure, the coefficient relating the absolute sizes of London-born clusters to town sizes yields $r=0.66$, well above the critical value appropriate at the 95 per cent and even 99 per cent levels of significance, 0.49 and 0.62 respectively. All these coefficients are sufficiently strong to enable us to conclude that there was a positive relationship between the sizes of the receiving communities and the absolute sizes (and to a lesser extent proportions) of the London-born contingents residing in them.

This may seem to be a curiously heavy-handed way of stating the obvious: most readers will require little persuasion to believe that the larger the town, the greater its attractiveness to emigrant Londoners would be. Moreover, they might also suppose, with Redford's

Table 1: *Migratory flows between London and sixteen southern counties*

	(A) Migrants to London	(B) Migrants from London	(C) Net gain/loss (A - B)	(D) Aggregate exchange (A + B)	(E) Population of county (1851)	(F) Ratio of aggregate exchange to population (D:E)	(G) Ratio of losses to gains (A:B)
(I) Counties with major interaction							
Middlesex	31,426	22,788	-8,638	54,214	150,606	0.36	1.38
Surrey	38,581	18,625	-19,956	57,206	202,521	0.28	2.07
Kent	67,787	23,270	-44,517	91,057	485,021	0.19	2.91
Essex	57,737	14,935	-42,802	72,672	344,130	0.21	3.87
Herts	24,293	6,674	-17,619	30,967	173,962	0.18	3.64
Wilts	21,200	2,459	-18,741	42,915	240,966	0.18	8.62

(II) Counties with medium interaction

Bucks	17,738	3,599	-14,139	21,337	143,655	0.15	4.93
Berks	24,469	6,183	-18,286	30,652	199,224	0.15	3.96
Hants	34,474	11,444	-23,030	45,918	402,016	0.11	3.01
Sussex	28,155	13,887	-14,268	42,042	339,604	0.12	2.02
Oxon	16,092	3,164	-12,946	19,256	170,247	0.11	5.08

(III) Counties with low interaction

Dorset	10,247	1,741	-8,506	11,988	127,095	0.07	5.89
Devon	37,369	8,739	-28,630	46,108	572,330	0.08	4.28
Cornwall	9,981	1,436	-8,445	11,317	356,641	0.03	6.88
Somerset	32,447	5,282	-27,165	37,729	456,259	0.08	6.14
Gloucestershire	22,864	6,858	-16,006	29,722	419,514	0.07	3.33

Sources: Census of Great Britain, 1851. Population Tables, I, Numbers of the Inhabitants, (Divisions II-VI), P(arliamentary) P(apers) 1852-3, LXXXV; and Population Tables, II, Ages, Civil Condition, Occupations and Birthplaces of the People, (Divisions II-VI) PP 1852-3, LXXXVIII - Pt. I.

emphasis on the short-distance character of most migration in mind, that distance would be another highly relevant factor. Here, however, our simple statistical methods show their value, in markedly qualifying this impression. Sure enough, the *percentages* of London-born enumerated in distant towns were very low (eg. Truro, 1.43 per cent or one in 75 of the population) and, overall, the rank order coefficient r_s yields 0.79. But a similar rank order correlation coefficient linking the *absolute* sizes of London-born clusters to distance gives only $r_s=0.24$, where a value of 0.48 would be necessary to establish a relationship at the 95 per cent confidence level. So, it seemed advisable to try a product-moment coefficient. This yielded a value with the anticipated sign (minus, implying an inverse relationship) of $r=-0.26$, again well below the 0.52 necessarily to assume a relationship with 95 per cent confidence.

The preliminary conclusions which may be drawn from this part of the analysis are as follows:

- (i) Out-migrants from London were more likely to be enumerated in towns rather than in the rural areas.
- (ii) By and large, the bigger the town, the more Londoners were likely to be in evidence (in terms of the sizes of clusters and, less obviously, as proportions of the town populations in question).
- (iii) Distance from London emerges as a rather weak variable, in interpreting the patterns observed.

III

Hobsbawm has maintained that the sector of the home counties whose links with the London labour market were most patent and striking was Kent,¹⁹ and it is interesting to see that extra-metropolitan Kent accounted for the largest number of London-born among all the counties considered, some 23,270 (Table 1). The next stage of the analysis focuses on their distribution across the twenty-six registration districts of this county. Appendix C gives details of the numbers and proportions of the inhabitants of each district who were born in London together with the distance from the capital of its principal settlement: these range from ten miles (Bromley) to seventy-three (Deal, in the Eastry Registration District). Regardless of whether we take the percentages or absolute numbers of London-born, the relationship to distance from London appears to be a fairly weak one. In fact the rank order coefficient $r_s=0.32$ and the product-moment coefficient, minus as expected, works out to $r=-0.32$, both

short of the critical levels necessary to establish a relationship at the 95 per cent confidence level.²⁰

Of course, it could be argued that all of Kent was within comparatively easy reach of London and that the influence of distance upon migration would be overshadowed by the economic configuration of the county, as it varied between one registration district and another. The expectation raised by the previous section is that Londoners would be concentrated into the Kentish towns and much scarcer in the more rural districts, for most out-migrants from London can have had much aptitude for, or inclination to follow agricultural pursuits.²¹ This assumption is well-supported by the evidence. A simple index of rurality has been devised (Appendix C) by dividing the numbers of males over twenty in agriculture by all males in the age group, giving rise to a series ranging from 3.6 per cent (Gravesend) to 79.1 per cent (Hoo), and these figures may be related in turn to the proportions of London-born. The resulting coefficient of rank order is $r_s=0.73$ and using a rather more searching product-moment coefficient, $r=0.69$. Both values are well above those necessary to establish a statistically significant relationship, even at the 99 per cent confidence level, and they confirm that Londoners were decidedly under-represented in the more rural districts of Kent, either because they could find no niche there or because they were not attracted to them.

At this point it is possible to set aside the important, but rather desiccated approach through statistical testing and to move into a more descriptive mode of approach. Table 2, also based on the material in Appendix C, gives the absolute numbers of London-born in each registration district and arbitrary lines have been drawn through it at the points where 50 and 75 per cent of Londoners are embraced. In effect, this divides the data into three blocks, each of which is suitable for more extended comment.

Block A

It is rather striking that only five of the registration districts accounted for one-half (actually, 50.28 per cent) of the London-born in Kent. Taken as a whole, the districts comprised here were highly urbanized (63.7 per cent)²² and low on the scale of rurality (19.3 per cent in agriculture). However, each case is to some extent unique. *Gravesend. R.D.* was dominated by the borough of the same name, and occupied the top place in terms of its attractions for Londoners. Although not the closest registration district to London, it was regarded as 'the boundary of the port' and could boast several shipping-related industries as well as excellent communications with the metropolis which included regular steam packet boats.²³ *Dartford*

Table 2. Distribution of London-born in Kent, 1851, by Registration District

(A) Districts accounting for 50% of all London-born

	No. of London-born	% of population born in London	% Urban	% or occupied population in agriculture
Gravesend	2,579	8.59	63.7	19.3
Thanet	2,462			
Medway	2,423			
Dartford	2,411			
Bromley	1,825			

(B) Districts accounting for next 25% of all London-born

Dover	1,490	4.62	56.3	34.4
Tunbridge	1,361			
Maidstone	1,340			
Elham	891			
Faversham	857			

(C) Districts accounting for remaining 25% of all London-born

Sevenoaks	704	2.55	21.8	45.7
Sheppey	636			
Eastry	559			
Canterbury	550			
West Ashford	531			
North Aylesford	475			
Malling	441			
Blean	416			
East Ashford	235			
Cranbrook	231			
Milton	225			
Hollingbourne	220			
Bridge	178			
Tenterden	124			
Hoo	53			
Romney Marsh	53			

Source: see appendix C.

R.D. Dartford town was much smaller than Gravesend. It, too, enjoyed 'a considerable trade' and gunpowder works and foundries were in evidence. However, the town was situated up a creek from the Thames and (unlike the Gravesend *R.D.*), this district included extensive rural enclaves. *Medway R.D.* This populous and highly urbanized district contained the third largest contingent of Londoners. There was a major military and dockyard presence at Chatham, accounting for 6,505 persons. Water communications with London facilitated the transport of goods, but passengers still had to take omnibuses to Gravesend to link with the packets. The *Thanet R.D.* was likewise populous and fairly highly urbanized. In view of the distance from London, it may seem surprising to find Thanet accounting for so large a share of the London-born. But Margate was 'much frequented as a watering-place' with 'ready access to it by steam-boat', while Ramsgate was noted as much for its 'great popularity as a watering-place' as for fishing. The *Bromley R.D.* also shows a large number of London-born, although perhaps not to the extent expected, in view of the fact that it was the closest district to London. The town of Bromley had still to be reached by a railway (nearest access three and a half miles away) and a strong element of rurality (agricultural proportion, 43.5 per cent) characterized this district.²⁴

Block B

These registration districts, also five in number, accounted for about half as many London-born persons. As a whole, they were less urbanized than the districts in Block A (56.3 per cent)²⁵ and correspondingly showed a significantly higher degree of rurality, (34.4 per cent in agriculture). *Dover R.D.* Dover town was the largest urban settlement in the group and the terminus of the South Eastern Railway. Its industries were shipping-related, it was the major packet station for the continent and clearly a more fashionable place than today. Nevertheless it is mildly surprising to find here the largest contingent of London-born in Block B. The *Elham R.D.* likewise showed far more Londoners than might be expected in view of its distance from the capital. This is probably attributable to the watering-place factor operating at Folkestone, which also possessed a railway connection and a steam packet trade with France. The *Tonbridge R.D.* was likewise well-removed from London, but its principal settlements, Tonbridge and Tunbridge Wells, enjoyed a rail connection. The former was essentially a market town, the latter, a noteworthy spa, a difference finding its reflection in the numbers of resident gentry, sixty-eight and 181 respectively. The proportion of

Londoners in this district as a whole was probably depressed by large rural tracts. The *Maidstone R.D.* featured a sizeable market town with 'a great local traffic' and thriving paper mills. Maidstone possessed a railway link with London, but much of the remainder of the district was rural. Finally, the number of Londoners encountered in the *Faversham R.D.* was higher than expected. Despite the existence of manufactures of gunpowder, cement and beer, Faversham town was fairly small and access to London cannot have been convenient. From the creek, hoys were used to convey timber and corn to London, but at this period passengers still had to take omnibuses to Strood (eighteen miles) to reach the nearest railway station.

Block C

In all, this group comprises sixteen registration districts which between them accounted for the remaining 25 per cent of London-born in Kent. There were comparatively few towns²⁶ and correspondingly a comparatively large agricultural population (45.7 per cent). Among these districts, the *Sevenoaks R.D.* was the nearest to London (twenty-four miles) but more remote than this might suggest. As yet its largest settlement (Sevenoaks itself, a market town) was dependent for passenger connections with London on a daily pair-horse coach and omnibus. The district contained much wood and heath land, and Wealden clay in its southern reaches. These clays, not well-regarded as agricultural land, also predominated in the *Cranbrook*, *Tenterden* and *West Ashford R.D.*'s.²⁷ Ashford itself was the largest settlement and a market town of some note, latterly 'rendered of importance by the locomotive establishment of the South Eastern Railway', but still small and probably of greater interest to northern-born railwaymen than to Londoners.²⁸ The *Bridge*, *North Aylesford*, *East Ashford*, *Hollingbourne*, and *Malling R.D.*'s were all traversed by chalk downlands, with variable topography and soil types ranging from flinty clays (around Lenham and Challock) to well-drained loams facilitating fruit and hop-growing. Much of the land in the *Milton R.D.* lying between the river Swale and the North Downs was likewise in a high state of cultivation, with an emphasis on corn and fruit. The *Sheppey R.D.* included, at Sheerness, a sizeable naval dockyard and was not especially distant from London. But it was extraordinarily difficult of access. Apart from twice-weekly hoys, passengers had to go by ferry to the mainland, and proceed via Milton and Sittingbourne. Much of the terrain was marshy, and given over to sheep. The *Romney Marsh* and *Hoo R.D.*'s had still fewer Londoners. Both were exceptionally thinly

populated and given over almost entirely to farming, while neither enjoyed a good reputation for salubrity, owing to marshy conditions.²⁹ The *Eastry R.D.* was the most distant from London, measured to its principal centre of population, Deal. This town supplied vessels anchored on the Downs and there was some boat-building and sea-bathing, but it was less fashionable than Margate, Folkestone etc., and less busy than Dover which was gaining ascendancy at this period.³⁰ *Blean R.D.* comprised relatively wild country, woods and rough clay land. Whitstable on the coast was a packet station with hoys to London on four days a week, but chiefly noted for its oysters. It was linked to the emergent railway system, yet at this stage, only to Canterbury. The *Canterbury R.D.* is considered in more detail in the next section.

To summarize, an examination of the distribution of London-born across the county of Kent bears out some of the main conclusions applying to southern England as a whole. Distance from the metropolis appears to have been a relatively unimportant determinant, and the socio-economic complexion of the various registration districts was paramount. By and large, Londoners were more likely to be encountered in significant numbers in those districts which were relatively highly urbanized, and least dependent on agriculture as a means of support.

IV

Among the twenty-six registration districts, Canterbury stood in twelfth position, in terms of the absolute numbers of Londoners (550) and also as a proportion (3.90 per cent).³¹ In fact, the boundaries of the registration district and the town of Canterbury did not coincide. The borough (parliamentary or municipal) extended into the registration districts of Blean and Bridge, giving a total population of 18,398 (against 14,100 for the Canterbury registration district) and these borough limits have been taken to define the population under study in this section.

Canterbury was just over fifty-five miles from London by road and at the time of the census was served by a railway running from what later became known as Canterbury West to reach London via Ashford. There was virtually no industry to speak of, but many 'venerable edifices' and quite a wide range of shops and commercial services, as contemporary directories attest.³² Even so, the town was relatively slow-growing³³ and, to borrow a phrase from a much later work, 'huddled as if it sought protection against progress and

modernity.³⁴ For Cobbett, Canterbury was remarkable for its 'cleanliness and niceness', but Karl Marx on a day visit in 1863 found little to commend the place: 'an old, ugly medieval sort of town, not mended by a large modern English barracks at the one end and a dismal dry Railway Station at the other end of the oldish thing . . . Happily I was too tired, and it was too late, to look out for the celebrated cathedral.' On the face of things, there was little reason to suppose that Canterbury would exert any great attraction for emigrant Londoners. Yet, according to the published census returns they accounted for one in twenty-six of the entire population. A careful re-count, involving three successive trawls through the census enumerators' books gives rise to a total of 713 London-born individuals, although the correspondence with the printed abstracts was not quite so close as at first sight seems to be the case.³⁵ Still, this is quite a substantial population with which to work, in seeking further elucidation of the composition of the counter-current of emigrant Londoners.

Any student of the census enumerators' books can attest to the rich variety and human interest that crowds their pages. Prominent among Londoners out of the top drawer were Henry Lyall, Dean of Canterbury, with a staff of ten servants; James Grugeon, manager of the London and County Bank whose responsibilities entailed the upkeep of a wife and three unmarried adult daughters, all London-born; Mary Freeling, a forty-eight year old spinster and the daughter of a baronet, living in the cathedral precincts with two servants; and Zachariah Shapnel, who lived in a fashionable terrace at Dane John despite his apparent lack of means ('B.A. without occupation'). At the other end of the social scale, we encounter Jane Brett, a London-born 'travelling beggar', in a lodging house at Ivy Lane; and the wife and two children of John Walker, another traveller in a North Lane lodging house. Nor does it take much imagination to envisage the hardships experienced by the three London-born children of a widowed washerwoman, Elizabeth Holness of Kingsford's Buildings, Northgate, herself born at Chatham; or by Harriet Allen, an unmarried Londoner aged twenty-one, who lived alone in Chantry Lane with her two year old son, and earned her living as a brushmaker. Other Londoners had clearly come to Canterbury to retire, such as Thomas Moor, a ship's captain formerly with the East India Company, encountered in St Alphege Lane together with his London-born family. Some appear to have been positively attracted by specific local opportunities, such as a gas-fitter, William Hallam who brought his entire London-born family to live at St Peter's Place, apparently about 1847. A few young, unmarried males came down

from London to be apprenticed to relations. These included John Wiltshier, the nephew of a prominent Canterbury builder and James Mount, whose uncle was a druggist at Staplegate; while the true occupations of Mary Burke (forty-one) and her daughter Bridget (twenty), both unmarried, may have been undeclared – both were categorized as milliners but their abode was suspiciously close to Canterbury barracks. Some families (to judge from their children's birth places) had tried their luck in London but came to think better of it, such as Canterbury-born cabinet maker George Bradshaw in St Stephen's Place, or the George family, headed by an agricultural labourer in Goulden Square. A number of infant Londoners enumerated in Canterbury look like the fruits of their mothers' misadventures in London: for example, Francis Smith, the grandson of a miller's clerk in St Radigund's Street and presumably the offspring of his unmarried daughter; or the eight-month old 'son' of the Ogbournes in Rose Lane – since the couple were in their fifties the child almost certainly belonged to their unmarried twenty-five year old daughter. In other cases, early widowhood had prompted local women to return from London to the bosom of their families: this was apparently so, for example, in the household of James Dane, a baker in St Dunstan's, whose daughter had borne three children in London, while the unmarried male proprietor of the Rose Hotel, John Byars, accommodated his forty-one year old sister and her four London-born children.

Such details are engaging and could be multiplied, but if we are to discern any shape or pattern to the contingent of Londoners residing in Canterbury, it is necessary to return to a more aggregative style of approach, drawing on the summary statistics given for Canterbury in appendix D (1–2).

Sex ratio and age-composition

In the population of Canterbury borough as a whole, there was an excess of females (1,148 to every 1,000 males) which was notably higher than in the national population (1,042:1000), and this was still more marked with the London-born population (1,241:1000). The London-born were noticeably under-represented in the age-group 0–9; this is to be expected, because in the early years of life, those born locally will always dominate the percentage figures. Thereafter, as table 3 shows, Londoners were relatively over-represented in most age groups, the most notable difference between the sexes occurring at 15–24, for reasons which will be touched on below.

Table 3. Surplus (+) or deficit (-) of London-born by age-group, in relation to rest of population of Canterbury Borough

Age Group	Male	Female
0-	-	-
5-	-	-
10-	+	+
15-	+	-
20-	+	-
25-	+	+
30-	+	+
35-	+	+
40-	+	+
45-	+	+
50-	+	+
55-	-	+
60-	+	+
65-	+	-
70-	-	+

Source: Derived from data in Appendix D.2.

The Institutionalized London-born

By far the largest institution within the borough of Canterbury was the barracks, housing a total of 572 persons including 375 soldiers. Many of these men were born in Scotland or Ireland,³⁶ but their numbers included seventeen Londoners, comprising four officers, two sergeants and eleven privates. This was sufficient to ensure a slight over-representation of the London-born, by comparison with the borough as a whole (4.5 against 3.9 per cent), but this was more obviously true of the boarders in Canterbury's more prestigious schools, for example nine from among thirty-five boarders at The King's School (25.7 per cent), Dane John Academy (six from twenty-three, or 26.1 per cent) and The Limes (five from eighteen or 27.8 per cent). The matron and the schoolmaster of the Union workhouse were both Londoners by origin, but only six out of 168 of the resident paupers. The governor of the county gaol, and the matron of the Kent and County Hospital likewise hailed from London, yet their respective charges included a solitary London-born prisoner (among a total of fifty-eight) and not a single in-patient (in ninety-eight). On the whole, even when using a very broad definition of what was an institution,³⁷ and taking staff wives

and families into account, the aggregate number of Londoners residing in institutions was small (sixty-five from 715, or 9 per cent).

Spatial Distribution

When working through the enumerators' books, the London-born were encountered on a fairly regular basis. The impression that they were fairly evenly distributed across Canterbury (rather than clustered in ghettos) turned out to be well-founded. Across the sundry parishes and extra-parochial units which made up the borough, the non-institutionalized population of Londoners never fell below 2.12 per cent of the relevant population, nor did it rise above 5.77 per cent, except in the near vicinity of the cathedral (precincts of the Archbishop's Palace 7.10, Staplegate 9.74, and Ville of Christchurch, 9.74 per cent).³⁸ Moreover, the London-born appeared in no fewer than 104 separately designated streets, places or passages. Nor, as the following section shows, was there any marked tendency for Londoners to cluster together on a house-by-house basis.

Family Structure and Marriage Patterns

Among 172 London-born children, distributed across 105 separate families, only twelve were encountered with two (surviving) London-born parents (Table 4). But the very existence of such children offers *prima facie* evidence that their parents had at some stage been domiciled in the capital. Of course, the census affords no direct evidence on the circumstances in which young people met and married, for there is no information on the locations in which marriages occurred. Nevertheless, Table 5 is of considerable interest, showing that the majority of London-born adults enumerated in Canterbury as either male household heads or wives were married to non-Londoners and predominantly to spouses born in Kent. No doubt the table includes a number of mobile Londoners, chancing to work in Canterbury, who met suitable partners and decided to marry and settle there. It also hints at the importance of London itself as a marriage mart and a staging post. The likelihood is that many young persons (male or female) left early in life for London and there met their future life partners (who might or might not be native Londoners), before deciding to return. When a couple made this decision, it was likely to occur early in the history of the marriage, for only 19 per cent of these male household heads had a London-born co-resident child, and 17 per cent of the wives.

Table 4 London-born children and London-born parents

	% with two London-born parents	% with one London-born parent	% with no London-born parents
105 families with at least one London- born child	4.8	29.5	65.7
172 London-born children	7.0	34.9	58.1

Source: (P)ublic (R)ecord (O)ffice, H.O. 107/64-6

Table 5. Marriage Links of the London-born in Canterbury, 1851

Census designation	London	% of spouses born in		
		Canterbury	Rest of Kent	Elsewhere
Male household heads born in London (n=94)	15.0	26.2	29.9	29.0
Wives born in London (n=107)	18.1	27.7	35.1	19.2

Source: PRO H.O. 107/64-6

At all events, while 80.4 per cent of all the non-institutionalized London-born in Canterbury lived with identifiable kin, the proportion with fellow-Londoners *only* was a mere 5.7 per cent and those enumerated as isolates (not necessarily living alone, but with no co-resident Londoners or kin), 13.9 per cent.

Occupations

So far, much of the evidence suggests that the London-born in Canterbury was not a conspicuous group and apparently well-assimilated into the population at large.³⁹ However, the Londoners were fairly distinctive in some respects, as can be seen from the evidence on their occupational configuration, given in full in appendix D.3. Reflecting among other things their age-composition, Londoners were significantly more likely than others to be economically active. The percentage of London-born males holding recognized jobs was 77.3, against 62.9 in the Canterbury population

at large; and among females, 51.0 per cent against 27.4 per cent. The most noteworthy feature of the male occupational structure is that as many as one-third (over twice the city average) were engaged in public and professional services, together with white-collar industrial services. The method of classification employed means that the sixty-six men in question included a minority whose social standing cannot have been high, such as the eleven army privates and an assistant billiard-table keeper. But many were engaged in education (twelve), the church (eleven), and medicine (five), and the sixty-six included eight military officers, a miscellany of functionaries such as a couple of excise officers, the prison governor, a supervisor of the Inland Revenue, and a handful of accountants, bank employees, and clerks. The profile of the London-born females was even more distinctive. In a town where as much as 62 per cent of all female employment entailed some form of domestic service, this category was weakly represented (17 per cent), which may well go far to explain their relative absence from the 15–24 age-group (see Table 3). Londoners were marginally more frequently employed in manufacturing industry (mostly as dressmakers or milliners), and three times more likely to figure in the public service and professional group than the women of Canterbury as a whole, even though their role was confined largely to school-teaching, or they worked as governesses or nurses. Most strikingly of all, these London-born females were seven times more likely to fall into the property-owning and independent category, for no fewer than forty-four answered to this description, including nineteen annuitants and fourteen fundholders.

While the London-born were to be found in all walks of life, these findings suggest that on the whole they fared above average in terms of respectability and, probably, income. Although this could not be true in each individual case, those who had grown up in the metropolis and subsequently worked in Canterbury were likely to arrive with a certain amount of inbuilt advantage. From evidence on literacy rates, it seems fair to conclude that educational provision in London was superior to that generally ruling in the county of Kent, or at least that it touched more people. In the 1860s, male illiteracy was at its lowest level in London with Middlesex, while Kent stood tenth among fifty-two English and Welsh counties.⁴⁰ There is also some evidence, based upon the data which has been collected, that the London-born adult population of Canterbury was relatively numerate – or at any rate had a greater awareness of the significance of numerical precision – than was common among mid-nineteenth century urban populations.⁴¹ Moreover, some of the London-born

would have gained prior work experience in the capital, where the proportions engaged in the liberal professions, public service and commerce all stood well above the national averages.⁴² Finally, Llewellyn Smith was clearly correct in surmising that small towns had a certain attraction for fixed-income migrants:⁴³ doubtless he had in mind those who were not obliged to work, but needed to husband their resources fairly carefully.

The chief findings of this paper may be summarized briefly.

- (i) On a county basis, migratory flows to London always exceeded the number of Londoners received. The exchange came closest to achieving a balance in the cases of Middlesex and Surrey, but in general there was little correspondence between rates of inflow and outflow.
- (ii) Across the whole of the southern region, out-migrants from London tended to gravitate towards the towns, especially the larger ones. The relationship with the size of the receiving town was patently stronger than the factor of distance.
- (iii) Within the county of Kent, there was a strongish relationship with the economic configurations of the various registration districts: the more rural the area, the fewer Londoners were in evidence. This, again, tended to override the factor of distance.
- (iv) The case of Canterbury suggests that immigrant Londoners were highly integrated into the town at large. Most indicators fail to discern a very distinctive group, but Londoners – as a whole – were more likely to occupy higher status positions or to enjoy independent means.

These findings are not particularly momentous or spectacular, but are the first of their kind to be presented. In recent years, the notion that the southern counties languished during the period of the Industrial Revolution has been dispelled by the work of economic historians,⁴⁴ as has the idea that London simply drained away their vitality. In truth, the relationship between London and the southern counties was a symbiotic one, entailing flows of resources in both directions.

Appendices

(A) Table of principal towns in the south, with numbers and percentages of London-born, and distance from the capital

	Total Population	Absolute no. of London- born	% London- born	Distance from London (Miles)
Bath	54,240	2,013	3.71	102
Brighton	69,673	7,754	11.13	47
Bristol	137,328	3,272	2.38	108
Canterbury	18,398	709	3.85	53
Colchester	19,443	619	3.18	50
Dorchester	6,394	124	1.94	125
Exeter	32,818	814	2.48	167
Gloucester	17,572	483	2.75	93
Maidstone	20,740	1,111	5.36	31
Oxford	27,843	1,183	4.25	52
Plymouth	52,221	1,215	2.33	204
Portsmouth	72,096	3,116	4.32	65
Reading	21,456	1,186	5.53	38
Salisbury	11,657	265	2.27	80
Southampton	35,305	2,074	5.87	70
Truro	10,733	154	1.43	230
Winchester	13,704	571	4.17	63

Source: As Table 1 in main text. N.B. Distances from London are taken from J.R. McCulloch, *A Dictionary, Geographical, Statistical and Historical* (new ed., 4 vols., London 1866). Any minor inaccuracies in these mileages count for very little in the kinds of statistical tests used here.

(B.1) Worked example of a Spearman's rank order correlation coefficient (r_s)

This is given by the formula

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6 (\sum d^2)}{n (n^2 - 1)}$$

where d = the difference in rank order on the two variables being considered and n the number of cases. In the following example, seventeen towns are arranged in rank order according to the size of the London-born group found there, and then by distance from London.

	Rank order, size of London-born group	Rank order, distance from London	difference (d)	d ²
Brighton	1	3	2	4
Bristol	2	13	11	121
Portsmouth	3	8	5	25
Southampton	4	9	5	25
Bath	5	12	7	49
Plymouth	6	16	10	100
Oxford	7	5	2	4
Reading	8	2	6	36
Maidstone	9	1	8	64
Exeter	10	15	5	25
Canterbury	11	6	5	25
Colchester	12	4	8	64
Winchester	13	7	6	36
Gloucester	14	11	3	9
Salisbury	15	10	5	25
Truro	16	17	1	1
Dorchester	17	14	3	9

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6(622)}{17(17^2 - 1)}$$

$$= 0.24$$

Interpretation The critical levels of the rank-order coefficient r_s at the 95 and 99 per cent confidence levels were read from the table given in J. Zar, 'Significance testing of the Spearman rank correlation coefficient', *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, LXVII (1972), p. 579. On 17 cases, the 95% confidence level is .49 and the 9% level, 0.62. In this example, the coefficient $r_s = 0.24$ is clearly a weak one, the largest influence being exerted by Bristol, second on one order and thirteenth on the other.

(B.2) Worked example of a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r)

In this case, let x = the absolute size of the London-born group in each of 17 towns (and $\bar{x}$ the average size); y = total size of each town population ($\bar{y}$ = the average). All figures are given in thousands and the coefficient is given by the formula:

$$r = \frac{\sum (x - \bar{x})(y - \bar{y})}{\sqrt{[\sum (x - \bar{x})^2][\sum (y - \bar{y})^2]}}$$

The calculation proceeds as follows:-

	x	x - x̄	(x - x̄) ²	y	y - ȳ	y - ȳ ²	(x - x̄) (y - ȳ)
Brighton	7.75	+6.19	38.32	69.7	+33.1	1095.6	204.9
Bristol	3.27	+1.71	2.92	137.3	+100.8	10160.6	172.4
Portsmouth	3.12	+1.55	2.40	72.1	+35.3	1260.3	55.0
Southampton	2.07	+0.51	0.26	35.3	-1.3	1.7	-0.7
Bath	2.01	+0.45	0.20	54.2	+17.7	313.3	8.0
Plymouth	1.22	-0.35	0.12	52.2	+15.7	246.5	-5.5
Oxford	1.18	-0.38	0.14	27.8	-8.7	75.7	3.3
Reading	1.17	-0.40	0.16	21.5	-15.1	228.0	6.0
Maidstone	1.11	-0.46	0.21	20.7	-15.8	249.6	7.3
Exeter	0.81	-0.75	0.56	32.8	-3.7	13.7	2.8
Canterbury	0.71	-0.86	0.74	18.4	-18.2	331.3	15.7
Colchester	0.62	-0.95	0.90	19.4	-17.1	292.4	16.2
Winchester	0.57	-1.00	1.00	13.7	-22.9	524.4	22.9
Gloucester	0.48	-1.08	1.17	17.6	-19.0	361.0	20.5
Salisbury	0.27	-1.30	1.69	11.7	-24.9	620.0	32.4
Truro	0.15	-1.41	1.99	10.7	-25.8	665.6	36.4
Dorchester	0.12	-1.44	2.07	6.4	-30.2	912.0	43.5
			54.85			17151.6	641.1

Thus,

$$r = \frac{641.1}{\sqrt{[54.85][17151.6]}}$$

$$= \frac{0.66}{}$$

Interpretation A perfect (positive) correlation would be indicated by $r = 1.00$ and a perfect negative one by $r = -1.00$, though such values are rarely achieved in practice. Published tables showing the coefficients necessary to establish a link at the 95, 99 (etc) % confidence level are found in many statistical texts, eg. N.M. Downie and R.W. Heath, *Basic Statistical Methods*, 3rd edition (New York and London, 1970), p. 318; or S.M. Stahl and J.D. Hennes, *Reading and Understanding Applied Statistics*, 2nd edition (St Louis and London, 1980), pp. 344-5. As with the rank order correlation coefficient, critical levels vary according to the number of cases under consideration ($n = 17$ in this example) and it is conventional to reduce this by two 'degrees of freedom', that is, $df = n - 2$. In this case the calculated value of $r = 0.66$ exceeds the 95 and 99 per cent confidence levels for r at $df = 15$, which are 0.49 and 0.62 respectively in the Downie and Heath table.

(C) Summary data for 26 Kent registration districts, 1851

	Population ¹	No. of London-born ¹	% London-born ¹	Distance from London of principal settlement miles ²	% males engaged in agriculture ³
Bromley	17,637	1,825	10.35	10 (Bromley)	43.5
Dartford	27,330	2,411	8.82	15 (Dartford)	36.0
Gravesend	16,633	2,579	15.50	22 (Gravesend)	3.6
North Aylesford	16,569	475	2.87	27 (Cobham)	35.6
Hoo	2,845	53	1.86	33 (Hoo)	79.1
Medway	42,746	2,423	5.66	30 (Chatham)	5.5
Malling	19,579	441	2.25	27 (Malling)	57.4
Sevenoaks	22,095	704	3.19	24 (Sevenoaks)	53.8
Tonbridge	28,545	1,361	4.77	36 (Tunbridge Wells)	37.5
Maidstone	36,097	1,340	3.71	34 (Maidstone)	34.6
Hollingbourne	13,751	220	1.60	38 (Hollingbourne)	69.1
Cranbrook	13,069	231	1.77	48 (Cranbrook)	60.2
Tenterden	11,279	124	1.10	54 (Tenterden)	56.1
West Ashford	13,314	531	3.99	53 (Ashford)	41.5
East Ashford	11,960	235	1.96	56 (Wye)	60.6
Bridge	11,164	178	1.59	61 $\frac{3}{4}$ (Barham)	64.8

Canterbury	14,100	550	3.90	55½ (Canterbury)	9.3
Blean	14,100	416	2.84	54 (Whitstable)	33.2
Faversham	16,684	857	5.14	47 (Faversham)	44.7
Milton	12,026	225	1.87	39 (Sittingbourne with Milton)	42.0
Sheppey	13,385	636	4.75	50 (Sheerness)	14.9
Thanet	31,798	2,462	7.74	71½ (Ramsgate)	20.1
Eastry	25,162	559	2.22	73 (Deal)	40.2
Dover	28,325	1,490	5.26	71 (Dover)	17.4
Elham	18,780	891	4.74	70 (Folkestone)	35.3
Romney Marsh	5,437	53	0.97	70 (Lydd)	59.0

Notes: The sources and procedures used were as follows:

¹ For population and numbers of London-born in each registration district, PP 1852-3, LXXXV (see Table 1 in main text).

² Having identified from the census the principal settlements in each district, the distances from London were ascertained from *The Post Office Directory*, in each case by road. Most are direct statements, but nine have been estimated, as follows:-Hoo (=Rochester 29 miles less one plus five = 33); Chatham (=Rochester + 1 = 30); Malling (=Maidstone 34 - 7 = 27); Hollingbourne (=Maidstone, 34 + 4 = 38); Barham (=Canterbury, 55½ + 6½); Whitstable (=Faversham, 47 + 7); Sheerness (=Sittingbourne, 39 + 11 approx.); and Lydd (=Maidstone, 34 + 36). Very minor inaccuracies will not affect the rank order significantly, although it should be borne in mind that some places had alternative connections with London by water and/or rail, and the distances could vary, eg. Gravesend, 22 miles by road, 24 by rail, 26 by water, or Folkestone (70 by road, 82 by rail).

³ Males in agriculture are the occupations listed under Order IX in the census occupational returns (PP 1852-3, LXXXVIII - Pt. I, see Table 1 in main text), viz. landed proprietors, farmers, graziers, farmers' male relatives, bailiffs, agricultural labourers, shepherds, farm servants, woodmen, gardeners, nurserymen and others in arboriculture and horticulture. In each district the percentage given relates to the total male population (aged 20 and over).

(D) Identifying the London-born population of Canterbury

The aim was to include as Londoners all those born within the registration division and county of London, comprising the following registration districts: (Middlesex) Kensington, Chelsea, Hanover Square, Westminster, St Martin in the Fields, St James Westminster, Marylebone, Hampstead, Pancras, Islington, Hackney, St Giles, Strand, Holborn, Clerkenwell, St Luke, East London, West London, London City, Shoreditch, Bethnal Green, St George in the East, Stepney and Poplar; (Surrey) Southwark, Bermondsey, Newington, Lambeth, Wandsworth, Camberwell; (Kent) Greenwich, Deptford, Woolwich, Plumstead, Eltham, Lee, Lewisham and Sydenham.

Many of the entries in the census enumerators' books gave birthplaces in sufficient detail for easy determination of whether the individuals concerned had been born in London, so defined, eg. 'St James, Westminster' or 'Surrey, Brixton' or, conversely, should be excluded (eg. 'Middlesex, Enfield'). A number were recorded as 'London' only, but this seemed quite acceptable. Altogether, these two categories accounted for some 6-700 cases considered. However, there were some difficulties at the margin. Occasionally, the precise addresses given were illegible or untraceable ('Middlesex, Beygate'), while a few laconic entries were ambiguous, most frequently 'Kennington', which could refer either to a metropolitan district of Surrey, or a Kentish village situated two miles north of Ashford. And sometimes only the county of birth was given: this problem was not encountered with Kent, or Surrey, but in about twenty cases only 'Middlesex' was recorded.

After due consideration, the following were accepted as Londoners:

- (a) All those whose precise birthplaces lay clearly within the London registration division.
- (b) All whose birthplace was stated simply as 'London'.
- (c) Those born in Middlesex (unspecified location), bearing in mind the balance of probabilities: for the census showed that the metropolitan population of the county exceeded the extra-metropolitan in the ratio 11.5:1.

NB. In a few ambiguous cases, such as 'Kennington', it was assumed that the birthplace was the nearest settlement to Canterbury.

In the table given below, we arrive at a total of 533 Londoners for the Canterbury registration district, a figure somewhat at variance with that given in the printed census volume (550), although curiously enough there is an excellent match for the borough (715 on my count, 709 in the published census). Bearing in mind the manifold scope for errors, and the lack of personal incentive on the part of the census clerks to reach perfect exactitude, I prefer my own figures.

Table showing the distribution of population and numbers of London-born, by parish etc., in Canterbury, 1851

	Total Population	London- born in institutions ¹	London- born (non- institutional)	% London- born
<i>(a) Canterbury Registration District:</i>				
St Paul	1,729	7	46	3.06
St Martin	189	—	4	2.17
St Mary, Northgate	3,091 ²	20	78	3.17
St Mildred	2,003 ³	—	70	3.49
Holy Cross Within	225	—	13	5.78
St Mary Bredin	1,007	21	19	3.97
All Saints	412 ⁴	—	20	4.85
St Alphege	1,098	—	31	2.82
St Andrew	538	—	32	5.95
St Mary Breadman	391	—	16	4.09
St George the Martyr	1,186	1	54	4.64
St Mary Magdalene	413	4	16	4.84
St Margaret	620	2	29	5.00
St Peter	1,198	—	50	4.17
	14,100	55	478	3.78
<i>(b) Remainder of Canterbury Borough</i> (In the Blean Registration District)				
Archbishop's Palace (precincts)	183	—	13	7.10
Christ Church (precincts)	243	9	19	11.52
Ville of Staplegate	261	—	10	3.83
Ville of St Gregory	1,278	—	32	2.50
St Dunstan (part of)	1,246	1	67	5.46
St Stephen (part of)	43	—	—	—
<i>(In the Bridge Registration District)</i>				
Holy Cross Westgate Without	853	—	28	3.28
Nackington (part of)	20	—	1	5.00
Thanington (part of)	158	—	2	1.26
Patricbourne (part of)	13	—	—	—
	18,398	65	650	3.89

Sources: For population by parish, etc., PP 1852-3, LXXXV; for the London-born, locally-held copies of the census enumerators' books (Public Record Office, H.O. 107/64-6).

Notes:

¹ The following were classed as institutions: Kent and Canterbury Hospital, County Gaol, the Barracks, Union Workhouse, St Augustine's College (for missionaries), King's School, Dane John Academy, The Limes (school). In addition, six smaller schools were included, where four or more boarders were identified.

² St Mary Northgate includes the barracks and St John's precincts.

³ St Mildred includes Old Castle precincts.

⁴ All Saints includes East Bridge Hospital (almshouse).

*(D.2) Age and sex distribution of London-born population of Canterbury, 1851***(MALES)**

Age Group	No. of Londoners	% of London-born	% in borough as a whole, less Londoners
0-	13	4.08	12.16
5-	27	8.46	11.28
10-	40	12.54	11.12
15-	33	10.34	10.02
20-	33	10.34	9.02
25-	25	7.84	7.36
30-	22	6.90	6.88
35-	20	6.27	5.61
40-	28	8.78	5.36
45-	16	5.02	4.67
50-	14	4.39	4.23
55-	10	3.13	3.29
60-	19	5.96	3.29
65-	9	2.82	2.47
70-	10	3.13	3.24
	319	100.00	100.00

(FEMALES)

Age Group	No. of Londoners	% of London-born	% in borough as a whole, less Londoners
0-	16	4.04	11.26
5-	35	8.84	9.95
10-	38	9.60	9.58
15-	29	7.32	9.74
20-	37	9.34	9.47
25-	32	8.08	7.87
30-	35	8.84	7.11
35-	27	6.82	6.04
40-	29	7.32	5.53
45-	32	8.08	4.73
50-	24	6.06	4.38
55-	19	4.80	3.59
60-	16	4.04	3.63
65-	8	2.02	2.50
70-	19	4.80	4.61
	396	100.00	99.99

Source: PP 1852-3, LXXXVIII - Pt. I. See table 1 in main text.

(D.3) *Classification of Occupations, Canterbury Borough, 1851*

The sources used are the appropriate printed census volume for the borough as a whole (PP 1852-3, LXXXVIII - Pt. I), and the enumerators' books (PRO H.O. 107/64-6) for the London-born. These data have been analysed according to a method pioneered by Charles Booth and extended and developed in E.A. Wrigley (ed) *Nineteenth Century Society*, Cambridge, 1972, pp. 226-310, where the detailed attributions of specific occupations may be found. In the present context, it has been found useful to split the Industrial Service category: I.S.(2) comprises general labourers, but I.S.(1) which includes accountants, clerks etc. has been amalgamated with the public and professional sector.

(i) *MALES*

Employment Sector	All Males in Canterbury		London-born Males	
	% of total population	% of econo- mically active persons	% of all Londoners (n=282)	% of econo- mically active Londoners (n=218)
Agriculture	7.7	12.2	3.9	5.1
Mining	0.3	0.5	—	—
Building	6.2	9.8	3.9	5.1
Manufacture	18.3	29.1	23.4	30.3
Transport	2.3	3.7	2.5	3.2
Dealing	9.0	14.3	9.6	12.4
Industrial Service (2)	6.5	10.4	5.3	6.9
Public & Professional Services (2) + I.S. (1)	9.8	15.6	26.2	33.9
Domestic Service	2.8	4.5	2.5	3.2
		100.1		100.1
Persons of Indepen- dent Means	1.4		3.6	
Others	35.7		19.2	
	100.0		100.1	

(i) FEMALES

Employment Sector	All females in Canterbury		London-born females	
	% of total population	% of economically active persons	% of all Londoners (n=282)	% of economically active Londoners (n=218)
Agriculture			—	—
Mining	0.1	0.3	—	—
Manufacture	6.8	24.9	19.1	37.5
Transport	—	—	0.5	1.0
Dealing	1.7	6.2	2.5	4.8
Industrial Service (2)	—	—	0.5	1.0
Public and Professional Services + I.S. (1)	1.7	6.4	10.3	20.2
Domestic Service	17.0	62.1	18.1	35.6
		99.9		100.1
Persons of Independent Means	3.6		21.6	
Others	69.0		27.5	
	99.9		100.1	

Notes

¹ D. Keene, 'Medieval London and its Region', *The London Journal*, XIV (1989), p. 100.

² J. Patten, *Rural-Urban Migration in Pre-Industrial England* (Research Papers No. 6, School of Geography, University of Oxford, 1973), p. 23.

³ E.A. Wrigley, 'A Simple Model of London's Importance in Changing English Society and Economy, 1650-1750', *Past and Present*, No. 37 (1967), p. 49.

⁴ E.A. Wrigley, *People, Cities and Wealth* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 166-7.

⁵ A. Redford, *Labour Migration in England, 1800-1850* (Manchester, 1926), pp. 16, 183, 184-5, 195.

⁶ H.A. Shannon, 'Migration and the Growth of London, 1841-91', *Economic History Review*, V (1935), pp. 82, 84.

⁷ D.E. Baines, *Migration in a Mature Economy. Emigration and Internal Migration in England and Wales, 1861-1900* (Cambridge, 1985), p. 218.

⁸ By D. Mageean in Open University, D301 *Historical Sources and the Social Scientist*, Units 9-10, *Patterns and Processes of Internal Migration* (Milton Keynes, 1982), p. 20.

⁹ E.G. Ravenstein, 'The Laws of Migration', *Journal of the Statistical Society*, XLVIII (1885), pp. 187-8, 199.

¹⁰ H. Llewellyn Smith, 'The Influx of Population' in C. Booth, *Life and Labour of the People in London*, III, Part I, pp. 125, 126.

¹¹ Shannon, *Ec.H.R.*, V, p. 86.

¹² Baines, *Migration*, pp. 144, 162, 200, 218. Both figures are given net of returns.

¹³ See the discussion of this point in E. Higgs, *Making Sense of the Census* (Public Record Office Handbooks, No. 23, 1989), pp. 71-4. The general impression (and it can be no more than that) is that some 10-15% of birth-places were stated inaccurately.

¹⁴ It is possible to make some inferences about the steps involved in the migration of families by scrutinizing the birth-places of children. See, *inter alia*, D. Bryant, 'Demographic Trends in South Devon in the Mid-Nineteenth Century' in *Exeter Essays in Geography*, eds. K.I. Gregory and W.L.D. Ravenhill, (Exeter, 1971), pp. 137-41; M. Anderson, 'Urban Migration in Nineteenth Century Lancashire. Some insights into Two Competing Hypotheses', *Annales de Démographie Historique* (1971), pp. 23-4; and T. Gwynne & M. Sill, 'Census Enumeration Books: a Study of Mid-Nineteenth Century Migration', *The Local Historian*, XII, 1976, pp. 74-9. But large samples are required before useful conclusions can be drawn, and the attempt has not been made here.

¹⁵ Viz., those counties classed as southern as 'an operating convenience' by J.R. Lowerson in *Southern History*, I, (1979), p. 10, with the addition of Hertfordshire and Buckinghamshire.

¹⁶ According to J. Lowerson and J. Myerscough, *Time to Spare in Victorian England* (Hassocks, 1977), pp. 24-5, Brighton doubled its population between 1811 and 1821 and became the fastest growing town of over 20,000 in England in the ensuing decade. They describe its apotheosis as 'the result not only of its proximity to London, but also of a chance enthusiasm for the place on the part of the Prince of Wales.'

¹⁷ The full data is given in Appendix A.

¹⁸ For worked examples, see Appendix B (1 and 2).

¹⁹ E.J. Hobsbawm, 'The Nineteenth Century London labour market' in *London. Aspects of Change*, ed. R. Glass (1964), p. 15. This observation was based chiefly on the scrutiny of trade union organization and wage data.

²⁰ The critical values of r_s and r , on twenty-six cases, stand at 0.39 and 0.37 respectively.

²¹ Kentish agriculture was well-supplied with native labour, except at critical times such as hop-picking. This activity did, of course, attract vast numbers of Londoners on a seasonal basis, but it is not captured by the census, which was taken on 30-31 March.

²² The 1851 census (PP 1852-3, LXXXV, pp. 86-9) gives for extra-metropolitan Kent, population details for eight parliamentary boroughs (PB) and eleven municipal boroughs (MB), covering in all thirteen places. In addition, after consultation with Clerks of the Peace, another eight settlements of 2,000 and over (2K+) were deemed to be towns, although others were not. This contemporary working convention has been accepted here and accordingly in block A we have Chatham, 28,424 (PB); Gravesend, 16,633 (MB); Rochester, 14,938 (MB or PB); Ramsgate, 11,838 (2K+); Margate, 9,107 (2K+); and Dartford, 5,763 (2K+).

²³ Material on Gravesend taken from Kelly's *Post Office Directory of the Six Home Counties* (1851), kindly lent to me by my colleague Dr J. Whyman. In the section describing the registration districts which follows, all information quoted directly or indirectly comes from this source, or from Appendix C, unless otherwise noted.

²⁴ J.M. Rawcliffe, 'Bromley: Kentish Market Town to London Suburb, 1841-8' in

The Rise of Suburbia, ed. F.M.L. Thompson (Leicester, 1982), p. 31 argues that the absence of a railway was Bromley's most pressing problem prior to 1858.

²⁵ See note 22. In block B, we have Dover, 22,244 (MB or PB); Maidstone, 20,740 (MB); Tunbridge Wells, 10,587 (2K+); Folkestone, 6,726 (MB); Faversham, 4,595 (MB); Tonbridge, 4,539 (2K+); and Hythe, 2,857 (MB).

²⁶ See note 22. Block C includes Canterbury, 18,398 (MB or PB); Sheerness, 8,549 (2K+); Deal, 7,067 (MB); Ashford, 4,092 (2K+); and Sandwich, 2,966 (MB).

²⁷ For the characteristics of the primarily rural registration districts I have relied on G.H. Garrad, *A Survey of the Agriculture of Kent* (County Agricultural Surveys No. 1, Royal Agricultural Society of England, 1954), chapters II–VI.

²⁸ See G. Turner, *Ashford. The Coming of the Railway* (Maidstone, 1984), pp. 78, 173.

²⁹ See, eg. W.N. Ireland, *England's Topographer or A New and Complete History of the County of Kent* (London, 1828–30), II, p. 284, IV, p. 167.

³⁰ See J. Whyman, 'Rise and Decline: Dover and Deal in the Nineteenth Century', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, LXXXIV (1969), pp. 107–37 and LXXXV (1970), pp. 35–54.

³¹ See Appendix C.

³² Eg. Kelly's *Post Office Directory* (1851), which describes Canterbury on pp. 265–77.

³³ Between 1801 and 1851 the population of the borough expanded by 60%, but that of England and Wales doubled in the same period.

³⁴ An observation made by R. Cunningham Graham in 1928. This and the opinions of Cobbett and Marx which follow are taken from P. Brown, S. Hutchinson and M. Irwin, *Written City. A Literary Guide to Canterbury* (Canterbury, 1986), pp. 51, 71, 89–90.

³⁵ See Appendix D.1.

³⁶ As a consequence, the proportion of adults (twenty and over) born in Scotland and Ireland (2.8 and 1.6 per cent respectively) were higher than might be expected in a smallish southern town. (Compare, eg. Reading, 0.7 and 1.0 per cent).

³⁷ See Appendix D.1, note (1).

³⁸ See Appendix D.1, for full details.

³⁹ An obvious contrast would be with the Irish-born in many British towns and cities. See, *inter alia*, R. Swift and S. Gilley, *The Irish in the Victorian City*, (1985); L. Lees, *Exiles of Erin* (Manchester, 1979) and especially M. Anderson, 'Urban Migration in Victorian Britain. Problems of Assimilation?', in *Immigration et Société Urbaine en Europe Occidentale*, ed. Recherche sur les Civilisations (Paris, 1985). He contrasts the Irish with most British-born migrants who experienced relatively few difficulties of assimilation.

⁴⁰ Baines, *Migration*, pp. 328–30, who also shows that for females the relative positions were, London and Middlesex second, Kent sixth. For evidence of the long-standing superiority of London see D. Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order* (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 72–3, 124–5, 129.

⁴¹ Anderson, 'Urban Migration', p. 89 draws attention to the usefulness of 'age-heaping' (concentration on round numbers) as a surrogate indicator for numeracy. He divided the number of persons recording their ages as 20, 30, 40 and 50 by half the number recording ages of 19, 21, 29, 31, 39, 41, 49 and 51. Applying this method to 140 London-born persons in Canterbury, the resultant index is 1.11, a lower (ie. more favourable) ratio than all but two of the twenty-four quoted by Anderson for the migrant and non-migrant elements of urban and non-urban populations in 1851.

⁴² See F. Bédarida, 'Londres au milieu du XIX^e siècle', *Annales, Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, 23^e Année (1968), p. 281.

⁴³ Llewellyn Smith, 'Influx of Population', p. 127.

⁴⁴ See, in particular, P.J. Cain and A.G. Hopkins, 'Gentlemanly Capitalism and British expansion overseas, I, The Old Colonial System, 1688-1850', *Economic History Review*, 2nd series, XXXIX (1986); and C.H. Lee, *The British Economy since 1700. A Macroeconomic Perspective* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 125-41.