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THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF A SCOTTISH RURAL COMMUNITY

INTRODUCTION

One of the subsidiary objects of the research reported here was to discover how far anthropological techniques could be used in the study of modern society. In pursuance of this object, it was felt that a community should be studied which resembled as far as possible those primitive societies which anthropologists usually study. A rural community as remote from large towns as can be found nowadays was thought to meet the requirement. After some preliminary inspection of the borders of Scotland, the parish of Eskdalemuir was chosen as the field of study.
Eskdalemuir is in the north east of Dumfriesshire, a large mainly rural county in the south west of Scotland. Geographically the parish belongs to the area called The Southern Uplands. It is thought of by parishioners and people of nearby districts as belonging to "The Borders" - a not clearly defined area of Scotland of which the southern limit is the border between Scotland and England. The inhabitants of the Borders think of themselves as possessing some culture traits not found in other parts of Scotland, for example local dialects, and the Common Riding ceremonies of some Border towns. This feeling of a distinction is expressed in many ways. The people often refer to themselves as "Borderers"; there is a Border Rugby League distinct from the national one, though the teams which compete in this league also compete in the national one; and there are Borderer Associations in Edinburgh and Glasgow for Borderers exiled there.

From Carlisle north there are three main routes into central Scotland by rail and first class road. One goes through Dumfries and up Nithsdale; another through Lockerbie and up Annandale; and a third goes East towards Edinburgh, a road going through Langholm and Ewes Valley, and a railway through Liddesdale and into Teviotdale where it meets with the road. The upper part of Eskdale, north of Langholm, comprising the parishes of Westerkirk and Eskdalemuir, lies between the second and third routes. A second class road from Langholm goes through upper Eskdale into Ettrick, a sheep farming district similar to Eskdalemuir, and another second class road from Lockerbie joins it at Eskdalemuir Church.
Eskdalemuir is a somewhat isolated place in the eyes of people of the surrounding districts who live nearer the main lines of communication. The two nearest towns, Langholm and Lockerbie, are thirteen and fourteen miles from Eskdalemuir Post Office, which, though it is not equidistant from the northern and southern boundaries, is thought of by parishioners as the centre of the parish. Most of the dwellings in the parish are situated in the main valley (see p. ), and separated from settlements in adjoining parishes by long stretches of hill and moor. The isolation of the parish has not made it a holiday making place, or a place to which townsfolk might go for a day's trip. There are no celebrated mountains, extravagant waterfalls, romanticised lochs, sacred ruins, or any of the other features which seem to be necessary for that; neither are there any shops, hotels, public houses or hostelries. The road through Eskdalemuir lies on the route of a summer evening bus tour conducted by a firm in Selkirk, but apart from that tourists are seldom seen there. Cyclists and hikers so seldom come this way that their appearance may be a topic of conversation for parishioners. There is at times a slightly contemptuous and hostile attitude towards tourists who stop in the place. One summer Sunday recently some tourists stopped their car near the bridge over the Esk at the smiddy, and walked over a field to the river bank. They were seen by the blacksmith, who, as the only (Reserve) policeman in the parish has a police sergeant's greatcoat, which he wears in cold weather. The blacksmith's apprentice put on the greatcoat and walked over
towards the tourists. They retreated to their car where the apprentice caught up with them, and pretended to charge them with trespassing. The joke was widely appreciated in the parish.

Because of its remoteness Eskdalemuir was chosen by a committee of the Royal Society early in the present century as the location for an observatory, specialising in the study of terrestrial magnetism and atmospheric electricity, for it was judged that the instruments used in these studies would be unlikely in the foreseeable future to be disturbed by the presence of industrial installations.

The parish has been settled for several thousands of years. There are two prehistoric stone circles, many circular earth embankments, and at Raeburnfoot are the remains of a Roman Camp. The agricultural population bears names which have long been associated with the Borders - Elliot, Beattie, Scott, Little, Bell, Glendinning, and many others. The early history of these parts in Christian times is somewhat obscure; and virtually all that is known of Eskdalemuir and surrounding parishes until about the eighteenth century is the names of successive dominant landowners - the monks of Melrose, the Douglases, the Beattiesons, Scotts, and the Scotts of Buccleuch. After the first world war the Duke of Buccleuch sold his lands in the parish, most of the farms being bought by the farmers who were tenants of them at the time.

The first general account of the parish is that given by the Rev. W. D. Brown in the first statistical account of
Scotland, and it indicates that Eskdalemuir was then undergoing the changes in agricultural techniques general throughout the more enlightened parts of the country. The parish seems to have contributed to this revolution. Smith remarks "The open drain of the hill farm, said to have been first used in Eskdalemuir about 1770 has played an important part in the improvement of the herbage." At any rate it is clear from Brown's account that the economy of the parish was by the end of the 18th century assuming the form it retained until 1939. The main features of this economy were - division of the land into farms devoted to sheep rearing, with individual ownership or lease of farms, and hired labour paid in money wages and kind. This form of economy emerged from one the details of which are not clearly known, but in which sheep rearing was less prominent, in which money wages were insignificant, and in which farms were small. Brown writes in 1795 "In former times the inhabitants were much fonder of agriculture than they are at present. At a moderate calculation they ploughed twice as much as they do now. The reason of their leaving it off was owing......chiefly to the great demand in late years for sheep and wool." And "Formerly they were wont to

flock much with black cattle among their sheep." Brown also mentions various experiments some local farmers are carrying out on sheep husbandry. At this time there were in the parish 25,440 sheep, 445 black cattle, 75 horses, and 200 acres under tillage. Apart from the agricultural population there were in the parish 3 merchants, 1 miller, 3 wrights, 2 smiths, 4 tailors, 1 clogger and 9 weavers. Farms were being enlarged here as in most of Scotland, and Brown gives this as the reason for the population being "considerably reduced in the memory of its present inhabitants."

The Rev. Brown also wrote the account of the parish for the New Statistical account of 1845. The agrarian revolution was still in progress. By this time there were 400,000 roods of drains in the parish, and the larger rivers had been embanked in places. By one such embankment "an extensive haugh, of more than 100 acres, which in many places was a sour swamp and much over-flowed every flood by the river, has been dried and rendered productive both for crops and hay." There have been experiments with the cultivation of better grasses, and production of hay has increased to such an extent that farmers are no longer obliged to send their sheep to low lying farms in winter, as they had to do at the time of the first account. The number of acres in tillage or cultivated occasionally has gone up to 482. There has been a change in the breed of sheep favoured, all except two hirstles being now of the Cheviot breed.

Experiments in sheep breeding continued after this, the most
celebrated name in Eskdalemuir in this connection being Bryden of Moodlaw.

Since then three outstanding developments may be mentioned. First there has been a steady depopulation of the Border rural areas since the middle of the nineteenth century. The figures for Eskdalemuir are -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly there has been an increase in the efficiency of farming implements and methods, so that now, despite the fact of depopulation and that nearly 8,000 acres have been taken over by the Forestry Commission, there were in June 1951 in the parish, 29,140 sheep, 305 dairy cattle, 332 beef cattle, 208 acres under tillage and 349 under rotation grass.

Thirdly, a new element has been introduced into the economy by the afforestation of about 8,000 acres of what was before sheep pasture. This began in 1939.
Methodology.

In "The Foundations of Social Anthropology" Nadel writes "In recent anthropological literature, in fact the terms 'society' and 'culture' are accepted as referring to somewhat different things or, more precisely, to different ways of looking at the same thing." By "the same thing" is meant what the anthropologist observes during fieldwork – that is the "standardised behaviour" of the persons who make up the community he is studying. (To avoid any possible misunderstanding it may be added that material objects used in behaviour – clothes, houses, utensils, etc. – also provide material for observation. To simplify the writing of this section, such material objects will henceforth be included in the notion of standardised behaviour.)

From a study of recent anthropological literature it is apparent that the standardised behaviour of a community can be viewed from three standpoints. First it can be seen as subserving various "needs" of a biological and social nature.

Second, it can be seen as symptomatic of an underlying geist or spirit or ethos. Anthropologists who use their observations...

---


3. See B. Malinowski, "A Scientific Theory of Culture", Chapel Hill, 1944, for the exposition of this standpoint.

to disclose some underlying spirit animating the community are of two sorts, (a) those who describe the geist as a phenomenon of a mixed metaphysical, aesthetic and psychological nature, (b) those who attempt to resolve the geist into a purely psychological phenomenon, a personality held to be typical of or widespread in the group.\footnote{1} When/standardised behaviour observed is used in these two ways the writers describe themselves as dealing with the "culture" of the community. The third way of viewing the material of observation is, as Professor Fortes puts it, "as indices of social relations".\footnote{2} This is the way of looking at standardised behaviour that Nadel terms the standpoint of "society" - "Society as I see it means the totality of social facts projected onto the dimension of relationships and groupings."\footnote{3} Anthropologists who treat their observations in this way describe themselves as dealing with the "social structure" of the community. Thus the context of Fortes' remark quoted above is "As I am analysing Tale social structure in this book I treat Tale culture primarily as the content of social relations and not in its own right. I discuss customs, beliefs, conventional usages, religious values and so forth principally as indices of social relations."\footnote{4}

\begin{enumerate}
\item M. Fortes, "The Dynamics of Clanship Among the Tallensi", O.U.P., 1945, p.ix.
\item Nadel, op.cit., p.79.
\item Fortes, op.cit., p.ix.
\end{enumerate}
Since the material presented in this thesis is the result of a field study, an examination of the rival claims and merits of these three standpoints cannot be made here. Such an examination belongs to the literature of anthropological controversy. It is sufficient to state that, like most British anthropologists, I adopt the third standpoint, and use observations of standardised behaviour in the community studied to disclose a structure of social relations in that community.

Social Structure

The aim of studies conducted from the standpoint of "society" or "social structure" is to disclose behind the diverse activities and interactions of the persons making up a community a structure of social relations among them.

Social relations regulate the behaviour of persons to each other and can be described in terms of three aspects, first rights and obligations among those related, second in terms of their attitudes to each other, and third the normal behaviour they are expected to carry out with respect to each other. In

1. Some discussions of this are found in -
   a) Nadel, op.cit.


any relationship one or other aspect may be more heavily stressed (by the community) than another. For example in relations between employer and employee rights and obligations are more heavily stressed than the other two aspects - what amount of wages the employee has a right to in return for what amount of labour he is obliged to give to the employer. On the other hand in the relation between husband and wife, while rights and obligations are by no means unimportant, the attitude of each to the other is generally considered of more importance as far as day to day living is concerned. Norms defining the conduct expected between persons related to each other are referred to as institutions.

The unit of analysis in this method is not the individual but the person, i.e. the occupant of a position in the structure.\(^1\) The person, as Nadel points out, is "more than the individual; it is the individual with certain recognised, or institutionalised tasks and relationships."\(^2\) Most persons in a community are recognisable by having a type name, such as "citizen", "husband", "father" or "chief", "priest", "soldier". Sometimes a person does not have a special type name and is simply spoken of as "member of" such and such a group, a Methodist congregation, to use Radcliffe-Brown's example.

Persons are linked to each other in networks or structures

---

of relationships. In any society certain networks stand out more definitely than others, and these are usually referred to as groups—clans, lineages, etc. Some anthropologists, for example Prof. Evans-Pritchard, consider that such definite groups are the only object of study of the social anthropologist. It seems to me that this limits our field of study unduly, and I follow Radcliffe-Brown in including in our study "all social relation of person to person" and "the differentiation of individuals and of classes by their social role. The differential position of men and women, of chiefs and commoner, of employer and employees, are just as much determinants of social relations as belonging to different clans or different nations." The term role is used in this thesis to denote the actions which a person carries out.

The Community

So far the term community has been taken for granted, as simply meaning the widest group whose behaviour the anthropologist observes. Used in this way the term is transparent; yet a closer examination of "the widest group whose behaviour an anthropologist observes" raises serious difficulties. The main problem has been stated by most anthropologists who have written on methodology. Thus Radcliffe-Brown writes "It is rarely that

2. Radcliffe-Brown, op.cit.
we find a community that is absolutely isolated, having no outside contact. At the present moment of history, the network of social relations spreads over the whole world, without any absolute solution of continuity anywhere. This gives rise to a difficulty which I do not think that sociologists have really faced, the difficulty of defining what is meant by the term 'a society'.

In other words if there are no self contained communities, what in fact is the unit, the behaviour of whose members we observe, and the social structure of which it is our aim to disclose?

Radcliffe-Brown suggests the following solution. "If we take any convenient locality of convenient or suitable size, we can study the structural system as it appears in and from that region, i.e. the network of relations connecting the inhabitants amongst themselves and with the people of other regions." Fortes seems to suggest the same solution when he writes, "For the concept of society as a closed unit, a sort of thing distinguished from like things in the same way as one house is distinguished from others or one animal from another, we must substitute the concept of society as a socio-geographic region, the social elements of which are more closely knit together among themselves than any of them are knit together with social elements of the same kind outside that region." This seems to me a quite correct statement of what the anthropologist is forced to do; but it does not clarify

1. Radcliffe-Brown, *op.cit.*
the problems involved in so doing. A somewhat fuller discussion of them is provided by Prof. Firth.1

Firth starts by distinguishing the "unit of general survey" from the "unit of personal observation". The former he says "is commonly a tribal or other cultural group, and may be almost any size, even tens of thousands of people. Its boundaries delimit the area to which the conclusions of the scientist are expected to apply." He goes on "but the weight of the analysis rests on the unit of personal observation. The latter, chosen with an eye to its representative character, is usually not much more than 1,000 people, and is often considerably less. The unit is submitted to systematic study over a considerable period of time, in order to elucidate detailed social relations between as many persons as possible....Methodologically, the width of the gap between unit of general survey and unit of person observation is important, since if the investigator is to apply his generalisations over the wider community he must be sure that the unit he selects for close study is sufficiently representative."

The notion that communities of 1,000 people can be found which are representative of a larger unit "even tens of thousands of people" in size probably holds good for the sort of society usually studied by anthropologists, those called primitive or pre-literate. For the anthropologist can assume a uniformity of culture throughout the larger unit. Thus one village or clan is

almost identical with any other. Such cultural uniformity cannot be assumed in our own society — indeed we know that it does not obtain. The division of labour has developed to such an extent that no one community can be found representative of the whole society. The community described in this study for example contains no fishermen, nor miners, nor many other types of persons such as are found in villages and towns located elsewhere. It even differs from other rural communities in Scotland, for example the Isle of Barra, described by Mr. Frank Vallee,¹ the population of which is not occupied with large scale sheep farming, as are the majority of males in Eskdalemuir. Such being the case it is necessary to state that I cannot assert with any confidence that the conclusions I draw from the study of Eskdalemuir apply to any other community. At the most they might apply to other sheep farming communities in the Borders of Scotland; but how far they do so remains a matter for further research.

This is however a minor matter. The real problem has not yet been stated. It is touched upon by Firth.

"The small community", he writes, "which is the unit of personal observation is of two types, the integral community and the sectional community. The integral community is....structurally self contained. It is primarily independent of external social arrangements. The sectional small community, on the other hand, is structurally a part of a wider entity. Clan membership or a

religious system, or a superior political authority, are shared with other communities of the same kind.  

The integral small community presents no difficulties in analysis. Its structure forms a self contained whole, and any element of the structure, any relationship between two persons, can be placed in the structure in relation to all the other elements. There have been two notable accounts by anthropologists of rural communities in western civilisation, in which the communities are described as if they were integral communities; Arensberg and Kimball's study of an Irish community, and Miner's of a French Canadian. These are summarised below.

The dominant structure of social relations in the Irish community is the family, and it is in terms of this system of relationships that the social life of the community is described. Each family head owns a small farm. He and his sons supply the labour for the heavy work on the farm, while his wife and daughters look after the house and attend to the lighter work on the farm, such as milking, or feeding the chickens. It is largely a subsistence economy, the farms are small and make little monetary profit. From among his sons the farmer chooses one to inherit the farm. When he and his wife become too old to work effectively any longer, the family head decides to have this inheriting son married. The marriage is arranged between the parents and

1. Firth, op.cit., p.49.
relatives of the bridegroom and bride working through a socially accredited matchmaker. The girl brings a dowry (supplied by her father), the value of which is nicely adjusted to the value of the farm her partner is about to inherit. On the day of his marriage the son is given ownership of the farm, and the old couple retire. Part of the contract drawn up concerning the transfer is that the old couple will be given a room in the farmhouse to live in; this is always "the west room", the room with the best furniture, decorated with photos of kinsfolk and with sacred objects. The dowry is used to provide for siblings of the inheriting son. It may be used in the dowry of a sister or to apprentice a brother to a tradesman or shopkeeper in town, or to establish one in some profession.

In farm work there is a great deal of co-operation among relatives. Most marriages are between persons born and reared in the same locality so that kinship bonds are thick among the residents of any one community. Those few persons in a community who have no kinship ties with other members of the community neither receive nor give help in farm work. Corresponding to the importance of family relations in social life the concept of "blood" dominates their thinking about each other. A person's characteristics are explained by reference to his "blood".

Apart from ties of kinship, relations among members of the community are organised by age, or at least among male members. The father in this familistic type of organisation has great authority over his children, inculcating in them a great respect
for age. Hence the males are divided into youths still under the authority of a father, and the fathers. The first spend their leisure time playing cards, dancing and gambling, the latter in serious conversation in the course of which they lay down judgement on events and persons. Where the two come in contact age is always deferred to.

Relations between the country people and the townspeople, while of an economic cast, are yet of the nature of kinship and friendship relations. There is in fact a constant influx of country people taking up residence and jobs in towns. The shopkeepers farmers trade with are often relatives. From the shopkeepers the farmer obtains credit. However this is not looked upon as a debt in the ordinary commercial way, but as a guarantee of the continuity of the social bond between the two. The farmer wipes out his debt only if he intends to change his custom to another shop.

In these Irish communities there do not seem to be wide differences in culture between different groups.

The French-Canadian community presents similar features, particularly in its familistic organisation. There is one difference apparent between the two. Arensberg was unable to define the boundaries of the community he studied. Miner had no such difficulty in French Canada, for there the parish forms a social unit - "The unit of social life in French Canada is the parish".¹ The parish is both a religious and a civil unit.

¹ H. Miner, op.cit., p.63.
It constitutes a municipality directed by a mayor and council. Election to these offices is keenly contested. The council is empowered to levy taxes, used mainly for road upkeep. The schools in the parish have their own boards of commissioners, elected from parishioners. The parish also forms a congregation, in the charge of the cure. All parishioners regularly attend mass, and the cure is the most influential and respected man in the community.

The content of sermons and the symbolism of the Roman Catholic religion buttress the family, "the real basis of rural life". The head of the typical family owns a farm and has great authority over his children. The farm is worked by family labour, and most of its produce, whether consumed directly or sold, goes to maintain the family. There are many kinship ties among parishioners, and these are utilised in mutual aid practices among the farmers. One son is chosen to inherit the farm, his marriage is arranged, and the girl brings a dowry. The father and the inheriting son are obliged to settle the other siblings in a job, or in marriage. Previously there were plenty of jobs elsewhere for the inheriting son's brothers to go to, but these have become scarce recently, so that there has appeared in the rural parish a new category of persons, landless agricultural labourers.

The culture of the people does not seem to be entirely uniform, the original rural culture slowly giving way to cultural features originating in towns. Moreover the landless labourers
are somewhat critical of the Church. At the same time there do not seem to be startling differences in culture corresponding to different groups or categories.

Both these writers describe the unit of observation as if it were an integral community, clearly separable from the nations of which they are parts. Both too, in giving an overall characterisation of the community talk of "Balance, pattern, system, structure", as if the community were a self contained unit with clearly defined boundaries. At the same time, each mentions that there is a fairly constant emigration from the community to other parts of the nation, and also (in both cases) to the U.S.A. The relation between community and nation is viewed as that between two separate entities, in the manner illustrated in diagram A.

![Diagram A](image)

It seems to me that this is a false picture of the relation between the two, for the members of the community are also at the same time members of the nation, (and also of the "mass

---

society 1 extending beyond the nation). The farmers of the French-Canadian parish for example hold their lands by virtue of being citizens of the Canadian nation, a vast group which guarantees to protect the private property of its members. The same can be said of the farmers of the Irish community. A truer picture of the relation between community and nation would be as in the following diagram, 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th></th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This is not intended as a sweeping criticism of these writers; what is being insisted is that in our society the unit of observation, the community, or whatever it is called, cannot be realistically considered as a self-contained unit, or as a unit which has merely external relations with the wider society surrounding it. It is itself a part of the wider society, the persons in it are also persons in the wider society, and their participation in the wider society is by no means irrelevant to the structure of social relations among themselves in their local community. Moreover, it is not simply that the members of the local community are also all equally members of the nation, for further complications arise. Some, but not all, of the members of the community may be members of nation-wide

---

associations, and their membership of such an association may put them in a social relation to others in the community which would not obtain but for the existence of the nation-wide associations. This for example is the case in Eskdalemuir, where many of the farm labourers are members of a Trade Union to which farm labourers all over the country belong.

Two points of some significance emerge from this discussion. First, that any realistic description of the community studied must include references to these wider groups and associations of which members of the community are part. At the same time these wider groups and associations cannot be exhaustively described - otherwise the study would have to be a description of the whole nation. Secondly, as a result of this, the relationships as actually found among the population making up the community cannot be presented as forming an "integrated whole"; no neatly rounded off system with clear cut edges can be described. Whether in these circumstances we can speak of "a social structure" is open to question, for the notion of a structure seems to imply an integrated whole as the object of study. This obscure point however could only be settled by a long theoretical discussion; the method followed in this thesis is to show the structure of relations among the population studied - what we may call the "local structure", and at the appropriate points to show how this local structure is determined by groups and associations which

1. F. Vallee arrives at a similar conclusion in the study cited.
form part of the "wider structure" in which the local one is embedded.

In quoting Firth on "integral" and "sectional" communities, I have made it seem as if these were two absolutely distinct types. This is not the case - they merely represent two pure types at the ends of a scale; communities are more and less one or the other, in comparison with each other. It could be said for example that the two communities whose structure has been summarised are more integral than is Eskdalemuir. Part of the explanation of the present structure of Eskdalemuir however is that, in this terminology, it has become in recent times "less integral" and more "sectional". Accordingly the thesis begins with an historical account of this process.
CHAPTER I

HISTORY OF THE PARISH

It will be shown later that the dominant system of relationships in the parish is a system of social classes. A full discussion of this concept is given on pp. 165-176, meanwhile the term social class may be accepted in an unsophisticated sense. The aim of this history of the parish is to show how this system has come to dominate the social life of the parish. As remarked in the Introduction the history of the parish in recent times can be viewed as a process whereby it has become less integral and more sectional; the dominance of a class system is the main effect the process has had on the local structure.

The process is one whereby the local community has been increasingly absorbed into the wider structure politically, economically and socially. About fifty years ago the lives of the majority of parishioners were enclosed in four systems of social relationships, or groups - the family, the farm, social classes, and the parish. Over the last half century the parish and the farm have declined in significance, with a corresponding relative increase in the importance of the family and of social class. Since, as will be shown later (Ch. X1), families are differentiated according to the class position of their members, the dominant structure of relations is that of the class system. Moreover the class system has itself changed in a manner that will be indicated later. More concretely, the changes that
have occurred are (a) The parish as a unit of local government has been abolished and its functions taken over by the County and the State (b) Readier means of communication and transport along with increases in money wages for the majority of parishioners have brought parishioners into closer contact with nearby towns, both economically and socially (c) The growth of two nation wide organisations, the Farm Servants Union and the National Farmers Union, and increasing regulation by the State of relations between employers and employees, has completely altered the system of relationships constituting the farm. The total result of all these changes for the local structure is that which has been indicated above.

The turn of the century is taken as the point in time at which the past is compared with the present for two reasons. First because at that time the parish was still a fairly integral community, and secondly because there are many people still alive who were living then and can recall with clarity the social life of the period. Three sorts of sources have been used in tracing this history; first, primary sources such as Acts and Statutes, and minute books of constituted bodies such as the Parish Council; secondary sources - histories of the period; and lastly, statements about the past made by elderly or middle aged parishioners.

It is realised that the third sort of data must be carefully used, and I have used only information which has been corroborated by several informants and which in theory at least is verifiable. For example, several informants have told me that many years ago
after evening service on Sunday a crowd of youths met on Davington bridge to pass the evening in talk and horse play. That several of them say so seems to me to establish the fact that the gatherings took place. On the other hand, all the elderly when talking of the past say "Folks were more contented in these days." As we have no way of measuring contentment as between then and now, this statement cannot be verified, and while we may note with interest the feeling of persons who have experienced so much social change in their lives, we cannot take this as evidence that there has been some depreciation in the quality of living over the last fifty years.

The use of these various sources makes for a certain ambiguity, in the sense that data referring to the parish as a unit in the system of local government refers to all parishes in Scotland, whereas data given by an informant on, for example, forms of entertainment fifty years ago perhaps applies only to the informant's own parish, the one he or she lived in then. This possibility however does not really affect our main aim - the history we shall outline applies to Eskdalemuir, the parish we are concerned with; how far it applies to other parishes is perhaps a matter for further research. From enquiries I made in other parishes I am convinced that the trends described are typical of their history too.

The Parish as a Political Unit

Formerly the parish was an administrative unit within the structure of the state, controlling in ways described below the
lives of those living within its boundaries. This control was effected through two institutions, the Parish Council and the School Board.

The Parish Council

The Parish Council was instituted by the Local Government Act (Scotland) of 1894, and displaced the Parochial Boards then in existence. The Council was elected every three years (by ballot) by the heritors and ratepayers of the parish from among the candidates who put themselves forward. The number of councillors for any one parish was not fewer than five and not more than thirty-one. The office bearers within it were a chairman, treasurer and clerk. The chairman was always an elected member but the clerk was appointed by the Council and usually was not an elected member. Usually too the clerk was the rate collector and Inspector of Poor in the parish, for which duties he was paid a small emolument - about £14 a year. The Council was incorporated under the name of the parish council of the parish, with power to sue and be sued, and had perpetual right of succession.

The Council controlled a fund of money raised by levying within the parish a rate not exceeding sixpence in the pound on the annual value of the lands and heritages within the parish.

The duties of the Council were mainly -

1) To administer the Poor Law in the parish. This involved

1. The following account is a summary of the main provisions of the Act.
levying a rate upon parish ratepayers, deciding whether applicants for public relief came within the categories entitled to it, and deciding on the amount and kind of relief. A "casual ward" was maintained, i.e. a building within which vagrants and sick parishioners unable to be cared for in a house were housed and fed.

2) To provide places for the reception and temporary detention of children against whom offences had been or were believed to have been committed, to direct proceedings to be taken in regard to ill treatment and neglect of children and to pay the cost of such proceedings.

3) To administer the registrations of births, marriages, deaths, vaccinations, etc.

4) To administer in transfers of property held wholly or mainly for the benefit of the inhabitants of the parish - recreation grounds, burial grounds, etc.

Stated in this bald way the duties of the Parish Council seem unimportant and truly only of parochial interest. This is not the case. The Poor Law was an institution of the greatest significance at this time providing the only public provision against the miseries - hunger, exposure, etc. - of unemployment and destitution.¹ Just how much destitution there was in the country on the whole at this time was never exactly measured but

---

¹ For a penetrating analysis of the significance of the Poor Law see Karl Polanyi, "Origins of our Time", Gollancz, 1945.
there seems to have been general agreement that at least a tenth of the population was in this condition. At any rate, from accounts parishioners give, the casual ward in Eskdalemuir (and in surrounding parishes) was never empty. A lady who was partly in charge of it says "There was aye somebody wanting a night's shelter and a meal, tramps and wandering bodies, or maybe somebody in the parish, but mostly tramps". Moreover, the significance of these provisions cannot simply be assessed by the amount of relief they afforded to actual persons in want, because any hired employee (and they constituted the majority of the parishioners) might find himself unemployed or disabled in some way, from sickness or accident, or old age. As there was no vast contributory scheme of insurance against these vicissitudes, such as we take for granted today, the provisions of the poor law were all that stood between those who fell destitute and death.

While the Poor Law represented, so to speak, the hired employee's right not to die of starvation, there was a political and social stigma attached to the exercise of the right.

The political stigma consisted in disenfranchisement, the loss of the right to play one's part as a citizen of the state. The social stigma (at least in Eskdalemuir) consisted in being relegated to an inferior social class.2 This is dealt with in

a later section.

To return to the Parish; examination of the minute book of the Eskdalemuir Parish Council during its entire history shows that these duties were conscientiously carried out. There were five councillors of whom one was invariably a minister, there was usually though not invariably one of the larger farmers and the other three were usually small farmers. There was one short departure from this normal composition when a joiner got elected onto the Council, but he resigned after attending only a few meetings.

From 1897 until the abolition of the Parish Council, the clerk, rate collector and Inspector of poor in Eskdalemuir was the schoolmaster of the main school. To the council was brought information concerning those matters it was empowered to deal with, and in accordance with the information received the council acted. For example at the meeting of 3rd August, 1895, "Mr. X, one of the councillors, reported the case of Mrs. Z, Twiglees, who is at present ill with a young family of five. The Inspector was instructed to have the usual application form filled up and was authorised to pay aliment at the rate of 10/- per week as long as Mrs. Z. remained in her present invalid condition." Or there is the case of Mistress Y, receiving 4/- weekly for many years, and also, on the recommendation of the M.O., a bottle of

1. I am greatly indebted to the County Clerk of Dumfriesshire for access to this official record.
whiskey a week. On 13th February, 1904, is the entry, "The Inspector also stated that a report had reached him that Mistress Y was spending 3/- weekly on whiskey. He on enquiry found this report correct, and had put a stop to it." These illustrate the control exerted upon the individual from within the parish. A more dramatic example is shown in the following entry, 17th October, 1896 - "Dr. X having got notice to attend the meeting was asked to vindicate his character and clear himself of the scandal in connection with Mrs. Y. or send in his resignation of the office of Medical Officer to the Parish Council of Eskdalemuir within a week of the date, failing which he would be served with a formal dismissal." The doctor resigned though "protesting against the illegality and injustice of the Council's action."

The importance of the Parish Council for the destitute is obvious. At the same time, while the administration of the Poor Law seems to have occupied most of the Council's time, matters of more general interest to the parish at large were dealt with, e.g. building of footbridges, appointing of Medical Officers, the upkeep of cemeteries and so forth.

It should be remarked that there is no trace in these minutes of any harshness of dealing or favouritism in treatment of paupers. Indeed, while Mistress Y was firmly dealt with when she spent three-quarters of her relief money on whiskey, the fact that she was given a bottle of whiskey as part of her aliment shows that she was not unkindly dealt with. We may recall that even the Webbs, bent on changing the administration of the Poor
Law, were hard put to it to find fault with its administration in Scotland. They remark in "The Break up of the Poor Law"1 .... "We have been impressed with the much greater approach in Scotland to identity of treatment of similar cases in the same parish, and of similar cases in different parishes". And "There is a much nearer approach to an accurate, impartial and even execution of the will of the elected representatives" than in England and Ireland. The Webbs believed this was due to the greater power of the Inspector of Poor in Scotland and to the fact that a claimant for relief from a Parish Council had a right to appeal to higher authority, a right he did not have elsewhere.

The School Board

The School Board was instituted by the Education (Scotland) Act of 1872, 2 replacing a committee of heritors and the parish minister who had been responsible till then for the parish school or schools. This Act introduced a new conception of the duties of parents with regard to their children's education, making them responsible for ensuring that their children attended school from the age of five until thirteen (though the School Board could grant special exemption). The education of children became a matter of great import, and the board was empowered to

2. The following account is a summary of the relevant provisions of the Act.
enforce attendance of children, and to prosecute parents who disobeyed the new laws.

The number of members on a school board varied from five to fifteen, this being determined for each parish by the Board of Education, the national authority. The members were elected "by owners or occupiers of lands or heritages of the annual value of not less than four pounds, situated within the parish". The board was a body corporate, with right of perpetual succession, and power to acquire and hold land for purposes of the Act. The school, teacher's house and lands attached to these were vested in and under the management of the Board. It was empowered to enter into contracts for the erection, enlargement and maintenance of these. The Board administered a fund raised by a rate levied within the parish. The Board fixed fees for the school, appointed teachers, and had power to dismiss teachers.

The minute book of the Board for Eskdalemuir is not available, but inspection of that for the neighbouring parish of Westerkirk shows its composition to have been of the same sort as the Parish council. The minister was invariably a member, normally one of the big local landowners, or his estate factor, was on it, and three of the small farmers.

The powers the Board had to control the actions of parishioners with respect to the relevant laws regarding education were indeed

1. Education (Scotland) Act, 1872, para. 69.
2. I am greatly indebted to the County Clerk of Dumfriesshire for access to this Minute Book.
used, and the Westerkirk Board was firm in its determination to see that the children got an education. Here is an extract of 2nd November, 1917 - "The Clerk stated that Mr. John Davidson, Georgefield, for his child Peter K. Davidson, and Mr. Thom Welsh, for his child William had been summoned to attend this meeting for failing to secure the regular attendance of their respective children at school". The parents explained why the children's attendance was so poor but the Board..."on consideration of both cases were of opinion that the explanations given were not sufficient and did not satisfy the Board. The Board therefore granted an Attendance Order in both cases. The meeting directed the Clerk to transmit the necessary certificate signed by the chairman to Robert McGeorge, Solicitor, Langholm, the person appointed by the School Board to prosecute in terms of the Education Acts". On 14th November, 1914,..."the Clerk reported that as instructed by the Attendance Committee he had issued warnings to the parents of fourteen of the children named...." (for irregular attendance).

Parents who wanted their children to be excused from attending school, either for a temporary period when farm work was particularly intensive, or permanently i.e. before the child reached thirteen, had to get the Board's permission. This was not always granted. One mother for example, in Westerkirk, asked for her daughter to be permanently exempted "in order to study music". The Board did not think that was a sufficient reason, and refused the request.
The Board would display its relation to the Parish School by a ceremony it held on the arrival of a new head teacher. The minutes record that he was welcomed in the classroom by the Board, and then Mr. X "as chairman of the Board" made a little speech to the children, telling them how important it was for them to acquire an education, and therefore to be attentive and obedient to the new master, and so on.

The responsibilities of the Board to parishioners was increased in 1908 by its being made responsible for medical inspection of children. It also sometimes provided financial assistance in case of treatment arising from the inspection.

Children, school and parish

Children got little direct experience of the world outside the parish. The parish school was the only one most of them ever attended, and even before leaving school they had been inducted into the adult world of employment. The Westerkirk minute book reveals that sometimes girls of twelve were excused attendance in order to enter domestic service. A frequent request asked of the Board was to excuse some of the boys during days when farm work was particularly intensive. The two parents who were fined (p.34) gave as their reason for their sons' poor attendance that they were needed to help on the farm. All the present shepherds in Eskdalemuir started herding long before leaving school, by helping their fathers after school hours (see p.64 for further information on this.).

1. Education (Scotland) Act, 1908.
As soon as they left school the children started work, the girls as domestic servants and the boys on a farm. Mr. William Martin, an aged herd, describes this:

"In those days the children left school at twelve. If the boys were not needed at home they were hired to another shepherd from the beginning of lambing till the beginning of November. They assisted with the lambing, the garden, and perhaps a part of the hill till the sheep were clipped. Then the hay; when the herd went to cut the hay the boy went to the hill to see that there were no sheep left on the top and they could watch from where they worked to see that they all went out again. If one was seen lying back the boy was sent to see what was wrong.... when I started herding I was just like other boys then. I began at twelve years of age but was needed at home so I started on half a hirstle of 35 score and when I was sixteen I got the full hirstle, which I herded for thirty years." 1 Herds who began before 1939 give much the same account of their starting.

As we shall see in a later section (p.10), neither children nor adults in the country parish visited the town much. Hence the children had little experience of a natural or social environment different from those of the parish, and already "needed on the farm" before they left school, accepted without question one of the occupations in the parish.

---

1. Mr. Wm. Martin, "Experiences in herding Cheviot Hill Sheep during the Last Sixty Years", pp.14-16 in "Hill Sheep Husbandry in the Scottish Borders", being the proceedings of a Conference of Farmers held in the Tait Hall, Kelso, Roxburghshire, on Tuesday, 8th January, 1952.
The Schoolmaster

The changes which have occurred to the parish over the last fifty years are vividly exemplified in the changes in the role of the schoolmaster; for whereas he was formerly a person of note in the parish, with a large measure of independence in performing his job of educating the parish children, he now has no power in the parish and in the performance of his job merely carries out instructions given him by an agency outside the parish.

The schoolmaster had much more control over school affairs than he has now. He was in constant consultation with the Board — composed of fellow parishioners — about them. He made his own programme of instructions, though of course reading, writing and arithmetic were the main subjects taught. Natives of Eskdalemuir (of forty and above) recall with glee how their dominie, who was very fond of curling, used to close the school for a week or more when the season was on; or how in later life when he had acquired a car, he would close the school for a day while he went off to Langholm "to study the architecture", i.e. to spend the day in the pubs.

The schoolmaster was usually a very powerful figure in the parish. When the Eskdalemuir dominie first arrived in the parish in 1897, he was straightaway appointed Clerk of the Council and Inspector of Poor. These, with the position of assistant Registrar (and Librarian if there was a library), seem to have been regarded as the normal perquisites of the schoolmaster. In 1873, when negotiating with the Westerkirk Board, an applicant...
for the position of schoolmaster assumed that these other positions were part of the conditions of his appointment. The Board replied that "though the Board could not pledge themselves to promise the emoluments arising from the extra public offices which might possibly be acquired by the schoolmaster in addition to his salary still they expected from the practice of the parish hitherto that the office of Inspector of Poor etc. might be combined with that of schoolmaster".

Not only did the schoolmaster wield power in his official capacities, but in an unofficial way he was a leading figure in the parish. Farmers came to him to have their books (accounts) checked and to ask his advice on how to keep them. Any of the labouring population who had to deal with official bodies both inside and outside the parish came to him for an interpretation of laws and regulations and advice on how to approach the authorities. The Eskdalemuir dominie moreover used to coach in his spare time, and without payment, anyone who wanted more education after having left school. One parishioner who took advantage of his kindness and enthusiasm in this matter later got a job on the staff of the Eskdalemuir Observatory. When the dominie died, in 1936, after a lifetime's service to the parish, all his former pupils in the parish and many outside it subscribed to a decorated gravestone to him.

This account of the role of the teacher fifty years ago may be compared with that of the teacher today given on page 88.
Self sufficiency of the Parish, Economic and Social

Not only was the Parish a local political unit which controlled the behaviour of its members in the respects outlined above but it was also a unit within which by far the greater part of the individual's social and economic relationships were found. Or rather, his relations outside the parish were fewer than they are now. The extent and number of relationships outside the parish would of course vary with the situation of any particular parish, its distance from a town, or a railway station and so forth. The following account of the parish fifty years ago is derived mainly from informants' accounts of Eskdalemuir, but not exclusively so, for several informants spent their early life in some other place. From their accounts it seems that Eskdalemuir did not differ greatly from other country parishes.

Means of transport and communications with surrounding towns were in a very different state then from what they are now. There were no buses or cars or telephones. The roads into the two towns the parish has always been most in contact with, Langholm and Lockerbie, were unsurfaced. Sometimes in flood sections of a road would be washed away. All farmers then had horse drawn carriages, but the majority of the rest of the population had to walk if they wished to visit a town. There were however two public means of transport. One was the post master's cart, which he drove to and from Langholm daily except Sunday; for a few pence he would take a passenger. Those who remember him say he "took so long you were quicker walkin'." The
other was a horse-drawn bus owned by a Lockerbie firm which operated on some market days between Lockerbie and Eskdalemuir.

Though it was possible to get to town on these vehicles or by walking, hours of work were long and money wages low, so that few people had either the time to spare for a visit or money to spend when they got there. The shepherds and cattlemen who drove their animals to market might spend the rest of the day in town when the market was over, but this was the only regular visiting of the towns there was. It was especially difficult for wives and mothers to get to town and they very rarely did so. Even the men now, when discussing the past, usually add that, as one said, "It wis hardest on the weemen then, and it's them I pity", because they so rarely got away from the parish. Informants who remember the days when a visit to town was "a rarity" include not only the middle aged and the elderly, but also men and women in their forties. As one of these latter said, "Whan Ah wis a bairn Ah hardly kent what a shop wis, Ah'd only been tae a toon wance or twice till efter Ah stertet workin'."

As for "commercial transport", the only regular vehicle was again the postmaster's cart. Small goods could be sent up by it from town. There were no town shopkeepers making regular trips into the parish as there are now. Sheep and cattle were driven to market, the cattle on the ordinary road and sheep on ancient drove roads which followed routes through the hills. From the northern end of Eskdalemuir it took three days to drive the sheep to Lockerbie market, and there were fixed halting places
every night along the road. These halts were always situated near some shepherd's cottage, or farm, in which the drovers could lodge and eat for the night on payment of a few shillings. Many preferred to sleep out in the midst of their flocks. Davington steading was a halting place for the drovers from Ettrick, the parish to the North of Eskdalemuir. The farmer of Davington recalls how on the hillside above his steading drovers' fires would burn all night. His most vivid memory is of the fights that occurred between shepherds' dogs on these occasions. Speaking of the general arrangements of halting, he says "This was not a right they had, but an obligement on my part. They didn't pay me for keeping their lambs in the steading all night, but they probably paid the herd's wife for food for the night. Some used to sleep out all night with their lambs. They were wild men from Ettrick in those days."

**Services within the parish**

There operated within the parish then an exchange of services which has since been greatly reduced, for there were at this time several tradesmen in the parish who have either disappeared or who can no longer supply the sort of services parishioners now require. These were the blacksmith (also wheelwright), the miller, the bootmaker, the tailor and the joiner. The blacksmith and his assistant repaired all farm machinery, carts and carriages, shoed the horses, and also themselves fashioned many of the smaller farm implements - spades, hoes, etc. The Eskdalemuir smith was proud
of his ability to make iron gates (for carriageways up to farm houses) and several farms still have gates he made many years ago. There was enough work in one parish to keep him and his assistant busy (each parish had its smith then). The present Eskdalemuir smith, who came to the parish over fifty years ago, talks almost lyrically of "the old days" when, he says, "afore a market day ye'd see the horses lined up doon the road here (outside the smiddy) fur half a mile, waitin' their turn - cairts too sometimes. Oh it wis a sight Ah can tell ye." Such records of his accounts as he has kept show that he and his assistant were kept fully employed supplying their services to the parish.

There was a mill in Eskdalemuir then (and in most of the surrounding parishes) grinding locally grown grain, and the meal produced was consumed within the parish. There was enough work not only to provide the Eskdalemuir miller with a living, but also to provide him with enough profit to indulge a passion he had for buying farm machinery. He himself owned a field of about five acres, and, perhaps to convince himself that he was thereby a farmer, he used to buy brightly painted reaping machines, which he would later sell at a loss. The mill is now in ruins, as are those in the surrounding parishes.

The parish also supported a full time bootmaker, who fashioned boots as well as repairing them. In those days farm workers who wore boots bought in a shop in town were laughed at by the rest. The ones made by the local bootmaker were "mair comfortable onywey" as one old herd said. As his trade declined,
the bootmaker took on the supplementary job of postmaster in the parish. Even this however barely sufficed to provide him with a living, and when he died a few years after the first world war no other bootmaker succeeded him.

The tailor was probably the richest tradesman in the parish - he had four journeymen working for him who walked the surrounding countryside with samples of cloth, took orders for suits and dresses, and returned to the shop in Eskdalemuir to make them. The tailor still survives, but the nature of his trade has entirely changed, as will be recounted later. The joiner too still survives, but like the tailor his trade has completely altered.

A sketch of household economy, or "standards of living", of fifty years ago, confirms the picture so far presented of a fairly high degree of economic self sufficiency in the parish, or at any rate a higher degree than obtains now. For nearly all the food eaten was produced in the parish itself. Apart from the tradesmen, two or three retainers of the Duke of Buccleuch, the minister and the schoolmaster, everyone in the parish was attached to a farm. Money wages did not exceed about thirty-two pounds per year, and the rest of the wage consisted of farm produce. Maidservants and many of the unmarried male employees received their meals from the farm kitchen. Every family kept chickens and many a cow, while most cultivated a garden of vegetables. Many reared a pig or two every year to supply themselves with bacon. Sheep which died on the hill from accident or disease were eaten provided the carcase was discovered before putrefaction
set in. Farmers in those days could slaughter their own beasts whenever they wished to. In fact the only items of food which were imported into the parish were sugar, tea and flour. It was the custom in all households to lay in a store of these twice a year.

Standards of food consumption may be judged from descriptions like the following. A fifty year old farmer recalls his boyhood "Livin' was a lot rougher then. You had porridge twice a day, and you used to eat a lot of broth and tatties - there was aye plenty of meat mind. I've ate a lot of braxy sheep myself. I used to think fried mutton was good but I had some recently and didn't like it. Oh but it was rough then - nae fancy cakes then for your tea, just scones and tea." He was a farmer's son, and probably had a higher standard of living than the majority of parishioners (even though his mother was noted for the frugality of the regime she imposed on her family; for example it was the custom for each schoolchild to be presented with an orange at Christmas time - she had her children bring them home uneaten, and then made them into marmalade. Even in those days of rough living this was considered somewhat mean.) An elderly ploughman recalls his first job as a boy "the first job Ah had wis at £5 fur six months, an' Ah believe Ah had tae work harder fur that than Ah've ever done since. Ah slept in a loft an' Ah wis fed on porridge an' milk an' tatties an' Ah got tea on Sundays." Jokes about the standard of living of maidservants and boys fed by the farmer's wife are still current among the elderly. One
concerns a maid who after being fed on nothing but porridge and soup for a month complained to her mistress that her porridge had lumps in it. The mistress tasted it and retorted "What's wrong with it - why, I could very nearly eat it myself."

These accounts of the standard of living of the majority of parishioners could be multiplied indefinitely. A shepherd with whom I had been talking about fishing, went on to describe his early experiences of herding. He told how in his first year on one of the Eskdalemuir farms he had made only £18. He was married with a family. "Fish", he added, "You had to fish in they days to live". Stories are still told of one shepherd's family who used to eat sea trout and salmon after they had spawned and were uneatable for other people. "Some days it (these fish) wis a' the food the bairns got", said one who knew the family.

In talking of the standard of living of the time, people describe it either with ironic humour or with a wondering seriousness.

At that time peat and wood were almost the only fuels used, and both were got in the parish.

Every shepherd then was entitled to "one fat sheep" per year, i.e. a sheep from his master's flock which he himself chose. The meat was eaten, while from the fat was made candles and tallow for greasing his boots. The skin was made into rugs or sold. So frugal were people then that shepherds while walking the hills in the course of their daily work used to gather up the "pooks" (i.e. wisps of wool) that the animals shed, and store them. In two or three years they had several pounds of wool, which they
took to Langholm mills and either sold or had made into several yards of worsted.

Self-sufficiency of the parish

The relative independence of the parish from outside contacts described in the foregoing pages had its counterpart in an internal self-sufficiency and intensity of social relations. These cannot be analysed with sociological accuracy now, since information about them can be got only from the memories of the elderly, who speak in sweeping generalities. When talking spontaneously of the past they nearly always start with accounts of "entertainment", and we may as well follow them in this. They always stress that apart from the men drinking on market days, entertainment was not sought in local towns.

The only recreational institution which met regularly seems to have been the men's bowling club. People recall when there were only two dances a year, a concert or two and a whist-drive. This does not mean that this was all the organised entertainment open to parishioners, for in those days it was considered "nothing" to walk ten miles after work to attend a dance in another parish. However the low value placed on organised entertainment in the parish is seen in the fact that there was no special building devoted to it. Dances and whist drives were held either in the school or in some barn. It was not until 1922 that a public hall was erected in the parish, a hall used almost exclusively for recreational purposes.

At this time however there was a great deal more informal
entertainment within the parish than there is now. It is of course impossible to assess just how much more of it there was, and we have to rely on informants' memories and their assurance that there was. In this case however we are not relying only on the elderly, for people of the 30-35 age grade remember too that almost up until the 2nd world war there was very little visiting of towns for entertainment, and instead parishioners visited each other more than they do now. On these visits they might play at cards, or perform with musical instruments, or simply talk. There were other ways in which they entertained themselves too. The elderly recall seeing "thirty or forty boys and girls dancing on the road outside the smiddy on a summer evening", for example. The middle aged recall with delight the ploys they used to get up to as youths - unhinging gates and hiding them on the hillside, spreading tar on the handles of implements and so on. The youths had a way of dealing with an unpopular adult then - they would tar his cow or pig and turn it loose, so that he became covered with tar recapturing it. They would engage in trials of strength at the smiddy and generally engage in horseplay. The blacksmith, who thinks that the erection of the public hall in 1922 did "a lot of good for the parish" because it provided a place where the youths could bowl twice a week "instead of raising mischief" yet has an ambivalent attitude about it. He also recalls with a sigh that there doesn't seem to be "as much life

1. This type of "youth culture" is still found in rural Wales. See Alwyn D. Rees, "Life in a Welsh Countryside", Cardiff, 1951, Ch. VII.
about the place" as there used to be when the youths raised mischief.

In work a day activities too parishioners entered into relationships with each other much more than they do now. More mutual aid was practised among neighbours than is the case now. Occasions specially mentioned for this were peat cutting, blanket washing, and wall papering - but they say "There didn't have to be any set occasion - if someone in the house was ill, or if you were doing any big job, your neighbours would be in asking if you wanted a hand. Then sometime later you would give them a hand at something." It is impossible to assess just how much of this sort of mutual aid there was as compared with the present day, and we simply have to rely on informants' assurances that formerly there was much more. There is however one institutionalised form of mutual aid which has disappeared altogether, a form which does indicate how much the parish formed a distinct social unit. This was the "clipping band".¹

The clipping band was composed of all the shepherds in the parish, and most of the farmers too. Each year at clipping time (early July) the band went round every farm and clipped all the sheep. The order in which they visited farms was fixed by tradition and never varied. It was the duty of the farmer to feed the band every day it worked on his farm. The band seems

¹. The clipping band apparently survives in other parts of the country. See e.g. Rees, op.cit., p.94-95.
at first sight to be merely a rational organisation of labour for getting work done quickly. There were however ceremonial elements in the institution which clearly show that it was not merely a rational organisation of labour, but partook of the nature of a ritual expressing the unity of the parish. Apart from the communal meals eaten throughout the day, there was the fact that the men did not turn up in their dirtiest working clothes, as one would expect for a job like sheep shearing, but in newly cleaned clothes. Moreover often at the end of a day's clipping there would be impromptu fiddling, singing and dancing. There was always festivity of some sort after the last day's clipping. If the band had been only a way of getting work done there seems no reason for it to have disappeared, for sheep still have to be clipped (see p.140). If however we regard it as having been largely a ceremony expressing the unity of the parish, then its disappearance becomes at once understandable. For it is to be expected that as the parish lost its unity, ceremonies expressing that unity would disappear. This is discussed more fully in connection with the diminishing social value of the Church. In the meantime it may be remarked that this interpretation is supported by the fact that the clipping band is still found in Wales. For readers of Rees's account of the Welsh parish cannot fail to note how much more integral the

1. The relation between ritual and social organisation is most penetratingly analysed by E. Durkheim, in "Elementary Forms of the Religious Life".
Welsh parish is compared with Eskdalemuir.¹

Finally, it may be noted that the elderly say that simply to reside in the parish formerly meant that a person was an object of interest to all other parishioners. Every adult knew of the existence of everyone else, could name them and recognise them. The important events in an individual's life — birth, christening, marriage and death — were announced in church, and as everyone went to church everyone knew of them. A newcomer to the parish was semi-officially welcomed into it by the minister, who had to be the first person to visit the newcomer.

The Church and Religion

The parish fifty years ago seems from the foregoing account to have been a definite social unit of considerable importance to its members, a unit within which the greater part of the individual's interests were found, within which the greater part of his social life was lived. The integration of this unit was symbolised in the religious activities of parishioners. Only the very old and the sick did not appear in church on Sunday. People walked or came in carts as much as six miles to attend the service. The social organisation of the parish was displayed in the seating arrangements in church. A number of pews were reserved for the Duke of Buccleuch (and his household) who owned most of the land and had a shooting lodge in the parish in which

1. Rees, op.cit. See especially his chapters on "Kindred", "Neighbours", and "Religion".
he sometimes resided. No one else could use these pews so that even in the Duke's absence Buccleuch was always present. Heritors (owners of taxable property) similarly had their own pews, inherited by a man's heirs along with his property. Other people may have occupied some customary place in some pew, but the pew was not named after them, as were the heritor's and the Duke's. Whole families attended church together, and maidservants, usually dressed in some distinctive uniform, sat in the same pew as the families employing them, but separated by a gap of a few feet between themselves and their employer.

The Kirk Session (the body administering the affairs of a congregation) is composed of the minister and elders elected from the congregation by the congregation. Elders are always male and usually above the age of forty. Fifty years ago it was considered a signal honour to be elected an elder; election was not dependent on wealth or high status in secular affairs, but on worthiness as a Christian combined with administrative ability. It is the duty of the Kirk Session "to maintain good order, to cause the Acts of Assembly to be put into execution, to administer discipline, to judge and determine cases, and to superintend the religious and moral condition of the parish."¹ At the time of which we speak this duty was more an ideal than a reality, yet the minister himself was regarded with the utmost respect and could privately rebuke persons for lapses of piety. As one old

farmer put it "he was a power in the land second only to the Duke." It is important to note that it was the office of minister which was the object of this respect, not the person occupying the office at any given time. People yet under forty recall how when they were children they were sent out of the house by the backdoor when the minister was seen approaching the front door on one of his visits, their parents terrified lest they would do or say something to affront this powerful person.

The minister had a great deal of secular power too, as we saw from his membership of the Parish Council and the School Board. In the course of his duties he played an important part in integrating the parish. He was the only person who had the right to enter every household, and in doing so he kept everyone informed of events in the parish, and passed judgement on them. When a newcomer entered the parish he had to visit him, formally welcome him into the congregation and informant him about local affairs.

The Sabbath was then truly a holy day during which taboos were laid upon many of the weekday profane activities, taboos which impressed the sacredness of the day upon all. Everyone wore special clothes and refrained from gainful work. In some households no cooking was done. A somewhat extreme case of ritualisation of behaviour was that of a minister who would not let his chickens out the coop on Sunday lest he profane the

1. For the elucidation of this function of taboos see A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, "Taboo", Cambridge, 1939.
sacred day.

The farm. Tenant and landlord.

Fifty years ago all but three of the farms in Eskdalemuir were owned by the Duke of Buccleuch. These farms the Duke leased to tenants, who in return for rent paid to the Duke were entitled each to utilise the farm for his own profit. Tenants were selected by the duke from a list of applicants each time the lease of a farm fell vacant. A lease could of course be discontinued by either party subject to several months' notice.

The relation between tenant and landlord was not as distant as these details suggest. For another item in the contract between the two was that each should contribute one half towards the cost of any improvements to the farm. It was not laid down what improvements had to be made, so that in practice farmers and landlord (and the landlord's factor) were in constant consultation with each other, there being literally no end to the possible improvements in modern farming. Improvements meant not only additions to the fixed equipment of the farm but also the upkeep of fixtures subject to deterioration - dykes, buildings, drains and the land itself. The Duke for example had to pay half the cost of all the lime a farmer bought to fertilise the fields.

Hence the landlord did not simply collect rents, but played an active part in the farming itself. It was in the landlord's interest that farms should be kept in as good condition as possible,
for the better the farm the higher the rent he could charge.
The Duke used to make regular tours of inspection of his property,
and terminate the least of any farmer whom he thought was ruining
the farm.

Through this power he had over the farmers, the Duke wielded
considerable influence in local affairs. So at any rate people
say, though informants could never give instances of what exactly
they meant by saying that "the Duke was the law up here"; or as
one put it "he strode like a lion through the place". Probably
what is meant by statements like these is simply that all
parishioners were awed at the power and wealth and rank of the
Buccleuchs, and carried out any commands he cared to give.

The farm.

The farm formed a small group within which the individual
lived the greater part of his or her life. The personnel of the
farm consisted of the farmer (i.e. the person paying rent to the
Duke, or the person owning the farm) and his family, and the
persons (with their families) employed by him to perform the work
required on the farm. A word should perhaps be said here about
the "family farm", since this type of unit bulks so large in
anthropological descriptions of other rural areas of Great Britain.

1. a) Rees, op.cit. "The family farm is the basic institution of
the Welsh countryside", p.60.
c) The crofts of the Hebrides may be considered family farms,
even though many of them nowadays cannot support a family.
See - (i) F. Vallee, "A Hebridean Community", op.cit.
(ii) T. Owen, "Report to the School of Scottish Studies", Edinburgh, 1953.
There are in Eskdalemuir five farms small enough to be worked, nowadays, by a man, his wife, and one or two adult sons. Sometimes it happened in the past that one or two of these smaller farms would in fact be worked by the tenant and his own family, with the addition of an employed maid. Yet this, even fifty years ago, was by no means a regular pattern. From the enquiries I made, it seems that formerly even on these small farms on which the greater part of the labour was done by the tenant and his family, there was usually one hired man and invariably a hired maid. At the present time there is only one "family farm" in the parish. It is in a sense accidental that it can be called a family farm, since one of the labourers on it is the farmer's unmarried adult sister, a woman who has learned the craft of herding. This is a most unusual skill for a woman to acquire (no other female in the parish has learned it), and without her the farmer would have to hire a man. Hence the family farm is, and during the period considered always has been, an exception in this district.

The majority of the population then as now (p.116) consisted of employees (and their families) of the farmers. The employees then were both male and female, the females being milkmaids or housemaids. Both male and female employees at this time were called "farm servants". The girls who were hired normally came from one of the farm servants' families resident in the parish, or if not in Eskdalemuir, then in one of the adjoining parishes. The hiring and supervision of these girls was done by the farmer's
wife, who usually knew by repute at least both the girl and her family. Often in fact the mistress in need of a maid would ask a particular girl who had taken her fancy to come and work as a maid for her.

Male farm servants were hired at Hiring fairs, held once or twice yearly on fixed dates in various country towns; most Eskdalemuir farmers went to the Lockerbie hiring fair. There farm servants seeking employment congregated in one of the main streets of the town, and farmers seeking labour strolled through the crowd picking out likely looking men and youths, or men whom they already knew to be good workmen. Having picked someone, the farmer sought to "make a bargain" with the servant, i.e. to come to terms as to employment. The conditions of farming and the quantity of labour available set limits to the variability of the terms arrived at, but each bargain arrived at was unique, and differed in its terms from every other bargain.

The bargain consisted of two parts, money wages and "perquisites". Apart from these economic forces summed up as "the state of the market", there was no regulation of farm servants' wages, and within the limits set by the state of the market, each man's wage was decided by the course of the bargain-ing between him and his prospective employer. A shepherd's money wage was around £30 per year, and a ploughman's (in this district) two to four pounds less than a herd's. However, cash formed only a part of the bargain, the rest consisting of farm produce and various rights described below. This other part of
the total wage is nowadays often called "perquisites", suggesting that these are an addition to the money wage - a sort of free gift from generous farmers to employees. In point of fact "perquisites" were a customary part of the total payment from farmer to servant, and the servant depended upon "perquisites" to sustain him and his family almost as much as he did upon his cash wage. Even nowadays, with cash wages much greater than formerly, farm servants rarely use the word "perquisites" but talk either of a "bargain" as a whole, or of the detailed items of a bargain. "Perquisites" seems to be a term used mostly by farmers and townsmen. At any rate, this other part of the bargain varied from district to district, as wages did also. The following scale seems to have been general in Eskdalemuir for a married herd.

1) A cottage to house himself and his family. A few shillings rent could be charged by the farmer for this. However many cottages then as now were rent free.

2) 65 stone of meal per year. Sixty stone of this was for consumption by the herd and family, and five was for making a gruel fed to sick sheep at lambing time.

3) From 5-10 cwt. of potatoes.

4) A supply of peats for fuel. Generally there was no limitation placed on the amount - the herd simply cut sufficient to last his household for a year. Generally speaking, agricultural workers in hill districts never used coal.

5) "One fat sheep" per year. The herd chose one sheep from his master's flock to be disposed of as he thought fit (see p. 46).
6) Up to three pints of milk a day, or "the keep of a cow".

The list was much the same for other categories of servants, except the fat sheep, which was solely a herd's perquisite. In general too only herds had the right to the keep of a cow, the other servants receiving three pints of milk a day.

We must explain item six more fully, "the keep of a cow". All shepherds could bargain for the right to graze a cow of their own on the farmer's land. This supplied them with milk, butter, etc., and if the cow was the herd's own property its calves belonged to him. These calves he would sell, thus supplementing his wages a little. Sometimes it happened that a herd did not have a cow of his own and did not have the money to buy one. In this case he could make a bargain with the farmer to the effect that the farmer would loan him a cow to supply him with milk, etc., but the calves born belonged to the farmer. A cow obtained in this manner was called "a putten oan coo" since it was "putten oan" the ground by the farmer. As the arrangement had this special name it was probably fairly common, though like all other details of a bargain it was a secret between master and servant. It was however considered a shameful arrangement for a herd, an admission that one was penniless; "in fac' (as one said) it was a rare insult tae a man tae say his coo wis a putten oan coo. If ye telt it tae him tae his face, he'd just aboot cut yer throat".

It will be noted that hours of work did not form a subject for bargaining. That is because hours of work were decided
solely by the will of the farmer - men had to work as long as
he commanded them to, or be fired. As one elderly ploughman
put it "Ye were waked up at five i' the mornin' an' ye worked
can till ye were telt tae stop i' th' evenin'." Often in summer
months men worked on till darkness "Worrit tae death wi' midges
an' fair droppin' wi' hunger. Oh it wisney like it is noo -
soon as five o'clock comes he's (i.e. the farmer nowadays) orderin'
ye oot the field as fast as ye can get - he disney want tae pey
overtime". This power that the farmer had did not mean that the
farm servant worked every day from dawn till dusk, for just as
work went on in summer as long as the weather was good, so when
it rained work stopped, and in winter the men often spent days
sitting in a barn or hayshed, talking and playing cards (except
for routine indoor jobs).

Holidays too did not form a subject for bargaining. There
were no statutory holidays such as are laid down by Wages Boards
now. There were only three customary holidays in the year -
New Year's Day and the two Hiring Fair days.

One very important variation in this general account of the
bargain must be noted, a variation which concerned a whole
category of farm servants, viz. the shepherd. Up till about
forty years ago the majority of herds did not receive any cash in
the payment made to them by the farmer. Instead, each herd owned
a "pack" of sheep of his own, and the right to graze it on the
master's land constituted the herd's "wages". The term wages
is of course wholly unsuitable for this arrangement, and it may
rather be said that perquisites and the right to graze his flock constituted the herd's recompense for tending his master's flock. As with other details of the relation between master and servant, there were customary rules concerning the constitution of the pack. It consisted of 36 breeding ewes and 9 hoggs (female sheep one year old, not yet available for breeding purposes) and was then valued at about £100. A herd changing his job from one farm to another would sell his pack to the incoming herd and with the money buy the pack of the herd he was to replace. From the sale of lambs, wool, and cast sheep from his pack the herd made a yearly income.

It is impossible to say what the income from a pack was since it varied from year to year with the market price of lambs etc., with vicissitudes of weather, and from farm to farm with the quality of the stock and the herbage. In a bad snowstorm a herd might lose all his pack. We have already quoted one herd who one year made only £18. The best possible income a herd could make from his pack for the year 1900 is calculated below.

1. The prices quoted here are from "The Scotsman", Aug.12th, Sept.14th, and July 25th, 1900. At Lockerbie lamb sales, Aug.1900, wedder lambs sold at from 14/9 - 20/- apiece. Ewe lambs would be several shillings below that. If we assume that a herd had thirty lambs to sell at an average of 15/- a head, he would make £22.10/- from them. Cheviot draft ewes fetched about £2 per head - assume he had six to sell, making £12. Cheviot wool that year was about 6d. a pound. Calculating 4 lbs. of wool per fleece, he would make £4.10/- on wool. His total cash sale would amount to £39. This is the most he would make, and in arriving at this figure we are assuming that all his sheep survived the winter, that none died of disease, that they were of good quality, and that they produced 36 lambs all of which survived. These would be unusually fortunate circumstances.
We may add that already about fifty years ago this system of payment was beginning to disappear, the herds preferring cash wages to keeping a pack. At the present time there is to my knowledge only one herd in the whole of the Borders who still has a pack, a herd on one of the Eskdalemuir farms.

Firing, just as much as hiring, was regulated by customary rules. In this district the summer hiring fair was held on the last day of May. Six months later came "the speaking time". The farmer had to approach the servant and in an indirect way the two either reaffirmed the bargain of the previous May, or agreed to dissolve it. Dissolving it did not mean that the servant forthwith left the farm, but that he intended to leave next May (or was being ordered to leave next May). In other words six months notice had to be given of intention of leaving or of firing. Should a farmer and his servant have quarrelled in the course of the year it was understood that at speaking time either the farmer would fire the servant or the servant would give notice; but normally, speaking time was considered a delicate matter, since one of the two might unwittingly give offence to the other. Thus a suggestion by the farmer that the servant might want to leave might be interpreted by the servant that the farmer was suggesting that he ought to leave. However speaking time was a regular institution, and the farmer had to approach each servant every year separately and privately. Some readjustment of the bargain made at the hiring fair could be made at this time too.
This account of the master-servant relationship shows general features which could be described in a variety of ways. Since there is no standard terminology for describing the general features of social relations, these are best described in terms of the purpose of this history, which is to show the change from an integral community to a sectional one, and how as a result of this change social class has emerged as the dominant system of relations. Hence we need only point out how the details of the relationship were decided by the parties to it, the two persons concerned, but how control of the relationship was in the hands of the farmer. Once the bargain had been made the farmer was "the master" who had at his disposal the time and labour of the "servant" to a degree unimaginable today. Secondly, the farm servant's life was almost wholly enclosed in his relation to the farm. Not only was his time and labour so much at the disposal of the farmer, but he depended for his sustenance largely upon farm produce, paid to him by the farmer. Further details, described below, indicate how closely the farm servant and his family were tied to the farm.

Quite apart from perquisites, the servant ate a great many meals provided by the farmer and his wife. The farmer had customary obligations to provide these. The most important occasions on which he had to fulfill these obligations were at clipping, dipping, harvesting, haymaking and threshing. These meals were sometimes eaten outside in the fields, but just as often were eaten in the farmhouse kitchen. Estimates of the
amount of meals supplied per year vary from 25-40 days' meals per year - we may say that for the equivalent of a month a year the servant ate at the expense of the farmer and his wife. Maids and some of the unmarried male servants were even more closely attached to the farmhouse. Maids were part of the household in the sense that they lived in the farmhouse and ate all their meals in the farm kitchen. Part of the bargain between mistress and maid often was that the mistress had to supply the maid with one new dress every year. Indeed an outfit of clothes, free meals and lodging, was often the whole bargain when a girl newly left school at thirteen first entered into service. In this case the mistress as a reward might give the girl a few shillings to attend some local fair once a year. Often unmarried male servants, and especially boys, were included not perhaps in the household but along with the more valuable stock in the steading. They would sleep in a loft above the horses and be fed from the farmhouse.

The farm servant's family were incorporated into the farm in various ways. Very often a man and wife would be hired together, the wife as a sort of part time maid to help with the milking. Even when this was not the case the farm servant's family was often incorporated into the labour team. At hay-making and harvesting in particular, women and children all helped in the fields, and were recompensed by sharing in the communal meal distributed by the farmer. At peat digging too wives and children went out with the men and helped. Babies on these
occasions were left in a corner of a field "happed in a plad" as the elderly ladies say.

Schoolgirls in a farm servant's family helped their mothers in their own house. Boys, however, and especially shepherds' sons, were inducted into the labour team long before they left school, through having to help their fathers during holidays and after school hours. Herds' sons, even while still at school, had to help their fathers at the most exhausting task of the shepherd, at lambing time. Boys also formed a regular part of the clipping band. Indeed as we saw from the minutes of the Westerkirk School Board, parents were continually keeping their children off school in order to have them help on the farm during periods of intensive work. The induction of the boys into the labour team continued until recent times. A herd aged 35 says of the clipping band "When Ah started in Ettrick twenty years ago it wis nearly a' stool clippin' then, an' we boys had tae dae the catchin' (of the sheep) an' we had tae lift it up on tae the stool fur them, they never thought of gein' ye a haun up".

In other words the boys had a definite task to do. In fact all shepherds' sons learned the craft from their fathers long before they left school, so that as soon as they left school they were able to begin employment as assistant herds, or "boys" (see p.3b).

The farmer's family and the labour team.

At the time of which we are speaking a farmer and his family were as much a part of the labour team as the servant and his family. This may seem so obvious as to be hardly worth
mentioning, but in point of fact it stands in marked contrast to the state of affairs today, where on some farms not only does the farmer's family take little or no part in the work of the farm, but the farmer himself stands aloof from work, in the sense of manual labour, and contents himself with supervising the work of the men. A local phrase describes aptly the relation of these latter to the labour team; it is said of them that "they never have their jackets off from one day to the next". Fifty years ago this was unheard of among the Eskdalemuir farmers. All took part in the everyday work on the farm in addition to supervising the work of their servants. Several of them even learned to herd, and could do the work of any herd who fell ill. Similarly, their wives and children were also, to some extent, part of the labour team. All farmers' wives could milk, make butter, etc., and though these jobs were not part of the daily routine for them all, they "thought nothing" of doing them. Similarly, farmers' children like other children went to the local school and helped on the farm after school hours and during holidays. Those who intended to become farmers simply worked on their father's farm as herd or ploughboy as soon as they left school at thirteen.
Rank in the labour team.

The fact that the farmer and his family took part in the daily labouring on the farm does not mean that distinctions of rank were not drawn on the farm - the fact that the farmer was referred to as "the master" and his employees as "servants" already indicates a clear distinction between the two. What the participation of the farmer and his family in farm work does show is that the farm constituted a well-knit group, under the farmer's command, controlling the lives of its members in the ways described above. But in fact rank was much more emphasised then than it is now. By this we do not mean that the farmer's control over his men was greater, though that is indeed the case, but that his position as master had constantly to be affirmed by symbolic acts of deference on the part of the servants. Both farmers and servants say that this was the case. The acts were the normal ones in our society - the servants had to raise their caps on meeting the master and address him either as master or as "sir". (For further material on this see p.70.)

On hill farms, devoted to sheep breeding, the shepherd is the most important farm servant. As we have seen, fifty years ago the majority of herds were stockowners, as were the tenant farmers. As one old herd put it "herds were kin' o' fermers theirsels in a small way". On account of this herds were held to be "a little abune the others". This was only a very slight distinction and did not give the herd any right to command the actions of the other servants; it merely meant that the farmer
paid more attention to his herds, and held them in greater confidence. It was not such a distinction as to prevent herds and other servants from associating with each other in friendship and other class relations.

**Social Class.**

By social class is meant a stratification of persons in the parish into groupings of higher and lower prestige. It will be seen later that the concept is used in the second part of the thesis in a highly technical sense (see pp. 166-176). Since the technique used to determine the present day class system in the parish cannot be applied to the past, the concept must be used here in a rough sense, that is to say as used here the concept lacks exact content. This account of the class system is based partly on informants' accounts of it and partly on inferences I have made from the history of the parish and from my knowledge of the present day class system. As an overall characterisation of the class system of fifty years ago it may be said that it was a local system, that the classes of higher prestige had more power than they have now, and that the system was accepted by the majority of parishioners as part of the natural order of things.

The class of highest prestige was "the county", owners of large tracts of land and persons with hereditary titles, and
their near relatives. The Buccleuchs represented this class in Eskdalemuir (though never residing in the parish for more than a few weeks in the year) as the dominant landowners.

The next class consisted of the tenants of the larger farms in the parish, along with the minister. The next class consisted of the smaller farmers along with the schoolmaster. Next lowest were the majority of the population, the farm servants and the tradesmen. Finally, a class that has all but disappeared was composed mainly of tramps and also of a few individuals or families who were in habitual receipt of Poor Relief. The difference between the majority of the labouring population and this lowest class seems to have been that the labourers had steady jobs, lived in cottages, and accepted normal standards of personal cleanliness; whereas the lowest class were shiftless, constantly on the move, and unclean in their personal habits.

Since its members were constantly on the move, its composition in any one parish was constantly changing, yet as an element of the population it seems always to have been there.

**Class and power.**

It is already apparent from this meagre description and from the rest of our account of the parish that this class system represented a hierarchy of power, those of a higher class having power over those of a lower, either through owning land and hence having power over tenant farmers, or through leasing farms and hence having power over the labouring population. It is realised
that there is no exact correlation between class and power of this nature. Both large and small farmers hired labour yet they formed different classes (according to our definition of class. For a fuller definition see p. 174). The distinction between them as regards this sort of power is not that the larger farmers had power over the smaller but that the former had more power over the labouring population through employing more men.

The power mentioned above may be called "economic power", since it is implicit in the differential access to and control over the means of production, land, labour and capital, already described. There was the same unequal distribution of local political power among the classes. It has already been mentioned that the Parish Council of Eskdalemuir consisted throughout its history (with the sole and temporary exception of the joiner) of farmers and the minister, and that its clerk and Inspector of Poor was the schoolmaster. Accordingly, not only did the two classes represented on the council control the lives of the labouring population from day to day, in their capacity of employers, but when one of the labouring population fell destitute (which in practice meant that no one would employ him or her) these same two classes decided whether or not the pauper was entitled to relief, and to how much. Their control over the labouring population was complete.
Class and deference behaviour.

Part of the definition of a class system is that the classes must be regarded by the population so stratified, as superior and inferior to each other. These attitudes are usually expressed in deference behaviour of some sort. Judging from informants' accounts, it seems that fifty years ago these attitudes were more publicly displayed than they are now. Deference behaviour was more constantly and strictly demanded of the labouring classes by the two farming classes. The farm servant's cap lifting and "siring" of his master was extended to all of his master's class. As the blacksmith put it "It used tae be terrible, aye liftin' up yer bunnet - ye hardly had yer bunnet oan a' bloody day". A farm servant who did not give these signs of his inferior position risked being branded as "impudent" and fired from his job. There was never any shortage of labour in those days and farmers had no hesitation in firing men.

Class and Culture.

The culture of the "county" was utterly different from that of the other classes, and seems to have conformed to the description Veblen gives of the culture of the "leisure class" - abstention from useful employment, devotion to the pleasures of the chase, of opulent hospitality, and all other manner of "conspicuous consumption". Nothing is known of the culture of the lowest class.

Among the three remaining classes, those forming the bulk of the population, large and small farmers and the farm servants,
there were vast differences in "standards of living", especially as between the two farming classes and the rest. The description of the standard of living in the parish fifty years ago given on page 43 was that of the majority of the population, the farm servants and their families. That of the farming and professional classes was very much higher. The farmer on page 44 said that there was always plenty of meat to eat in the old days, but this only applied to the farming classes, as the remarks of the ploughmen and herds quoted testify. The two farming classes lived then (as now see p.139 ) in larger, more spacious houses, wore clothes of better quality, than the labourers, and never had to depend on fishing the burns to get something to eat. Each family in the former two classes had its horse carriage, so that they could more easily leave the parish for visits to town.

Apart from those items which are normally included in the concept of a 'standard of living' however, there seems to have been more cultural uniformity among all these classes than exists now. This was the result of the whole population receiving the same education from the same two agencies, the parish school and the Kirk. Probably too the fact that the whole population worked provided a basic culture for everyone. At school farmers' sons and servants' sons alike received a thorough grounding in the three R's and in "discipline". This latter, the alleged absence of which in modern education adult parishioners deplore, consisted of learning to obey the orders of the teacher without question and of acquiring the habit of serious application to any task set by
him. Further education was got in church and as we saw the whole population attended church. We do not mean to assert that the aim of the church was to provide 'further education' in the secular modern sense, but only that in pursuance of its own aims it provided a universal sort of education lacking nowadays. Religion, as we saw, was a serious aspect of life then, and a common piety overarched class differences in other spheres of life.

From all accounts there were not great differences in the realm of culture in the ordinary sense. The Bible and Burns were the staple reading matter of all classes, and Scottish dance music and song the only music there was. All classes spoke the same dialect; the speech of the two farming classes had hardly been Anglicised, as they are now. All this may be compared with the description of class cultures given on page 265.
CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF THE PARISH (Contd.)

Processes of Change.

In the preceding chapter the parish was described as if it were a self-contained integral structure. This was done deliberately, in order to provide a contrast with the parish now, so that the extent of the changes over the last half century may be fully appreciated. It must be emphasised now however that the parish then was by no means a purely self-contained structure. It was a unit in a nationwide system of local government, and it was linked to a worldwide economic system. The Parish Council and the School Board had both been instituted by the State, and their authority rested ultimately on it. The stock bred in the parish was sold to buyers in various parts of the country, while the wool sold eventually went to Italy. Moreover the profitability of farming over the whole country depended very much on farming conditions in other parts of the world. For some thirty years before 1900 British farming had suffered a severe depression through America and Australia selling farm produce in the world market far more cheaply than Britain could.¹

Since 1900 events originating in the wider structure have completely altered the local structure as it was then; it is less integral and more integrated into the wider structure.

The processes by which this has come about are too complicated to analyse in detail, and in any case belong to the history of the wider structure. Here, accordingly, only a brief account will be given of the salient events in these processes, and in the following chapter their effects on the local structure will be described.

Some of the main events were brought about by State action. This abolished the parish as a unit of local government, extended the period of compulsory education for schoolchildren, and by an extension of social rights to all citizens freed the farm-worker to some extent from his dependence on the farm.

The major changes in local government which have affected the parish since 1900 were effected by the Local Government (Scotland) Act of 1929 and the Education (Scotland) Acts of 1918 and 1929. By the first of these the Parish Council was abolished and its main functions transferred to the County Council (or to Town Councils in large burghs). The far reaching

---

1. Many secondary sources have been consulted for this section. In addition to the one referred to in the above footnote, the following were found particularly useful.
effects of this Act can be seen by a comparison of the number of Local Government bodies operating in Scotland before its passing and after.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior to 1929 Act</th>
<th>After 1929 Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Councils</td>
<td>Town Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>(large burghs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Councils</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Town Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Committees</td>
<td>(small burghs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Joint Committees</td>
<td>District Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners of Supply</td>
<td>County Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Councils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Boards of Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distress Committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We may mention here briefly the District Councils. Prior to the 1929 Act, a county of six or more parishes was divided into districts for the carrying out of certain duties. District Committees administered these units. Each Parish Council sent a representative to sit on these Committees. Its main duties lay in the execution of some of the Public Health regulations and those concerning roads and bridges. It could not however rate for expenditure, nor hold land, nor undertake work involving capital expenditure without the consent of the County Council.

Each parish now elects a representative to the District Council. Its duties are merely those minor ones of the old Parish Council concerning the maintenance of graveyards, recreation grounds and so forth. It has no duties with regard to Public Health, Education, Insurance, etc., and cannot levy a rate of more than 1ld. in the £. Shaw remarks in his survey of present conditions in Local Government..."District committees are not taken into account as their duties are insignificant."¹ The representative of Eskdalemuir on the District Council complains of the same fact, says he rarely attends meetings, and grumbles that all the council is allowed to do is to "Vet the inscriptions on local tombstones".

Each parish now elects one or in some cases two Councillors to the County Council, but here the parish is merely an electoral division, and its councillor is responsible to the electorate of the County as a whole, along with the other Councillors. The parish as a unit of Local Government only exists now for the registration of birth, marriage and death.

The various Education Acts have been equally destructive of the autonomy of the parish, the most important being the Act of 1918.² By this the unit of administration in education was changed from the parish to the County, through the abolition of

---

2. Education (Scotland) Act, 1918.
the School Board and the institution of Education Authorities for each county. By an Act of 1928 the functions of these Authorities were vested in the County Council.

These perhaps seem merely "administrative" changes. Yet they have an important bearing on our theme, for the effect of these changes on the parish was to remove power from those parishioners elected to the Parish Council and the School Board. This aspect of these changes will be considered later. Meanwhile, it is to be noted that simultaneously with these, other more important changes were being effected by the State.

The Poor Law in the form described on pp. 28-29 had been in operation since 1834. As recurrent economic crises throughout the nineteenth century forced more and more of the labouring population into the position of paupers, it became evident that the provisions of the Poor Law were neither adequate nor just. The 1909 Minority Report on the Poor Law declared that poor relief in the old sense was an obsolete conception, and recommended that social services should be specialised under expert officers. The report marked the start of the increase in the scope of the rights of citizenship and the vast bureaucratic apparatus to make them effective which has culminated in the Welfare State. In the same year the Old Age Pension scheme was inaugurated: in 1911 the first unemployment insurance scheme.

1. Education (Scotland) Act, 1928.
In 1918 the disability of disenfranchisement was removed from receipt of poor relief. The original unemployment insurance scheme has since been gradually extended in scope, both as regards the population served and the kinds of services offered, until now it is a vast scheme to insure the whole population of Britain against sickness, disability and unemployment.

Trade Unionism.

Another equally important process has been the formation and growth of a nationwide association, the Farm Servants Union, which has broken the bonds that tied the farm servant so closely to his farm. Farmers have also formed a union, and official representatives of these two bodies now regulate the relationship between all farmers and farm servants. Latterly the State has intervened in bargaining between the two unions.

Scottish farm servants were slow to form a trade union. In England a flourishing Union of Agricultural Workers was founded in 1872, the aim of which in the words of its founder Joseph Arch was "to raise wages, shorten the hours, and make a man out of a land tied slave". Though the Scottish farm servant was just as much a "land tied slave" as his English counterpart, he never seems to have made any serious attempt to alter his position during the nineteenth century. Tom Johnstone, in his History of the Working Classes in Scotland

---

remarks "...we can find no evidence in rural society of the class struggle so prominent in English rural life" (at this time).

In 1912 however Scottish farm servants founded a Union with the same general aims as those announced by Arch. The union was nation wide (if Scotland be considered a nation) and linked farm servants in all parts of the country in an association to prosecute those aims. The method was to persuade farm servants at hiring fairs to demand a certain wage and to refuse a bargain in which the wage offered fell below that. Thus each servant no longer bargained alone, but as it were only as a representative of his occupational category and knowing that many others in his occupation were supporting him in his claims. By these means farm servants managed to increase their wages by a few shillings a week, and to get a half day’s holiday every Saturday.

In 1917 farmers formed a union, and for some time afterwards officials of the two unions bargained over wages on behalf of all farmers and all servants.

After the first world war the agricultural industry entered another long depression, and the Farm Servants Union made little headway with its aims. In 1932 it became affiliated to another, more powerful, union, the Transport and General Workers, and


3. "Then and Now", undated pamphlet issued by the Scottish Farm Servants section of the Transport and General Workers Union.
soon after this it began to demand wage increases and shorter working hours. A new feature of its demands was for a legally guaranteed minimum wage. This could of course only be guaranteed by the State, and from that time on the State has intervened in the regulation of the relationship between farmer and farm servant. An Agricultural Wages Board for Scotland was instituted, composed of an equal number of representatives from the two unions, two members appointed by the Department of Agriculture for Scotland, and an independent chairman. With the complete history of negotiations over wages and working hours we are not concerned. The position in 1951 with regard to wages and working hours was that for a 48 hour week the minimum wage for a 20 year old general farm worker was 108/-.

Our main point, however, is that the farmer and the farm servant are no longer directly related to each other as formerly but are related to each other only as members of two associations, membership of which is nationwide. One point should be added here, that is that the Wages Board's decisions regarding the relationship are binding upon all persons in the two occupational categories, whether or not they are actual members of the two Unions representing the interests of the occupations.

---

1. By Order No. 15, District No. 7, of the Scottish Agricultural Wages Board, Edinburgh, 1951. For further details concerning wages and working hours, see p. 341.
Transport and communication.

Another process of great importance for our theme has been the development of local systems of public transport. Buses replaced horse drawn carts, roads were improved, and regular and frequent communication with neighbouring towns became the norm.

A bus carries mail between Langholm and Eskdalemuir twice daily, and can be used by the public. Another bus takes the older schoolchildren to a school in Langholm, and the unmarried girls to work in Langholm tweed mills. On Saturdays a bus runs two trips into Lockerbie.

These public and private means of transport enable parishioners to visit towns with ease, while increased money wages and leisure hours provide incentive to do so.

At the same time, town tradesmen are enabled to bring their products into the parish. The number of tradesmen bringing consumer goods into Eskdalemuir varies from time to time as some tradesman in the towns decides to extend his custom to the parish, or as some already visiting the parish decides it is not profitable. However the basic timetable of tradesmen's visits is as follows -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Grocer and baker</td>
<td>Langholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grocer and baker</td>
<td>Langholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>Lockerbie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td>Lockerbie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fruit and vegetable</td>
<td>Langholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td>Langholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>Lockerbie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Grocer and baker</td>
<td>Langholm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition a grocer and a butcher visit the parish once a week but penetrate the parish only as far as the post office. An ironmonger from Lanarkshire visits about once a month, and a clothier about three times a year.

These are routine visits, the parishioners depend on the tradesmen coming on these days for their weekly supplies of foods. In addition, goods supplied in bulk are brought into the parish as occasion demands. Thus meal and fodder for animals are brought in from various places – Carlisle and Lockerbie mainly. Similarly a Langholm firm delivers coal, which everyone uses.

The effect of this closer contact with outside agencies of supply is seen in the reduction of services within the parish, and in the parishioners' increased dependence on food brought in from outside the parish. This will be discussed in the following section.

One other process which has taken place must be mentioned for the sake of completeness, though it cannot be documented here, since the subject is too vast. That is the great expansion of industries producing "consumer goods" of all sorts since the last decade of the nineteenth century, goods ranging from ready made horseshoes to corn flakes, from suits of clothing to wireless sets. This is 'common knowledge' and does not require documentation. It is noted by all historians of the period.
The data presented here shows in outline the gradual disappearance of what was once an important social unit, the country parish. Rights which an individual once possessed by virtue of his membership of this unit he now possesses by virtue of his membership of either the County or the State. It is now the duty of the County to educate him for instance, and the duty of the State to aliment him should he lose his job and fall into poverty. And just as these rights now accrue to the individual by virtue of his membership of a larger social unit than the parish, so his social contacts have widened. He is no longer dependent on other members of the parish economically, nor for recreation. His rights and obligations as regards employment are no longer arranged between his employer and himself. Even the social horizon of the children has been enormously widened, by their being sent to schools in town after the age of thirteen. In short, the term "parish" now refers merely to a population living within a geographically defined boundary which has little sociological significance.
Effects of These Processes.

The effects on the local structure of the processes described will now be considered, first of all on the parish. This was described both as a unit of local government and as a community with a fairly high degree of economic and social self-sufficiency. It has already been shown that as a political unit the parish has been abolished; the effects of this on the local class structure are discussed later. More interesting perhaps have been the effects of these processes on the community.

Goods manufactured elsewhere are bought in town; even horseshoes are bought ready made, the smith merely fitting them on.

The exchange of services within the parish has been greatly reduced. The bootmaker and the miller have gone; boots are bought now in town shops; the tailor has no journeymen and, after practically having gone out of business, was revived by clothes rationing during the war, for then his services came into demand for repairs, and he continues on this basis. A joiner and assistant continue to enjoy a steady trade, though not in joinering. They have to be prepared to do any odd job, wall-papering, chimney cleaning, painting, minor car and radio repairs and so forth. The joiner also has a contract with the County Education Department to run a taxi service taking children to school who live more than half a mile from it.

The blacksmith has survived too, in Eskdalemuir, precisely
because he has taken advantage of the widening of communications which have destroyed these other tradesmen. There is no longer enough work in the parish to keep him going (even though he makes some small implements for the forestry), so by a fertile stroke of imagination he and his assistant have equipped themselves with a mobile workshop, carried in an old army truck. In this the assistant visits farms over a wide area shoeing horses. The farmer pays the cost of petrol used in the journey over and above the charge for shoeing. The mobile smiddy goes to places as far away as Hawick, and even into England. That only this device has saved him from extinction is seen in the fact that the smiddys in the neighbouring parishes have all closed down.

I have no reliable data on the amount of money spent on the goods tradesmen bring into the parish (see p. 81) and cannot strictly document the increasing dependence of parishioners on them, but the fact that so many tradesmen find it profitable to come to the parish in itself shows how much parishioners have become dependent on them, and have lost the self sufficiency of fifty years ago. Parishioners themselves are aware of this and often remark on it. The dependency of Eskdalemuir itself has been greatly increased since 1939 by the arrival in the parish of forestry workers. Most of the farm workers (and farmers) raise a pig every year, and keep hens, and many keep a cow. Hence they are independent of town supplies of bacon, eggs and milk. Few of the forestry workers however keep animals or chickens, so they have milk delivered daily from Langholm twelve
miles away. In addition to buying from visiting tradesmen parishioners shop regularly in Lockerbie and Dumfries on Saturdays. The elderly, contrasting the present with the past in this respect, remark sardonically that during the severe winter of 1947, when Eskdalemuir was cut off from the towns for a week by snowdrifts, "Some of the younger yins just about panicked. They thought they would starve to death". In their youth being cut off from the town was no cause for panic - indeed it was the normal state of affairs.

This increased dependency can also be indirectly documented from changes in the types of food consumed. Porridge twice a day made from local meal is now a thing of the past (the mill itself is now in ruins), cereals having replaced it on the breakfast table. Braxy sheep are rare now, due to advances in veterinary science, and sheep which die on the hill from any cause are rarely eaten. A supply of meal is no longer part of the bargain between farmer and servant. Shop bought bread is eaten as much as home baked scones, and processed foods like semolina and creamola are as popular here as elsewhere. A great deal of locally grown vegetables are eaten, yet fresh fruit and vegetables are sold by the tradesmen all the year round.

These changes are not peculiar to the Borders of Scotland. Rees in his survey of the Welsh parish notes that its recent history shows an increasing dependence on "consumption goods produced elsewhere". There are now (in the parish he studied)
no tailors, shoe-makers, furniture-makers or dressmakers, while "generally speaking the function of the wheelwright and the smith has changed from making implements to repairing the products of factories - even horseshoes are imported ready made". "Thus", he concludes, "apart from certain items of food, Llanfihangel imports practically all its requirements as finished goods, and its material culture retains little that is distinctive." Similarly Arensberg notes that even in rural Ireland, where small farming economy is still largely on a subsistence basis, "nearly all of (the craftsmen) except the smith, their peer, have been swept away before the skill of townsmen and factory". Finally, V. Bonham Carter describes these same changes as having occurred in the English Village.

The parish school.

With the abolition of the School Board parishioners now have no control over the affairs of the school. The teacher is appointed without reference to them, and is not answerable to them for his or her work; the finances of the school are managed by the Education Committee of the County Council. Nor is the teacher so independent in his work, a curriculum and time table being laid down by the County Education Authority. Nowadays too the teacher never dares to close the school on his or her own

1. Rees, op.cit., p.27.
3. V. Bonham Carter, "The English Village".
initiative - holidays are strictly controlled by the same body. In a sense the parish school can hardly be regarded as such any longer for not all the children in the parish attend it. In Eskdalemuir for example the children who live at Castle O'er (see map) are conveyed by bus to Westerkirk parish school, and those who live at Twiglees are conveyed to Boreland school.

Earlier it was pointed out that the parish school was the only one the children of the parish ever attended, leaving at thirteen to take up employment on some farm, and that this restricted their experience of the world outside the parish. Now the school leaving age is 15, and parish schools are permitted to give education only up to the age of twelve. Hence every child now has to attend a secondary school in some town for three years, either in Langholm or Lockerbie. Thus before leaving school the children now have some notion of what town life is like, and are aware of other jobs besides herding or labouring on a farm. Indeed many parishioners blame this practice of sending the children to town for causing "rural depopulation". This will be discussed later (see Ch. VIII).

Entertainment.

Increase of leisure hours, of wages, and the availability of transport have made it possible for parishioners to participate in entertainments found in the town. Visits to Langholm and Lockerbie on Saturday purely for entertainment are common - pubs, picture houses and dance halls are the most frequented places for
it. A few men go to Dumfries fairly regularly to see football matches. There has also been an increase in voluntary associations for entertainment within the parish, but as these vary from place to place no general account of them will be given here. Those found in Eskdalemuir are described on page 313.

All that we have described so far in this chapter may be viewed primarily as a result of parishioners being more closely related to nearby towns. This process culminated in 1946 in Eskdalemuir becoming a dormitory suburb of Langholm, for some parishioners at least. In that year the Langholm tweed manufacturers found themselves short of labour, so they subsidised a bus service into Eskdalemuir (and surrounding parishes) to enable parish girls to take employment in the Langholm mills. All the Eskdalemuir girls who were employed as maidservants at the time promptly became mill-girls. There have not been any maids in the parish since.

The community.

We described earlier how the unity of the parish was expressed in the interest parishioners took in each other's lives, in the institution of the clipping band, and in the Kirk. If the parish has lost its former integrity we should expect to find changes here. This is indeed the case. To be a parishioner is no longer to be an object of interest to all other parishioners. Indeed there are few parishioners who are aware of the existence of all other parishioners. As it was known that I knew everyone
in the parish, often at dances or other public occasions, I would be asked by a friend to identify some "stranger" for him - the stranger usually being a fellow parishioner. The parish registrar, one of the few who knows every other parishioner, says she is similarly often asked to identify "strangers". The blacksmith who formerly in the course of his work got to know everyone remarked one day "Ye dinny ken half the buggers ye see noo, there's that many strangers wanderin' aboot the bloody place."

The disappearance of the clipping band has already been commented upon, along with other forms of mutual aid.

The Kirk.

The decline in the importance of the Church and many traditional Christian practices among the majority of the population of the country has so often been commented upon it needs no stressing here. Just as the parish as a social unit has disappeared, so the Kirk as a symbol of its integration is no longer of much importance for parishioners. The Kirk was built to hold about four hundred worshippers (in 1826). The average number at an ordinary Sunday service is now twelve. Interest is not entirely lacking in other ritual - communion attracts a slightly larger attendance than the ordinary service and at baptism, marriage and funerals the traditional ceremonies are still performed.

Sunday is no longer a day rigorously set apart from workaday profane life. I have myself helped a shepherd to build haystacks
on a Sunday, he being unwilling to waste the opportunity the dry
day afforded for the work. The Clerk of the Kirk Session, a
notably keen farmer, sowed turnips on two successive Sundays
recently. This was thought somewhat outrageous for a Session
Clerk by several elderly people, but no attempt was made to reprove
him, far less stop him. Work on Sunday is a very recent practice.
A lady whose husband employs a manager to supervise his farm
remarked that in June of 1950 "the manager came to me in great
agitation one Sunday and asked if I minded if he led in that day
(i.e. carted sheaves of corn from the field into the shed). He
said he's never done it in his life before but didn't like to
miss such a fine day." There are not many commercial entertain-
ments available on a Sunday in this district but such as there are
are often attended by the youth of the parish. For example they
often attend motor cycle race meetings at Powfoot, in summer time.

Along with withdrawal of respect for the Sabbath has gone
withdrawal of respect for the minister. His presence in a house
no longer creates a situation of danger to be alleviated by the
children being sent out. Indeed the present minister complains
that the children do not even salute him when they meet him on the
roads. He does not any longer rebuke a person for not attending
Church (men say scornfully "he daren't try"). A woman expressed
the general attitude of the working class to the minister in the
following anecdote - "They say ministers are getting worried about
falling attendances, but they have only theirsels to blame. They
try and ram it doon yer throat. Three years ago (an uncle) and
(a cousin) turned up for communion. The minister said from the pulpit that it wasn't good enough just to turn up for communion and on no other day. So (her two relatives) decided they weren't coming again. And quite right. It sticks in your throat that."
The three indices of secularisation I have used, lack of interest in ritual, withdrawal of respect for the Sabbath and for the minister, are neatly exemplified by a woman who told me that at one time she used to go to church sometimes, but that then "the minister used to come and visit us. But he stayed for hours and bored me, so to shake him off I stopped going to church and he hasn't been near me since. I don't go to church now because I'm afraid the minister will start visiting me again and bore me." She explained this to me while spring cleaning one Sunday morning.

It is necessary to emphasise that by minister is meant the office of minister and not the incumbent of the office at any particular time or place. This is shown by the fact that the attitude of people in surrounding parishes to their minister is much the same as that described for Eskdalemuir. It is also shown in the fact that many people who never attend Church and who think that "a Minister" has no right to insist that they should, yet say that they like the present minister as a man. When they say this they assess his worth on secular, purely personal grounds; for example some of the men admire him because he is a skilled amateur motor mechanic while some like him because when they meet him he "doesn't talk religion". The minister in short is regarded in a purely secular light and judged by the same
criteria as other men. This process of stripping the office of its sacredness has gone so far that some call the ministry a trade and enquire sarcastically why ministers complain of low salaries when "they do nothing for their money".

Finally as is to be expected in the circumstances described, to be an elder is not generally regarded as a signal honour, and the present ones are not accorded any special respect.

To account satisfactorily for the decline of the Kirk would require a separate thesis, and all that can be attempted here is an indication of the most obvious lines such an account would have to take.

As indicated above the phenomenon is in some way bound up with the loss of integrity of the local community. The point has indeed been stressed many times in sociological literature, particularly by Tonnies, while many anthropological descriptions of primitive or peasant communities undergoing absorption into the structure of modern society show the same process occurring among them. Moreover, it seems that the more completely the local community is absorbed into the wider structure, the more unimportant religion becomes for the population concerned. Thus the Hebridean communities described by Vallee and Owen and the Welsh parish by Rees, all seem much more integral than Eskdalemuir; and correspondingly, in these communities religion plays

---

1. F. Tonnies, "Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft".
2. See e.g. Redfield, "The Folk Culture of Yucatan", Chicago, 1941.
a greater part in the lives of their inhabitants.

Yet this explanation does not seem to me entirely satisfactory, for these latter communities too are being absorbed into the wider structure. Another factor that must be taken into account is the difference in internal structure between Eskdalemuir and these other communities. In them, social class is not such an important principle of organisation as it is in Eskdalemuir.

In the next section it will be shown that from being an accepted system of social relations half a century ago, the class system came to be questioned, so that now the working class and the middle classes stand in opposition to each other. This has an important bearing on the diminishing significance of religion, for the minister has come to be identified with the middle classes in the eyes of many of the working class. These latter adopt a hostile attitude to the minister, and be extension to the Church itself. It is not surprising that the minister is thus identified, since as we show on page 95 he is in fact a "middle class person" - he associates by choice with other middle class persons and lives within a middle class culture.

It has already been shown that attitudes of disrespect towards the minister are commonly expressed. Attitudes of hostility towards the office however are expressed only by working class persons. Here are examples 1.

1. These examples were expressed spontaneously, and were not made during the course of interviews.
A shepherd - "most ministers just mix wi' the top lot,¹ so why should we workin' folk go to their church?" Another shepherd, reading in the Daily Mail that the Church wished to abolish gambling on football pools, shouted angrily "Just like the Church - always interferin' wi' a workin' man's pleasures. Christ Allbloody Mighty - whit pleasures dae we have if we canny gamble now and then."

A ploughman, "ministers are always complainin' they're no peyed enough. They say they canny manage on five hunder a year. Whit aboot us - we've tae manage on half that? They just want tae keep up a position. It isney as if they did anything for it - it's just a trade nowadays". He went on to say that ministers now were just "college boys" who had discovered they were not fit for a "real job" so took to the ministry because it was "cushy". Many similar remarks could be quoted.

Where social classes are in opposition to each other, the minister and with him the Church must be identified with one or other of them. The following set of events, related to me by the Eskdalemuir minister, shows unequivocally that in these circumstances the minister can no longer symbolise a unified social and moral order. About 1935 the minister became alarmed at the hostility that obtained between farmers and farm workers, and began to preach sermons to the effect that both were forgetting their duties as Christians. Farmers were trying to get

¹. A local synonym for the highest class in the parish.
as much work from the servant for as little payment as possible, while the servants were trying to give as little labour for as much money as possible. As far as I could gather from other informants these sermons had no doctrinaire political bias (the minister himself is a member of the local Unionist Association), yet several of the farmers took exception to them and began to accuse the minister of "preaching Socialism". One of the richest farmers stopped giving voluntary contributions to the Church funds. When the Minister asked him why, he said "You preach a few sermons telling the farm servant his master's his best friend and to do what his master tells him and I'll give you your voluntary contribution." The minister was almost speechless with indignation as he told me this - "I was being bribed, bribed - a minister, can you imagine?"¹

All this seems to indicate that "loss of integrity" of the local community is not the only reason for loss of dignity of the Church, or rather it seems to indicate that "loss of integrity" in any such investigation would have to be further analysed, and various types of disintegration distinguished. From a comparison of all the British communities mentioned two types can be distinguished, first that in which disintegration is simply a process of absorption into the wider structure; and second, that in which disintegration consists of opposition between different sections of the community. Both types are apparent in Eskdalemuir.

¹. It will be understood by readers that this information is utterly confidential.
The Farm.

From the account given of the incorporation of farmers and servants into nation-wide Unions, of the extension of rights of citizenship, increases in money wages and leisure hours, and the buying of food stuffs from outside the parish, it will be readily apparent that the whole structure of the farm has changed completely. As an overall characterisation of the relation of the farm servant to the farm it was pointed out how subject he was to the will of the farmer, and how much his life and that of his family was enclosed within the farm. This is no longer the case. The former personal relation between master and servant has given way to an impersonal one - they confront each other as abstract administrative categories, employer and employee, whose relationship is regulated by the two unions and the State. The employee is now sufficiently protected against the danger of unemployment to resist the will of the employer if he wishes to do so.

Perhaps nothing symbolises the new relationship as much as the new nomenclature used instead of master and servant. The term "farm servant" still survives but only in bureaucratic literature, while "master" has all but disappeared. Instead, the farmer refers to his employees as "the men" and usually to himself as "the farmer"; while the men refer to themselves as "farm workers" and to their employer as "the boss".

The change is also strikingly reflected in the great decrease in meals supplied by the farmer to farm workers. No
farmer to my knowledge provides food for his men on any occasion except clipping time (and at threshing if outside help is called in) which rarely lasts longer than five days on any farm, and on the smaller farms is over in two days. Moreover a subtle change in the organisation of these meals still distributed has taken place. Formerly the farmer’s wife herself organised the preparation and distribution of these meals. Now on most farms this is left to one of the shepherds’ wives to do.

The customs in connection with hiring and firing have disappeared. Hiring fairs died out (in Dumfriesshire) before the second world war, and farmers now advertise in local newspapers if they wish to hire labour. Similarly "speaking time" has died out – men can be fired or give notice at any time.

The farm worker’s family is no longer in any sense part of the farm, and his relations to farm and family have become "segmented" (in sociological terminology), i.e. to the farm he is related solely as an employee and to his family solely as father, and the roles are kept strictly separate. His wife and children do not help in the hay or harvest field, nor do other his sons, if he is a shepherd, help at lambing or at any/time. Sometimes "for fun" children will enjoy themselves in the hay-fields for an hour or two then go off to some other game. As a consequence the worker’s family do not receive meals from the farmhouse.

This leads us to the second point, that the worker and his family are no longer so dependent upon the farm for their food,
nor are their lives so wholly enclosed within the farm. This latter is implicit in much that has been described already - the shorter working hours, more frequent contact with towns and higher cash wages, and the purchase of foods from tradesmen. In addition, there has been a trend towards commuting perquisites for money. Each worker still makes his secret bargain with his employer, and they are loth to talk about it, so that I do not know how far this trend has been carried. It is certain however that few now receive either meal or potatoes, while one or two do not even have a supply of milk included in the bargain. Another item which has all but disappeared is the "one fat sheep", most herds now taking money in lieu.

The shepherd's relation to the farm has changed more than is the case with the other workers. We described how he was "a bit of a farmer himself in a small way" and somewhat distinguished from the others, through his ownership of the pack. The pack has disappeared throughout the Borders except for one herd in Eskdalemuir, (other herds say he "very likely" receives a small money wage in addition to grazing his pack). It was in fact about the turn of the century that shepherds began to give up owning packs, and to ask for money wages in lieu. Those still alive who formerly had one say they gave it up precisely because you could not calculate how much money you might make from it in any one year, or indeed whether you would make any. It seems to have been the herds themselves who wanted to give up the pack, not the farmers. Having a pack instead of wages
formerly made the herd much more dependent on the farm than the other workers, and the abandoning of this system of payment is another expression of the effort to be no longer a "land tied slave" which led to the formation of the F.S.U. As a result of abandoning the pack, however, the herd has lost the little distinction he once had, and as they all admit now herds are "just farm workers, just like the others."
Social Class.

Earlier we pointed out that formerly four main systems of relationships made up the structure of the community, the family, the farm, social class and the parish. This history has shown how both the parish and the farm are no longer important social units, the one being practically non-existent, the other no longer an independent entity but made up of relationships regulated by far larger social groups. The two systems of relationships that are left are then the family and social classes. As already mentioned, the family is the unit of social class and will be treated as such in this thesis. Hence the dominant system of relationships regulating the lives of the inhabitants of the parish is now the class system. The second part of this thesis is a demonstration of this proposition so that too much cannot be said about it here. Here we will only note the major changes which have occurred in it concomitant with changes described above.

These changes are first a reduction in the number of classes represented in the community; secondly a redistribution of power among the classes; and thirdly, whereas formerly the system was accepted by everyone as part of the natural order of things, it became questioned by the working class (and still is to some extent).

After the first world war the Buccleuchs began selling their lands in Eskdalemuir, and now have none. Thus the topmost class in the old system are no longer represented in the parish. With the institution of Old Age Pensions, more adequate unemployment
relief and the disappearance of any stigma attached to receipt of it, the very lowest class also gradually disappeared. It had practically disappeared by the second world war, and the full employment of the war and subsequent years finally disposed of it. During the period considered, there has been a decline in population in most rural areas (see p.32.), certainly in this one. This decline in population has meant less unemployment in rural areas, and it may be supposed that this too has hastened the disappearance of the lowest class.

It has been implicit in the material presented in this history that the two farming classes have steadily lost power in the local structure. The abolition of the Parish Council has meant that they no longer control the measures of relief to indigents (formerly always members of the labouring class). When we said that "the parish has no control over the education given its children" what in effect this meant was that the farming classes, from which the members of the school board were recruited, no longer had any control over the education given parish children. Most important of all, as has been shown at some length, farmers do not now exercise such stringent control over their men as they once did, the relationship between the two being controlled by nation-wide bodies. This is not to say that the farming classes have no power over the labouring class, but only that it has diminished. They themselves are aware that their power has diminished (see p.25.), and regret the fact.

The third change too is implicit in some of the material
already presented. It has been shown how the farm workers opposed the power of the farmers through the formation of a Trade Union. Partly perhaps as an extension of this opposition, but also (one gathers from informants) from moral indignation, members of the labouring class began to object to the arrogant manner in which the farming classes treated them in daily interaction. A middle-aged workman's wife recalls "When Ah was a girl we used to have to curtsey to the ladies, the big farmers' wives. Some o' them were just - Ah won't say what. And Ah made up my mind if ever Ah had children Ah'd never tell them to curtsey to the likes of them." The blacksmith, after saying how terrible it used to be always having to lift your bonnet (p.10) went on "It used tae fair drive ye aff yer bloody heed, the way they spoke tae ye - as if ye werney human ye ken. Just like they spoke tae their bloody dugs. Oh some o' us used tae swear, Ah can tell ye."

A story often told by labourers to illustrate how they began to insist on less arrogant treatment has its point in the rude way in which the member of the farming classes formerly addressed a labourer by his surname, while insisting on being addressed as "Mr." or "Mrs." him or her self. A farmer's wife took exception to a labourer's (quite unexceptionable) behaviour and demanded "What's the meaning of this X (surname)". He retorted "Mr. X to you". X or Mr. X is called a "hero" by those who recount the tale. Several other episodes of a similar sort are also told. The safeguards against unemployment, the support provided
by membership of a Trade Union, and latterly a scarcity of farm labour due to rural depopulation, have all enabled the labouring class to insist on less arrogant treatment from the farming classes.

Eskdalemuir and other rural areas of Britain.

Recent studies of other rural communities in Great Britain (already mentioned) provide comparison with Eskdalemuir. The island of Barra exhibits no class system, or only vestiges of one, as Vallee shows. This is partly explained by the different nature of its recent history. Formerly Barra and surrounding islands were owned by Lady Gordon Cluny who leased the land to farmers and crofters. Some of the farms were large social and employed hired men. At this time farmers formed a class distinct from the rest of the population, and from them were drawn officials of local government, as in Eskdalemuir. Since the passing of the Crofters Holding Act in 1886 however, these large farms have been done away with. The entire population (apart from priests, schoolteachers, etc.) then became composed of crofters, among whom differences in size of land holding were negligible. There is thus in Barra at the present time no section of the population employing large numbers from the rest of the population. This would seem to be the main difference between the two communities explaining the absence of a class system in Barra. Or rather, since there are differences in social rank among individuals in Barra, why the principle of social class is so much less important there than other

1. Vallee, op.cit.
principles of social organisation, particularly kinship, age and sex.

This conclusion would seem to be borne out by studies of Owen and Rees. In the crofting community in the Island of Lewis studied by Owen the only person of distinct social rank is a farmer who employs men to work his farm. In the Welsh parish social class is less important than it is in Eskdalemuir, and correlated with this is an absence of any marked division of the population into employers and employees. Rees says "on the farms of Llanfihangel, excluding smallholdings under twenty acres where all the work is done by the family, farmers and their relatives do eighty per cent of the male work." Such hired labourers as there are, are often nephews or cousins of the farmer's family, "they live under the same roof as their employer and his family and eat at the same table except at one or two large farms."

"The family farm is the basic institution of the Welsh countryside", as Rees remarks, and where this is the case, social class seems to be absent from the organisation of the community, as we saw from the studies of Irish and French Canadian communities (p.16-20).

At the same time the Welsh parish is not entirely made up of farm owning families; there are a few landless labourers who make a living entirely by selling their labour to farmers

1. Owen, op.cit.

2. Rees, op.cit., p.142. "Class distinction is comparatively weak in Llanfihangel and it never interferes with free social intercourse between individuals and families."
who are not kinsfolk. Moreover, in the Welsh parish, there are
great differences in the size of landholdings, which range from
twenty acres to several hundred. In these respects the Welsh
community stands somewhere in between Eskdalemuir and Barra. In
the same way, in respect of the importance of class as a principle
of social organisation, the Welsh parish seems to stand midway
between Eskdalemuir and Barra. For Rees found not that social
class was entirely absent, but that "class distinction is compara-
tively weak." Such class distinction as there is is based first
on a distinction between persons who are members of a farming
family and landless labourers, and next on relative size of farms
(as Rees did not make a detailed study of the matter, it is not
clear what sizes of farm are crucial in social grading). As we
shall see, these criteria provide the bases for class distinctions
in Eskdalemuir. That the Welsh community stands midway between
Barra and Eskdalemuir in all these respects points to the import-
ance of differences in size of landholdings, and division of the
population into employers and employees, as explaining the differ-
ence in social structure between Eskdalemuir and the other
communities referred to.
CHAPTER III
THE COMMUNITY

The Parish of Eskdalemuir.

The foregoing is an account of the history of the parish in the Border area, and Eskdalemuir figured in it only as an example of the parish in general. In this chapter we shall describe in more detail than was possible in the last some of the main features of this particular parish.

1 Geography.

The parish lies at the head of the river Esk, and encompasses the land drained by that river and its tributary Black Esk from their sources to their junction. It is twelve miles long and about eight broad at its widest, the total acreage being 42,804. The valley floor lies between five and seven hundred feet above sea level, and is rarely more than a quarter of a mile wide (see photos p.108). From it rises the typical round grass covered hills of the Southern Uplands, which at the southern end of the parish are about 900 feet above sea level and at the northern end about two thousand, the highest being Ettrick Pen (2,276). The silurian strata of the region is covered mainly with glacial boulder clay patched with peat moss. Through this clay runs the strip of alluvium formed on the floor of the Esk valley.

1. The following geographical description is based on a survey by the Planning Division of the Dept. of Health for Scotland. April, 1948.
The Esk Valley
Eskdalemuir

Southern end

Northern end
At Garwald, Moodlaw, Midraeburn, Tanlawhill and Twiglees (see map no. 2) there are a few acres of alluvium in the small valleys of tributaries of the Esk. Rainfall is heavy, over fifty inches per year, compared with about forty in the low lying parts of Dumfriesshire, and this along with altitude and barren subsoils results in cold unfertile soils over most of the parish. Cultivation, (including that of grass and hay) is confined to the strips of alluvium and to fields on some of the low hillsides which rise from the valley floor.

Ninety seven per cent of the land is classified as rough grazing, and all but two farms have over ninety per cent of their acreage under rough grazing. The vegetation of the hills is mainly mardus, agrostic and fessue, with wetter patches colonised by molina juniper and rushes. (Forestry Commission plantings are mainly of Norway and Sitka spruce and pine).

There are no minerals of commercial importance in the parish, and the three quarries are used only by the farmers to patch up roads. Only two ways of exploiting the territory have been found, by breeding sheep, and by forestry. Until 1939, all the land was given over to sheep rearing, and it is apparent that most of it still is.
The land is distributed among fourteen farms, and two forests, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendearg</td>
<td>1,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Cassock</td>
<td>1,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nether Cassock</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davington</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfealing</td>
<td>6,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garwald</td>
<td>5,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craighaugh</td>
<td>1,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodlaw</td>
<td>4,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clurkhill</td>
<td>1,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holm</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterrick</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennelburn</td>
<td>1,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cot</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanlawhill</td>
<td>2,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twiglees (forest)</td>
<td>5100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle O'er and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crurie (forest)</td>
<td>2646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,804</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two forests belong to the State Forestry Commission, which in 1939 purchased two farms in the parish. All the farms are sheep farms, that is the farmers derive their income from the sale of lambs and wool. Such fields as there are, are given over mainly to the cultivation of hay, to provide winter feed for the animals.

**The Farms and the Land.**

The position of the farms on the ground is shown on map no. 7. It is apparent that the division of the land into farms has not been a haphazard affair, but that there is a certain order in the way they are placed. For each is situated so that it includes within its boundaries a certain
certain acreage of alluvial soil, which, unlike the unfertile hill land, can be cultivated. Thus, most of the farms includes a stip of the fertile soil of the Esk valley floor. From this "front" on the valley, each farm stretches back into the hills, some to the boundaries of the parish.

This disposition of farms has probably arisen from one of the difficulties of stock-breeding in these high altitudes, namely the shortage of winter feed. A few farmers send a section of their flock, the hoggs, to low lying farms in Annandale during the winter months. Not only is there a shortage of feed even during the mildest winter, but also, if a heavy fall of snow lies on the ground for more than three or four days, the sheep begin to starve. Moreover, most farms have a few cattle and a horse to feed as well as the sheep. The difficulty can only be met by each farm laying in a store of hay for the winter, and it is vastly more economical to grow one's own hay than to buy it. By the placement of farms in the pattern shown (map No. 1), every farm includes a few cultivable fields in which some winter feeding crop can be grown. In Eskdalemuir this crop is always hay. The farmer and the farmworker regard the hay crop as the vital one, and it is on it, of all the crops, that most labour and anxiety is expended.
Settlement Pattern.

This division of land among the farms accounts to a large extent for the pattern of settlement in the valley, a plan of which is shown below. There is no village in the parish. Instead, dwellings are spread out along the length of the valley, with here and there a small cluster of them. Most cottages (apart from those erected by the Forestry Commission to house their own employees in) belong to the farms. That is they are part of the property owned by a farmer, are situated on his land, and are occupied by his employees. They are "tied cottages" - i.e. can be rented from a farmer only if one is in his employ, and must be vacated if one takes a job with another farmer. It will be noted, too, that on each farm most of the cottages are situated beside the areable fields and farmhouse, while a few are placed far back in the hills. To explain this feature of the pattern of settlement, a brief outline of the organisation of the hill sheep farm is necessary.

The farm consists of two types of land, fields on the valley floors or on the lower hillsides rising immediately from the floors, and rough hill grazing land; the two types are called respectively "in-Bye" and "out-Bye" land. Farmhouses are situated beside the fields, and close to the farmhouse is the steading (see photos p.138), the sheds,
byres, stables, etc., which are always placed so as to form a rectangular or square courtyard. On a small farm these may be the only buildings on the farm. This is the case with Overcassock and Glendearg for example. Most farms, however, have situated near the steading one or two cottages. Those employees of the farmer whose work is in the fields and steading - ploughmen, general agricultural workers, etc. - live in these cottages. A shepherd whose flock grazes on the hillsides above the fields may also occupy a cottage near the steading.

The hill grazing land on each farm is divided into hirstles; a histle is an area of ground plus a flock of sheep on it for which one shepherd is responsible. Farm boundaries are marked off by dykes or wire fences. The hirstles on one farm are marked off from each other only by natural features -- hill burns, ridge tops, etc. The ratio of sheep to land is one ewe sheep to $1\frac{1}{2} - 2$ acres; hirstles vary in area from four hundred to twelve hundred acres, and in sheep population from two hundred to six hundred sheep. A farm of twelve hundred acres or under, will consist of only one histle, as for example Cot (600 acres). The largest farm in the parish has seven hirstles. On those large farms which stretch back to the parish boundary, some of the hirstles obviously have to lie far back in the hills. The shepherds in charge of
of them, like the workers in the fields, have to live beside their place of work. The cottages in the hills are all occupied by the shepherds.

Not all dwelling houses are those of farm workers. Three separate clusters of houses are found, at the Observatory, Castle O' er Forest and Twiglees Forest, housing employees of those organisations. In addition, in 1951, a group of four cottages was built by the County Council at Craighaugh, intended for agriculture workers. Other dwellings, such as the manse, the schoolhouse, etc., and all public buildings such as the post office and school are situated beside the main highway which runs along the valley floor. The majority of these other dwellings, and also public buildings are found in the vicinity of the junction of this road and the road to Lockerbie. The post office and the blacksmith's shop, situated a few hundred yards from this junction, are thought of as "the centre of the Parish", by parishioners, though the geographical centre is actually two miles north, where the Public Hall is sited. The post office and the smiddy, however, are the centre of communication within the parish. The only public telephone is here, it is the terminus for public buses from Langholm, while the smiddy is the only place one is likely to meet fellow parishioners (apart from workmates) in the course of the working day. The two most
most influential persons in community activities live in this vicinity, the parish registrar and the blacksmith. Whether this is an accident or whether they owe their influence to some extent to living at the centre of communication cannot be said.

The foregoing account seems to suggest that the scattered pattern of settlement can be explained simply by reference to the environment and the requirements of sheep farming. This is not entirely the case. Dwellings could be grouped in one or two villages and men could travel to work every day as is common in cities. This scattered pattern, while it is one adaptation to the environment, is not the only possible one. It is a settlement pattern which developed under the old organisation of the farm, when, as we described, the farm worker and his family were much more closely tied to the farm than they are now; they in a very real sense "belonged" to the farm. The settlement pattern is partly a reflection of this former organisation.

This perhaps accounts for the difference in pattern of settlement between Eskdalemuir and the rural communities studied by Vallee and Owen, where the settlement is in the form of "townships", hamlets or villages. In these places there are no (Barra) or few (Lewis) large farms.

1. F. Vallee, op. cit.
2. T. Owen, op. cit.
Instead the arable land is divided into crofts, of acreage varying only from five to twenty acres. Rough grazing land is owned in common by the crofters of a township, who cooperate in herding the animals grazing there. Crofts are worked by families, or members of a family, and there are no paid employees. In short, with such small land holdings worked by families who cooperate in tasks like herding, it is possible for families to live beside each other. This is also the settlement pattern in Western Ireland, where again small family farms of twenty acres or so are the rule.

In our last chapter we shall show that new attitudes to the isolation of cottages which the Eskdalemuir pattern imposes have arisen, following upon the closer contact between the farm workers and towns people already described. These new attitudes reject isolation. This does not mean, however, that parishioners "object" to the settlement pattern, in the sense of agitating for a new one. On the contrary, both farmers and farm workers assert that it is best to live as near as possible to their place of work. With the present distribution of farms in the parish this inevitably entails the present settlement pattern. Stated in this brief way, this seems to contradict the new attitudes. Our last chapter will resolve this contradiction.

1. C. Arensberg, op. cit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolchildren (Male)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolchildren (Female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherds</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd managers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant shepherds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry employees</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Agricultural Worker</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Retired&quot; (Male)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Retired&quot; (Female)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeepers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millworkers (weavers) (Female)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(work outside parish)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainers (casual) (from outside parish)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Scientific Officers (Observatory)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postman and postal deliverer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith and apprentice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist (Observatory)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housemaid (&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handyman (&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician (&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Attendant (Temporary, from outside)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank clerk (works outside parish)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Mechanic (do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1
Population and Occupation.

The population of the parish in 1949, when I took a census with the help of the parish registrar, amounted to 324 in all. The occupations and the numbers in each are shown in table No. 1. From this it is clear that, despite the establishment of two forests, the majority of parishioners are still dependant in one way or another on sheep farming.

Household Family and Kin.

In rural communities in Great Britain hitherto studied by anthropologists, the family and kinship relations originating in it have been found to be of the utmost importance in the local structure. This is not the case in our community. By this we do not mean that the family is not of great importance to its members. Our point is the methodological one, that the family and kinship relations are not crucial for the understanding of the social structure of the community. The point is made by K. Little with reference to the study of an urban community in modern society. He writes "By analysing the life of and sanctions governing a single family or a random series of families in a pre-literate society, the anthropologist has a guide to the structure of that society and is often able to forecast the behaviour of a whole community.

1. a) Arensberg, op.cit.
b) Vallee, op.cit.
Such a procedure is valid, however, only if the community in question provides virtually the whole world of its members," and if the family provides "the general focus for nearly all interests and activities, and serves as the regulator of social behaviour and the cultural norm." It is already apparent from our previous chapters that these conditions do not exist for Eskdalemuir. In a later chapter we shall show that in this community families are differentiated according to the social class of their members, that in fact the family is the unit of social class.

Meanwhile an indication of the relative unimportance of the family is to be seen in the following facts. At the time I took a census, the population was made up of 97 households. Now if we take a family to mean a group consisting of husband wife and children living together in one house, only 53 of these households in the parish contained a complete family. The following table shows the composition of the other households.

- 23 households containing only a husband and wife
- 7 elderly couples whose children have left them
- 7 elderly and middle aged couples who have never had children
- 9 young couples without any children as yet
- 2 households containing a widow and some of her children
- 2 households containing widows living alone
- 3 " " an unmarried mother and her child
- 1 " " a widower and some of his children
- 1 " " a divorced husband living alone
- 13 " " a middle aged bachelor either living alone, or with an unmarried sibling, or with a paid housekeeper.

---

Where the family provides "the general focus for nearly all interests and activity," kinship bonds linking one family to another become important in the local structure. Thus in the three communities mentioned almost every household is connected to several other households by close kinship ties. Moreover, the kinship ties among the members of these communities are so numerous that the investigators are unable to enumerate them all. In contrast to this situation, the majority of households in Eskdalemuir have no kinship connections whatsoever with other households in the parish. A closer examination of the kinship system shows that the family is very much an isolated unit within it, and that kinship bonds outside the family, so far from integrating the parishioners into a social unit, spread far beyond the parish and integrate its members with the nation as a whole.

The Kinship System.

It is established in social anthropology that kinship terminology provides a preliminary guide to the system of social relations obtaining among kinsfolk. The terminology used in Eskdalemuir is that used throughout the English speaking world, and is shown as follows.

Table 2

As on maternal side.

Great-grand etc.

Grand-father

Grand-mother

Great-uncle

Great-aunt

Father

Mother

Uncle

Aunt

Father-in-law

Mother-in-law

Sister-in-law

Brother-in-law

Brother's descendants

Same terms as sisters.

Son

Daughter

Sister

Brother

Nephew

Neice

1st cousins once removed

2nd cousins

3rd cousins

Great-grand etc.

Great-grand etc.

English kinship terminology
As for terminology which names kinship groups, the only one is "the family" (i.e. the group defined above). This is an indication of the social importance of this group as compared with kinsfolk outside it, who are not organised in groups but merely constitute a number of "relatives."

Some remarks must be made concerning the application of this terminology by the people of Eskdalemuir. As seems to be the case in many parts of the British Isles qualifiers of cousin—"first", "second", "once removed", "twice removed"—are very rarely used. Indeed, from discussions with parishioners it is evident that most people do not know to what category of relatives such designations apply. In this locality, anyone to whom ego knows he is related can be referred to as a "freen". The term is used mainly in two contexts—when the speaker does not wish to specify the precise connection between himself and the referent, but more often when the speaker does not know clearly the exact nature of the connection between himself and the referent. "Cousin" usually means "first cousin" and collaterals more remote than first cousin are almost invariably referred to as "Freens". The only qualifications made to this term are "far out" and "near", the meanings of which are self evident.

The vagueness concerning the nature of the bond between ego and these other collaterals reflects the nature of the social relations between ego and them, for no clearly specified rights and obligations obtain between the two.

One other term used in reference to kinship ties is "kind". As a social categoriser it is not confined to kinship, but used to point out any social category or social class or even personality type. In kinship, its usual reference is to a number of persons among whom kinship relations are thought to obtain but which are in fact untraceable (and socially of no significance). For example two or more persons with the same surname and having long associations with the same locality will be said to be the "same kind", though no kinship bond is known between them.

Returning to the terminology general throughout the English speaking world, the important features of the kinship system it discloses are:

a) absence of any units cutting across the family, such as lineage, clan etc.

b) the terms "father" and "mother", "husband" and "wife", can apply to only one person at a time, reflecting the rule of monogamy.

c) For ego there is a core of kinsfolk, terminologically distinct from all other relatives by their specificity,

1. This term is borrowed from Curle, op.cit.
- Father, mother, brothers, sisters, spouse, sons, daughters. Only ego's parents' children can be his brothers and sisters, whereas "cousin" refers indifferently to the children of any of the siblings of his parents. This core of specific kinsfolk comprises the members of the two families of which ego himself is a member in the course of his life, those Warner has called the family of orientation in which ego is a child, and the family of procreation in which ego is a parent.

d) Each member of this inner core (assuming all his siblings and children marry) links ego with one other family.

A significant fact in this terminology is that there is no distinction made between paternal and maternal families of orientation. This reflects the fact that the only obligatory emphasis on patrilinal descent concerns the inheritance of surname.

There are no rules concerning preferential marriage, though there is a ban on ego marrying certain relatives, the most important of these being the members of his family of orientation and his own children.

This terminology clearly reflects the main institutional features of the kinship system, in particular the importance of the family.

Family, House, Household.

The singling out of the family which we saw in
terminology has its counterpart in the special location of persons, in that it is held that each family of parents and unmarried children should occupy a house of which they are the sole inhabitants. As we saw, this does not mean that each house in Eskdalemuir is in fact occupied by a complete family. The fragments of families making up the other households do not qualify the general norm in any way, however, being simply the result of contingencies of various sorts as shown in the table. The norm that a family should have a house to live in, separate from other kinsfolk of either spouse, is held to apply from the starting of a family, that is at marriage. Parishoners are quite explicit that this is in order to free both spouses from kinship ties in the households they have been living in up till marriage, i.e. from their families of orientation, in case these conflict with their obligations and sentiments towards each other. It is held to be dangerous, or at the very least, an uncomfortable situation, for a married couple with or without children to be members of a household containing the parents or a parent of one of the spouses. This is especially so if the spouse's parent is the householder, i.e. owns the house or is responsible for paying the rent. To the danger of conflicting loyalties among kinsfolk is added, in this situation, the danger of a failure in the relationship between the spouses through the husband's
humiliation at being unable to fulfill one of his primary obligations to his wife - to provide a house of which she is mistress.

A few couples, married immediately after the war, had to live as members of a household in a house belonging to the parents of one of them, and spoke feelingly to me of the intense discomfort of the situation. Several of the couples of which the husband is employed by the Forestry declare that he took his employment solely in order to get a house they could live in themselves. (The Forestry Commission provides a house for all married employees.) The following case shows how important the norm is. A forestry worker got married to a local girl. It so happened that there was no house available for them on the forest at the time, though they were promised one in due course. They went to live in the house of the wife's mother, a widow with several immature children. The husband had shown promise at his job, had been sent to a forestry school and qualified, and was on the road to a foremanship, then managership. However, finding his household situation intolerable, he took another job as a gardener in an adjoining parish, a job that provided a house for his wife and himself, but at the cost of sacrificing his future prospects with the Forestry Commission.
The same norm is responsible for a form of household composition fairly common in Eskdalemuir - that in which a bachelor and his elderly parents or parent form the household. When a husband retires from work, a problem arises as to where the couple are to live, for the majority of cottages in the parish are tied. The couple, if they cannot get an untied cottage somewhere, have to live with a relative (or go into some public institution) who has a house. A working bachelor son is the most suitable person, for a daughter is either married or if she is not, she is not likely to be employed by a farmer and given a cottage. A married son already has his own household. Hence there are in Eskdalemuir no elderly couples (of which the husband is retired) living alone as a household, but there are four households consisting of a bachelor son and both parents, and two consisting of a bachelor son and one parent. In all cases the parents have other living children. There were in fact, while the fieldwork was in progress, two cases of bachelor sons changing employment from one farm to another solely to acquire a house in which they might live with their elderly parents.

Household and Kinship.

If social relations based on kinship were important in the local structure, there would have to be many kinship
connections among the population. As an index of the amount of kinship connections among parishoners, we may consider how many first degree connections exist among adult members of households. "Adult" here means both husband and wife where the household includes such, and the householder in those which do not. By first degree is meant those connections between the "core" kinsfolk plus first cousinship. Husband and wife are considered separately, so that in some cases one household has two connections between it and two other households, as the following example:

a) Using this index we find that out of ninety six households analyzed, there are fifty seven without kinship connections with other households in the parish. The remaining thirty nine households, each a household, among themselves, twenty three connections.

This does not, of course, constitute the total amount of kinship connections in the parish. For instance, the husband of No.1 is son-in-law to husband of No.3, and the wife of No.1 sister-in-law to the wife of No.3. The children of 1 and 3 are cousin, and as such serve as relatives, however, merely intensity the relationships among the households considered. In addition considered, two households are connected by several sets between adult members of them.
In other cases, one adult member of a household has two connections with two other households, as in this example:

![Diagram](attachment:image.png)

Using this index we find that out of ninety six households analysed, there are fifty seven without kinship connections with other households in the parish. The remaining thirty nine households have, among themselves, twenty three connections.

This does not, of course, describe the total amount of kinship connections in the parish. In example A for instance, the husband in No.1 is son-in-law to the husband of No.3, and the wife of No.1 sister-in-law to the wife of No.2. The children of 1 and 2 are cousins, and so on. These relationships, however, merely intensify the connections among the households considered. In addition to those considered, two households are connected by affinal bonds between adult members of them.
The majority of households which have kinship connections within the parish are composed of persons who are either natives of the place, or have lived in it a long time.

The facts given above already indicate that in our community kinship is not "a force to be reckoned with in every sphere of social life." Moreover, as we shall show in a later chapter (VII), kinship ties are sometimes ignored if they conflict with the principle of social class.

Meanwhile, a further indication of the unimportance of kinship relationship, and a partial explanation of this situation, can be got from a consideration of the length of residence in the parish of the present population. This is shown on table 3. The coloured figures show the number of natives in the relevant age categories. These figures show that in all but two age categories non-natives outnumber natives. (Under the category "native" are included ten people born in the parish and now resident in it, who have lived a large part of their lives somewhere else.) The figures also show that the majority of the people have lived in the parish only from one to ten years.

Now it is impossible that in a community whose population includes so few natives, and so many people who have only recently come into it, kinship should play a vital part in the social structure. This is recognised by Rees who remarks

1. Rees, op. cit. p. 80.
**Table 3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Length of residence in parish (in years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Red figures show the no. of natives in each age category.

Total natives = 86

Total others = 235

In a community the majority of whose members were born in the same locality, it is natural that they should play a larger part than it in making up the community. This is borne out by our findings, that in our community kinship ties are numerous among natives and those long resident in the parish, though these figures show the relative number of those born in different parishes, they also point to the conclusion, namely, that the majority of parishioners live in Barlaam and below because they have sought work in the seat of the majority in the nearest parishes. In short, they do not live there in order to live in a less isolated situation. In short, the majority of them leave a farm, and in 1951 seven of the parishioners not because they are rich, living there most parishioners live in Barlaam not because they are rich, but simply because their occupation made clear on p. 69.

1. Roos, op. cit. p. 75.
"In a community the majority of whose members were born in the same locality, kinship naturally plays a larger part than it does in modern urban communities where kinsfolk are dispersed and a large proportion of those who live and work together know nothing of one another's antecedents." 1 This is borne out by our own findings, that in our community kinship ties on the whole are more numerous among natives and those long resident in the parish.

At the same time as these figures show the relative unimportance of kinship relations in Eskdalemuir, they also point to the explanation of the fact, namely, that the majority of parishoners live in Eskdalemuir because they have sought work with a farmer or on a forest there. They do not live there because they expect some day to inherit a farm, as is the case with the majority in the Welsh parish and the Irish community described by Arensberg. Every year, in Eskdalemuir, a few people leave the parish and new ones arrive; in 1950 six left and were replaced, and in 1951 seven. The reasons given for these moves were either to get a more congenial job, or in order to live in a less isolated district. In short, most parishoners live in Eskdalemuir not because the parish is a group they have to belong to or because living there confers special rights, but simply because their occupation or that of their husbands and fathers lies there. This is made clear on p. 131.

1. Rees, op. cit. p. 73.
Kinship and the wider Structure.

While kinship connections within the parish are relatively few, any one person has innumerable connections outside it. After collecting a few genealogies, it became apparent that although the majority of any one person's relatives were in Scotland, the geographical spread of kinship connections from Eskdalemuir covered the whole British Empire and a few other places besides. The following fragments of kinship charts illustrate this point. Only kinsfolk alive now are considered.
The data so far presented have shown that, in terminology and spelling as well as in the family unit sharply separated from all the other kinsfolk of his parish, and that the geographical spread of kinship connections of parishioners is for the most part wider than within the family, and hardly exists outside it. The husband and father is responsible for maintaining his wife and children — providing a home, food, clothing etc. and both parents educate their children.

No. 2

Leith Shrewsbury Hawick Eskdalemuir Longholm Hawick Manchester Ashkirk Hawick

Edinburgh Carlisle (a seaman) Carlisle Glasgow Eskdalemuir Patagonia Eastriggs

N. Zealand Boreland Liverpool N. Zealand Eskdalemuir

Rights and obligations outside the family are insignificant compared with those within the family.
Rights and Obligations of Kinship.

The data so far presented have shown that in terminology and in dwelling arrangements the family is a unit sharply separated from all the other kinsfolk of its members, and that the geographical spread of kinship connections of parishoners is far wider than the parish. The reason for this is that rights and obligations among kinsfolk are heaviest within the family, and hardly exist outside it. The husband and father is responsible for maintaining his wife and children - providing a house, food, clothing etc., and both parents are responsible for the care of the children. There are no obligations on other kinsfolk in these matters. The vast majority of husbands have to fulfill their obligations by earning money in some occupation. Hence his occupation is more important in determining the place of residence of his family than anything else. Almost all newcomers to the parish come through being employed by farmers or the Forestry Commission. The husband is under no obligation to share his earnings with his siblings or other kinsfolk, and only in desperate circumstances can he call upon them for financial aid. Finally, inheritance (as far as I could discover) is normally within the family, passing from parents to children.

Rights and obligations outside the family are insignificant compared with those within, and are not clearly specified.
Whether a kinship connection outside the family becomes of social significance or not is contingent upon a great many things, for example the geographical distance between the relatives, whether or not they have sufficient wealth to overcome distance, and whether or not they like each other. This is perfectly understood by everyone, for it is recognised that outside family relations, a kinship connection can be "kept up" or not, as the relatives wish. This applies not only as between persons in Eskdalemuir and relatives outside, but between relatives within the parish itself. For example, one married woman has both a mother's brother and mother's sister in the parish. Both live at almost equal distance from her, yet she (and her husband) rarely see her uncle, but see a lot of her aunt. The niece and her husband openly explain this is so because they dislike the uncle's family. Two of the farmers are second cousins, yet have little interest in each other. People remark casually "They don't want to keep up the connection."

A kinship connection outside those established by family membership means only that the persons concerned are entitled to put forward on each other a claim to priority consideration in the way of invitations to weddings, funerals, of hospitality and minor assistance, and of protection against depreciatory judgements by non-relatives. There is no insistence that a
that a person must put forward such claims, and except for the last, there is no guarantee that the relative appealed to will meet the claim. These same claims can be put forward between established friends, so that the relationship between established friends can hardly be distinguished from those between kinsfolk of the same generation. There is, however, this difference between the two sorts of relationship, that in the latter case the kinship connection itself confers a right to put forward these claims, while in friendship such claims can only be tentatively advanced in accordance with the character of the relationship itself. In other words, in the case of kinship, the right exists prior to any given person making such a claim, while in friendship the right to make the claim is only gradually established.

It may be stressed, that we are not trying here to minimise the importance of kinship connections for the individual. Indeed, from such cases as we were able to observe, the the relationship between, for example, grandparent and grandchild, one of warmth and affection, was a source of satisfaction to both. It is in fact a fairly common practice for children to be sent to live with grandparents during the summer school holiday. But the fact that they are sent, i.e. outside the parish, reinforces our point that for an understanding of the local structure, kinship relations outside the immediate family of husband, wife and children living together, are of little importance.
As for the family itself, it does not occupy the centre of our study for several reasons. The most important reason is that families here are differentiated according to the class position of their members, and are in fact the unit of the class system. (ch. VII) Another reason is that, in my opinion, without much more precise techniques than are available to the anthropologist, nothing more can be discovered about this structure than is already known.

In this chapter occupation has been stressed both in accounting for the form of settlement of the parish and the configuration of kinship relations within it. The next chapter deals with the two most important occupations in the parish.
Chapter IV

THE FARM AND THE FOREST

The Farm - General.

The farms in Eskdalemuir are all owned by a farmer; there are no tenants. Not all the farm owners, however, reside on their Eskdalemuir farms, for some also own farms elsewhere, where they live with their families. These absentee owners put shepherd managers in charge of their Eskdalemuir farms. The following farms are owner occupied or "led", (i.e. managed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Led</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nether Cassock</td>
<td>Over Cassock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davington</td>
<td>Glendearg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfedling</td>
<td>Moodlaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garwald</td>
<td>Rennelburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craighaugh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerkhill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watcarrick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanlawhill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distinction between the two types is not a hard and fast one. Thus, the Craighaugh farmer, though resident on his farm, employs a manager, while the Davington farmer occupies his farm for only six months of the year, yet his herd is not designated manager nor in function is he.
All these farms are devoted to breeding lambs, from the sale of which the farmer gets most of his income. Consequently the permanent stock on the farm consists of ewes. The second steady source of income is from the sale of the fleeces of these latter animals. There are other ways of making money, but these are the main ones, and all the farmers get by far the greater part of their income from them. Other ways are, by the sale of tups born and bred on the farm, and by rearing cattle and selling them. One farmer has a herd of dairy cattle and sells milk to a Langholm dairy. One farmer hires out a lorry and tractor. Occasionally some farmer will produce a small surplus crop of potatoes or some other crop, which he will sell. Many farmers' wives sell eggs, the income from which is her own, in the sense that she disposes of it, but it is by tradition at least supposed to be used to buy groceries.

The division of a farm's land into fields on the one hand and hill pasture on the other, has already been described. With this division of land goes a division of labour. - General Agricultural Labourers, Horsemen, Tractormen, Cowmen work in the fields and in the steading, while shepherds work on the hills and at the folds. The work in the fields requires more men per unit of ground than work in the hills, so the number of workmen on each farm varies with the total size of
of the farm and the amount of field land on it. The number of employees on each farm is as follows (i.e. apart from the farmer):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nether Cassock</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>11 (7 herds, 4 others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfedling</td>
<td>6,024</td>
<td>8 (5 &quot; , 3 &quot; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garwald</td>
<td>5,368</td>
<td>9 (6 &quot; , 3 &quot; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodlaw</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>7 (5 &quot; , 2 &quot; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanlawhill</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td>3 (2 &quot; , 1 &quot; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerkhill</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>6 (2 &quot; , 4 &quot; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcassock</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>1 (herd )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendearg</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>2 (herds )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craighaugh</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>4 (2 herds, 2 others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennelburnn</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>2 (1 herd, 1 other )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa tcarrick</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2 (1 &quot; , 1 &quot; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davington</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>1 (herd )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cot</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1 (other. Farmer herds )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holm</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>2 (others. Farmer herds. The two others are his sister and his eldest son. )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers given here constitute the permanent labour team on each farm. At seasons of heavy work, temporary help is sometimes employed. These temporary workers are always Continental displaced persons, a number of whom live in Ministry of Agriculture hostels near Lockerbie.

It may be emphasised once again that these employees are (except for the two noted ) all hired men, and stand in no relationship to the farmer but that of employee. They are not hired because they are kinsmen of the farmer, but simply because they have skills and labour to sell which the farmer wishes to buy. This fact, and the size of the farms illustrate the main difference between this community and
those others with which comparison has already been made.

The techniques and implements used on these farms are those in general use throughout the country, and present no distinctive features. Although no farm has extensive enough fields to make it profitable to use expensive machines such as combine harvesters, all use in varying degree tractors, trucks, modern threshing machines and so on.

For the sake of convenience in the writing of what follows, we may mention the parts played by farmer and shepherd in the work of the farm. Farmers, as well as supervising the general work of the labour team, are responsible for the breeding policy followed on the farm, while herds are responsible for the health and safety of the stock which results from that policy. The farmer decides what sort of animals he wants to breed, - strong-boned animals with poor quality wool, or finer-boned animals with better wool, and so on. He chooses the rams which are put to the ewes in November, the crucial choice in determining what sort of stock the farm will have. The shepherd is responsible for protecting the animals resulting from this policy from death by accident or sickness. The herd is also responsible for ensuring that a good crop of lambs is delivered every year.
Relations between Farmers.

Each farm is a productive unit on its own, a business from which the farmer tries to make a profit. There is very little co-operation in work among them. There are, however, a few occasions on which a farm's own labour team is not large enough to cope with the work required, and on these occasions help may be sought from another farm's team. The occasion which gives rise to most co-operation is sheep clipping, next threshing, and lastly sheep dipping. In general, small farms seek help more often than large ones.

Help at threshing is required on farms which do not have a modern threshing machine of their own, and which hire one from the Dept. of Agriculture. Since these machines are expensive to hire, farmers like to get it done in a day, and invite help from anyone who can spare the time. There are no institutionalised arrangements with regard to the recruitment of such help, – anyone from any nearby farm may help, provided he gets his own employer's permission. No payment is given, but the farmer has to feed everyone present, (including his own labour team). Those who give help, enjoy a day spent with neighbours. Such co-operation as occurs at dipping, is confined entirely to the smaller farms, and again the operation lasts only a day. All those present are fed by the farmer throughout the day.
It was noted that the clipping band as an institution has disappeared (p. 48). The larger farms in the parish (Nether Cassock, Garwald, Dumfedling, Moodlaw) do not seek outside help for clipping, but all the other farms require extra men in order to get it over with in the shortest possible time. Clerkhill and Tanlawhill hire men from the Forestry Commission, whom they pay wages. Cot and Holm help each other, and so do Craighaugh and Watcarrick. It is interesting to note that this latter instance of mutual aid between farms has sprung up since the disappearance of the clipping band, follows class lines (see p. 86), the two former farms being owned by lower middle class farmers, and the latter two by upper middle class farmers.

It was remarked that the four largest farms did not seek outside help for clipping. Nevertheless, Nether Cassock and Dumfedling receive it. This is because the three smaller farms at the north end of the parish require outside help, so the herds on these attend the clipping on the larger farms in order to get help for their own clipping. Again, whether farmers hire labour from the Forestry Commission or get help from neighbours, all men present at the clipping are fed by the farmer.

From all this it appears that there is much less mutual aid among the farms here than in the other rural communities
in Britain already mentioned. Since in these other communities farms are very much smaller, and we noted that small farms in Eskdalemuir seek help oftener than large ones, it may be thought that size of farm explains this difference. This is not altogether the case, for in these other communities the small farms are also family farms, and kinship bonds among the families are numerous. Co-operation among them is not merely an economic necessity, but an affirmation of social bonds among those helping each other. This is very clearly brought out by Arensberg, who shows that the Irish countryman explains his act of mutual aid "as part of the traditional reciprocities of sentiment and duty which make up his system of kinship." Rees shows that assistance is part of the relationship of kinsfolk or neighbours. Only two of the farmers in Eskdalemuir, however, are kinsmen (second cousins) and this connection they do not "keep up."

In addition, however, there is a less tangible factor accounting for the relative lack of mutual aid in Eskdalemuir. For it is held that a man, any man, should be as independent as possible from other people. This was very clearly brought out in the discussions concerning smallholdings. While informants thought that in general smallholdings were a good

2. Rees, op.cit. Ch. VIII.
"good idea", they objected to them on the score that they were too small to be self-sufficient. As one herd put it: "A ferm has tae be big enough so that ye have everything on it. It's nae use if ye've always tae be beholden tae yer neebour. It's nae use if he has a horse an you haveney, an' ye have tae rin tae him fur a len' o' it. If yer neebour starts ploughin' then it's time you were ploughin' tae, it's no use waitin' till he's feenished wi' the cuddy." It is not that the neighbours object to giving assistance when it is required, but simply that assistance should not be constantly called for; it should be unusual, not the norm.

This individualistic spirit is not, however, explained simply by the lack of kinship ties among the farming population. It is a positive outlook which reflects the structure of relationships among the farmers, for as is shown below, farmers stand in relation of rivalry to each other. The farmers in Eskdalemuir do not farm on a subsistance basis, as seems to be the case in areas where the family farm or the croft predominates. The farm in Eskdalemuir is a business enterprise, from which the farmer hopes to make a profit, by the sale of lambs an' wool in the open market. If he can accumulate enough money, he may buy a larger farm, or buy another farm which he will leave in charge of a manager. Or, if he is getting too old for hard work, he may buy a
house in a town nearby and retire. Or, if he has more than one son who wishes to become a farmer, he will try to set them up before he retires or dies.

We may phrase our hypothesis in this way, that up to a certain size (which could only be determined by specific research on the matter) farms have to be worked on a subsistence basis. Where this is the case, the family farm is the basic economic group, and any community of such farms will be characterised by kinship ties among the families. In such a community mutual aid practices will be the norm, not only from economic necessity, but also as an expression of these social bonds. Above a certain size, farms become business enterprises, capable of yielding a profit. Such farms are sold and bought in the normal way of business. In a community of such farms, kinship ties do not exist among farmers. Instead, farmers compete with each other in the market. This competition implies a spirit of rivalry incompatible with extensive practices of mutual aid.

Rivalry will be discussed below. Meanwhile, it may be stressed again that farmers in Eskdalemuir, though in competition with each other, are not, as it were, at war with each other, and rarely refuse a request for assistance from a neighbour. The point is that such requests are rare, compared with the other communities mentioned.
Farms and Rivalry.

Farmers are in competition with each other in selling lambs and tups in the market. The farms competing with each other in this are, of course, much more numerous than simply the fourteen farms in Eskdalemuir. A study of this competition belongs to economics and cannot be undertaken here. More important for this study of the parish is, that among farmers in any one locality, this competition takes on the aspect of rivalry for reputation. Reputation as a good stocksman is gratifying in itself, and also gives a farmer an advantage in another arena of competition, viz. for good labour.

That esteem as a stocksman is highly valued by farmers, soon becomes evident on moving among them. Open boasting, or denigration of rivals, is rarely indulged in, but they are passionately interested in the quality of their own and each other's stock. They are constantly talking about it, and eagerly note improvements and deteriorations in relative quality. The signs of relative quality are the price the farmer gets for his lambs and tups in the market, and the prizes he gets for them at fairs and agricultural shows. In most farmhouses photographs of prize-winning or costly animals bred on the farm are hung on the walls, sometimes along with portraits of the father or grandfather of the
of the present farmer. One farmer was quite explicit about his interest in reputation, remarking to me that he supposed every sheep farmer, like himself, wanted most in life to win a reputation as a stocksman. Another, an elderly man about to retire, who has been a notable stocksman all his life, used often to boast to me when in a maudlin mood in the course of drinking. Here is a sample of his monologues on those occasions -- "the top of the tree, that's it........mind you, you get no thanks for being at the top of the tree, oh no...... people are jealous...........just a lot of abuse. But I never mind them....I've been at the top of the tree for fifty years now, and I've had my day........ The name of X (his farm) has always stood for the best. The top of the tree..... that's where you want to be......" (here followed denigration of some rivals)

As there is a tendency in our society to reduce human motivation to a few simple drives of which desire for money is the most prominent, it is necessary to stress here that farmers, in wanting to be at the top of the tree (in the sheep farming world) are not motivated entirely by the financial benefits that position entails (for being at the top of the tree implies that one's animals fetch high prices in the market.)

1. No proof is offered for this statement; the tendency being so pervasive, it is assumed the reader is aware of it.
If farmers were interested solely in the amount of money they made, and reputations were accorded by this criteria, obviously those with bigger farms would always have a higher reputation than those with smaller. But this is not the case. The owner of the smallest farm in Eskdalemuir is widely esteemed as a breeder of tups. The farm noted above, X, whose owner is also esteemed, is the third smallest in the parish.

The farmer's interest in reputation is most clearly seen, however, in the matter of breeding tups. The majority of farmers in the parish breed and sell tups at the annual tup fair held in Lockerbie in September. The fair lasts two days and is the highlight of the sheep farming year. On the first day the animals are exhibited in public and three prizes are awarded, one for the best animal, one for the second best, and one for the best group of five beasts. The following day they are sold by public auction. The interest and excitement of the fair can be judged by the amount of ceremony accompanying the preparation, exhibition, and auctioning of the beasts.

About three weeks before the fair, farmers start visiting each other, and inviting visits, to "view the tups". This they do in the evenings, dressed in clothes different from those worn at work. The herd who looks after the tups, corners them in a field or brings them into the pen. The host, visitors and herd regard the animals sometimes for an hour or
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or two, pointing out their good points and discussing tups in general. If any of the visitors shows keen interest in one of the tups, the party may be asked into the farmer's house for a drink.

During this period dressing the tups becomes the most important job of the herd put in charge of them, or of the farmer himself. Dressing the tups means deftly and fastidiously clipping the fleece in such a way as to hide the animal's bad points and show off it's good points to the best advantage. This at any rate is what both farmer and herd say, though from the animation they display when examining a good tup it is likely that they find some aesthetic satisfaction in the proportions of a good beast. At any rate, day after day for about three weeks, the herd takes each animal and with the utmost finickiness snips off little wisps of wool here and there. Several hours a day are spent thus, the farmer often helping or standing by and watching. The evening before the show the tups have their faces washed with hot water and soap, and then painted white. The fleece is usually sprinkled with sheep dip to give it a yellow bloom. (This decoration of the beasts is repeated the evening after the show, so that they will be looking their best at the sale next day.)

1. Several farmers do this also with their wedder lambs.
At the show next day, attended by thousands of farmers and herds from a wide radius, the excitement is intense. Ribbards are pinned on to the prize-winning animals. The victors usually celebrate in the pubs. It is permissable for the owner and the herd in charge of the prize-winning animals to boast a little. An account of the show with the names of the prize-winning farmers is printed in the two national newspapers of Scotland, and sometimes is broadcast on the radio, so that they become known to all who are interested in these matters. In 1951 the 1st prize was won by an Eskdalemuir shepherd-manager. Normally he drinks little, but was gleefully drunk for the rest of the day, and was seen dancing at the smiddy with his friend the blacksmith. The following day his children appeared in school waving the first prize ribband in the faces of the other children, to the chagrin of some of them. It often happens that at the sale next day, the tup sold for the highest price is not the one which got the first prize at the show. The owner of this beast and his herd then similarly celebrate.

The sale itself shows in some of its features that reputation as a stock breeder is desired per se, apart from any financial benefit it may bring. The tups are sold by auction, and the price paid for one may be as high as £1,200. Now, when an animal is sold for such a sum as that, farmers and herds (apart from the seller and the buyer) say there must
must have been a conspiracy between the seller and his friends. This imputed conspiracy consists of the seller and his friends forming a buying ring, in which they all bid for each other's beasts, and bid highly so that the prices reach a high level. Afterwards, the conspirators exchange money so that none of them gain any and none of them lose any. Whether it is true or not that these buying rings actually operate, the important point is, that, when it is pointed out that no one in the ring profits financially from the transactions, farmers and herds invariably reply, that it is not the money that the conspirators want, but the "name", i.e. the name of being good stocksmen, of having bred animals which commanded such fabulous prices.

How important the quality of his tups is for a farmer's self-esteem, is shown by the following incident. One farmer on whose farm I worked a lot, had a high reputation as a stocksman. He had two friends in the parish, also farmers, who had not. Now, the good stocksman from time to time bought a tup from one of his friends, but when he did so, he gave strict instructions to his herd to lock the beast up, and make sure it did not breed with his own stock. He explained, that he only bought the animals (which usually cost about £30) "out of friendship."

Relations of Farmer to Labour Team.

The farmer (or farm manager) controls the activities of the labour team. Where the farmer is an absentee owner, he cannot control the labour team, but leaves this to his manager.
Farm managers in the parish are all herds. Probably to ensure easier control of the team, these shepherd managers try to have sons employed on the farm they manage. Thus the manager of Glendearg has his youngest son working with him as a herd, the two forming the labour team for the farm. The manager of Moodlaw has two of his sons working on the farm. The degree to which the farmer or manager controls the daily activities of the men differs greatly as between shepherds and the others. Every morning the farmer meets the others at the steading and announces what the day's work is to be. Many of the farmers work alongside or in conjunction with these men, and control their activities all day long. A few farmers do little actual work, but always give daily orders, and keep an eye on the progress of the work.

Herd, however, have an entirely different relation to the farmers. The farmer does not see his herds every morning and give out orders for the day's work, nor does he ever supervise the daily work a herd performs on his own hirstle. The herd at Pengraine, for example, reckons he sees his farmer only about four times a year. Each herd is entirely responsible for the safety and health of the sheep on his hirstle, and guards his independence from the farmer's control. Several remarked to me that, if the farmer came "nosing" round their hirstle too often, they would leave the farm, because such nosing would imply lack of trust between the farmer
and his herd. All herds speak of "my hirstle", sometimes "my own hirstle". In any case, farmers all say, that a herd who did not know his job better than the farmer did, would not be worth employing, and few farmers are knowledgeable enough about the herd's craft to be able to supervise his daily work. Moreover, on a large farm with several herds, it would obviously be impossible for the farmer to supervise the daily work of all his herds. So the herd is left very much to himself, and only his own conscience controls the amount and quality of the work he does. So important is the character of the herd for the efficient running of a sheep farm, that all the farmers said that the most decisive control they have over the whole process of sheep farming, is "hiring the right herd".

On certain occasions, the herds on a farm cooperate under the supervision of the farmer, particularly at clipping, dipping, sortings and innoculations, but these do not occupy more than about forty days in the year, and in any case, the farmer is not always present at these.

The herd's independance and responsibility is officially recognised, as shown in the higher wages he receives. (p. 14/ ) All these distinctions, in his freedom from control, and in his higher wages, mark off the herd from the other agricultural workers. According to elderly shepherds, there was formerly a distinct cleavage between the two, amounting to a status
distinction. They say: "The herd used to think himself a bit above the others, and didn't mix with them." There is certainly no status distinction between the two now, but the difference between them is still apparent. It is seen, for example, in momentary joking relations, which spring up between the two, in which they argue which of them does the most work. It is probably also seen in membership of the agricultural workers' union. Though I was unable to obtain exact figures on this, it seems that other agricultural workers are more enthusiastic supporters of the union than are the herds.

How far this is the case, remains for further research. However, both herds and other A.W.s join their union. Like other unions, this one represents the interests of its members in opposition to those of their employers. Farmers in Eskdalemuir openly express hostility to the farm workers union, and at the same time often congratulate themselves that their relations with their men are more harmonious than is the case with employers and employees in industry. The truth in this latter view will be considered shortly; here we must point out that the existence of the union, and the farmers' hostility to it, indicate the opposition between farmers and farm workers, the former wanting to buy labour at the lowest possible cost, the latter wanting to sell it at the highest possible price.
The opposition is indicated not only by the existence of the workmen's union, but it is often expressed by the workmen themselves. When they express it, they do not express hostility to any one farmer, but they express hostility to the category "farmers". It is precisely because the opposition is between two categories, farmers and workmen, and not between individuals; and also because the conflict of interests is fought out on a national level between two unions, the Farm Workers and the Farmers, that relations between individual farmers and their workmen can sometimes be fairly harmonious. Some concrete examples of expressions of opposition or hostility make this clear.

A herd, renowned for his skill and conscientiousness. "Farmers are mean, you know. They're always good at finding excuses for not paying more than the minimum wage."

A herd: "There isn't a meaner lot than farmers." A cowman, referring to farmers' complaints that men do not work hard enough nowadays - "they've only themselves to blame. Before the war they made us work hard enough for them." This latter is a common theme in workmen's discussions of their relations with farmers. "It's not so bad now, but before the war you didn't say a word or out you'd go; and you had to take what wages you were offered, or they told you, if you weren't satisfied with them there was plenty others who would be," (a herd).
Another, reminiscing over his experiences twenty years ago, said "He (a farmer he had applied for a job with) told me to meet him in (a pub). Soon as I got in the door, he said, I'll give you twenty five bob a week, a sack of meal, and the keep of a cow. And if you don't like it, away you go. I've half a dozen men waiting to see me outside.' They were all like that in those days. They have to be a bit more careful nowadays."

The workmen think their position vis-a-vis farmers has improved since the war. The latter correspondingly think, their position has worsened. Their most frequent complaint is, that workmen do not work so hard now, and also, that there are not enough of them, i.e. that labour is scarce. "I don't mind workmen having high wages," says one, "but I do insist that they put in a good day's work for them. And that's just what they don't do now." Another, still a young man, contrasted the position of his father and himself in this respect. He imitated his father stepping out of the door in the morning, twisting his moustache once and uttering a loud snort - - "and then there wasn't a workman in sight. They had all fled to the fields and were working like slaves. You and I can't do that," he said, turning to another farmer, "they don't take any notice of us."

This hostility between the two categories became more openly expressed in the parish, when the public hall was
declared dangerous for dancing in, and parishoners decided to build a new one. Money had to be raised for the new structure, and the requisite sum was a long time in being collected. Workmen started grumbling, that the farmers were rich enough to be able to donate the sum, (about a thousand pounds) and ought to do it, "because they make it out of us," as one put it. One ploughman, when his farmer remarked that he had heard the hall had been declared unsound, replied: "Aye. An' if there's no another built soon, then there'll be nobody in Eskdalemuir to work for the farms." Everyone, including the farmer, knew this was a hint that if the farmers did not provide the money to build a new hall, their labour difficulties would be increased by men leaving the parish for jobs elsewhere. The farmers were fully aware of the workmen's attitude, and made remarks like this, "These people want everything done for them. We don't use the hall, it's just they who do. If they want a hall, they should raise the money."

Quite apart from this incident, a few farmers occasionally express opposition between themselves and the men with somewhat drastic words. Thus, while discussing labour shortage and difficulties with one, he said calmly: "Of course, what I'm hoping for soon, is more unemployment. Then there'll be no difficulty. I notice, Fergusons have had to lay quite a lot of their men off recently. Once there's unemployment,
there'll be a lot of men coming back to the country."
Another one was reported to me as saying several times, that he, too, hoped there would be widespread unemployment soon, to solve his labour difficulties for him.

Finally, the opposition between the two, as to how much labour is to be given for how much wages, is seen in the fact, that farmers are quite sophisticated about techniques for making the men work harder. They all have theories as to how 'the men' should be treated in order that they should work hard. "The great thing," one says,"is not to give them the impression you are ordering them. You have to do it as if you were asking them." Another,"I think, if you work with the men and show them and interest in what they are doing,they will work,too." (This particular farmer's men call him a "slave driver" behind his back.) "You have to work with them, not against them", says a third. And so on, all have their theories as to how it should be done.

Despite this opposition between the two categories, workmen sometimes respect their own farmer. To understand this, relations among the men themselves must be understood.

**Rivalry among the Men.**

Rivalry among the men on one farm is not very much in evidence, but is apparent in relations between men of different farms, and especially among shepherds, who, as we saw above, are more independent in their work than the others.
Interest in reputation is as keen among farmers as among herds, and a good herd is highly esteemed. The standards by which they are judged are known to everyone, and there is consensus among both farmers and herds as to the efficiency of the herds in the parish. This was evident from the judgements they made in conversation, and was also shown, when I asked several, two farmers and two herds to grade the herds of the parish on a three-point scale as first, second, or third class. Their ratings agreed exactly.

A good herd is one who can control his dogs and so move the sheep easily and without fuss, who can spot sickness or accident among his flock before it becomes dangerous, who consistently does his hill round, who can shear neatly, and who cares for the general welfare of his flock. A sign of a good shepherd is his being a "guid kenner", i.e., he can recognise each sheep in his flock individually. Considering, that a flock may be as many as 500 beasts, and that every year one sixth of them are sold and new ones come in to replace them, this is no mean feat. Not all good shepherds have this gift, but one who has it, has always the other qualities of the good herd. Another sign of a good herd is, if he takes a job on a new farm and the market price of the lambs on his hirstle goes up from what it was before. The quality of a herd's work soon becomes known, and his reputation spreads
spreads quickly, for as with the farmer, the product of his work, lambs and tups, are auctioned in the open market, where all his peers can see and judge it. Even the way a herd moves his lambs round the ring in the auction mart, tells other herds whether or not he is a good craftsman.

Herds on the same farm do not allow each other to "trespass" on each other's hirstles. This they themselves sometimes explain on the grounds of jealousy. At any rate, they openly recognise the rivalry among themselves, often using sporting metaphors to talk about it, as for instance one who pointed to a neighbour's hirstle while doing his hill round, and exclaimed - "there's the bugger that beat me in the League Table last year." He was referring to the fact that his lambs got the second top price at Lockerbie wedder lamb sale, while his neighbour's got the top price. Rivalry in efficiency in one of their main skillst has become institutionalised, through sheepdog trials, a popular summer entertainment in country towns and at agricultural shows. At these trials, herds and those farmers who have leaned the art of herding, compete before an audience and judges in skilfull handling of dogs. These trials are of varying importance, culminating in a yearly International Sheepdog Trial, with competitors from Scotland, England and Wales. The winners and near-winners at this International become known to herds in all three countries.
The other workers are less publicly acclaimed in this sheep-rearing country, though it is to be noted, that international ploughing matches are held every year, and presumably in arable farming districts skill in ploughing and related techniques, are as highly valued as are the skills of the herd in sheep farming areas. Even in Eskdalemuir, however, the relative efficiency of the other workers is noted. All the farmers and workers know, or know of, each other, and while passing each other's fields, take note of the neatness and thoroughness of the work done in them. This is particularly so of men above the age of thirty-five, who are never tired of observing how standards of work have declined in the young, since they themselves were young.

The experts, whether in herding or in other work, receive the regard of their fellows, are listened to, and asked for advice, and are usually popular at social gatherings. On a large farm it is one of the expert herds, who will be given the job of looking after the tups and preparing them for the fair. Even workmen who are politically antagonistic to "bosses", and interpret the esteem given to good workmen as a trick that employers have somehow played upon workmen, desire the respect accorded a good workman. One ploughman, for example, a noted Socialist, used to grumble that "a good workman is the character of a horse"; yet he himself was a noted stackbuilder, and proud of his reputation for it. He always took it upon
upon himself to direct stackbuilding on the farm he was employed on, and to perform the more difficult parts of the operation.

In addition to providing gratification on its own account, reputation as a good workman enables a man to get the best jobs (however he may define them). For example, a new herd came to the farm X one year, and that year there was a very good crop of lambs on the farm. It is a one-hirstle farm, and he the only herd on it. He was very excited before the first lamb sale, and admitted to me, "this sale means a lot to me, 'cos the lambs will get a good price. Then the farmers will start askin' each other 'who's herdin' at X now?' and I'll get a name. Then I'll be able to pick the jobs I want." Another, who had some good tups in his charge, was similarly excited at the prospect of acquiring a name and being in a position, as he put it, "to pick" his jobs. Now, the importance of this for relations between farmers and men is, that a good job is defined either as a shepherd manager's, or as a job on a farm run by a good farmer. The first in this district is open only to herds, but both herds and others prefer to work with an efficient farmer rather than with an inefficient one, even though the inefficient one might offer slightly higher wages. This preference is openly stated by them, both herds and others claiming, that it is easier to work for an efficient farmer, and the herds also pointing out, that it is impossible
to acquire a name for oneself, while working for a poor farmer. A good farmer is one who can breed good beasts, and in a good stock there is less sickness than in a poor stock, and moreover lambing is easier with a good stock.

This preference is not merely stated, but (in Eskdalemuir) is shown by the fact, that men stay longer in the employ of a good farmer than in the employ of an inefficient one. Thus the farmer most esteemed in the parish is a man with a worldwide reputation, who sells tups to farmers in Canada and New Zealand. This farmer is also known as "the meanest man in the parish". He never pays his men more than the minimum laid down by the wages board, and his herds he pays every six months in order, it is said, to accrue interest by having the money in the bank. His own men say he is the meanest man they know, - yet they stay with him. A rival farmer speaks of him thus: "I can't understand these men. - There's X (the efficient farmer above), he never pays his men a ha'penny more than the minimum, yet they stay with him a lifetime." This rival is one of the inefficient farmers, and is always having men leave him, despite his paying them a little above the minimum wage. The point is admitted by officials of the Farmers Union. Referring to the present shortage of agricultural labour, an official added that it was difficult to estimate the real extent of the shortage, since only the inefficient farmers complained of it.

1. Unofficial conversation.
Good workmen and good farmers tend to seek each other out; each helps the other to build up his reputation, and on those farms on which the two are found, the farmer and the good workman respect each other's skill. Just how much each contributes to this common reputation may at times be a matter of dispute. For example, recently a farmer and his herd quarrelled. In the course of it, the herd claimed that he "had made X" (the name of the farm), meaning that by his herding he had made a reputation for it. The farmer answered: "It wasn't you that made X, it was X that made you. X was a farm before you came here." However, this was after the herd had been fourteen years on the farm, so that obviously the two had been satisfied with each other for a long time. Normally, by virtue of the bond of mutual respect the efficient farmer and the efficient workman work harmoniously together. It is for this reason that, though there is opposition between the category "farmers" and the category "workmen", the relations between the two on particular farms can sometimes be harmonious.

The Forest.

The two forests do not fit into the scheme of relationships described above, as will be shown in Ch. VIII, they are related to the farms only in that they offer alternative employment for farmworkers, an alternative that seems to be becoming more attractive than farm work itself.
As for the internal organisation of the forest, it is of a typically bureaucratic nature. Each forest is one unit in a state organisation, the Forestry Commission. In charge of each forest is a manager appointed by the Commission, and under the manager is a foreman (sometimes two) similarly appointed. Among the men are two or three gangers, appointed by the manager with the sanction of the Commission. The foremen and the manager have to qualify for these offices by attending a forestry school and passing examinations.

It is only in a very loose sense that the manager can be said to employ the labourers on the forest. In the first place, their wage is the minimum as laid down for General Agricultural Workers (see p. 344), and the manager, unlike the farmer, cannot offer more than the minimum, nor can he offer any perquisites. In the second place, the number of men he may employ is ultimately decided by a higher authority in the Commission. And thirdly, many of the men who work on the forest will have applied for a job not to him, but to a higher official, the Conservator of Forests for the area. The Conservator details such applicants to the forests they work on.

Despite this, there is the same opposition between forestry labourers and forestry management that obtains between farm workers and farmers.
Thus, one of the two managers remarked that "The workers here don't know what work is. They don't work nearly fast enough. They're a poor bunch." The labourers are aware that the manager they work under has no control over the amount of their wages, and their opposition is not expressed in terms of low wages. Instead, their hostility is expressed in terms of the amount of work demanded of them. Since it is not the manager himself who supervises their daily labour, but the foreman, their hostility is directed against this latter person. It is expressed in numerous ways, in bickering with him over the amount of work done, in obeying his orders with the utmost slowness, and verbally behind his back. For example, once while with a squad of labourers, I heard them making references to "a Christmas present for the foreman." I asked what the present was to be, and was told "a bloody great length of rope, to hang himself from the highest tree with." In fact, all the workmen I spoke to on the matter, cursed the foreman. As there were three foremen (while I was there) and all were equally hated, the hostility was evidently not a matter of dislike of any one's personality. What the men objected to, was the foreman giving them orders, (though these are in fact the manager's orders relayed through the foreman), and "always watchin' to see if you're workin'." As one labourer put it, "the foreman's just really a worker, but he's a boss's man."
The unfortunate position of the foreman is also seen in his social life outside work. As is shown later, the forestry manager and the forestry labourer belong to different social classes, and do not associate with each other outside work. Two of the three foremen had no close associates outside work at all (apart from their families). Both in fact complained that one of the drawbacks to Eskdalemuir, as far as they were concerned, was that they had no friends there.
Chapter V

SOCIAL CLASS

Social Class - Preliminary.

Only in the last few decades have field studies of social classes been made, and they have been more often done in America than in this country (see bibliography). Before field studies began, the topic was much debated by sociologists and historians. The outstanding contributions to these theoretical discussions were made by Marx, Veblen and Weber. In Marx's view the idea of class was closely linked to a theory of history; history was a record of a struggle between classes for power. Hence, his analysis of classes was conducted with the object of showing where power lay within the modern state, and why it was distributed in the way it was. To him, the only two classes which mattered in the State, were the bourgeoisie, those who disposed of capital, and the proletariat, those who had no access to capital and earned wages by selling their labour to the bourgeoisie. He was aware, that within these classes various sub-classes could be distinguished, but ignored them as irrelevant to his main theme - the analysis of the structure of power.

2. K. Marx, Capital.
These two main classes were defined above all by their "interests", a key term, as Parsons shows, in Marx's analysis. Each member of the bourgeoisie had to make as much profit from this use of capital as possible, or be driven out of business by the competition of other members of his class. Hence, in relation to the proletariat, it was to the interest of the bourgeoisie to pay as low wages as possible. It was to the interest of the proletariat, on the other hand, to sell their labour at the highest possible price. Hence, the two classes stood in opposition to each other. Marx developed the theme of opposition at great length, showing for example, how in times of economic crisis large numbers of the proletariat found themselves unable even to sell their labour. In this situation the State (and in subtler form the Church) was simply a form of coercion in the hands of the bourgeoisie. "Opposition" in fact to Marx was more than a statement of the relation between the two classes, it was a slogan in a program of political action, the aim of which was to incite the proletariat to revolt against the bourgeoisie and seize power themselves.

As a result of this analysis being overlaid by his political program, it seems to me, that Marx exaggerated the degree of opposition between the two classes. Moreover, the sub-classes he chose to ignore, might not fall unequivocally on one or other side in this opposition, and hence might supply

---

supply a stabilising element in the total social structure. However, the main insight into social structure which he provided, viz. an opposition of interests between capitalist employers and wage earners seems to me valid – indeed few European sociologists contest its truth, while most historians agree, that it has been a basic factor in European history over the last hundred years. The insight has already been used in this thesis (§p. ), and will be utilised in the second part of the thesis (see ch. ).

Veblen's main contribution was to stress the reverse aspect of the relation between social classes, viz. what kept them together as part of the same society. He recognised the power structure of society as a basic fact just as much as Marx did, – indeed, he stressed that every ruling class seizes power by predatory acts and proceeds to "exploit" the rest of the population. Having consolidated their position as rulers, this class then becomes "the leisure class", exempt from manual labour, who display their position of dominance in society by "conspicuous consumption" – i.e. by expending large amounts of time and money on "useless" objects and activities, thus "putting in evidence... ability to sustain large pecuniary damage without impairing (their) superior opulence." Examples of these useless activities and objects are ceremonious manners and large retinues of servants.

Veblen's main aim was to examine our culture in the light of the norm of conspicuous consumption, a norm, which, he showed, dominated most of our non-productive activities. However, in doing this, he showed why the notion of "opposition of interests" does not fully describe the relation between those who wield power and those who do not. For the ruling group sets the standard of excellence in all spheres of life, they have greater prestige, and the rest of the population accepts these standards; hence they admire the ruling group and accept their own inferiority compared to them, that is they accept their own position in society as a natural consequence of their own lesser worth. In this situation the rest of the population attempt to imitate the culture of the leisure class. This, too, seems to me a valuable insight, and its truth is illustrated and utilised later.

It may be objected that this insight of Veblen's is exactly contrary to Marx's. It is true, that the two are contradictory, but, as Marshall points out "... the sociologist... remembers that social behaviour is not governed by logic, and that a human society can make a square meal out of a stew of paradox without getting indigestion - at least for quite a long time."

Marshall adds that in a social organisation "apparent inconsistencies are in fact a source of stability achieved through a compromise which is not dictated by logic."

Anthropologists have often demonstrated in field monographs how opposition and union between groups and categories are the very essence of social organisation.

1 Weber's main contribution was to show that societies can be stratified in various ways, and to point out the different criteria by which some societies are stratified. Thus, he distinguishes classes, status groups, and castes, as three types of stratification. A class consists of a number of persons occupying the same position in an economic system, as for example the proletariat in Marx's sense. The persons in a class all have the same Lebenschancen, i.e. the same chance "for a supply of goods, external living conditions, and personal life experiences", because of their position in the economic order.

Weber distinguishes status groups from classes as defined above. A status group is not defined in relation to the economic system, but in relation to a "social estimation of honour", that is in terms of prestige. A status group may contain persons who stand in very different relations to the economic system, but all are accorded the same prestige by the rest of society. A class in Weber's terms is an economic category, whereas a status group forms a community - its members share a specific style of life, and restrict their social intercourse to each other.

1. For a recent excellent demonstration of this see Max Gluckman, "The Role of the Sexes in Wiko Circumcision Ceremonies" in Social Structure, ed. M. Fortes, Oxford 1949.
Finally, though this does not concern us, where such distinctions of status are marked, and are expressed in ritual as well as in law and convention, society is stratified into castes.

Most sociologists now accept Weber's distinction between class as economic category and class as a social category (i.e. status groups), though this terminology is not generally followed. Class as a social category is usually simply termed "social class", the usage we follow here. However, a further distinction has since been made and accepted by most sociologists; that is between social classes whose different positions in society are guaranteed in law, and social classes whose different positions are not so guaranteed. Thus Tawney points out, that until recent times in France and Germany, society was stratified into "estates", among whom "... inequality was not primarily economic, but juristic, and that, in spite of gross disparities in wealth, it rested on difference, not merely of income, but of legal status. Civil, not to mention, political rights, were not identical for all men, but graded from class to class." Tawney goes on to show, that classes in Britain today are not of this character, since all men are equal before the law. Maclver and Sprott make the same distinction. Marshall puts the matter very clearly; writing of the two types of social class, he says: "In the first of these, class is based on hierarchy of status, and the difference between one class and another is expressed in terms of legal rights and established customs, which have the essential binding character of law. ... Class is, as it were, 1. Tawney. Equality. (Allen & Unwin, 1931), p.121. 2. T.H.Marshall, op.cit.
an institution in its own right." Contrasted with this is the type of class system found in Britain today, where "Social Class ... is not so much an institution in its own right, as a byproduct of other institutions.... Class differences are not established and defined by laws and customs of the society... but emerge from the interplay of a variety of factors related to the institution of property and education, and the structure of the national economy." In this thesis, as will be shown, the class system we are concerned with is of the latter type.

So far, in this brief summary of concepts of social class, we have been concerned with concepts of a sociological nature - i.e. these concepts presuppose or imply a structure of social relations. There is, however, one concept of social class, which is not of a sociological nature, and hence has no meaning for us. This concept simply means a grading of the occupations among a given population into various strata, according to some notion of prestige, which the grader himself applies to the occupations. The concept is best illustrated by the first use made of it, viz. by the Registrar General for England and Wales in his report for 1911. He classified occupations in the following prestige hierarchy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Capitalists, managers, scientists, artists, Professionals, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Small Shopkeepers, lower professionals, farmers etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Skilled Labour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Semi-skilled Labour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Unskilled Labour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. " " " " p. 31.
The percentage of population falling into each grade was then found and the fertility rate of each grade calculated. The concept is, in fact, purely an administrative device. As Sprott remarks, "this rough classification is frequently used for statistical purposes, e.g. to determine the degree of intelligence required for each class of occupation, or the class differences in mortality or incidence of illnesses."

The reason why we reject this concept, leads to further understanding of the sociological concept of social class. We have seen that a social class consists of persons accorded the same "social estimation of honour", the same prestige. Now obviously, a society cannot be stratified into social classes unless the majority of its members have the same estimation of the prestige of the various classes. There is, however, no guarantee, that the Registrar General's estimation is shared by everyone else, hence his "classes" are not a social reality. Moreover, it is not persons he is dealing with, but occupations.

This aspect of a class system, the fact that there must be some general recognition among the members of the society of the relative prestige of the various classes, is discussed by most sociologists in terms of the necessity for both "objective" and "subjective" criteria in the delimitation of social classes.

Not only must the classes in a stratified society be identifiable as separate groups by objective criteria, but also the differential prestige accorded to the classes must be appreciated by the persons making up the society. The classes must be held to be "superior" and "inferior" to each other.

A glance at some of the literature on the subject shows wide agreement among sociologists on this. Thus MacIver writes, "... the concept of class loses its sociological significance if it is defined by any purely objective criterion, such as income level or occupational function. Class does not unite people and separate them from others unless they feel their unity or separation." Similarly Ginsberg defines social classes as "portions of the community or collections of individuals standing to each other in the relation of equality and marked off from other portions by accepted standards of inferiority and superiority." Marshall writes, "the essence of social class is the way a man is treated by his fellows (and reciprocally, the way he treats them), not the qualities or the possessions which cause the treatment," and goes on to show that this implies both an objective ordering of persons and also a "recognition" by the persons of each other's place in the order. Finally, we may refer to the views of two distinguished field anthropologists who have studied the class systems.

Nadel, in "A Black Byzantium" says, "To understand it fully, we must view social class under two aspects. The first is that of firmly established and comparatively permanent differences in actual conduct. The second aspect is that of the social agency which attaches to these differences of conduct the index "inferior" or "superior", and makes them reflect different grades on a common scale of values." 1 Prof. Warner, who has made a special study of social class in America, and has promoted many field studies of the subject, defines social class as "...two or more orders of people who are believed to be, and are accordingly ranked by the members of the community, in socially superior and inferior positions." 2 All these definitions and pronouncements have much in common, and any one would do as a preliminary indication of the subject matter of this part of the thesis. However, since we have been so stimulated by the work of Warner and his associates, we prefer to take his. Further references to field studies of social class will be made in the course of our analysis of the class system of Eskdalemuir.

3. In addition to the work cited see also:
c) Davis, Allison and John Dollard, Children of Bondage. Washington, 1940.
Class and Community.

It must be emphasised, however, that we have merely been arriving at a preliminary definition in the above discussion, - an indication of the subject matter of the next few chapters. And though we are taking Warner's definition as our starting point, we by no means follow his methods. For, stimulating though his (and his associates') work has been, he has in our opinion made a serious error in his studies - an error theoretically discussed in the section on Methodology (pp;14-15). For Warner's investigations of social class have been carried out within the framework of a local community, and he has regarded the local community as integral, not sectional. Consequently, the social classes he describes, seem to have no bearing on the wider American society, of which the persons composing the local classes are part. A detailed analysis of the errors of interpretation on Warner's part, which this has led to, is found in two papers by Lipset and Bendix. Goldschmidt, another American Anthropologist, who has also studied social class, attacks Warner on this same score, that "the community is but part of a total culture with a generalised organisation."

It is because the community is but part of a wider society, that we are entitled to use the insights of Marx and Veblen in our study of a local class system.

These two sociologists dealt with the State, the wider structure in our terminology, of which Eskdalemuir is part.

Method of Investigation.

It would be somewhat disingenuous for a European to pretend that in investigating the social structure of a community in his native land he had no expectation of finding social classes in that community. Since I knew before entering the parish, that farmers hired labourers, I should have been surprised not to find social class as a principle of organisation in the community. Partly for this reason, it seems necessary to describe the methods used in investigating this class system, so that it may be judged whether any prior expectations have biased the inquiry in any way. This account of the methods is given for another and more important reason, however, namely, that the meaning of any phenomenon is inextricably bound up with the methods used to study it, so that in describing the methods, I shall also be describing some of the essential characteristics of the class system.

The method consisted of three operations,

a) listening during informal conversations with parishioners for direct and indirect references to a class system, (as defined in the previous section). This is the basic operation in any field study of social class, and has been followed by all American anthropologists who have studied class systems.\(^1\)

\(^1\) P.W.Bridgeman, *The Logic of Modern Physics.*

2. See bibliography. No British anthropologist has made a special study of a system of social classes in Great Britain itself.
Since, according to our definition, the persons involved in a class system must be in some way aware of it, it is necessary at the outset to discover if the population investigated is conscious of gradation of status among themselves. This grading of each other constitutes the "subjective aspect" of social class.

b) Discovering by observation, from reports of parishioners, and by asking questions during conversation, who associated with whom in various contexts apart from work. This operation follows from that part of our definition which stresses the aspect of social relations in a class system, that is, stresses the separation of the population into "strata" or "groups". Separation or "social distance" between strata constitutes the objective aspect of social class.

c) From data gathered in this way, a schematic picture of the class system was obtained. After this, interviews were held with various parishioners on the subject, in the course of which the informants were asked to place parishioners in social classes.

These operations will now be described more fully, and in the course of the description some of the characteristics of the class system will become apparent. Direct and indirect references to a class system were fairly frequent in the early weeks of fieldwork. For example, the doctors, most of the parishioners consult, described to me how, before the inauguration of the National Health Service his clients in the parish and surrounding
district were drawn "mainly from the better classes," who were now apt to get annoyed with him because, since he had now "the others" to deal with, too, he could not give the better classes as much attention as formerly. Similarly, shepherds and ploughmen sometimes referred to the "aristocracy of Eskdalemuir", which they distinguished from "we working folk". Asked, who the aristocracy were, they would name some of the wealthier farmers in the parish. Indirect references were much commoner. Among farm workers a categorisation of persons into "gentlemen farmers", "working farmers", and "working men" kept cropping up whenever I asked one of them to identify a third person for me. Moreover, the references made showed clearly, that these were thought of as superior and inferior to each other. For example, if I asked a person whether a third person was a farmer, when in fact the third person was a shepherd, the reply was always like this (actual) one, "No, he's only a herd, just a working man like me." Or, if the third person were a working farmer, and I asked if he was a gentleman farmer, I would be told that he was "only a working farmer." Often I would ask concerning the social identity of a person when I already knew it, to discover if the attitudes implicit in these replies were standardised, and it was apparent from their frequency that they were. Moreover, when I asked for a list of the names of

1. West, in his study of Plainsville, an American rural community, remarks on the same fact, "Comments suggesting class ranking are more frequently made by inference and innuendo than by outright statement."
gentlemen farmers, working farmers, and working men, the lists always coincided; that is, there was agreement as to who were in these various categories. The list of gentlemen farmers also coincided with the list, also obtained, of "the aristocracy of Eskdalemuir." When asked the names of "working folk", informants usually stopped after a few names and continued by naming categories like "herds, forestry workers, and people like that." Other names, parishioners gave to these categories, clearly indicated that the categories were ranked. The gentlemen farmers were sometimes called "the top lot", the working farmers "the middle lot", and the working folk "the bottom lot".

While data were being gathered in this way, information was being collected on people's associations with each other, in contexts apart from work, - such as social intercourse for its own sake, association in voluntary clubs, such as the men's bowling club, and the Women's Rural Institute, and in marriage. This information was got in several ways. I joined all the voluntary associations open to me, and attended their meetings regularly, and went to every dance and whist drive held in the parish while I was there. Next, reports of gatherings to which I was not invited, such as shooting parties, were easily obtained from someone who had attended. For example, a shepherd friend acted as beater at several of these; while the minister was able to inform me of most of the attendances at dinner parties I was not myself at. Friendships could also be observed - there were
several households I visited regularly, and I soon became acquainted with other regular visitors to them. Also on market days in town, in pubs and at the market itself, some of these cliques and friendships among prisoners became apparent. Finally, to check these observations, I asked two natives of the parish to list all the cliques and friendships known to them. One of these was the parish registrar, who had lived in the place for fifty years, the other was the blacksmith's apprentice who had lived in the place thirty years. Both knew everyone in the parish.

At public entertainments in the parish, a note was taken of those present, and these were fitted into the categories noted above. Here is a random collection of such data,

30th Dec. Dance at Twiglees. About 200 attended. All "working folk" except forestry manager and one "working farmer's" daughter.

25th Aug. Dance at Davington, about 50 attended. 33 from the parish All "working folk"

19th Jan. Busload of 35 leaves parish to attend Dance at Lockerbie.

18th Aug. Dance at Davington. About 80 attended. All "working folk" except two "working farmers" daughters

24th Dec. Christmas party at Davinton, about 80. 7 working farmers & family, 4 forestry managers & family, 1 minister, remain working folk.

6th Jan. Shooting party. Three from parish. All gentlemen farmers.

20th Jan. " " Four " " " " 
20th June, Cocktail party given by a gentleman farmer. All attending from parish were gentlemen farmers & wives.  
30th July, Dinnerparty given by a gentleman farmer

And so on. Numerous other accounts of attendances at dances, whist drives, in pubs and at private parties, confirm the picture presented by these data, that in these contexts persons of the three categories, "gentlemen farmers", "working farmers", and "working folk" do not mix very much - indeed, attendance is often exclusively one category. It will be noted that gentlemen farmers do not mix with the other categories at all, whereas working farmers or rather one or two of them, are sometimes found mixing with working folk.

Even when working farmers or their families attended dances or whist drives along with working folk, however, there was a distinct tendency for them to spend most of the evening in each other's company rather than in interaction with working folk. At dances, various categories of persons tended to occupy different parts of the room when not dancing. A note was always made of the way these categories arranged themselves in the room, such as in the following plan. This arrangement occurred at all dances or parties at Davington at which children were present. (see next page)
Whatever the actual arrangement was, this same feature was always present, that working farmers and their families tended to separate themselves from the others. This feature of gatherings at which members of several categories were present, was often stressed by informants during interviews. "You should have been here during the war," said one, "then you'd have seen the social classes all right. If there was a dance or anything to raise comforts for the troops, then the whole parish used to come. But you'd see them there in the hall in three separate groups. They only mixed with their own kind." This phrase "they only mix with their own kind", was used by informants time and time again to describe relations between the categories.

From a consideration of cliques and friendships the same conclusion emerges, that members of the three categories form friendships only with each other, or are members of cliques composed of persons of their own category. This sort of material
cannot be so easily presented, or rather, would simply consist of lists of names of no significance to the reader. Hence, though this information took a long time to gather, and was essential to a field worker, it is omitted here.

It may be remarked here that class systems seem to vary in the degree to which friendships across class boundaries are permitted. Thus, West found that "cliques of families who neighbour extensively and exchange visits are of the same class." This seems to indicate that this rural area resembles Eskdalemuir in this respect. Warner and the authors of "Deep South" however, stress"the fact that all cliques fell into a interlocking vertical hierarchy which crosscuts the entire society." It is perhaps significant here that both Warner and the authors of "Deep South" deal with a class system in an urban area, in contrast to Plainsville and Eskdalemuir. In an urban area one's associations can be segmented, if one wishes to make them so, - i.e. one can have a circle of associates who do not associate with one's family, (do not even 'know' one's family). One can also have a circle of associates who do not associate with each other, and are not even aware of each other's existence.

In rural society, however, it is impossible to segment one's associations to this extent. Every one person one associates with, knows, who else one associates with. One's cards, as it were, are face up on the social table; in other words, one's

---

2. Warner, Social Life of a Modern Community, p.112.
   See also Deep South, ch.VII.
loyalties to groups have to be declared in a more unequivocable manner in rural society. As we shall see later, a person in Eskdalemuir who attempts to associate with persons of a class above his own, is stigmatised as a "social climber" by the other members of his class, and though not ostracised entirely, is "unpopular."

On the basis of all sorts of data mentioned above, it became apparent, that (by our criteria) the population was divided into three social classes, which from now on will be described as upper middle, lower middle, and working class, in that order of rank. The numbers in each class are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final source of data was interviews in which informants were asked to place their fellow parishioners in social classes. For this purpose I wrote down the name of each person in the parish on a filing card, and asked informants to put people of one class in a separate file. No guidance was given as to what I meant by social class, so that each interview disclosed what the informant understood as the class system of the parish. After this part of the interview we discussed the informant's arrangements of the cards, and talked about the subject in a general way. The result of these class placements by parishioners

1. This device was borrowed from Harold Kaufman, who describes it in his monograph "Prestige Classes in a New York Rural Community." Agricultural Experiment Station, Cornell University, Memoir 260.
are shown on Table 4. The main points arising from these interviews are:

a) There is no general agreement among people as to the meaning of the term "social class". At the same time, there is general agreement among parishioners as to the social status of parishioners. That is, for example, everyone is agreed that the schoolteacher occupies a higher status than any shepherd, and that the man who owns the largest farm has a higher status than the man who owns the smallest farm. The lack of agreement concerning the meaning of social class is dealt with later. (see p.126).

b) The criterion of association outside work situations, which I used in determining the class position of individuals, is also the commonest one used by parishioners themselves.

c) Parishioners are aware that other social classes exist outside the parish than those represented in the parish. Thus, above the gentlemen farmers, everyone agreed, were the "County Lot". These are landowners whose families have a long history of landowning behind them. Below the working folk of Eskdalemuir were to be found in towns and cities a "slum class", distinguished mainly by shiftless habits and rejection of the moral code of the rest of society. The Eskdalemuir people had been in contact with them through having had them billeted on them during the war. Particularly shocking to parishioners was the discovery that mothers of this class were unable to cook, mend clothing, or keep their children clean.
Table of class placements.

Red lines show ideas as to where divisions between classes were.

| Informants’ Social Classes | The A’s Occupation | The B’s | The C’s | The D’s | The E’s | The F’s | The G’s | The H’s Occupation | The I’s | The J’s | The K’s | The L’s | The M’s | The N’s | The O’s | The P’s | The Q’s | The R’s | The S’s | The T’s | The U’s | The V’s | The W’s | The X’s | The Y’s | The Z’s |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
d) One result of the placements, which may be stressed, is, that no one placed him or her self wrongly. That is, each informant claimed for him or her self the same class status that both other informants and I judged him or her to occupy. No working class man claimed to belong to either of the middle classes or vice versa each person knew his or her place in the system. This fact alone seems to me to demonstrate the reality of the class system I am discussing. This perhaps answers a query asked by G.D.H. Cole, who writes, "As far as I know, no one has attempted a poll in which no labels are given by the investigator, but each individual is simply asked to say what class he or she feel themselves to belong to."

Material from the interviews which followed each informant's placing of the cards, is found scattered throughout the following chapters, and nothing need be said about the information at this point.

Attitudes of Superiority and Inferiority, and Behaviour indicative of them.

Little evidence, apart from that presented on page 179-180 has been given to show that the classes are regarded as superior and inferior to each other. What has mainly been shown, is, that the classes do not associate with each other in the context described. However, farm workers and forestry workers do not mix with each other very much either, yet both are of working class status. So, relative lack of association between the categories of persons is not by itself an indication that they are of

different social classes. Such common phrases of identification as "he's only a herd" etc. (as distinguished from a farmer) do of course indicate that one category is held to be inferior to another, but this section will be devoted to presenting further evidence to substantiate this part of the hypothesis. Purely verbal expressions of attitudes of superiority and inferiority must be distinguished from behaviour indicative of such attitudes. The former will be exemplified first.

Direct verbal expression of these attitudes is very rare, and, as far as I know, they are never expressed in the presence of persons of a class different from the speaker. Here, however, are some examples of such expression. An upper middle class man, discussing shepherds with me, remarked calmly, "Of course some of these people are hardly better than animals in intelligence and way of living." Sometimes, an outburst of irritation at one individual of the working class, produces a sweeping condemnatory judgement on the whole class, as with the farmer who said a propos some minor lapse on the part of his herd, "These people are all alike, they just can't think." A lower middle class lady, discussing the habits of the "cottagers" (i.e. the working class), expressed disgust at some of their habits, for example using one plate at dinner to hold first soup, then meat, then pudding, without it being washed in between. (Not by any means all do this. She thought all did.) This lady hires one of the cottage women to help her daily with the housework. "You can see the lower element
coming out even in Mrs. X," (her help) she added. Another characteristic she found in cottagers, was their "childishness", an attribute which many people of the middle classes see in working class people. As adults stand in a relation of superiority to children, the middle classes must think of themselves as superior to the working class. Indirect references by members of the middle classes to the inferior position of members of the working class are fairly common, as with the farmer who said to me, "This morning a stranger passed by the field while I was working in it, and said 'good morning' to me as if I were just a labourer. I was quite pleased. In fact, a lifelong ambition of mine has been to be treated as if I were nobody, completely undistinguished for anything."

The examples given above show the attitude of both middle classes to the working class. The attitude of the upper middle to the lower middle is somewhat different. The former do not express a feeling that the latter are in some radical way inferior to themselves, but rather take a patronising attitude to them, as if lower middle class people were merely poor imitations of themselves. They talk somewhat condescendingly of the latter as "nice people" or "hard workers" or of one of them as being a "steady fellow." They do not use these phrases of each other. Occasionally one may hear a remark which reveals more openly the attitude of the upper middle to the lower middle class, as when an upper middle class lady said that the trouble
with Eskdalemuir was, that there were no children her own children could play with (when they were at home during school holidays). I pointed out a lower middle class family whose children were about the same age as her own, "Oh them", she said in disgust.

Direct verbal expression of feelings of inferiority on the part of members of the lower class vis-a-vis members of a higher one are again not very common. Remarks like the following are about the most direct that I heard. A ploughman speaks of discomfort and embarrassment that result when members of different classes mix in social gatherings. "Supposing X (an upper middle class farmer) comes to the public hall, you can tell he's in fair misery and wants to go. He couldn't talk to me and I couldn't talk to him. He'd bore me and I'd bore him. His standards are too high." This implies that the ploughman thought of his own standards as lower. As he was in this context thinking of himself as an example of working men in general, he seems to imply, that working men's standards are lower. The blacksmith's apprentice clearly pointed to the existence of feelings of inferiority in working class people, in the course of describing to me how even if upper middle class people attempt a minimum of sociability with the working class they are often prevented; he says, "Working folk often put a brick wall round themselves. Some of the older top lot, the real gentlemen, they won't mix with you socially, but
they might stop and chat with you in the street. Now, some working men will pass them by, They won't stop and chat. That's because some of them are ashamed of being working folk, others feel they would be deserting their own class." A recognition of the superiority of classes above them seems to be implied in the following explanation by a working man, as to why working class clubs and associations so often have difficulty over leadership. "If you get fifty working folk in a club of anything, and one is chairman, they won't agree. But get one from a higher social class, and they will." Asked why this was, he said, "It's envy. They won't recognise that the working man has any more gifts than they. But if the chairman is, say, a farmer, then they can't say that about him."

More convincing evidence of these attitudes of one class to another and to itself, is found in certain forms of behaviour, and the comments people make on them. Members of the working class are constantly pointing to attitudes of superiority on the part of both the middle classes vis-à-vis themselves. "They think themselves above us," is a phrase I heard the working class use often use of the middle classes. When I asked how they (the working folk) knew, middle class people thought of themselves as superior, these informants always pointed to certain forms of behaviour described below.

1."To the outward observer class is primarily a matter of behaviour, speech, dress, education, and especially habits of social intercourse. People within the same class meet each other on equal terms, but when they are in contact with members of other classes, we find them behaving in a way which implies deference or submission on the one hand, and self-confidence and assertion on the other." (Ginsberg, op.cit. p.159.)
Moreover, members of the lower middle class point to exactly the same forms of behaviour when inferring attitudes of superiority on the part of the upper middle class.

The typical form this behaviour takes, is described by a lower middle class woman as follows. She had said to me during casual conversation that certain upper middle class women made her "Sick, the way they go about thinking themselves so superior to you." I asked how she knew they thought that. "Well," she replied, "if you're speaking to one of them you can't tell, because if you meet one alone she might be quite friendly and speak to you without any airs. But if another of their kind comes on the scene, the one that was talking to you, begins to talk to the other one, and soon they're edging away from you, and before you know where you are, you're left alone." In other words, the upper middle class person rejects the lower middle class person in favour of one of her own class. This, of course, is merely an example on a personal level of the relation between the two classes - the rejection of the lower as associates by the higher. Every informant in the lower middle class was able to give examples of this happening to him or herself. Similarly, working class people were able to give instances of this rejection of themselves by members of both middle classes. For example, a ploughman told how recently he had been talking to his boss - an upper middle class farmer, when a class peer of the farmer appeared on the scene. The farmer immediately turned his back on the
ploughman, and walked off with his class peer. The ploughman commented, "It just shows you, they think we're not good enough to talk to." These sort of incidents are constantly occurring, when individuals of different class status find themselves together. Moreover, the preference which an individual of a given class shows for the company of another member of his own class, as opposed to one of a lower class, has nothing to do with friendship. For example, I was talking with a farmer and his herd, when another farmer appeared on the scene. The first farmer introduced me to the second, but did not introduce his herd (who like me had never met the second farmer before). Then the first farmer asked the second and myself into his house for a drink, but again ignored the herd... Now, these two farmers were not friends; the second had been in the parish only a short time, and as soon as he had gone, the host turned to me and remarked what a poor farmer the visitor was, how he was conceited and would never learn anything about farming, and so on. Examples such as this could be multiplied indefinitely.

So far we have been considering situations, in which members of a higher class reveal by their behaviour that they consider members of their own class more worthy of attention than members of a lower class. We shall now consider situations in which members of a lower class show by their behaviour that they, too, consider members of a higher class more worthy of attention than their own. This is rarely shown in informal behaviour such as described above, for a person of a lower class who constantly
seeks the company of members of a higher class, is called a "social climber" by members of his own class, and is shunned by them. This in itself illustrates the present theme, for while there are several social climbers in each class, there are no persons in any class accused of seeking out the company of members of a class lower than their own. However, that members of a lower class regard those of a higher class as superior to themselves is most clearly seen from a consideration of office bearers in formal voluntary associations. For in associations the membership of which includes persons of different social class, those of higher class occupy positions of leadership more frequently than those of lower class. Since in those associations the official positions are filled by election, and there are more people of lower than of higher status among the electors, it follows that those of lower class status consider those of higher class status more worthy of occupying positions of leadership. The first example is the Eskdalemuir Women's Institute, showing the class affiliation of office bearers for 1951 - 52.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Upper Middle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President</td>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The class affiliation of office bearers of this association has remained much the same throughout its existence. It was instituted in 1922; from 1924 until 1930, the office bearers were:

- President: Upper middle
- Vice-President: "
- Secretary: Lower middle
- Treasurer: "

There were few changes in this composition from 1931-39. During the war and since, working class women have begun to hold office. The two key offices, however, President and Secretary, have always been held by members of the middle classes, except for a short period of a few months, when a working class woman was president.

The case of the working class president strikingly illustrates how a class system imposes on its members self-conceptions of high and low worth in accordance with their positions in it. She is a woman, of whom both middle classes speak approvingly, saying that she has better manners and is more intelligent than most of the cottagers. She was elected President against her own wishes and accepted office only on condition that she could resign any time she pleased. She was invariably uncomfortable while carrying out her duties as president. Normally she speaks fluently, but as president spoke nervously and haltingly. She kept repeating to her friends that she was not "educated enough" to be able to cope with the job, and claimed that it "wasn't her place" to stand up in front of all the others and run the association. Eventually she resigned before her term of office.
was over.

The same situation arose in the other branch of the W.R.I. in the parish. This branch was formed after the war by several working class women who were discontented with the branch that already existed. A few lower middle class women joined them. This branch has always had difficulties over office bearers, but particularly over the position of president. Every year the same shepherd's wife is elected president and declines the office, saying she is not well enough educated to carry it out. Recently, a woman has been elected whom the rest despise. She is a working class woman who came into the parish recently from Glasgow, she has no friends in the parish and is sneered at as being "above herself", partly because she has accepted this office. She is unable to maintain order at meetings, and the rest laugh at her. Meanwhile, a lower middle class woman has since its inception occupied the office of secretary, and has the confidence of members.

Other associations with mixed class membership show the same features as the W.R.I. with regard to office bearers. Thus, in the badminton club the two office bearers are both lower middle class. The same applies to the drama club. (There are no members of the upper middle class in these two clubs). The committee of twelve which administers the affairs of the public hall, shows the same concentration of office bearers among the middle classes. Its composition itself shows this same
disproportion, being usually six or seven middle class persons to six or five working class persons.

Another sign of deference is permitting another's opinion to sway one's own. This sort of deference behaviour is a normal feature of discussions on policy matters in these associations and in the hall committee. For example, recently the public hall had to be rebuilt, and the Committee had to make the necessary arrangements. The parish registrar, a committee member, described how, after the arrangements had been made, she met one of the working class committee members...."He said the architect's fee was too high, and they ought to have got a practical builder for the job, it would have saved a lot of money. Now, I said, you were at the meeting when this was discussed. Captain X, (upper middle) stood up and said he was not going to have anything to do with it unless a qualified architect was going to do it. And Y, (another upper middle man) seconded the proposal. That was the time to object, when the proposal was put forward, but nobody did, and you were there. Oh, said he, but nobody says anything against them." (i.e. against the upper middle class men).

The working class members of the committee are always complaining that they can never get a word in at the committee meetings. But there seems no reason why they should not, except for their own feeling that, whatever they have to say, is less important than what the middle class members have to say.

A final instance of deference behaviour, this time institutionalised, is the naming system used among men in the parish.
The essence of the system is, that a person of higher class status may, if he wishes, address a person of lower status by his Christian name, but the person of lower status must address the person of higher status by his surname prefixed by "Mr." This prefix "Mr." is a status symbol in these parts. Working class men always address each other by their Christian names, and if by any chance they are addressed as "mister" think that the speaker is making fun of them. Thus, a shepherd I once addressed in this way said, "My name is Simon. Don't call me mister. I haven't reached that status, and probably never will." On the other hand, middle class men always address each other as Mr., unless they are close friends. They insist that the working men address them in this way, and normally the working men do.

The naming system not only illustrates the deference behaviour on the part of the working man, but also shows that middle class men expect such deference, for they are annoyed if this title is not forthcoming. Working class people are perfectly aware of this. As the smith once said, "X (upper middle) can come into the smiddy here and say 'hullo Jimmy', in fact he does, as we were great friends. But he'd be damned annoyed if I said back to him 'hullo John'." Some instances of a working man breaking this naming rule and causing a "row" were given to me.

Determinants of Class Status.

So far we have been dealing with what Marshall called "the essence of social class" - the way a man is treated by his fellows. The methods used to discover how many social classes there are in Eskdalemuir and who exactly is in each class, however, do not
answer the question why some people are in one class and some in another; that is, do not disclose what are the qualities or possessions which cause that treatment. This section is devoted to attempting to answer this question.

From various studies of social class (which will be noted as our enquiry proceeds) both theoretical and field, it seems, that most likely "Qualities or Possessions" are occupation, amount of property owned, amount of education received, amount of power wielded over others, and wealth. Accordingly, the method used here, is to correlate class membership with these qualities, with the object of discovering whether any one or any combination of them accounts for the composition of a class.

Class and Occupation.

It has already been made apparent, that there is a close connection between occupation and class status - the names "gentlemen farmers" and "we working folk" used by parishioners to designate classes show that. One sociologist, Parsons, has gone so far as to state, that "the main criteria of class status are to be found in the occupational achievements of men."

Our data show, that this is not quite the case. The occupations of the members of the various classes are:

Upper middle - Farmers, minister, director of observatory. Two of the farmers have only recently become farmers. Previously they occupied high positions in the Colonial Service.

Lower middle - Farmers, forestry managers, schoolteacher, a retired farmer, a farm manager who formerly was a farmer himself, a clerk in the forestry commission married to the schoolteacher, a schoolmaster's widow.

Working class - Shepherds, shepherd managers, general agricultural workers, millworkers, postman, roadman, forestry labourers, and all the craftsmen, smiths, joiners, tailor, and electrician.

The class position of the persons with the above occupations remains fixed, as far as I could gather. Thus, the minister and the director of the observatory, no matter what actual individuals occupy these offices, have always been members of the upper middle class. The schoolteacher has always been a member of the lower middle, and herds, labourers etc., have always been the working class.

Yet, an occupation does not invariably determine the class position of those who follow it, as is shown by the fact that farmers are found in both the upper and lower middle classes. What determines the class a farmer belongs to? One of the initial starting points of the investigation was the division of farmers into "gentlemen" and "working farmers", which the parishioner made. This distinction would seem to imply that gentlemen farmers do not work. This, however, is not the case; in fact, one of the gentlemen farmers is sometimes described as "the hardest working man in Eskdalemuir." The answer is found partly in the size of farm the farmer owns, as is shown in the next section.

1. see next page.
Class and Land Ownership.

When discussing status symbols with the blacksmith, I asked him if he could identify a stranger as a member of the upper middle class. He said he could, and asked how, replied, "Goodness, almost anything about them tells you. They look as if they owned the bloody world." It is hardly surprising if they look like this, since of the total acreage of 142,804 in the parish, 22,972 is owned by members of this class; 2,921 by the lower middle, and about 12 by the working class. Of the remainder of 16,911 acres, about half is owned by the forestry commission and the rest by absentee owners.

f.n. from previous page.

1. The size of farms (within any one homogenous farming district) seems to be intimately connected with social class in rural areas. We have already remarked on differences between Eskdalemuir and other rural areas in this respect. (see pp. 141-143) Arensberg notes, too, that in the Irish community he studied, there were differences of status among farmers according to size of farm, these differences being made explicit at marriages. For the amount of dowry a bride brought into a marriage, had to be "finely adjusted" to the size of farm her husband was about to inherit. This might mean, that marriage between persons of high and low status are impossible, but Arensberg, like Rees, does not say what the crucial sizes are in distinctions of status. Had Rees and Arensberg made more thorough investigations into this point, it might have been discovered that social class was more important in the communities they studied than they claim it to be.
The following table shows the relation between the size of the classes and the amount of land they own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>No. of Persons</th>
<th>No. of Acres owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is not very meaningful, since some members of all classes do not own any land. More significant is the range in size of farms within each class, which is:

- Upper middle: 6,600 : 6,024 : 5,368 : 2,176 : 1,104 : 1,000 : 710
- Lower middle: 1,877 : 600 : 454
- Working class: No farms owned, three individuals own a few fields among them.

These figures show that if a farm is around 2,000 acres or less in size, the farmer may belong to either class, but that if it is larger then he belongs to the upper middle. However, while the owner of a farm above 2,000 acres is likely to belong to the upper middle class, size of farm in itself does not determine class status.

The same conclusion holds, if not acreage of land, but the value of all property of any sort owned by members of the various classes is considered. The following tables do not give the

f.n. 1. see next page.
market value of property owned, i.e. the amount the proprietors would be likely to get if they sold their property in the market, but the "gross annual value, being yearly rent or value" of property, as given in the valuation roll of the County of Dumfries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Amount of Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>£ 1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>£ 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>£ 79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range in value of property held by individual members of the classes is:

Upper middle — from £ 1,263 to nil.
Lower middle — " £ 456 " " 
Workingclass — " £ 18 " " 

These figures account only for property held within the parish. They show, that, while property within the parish is concentrated in the upper middle class, the amount of property a person owns does not by itself determine his class position.

Class and Education.

There are a great many aspects to the relation between formal education and class membership, but all that is being considered here is, where the classes receive education, and how much each gets. Employed (and retired) persons are considered

1. "'Property' and 'lack of property' are therefore, the basic categories of a 11 class situations." (Weber in Gerth and Mills op.cit. p.182.)
2. Property owned by the forestry commission and by absentee owners is not taken into account.
separately from children at present attending school. Dividing
the latter by class membership, we find -

in the upper middle, of seven children of various ages, all attend
boarding schools outside the parish. Two are older than fifteen.

in the lower middle, of eight children of various ages, all attend
the parish schools of Boreland or of Eskdalemuir, or, if between 13 and 15, either
Langholm or Lockerbie Academy. None of these 8 children is over 15.

in the working class, all schoolchildren attend the same schools
as in the lower middle class. None of them are above 15 years old.

From this it appears that at the present day, upper middle class
children receive education outside the parish in boarding schools,
and children of the two lower classes in the parish and local
schools.

To discover the amount of education within each class, the
adult population has to be considered. From this the amount of
education within each class (as judged by the normal standards
- degrees and certificates held) seems to be neatly graded
according to the rank of the class.

In the upper middle class, of 16 adults,

4 have university degrees of the
honours M.A. standard or equivalent.
2 attended a college of agriculture.
only two males are without the school
leaving certificate.

f.n.l. see next page.
In the lower middle, of 18 adults

None have university degrees of the honours M.A. standard.
3 have university degrees of the ordinary M.A. standard.
2 have attended courses in a forestry school.
4 of the males are without the school leaving certificate.

In the working class, none have university degrees.
three have attended courses in a forestry school.
only two persons have the school leaving certificate, both females.

(f.note from previous page)

1. This is a common finding in field studies of social class. E.g. both Kaufman (op.cit.) and Warner (Social Life of a Modern Community) find that amount of education decreases the lower the class. Similarly, Rees (op.cit.) notes as reason for the lesser importance of class distinctions in the Welsh parish that "every family has, broadly speaking, the same cultural and educational background, and they are therefore at ease with each other."
As the majority of persons in any one class have descended from parents of the same class, (see page 273), it follows, that the higher the class into which a child is born, the more likely it is that it will receive more extensive education than a child of a lower class. Acquiring more education than is normal in one's own class, is also a way of moving from one's original class into a higher one, but this is considered later.

From all this, however, it does not follow, that one's class status is dependent on the amount of education one receives. For example, two of the upper middle farmers attended school at Davington (now closed) in the top end of the parish until the age of thirteen, then left, and have not had any more schooling or formal education of any sort. This is not because they could not have got it (their parents were upper middle class and wealthy) but because they were destined to become farmers, and their parents presumably thought further education unnecessary. Similarly, those of the lower middle class who left school early, remained lower middle, while the two working class persons with a leaving certificate did not thereby become members of the lower middle class. In short, while a person is more likely to receive extensive education the higher the class into which he was born, class status is not dependent on only the amount of education one has.
Class and Power.

As the parish is no longer a political unit, it can hardly be said, that any class in it has political power. In informal ways, however, some members of the two middle classes wield considerable power over others in their capacity as employers. As such they are entitled to hire and fire employees. If the two forestry managers are excluded, since they hire and fire on behalf of the forestry commission and not on their own account, (and also the director of the observatory for similar reasons) the amount of labour employed by each class is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Employer</th>
<th>No. of Employers</th>
<th>No. of Employees</th>
<th>Class of Employees</th>
<th>Ratio of Employer/Employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>1/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the two forestry managers are included, the figures are:

| Lower Middle | 6 | 39 | Working Class | 1/6.5 |

1. Here we are employing the criteria of class used by Marx, (see p. 145). These criteria were also used by the Lynds in their study of Middletown. See especially "Middletown in Transition" (Constable, 1937) Chapter III.
However, forestry managers do not have the same power over their employees that a farmer has, for a dismissed forestry labourer has the right to appeal to a higher authority against dismissal.

Accordingly, as we include or exclude forestry managers, one or other of the two middle classes has more power over the working class than the latter has over any other class.

Again, however, if we consider the range of power of this sort wielded by individuals within each class, it is apparent, that the amount of power an individual has does not determine his class status. The range is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Highest No. of Employees per individual</th>
<th>Lowest No. of Employees per individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

a) Excluding Forestry Manager  
b) Including Forestry Manager
Despite the present shortage of farm labour (see p. 343) the power farmers have over workmen's chances of employment is by no means negligible. Nowadays, they can hardly prevent a man being employed elsewhere, but they can prevent him being employed in a particular district. This power is exercised in the following way.

From employees work of a certain standard is expected by employers. Employers are in an informal compact with each other to ensure that that standard is maintained, and employees who do not work according to the specifications of that standard find the utmost difficulty in being employed in any one district. The informal compact among employers is described in this account a farmer gave me of how employees are hired. "You advertise in the papers and wait and hope someone will answer. Then, when you do get an answer, you ring up his employer and ask 'are you finished with this man' - 'yes' - 'is he any good' - 'wouldn't touch him with a barge pole' - 'allright thank you'. Eventually you arrange to meet a man and you tell him the conditions he'll work under........". In other words, employers, even though they do not know each other personally, consult each other concerning the merits of workmen and tend to accept each other's judgements on workmen. These judgements are exchanged without the workmen knowing that they are.

When a workman leaves an employer for any reason, he generally
a sks for a written testimonial. This is nearly always given, and never contains an adverse judgement of the man. Yet, everyone, the workman included, knows that these written testimonials are of no real value. As one shepherd explained, "You only ask for the testimonial, because, if you don't get one, your neighbours would think there was something far wrong. But they (the bosses) talk about you on the telephone to each other. That's where they have you. You can't afford to get a bad character." I was given several instances of men getting bad characters from one boss, and then having difficulty in finding further employment on account of it. Eventually these men left the district. These instances were given me by workmen, who accused the particular bosses of malice. Whether these accusations were well founded or not, does not matter here, since all that is being shown here is that employers do have power over their men.

Determinants of Class Status

In this section, various possible determinants of class status have been considered, and it has been shown that no one of these by itself provides a scale of value at selected points on which class statuses can be marked off from one another. Thus, one lower middle class farmer has a larger farm than several upper middle class farmers. Two working class persons own a little property, while several middle class persons do not. Several persons of the working and lower middle classes
have higher formal educational qualifications than some of the upper middle class, and so on.

It may be objected at this point, that behind all the factors considered, lies the factor of wealth, conceived of as the purchasing power a man has, and that examination of it would reveal a clear correlation between it and class status. But there is a good reason why wealth conceived in this manner has not been used in examining the determinants of class status, namely, that neither I nor the parishioners know how much any one person has. People do not discuss the purchasing power at their command, and are secretive concerning how much they have and the use they make of it. For example, it is the height of bad manners to approach a grocer's (or other) van while someone is making a purchase from it. As one farmer said during the interview on class "It can't be wealth that makes class, for nobody here knows how much another man has. We keep that secret."

At the same time, as we shall see, working class informants stressed wealth as the main determinant, and while it is no doubt true that among farmers it is difficult to know how much any man has, this does not apply to most occupations in the working class, nor to the professions in the middle classes. Working men know roughly each other's wages, and most of the
middle class members know the scales of workmen's wages. Finally, the purchasing power a person has, becomes visible to some extent in what he actually purchases - in all that goes to make up a 'standard of living'. In the description of class cultures that follows, it will be shown that certain items which form part of a standard of living are in fact viewed as status symbols. Wealth, as judged by the amount of property a person owns, or by estimates of his income as judged by his 'standard of living' (i.e. the status symbols he displays) seems to be the most important single criterion by which class statuses in this community are allotted to people.

Yet, there are exceptions to this, which we have already observed, - the minister and director of the observatory are considered by informants to be less wealthy than several of the lower middle class farmers. The joiners, smiths are held to be wealthier than several lower middle class people, wealthier too than the minister, who belongs to the upper middle class. The conclusion is unescapable, that none of the factors considered provides by itself the measuring rod by which persons are allotted class status. A consideration of individual cases

---

1. Warner came to the same conclusion from his studies of Class in America, that "economic factors are not sufficient to predict where a particular family or individual will be or to explain completely the phenomenon of social class." "Social Class in America," p. 21.
in the upper middle class confirms this. Consider first the three upper middle class farmers whose farms are under 2,000 acres. We shall call them A. B. and C.

A. is a retired Colonial Governor, knighted for his services. He is considered by all to have the highest social status in the parish. While no one knows what his pension is, it is considered that he is less wealthy than some of the farmers. People do not mention his wealth or education when awarding him the highest status, but point simply to his knighthood. As one said "you can't get past that."

B. is a retired colonial civil servant. His farm of 1,000 acres is a poor one and he has to work very hard every day. He is the person sometimes called "the hardest working man in the parish." He has four children all in public schools in England. His class peers, when awarding him the same status as themselves, stress his education and "background."

C. has a farm of 710 acres. He left the local school at thirteen. Working class people say he is very poor, and that it is only because his wife has a little money of her own and no children that he can afford so much whiskey and gin, and to associate with the upper middle class farmers. Yet, as A. said of him, "we can't leave him out, he's our oldest laird."
This is a reference to the fact that C's family have owned this small farm for centuries. Moreover, C's own father was wealthier than C, being tenant of a large farm before the Duke of Buccleuch sold it (in addition to owning the small farm).
The minister is a quite different case. He is known to be very poor compared with most of his class peers. He has on the other hand high educational qualifications, and these are respected by the upper middle class. Yet his status seems to depend simply on his calling itself. As two of his class peers said "the minister should always be one of us". They thought it a matter of regret that ministers could no longer "live like gentlemen", yet felt that he still belonged with themselves in class status.

D. owns the largest farm in the parish, employing 12 men regularly, and represents the parish on the County Council. He inherited his farm from his father, has lived all his life on it. He left a parish school at thirteen. Working class people say he is "almost a millionaire". Several of his class peers despise the man personally on account of his lack of knowledge of anything but farming and local politics, and his lack of social graces. As one of these said "He gets in (to the upper middle class) purely on account of his wealth".

Individual cases from other classes confirm the general conclusion. The head joiner for example, a working class man, is generally held to be wealthier than several people of higher status. As well as his joinering business he runs a dance band, and has a contract with the County Education Authority to convey certain schoolchildren to and from school in his car. He owns a little property, and can afford an electric milking machine (only one farmer has this). Yet as people say "he's just a
joiner". A joiner is expected to be a member of the working class, whatever his wealth or accomplishments are. It seems in this case that occupation by itself is the most important determinant of status.

From these examples it is clear that in this community at least, class status is not awarded by reference to any one factor, such as have been considered. Instead there seems to be a sort of "class quota" in terms of which a person is accorded one of the three class statuses. By that I mean that in judging a person's status, those judging as it were award points on the basis of all the factors considered. Which factors are considered important in determining class status will vary from one community to another, but our general conclusion that no one factor by itself "provides the measuring rod by which persons are allotted a class status" seems to be widely applicable. The same conclusion was reached by the Gardners and Davis; they write, "class position is determined rather by the configuration of traits which an individual possesses". Warner too notes that "...while occupation and wealth could and did contribute greatly to the rank status of an individual, they were but two of the many factors which decided a man's ranking in the whole community". Since the conclusion applies to two different communities in the U.S.A. and to Eskdalemuir, it is likely to apply to all communities in

1. Davis, Gardner & Gardner, "Deep South", Chicago, 1941, p.73.
2. Warner & Lunt "Social Life of a Modern Community", Yale, 1941, p.82.
Great Britain which have a marked class structure. This would seem to render null and void recent attempts by British sociologists to study certain aspects of social class on the assumption that occupation determines class position.

More important than polemics however is the realisation that at different points in the class system (of Eskdalemuir), different factors are more and less important in allotting class status. Thus any herd or labourer, judging from his wages and visible standard of living, is obviously less wealthy than any farmer, so that there is no difficulty in allotting them different status on that score, as in fact working class men do (see p.117). When however the farmer with the smallest farm (454 acres) is compared with the head joiner (say) a difference in status as judged by standard of living and wealth is not feasible. All informants hesitated in making a distinction between this farmer and all the craftsmen. However all eventually placed the farmer higher than the craftsmen because "he owns a farm after all". At this point the fact of owning property becomes important in awarding class status.

When the farm is in the 1,000 acre region there is no doubt concerning the status distinction between the farmer and the joiner. As we have seen, round about 2,000 acres next becomes a crucial size in distinguishing upper middle from lower middle class status. Above that size, the farmers are all of upper

---

middle status. Below that size farmers may be of either class, and in deciding which status to give him, his judges as we saw took into consideration the amount of education he had and his family and personal history. Finally, ownership of a farm of 6,000 acres provides entry into the upper middle class without any other "qualities or possessions" being required.

All these considerations suggest that the class system we are considering lacks definiteness and clear outlines. This feature of the type of class system we are dealing with has often been noted, both by field researchers and theoretical writers. Parsons, for example, speaks of "...a certain vagueness in the scale of stratification" (in the American class system). McIver notes that "...in the mobile capitalistic societies of the modern world they (the various factors in the class complex) tend to become dissociated, so that class demarcations are blurred". Kaufman speaks of a certain "fluidity of the class system". Remarks of a similar sort are to be found in most writings on social class. This same "vagueness" is apparent in the class system of Eskdalemuir, but in no way destroys its reality, as we shall show.

Class Boundaries.

So far we have been talking of social classes as if they were discrete entities. This has been in order to make description easier, but in doing this an essential feature of the class system as it now exists in the parish has been ignored, namely, the lack of clarity. This lack of clarity itself calls for an explanation but first it must be described. Briefly the position is that while the upper middle class is sharply distinguished from the lower middle, the latter is not sharply distinguished from the working class. Using the criteria of association, this means that while members of the upper middle class do not associate with members of the lower middle class, some members of the latter class do sometimes associate with members of the working class. This is partly because within each class there are gradations of status, hence persons of low status in the lower middle class sometimes associate with persons of high status in the working class.

First, to illustrate association between lower middle and working class. The farmer who owns the smallest farm (410 acres) is granted lower middle status by everyone (he is M on the chart on page 222). He often visits the blacksmith's and a shepherd manager's house, to play drafts with them, and they sometimes visit him for the same purpose. Also in the course of his work he often

---

1. It is a curious fact that Warner found this same feature in Yankee City. He writes (Social Life of a Modern Community, p.91), "The separation of the upper middle from the lower middle class is clear and distinct, but that between the lower middle and upper lower class is less clear, and, in certain respects, the least distinct of all." I have called the fact curious simply because I find the correspondence inexplicable.
has to pass the smiddy and goes in to chat with the smith. This farmer about two or three times a year turns up at the bowling club, of which he is the only adult member who is not of the working class. The fact that he associates with these two working class men does not obscure the distinction between them. He himself associates with several lower middle class people whom the smith and the herd manager do not associate with. Moreover the smith once remarked of him that "Though he comes here quite a lot he always thinks he's a bit above us. It must be owning that farm that does that". A brief account of the farmer's history helps to explain this association across class lines. He is the fourth son of his father. As the sons grew up the two eldest got tenancies of farms elsewhere, while the third son took over the father's farm. The fourth, rather than work under his brother, hired himself out as a herd to a farmer in another parish. The third son was accidentally drowned in a flood, and the fourth son, M, took over the farm. But for the accident to his brother he would be a herd yet. While a herd, he married a working class girl, some of whose relatives live in the parish. Informants used to ponder on this history while deciding in what class to place him. All paused when confronted with his name and were doubtful which class to place him in. A typical comment on his status was "He's really only a working man, but then he owns that farm". He was only just a member of the lower middle class.

Another lower middle class person noted for associating with working class persons is the schoolmaster's widow. She has a
wide circle of friends whom she visits, and is to some extent an institution rather than a person. She is parish registrar, secretary of the W.R.I. and in addition does a great deal of public work in the parish. However in addition to having to visit almost everyone in the parish in the course of her duties she has a few friends in the working class whom, as she says, she likes to visit, elderly shepherds' wives who like herself have lived a long time in the parish. She also has friends in the lower middle class who do not associate with her working class friends. Like the farmer above, she has a working class background, being the daughter of a servant of the Duke of Buccleuch.

These are the two most notable examples of persons whose associations spread over class boundaries, thus blurring the distinction between the two. These associations described above are stable ones, i.e. have continued over the course of years. In addition, a few lower middle class persons occasionally associate with a working class person for some specific purpose, e.g. the schoolteacher's husband sometimes goes fishing with a ploughman neighbour, though the two do not visit each other's houses.

There are no analogous associations between the upper and lower middle classes. Sometimes there are visits between members of the two but these are always of a business nature. For example Mrs. J is sometimes invited to tea with Lady A, but as she herself says, "It's only to discuss the Brownies or some other business. I know she's only using me". Lady A is never in Mrs. J's house for tea. In short there is a sharp barrier to association
between these two classes.

This conclusion is confirmed by the table of class placements. It will be noted that the upper middle class informants are all agreed as to who is in their class and who is not. No other class is so decisive in its judgments as to who exactly are members of it. Both among working class and lower middle class informants, some put the blacksmith, joiner and tailor in one class and some in another. We remarked too that the position of the farmer M was somewhat ambiguous, in the eyes of informants.

Status within a class.

That the line between these two latter classes is not sharply drawn by the community becomes understandable in the light of the fact that within each class there are gradations of status. All informants agreed on this, most of them volunteering the information. At the same time it is difficult to give objective indices of this ranking that occurs within a social class. However parishioners themselves point to two indices of such ranking. The first is asymmetry of any form in a relationship between two members of one class. For example, in the upper middle class, as several pointed out, whenever Sir A invites any of the farmers to dinner they always come (though several are known to dislike Sir A), whereas Sir A does not always respond to an invitation to dinner from one of them. "They have to go with him more than he has to go with them" as one informant said.

1. Several other students of social class have noted this fact, e.g., Marshall writes "The same principle of class which creates them (social classes) also operates within them to produce subtler differentiation". Similarly West (Plainsville, p.119) speaks of the members of a class "varying in relative rank".
This fact parishioners interpret as meaning that Sir A has a slightly higher status than the farmers. Similarly at W.R.I. meetings, Mrs. P is more eager to speak to Mrs. J than Mrs. J is to speak to Mrs. P. This asymmetrical relation is again taken as a sign by informants that Mrs. J is of slightly higher status than Mrs. P.

This does not mean that within a class each person has a rank different from everyone else in the class. Generally speaking it means only that in any one class a few individuals stand out as of slightly higher rank than the majority, and a few stand out as of slightly lower rank than the majority. Confirmation of this is found in the fact that each person so singled out by members of his own class as being of slightly higher status, was also singled out by members of the next higher class for special notice. Thus Sir A, marked off a little from his class peers as indicated above, is occasionally (very occasionally) invited into the home of one of the next higher class, the "county lot" (though none of the county lot appears in his home). Similarly, though Mr. J (of the lower middle class) does not associate with the upper middle class, these latter all speak approvingly of him and his family. One went so far as to say "I think if he wanted to he could take his place with us". In the same way, lower middle class people speak approvingly of the smith, the head joiner and the tailor. Those thus singled out for approval by the next highest class, and awarded a slightly distinctive rank by their class peers, do in fact possess some
of the attributes of persons of the next class. Thus Sir A has a title, and a distinguished personal, if not family, history. Mr. J owns a farm larger than some owned by members of the upper middle class. The smith and the joiner both own a little property and are not in someone else's employ, as is also the case with the tailor.

Lack of consensus as to the meaning of social class.

We have shown above that the lack of definite outlines in our class system applies only to the distinction between the lower middle and the working class, when we apply our criterion of association. The blurring of this distinction is due to a few, but only a few, individuals associating across the class line. There is however another source of indefiniteness, illustrated in the table of class placements (p.221).

The table of class placements shows that while everyone is aware that parishioners are of higher and lower status, there is no common conception of a class system. One herd's wife for example insisted that there were seven social classes in the parish, while one ploughman, a noted socialist, insisted that there were only two, property owners and non-property owners. This calls for some explanation. Leaving aside the fact that a sociological analysis of a social system invariably gives an impression of exactness and precision as characteristic of the system simply because analysis itself attempts to be exact and precise, the explanation would seem to be as follows.
First, as has been shown, there is in fact a certain indefiniteness as to the boundary between lower middle and working class. Second, and more important, is the fact that there is no one criterion, no one single scale of value by which class status can be measured. As was shown in previous paragraphs, size of farm, education, background, wealth, etc., are all taken into consideration in allotting class status. One result of this is that from different positions in the system, one criterion tends to be stressed at the expense of the rest. For example, the working class men tended to stress wealth and size of farm as the determinants of status. One herd, for example, while stacking the cards said "with farmers it's a case of how much money they have, otherwise they'd all be the same, wouldn't they? And the bigger the farm the more money it makes". So at first in placing people he put Mr. G along with the lower middle farmers, because "his farm's only a thousand acres or so", then he reconsidered, remarked that Mr. G went around with "that crowd" (i.e. upper middle) and changed G's placement to upper middle. Similarly a ploughman remarked "It's just a matter of money and property - who has and who hasn't", and at first divided the population into farmers and others. Then he recalled that the forestry managers and the professional people associated with the farmers, so he placed them with the farmers. One divided the upper middle class into those with a lot of money and those

1. This is perhaps a general feature of class systems in modern societies. David and Gardner (op. cit.) state the principle very clearly (p.61), "In other words the social perspective varied with the social position of the individual".
without, though remarking at the end of his sorting of the cards that these two categories formed one class, but he expected they distinguished among themselves who had money and who had not. Another, every time he put some one in the upper middle class, said (almost viciously) "He's got pots of money". He came to Mr. F and said "his farm's not very big - he'll go there" (with the lower middle class). I said "But he's got pots of money". He immediately changed Mr. F from lower middle to upper middle. These examples all show how working men stress wealth as the measure of status.

Confirmation of this comes from a curious source, Vallee's study of the island of Barra, where social classes in the sense in which they are found in Eskdalemuir do not exist. However in Barra there are a few individuals who are ranked somewhat higher than the majority. Vallee writes "Informants of low rank tended to place merchants higher than teachers, whereas there was a certain tendency among higher ranking individuals (merchants included) to place teachers higher than merchants". The authors of "Deep South" found exactly the same orientation in the community they studied, "...the very bases of class distinction in this society are variously interpreted by the different groups. Lower class people....view the whole stratification of society as a hierarchy of wealth".

1. Vallee, op.cit.
2. Davis, Gardner & Gardner, op.cit., p.72.
Women of the working class, however, while acknowledging the importance of wealth in determining status, paid more attention than the men did to those aspects of life which are in woman's care. Thus the classes (see \text{660}) have different arrangements concerning which places in the house food is eaten in. Working class people eat in the kitchen, lower middle class people sometimes do also, while the upper middle class has a special room set aside for the purpose, a dining room. Preparing and serving meals (or supervising them) and care of the house is woman's work. Now working class women in placing people made a point of noting whether the family ate in the kitchen or not. Thus two of them insisted that Mrs. J (high ranking lower middle class) was a member of the upper middle class because she "never ate in the kitchen". (When I later remarked to an upper middle class woman that Mrs. J was thought to belong to her class, she replied "I'm sure only working class women think so".) Similarly women were inclined to stress "manners" as a determinant of status, simply because manners constitute a sphere of life particularly in woman's care (see \text{p.313}).

The upper middle class on the other hand, perhaps because they have enough of it, do not stress wealth as a determinant of status, but rather education and general culture (in the ordinary sense of the term). As one remarked "Public schoolboys and university men are generally considered to be in this lot" (his own class). Or Sir A, placing Mr. G, "it's true his farm's small, but....He's Shrewsbury and Balliol - Same background as
myself". Being employers of labour, and not employed by anyone themselves, they bestowed approval on the independent tradesmen in the working class, one of them placing the tradesmen in the middle class.

The lower middle class tended to stress manners more than any other class. This is perhaps because the poorer members of this class are distinguished from the working class mainly by their middle class manners, described below. The men of this class also tended to stress the authority a person has over others as a determinant of status. For this reason one of them put in the lower middle class a shepherd who manages a farm employing seven men.

Finally, personal interests and idiosyncracies may influence a person's view of the class system. Thus the schoolteacher was very insistent that social class "didn't matter" in life generally, and that all that mattered about a person was his worth in the eyes of God. She takes her job very seriously, and has great respect for education and for manners. She reckons manners "are about the most important thing I teach". To pay any attention to class differences she holds to be bad manners. She herself is of working class origin, being a miner's daughter. In accordance with these views and interests she included in the lower middle class a number of working class women whom she considered to be well mannered, of good character, and education. More idiosyncratically, the joiner placed a certain emphasis on sociability in his class placement of parishioners. He is a radical Socialist,
and any class but the working class is to him merely a falling away from human perfection. The other classes are snobbish, greedy, and ruled by false values. He himself is a very sociable person, and in charging customers for the work he does for them goes on a sort of Robin Hood principle of soaking the rich and asking nothing from the poor. He is leader of the local country dance band, is noted for his wit, and altogether enjoys friendly company and cheerfulness more than anything else in life. Despite the deficiencies of the other classes in general, he thinks one or two individuals in them are "like us" (i.e. like working folk). So he placed two farmers in the working class for this reason.

The stressing of one determinant of status at the expense of others, either because of one's position in the system or from personal interests, partly explains the lack of consensus among parishioners concerning the class system. An equally cogent reason is that the topic is very rarely talked about in the parish, among parishioners themselves. There is no reason explicitly given for this - it is simply a tabooed subject. While references to categories like "working folk" or "cottagers" or "gentlemen farmers" crop up spontaneously in conversation it is felt by some in all classes that there is something indecent in critically examining the terms, or discussing social class openly. For example one elderly shepherd refused to be interviewed on the subject, saying that it wasn't a "very nice" thing to talk about. An upper middle class farmer also refused on the grounds that there was "something rather invidious about putting people

1. This attitude seems to be widespread among the urban working classes. See F. Zweig, "The British Worker", Pelican Books, 1942
into categories like that". On the other hand some of those interviewed gave an exactly opposite reaction which again showed that the topic is never or rarely discussed openly. One ploughman's wife expressed herself delighted with the interview, asked for another, and said she had "never talked to anybody about these things before". Similarly, another working class woman thanked me for the interview saying "It does you good to get it off your chest".

The facts that there is no one determinant of status, that a certain amount of association across one class line does occur, that social perspectives vary from one position to another in the society, seem to me to explain sufficiently the lack of clear outline in this class system. A different explanation has been attempted by Parsons for the same lack of clarity in the American system. He holds that it is due to a necessity to maintain kinship relations against the separating force of social class. Thus, were rigid barriers drawn between classes, kinsfolk in different classes would be unable to associate with each other. By permitting a certain vagueness about class boundaries, society allows kinsfolk of different status to continue associating.

Parsons offers no evidence for this view. It could perhaps be shown to be correct if some evidence was produced showing that there is a great deal of marriage across class lines and a great deal of movement from one class into another. Parsons however

---

does not show that this is the case. In the next chapter we shall show that there is in our society not much cross-class marriage, nor much upward social mobility. Hence our explanation, agreeing as it does with the findings of other fieldworkers referred to, seems the better one.

It was remarked on p.220 that a certain indefiniteness concerning the class structure of modern society had been noted by many sociologists. Two tendencies are discernible in their attempts to deal with this indefiniteness, exemplified most clearly in the work of Warner and of Marshall. Warner's way of dealing with it is to multiply his field techniques and to use mathematical devices in the hope that every person in the community studied can then be allotted an unambiguous class status. Warner tends to treat social classes as distinct groups, and is interested in giving as full a description as possible of the social characteristics of each class in whichever community he studies. Marshall on the other hand goes in entirely the opposite direction; he stresses the difficulty of delimiting class boundaries, and in the end decides not to speak of social classes, but only of "the principle of class" as an organising element in society. Marshall, unlike Warner, has never done a field study of social class, and his writings on the subject are devoted mainly to clarifying concepts and offering hypotheses.


Whether one talks of classes as groups, or of social class as a principle of social organisation is of course a matter of convenience, decided by the nature of one’s discourse. Yet it seems to me dangerous to push either tendency to the extremes which these two writers have. Thus Warner's way of dealing with the indefiniteness is in effect to get rid of it by making his techniques more precise. But the resulting gain in precision belongs only to his techniques, and is won at the cost of virtually ignoring an essential element of the modern class system. It is for this reason that we have not followed the complicated procedures of investigation recommended by Warner in "Social Class in America".

Marshall's way, on the other hand, while stressing this feature of the class system, seems to dissolve the system itself into indefiniteness. Thus it ignores the fact that in any one community, boundaries may be sharply or loosely drawn as between various classes. We have shown the difference between the upper middle - lower middle, and the lower middle - working class boundaries in this respect. Hence I have tried to steer a middle course between these two extremes - recognising a certain indefiniteness as a feature of the system itself, but not allowing that indefiniteness to engulf the system to the point of rendering my account of it unnecessarily obscure.

This discussion is by no means a mere quibble over theoretical points of dubious value. For the structure (of relations) we
have described appears to be significant no matter from what point of view we regard the Æskdalemuir class system. The structure, briefly, is characterised by an exclusiveness of the upper middle class, a sharp barrier between it and the lower middle class, and a gradual merging of the lower middle into the working class. This same structure reappears if we consider classes as cultural groups, and if we view the system from the aspect of social mobility. These matters are dealt with in the following pages.
CHAPTER VII
CLASS CULTURE

Class and Culture.

Some of the standardised behaviour and material culture of the various classes differ; hence social classes can be thought of as cultural categories. However, some large provisos must be made to this statement, for just as classes are not discrete groups so the cultures exhibited by each class are not discrete entities. There is in the first place a certain basic culture shared by all classes, for example a language, use of money, of the same basic type of clothing and so on. It is impossible to list all the institutions and equipments which all classes share, and it is assumed that the reader is already aware of most of them. In the second place, differences in culture between the classes follow the same structural pattern that has been shown to hold for social relations in this particular class system, that is, upper middle class culture is clearly distinguishable from lower middle class culture, but the latter merges into working class culture without any clarity of boundary between the two. So that while it is easy to describe an upper middle class culture and a working class culture it is hardly possible to describe a culture which could be said to be characteristic of the lower middle class. Accordingly, the main contrast in cultures will be drawn here between the upper middle and the working class, and a few notes
added concerning the behaviour and material culture of the lower middle. One other point must be added. Since the sexes have somewhat different cultures in each class, the culture described here is that common to both sexes in any given class.

Another proviso which must be made is that the norms of behaviour for any one class described below, are not binding on all members of that class. One of the differences between a primitive society and our own is the wider range of choice open to the individual here as to what sort of behaviour he will carry out. For example, upper middle class people drink alcohol in the home far more frequently than working class people, who drink mainly in pubs. Yet some of both classes never drink at all. Accordingly an account of some of the distinctive features of the cultures of the various classes is not to be taken as an account of behaviour obligatory for all members of that class. Finally, since some selection has had to be made from all the features of culture wherein the classes differ, only those have been selected which have some relevance to our aim of giving an account of the structure of the community. The features which have been selected are all significant for this structure in that they function as symbols of class status, i.e. possession of them marks their possessor as belonging to one or other class.

Upper middle class culture.

The most striking item of material equipment wherein the classes differ is the type of house characteristic of each.
House Types

Upper middle

Lower middle

Working class
Upper middle. Note wall and gate separating House from Steading.

Lower middle. House forms part of steading.
The upper middle class dwelling is a large mansion house type of structure, very often hidden from view behind trees. Surrounding or beside it is a large garden, much of which is given over to lawns, bushes and flowers. The garden often has some distinctive decorative feature, such as a summer house or a fish pond. Leading up to the house is a drive, flanked often by a strip of lawn on either side, and behind the strip small trees or bushes. It was noted on p.111 that farm houses are situated close to the steading. There is a subtle difference however between upper middle and lower middle farmhouses in this respect, for whereas the back door of the latter opens directly on to the steading, so that the farmhouse itself is part of the steading, the back door of the former does not open on to the steading. Indeed there is usually a barrier of some sort such as the wall and fence in photo no.4 between the upper middle farmhouse and the steading. This difference in the relation of the house in which people live, and the steading in which people work, aptly symbolises the difference between gentleman farmer and working farmer. For the latter work is the main feature of life, for the former work can be kept separate from other aspects of living.

The upper middle class house itself, being larger than houses of the other classes, has more rooms and these are more sharply separated in the use to which they are put than is the case in other classes. Their food is cooked in a kitchen, eaten in a dining room, while another room is set aside for the
family to sit or play in, and yet other rooms are set aside for sleeping in. If there are young children in the family, they will have yet another room set aside for them to play in. There is plenty of space in the house for each person, and anyone in the household can easily shut himself off from the other members of it.

There is a great difference between the upper middle and the working class with regard to meals. The upper middle class has three cooked meals a day, breakfast, lunch and dinner, and one other meal, tea. There is also a great difference between the two with regard to the ritual carried out at these meals. This is described on page 306-308.

Though all classes wear the same basic type of clothes, those worn by this class are much more expensive than those worn by the other classes. Thus though all males in the parish normally wear cloth caps for everyday use, working class men use cloth caps while upper middle class men wear tweed ones. Some of the women of this class have a habit of boasting of the expense of their clothes. As open boasting in a joyful spirit is disapproved of here, they do it by expressing indignation at the rapacity of tailors in charging them so much (then announcing just what the garment cost) or in some other indirect way.

The dialect used by the upper middle class is very different from that used by the working class. This latter one is distinctively Scottish both in vocabulary and accent. The upper middle class avoids this distinctively Scottish dialect
just as it avoids involvement in distinctively Scottish culture - folk songs, dances, etc. Sometimes they use a Scots word in conversation in order to achieve a droll or humorous effect. By this device they demonstrate how utterly foreign the Scottish dialect of the working class is to them. An interest in distinctively Scottish culture (in the ordinary sense of the word) is permitted in this class only if it partakes of the character of "research" into something antiquated. For example, one gentleman farmer takes an antiquarian delight in looking up in Jamieson's Scottish dictionary words which are used as a matter of course by an aged shepherd he employs. But he never uses these words himself, in his daily life, (nor does he adopt the manner of speaking of the younger herds), he merely finds them "interesting". A lower middle class family which takes a genuine interest in Scottish music and poetry is stigmatised as "boring" by this class.

The wider social contacts (see p.66-71) of this class and their position in society as property owners and primary producers is reflected in their conversation. This is rarely about parochial events. They are fond of discussing political affairs both on a national and an international level. They are quick to show in conversation that they know how to take advantage of public institutions - the County Council, the Department of Agriculture and so forth. They talk little about their personal history, unless to describe some event which indicates that they have been in contact with institutions and persons of high
prestige - members of the peerage, politicians, celebrated schools, universities, internationally known hotels, and so on.

They place a much higher value upon conversation than do the other classes, and are much more skilful at it, deftly playing with words and keenly sensitive to the implications of changes of tone of voice, of silences and hesitations in speech. They can converse easily about matters of little importance to them personally, and enjoy the exercise of their skill in speech for its own sake.

**Working class culture.**

Except for two or three who live in farm-houses, on farms the owner does not live on himself, all working class people live in cottages of the type shown in photo no. Gardens are small in size and very rarely is any part of them given over to lawns. In no case is the cottage hidden from sight by trees. Some cottagers grow a few flowers, but many give over the whole garden to vegetables. As contrasted with the 10-14 rooms in the upper middle class house, the cottage rarely has more than four rooms, a kitchen and bathroom. Until recently, several had only two rooms, kitchen and bathroom. Rooms are not clearly distinguished in the use to which they are put.

1. It is interesting to note that an American anthropologist who has studied a local class system without, as Warner does, limiting his frame of reference to the community, speaks of "the expanding social horizon of the elite and their orientation to higher county and state wide strata." The anthropologist is W. Goldschmidt; unfortunately I have not been able to obtain his published account of his fieldwork. The quotation is from an article "Social Class in America - a critical Review", in the A.A. Vol.52, 1950, pp.483-498.
It is common for one room to be used for cooking food in, eating food in, and sitting in in the evenings; sometimes too, in large families, this same room will be used for sleeping in. In these houses members of the household live in close contact with each other, and it is hardly possible for any one member to isolate himself from the rest. In fact no member ever does. Whereas in the upper middle class it is quite common for a member of the household to sit alone in some room, reading or following some hobby. Generally speaking, only one cooked meal per day is eaten in this class, though some families sometimes have two. The cooked meal is eaten at midday and is called dinner.

The quality of clothing worn in this class is of the cheapest sort, and as far as I could observe they possessed less of it than the other classes. Indeed, when discussing with parishioners the advantages and disadvantages of living in the country, working class people almost always said that one of the advantages was that "you don't need to bother about your clothes - you can wear anything all the time".

The dialect used by this class is a distinctively Scottish one. For example when counting they proceed - yin, twae, thri, fower, five, six, seeven, echt, nine, ten. Some words they use are not used outside Scotland, such as "thruck" for tombstone, "thole" for bear. Not only is the dialect of the working class distinctively Scottish, but their culture (in the normal sense
of the word) is too. For example their favourite music is Scottish folksong and dance music. Many of them play the fiddle, and several play bagpipes. The accordion is their favourite instrument next to the fiddle, but again only Scottish music is played on it. Very few of the middle classes play any instrument, and few are interested in Scottish music. One of the most celebrated dance bands in the Borders is The Eskdaleonians, two of the players in which come from Eskdalemuir, both working men. Their dances are all Scottish country dances, and there has never been a period when they danced anything else — in other words their interest in Scottish dances is not a "revival" of interest in them such as is occurring now in towns. Working class people have a deep interest in the poetry of Robert Burns, and it is widely read among them. They have a saying that an answer to every question in life will be found either in the Bible or Burns. One or two of the elderly herds are devoted scholars of the two. Some make almost a cult of Burns, having a portrait of him on the wall, proudly shown to visitors, and numerous small articles and trinkets with either his portrait or a few lines of poetry on them. One (married) woman has a small picture of him in the hall and a large one in her bedroom, looking down on the bed, which she showed me with an attitude of veneration.

The conversation of this class reflects the narrow range of their social contacts. A great deal of their conversation
is about parochial events, neighbours, kinsfolk and work. Apart from this their interest is focussed mainly on sport (among men) and on the Royal Family (among women). Shepherds' wives often complain that their husbands can talk about nothing but sheep. Among acquaintances, one's personal life history may be referred to quite a lot in conversation - a topic never heard in the upper middle class. Conversation is not valued for its own sake in this class, that is it is not regarded as a skill from the use of which enjoyment can be got. It is regarded more as only an instrument for conveying information. Hence no matter what the content of the conversation is, there is a certain tone of seriousness to it which the upper middle class finds a little boring. A term of praise uttered often among the working class is "sincere fellow", which (as far as I could tell) means that the person praised 'means' what he says. On the other hand, among the upper middle class a common term of praise is to say of someone "he's good company".

Whereas among the upper middle class everyone is expected to be entertaining in company, the working class tends to have specialists in this line. Thus they distinguish two types of persons who are good at this, the "wag" and the "comic". These terms are never used of any one in the upper middle class. The wag is the person who is invariably cheerful and has a lot to say of a mildly humorous nature. The comic is a person who has the same role as the jester at the king's court - he is
funny both in speech and action mainly at the expense of others. He is fully accepted by his companions however, and no one, however much he may be offended by the comic's sallies, ever dares to retaliate against him.

Unlike the upper middle class, the working class is not afraid of silence in a gathering, and often admits implicitly that there is nothing to say which is particularly worth saying. It is not uncommon for friends to sit silently on opposite sides of the fire all evening saying practically nothing. (In case readers should think this is a false observation, and that they sat silent because of my presence, it may be said that one or two of them themselves commented on this characteristic.) A ploughman who was a neighbour of mine used to visit someone every evening, and after a short exchange about the day's work, sit silent before the fire for several hours. One old shepherd, if he couldn't think of anything to say to a visitor, simply went off to bed, without saying so. This was disconcerting to a visitor who did not know his habits, but of course most of his visitors did, so that he never caused offence.

As with the comic's behaviour, such behaviour as this is unthinkable among the upper middle class. Among them silence in a gathering is an implicit admission of failure. They have no way of dealing with it when it does happen, and everyone simply feels uncomfortable. The working class has a device for dealing with such a silence. After several minutes someone
will say with a sigh "Ay Ay". What is being said by this noise is extremely complicated but as far as I could tell meant something like "Here we are, still alive but not quite sure why; we've said all we have to say that's worth saying, and now await some grace that will enable us to say something else." At any rate, whatever it means, the sound keeps the gathering together round a meaning understood by all, integrates it against the threat the surrounding silence offers.

While the life of this class is very much confined within the parish and surrounding district, and their conversation on the whole reflects this, a few individuals within it seemed to me to have the widest horizons of all. For most people in the parish, and for all individuals in the middle classes, life is enclosed within present day society, whatever the range of social contacts a person has. A few elderly working class men however seemed liberated from society itself. Social status, money, convention, ambition - none of these interested them. Among them serious discussion of man's history and destiny can be heard (by serious I do not mean pretentious). They were much less bound down by time than other people. For example one old shepherd told me of a plague of mice which swept Eskdalemuir thirty years ago (an authentic event). They ate so much herbage on some hills that there was none left for the sheep. I expressed surprise at this. He added in a tone of slight rebuke that there was nothing surprising about a plague, as they
had them constantly in Biblical times. They do not think of themselves, these elderly herds, as employees getting a wage by working for an employer, but hold that shepherds are in the world to look after sheep which could not survive without shepherds. If this is questioned, they say that there never has been a time when there were sheep without herds to look after them, as the Bible clearly shows. However, these views are uncommon, there being only three or four old men who have the attitude of mind described above.

Lower middle class culture.

It is difficult to describe any thing that could be said to be characteristic of lower middle class culture. The most general remark that can be made about people in this class in regard to the features of culture which have been described—house type, meals, clothing, form and content of conversation etc.—is that they (the people) distinguish themselves to a greater or less degree from the working class by imitating the upper middle class yet are still clearly distinguishable from the upper middle class. In short this class does not have a culture of its own, but individuals in it simply combine as best as they can features of the culture of the two other classes. The result is that individuals of high rank in this class resemble the upper middle class in culture, while individuals of low rank resemble the working class. To illustrate this a contrast will be drawn between the family of highest rank in
the class, and the family of lowest rank.

The family of highest rank lives in a house which is as large as that of the upper middle type, yet the back door opens directly on to the steading. The husband went to an Edinburgh boarding school as a boy, while the wife was once a school-teacher. Their own children, unlike the upper middle class children, are being educated at Eskdalemuir school. They have four distinct meals a day, and never eat in the kitchen. Yet the room they eat in is also the room the family sits in in the evening. The clothes the family wears are of the same quality as those worn in the upper middle class. The husband works very hard every day, and some people say he is happier in the fields than in his house. The family does not have wide social contacts outside the parish - the wife somewhat sadly says she has not had a holiday of more than a day's duration since she married. Their conversation is limited to parochial events, family affairs, the farm and so on. Neither husband nor wife makes authoritative pronouncements about political affairs, nor is either adroit at conversation. Neither of them drinks, nor do they belong to clubs outside the parish. Their manners from the point of view of the upper middle class are unimpeachable, and the family is described by them as "nice".

At the other end of the lower middle class is the farmer already described, who has been himself a herd in the employ of another farmer. He left the local school at thirteen. His wife is a shepherd's daughter. Their house, while larger than
a cottage, is shaped like a cottage (see photo No. 2). They cook food, eat it, and live, all in one room, like the working class. Their clothes are hardly distinguishable from those worn in the working class. Though the family has slightly wider horizons than the working class, most of their conversation is about local events. Their dialect and manners are the same as that of the working class. Working class people say "He's a farmer and keeps himself apart from us, but he's really only a working man". Upper middle class people say of him that he is "rough" in manner.

The lower middle class does not have a culture of its own. Its members exhibit features of the cultures of the two other classes in varying degrees.

Class and attitudes.

Not only do the classes display different culture traits, but their attitudes to events differ. Possibly if these attitudes were examined exhaustively, it might be found that the attitudes of a class crystallise into a coherent ideology.

Though I did not make an exhaustive study of the attitudes found in the various classes I doubt if this would be found to be the case. As an illustration of the complexity of this aspect of culture, political attitude may be considered.

In the case of political attitudes, there is the initial difficulty of discovering what attitudes people in fact do have. For example, all the members of the two middle classes belong to
the local branch of the Unionist Association, while only a small proportion of the working class belongs (about a dozen). Yet this does not mean that the majority of the working class votes for a party opposed to the Conservatives. Several whom I know to vote Conservative have nothing to do with the Unionist Club because (they explain) of the embarrassments which arise whenever members of different classes mix. At the same time it is impossible to find out which parties all individuals vote for, since working class people are very secretive about this. The reason for the secrecy, they explain, is first that if everyone’s political allegiance was known to everyone else, quarrels might arise between friends, and secondly that if you become known as a Socialist you might be discriminated against in some way by your boss. Since the constituency is mainly a rural one and the M.P. who represents it is a Liberal-Unionist officially sponsored by the Conservative party, one can only suppose that the majority of rural working men and women vote Conservative.

That all middle class adults belong to the Unionist club does not mean either that they all vote Conservative, or that the class possesses, as a class, a clear cut political ideology. In the first place several small farmers are suspected by acquaintances of voting Labour, and of joining the Unionist Club simply in order to hide the fact through fear of the comments of class peers should their allegiance become known. This indicates that middle class people expect each other to vote Conservative; but there is again no way of finding out how many
Moreover, even if all of the two middle classes actually vote Conservative, there is a distinct cleavage in political attitude among them between those who are property owners and those who are professional men or have been so. It was remarked that all adults in the middle classes belonged to the Unionist Club. This was true until the last general election, when Sir A., who was chairman of the local Club, was asked to stand as a Liberal candidate in another constituency, which he did. He explained to me later that he had always been a Liberal, and had accepted the office of chairman of the Unionists "just because they asked me to". Sir A. has been a civil servant, and like all the professional people in the parish, the forestry managers, minister, schoolteacher, etc., has no ideological hostility to Socialism, whereas the larger farmers have. The professional people seem to see political problems as only problems of administration, that is, problems of administering the Welfare State. They have no objection to the nationalisation of industry, medicine and so forth. The majority of middle class farmers on the other hand are deeply hostile to the Labour party and to all that it did while in office. One or two of the professional people have told me they have no fixed political loyalty, i.e. they sometimes vote for one party, sometimes for another. Finally, to complicate matters further, it seems that many working class women in the parish do not vote at all, claiming they know nothing about politics, and that it is strictly men's business. In view of all these complications, it is hardly possible, without specific research on the matter,
to assert that each class is dominated in its thinking by a
clear cut ideology peculiar to itself. All that can be said
with regard to politics is what is already known, that the middle
classes tend to vote Conservative, while the working class is
divided on the matter, the majority apparently voting Conservative.

These observations, inadequate as they are, show two struc-
tural features which seem to be general, as regards attitudes,
namely that the working class is divided in its opinions and
attitudes, and the middle classes tend to be more unanimous,
though there is a certain cleavage between professional people
and property owners. For example, attitudes towards the modern
educational system show this same structure. The feature of
the system which arouses controversy is the practice of sending
the children of the parish to town schools at the age of thirteen.
The farmers are indignant about this, the upper middle class ones
most so, despite the fact that they send their children outside
the parish for schooling themselves. The farmers hold that in
the first place the children who attend the local school don't
need any schooling after the age of thirteen, and don't benefit
from it. In the second place they claim that the experience
which the children gain of town life makes them reject the life
of rural dwellers, and of farm work in particular. It is this
practice, they claim, which is responsible for the problem of
"rural depopulation". At the same time, the professional people
while concerned about rural depopulation, insist that every child should have an opportunity of attending a secondary school, in order that those who can benefit from further education may be able to do so.

The working class is divided sharply on the matter. Most (as far as I could see) while having no special regard for education, hold that working class children should have the same opportunity for secondary education as anyone else. As for the farmers' objection that sending them to town schools causes rural depopulation, they sneer and accuse the farmers of "thinking only of theirsels" i.e. of wanting to prevent the children from acquiring further education in town solely in order to ensure a good supply of cheap labour. (Farmers are aware of this accusation and resent it. As one said "It's not just ourselves we're thinking of - if the farms can't keep going, how are people going to eat?") Yet among the working class are many who agree wholeheartedly with the farmers on the matter. They too claim that the majority of children do not benefit from their two years in a secondary school, "Most of them are duds", it is said. They too think that it is more important to keep farms going than to give the children more education than the parish school provides. They agree that the "taste of town life" the children get is largely responsible for rural depopulation, and deplore it. One elderly shepherd, pointing out that a bus capable of holding 32 made two journeys a day to and from Langholm to carry half a dozen Eskdalemuir children to and from school,
asked rhetorically why the authorities couldn't send the Langholm children to Eskdalemuir. "At least," he said, "if they didn't learn anything they'd get some fresh air for a change". It may be added that this division of opinion in the working class is not correlated with age or with political opinion.

As a final example of this structuring of attitudes we may consider those towards the history of the parish as described in an earlier chapter. For the middle classes this has been a record of a change from a good state of affairs to a bad state of affairs. Workmen no longer work as hard and are less controllable. The abolition of the Parish Council and the School Board, and the transfer of power from local farmers to paid bureaucrats in the County Council and Ministry of Health and Insurance have been a mistake. The bureaucrats are less in touch with parochial opinion and are ignorant of parochial needs. There is nowadays too much travelling into town by workmen and their wives, and the lure of the town is beginning to destroy the countryside. They regret the change in the position of the minister, and hold that his loss of power is due to his not having any longer a salary which will enable him to "live like a gentleman" (as one of them put it). The professional people are less concerned about the minister's loss of power, but they too deplore that a so highly educated man should receive so little. This view of the history of the country parish is perhaps unpopular today, but is nevertheless as worthy of serious consideration as the opposite evaluation. The professional
people again do not subscribe to these views without reservation. Some consider that transfer of power from local amateurs to paid bureaucrats has justified itself by increased efficiency in administration. Some maintain that the agricultural worker was underpaid formerly, but at the same time regret that a union should have bargained for the increase.

An opposite evaluation is held by most of the working class. There has been over the last two generations a change from a bad state of affairs to a better one. Farmers are just as mean as ever but are now forced to pay a decent wage, and can't make you slave on in summer time till darkness falls. There is a joke they tell which has become part of their traditional stock, which they use to illustrate this change in their favour. Once a farmer made his men work from five in the morning till half past ten at night. Then he told them they could go to bed, adding that bed was the best thing in life. A herd retorted that bed wasn't such a good thing as darkness, for without darkness they would never get to bed. "They can't do that now" present day workmen exult. Again, life in the country is more bearable now, especially for women, because it's easier to get to town. They are actively hostile to the ministry, and think it only right that a man who does so little should be paid little. Indeed some get very angry when they read of ministers complaining of low salaries, since as they point out, ministers get twice as much as they themselves. And
so on - an entirely opposite evaluation from the first.

Yet the working class are by no means united in this view of the history of rural society. The elderly especially are apt to complain that people were happier before, and it has already been remarked that not all approve of the present day educational system. Some even say that despite higher wages their standard of living has hardly improved, and cite as evidence the fact that when they were young they found it possible to save money, whereas now they cannot.

Even with regard to recent history therefore, the working class is less united in its outlook than the middle classes.

The significance of class cultures.

This brief account of some features of the culture of the various classes has not been given only to demonstrate their existence, for these features play an important part in the system of social relations we have described. For almost any distinctive feature of a class becomes a symbol of it. This has been implicit in the foregoing account of the class system. For example it has been mentioned that "cottager" is a term used by the middle class sometimes for "a working class person". In the same way clothes in their varying degree of expensiveness, dialect, range of social contact and its reflection in conversation, manners, all have the character of class symbols. Thus, informants were asked if they could identify the class status of strangers, and all replied that they could by means of noting
one or several of the above signs. Dialect and particularly accent was most frequently mentioned.

That these function as status symbols is most clearly seen in the treatment meted out to persons who attempt to display one of these cultural characteristics as it is displayed by a class higher than the one they are known to belong to. For parishioners ridicule such a person in terms which clearly indicate that he is thought by them to be claiming a class status to which he is not entitled - the cultural characteristic is viewed by parishioners as a symbol without reality behind it. For example a few years ago some working class youths bought a suit of clothing each of the expensive sort worn in the middle classes. They were openly jeered at by the other youths of their class, and each given a nickname which showed he was regarded as claiming an illegitimate status; one was called "Lord Eskdale", another Sir (somebody) and so on. Similarly there is one working family the members of which speak more like middle class people than like working class people. A few middle class informants mentioned this family with approval, saying that though they were only cottagers yet their manners were good and they did not speak "so Scotch" as the rest of the working class. To these middle class people not "speaking Scotch" was intrinsically valuable. To other working class people however the family seems "affected", it is accused of "putting on airs" and of "thinking itself a bit above us". That is, by
speaking in an un-Scotch manner it is held to be claiming a class status higher than working class. We noted that working class culture was altogether more distinctively Scottish than the others. Too great involvement in this Scottish culture (songs, Burns, etc.) is somewhat frowned upon by the upper middle class, and avoided by the lower middle class. One lower middle class family is deeply interested in Scottish music and dancing. It does not lose its class status on that account but is held to be a little "narrow minded" by several other lower middle class families, and "boring" by the upper middle class.

Another indication of the importance of these cultural features as status symbols is that they are used sometimes by a person of low status to get favourable treatment from another of high status. In this situation the two persons have to be 'strangers' to each other, or at least the one of higher status must not know the actual status of the one of lower status. A forestry foreman, new to the parish, described how he dealt in this way with an upper middle class farmer who wanted advice about planting shelter belts. This foreman wears a trench coat and a hat, unlike the other working class men. He is also (by various accidents of personal history) a very sophisticated person with the same broad social horizons as the upper middle class, discoursing with ease on politics, travel, books and so forth. "I knew if he knew I was only a foreman in the forestry he'd treat me like dirt" (he said), "so I wore my hat and raincoat when I
went up to see him. He was a bit puzzled at first, you could see it in his face - he'd been expecting someone he could boss around. But I just looked knowledgeable, and discoursed largely about this and that - put on an accent a bit, and so on. So he thawed down gradually. He treated me as an equal anyway."

Occasionally the status symbols are manipulated for gain. Thus recently a man appeared in the district who displayed all the symbols of upper middle class status. He lived in an expensive hotel, spent a lot of time drinking and conversing, discoursing fluently on a wide variety of topics, and mentioning a few nationally known people he claimed to be related (socially) to. He drove an expensive car, wore expensive clothes and claimed to be on holiday. He could hardly have displayed more symbols of upper middle class status. He was welcomed by the upper middle class people of the district as one of themselves, was entertained by them, and stayed with some of them. Finally he disappeared, in the Eskdalemuir minister's car, without paying his hotel bills. When finally apprehended it transpired that he was a professional confidence trickster.

One point regarding this view of culture may be mentioned. We are viewing culture here as a set of symbols which announce positions in a system of social relations, and as we pointed out parishioners regard those items of culture we have mentioned in the same light. But there is in fact no limit to the amount of items of culture which can be regarded in this way. We
remember that the blacksmith's apprentice said he could spot a
member of the upper middle class simply by the fact that "they
look as if they owned the bloody world". Several other inform-
ants mentioned much the same thing. One said you could tell
them by the way they walked, for they walked as if they thought
they were "important". Not all informants however mentioned
such minute examples of standardised behaviour in their lists
of class status symbols. Evidently, either these particular
informants are more sensitive observers of their fellow men, or
else they are mistaken. My own observations lead me to believe
they are not mistaken, but I was not able to carry out conclusive
tests of the matter. The test would be to see, experimentally,
how often an informant correctly identified the class position
of a stranger. I did try some experiments on these lines, but
not enough to prove anything.

One further point may be mentioned. That is that an item
of material culture, which has one form and ostensibly one
function, may be handled in different ways by members of different
classes so that the different ways of handling the apparently
same object become status symbols. For example, both shepherds
and farmers constantly carry walking sticks. But while herds
carry their sticks soberly, actually using them to assist walking,
farmers carry them as if they were for playing with, swinging
them jauntily up in the air. This difference is noted by
parishioners, who can pick out farmers and herds in local towns
by simply noting how a man carries his walking stick. This would seem to create difficulties for Malinowski's view that the form and function of an artifact are related to each other. This is by no means an isolated example. Caps, for example, are worn differently by men of the upper middle and the working class, the former placing them straight on the head and slightly down at the front, the latter slightly to one side and to the back.

Another aspect of the social significance of class cultures is that certain features of culture associated with a class of high status come to be officially defined as more valuable than the same cultural feature as found associated with a class of low status. Nadel found this among the Nupe of West Africa, also a stratified society, where the elite "have set the standard of cultural desirability and superiority in general. They have imparted to customs which differ from the standard the stigma of lower, less respectable, ways of life." This is particularly so with regard to dialect and "manners" in our society. Thus the written language used in the parish school room contains no trace of the Scottish dialect the majority of children use outside the schoolroom. The teacher too speaks with little trace of this dialect when in the class room, though

1. B. Malinowski, "A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays", Chapel Hill, 1944, p.33. I am not suggesting that Malinowski is incorrect here; only that artifacts may have a significance as social symbols in addition to the significance they have as tools.

she uses it outside. The children in fact are discouraged from using their own speech. For example, during one lesson the children were asked to name various sorts of buildings shown to them as pictures. One was a kennel. When one of the boys was asked to name it he replied, correctly in dialect, "a dughoose". He was very surprised to be told he was "wrong", and that it was a kennel, a word never used among the working class. In short the children are being trained to believe that their normal way of speaking is wrong, and to imitate the dialect of the upper middle class.

What effect this has on the children's attitude to school is a subject for further study; but judging from the fact that very few working class children have any desire for education beyond the school leaving age it is reasonable to suppose that it contributes to discouraging them from developing much interest in what happens in school.

It was noted earlier that fifty years ago there was not such a difference in dialect between the classes as there is now. The evidence for this is not only what informants say, but also the fact that upper middle class persons of sixty or more all speak in a manner much more like the working class than is the manner of their younger class peers. It may be remembered that when these elderly farmers were boys they went to the local school, and worked on the farm along with the labourers' sons. The process involved here, which may (somewhat pretentiously perhaps) be called the Anglicisation of the speech of Scotsmen, is not
confined to this part of the country. Thus Owen notes the process in the island of Lewis, and Vallee in the island of Barra. In these places it is not merely a gradual change in dialect that is occurring, but a change from one language to another, Gaelic to English. In both places, as the writers make clear, the process, as in Eskdalemuir, is essentially due to persons of highest rank adopting English speech. In both places, the local language or dialect is stigmatised as an inferior form of speech.

So superior are the manners of the upper middle class (and those of the lower middle class who imitate them) held to be that they are in fact held to be the only manners - the working not class (especially the men, see p.3/6) is thought/to have any. Thus the teacher told me she was horrified at the lack of manners among the working class children, when she first came to the parish, and determined to make a point of teaching them. She still considers the subject to be the "most important" one she teaches. In fact what she does is to attempt to alter the children’s manners from those characteristic of the working class to those characteristic of the middle class. For example she teaches them to use handkerchiefs, not to swear, to refer to adults as "Mr." and "Mrs.", and to use "please", "thank you" and "excuse me" liberally in interaction with others. These are all middle class habits. The children obey her in school but return to more familiar habits and usages outside.


2. Vallee, *op.cit.*, Ch. II.
The greater prestige of the customs of the higher classes in a stratified society which exhibits marked differences of culture between strata, seems to be universal. We have already quoted Nadel's findings in West Africa. Similarly, West and Warner report the same feature from Plainsville and Yankee City.

Anthropological research has shown that it is possible for a society to be stratified without great differences of culture between the strata. Nevertheless, it seems a reasonable hypothesis that in this society, cultural differences, as well as announcing persons' positions in the class system, serve to maintain social distance between the classes. It is difficult to speak with exactitude on this matter, and we can merely point to the fact that, as shown by previous quotations, when persons of different class interact neither feels at ease. Many of the differences of culture we have mentioned are visible or audible immediately. Rees mentions as one of the main reasons for the unimportance of class distinctions in the Welsh parish that "every family has, broadly speaking, the same cultural and educational background, and they are therefore at ease with each other." Moreover many of the habits and customs of the middle

1. West, op.cit.
2. Warner & Lunt, op.cit.
classes do in fact establish spatial distance between themselves and the working class - their sending of their children outside the parish for education, their planting of trees round their houses, for example. Also, as each middle class household in the parish possesses at least one car, they are rarely found in public forms of transport which the rest of the population uses.
Class and Social Organisation.

So far the class system has been considered separately from other features of the social organisation of the parish. How it is linked with other systems of relationships in the parish, is the theme of this chapter. First will be considered the relation between the class system of the parish and association of parishioners with the wider society around them. The classes differ in the range and frequency of their associations outside the parish, the higher having wider and more frequent contacts outside than the lower. The basis for this is the former's relative freedom from having to work to a routine timetable, and their ownership of private means of transport and communication, cars and telephones, as opposed to the latter's being tied down day after day to some job, and being dependent on public transport.

Consider membership of voluntary associations outside the parish. Members of all classes belong to a Masonic Lodge in Langholm and to the Langholm branch of the British Legion; members of the lower middle and the working classes belong to a unit of the Observer Corps which has its H.Q. in Carlisle.
The individuals concerned attend more or less regularly the meetings of these bodies. Members of all classes are in their appropriate unions and attend branch meetings either at Langholm or Lockerbie. This defines the extent of working- and lower middle class membership of associations outside the parish. The upper middle class, however, is founding voluntary associations much further afield. Several belong to a bridge club which meets once a week in winter months in Moffat, a town 25 miles away. Two belong to men's clubs in Edinburgh. One belongs to a Philatelic Society with its headquarters in London, where he sometimes attends exhibitions of the society.

Distance is not very much of a barrier to the upper middle class in pursuit of recreational or professional interests. Many attend from time to time lectures on agricultural topics in Edinburgh, a few sometimes attend critical meetings of the farmer's union in Edinburgh or London. One travels to York market, the centre for red-poll cattle, partly for business but also from a passion for this type of animal; he is training to be an officials judge of them, and travels to agricultural shows, in order to inspect them and practise judging. One couple attends events at the Edinburgh Festival, another fairly regularly attends social functions in Edinburgh, balls, garden parties, and so forth. One member of this
class lives half (the cold half) of the year in Moffat, motoring out to his farm once or twice a week to supervise it. Two, who are notable drinkers, sometimes disappear for several days at a time; once one of them for a joke took the blacksmith with him, (telling him that he only intended to go to Lockerbie for a drink) to Newcastle, where they stayed several days drinking. The attitude of disdain for distance was carried to its extreme by one farmer who is a member of a local hunt. The hunt seemed about to disband through various difficulties, but he declared (seriously) that the prospect did not dismay him, for he would then fly over to Ireland once a week and hunt there.

The classes differ in their practices with regard to holidays. Working class children are often during the school summer holidays sent to live with grandparents in some nearby parish or town. Working class adults rarely have a holiday, in the sense of spending several consecutive days living somewhere else. Though all employed males are entitled to so many holidays with pay, agricultural workers rarely have more than one day off work at a time, during which they go no further than some nearby town. Forestry workers have ten consecutive days holiday, usually spent at home or living with relatives in nearby parishes and towns. There are, of course, exceptions to this general pattern in the working class, particularly among the youths, i.e. those between fifteen and
twenty-five, and bachelors. Every year three or four go to some recognised holiday place, such as the Isle of Man.

Among the lower middle class, holidays are much the same as in the working class, at least among farming families. They are rarely away from the farm for more than a day at a time. However, they get away oftener than the majority of working people, and, possessing cars, they can get away whenever they feel like it, not on Saturdays only, as is the case with those dependent on public transport. They seem to range wider in their contacts outside the parish than the working class, being familiar with the topography of either Glasgow or Edinburgh.

Members of the upper middle class take holidays every year - i.e. spend a week or a fortnight living outside the parish - sometimes longer. They go farther afield than any other class - London, Ireland, or the Continent. In the course of their lives they visit parts of the world the other classes see, if at all, only as members of Her Majesty's Forces. The two ex-colonial civil servants have, of course, lived in various places in the colonies in the course of their former duties. In addition, however, members of this class have visited at their own expense such countries as America, Canada, the Argentine, Scandinavia, Austria. The difference between the children of this class and of the other two with regard to schooling has already been mentioned.
Regular contact with official bodies outside the parish is also more frequent among this class than is the case with the other two. It has already been mentioned that the official representative of the parish on the County Council has been for two generations a member of this class, and the representative on the District Council is also of this class. Two of them have for some years been members of Committees set up by the Department of Agriculture for Scotland. Another is on the governing committee of a Missionary Society. The minister naturally attends each year the meetings of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. One of the women of this class is on the County Committee of the Brownies Association, and the District Committee of the Women's Rural Institute. She is sometimes accused by other women of having taken an interest in the parish W.R.I. only in order to get onto the District Committee. From time to time one or other of them accepts office in some outside body - in the local branch of the Farmers Union, on the committee of some agricultural show etc. There is, however, no need to multiply examples, as members of the two other classes are rarely found holding office in any body outside the parish.

This study is limited to one parish, but since we have shown that contact outside the parish is more frequent and of further range the higher the social class of the persons considered we may be allowed to speculate here a little.
If all country parishes in the Borders are similar to Eskdalemuir, then this generalisation will hold for them, too. The result of this will be that official bodies, the transactions of which have some bearing on the lives of parishoners, will be contacted more by the upper middle class than by any other - indeed may be composed of persons of this class. This indeed seems to be the case. The membership of the County Council over the last twenty years was studied from this point of view. The representatives of the country parishes on the Council were scrutinised with regard to those characteristics we found were important in determining class status - amount of property owned, size of farm, etc., and, while we cannot claim that our findings were one hundred per cent accurate, without more prolonged research in these other parishes, it seemed that the vast majority of rural representatives belonged to the upper middle class. Another body we studied from this point of view, was the local branch of the National Farmers Union, the office bearers of which, (drawn from the county of Dumfriesshire) were found to belong to this same class.

At this point the question may be raised whether there really has been such a change in the local class system, such as we described in our history of the parish. Our hypothesis still holds good, for despite the greater representation of the upper middle class from rural areas, the middle classes are
by no means dominant on the County Council. For the burghs and towns in the county also elect representatives to the Council, the majority of whom seem to belong to the working class. In addition, the greater part of the work of the Council is done by paid bureaucrats, whose main interest, as far as I could discover from interviews with them, was simply to supply services as efficiently as possible. Their outlook in fact was exactly similar to that of the professional people in Eskdalemuir.

These matters, however, require more investigation than I could devote to them. All that our data permit, is to suggest that the more frequent contacts, both formal and informal, of the upper middle class outside the parish, in ways which cannot as yet be specified, serve to maintain their position of dominance within the parish.

The Family and the Class System.

It has several times been observed by theoretical sociologists, that "the true unit of social class is the family," without much evidence being offered for the statement. In a general way, the statement is true, but must be rendered more precise, for it is not the family in the abstract that is the unit of the social class, but those members of a family living together in the same household. In a later section we shall show that members of a family may have different class status, but in all such cases the family
members of different status belong to different households. But all the members of a family who live in the same household are accorded the same class status. (When we talk of the family here, we mean the family in this sense.) This was made evident from informant's status placements - only in one instance did one informant separate a wife from her husband in class position (for a reason made evident later) while no one separated children from parents.

It was also made clear from informants' comments while making the placements, that for the purpose of awarding class status, a family was thought of as a unit. For example, they would pick up a card with a man's name on it X, and remark, "The Xs - they go there." In fact, very rarely during these interviews was an individual's name mentioned, it was always "the so and so's". It could hardly have been otherwise, since a family living in one household shares so many of the symbols and circumstances of a class status. For example, the house type itself, as we have already seen, distinguishes the classes to such an extent that a synonym for working class is "cottagers." A family shares the same standard of living, culture, and so forth, - all the symbols of status we showed to be so important in displaying one's class position to the community. Since children automatically belong to the class of their parents, it may be said that entry into the class in which one's life commences, is determined by parentage.
Since the family is the unit of social class, we should expect to find many connections between the two systems of relationships. In the following pages we shall show these connections.

It was shown previously, that occupation is an important factor in determining class status. In this community some occupations are very much bound up with membership of a family. This is seen in the following facts:

1) Of the ten farmers resident in the parish, seven are sons of farmers, and inherited their farms from their fathers.
2) All shepherds are sons of shepherds. (There is one 'exception' to this at the present moment. There is an English lawyer's son employed as a herd on one farm. However, he looks forward to having his own farm some day, and is really only learning how to be a sheepfarmer.)

This does not mean, that a person's occupation is determined by his membership of a family. This is clear if we consider not the occupations of the fathers of the present herds in the parish, but the occupations of their brothers. Thus a sample of sixteen herds working in the parish have a total of thirty three brothers employed elsewhere. Of these thirty three seventeen are also herds, and the remainder are employed in various other ways. That is, two out of three shepherd's sons are also shepherds. In the same way, not all farmer's sons are farmers. Moreover there is little connection between
fathers and sons' occupations in general agricultural work, in the trades, and in forestry labouring.

A relation between family and occupation seems to hold to any significant degree only in the cases of herding and farming. The connection between the two in both cases is the institution of inheritance, - in the one case farms are inherited, in the other skills. Thus the seven farmers, who are sons of farmers, all inherited the farm from their fathers or received it as a gift from him before he died. The herds all learned their craft from their fathers. Many of the skills of herding, such as handling dogs, identifying illness in sheep, assisting sheep to give birth, take some time to learn, and require that the learner be instructed in them. They also require constant practice. Since no institution teaches these skills, they can only be learned from another herd, who in all cases is the father.

The two occupations are considered the most important in this particular community. Yet they are probably special cases of occupations in which son follows father. The other occupations represented in the parish do not show this feature to nearly the same extent. However, in most families, sons follow an occupation which does not remove them in class status from that of their father.

1) see p.306-30 for analysis of the exceptions.
Thus the present agricultural labourers are sons of shepherds, ploughmen, stonemasons, gamekeepers, and so on. The manifold influences which must operate to bring about this situation cannot be analysed here; we simply state it as a fact.

Class, Family, and Marriage.

There are other more important aspects to the relation between family and class. A family has to begin with the marriage of a man with a woman. Where a class system prevails, there are three possible combinations of class status of the partners to the marriage. The two could be of equal status; the man could be of higher status than the woman; or the woman could be of higher status than the man. The first combination is the normal one. Thus the half dozen marriages that took place while field work was being done, were all of this sort. Moreover, of the married couples in the parish, all but eight conformed to this combination. The majority of persons marry members of their own class.

In the case of combination of both the other two types, the woman has conferred upon her the class status of the man. Thus in the eight cases in the parish of a marriage between a woman of lower status and a man of higher, the wife is accepted as an associate by wives of the husband's friends and class peers.

1. Field work being conducted by my colleague Dr. Girling is intended to elucidate this complicated problem.
2. This has been found to be the case by all field students of social class already mentioned.
If the gap in status between the two is considerable, it may become an issue among the husband's acquaintances as to whether his lower-status wife will be accepted or not. Thus an upper middle class man has a wife whose father is a miner. When he first brought her to live with him in the parish, it was, as one woman said, "touch and go", whether or not the other middle class women would associate with her. At that time the upper middle class woman had a sort of social leader, a woman of strong character whose judgement on all sorts of matters was accepted by the rest. After the new wife had visited this social leader several times, putting herself on parade before the colonel, so to speak, the leader decided to accept her as an associate, and the others followed suit. The wife, however, is well aware of the issues the marriage created for her husband. Thus once when her husband was unsober, he began to complain that he never seemed able to gain any position of influence in local politics. His wife said, "That's because you married me." (It is pleasing to add that the husband refused to countenance this explanation.) In all other cases of this combination, the status gap was much less, and there was never any issue as to whether or not the wife would be awarded the same status as her husband.

The opposite combination is even rarer than the above, that is, where the woman is of higher status than the man. For whereas in the above case the man maintains his status and the woman takes his, thus gaining status, when the man is of lower
status, the woman still takes his, and hence loses status. This was the case with one couple in the parish. The wife was the daughter of a small farmer, (in another parish) and the husband a herd. This wife never associated with lower middle class women in Eskdalemuir, but with other working class women. It is interesting to note that within the working class she was held in great respect, - she is the woman previously referred to, who is year after year elected president of Davington W.R.I. and always declines the office.

While I was in the parish, a lower middle class farmer's daughter became engaged to a shepherd. She told me of the opposition of her parents to the match, and how in fact her parents had always tried to prevent her and her sister from associating with working class youths. "They've always been against X, (her fiancee) from the beginning. It's just because he's a cottager. They've always tried to prevent us from having anything to do with the cottagers. They used to stop us going to dances round about, (local dances are patronised mainly by working class people.) and we used to have to do it behind their backs. - We used to creep out the house when they were asleep. But they've always - mother especially - tried to turn me against X. I always said, 'if he were a farmer's son, you wouldn't find anything wrong with him.'"

She also said she knew that some of her friends would stop visiting her if she married the man, but didn't care. -"I'll find out who my real friends are," she said.
Everyone in the parish with whom I discussed the prospective marriage, was openly cynical about the motives of the man, (except two upper middle class persons who were too uninterested to talk about it.) They thought that he was marrying the girl with the hope that her parents, rather than have their daughter permanently a shepherd's wife, would provide him with the money to rent a farm somewhere. Whether this is true or not, the fact that they interpreted the man's motives in this way, and the probable response of the girl's parents, shows that in this combination the woman loses status, unless she can bring property or another income into the marriage to raise the man to her own status.

Why this latter type of combination is rare in rural society than the type in which the man is of higher status, will be disclosed in the next section. Here the question may be raised, why any sort of marriage across the class line is so rare. We can point to many reasons which, however, already presuppose a class system. In the first place, as has been shown, and as is implicit in a class system, members of one class do not associate with members of another class as much as they do with members of their own class. Hence occasions for the youth of different classes to meet and form the intimate association leading up to marriage are rare. Moreover, as the girl engaged to the shepherd stated, parents actively prevent or discourage such contacts across class lines.
Further evidence of this is presented on page 3.

In the second place, as was shown, members of a higher class regard those of a lower class as in some sense inferior to themselves. This attitude is found in different degree in different individuals, but is common to all members of a class. Thus even the girl about to marry a herd, spoke slightingly of "cottagers", i.e. of the working class in general. In point of fact, her fiancee, when he started to court her, changed his habits and manners a great deal in the direction of those normal among the lower middle class. Acquaintances of his among the working class also noticed this, for several pointed it out to me. For example, he began to wear more expensive clothes, to shave every day, to keep his nails clean, and got himself a different sort of haircut not characteristic of the working class. (The new haircut was the sort men wear in advertisements found in such periodicals as "Lilliput", "Men Only", etc.) It is reasonable to suppose that this attitude of superiority towards a lower class is incompatible with the sort of association between two persons that normally precedes marriage. The attitude may be dispelled for any one individual of course, but must form an initial barrier to any such close association.

Not only are the classes separated socially, they are also characterised by differences in culture. This means that in a marriage between members of two different classes, one may
have to alter his or her behaviour to a certain extent, as did the herd above. Adjustments can be made in behaviour with varying degrees of ease by different individuals, but the fact that adjustments may have to be made, must again act as an initial barrier to the association preceding marriage. Parishoners themselves believe that a difficulty of this sort exists. Several told me of marriages which turned out to be "difficult" for this very reason of initial differences in culture between partners. For example, one herd has an uncle, also a herd, who married a schoolteacher. According to my informant, the couple quarrelled constantly over the speech of the children, the uncle wanting them to speak in the normal working class way, the wife in the more Anglicised way in which she used to teach children in school. It cannot be verified whether or not these marriages were "difficult" for the reasons given, but it is clear that people believe that there is a difficulty here.

A final reason which may be more cogent than these mentioned, is to be found in the incompatibility of the norms governing relations between classes and those governing relations between kinsfolk. Thus, (p.113) there is supposed to be warm friendly relationship between grandparents and grandchildren, and between parents' siblings and siblings' children. In a marriage of persons of different class status, the children of the marriage find themselves in a different class from the
parents and siblings of one of the spouses. People of different class do not associate, or if they do, then in anything but warm and friendly relations.

Indeed, if marriage between members of different classes became general, either the class system or the kinship system would have to alter very much from their present form. This is perhaps the most interesting hypothesis to account for the sparsity of marriages between classes, but unfortunately, not enough data were available in Eskdalemuir to verify it. The data available, however, do show an incompatibility between the two systems of relationships, and suggest, that when the two conflict, the class principle takes precedence over the kinship one.

J., a lower middle class farmer, is a child of a marriage between a farmer and a maidservant. His mother's brother, who is a ploughman, still resides in the parish. The two never associate. This is entirely because J. and his wife do not want to associate with the ploughman, whom they call a "silly old man". The uncle, however, is highly respected among the working class, (I myself could not see him as a silly old man.) The uncle and members of his household are angry because the nephew and his family ignore them, call them snobs and so forth. Two of the uncle's children are resident in the parish. Again however, there is no association whatsoever between the farmer and his working class cousins.
M., the farmer who was once a herd, is married to a herd's daughter. His wife's sister, married to a roadman, is resident in the parish. The farmer's wife sometimes visits her sister, but the sister does not visit the farmer's wife, nor do other members of the two households, both of which have children, visit each other. Moreover, the farmer's wife associates more with friends in the lower middle class than with her sister. She is for this reason often accused of snobbery by members of the working class, (though not as far as I know, by her sister).

These are the only instances which were available to me for observation, but they do suggest that kinship relations described are nullified by social class relations where the two come into conflict.

In both these cases, however, it was the woman who married a man of higher status. This type of marriage across class lines is much commoner than where a woman marries a man of lower status. This was also found to be the case in Barra, and in the Welsh parish. This suggests a purely sociological explanation for the scarcity of marriages across class lines; that is, as we suggested, that too frequent cross-class marriages would eventually destroy the class system.

1. Vallee, op.cit.
2. Rees, op.cit.
For in the latter combination, the woman loses status. Now, though it is the family living as one household, which is the unit of social class, it would seem from the example discussed, that this loss of status is to some extent shared by the woman's family of orientation, i.e. her parents, to some extent, lose status. This seems to be confirmed by Rees' remark that "the marriage of a farmer's daughter to a labourer is a more serious matter, sometimes leading to lasting estrangements."¹

In other words, the farmer's daughter's family of orientation, rather than lose status, sever their connection with her.

If we may put the matter in an abstract way - society has a given stock of status to distribute, each family being guardian of a certain amount, according to its position in the class system. If women commonly married men of lower status, this stock of status would eventually be dissipated, - or else there would have to be "lasting estrangements" between members of the 'core' kinship grouping. This is merely to state in an abstract way, what, were this to happen, would be observable; namely, that close friendly relations between members of different classes would occur, i.e. either classes would disappear, or kinship relations be broken.

¹ Rees, op.cit. p. 146.
Class, Family, and Culture.

The close connection between family and culture has been recognised by many sociologists. Much of the behaviour which goes to make up a class culture is taught in the family by parents to children, and much of the material culture consists of equipment which the family uses. The family shares a common standard of living, - house, food, clothes, and so on. Manners, dialect, and form and content of conversation are taught in the family. A lower middle class mother says: "I've always been afraid, that they (her children) would pick up the accent of the cottagers from the other children at school, but they haven't, they speak just like us." She added that her children are always pointing out differences of behaviour between themselves and the working class children they meet at school, and asking why there are such differences. She adds: "I don't want them to be snobbish, but I always say something to make them see that our ways are best. For example A. (her eldest daughter) said the other day that B. (a working class school girl) gets her meat out the same plate she has her soup in, and why was that. So I just said 'aren't you a lucky girl to have two plates'."

It is the family, too, which shares the same pattern of eating habits, both as regards the number of meals per day, and their content, and also the room they are eaten in. It has been shown, too, how the house is an important status symbol.
It is no accident that this is so, for one of the main indices the parishioners use in deciding what social class a person belongs to, is, who he associates closely with, and this is decided by considering whom he visits and eats food with. Here as elsewhere throughout the world, commensality is a sign of close relations between those participating. Thus, in the interviews, whenever I asked a working class person why he or she placed someone in one of the two middle classes, the answer almost invariably was, "because he wouldn't come in here and have a cup of tea," sometimes with the addition, "I wouldn't ask him and he wouldn't ask me." Similarly, one elderly man, (working class) who maintained that the barriers between classes are less rigorous now than in his youth, based his argument on the fact that formerly he was never asked inside a middle class house, whereas now, when he has had occasion to contact some middle class man at the latter's home, "I'm sometimes allowed in as far as the kitchen." His general argument cannot be proved or disproved, but the point here is the importance placed on entry into houses as an index of the social relations crucial for class membership. Innumerable examples could be given, showing how important this act is in symbolising the closeness and distance between people. For example, many people had difficulty in placing the minister and the director of the observatory in any class, and did so only after some thought, because the minister associates with people
of all classes, (i.e. visits them and drinks tea with them) while the director, a semi-invalid, does not associate with anyone, never leaves his own house and is seldom visited.

After thinking about the matter, informants drew distinction between the minister's associations while on duty (he has to visit everybody, they said) and while off duty, and according to the latter he was undoubtedly upper middle class. In the case of the director, informants simply switched their criteria of judgement from association to status symbols, and pointed to his salary, his large house, and so on.

Or again, an upper middle class woman was boasting that her husband had been invited to one or two shooting parties by members of the 'County Lot', implying he was a close associate of them. The husband deflated her with the remark, "Yes, but I'm never asked in." (i.e. into the house.) An upper middle class farmer told how, when he first started farming, at a clipping or dipping he had his meals outside with the men. "However," he added, "I noticed that my being there put a damper on their conversation, and it was very uncomfortable, so I stopped it." Since to eat together is a symbol of close relations, eating with the men, when in fact he was not in close relationship with them, only made everyone uncomfortable.

In short, to associate closely with someone means to enter his house and eat with him regularly.
Dr. Brinley Thomas has commented on the significance of meals in a class system, from a somewhat different point of view, yet one which reinforces our argument. He writes, "..... nothing indicates more clearly the reality of class distinctions than the behaviour and feelings of a person when he is present at a meal in the house of a "superior" or "inferior" host." He is evidently referring to the discomfort such a situation creates. Another observer has mentioned that, as he somewhat dramatically put it, "class barriers are erected at the portals of the house." Professor C.A.Mace explains this as due to the parents wanting to prevent their children from marrying persons of a lower class. This explanation is less cogent than ours, for if it were true, then we should expect childless couples to ignore class distinctions as far as inviting people into their house was concerned. But this is not the case. There are several childless couples among the two middle classes, and none of them invite working class persons into their house.

The family then is most intimately related to the class system. Inheritance of property and skills takes place within the family; the family passes on much of the culture characteristics of a class, hence passes on the symbols of

2. C.A. Mace, "Beliefs and Attitudes in Class Relations", in the above publication.
class membership. Choice of partners in marriage is largely confined to members of one's own class, and has to be restricted, otherwise either relations between kinsfolk or relations between classes would have to alter considerably. Parents exert pressure on children to keep their choice of spouse within their own class. And finally, it is sharing the house and meals of families (or households) other than one's own, which constitutes the exemplary type of association that fixes one's class unambiguously.

The amount of kinship connections within the parish differs as between the working class and the two middle classes. The ratio of connected to unconnected households in the working class is \( \frac{1}{2.2} \), in the lower middle class \( \frac{1}{4.5} \), and in the upper middle class \( \frac{1}{4.5} \). While the numbers concerned are too small to permit of significant generalisations, it may be noted that the directions of the connections vary from class to class. Thus the two connected households in the upper middle class are connected with each other. Of kinship connections between this class and those lower down, the only hint is an unverified report, that one of the illegitimate working class children was fathered by an upper middle class farmer.

None of the lower middle class households are connected with each other, the two with connections being connected with four working class households. The majority of households in the working class with connections, are connected with each other. The direction of these connections seems in keeping with a point made earlier, namely the exclusiveness of the upper middle class, compared with the other two.
Sex and Class.

The object of this section is to relate the class system to the sex system. By sex system is meant simply, that the sexes in Eskdalemuir, as everywhere, are allotted different roles in society. The most obvious feature in this system is, that men are gainfully occupied, while women tend children and work in the house, at least after marriage. Between leaving school and marriage, most women engage in some gainful occupation. As already mentioned, the women in this stage in Eskdalemuir are either paid housekeepers, or, if they left school after the war, they are millgirls, employed in Langholm. The vast majority of adult women in the parish, however, are housewives. No extended description of this division of labour is given here, as it is common knowledge. This part of our thesis deals with somewhat more subtle aspects of the male and female roles, and our intention is to show how the sexes are related in different ways to the class system.

It seems to be assumed in studies of social class, that all persons within one class stand in exactly the same relationship to the class system, or to use Weber's terminology, that all within the same class have exactly the same Lebenschancen. Marshall states this with his usual clarity, "I submit, therefore, that, if we are thinking of a social class as a group based on a certain resemblance of its members, we must regard it as a

group of persons with similar social chances. . . "

We shall try to show that this is not the case in our community, by considering the sexes in relation to social mobility, the movement of persons from one class to another. The cases of upward and downward movement among the present population of Eskdalemuir and its siblings elsewhere, are all instances of movement from the working class into one of the middle classes or into the "slum" class below the working class. Hence we shall be mainly concerned with the working class and movement out of it.

A word should perhaps be said about the notion of portability. This refers to actions, skills, objects, ideas, and persons, which an individual may carry with him from one position to another in the course of upward movement through society without prejudice to his chance of success. Prejudice to success may be positive, by, for example, a skill being symbolic of the lower or rejected status, or at least diagnostic of the individual's unfavourable social background. Thus skill in razor slashing would not be portable for movement into the middle classes. Or again, one's colour may debar one from associating with a great many people in those societies characterised by a colour bar. One's colour in that case is not portable. Prejudice to success may be negative, due, in the case of a skill for example, to the fact, that exercising it may occupy the person's time so much that he has no time

2. This concept, as far as I know, is my own invention.
to develop the skills necessary for movement into another position. Whether a skill, idea, person, etc. is portable or not, will depend on the position from which the person starts his movement, the new position he aims at, and local conditions affecting his strategy. However, skills used by more than one social class are obviously portable as far as movement between these classes is concerned.

It has been shown that the family is the unit of social class. It has also been implicit in much that has gone before, that the class status of the family derives from that of its head, the father or husband. The fact that a woman on marriage has conferred upon her the status of her husband, shows this. The children's status is that of their parents. This means, that a woman derives her class status from her relationship to a man, either father or husband. This does not mean that a woman living alone, or without a living father or husband, is not accorded a class status.

Of the few widows and single women not living with their families, the majority are classed by reference to their occupation, and the others in the same way as the rest of the females, by reference to a man, father or husband, alive or deceased. In short, most women's status depends upon that of a man. This is clearly illustrated by the case of a woman whose father was working class and whose husband was upper middle.
It was felt that she had not acquired all the social skills of her husband's class, and at the same time her standard of living was well above her father's. Her class status was felt to be somewhat ambiguous, and in discussing it, people would settle the matter one way or the other by reference to the class status of one or the other of the two men.

Because a woman's class status derives from that of a man, it might seem as if the wife and mother had no responsibility for the status of the family. But in the working class at least this is not the case. The wife can have little responsibility for gaining status for her family, but she has a great deal of responsibility for maintaining its status, and can be responsible for its downfall into the non-respectable "slum" class. A consideration of the criteria which mark off this lowest class from the respectable working class, makes this clear. For the only difference between the two concerns standards of household economy, which are exclusively the wife's concern.

In the working class, for example, the family is expected to use (normally) a tablecloth or oil cloth, and not eat always off bare boards; to use earthenware and china dishes, and not enammelled tin ones; to have at least one cooked meal a day; not to get into debt with tradesmen; to have a clean costume, (a suit for the men, a dress etc. for the women) for public appearances.

1. This same point is made by the authors of "Deep South" p.173.
The children's school clothes should not fall below a certain standard of cleanliness and neatness, nor should the material apparatus of the household.

It is failure to maintain these standards which distinguishes the non-respectable "slum" class from the working class. In Eskdalemuir itself, there is only one such family, and for many purposes it would not be useful to think of a single family as constituting a separate social class. However, this family is pointed out by working class people as an example of a family in that "slum" social class, which they think of as inferior to themselves. Here is an example of the way in which the family is talked of by others, and of the relations between the family and its neighbours. "He was a nice fella... but she was an awful cratur. They left as she owed too much all round... She used to be after everybody here. She'd ask for anything - clothes, money, food... she used to send the bairns (for them)... oh it was terrible, every time ye looked out the window and saw one of the bairns, ye sat quaking in case (they were coming to ask you for something). She never cooked anything... bread and jam it was, just bread and jam." The informant went on to describe how everyone tried to avoid contact with the wife. Responsibility for the downfall of the family was fixed on her by the community by virtue of criteria - consumption patterns - visible to all. The husband earned as much as the other agricultural and forestry labourers, and
was extremely moderate in his own personal consumption, (cigarettes, entertainment). The wife, however, spent too much money on cigarettes to be able to maintain the standards of household consumption (referred to above) necessary for membership in the respectable working class. "It's the cigarettes that drag her down", it was said. Such families are more numerous in country (and other) towns than in the countryside proper, and welfare workers inform me that in the majority of cases their low status is due to the wife's inability to maintain the correct consumption patterns. Whether the point can be stated as a statistical regularity is, however, irrelevant, as I am merely observing that the wife, because of the content of her role, can be responsible for the downward mobility of a respectable working class family. Hence the consumption skills of the respectable working class wife are at least status maintaining, and since household consumption patterns are one of the main criteria that distinguish the respectable from the non-respectable working class, these consumption skills are of the utmost importance in maintaining the status of the family.

On the other hand, the wife and mother has no responsibility for gaining status for the total family, i.e. herself and her husband and children. A move from working class to middle class can only be accomplished by the husband's efforts. All farmers and forestry managers are of the middle class, all
agricultural and forestry workers are of the working class.

For agricultural workers to move into the middle class requires the acquisition of capital, by a loan from a bank or some other credit-giving institution. This is a difficult achievement for an agricultural worker, since such institutions require security, i.e. prior to possession of some capital and the assurance of some middle class patron that the working class man is a good risk. In point of fact, as one bank manager in Langholm pointed out, the price of a farm and stocks has risen to such heights in the last few decades that it is virtually impossible for a farm labourer to acquire a farm.

For a forestry worker to move, he must recommend himself to the manager of the forest by hard work, skill, and by showing a capacity for command. The manager recommends him to higher authority as a candidate for entry to a forestry school. After a long, typically bureaucratic process of examination, he may emerge from the school a foreman, and in due course he is promoted to manager. This, too, is difficult to do. It must be accomplished by the age of twenty five, the age limit for entry to a forestry school. It is most unusual for a workman to display a capacity for command, since his workmates resent commands from anyone not a manager (see p. 16). Finally, the ratio of foremen to workmen is in the region of 1 : 20.

The only other possible way of moving into the middle class
is to change occupation altogether, which means migrating to the town. The difficulty of these moves is of secondary importance at the moment; what is important is that they can be accomplished only by the male. Hence, as far as the mobility of a family is concerned, only the male can accomplish upward movement, while the female has a large responsibility for maintaining status, and can be responsible for downward movement.

So far I have been considering the relation of the sexes to the class system in respect of the roles of husband and wife. Considerations of the movement of single persons brings out other more interesting aspects of the different relationships of the sexes to the class system. Most upward movement is in fact accomplished by individuals before marriage or by the act of marriage itself. Of the present agricultural population of the community and its siblings who live outside the district, twenty have moved up in their own lifetime from working class to middle class. In all but one case the step was accomplished before marriage, or the first crucial steps taken before marriage (e.g. acquiring an education), or it was effected by the act of marriage itself. Since upward movement after marriage depends so much on the male, marriage for the female is a crucial choice as regards her class status. She cannot by her own action gain further status, but only maintain or lose it. Of the twenty who have moved, six are men and fourteen are women. The men moved by leaving the district and changing
occurrences. Of the women, eight moved by the act of marriage (i.e. by marrying a man of higher status), and six by acquiring an education which entitled them to middle class jobs. Of these six, two consolidated their position by marrying middle class men. It would seem that the roles allotted to the sexes in the working class favours mobility in the female.

Before going on to explain why this is so, a few brief biographies of some of these socially mobile people may help to make clearer the picture drawn here. The letters used as pseudonyms in these biographies have no connection with letters similarly used elsewhere.

1. I am aware that these figures are not very convincing. This illustrates the weakness of anthropological methods in the study of modern society, i.e. the limitations of selecting local groups for study, rather than statistically relevant populations.

   It may be added that one statistical study confirms part of my findings. In a study of a large population in Germany, it was discovered, that 2 out of 5 working class women secured a higher social status through marriage. Unfortunately, the authors did not find out if this was higher than the proportion of working class men who secured a higher status. The enquiry is reported by Dr. Brinley Thomas in his paper "The problem of Bridges and Barriers - Occupation", in Papers on the Social Sciences, third series, published by Le Play House, London 1939.
Mrs. A.
Her father was gamekeeper in an adjoining parish. She was clever at school, Langholm Academy, and won a scholarship to Dumfries Academy. Her father died, and her mother became housekeeper to a family in the "county lot." By winning further scholarships she was enabled to go to a University for three years, taking an ordinary M.A. degree. Then she went to a teachers training college, and qualifying got a post as teacher at Eskdalemuir school. Shortly after this she married a prosperous lower middle class farmer. People of both working and lower middle class say she would like to move into the upper middle class, but can't because everyone knows, "her father was just a gamekeeper."

Mrs. B.
Her father is a miner in an industrial district. She became a nurse, and while on duty in an institution for the cure of alcoholism met her present husband, a wealthy upper middle class farmer. Some working class persons are quite malicious in their comments on her, calling her for example "a glorified housekeeper." An upper middle class man once said to her, "She does her best to be his wife but can't really manage it. You should hear her on the phone..." here he mimicked her trying to speak with the intonation and accent of the upper middle class. He laughed, then added, that she was nice all the same.
Mrs. C.
She is now in her seventies. Her father was a ploughman in the next parish; she became a servant in a lower middle class farmer's household. The farmer was a bachelor and had a wide reputation as a seducer of servant girls, - "goodness knows how many children he has around the countryside," one informant said, "of course they would (i.e. the servant girls) all be hoping to catch him (i.e. marry him), but he just sent them packing with a present of money." However, when this particular servant girl became pregnant, her father insisted that the farmer marry her, which he did.

Mrs. D.
She is a herd's daughter, an attractive girl, who had kept house for her father and brothers after her mother's death. While still young, she knew all the routine of housekeeping in a farmhouse. She married a lower middle class farmer in an adjoining parish.

Mr. E.
He is a shepherd's son. The schoolteacher at the time he was at the parish school, was Mrs. A. above, who says of him, "I saw as soon as I set eyes on him, that he was different from the others. He was so shy and well mannered. But it wasn't just that, - he was so interested. He used to come and ask me for books to read. I felt instinctively he was one of us." (her emphasis). However, he left school at fourteen and became a shepherd. After about six years of this he left the parish
and became a policeman in Glasgow. Shortly after this the war started; he joined the military police and became a captain. During the war he married, and after being demobilised he rejoined the police force. Promotion came quickly, and he is now in charge of a police station in a country town, with the rank of sergeant. He associates there with schoolteachers, shopkeepers etc.

Mr. F.
A shepherd's son, he became a herd on leaving school at 14. He was described as a "jessie" by his class peers and shunned by them, because he used to help his widowed mother a lot in the house, and because he had little of a "Scotch" accent (though a native of the parish). He rarely associated with anyone, and spent much of his time reading books. At about the age of twenty he went to Glasgow and got a job in the Post Office. He went to night school, studied, passed exams, and now has a responsible job in the Post Office. When he visits the parish now, he associates with a few lower middle class families in addition to his own.

Mr. G.
Son of a gardener to an upper middle class family which formerly lived in the parish. His mother's father was a joiner, and he became apprenticed to his grandfather. At about twenty he went to Glasgow and while working as a joiner studied draughtsmanship.
at night school. He got a job as draughtsman, saved money, and emigrated to New Zealand. There he set up a joinering firm. His brother in the parish says that he is now very rich, and adds, "he was always ambitious and determined to get on."

These biographies are given, simply to provide a clearer picture of our previous discussion. The point we reached was, that females seemed to be more successful in upward mobility than males. This we attribute to the different nature of their roles, and now undertake to explain this.

The female role contains skills which within the present structure of rural society provide better opportunity for upward mobility. Her main skills in the first place are portable - housekeeping differs only in scale from working to lower middle class, and varies, if at all, only in minor details with the occupation of the husband. (I cannot say whether child-rearing techniques differ significantly in the two classes). Some of her skills, too, such as adornment, or "manners", are not only portable, but also are pure social techniques, enabling the manipulation of others and fostering a keen insight into social relations.

1. This has been noted by Talcott Parsons, in "An Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification" (already referred to). He writes, "Women's interests and the standards of judgement applied to them, run, in our society, far more in the direction of personal adornment and the related qualities of personal charm, than is the case with men."
These skills are important in achieving the main objective in the strategy of upward movement in the female, viz. marriage. The male role on the other hand is heavily loaded with occupational skills, which are either not portable or are portable only within one occupational hierarchy. Movement up the occupational hierarchy, however, does not depend only on the development of these skills, but may involve the acquisition of capital, or of a skill not intrinsic to the occupation or the male role itself, (i.e. skill in command, in the case of forestry workers). For understanding of this situation, further analysis of the structure of rural society is necessary.

An element of structure important for the understanding of this situation is the relation between the sexes in the working class. Dominance of the male and distance between the sexes are the outstanding characteristics of the relationship. In general, in our class system, the higher the class the less dominant the male and the less distance between the sexes. The distance between the sexes in the working class is very apparent, a distance which permits a wide divergence of culture between them. There is first of course the division of labour between them, but the clearest evidence is found in the sphere of recreation. Three associations draw their membership mainly from the working class, - the bowling club, the W.R.I., and the Church Guild.

The first is exclusively male, and the other two exclusively female. The other associations, a badminton club and a drama club, recruit from both lower middle class and working class, and both sexes of the lower middle class participate equally in them, but not both sexes of the working class. While dancing and courtship naturally require the participation of both sexes, the pattern for the married and for those past youth, when on visits to town on Saturday nights, is for the men to spend the evening in pubs, and women at the cinema or visiting relatives. In the lower middle class both sexes participate together in many recreations, for example, in addition to those mentioned, motoring and picture-going, and in the upper middle in most recreations, - bridge, dinner parties, travel, etc. In reading matter the same distance is found. The basic pattern for the working class is, that men read Westerns, thrillers, and technical magazines on farming, while women read romances and technical magazines on housekeeping. There are of course common daily and weekly papers, and sometimes magazines designed for both sexes, (Picture Post, S.M.T., etc.) are found in working class homes, often pass through magazine lending circuits starting in the middle class. Magazines and books read by both sexes increase the higher the class, though each sex still has its own technical magazines. An interesting example is car driving. In the working class it is rare to find a woman who drives; (i.e. in those families possessing a car); in the lower
middle class it is less rare, but female drivers are less skilled than male; most upper middle class females drive, and are as expert as the males. The distance between the sexes in the working class is aptly indicated in terms of reference used by husband and wife. He refers to her as "she", or "the wife", and she refers to him as "my man", or "the man", and sometimes "he". It is notable too, that working men often address a recalcitrant cow or ewe as "woman", just as they do when they give brusque or angry commands to their wives. This distance between the sexes is important for this analysis, since it permits the women to develop a distinct culture from the men, as I shall show later.

Males, of course, control the more valued activities in our societies, and in most classes the woman has to live wherever her husband's job takes him. However, within the working class, male dominance is exemplified in numerous details of social life. For example, husbands sometimes censure wives in front of children. Visitors in a working class house are usually offered the fireside chair the wife normally occupies, while the husband stays put in his. If other men are in the house, the wife must either remain silent or join in the men's conversation which always centres around male topics, particularly work, sport, politics, or personal history.

1. This feature of the class system under discussion, viz. greater distance between the sexes ,the lower the class, seems to be a feature of the class system in Yankee City, though Warner does not make it explicit. He writes,(Social Life of a modern Community, p.119.) "Sexual solidarities are very strong in the lower group."
In the middle class, male dominance in everyday life is less apparent, and in the upper middle deference is accorded the female by the male. He will stand aside to let her go through doorways first, will rise when she enters the room and give her his seat, and so on. Conversations can be initiated by women, about prices, babies, etc., (or about such topics as politics, economic conditions, etc., which in the other classes are 'male' topics), in which men join in, and women have a large say in many spheres of family life, particularly in the education of children.

A Household Ceremony.

The higher position of the wife in the middle class household vis-a-vis the husband is expressed in the ceremony surrounding meals, particularly tea, a meal at which all members of the family, in all classes, are usually present. There is a marked difference between the working class on the one hand and the two middle classes on the other, in the way behaviour is patterned during the meal, a difference which aptly expresses the difference in status of the wife in the two sorts of household.

In the upper middle class, where a whole family is present at tea, everyone sits down at the table together, including the housewife. At her side are the teapot, milk jug, sugar bowl, and all the cups. She knows the tastes of the members of her family, and hands each a complete cup of tea, milk, and sugar, ready for drinking. Each says "thank you" as she hands it to them.
Should a visitor be present, she asks him if he takes milk. If he does, she adds it to the tea she has poured into his cup, then asks him if he takes sugar, and adds it if he does. To her queries the visitor has to respond with "yes please", or "no thank you." During the course of the meal the wife keeps asking everyone if they would like another cup of tea. Also, during the course of the meal she has to keep offering everyone things to eat. It is considered bad manners for a visitor to help himself to any food on the table. Even if he wanted to, however, he would hardly get the opportunity to do so, for the wife is quick to invite him to eat something else as soon as he has finished some little morsel of food. Members of the family are also invited by the wife to eat; they do not have to wait for her to offer the food, but if they want some, they have to ask for it, adding "please", or saying, "pass me (something) please". The food itself is so arranged as to facilitate these operations of the wife, - bread is cut thin, often made into minute sandwiches; scones are small, and large cakes are put on the table uncut, so that if anyone wants a piece of cake, he or she can only have it after the housewife has specially cut a piece for him. All this ceremony emphasises the control the housewife has over food. One gets food by virtue of her kindness.

At the working class table, arrangements and behaviour are very different. Usually each person has an empty cup set beside his plate. The housewife walks round the table pouring
tea into these cups before she sits down. Sometimes she has the cups beside her, as in the middle class arrangement, and sends out a cup containing only tea to each person. Whatever the exact arrangement here, each person gets a cup containing only tea. Milk and sugar are in the centre of the table and each person simply reaches out his hand for them and adds them as he wishes to his cup. Food is in the centre of the table, too, and each person reaches out his hand and takes what he wants, without reference to the wife or anyone else. If some plate of food is beyond arm's reach, one takes one's knife and stabs the desired item on the plate and brings it onto one's own plate. A visitor is told to "help yourself" or "pit oot yer haun an' reach", and the wife never offers him anything until he shows signs of stopping eating altogether. The food is again arranged specifically to fit into this pattern of activity, — bread is cut thick, and is never made into sandwiches, scones are large, and cakes are put on the table already cut into pieces. If one wants more tea, one simply passes one's cup to the housewife, without using any words. Often, however, she rises and brings the teapot to one, as soon as she sees that one's cup is empty. In other words, the wife here has no control over the food, but instead performs a servant-like role during the meal.

Though they do not offer any interpretation of it, two American studies of social class note the phenomenon we have
described, that "There is considerably more ritual surrounding the behaviour of the immediate family in the middle class household than is found in the lower class." The context of this quotation makes clear that the authors are referring mainly to ritual during meals. WaIler, too, remarks, "These ritual elements surrounding the daily life within a household tend to increase in number and intensity of function with the height of the stratification of the family."

The dominance of the male implies that the woman's role has little prestige, compared with the man's. Since it carries little prestige, women can never gain as much esteem for efficient performance of it as the men can for theirs. This is indeed the case. Men consider the woman's role requires less skill than theirs, an evaluation which the women on the whole accept. How superior the male is held to be, is shown by the fact that a man who develops women's skills, (i.e. in housekeeping, or knitting) is disparagingly called a "Jessie" by both men and women, or a man who possesses the womanish trait of gossiping, will be contemptuously called a "sweetiewife" by both sexes. A woman who develops some male skill, on the other hand, such as herding, is admired for it.

3. There is one such woman in the parish.
Women are publicly proud of any outstanding accomplishment of their husbands, (e.g. breeding a prize-winning animal), while men do not exhibit publicly any pride in an outstanding achievement of their wives, (e.g. winning a baking competition). Moreover, the reputation a man can win in his occupational role, ranges farther than any woman can win in her role. Rivalry in reputation is institutionalised for the men in ploughing competitions and sheep dog trials, which operate up to a national level, while institutionalised rivalry for women, baking and sewing etc. competitions, draws contestants only from a parish or small locality. Men are constantly being judged as good or bad farmers, shepherds, etc., while women are less often and with less fine discrimination so judged. The range of judgement differs too, - for the men the whole Border area, for the women the local community. Men, in short, are heavily involved in an esteem system, while women, excluded from winning wide or great esteem, focus their interest on status. (Readers are referred to chapter IV for a more extensive account of men's interest in reputation.)

This different orientation is clearly reflected in the reading matters of the sexes. The men's stories, Westerns and thrillers, are all action and little social structure; the heroes perform super-efficiently, and that is all. Many of the women's stories on the other hand are all about social structure and how to deal with it. The favorite magazine of

---

for ref.1 see following page.
the women is "The People's Friend." The stories in it deal
mainly with marriage and kinship relations, and with social
class. For example, in the summer of 1951, the two serials
in it told, the one of how a working class girl married a
middle class man, and the other of how a working class mother
pushed several of her children into the middle class. Class
structure in these stories is taken for granted, and situations
are built around it.

More direct evidence of the women's interest in status and
of the importance of marriage in her status-gaining behaviour,
can occasionally be got, as in the statement of this workman's
wife: "I didn't want to marry a working man, (reason given and
positive expression of desire for a middle class man) . . . but
I got landed with (my baby). My cousin laughed at me when I
married, and said she would never marry a working man. But
I had the last laugh, for she got landed too, and had to marry
- and he's a(working man)."

Contrast this with the following statement of a working
man: "Most working men are content to be where they are, they
want more money, higher wages, of course, but they've no desire
to rise up. I'll tell you where the trouble starts, it's when
a working lassie marries a man higher than herself, then she's
not content, but wants to go on higher and higher."

f.n.1, p.318 The same difference in orientation is perhaps also
present in the American class system, though none of the writers
on it are fully explicit on the point. But West (op.cit.p.118)
remarks that girls become aware of class distinction at an earlier
age than boys. (Cf.our own experiment p.318 ). Warner & Lunt
(op.cit.p.89) remark that "Women were very conscious of class in
Yankee City". There seems no point to this remark unless they
were more conscious than men.
The different orientation is also reflected in the fact that publicly identified "social climbers" in Eskdalemuir are all women. By publicly identified I mean that a wide range of people felt it safe or permissible to label these women as "social climbers" to an outsider. (myself). I do not mean that the sexes exhibit exclusively different orientations, only that women value status more than men, and men value esteem more than women.

For an understanding of the different skills developed by men and women, another structural feature of rural society must be considered, that is, relations between members of the same sex but of different social classes. Here I am altering the conception of social class somewhat from the strictly anthropological to the Marxian, and lower and upper middle will be described simply as the middle class. This is justified in view of the fact that the majority of lower and upper middle class men in this parish are property owners, while the majority of working class men are not. Working class men and middle class men stand in relationship of opposition. The point has already been stressed in earlier chapters. On the other hand, there is nothing in the roles of the women of the two classes to bring them into opposition, and middle class women stand in relation of patronage to working class women. Working class men, through being organised in unions, are consciously united in opposition to middle class men, while the women are not.
The men are forced to reject the middle class, while the women are not.

The different relationships are apparent in many features of social life, but are seen most strikingly in the formal associations of the community (apart from church). Membership of these by class and sex is as follows:

Bowling Club (Men Only) - All working class men (except one farmer who rarely attends, and who significantly is the only farmer who uses his own family labour on the farm. He was, moreover, for several years a shepherd.)

Badminton Club (Men and Women) - Lower middle class couples, " " youths (both sexes) Working class wives (a few) " " girls. One working class school boy.

Dramatic Club (Men and Women) - (small and fluctuating membership) 3 - 4 working class women. 1 - 2 working class men (one an independent tradesman, one an employee on the farm of the leader of the club).

Women's Rural Institute (Women Only) - All three classes represented (mainly working and lower middle class)

Women's Church Guild (Women Only) - Working class and lower middle (occasionally a representative of upper middle).

The Brownies (Women Only) - (members and officers) - All three represented.

It is apparent that in these organisations for men only or for both sexes, where the middle class is represented, few or no working class men are members, while the presence of middle class persons in an organisation is no deterrent to working class
women. The patronage relationship of the women is illustrated by two of the "Women Only" associations, whose leaders are middle class. Several of the leaders think of themselves as "doing things for" the working class. Thus one Brownie leader thought that the Brownies had "done a lot for" children in the association, (and estimate on which there was general consensus in the community), all but one of whom are working class. Middle class women sometimes enter into non-reciprocal relations with working class women, e.g. lending or passing on clothes to them; or occasionally visiting them without asking or permitting them to return the visit.

The difference in relationships between the men of the two classes and the women of the two classes is reflected in many, (I am inclined to say all relevant) culture traits. In style of adornment and manners and speech, working class women resemble middle class women more than working class men resemble middle class men. Without photographs and recordings it is difficult to demonstrate this; but the interview material given below shows that this is also the judgement of middle class women. An interesting example in speech, however, is that many middle class men have two dialects - the middle class one which they use in the home and in speaking to persons of equal status, and the working class one, (or one resembling the working class one) which they use when speaking to working class men. A concrete example - a farmer used the following working class construction
in speaking to the men' - "that corn'll no be wet?" (an oblique command typical of farmer - employee relations - "make sure that corn isn't wet!") A few minutes later in his house he used the middle class construction "it won't be?" ... in speaking to his sons. Working class men do not modify their speech to suit middle class standards, but constrain many middle class men to modify theirs to suit them. This does not occur between the women of the two classes, for the difference between them in accent and vocabulary is not as great, the working class women permanently accommodating themselves to middle class standards.

In talking about social class, middle class women (especially lower middle class) stress the importance of manners. For the purpose in hand it is enough to accept the middle class standpoint that manners are ways of treating others which they themselves use, but which working class women do not use so much, and which working class men use hardly at all. To pick one's nose or to spit when in the presence of another is bad manners from a middle class point of view, and they never do it. Neither do working class women, but working class men do often. The same pattern holds for swearing, use of handkerchieves, and, particularly important, the use of the terms of address and reference "Mr." and "Mrs." These are important because as a result of the pattern described, "Mr." is a class symbol, while "Mrs." is not. Working class women use "Mrs." among themselves
when addressing or referring to appropriate persons (someone not intimately related to the speaker), and nearly always use it with reference to middle class women. These cultural differences are reflected in a feeling, working class men have, that middle class men are slightly effeminate, since their manners are like those of the women of both classes. That the distance between the sexes in the working class, and the very different relationship with members of the same sex in the middle class, result in the women being in a more favourable strategic position for upward mobility, is shown in the following material. I asked a middle class lady if she would attempt to control her daughter's choice when she reached courting age -

M.C.L.: "I should be diplomatic, but I should be sorry to see her make a hash of her choices."

J.L.: What do you consider a hash?"

M.C.L.: "If she formed an attachment with one of the cottagers, working lads, like X or Y, they're fine young men, but wouldn't make her happy. They haven't the background of culture and thought that she has . . . Probably for (my son) it's rather different, the (working class) girls here have greater refinement of manners and appearance than the boys. You've only to see them on the bus or changing at dances to see how nice and wholesome they are. So that I should consider."
Another middle class lady, extolling the virtues of a maid she had had . . . "she could go anywhere, but she'd need to learn of course. I would like to take her to London and show her things, for she's so appreciative. I told my nephew he should book her (for a wife). She was so clever at picking things up. It's curious how a girl will take polish while a man won't." She went on to compare the girl with her brother, who was "gauche and crude", to illustrate her last point.

Significant, too, is the case of an upper middle class woman from another district, but connected by kinship ties to this community, who, wishing to see her son married and settled down, chose a wife for him from among the working class girls in the district.

Association with middle class women is probably one situation where working class women learn the status-gaining skills, the cultural habits of the middle class, which distinguish them from the working class men. Reading a woman's magazine is probably another. However, in so far as education in the broadest sense is a preparation of the child for the adult role, working class female children are certainly educated somehow in these status-gaining skills. Their manners, like those of the women, are similar to middle class manners, whereas the manners of the boys are the same as those of working class men. The treatment accorded boys and girls by their elders differs significantly, in ways consistent with the structure of
relationships described here. Boys are treated with joking aggressiveness by the men - their achievements, performance, property, are belittled in a blunt but joking way. The boys are expected to, and usually do respond by an aggressive defence of themselves. The men, e.g., delight in pretending to censure a boy for swearing, and laugh loudly when he responds by further swearing. This treatment continues up to the age of about fifteen, when the boys start working. By this treatment they are being told they have yet to make the grade as skilled, tough males. Girls are rarely treated like this by either men or women. They are either ignored or treated in a kindly, sometimes sentimental, manner. The girls are slowly inducted into the adult female activities, and by the age of fifteen are supposed to be able to do all the household jobs. By then too, they have developed some skill in the art of adornment and attracting the other sex, and are ready to begin courting.

The difference in orientation between the sexes is seen, too, in the occupation preference of schoolchildren. (The figures again are not very convincing. Children leave school (the local school) at twelve years, and the infants cannot answer to questionnaires). Of ten girls who answered my question, eight wanted occupations which provided a gain in status, (the two occupations preferred were teaching and nursing), while of eight boys who answered, only one preferred an occupation which provided a definite status gain, (the occupation he preferred was to be a fighter pilot - probably attractive more because of the
esteem to be won than of status to be gained). The others wanted either agricultural work or trades such as motor mechanic.

A question arises from this analysis - women in Scottish rural communities seem to derive few gratifications from the social system; what is there "in it" for them?

That women are dissatisfied with their place in the system is shown by the direction in which it is changing. The dominance of the male is being successfully challenged by the female, and the distance between the sexes is narrowing. For example, young wives often now refuse to live in outbye places, (i.e. cottages situated a mile or more from the main road), and sometimes will not permit their husbands to take employment which involves living in such places: some will not permit their husbands to take employment which involves living in cottages without electric light and hot water systems.

Amongst those above the age of about forty, male and female tasks are sharply separated - the woman has the duty of milking the cow and feeding the chickens for example, and the male never performs these tasks. Below that age, however, these duties are not specifically allotted to either sex, but may be performed by either. (Some of the younger women refuse to milk on the ground that it is a dirty job). An elderly energetic lady describes the symptoms thus: "Wives don't do as much as they used to - milking and helping in the garden and that. They stand in the garden with arms folded and tell their husbands what to do. I can't thole them. It's all leisure and
pleasure nowadays." The term "challenge" is perhaps too strong, for some of the younger husbands also promote this change. One such man, who helps his wife with milking and some of the housework, described an elderly male relative's relationship with his wife thus: "He's one of the old type - you know - you do your work and I'll do mine, and that's that." This young husband agreed with his wife in the ensuing discussion that his elderly relative could well do more about the house than he does.

These last few paragraphs have perhaps been something in the nature of a digression, though we shall pick up the theme again in the next chapter. Our aim in this section was to show how the sexes were related in different ways to the class system, illustrating this by first the different responsibilities of husband and wife with regard to social mobility, and second by different social mobility rates for the two sexes. It may be noted here that even though our figures on this are inadequate, and should more rigorous statistical enquiry show, that sex rates of mobility do not differ, or are the reverse of what is the case in Eskdalemuir, our observations on the different cultures, attitudes and orientations of the sexes would still stand.
CHAPTER VIII
THE PARISH AND THE TOWN

In the preceding chapters we have analysed the internal structure of the parish. In the first two chapters we described the history of the parish, characterised by the gradual absorption of the parish into the wider structure of which it is a part. One aspect of this gradual absorption we saw was that contact between parishioners and nearby towns had increased. In this last chapter we shall examine the relationship between the country parish and the town in the light of our knowledge of the social structure of the parish.

In an earlier chapter it was shown how the parish had lost its unity and self sufficiency, and how both economically and socially it has become more dependent on nearby towns. The dominance of the town characterises the relationship between it and the rural parish. This chapter is devoted to an analysis of this relationship. The dominance of the town is most dramatically expressed in the phenomenon of "rural depopulation" - the rejection of the countryside as a place to live in, by people previously resident in it, in favour of some town. Since the amount of migration from any one parish to a town over the course of even a decade is not enough to provide material for generalisation, the problem cannot be treated directly from the data gathered in the course of field work in Eskdalemuir. Consequently statistical data referring to larger
populations than exist in Eskdalemuir are used below. Moreover rural depopulation is only one expression of the dominance of the town over the countryside, and in this chapter other expressions of it are dealt with. The analysis of these other expressions provides conclusions applicable to depopulation itself.

The figures on depopulation in Eskdalemuir are –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Registrar General for Scotland notes in his report for 1951 – "The population resident in rural areas in Scotland was 1,150,252 in 1901, or 25.7 per cent of the population of Scotland at that time. In 1951 it had fallen, notwithstanding the increase in the Scottish population in the meantime, to 869,157 or 17.1 per cent of the total population of the country." Migration from rural areas to industrial areas has been a feature of the national

social life for over a century now, and its original causes are obviously bound up with the growth and development of industry. However it seems to me that the dominance of the town can no longer be explained on an entirely economic basis. The reason for this view will become clear from the data presented below.

**Attitude of townsman to countryman.**

The dominance of the town is expressed not only by a movement of population from the countryside to towns, but also in the distinction made between townsmen and countrymen and in the attitude of mingled pity and derision which the former adopt towards the latter. The stereotype of the countryman in our society is summed up in the term "yokel", a term applied only to him. The dictionary definition of it is "Yokel. 1812. (origin obsc.) A countryman, rustic; a country bumpkin". The term yokel as the last phrase in the definition implies is a somewhat derogatory one, and evokes an image of a dull witted, inarticulate, slow moving creature. This is the picture the townspeople of Langholm and Lockerbie have of the inhabitants of Eskdalemuir - not that these townspeople know the parish and its inhabitants very well, for it is surprising how many in the towns have never been in Eskdalemuir. This in itself is an indication of the relationship between the two towns and the parish, for there are no parishioners (I could discover) who do not visit the towns fairly regularly. However the picture townspeople have of a parishioners was aptly summed up by/Langholm man as follows

"We (of Langholm) think they (of Eskdalemuir) are all sort of daft - I don't mean mental - but just, well, they don't know how to behave properly.

These are expressions of an attitude which has been noted by many other observers. Thus T. Burns writes, "Urban living has enjoyed greater prestige, since most of the values of contemporary society have been created by urban communities". Similarly, H. P. White observes, "Finally it must be faced that agriculture has a somewhat low status in the country as a whole. The legend of the straw chewing yokel and the 'what is good enough for father' attitude of farmers dies hard in the townsman's mind." We shall show later that this observation of White's is not quite accurate, nevertheless it is true for the majority of the population. It may be noted that the townsman's attitude described seems to arise in any society which has reached a high stage of urbanisation. Thus Nadel writes of the Nupe of West Africa "...the commoner of the town, the people of no name and title, rank higher than the people outside the capital, with their petty village titles and affairs. The citizens of Bida look down upon 'the heathen' in the village, ridiculing their habits and character, their fashions and the way they talk, their lack of education and 'urbanity'."

Other evidence will be given below showing that this attitude towards countrymen is widespread among townsmen. For the moment the point I wish to stress is that country people are aware of these judgements, and are forced to deal with them. That is, they are forced to deal with the knowledge that a majority thinks of them as somewhat inferior to themselves. They are perfectly sophisticated about it, as the following conversations show.

It would in fact be strange if they were not sophisticated about it since articles in the press discussing the rival merits of life in the town and in the country are by no means uncommon. These discussions usually present the matter as an issue - "is it better to live in the country or the town", on which a person must come to a decision. The Eskdalemuir Women's Rural Institute held a debate on this very subject a few years ago, voted 50-50 on it, and all went home to bed.

Here are examples of countrypeople talking about townsmen's attitude to them. A shepherd says of townsmen "People think we're mugs, yokels, we country workers, but we're not." He told how a transport driver passing through that morning had told him he was a mug to stay in a place like Eskdalemuir and work at herding, and the long argument they had had. A ploughman talks of the shop-keepers of Lockerbie - "They're guid to country folk, they'll gie us things under the counter the Lockerbie folks can't get. (He laughs ironically.) They think we've such a hard time of it up in Eskdalemuir we deserve a guid turn now and then." An ex-serviceman tells how he arrived in London for the first time and
was persuaded to buy articles and services he didn't want - "They saw I was a mug straight away. I was green, fresh from the country. Even in wee places like Langholm and Moffat," he added, "they know you're from the country - maybe it's the bronzed complexion or something (said ironically), and as soon as they see you they start talking about the crops or something." A young couple early in my fieldwork asked me how I liked the country. The wife remarked that I would find the country strange and would probably dislike it. I said I'd found it interesting so far. The husband sat up in his chair with a pleased smile and said there was always something interesting to see in the country if you cared to look for it. "The trouble with most townspeople is they are'ny interested in us, so we are'ny interested in them, so when they come here they never find out anything interesting and get bored." He went on to say how much he resented "people" being interested in "the country" at the present moment only because food was short, whereas before the war "the country was neglected".

Their sophistication is also displayed in the following incident. An Indian pedlar came round the parish selling linen articles. Shortly after I was speaking to a young working class housewife, who asked had I bought anything from the pedlar? I said no and she said she hadn't either. I said his prices were too high for me. She said his prices were too high for her too and added with energy and aggression "They're all the same these pedlars, they just think we country people don't know what the right prices are". Shortly after this I learned from one of
the housewife's relatives that she (the housewife) had bought over two pounds worth of goods from the pedlar. In other words, all the time she had been speaking to me she had simply been trying to destroy a conception of herself which she feared I (a townsman) might have of her - a conception of herself as one ignorant of the right price of linen goods, a country person.

**Townsman's reasons for his attitude.**

The reason the townsman gives for his attitude is that country people are "mugs", or at least unfortunate, because they have to live in the countryside, and the countryside (especially Eskdalemuir) is "isolated", "wild" or "uncivilised". The tradesmen from the towns were constantly asking me how I could bear to live in the place. For example "I don't know how you can stick it up here. There's no life up here. You hardly see a soul" (a butcher). A tradesman in town says "I don't know how they manage to live up there - but it's no a living, only an existence. They never see anybody from one day to another, except their neighbours". Another "It's an uncivilised place. There's nothing to do, and hardly a soul in the place". An elderly lady, a parishioner, tells how when town friends of hers visit her they say "What do you do up here? How can you bear it? You never see anybody hardly. There's no picture house, no nothing". To be "isolated" means not to be able to associate with other people in large numbers, in cinemas, pubs and streets. Without such association one cannot be "alive". This is the townsman's view.
We have already seen that countrymen are aware of the towns-
men's attitude to them. Whether the distinction between the two
can be called a status difference is open to question, but
certainly the attitude of the townsman is that the countryman is
inferior to himself, that his conditions of life are inferior to
his own. Not only are countrymen aware of this attitude, however,
but they accept the low evaluation of "isolation" on which the
townsman's attitude is based.

Rural Social Structure and the town.

Before going on to show this, more precision must be intro-
duced into the analysis by relating the material presented above
to our analysis of the social structure of the parish. So far
in this chapter we have talked of "countrymen" or parishioners" as if they were an undifferentiated population, which is not the
case. Migration from country to town is confined almost solely
to the working class. Thus the Social Survey, in its examination
of depopulation in the Solway Counties (an area which includes
Eskdalemuir), remarks "Within agriculture, farmers, bailiffs and
foremen showed the smallest proportion of potential migrants (4%)

1. This acceptance of townsmen's valuations by countrymen has
been noted by other writers. T. Burns (op.cit., p.40) writes
"Also the intrusion of urban values, codes and symbols into
rural life has made the countryman familiar with them".
Perhaps this is partly what is meant by a statement of
T. Mitchell's that "where social disintegration (in rural
communities) has reached an advanced stage, it is usually
found to be a function of the penetration of an urban culture
pattern", in "Depopulation and Rural Social Structure".
S.R. 1950.
of all occupations".  

In Eskdalemuir, the few examples of actual transfer of residence from the parish to the town which occurred while field-work was in progress, three in all, were all working class people. Moreover, siblings of country born residents in the parish who have migrated permanently to towns are all of the working class. It was mentioned earlier that the unmarried girls of the parish all became mill workers after the war. In 1953 they all stopped travelling daily to and from Langholm and lived in lodgings in the town. (Whether this is a permanent move or not cannot, of course, be said.)

It might be said that rural depopulation is bound to be almost exclusively a working class phenomenon simply because there are so many more of them than of any other class. However, not only is depopulation a trend characteristic of the working class, but the opposite trend is apparent in the upper middle class. In Eskdalemuir and in every adjoining parish are two or three upper middle class farmers who have recently taken up residence (and work) in the country rather than the town by an act of choice. Thus in Eskdalemuir, since the war, two ex-colonial civil servants and a shipowner have bought farms and settled on them; in Westerkirk a stockbroker and an ex-chartered accountant; in Hutton a member of a whiskey distilling firm and an ex-navy commander. That this trend is not confined to Eskdalemuir and

---

district is confirmed by a banker and an agent of a fodder supply company. (What exactly the position of the lower middle class is I was unable to determine, through lack of enough cases to generalise from. It seems however that their numbers in the countryside are shrinking through owners of large farms buying small farms.)

Similarly the disparaging attitude to countrymen and the countryside is characteristic only of the town working class. The middle class in town indeed often expressed envy of the independence and open air life of the farmer. The middle class in Eskdalemuir do not feel called upon to defend themselves against a charge of being mugs, presumably because such a charge is never made against them. Nor do they feel obliged to defend themselves against the judgement that they live in an isolated place; for in fact, as was shown on page 267-70 they do not. To them Eskdalemuir is not an isolated place because they have no difficulty in getting away from it. In short the rejection of the countryside as an habitat is exclusively a working class characteristic. One or two of the working men indeed are somewhat resentful that middle class persons regard rural depopulation as a "problem" (i.e. as something that should be stopped), pointing out that "it's all right to say the country's a great place if you own a farm, but it's not so much fun if you don't. If people don't want to live in the country it's nobody's business but their own."
Working class countrymen and "isolation".

We have now to show that working class countrymen accept the same values on which the derogatory attitude of the town working class to countrymen is based. This is seen in parishioners' evaluation of the location of dwelling houses in the parish.

This evaluation hinges on a distinction between habitations from which association with other people is easy and those from which it is not. The meaning of two terms used in verbalising this distinction must first be explored, "in-bye" and "out-bye". The terms are used in the first place to distinguish two types of land, in-bye land being the fields and out-bye the hill grazing land. The terms are used in a relative sense according to the unit of land being referred to. Thus the two types are distinguished on a single farm. Similarly an arable farm on the plains of Dumfriesshire will be distinguished as a whole, from a hillsheep farm in Eskdalemuir as a whole, by being called an in-bye farm as opposed to the Eskdalemuir out-bye farm. Similarly the whole upland parish of Eskdalemuir is contrasted with a lowland parish in the same terms.

The primary meaning is extended to things associated with the two types of land, principally stock and habitations. Several farmers pasture a small flock of sheep on their fields; these are called "in-bye" sheep and are kept strictly separate from the hill sheep. When applied to dwellings, the terms not only distinguish but also evaluate, and to call a cottage "out-bye" is to pass a depreciatory judgement on it.

Let me attempt to sketch some of the associations the terms
have for the inhabitants of the upland parish (see photos p.333). The one land consists of fields lying at the side of the road, or visible from the road. The fields are worked upon by men, are protected by hedges, dykes, woods. They are more productive than the hills. In-by sheep are always bigger, heavier, more valuable animals than the hill sheep, which are often brought down from the hills and grazed in the fields for a day or two before being despatched to market, in order to acquire healthy bloom. In a snowstorm the field sheep rarely require protection, unlike the hill sheep. Casualties are expected among the hill sheep, but not among the field sheep. Finally, the hills are bare and treeless, can be dangerous in winter; an out-bye cottage is sometimes cut off from the rest of the world for a few days by flood or snowstorm. Yet a cottage need not be situated in the hills for it to be condemned as out-bye.

An out-bye dwelling is any one which for whatever reason is "isolated", one from which it is difficult to contact other people. Farmhouses occupied by farmers are never called out-bye, though farmhouses occupied by shepherds are. Farmers all have cars and telephones, herds don't. Hence farmers can always easily make contact with others. The terms as used in referring to habitations within the parish are applied only to cottages and farmhouses occupied by working class persons.

We have still to provide evidence that "out-bye" as applied to a cottage is a condemnation of it. The tone of voice in
In-bye and Out-bye Cottages
which it is uttered is enough to make the hearer realise it. However verbal judgements on outlying cottages are often made by roadside dwellers which indicate their attitude. For example I remarked to a shepherd's wife one day that I was going to visit a cottage four miles away in the hills, and two from its nearest neighbour. She replied in a horrified tone that she wouldn't live there "for anything". Several natives of the parish have never been out to this particular cottage. Walking the hill one day with a herd, we saw in the distance another out-byre cottage; "how wid ye like tae be stuck oot there a' yer bloody life", he asked grimly. On a car tour of the Borders with an elderly herd once, he pointed to a desolate glen and, saying that there was a cottage at the head of it, added "ye'd have tae be born in it tae be able tae live in a place like that".

An event which occurred in the summer of 1951 and which aroused more comment than any other that summer illustrates the common attitude to these cottages. A family which had lived fairly near the road moved to a cottage four miles from it, following on the chief wage earner changing his job. It consisted of a father, two sons and a daughter, all adult.

I visit the family before they move, in the house they have occupied for thirty years. I remark to the father it will be a break for him to leave. He is embarrassed, and explains at length that he is sorry to be leaving a farm he has served for
so long; he looks down, wags his head from side to side, keeps passing his hand over his hair, hides his eyes by putting his hand on his brow. I ask the daughter (alone) if she is sorry to be leaving. She almost bursts into tears, sobs that "it can't be helped" and says of the cottage they are going to "Och well, it's a hoose anyway....and ye mak it how ye like". Both stress that since one of the sons has a car they won't be "far away" anyway.

The daughter's reply was at odds with the public face she was wearing about the matter. A thirty year old female roadside dweller said to me "it's awful them goin' away out there. But (the daughter) said she wisney carin', they were askin' her aboot it in the hall the other night and she said she was lookin' forward to it". The speaker added that she couldn't understand why they were going "because they could have got a place nearer the road if they'd wanted".

Other parishioners' comments on it:

A seventy year old woman - "...a bad move that. And they could have got a place nearer the road if they'd wanted."

A young tractor driver - "Aye, it's a bit fer oot. It isney a great place tae gang to."

A thirty year old shepherd - "A bad move that. You'd have thought they'd want nearer the road." His wife made similar remarks.

A fifty-five year old woman - "Isn't it terrible? Ah wouldney like to live there." Two of these comments came from relatives of the family concerned. All occurred in informal talk.
It is clear from the account of the family moving that out-bye dwellers are aware of the judgement passed on their dwelling by the others and feel obliged sometimes to defend themselves from it. The same girl on the occasion of my asking her about the move, remarked angrily "they say Moodlaw's an oot-bye place but it's no". People are identified (in this context) with their dwelling, and accordingly a distinction is felt to exist between in-bye dwellers and out-bye dwellers. For example the housekeeper at a cottage three miles from the road telling me about "the people doon there" (by the roadside) says "Ye've got to watch your sel doon there, there's three or four o' them run the place an' if ye get on the wrong side o' them ye're feenished". An out-bye herd says "when ye go doon intae Esdilmair (his cottage is in the parish) you'd think ye came from a foreign country the way people treat ye, 'how're ye gettin' on up there' they say, ye just aboot need a passport". When mimicking the people asking he screwed up his face and nodded his head and used a patronising tone of voice. The distinction is expressed by in-bye dwellers in ways which make it clear that they think of themselves as being in some sense superior to out-bye dwellers - they not only are deprived of the right to communicate with others, it is said, but also in time they lose the ability for it. They become "backward", i.e. are unable to interact readily.

For example a herd, discussing the matter, says "....in the
past an' even up tae just afore the war people lived in they oot-bye places cos they kent no better. They never saw naebody. Afore the war when ye went tae visit them or went near some o' the oot-bye places ye never saw the kids. They a' hid when they saw ye comin'. Ye saw them keekin' oot ahint the curtains or somewhere. They grew up shy and backward." A doctor, a friend and myself are driving towards an out-bye cottage the doctor has to visit. There are two middle aged spinster sisters and a brother in it who have lived there many years. The doctor, new to the district, remarks that the sisters regard him with suspicion and the suspects they do not follow his instructions. The parishioner then explains that "people who have lived in an out of the way place as long as they have become queer, they get queer ideas, and they don't know how to treat people".

This low evaluation of isolation is not simply a matter of talk. The following table, listing all but two shepherds' cottages, shows the distance of each cottage from the road and the number of times it has been vacated between 1940 and 1950. While one or two out-bye cottages have not been vacated at all during this period, it is clear that they are more often vacated than the others.

1. The Dept. of Agriculture for Scotland calculate that the average length of service in the same job is just over six years for shepherds, so more than one rejection of a cottage in ten years can be taken as a sign of dissatisfaction with it. See Farm Economics No. 21, Spring 1951.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage</th>
<th>Distance from Road</th>
<th>No. of Times Vacated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lanshawburn</td>
<td>4 miles</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raeburnhead</td>
<td>3 1/2 &quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pengrane</td>
<td>3 &quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiddom</td>
<td>2 1/2-3 &quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickside</td>
<td>2 1/2-3 &quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberlosh</td>
<td>2 1/4 &quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garwaldbank</td>
<td>2 &quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midraeburn 1.</td>
<td>1 1/2-2 &quot;</td>
<td>3 (cottage vac-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and 3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midraeburn 2.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pockleaves</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkinshaw</td>
<td>1 1/2 &quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodlaw (farmhouse)</td>
<td>1 1/2 &quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerkhill Grain</td>
<td>1-1 1/2 &quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raeburnfoot</td>
<td>1/2 &quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Fedling</td>
<td>1/2 &quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanlawhill</td>
<td>1/2 &quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside</td>
<td>Not known.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foulbog</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fingland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davington Cottage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston Cottage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raenelburn Cottage 1.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burncleugh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It may be added here that these out-byre cottages are in as good condition as the in-byre ones. This is stressed because several writers on rural depopulation assert that bad housing is a major cause of it. Our thesis implies that bad housing has little or nothing to do with it.

Two points must be made clear here. First that in-byre and out-byre are relative terms, and not absolute discriminations. Thus the majority of people living in cottages at the roadside in Eskdalemuir think of themselves as in-byre dwellers in relation to parishioners living in cottages some distance from the main road. The people of Lockerbie on the other hand think of everyone in Eskdalemuir as an out-byre dweller (though they do not always use that term). Thus whether a dwelling is thought of as isolated or not depends on the relation of the thinker to it. To a townsman of the working class all dwellings in Eskdalemuir are isolated. To an inhabitant of Eskdalemuir the roadside cottages are not isolated but the others are. Those who at any time dwell in the out-byre cottages either deny that they are out-byre or, as with two shepherds I knew, simply say that they prefer to live somewhat isolated from other people.


2. This same scale of discriminations seems to be implicit in Owen's description of the island of Lewis, where the town of Lochmaddy has higher prestige than the crofting township, but mainland towns have higher prestige than Lochmaddy.
The second point is that this low evaluation of out-bye cottages is a fairly recent phenomenon in the country.

1. Our conclusion, that outbye cottages are devalued, seems to conflict with the findings of a recent study of rural depopulation undertaken by the Social Survey, and directed by Dr. Hutchinson. Indeed we have dealt with the matter at such length because of the apparent discrepancy. The Survey, believing that dissatisfaction with housing was one of the main causes of rural depopulation, asked 2,801 informants in the area of the Solway Counties (an area which included Eskdalemuir) whether their houses were conveniently situated. The survey itself classified cottages (as shown in the table) as isolated or not, according to unspecified criteria of its own. The results of the questions are as shown in the table.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Convenient No.</th>
<th>Inconvenient No.</th>
<th>Inconvenient in some ways No.</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burgh</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>912 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>830 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouped</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>363 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>696 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hutchison notes that the proportion thinking that their houses were located conveniently decreased consistently from 93% of those living in Burghs, to 89% in villages, 82% in grouped houses, and 80% in isolated houses; but adds that "too much emphasis should not be placed upon the inconvenient location of rural housing", since "three fifths of the most isolated were convenient". It may seem from this that I have been over-emphasising the low evaluation of outbye cottages by the people of Eskdalemuir. The apparent discrepancy however is due mainly to different questions being asked. I am not concerned with knowing how many people find the location of their own dwellings convenient as far as their own activities are concerned, but showing that isolated dwellings are negatively valued, and that what is considered an isolated dwelling depends on the position of one's own dwelling compared to others. We have already noted the relativity of the term "outbye".
Informants, talking about the situation, stress that up to about a generation ago, out-bye cottages were more highly valued than the others, and were often occupied by one herding family for generations, son succeeding father in them. e.g., A female parishioner: "In the old days the shepherds said they preferred the isolated cottages, for then they didn't have any work around the steading. They were their own masters." A farmer: "At one time shepherds stayed a lifetime in out-bye places. But not now - just the change in people's way of living. They were happy to be there, they were their own boss." The young herd quoted on backwardness... "they grew up shy and backward. So the sons didn't know anything else and just followed in their fathers' footsteps."

Other instances of isolation being rejected.

So far it has been established that townsmen (of the working class) regard Eskdalemuir with horror, as an isolated place, and the people in it (of the working class) as unfortunate for having to live there; and that countrymen themselves express a horror of isolation. Now isolation means not being able to associate with other people, and its causes may be various. So far we have considered only one cause of it, a geographical one. But it can be due to other causes, for example to long working hours. In this section other instances of country persons in a position of relative isolation will be examined, and again it will be apparent that these positions are being rejected.
Amongst the occupations (for men) in the country, the most heavily rejected is that of herding. For example, two of the double hirstles lack their full complement of herds, that is there is only one herd on each of these instead of two. Moreover they have been tended by one herd for some years, so that in both cases the farmer has given up trying to get a second herd for them. The age structure of the herding population in the parish also indicates that the occupation is being rejected, there being very few under 25, none under 20 and many in the older age grades. The figures are -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No. of Shepherds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-54</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Herdng is a hereditary craft in the sense that only herds' sons become herds. Consequently if there has been a fall in the recruitment of them, it must be because herds' sons prefer
other jobs. This is the case in the parish. Of the five sons of shepherds between 15 and 25 in the parish, only one is a herd, three being horsemen and one a joiner. These meagre figures carry little conviction as a picture of a general movement, but the following table of percentages of agricultural workers of different ages in Scotland as a whole, indicates that of all the occupations connected with farming, herding is being more rejected than any other, there being fewer young men in it than in any other occupation.

TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Herds %</th>
<th>Grieves %</th>
<th>Stockmen %</th>
<th>Tractor-men %</th>
<th>Horse-men %</th>
<th>General Agric. Workers %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage unrecorded</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, as evidence of this move away from herding, there is the testimony of farmers and herds themselves, and of official

1. These figures were given me by courtesy of Mr. H.J. Shemilt, of the Dept. of Agriculture for Scotland. They have not as yet been published.
reports on the subject. Herds often remark that their craft seems to be dying out. One remarked at a lamb sale to me "Do you notice nearly every herd here is over 35? It's the same at all the sales." Farmers too bemoan the difficulty of finding herds these days, and in morose moments envisage the sheepfarms having to be abandoned in a generation or two, for lack of them. Finally there are official reports, from one of which only I shall quote, the Committee on the Development of the Scottish Borders..."Labour shortage (in farming) is worst however on upland and hill farms, among stockmen, and especially among shepherds".

The case of shepherds is important for our argument. Rural depopulation is a rejection of the status of working class countrymen. Any satisfactory explanation of it must also explain why the position of shepherd is more heavily rejected than any other within this category. An explanation of rural depopulation that is frequently put forward is that it is due to the low wages paid the country worker in comparison with the town worker. This explanation is hardly convincing in view of the fact that the shepherd is the most highly paid of all the agricultural workers. The regular cash wages of agricultural workers varies a little from district to district, but the proportionate wage of any one class of worker relative to the

1. Unpublished. I was given access to it by courtesy of Mr. T. Burns, one of the committee members. The reference is on page 5.
others does not vary much. The official minimum wages over most of the Borders are -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>15-16</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>17-18</th>
<th>18-19</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male worker (general worker)</td>
<td>46/3</td>
<td>54/-</td>
<td>62/3</td>
<td>75/-</td>
<td>91/9</td>
<td>108/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsemen, tractor-men, stockmen</td>
<td>50/3</td>
<td>61/3</td>
<td>70/3</td>
<td>83/6</td>
<td>100/3</td>
<td>117/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherds</td>
<td>51/3</td>
<td>62/3</td>
<td>71/3</td>
<td>85/6</td>
<td>102/6</td>
<td>120/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shepherds have less opportunity than the others to earn overtime pay through their hours of work not being officially delimited. Perhaps then their actual earnings are less than those of the others? The Department of Agriculture for Scotland, using records of 2,242 farms, comes to the conclusion that this is not the case. Taking all benefits and bonuses into account, the shepherd's total weekly earnings averaged (in 1951) £6.2.9d. for all herds aged 21 to 65 in Scotland, "which was higher than for any other class of workers apart from grieves". I have never heard shepherds complaining that their wages were not just in comparison with those of other farm workers.

What shepherds do complain of is that from the nature of their job they can rarely get away from the farm. The daily working hours of the other agricultural workers are specified for various periods of the year, but not the shepherds. For the district which includes Eskdalemuir, hours are laid down as follows -

(Extract from Clause 6.)

1.28. **Hours.**

1. Worker, (except as specified at (11) below:—

**Period of Year.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working hours per week.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From midnight on the last Sunday in January to midnight on the last Sunday in October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From midnight on the last Sunday in October....etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Worker employed Wholly or Mainly in one of the following classes:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in Horsemen and Horsewomen - as at (1) above with/addition not more than 7 hours per week for necessary garage work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stockmen - etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherds:- <strong>Customary hours tending sheep and grazing stock.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other words no hours are laid down for the herd, nor by the nature of his work could they be. It is about this that shepherds do complain, or rather when discussing the advantages and disadvantages of their job, it is always this that is stressed as the major drawback to it. For example a young herd, discussing rural depopulation, said that many people preferred jobs in towns because in them "you have definite leisure hours, especially a free week end you can count on having". This was said at ten o'clock at night, while the two of us were gathering in sheep from the hill preparatory to a sorting the following morning. "Look at me", he added, "I'm still at work at ten o'clock". A herd I met one Sunday evening doing his hill round similarly mentioned the lack of specificity of working hours
before wages as a ground for dissatisfaction. "The herd's tied to his work", he said, "even work on Sundays just now. That puts a lot off. I've a brither in a steelworks used to be a herd. He says he's better off now, gets his weekends free, and bigger wages too though he doesn't make out any better than me." Farmers give the same reason for the shortage of herds; one of them added "I don't blame them. I don't think anyone wants to be tied at the weekends."

In other words the shepherd is less able than other agricultural workers to get away from his work and engage in activities and associations of his own choice. He has less freedom to associate with whom he pleases. This is already implicit in some of the quotations given, and is explicit in the following words of a herd, given in the course of an interview on how one learns to be a herd. After describing how he helped his father at lambing, he went on to say that no boys he knew, at school or over school leaving age, were learning the craft now. Asked why, he replied that "you can get into town more easily now....in my young days (he is 36) a visit to town was an occasion. Of course it's worse for herds than for ploughmen, for we work seven days a week and they don't. Of course we have our slack times but we're rarely free (his emphasis). What happens now is a herd goes to town once in a while, meets pals who have leisure at week ends and the same wage or mebbe more, and he knows they have leisure every week end."

Now there is a movement in Eskdalemuir from one occupation
to another which confirms this interpretation, a movement of men from other agricultural work into forestry labouring. Thus two G.A.W.s were formerly herds, and seven forestry labourers were formerly herds or ploughmen. There is no movement back from forestry into agriculture.

The significance of this movement for the theme of this chapter is that in it there is a progressive decrease in wages from herd to forestry labourer, but a progressive increase in calculable leisure time. The decrease in wages is shown on the table on page 347. Forestry labourers are paid at the same rate as "General Workers", the lowest agricultural rate.

There is another structural element in this situation which adds weight to the interpretation given, that is that wives are much more critical of the isolation of Eskdalemuir than the husbands are, and that husbands often say that while they themselves are content to live in the parish "it's harder on the wife, because she is tied to the house all day and never sees anybody", while the husband associates with others often in the course of his work. Indeed farmers say now that when they interview applicants for a job, it's the applicant's wife who really decides whether or not the man will take the new job, after having been given information about the location of the cottage the new job would entail. For example a farmer describes how he went to Prestwick (on the Ayrshire coast, 80 miles away) to interview a man he wanted to hire as ploughman. "It was all right while I spoke to him, and he seemed quite
willing to take the job. Then his two daughters came in - he was a widower - and asked how far the cottage was from the nearest town, and what the bus services were like and so on and when I told them they flatly refused to come. So of course he couldn't either." Another farmer "It was my ploughman's wife that persuaded him to leave me. She said the place was too outbye". Most farmers can tell of similar experiences. That it is harder on the wife is seen from the fact that a wife sometimes complains that her own cottage is "outbye" when the husband doesn't. For example, there is the case with the two couples dwelling in the two roadside cottages at Nether Cassock. Finally the majority of herds in cottages in the hills are actually batchelors, the housekeeping being done by a widowed mother, a sister or a paid housekeeper. Farmers say it is difficult to get married herds to take jobs which entail living in these lonely dwellings.

One other recent event in the parish confirms our interpretation - the alacrity with which the girls employed as maidservants abandoned the job for work in the Langholm mills as soon as the opportunity arose. For the maidservant then was in the position of not having calculable leisure hours, whereas the mill girls' work stops every day at six o'clock. It is in fact this feature of the work which the girls stress when explaining why they changed so quickly. As one tersely put it, as a mill girl "ye ken when ye're finished".
Locality and Association.

The hypothesis put forward in this chapter is that working class countrymen have accepted the working class townsman's low evaluation of isolation, and that what is meant by isolation is being limited in one's choice of associating with other people. Limitation upon one's choice may be due to the geographical position of one's dwelling, lack of leisure time, being confined to one's house, and perhaps to other circumstances not represented in Eskdalemuir. Now by their geographical position all parishioners are more limited in their choice of association than are townsman. That the majority accept the evaluation of townsman to some degree is seen in their preference for Lockerbie rather than Langholm.

Despite the fact that commercial ties between parishioners and Langholm are more numerous than with Lockerbie (see table of tradesmen's visits, p.31), parishioners prefer to visit the latter. Now the difference between the two towns is simply that the latter is more "townlike" than Langholm. To say this is hardly illuminating, but I shall try and isolate the difference between the two, which difference will indicate what I mean by "townlike".

It is sometimes said that country people migrate to towns, or value towns because of the opportunities for entertainment
in them. Yet there is no form of entertainment in Lockerbie which cannot be found in Langholm. There is a cinema in both places, a dance hall in both, public houses and cafes in both. But there is this difference - that the area of choice is greater in Lockerbie, and this town has a more modern facade and copes with a greater number of people. Lockerbie is in ecological terms a "centre of dominance" for a large area, whereas Langholm, to quote a parishioner, is a "dead wee hole". It has far fewer shops and pubs and cafes. Each town has one dance hall and one cinema. The Langholm cinema building is a converted church hall, whereas the Lockerbie one was built as a cinema and, except in size, looks like any modern cinema. Similarly several of the Lockerbie pubs have the glitter and shine of modern metropolitan pubs, but only one of the Langholm ones has. The Lockerbie dance hall manages far more often to engage nationally celebrated country dance bands. In short the difference between the two towns is not that one provides entertainment and the other does not, but that Lockerbie offers mingling with larger crowds of people, a greater range of choice, and an opportunity to participate in cultural forms the styles of which are nearer to those found in large towns.

In short, by spending one's time in Lockerbie rather than in Langholm, one is affirming one's participation in a culture

1. This is because country people sometimes venture this hypothesis to explain their behaviour. For example the Social Survey (op.cit.) found among its informants "a desire for such amenities as are today pre-eminently those of the towns; cinemas, theatres, dance halls, social centres, and clubs. Good transport, and in general the opportunities for a fuller and more varied social life." The Survey concludes that this is a motive for migration.
freer of local peculiarities of style than that of Langholm, and one's capacity to enter into association (however ephemeral) not determined by a narrow locality.

Our first chapter showed how the local rural community disintegrated and its population was brought into closer relation to the "wider structure". This means that this population, brought into contact with a much wider range of persons than formerly, have been forced to compare their status and circumstances with that of the others in the wider structure. It seems from the evidence presented that the parishioners have to a large extent accepted the evaluation of their status and circumstances which the others hold. This view I think is what a farmer (the one who was a herd) was expressing when he said, "In the old days ye couldney get anywhere, ye just stayed here and ye never knew anything else. So everyone was contentit. Now everywhere and everything's within reach, but because they (i.e. parishioners) know other people can get anything there's nobody contentit now."

Those countrymen who actually do migrate to the town would in this view simply be those who have wholly accepted this evaluation. This seems consistent with the findings of the Social Survey that "It was fairly clear that potential migrants tended to regard their environment more critically than those who did not wish to move", and "what is strongly suggested by

the anomalous and apparently inconsistent nature of some of 
the evidence is that rural migration in many cases has sprung 
basically from a general dissatisfaction with rural life rather 
than with one or other aspect of it.

Our hypothesis at least has the merit of relating the facts 
described to the local structure of the community. We have 
shown here that it is only the working class countryman who has 
to reckon with the judgement that he is a mug for living in 
isolated places. Earlier, (ch. V) we showed that the higher 
the social class the more extensive and frequent were its contacts 
outside the parish. This is clearly reflected in a different 
attitude to the "isolation" of Eskdalemuir between the working 
and middle classes. Many members of the working class, especially 
women, state that Eskdalemuir is an isolated place. Not so, 
however, the middle classes. One farmer, for instance, dis-
cussing rural depopulation said, "They (workmen) often grumble 
that Eskdalemuir's isolated, but it isn't. It only takes me 
two hours in the car to get to Edinburgh." That only four 
working class families possessed a car did not seem to occur 
to him.

CONCLUSION

Our last chapter has shown how the country parish today is dominated, socially, by the town. Not only is there a movement of population from country to town, but the majority of those who remain in the country have accepted to some extent the townsman's evaluation of themselves. In a sense this could be said to be the main theme of our earlier, historical chapters. There we showed how the structure of the parish changed through increasing economic dependence upon consumer goods made in towns, through increasing use of money, through the formation of Trade Unions, and through changes in administration brought about by the State. All these elements of social life originated in urban centres and are essentially urban in nature. Country dwellers must already, fifty years ago, have begun to imitate town dwellers or had these elements of urban social life forced upon them. Probably both processes, imitation and (legally sanctioned) force were at work.

At the same time, as our last chapter also showed, the domination of the town does not fall equally upon the whole population of the rural parish. The main feature of the social structure of the parish is a system of social classes. The classes differ in their relationship to the town and their conception of themselves in relation to the town. Persons of the middle classes do not think of themselves as living in "isolation" or as undergoing hardships from which the townsman is free, whereas persons of the working class do.
Our thesis was mainly concerned with the class system of the parish, since it has come to be the dominating system of social relations. Over the last fifty years the cohesiveness and importance of the parish as a social group has declined, while the autonomy of the farm has been shattered. These are both results of a process whereby the population making up the parish has been absorbed into wider groups – the County, the Nation, and nationwide organisations such as Trade Unions. The parish no longer really exists as a social unit, membership of it neither confers important rights nor imposes important obligations, while economically and socially parishioners are linked to, even dependent upon, a far wider population than exists within the parish boundaries. The farm, at one time a system of relationship and activity which controlled the lives of its members to a degree unimaginable today, is no longer such a dominating unit in the lives of the majority of parishioners. Farmer and farm worker no longer bargain directly with each other, face to face as persons who have to come to terms with each other, but stand opposed to each other merely as representatives of two trade Unions who decide the terms of the relationship within a framework of rights and obligations ultimately sanctioned by the State. The married farm worker’s role as employee is now sharply separated from his role as head of a family capable of supplying labour so his family is hardly related at all to the farm. Increases in wages and leisure, the development of public systems of transport, the growth of industries manufacturing consumer goods, have all brought parishioners into close relationship with nearby towns and agencies of supply.

With the decline in importance of the parish and the farm, social class and the family have provided the dominant system of relationships
within the parish. The family and kinship ties originating in it have not occupied the centre of our interest for several reasons, principally because kinship ties only obtain among a minority of parishioners and tend to be ignored if they conflict with the principle of social class, and because the family, far from being "the regulator of social behaviour and the cultural norm", is merely the unit of social class. This last concept so often used by sociologists, of the family as the unit of social class, has been given empirical content in this study. We have shown that class status is allotted in the first place not to individuals but to the family, that the female has status conferred upon her in virtue of her relationship to a male, either father or husband, and that the family is the guardian of status in the sense that pressure is put upon daughters to ensure they do not lose status by marrying a man of lower class than themselves. A class culture, the items of which are viewed as symbols of class status, is largely maintained and passed on to the next generation within the family. Finally, being admitted to households and sharing meals with householders is the exemplary type of association which provides the most unambiguous index of class status. As we showed, household and family by no means co-incide, if a family is defined as a group consisting of husband, wife and children living together in one house. Ideally, however, a household is started by the formation of such a group, and a household not consisting of these persons is usually simply the result of such inescapable vicissitudes as death upon a family.

The operations, both conceptual and practical (i.e. in the field) by which the existence of a system of three social classes
was disclosed, were fully described. This answers the question which may be asked, "what do I (the fieldworker) mean by social class?" for what I mean by social class is precisely what emerged from these operations (in the context of Eskdalemuir), viz. a population divided into three ranked strata thought of as superior and inferior relative to each other by the population and controlling, in the many ways described, the behaviour of the population. The possibility of other conceptual and practical operations is not denied.

In any system of social stratification there must be criteria by which the units of the system are allotted to one or other strata. In the system we described there is no single criterion of this nature, but wealth, amount of property owned, occupation, personal and family history are all taken into account in allotting units to the different strata. We have suggested that some notion of a "class quota" must exist as part of what Durkheim called the collective consciousness of this society. At any rate, these multiple criteria make for untidiness in the system, a lack of clear definition of class boundaries. This is not so marked as to prevent treating classes as separate groups with differing cultures; at the same time it raises what I consider to be a major problem worthy of further detailed research, namely that there is a sharp division between the upper middle class and the lower middle, but a much hazier division between the lower middle and the working class. From general observation of our society, I am certain that this is a general feature of social class, found in other communities besides Eskdalemuir: an explanation of it would require detailed comparison of class system in several communities. No exhaustive account of class cultures has been attempted here; instead we described mainly such items of class cultures as are most conspicuously viewed by the community itself as symbols of class status.
Perhaps the most novel part of our treatment of social class concerns the relations of the sexes to the class system. There we showed that in respect of movement from one class to another, the sexes do not stand in the same relationship to the class system. In particular, it seems that movement from the working to the lower middle class is more frequent among females than among males. This we attributed to a complex of reasons located within the total social structure. The men of the working class are in opposition to the men of the middle classes through their respective roles as employees and employers, while the women of the two classes are not, but stand in a patronage relationship. Because of the distance between the sexes in the working class divergent cultures have developed in them, that of the women being more like the culture of their middle class patrons than that of the men standing opposed to the middle class. The female role permits development of portable skills such as housekeeping, adornment and manner$1$ while the male role, heavily involved in occupation, does not so easily permit the development of portable skills. Since the female role is regarded as inferior to the male (in the working class) the female can never win great esteem in it, hence she values social status; on the other hand the men are deeply involved in winning esteem through skill in occupation and tend to value esteem more than social status. The main avenues of mobility differ in accordance with the roles allotted to the sexes, marriage in the case of women, occupation in the case of men. The upshot is that working class women (in this community) are more successful in moving into the lower middle class than are the men. This casts doubt on a conception of a social class as a number of persons who have the same social chances in life.
At the beginning of our analysis of the class system we drew attention to the difference between Marx's and Veblen's analysis of the modern class system, the one emphasising opposition between classes, the other emphasising cohesion. Our analysis of the different relations of the sexes to the class system shows these two accounts do not conflict but are complementary to each other. Each emphasises an aspect of the relation between classes which is thrown into sharper focus when the class system is related to the sex system.

Finally, we may call attention to a weakness of anthropological method as applied to the study of modern society, a weakness noted earlier, namely that its results apply to only a small population. Would study of larger populations, as organised in communities, reveal that women are generally more successful in upward mobility than men? That kinship ties are generally broken when they conflict with the class principle? The answers to such questions await further research.
The following abbreviations are used in the bibliography.

A.A. American Anthropologist.

A.J.S. American Journal of Sociology.

B.J.S. British Journal of Sociology.


S.R. Sociological Review.
C. Arensberg, The Irish Countryman, New York.


Census 1951, Scotland, Vol. II, H.M.S.O.


J. T. Cox, Practice and Procedure in the Church of Scotland, Edinburgh, 1934.


A. Davis & J. Dollard, Children of Bondage, Washington, 1940.


E. Durkheim, Elementary Forms of the Religious Life.

Education (Scotland) Acts, of 1872, 1908 and 1918.


E. E. Evans Pritchard, The Nuer, O.U.P.


M. Ginsberg, Sociology, H.U.L.


R. Groves, Sharpen the Sickle, 1952.


B. Hutchinson, Depopulation and Rural Life in Scotland, The Social Survey, H.M.S.O.


H. Kaufman, Prestige Classes in a New York Rural Community, Agricultural Experimental Station, Cornell University, Memoir 260.

H. Kuper, An African Aristocracy.


Local Government Act (Scotland) 1894.


B. Malinowski, A Scientific Theory of Culture, Chapel Hill, 1944.


W. Martin, Experiences in Herding Cheviot Hill Sheep during the Last Sixty Years, in Hill Sheep Husbandry in the Scottish Borders, Edinburgh, 1952.

K. Marx, Das Kapital.

The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte.


H. Miner, St. Denis, Chicago, 1939.


F. Nietzsche, The Birth of Tragedy.


The Structure of Social Action.


R. Redfield, The Folk Culture of Yucatan, Chicago, 1941.

A. D. Rees, Life in a Welsh Countryside, Cardiff, 1951.

The Scotsman, for July, August and September, 1900.


W. J. H. Sprott, Sociology, H.U.L.


F. Tonnies, Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft.

Transport and General Workers Union (Scottish Farm Servants Section), Then and Now.


W. L. Warner & P. S. Lunt, The Social Life of a Modern Community, Yale, 1941.

The Status System of a Modern Community, New Haven, 1949.


