UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY
OU_148931
UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OUP—24—4-1-69—5,000

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 301.44 Accession No. 3011

Author P35E P.G

Title

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked l

5 OCT 1969

11 NOV 1969

12 MAR 1976

ENGLISH SOCIAL DIFFERENCES

By the same author

REMEMBERING AND FORGETTING
SKILL IN WORK AND PLAY
FITNESS FOR WORK
THE ART OF STUDY
VOICE AND PERSONALITY
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF EFFECTIVE SPEAKING
RELIGION AND CONTEMPORARY PSYCHOLOGY
THE MATURING MIND
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF CONVERSATION

English Social Differences

T. H. PEAR
M.A., B.SC.

Emeritus Professor of Psychology
University of Manchester,
Fellow of King's College, London

LONDON
GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD
RUSKIN HOUSE MUSEUM STREET

First published in 1955

This book is copyright under the Berne Convention. Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of private study, research, criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright Act 1911, *no portion may be reproduced by any process without written permission. Enquiry should be made to the publisher.*

© *George Allen & Unwin Ltd.,* 1955

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As it was my intention to take notice of as many relevant contemporary books as possible, numerous quotations and paraphrases appear, and are acknowledged in the text. Thanks are especially due to Lady Violet Bonham-Carter and the Oxford University Press; Professor D. W. Brogan and Hamish Hamilton; Dr. R. Centers and the Princeton University Press; Professor G. D. H. Cole and Methuen & Co.; Mr. T. S. Eliot and Faber & Faber; Messrs. R. Lewis and A. Maude and Phoenix House and Penguin Books; Professor T. H. Marshall, the Cambridge University Press and the Leplay House Press; Mr. J. B. Priestley and Messrs. Heinemann, Mr. Clive Sansom and Messrs. Hinrichsen; and Dr. F. Zweig and Messrs. Gollancz and Pelican Books.

Printed in Great Britain
in 11 *point Bell type*
by C. Tinling & Co., Ltd.
Liverpool, London and Prescot.

PREFACE

That in England to-day there are important social differences is obvious to anyone who lives here, and to visitors. To our guests, the differences are striking and puzzling: most natives tend to take them for granted. They are much more effective in some localities than in others.

This book deals with England only. Perhaps it may stimulate someone to attempt a picture, on similar lines, of Scotland, Wales, Northern and Southern Ireland and the Channel Islands. It would be a valuable help in the assessment of the famous 'British Character'.

The subject has been approached from the social psychologist's standpoint. To demarcate social psychology from sociology is, however, so difficult that I have gladly availed myself of writings by and advice from several sociologists.

The chapter headings and arrangement of the themes inevitably reflect personal interests. In dealing with concepts, I have tried to represent fairly the views of contemporary students of society. My own opinion may perhaps be mentioned: that the concepts of stratum, status and élite may be more useful than that of class in studying many social problems today, and while certain strata are noticeably class-implicated, others are not.

All sciences begin as 'natural history'. In this phase, likenesses and differences between phenomena are noted and named, to further the development of a stage of knowledge in which, on the basis of recorded, classified facts, tentative generalisations can be made, and tested by experience or experiment. Yet in the early stage of any science, 'laws' may be based prematurely upon insufficient data. Some psychologists and sociologists seem a little too eager to generalise. Often when reading that 'people' act, think or feel in certain ways, one reflects that this assertion may be true chiefly or only about the writer's own social milieu. Articles have been written about "the miners", as if they, as a class, are in constant close touch with fellow workers in distant areas, yet reports by those who

know the miners well suggest that some of their beliefs characterise only a particular age group in a particular region.

This book may seem little more than pluckings by an amateur from gardens visited at random. Perhaps some blooms were selected because they appeal specially to this collector. So be it; I have yet to read any psychological treatise which did not tell a percipient reader something about the writer's predilections.

It may help critics if a few of the book's many defects are pointed out here. Historical background is almost absent, yet excellent social histories, with which many readers will be familiar, are cited. But the social history of many of the events mentioned in this book is still unwritten. 'Perspective' is usually attributed to the historian's writings, yet very different perspectives would be obtained from reading books by social observers to-day. An economist might regret that many problems with economic implications have been discussed here from a purely psychological standpoint, but he will know the chief reason for this.

Inevitably, any student of social events prefers aspects which he habitually discusses: it would be interesting to discover the motives which impel him to this choice; some are probably unconscious. If he wishes the hierarchies in English society to be maintained, modified or abolished, his effort to be impartial is likely to fail. Though the present writer has selected his data, he pleads that he has kept this bias in mind oftener than many of his predecessors have done. He belongs to that congeries ; the English Middle Classes, the Middle Class having ceased to exist, despite attempts to preserve it. He does not describe only things personally perceived, but has been helped by many friends, not all of them middle-class; has read many relevant books, from some of which quotations will appear, and has discussed with colleagues developments of psychology in which the consideration of social differences is at present inadequate.

The chapters are written in different keys, for several reasons. The book took much longer to write than was anticipated, and while some of its themes are substantially documented,

others have been treated chiefly in novels, plays and films.

Unfortunately the book went to press too early to include in Chapter 10 accounts of the excellent *Planning* Reports "The Keele Experiment" and "Background of the University Student". References are given in the bibliography.

For kind permission to reprint articles already published, I wish to thank the editors of the *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, the *Yearbook of Education*, and the *Monthly Record* of Conway Hall.

I gratefully acknowledge many personal debts; first to Dr. R. H. Thouless, whose writings on social stratification first interested me professionally in the subject. Thanks are given to Mrs. Nancy E. Lingard and Dr. J. A. Waites, who co-operated with me in studying the social and educational background of Members of Parliament and His Majesty's Judges; to Mr. Nigel Nicolson, M.P. for advice during the preparation of part of the book, to Mr. T. M. Higham for criticising most of the typescript, and to Miss G. Blunt, Miss Mary Hilton, Miss Eileen Rice and Miss Nora M. Williamson for typing it, to Miss Margery Allingham, Miss Dorothy M. Richardson and Mrs. Barbara Wootton for advice and help, and to the Simon Research Fund of Manchester University for a grant to collect data.

Mrs. Alice Hall and Mrs. Pamela Holland Gems kindly allow me to use data from their unpublished theses, for Chapters 3 and 11. Messrs. Gustav Jahoda, James Laver and Felix Salmon gave valuable assistance in the preparation of Chapters 1, 7 and 8.

I am also indebted for help and encouragement to Miss Barbara Bonner, Sir Cyril Burt, Miss Rosalind C. Chambers, Professor R. A. Eastwood, Professor D. V. Glass, Dr. T. F. Fox, editor of the *Lancet*, Mr. R. G. Freeman, Mr. Hector Hawton, Professor D. W. Harding, Professor L. C. Knights, Mr. Hugh T. Lane, Dr. D. G. MacRae, Miss Faith Morton, the proprietors of the *Observer*, Professor Harold Orton, Mr. Richard H. Pear, Dr. R. W. Pickford, Mrs. Winifred Raphael, Mr. F. Shepherd, Mrs. Joan E. Turner and Mr. Philip Unwin.

T. H. PEAR

London, *January*, 1955

CONTENTS

	PREFACE	PAGE 5
1	*Social Differences in English Life*	9
2	*Psychological Aspects of English Social Stratification*	58
3	*Ways of Speaking, Manners, Etiquette and Goodwill*	85
4	*Cultural and Social Differences*	119
5	*Snobs*	129
6	*The Classes; Upper, Middle, Working*	138
7	*Clothes and Fashion*	168
8	*Eating and Drinking*	180
9	*The Training of Character in Some English Schools*	189
10	*Social Differences in English Education*	209
11	*Social Differences in Leisure Pursuits*	243
12	*Social Stratification and the English Character*	270
13	*Summary and Conclusions. Personal Prejudices*	287
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	295
	INDEX	311

CHAPTER ONE

Social Differences in English Life

The nature and use of concepts. Concepts of class, stratum, status and élite. Examples of strata (economic, vocational, education, cultural, recreational) and of élites.

Speech and occupation; important determinants of social differences. Strata within occupations. Professions, trades and manual work. Class consciousness and class feeling. Social stratification and health; physical and mental.

To what extent do English adolescents value class or status today? Marks of status. The prestige of occupations. Is social status attached to branches of science? Class symbols and devices for restricting their misrepresentative use. Curator groups. The changing status of some professions. A study of an outstanding élite, the English Judges.

EVEN after two great wars, few changes in England can be described completely without reference to social differences between groups; the bare statement of many social problems necessitates this. The brief title of this book, *English Social Differences*, was chosen after much thought. It is general enough to exempt a writer from appearing to support the exclusive use of one of the rival concepts employed today in attempting to explain social differences in this country. A 'natural historian' of society may reasonably describe differences which to him are interesting, or puzzling, even if at first sight they do not seem important. This practice is common enough in the early stages of a science. Anyone who, after a casual glance, is inclined to assess the social significance of a novel custom or belief might reflect upon the fact that only thirty years ago many serious-minded people thought the effect of radio to be too trivial for study, and the social significance of televising the Coronation Service did not seem to have been grasped at first by the authorities who were responsible for deciding eventually, but not unanimously, to let the world see the ceremony.

Occasionally a custom or usage is termed 'superficial,' contrasted with 'deep,' the assumption being that depth is always more important. This may result from misreading early

formulations of psychoanalysis, but possibly this attractive spatial metaphor is of limited use in the study of society. Usages can often be interpreted in different ways, though the fashionable explanation in terms of 'levels' may also illustrate the limits of 'spatial' explanations. Customs which appear foolish (arising after upheavals like wars) may spring from causes related to deep feelings.

Criticisms of social researches based on the objection that the 'wrong' concept (i.e. one which the critic does not favour) is being used, or that the investigations deal with unimportant matters, should be examined today with special care.

Concepts which present themselves as possibly useful are those of *class*, *stratum*, *status* and *élite*. We will examine them separately, offering examples.

A full account of these concepts as they have been used up to 1946, is given by Dr. Richard Centers (42). One guesses at the date of writing (the book was published in 1949) from the sentence (p. 3) 'In Britain a Socialist government has already for many months held power.'

It may be useful to indicate for the non-technical reader the difference between phenomena and concepts. Phenomena are 'appearances'; to any sense, not only to sight. Any objects perceived in a social setting are likely to suggest, to an observant mind in our culture-pattern, social 'placings.' The style of a hair-cut, the sound of a vowel, the use of a particular scent, the choice of a drink, the touch of a hand—all these can symbolise social differences.

A concept is a mental pattern formed to subsume perceived facts into some sort of satisfactory shape, often with the aim of discovering new, related facts. Since the pattern may depend upon the selection of facts it is not surprising that rival concepts claim the psychologist's attention.

'Class,' says Centers, 'is still a poorly understood concept.' He holds that much greater agreement exists concerning the meaning of stratification.

Social stratification is defined by Professor P. Sorokin (204) as

the differentiation of a given population into hierarchically superposed

classes. It is manifested in the existence of upper and lower social layers. Its basis and very existence consist in an unequal distribution of rights and privileges, duties and responsibilities, social values and privations, social power and influence among the members of a society.

Sorokin believes that most forms of stratification may be reduced to three principal types: *economic*, *political* and *occupational*. These are so intercorrelated that they can be separated only abstractly or conceptually. Strata, thus conceptually formed, may or may not act in society as cohesive groups.

Stratification, says Centers, is a valuable and useful concept because of its objectivity: class involves something subjective. This view will be taken throughout the present book.

Of social classes, not surprisingly, many definitions have been proposed. Extremes are represented by the objectivists, who identify classes with strata, defined by some objective criterion such as income or occupation, and subjectivists, who lay stress upon common interests and 'consciousness of kind' as basic and essential factors. At present neither definition is universally accepted.

A man's class, says Centers,

is a part of his ego, *a feeling on his part of belongingness to something;* an *identification* with something larger than himself. More even than being an American or Frenchman, Texan or Californian, or Rotarian, Methodist or Episcopalian, it is an entirely subjective kind of membership, for it is marked or recognised by no external or objective insignia or badge of constitutional membership whatever.

In several sections of English society, the mere mention of examples of social class, to say nothing of attempts to record, interpret or explain them, though seldom overtly opposed, is ranked among the 'not-dones.' Less resistance, overt and covert, might be shown to the idea of special strata. For while a person is seldom regarded as belonging simultaneously to several social classes, many people are members of several strata—economic, vocational, educational, recreational. Some strata may be restricted to a single class (e.g. the layer comprising persons eligible for admission to the Royal Enclosure

at Ascot), but probably the number of such strata is decreasing, and it is significant that when a particular stratum is described as 'upper class,' the remark, toned with regret or triumph, is likely to follow, that 'upper-middles' are now admitted. The 'hunts,' stratified among themselves, are nowadays so short of funds that they may admit some persons (this word is used oftener in reference to class than to stratum), whose money could never have purchased entrance in the palmy days.

Economic strata, though they are often called 'classes,' are illustrated when passengers buy superior and inferior accommodation on railway trains. To travel in a first-class compartment, little more than ability to pay is necessary. If by-laws exist, prohibiting certain persons, e.g. those wearing offensively dirty clothes, from using the first class, they are probably few. Convivial relations—the overt mark of real class—between strangers travelling 'first' are not only infrequent, but are expected to be so, and except in war-time, 'third' passengers are excluded; legally and psychologically. Yet if a train is full, there is a tendency to surge into the favoured class, and an equal and opposite tendency to discourage the intruders, unless, as often happened during the War, the smiling, confident bearers of green tickets were American soldiers. Occasionally, on a long journey, first-class passengers discreetly observe fellow travellers to see and hear if they belong to the 'right' social class. If this test is passed, ease of relationship, established cautiously, increases when possible mutual acquaintances are mentioned tentatively. If a third-class ticket holder then enters the compartment because the train is full, he may be made clearly aware of the coagulation, real if ephemeral, between the others.

The distinction between stratum and class (membership of certain strata is almost irrelevant to class), made it possible, a generation ago, for a hostess to describe how a famous artist and an almost equally well-known professor were barked at by her dog, or kept waiting by a maid, because they looked like tramps. But the tramp too is dying out and since the War the social status of the civilian hitch-hiker, a new kind of tramp,

is a matter for angry discussion, between members of the older generation, in the newspapers.

The musical profession today forms a stratum in which ambition, or lack of it, to improve one's class seems to be regarded as a personal, private matter. And at social parties authors, it is said, are more often seen than leading scientists, who use directer ways of exerting influence in high quarters.

There may be social forces which preserve more or less successfully the edges of a stratum. To discover the nature, direction and degree of permanence of these forces would be interesting.

Let us consider some strata in detail. Economic strata need little comment. Possession of horses, man-servants, large West End and country houses is nowadays impossible to many sons of people who once took this for granted, yet still within the reach of others. There are border-line cases; e.g. schools which require a yearly expenditure of £300 to £400 per pupil (for the school terms alone) and admit children of the newly-rich.

Nowadays, a man's awareness of his economic stratum seldom binds him to other members of it, except when this conceptual bond is mentioned; e.g. by trade-union leaders. Any 'medium' economic stratum comprises many persons who earn their living in very different ways, whose awareness of other strata to which they belong, or whose class-feeling, overshadows any loyalty to economic stratum. Imagine for instance the number of different ways in which £7 a week can be earned today!

The relation between economic and cultural strata is less simple than writers like Mr. T. S. Eliot (61b) make it appear. Obviously the newly-rich still find that many doors to the higher ranks of society, especially in the country, will not open to money alone. The assertion 'Good taste cannot be bought' is still true if it applies to the purchaser's habitual social attitudes, yet 'good' clothes, furniture and houses are available to those willing to pay for advice, sometimes even for advice about advisers. When Mr. J. D. Rockefeller was making his art collections, he took Mr. Roger Fry around Italy with him, and disarmed criticism.

Relevant to this discussion is S. N. Behrman's book on Lord

Duveen (23), who made it his business to 'work on' wealthy men, persuading them that it was their duty not only to buy pictures, but certain pictures to which he literally led them.

Some intellectual strata are definitely outlined; e.g. Fellowship of the Royal Society or of the British Academy is indicated by letters. A particular stratum may have little connection with class; yet its class-implication may increase rapidly if at any time it happens to contain some politically ambitious leading lights. The Universities, some of their colleges and some communities inside these (cf. Chapter 9) form intellectual strata, from which members of élites may be drawn. Inside an intellectual stratum there may be class-differences, but these are apt to be ignored if the members of the stratum act as a whole.

At present there is little reliable information about the reactions of different types of person to any special situation in which they are made aware that their own class is higher or lower than that of the people with whom they are temporarily in relationship. By trained social anthropologists, speaking, clothing, architecture, furniture (44) and the outward signs of manners and tact could be described objectively. In practice they have seldom been so described, except when they characterise primitive inhabitants of a remote country. The reasons given for this neglect are well known, though not accepted today as unquestioningly as a generation ago. The weightiest is that in studying cultures unlike one's own, objectivity is easier to maintain. Yet to an objective description of behaviour it is desirable for the social psychologist to add subjective accounts which can be partially evaluated in the light of objective data.

This can be illustrated if we consider speaking. One rarely hears or reads any description of *how* someone speaks without some hint at social evaluation. The *Radio Times* has printed millions of words from correspondents discussing speech; usually with the implication that 'people' ought to speak in a certain way.

Social stratification enters, too, into art-criticism. Some professional critics' accounts of the 1949 Chantrey Bequest

Exhibition implied that while it was once socially correct to like its pictures, it was not 'done' today, except by the middle-aged and by would-be eccentrics. This disapproval extended even to the Murillos in the Munich Collection at the National Art Gallery. The untiring efforts of the Sitwells, both here and in America, to make modern ideas in art and music socially acceptable are well known.

Though much has been written about that real and important obstacle to social success, the 'inferiority-complex,' we know little about causes, conscious and unconscious, of attitudes of inferiority and superiority (these may be quite healthy and normal), and how they arise. It would be interesting to try to explain, by analysis of present and past experience, why, when suddenly confronted by a social group, one occasionally feels socially superior or inferior to its members. What are the causes? Awareness of possessing unusually appropriate social skills, of being better dressed, of having more ready money than the others? Of some factors we may be half aware, e.g. if we feel deferential towards a stranger, his appearance or voice may have reminded us vaguely of someone—prefect, clergyman, officer—whose rank is superior to ours. To an adult, a tendency to obey or to agree when addressed in a 'prefect-manner,' may be an embarrassment; so might the temptation to reply with truculence or frigid politeness, because the speech of the *vis à vis* stirs up vague memories of early slights or snubbings.

Asked to select and to name factors in the situation being considered in this way, the observer would throw some light upon his own social stratum. If he were to describe a suit as in the height of fashion, this might be a correct judgment, but might indicate that he seldom saw fashionable people, or was entirely unperceptive. An undiscriminating ear mistakes for 'ruling-class speech' a synthetic approximation to it.

In studying social stratification, it is necessary to free oneself as far as possible from 'ego-involvement' (38). A preliminary examination of one's social prejudices, a combination of auto- and hetero-analysis, is needed, but seldom carried out.

The phenomena of English social stratification are constantly

changing. This book is written with the sense of urgency which often affects the anthropologist studying a primitive community. For this and other reasons it is impracticable to paint in a historical background, as R. Lewis and Angus Maude have done for the middle classes (128). Had this been possible, it would have helped the reader to decide how many of the subjects described, e.g. the public school system, are long-standing; how many are new, e.g. customs of the R.A.F., how many are important though transient, e.g. varieties of slang.

The economic implications of this subject are inescapable. The legal aspects of social stratification and the social aspects of stratification amongst lawyers are important; some of these are described in this chapter.

It is useful here to state—remembering that brevity is occasionally the soul of dogmatism—my own attitude towards the concept of Class as a working tool for social psychologists. Many different definitions of class have been proposed. Some are collected in Richard Centers' *Psychology of Class Differences.* Because sociologists, when carrying out investigations, are apt to distrust subjective factors, many definitions of class are claimed to be objective, yet it is certain that class-feeling, whether justified or not by objective factors, powerfully influences social movements.

Avoiding the metaphysical question, whether classes exist in the space-time world, let us inquire if the class concept helps to explain existing social events. Some contemporary writers, since they use the concept, seem satisfied with it; others may tend to use 'stratum' when they avoid writing the same word too often, and sacrifice clarity to style. This can often be noted in articles dealing with subjects on the borderline between 'Science' and 'Arts.'

There are many authors who when they write 'class,' make their meaning clear. Mr. T. S. Eliot likes the class-system because he believes it tends towards the preservation of culture. Mr. Archibald Robertson has asserted that in this country even class-war would be less calamitous than another so-called national war. Some writers use 'class' under protest. Mr. A. J. Cummings wrote in the *News Chronicle* that he had tried

in vain to find a label better than 'working-class' (this description, taken literally, would apply to Sir Winston Churchill, whose exceptional industry has been shown both in the intellectual and manual sphere) and Mrs. Barbara Wootton reports in *Adult Education* (232), that her investigations suggest 'there is no working-class, but there are the poor.' The concept of class was accepted by contributors to a B.B.C. symposium, published in the *Listener* (133), yet in 1949 the *Spectator* asserted that we never publicly mention the upper class or the 'lower orders.' Dr. H. J. Eysenck (64) Mrs. Jean Floud (65a) criticising Dr. Centers's and Messrs. Lewis & Maude's books respectively, has shown how difficult it is to accept a simple distinction of class, and the choice of the title *The Middle Classes* suggests that its authors are satisfied with no simple concept.

A link between the concepts of class and stratum can be found in American writings. In some, the two terms seem to be used interchangeably, yet 'socio-economic status' is a concept which ought never to have crossed the Atlantic. It seems to have worked loose over there. In describing the line-up, in some Southern States, for the 1948 Presidential Election, Alistair Cooke said that many 'poor Whites,' though in the same economic bracket as poor Negroes, would feel themselves to be like, and vote with, whites far superior to them in financial status.

In England, the concept 'socio-economic' seems less useful: university students have been known to smile when it was described. 'Pockets' of industrial England can be found with no landed gentry and few professional people, where a worker's social status corresponds closely with the amount of his wages, yet this is exceptional. Before 1939, in many villages, though by objective standards the Vicar was poor, his sons often went to public schools and the older universities, helped by special scholarships, and possibly by rich relations, but mainly by parents' sacrifice. This excited little comment from the parishioners. It has been said that if for generations a man's family has stood high in English society, it is almost impossible for him to fall very far, if he stays in this country, for his

relatives will rally round him. His children may fall, but will probably retain their ambition to rise again.

These examples may show that, in England at least, class and stratum cannot be regarded as synonymous. Possibly, except where class is objectively signalised by rank or title, the term class is most suitably applicable to attitudes—the way in which one regards and treats other people, and is regarded and treated by them.

To illustrate the concept of stratum, let us consider an example not wildly imaginary. A youth comes to Manchester to work in a large business. He finds cheap lodgings, intending to spend much of his spare money on concerts. Meeting music-lovers at these, he joins one of their clubs. If he plays a musical instrument and can act, he may be welcomed by three societies. Succeeding in one of these as an executant, or social organiser, he finds himself in several independent strata. If he plays football, cricket or tennis, he will belong to more than one games-stratum. In a busy city, his 'class,' if he satisfies standards of speech, dress and manners, will seldom entirely determine social success. Some mixing might be less easy in a country town, still less in one with a Cathedral and an established military community.

If for a long time, several strata remain parallel and inter-related, they may fuse into a class. Possibly this has happened in the upper classes, whose sports and games are discussed in Chapter 11. Most strata, however, run obliquely; some are nearly vertical.

Recruitment to the fighting services illustrates class, stratum and rank. In World War II, when conscription came, a distinction between class and stratum was often perceptible. Though screening of recruits according to their intelligence and educational achievement prevented many anomalies, a persons's intellectual and cultural background was often superior to that of men above him in rank. Probably these discrepancies count less in the younger services. An ex-army-officer writes 'An interesting point concerns the recruit waiting to go to O.C.T.U. (Officer Cadet Training Unit) who is a 'member' of the ranks but refers himself to the Officer class.'

Until recently, in most countries, England not excepted, the

higher ranks of the regular Army and Navy were élites (52). In peace-time, some of their interests were more closely related to those of similar élites in other countries, than to those of any civilians in their own, hence the visits to our annual army manoeuvres of high-ranking officers from potential enemy countries. Did we not, shortly before World War II, exhibit our lack of air-raid precautions to the German General Milch? The professionalisation of warfare has produced a stratum of people who are expected to take the occurrence of war for granted, yet some upper-class English, as well as others, felt that the publication, in the middle of the War, of photographs showing an English general discussing with his captured opposite number, how the battle 'ought' to have been fought, was indecent. It was interesting to note the conflict of opinion in letters to a newspaper, when it was reported that German senior officer prisoners of war had been left to handle their own suitcases on an English railway station. An ex-officer member of the House of Lords, whose family is old and famous for long military service, promptly wrote that as a result of this war with Germany, his wife had had to do this more than once. The correspondence ceased.

What are the chief determinants of social differences? It is sometimes asserted that our most important class-label is occupation. It is often replied that speech rivals it in significance, and that in England, occupations are highly correlated with ways of speaking. Some years ago in England, a lawyer, an army officer and a university professor carried on a radio-discussion with their opposite numbers in the U.S.A. To this listener, the Englishmen's modes of speech were just what anyone knowing their different professions might have expected; the Americans left him guessing. Many Americans, indeed, see no reason why a lawyer should speak differently from anyone else. Yet in England, while a waiter might wish to sound like the Army officer he once was, he would not keep his job if he did. To quote a rhetorical question asked years ago, and naturally unanswered, if a newly-ordained curate could talk like a bishop, would he? Conceivably, if socially ambitious, he might act and talk as if in the rank just above his own.

Within any one occupation, e.g. medicine, there are social strata. This fact was seldom mentioned in the Press during the prolonged negotiations and widespread discussions between doctors, Ministers and the public, which preceded the passing of the National Health Act. As then used, the term 'doctor' could be applied to several types—a full-time professor of medicine ('doctor' in the original sense), a specialist, who may spend part of his time on a hospital staff, or all of it working as a private individual, a general practitioner (the locality of the practice and the economic stratum of the patients are important), a school medical officer, an industrial medical officer, or a medically qualified researcher. Awareness of belonging to one of these strata may encourage different kinds and degrees of ambition, in the doctor, his wife and children. Since July, 1948, social forces are altering not only the stratification inside the medical profession, but the status of many doctors. The general practitioner has justifiable prestige, and this, it is urged, helps him in his relations with patients of all classes. Yet there are 'ceilings' to the usefulness of such a reputation, for, as Margaret Cole remarks (51), though elevation to a knighthood usually helps a specialist, to become a peer may be costly, since nowadays few patients believe that they can afford to be medically attended by a Lord.

An instance may illustrate several relevant facts. Fifty years ago, a Manchester merchant would have been proud to send his son to the local Grammar School and University. If the son, trained as a medical man, succeeded, he would often wish his sons to go to a public (boarding) school and to Oxbridge, and his daughters to boarding schools. This ambition, twenty-five years ago, would have seemed a natural correlate to his desire to work hard, yet after 1939 such desires often led to financial worries, the causes of which may seldom have been exposed in detail in the British Medical Association's negotiations with the Ministry of Health.

A similar analysis may be applied to the occupations of lawyer,' 'engineer,' 'author.' The more one knows about them, the more strata one is likely to discern, and often to take for granted. An American sociologist who lived here during

1949–50 told me how deeply this fact had impressed him, suggesting the difficulty of grading English social status by 'occupation,' if this is indicated by a single word.

Tricky questions concerning mobility between strata may affect the study of mobility of occupation. (81) (91) (92). To ascend from a low to a high occupational stratum usually requires several outstanding successes. Occasionally a person, who having socially 'arrived' in England, goes abroad, may discover that his prestige has been lost in transit. Recently in one of the Dominions, an English professional boxer was embarrassed at his treatment by class-conscious 'sportsmen,' which occasioned comment here. While a few professions remain for a long time at or near the summit of the social scale, others move up and down, their positions depending to a certain extent upon fashion, and the ambition of their leaders. Social class counts for little today in the physical sciences, yet the spectacular success of English physicists in the last century, as compared with the limping gait of our social studies, may itself be partly due to social stratification. Dr. C. D. Darlington (54a) has described the cramping influence of some social groups upon the social application of biological discoveries. Professor L. Hogben has asserted that until lately English universities tolerated economic studies only when they had futility value. These are only more sharply focused statements of a thesis which Professor John Cohen has propounded (48).

Possibly, therefore, our present lack in England of trained sociologists and social psychologists is partly due to this. Our social psychology is still largely an account of the middle-classes by middle-class investigators. Dr. F. Zweig's *Men in the Pits* (237) and *The British Worker* (238) valuably supplement our knowledge. The fact that they are not written by an Englishman is significant.

In Chapter 6, on the Classes, we shall see that awareness of belonging to certain strata is suffused with strong class-feeling. This is particularly true where sharp distinctions are drawn between professions and trades (many of these are internally stratified). It is salutary to reflect that nowadays the highest-ranking professions are those the members of which are

entrusted with the greatest power to benefit or injure mankind—the medical, the legal and the fighting forces. Respect for their devotion to public service and relative forgetfulness of self interest is accompanied by expectation of these virtues; disciplinary action against offenders is severe and nowadays often public.

Since the various branches of the teaching profession offer few financial prizes, their moral esteem is higher than their social prestige. Inside them there is obvious social stratification, seldom discussed in detail.

The sharpest dividing lines in society lie between the professions, the trades and manual work. An important criterion of class-differences; non-reciprocal obligations, applies to most retail trades, since normally the buyer exercises his choice of shops. Yet there are interesting anomalies; selling pictures, horses and certain breeds of dog, have their own rules. The buyer's social class may be, and often is, lower than the seller's; moreover, the mere possession of special knowledge about horses (235) and dogs may carry a social *cachet*. (cf. Chapter 11.) Members of the professions may or may not depend for sheer economic existence upon the number of 'customers' (clients or pupils) they can attract; tradespeople usually do. A lawyer or doctor is resentful if a tendency, even an unfulfilled wish, to take clients or patients away from competitors is attributed to him. This can occasionally be seen in university life; the proposer of a new examination regulation would seldom or never urge to a committee that the change might attract more students from other British universities—that they might come from abroad is often mentioned. After World War I, the scramble among some universities to offer the first honorary degrees to the victorious generals, was deprecated, even by some who admired the winners in this race.

In commerce and trade, on a national or a smaller scale, the number of buyers is a very important factor. Some Press-lords are wounded, defiant, or amused at the suggestion that increased circulation is one of their first aims. In this respect, the position of the Press seems halfway between that of profession and trade. Recently a popular national newspaper announced in the

advertisement columns of its competitors, a change of policy, in terms suggestive of an intention to repent as well as to reform. In normal circumstances, the customer, whether right or wrong, can immediately terminate a relationship with the vendor; knowledge of this fact must decrease his feeling of independence during, and in a small community outside, working hours.

Within the wholesale trade there are interesting strata-differences. Sellers of food, obviously beneficial to mankind, often, perhaps usually, rank below those who, in a big way, distribute wines and spirits. There is, or used to be, a tendency for brewers to belong to or to support, the Church of England; seldom or never to be Nonconformists. Chemicals of most kinds rose in the social scale when they became Imperial. Armament-sellers occupy interesting places on the social adder (16). Basil Zaharoff, an early exponent of the art of offering armaments to both sides in an impending national conflict, earned great wealth abroad, and in this country, a knighthood and an honorary degree.

Before 1948, many members of the public assumed that doctors are paid primarily to cure illnesses, not to preserve health, and until a generation ago, medical teaching focused upon diseases. Two important reasons why a citizen worked hard and saved money were to provide for education and doctoring.' It was said that any wise person would choose to be either unmistakably rich or poor, though this cynical view ignored the fact that in hospitals, before July 1948, long waiting-lists for beds and long waiting-forms in out-patient departments existed. An immediate result of the Public Health Act is that a medical graduate's economic stratum is taken into account less seriously, when appointing him to a first post.

Little is known about the relations of mental health to social stratification, and in the 1948 International Congress on Mental Hygiene in London, no paper dealt with this subject. It would indeed be difficult to get data about mental health among the English upper-classes, since they may regard unusual behaviour by members of their family or by friends as tolerable, if it is a

private affair. Serious abnormality, if it becomes publicly obvious, is regarded as a matter for the lawyer or psychiatrist. Boarding schools deal privately with many breaches of behaviour: as a result the juvenile delinquency reported in the newspapers is usually among the poorer classes. Yet security and insecurity, economic or emotional, cannot be understood without reference to stratification; psychiatric social workers find that many parental worries classed as financial, are caused by a strong desire that their children shall rise in the social scale.

We have considered the usefulness of regarding English society in terms of *classes* and *strata*. A concept developed on the European continent is that of *élites*. An Englishman, if not at the apex or base of society, may belong simultaneously to several strata, but he is governed by élites, and may himself belong to one or more. Moreover, he may know powerful members of an élite, and thus can influence action at a high level. Of many other élites he knows nothing except from hearsay, seldom thinks about them, and may even be surprised to hear of their existence.

Examples of overt, well-known élites are the M.P.s (194a) His Majesty's Judges (discussed in this Chapter) and Trade Union leaders. Mrs. Barbara Wootton found in her investigation in 1940 (232), that the only members of the English proletariat who were put in Class A were elected leaders of trade unions. We may usefully remind ourselves at this point that in England there are several social ladders.

The Royal Society is an important élite, influencing others, directly or indirectly. Committees, e.g. the Medical Research Council, which advise the Lord President of the Council, are élites. Less obvious and not publicly elected are the élites of letters, art and music.

Within élites, strata may exist, e.g. the economic strata which make such a venture as Glyndebourne opera possible, or those which can cause the financial future of players in symphony orchestras to be powerfully influenced by promoters of dance-bands. A large corporation, like the B.B.C., or Imperial Chemical Industries, continually seeks advice from experts,

who themselves can form a powerful and exclusive élite. Since some of these experts may write regularly for the Press, the influence of any one may radiate in many directions, as an M.P., author, radio speaker or spokesman for commercial television.

An élite may be elected from a large group or be self-elected, like the Headmasters' Conference. Its influence may be overt, semi-covert, as in military élites, or covert.

Let us examine some meanings which the term has borne during the short time it has been in common use amongst students of society. Apparently it was first applied in a specifically social, as contrasted with an earlier religious, context, during the 19th century. An élite is not necessarily an aristocracy: indeed, a useful definition with which to open this discussion is: 'A minority, or single individual, characterised by maximal achievement within a social stratum, class or occupational group.'

Used descriptively, élite may denote a group of people who exercise certain functions in society. It need imply no ethical considerations. This meaning, favoured by sociologists and political scientists, will be used by the present writer. Not surprisingly, there is a normative use of 'élite', of which political writers are fond. They term élites those groups which they consider best, or most capable.

The concept of *status* is perhaps easier to grasp. 'Social position, rank, relation to others, relative importance' are meanings given by the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* (1926). The concept can be easily related to those of class and stratum. Status is not identical with rank, definable and often defined, or with Title. Titles are so often wrongly used that there are well-known books to guide the uninstructed (213a).

Dr. Herbert H. Hyman (103a) defines status as the position of an individual relative to other individuals. Each individual, he says, can have many statuses (*Modern English Usage*, however, says 'pl.prob. not used') and a general status. Hyman investigated the ways in which people view their own status. He distinguishes objective status (e.g. that of mayor) from subjective status (a person's concept of his own position

relative to that of other individuals) and accorded status. 'Accorded by whom?' raises many questions. Several could be easily formulated by anyone who, acquainted with the complexities of social life, meditates upon the accorded status of 'doctor,' here and in the U.S.A.

Hyman set out to study 'the relation of subjective status social attitudes and other independent variables.' Actually, his inquiry was limited to 'radical' attitudes, and this term is less ambiguous in America than in England (35). A statement which seems odd to an English psychologist but may be true of his American colleagues is '. . . among psychologists. . . . man's intellectual status may be a function of scientific achievement or theoretical ability, and whether he is cultured or not does not affect his intellectual status. In the eyes of the total population, the two statuses may be linked.' Though it is difficult to decide whether there is sufficient evidence for the 'does not,' the paragraph illustrates the relativity of the concept of status. The cultural and social background of psychologists is a subject about which little has been written. In passing, it may be noted that among the personal factors influencing status, Hyman lists 'looks' but not speech.

Today, with increased democratisation, status has been achieved by people whose social class is far from high. Examining Alfred Marshall's expressed belief (145) that through the progress of mechanization and the advance of education every man would become a gentleman, Professor T. H. Marshall writes (148), 77 years later,

> The extension of civil rights and to some extent of political rights have had little influence on class structure. Class-abatement has acquired a new meaning . . . converting a sky-scraper into a bungalow. The social services have not eliminated class inequalities but established equality of status. Thus the growth of citizenship, with its new rights and duties for the ordinary citizen, has had a profound influence on class structure, partly by removing much inequality, and partly by bringing about new social groupings. For the broad mass of the people, what is important is status, an assured and recognised place in society which recognises the dignity of the individual and which offers him the opportunity of sharing in the culture which is the common heritage of all.

I hope it will not seem an attempt to encourage class antagonism if I mention that in an unpublished investigation (cf. 185) investigating the attribution of 'class' to ways of speaking, boys at a famous public school described one sample of speech as like that of a town councillor. Mayors, on taking up their duties may joke defensively about their ways of speech: would this happen in any other country?

If the status of 'professor' in England (in different educational institutions) in pre-war Germany and Austria, France, the East and West of the U.S.A., be compared, it will be found that generalisations are impossible. When reading accounts of attempts to study status, it is not always easy to be sure that the concept has been kept reasonably clear of those of class and stratum (they overlap, of course), so criticisms of subjective valuation of status are not hard to find.

S. M. Lipset and R. Bendix (132) describe a subjective aspect of status; 'the conscious identification of an individual with a social class, and the acting-out of this identification with organizational participation.' This definition may help the investigator to deal with difficulties due to the intra-stratification of some professions; e.g. the medical and clerical. Some general practitioners would feel socially more inferior than others in the presence of a famous specialist; the same is true of some curates visiting their bishops. Lipset and Bendix doubt the validity of the basic assumption of the subjective approach, that persons living in a large community actually can rank one another in terms of relative status. . . . In cities like Dallas, Seattle or Buffalo, the only class of people who know and rank one another are W. Lloyd Warner's 'upper-uppers', i.e. those who are known as 'society.' The other 'five classes are much too numerous to permit that degree of personal acquaintance, which alone would make a system of interlocking status-evaluations feasible.' Moreover, in dealing with subjective status-evaluation, the marked difference between the class structure of the small town and of the metropolis should be kept in mind. 'The upper class of "Yankee City" and of other small American cities is largely composed of people who are middle-class. when we look at class from the perspective of the

estimation of his chances of moving upwards in society. In his answers, the middle-class boy in the Modern school deviates from the rest of the sample. He emphasises, more than do members of any other group, the importance of manners, dress and speech, referring less often to factors such as effort, ability or suitable personality. In the Modern school, a middle-class boy finds himself in the minority. Perhaps he reacts to this discovery by overestimating the importance of those aspects of his behaviour and appearance (manners, speech and dress) which, taught in his home, differentiate him from children of working-class background. In view of his failure to gain entry to the Grammar School, attended by most boys with his type of background, he underestimates, in comparison with other boys, factors such as effort, initiative and ability

It might be commented that to bracket manners, dress and speech may make it impossible to discover if the boys distinguished these as factors in the recognition of other pupils' social class. Many schools encourage uniformity, and actively discourage unusualness in dress, but the efforts in the same schools to standardise ways of speaking might be fewer and less active.

From the summary of this investigation (p. 170) the following extract may be given:

Although 60 per cent of the adolescents did not know what the *term* 'social class' meant, there can be little doubt that the boys had already acquired a very thorough understanding of our social class system. . . . It suggests that class distinctions form so much a part of the day-to-day experiences of boys (of 13-14) that when asked to talk about them they can do so without difficulty. The results show that as part of the general socialisation process, knowledge about the social class system is transmitted from one generation to the next with remarkable thoroughness. The ways in which the boys view the social stratification system is related to their aspirations for improved social status. Each social class in the Grammar School has more ambitious aspirations than its counterpart in the Modern School. This is especially the case for working-class Grammar School boys. The middle class boys in the Modern School show expectations of downward mobility, indicating their awareness. The boys, especially those of the lower middle class in the Grammar School, are aware of parental pressure towards social ascent.

[illegible]. F. Davies gives a pessimistic account of researches into [illegible] prestige of occupations (56). He doubts the existence of a [illegible]licly recognised prestige-hierarchy. The same occupations [illegible]y be differently regarded in different regions of the same [illegible]ety, and judgments of the prestige of occupations may vary [illegible]bly with the informants' social status or class position. [illegible] is implied in the Marxist and syndicalist notions of the [illegible]entic proletarian' as one whose values are not 'bourgeois'. [illegible]official.' There may be two types of recognition of [illegible]pational prestige-differences: W. Lloyd Warner found [illegible] members of upper and lower strata, viewing the social [illegible]e, tend to 'telescope' its further reaches. Davies also [illegible]estions the singleness of the hierarchy in which occupations [illegible]e placed.

He examines several relevant investigations. J. Hall and [illegible]. Caradog Jones made the first English study of occupational [illegible]restige (90). Over a thousand adults graded thirty occupations ('lower occupational levels being seriously under-represented') [illegible]with 'surprisingly high agreement.' (These comments are Davies's.) He notes 'a regrettable tendency to make do with [illegible]school children and students, as judges of prestige,' also that differences shown in the precision of judgments of occupational [illegible]restige are one direction in which the informant's social [illegible]ratification affects judgments.

A social psychologist is likely to remark that the results [illegible]btained in such sociological researches may have been affected [illegible] the neglect of individual mental differences in judges of [illegible]tus. Hyman's study discovered significant differences in [illegible]atus-awareness.' Some of his subjects continually reflected [illegible]on their status, comparing and contrasting it with that of a [illegible]end or acquaintance, while other rarely attended to this [illegible]ject. The contrast between personalities was noted not [illegible]y when members of different strata were compared, but also [illegible]en they belonged to the same stratum. None of the [illegible]estigators whose work Davies criticises collected subjective [illegible]orts from respondents on their task of ranking, or reported [illegible] own impression of their reactions. Hyman concludes: 'the [illegible]k that has been done, essentially modest in design (and so

intriguingly the product of concern over the status of teachers) still tantalises us with the hope of an invaluable tool of research into social class.'

We have seen that a stratum may be 'class-implicated,' to a degree which varies from time to time. R. L. Meier (156) asserts that social status attaches to certain branches of British science. He refers to research and practical applications rather than to teaching.

> The Brahmins of contemporary British science are the mathematicians, the theoretical physicists and chemists and the geneticists. Feeling somewhat inferior to them are the ordinary organic chemists, metallurgists and biologists. Alienated from these but probably of equivalent rank, are the advanced design engineers. . . . In third rank are the university graduates who are spending full time accumulating and checking the practical information which will be the basis of industry, medicine and agriculture tomorrow. They are the applied scientists and engineers. Below them are the men who went to engineering and technical day schools for several years, and finally at the bottom is a more heterogeneous group which picked up its training as best it could in evening classes and the industrial or trades training courses. . . . The distinctions between these classes lie very deep in the English educational system (they are less marked in the Scottish). . . . Many of the same tendencies are recognisable in the United States, especially in the Eastern parts, but social mobility is far greater and many more conscious efforts are made to eliminate class distinctions.

Meier believes that class barriers tend to prevent communication between the various groups responsible for progress in research and development. Each stratum uses a different jargon, moves in its own social circle, and has a recognised groove for promotion and advancement. A series of social misunderstandings and emotional blocks exist which make communication between the specialists in Great Britain more difficult than in the other advanced economies. These social barriers are far more important than most of the British scientists and administrators recognise; they are responsible for a great deal of friction and inefficiency in the older research organisations. He gives examples (p. 98): specialists in the

hnical side of research (usually trained here in technical oools) are reluctant to consult the central research stations the research associations, where they would be dealing with versity men. And in most research organisations people addressed by rank, e.g. 'Doctor' or 'Professor.' This ns unnecessarily the social distance between people who d co-operate better.

e pass now to consider marks of status. In an article, bols of Class Status,' Erving Goffman states that in ral, the rights and obligations of a status are fixed through by means of external sanctions enforced by law, public ion, and threat of socio-economic loss, and by internalised tions of the kind that are built into a conception of self, give rise to guilt, remorse and shame.

status may be ranked on a scale of prestige, according to social value attributed to it, relative to other statuses in ame social sector. An individual may be rated on a scale teem, which depends upon the closeness of his performance e ideal established for that status.

he rights and obligations of a status are frequently ill-ted to ordinary communication: consequently, specialised ns of displaying one's position develop. Status symbols ign-vehicles, cues which determine the status to be imputed person and the way in which others ought to treat him. y are distinguishable from collective symbols, denying the erence between categories, in order that members of all gories may be drawn together, affirming a single moral munity.

tatus symbols designate the position which an occupant s, not the way in which he fulfils its expectations. They are nguished from esteem symbols, which designate the degree which a person performs the duties of his position in rdance with ideal standards, regardless of its particular . An example is the Victoria Cross. Examples of status bols are the insignia which tell us a soldier's rank, but not standard achieved in performing its duties. A captain may rated higher than a lieutenant-colonel in terms of the esteem rded to good soldiers.

A status symbol carries categorical significance, but it may also carry expressive significance, proclaiming the point of view, the style of life, and the cultural values of a person, or satisfying the 'needs' of his social position. For example, in Europe the practice of fighting a duel of honour was for three centuries a symbol of gentlemanly status.

Continuance of status symbols in social situations requires occupation and class symbols to restrict opportunities for misrepresentation. Examples of occupation symbols are credentials which testify to a person's training in a factory or business; private offices and segregated eating-rooms, etc. These are objectively verifiable or identifiable. Goffman points out that a definition of class must refer to rights exercised and conceded, but not specifically laid down in law or contract and not invariably recognised in practice. 'Offenders' commit a presumption, not a crime. Class-gains typically refer to attitudes of superiority, not officially or too openly discussed, and in the matter of jobs, services and economic exchanges, to preferential treatment not openly or officially approved. We tend to justify class-gains in terms of cultural values which in a given society 'everyone' presumably respects; in our own, education, skill and talent. Class symbols serve not so much to represent or misrepresent one's position, as to influence, in a desired direction, other persons' judgment of it.

Every class symbol (following Goffman) embodies one or more devices for restricting misrepresentative use of it; e.g.

(1) *Moral restrictions.* In Western society, some persons who for the first time can afford to emulate upper class conspicuous consumption refrain from doing so on grounds of religious scruples, cultural disdain, ethnic and racial loyalty, economic and civic propriety, or even undisguised 'sense of one's place.'

(2) *Intrinsic restrictions.* One kind of symbol involves appreciated use of certain rights or characteristics. People symbolise their wealth by displaying it, their power by using it, their skill by exercising it.

(3) *Natural restrictions.* Natural scarcity of objects is a fact-

which may operate in the choice of certain symbols of status. Genuine diamonds are the obvious example; others are property, e.g. large buildings, to produce which requires an appreciable fraction of the total available means of production. Children may share, in part, their parents' status; not only because the connection is usually demonstrable but also because the number of children a woman can bear is limited. Personal association with individuals of high status is often employed as a symbol of status. Play-going, especially in the metropolis or a festival town, can be used as a symbol of status, but a visit to the cinema usually cannot.

(4) *Socialization restrictions.* During informal interaction, membership of a particular class is displayed by acts which impress other like-minded persons with the suitability and likeableness of one's general manner. 'One of our sort,' they think. Goffman writes that such general impressions seem built upon a response to many 'particles' of behaviour—matters of etiquette, dress, deportment, gesture, intonation, dialect, vocabulary, small bodily movements and automatically expressed evaluations concerning the substance and the details of life. All these constitute a 'social style,' carrying deep expressive significance.

Obviously style and manners of one class can be psychologically ill-suited to persons brought up in another. Consequently exclusive symbols arise; one class may use as a symbol some inclusive act (password or fraternal sign) which another class does not know is being employed to exclude it. (Cf. Chapter 3.)

(5) *Cultivation restrictions.* In many societies the cultivation of arts, 'tastes,' sports and handicrafts are symbols of class status (cf. gardening, of the kind which needs carefully selected gardeners, as distinct from working on one's allotment). Expertness requires concentrated attention over a long period; e.g. a command of several languages. Many classes place high value on restraint, a form of negative cultivation, involving a studied withdrawal of attention from many areas of experience. In Western society, the negative and positive aspects of

cultivation are typically combined in 'sophistication' concerning food, drink, clothes and furnishings.

(6) A person's status is based not only on social qualifications but also on the length of time he has possessed them. In Britain, condition of hands and height in men, and secondary sexual characteristics in women, are symbols of status based ultimately on the long-range physical effects of diet, work and environment.

All the above devices restrict the misuse of class symbols, yet no single mode of restriction can withstand too many contingencies, nor is there any restriction which is not regularly and systematically circumvented. Surprisingly as it may seem to some English readers, Goffman cites as a successful circumventing institution, England's Public School system; 'a machine for systematically re-creating middle-class people in the image of the aristocracy'—a task in which twenty-six Charm Schools in Chicago are similarly engaged, but with a somewhat different clientéle and a somewhat different ideal image.'

An interesting concept is that of Curator Groups, 'Wherever the symbolising equipment of a class becomes elaborate, a curator personnel may develop, to build and service this machinery of status. It includes members of such occupational categories as domestic servants, fashion experts and models, interior decorators, architects, teachers in the field of higher learning, actors, and artists of all kinds. These are typically recruited from classes with much less prestige than the classes to which such services are sold.'

Goffman concludes with a plea for studying the social career of particular status symbols—Dr. J. H. Mueller, for example, has examined the transfer of a given kind of musical taste from one social group to another (163). Such studies are useful now that widespread cultural communication has increased the circulation of symbols, the power of curator groups, and the ranges of behaviour accepted as vehicles for symbols of status. (Cf. Chapter 4). The best examples of occupations which imply status accorded to the holder not only by colleagues but also by the majority of the public are those of the Fighting Services, the Church, Medicine and the Law. The Fighting

Services are often called 'the Services' by those who are professionally connected with them, though the rapid increase in the social services may have strengthened the civilian tendency to prefix 'fighting' as a distinction, since these are the only professions into which, in peace-time, persons are conscripted; while in time of war, they may be 'directed' into the others.

Any remarks made about status in this book are qualified by the statement that a person's status, as conceived by himself, may or may not be identical with that which others accord to him. In this connexion Hyman's work may be cited; also because it shows how little is known about the subjective aspects of status. It is important to remember that though self-delusion about one's economic stratum is possible, one's bank manager or the income tax authorities may express a more realistic view at regular intervals of time, yet a person may misjudge the status accorded him by his neighbours.

The changing status of the professions has been described by Dr. T. F. Fox, Editor of the *Lancet* (72). He points out that 150 years ago in England the professions were few and small. Besides the profession of arms, there were only the Church, Law and Medicine. Even among doctors the vast majority were beyond the pale because, as general practitioners, they sold medicines for profit. But today the professions are very numerous, and many of them are very big.

Ought we, he asks, to welcome or deplore this tendency to spread? (Lewis and Maude deplore it explicitly and at length, but not everyone shares their liking for professions: indeed, they have been described as conspiracies against the public.) Do we wish to see their identity merged in the larger service of the State? Or should they remain in strong and independent groups, owning no master but their collective conscience? If it is desirable for them to be independent, is it still possible?

People want professional status in work because it carries the same sort of social cachet as amateur status in sport and for similar historical reasons. Professor T. H. Marshall has described how in this country the early physicians and lawyers enjoyed the aristocratic privilege of leisure, which he defines as 'freedom to choose your activities according to your own preferences

and your own standards of what is best.' The professional man does not work in order to be paid; he is paid in order that he may work. We should note that there are still professions in which to sue for fees is 'not done.'

Yet today the doctor and lawyer usually work as hard as the tradesman, and so, latterly, they have emphasised their ethical code and their position of trust. As Adam Smith (quoted by Marshall) says in *The Wealth of Nations*, our health, our fortune, our life or reputation cannot safely be reposed in 'people of a very mean or low condition,' and the doctor's and attorney's rewards must be such as may give them 'that rank in the society which so important a trust requires.'

'That rank' may have been simple to describe in Adam Smith's day, but now status is claimed by doctors for different reasons. Life, fortune and reputation are now entrusted to the air pilot, the midwife, the accountant, the public relations officer. The doctor may point not only to the length of his training but also to its expense. Yet today there are many other people in positions of trust attained only after long training, and much of the cost of producing a doctor is borne, not by his parents but by the state. Why then, asks Dr. Fox, should the doctor still claim a higher status than anybody else?

His reply, with which many of us would agree, is not that given by all prominent members of the medical profession, but let that pass. The doctor must have it because society and the problems of medical science have become so much more complex, and the patient badly needs the help of someone capable of coping with both.

'Never, I believe, was there more need that the doctor should be a cultivated person, respected for his own sake and for his knowledge of men and things, whose way of life gives him leisure and balance and a chance to reflect. Even if little can be done about it today, let us note that professional freedom should include freedom from overwork and financial anxiety on the one hand—and from too many household duties on the other. If I may coin another Arab motto: "Wisdom is born in the bath but dies in the sink." There is real danger that our rulers will foolishly think in terms of medical technicians, not of physicians—of quantity, not of quality' (72).

One hears today eloquent pleas for the greater support and use of rigidly scientific medicine, described by some, perhaps in exaggeration, as only 50 years old. Yet how far can the general practitioner be rigidly scientific in this sense, and if he could and did, would he not become the 'medical technician' of whom some doctors disapprove? Who would then deal with the patients' disabilities, inabilities, disorders, as distinct from narrowly defined 'diseases'? And would the patient, *qua* patient, be allowed to be neurotic, or ever normally worried or subject to conflicts? Would the average doctor be happy if his 'non-scientific' problems were handed over entirely to almoners, social workers, psychiatric social workers, marriage guidance counsellors, family welfare advisers, poor man's lawyers and specially selected priests? Most of these perform their functions excellently when properly chosen and trained, but would the increase in their responsibilities and numbers decrease those of the doctors, as we understand the term? And might not the numbers of those who fulfil these ancillary duties vary with the ideals of the political party in power?

Lewis and Maude ask what may happen if the State, by subsidising and stimulating the output of medical students, sees a chance of diluting the medical profession sufficiently to remove the scarcity-value of doctors. The recent bad record of successive governments in the matter of school education is remembered. As Dr. Fox quotes, 'they have offered the minimum salaries and conditions of work consistent with securing the services of people with the minimum qualifications for the work they want done . . . they have given the profession of teachers in maintained and aided schools a social status that deters large numbers of people most needed in these schools. Teachers have suffered, too, from the tendency of public services to burden professional people with work that ought to be done by clerks or caterers—or not at all.'

The doctors and the teachers however have some special professional ambitions which are not quite comparable. Probably no teacher with a specialised university training, which qualifies him to teach his subject to a high standard, if with much reading he can keep abreast of his pupils, really wants to fill up forms

and to arrange details of school lunches. The argument that it is good for his soul may be countered by the reminder that some heavy manual work might be good for the souls of surgeons and dentists—but not for their hands. Yet the doctor may not wish to have his penumbral work entirely done for him, and if he is working in the country or a small town, there will be little chance of this.

Perhaps the dilemma to be described below has been made artificially sharp in debate, yet one can hear arguments by well informed doctors on these lines: Ought a general practitioner to aim at being austerely scientific, at the risk of appearing impersonal, even unkind, to the patient (as he would, and quite rightly, if a recalcitrant patient had bubonic plague) or should he be first the patient's friend, and secondly perhaps, the family's? If so, he will have to know much more than his father did. And today a 'G.P.' who sends his patient to a hospital, public or private, sometimes feels 'out of it'; even that his visits are unwelcome. Here questions of status arise in acute forms.

An opinion expressed by Gerald Heard is that, far from being downtrodden, the medical profession, already the most powerful, is achieving social ascendency. The doctor has been 'inevitably translated from being an independent 'medical adviser' of private clients who chose him, into medical authority over a public that is officially subject to him'. Heard is alarmed at the doctor's increasing ability to change bodies and minds. Sometimes this is done by trial and error methods which help to increase scientific knowledge but may bear hardly on the victims of the errors.

Lewis and Maude's *Professional People* (129), though consistently interesting and provocative, may disappoint the social psychologist because in their book the authors have not explicitly dissociated the concept of status from that of class. Since they did not set out with this intention, it would be unfair to blame them for this omission, yet, as society is at present constituted, a man may achieve and maintain a certain social status without frequent reference being made by others to his class. The fact that even in 1954 several chief spokesmen for

the Labour Party are visibly and audibly upper or upper-middle class occasionally makes trouble for their critics, especially if these latter belong themselves to a relatively lower class.

The opening paragraph of *Professional People* illustrates the above remarks. It refers to 'that almost hereditary professional aristocracy which is a peculiarly British institution' and compares it with 'those who . . . have achieved professional recognised status from a family background of manual labour.' There are at stake 'a valued culture, complicated or subtle techniques' . . . 'a tradition of self-examining integrity and self-forgetful service which is believed to be irreplaceable.'

Several of these postulates will be readily granted; others seem dubious. And throughout the book one finds expressions which in any debate would provoke opposition and exposition of other points of view. References to 'State snoopers' (p. 55) 'specialoids' in the medical profession (4), 'the National Health Service completed the general practitioner's dethronement' (40), the attribution to non public-school products of 'second-rate brains and undeveloped characters' (89), the selection for Dartmouth under the new regulations, of a 'rather less desirable type of boy, in terms of character and motive' (218); this change being attributable to 'socialist dislike of the old type of naval officer' (219), the assumption that the daughter of a manual worker is 'less gifted' than the daughter of a doctor, and that for a professional man 'a necessary expense is £150 a year for sherry and spirits for consumption at home'; all these are coats trailed before the reader.

Interesting miscellaneous contributions to the problems of status are the assertions that in the negotiations with the doctors before the passing of the National Health Insurance Act, Mr. Aneurin Bevan regarded doctors simply as workers with special skills (pp. 10–13), that at one time the experts were in awe of the Church, then the Church was in awe of the experts, now the professional sociologist is beginning to talk to the experts as the Church once did (14), that the 'boffins' are an élite on trial (51).

The fact that one-half of the world (even perhaps of this

country) doesn't know how the other half thinks is illustrated by the authors' attitude to warfare (in 1952). They write: (p. 93)

> At the outbreak of the Crimean War (1854) . . . those were days in which the professional soldier and sailor could occasionally practise privately, which is now hardly ever the case: when upon peace being declared in 1815, naval officers found themselves expected to live as gentlemen and support their families on £91.5.0 a year, they sought out new clients in South America or Greece and conducted for them some successful wars of liberation. . . .
>
> The naval officer, narrowly specialised in the complex function of operating a warship, is vulnerable. Private practice now being very limited, the 'axed' R.N. in periods of retrenchment has only general administrative ability to profess (see p. 113).

'Private practice' and 'clients' are terms which in this connexion seem difficult to reconcile with the tradition of 'self-examining integrity and self-forgetful service' claimed for the professional aristocracy. And the complaint of writers on the international trade in armaments between 1918 and 1930 was not so much that an 'axed' officer might put his knowledge at the disposal of firms selling armaments to our potential enemies, as that he was approached by these firms some time before his retirement, when he could, if he wished, affect buying policy inside the Services.

Sir Cyril Burt's Hobhouse Memorial Lecture in 1953: 'Contributions of Psychology to Social Problems' (34) is almost unique, expressing as it does an English psychologist's attitude towards the present investigations of social class here and in America. The social sciences, at least in this country, he remarks, have remained comparatively out of touch with current work in psychology; e.g. concerning backwardness, delinquency, medical psychology, industrial psychology and education.

In all these fields it is easy to see how social class complicates the issues. Moreover, 'in dealing with questions of social psychology, it seems to me very rash to assume, without further check, that conclusions about social matters reached by investigations in the United States will also hold good in this country.'

Following the two pioneers who built up the first British psychological laboratories, McDougall at University College, London and Myers at Cambridge (both experimentalists and anthropologists) he strongly holds the view that training the investigators in both experimental and observational methods was of great importance, and he believes that this second type of training is now relatively neglected in English universities.

In Burt's view, the psychologist who investigates social class has three broad questions to answer:

(1) How are we to distinguish or define the different social classes? (2) How do mental or moral characteristics differ from one class to another? What special interests, attitudes, ideals, and ways of thought are correlated with class membership? (3) How far is class membership itself the cause of the psychological peculiarities thus discovered, and how far, if at all, do the peculiarities of individuals determine their social class?

This outlines a programme for many years of future investigation, by psychologists with special qualifications. He suggests that for the purposes of the psychologist a social class may perhaps best be defined as a group of persons who could have social intercourse on equal terms, so far as their age and sex allows. In this connexion might be mentioned a complication partly due to the effect of economic strata. Since 1939 there have been many obstacles to convivial relations in the strict sense of that term. Forty years ago, when rent, food and drink (to say nothing of clothes) cost much less, and many more people could employ servants cheaply, entertaining was easy. Between say, 1914 and 1930, many middle class people kept open houses on one night of the week, and knew that on each of the other nights the houses of some friend would be open to them. At the earlier part of this period a chicken or a bottle of wine could be bought for 3/6, a bottle of whisky for 4/6, ten cigarettes for 3d, a dozen bottles of beer or cider for 3/– or less.

Nowadays people of a similar class live in smaller houses, drink is fantastically expensive, servants are obtainable only by the rich, and a generation has grown up, the members of

which may regard as necessary and normal, whole day excursions in the car, frequent visits to the cinema or dances, meals 'out,' weekends away from home, and an annual Continental holiday. Is it surprising that they may not consider their class matters much, especially if their economic stratum and the status of their job matter more?

Burt points out that the criteria of class employed by different writers vary considerably even in this country. The commonest, and today one of the most misleading, is income: a definite mark of stratum. Occupation and its sub-varieties are closely connected with class though new occupations are emerging which would be difficult to classify socially; e.g. those connected with the administration of large businesses, as Lewis and Maude have found (129). What social class, for example, attaches to modern advertisers or journalists? Property, 'whether in the shape of land, capital, or the visible equipment of the home,' is a sign of social class, but this criterion is far from simple. An owner of several thousand acres of land in the country may be, but often is not, a member of the aristocracy or the upper classes. The social ranking given to him by others may depend upon his father's occupation, his own education, culture, and the standards of those with a comparable income who live within a few miles of his home. An obviously upper class couple may live in a very small if expensive town flat. The social ascent of a man who by his own efforts acquires much capital may depend not only on his personality and character but upon those of his wife and children. (It was once said that the financial support of higher education in England would leap up if the peerage were abolished).

As for the visible equipment of the home, Burt remarks 'In a conference (on classification by social position) held in 1913, I remember Lord Morley suggesting "the possession of a Tennyson," and a school attendance officer suggesting instead "the possession of a servant, more than one servant, or no servant at all." Both would now be quite out of date.'

An interesting survey along these lines was carried out by Dr. Dennis Chapman (44). When the report originally appeared, one comment was that the social importance of the radio-set (not

home-made) had been underestimated. Today the relation of social class to the proclaimed possession (by means of an outdoor aerial) of a television set is complicated. Until the 1953 Coronation stimulated the buying of TV sets, it was difficult to 'confess' that one did not possess a TV set without appearing to brag. And early in 1953, a BBC investigator who toured the U.S.A. to see TV organisations of all kinds discovered that none of the hosts with whom she had stayed possessed a TV set.

Burt's other suggested criteria of class are similar to those adopted in the present book. On dress (cf. Chapter 7) he remarks 'It is the first to strike the eye. Nevertheless, in this country class differences in dress are no longer so conspicuous as they were forty years ago.

> In my boyhood, though the farm labourer's smock had already vanished, the neckerchief, cap, and corduroy trousers (gartered with straps below the knees) still formed the badges of the manual worker; the bowler, black coat, white hands and white collar betrayed the office clerk; while the top hat, the morning coat, and the monocle or pince-nez, with gloves, stick, or neatly rolled umbrella, distinguished the professional man and the aristocrat; the doctor still often carried a gold-headed cane (I myself inherit one from my father). Today the observer has to watch for clues at once more subtle and less conclusive.

The other criteria which he considers important are vocabulary and phraseology, accent and speech intonation, manners and etiquette. These are dealt with in Chapter 3 of the present book.

A valuable contribution to the study of social differences has recently been made by Dr. D. G. MacRae (140). In his bibliography of studies of social stratification he includes references (a) important or interesting (b) influential on writers and research workers (c) widely quoted (d) casting light on amusing or neglected aspects of the problem. By adding (d) he steps aside from the ranks of conventional sociologists, whose many solid virtues seldom include interest in amusing facts, however important, and often exhibit striking agreement concerning subjects which they consider worthy of omission

from their chapters. He concludes his 'trend report' by regretting deeply that modern sociology in all countries is so structured and prejudiced that 'synthetic comparative and genetic research in social stratification is unlikely to take place in the immediate future.'

Perhaps the anxiety (or *Angst*) of many social investigators to be considered scientific, not only by their professional colleagues but also by physical scientists, who are usually looking the other way, has caused many books on sociology and social psychology, purporting to deal with the Proper Study of Mankind, to be remarkably solemn as well as serious. Compared with them, any writings which notice the existence of good-will, good manners, charm, humour and beauty may seem irreverent. What social psychologist has yet considered seriously the implications of the doubt, often expressed, that if society were to become much more democratic than it is at present in England, life might be happier but would be duller?

MacRae defies another unwritten convention; that the scientific writer must never attribute motives to another scientist, especially if he is in the same line of business. Yet today it must be hard for any social psychologist to believe in the existence of a single, simple human instinct of curiosity eventually sublimating itself to benefit society, and if he faces the facts, he may be compelled reluctantly to speculate concerning the motives of other investigators who embark upon research projects requiring years of concentrated work. He may even shock some modern psychologists by indulging in introspection concerning his own motives.

MacRae asserts that most writers on stratification, consciously or not, are egalitarians of some kind in philosophy. This may bias their judgments: it certainly affects their selection of topics for research. But, he adds 'this influence, or spur, is of comparatively little importance in affecting the scientific quality of their work.' The economists, he says, are not today deeply involved in the subject.

He praises the iconoclast Veblen (218) highly, even though he writes about amusing subjects, such as the psychology of 'society' (i.e. of the extreme upper class) and the function of

fashion in diffusing, through emulation, the marks of high status. The recent work of C. W. Mills (160) and D. Riesman (194) (194a) gives reason to hope that the succession is not entirely lost.

An analysis is offered of the role of Marxism (as a conscious factor) in stratification research, and its strengths and weaknesses are assessed. The rise of Nazism focused attention on Germany's class-structure, and the Nazis' social policy sent a flood of scholars into exile throughout the world, above all, to France, Britain and America. . . . There was inevitably a new sympathy for Marxism, which then appeared as both the major opponent of Nazism and its major interpreter . . . thus the 30's saw a new interest in stratification in the sense of the analysis of 'class'; even of political 'class.' The facts of social life forced home the lesson that society is stratified and that stratification is one of the central aspects of social structure. But in the long run, the influence of Marxism proved to be small, for reasons which MacRae gives.

He emphasises the importance of distinguishing between class consciousness and class feeling. Class consciousness, he suggests, is greater and class feeling less in the North than in the South of England, and in Scotland, even if occupational ranking is similar, the social differences representing ranks are certainly less than in England. He calls attention, too, to the sharp differentiation of 'manner' in English society, and its relation to accent, dress, etc., and since these subjects though interesting, may seem trivial to some minds, remarks on the 'lengthy avoidance of the significant' in most textbooks. He deplores too, the unfortunate divorce in this country between history and sociology.

In the next chapter, concrete examples of English social stratification are discussed.

An excellent example of a powerful élite in this country is provided by the group of men known collectively as the English Judges. (The methods of appointing them are described on pages 53 – 55.)

In his *Hereditary Genius*, Sir Francis Galton wrote:

The office of a Judge is really a sufficient guarantee that its possessor

is exceptionally gifted. In other countries it may be different from what it is with us, but we all know that in England the Bench is never spoken of without reverence for the intellectual power of its occupier (76).

Galton was one of the fathers of psychology, yet nowadays most psychologists would doubt several of his assumptions, which in his day few would question, so it is interesting to note how confidently, when discussing mental heredity, he cited the English Judges. Today, many laymen as well as psychologists would raise eyebrows at the problems indicated, or questions begged, in the vast sweep of this short quotation. Its writer was untroubled by much knowledge of the distribution of intelligence and of talents, of power derived primarily from birth or special types of education, and of the English attitude to other nations. Today few Australians, Americans or Russians would read this passage unquestioningly. Yet our Judges are highly respected; some of their names—and their fathers'—are familiar in our mouths as household words; many of the Judges are public figures. This is not surprising: the proximity of the Temple to Fleet Street is not merely topographical. Yet not many people know much about the background of any individual Judge. It is hard to think of a group more powerful, less well known, as distinct from widely known, even more mysterious than this.

In these days of illustrated newspapers, films and television, which in its present period, with stage and budget severely limited in size, offers the public a plethora of 'court-scenes,' themselves ready-made dramas, many people must possess a stereotyped mental picture of an English Judge. He will have a grey wig, or black cap, white gloves, and somewhere in the picture may be a nosegay, trumpeters and a procession, symbolising dignity, inscrutability, remoteness, permanence. The face is clean-shaven, with a firm mouth and serious eyes, capable of twinkling with benign humanity, suggesting a tendency to profess ignorance of facts and persons known to millions, and to emit epigrams which might be, but seldom are, capped by his hearers. So far as character can be read from

the face, he has infinite patience, good manners, occasionally derived from charm in early youth. The wig makes it difficult to give him an age, but he seems to be in or only just past the prime of life. He is never, or hardly ever, approaching senility, though there is no rule that a High Court Judge must retire at any specified age.

This is a mere impressionist sketch: let us build up a median, or at least average, representation. This picture, representing the small group—one could visualise the 107 (in 1946) comfortably if improbably riding inside one large tram—because of the homogeneous social and educational background of the judges, will be sharper than is usual in composite photographs. It is based upon an investigation carried out in 1946 by the Department of Psychology of Manchester University. It formed part of a more extensive study of the social stratification of the rulers of England after the 1945 Election. Data concerning the Members of Parliament have been published (194a). It is interesting to compare these with those relating to the Judges.*

Their social background is much less varied than that of the M.P.s. Since the occupations of the Judges' fathers were in closely related social strata, the background of the great majority of judges (public school and older university) was fairly homogeneous. It was very similar to that of the typical Conservative M.P. in the 1945 Parliament.

Perhaps the greatest contrast between Judges and M.P.s is in the average age at which they began to take up paid employment. The average Judge's much later start puts him in a special category. Since Judges are specialists in legal matters, it is not surprising that most of them began and continued in their chosen profession. In this way they differ from M.P.s who show a great range, both of first employment, and of later changes into other occupations.

Let us turn now to details of the Manchester University investigation. In February 1946, a questionnaire was sent out

* The investigation was carried out by the present writer, Nancy E. Lingard and J. A. Waites, with a grant from the Simon Research Fund. The account of the research, as it concerns the Judges, has not been published elsewhere, though it has been the subject of a broadcast discussion.

by the Department of Psychology to all English Judges. It was identical with that received by Cabinet Ministers, M.P.s, heads of Civil Service Departments, Recorders, Stipendiary Magistrates and officials of the House of Commons.

Early in June 1946, 74 Judges, 69 per cent of the possible total, had replied. Since answering questionnaires might be assumed to be more distasteful to them than to most English people, it is gratifying, perhaps surprising, that the percentage of their returns was the highest of all the categories studied; the M.P.s sent in 66 per cent, the Magistrates 50 per cent. Some judges kindly sent unsolicited letters, amplifying their questionnaire answers with personal details.

Unless otherwise stated, all the following results are given as percentages of the number of answers *received* (to repeat, 69 per cent of the possible total). Let us first consider answers about education. The Judges' schools usually corresponded to their parents' social status. 'Primary' education had been received by 85 per cent in private, and by 15 per cent in elementary schools. 74 per cent went to Public Schools, 15 per cent to Grammar, 7 per cent to Secondary Schools. Of the 55 ex-public-schoolboys who answered, 10 had been to Winchester, 5 to Eton; Harrow and Westminster had 2 each. (In contrast with this, Eton and Harrow had been the more important training grounds for the ex-public school M.P.s).

In our sample of Judges, the majority of public schoolboys had been to schools not included among those usually called 'big' (Charterhouse, Eton, Harrow, Marlborough, Rugby, Westminster, Winchester). 65 out of our 74 had attended universities, 58 had taken degrees. Of these graduates, 39 went to Oxford, 15 to Cambridge, 2 to London, 2 to other British universities, 2 had attended foreign, in addition to English universities.

Of our sample, 12 per cent had been to no university. This fact appears to surprise many British university graduates who do not know the English judiciary system in detail, and possibly the reaction of some readers in the U.S.A., France and Germany will be similar.

On the whole, the type and 'path' of the Judge's education

tended to resemble his father's. 30 had won University Scholarships from public or Grammar Schools. Of the 65 who had received education in any way from universities (we include degrees taken by private study, research, extension courses, war-time degrees, etc.) 61 graduated. If legal subjects are classified under 'Arts,' there are 60 Arts and 1 Science Degree. 6 Judges had attended evening classes. This number is small but socially significant, for the few could exert considerable influence upon public life.

Though a very wide range of first paid occupations was revealed in the M.P.s results, no less than 41 Judges had begun and continued without break in the legal profession. While the M.P.s average age of first paid employment was in the early 'teens, that for the Judges is 24: the highest for all groups investigated.

English Judges are apt to be sons of Judges. Name an English Judge; you will often be asked 'Father or son?' This is an old story; the hereditary factor in the profession of the Judges was described as far back as 50 years ago, by Galton. Studying a period of 300 years, he found that of 289 Judges, more than one in every 9 had been father, son or brother of a Judge. From our sample of 74, the fathers of 25 (34 per cent) had been lawyers. Of the remaining fathers, 9 were industrialists, 4 concerned with finance, 4 with central government, 4 were clergymen, 4 artists. None was directly connected with agriculture, politics or academic life.

Leaving the numerical returns, let us consider their significance. Of paramount importance in the government of our country are decisions in Courts of Justice concerning individual cases. A recent example is the case of William Joyce. He was charged with treason for making his famous broadcasts (225). But treason can be committed only by a person, 'owing allegiance to our lord the King.' The main argument of the trial was focused on the question: did Joyce owe such allegiance? His counsel claimed that he did not, because he was not British either by birth or by adoption. The prosecution said that he did, because holding a British passport imposed on him a duty of fidelity to the King, in return for the protection which he

received as a holder of a British passport. The question then arose: Does a person become British because he has a British passport? No one knew, because there had been no case of its kind before.

Finally Mr. Justice Tucker ruled that Joyce did owe allegiance to our country because he possessed a British passport. That ruling has now passed into our law, and our reason for saying that it is the law is that it has been so decided by a Judge. That was an outstanding case, but there are thousands of others, varying in complexity and dramatic appeal, which illustrate the important part played by judges in the law-making of this country.

These decisions are made by single persons, each with a background; racial, national, social, educational and cultural. Social psychologists are impressed by the importance of knowing as much about this as possible, if they are to study the people who run the country, for a Judge's decision may often make a law.

In a democracy like ours, dominated by an unwritten constitution, the qualities which may be expected in a Judge are that he should be independent, uninfluenced by Government or party pressure, not venal, highly skilled, possessing sufficient aptitude, erudition and experience for right, or at least wise, decisions. It cannot be assumed that such virtues descend automatically upon Judges with their robes of office. Inevitably there are critics of the present system. R. C. K. Ensor asserts that the English Judge's academic learning is commonly inferior to that of his continental homologue, and that 'the advocate must study law, not *in abstracto*, but with an eye and a feeling for the idiosyncrasies of particular judges, and still more for those mental fashions which, radiating from the leaders of the Bench, dominate the interpretations of the law at different epochs' (62).

Professor Harold J. Laski, describing what he considered to be defects in the judicial interpretation of statutes, asserted that the canons of the historical method now operative underestimate the degree to which the Judge's personality plays a part in determining the intention he attributes to Parliament.

Particularly in the realm of great social experiment, they make difficult the task of considering the relationship of statutes to the social welfare they are intended to promote, for the end involved may easily become unduly narrowed, either because of the Judge's unconscious assumptions or because he is observing principles of interpretation devised to protect interests we are no longer concerned to protect in the same degree as formerly (116).

It seems clear that Professor Laski's criticisms relate almost entirely to the psychological factors involved in Judges' decisions.

Professor G. W. Keeton, citing this country's increasing use of the technique of inquiries presided over by Judges, e.g. the Lynskey Tribunal, the Porter Committee on the Law of Defamation, and the Scott, Uthwatt and Barlow reports on town and country planning and the use of land, says that these imply faith in and respect for the judicial method both as a guarantee of impartiality and of the exclusion of irrelevant factors. Yet we are witnessing a limitation of the judicial function without parallel in Western Europe, by the growth of administrative process. This is due (among other things) to a distrust of the responsiveness of the judiciary to modern social needs. Nevertheless our judiciary commands universal confidence, for incorruptibility, acuteness of intellect and impartiality (112).

All these critics refer to personal factors involved in Judges' decisions. It is clear that law-makers must reflect, in some degree, the particular culture-pattern in which they have grown or to which they have later become subjected. This tends to colour thoughts and beliefs, control decisions and shape actions.

To investigators who habitually deal with large numbers, a 'population' so small as 107 might appear unworthy of much time and effort. But has any investigator ever examined a group not only complete in itself—a significant fact—but more powerful, more deeply entrenched socially and less known than this? The results are a high percentage of a whole, not of a sample.

It may be useful to give some details of the manner in which

the Judges are appointed. At the summit of their hierarchy are three titled Judges; the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice and the Master of the Rolls. These are appointed by the Prime Minister, who usually consults the Lord Chancellor about the appointment of the latter two. It seems to be common practice that the posts are given to those who, among the Prime Minister's political followers, occupy the highest Bar rank. However, the Master of the Rolls is often chosen from the supreme Court Judges.

Next come the seven Law Lords: they are usually not titled judges from below, but barristers who have served politically, yet held no previous judicial post.

Next are the 33 Supreme Court Judges.

There follow the 55 County Court Judges, appointed direct from the Bar.

From examination of the judicial system three facts emerge: (1) Unlike some Continental systems, ours has no place for a judicial profession as such. Usually the Judges are drawn from the ranks of the working advocates, and are of ripe age and experience. (2) The English system is unique in that there is little promotion from one grade of judge to another, so a judge's decisions are unlikely to have been affected consciously or unconsciously by consideration of the chance of promotion. (3) It is usual for the Judges to sit singly, or in very small groups. Ordinarily no civil case, except an appeal, is heard before more than one judge.

Concerning the general procedure of appointment Ensor writes (62).

> The appointments of the three great titled judges and of their humbler brother the President, of the seven Law Lords, and of the five Lords Justices are, by long-established practice, in the hands of the Prime Minister; who is, therefore, the supreme source of judicial promotion. On the other hand, the appointments to plain Justiceships in the High Court, as well as to the County Court judgeships and to five judgeships at the few surviving courts of local origin . . . are made on the recommendation of the Lord Chancellor. The point need not be overstressed, for it is one of practice, not of written law; the Judicature Act, 1873, merely said regarding the various

Supreme Court Judges, that they were to be appointed 'in the manner as heretofore' or as their previous equivalents had been 'heretofore appointed'. But it illustrates how very far judicial appointments and promotions in England are from being systematised, as abroad, in the hands of a single Minister and Department.

It is therefore important to consider the Judges in relation to the political background of their day.

It has been alleged that the knowledge possessed by English judges, as compared with that of other erudite persons, appears to be more restricted to legal matters, and their experience of life correspondingly focused upon legal situations. Some critics hold that the English judges are commonly less well educated than are those in other countries.

Compared with the French and the German methods the English requirements appear scanty. Ensor states them in one sentence:

> It is not necessary for (the Judge) to have read law in a university at all, and the only examinations which he need ever have passed—those for admission to the Bar—require very low standards of performance.

The English aspirant usually spends much of his training period in the chambers of some barrister. This may resemble the Frenc *stage d'avocat* and the German *Referendar*. Since the end of nineteenth century the quarrel between the older univer and the Inns of Courts has died down and English law i subject of University study. However, English law maintain that the only way to become adept in law and practise at the Bar itself.

Among important issues raised by this stu What, in this profession, are the relative v specific and of indirect or general training? stated over and over again most of the i troversy, though there is little evidence when making important public app Judge's education path seems to exe way. Compared with the differer

present M.P.s trod, it is clearly defined, yet vaguer than that of judges in countries near to our own.

At present it is not idle to speculate whether the selection committee (usually small) which appoints judges is unduly biased by school loyalties and similar prejudices, though in the next generation the influence of such factors might be less.

It seems unusual for laymen to attempt to criticise, even constructively an institution so British as that of the judges. Yet the relative importance of general and specific training is a consideration which arises in reflecting upon the function of judges, as upon any other activity of a public service. An illustration may help here. A medical practitioner, as a result of study by himself or others of individual differences in the make-up of human bodies and minds, may prescribe a complicated, lengthy treatment. In his own training, if he is a reliable consultant, he will have carried out, or at least observed, such treatment. Would not our future judges benefit if, during their training they learnt more about the chief mental differences between offenders, and observed, under expert guidance in penal and reformatory institutions how the different treatments which they will prescribe are actually carried out, and the relative success of such measures, as estimated by the staff? It may be answered that Judges deal with cases, not with ersons. Yet through the centuries, concepts of English justice of its relation to punishment and reform, have changed and anging. Many prison administrators, probation officers, rists, social psychologists and psychiatric social workers in deciding upon a criminal's punishment and treat- assessment of legal points, facts relevant to his ersonality and character will be considered. All the urgency of ascertaining the relative born and cultural factors in the motivation of idering them when prescribing penal treat- ly desirable that the future judge should the probable results of his decisions. eved not only through reading, and achers, bu observing the different treate v.

In 1953 the Government proposed a Judges Remuneration Bill, which if passed, would have given our judges an increase in stipend of £1,000 a year, tax free. There was widespread criticism (to quote Francis Williams in the *News Chronicle*) that 'this would be to make them a privileged group standing apart from the buffets and turmoils of ordinary life.' Mr. Williams suggests that the time is ripe for Cabinet Ministers to reconsider the whole question of the place of privilege in modern life.

The old privileges of wealth which once dominated our society have not quite gone, but they are going. Those who seek to exercise them no longer bring to the task the same confidence as they once did. They look constantly over their shoulders. Public opinion is, they cannot but be aware, hard on their heels. . . . But with one set of privileges out of the way we are in some danger—if it is a danger—of adopting a whole new set. Privilege, not of wealth, but of occupation. . . . There is hardly an occupation without its 'perks,' whether it be the privileged travel tickets of the railway worker and his family, the cheap canteen lunches of the factory worker, or the expense allowance—stretched to cover tax-free dinners to his friends at all the best restaurants—of the company director.

He argues that occupational privilege in one form or another is becoming the rule rather than the exception. Nor has this anything to do with Socialism or Capitalism, Communism, free enterprise or the Social Security State.

The most privilege-ridden community in the world is the Communist Russia, where the size of flat you may ho inhabit, the kind of luxuries with which you may h enliven your table, and the sort of car, if any, in whic go for a drive in the country are almost exclusively by your occupational status.

He points out that the two sets of privilege with each other on the Coronation stands: th rank and the new of occupation. . . . T privilege, which is another form i nature. If privilege is a form tha without making him contempt regard it with too cold an eye

CHAPTER TWO

Psychological Aspects of English Social Stratification

Stratification in England and the U.S.A. Relations between social and economic status. Social obligations of a group. Manners, reciprocal and non-reciprocal. The buyer-seller relationship. The 'people' and the 'masses.'

Property. Opportunity-class and social class. Signs of social strata; visual, auditory, tactual, olfactory.

Types of religion and of education. Concepts of gentleman and aristocrat. Has the real aristocratic system vanished? The realities corresponding to the terms 'ruling class' and 'working class.' Effects of evacuation during the War. Warfare, viewed from the standpoint of different classes. Distinction between the aims of lessening privilege and decreasing tolerance of individual differences.

THE stratification of our society, though obvious and striking, is hardly mentioned in English psychological textbooks, except those by J. M. Blackburn (25), R. H. Thouless (212) and W. J. H. Sprott (206)* English sociologists; Margaret and G. D. H. Cole (50, 50a, 51), Morris Ginsberg (78, 79), T. H. Marshall (148, 149), H. A. Mess (158), R. H. Tawney (210, 211) and Barbara Wootton (232, 233) have discussed this subject, and recently R. Lewis and A. Maude have added valuable contributions to this collection (128, 129).

The surprise at this neglect by psychologists may be lessened by the realisation that this tepidity of interest itself offers [illegible]al problems. Social forces make it difficult for a [illegible] thinker to regard his own position in society [illegible] to comprehend its meaning in a social [illegible]

[illegible]ratification exists, yet upon the English [illegible]ide [illegible]'19th century psychologists, particularly those [illegible]y desi[illegible]ophical Radicals, were fully aware of the [illegible] the p[illegible]nning of this century the subject attracted [illegible]eved n[illegible] Graham Wallas, L. T. Hobhouse and [illegible] to the fore in the early controversies [illegible]achers,[illegible]ntalists, and educational psychologists, [illegible]ssed its relation to the problems of treate[illegible]

it exerts a powerful, subtle influence. In younger nations matters are less complex. In the U.S.A. as Professor D. W. Brogan has pointed out (33) social stratification is important, but its delimitations and the forces producing these differ considerably from those known in England. He writes:

It is only an apparent contradiction in terms to assert that the fundamental democratic and egalitarian character of American life is demonstrated by the ingenuity and persistence shown in inventing marks of differences and symbols of superiority. In a truly class-conscious and caste-dominated society, the marks of differences are universally recognized even if resented. In America they must be stressed, or they might easily be forgotten, and they must be added to, as the old standards of distinction cease to serve their purpose. Apart from the simple economic criterion of conspicuous display, there are no generally accepted marks of social differences in America. And modern salesmanship makes clothes, cars, and personal adornment far more alike than was possible in the old days of belated styles and the Model T Ford. It is worth noting that the main stress of American class distinction is put on 'exclusiveness.' In a society without formal public recognition of differences in rank, with a poor and diminishing stock of natural reverence for hereditary eminence, and with a constant rise to the top of the economic system of new men amply provided with the only substitute for hereditary eminence, wealth, it becomes extremely difficult to make 'society' anything but the spare-time activities of the rich. It is characteristic that it is in cities whose days of economic advance are over, in Boston, Philadelphia, Charleston, that it has proved easiest to keep out the newcomers.

In some parts of England the relation between social and economic status is complex. A poor country vicar may often visit rich neighbours, but he does not 'mix with,' as distinct from visiting parochially, many parishioners whose incomes may equal or surpass his own. In the intellectual professions, especially in large towns with literary and musical coteries, within certain limits social status may be variable almost at will. Yet nowadays wealth is an important distinguishing factor of the English upper strata, since few impoverished aristocrats can live entirely on credit.

In this country, economic status is easy to guess at. Though to indicate it overtly, while referring to anyone by name, is 'not done,' euphemisms—'comfortably off,' 'in reduced circumstances'—hint with fair accuracy at financial position. Nevertheless, widespread severe taboos are imposed upon detailed consideration of social status (especially of persons living in any but the 'top' and 'bottom' layers of society), and of speaking and clothing; the chief signs of class. These prohibitions are overt in upper and middle-class society, where 'gentlemen' and 'ladies' are seldom referred to as such, except perhaps by old people. Moreover, at a less conscious level, any attempt to describe or record the outstanding characteristics of gentlemen and ladies would be resented and resisted. As a Continental sociologist put it, there has been little field-work among the English upper classes. Similar taboos probably exist in the minds of some social philosophers who consider themselves immune to such foolishness.

This unanalysed acceptance of social stratum ('knowing one's place') partly explains the sociologists' and psychologists' neglect to consider social stratification, clothing and speaking. No British psychologist, except Dr. R. H. Thouless, who made a promising start with social stratification and Professors J. M. Blackburn and W. J. H. Sprott (25, 206), who devote chapters to it, have thought these subjects worthy of detailed treatment in a textbook. English social psychology is, on the whole, an account by middle-class writers of middle-class behaviour. First-hand studies have been made in England by 'foreign' observers from Poland, Dr. F. Zweig (237, 238); the U.S.A., E. W. Bakke (17); and Austria, Dr. Marie Jahoda (105).

Psychologists ought to regard social stratification objectively, as a geologist sees layers in a cliff-face, unprejudiced about the desirability of their relative positions; even of their existence. The analogy is not far-fetched. An artist's painting of a stratified cliff might omit, widen, or narrow some layers, and transpose others, as some describers of English society are tempted to do. In society, too, the boundaries between layers may be blurred, oblique or curved, while until recently the B.B.C.'s Third

Programme produced a fine example of vertical stratification, since in some towns within a few miles of special aerials, reception is reasonably good on a cheap set, while in many regions such a result cannot be bought.

Dr. Thouless describes significant aspects of social stratification. Among them are the social obligations of a group, summed up in its code of manners. Salutations at meeting and parting are a good example of differences in procedure in various strata of our own society. A code of manners facilitates social intercourse and the adoption of the attitude of primitive comradeship within the group. It also often increases (and this is important for our present subject) the separateness of groups from others. Dr. Thouless followed a current usage speaking of 'superior' and 'inferior' classes, but thoughtfully added:

The terms 'superior' and 'inferior' social classes will be used frequently. It is necessary to make clear that these terms are used in a severely technical sense to mean only superiority and inferiority in the scale of social stratification. Stratification is a fact of social organisation which we can recognise by various marks, perhaps most easily by noticing that the member of a superior social class gives orders to one of inferior social class while the other obeys them, and that there is a social obligation on the member of the inferior social class to use gestures or methods of address indicating respect which the other is not under the same obligation to reciprocate. Many of the differences are external signs of a relatively intangible but very real difference in social prestige attached to different classes. The use of the term 'superior' in this connection does not imply that the member of a socially superior class is superior in intelligence, social usefulness, or in any other respect except that of occupying a higher position in a stratified social system.

Manners, as he points out, may be reciprocal or non-reciprocal:

They may also serve to mark the relationship of superior and inferior in different social strata. Between equals the social obligations of manners are reciprocal—an obligation of behaviour or speech of A towards B is equally an obligation of B towards A. Other social obligations, however, are non-reciprocal. A is required to adopt a certain form of behaviour or speech towards B who is socially superior,

although this obligation does not exist or exists in a different form from B to A.

Few writers have subsequently used the terms 'superior' and 'inferior,' possibly because to many readers, these words would have just that unpleasant aura of which Dr. Thouless tried to rid them. We shall not employ these adjectives, though agreeing that they are logically suitable.

Perhaps one of the most important and least often mentioned aspects of English social stratification is the inferiority of the seller in the buyer-seller relationship. This principle determines the line drawn between people 'in trade,' and those in the professional classes—lawyers, accountants, etc.

A sharp stratum-line between wholesale and retail trade is usually observable. The reason why, in peace-time with free competition, the retail seller may feel inferior, in both the narrow and the wide senses of this term, seems to be clearly expressed in the maxims 'Caveat emptor!' 'Let the buyer beware!' and 'The customer is always right.' However independent in manner a retailer wishes to be, he can seldom risk losing trade. Reluctant recognition of post-war social change was perhaps expressed in a notice on a laundry-van 'We are now prepared to accept applications from new customers,' and in overt disapproval, by some suppliers of coal and milk, of the Government's permission of a change of retailer. In the U.S.A. it was an English writer who noted that in a store a customer's opening speech is apt to begin with 'Gimme!' and not to end with 'please!' A contrast in manners can sometimes be seen in an English pharmacist's if specially dispensed medicines are sold at the same counter as ready-made drugs and toilet requisites. Those who remember the manners, and charges, at a pre-war German or a present day Swiss *Apotheke* will understand why.

This discussion may annoy some readers, but may demonstrate that it concerns a matter considered important by some purchasers. At times, the retailer must be very nearly all things to all men; the wholesaler's politeness can be more impersonal. American journalists who occasionally write 'clients' for 'customers,' and *vice versa*, illustrate a type of

humour which does not meet with universal approbation in say the Inner Temple or, perhaps, Bond Street.

Let us try to summarise current conflicting opinions about our present and future social stratification. Our aim is to show not only that the practical issues are of prime importance for our future welfare, for that is obvious to thoughtful people, but that where these questions are not economic they are psychological. We will then discuss psychological aspects of the general problem, hoping that it may help those who wish, while drastically changing our social system, to retain its useful features.

Here social psychology verges upon economics: many differences between English social classes are economically conditioned. Not all people in the lowest and lower-middle ranges of the economic scale, however, if they became wealthy, would choose to adopt all the customs and conventions common among the rich. Some of these usages would seem foolish, insincere, irksome or wicked to the newly-rich, who would have brought along their own prejudices, many of them also irrational.

The reader may reasonably assume that at the date of writing English social stratification is not what it was in 1939, and that it changed considerably when peace came. This has been kept in mind but as there are few data about social changes during the war, little time can be spent upon them here. It is, however, important to record that, as in Disraeli's time, there are still two Englands. Today they may perhaps be symbolised by the one of Miss Alice Duer Miller's *The White Cliffs* (159) and the other, explicitly distinguished from it by Mr. J. B. Priestley, in *Out of the People* and *English Journey* (189). He contrasts, as pictures and as social patterns, the South and the North, the counties with leisured beauty and those with the crowded, noisy, dirty, ugly but useful towns. Though people often try to silence any mention of the corresponding social differences, or even pretend that they do not exist, they are immediately observed and commented upon by visitors from abroad, especially from the Dominions or the U.S.A. Acute awareness of these differences was still evident

in the questions asked before Dunkirk of candidates for commissions in some of our fighting services.

From many directions we heard that after the war there would be great changes in the English social classes. In one sense this is a platitude. All modern wars cause social change; this is what they are fought for. In another sense, the statement is more interesting. It usually implies that the differences of social stratification will be fewer, and the lines of demarcation less clear. This prophecy is received by many with a sigh for the pre-war state, which they regarded as historically interesting, beautiful, romantic, desirable. Even if they personally played no actual part in the grand world, they saw it as a fairy-land, an escape-country, or a goal, if not for themselves, for their children or grandchildren. At the beginning of World War II some urged that it should be fought for the 'English way of life,' describing it in a manner which might be recognised by their friends, if not by the majority of the English. Since then, many have pointed out that no national way of life ever completely survives a great war; that when peace is declared, relatively few could wish our social structure to be restored; cracks, moss, mildew and all, and the advocates of the *status quo* have been almost silent. We may, however, distinguish between writers who feel certain that great social changes, not named precisely, are inevitable, and those who suggest definite innovations.

Mr. Priestley in 1941 opposed Walt Whitman's concept of 'the people' to that of 'masters' and 'masses.' We are not, or ought not to be, he wrote, conducting the war as members of different classes, but as people. 'The people can . . . be praised for their conduct so far in the war. . . . On the whole, the classes as such have behaved rather badly, being more concerned about their own particular rights and privileges than about the extent and force of our war effort. On the other hand, it is the people and not the classes who have so magnificently manned our air-raid services.' The people, he insists

> are not the masses. These are two different conceptions. Indeed, they are opposed. One rejects the other. When I say to myself 'the people,' I have a confused but lively vision of a hundred faces and a hundred

voices, as if a picture by old Breughel had suddenly come to life. In short, I think of persons. But when I say to myself 'the masses,' I see at once a grey, featureless horde, and hear nothing but a muttering and murmuring. I do not think of persons. The masses are not real human beings. They have been de-humanised. The supreme mystery does not flower in them as it does in us, who always feel ourselves separated from them. They are rough bundles of instincts and appetites. They are units of man-power. After using their muscles and collecting their pennies, you can consider and gratify their immediate needs; you cannot love them. They are not real persons.

We have been searching for years now for that division of the modern world that cuts the deepest. Once it was socialism against capitalism; then it was fascism against communism. Lately it has been totalitarianism against democracy. A welcome change from these is the division between those who think in terms of the masses and those who think in terms of the people. I believe it cuts very deep indeed.

Some of these arguments may seem irrelevant to one who, while actively rejecting the concept of masters and masses, firmly believes (both pragmatically and theoretically) in the 'classes.' He would state, as postulates not axioms, that the class-division still exists here, that on the whole it has worked fairly well and that it is a social psychologist's business, by noting, describing and explaining the fact, to help the classes to co-operate without friction and jealousy. He may regard the impulse to rise socially as justifiable and useful.

Social stratification, however, is not the result of forces as inevitable as those which divide into neat layers a mixture of liquids of different density. It is less easy to map in a large industrial town than in a village. Mr. Priestley asserts that even before the war the division into classes had lost nearly all political and economic (though not purely social) reality, that nowadays a good deal of it is merely an ornamental cover, bearing much the same relation to the basic realities of modern life that fancy dress does to ordinary clothes. As evidence, he cites the selling of titles in exchange for contributions to the funds of a political party, and Mrs. Barbara Wootton's investigation (quoted on pp. 76–79 of this book) which, in 1939 con-

cluded that today the fundamental difference between classes was one of wealth. He claims that the real aristocratic system vanished years ago, and what we have had since is a plutocratic system pretending to be aristocratic. It allows the strongly acquisitive man not only to grab money and power, but to escape much criticism by leaving the district where he made his wealth. He appears in the South as an old English gentleman, pleading for 'our good old English ways.' Going farther than this, we can point out that nowadays the rich man may not even be promoted into the ruling class. He and his female relations may merely become passive members of inner rings of big business and high finance.

Since Mr. Priestley's views concern the town-bred money-maker who finds protective coloration amongst country people, we are left wondering about his opinions of the latter. They are apt to be mute, because talking is usually not their job, still less writing. To a social psychologist looking for trustworthy information, this is disappointing, for in different parts of England social stratification might present either the same pattern with varying emphasis upon certain parts (the relative widths of the stripes, so to speak, may change) or a different pattern. The economic and political details are obtainable; indeed, many are known. But for the psychological facts we depend at present upon our individual experiences, casual communications and the selective insight of novelists and playwrights. Yet questions about social stratification could be as useful as those which served so well in Middletown (137), Marienthal (124), and Metrop (141). Few English people are really unaware of their class, though on some occasions they may act as if they are 'the people' and class is irrelevant.

Miss Margery Allingham's assertion in *The Oaken Heart* (3) a description of how an Essex village 'took' the first years of World War II may be true of many an Englishman. When he 'gets oh,' he hardly ever stays a rich member of the proletariat, but submits himself and his family to the discomforts of a way of life which he thinks is better and grander than his old one. He wants to be equal to what he thinks, rightly or wrongly,

to be the best. He expects the upper classes to keep the code of behaviour, possessions and manners *up*, so that his ascent may be the higher. He knows well that the journey may take a generation or two, for how many of our best families are very old? We are reminded that some goals exert an enormous pull upon the social climber, though we are not told what they are. Are they always the same? Power, a hope of extinction of inferiority-complexes, of more intellectual pleasures and gentler ways of life for children and grandchildren? And what, in this context, is the meaning of gentle? To this question we will return.

Mrs. Wootton evaluates the pulling power of some peaks above the social climber's head. She writes from the standpoint of an economist rather than of the social psychologist; yet *End Social Inequality, A Programme for Ordinary People* (233), illustrates the common fields of these two studies. The opening pages might have been written by a social psychologist (new style). She points out that modern English class differences are, in one sense, very pronounced, while in another they are not. In the first sense, they prevent many people from doing things which it is open to others to do, and cause those who choose to behave as if ours was a classless society, to appear highly eccentric or even ridiculous. Yet to avoid the accusation of bad taste one must adapt oneself to the caste system while pretending that it does not exist.

English class-privilege consists of two distinct but related systems. The first she calls opportunity-class; the second social (or snob*) class. They must be discussed separately, because, although their foundations have much in common, one might survive even if the other were abolished.

Opportunity-class is simply an unequal distribution of opportunity. There is nothing particularly subtle or evasive about it: at this stage its study is probably a matter for economists and for those medical practitioners sensitive to political problems, as she shows by her first example; the opportunity to go on living in this world, once you have been born. Here

*I have tried and failed to find a synonym, or even a near-synonym which satisfies those who sincerely believe that the English class-system is a good thing.

we meet our first great inequality. In *Poverty and Population*, Professor Richard Titmuss (214) contrasted the death-rates prevailing in the Home Counties (excluding London) with those in Wales and in a largely industrial area, comprising Durham, Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmorland, Yorkshire, Cheshire and Lancashire. The results showed that if deaths in these latter districts (age for age) could be brought down to the level prevailing in the Home Counties, 53,951 people who actually did die in a single year (1936) would not have done so. This unnecessary loss of life actually exceeds the rate of recorded air-raid casualties during the period of intensive bombing between September, 1940, and February, 1941. She cites as further examples of opportunity-class influence, the choosing, from an arbitrarily restricted group of the population, of persons to hold positions of power and responsibility and to enjoy skilled and interesting jobs.

Snob-class is the system which confers on certain groups of people a *general* (not functional) social prestige. It precludes normal social intercourse between those who are high up and those who are low down in this scale of esteem. Snob-class is not the individual distinction, 'glamour' or halo which may surround a film star, boxing champion, explorer, scientist or even philosopher; spilling over, so to speak, from the circle of experience or performance in which they have proved their excellence. Nor is it the prestige which properly accompanies the superior authority exercised by people who occupy positions of power: the respect paid, for instance, to the policeman who controls traffic at a busy crossing. For this prestige vanishes almost completely when the functionary is off duty—especially when in mufti. In contrast, snob-class privilege gives prestige which is generalised and irrelevant to personal merits and accomplishments. Furthermore it extends to the family of the person enjoying it. Such a family often contains members whose claims to esteem, reckoned on any other scale, would be dim to vanishing-point.

Snob-class, like opportunity-class, is based mainly upon titles, money and education. But its stratification contains some subtleties of its own, e.g. the ownership of landed estates

carries a peculiar distinction and the performance of manual work a corresponding stigma.

To sum up, this two-class division in English society means that public life is administered by people who, quite literally, know next to nothing at first hand about the life of the public, are not even conscious of their own ignorance, and tacitly assume that they are typical English men and women. This is not class-consciousness, but class-*un*consciousness.

This statement was written in 1942. I have not altered it, since the present book and Professor David V. Glass's studies of Social Mobility in Britain (81) offer data which allow the reader to judge how far matters have changed.

Let us return to consider, as objectively as possible, some of the psychological problems of social stratification.

English social strata have manifest visible and audible signs. To a blind man there are also tactual signs, for example, the soft hands of the leisured. To people with sensitive noses, class may have olfactory divisions. The use of scents—these, too, are socially stratified—suggests that people might be classed as naturally or artificially odorous and unnaturally inodorous.

We will confine ourselves here to the visible and audible signs. The latter are the more important; upper-class speech being much more difficult to acquire than upper-class clothes. Speech and clothes are discussed on pp. 85f and pp. 168f. In the following description there is no suggestion that one way of speaking is better, more beautiful or more effective than another, though most people have strong prejudices about this subject, as the B.B.C. knows to its sorrow, or amusement.

Social differences are shown by the choice of words and phrases. Each class uses characteristic terms of approval, disapproval, intimacy, endearment, enthusiasm and boredom, and each ignores or ridicules the choice of others. Euphemisms, too, are class-labels. Perhaps most of these are used by the middle (especially the lower-middle) class, for reasons obvious in a society permitting vertical movement. Of the phrases which especially indicate social strata the emollient group are

the most striking. A good diplomat has many in stock, and knows when to produce the right one. They are used to begin, interrupt or end a conversation, to refuse or decline a request, suggestion or invitation; to correct a misstatement, to oppose a proposition without rancour, to adduce incontrovertible if unwelcome evidence, to accost a stranger, encourage a shy person or reprove a backslider. They are learnt after birth, and are not, as a few appear to believe, congenital.

Some readers, interpreting this as an oblique reference to a famous 'North-South' difference, may assert that the Southerner uses many emollient phrases which the Northerner would scorn to employ even if he knew them (which he often does); that they are a sign of insincerity, if not of downright craftiness. Many assertions about North and South 'accent' imply that one is sincerer than the other. Yet 'The North' is a big place. It includes Yorkshire, Lancashire, Northumbria and the Lake District. In all these regions a forthrightness of speech is heard, but dwellers in the North easily identify different varieties and degrees of it. Independent straightforwardness differs, for example, from truculence. And it is fair to record that in the last fifty years when a Northerner became wealthy he often sent his children to schools south of the Trent. These pupils, now grown up, form a powerful section of the middle-aged 'upper-class' in the North. They frequently use emollient phrases, though their accents still may be (they usually are not) pure 'North-country.' This is an example of the difficulty of separating 'geographical' from 'social' dialects, since the public schools spread the latter all over England.

About phrases which mark off social classes I will say little, referring the reader to Professor A. Lloyd James's *The Broadcast Word* (134) and our *Spoken Language*,(135) and to my own *Voice and Personality* (183), and *The Psychology of Effective Speaking* (184). Most phoneticians are more interested in the geographical and historical differences of spoken sound than in the social stratification of language, though Mr. George Bernard Shaw zestfully attacked this theme in *Pygmalion* (199) and the preface to it. He reopened the subject

in an introduction to Professor Richard Albert Wilson's *The Miraculous Birth of Language* (230).

One social group may inaccurately attribute 'bad' speech to another. American journalists, when they 'quote' English working-class speech, are apt to write it without aspirates, yet in many parts of industrial England, the 'h' is seldom dropped. With such warnings in mind, it may be said that difference in vowel-pronunciation is an important mark of social class. The Cockney modifies all the English vowels, usually transforming them into diphthongs. Cockney radio-impersonations represent various types—even different generations—of this 'district-dialect.' It is interesting that modern upper-class fashions in pronunciation frequently approach, though without quite touching, the Cockney language; e.g. 'Go home,' pronounced by a modern actor, may be almost indistinguishable from a coster's speech. Both, Mr. Shaw remarks, may call the sun the san and a rose a rah-ooz. A B.B.C. announcer has been heard to say 'Tao-Keaow.' But the Cockney pronunciation of 'Bill,' 'milk,' 'field' and 'towel' has not been adopted by fashionable English people.

Of speaking, considered as a means of social communication, 'speech-melody' is perhaps the subtlest characteristic. By varying it, emotional relationships are established with others who understand out language. This proviso must be remembered. Since intimacy or 'distance,' friendliness or enmity, interest or boredom, command or prayer, deference or disrespect are expressed by speech-melody, it is not surprising that social differences are emphasised by the way in which words go 'up and down.' This is well known to self-constituted judges of good manners, especially those who, on the basis of a brief interview, recommend candidates for posts.

The auditory 'aspect' of speech is perhaps more important than the visual accompaniments, facial expression, gesture and posture. Possibly the comparative absence of facial expression and gesture from the speech-behaviour of the English 'ruling classes' is a sign of social stratification* observed particularly

* Originally suggested by Miss Dorothy M. Richardson in *Pilgrimage*, London, Constable, and discussed in the author's *The Psychology of Conversation*. (178).

in officers in the older fighting services and in some school prefects. Within the different geographical dialects of England there are social layers. Lancashire provides many different ways of speaking. Some of those reflect social gradations. The Londoners in the first act of *Pygmalion* all speak differently. Until it is widely recognised that many variations are social rather than geographical some of the chief causes of English social differentiation will be overlooked.

Concerning clothes, in peace-time, as Dr. J. C. Flugel has shown (69) there are two continuous opposed waves of influence, towards and away from standardisation. Some expensive clothes are copied and then mass-produced; when this happens, further designs, resembling these in shape or shade, yet clearly distinguishable from the popular model, are produced in limited quantities by 'exclusive' firms. Perhaps some inexpensive clothes for men are shaped to look cheap for the same firm may sell both these and dearer suits. This seems a deliberate attempt, encouraged by public support, to perpetuate class-difference. Similarly, speakers who in standard English exhort others to adhere to their dialects may not be keen egalitarians.

The psychology of eating and drinking (what is eaten, how, when, where, and with whom) involves consideration of social differences. Some of these immediately become clear to those who faced the problems of communal feeding. Certain hotels, restaurants and public-houses are recognised as the resorts of different classes. This fact is reflected in their prices, but not simply, at least in London. A large hotel may contain restaurants, and a public-house bars, socially graded (150, 196, 258).

Table manners are admitted class-signs; a fact which evacuation in war-time underlined. Foreign observers have noted the sociological importance during the last century of our tea-shops and Corner Houses, offering to thousands opportunities to eat in public which formerly did not exist for them—since many would never willingly enter a public-house and could not afford the nineteenth-century hotel or restaurant.

Differences in social status arising from the possession of property have been often described by novelists: John Galsworthy succeeded so well in presenting the Englishman as a Man of Property that many Continental readers firmly believed the Forsytes to be a common English type. To some extent they were; for centuries English law and politics have been very kind to the landowner, and offences against property are still severely punished. This fact complicates the treatment of juvenile delinquency, especially in war-time (144, 77).

The type of house in which a person lives, its locality—in London, and presumably elsewhere, long streets may have a 'right' and 'wrong' end—its furnishings and pictures, and its garden, if any, give him social standing. So does the possession of an automobile (the make and date often being taken into account), a telephone, a radio, and a television set. At least one social survey has been wrecked because the people canvassed were telephone-renters, whose names were thus easily obtainable, but who, because of this fact, were all above a certain income-line.

No Englishman needs reminding that in the matter of education there are two Englands. The social and economic differences between our types of educational 'facilities' appear to be the wonder of the world. At present they are being discussed so widely that a special chapter would be required even to summarise the conflicting arguments (103, 188, 234). Without taking sides in this controversy, it may be remarked that though the public schools have virtues which an ideal system of education could well retain, to a democrat their most undesirable feature is the deliberate segregation of their pupils, during their formative years, from the rest of the community. It is possible for an English boy at the age of eight to go to a residential preparatory school, then to a public school, afterwards to a university; and on graduation to join the staff of another (or the same) public school; to live to a ripe old age, having taught thousands of boys, yet never having been in the outside world except for holidays. Even those will probably have been spent among people of his own class. Of all the factors which, during the last half-century, have perpetuated

and increased social stratification, the public schools are in the front rank.

The type of religion which the Englishman professes often reflects his social standing. Stratification is very obvious in the Church of England. Distinctions between 'high' and 'low' church, though usually assumed to refer to differences of preference for ritual, are often social. In many parts of England there is still a social difference between 'church' and 'chapel.' The social status of English Roman Catholics in general is undefined, but amongst themselves they are not unstratified.

In this space, only the general directions of arguments put forward today to justify or to condemn social stratification can be indicated. The case for it is supported by asserting that if, for centuries, there is freedom for selective mating (obviously the poor, lacking chances to travel, and to meet many different people, have less freedom), the offspring are likely on the whole to be healthier, stronger, more beautiful and more intelligent. A leisured class will encourage and defend culture, appreciating its advantages. (This is discussed in Chapter 4, cf. also (65a). It is urged that if one 'knows one's station,' with its privileges and corresponding duties, this promotes easy working of the social scheme. A hereditary aristocracy, it is argued, tends towards tolerance (arising from knowledge that individual differences are great), 'intuitive' leadership, and a sentiment of responsibility for others, developed by generations of feudalism; *noblesse oblige.* The force of these arguments, however, assuming their validity, depends upon the privileged stratum retaining its characteristics. During the last century the social layers from which our ruling class is drawn have not remained constant.

Many have criticised the above claims, or have accepted some of them, commenting that such assertions could be made of any privileged class, and that, to use an Irishism, everyone ought to be privileged, if this means to have opportunities for leisure, travel, training in social responsibility, and where desirable leadership. In *The Dangers of being a Gentleman**(117)

* Cf. E. Wingfield-Stratford (231).

Professor Harold J. Laski described the ideal of gentlemanliness. It may be summarised here.

A gentleman is, rather than does. He is interested in nothing in a professional way. He is allowed to cultivate hobbies, even eccentricities, but must not practise a vocation. He must know how to ride and shoot and cast a fly. He should have relatives in the army and navy and at least one connection in the diplomatic service. But there are weaknesses in the English gentleman's ability to rule us to-day. He usually knows nothing of political economy and less about how foreign countries are governed. He does not respect learning and prefers 'sport.' The problem set for society is not the virtues of the type so much as its adequacy for its function, and here grave difficulties arise. He refuses to consider sufficiently the wants of the customer, who must buy, not the thing he desires but the thing the English gentleman wants to sell. He attends inadequately to technological development. Disbelieving in the necessity of large-scale production in the modern world, he is passionately devoted to excessive secrecy, both in finance and method of production. He has an incurable and widespread nepotism in appointment, discounting ability and relying upon a mystic entity called 'character,' which means, in a gentleman's mouth, the qualities he traditionally possesses himself. His lack of imagination and the narrowness of his social loyalties have ranged against him one of the fundamental estates of the realm. He is incapable of that imaginative realism which admits that this is a new world to which he must adjust himself and his institutions, that every privilege he formerly took as of right he can now attain only by offering proof that it is directly relevant to social welfare.

In short, 'breeding' has often worked well, but for types of social pattern which no longer exist. Sometimes, however, it worked badly even for them.

But all classes, not one alone, ought to have leisure, in which culture can be attained. Tolerance—and intolerance—are not the prerogatives of any one class. Both these characteristics can be acquired, especially when taught deliberately by example and precept. During the last fifty years the upper classes have

often failed to shoulder responsibility. Finally, culture is acquired, not innate. The baby, even if born in the purple, is lamentably uncultured.

The case against privilege has been argued by Professor Lancelot Hogben in *Dangerous Thoughts* (100) and by Mrs. Barbara Wootton in *End Social Inequality* (233).

The views about English social stratification held by readers of newspapers and novels (it is from these sources, as well as from parental teaching and example and the social environment in school, work, pastimes and sports that the average person's opinions come) may truly represent certain facts but not others. It needs no deep insight to see that in England yachting is an upper-class pastime while pigeon-flying is not; that Rugby football is socially in 'higher' esteem than the Association code (cf. Chapter 11) Other games may rise and fall rapidly. Until recent times, darts was a lower-class game. It was embraced by the upper classes when the Queen Mother, visiting a welfare centre at Slough, happened to take up a dart and throw it at a target. This event, immediately followed by the 'pushing' of darts by the B.B.C. who, unopposed by brewers, sedulously linked up the idea of the game with that of public-houses, made darts popular with all classes for a time.

Some aspects of our social structure, however, may have changed imperceptibly in the last few decades. Several of these were studied in 1939 and 1940 by Mrs. Wootton (232) and an advanced tutorial class, of which she was the teacher. Their object was to form

> as realistic a picture as possible of the class structure of our society, and to test against this the validity of opinions commonly held about the meaning and relationship of classes. In particular to discover what, if any, are the realities that correspond today to the terms 'Working Class' and 'Ruling Class.'

Their methods are described in the article.

They distinguish two senses in which the term 'class' is commonly (if unthinkingly) used:

(1) A group of people who have a 'common economic interest,'

i.e. whose common economic interests outweigh their economic conflicts.

(2) A social group, i.e. a group of people who mingle in ordinary social intercourse and are set in a hierarchy whose order is generally recognised, so that they are debarred by convention from so mingling with groups above or below them in the social scale.

They divided 'Economic Class' into

(1) Groups with a subjective economic interest only, who imagine they are economically united, but in fact are not.

(2) Groups with an objective economic interest only, a real bond of which they are unconscious.

(3) Groups with an objective and subjective interest.

Social Class they defined as

groups of people who mingle with each other in normal social intercourse (e.g. entertain each other in their homes) without restraint but who are conventionally debarred from so mingling with other groups who are socially inferior or superior according to a generally recognized hierarchy. This hierarchy is a scale of prestige; prestige which if related to the individual's function in society (occupation) extends beyond the function both during non-exercise of the function and into retirement. (For example, a factory manager is accustomed to be called 'Sir' by his workmen not only in the shop but at the sports club and the bar parlour.) The prestige of an individual extends normally to his family and dependants.

After considerable examination and discussion, they decided that the quantitative prestige-differences which are the basis of social stratification in Great Britain to-day depend on wealth, birth, education and occupation. Weighing these four sources of prestige against each other, they formed the opinion that the greatest of these is wealth, and adduce evidence for this. They continue

If the foregoing were only what we believed to be the nature of the social hierarchy in Great Britain it could reasonably be dismissed as pure conjecture. It coincides, however, with what we identified as socially important in our study of particular individuals.

They examined certain characteristics of the people who rule Britain, i.e. those who possess political and administrative power. Concerning the alleged 'ruling class' their conclusions were

(1) Family, Education, Occupation and Recreations of men in ruling positions are by no means typical of an average group of the population.

(2) The following attributes appear in much higher frequency amongst these rulers than amongst other people:

Family—Titled and Professional.
Education—Public and Grammar School, University education.
Occupation—None or Professional.
Clubs—Carlton and Brooks.
Recreations—Shooting and Golf.

These attributes can be called ruling-class attributes, because people who possess them have a more than average chance of acquiring ruling power.

(3) The ruling class is primarily a social group, maintaining its exclusiveness and unity primarily by the possession of wealth, with the other characteristics studied playing only a secondary part.

(4) The possession of wealth and the wish to keep it is the one objective economic interest which outweighs the many economic conflicts found in the ruling class. There is, therefore, a clear objective basis for political rather than for industrial unity.

(5) The ruling class is not so much a class of employers set against all employees, as it is a class of rich people set against poor.

(6) A large percentage of those people who attain ruling power without coming from the ruling class are Trade Union leaders.

(7) People who are not ruling class are seldom found in any but *elected* positions of power.

(8) As long as attendance at expensive schools and universities is the training needed for administrative power, there will still be a ruling class, for poor people will be excluded from the necessary training.

(9) As long as the people who rule are paid a salary which is very much higher than the average salary, their social habits will cut them off from the average man.

Concerning the working classes they concluded

(1) If there is a working class, there is no common agreement on its definition.

(2) None of the definitions offered pointed to a common objective economic interest.

(3) Many workers might feel a common interest in that they all worked, or were important to society, or that their work was misapplied.

(4) The significant class struggle is not between workers and employers, or between those who work and those who do not.

(5) Within the widest definition of working class there are distinct social groups. These correspond to some extent with a subjective economic interest. Social stratification overrides economic unity.

(6) The general belief in the existence of a working class is due to the exclusion of certain groups from the ruling class.

(7) The factors making for the exclusion are poverty, lowly birth, humble occupation and lack of education.

(8) The most important factor in class exclusion and class unity is poverty, not the fact of being a worker.

(9) The belief in the existence of a working class is justified, but that class would better be called the poor.

During recent years many events have given us chances to note the effects of social stratification. Evacuation of children and mothers from dangerous to safe areas offered one opportunity, and many publications about the impact of class upon class appeared (3, 104, 219). Everywhere one fact emerges; difficulties in adjustment to strange social situations caused by the manners and customs of their hosts were very much less for the younger children. Some will regard this as a blinding glimpse of the obvious: yet it should be recorded and emphasised because if we wish to decrease class consciousness it shows one easy way to begin. Day nurseries, nursery schools and nursery classes offer a chance of diminishing social 'distance.' It would also be helpful to discover the ages and con-

ditions which make awareness of class-difference most intense.

One might add that the difficulties of evacuee-children in meeting novel social demands were not always due to class-difference. In one report, kindly sent me by the headmaster of a city school whose pupils went to a seaside town (names are omitted for obvious reasons), the boys were all 'lower middle-class.' There were few social distinctions between them. The hosts appeared to be of a class similar to that of the pupils, yet real difficulties arose, due to local usages and preferences, or to age disparity between hosts and guests.

The evacuation reports seldom analyse the subjects of disagreement and friction, though many are named and described. They may be divided into avoidable and unavoidable—e.g. a person who has regarded solitude in a bedroom, or a quiet place in which to read and write, as necessities, may, if he entertains evacuees, never get used to the continual company of unchosen guests. Dislike for close contact with people less clean than oneself may seem just as deep-rooted, yet many lose or dissemble it in army or camp, and during the 1940–41 winter, shelter-life rapidly decreased the cleanliness of thousands, not all of whom regarded this as an unmitigated evil. There are class prejudices due to unreasoned dislikes, traceable to early conditioning, or to personal complexes. People who have overcome this weakness may still wince at a few varieties of transatlantic speech, though tolerating some of its ingredients (e.g. the hard 'r') in West-Country dialect. To some ears, Aberdonian 'pure' English sounds mincing and finicky. Some are affronted by all 'upper-class' accents; this attitude may arise from ambivalent inferiority-complexes. Many travelled English, readily ignoring 'foreigners' ' unusual methods of handling knife and fork, are disdainful of them in fellow-countrymen of a lower social class. Others, gratified when an American says he is pleased to meet them, are amused at an Englishman's use of this phrase. The employment of circumlocutions and of long or 'elegant' words indicates class, and many English are contemptuous towards compatriots who employ unnecessary or 'wrong' ones, but not towards English-speaking foreigners who do so.

Social psychologists have seldom or never studied differences between English codes of manners. Books of etiquette exist, codifying some manners of the upper classes, implying that they set the standard for everyone. Yet these books 'date,' and after the war the best of them may have to be rewritten. Questions to which a standard guide to manners might give out-of-date answers concern the use of alcoholic drinks, tobacco and cosmetics (especially regarding time and place), and the modes of address and behaviour of one sex to the other. In the early years of World War II, letters to the newspapers suggested that an A.T.S. private would resent a reproof less if it came from a man officer than from a woman; an assertion which starts a complicated train of thought.

Some may believe that there are fundamental, unchangeable principles of civilised behaviour. Though this may be question-begging, since it is difficult to define 'civilised' in a way which would suit everyone, we may assume, in our own culture-pattern at least, certain conventions which most people consider essential. Interest might therefore be taken in some articles concerning the proposed democratisation of the Diplomatic and Civil Services, which appeared in the *Manchester Guardian*. In the issue of June 30, 1941, Mr. Thomas Jones discussed some proposed changes in the Foreign Office, and the possibility of recruiting the Diplomatic Corps in ways which would not prejudice a candidate without private means. In his view, there was little hope of getting desirable men from the classes usually termed lower.

In a letter to this newspaper (July 17) Professor Harold J. Laski examined some of Mr. Jones's arguments. One was the value of ' "contacts" due to the associations of well-travelled families.' Professor Laski replied, 'The underlying assumption of this argument is the maintenance of an unequal society in Europe in which only the well-endowed will have the opportunity of foreign travel.' Mr Jones had written 'The grace and ease of cultivated conversation are a lubricating accomplishment normally more often found in the youth of Eton than of Plumstead.' But, answered Professor Laski, 'Most of the youth of Plumstead do not have the advantages of the youth

of Eton. Those of them who, through scholarships, have the advantage of an equivalent education are not, in my 25 years' experience as a university teacher, less capable of the "grace and ease" of which he speaks. And in general they are more open to new impressions and to the significance of new experience.' To Mr. Jones's assertion 'There is no presumption in favour of the products of our elementary schools being inherently better qualified for diplomacy than the youth of the great public schools,' the reply was made 'That is not the question. What disturbs the critics is that the system now in operation should assume that over 60 per cent. of the natural diplomatic ability of this country should, in the last 75 years, have been concentrated in some half-dozen schools. It has not been thus in the case of other faculties. Is it not possible that diplomatic ability is only so limited because the system has not responded to changes in the structure of European society?'

Passing to the Civil Services, Professor Laski wrote, 'The main traditions of the service are hostile to initiative, risk-taking, large-scale experiment. Those, for the most part, who climb up are the men who impress their superiors as "sound and safe" and likely to conform to the tradition; this is especially true of those who are selected for promotion from the lower grades. In 15 years' experience of the Civil Service Tribunal I have met many men of first-class ability in the executive and clerical classes who have stagnated there. They have not been lifted out of their grades because they do not accept the unstated assumptions which shape the central tradition of the administrative class.'

A few years ago few would have regarded such a difference of expert opinion as a matter for psychologists. Social gradations exist; they have made England what she is; why drag them into the limelight? Nowadays, however, it is reasonable to inquire whether the characteristics discussed above can be analysed and their development explained.

In the *Manchester Guardian* of 5th August, 1941, the present writer suggested that the psychological constituents of diplomatic and democratic manners might be examined. Especially important are intonation, speech-melody and choice of words

and phrases suited to particular occasions, such as committee meetings or debates. The Englishman's reserve is less mysterious to, and perhaps less respected by, 'foreigners' than it used to be. Ability to converse and discuss do not result from 'instinct' or selective breeding. If certain classes discuss better than others, the reasons ought to be discovered.

Few psychologists, for example, have tried to interpret data obtained by phoneticians. Many of their problems, e.g. prejudices concerning standard English and dialects, are matters for social psychology. To treat them thus, however, offends the taboo already mentioned.

In attempts to support the view that the upper classes are specially fitted for the diplomatic services, it is pointed out that the diplomat's aim is not mere politeness; that knowing 'who is who' and 'what is what' is more important. This assumes that the social knowledge upon which discrimination may be exercised is the prerogative of one class. Critics assert that occasionally, e.g. in 1933 and 1939, our representatives do not seem to have known who is who, and urge that a diplomat should be intelligent, honest, truthful, friendly and know the relevant facts.

To examine and criticise such assertions is necessary if democratisation of the Diplomatic and Civil Services is to be tackled effectively. It presents clearly many thorny points of English social stratification. Two people, one whose family had been connected with the diplomatic services for generations, the other a fervent democrat, would have to sink many prejudices before they could even begin to discuss the question profitably. To an Englishman this may seem natural, requiring no comment, yet in younger countries comment upon our social layers is free and pungent (89a, 94, 221).

The solution of many problems in social psychology needs more knowledge of the sentiments and ideals which characterise different social strata (9, 79, 138, 158). Often an author's class can be accurately deduced by examining his postulates. On reading attempts made between 1918 and 1939, to explain war in terms of human experience and behaviour, one seems driven to conclude that most of them were conceived from an upper-

class standpoint. Underlying them seems to be the assumption that when war is declared, the author will take—or be holding—a commission, and will lead 'his' men. Few, especially those who 'explain' the stirring up of war in peace-time as due to aggressiveness, ask themselves how much the poorer people know about the nations for whom, after war has broken out, they are exhorted to feel emotions specified by the propagandists (*5a*, 182).

To conclude, my view, I hope, is clear. In the past, privilege may have exercised good influences in many directions, but during our lifetime its shortcomings have been increasingly obvious. Today it seems to be falling into disfavour all over the world. Yet the difference ought to be clearly recognised between lessening privilege and decreasing tolerance of individual differences. I write this, though believing that recent attempts to retain privilege at all costs were powerful factors in bringing about the last war. If democratisation sets in suddenly and violently, there is a danger that not only the polish of social life but the material upon which during centuries that polish has been achieved, may be destroyed. I would urge the social psychologist to study the more and less desirable social phenomena, both in the upper and the lower classes, to find out how, when the cause was not economic, they have arisen. For gentle manners are not the result of an accident, and it would be a tragedy if we lost them.

A social psychologist who makes this study must expect to be shot at from both sides. Weapons used against him may be not only opposition, but 'good-humoured' ridicule; an effective instrument of attack today. Yet standards of humour have been known to change, even in England.

CHAPTER THREE

Ways of Speaking, Manners, Etiquette and Goodwill

The act of speaking is perceived by others as a pattern of auditory and visual cues. Difference in ways of speaking, attributable to locality and class. Validity of speech judgments. Listeners' qualifications to judge, often slight, are confidently assumed. Attitudes towards speech characterising a class higher or lower than the hearer's.

Social differences shown by choice of words and phrases, use or avoidance of euphemisms, foreign words, clichés, new terms. 25 years of radio have produced prototypes and stereotypes of speech. Occupational speech.

Socially inclusive and exclusive ways of speaking. Emollient phrases. The 'sound barrier.' Dialect. Standard English, 'received pronunciation.' Is a dialect ever a social handicap? Attempts to improve speech in schools.

Manners, etiquette and their relation to goodwill.

IN human beings, the behaviour called 'speaking' is a complex pattern, usually perceived as a whole. Infants and domestic animals probably adjust much of their social conduct with reference to an elder's 'tone of voice,' which in English adults is often as important as the words used. This seems less true of some parts of the U.S.A. In socially stratified England, writers on this subject usually quote the late Albert Chevalier's song: 'It ain't exactly *wot* 'e sez; it's the narsty wy 'e sez it.' If any readers in the United States, the British Dominions or colonies find this illustration boring, they may be assured that the very existence of their attitude points to a chapter of social history.

'Tone of voice' designates not only its momentary note, describable in terms of its pitch, timbre, intensity and duration, but also speech-melody. This may indicate the locality from which the speaker comes, and his social status. Almost invariably it defies 'foreigners' ' attempts to copy it faithfully.

Since any person when directly addressed, usually looks at the speaker, visual awareness of facial expression, gesture, posture and even tactual impressions, as of a hand-shake or a touch, fuse into the percept of speech.

Signs, objective or subjective, of social strata inhere in every aspect', auditory, visual and tactual, of this experience of being spoken to. Such manifestations are usually unambiguous to anyone who has interpreted them for a lifetime, yet they often seriously mislead people from other countries, even from another social class in England.

Here we encounter a problem so complex that it can keep a psychologically-trained phonetician busy for his lifetime; the difference in English ways of speaking attributable (a) to locality (b) to social class, and (c) to a combination of these. For example, the first sound in 'congratulate' and 'examination' is often heavily accented by Northerners, but not by their children if they have been sent to a public school in the South, or even perhaps in the North. The desirable breadth of the vowel 'a'; e.g. in 'bath,' cannot be discussed by a social psychologist in the aseptic manner of phoneticians like Otto Jespersen (110) he cannot adopt the anthropologist's detached attitude—'Some do: some don't,' or fall back on the easy resource of citing a few Northerners who stuck to the 'thin' 'a,' and achieved social success in the South. Mr. W. E. Gladstone did this, but his speech was described in London as 'still having something provincial about it.'

Indirect light upon this subject comes from the U.S.A. Cornelia Otis Skinner writes that once in her own city, New York, intimidated by the upper-class speech of an Englishwoman, in amazement she heard herself say 'my harnd.' The *New Yorker*, recording a very infrequent American attempt to study social stratification in speech, notes that a researcher, finding that, in high social circles, women are more inclined than men to graft a broad 'a' onto their basic New Yorkese, thinks this is because 'women have more time to mess about with culture.' The *Manchester Guardian* (March 3, 1953) notes a problem of the spelling reformer: not only American, Australian, Irish and Scots are liable to object to the 'Correct English pronunciation.' Many a Northerner has felt annoyed at the bland assumption in the Pitman shorthand textbook, that the Southern way of speaking is the right one.

The contributor of this note adds that Ford Madox Ford,

chance-met in a German hotel, insisted on standing him a bottle of Bopparder Hamm 1929 'because I love the way you say Manchester.' Presumably, however, Ford had no intention of imitating the ways he loved.

A sociologist who is studying the English middle classes, tells us that today in rural Essex, pronunciations regarded in London as lower-class, are used by people who are considered, and consider themselves, to be upper-middle. There is a belief that very old upper-class Londoners use some pronunciations what are now dialect in Essex, from which their stratum originally came. 'Ain't you?' was upper-class a century ago.

Boarding schools, the stage, radio and cinema encourage the young to copy Southern public-school speech. In the last thirty years—the radio-age—there may well have been what engineers call a 'feed-back.' In a fairly recent production of 'Hamlet' in a Northern city, by a well-known amateur society, there were about twenty actors. In the speech of only two did I notice any distinctively Northern sounds, which probably amounted to less than one in a thousand, yet the cast was almost entirely composed of Northerners.

Radio-plays from the Northern Region usually present Northern speech in dialect-parts. Can the existence of an urge 'upwards' (this word begs the question, but it is hard to find another) in speech-behaviour be assumed throughout England? Perhaps in every social stratum except the lowest, yet there will be local differences in the strength of this wish, depending upon such factors as density of population (a recent study of Yorkshire dialect by Professor Harold Orton of Leeds, concentrates upon rural districts) and the number of occupations limited to particular social strata.

In present conditions, any occupation requiring a worker's personal attention to people, who pay for this, is likely to make him or her aware of the customer's or client's social class, and ready to adjust his behaviour, occasionally with reluctance or resentment.

Of the small number of writers on class differences in ways of speaking, few mention the great differences between listeners' qualifications to judge speech. Often the amateur

critic, imagining himself the successor of Professor Higgins, behaves like a bull in a china-shop. It might seem a waste of time to listen to a non-expert opinion about anyone's speech, yet experts may differ as irreconcilably as in the controversies about pictorial art. Moreover, every night, millions of non-experts listen to radio-actors whose way of speech is intended to suggest a particular social class, and since radio-plays have now been heard over a period of twenty-five years, a generation has grown up which not only accepts but copies prototypes and stereotypes suggested by the B.B.C. and the colleges of dramatic art.

We must record the fact that an English person, on hearing another speak, is apt to attribute a certain social class to him or her—this judgment is seldom verbalised—and to react accordingly. Such behaviour is often directed by a genuine inferiority-complex; i.e. its constituents are both conscious and unconscious. Disputes about Alfred Adler's theory of inferiority are often especially heated between persons whose way of life exemplifies it. This may account for a widespread tendency to dislike, simply or ambivalently, a way of speaking attributed to a class above the hearer's, to regard with affectionate amusement the speech of a definitely lower class, and with unloving scorn the speech of the class just beneath that of the listener's. Plenty of people, however, enjoy hearing upper-class speech if, like the 'movies,' it suggests the world they would wish to live in.

It is not implied here that one way of speaking is better, more beautiful or more desirable than another, though few people are free from prejudice about this subject, as editors of correspondence-columns know.

Social speech-differences are shown in many ways; first, by choice of words and phrases. Many of these are regarded with contempt—not always pure and simple—or ridiculed, by members of other classes. The 'fun' poked at them is usually good-natured; often affectionate; this being a common and puzzling result of English social stratification. Radio-copies of lower-middle, upper-lower and middle-lower speech, e.g. by Joyce Grenfell, Elsie and Doris Waters and Jack Warner,

all sound friendly. There are few serious impersonations of the lower-lower class; Leon Cortez and Arthur English can be regarded as non-serious, and this is a socially significant fact. The young of the upper, lower-upper and upper-middle borrow phrases from lower strata; 'Not my cup of tea!' or 'nice!' (dipthongised). Each social class uses special words to express approval, disapproval, endearment, intimacy, enthusiasm, disinterest and boredom; each ignores, ridicules or may amusedly borrow some from other layers.

Euphemisms are natural class-labels, often used, unwisely, by social climbers. References to parts of the body, excretory functions, sex, pregnancy and childbirth are apt to be simpler and more direct in the upper and lower classes, though this statement requires some qualification, as doctors who work in the slums remind us.

Some phrases, taboo in the upper class because they may stamp a speaker as 'middle,' are possibly traceable to a mistaken idea of aristocratic expressions. The widespread use of 'commence' and 'pardon' may once have signified an attempt to exhibit familiarity with the French language, and though, as Virginia Graham remarks in *Say Please!* (85) the standard set by our parents regarding the use of words has been lowered to such a degree that it can almost be said to be furled, their children still wipe their mouths on 'napkins' and say 'Forgive me!' or 'I'm so sorry!' when they scramble over people in the stalls. And nowadays, she adds, though it is not possible to love people who use serviettes, napkin-users can like them very much indeed, and even, if they are sufficiently rich, accept their hospitality.

'Pleased to meet you!' sounds insincere. Its use may arise from a mistaken idea that it is expected of polite people, though an American's 'I'm very pleased to meet you, Mr. X,' with an obvious desire to catch your name and pronounce it correctly, and a cheerful determination to hold up the social traffic until he can, is endearing. After she has made someone's acquaintance, an English lady may indicate that she *has* been pleased, but in a way which sounds, and usually is, sincere. 'A very small portion of,' and 'partial to,' hint at a reluctance,

usually in older people, to admit to the possession of normal human appetites. 'Nice' is derided, probably because it usually means so much or so little (Joyce Grenfell has based a whole sketch on it). 'Meet the wife!' is discourteous, being used impersonally in a situation which needs a personal touch.

An objection to the use of 'person'—the existence of this distaste is both asserted and denied by my informants—seems confined to upper-middles, and possibly to a certain age-group of them. Perhaps while many people use 'person' indiscriminately, some 'uppers' employ it chiefly in a derogatory sense; e.g. 'a curious person' ('curious' can be deliberately ambiguous) 'not at all a pleasant person,' or 'quite a nice little person' e.g. of someone who 'does for' the speaker.

As soon as members of the lower classes rise socially, they tend to adopt, and when 'middle-middles' become 'upper-middles' they, in their turn, to drop, middle-class euphemisms; for unless they do, they may find their ascent of the social ladder hindered by people at both ends of it. But the mixing of classes and of sexes in the Forces and Civil Defence in World War II, as well as the present popularity of scientific terms has decreased the frequency of certain taboos. In the Forces, the use, by men and women, of ugly words for ugly facts may have been in self-defence, even in a semi-conscious shifting of blame to their elders, as if the speaker implied 'To disclaim personal responsibility for this, I call a spade a spade.'

The lifting of taboos upon the discussion of many subjects (though as Robert Graves prophesied in *Lars Porsena or The Future of Swearing* (86), the Navy is still adequately protected) and life in the Forces with the consequent temporary shaking up of strata did much to displace certain speech-patterns of our society. In *Contact* No. 1 examples are given of the upper class fashion of speaking in 'quotes'—'I don't mind if I do' (in a pronounced Cockney accent) or 'actually' (in an exaggerated imitation of an upper-class voice). There are no rules, but quickly changing affectations, into which the speaker must 'feel' himself. Such fashions resemble those governing women's dress, for if lower classes borrow a mode from the upper, the initiators usually drop it.

This is a suitable place to mention taboos which often forbid the use of 'lady' and 'gentleman.' Stories of the cruel fate which awaits any breaker of these prohibitions have been well received in the middle and lower-upper classes, for obvious reasons.

Sir Cyril Burt (35) notes that the use of stereotyped phrases and clichés (changed so rapidly that it is useless to offer examples here) mark off classes. In one sense they illustrate his suggestion that class-traits are ostensible tokens of power over other people, since the use, in speaking to other persons, of certain phrases ensures the exclusion from the group, at least temporarily, of those who do not understand or employ them habitually. How far our fashionable playwrights borrow the catch-phrases of Society and to what extent the process works in the other direction, it is difficult to judge. By broadcasting plays, radio and television make such phrases known to millions: whether many of these millions borrow the clichés as they certainly borrow Americanisms from the films, can be answered only speculatively. It is certain that as soon as fashionable phrases pass into common use, others are invented. Perhaps the inventors, with ear to the ground, are members of those 'curator groups' which guard upper class distinctions (cf. Chapter 1).

Phrases, gestures and behaviour used in greeting, taking leave, expressing sorrow or regret, apologising (a famous university don advised 'Never apologise, never explain,' but in those days dons were allowed to have special manners) also mark off class. Mr. Nigel Nicolson, however, has recorded that today, hardly anyone in England seems to know when to shake hands (167).

Burt states that in speech, the obvious mark of the upper class is the clarity and haughtiness of tone—*de haut en bas*—that become habitual in those accustomed from youth upwards to issuing orders. No phonetician seems to have studied scientifically the auditory constituents of this 'tone'; and compared them with those making up the corresponding tone in the upper class of other countries. The reactions to English haughtiness by members of newer English-speaking countries would be interesting to study and to classify.

There are still marked differences of opinion about the importance of deliberately preserving dialect. To prevent it from decay or disappearance may seem comparable to preserving a house historically important, an obvious public duty. If the building is in such disrepair that it threatened public safety it could be shored up. Here, some would say, the analogy breaks down; the mere presence of the ancient structure is seldom a bar to the happiness of large numbers of people. And as phoneticians occasionally point out, exhortations, to others, to continue speaking in 'the good old way' are apt to be made in Standard English.

This discussion is always being revived. In December 1953, the chairman of the council of the Yorkshire Dialect Society was reported in the Press to have said that the Leeds University survey of dialect 'was of such national importance that they ought to have access to funds, public and private, to enable the work to go on.' The writer of a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* of 19th December 1953 commenting that this remark is often heard, continued:—

Dialect is a fascinating entertainment whether spoken by a mimic or, in all seriousness, by the oldest inhabitant of hill or valley. But that its preservation is work of national importance may be disputed. Surely the most important function of speech is that one can be understood.

Even country dwellers must come to town some time, e.g. to the employment exchange, the hospital, or the dentist, and I find it pathetic to visualise that they may be unable to take full advantage of the Welfare State because some university department selfishly wishes them to retain their dialect.

This raises a fundamental question concerning the functions of speaking. They are sometimes stated thus: to induce sympathy in the listener, to issue directions or orders and to impart or request information. Mr. G. B. Shaw's views concerning the first function are expressed all through his preface to *Pygmalion*. In England there is a dialect in which orders or commands can often be successfully issued, but it is a dialect of class, not of place. And in this ever-shrinking world, information is most

clearly expressed in the received pronounciation of the language.

The writer of the above letter did not mention the possibility that a country dweller may not wish to 'stay put,' geographically or socially. Teachers of speaking often receive and accede to requests for help from such dissatisfied people.

The *New Yorker* staff, in 1949, almost correctly represented an upper-class Englishwoman as saying 'Na-o'; perhaps 'Nay-o' is nearer the mark. And on the English radio, 'signature-remarks' like Sam Costa's ('Goo-morn', sir; was there sam-fing?') represent a lower class. The 'a' in 'carefully,' or 'man,' the 'i' and 'r' in 'entirely,' 'fire' and 'wire,' the first 'e' in 'vehicle,' the 'i' in 'girl,' are given special sounds by the 'uppers.' An ex-staff officer volunteers the information that one of his colleagues used to employ two pronunciations of 'vehicle'; for ranks respectively above and below his own.

The next assertion suggests delicate, perhaps embarrassing, yet important problems. Many English men and women, of nearly all social strata, acknowledge consciously or unconsciously the presence of class differences by speaking in a specially adjusted way to a person whose position in the social scale they clearly recognise. Curtness or its antithesis, tones which have a snap of command, or suggest that the sentence is meant as a basis for discussion, ('I wonder if you would care to . . . .') or are quite impersonal, asking a string of questions in a shop or at a booking office, implying that the feelings of the person addressed and of the people waiting in the queue do not matter: these manners are noticed, but not always approved, by visitors to this country.

The subtlest stratum-characteristic is 'speech-melody.' By varying it, relationships, sympathetic or antipathetic, are established with people who understand the speaker's idiom. This proviso should be remembered; an Englishman who employs gentle irony or under-statement, when speaking to a foreigner who thinks he understands English, runs the risk of being taken seriously. English visitors to some of the Dominions occasionally discover that if they use a type of irony, the effect of which depends upon speaker and spoken-to recognis-

ing a difference in their respective duties, it misfires. In the ex-R.A.F. hierarchy of the radio-item 'Much-Binding-in-the-Marsh,' sarcasm, however gentle, directed upwards was instantaneously extinguished by one word (usually a duet)—'Costa!'

Since social intimacy or distance, friendliness or enmity, interest or boredom, command or prayer, deference or disrespect are usually expressed by an appropriate speech-melody, social differences can be emphasised by the way in which the voice 'goes up and down.' This is well known to judges of manners, especially to those who after a brief interview confidently recommend or turn down candidates for important appointments, without giving reasons.

Speech-melody may even complicate our relations with other English-speaking nations. To anyone who studies speech objectively, the melody, a physical, recordable fact, may seem to be just a series of 'outward and audible' events, not necessarily expressing (to borrow from the Church Catechism) inward and spiritual grace. Polyglots might deny that speech-melody can really express character-traits, yet to some English ears there seems a pedantic insistence in German; finickiness or complacency in different types of Scots, excitability in Welsh and argumentativeness in some Ulster speech-melodies. Is the connection real and deep-rooted, or may it be, as a phonetician once suggested to me, that an Englishman would sound pedantic to another Englishman if he used a certain speech-melody which in German is not pedantic?

Such examples suggest an important problem—are the friendliness and unfriendliness attributed to certain ways of speaking which characterise some English localities and social classes, illusory, or do they exist only in the listener's ear? (A correspondent suggests that the more intelligent and sophisticated persons can use and understand subtle shades of emotional expression.)

It was noted earlier that though when a person speaks, the auditory effect is the most important, visual accompaniments usually fuse with it into a unitary percept. In war-time, imperative tones proceeding from the wearer of an appropriate

uniform sound natural. In peace, especially if they proceed from the wearer of shabby 'civvies,' they can sound incongrous, annoying, impertinent or pathetic. Often connected with the kind of clothing worn are the speaker's posture, facial expression and gestures. The comparative absence of the two latter from the speech-behaviour of the pre-war English ruling classes was a sign of social stratification, observed particularly in officers in the fighting services (occasionally in their womenfolk). A moustache conceals finer movements of the mouth, as all subalterns know, and it may be significant that different groups of our fighting forces favour various degrees of mouth-concealment. One is apt to think of American men as democratically clean-shaven, yet the nuances of meaning conveyed by Mr. Dean Acheson's moustache in varying moods have been described affectionately in—needless to say—the *New Yorker*.

The affection and amusement which the luxuriant moustaches of the Royal Air Force inspire in its members and ex-members, as well as in civilian theatre-goers and 'viewers', suggest several psychological problems. Inch-long waxed points at the end of military moustaches may hint at the wearer's age as well as rank. Between 1919 and 1939, in academic circles, a close relationship between presence or absence of moustache and political party leanings might have been inferred. At the 1954 British Association meeting the readers of scientific papers seemed usually to be clean shaven. Beards will not be discussed here.

Few students of voice or speech seem to have considered the validity of their judgments; the extent to which they agree with objectively ascertainable facts. Assertions, both true, that one voice heard on the English radio sounded as if the speaker came from Ireland and Sandhurst, and another proceeded from a clergyman—schoolmaster—army officer—ex-Cambridge man (183) were objectively verified, but the judgment 'a nauseating London simper' (Professor Daniel Jones records this opinion of his own speech) is obviously subjective. 'Charming' or 'virile,' attributed to the possessors of voices, fall between these extremes.

The validity of such impressions may vary from zero to perfection, though a completely invalid judgment, if made by millions, would be an important psychological datum. Criteria used by a phonetician and a radio-play 'caster' might be similar or different. An impression of beauty or ugliness in the speech of a fellow-countryman, especially of a fellow countrywoman—may be complicated by the attribution to it of a social class. This may remind psychologists that in the Binet-Simon scale estimating a child's 'mental age,' one test asks 'Which is the pretty, and which is the ugly, lady?' In the picture originally prescribed, the contrast is so great that the test might seem fatuous, yet in one primitive community, normal children would not answer until they had been told the lady's rank.

Probably there is no simple general tendency to consider all upper-class speech beautiful. For example, favourable, unfavourable and possibly ambivalent judgments resulted when certain speech-records were played to a working-class audience. One record was of a definitely upper-class voice, the speaker's name being known only to the experimenter. Some listeners disliked it intensely, others liked it, saying that they seldom had a chance to hear that kind of speech. Age-difference and attendance at cinemas might affect such impressions. A radio-play producer in an English Region said that many girls in the provinces who seek to be trained in voice-production, want to drop their own manner of speaking and to copy upper-class ways which they hear in the cinema, on the air, or in the theatre, just as they imitate film stars' dress, hair-style and deportment.

Before the election in which Franklin D. Roosevelt was returned as President for the last time, the *New Yorker* expressed anxiety lest the British middle and lower classes might be antagonised by his Groton accent. It would have been interesting to know the percentage of such people who noticed a difference between it and the accent of other well known American speakers.

It is possible to doubt whether many of the late Mr. John Winant's numerous English admirers heard 'class' in his speech. In contrast, many Americans, expressing dislike of the 'sissy' speech of some Englishmen who, before Pearl Harbour, visited

the U.S.A. to expound Britain's case, urged that they wanted to hear middle and working-class folk. And during the war, an American journalist, favourably impressed with everything he heard in a House of Commons debate, though he praised the sense of a Labour Minister's speech, wondered, with a bitter reference to the Chinese habit of binding children's feet, if, fifty years ago, our rulers had deliberately encouraged the poor to make socially crippling sounds.

Since class-labels are widely assigned to English speech, it would be interesting to record 'class-ways' of speaking which are noticed by most English people, and those perceptible only in the speaker's class, or by people who professionally adjust their own behaviour towards those who speak in such ways, e.g. schoolteachers, music, dancing or sports instructors, nurses, shop assistants, waiters and servants, and to find how they make these distinctions. In London, many waitresses and shop assistants are bi-lingual.

A contribution to English social history could deal with implications of the fact that some stereotypes ('professional') of voices and speech are generally accepted and perpetuated. Many Church of England clergy, lawyers, doctors and Army officers speak in a distinctive manner.

To anyone who thinks this problem simple, a note of warning may be sounded; in twenty-five years of radio and many more of theatre-plays, speech prototypes and stereotypes have been built up. Gladys Young's influence upon millions is impressive, for she broadcasts in many different roles. Sam Costa gives a 'rear-gunner' speech-stereotype (upon this, a few ex-rear-gunners offer a minority report); perhaps Richard Murdoch speaks for squadron-leaders, Kenneth Horne for group-captains.

If, as seems possible, some of these prototypes and stereotypes have been deliberately synthetized by professional actors, are they real or artifacts? To answer this might lure us into metaphysics, yet any successful model may stimulate people to copy it; Nature in time overtakes Art. If millions attribute a particular way of speaking to a certain social stratum, this fact is psychologically real, for stage-stereotypes of speaking

exist, which though disowned by many members of the professions or trades they are alleged to represent, are accepted by the public.

A social stratum may contain people who speak very differently: one cannot predict confidently how a prominent English musician will speak. English University professors, possibly because the growth of applied science has made research as important as teaching, now speak in very different ways. Knowledge of this reached Portland Place long ago, though it seems doubtful if it has yet arrived at Shaftesbury Avenue and Wardour Street.

In the professions of Law, Medicine and the Church there are forces which constrain distinctive ways of speech. Some theological colleges are said to teach aspiring individuals to speak in an upper-class way with a priestly timbre.

When investigating the relation of speech to class, one encounters the assertion, sometimes made defensively; 'People don't think how they speak.' To tease out the meanings of this is impossible here, yet anyone anxious to speak a foreign language effectively will attend both to matter and to manner. Socially ambitious people, if they lose their temper, may sometimes speak 'naturally', to the surprise of those who do not know them well. The degree and frequency of conscious speech-control may depend upon profession and occupation. In the upper class, speech-fashions vary; phrases and 'cosmetic' modifications of vowels are invented, adopted and discarded. Such fads spread to the dramatic academies; perhaps some originate here.

In judging class from speech it is useful to take age into account. In some parts of the upper class, age may decide whether a speaker says *an* hotel, drops the 'g' in 'hunting' and 'shooting', pronounces 'girl' as 'gairl,' cough as 'cawf,' and speaks without circumlocution, of the 'lower classes.' The only time I ever heard a serious radio-talker refer to the 'lower orders,' it was with a lower-middle London accent.

A few writers have discussed the speech-fashions of young members of the upper-class. They talk in distinctive ways,

just as with the disappearance of coupons they now wear distinctive clothes. Our attitude towards the speech and clothes of others is well worth studying; as Dr. J. C. Flugel has pointed out (69). In our culture-pattern and in those resembling it, men expect a woman to be more narcissistic than they. Achieving this state, she tends to speak in ways which will increase her attractiveness and social distinction, and usually her man approves of this, whatever he might say if—it seems improbable—he were asked for his opinion.

To some people, speech seems the only remaining private part of their personality; what then, if 'society' begins to criticise it; now that, incited by newspapers, films and television, the public comments freely upon people's bodily appearance and clothes? Probably nobody who agrees to address an audience has any right to resent honest criticism of the sounds he makes. Yet many people who would not object to constructive criticism of their appearance, if they could have it improved without discomfort, flare up at any suggestion (except from a speech-trainer consulted voluntarily) of possible improvements in their speech. On the other hand, some readily seek such advice, and a low-pitched voice is often deliberately nurtured by women.

Introspective evidence concerning differences in willingness to alter signs of personality is sometimes offered to psychologists. Middle-class men and women have freely admitted that one aim in going up to Oxford was to acquire a socially advantageous manner of speaking; often with the approval of their family, left behind to talk 'naturally.'

Class-signs are simultaneously inclusive and exclusive; this is especially true of clothing and speaking. Army uniform must not be worn by civilians, and its marks of hierarchy are exclusive inside the Army. Battle-dress, said to have been copied from the ski-runner, was a great leveller, but ways of distinguishing important individuals were soon discovered. Similarly, a speaking manner can be deliberately inclusive: in the early days of radio, 'Good-evening, everyone!' was a favourite phrase. 'Goodnight, all,' 'you-all' (Southern States) 'chaps', and 'tergither' (East Anglia) are all 'matey.'

Certain ways of speaking, common in the Services—its branches show interesting differences—in some public schools, colleges and universities, when used by 'insiders' in the presence of 'outsiders,' are meant to exclude them. Occasionally people who feel shut out put up a defence, by discovering members of their own circle, who then use esoteric phrases and refer to heroes by mysterious Christian names.

Perhaps those who speak in ways characteristic of their profession seldom do so consciously, yet the late Master of the Temple, the Rev. Harold Anson, after writing that a clergyman taught him when young to overcome a stammer, adds with characteristic frankness; 'If I have a fairly good voice for broadcasting, I believe it to be due largely to these admirable lessons. But *how* I hated having to talk in those pompous and deliberate tones!' (11).

While nowadays few persons publicly describe their own class as 'upper,' using, to their intimates, understood phrases such as 'people like us,' or 'our sort,' and though gentlewomen (specifically defined in a document dealing with the distribution of funds to help them) may be described as 'in straightened financial circumstances,' many people speak of themselves as 'middle-class.' Professor Hadley Cantril's investigations showed that in the U.S.A. there is a strong general tendency to indentify oneself with the middle class; whatever one's 'economic bracket' may be (37) and this is discussed in Dr. Centers' book (42). Yet 'middle-class,' as used by the dustman Henry Dolittle, in Shaw's *Pygmalion*, was a term of contempt, even if ambivalent, and applied by anti-Nazi writers like Dr. Erich Fromm (73) to pre-war Germans, it implied political condemnation. In England, the term often expresses praise for social stability, real or imagined virtues ('the Middle Class is the backbone of England and preserves the country's culture': 'Today's legislation threatens the Middle-Class') or blame for selfishness and complacency, as when inhabitants of certain large seaside towns in the South are described as 'retired middle-class trying to forget the North.'

As time goes on, the upper-middle class shades more and more imperceptibly into the lower-upper, chiefly for economic

reasons. This can be observed in the wealthy upper-middles' choice of public schools, hotels, restaurants, clothes and 'class' on the railway. When the economic or physical safety of the upper class become threatened, some barriers are lowered; in World War II, when for reasons of national security the functions of Sandhurst were modified, 'officer'-cadets succeeded 'gentleman'-cadets. Wealthy 'middles' are now admitted to some formerly exclusive hunts, and may partner the uppers' daughters at balls. But in such circumstances spontaneous conviviality—the real test of class—may be lacking or not easily aroused.

Because members of the middle class are always meeting those in the class above and below it, the emollient function of their speech is important. 'Phatic communion'; the mere establishment of social relations, can be furthered by it. There are, of course, many uses of the emollient phrase. Its user may wish to ascertain the social stratum of an attractive fellow-traveller, or to push the beginning of a conversation over a dead centre. He may want to avert a difficult situation, to decrease existing tension by means of a polite interruption, to make a legitimate complaint, to suggest a reasonable improvement, to ask a favour, or to offer information which he thinks his *vis-à-vis* will be glad or sorry to hear. The intention of such approaches is often to suggest, sincerely or not, that the addressee is the social equal, possibly the superior of the speaker. Initiation of a relationship by a special phrase, with suitable speech-melody, facial expression and gesture, can imply all this to a perceptive stranger.

The use in England of 'Sir' as a mode of address may imply that the addressee is superior in rank, older, a stranger, or that deference is temporary, e.g. in a protest made in a game, or in an objection to alleged improper treatment by an official. The addressee is regarded as a social equal, but if his reaction is unsatisfactory, the mode of address may change. The English policeman's prestige enables him to reprove a citizen though calling him 'sir'; this surprises and delights many visitors to this country.

Among the literate English (this stratum traverses several

classes) are some whose speech contains nearly as many distinctions as their writing, others whose oral expression uses only the handful of adjectives permitted by current fashion. Though adult, they deliberately use the vocabulary of schoolchildren; upon this George Orwell comments in his book *The English* (170). Such adjectives express, in a standardised, undifferentiated way, good and bad, beautiful and ugly, but inevitably acquire secondary meanings, denoting intensity and quality, which puzzle the uninitiated. By using a word with a facial expression understood by the *vis-à-vis*, a speaker can imply its antithesis.

Speech-melody, in English, at any rate, easily conveys irony or sarcasm, and since for a quarter of a century English radio-listeners have become used to it, the practice has probably spread. 'Quaint' and 'queer' may be either derogatory or euphemistic. A famous editor's strongest adjective for people of whom he disapproved was 'unsatisfactory.' To a speaker's intimate friends, 'tiresome' may mean slightly annoying or extremely unpleasant. Terms borrowed from sexual pathology are sometimes used in mild disapproval; seldom as correct descriptions. Twenty years ago the free use of Freud's concepts characterised a certain intellectual stratum; today magazines, novels and films have so vulgarised them that the intelligentsia may mention them apologetically, since in their circles, these are old-fashioned.

Some varieties of this behaviour may express the delayed adolescence which critics of public schools, e.g. Orwell and Caudwell, allege that professionally adolescent teachers produce, or may reflect the increasing rate at which spoken deviates from written English. During the last war lecturers to the Forces often found it hard to steer between polysyllabic accuracy and terse, misleading simplification.

Clive Sansom, discussing our speech-barriers (198), quotes from *Judges*

> . . . the men of Gilead said unto him, 'Art thou an Ephraimite?' If he said 'Nay,' then said they unto him, 'Say now Shibboleth'; and he said 'Sibboleth,' for he could not frame to pronounce it right. Then they took him and slew him.

Sansom points out that though two wars, with their attendant taxation, shortages and rationing have increased the levelling of society, we still have with us the first-class-compartment voice and the third-class-compartment voice; the owner of the voice that is kept waiting by the boss, and the owner that is shown right in by the office boy. As one observer has said, the British working-man is 'branded on his tongue,' and this operates in reverse. The pronunciation of the upper class makes it almost impossible for them to mix freely with half of their fellow-countrymen, however much they may want to. Aldous Huxley once described how he tried, and failed, to express himself to working-class audiences.

Few people seem to have analysed 'vulgar' and 'nurtured' speech into vowel sounds, tone qualities, points of emphasis and vocabulary: still fewer have tried to identify and describe the memories evoked by hearing such speech. Two English psychologists, lovers, though not natives, of London, agree that they are sometimes suddenly aware of a 'lower-class-London' way of speaking, accompanied by a peculiar facial expression, particularly of the lips, suggesting a sneer. Such a manner may have unfortunate results in an interview for a high-grade post, either in or outside the capital.

Some people urge that such misfits could be decreased by teaching everyone a common 'dialect.' Criticism of this recommendation is many-sided. That speech is 'natural,' and therefore should never be taught, is sometimes urged by people who moan that good hand-writing isn't taught in school nowadays. Both speech and writing are learnt under the influence of imitation. A common objection is that speech-education would produce a dull uniformity, yet no two persons, even B.B.C. announcers, actually speak alike. Other critics urge that there would never be agreement concerning the exact form of any standard pronunciation.

Clive Sansom writes

Mr. George Orwell in *The English People*, suggests that this national accent designed to remove class-labels should be 'a modification of Cockney or of one of the Northern dialects.' But this appears to be an

example of that inverted snobbery to which the 'intellectual socialist' is prone. A national accent already exists, and has been developing for centuries; there is no point in inventing another. It is called Standard English, and has the supreme advantage of infuriating the fewest listeners over the widest area. It is instantly recognised and accepted by the majority of educated men and women. And if we are agreed that some standard of pronunciation should be taught in State schools, this is the obvious one for the purpose.

Whenever this is advocated, however, these arise a host of dialect-defenders. Few of these can speak a dialect themselves, nor would they dream of sending a child of their own to a school where he might acquire one—that is one powerful reason for the survival of the independent school—but they are determined to defend to their last drop of printer's ink the right of other men's sons. When, in the House of Lords a few years ago, Lord Brabazon proposed that every boy and girl in this country should be taught to use a Standard English pronunciation by phonetically trained teachers, his peers were for once united in opposition. Liberals sprang to the rescue of linguistic liberty. Labour peers protested that the insulted working-man should be allowed to speak as he pleased. Conservatives were anxious (we will be charitable enough to say unconsciously) to preserve the *status quo*, for dialects are a symbol of those days when 'there was a place for everyone and everyone knew his place.'

Nobody taking part in that debate seemed to realize that the teaching of Standard English in the school would in no way prevent children from talking a dialect outside it. In fact, in a dialect home it would be essential to use one, because that is the right type of speech for that particular environment. But the value of dialect is confined to the home, class or locality which gave it birth, and to be able to speak only a dialect is a severe limitation. Besides, there are so many other conditions threatening dialects more seriously than Standard English—and ones for which the Lords and Commons are largely responsible. Broadcasting, improved transport, and higher standards of living are all helping to alter our speech-patterns.

Most universities still ignore the subject and limit themselves to a study of the written language. But more and more training colleges for teachers are including speech training in their curriculum, and more and more schools—especially Primary schools—are giving systematic attention to it.

Two comments may be added. In Kenneth Harris's delightful *Travelling Tongues* (96): an account of the U.S.A. tour of an Oxford University debating team, he mentions that in one American university they visited, the wife of the Professor of Speech remarked that they were all a credit to the Oxford Speech Department. Comment upon this may seem needless, though Sir Harold Nicolson, when in the *Observer* he quoted the remark, did not conceal affectionate amusement, as he added

> They (Mr. Harris, Mr. Wedgwood Benn, and Sir Arthur Boyle) must have been. They realised early in their tour that the Americans hate innuendo and prefer hard, straight hitting; they realised how sensitive are all Americans to any symptom of superciliousness or tittering; they realised that the Americans are madly irritated by our under-statement, reserve and modesty: they realised that one can be anything on earth in America, provided one is not genteel. They realised, what had never suspected before, that they were genteel. And that made them laugh long and loud.

Dialect was threatened too, by World War II, which forcibly transplanted many young men and women from their birthplaces and social class. Applicants for commissions became aware of the usefulness of speaking with at least 'received pronunciation.' There were, of course, repercussions. It was said that before psychologists had been allowed to complicate the War Office Selection Board procedure, one Board, after several unfortunate *gaffes*, tremblingly passed for a commission any candidate with a Canadian accent.

Recently in a booklet entitled *The Art of Speaking* the L.C.C.'s education inspectors have made assertions (about London speech, not that of the whole of England) which a few years ago would have infuriated many stalwart upholders of dialect (in others). The aims of the school are 'to impart to pupils the power of courteous, fluent and clearly articulated speech which shall not warp the personality or cause a child to be a stranger in his home environment. For the great majority of pupils, bilingualism is to be preferred to the replacement of their native speech by a colourless standard dialect' . . .

'in face of great difficulties, London teachers are doing much to help children to "speak clearly, gracefully and with pride"' (this last phrase is a quotation from the 1946 report on Primary Education in Scotland).

The pamphlet states categorically; 'more and more as wireless, television, the cinema and the telephone tend to replace the printed word as a vehicle of communication and of culture, the spoken word increases in importance. Furthermore, as society loses its more rigid stratification, and opportunities for much wider intercourse become possible, so the value of acquiring good speech in school is enhanced, especially for those who are least fortunate in their early cultural environment.'

It goes on to mention the advantages that children from good residential areas have in being encouraged to talk and discuss with courteous attention to other speakers, whereas in over-crowded homes, the children are more likely to be 'shut up' than listened to by their elders. . . . 'By laying good foundations in the schools we can save many a young Londoner from frustration and social bitterness.'

It is impossible to dissociate ways of speaking from manners, of which speech is a very important part, and etiquette. The advantage of etiquette is that it codifies widely accepted manners. People who read books on etiquette, unless they do this with the specialised interest of the anthropologist, do not wish to learn how persons in their own class behave, for that they know, but how members of the stratum above theirs are expected to conduct themselves. It is hard to find articles describing lower middle-class or working-class etiquette. It is possible to write them, though their circulation might not be wide. Hospitality, ways of eating, drinking and making love, ceremonial deemed proper for weddings and funerals, relationships between parents and children, husbands and wives, have their rules, and all social workers should know about them, though possibly much time is wasted in learning them by personal experience.

One may however, derive from articles on upper-class etiquette, general truths applicable to some other classes.

Nigel Nicolson (167) has described some features of the English dinner-party, which is directed, controlled or confined by etiquette—e.g. the manner of drinking soup, of conversing alternately with one's right and left hand neighbours at table, and the extent to which attention, in public, to personal appearance is permissible. Underlying such rigid rules are certain sensible desiderata, e.g. avoidance of disagreeable sounds and gestures, personal kindness and the convenience of the majority.

In order that etiquette may 'work' smoothly, or at all, everyone must obey the same rules, even if these create hard cases. That etiquette should prevent A, at dinner, from continuing his talk with B on a subject highly interesting to both, and compel him to address C, who both hates and bores him, may be temporarily distasteful to all three, yet it prevents D from feeling himself or herself entirely left out. That this calamity often happens at a dance, especially in America, suggests that only at formal dances can the maximum number of heart-burnings be avoided.

The social psychologist is repaid by the study of instances where the rules of etiquette have worked loose, are observed by one person but not by another, or have been out-distanced by events. To form a refreshment queue at some private receptions might be efficient, but would call attention to a shortage of waiters; perhaps even of food and drink. In these semi-democratic days, few thoughtful people in daily contact with several different classes seem happy about the problems of introducing people to each other. Mr. Nicolson remarks that the English seem to have drifted into a state of anarchy about the custom of shaking hands, even between men. If, on being made acquainted, one man bows with hands behind his back, and the other does likewise, all is well, but if the other half-heartedly extends and then withdraws his, confusion, timorous uncertainty and embarrassment result. Among the middle and lower-middle classes—perhaps slightly further upwards too—there are examples of doubt and uncertainty concerning when, how and to whom to say 'thank you.'

Some codes of manners exclude members of certain classes

from close relationship with members of another. This, as we have seen, is true of ways of speaking and it is interesting to notice how seldom, in these days when (except on formal occasions) bows and curtseys are almost obsolete, queues universal, and revolving doors replace the hinged kind, wordless manners are shown, except in hat-raising—when there is a hat to raise—and saluting. Both these are examples of in-group manners.

In *Europe without Baedeker* (229, 229a) Mr. Edmund Wilson, an American who has long been interested in our social stratification—he is widely known for his psychological portrait in *The Wound and the Bow* (228) of Charles Dickens—has given examples of exclusiveness in English manners. It might seem easy to laugh this off by suggesting that he was touchy and on the look-out for slights, but a careful re-reading, by affronted Englishmen when they have cooled down, will make it clear that there is substance in his acid comments.

Psychologists have given relatively little consideration to the effects upon the group and the individual (particularly the latter) of codes of behaviour and good manners (including speech, facial expression, gestures and postures) and the unwritten sanctions which make everyday social life easier. It would be psychologically interesting to trace the reasons for this lack of interest in this most social of social problems.

Some parents, nurses and teachers talk about, while inculcating, manners, when in charge of their children: grown-ups seldom mention the subject to each other, except in disapproval of bad manners.

Books on etiquette can be bought—in the first half of 1947 Emily Post's *Etiquette* sold 50,000 copies—but codes of etiquette change more slowly than manners, and the two recent wars have altered both in many respects.

We may agree that, though the adjective "good" begs the question, good manners are those which ease social relations. About these there are regional and class differences of opinion, even in England. Stratum-differences are also observable, e.g., in the Universities, the Forces and business life, where modes of address and convivial customs are far from being

identical. Some of these manners exclude the 'outsider' while including the 'in-grouper'; thereby contributing to goodwill only in a restricted sense.

If a basic structure of good manners, applicable to *genus homo* at all times and everywhere, exists, I have never heard of one. Anthropologists would discourage such simple wishful thinking. If hunger, thirst, elimination and sex are basic drives, their satisfaction is achieved in very different ways in different regions of the world, and even in the same region. For example, phrases and gestures expressing thanks or regret differ in different social classes in England, and each class seems amused, occasionally with malice, at the choice made by the others. Yet if codes of manners differ for different social classes, does this fact help to perpetuate them by making their boundaries stricter? If so, does not this impede the spread of goodwill?

It is sometimes asserted that in a hierarchical society 'things get done' and in a classless one they wouldn't—if these things are unpleasant or irksome. A battleship has been cited as the perfect example of a community in which things get done, but from a civilised community, battleships would presumably have disappeared.

Mr. T. S. Eliot suggests that contributions to culture come most desirably from a restricted group communicating with a larger, yet still restricted group. But the relation between culture and goodwill is complex and has never been worked out. Vienna in 1914 was cultured, but torn by dissension; a fact which is represented in Freud's general picture of the human mind.

At the moment, the student of manners from the psychological aspect has little to go upon, except his own observations. He must do his utmost to free them from the influence of local, national or class prejudices—and those of people similarly engaged. Novelists at all times make valuable suggestions, but many have not even tried to be free from bias. It would be interesting if psychologists would investigate the amount and directions of agreement with recommendations expressed in recent books; e.g., Ray Allister's *Manners for Moderns* (4)

or broadcasts, e.g., by Phyllis Digby Morton. The respondents could be classed according to sex, age, social class and locality. It is true that these data would concern not only what the answerers do, but what they think ought to be done, yet at present we know little about the codes of different ages in our own civilisation. Questionnaires, 'closed or open-end,' might lead to interviews and written personal and private communications. In this way much could be learnt about inferiority-attitudes and complexes which motivate unusual behaviour and emotions.

The aim of this dissertation is to inquire whether and how manners achieve or fail to achieve their presumable purposes, and to trace the relations between them, etiquette and goodwill. Codes of etiquette, even of manners, can be observed when goodwill is at a minimum, the behaviour of diplomatists being an obvious example. A primitive people may behave in a friendly way to a newly-arrived explorer who might find it hard on first acquaintance to determine whether this conduct was dictated by a code.

Etiquette codifies the manners which are, or were, desirable in a community. Probably it always lags behind them. It is usually fixed and hard to alter, yet in the days between the death and the funeral of the late King, many people who had obeyed the laws of etiquette were already urging in speech and print that the young Queen ought in future to be less burdened with etiquette.

Etiquette, from its very nature, excludes many from the society which it regulates: goodwill presumably is inclusive. Today in our country much goodwill exists between individuals and small groups. Even the apparent 'neutrality' of the city-dweller or the passenger in a train may be prompted by goodwill which expresses the desire not to intrude unnecessarily upon another's privacy. Is it true that large groups cannot be formed without a serious loss of goodwill or even an increase in ill-will? There is ill-will at present between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., but goodwill between the various states of the U.S.A. itself.

The various meanings of 'goodwill' might be valuably explored. 'Love thy neighbour as thyself' still prompts the

question: 'Who is my neighbour?' What are the reasons given for not wanting to know one's neighbour well in a large town, and for occasionally wishing one did not, in a village? The desire to 'keep oneself to oneself' or to keep the family together may be sustained by complex motives not yet fully understood. Some family patterns are noticeably unfriendly to outsiders.

The extravert's and the introvert's idea of good manners and goodwill, even in the same sub-culture-pattern, are very different. Personal and impersonal goodwill are distinguishable—e.g., being ready to help actual cases of need or sickness which come within one's personal experience, and being relatively callous to all others, or preferring to subscribe to funds, or to belong to a political party, which show goodwill on a larger scale, and perhaps, more discriminatingly.

It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to discuss, as if it were an objective fact in the external world, a person's character. Is it observable by all, at least in principle; measurable, or quantitatively assessible, e.g. by awarding marks? A person's height and weight can be 'public property'; his physical health, if fairly good, can be assessed by a careful examiner; his intelligence, at least of the kind which testers warily call 'g,' (it plays a great part in passing school and university examinations) can be estimated. Character is harder to judge, and the tendency of some psychologists to call it 'personality,' on the ground that character has ethical and therefore normative implications, confuses rather than helps. Many people believe that they can judge character, and sometimes they can, but the reasons offered are seldom entirely convincing. A highly integrated person is likely to have a 'strong' character, and one of which some people are sure to disapprove, because his values are not theirs. Was not the last war fought against dictators, one of whom had a strong character?

Such questions arise in considering a recent discussion by the English Press of the visit by journalists in October 1953 to a meeting of a selection board deciding which candidates should be admitted to the famous naval training college, Dartmouth.

Under the provocative titles 'Is there a Sound Barrier against your Son?' and 'It might hang on a dropped "h", ' the *Evening Standard* and the *News Chronicle* described their representatives' visit. The *Manchester Guardian* headed its article 'The Admiralty chooses its Future Officers,' reporting that the Board, 'aware of some public distrust of its decisions, admitted the Press to watch the process of selection.' This lasted two days, and was carried out by six members of the Board: a Rear-Admiral, three captains R.N., a Director of Education and the headmaster of a London Grammar School. The First Lord of the Admiralty and the Senior Psychologist of the Admiralty were represented.

The process of selection comprised a medical examination and selection tests constructed to distinguish between basic intelligence and acquired knowledge. These tests are designed to help to decide which branch of the Navy would suit a particular candidate, and there is no question of passing or failing them.

Since some public distrust of the Admiralty's final decision has been officially admitted (this Board is only the penultimate authority), it is interesting to read some of the reasons given for this lack of confidence, voiced in the *Evening Standard* by Mr. J. P. W. Mallalieu, Labour M.P. for Huddersfield, author of *Very Ordinary Seaman*, who was in the Royal Navy from 1942 to 1945. He served on the Lower Deck, in convoys to Russia, and later was commissioned. His view is that enthusiasm for the Royal Navy may not continue much longer; and not only because the glamour and importance of the R.A.F. are increasing. . . . Many applicants for commissions now feel that success or failure depends on accent, and hence, on social status. . . . A boy who sounds as if he came from Lancashire, Yorkshire, or the East End of London—well, 'he'd do better on the music halls than on the quarter deck.'

Here we encounter a psychological problem. Even if these assertions are unwarranted, but the potential candidates believe them, they are mental facts. What, too, if their headmasters believe them? Then the boys are unlikely to appear before the Dartmouth Board.

Laurence Thompson of the *News Chronicle* says that the Navy is not attracting enough future officers. The number of cadets accepted for entry at the age of 16 has fallen below the number of vacancies. Of 1330 candidates from grammar schools, 70 have been accepted: of 491 from public schools, 89. There have been allegations that the Admiralty interviewing board is unconsciously biassed against grammar school boys with working-class accents and backgrounds. Perhaps, it may be commented, the accents against which the bias works are not only working-class: many provincial accents (the reader can hear them in radio plays produced in the Northern or Midland studios) though praised by most London journalists (who incidentally are apt to come from the provinces or Scotland) as forthright, sturdy, stubborn, obstinate are regarded with affectionate amusement by many who would never encourage members of their own family to use them exclusively. Wilfred Pickles, who represents the North of England to millions of listeners here and overseas, can, and often does, speak Standard English. It is true that in the past a West-Country accent characterised some of our greatest sailors, but radio listeners nowadays are conditioned to expect from its users a blend of commonsense and earthy, rather than salty, humour, with no snap in the voice. Is it then remarkable if the Admiralty is biassed, unconsciously or not, against 'provincial' accents?

The *News Chronicle* (15 Oct., 1953) writes of a test which consisted of requiring a group of candidates to get a barrel across an imaginary river, using only allotted ropes and planks. A tall lad with a naval background automatically assumed command. A grammar school boy made constructive suggestions: others were inclined to apologise and fiddle with their hands. They had not been told that taking command was more important than the way the job was done, and not all the boys understood this.

In the next test; impromptu discussions, a grammar school boy who in the gymnasium had been swamped by the ostentatious competence of the naval type, delivered an address on why he would have liked to meet Guy Fawkes, which might not have endeared him to M.P.s but clearly did to the Admiral.

In the personal interview, the boy who showed up well in the gym, and proved colourless afterwards, had 6 votes against and 2 for him. The Grammar school boy with the aggressive manner was passed unanimously. Four candidates eventually passed: 2 grammar school and 2 public school boys. One might comment that in this decision of the Board, snobbery seemed to play no part.

Mr. Mallalieu (*Evening Standard*, 16 Oct., 1953) answers his question 'Do the Navy Boys get a Square Deal?' with 'Yes, with one doubt.' He points out that the final decision is made not by the Interview Board but by their Lordships in the Admiralty. And Laurence Thompson asserts 'If two boys are on the borderline, and one speaks Owdham, the other Eton, the Lancashire boy will fail.' The real problem however is not one of accent or family background, in his view, but that few grammar school headmasters will put forward 16-year-olds for whom they can see a university career.

Accent, of course, is by no means the only 'open sesame' to Dartmouth, but it is an outward and audible sign (to modify only slightly the words of the English Church Catechism) of that vaguer 'inward and spiritual grace' which comes from a social background deemed desirable by the judge, and indeed is looked for by him. Perhaps his attitude is fairly expressed by Rupert Martin, who writes in the *Fortnightly* for January 1954, that there is a strong body of naval opinion which says in effect 'We've been on this job for some centuries, and don't want our outstanding efficiency marred by either political or educational theorists.'

Nobody could deny that the 13-year-old entry loads the dice heavily in favour of the boy from the independent (private) 'prep' school, and such a school is naturally expensive; one reason being that its classes are kept small, 12 perhaps being a representative average number. Mr. Martin writes that this favours the sons of 'prosperous' parents: he does not mention the class to which they belong.

The argument for entrance at 13 is that naval officers should be trained, somewhat more closely than those in the Army or the R.A.F., to a type. 'There is not much room in a warship at

sea,' and in it the R.N. type of good mixer is the most desirable. (Comments from successful R.N.V.R. and Merchant Navy officers might be interesting.)

Now that (November 1953) the Board of Admiralty has published its new regulations for officer training in the R.N. and has decided that the entrance age shall be 18, excluding the possibility of entrance at 13, the matter is open for discussion. Under the title 'Dartmouth Surrendered,' a leader-writer in the London *Times* said 'The chief sacrifice is of the Royal Naval College itself. . . . A Conservative Government has surrendered a fine instrument of training which the Navy wished to keep.'

The issues raised seem to be ultimately psychological. Is there no way of producing the character desirable in the Navy of today except that in favour with the Dartmouth authorities (we are hardly likely to know whether their decision was unanimous) whose criteria of desirable character have presumably been the same for centuries? In both the last two wars, the Navy has been compelled to ask for help from theorists, in physics, mathematics, and, as it happens, psychology: are all those who wish to see its training kept up-to-date to be written down as 'educational theorists'? Now that the Navy must fight in the air and under the sea, must it not develop new concepts of training? Since the Navy can hardly claim to diagnose character at 13 years of age, are we to conclude that the criterion of the desirable character at this age would have been a perceived resemblance to its own type, by members of the Board?

It is not easy to decide after observation, however frequent and serious (over a long period the present writer has made such observations both seriously and frequently) how far manners, good and bad, whether expressed by general behaviour or by speech, characterise a social class. 'Occupational' manners expected from doctors, civil servants, policemen, bus conductors, shop-assistants and waiters would be a fruitful subject for study. Unfortunately, one is more likely to read in the newspapers complaints of bad manners in specific, often exceptional instances than appreciations of good manners; for example, the

courtesy and kindness often shown on buses and in busy post-offices at rush hours deserve a public tribute.

Ray Allister's *Manners for Moderns* (4) gives an account of manners as seen by a writer who takes the point of view of a member of the upper middle or lower upper class. As might be anticipated, many actions described are expected from anyone who, in our country behaves 'decently' but hints are also given concerning conduct in expensive hotels, restaurants and ships, and in the homes of relatively wealthy people.

Pearl Jephcott's books: *Rising Twenty* (109) and *Girls Growing Up* (108) give an idea of the manners of some working class adolescents. A few of their gaucheries are natural in any English adolescent—anthropologists like Margaret Mead remind us that the process of growing up differs in different cultures—but it must not be forgotten that most of these crudities are remedied when they appear in boys or girls at many schools, both primary and secondary, and the expensive public and 'finishing' schools are expected to pay special attention to manners. Some observers of the public schoolboy's manners note a certain selectivity: good manners are directed chiefly towards a section of the community recognised as his own. If he becomes a Cabinet Minister, and these habits have become ingrained, one may read complaints of his overbearing, contumacious manner when answering questions in the House, and warm defences by his friends who argue that X is really charming when you know him; they might admit that few have that privilege.

It is interesting that the National Association of Girls' Clubs and Mixed Clubs (30 Devonshire Street, London, W.1.) has published broadsheets intended to help their youthful members on manners and etiquette. Good and less good behaviour is pictorially presented with explanations in light-hearted doggerel, presumably written to appeal to the young but not to seem 'stuffy.'

The opening verse distinguishes manners from etiquette: 'the former really make for grace; the other only saves your face.' Important points are emphasized: e.g. when walking with a girl the boy takes the outside of the pavement and observes the

rule 'Ladies first,' except when getting off a bus or train. He gives up his seat to older people, or to women and girls, when in a public vehicle. When going out to a meal, he enters the room punctually with clean shoes, without coat and hat. At a formal meal, 'faced by many knives and forks' he proceeds from 'outside in.' At a party the boy takes his share in conversation and offers seats to others. On leaving, the host and hostess should be thanked as if one meant it, and after staying the night a 'thank you' letter should be sent. Clothes should be inconspicuous, suitable to the place and time.

The suggestions continue: introduce young people to older ones, men to women, the less important to the more important, don't swear.

Hints on manners in special circumstances are given. 'Town Manners' include: Get to your theatre or cinema seat punctually. Offered a seat in a bus a girl should smile, not fuss. Don't throw cigarette ends on carpets, don't walk three abreast on narrow pavements, don't step dreamily in front of traffic; when in a queue at a railway ticket office, don't grumble if an old, slow person is in front. Don't be noisy outside hospitals.

Country manners include several important 'don'ts,' relating to leaving gates open, disturbing hay, entering private grounds, taking birds' eggs, picking too many wild flowers, leaving litter behind. 'Cycling manners' include: Don't ride three abreast, don't weave through a traffic-jam, respect all road signs, especially those for schools and steep hills, don't ride with hands off the handles, don't carry luggage which impedes others, give clear road signs.

'Walking manners'—don't dash out behind a stationary car, do help old people and small children across the road, don't step suddenly off the kerb, or play games in the street, don't block the motor driver's view by grouping at a kerb corner; do use marked crossings.

There are appropriate remarks on Seaside manners—how to leave a holiday house in a condition acceptable to one's successors. Helping hints are offered to members who are temporary hosts or guests at Youth Clubs.

Presumably this compilation was not the outcome of a

scientific investigation but the result of several officers' experience. Obviously it is not a complete list of good manners, but only or chiefly relates to those situations in which inexperienced club members have been known to behave unsuitably or inadequately.

CHAPTER FOUR

Cultural and Social Differences

Suggested definitions of culture, and of a cultured person. The anthropological concept of culture as supra-individual. Explicit and implicit culture. Sanctioned and behavioural patterns. T. S. Eliot's views of culture and its transmission. Who are the curators and disseminators of culture today?

THE value of the concept 'social stratum' is shown by the existence in England of cultural strata. Some run horizontally within a single class, but most of them extend obliquely, involving more than one class. Nowadays, it is claimed by few that our upper classes are the conscious and deliberate preservers of English culture; aware of a duty; not only to preserve but to increase and disseminate culture. Probably for the last fifty years the chief repositories of culture have been professional groups and the wealthy upper-middle classes (14). But when writers on culture today exclude from their discussion the lower-middle and working classes, it might be wise to ask 'What *is* Culture?' Attempting to cross the gulf separating anthropologists from 'Arts men,' let us ask 'What makes a cultured person?' and, 'What is meant by Civilisation, and a civilised person?'

In such a discussion, semantic difficulties are considerable, but cannot be treated here. Let us attempt to clear a path by making a few statements which may appear dogmatic, even to those who agree with them.

Material may be distinguished from mental culture: this feat is easy now that in Europe rubble exists alongside signs of mental culture (in the non-anthropological sense) and in other parts of the world, a complex material culture coexists with poor mental culture. Think of Vienna before 1914, with its beautiful buildings, pictures, music and charming manners; yet was not Emperor Franz Josef afraid to repeat an unprepared sight of his poorest citizens? If Viennese life had not harboured so much envy, hatred, malice and uncharitableness, would

Freud's hypotheses have been conceived in their original forms? Perhaps the English over-emphasize the importance of the fact that in younger countries, possession of material wealth is often unconnected with a high level of culture, yet if the children of these relatively uncultured persons attend universities, their own children are even more likely to do so.

I will now describe a cultured person: I was once the guest of a business man amongst the hills in a foreign country. The first morning, while it rained incessantly, we sat on his balcony. In excellent English, he told me about the economic state of his capital city, before and after the 1914–18 war. I surmised that though personally he longed for the good old days, he was vividly interested in the new condition of affairs, which had made life more complex for him. After a while he said, 'Could you bear some rather good Schubert gramophone records?' They were not rather good; they were excellent and unusual. He then described new mural paintings in the neighbouring church, and the life-history and personality of the artist. 'At tea-time,' he said, 'you may like to go into the town to hear some modern piano compositions. I prefer Beethoven, but I think this new music is psychologically interesting. Meanwhile, let's go into the kitchen; I'll teach you how to make risotto.' I followed him; he waved away a smiling cook, used to such treatment, juggled with pots and pans, and soon produced a meal. (He emphasised that the different flavours must permeate the rice.) This many-sidedness was expressed casually within two hours of his companionship. Need I add that the country was Austria?

The aim of this example is to depict a personality permeated by the flavours of culture. The cultured man knows 'who is who' and 'what is what'; for usually his discrimination is directed towards both people and things. Expression of his opinions is not limited to gush or boorish condemnation.

Can a cultured person be psychologically described? It may be suggested that he shows unusual delicacy in discriminating between situations and people, and in graduating his responses to them. 'Response' may include overt behaviour and abstention from it, as in the expression of tolerance.

This is an extension of a concept which we owe to the late Sir Henry Head and Dr. W. H. R. Rivers. Though recent investigations have shown that the Head-Rivers work on peripheral nerves can be explained in another way, the concepts of increased delicacy of discrimination and gradation of response when applied to human experience are still suggestive.

A cultured person's responses are graduated, in the light of judgments based upon acceptance of ethical, aesthetic and other values. Culture rises and falls with value-systems current in the community. While the level of general culture in a social group can rise only slowly, it can fall with an alarming rapidity, as it did in World War II.

Whether the above view of cultured persons is acceptable or not, there is probably general agreement that they exist and are often recognisable. But some anthropologists hold that an individual cannot have a culture. In a personal letter to me about an article: 'Personality in its Cultural Context' (186), Mr. Geoffrey Gorer, while acknowledging the fitness of the title, deplores 'the contradiction in the phrase "the culture of the individual".' Culture, he maintains, is a social concept; aspects of individual behaviour represent elements shared with other members of the society, and hence cultural, 'but an individual cannot have a culture.'

Let us therefore look at an anthropologist's definition of culture. Professor Ralph Linton's is:

> A culture is the configuration of learned behaviour and results of behaviour, whose component elements are shared and transmitted by the members of a particular society. As used in scientific studies, 'culture' refers to the total way of life of any society, not simply to those parts of that way which the society regards as higher or more desirable. . . For the social scientist, there are no uncultured societies or even individuals. . . There are many possible definitions of a culture, each of which is useful in connection with investigation of a particular sort (130).

In Stuart Chase's *The Proper Study of Mankind* (46), the concept of culture as a group's way of life is expounded. The group's aims, ideals, values, skills, and achievements, material

and mental, are woven into a characteristic pattern, as the result of selection from a wide possible range. Culture cements together the members of the group and keeps it from flying into a thousand fragments.

Perhaps these views may be reconcilable if we say that a cultured person has refined his discrimination of situations (physically or mentally caused) and graded his responses, inside his own Culture.

The 'culture-pattern' concept assumes that in a group, sentiments, interests and values are organised into a pattern, discernible by a 'good' observer. The publications of Ruth Benedict (24), Margaret Mead (155), Geoffrey Gorer (83, 83a) and others have used this concept, and refinements have been made by Clyde Kluckhohn and W. H. Kelly (114) who offer, as a working concept of Culture:

> All those historically created designs for living, explicit and implicit, rational, irrational and non-rational, which exist at any given time as potential guides for the behaviour of man.

This distinction between explicit culture; 'all features of a group-design for living which might be described to an outsider by participants in the culture'; and implicit culture: 'that sector of behaviour of which members of the group are unaware, or minimally aware,' is important. For example, in R. C. Sherriff's play 'Badger's Green,' which depicts the reactions of inhabitants of an English village to the threat of modern 'improvements,' explicit and implicit values are interwoven. As the chief characters are the doctor, a retired army officer, an innkeeper and an upper-middle class invader, who is however a cricketer, the plot will be explicitly and implicitly understood by many Englishmen, fewer Scots and Americans, and by almost no Chinese or Russians.

Kluckhohn and Kelly distinguish sanctioned from behavioural patterns. A sanctioned pattern, if described, would convey an idea of what, in a defined situation, people would do or say if they conformed completely to ideals accepted in the culture. We might suggest as an example the practice of forming a bus-queue, in parts of England. In a behavioural pattern, the

attention is focussed upon some mode of what people in fact do. The bus-queue again may illustrate this, since its very existence depends upon place and time. In an industrial city, a bus-conductor told me that 'good' or 'bad' behaviour in boarding his bus during rush-hours depends upon whether the destination is North or South; the social equivalent of East or West in London. It is easy to see the relevance of this distinction when considering manners and etiquette (Cf. Chapter 3).

Now that some concepts of Culture and of cultured persons have been compared, it will be seen that any judgments of an individual's degree of culture are likely to be made by other persons living in the same 'sub-culture,' as when a classical scholar appraises the work of another. Yet the assessment may be made by someone from another sub-culture; a physical scientist or economist. Any one of these assessors may appear to the others as relatively uncultured. For example, Lewis and Maude write that the universities are turning out scientists so narrowly specialized, so ignorant of everything outside a narrow sector of science itself, as to be totally unaware even that they lack culture. Considerations of culture arise when a man's fitness to take part in governing is discussed. Today, the competence of the ordinary M.P. who has seldom had special training in physical science, even to understand the problems of future warfare, has been questioned (Cf. 194a). Scientists, in turn, are criticised for their alleged ignorance of politics, economics, diplomacy and social psychology. Judges who prescribe punishments or remedial treatment for offenders are chided for their ignorance, sometimes deliberate, of the ways in which these punishments or treatments will be administered. Military leaders are increasingly charged with ignorance of social anthropology; it is sometimes asserted that for this reason the 'man on the spot' may misconceive the problem.

Our highly specialised and integrated sub-cultures are flying apart and specialists find it difficult to communicate with each other, though many do not try very hard. Here we approach the problem of the relation of strata, classes and élites. Any one culture observed by a cultured person may contain many items that he likes or dislikes, admires or deplores, though he sees

that it 'cements people together.' Perhaps Mr. T. S. Eliot's approach to this subject illustrates this (61b). He approves the following senses in which 'culture' may be used, as a descriptive term:

(1) the conscious self-cultivation of the individual, his attempt to raise himself out of the average mass to the level of the élite.
(2) the ways of believing, thinking and feeling of the particular group within society to which an individual belongs.
(3) the still less conscious way of life of society as a whole.

Sense (1) seems to represent Mr. Eliot's own preference: he writes that our own period is one of decline of culture, and—one hears a growl from the anthropologists—'we can foresee a period of no culture.' If this came, Culture, he says, would have 'to grow again from the soil.' A social scientist may find it hard to decide whether this is prose or poetry. Dr. R. H. Thouless in *Straight and Crooked Thinking* (213) collects a number of 'emotional' terms, which ought not to be used, (except by poets), where an unemotional term would serve. Remembering a fairly recent use of '*Blut und Boden*,' it is hard to understand why Mr. Eliot leans on this deliquescent image.

He mentions another meaning of culture; refinement of manners, or urbanity and civility. Yet he admits that manners differ in different classes, which have their own criteria. Mr. Eliot's compatriot, Mr. Edmund Wilson (229), has noted that some English people term anyone 'incivil' who, as judged by them, does not know, or forgets, his 'place' in society. In the House of Commons, unruffled urbanity has at times been interpreted as arrogant insensitivity.

The problem of cultural innovation is distinct from that of cultural transmission. Mr. Eliot does not discuss the ways in which newspapers, the films, radio and television influence public opinion (123) but one gets the impression that the cultural innovations which he has noticed displease him. Yet a social anthropologist studying culture-change is cognisant not only of new ways of communication but also of applications of the physical sciences, such as aviation, population control, soil control, the uses of atomic energy and the daring employment

of physics and chemistry in modern medicine. All these too are cultural innovations. Here the gulf between Mr. Eliot and the scientists seems wide. He has, perhaps, little desire to bridge it, for he writes 'the person who contributes to culture is not always a "cultured person".'

A distinction between intensively and extensively cultured persons may be suggested. Executant musicians can be cited in illustration. Principals of Colleges of Music say that one of their difficult tasks is to provide education leading to more extensive culture, for a pupil who as early as ten, has shown supernormal talent; and not only to provide such possibilities but to coax the aspiring concert star to avail himself of them. The situation is similar with a pupil gifted in mathematics, who has probably known this at an early age. At twenty he will be intensively, not extensively cultured.

Persons who are extensively but not intensively cultured are numerous; many of them work for broadcasting companies. Before so much scientific knowledge about cerebral activity existed, a common argument for preferring the possessor of a 'first-class brain' to a narrowly specialised person implied belief in the existence of an extensively cultured mind, 'ready for anything.' This assumption begs several questions, and discussions of the abilities required in the upper ranks of our Civil Service might be clarified by concepts of extensive and intensive culture.

Discussing the transmission of culture, Mr. Eliot premises that no culture has appeared or evolved except in connexion with a religion. He maintains that transmission of culture depends on three conditions:

(1) the persistence of social classes

(2) the diversity of local or regional cultures within a larger cultural unit

(3) the diversity of religious cult and devotion within a large universality of religious belief.

If, following Mr. W. H. Auden, we regard premise (3) as

'undeniable even by the most violent atheist, since "religion" simply means that which is binding, the beliefs or habits of conduct that the conscience of an individual or a society tell him he should affirm even at the cost of his life' (14), Mr. Eliot seems to ask for trouble when he cites as examples of religion, Dyak head-hunting, gaiters and the Athenaeum. Many Englishmen, including some bishops, might welcome the disappearance of the first two institutions.

When Mr. Eliot asserts that culture is what makes life worth living, he seems to approach the anthropologists' standpoint. He may mean that to a cultured man, life is worth less without cultural joys, but soldiers and explorers usually consider life to be sweet.

His approval of hereditary classes and his doubts concerning the good effects of universal education are clearly expressed:

> In a healthily stratified society, public affairs would be a responsibility not equally borne: a greater responsibility would be inherited by those who inherited special advantages and in whom self-interest, and interest for the sake of their families (a stake in the country), should cohere with public spirit.
>
> In justice to Thomas Gray, we should remind ourselves of the last and finest line of the quatrain, and remember that we may also have escaped some Cromwell guilty of his country's blood. The proposition that we lost a number of Miltons and Cromwells through our tardiness in providing a comprehensive state system of education cannot be either proved or disproved: it has a strong attraction for many ardent reforming spirits.

On this Mr. Auden writes:

> How has culture been transmitted in the past? If the methods of the past are no longer possible, how can it be transmitted now? Mr. Eliot is only partly right, I think, in asserting that in the past the role of transmission was played by a class or by classes. For many centuries, it was transmitted by the Church; i.e. by an institution with a hereditary status, whose members could be drawn from any special class. In England, it was only during the last two centuries or so that the responsibility for culture passed to social classes, first to the landed aristocracy, and then, when they became stock-holders without responsibility, to the professional classes—the clergy, the doctors,

the lawyers, etc. And even then it was certain institutions—the greater universities, the cathedral closes—that were really responsible.

In this suggestive, provocative book, the frequently occurring word 'must' puzzles a psychologist. He may read with surprise 'there must be groups of families persisting from generation to generation, each in the same way of life.' Where are these groups in England today? When Mr. Eliot laments 'the chaos of ideals and confusion of thought in our large-scale mass education,' and 'the disappearance of any class of people who recognise public and private responsibility for the patronage of the best that is made and written' we wonder what is included under 'made.' Music, for example? It is hard to disagree with Hector Hawton's comment 'He is nostalgic for the time when there were no Penguin Books, and Church and State went as admirably together as (in Disraeli's phrase) strawberries and cream. That most people should try to think for themselves he considers the modern heresy; they should have their thinking done for them, presumably by Anglican bishops and literary men like Mr. Eliot. At all costs the scientist must be kept out of this exclusive "club" ' (98).

In the many pleas to preserve 'our' culture there seems to be insufficient acknowledgment of the possibility that extensive culture of individual minds, accompanied or not by intensive culture of certain departments of them, has increased. Some will object 'But that is not what *I* call culture.' Yet are the audiences, which in our cities listen nightly to first-class orchestras, uncultured? If it be objected that the orchestra is a spectacle and usually plays some popular music, it might be noted that the Royal Festival Hall was filled for Elisabeth Schwarzkopf's recital of songs by Hugo Wolf. 'Listening figures' for the Reith lectures and reports on non-fiction books borrowed from public libraries are impressive. Lists of extra-mural University classes and of cheap editions of undoubtedly good books suggest that culture has broadened.

It is difficult to believe that, in these days of taxation, austere living and emigration, the upper classes can be the guardians of culture, in the wide sense of the word. A man living in the

country may have never heard great plays or music directly, but the radio brings them to him. The Sunday critics cause many listeners to think about plays, books, films and radio itself. There seems to be no way to avoid this concept of culture, and little reason to try to do so. The sentence, so often misquoted, 'If I hear the word "culture," I take the safety-catch off my Browning' only makes some people determine to use the word.

Mr. Eliot fears that culture will become too unified, too world-wide, too common. He supports regionalisation of culture, yet is this not like 'supporting' candle-clocks, ear-trumpets, warming-pans and stage-coaches? Radio certainly breaks down much regional culture, though the introduction of frequency modulation might do a great deal to foster it.

Mr. Eliot's personal preference to restrict culture to a few can be respected, but the tide is flowing strongly in the other direction. (It should be remembered that he wrote in 1948.)

Lewis and Maude write, of the middle classes 'their leisure has been employed in the pursuit of culture as much as in the search for amusement' (p. 69).

On November 22nd, 1953, a few days before the House of Lords debate on commercial television, the politically independent *Observer* wrote, in 'Table Talk'

The B.B.C. has already proved itself an instrument for reviewing the disinterested patronage of learning and the arts, such as we have lacked since the passing of the great noblemen of the eighteenth century. Instead of taking the B.B.C. as a dangerous example of State action, Tory leaders should claim it as an example of the aristocratic principle triumphing in modern form,

and in the 'Comment' columns

The issue (commercial television) provides a searching test of the soul of the Conservative Party by putting the question whether that party stands for conserving cultural and social values, or has merely become the champion of commercialism.

CHAPTER FIVE

Snobs

Different meanings of 'snob.' Intellectual snobbishness, in England and the U.S.A. English snobbery as imagined by some 'foreign' writers; is the reaction ambivalent? The inverted snob, defined and illustrated. Snobbery depicted in novels. Decrease of snobbery in women's organisations.

TODAY many people avoid talking of snobbery and snobbishness, even if, to intimate friends, they confess to suffering from a variety of this ailment. Some believe that 'snobbishness', suggesting perhaps an occasional lapse rather than a chronic weakness (166) is less offensive than 'snobbery.' However, the dictionary does not distinguish between them. The meanings, in English, of 'snob' are interesting. Its origin is unknown. As a dialect or colloquial word it meant a shoemaker, cobbler or cobbler's apprentice. In 1865, in Cambridge University slang, it designated anyone who was not a gownsman. In 1852 it was applied to a person belonging to the lower ranks of society and (note) having no pretensions to rank or gentility. It then became applicable to a vulgar and ostentatious person, and to one whose ideas and conduct are prompted by a vulgar admiration for rank and social position. The dictionary hints that snobbishness may accompany a feeling of intellectual superiority.

So it is difficult to apply these words confidently in these days of taxation, intended to approximate rich and poor, of expensive clothes, of greater tolerance in the dress of both sexes, of queer, bizarre or sensible innovations, of B.B.C. English, democratisation of education and a numerically powerful Labour Party. To assume that any exhibition of snobbery is necessarily vulgar begs the question and leads one into a semantic bog. Obviously, vulgar admiration for social position or wealth would be snobbery, yet at what point in 1953 did the widespread admiration for social position become vulgar?

The meaning of 'intellectual snobbishness' is fairly clear, though attempts to define 'intellectual' fail to secure popular acceptance. On the day after the result of the 1952 Presidential election in the U.S.A. was announced, several American University professors, on a visit to England, described the swing as a defeat for the intellectuals. It is instructive to note the ingenuity with which apologists, in the proper sense of that word, for the B.B.C.'s Third Programme avoid using either 'intellectual' or 'cultured' to describe it, when obviously it is both.

In spite of these discouragements, let us try to describe an intellectual snob. Like all snobs, he is apt to look downwards because he looks upward so often, and when with friends, he will refer to persons, places, books, plays and films which he considers to be 'right.' At the time of writing, he may consider it necessary to mention that he does not own a television set.

Looking up to, or down upon, a person or a social group may be caused by awareness of facts undeniable because they are 'objective'; e.g. in the combatant Services, rank is unmistakably indicated, and promotion, demotion and 'bowler-hatting' freely discussed. In some branches of Government service, stipends and salaries (there is, of course, a difference) are publicly stated. A business man's status, even today, may often be deduced from the size, location and furnishings of his house, the clubs to which he and his family belong, and the shops which they patronise, especially those selling expensive, inessential goods. Less obvious criteria are available when an intellectual snob aspires to resemble people whom he considers are above him, and looks down upon many others, but it might matter little if he were mistaken in his judgment, since he seldom has the chance to establish convivial relationships with his heroes or heroines. If he knew them well, he might be disappointed. Often, being intelligent and educated enough to suspect this, he remains blissfully unsnubbed. If poor, but living in a large town with libraries, plays, lectures and concerts, easily available, he may regard himself as superior to any persons, whatever their class, outside the intellectual stratum

which he considers to be his. Thus, some kinds of intellectual snobbishness are a successful defence against possible slights from 'all-round' snobs, conscious of their advantages of birth, property or wealth.

A man who is not rich may choose to spend his 'pleasure-allowance' in visiting the 'right' places, here and abroad, buying the 'right' books (many decisions, but not all, are made for him by Sunday critics) though he may avoid Book Clubs, feeling that his 'own' stratum disdains grandmotherly guidance. He may or may not try to know the 'right' people. Such activities give him collector's pride, which may be loaded with snobbery.

This example illustrates the usefulness of the concept of stratum as distinct from class, for some intellectuals find that their special interests eventually win the friendship, not merely the acquaintance, of people in social classes above, or below, their own, in meetings, conferences, summer schools, where class is almost irrelevant.

Whether the Third Programme affords a mental meeting place and a height from which intellectuals can look down on the rest of mankind is an interesting subject for speculation. The 'Third' has caused an increasing degree of stratification of the B.B.C.'s general output: perhaps the 'Third's' organisers accept and present in a learned way subjects which could have been popularised with benefit to the larger Home and Light audiences.

Today, intellectual snobbishness is increased by the ease with which semi-exclusive technical terms and esoteric phrases can be borrowed. To exclude others from one's group by wearing superior clothes is costly; to use the special language of an 'in-group' is cheaper and quicker. The terms may come from contemporary, or not entirely *passé*, philosophy or psycho-pathology; the writings of Croce, Sartre, Kierkegaard, and naturally, of Freud, Jung and Adler. The terms of normal psychology have never achieved snob-value; indeed, literary critics sometimes describe them as repellent, but the names of writers believed to have derived inspiration from psychological sources—Pirandello, Joyce, Kafka, Virginia Woolf, Koestler,

are freely used, together with those of 'difficult' novelists, by an intellectual snob.

Newspaper readers may note that snobs can disagree about the ranking to be given to their enthusiasms. When an English intellectual weekly offered a prize for a list of today's social taboos, it was remarked that either of the other two comparable publications might have obtained a different list. Virginia Graham's *Say Please!* (85) guys, it would seem, every kind of snobbishness except the intellectual*, but Osbert Lancaster's illustrations compensate for this omission.

Some sociologists who regard with disfavour any non-objective indications of class will be uninterested in a conceivable stratification of society along the lines of intellect or erudition, yet this may be happening. Fear of this possibly influences some current objections to intelligence-testing. The idea of social stratification according to intelligence is resented by many, not all of whom are uneducated or particularly unintelligent. Probably an inkling of this threatening division is in their minds when they discuss, as amateurs, the relative merits of unilateral, 'modern,' technical and grammar schools, or enjoy hearty jokes (fewer recently) about highbrows or 'egg-heads.'

According to Russell Lynes, writing in 1949 (137a) a similar tendency is noticeable in the U.S.A. He maintains that in some parts of that country, the old social structure of upper, middle and lower class is being replaced by one divided into highbrows, middlebrows and lowbrows. 'Their heroes are not the Carnegies or the Morgans, but the intellectuals—the atomic scientists, the cultural historians, the writers, the commentators, the thinkers of global thoughts who, we assume, for lack of another faith, know better than anyone else how we shall cope with what we call with new resonance, national destiny.' We are headed for a social structure in which the highbrows are the élite, the middlebrows are the bourgeoisie and the lowbrows are *hoi polloi*.

He distinguishes two types of highbrow, the militant or

* Is it possible that snobbishness may be projected upon those who cannot speak for themselves? A pamphlet issued by a South Coast hotel in 1949 contained the sentence 'Guests' dogs are charged for at the rate of either 1/- or 1/6 each day, according to the size and social standing of the dog.'

crusader and the passive or dilettante. The first carries the torch, the second reads by its light. They form the intellectual élite, whose accepted role in society is to perpetuate traditional ideas and values, and to create new ones. The highbrow creative artist may become a vested interest. He will be sold—at a par decided upon by the highbrows—to the middlebrows, who are natural gamblers in the commodities of culture. The upper middlebrows are the principal purveyors of highbrow ideas: the lower middlebrows the principal consumers of what the upper middlebrows pass along to them. The upper middlebrow takes his culture seriously, and in his leisure hours reads Toynbee or Sartre or Osbert Sitwell. He is unsure of his own tastes but firm in his belief that taste is extremely important. The lower middlebrow ardently believes that he knows what he likes and yet his taste is constantly susceptible to the pressures that put him in knickerbockers one year and rust-coloured slacks the other. In matters of taste, the lower middlebrow world is largely dominated by women. It is not considered quite manly for the male to express opinions about things which come under the category of 'artistic.' The highbrows would like to eliminate the middlebrows and devise a society that would approximate an intellectual feudal system in which the lowbrows do the work and create folk arts, and the highbrows do the thinking and create fine art.

It is interesting to see how English snobbishness, as imagined by Hollywood, is presented in its films. These, writes Siegfried Krakauer (115), establish a hierarchy among those traits in which snobbishness figures foremost. 'It is the one British characteristic which American movies never tire of acknowledging, ridiculing, condoning or repudiating according to the views expressed in them.' To Americans, English caste spirit stands out . . . because it affected them deeply under British rule. The mass of Americans, among them swarms of Irish immigrants, took it for granted that the typical Briton is essentially a caste-bound snob. They condemned British snobbishness for offending their sense of equality . . . they admired and imitated it. Significantly, most Hollywood films about Britain at war, *Mrs. Miniver*, *The Pied Piper*, *The White*

Cliffs of Dover attempted to weaken existing antipathies against English snobbishness, thus reaffirming American obsession with this trait. To what extent they distorted English reality can be inferred from the criticism with which they were received in Britain itself. *Mrs. Miniver*, though recognised as a laudable American tribute to English war-heroism, was nevertheless blamed for 'its faults and frequent air of unreality.' Of *The White Cliffs of Dover*, the London *Times* said that it 'misses the tones and accents of the country in which the action passes.'

Krakauer in 1949, states that instead of Hollywood acknowledging the decline of class-mindedness and snobbery in England which it praised during the war, it resolutely turned its back on Britain. The peculiar flavour of English democracy so little pleases many Americans that the Lady Beldons are being held *incommunicado* until further notice.'

Inverted snobbery is less simple than it appears. It expresses a tendency to compensate for temptations to behave snobbishly by conduct which suggests spiritual, if no other, affinity with people of a lower social class. In this way, indifference, sometimes apparent only, to the opinion of people in a higher social class can be expressed. Perhaps an inverted snob has repressed a kow-towing tendency, and increases his self-regard by behaving like those who ignore or disapprove any people considered (by 'society') to be their social superiors. While he would seldom or never use vituperative expressions, in public, about the upper class, he may be pleased when others do.

In Chapter 3 a proposal to base Standard English upon Cockney or North Country dialect was mentioned. This, coming from an ex-public schoolboy Southerner, has been described (see pp. 104f) as inverted snobbery. Paul Bloomfield, in *B.B.C.* (26), is amused at some Southerners who, on coming to work in the North of England, express more Northern enthusiasms than do the natives. The B.B.C. can justifiably claim to be free from inverted snobbery in its choice of announcers, for it has decided that the variety of speech adopted, as the result of much investigation, shall be used by most announcers. That many educated people speak it is all-important: it is not characteristically 'upper,' for few members

of this class could become satisfactory announcers without considerable 'grooming.'

Nothing short of getting inside the mind of a person could tell you if his expression of certain attitudes results from inverted snobbery. If a Cabinet Minister were to decline to wear evening dress at any public function whatever, many would regard this as inverted snobbery, and it might be. Yet in wartime, an army officer might proudly attend all public functions in uniform, even if mufti were permitted, and in a recent case of alleged indiscipline in the Forces, the prosecution claimed that an officer is always on duty, whether in uniform or not.

For obvious reasons we are unlikely to read of many studies of snobbery carried out in the aseptic manner which ought to characterise the social psychologist. Books like Monica Dickens's *One Pair of Hands*, describing her experiences as a maidservant; *One Pair of Feet*, depicting her life as a hospital nurse, and Marghanita Laski's *The Village*, describing post-war rural stratification, have the attractions and drawbacks of the novelist's methods. In *Kipps*, H. G. Wells paints vivid pictures of an inferiority complex. These are suggestive, but scarcely contributions to social science.

Recently however, as part of a larger investigation into social mobility, under the direction of Professor David Glass at the London School of Economics, Miss Rosalind C. Chambers has made a special study of the three great women's organisations in this country (43) the Women's Institutes (W.I.) the Women's Voluntary Services (W.V.S.) and the British Red Cross Society (B.R.C.S.). The book containing this chapter will be published in 1954. I am grateful to Miss Chambers and to Professor Glass for kind permission to quote, more particularly from the conclusion of her report.

'The field of social service and philanthropy is one in which, until recently, social stratification was particularly marked: in no sphere of national life, perhaps, were Disraeli's Two Nations more apparent.' Benefactors and beneficiaries were two distinct groups. But such a relationship did not necessarily imply patronage or servility: a division of society into classes below preparing for a hierarchic heaven above was simply an accepted

part of the divinely ordered scheme of things, and the very sense of social obligation and responsibility which undoubtedly inspired many of the English upper classes helped to perpetuate it.

During the last part of the 19th century, the lady bountiful was frequently supplanted by the qualified woman, and the *nouveaux riches* appeared usually in rural areas. They often lacked the sense of social responsibility possessed by the older aristocracy, so that personal relations between the benefactor and beneficiary class were less satisfactory, but this did not materially change the situation: social change in these respects merely meant the substitution of one élite for another.

Up to 1939, it would have been almost inconceivable that in a philanthropic organisation the relationships of committee members and clients could be interchangeable, or that members of particular trades or industries or even residents in a 'poor' locality could take part in social service, much less in the control of such service. But, as this study has shown, such an almost incredible change has occurred.

Differences, interesting to the social scientist, between the organisations, and especially their hierarchies, are described. Miss Chambers makes the valuable point that to group the members of different branches of national societies according to occupation or income-level would not present a true picture, because the social status of such groups varies in different parts of the country. Farming is a good example—is the district one of large or small farms? In some parts the wife of a leading tractor driver might, as far as education and income are concerned, stand higher in the social scale than the wife of a small independent farmer, yet she would be classed as an agricultural worker's wife. In a manufacturing city in the North, the wives of industrialists and managers would be given higher status than in a cathedral city with an élite of its own.

Snobbery appears in several forms, especially since office-bearers no longer belong to one social group. Ordinary members have resented 'someone like us' being appointed to positions of control. An officer of one organisation remarked that the village woman is usually a snob, and would much prefer to

follow the squiress or vicaress, whom she would regard as the 'natural' leader. Another officer said that if she wanted to start a new branch, she would approach the woman in the 'big house', because if interest could be aroused there, the rest of the community would almost certainly follow the example set. Yet today factors in the assumption of positions of control are most frequently the possession of a telephone or a car, or—most important—time to attend meetings. The faith in a divinely ordered, graded society is disappearing, and particular groups are no longer regarded as inherently incapable of fulfilling particular functions.

CHAPTER SIX

The Classes; Upper, Middle, Working

Few attempts by social psychologists to study the upper classes; possible reasons. Limitations to the psychologist's use of novels, plays and films. The upper classes and the aristocracy. Arguments in support of upper class conventions.

The Middle Class or middle classes? Objective and subjective criteria. 'Gentry' traditions; speech and clothes. Tendency of the intellectual to 'go left' in politics. Class differences in professions and trades.

The upper middle class. 'Bourgeois morality.' The working classes; Zweig's investigations. 'The social ladder of the working classes consists of innumerable rungs.' Industrial types. Class consciousness in the North. Relations of working class sons to fathers and mothers. The adolescent working girl.

IT is hardly surprising that few social psychologists have discussed, from their special standpoint, the upper classes. No anthropologist has done field work among them: even to write this exposes one to humorous attack from believers and disbelievers in the usefulness and desirability of an English upper class. No picture of the characteristic behaviour and 'self-image' of these classes can be offered. One can name people who have recently described, dramatised, attacked and defended the upper classes: John Galsworthy, G. B. Shaw, H. G. Wells, Osbert Sitwell, Angela Thirkell, Jan Struther, Monica Dickens, Noel Coward, Nancy Mitford, Virginia Graham; yet many of these were chiefly concerned to interest, amuse or shock their public. The few serious descriptions of these classes (there are plenty of the other kind) are mentioned in relevant parts of the present book.

The numerous references in novels and plays are seldom sociologically reliable, however significant they may be in other ways. Some of the writers, themselves born in a lower class, describe their ascent years after it has been successfully achieved. If one were unacquainted with theories of compensation and over-compensation for inferiority-complexes, one might read these books with fewer mental reservations. Descriptions with admiration, amusement, sarcasm or irony often suggest the possibility of ambivalence in the author.

Ought this chapter, in a book on contemporary social differences, to have a historical background? To ask this may seem foolish: how can any social happening be understood except in historical perspective? Perspective, however, may depend upon the individual historian's personality, character, nationality, race, attitude towards fundamental social issues like peace and war, access to and capability to understand records of world events. In what historical perspective can we see the changes which radio, television, faster-than-sound travel, push-button warfare, mass communication, propaganda, and social medicine are causing in our social life? We are on safer ground if we restrict our backward look, as Professor G. M. Trevelyan has done, to 1901. In his incomparable *English Social History* (216) the nature, status and functions of the aristocracy, the upper classes and the squirearchy are brilliantly described. Pages 252–3, 271–9, 306–312, 358, 364, 404, 466, 479, 499, 570 and 584–6 are especially helpful to anyone trying to understand social changes at the times when they occurred with less bewildering rapidity than now.

Looking up and looking down, literally and metaphorically, may be uncomfortable, either for physiological or psychological reasons. A neutral psychologist suspects that looking up socially may produce envy or jealousy: looking down, patronage, pharisaism or distaste. A writer in a well-known 'weekly' which records the doings of 'Society,' recently warned readers of a threat to the upper classes: if sociologists study and write about them, they will become less profitable to journalists and less interesting to their readers.

It seems reasonable to believe that several upper classes are distinguishable. The phrase 'ruling classes' is seldom heard, and 'Our Rulers' is sometimes used with a Somerset Maugham flavour. In these classes, strata—in music, literature and the arts—are increasingly apparent. There is stratification too among 'county' people and among the hunts.

Professor G. D. H. Cole in an article 'The Conception of the Middle Classes' (50a) asks 'What is the Upper Class?' He answers in effect that there are three kinds. First the recognised aristocracy, accepted as such because of their

possession of land, mercantile wealth and the privileges—titles, offices, status—attached to these possessions. Second, the lesser landowners (squires) who sometimes intermarry with the aristocracy. Both these classes are called 'gentlefolk.' Some aristocratic circles are more open than others, and admit the 'upstart merchant,' who buys land, sets up as a country gentleman, and perhaps in due course prepares the way for the family to achieve ennoblement.

The merchant aristocracies, forming the third upper class, are less closed. They, a product of great trading centres, are groups rather than classes, subsections of a wider top layer of society. After the Industrial Revolution came a body of wealthy men, neither assimilable in manners to the existing upper class, nor desirous of joining it, a politically and economically strong and conscious middle class. They needed many more superior shopkeepers, craftsmen, attorneys, solicitors, 'better' medical men, ministers of religion (especially nonconformists) and 'better' teachers. The top layers of the apothecaries, attorneys and teachers turned into a sort of 'middle class gentlemen'; the new professions, civil engineers, railway technicians, dissenting ministers did not. But the public schools steadily assimilated the outlook and manners of the lesser aristocracy and the middle class, and the joint stock system created a new class of salaried managers and administrators.

Professor Cole offers 'a very tentative classification of groups of the Middle Classes':

(a) The main body of heads of private business, or of active partners or directors in businesses, except the greatest, concerned with manufacture or wholesale trading, or with other commercial or financial occupations.

(b) The main body of salaried administrators, managers, technicians and accountants in similar types of business, including businesses publicly or co-operatively owned; and the higher salaried officers of a wide range of institutions and societies, from political parties and Trade Unions or Trade Associations to philanthropic, educational and cultural bodies.

(c) The members of the principal recognised professions, whether

salaried or working as consultants and remunerated by professional fees; including medical men, lawyers, ministers of religion, officers of the armed services, the upper ranges of the teaching profession, and the upper and middle ranges of the artistic professions.

(d) The higher and middle grades of the Civil Service, the Local Government service, and of other public or semi-public administrative services; and the corresponding grades of 'voluntary' social service employees.

(e) The big and middle shopkeepers, garage keepers, hotel keepers; and also the analogous groups of employed managers, accountants, and other officers employed by joint stock companies operating in these fields.

(f) The large and middle farmers; and with them the relatively small numbers of managerial salaried workers employed on big farms.

(g) The unoccupied *rentiers*, living on unearned incomes, except the largest and some of the smallest—the latter a group composed mainly of retired persons, widows, poor relations of wealthy families, reduced members of the aristocracy, and other very heterogeneous minor groups.

(h) Full-time students who have embarked on higher education at a university or comparable level, but have not completed their education, including students drawn from working-class households.

(i) More doubtfully, the main bodies of clerks, typists, and other non-manual workers whose work falls below the managerial or recognised professional level.

(j) Still more doubtfully, the members of certain lesser professions, such as nursing, the lower ranges of school teaching, and the less recognised social service occupations.

(k) Most doubtfully of all, the main body of shop assistants, warehouse workers, postal workers other than clerks, and minor institutional officials.

(l) Just possibly, persons belonging to the lower supervisory grades in industry, transport and other types of business, but falling below the managerial grades.

He also discusses the *intelligentsia*, which, centred mainly on the upper professions, forms a recognisable, essentially middle class group, but its unity is much more of culture and

manners than of economic interest or social and political attitude, and it forms only a fraction of the middle class, even on the narrowest definition. He believes that this ill-defined, heterogeneous middle class shows no sign of disappearing, except in the countries which have passed under Communist domination. There is rather a growth of some of its groups, compensating for a decline in others and resulting in a change in its composition and social strata.

It is doubtful if 'aristocracy' and 'upper classes' can be legitimately regarded as equivalent terms in England today. There are, moreover, distinguishable sections of the aristocracy, and few of their members might welcome a discussion of the characteristics alleged to distinguish them from each other.

The belief is widespread that one mark of an aristocrat is that he cares little what people in another class say or think of him. Yet since at the time of writing, the aristocrats' claims to Abbey seats at the Coronation service were being officially considered and publicly discussed, this aspect of their lives could hardly be considered as private. In the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 13th edition, 1926, the writer of the article 'Aristocracy' asserts that in Great Britain the aristocracy generally, apart from the Lords, has no special privileges.

The following more recent assertion is picturesque:

> The chief difference between an aristocrat and a gentleman is that the former will dare all, and having barely won one throw, will be ready immediately to hazard all on another throw. If he loses, he smiles, and goes to the scaffold or the guillotine or into obscurity, keeping his own counsel to the last. Another difference between aristocrat and gentleman concerns the heart, which, with the former, is subject to the mind. In a matter of statesmanship, a gentleman will, in the end, usually succumb to strong and well-advocated sentiment; an aristocrat—never. In the long run it is better for a nation to be ruled by those who can resist sentiment. Some day, perhaps, the Americans will realise this. Compare Attlee the gentleman with Churchill the aristocrat, and you will understand what I mean. (161).

We feel justified in borrowing from an article on the Upper Classes by an anonymous author who, to quote the Editor of *Contact No.* 1 in which it appeared, 'has sustained a sincere

interest, and an inherited familiarity with the subject-matter. They are described with wit and insight.'

The writer, who does not seem to distinguish sharply between aristocrats and gentlemen, summarises arguments and excuses put forward in defence of upper-class conventions. A hereditary class has patronised the arts, nurtured statemen, founded vast Empires and carried on local government and administration of justice throughout the land. Without the advantages of birth, upper class members would not have possessed the qualities necessary for these great achievements. Was it too high a price to pay?

Presumably the question is rhetorical: the author does not reply, but '*Is* it too high a price to pay?' He states that the defenders would call as witnesses our leaders in the last two wars; Justices of the Peace, unpaid members of the County Council, and the squirearchy. A second line of defence is the argument that the upper class is no longer so rigidly defined as before. Its members fall back on 'people of *our* sort, if you know what I mean,' and the description is greeted with an understanding nod. The suggestion is made that no longer is it necessary to define class-distinctions.

The upper and lower classes are said to share certain characteristics denied to the middle class, e.g. a common directness of speech (a 'smell' is not a 'scent' or 'odour'), a capacity for getting on with each other, as between waiters and customers, landlords and farm-labourers. And (since 1945 this may be less true) the popularity of 'jobs' amongst the younger women of the aristocracy.

The third line of resistance, rarely resorted to, is bare-faced selfishness: 'We've got it. We probably shan't have it much longer. Let's enjoy it while we can; or The good things of life are the things I fought for; I don't see why I should give them up now; or, still more starkly, Who's going to make me, anyway?'

Little evidence is available concerning the ways in which today's upper classes feel about social and economic changes since 1939. But their modes of address, speech and manners have obvious exclusive and inclusive effects. These techniques

of keeping out 'wrong' and bringing in 'right' people are easily observed. To what extent are they employed deliberately? Whole-hearted defenders might say 'Seldom,' yet men and women members of the Forces in World War II, who in their early days of service, saw and heard this class recognising its own kind, can hardly believe that these manners all came from unconscious sources.

Does *the* Middle Class exist in England today? Is it not a loose collocation of classes? Only occasionally as in General Elections or national crises, real or alleged, is there a specific reference to *a* Middle Class, with characteristic attitudes and behaviour. It seems nearer the truth, paraphrasing Professor Cole, to describe this so-called class as composed of persons belonging to strata, (economic, educational etc.) some of which are, while others are not, functionally related; individuals with a certain status who play certain roles, who, on suitable occasions, may show signs of class-feeling, these signs being easily noticed by observers from other strata.

An interesting example of the significance of stratum when it overshadows class is *Period Piece*, by Gwen Raverat (192). The author, who writes in a delightfully detached manner, is the daughter of the late Professor Sir George Darwin, son of Charles Darwin, the naturalist. Her mother was Miss Maud du Puy of Philadelphia.

Mrs. Raverat describes her childhood and youth in Cambridge, living among intellectuals, and perhaps knowing intimately almost no non-intellectuals.

Members of her family were more interested in ideas than in anything else. In Cambridge, the Darwins' status was assured, unquestioned: their place in the economic stratification of this country was safe, and presumably taken for granted by them. They maintained some relationships with members of the artistic strata of Eastern and South Eastern England.

The book appears (and people who knew Cambridge University from 1890 to 1910 would possibly agree with this impression), to portray a group of neighbouring families for whom class-consciousness, though it existed, was usually submerged below stratum-consciousness.

It is easier, because it is less likely to hurt feelings, to write about this social state than about one which by 1919 had established itself in England, one in which consciousness of economic stratum mattered most. For obvious reasons such awareness is common in younger countries.

So much has been said and written about the English Middle Class that readers might assume it to exist as an observable fact in the space-time world. Yet we may remind ourselves here of the difference between phenomena; events known by being seen, heard and touched, and concepts: patterns in the mind which subsume these experiences. While some people assert their belief in the existence of the Middle Class, or Classes, as phenomena, others hold that there are good reasons for asserting that no simple concept of Class now fits the facts, and that the day may come when, like the second class on trains, it becomes rare.

It is useful to quote from notes made of a statement about the Middle Classes by R. B. McCallum, opening a radio-discussion 'The Labour Party and the Middle Classes' on March 3rd, 1948 (154).

To some minds, the Labour victory in the 1945 election was caused by 'a movement of the Middle Class.' The political dispute was largely a matter of class, yet other factors, e.g. religion, nationality, geography and individual temperament may often have cut across class-differences. If any one of these factors influences his judgment, a man may be praised as 'rising superior to class-prejudice' or condemned as 'a traitor to his class.'

The distinction between the upper and middle classes is not now so great as in the days of Cobden and Bright. If we ask 'Who are the middle classes today?' one answer might be:

(a) The professional and managerial classes (the core)

(b) Those who not being extremely rich, earn more than the majority.

(c) Those who by birth and upbringing feel themselves to be members of the Middle Class.

(d) Those whose education has extended beyond the 'elementary' stage.

(e) Those who are ready to make sacrifices for the education of their children (this includes many of the 'working' class). If the

Middle Class is thus defined, naturally all politicians are concerned to woo the 'Middle Class vote.'

Writers who believe that a middle class (or middle classes) exist and are important include Honor Croome, Roy Lewis and Angus Maude, authors of *The English Middle Classes* (128); the fullest account of this subject in recent years.

A social psychologist understands the desire of sociologists for objective criteria of class, and their dislike of definitions with a subjective emphasis, yet subjective criteria are perhaps the most important factors in forming typical middle-class attitudes. It is significant that Lewis and Maude, in asking (Chap. 1) 'Who are the Middle Classes?' immediately mention as a pre-war middle-class mark, napkin-rings. But they omit something just as important: the attitude of persons 'who used a clean napkin at every meal' towards those who called them 'serviettes.' Since the correct approach of a social scientist to his data is unprejudiced, I looked up the meaning of serviette in the first French and English dictionaries to hand. Hachette's *New Dictionary of the French and English Languages* (ed. E. C. Clifton and Adrian Grinaux) gives 'napkin; table-napkin; (for the skin) towel, paper-case.' *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* (adapted by H. W. and F. G. Fowler) gives 'table-napkin (chiefly used by and to waiters and servants).'

These are objective criteria: it is subjective ones which bedevil the social climber—usually he has the necessary money or he would not attempt the ascent—and nowadays he may have the sense to seek advice concerning outward and visible signs such as bodily appearance, clothes, furniture, cars and 'suitable' behaviour. Yet people who have acquired enough wealth to succeed in mixing with the upper classes may, if neither young nor mentally plastic, be burdened with so many 'inadmissible' middle-class attitudes, sentiments, complexes, enthusiasms and prejudices, that they hope for little more than to ensure that their children possibly, and their grandchildren certainly, will move easily and happily in the upper class. Such people, though they have moved economically out of the middle classes, remain mentally in them.

In contrast are those who, inside an economic stratum suitable to the middle class, retain upper-class methods of behaviour, especially of speaking and dressing, which mark them off from members of the class into which they have 'fallen.' This compensatory behaviour, if conscious, is class-motivated. Here the concept of stratum may explain other modes of behaviour which seem classless or even 'anti-class'—if this vague term may be used.

Imagine that a family in a middle-class suburb habitually dries its washing in the garden on Sunday. This is not middle-class conduct. Nor, thirty years ago, would have been Sunday sun-bathing in 'appropriate' costume on the lawn, but many middle-class neighbours with adolescent children tolerate this latter behaviour while still objecting to the Sunday exhibition of underclothes. Yet people who behave in these deviant ways may belong, and consciously, to some stratum; intellectual, artistic or musical, above that of their neighbours. They may disapprove a distant piano playing Gilbert and Sullivan, or be 'intellectually' amused at 'next door's' choice of garden flowers.

Economic factors may alter class-feeling, by driving people into strata new to them. Certain pastimes, e.g. golf and motoring, characteristic of the 1938 middle-class, are now beyond the reach of many people with middle-class sentiments. But some of these may have changed. If from 1939 to 1945 such people went without a car, and got used to it, they may have smiled at the agitation of those who clamoured to 'Set the Petrol Free.' (In 1950, a *Punch* cartoon shows an enraged woman in a car caught in a traffic-jam extending to the horizon, protesting to her husband that 'they' had promised the people were to be set free). The car-less middle-class man who still hails a taxi when he has luggage, may now be infuriated at the inconvenience caused by members of his class whose cars are jammed solid outside the railway terminus when he approaches, and into this mood little conscious jealousy need enter.

In people who cannot afford to visit the Continent for a holiday, the moans of unfortunates who fail to 'make do' on whatever the Government allows may produce only wry amusement. These 'new poor' may visit theatres so infrequently

that the cost of West End stalls is tiresome even to read about, but if their family is large and myopic, the prospect of cheap and good spectacles may delight them. Such people are difficult to classify, though not unstratified.

Nowadays a class does not represent a community of economic interest, but it is perhaps not commonly recognised that in a world where education and culture are more widely spread than formerly, these factors may make many people feel almost classless. The Royal Family shares our broadcast programmes and enjoys several of them.

Both Lewis and Maude and T. S. Eliot believe the family to be the touchstone of class, and social class-division is a matter of families rather than of individuals. 'When an individual is in danger of becoming déclassé, his family (short of shipping him overseas) will generally be anxious to rescue him from the abyss, for his fall will reflect upon the family as a whole.' This is a reminder of the risks involved in any attempt to define social classes in such a way that they become no more than congeries of individuals, graded according to income, occupation or some other single, arbitrarily chosen measure.

One definition of a class implies full and free social intercourse between the families comprising it. As Lewis and Maude point out, social distinctions exist even between members of the same calling; a doctor may hesitate to engage an assistant, however much he likes him, before their wives have met, even though in England a wife usually, not always, takes her husband's social status. Out of working hours, executives in the same firm may move in different social classes.

These authors point out that in deciding whether an individual belongs to a particular class, we must take into account a wide range of considerations, including income, occupation, accent, spending habits, residence, culture, leisure-pursuits, clothes, education and moral attitudes in relationships with other individuals. An important rider is 'Nor can it be assumed that a single failure to conform will exclude him from membership.'

Certainly the dividing line is not one of income . . . Old age or repeated misfortune may drive men and women with their dependants

from affluence to poverty but very few of them thereby become proletarians. They remain recognisably what they are, decayed gentlefolk, indigent lodgers, people who have seen better days; their children, whatever hardships they may undergo, are likely to set out on the upward climb as soon as they are able to earn.

Besides income and function, the influence of heredity, environment and education must be considered. This includes the 'gentry' traditions; speech and clothes.

About clothes one cannot be dogmatic. Many people who in 1939 had a varied range of suits, 'good' in material and cut, must by now have worn them out. If in coupon-days many men were resigned to buying one 'good' suit (£30 to £50 or more) every two years, even paying by instalments, by now some may think the struggle not worth while, and may wear, on non-ceremonial occasions, clothes which hardly mark them off from the 'upper lowers.' In a large provincial town it would be reckless to assign any man or woman to the middle-class by a clothes criterion alone. In 1951, newspaper articles on the Oxford undergraduate today emphasised that he was apt, on 'coming up,' to bring most of his clothes with him, and high-class Oxford tailors were feeling the draught.

Lewis and Maude quote the American writer, Mary Ellen Chase, who, in *In England Now* (1937), recorded that respect for birth, rank and decently acquired wealth is stronger in England than anywhere in the world. The ideal towards which class-structure tends is that of gentility, not efficiency (45). The word 'gentleman' in English connotes fair dealing as well as rank and position, and the Englishman with an 'instinct born of experience' (this self-destructive phrase by class-conscious writers shocks a psychologist, but he understands) willingly places his trust in it.

To quote Lewis and Maude:

From Chaucer's 'Parfit Gentil Knight' to Captain Oates, from 'Tom Brown's Schooldays' to the 'Magnet,' from Tennyson's 'Round Table' to Dorothy Sayers' Lord Peter Wimsey, from Burghley to Baldwin, the spoor can be followed, albeit with trouble in the marshy spots. Nothing was at once so heartlessly obtuse and yet revealed so

clear an understanding of human nature and of social problems as the coinage of the upper-middle class phrase 'temporary gentleman' in the 1914–18 war. It was not used in the second phase of the conflict, twenty years later. The middle classes had changed again.

In 1949, Lewis and Maude wrote:

" . . . as the upper levels of the middle classes conquered, married into, and ultimately merged with the nobility, so the upper levels of the working class have overtaken, and in respect of income are now indistinguishable from, a very deep sector at the lower end of the middle class. At present the two streams may seem to run side by side without mingling, because the patterns of middle class professional life and well-to-do working class life are still very different. But the change is profound, and has indeed been described as a social revolution, the last act in the long drama of middle class domination. It appears to some as the dawn of a classless society. To others it may seem that even the huge redistribution of wealth which has taken place has left the country as 'naturally' stratified and as class conscious as before the war. A big 'fault' has developed in the strata, and that is all.

This passage might be clearer if the concepts of stratum and class were kept apart. Occasionally, as in the 'upper-uppers,' several strata run parallel and are functionally related, but even there, the two concepts are separable. I have heard a tactfully-worded complaint from upper-middle-class scientists that the committee of their specialist Society contains too many hereditary Lords—the public may not believe that high intellectual standards are being maintained. An example of the utility of keeping apart the concepts of class and stratum could be drawn from Lewis and Maude's discussion of the undoubted smudging of the lines between the 'upper-working' and 'lower-middle' classes. If 'strata' are conceived as objectively existent, demonstrable to anyone who comprehends them, and 'class' primarily as subjective, the present situation can be more easily understood. In 1954, social workers note that many working-class people mention a television set as a necessity; other classes may still regard its non-possession as a desirable mark of distinction.

May one assume that the economic stratum of upper working and lower middle is identical, but that in them 'cultural' strata (educational, aesthetic, leisure, sporting) are different, and that class-feeling may or may not enter into the awareness of strata-differences? A might speak in a friendly way to B in a shopping queue, a temporary collocation, but might not wish to converse at length with him on a long railway journey or in a holiday hotel for which both are paying identical prices. An argument often heard from democrats for the continued existence of a House of Lords is that more men (and perhaps women too) of high intelligence and culture could be employed there with advantage.

In a broadcast published in *The Listener* of 16th January 1953, Mr. A. Maude asserted that the English intellectual tends to become 'left-wing' in politics. S. M. Lipset and Reinhard Bendix (132) suggest that radicals from the upper class are individuals who do not receive the social prestige or recognition which is commensurate with their economic position.

Lewis and Maude ask whether the machine-age is evolving its own kind of middle class, a band of organisers, planners and social architects, at once conservators of traditions or skill and innovators of new techniques, such as even now officials of the Soviet Union consider themselves to be. In that case, will the 'intelligentsia' of England, now middle class, become its aristocracy?

Here the concept of stratum seems preferable to that of class. Intelligent and energetic organisers and social architects may, and often do, belong to different strata. To understand large-scale problems of preventive medicine, building, defence, requires a grasp of the principles of biology, statistics, economics, sociology, psychology and the planning of experiments—especially pilot experiments. The objective signs of 'belonging' to a stratum which separates those who understand or practise a speciality from those who do not (and with respect and gratitude to the busy M.P. of today, it must be remarked that he is usually in the latter category) are as definite as sartorial and other signs of class were a century ago. A British physicist is either acknowledged or not by the Physical Society;

some important scientific truths are communicable only to those who understand mathematics; a political or military leader too headstrong or rigid to comprehend economic or anthropological issues may occasionally find himself superseded or peaceably by-passed by special techniques. ('Old X doesn't believe in such and such a subject' was heard less often in World War II than in 1914–18). Strata-conscious persons are not necessarily class-conscious—some indeed seem aware of nothing but their speciality, and this obviously can be socially dangerous, yet queer 'boffins' are often indispensable—our potential enemy might employ them.

Lewis and Maude point out the defects of excessive specialisation—of thinking and planning in a series of separate compartments. The professional bodies have turned themselves into a series of intellectual closed shops. Yet during the War, 'Operational Research' necessitated breaking down many barriers between subjects and, it should be added, some, though not all, scientists are still trying against opposition, to keep such connecting paths open.

These authors write justifiably of the dilution of the teaching profession, but when they comment on the fighting Services ('the decline in the social status of Army officers has been very marked') and the medical profession ('the enterprising young medico can make a good thing out of the new game of "squatting" ') their way of writing exemplifies the difference between attitudes due to stratum and to class respectively. So far as the Army is concerned, atom- and germ-warfare and the use of hydrogen bombs will never be activities suitable for gentlemen—or sportsmen; and even before the passing of the National Health Insurance Act there were outwardly 'unenterprising' medicos who 'made a good thing' out of the 'old game' of selling practices. In medicine the focus of interest has shifted; doctors tend to rephrase their problem; 'how many patients can recover; how quickly? and 'how many can be prevented from becoming ill and encouraged to keep well?' Neither war nor disease is now regarded as affording an undisputed opportunity to make money laudably.

Class-feeling about the distinction between professions and

'trade' is not old; it grew up in the eighteenth century when the affluent land-owning aristocracy put their sons into the law, the Church, administration, and the Army and Navy.

The middle classes followed their example. Yet this distinction did not last. Perhaps the practice of medicine—not included in the above list—must always excite ambivalent attitudes, both in doctor and patient. These were shown in many arguments brought against the National Health Act. For until recently the medical profession was unmistakably stratified. As Lewis and Maude write:

> Physicians were gentlemen, but not surgeons or apothecaries, who still carried a stigma of the medieval alliances with the barbers and chemists respectively. But it was from the surgeons and apothecaries that the modern medical profession emerged. As science and commerce expanded together, gentlemen became glad enough to qualify as engineers, accountants, surveyors, technicians and bankers.

It is interesting that while the Premiership of this country had for some time been regarded as 'naturally' an upper-class perquisite, after 1923, when Lord Curzon was passed over in favour of Stanley Baldwin, it became associated with the middle class. In 1923, says S. K. Ratcliffe (191):

> The Conservatives were making known that the most important Premiership in the world had been finally surrendered. The middle classes in England have their roots in trade and farming. For two hundred years their socio-religious framework was nonconformity.
>
> They are more diversified than others (e.g. the bourgeoisie of France and imperial Germany) having many more sub-divisions, though all alike have exhibited the main and deplorable contrast between the governing bourgeoisie and the multitude, which the snobbish usage of our country labels the 'lower middles.' In the transformation of the social scene that we are witnessing, it is not easy to say whether the changes so far are more vital or revolutionary in the upper or the lower division, but indubitably the forces at work during the past half century have gone a long way towards the reduction of that minority in our country which, judged by wealth and privilege, was without parallel in the world.
>
> In England a hundred years ago, our new rich were the product of

industry and commerce. Their energy and character moulded the society of the gilded age. They were allied with the landed gentry. Their rule was extended over the professions and government offices. The empire of privilege was theirs. Their investments were the marvel of the world. A trivial income-tax left their profits unimpaired. Before the epoch of war and revolution their sense of security was absolute. And who would be so ignorant as to deny that they provided a major portion of the nation's resources in voluntary service and public spirit?

Yet Carlyle foretold the day of judgment. Ruskin's outlook was settled gloom. For thirty years Matthew Arnold taunted the middle classes as philistines, indifferent to culture and woefully lacking in ideas. Our middle classes, said he, know neither man nor the world. They have no light and can give none.

Mr. Ratcliffe reminds us of the immensely altered circumstances of the middle classes, both upper and lower.

On the whole, we may conclude that there is in England today no social process of greater interest than the shock from which the upper middle class is now reeling. The citadel of its governing authority is undermined. Its hope of political recovery would appear to be tenuous. Its grip of educational privilege, until recently complete, is challenged by a host of scholarship-winners. Its big one-family houses are being abandoned. Taxation and the rising cost of luxuries once thought of as necessities, are enforcing a strictly limited domesticity. The Englishwoman who took for granted a famous standard of comfort is doing her own work. She takes her place in the queue, and does not need to be told that every kind of service has become scarce.

The authors of the newest book on the English middle classes (Roy Lewis and Angus Maude) believe that a collective sense of guilt, in reference to the failures of the inter-war years, accompanies this momentous transition. I am inclined to doubt that, but it is not possible for any man or woman in the class we are considering to be free from misgiving over the past or anxiety for the future. The more thoughtful among them, also, must at times reflect upon the brevity of the period during which their privileged order has held the reins of power. A single century is the span between the Reform Act and the great overturn.

To all this there is an ethical conclusion that may be stated in the simplest words. In our day, for reasons that need not be particularised,

some opprobrium has been attached to the term 'bourgeois morality.' The implication is that certain virtues, deemed to be peculiarly those of the middle class, are pedantic, outworn, contemptible. Yet they include sobriety, honesty, fidelity to the pledged word. How can morality, the good life, be related to class divisions? And if it could, how in the world can the middle station be disgraced by caring for virtues without which society could not be held together?

It is confidently asserted, and probably with truth, that today's middle-class supporters of Labour are young, so they are generally without property, and ex-service men and women, having come in contact with the working class and with the upper, may realise that the virtues and failings of the class below them have something in common with their own. Moreover, this has taught them to understand the real meaning of poverty and unemployment. 'In the ranks of the Forces, the jealously guarded differences between the lower-middle and the working class came near to disappearing.'

In 1953, Mr. Maude, now Conservative M.P. for Ealing South and Director of the Conservative Political Centre, returned to this subject in an article in the *Political Quarterly* (153). He discusses the relation of the Conservatives to 'the changing class structure.' He defines social class as 'a group of persons conscious of certain common traits and of certain common ways of behaviour which distinguish them from members of other social classes with other traits and other ways of behaviour.' He adds that 'to be a full member of a social class an individual must both feel himself to be so and must be felt by others to be so.' The effect of increasing the amenities and 'betterments' of life is not only to expand the size of the middle class but also to instil 'middle-class aspirations' into an increasing number of artisans and their families.

A Gallup Poll in Great Britain in 1952 found that no fewer than 49 per cent of the sample claimed to be middle class, compared with only 46 per cent who thought they belonged to the working class. So since 'many more people are now beginning to *feel* middle class than would be regarded as such by most people applying all the conventional tests,' . . . if

the pattern of income-distribution remains roughly as it is at present, the trend will continue and be intensified by housing policies and the social services.

Comment might be made here that if a large number of people, ascending to higher economic, educational and cultural strata call themselves middle-class, even though they would not pass 'all the conventional tests,' the concept of strata, often easily discernible, may become more important than the increasingly blurred concept of classes.

The Working Classes

Describers of social events, whether journalists, novelists or social psychologists, encounter the difficulty of finding a name for the class or classes 'below' the middles. 'Lower' seems logical, yet such is the entanglement, helped by some religious teachings, of 'lower' with 'animal' or even 'immoral,' that the widespread objection to it is comprehensible. 'Working' is at first sight, more acceptable, yet in an age when not to work, if physically fit, seems 'wrong' conduct, and the right to work is often claimed, it seems clear that in one sense most people—especially Monarchs and Prime Ministers—work.

Perhaps it is best to use the adjective 'working' with all its ambiguities, especially as the phrase 'lower economic bracket' is scarcely useful in the present book, since the total earnings of a large adult family living together, might be in the neighbourhood of £30 a week.

As this book is concerned with social differences in experience and behaviour, a difficulty arises in the present context, for when many working people rise socially, they may deliberately assume the habits and outlook of the class above theirs, noting and imitating them (many opportunities for such imitation occur in Service life) as they are displayed in streets, shops, on the radio, films and television. In the Coronation year, there have been daily chances for one class to learn about the habits of those above it, assuming, as probably we may, that the details are usually correctly reported. There will of course be a number of working-class people who, if they rise to a higher economic stratum, will not wish to imitate all the characteristic behaviour

of the class above them, yet it seems certain that some of this will be copied by their children.

Here we meet with the usual difficulty; accounts of the working-class are not always neutral, aesthetically, ethically or psychologically. Perhaps no existing description is unbiased, for what social investigator has yet subjected himself to a 'social analysis'? (181). In some ways the nearest approximation to neutrality has been made by Dr. Ferdynand Zweig, formerly Professor of Political Economy at the University of Cracow, Poland, and at the time of writing, Simon Research Fellow in the University of Manchester. Since the end of the war he has devoted himself to the study of the British working classes, and his books *Work, Wealth and Poverty* (236), *Men in the Pits* (237), and *The British Worker* (238), are most helpful. Other sources for this chapter are Pearl Jephcott's *Girls Growing Up* (108), and *Rising Twenty* (109), G. R. Lavers and B. S. Rowntree's *English Life and Leisure* (196) and the reports of *Mass Observation.*

Since space is limited, our chief borrowings are from Dr. Zweig's *The British Worker.* Why, asks Professor C. A. Mace, in his introduction to the book, were working men so ready to talk to a foreigner? He gives several cogent reasons, 'Who would not rather confess to a continental curé than to his parish priest round the corner?' Our social stratification of linguistic habits makes it more difficult for a British worker to give intimate details to another Britisher who speaks with the worker's local dialect or with an 'Oxford accent.' 'The British worker likes to explain to an Australian or a Pole so many things which in talking to an Englishman he would take for granted.' ('The British working woman may be another story'.)

Zweig maintains that the social ladder of the working classes consists of innumerable rungs:

Social and industrial levels are determined not only by the skill and grade of the job a man does, but by many other personal factors such as health, physical strength, mental balance, age, spending habits, education, marital status, and the size of the family. The status

of a man is, in fact, conditioned by the whole pattern of his way of life. Many labourers are better off and lead a better life than craftsmen, and many craftsmen fare better than foremen. And again many labourers fall into the category of casuals and vagrants although they earn a good wage. The position is changeable all the time, and a man can move from one category to another. Insecurity and fluidity are the best terms to describe the constant movements up and down in the working class. Unemployment, ill health, disability, age, constant changes of job, new company, or new expensive habits basically affect the movement. I have seen labourers earning £5 to £6, and without family responsibilities, living in hostels for a shilling a night and going in rags, saying that they cannot save enough money in one stretch to buy a decent suit, or to go into digs.

If a craftsman is passionately devoted to dog racing, even at £7 to £8 a week he will gradually slip down. If he is emotionally unstable he will wander from town to town changing jobs, accumulating experience of life but all the time going down in the social scale.

On the whole, being married has a steadying effect on the social position of a man. It changes with age, though age is both a promoting and demoting factor. The sense of inferiority is very common among working class men, who are afraid of new duties and unknown responsibilities. Very often it is from this fear that the unwillingness to marry arises.

He distinguishes five social layers in the working classes: (1) the bottom layer: chronically unemployed men, the 'hard core' of unemployment: the disabled or physically handicapped, subnormal or maladjusted men, or men emotionally unstable or broken in health or spirit. (2) Next come the labourers in whom he distinguishes five categories: light, general, heavy, 'craftsman's'; and the handyman—a 'Jack of all trades.' However, he does not arrange them in a hierarchy.

Naturally, the mechanisation of labour and mass production methods increase the number in class (3) semi-skilled men. Then come (4) the craftsmen or skilled men, who develop a special pride in their jobs, trades and unions.

The premium on skill, as shown by the gap between the skilled man's rate and the unskilled labourer's rate, has declined since the turn of the century, and this may be regarded as a

continuing trend. (Figures relating to the building, engineering and cotton industries are given.)

(5) The upper stratum of the working class is formed by the supervisory grades, the position of which corresponds to that of N.C.O. in the Army. There is a slow passage from craftsmen to the managerial grades, and the categories are: leading-hand, charge-hand, sub-foreman, foreman, general foreman and departmental manager. 'The position of foremen is ambiguous: they are regarded as junior executives by the management and as one of themselves by the workers. Joint Consultative Committees, on which he may not be represented, often surprise him with decisions about which he is the last to be informed.'

Here are some of Zweig's comments on industrial types. Engineering workers regard themselves as the vanguard of the working classes; as free from the prejudices of the working class and from its sense of inferiority. They are matter-of-fact in outlook, they mix with others freely and do not live in closely knit communities. But cotton workers do. They are not very keen to send their children to the mill. Printers are above average intelligence: more intellectual than other workers and have more artistic interests*. Many miners discourage their sons from going down the pit. There are, too, regional types, and this, as Zweig has shown in *Men in the Pits*, makes it difficult to generalise about the miners.

There is a great difference between workers in highly urbanised and congested areas and rural areas. In London very few men lunch at home, while in the country most men take their midday meal with their family. In London, family life is weaker and personal relationship poorer than in the country.

The worker in the North is like a hardy plant born and bred against the background of a hard industrial struggle. He has been moulded and selected by the industry for its own particular needs. He knows the requirements, the rigour, and the discipline of industry. On the whole he is completely divorced from the land and from farm life; he is more class conscious, and determined to fight for his rights.

* In Marghanita Laski's novel, *The Village*, the 'anti-class' ex-soldier is a compositor.

What is called the 'industrial proletariat' *par excellence* is known in the North, but there is little of it in the South.

When you come to the South-West, even to places with a large agglomeration of several thousand industrial workers, you find yourself in a different atmosphere, one of ease and contentment. The workers are less class conscious, they are less divorced from the land, they still have farmers' pastimes. Everyone knows everyone else and there is still a personal relationship with the employer.

The young man in his twenties (George) does not care as much about security as a man in his fifties (Peter). He is more interested in his welfare rights. He will expect those he had in the Army; a clean job, or a locker to keep a change of clothes, and a shower-bath. George spends perhaps twice as much on his clothes as Peter, for he likes dances, cinemas and shows, while Peter is primarily a pub-goer. George is less satisfied with his job than Peter is. When the boss comes along, Peter longs for the pat on the back and stands at attention when spoken to, but George knows his own status and expects better treatment. War-time evacuation and service in the Forces have only strengthened the feeling of class barriers, especially where education is concerned.

Zweig is justified in his remark that the relations between working class parents and children need much more study. He quotes views, on the similarity and contrasts of family life of the upper middle and working classes, given by a young chauffeur, by a former coalminer, and by a labourer in the building industry, who had ample opportunities of studying a middle-class family. 'The son of a well-to-do family expects help from his family the whole time, while a working-class son is just the opposite, and wants to be helping his family all the time. When he is a child he has to help his mother with the housework or look after his younger brothers or sisters, and at 14 or 15 he starts helping his family by bringing home his wage-packet. . . . Don't men feel more deeply towards people they help?'

Zweig writes of a 'frequently recurring pattern' in the relations of sons to father and mother. The mother-son relation-

ship is warm and affectionate, often glowing with a deep sense of attachment and admiration, but the feeling of a son for his father is cold and often hostile. A working man, especially if he is in one of the lower grades, is often kept down and ordered about and he compensates by similar behaviour to his sons. But bitter remarks about fathers come more often from very young men than from the middle-aged. The poorer-class worker has to struggle hard to keep his head above water, and his emotional and mental balance unimpaired. This struggle sometimes prevents him from treating his children as he would like to. The mother's instincts are stronger and less affected by the strain of poverty. Zweig speculates that poverty may be conducive to this warm relation, and affect the distribution of authority in the working-class family. Pearl Jephcott also notes that some of the London girls practically never mention their father in casual conversation, almost as if he did not exist.

No book on English social differences can omit mention of that peculiarly British institution the public-house, 'pub' or 'local,' and once more we note how difficult it is to write neutrally about it. One thing is clear, the country and the town pub ought to be treated separately; the types of 'pub' even in London itself require and get expert treatment, especially in their social aspect, for while some encourage social mixing, others seem to be simply places where a man or woman can down expensive drinks quickly—often before a meal eaten elsewhere. The most detailed study is Mass-Observation's *The Pub and the Public* (150); Lavers and Rowntree and Zweig devote many pages to England's drinking habits. Maurice A. C. Gorham gives interesting details about London's pubs (84, 84a) and Pearl Jephcott discusses public-houses and their relation to dance-halls in so far as this is an aspect of the life of working-girls. Here we are concerned only with the social differences which come out in pub-going.

Is it generally true, as a worker told Zweig, that the opposite ends of the pole in England are the public-school man and the public-house man; and both of them are educated for life in society? Many public-school men visit public-houses, yet their choice of houses and friends or acquaintances there, and

especially the content and manner of their conversation, may mark them off from the 'public-house man' whom the worker had in mind. And the public-house may be small with only one bar, or ten times as big, with four or more bars, a public bar, a saloon and private bar, and a smoking lounge. As Mass-Observation shows, at the weekends, some customers 'go up one' (and dress accordingly) ascending from the 'vault' to the public bar, or from this stage, with their wives or girl friends, to the 'lounge.'

Pearl Jephcott studied girls aged 17 to 21 in three parts of England, a pit village in County Durham, a cluster of decayed and blitzed streets within a mile of London's Piccadilly Circus, and a northern industrial town (called for the purpose, Needham) notable for its armaments and shipbuilding. To many of the London girls, she writes, pub-going is a recognised way of enjoying their free time, and drunkenness seen there shocks them little, since they may be familiar with it in their own homes. 'The new pub-going habit for girls and women is a genuine problem for some of them today.' This does not necessarily contradict Zweig's belief that pub-life is stronger in the provinces than it is in London, where there are so many other things to do. But remembering that Pearl Jephcott was studying a special and a typical part of London, we may note that Zweig writes of the males, Boys under 20 keep away from the pub and men between 20 and 30 go rather seldom. He thinks that the pub-life of Britain is definitely on the decline, though he quotes many opinions of pub-goers, including 'I wish you intellectuals who know nothing about life, I mean about the misery of life, would stop complaining about the pubs. If you want men to give up pubs, make life better so that people don't need to escape from the bitterness and monotony of life.' But all pub-goers have in common a wish for company and relaxation. 'We don't easily make friends, but it's different in the pub. People don't mind talking to strangers here.' And we may conclude with Zweig's opinion: Those, and there are plenty among the working-class, who loathe the public-houses are the politically-minded, the religious and the ambitious. The majority of pub-goers are content to 'stay put.'

Impressed by the significance of class distinctions, the *Observer* recently ran a competition, with two prizes of £100 and ten prizes of £10 for the 'best defence' of and the 'best attack' on 'British class distinctions.' The result was reported in its issue of 27 December, 1953.

The fact that the judges 'concluded, reluctantly, that none of those that were clearly superior in quality had adhered adequately to the terms of reference by coming down persuasively enough on one side or the other' and 'therefore, decided to divide the prize-money evenly' between the writers of 'the twelve articles judged to be the best, regardless of which view they support' may suggest that the promoters were a little disappointed. If so, it is possible to suggest psychological reasons. To prescribe, as the subject, British class distinctions may have prevented competitors from drawing those fine shades which make the study of English social differences so fascinating. In Scotland (which contains the Highlands, Edinburgh and Glasgow), and Wales, class distinctions are not identical with those in England.

Furthermore, out of the 12 prize-winners, the addresses of those who gave them in detail are interesting. 6 wrote from London (W.C.1, S.W.11, N.1, N.10, N.W.3) none from the East or the West postal district. 2 came from districts near London; almost dormitory suburbs (Pinner, Welwyn), 1 from the South (Rye), 2 from the West (Swindon, Hereford), and 1 from the East (Brigg, Lincs.). No winners came from the huge industrial North or from Scotland. The anonymous 'Lisson Grove,' if his address is to be taken seriously, writes from London N.W.1 or N.W.8. Since the *Observer* is widely read outside London, it would be interesting to know if its competition interested non-Londoners less, or if people in this category feel less inclined to come down heavily on one side or the other. Did this restriction, made in the interests perhaps of literary style, lame the project from the start? It may be an outstanding feature of the English class system (if it can be fairly called a system) that few people will come out for or against it. Perhaps therefore the competition may provide some valuable negative evidence for the social psychologist.

The following extracts from the printed letters seem relevant to the themes of the present book. (In each case, the address but not the name of the writer is quoted.)

(Brigg) In 'our town' we should resent being called snobs, but we look down on those who have no T.V. We are not quite at ease with anyone who is not our sort, 'but in spite of our self-confidence there is still the little twinge in our hearts that perhaps some other people some of the time hold the key to a way of life which is of a higher quality. . . .' 'Our talk that class distinctions do not exist near us is a trifle forced and shrill . . .' 'the workman persists in recognising the different grades in his industry, the foreman and the manager and their wives—especially their wives—take their cue from their immediate bosses, and everyone looks up to the few old families in the county for a social lead.'

('Lisson Grove') 'I am the classless man. . . .' My father was a crazy evangelist. . . . My mother was the daughter of a paperhanger. His brother was a South Kensington Art Inspector, his grand-uncle a doctor. My childhood was passed in isolation and frustration . . . alleviated . . . by a passion for the life intellectual. . . . No one I really knew attached any importance to getting on in the world. 'We were so classless that I hardly ever knew class consciousness existed.'

(Pinner) 'As children, we lived on the lower-class fringe of an upper-class suburb. . . . We were constantly being pulled up for some real or fancied coarseness of enunciation or vulgar phrase. I soon found that speech, which distinguishes man from animals, distinguishes Briton from Briton almost as sharply. . . . I saw that learning to speak English with a genteel accent was more important to getting on in life than learning to speak French or German. . . . The barrier between classes today is chiefly a sound barrier. And the man who tries to crash through it had better beware: he is likely to end, not with a bang but a whimper. . . .'

(London W.C.1) 'I am careful not to tie my tie too tightly or to let my turn-ups droop down to my heel—I do not want to be mistaken for a salesman. . . . My speech is, I hope,

'standard'—neither public school nor public house—because I belong to that part of society which is classless: the professional middle class. . . . We are caught in a web of class distinctions. . . . We know that some people are gentlemen and some are not. . . . It all adds something to the variety of life. But that variety is too dearly paid for in feelings of unjustified superiority, needless feelings of inferiority, and frantic efforts to conform to standards which are, for the most part, little related to the true, the good or the beautiful.'

(London, S.W.11) This contributor, one of the two women prize winners, regards the system as unpardonable and indefensible as our attitude towards it, and attacks it whole-heartedly in thirty-five lines which contain not a single word in extenuation of it.

(Rye, Sussex) The second of the women prize winners writes 'In class distinction we have set up an idol with feet so large, and of such obviously poor quality clay, that we are bound to be suspicious of all idols. And so we, of all nations, have the best chance of arriving within the foreseeable future at the logical, democratic and Christian goal of a classless society. . . . *We* have no need to spill blood or even ink, breaking down the barriers of wealth, talent, education or political influence. For us there is only one barrier, class distinction, and that we have already seen through.'

(London, N.1) Snobbery is a decoration rather than the cement of society. The saying 'noblesse oblige' was invented by the upper classes for the comfort of the upper classes; it has never had the smallest appeal to the poor and the ordinary. The notion that being governed by a man makes it any easier to respect him is just one of the stock illusions of theoretical Tories. . . .

(London, N.W.8) 'Stratification by class releases the individual from preoccupation with his own personal failures. He finds it impossible to compare himself at all strictly with any of his contemporaries except the small minority whose class-background is precisely similar. . . . The man whose ancestors were landowners, and the man whose son has won a scholarship

to Winchester, are both universally agreed to be entitled to their vanity. Since we cannot eradicate vanity, it is good that it should so far as possible be divorced from the grosser forms of self-love, and fixed instead upon the conventional myth. . . .'

The value of distinguishing between class and stratum, if one is to think clearly, is suggested when one reads newspaper reports and comments on what the *News Chronicle* described as a mordant speech made on Feb. 18, 1954 by the chairman of Barclay's Bank, Mr. Anthony W. Tuke. It contained a detailed plea for the 'middle classes,' and an entreaty to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. R. A. Butler, 'when you have some money to spare, please give a thought to the middle classes.' Mr. Tuke's forcible arguments are well worth summarising here. He refers to

> the plight of the men and women who provide the brains, the enterprise, the leadership, without which the manual workers, however skilled, would be as helpless as sheep without a shepherd . . . those who occupy the executive and managerial posts in industry and commerce . . . (and) notably members of the professions, against whom the dice are specially loaded because they cannot possibly make adequate provision out of income for their dependents and for their own old age.

He says, moderately, that the section of the community to which he refers 'might be described as the middle classes.' It is perhaps important to note that, like Lewis and Maude, whose two books the speaker may have read, he does not claim that there exists today *a* middle class, and the phrase 'might be described as' suggests that he is not dogmatic on the question of nomenclature. He also states that membership of this section is not merely a question of breeding and environment, important as these factors are, for better or worse. There is a constant flow from *one class or income group* (my italics) to another, and not all of it is in the same direction.

He goes on to use the well-known phrase 'the backbone of the nation,' though it is unusual for an animal to have several or many backbones relatively unrelated to each other, and asserts that 'with the passing of the great houses of England, they (the

middle classes) provide the only channel through which the arts of civilisation can be handed down to future generations.' This seems to approach the view of Mr. T. S. Eliot, discussed in Chapter 4. The statement might provide a suitable topic for a B.B.C. discussion, when presumably some speaker would express the opinion that the B.B.C. itself plays no small part in the handing down of the arts of civilisation.

In a leading article on this speech, the *News Chronicle* of Feb. 19, 1954, remarks 'The belief that the Welfare State in Britain has victimised a middle-class minority recurs in a good deal of our post-war writing and speaking. But it needs a little more examination than it often gets. The middle classes are not a minority. The Gallup Poll discovered some time ago that 47 per cent of a representative sample of Britons described themselves as middle class. There were 46 per cent who called themselves working class. The considerable redistribution of income which the Welfare State has produced has blurred the line which used to divide the two most numerous classes. Nor is there anything . . . to encourage the belief that two sorts of Britons are advancing rival claims for fiscal favours.' (Cf. also 65a.)

Without comment, we quote the next paragraph:

There is very much more to be said for an effort to see the fate of the 47 per cent and the fate of the 46 per cent as inseparable, and, in the last analysis, as identical. And it is greatly in the national interest that many of the contemporary leaders of predominantly working-class groups should now be looking across, rather than pointing up, the old dividing line.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Clothes and Fashion

Hierarchy, utility and sex principles in dress: fusion and conflict between them. Some clothes are distinctive of strata rather than of class. Clothes proclaiming the possession of money and leisure. Uniformity of certain fashions a peculiarity of our time. Opposed tendencies; to produce exclusive types and to standardise them. Class symbols in dress. 'Savile Row.' The evolution of men's fashions and women's influence on them.

DIFFERENCES in clothes and in ways of wearing them offer a theme the treatment of which illustrates the selective emphasis which writers on English social differences are likely to exert, since every man and woman harbours prejudices about clothes; his or hers, and other people's. The 'hierarchy-principle,' as James Laver terms it, is exhibited strikingly in that very sphere, the fighting Forces, in which to a naïve mind the word 'uniform' might suggest equality. Even democratic 'battle-dress' can be made smart (i.e. tight) achieving distinctiveness at the cost of utility, and indicates the wearer's rank on all occasions, except when it would endanger his life. Interestingly enough, for playing certain games, the rules of which are imposed from above, 'correct' clothes are often democratically defined, and worn by most players, as in cricket, lawn-tennis and swimming. However, the millinery which may supplement white flannels when the player is not in action shows marked social differences, and raillery which punishes the wearer of incorrect cricket clothes often shows class-feeling.

On the whole, 'the utility principle' is paramount in these sports, and this is as it should be, especially when, as in ski-ing clothes (said to have suggested battle-dress) the wearer's safety can be obviously increased. Gay incursions of Laver's 'seduction' (serious Freudians may prefer 'sex') 'principle' have been observed even on Wimbledon's sacred centre court, but for a long time, lawn-tennis stars have been intensely 'spectator-conscious,' and therefore a little vulgar, in the original sense of that word.

To give, in the available space, as complete a picture as possible, we may mention that in England there are occasions when clothes, whether the wearer owns or hires them, unequivocally proclaim social rank and status. The distinctive dress of Royalty, and of peers and peeresses, seen at Coronation ceremonies, are matters of great interest to millions.

Some social strata, as distinct from classes, are marked by 'usual' clothes, e.g. those of lawyers, clergy and doctors (at least, in certain parts of London) though all these professions have class differences inside themselves. Nowadays men's 'correct' dress for any but the most formal occasions seems to be governed by considerations of comfort, though not entirely. Photographs of men at fashionable theatrical first-nights, even of persons accompanying Royalty, show the comfortable dinner-jacket (tuxedo or 'smoking') instead of the tight tail-coat.

An interesting example of conflict between (perhaps) the hierarchy and utility principles has recently been reported. In one large city, young detectives in the Criminal Investigation Department were sternly reminded that though, for good reasons, they work in plain clothes, they must wear hats, since 'people' would object to be interrogated by a hatless official. Yet in one casual outdoor gathering the only three hat-wearers were C.I.D. men.

One change in convention seems to oppose the tendency towards informality. It has been accompanied or caused by the establishment in the larger towns of firms at which 'everyone' laughs, and which 'nearly everybody,' at some time or other, patronises; those which hire out formal dress for any and every occasion. A wedding party of comparatively poor people may employ a firm to clothe the men, and if they wish, the women, in a style current in a higher social class.

Now that for several years clothes-rationing has been 'out,' and rationing by the purse 'in,' one can notice how the aristocracy and plutocracy can distinguish themselves by clothes. It is easy but insincere to object that the real aristocracy is shabby and patched: Coronation Year told its own story.

Let us turn to reports by experts. In 1945, writes an anonymous contributor to the first issue of *Contact*, patched elbows and wrists disappeared from West End men. The distinctive bowler hat and mufti suit of the Guards officer reappeared. The New and Newer Looks both indicated, even before coupons disappeared, that some people with money were going to spend it in ways which would distinguish them from ordinary persons. Women wore outer and corresponding inner clothes, which proclaimed non-utility, femininity, helplessness. Whereas the well-cut utility suit could be worn by, say, the munition worker, the New Look (earliest version) could not. All these changes conspicuously proclaimed that these people had money to spend, and leisure, even in daytime, to wear such clothes.

It may be added that since nowadays money can buy advice concerning 'good' clothes, people who in 1919 might have been called war-profiteers could in 1945 purchase clothes like those worn by the upper classes.

In 1948, Margaret Cole (51) wrote that when she was a child (say, fifty years ago) women's dresses, hats and the shape of their legs proclaimed their social provenance, even before you got within ear-shot of their speech. Working men's best suits and haircuts were unmistakable. For the bulk, though not the whole, of the working class, there has been a change. Rayon, staple fibres and new dyes are some causes: short hair and cheap 'settings' have approximated the appearance of the working class to that of the professional and leisured classes.

Victor Stiebel (207), in an article on creating fashion, remarks that Britain has the best and biggest woollen industry in the world, its tailors are as good as any you will find, and the best-tailored suits are in London.

Ruth Sheradski (200) writes that the uniformity of fashion by which the working girl can choose and afford a dress similar to that of the rich and leisured woman is a peculiarity of our time. 'Some thirty thousand young women have during the last month been wearing copies of Princess Elizabeth's going-away hat, which to the unpractised eye were indistinguishable from the original.' The first great couturiers, Worth, Paquin and

Redfern arose during the prosperity of the new industrialists in the early 19th century. Fashions were 'created' only for the very few and very wealthy. Accepted trends could not be copied. But after 1918 the (middle class) new woman's new-found liberty and economic freedom began the great levelling process in feminine costume. Women of all classes began to resemble each other; this had never been known before. The widespread appearance of women's magazines specially devoted to changes in fashion helped to decrease social distinctions in dress: later came the enormous and penetrating influence of the films, and of synthetic productions, e.g. artificial silk stockings. Today it is impossible to tell to which class any moderately well-dressed woman belongs. 1939-45 made us a nation clad in utility. But in 1947–8 Dior's New Look brought about the stage when a rich woman's suit made for her has the new fashionable proportions, while her secretary can buy a simple adaptation of the same suit for perhaps a tenth of the price. Never again will there be enough rich women to maintain a new fashion, unless it is also upheld by women of every order of society.

Yet in 1950 an unknown author (7) writes that 'Paris' is complaining; the lucrative American clientèle of a few years back is cutting down the number of dresses it buys in order to spend its dollars in restaurants. The custom-made aspect of Dior's business now rests on a handful of film-stars, Portuguese and South Americans. Fath and Alwynne are creating many of their models with one eye on their potential mass-production.

Lest any reader may think that this subject is receiving too much attention in a serious book, it may be remarked that in 1949 Mary Delane (58) wrote 'The fashion industry of today is enormous. In this country in 1949 we spent 500 millions on it. It is the second largest industry in the U.S.A. (food is the most important) and the third largest industry in France, giving employment there to nearly half a million people.'

These are facts given by professionals who earn their living by selling or promoting the sale of clothes. All that they write confirms Dr. J. C. Flügel's assertion (69) that alongside great efforts to oppose standardisation in dress there are efforts to

standardise it. Except Dr. Flügel and Mr. Laver, however, few have written about clothes from the psychological standpoint.

Let us record some obvious class-symbols in clothes. First, in men, formal dress, marking off a class with leisure to wear prescribed clothes, freely or with no compulsion except that of group opinion. There are class-differences in the shape of a soft cap or a bowler. The special mufti of the Guards' officers is practically a uniform; prescribed by them. Presumably if outsiders borrowed it the Guards might alter its details. But attempts by the 'trade' to accentuate class-differences, e.g. to persuade employers in certain types of office to make men wear bowler hats, or coats and trousers of a distinctive cut, have only partially succeeded.

Obviously, a suit made from material which 'everyone' knows to be expensive may label its wearer with a high economic stratum, though not necessarily a class: a visitor to London from a woollen manufacturing town will probably be wearing a good cloth—unless he were poor, he would have rejected any other—but the suit will not necessarily be 'well' cut, from London's standpoint.

About style in tailoring, much has been written. 'Savile Row' is a *mystique* as well as an area of London's West End (52a), and it may suffice for an outsider to write that a cutter regards a certain finish of the lapels of a coat as evidence of expert workmanship visible to 'anybody,' while the tendency to conform with fashion, but not its extremes, marks the Savile Row tailor.

Some clothes worn for special sports, e.g. hunting, are manifestly expensive: the class significance of sports is discussed in Chapter 11.

The ability to preserve the exclusiveness of a suit or its material is challenged today by mass-communication, especially pictorial advertisement, and presumably, since there is always the chance of a buyers' strike against very expensive men's suits, few tailors would decline to serve a customer who knows good material when he sees and feels it, and is ready to pay cash. Savile Row is said to look favourably upon South American customers for obvious reasons, and perhaps, as an American

paper suggested, for one less obvious, that the suits are to be worn far away from England, and therefore more latitude (aesthetic at least) can be allowed to the customer.

There are still examples of class-attitude towards clothing-material: on demobilisation after the last war, some soldiers, by avoiding the 'nice quiet blue pin-stripe' (already, according to the comic papers, the subject of castaways' dreams on desert islands) obtained suits of better cloth. Ukases concerning fashion-changes are not confined to a few mysterious arbiters: a salesman in a branch of a large multiple cheap tailoring firm recently confided to a customer 'we've been told to discourage this type of cloth: it has become too popular.'

At one time, durability was a mark of 'good' clothes (when rationing was introduced, many members of the upper classes relied upon the contents of their wardrobes for several years' time) but in the younger generation of males there may have been a change of opinion, corresponding to their sisters'. Since fashions in material, cut and hue of clothes for sports and leisure change rapidly, especially in America, the young customer may not choose to buy a durable variety of sports shirt or 'slacks' which may soon be copied and made by thousands in a cheaper type. Here, as elsewhere, rationing by the purse has set in, so that it is difficult to distinguish between differences of stratum and of class.

Class differences are still noticeable in the special dress and appurtenances insisted upon at certain public and preparatory schools. Impecunious parents have been known to protest in vain, both privately and publicly, against the high prices of these.

Probably men who have served in the Forces in very different countries and climates, especially in a branch like the R.A.F., where utility can often be the overriding principle, may be more pervious to suggestions that a new type of dress is 'right' because it promises to do its job more efficiently. A few years ago, English people were surprised to see Americans, in a cold English summer, wearing shirts outside their trousers. But Englishmen who have lived in hot, damp countries explain that this habit makes work as well as play easier, since the arms

are freer to move. And in a broadcast, Alastair Cooke speculated that before long in an American summer, the jacket may disappear, even in 'good' society, and that the 'trade' had this in mind.

We conclude this section, which to some readers may appear frivolous (though where would Lancashire and Yorkshire be without their textile industries?) by remarking that America's export drive of decorative ties has not succeeded among the English upper and middle classes. Some articles of clothing are, quite properly, almost sacred.

Mr. James Laver's numerous articles and books on the social significance of clothes, taste and fashion are consistently interesting and light-hearted. Neither of these engaging characteristics will necessarily commend him to a solemn scientist who desires more statistics and less wit, yet at present he must choose between these contributions and nothing; if to phrase it thus is not to appear ungracious. Keeping in mind Mr. Laver's three 'principles' of clothing: hierarchy, utility and attractiveness, we find in his writings many observations and speculations useful to the social psychologist.

Perhaps the most far-reaching is his theory about the social forces influencing the stages through which, in the last few centuries, men's clothes have passed. A particular combination of coat, waistcoat and trousers begins as sportswear, in the country; then it passes to the town, as informal wear, and after being made 'smarter,' i.e. tighter, it becomes formal town wear. From this it becomes evening dress, which has changed little in the last hundred years (a famous, popular Lord who died recently is said to have remarked that his dress-suit had been in fashion three times) and finally it becomes servants' wear, perpetually out of date. For instance, the nineteenth century footman wore the discarded clothes of the 18th century; buckled shoes, white silk stockings, knee-breeches, embroidered coat, even powdered hair. At times, the contrast between the evening dress of guests and servants lessened; so, in order that a guest should run no risk of being mistaken for a servant, 'mistakes' were put into the latter's dress. The butler wears striped 'morning' trousers with his evening tail-coat; a waiter's

tail-coat may lack silk facings; a footman wears metal buttons and a waistcoat with black and yellow stripes.

Men's clothes suggest class-consciousness, even today; they are chiefly determined by the hierarchy-principle: to a certain degree, they show, as Laver says, the rigidity of fossils. This has advantages; e.g. if a man possesses, or can borrow 'correct' evening dress, even if it is not in the latest fashion, he need not worry overmuch about his appearance at large social functions where evening dress is expected. He knows that he is in a uniform, with the social security which uniform affords.

In contrast, women's clothes, Laver claims, are little affected, except in wartime, by the utility or the hierarchy-principle. Being chiefly an expression of the attraction-principle, they are 'as alive as flowers.'

Where there have been innovations in man's dress, the hierarchy-principle has often accounted for or assisted their appearance. The rise of 'plus-fours' 'had a purely snobbish origin in the customs of the Guards regiments' (Laver). Even before they became fashionable, as anyone who visits Norfolk may see in photographs on the walls of houses or hotels, the late King Edward VII, when Prince of Wales, wore such garments for shooting, 'but such was their prestige that they established themselves for nearly a decade.' Perhaps too, factors connected with economic stratum as well as class also helped. In the General Strike of 1926, many strike-breakers (as they were called by both sides in the dispute) appeared in 'plus-fours,' and for years afterwards, they were worn by golfers: men who in England belong to the comfortably-off classes.

King Edward VIII, when Prince of Wales, did much to popularise the beret and the Fair Isle pullover, yet it is said, his influence did not establish as correct the combination of white waist-coat with dinner-jacket. This type of coat is now so popular that some observers prophesy that it will oust 'tails' entirely: presumably then, these will become the sole property of waiters. Permission by higher authority to wear military decorations on the lapels of a dinner-jacket would hasten this change.

There are interesting minor marks of class in men's clothes.

A made-up tie should not be worn, even if a wretched man is incapable of tying a bow. Yet an asymmetrical tie has been sold, suggesting that an amateur had made a passable attempt. One sees in London the tightly-rolled umbrella, which may never have been opened since it left the shop, the unworn but conspicuously carried gloves, the uncomfortable top-hat or bowler and now again in 1953, narrow stove-pipe trousers (209). One must suffer to be beautiful.

While some observers see in this recent literal tightening-up merely a fad (yet fads have their causes) or a concerted move by tailors, alarmed at sales-resistance to mounting prices, Mr. Laver theorises boldly. Drawing attention to the biological fact that in the animal kingdom it is the male crest, tail and neck which are decorative, and the female is drab and undistinguished, in human beings as we know them here and now, 'woman's most fundamental instinct is not the attractiveness of the male as such (but) the safety of her future family. It is well that it should be so, otherwise the race would undoubtedly have died out.' But when civilisation sets in, when property is protected, then the man with most to offer may no longer be the biggest and strongest, with all the masculine attributes pushed to their highest point. He is now the socially superior man—the aristocrat.

But after this, a rather different type developed: the gentleman. At the period of the Regency, to be in trade still bore a social stigma, although in practice the rising manufacturers and financiers of the period found very few doors closed to them. What served to bridge the gap and to mask the change which had taken place was the new invention of gentility, a typically English phenomenon . . . a conspiracy against the aristocracy. For 'the point of honour' it substituted 'good form,' and good form put it about that there was something ungentlemanly in being too conspicuous. So people who wished to be genteel dressed like bankers. 'There is an element of respectability in men's clothes that women's clothes do not need to bother about. Gaudy clothes in men suggest that those who wear them are spivs or worse.'

It seems relevant to mention here that in 1953 a very old

and famous London bank prescribed a distinctive dress for its clerks, not, be it noted, only for its porters. The motives can be inferred. Perhaps the populace seemed to threaten to catch up with the upper class, or subversive forces, to be mentioned in a moment, were conceived as endangering the stability of the financial world.

The tidiness of this picture of English clothing-habits is upset from time to time by importations, as one might expect, from the young and rich country, America. The usual mechanisms of long-distance communication; newspapers, films, radio and television, have been supplemented by direct contact of members of the two cultures: for over twenty years many Americans have been among us, wearing both distinctive uniforms and civilian clothes. Some of these, e.g. the lumber-jacket, obviously illustrate the utility-principle, and in so far as the garment suggests that its wearer is about to work hard, in difficult conditions, the sex-attractiveness principle as well. Other American garments, with padded shoulders and the 'draped' jacket, hinting at least that the wearer is broad with narrow hips, like a he-man film star, express this principle.

Exaggerations of these features, which in a mild form are to be seen in many ordinary suits today, characterise the costume which one associates with the 'spiv'; (defined as a man who earns his living in ways which a Government has not yet made illegal) or the 'tough guy.'

At present, as Laver suggests, we may see arrayed (literally) against each other extreme movements which respectively illustrate these two principles: the deliberate shaping of man's dress to accentuate his physical attractiveness to woman, and a counter-move; a return to the old-fashioned respectable tight 'lounge' suit, now rendered unsuitable for lounging. In 1948, a play with a cast of 12, and 30 changes of clothing for its male actors, was sent from London to New York, backed by the National Federation of Merchant Tailors. It attempted to 'push' a type of suit which some tailors hoped to popularise (within limits not too wide) with cuffed sleeve, lapelled waist-coat, and important in the present context—narrower trouser-leg.

We are now in 1953: has this movement succeeded? It will

be clear that the aim was not stated explicitly. It was, presumably, to persuade a large, but not too large, number of rich men to exchange their type of dress for one less comfortable, and to pay for the privilege of conspicuously appearing to revert to a state of modesty. Casual observation in the streets of London does not suggest that the fashion has spread widely.

Meanwhile, has the 'spiv' suit been modified in any way as a result of this protest? Probably not: these two classes are mentally so far apart (the only conceivable place where they might meet being the Stock Exchange) that they will not affect each other. They are not ignorant of each others' existence, but neither class cares what the other thinks of it.[1] Perhaps this is symptomatic of the times, and may offer further evidence that today class is less important than stratum.

Quoting Laver, who in this context speaks for himself:

> When woman becomes completely independent economically, if ever she does so, we may see a new development. No longer compelled by her most fundamental instinct to choose a partner in life who looks respectable—that is, likely to be able and willing to bring up a family—she may begin to choose her males for their masculinity. In this case, men's clothes may exaggerate the male characteristics as women's clothes now exaggerate the female characteristics, or at least draw attention to them. We shall all dress like spivs; but with such a development as this, I am sure the banks and the bankers would wish to have nothing to do (120).

As we have seen, it is probable that two antagonistic social forces are continually at work. One creates new, exclusive fashions, using whatever means it can to keep a particular style from spreading socially: the other mass-produces, for popularity and cheapness, some formerly exclusive styles. This move increases the efforts of makers of exclusive clothes to get away from that style. It has been said, with what degree of truth I cannot judge, that a powerful firm which has been too late to 'climb on the band-waggon' may deliberately discourage a new style by producing a cheap version. It also seems possible that designers employed by some firms, knowing the earmarks of a

[1] But see note at end of this chapter.

style generally deemed to be cheap, may produce a 'wrong' style, or colour, for a section of its clientele; sinning against the light, from an upper class point of view, yet public-spiritedly preserving a social distance.

Relevant here, because it concerns origins, is the ancient question. 'Who decides what women shall wear?' One popular answer hints at a Paris group, mysterious yet well advertised. But concerning different aspects of this complex question, London, New York and Hollywood each has its say, and in Coronation Year a West End couturier designed two types of head-dress, the first really exclusive, the second popular but closely resembling the expensive one.

Laver does not believe that any small group, however powerful, can produce such marked and extensively spread changes in the dress of half the world. (And we are unlikely to hear much about failures to impose novelties upon the public or the abortive innovations snatched back after a try-out, say, at Ascot, and perhaps held over for a more favourable day). He says roundly that the creation of fashion is a subconscious process. 'Fashion sums up all the subterranean tendencies, the social trends, the economic conditions, even the religious aspirations of the time, and it can't help doing this, whatever fashion designers may intend or women may think they want to wear.' He believes, in short, in the 'Tyranny of the Time-Spirit.'

Some general statements on page 178 seem to be challenged by the recent appearance of groups of young men (called by the Press 'Teddy boys') whose clothes reflect, in certain ways, Edwardian fashions. Some of these groups have contained criminals. Yet many 'Teddy boys' are law-abiding. It has been asserted that, but for the appearance of these suits in the criminal courts, the fashion would have spread downwards without jumping a class.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Eating and Drinking

The class significance of ways of eating and drinking more important here than in younger countries. What is eaten by different classes; when and how.

THE gulf which yawns between social psychology and anthropology varies in width, but at one of its broadest points even a casual observer can notice that an anthropologist will describe and discuss in detail the choices of foods and drinks, the ritual of eating and drinking, and an economist its relative and absolute cost; thus casting light upon 'national habits'—far too simple a phrase to be approved by a psychologist. Yet large books on social psychology written by Americans usually give only the briefest account of this subject, perhaps because it is of less interest in a new country.

A cleft is noticeable in the field of psychology itself: impersonal chapters on Taste and Smell still appear with little or no consideration of who is supposed to be tasting and smelling, what are the objects thus perceived, and in what social setting the perceiver finds himself; whether, for example, the smell emanates from a pheasant or expensive cheese, or from an article of food less socially acceptable, e.g. a bloater.

Inevitably it may appear to a reader that the following sentences merely state facts which 'everyone' knows, yet if he will compare notes with another, he may find that the assertions which they respectively consider obvious or platitudinous are not identical.

First, let us consider *what* is eaten, denying ourselves an interesting inquiry into prohibitions and taboos; religious (Jewish, Roman Catholic); superstitious (eating blackberries in Brittany); semi-superstitious, possibly supported by scientific knowledge; e.g. refraining from eating pork and oysters in a month the name of which contains no 'r.' It is, of course, difficult to draw a line here; some Jewish prohibitions would be wise

in a hot country; cults like vegetarianism may be supported by evidence of their healthiness (when the small amount of meat allowed by rationing is tough and tired-looking, converts to vegetarianism are probable); the schools of 'Health and Beauty' and slimming may, as time went on, have attracted members of the class or classes 'below' the one which originally provided recruits; the 'anti-constipation' attitude will have made some people more enthusiastic about bulky foods. Jewish people who have given up the ritual of their religion may still find pork repulsive.

I am informed that the following are frowned upon by the upper classes (this is reported without comment): 'done-up' foods, e.g. rissoles; pickles, vinegar, and bottled sauces appearing on the table as themselves, fish served with the head still on the body (whitebait excepted). Presumably, members of other classes may have similar objections.

Have any important food habits changed since 1939? Fewer foods are eaten with cream, owing to the difficulty of obtaining real cream; indeed, a generation may be growing up which finds even the idea of cream repellent. More money is spent upon food to be eaten at home. Reasons for this are the increased prices at restaurants since the cost of meals has been decontrolled, earlier closing at night, and perhaps the undisguised anxiety of waiters and waitresses to get the customer out and another one in (in some London restaurants he is encouraged to get out before 1 p.m. by a 10 per cent reduction on his bill). The increase of *delikatessen* shops, and especially in their sales of liver-sausage and similar 'wursts,' is attributed, in London at least, to the influence of refugees during the last twenty years. They have also encouraged the sale of rye-bread and similar continental brands, to the benefit of the English digestion (it will be interesting to see if the re-introduction of white bread will carry with it a class distinction). More cooking recipes (it is fashionable to swap them) have appeared recently in the newspapers and magazines, and the B.B.C., on radio and television, continues to popularise the discussion of cooking.

Are the upper classes, it might be asked, more catholic in

their tastes because of their foreign travel? Members of the upper economic strata—here we see the usefulness of distinguishing class from stratum—who patronise *hotels de luxe* are often not catholic but conservative, since they like the expensive dishes which are served in such hotels, whatever their locality. These customers may have little knowledge about ways of preparing foods specific to a particular district of a country.

Books on English class differences occasionally mention, as a mark of class, a liking or distaste for, or ignorance of, certain foods. Are some 'lower-class' foods barred simply because of their smell, considered by the upper class to be offensive? As in the case of 'high' meats, this may be a matter of conditioning. Still, there are puzzles: lower-class people like both bloaters and kippers; the latter are admitted to higher class tables at certain times of the day, or night. Possibly the housing shortage may have an effect; to have only one room in which to store food may make the housewife chary of introducing anything which smells strongly. The House of Commons has found that 'high tea' requires a room to itself.

It is difficult nowadays to estimate the influence of restaurants in emphasising or blurring the distinctions between classes. At one time, awareness of possessing enough cash to pay the bill and to tip adequately would not have been enough to make all Englishmen feel completely at their ease in a number of London and provincial restaurants. Yet two wars, providing many young men and women with ample money for such visits, and a uniform which commanded respect from most waiters (themselves in mufti) may have altered matters. In such situations American and Dominion soldiers have always felt less 'mere' than the English. An American ex-soldier put it this way, that when he visited London's high-class restaurants, most visitors seemed pretty much at ease, looking dressed for the place, talking in the same kind of accent. 'Another couple, the way the waiter'd treat them, they didn't belong. He wouldn't do a bum job for them; it's just that he wouldn't put on the full act'. Commenting on the suggestion that the man who leaves far too big a tip for the waiter earns his contempt, the American

said 'In the U.S.A. if a guy did get a bit out of his depth he'd be more likely to take a sock at the waiter than leave too big a tip' (96).

Many people who, before 1939, would have been at ease in fashionable restaurants have not the money to spend in them, except occasionally. These social changes must inevitably blur class distinctions, and there is at present little encouragement for restaurateurs to try to improve their customers' tastes. If baked beans, 'fish and chips,' 'pie and chips,' 'Vienna steak,' 'meat and two veg' have become standardised, experiments to extend this range are not popularly encouraged.

The 'help yourself' cafeteria system might occasionally extend the customer's range of choice, since it may present to his eye a dish unfamiliar to him; but usually for economic reasons, it has the opposite effect. The Catering Wages Act provisions have made many restaurateurs view with disfavour any proposed later opening of theatres, which might lead to a demand for the re-introduction of theatre suppers on a large and democratic scale. People's theatre-going habits, too, have changed. Many visitors to London or provincial pantomimes, some of which run for three months, come in motor-coaches from distant towns, and have no time to dally over supper. London Transport, too, is unlikely to favour late extension of its services.

All these tendencies blur distinctions between middle and upper class, though a walk round London's West End after 10 p.m. suggests that some supper places are doing well out of the moneyed visitor, whatever his class.

Where, otherwise than in the home, is the food eaten? Mostly in restaurants and cafés, seldom in public-houses. On the whole, there is little eating in 'pubs,' but there has been a great increase in canteen feeding, and 'industrial caterers' have sprung up. The practice of using meal vouchers also tends to narrow the buyer's choice. The growth of the practice of buying sandwiches and in a fine summer, of eating them in the open air, may also diminish class distinctions.

Snack bars and milk bars seem inevitably to iron out any differences except those of economic stratum, since these places are often crowded, and as they must be in districts where people

congregate, rents are high. Consequently the patrons take for granted the uncomfortable stools and enforced proximity of strangers; after all, if they don't like it they can finish eating quickly and make room for another customer.

At the time of writing, the problems of eating on trains are actue and complex. An increase in the price of the set meal means that with drink and tip, the lunch may cost the customer, or the firm which employs him, ten shillings. Consequently, the traveller who is paying for himself, whatever his class, may eat sandwiches in his compartment or visit the buffet car provided on a few trains.

When is food eaten? Are there today meal-times which mark off classes? Here one must remember regional differences, especially between North and South. Probably breakfasts tend to be less important, both qualitatively and quantitatively, in all classes, since bacon and fish are expensive. Coffee for breakfast instead of tea (which may have been drunk on waking) is almost certainly a class mark, though the rationing of tea may have brought about a change in the habits of younger people. The freeing of both tea and coffee from price-control may restore class marks: the names of many varieties of tea and coffee now quoted in circulars or displayed in shop windows would have been familiar before 1939 only to members of the upper and upper-middle classes.

Works and canteens have so habituated workers to expect mid-morning and mid-afternoon drinks that such a custom hardly marks off a class. But the pattern and ritual of afternoon tea (not distinguished as 'afternoon' by those for whom it is the last tea-occasion of the day) is miles away from the informal, hasty consumption of tea-with-biscuit. Here it is relevant to mention the American assertion (it has been set to music) that in England 'Everything stops for tea,' and that on the Judgment Day at 4 p.m. proceedings will be suspended for an hour by the British.

Dinner in the evening is probably still the mark of the upper-middle and upper class. For the working class, the substantial evening meal is 'tea,' whether 'high' (including meat) or not. One of my informants quotes a workman, who agreed to come

in to adjust a gas breakdown at 9 p.m., though, as he said 'I haven't had my tea yet.'

Perhaps it is relevant to add that in a recent account of social life in Norway, it was mentioned that for most classes the evening meal is between 4 and 6, and that there is less class-difference in the quality of the food eaten then, than we find in England.

How is food eaten by members of the various classes? Attempting to answer this puts one between Scylla and Charybdis. A detailed anthropological account, which incidentally would not rest upon any existing extensive survey, would make this book far too long, and be open to contradiction at many points on matters of detail. A mere statement of the chief headings of such report will be unsatisfactory, but we can attempt little more here.

First, the apparatus. Except for tea (the meal), groups of all classes sit at a table. Afternoon tea is served where the guest is sitting. Small occasional tables (their possession is a stratum-mark) (44) may be provided for the men, though ability to juggle at this meal is expected.

There are starting and stopping points in the social scale for the use of certain instruments of eating. Somewhere in the scale, twenty years ago, the use of sugar-tongs began and ended. Presumably there was an implication that some fingers were expected to be cleaner than others: this would account for the absence from private homes, and the presence in cafés, of sugar-tongs. (The thefts from hotels, restaurants and dining-cars may have sounded the death-knell of any implements not considered absolutely necessary.) There is a tendency to use the fork only, for food which can be managed in this way (sweets especially). The complicated question of fish-knives will not be tackled here: their use begins and ends somewhere up the social scale. The cognoscenti eat curry with spoon and fork. Pastry is sometimes eaten with a special fork (possibly stolen in wartime, see above) and an essay might be written—it has been (116)—about the social significance of eating soup from the side of the spoon, from a plate tilted away from the eater. Possibly the use of the table-napkin is less important

than the name given to it. There is the old story of an eminent political leader who, presented by his constituents with a case of napkin-rings, made a gracious speech of thanks and then asked a trusted friend, *sotto voce*, what they were for.

The use at tables of tea-strainers, finger-bowls and (abroad, or by obvious foreigners) tooth-picks can merely be mentioned here. There is said to be a class which considers the tea-mug very *chic*.

Motives might be misunderstood were one even to mention that there are social differences in the phrases about eating. Some people consider it rude, in a private house, to speak about the food (though war-time must have put a strain on them). Others express quietly and personally, appreciation of a special dish, particularly if they know it to be one which the hostess is proud to offer. There is of course, the usual playful employment of phrases understood by both parties to be current in 'lower' circles, e.g. 'Have a cuppa'; 'char' (used by the Services). 'Thank you; I've had sufficient' is said to express a pseudo-gentility; 'I don't mind if I do' often is a defiant attempt to compensate for an inferiority-complex. The social psychology of thanking is discussed in Chapter 3.

A queer custom which has arisen in the last decade is that of pocketing pepper in restaurants: this is due to the fantastic rise in the cost of this article. The shortage of tinned goods a few years ago tended to improve home cooking.

We pass lightly over the complicated issues raised by English drinking habits. Coffee, as we saw, is more high-brow as well as high-class than tea. (Mrs. Dale, of the B.B.C. programme; as one might suppose, drinks coffee; the Archers, tea). Besides real coffee, there is coffee made with powder and with essence: in this sentence their social cachets are represented in descending order.

There is a class difference in the custom of drinking, after a meal, tea or coffee. Some waiters are proud to assert that their establishment does not serve tea after a meal, even if the customer wishes for it. In one of London's biggest hotels the coffee-waiter once insisted that only black coffee 'was' served after luncheon—a poor and expensive one.

While cocoa in the solid state, as chocolate, appeals to all classes and can be sold at high prices to be given as presents, cocoa as a beverage has never caught on, above the working class. It has been suggested that there is an economic reason for the relative unpopularity of cocoa as a drink. To be palatable, it requires a large proportion of milk, expensive and at times restricted. Yet cocoa has always been a failure with the middle and upper classes.

'Milk Bar'! The name attracts or repels according to one's past reaction to either or both of these words. Perhaps there are days when the idea of milk may repel even a teetotaller: 'bar' may evoke images of nocturnal gaiety, especially if one has lived on the Continent or knows people who have (the title of a musical comedy 'Wonder Bar' was well chosen) or of utter gloom, of drinking alone and then getting out quickly; a habit not discouraged in some Scottish 'pubs.'

The milk bar was born of an excellent idea, and there are some which are good, in their fashion, but in England at least (they order these things better in Switzerland, one hears) it turns into a small slum with depressing rapidity. Smudging any class differences which might, from external signs, be predicated of its patrons, it affords an example of egalitarianism at its grimmest.

It is not without social significance that twice the *Manchester Guardian* has sent representatives to report on these institutions. On Feb. 2, 1953, under the title 'More Indifference than Dirt: Too Meek Customers to blame for Cold Comfort Snack-Houses,' the London staff gave such an account. The investigation 'took in' neon-lighted places on the main London thoroughfares and others in the back streets of Soho, where one peered through a haze of tobacco smoke and found about one customer in three speaking English. 'Most staffs seem to make a genuine effort to keep their premises clean and tidy, or at any rate to start the day with them so.' But cracks in counter-tops, harbouring grease and germs, a lack of ash-trays (or their non-use by customers) and other fitments broken or outworn, defeat their efforts. The ventilation is poor: windows may be opaque with steam, or doors flung wide to entice customers to

buy the uncovered wares, and then 'to stand chilled at a little shelf, wondering why they put up with this lack of comfort.'

All the milk-bars, and they are many, says the *Manchester Guardian*, must be doing so well that they are aware of no need to improve. Far too often the public meekly accept all faults (waitresses' dirty fingernails, no clean coats or similar garment, hands touching money and food in quick succession).

What are the social amenities in such place? None at all, one might answer, except to couples who would be happy or pleasantly miserable with each other, anywhere. 'There is psychology to be considered in the furnishing of these places: the standing customer is likely to remove himself much more quickly than the one permitted the luxury of a stool.'

In such places, 'class' does not matter. Presumably economic stratum does, for some of these restaurants are quite expensive. The socially correct behaviour is to choose, pay, eat and leave, all as quickly as possible.

The other article, 'Milk and Morals' is the first of the collection in 'The Bedside Guardian' (1952, Collins) and I leave the reader to make up his own mind about it.

It may surprise some readers that little is said here about social differences in drinking. Forty years ago, this subject could have been treated in detail. But shortage (during the War) and dearness have caused great social changes. Disproving a common assertion, many people have been made sober by Act of Parliament. By 1945, wines which in 1938 had been called cheap and nasty were dear, and still nasty. Prejudices against the products of the younger countries were stifled. Today, many judges of a good wine can afford to buy it only rarely. Yet, since books about wine and the missionary efforts of Wine and Food Societies have spread this cultural knowledge, wine snobbery, like horse snobbery, still exists.

CHAPTER NINE

The Training of Character in Some English Schools

Character and personality defined and distinguished. The concept of 'character structure.' The English public schools' claim to train character. 'Transfer of training' and the psychoanalyst's concept of 'transference'. Alleged virtues and defects of the 'public school character.' Attitudes towards parents. Achieving maturity.

THE English public schools' merits and demerits have been discussed in great detail during the last three decades. Almost any writings, however repetitive, about this subject seem welcome to some newspapers. Many of these articles defend or attack with no attempt at objectivity: such a treatment is considered dull. Most writers class all the public schools together, yet there are nearly 200: the issue is further confused when girls' 'public' schools are included implicitly or explicitly, or the 'prep' school is assumed to be a normal training ground for all public schools. Some defenders tacitly ignore public day schools, however ancient or famous, to the surprise of readers who have attended them. Few writers would deny that public schools are expensive, yet fees vary widely. In some articles it is assumed that the pride which results from being in a public school derives from awareness that its foundation is ancient, though many public schools are not a century old.

Are special merits claimed for all of them? One is that they contribute valuably to the formation of moral character, sentiments, attitudes, ideals, ethical standards and codes (this collection of psychological terms is taken from the 1951 *Year Book of Education*) (234a). Apologists for the system do not necessarily imply that English schools of other types fail to train character, but urge that the public school's primary aim is to train character rather than intellect.

As these two terms, however employed, are psychological,

it is reasonable for a psychologist to inquire how far and in what ways such a claim has been examined.

It is surprising that, though during the last four decades there has been extensive and intensive psychological investigation into character-training, it has hardly affected estimations of English public schools and their functions.

An explanatory note about the use of the words 'public' and 'preparatory' schools is necessary. The English public school is not public in the sense in which Americans use this term. It is privately owned; entry is restricted and expensive. Though it may (often it does not) receive grants from public authorities, it vigorously maintains its independence. In no sense, therefore, today, is it public.

The 'preparatory' (or 'prep') school is also privately owned and organised, and its function is to prepare boys for a public school.

Whether there are girls' public schools, and what is the basis of their claim to this title, will be left to others, e.g. lawyers and (perhaps) modern historians. For the sake of relative simplicity, this article will not discuss the question.

The popular opinion is that the English public schools train 'character,' and it is significant that the noun usually appears without any qualifying adjective. In prize-day speeches the assumption is obviously that the training is aimed at forming a good character. Yet this claim, like all value-claims, may hide ambiguities. Agreeing readily that the training is intended to form desirable traits, and in most cases succeeds, it is only fair to assert that all character-training need not be good. In Charles Dickens's *Oliver Twist*, Fagin's kitchen certainly trained the boys, in ways of wickedness. There were some very nasty characters at Rugby when Arnold became Headmaster, and some writers assert that these boys could have easily been trained into Nazi thugs, if they had been given modern scientific weapons and equally scientific drill.

Character and Personality

Let us examine the concept of character and see its relevance to our present question. Even now, the word bears different

meanings, not only in different languages, but in different countries using the same language. For the sake of brevity, let us confine ourselves to the English-speaking nations on opposite sides of the Atlantic. Most people can distinguish between an attractive personality and an unstable, dishonest, or disloyal character. Fifty years ago, a servant who on leaving her situation asked her mistress for a 'character' would mean a written estimate of her loyalty, trustworthiness, sobriety, punctuality, etc.; not a catalogue of the visible or audible signs which might render her attractive or unattractive to others. Paraphrasing Professor William McDougall's, and borrowing from Sir Godfrey H. Thomson's definition, I have, elsewhere, for working purposes, defined Character in this way:

> The comparatively stable structure of the mind and body, wrought by the integration of habits, skills, attitudes and sentiments into a relative unity (186).

The definition allows for two important facts: first, that in the complex social world of today it is impossible to exhibit an excellent character without possessing the skills necessary for one's trade or profession. A chauffeur who cannot drive safely, a journalist who cannot write efficiently, an administrator who cannot be trusted to handle people, might show strength of character elsewhere, say, in the home, but his professional reputation would be poor. Even in the family, during periods of economic depression, an out-of-work father is likely to find, if he tries to reprimand his fully employed children, that their idea of his 'character' depends in part upon his professional achievement.

It is not always appreciated that McDougall's concept expresses the idea that in any stable character, organisation of sentiments is all-important. Often his concept of a sentiment has been incompletely grasped. A sentiment is an organisation of emotional *dispositions* grouped about the idea of an object; not an organisation of emotions. According to him, sentiments are not actually experienced. We enjoy, directly, the light from an electrical installation, but not the organisation of wires, dynamos, and bulbs which makes it possible; the feeling of

financial security, but not our bank balance or the system which lies behind it. Furthermore, the extension of sentiments from persons or concrete objects to general ideas is important in character-formation; the theme of the present article.

The Concept of Character-structure

Here we encounter the great difficulty already mentioned; the term 'character' may suggest different meanings, not only to general readers, but to psychologists in different countries. It would seem that in the U.S.A. 'character' is generally assumed to have a moral connotation; the adjectives 'good' and 'bad' are always, so to speak, wanting to link themselves with it. Psychologists there prefer the term 'personality.' Yet, as I have already hinted, in popular usage—and for once the voice of the people might be right—such qualities as charm and tactfulness or their antitheses—physical beauty or ugliness, attractive or repellent appearance or speech—might 'go with' either a good or a bad character. A film actress would lose her professional charm if a rival were to throw acid in her face, but subsequent events might show that she had a strong or weak character, quite apart from the moral aspect of her behaviour. For this reason, I have proposed as a working definition of Personality:

> The effect upon others of a living being's appearance, behaviour, etc., so far as they are interpreted as distinctive signs of that being. (A person may be aware or unaware of these signs.) (186)

Recent uses by Professor Ernest Beaglehole (21) and Dr. W. V. Dicks (60) of the term 'character-structure' make it clear that the concept can usually be separated, for working purposes, from that of personality, and that so far as integration, strength, or dependability are concerned, character need not be described in moral terms. Professor Ernest Beaglehole describes the Maori and Dr. H. V. Dicks the Nazi character-structure without implying moral judgment at every turn. Recent writings by non-psychologists about Mussolini and Rommel, and the different estimations by critics of the value of these biographies, often confuse integration of character with moral praiseworthiness.

The English Public School Character

When considering the 'English public school character' it is important to remember that much of the training which the boy receives at school is aimed at enhancing the attractiveness of his personality (in the above sense of the word), at least to people of the social stratum in which he was brought up and intends to live. The probability is very high that one type of public school training may produce in the average boy general good manners, while another might endow him only with manners admissible or recognised in certain restricted circles. Some discussions of character, between ex-public school boys, turn upon this point. Bearing this in mind, let us consider whether there is not some value in the idea, expressed so often by 'old boys' who return to distribute prizes, that while their school never claims to train (except indirectly) the intellect, it produces and sets great store by 'character.' The speech often refers implicitly to William of Wykeham's 'Manners (mores) makyth man,' though it is doubtful if 'manners' in the sense in which the speaker uses it today, means the same as 'mores.' Now, since it is unlikely that in every public school each lesson is focused chiefly upon the training of character, and since the susceptibility of individual pupils to any kind of training obviously differs, an important problem ought to arise, though usually it is ignored. This concerns the 'transfer of training'—what is transferred; how much, and in what conditions.

We can merely glance at the long story of investigations into this problem. The first stage was concerned with what has not unnaturally been called the 'debunking' of an ancient creed, still expressed in sermons, editorials, and conversation in school and university common-rooms. This is the belief in general or 'formal' training; it assumes that the mind resembles a muscle, in that its 'size' and 'strength' can be increased by many different forms of exercise, just as a biceps can be developed either in the smithy or in the boxing-ring. In particular, it was asserted that to study Latin develops the whole mind; later, mathematics was claimed as a 'vehicle' of general training. The utilitarian argument, that Latin was once indispensable for all scholars, and that mathematics becomes increasingly necessary to scientists, is

seldom used; rather is it urged that to study these two subjects alleged to be 'focal' trains important 'faculties,' particularly that of 'reasoning.'

Upon this hypothesis early experimenters directed their efforts. They found surprisingly little evidence of transfer, even between performances which on casual inspection had seemed to resemble each other. (The results are summarised in most textbooks of educational psychology.) Consequently, for a time there was a general tendency to be sceptical concerning any claim of transfer-effects, and to advise anyone who wished to be highly proficient in one skill or one form of memory, to train that one and no other. Few great pianists have ever attained the highest pinnacle of skill by practising the organ; champion figure-skaters would find that ski-running interfered with the more important aspects of their polished skill, i.e. negative as well as positive transfer is possible.

This belief might be summarised, to quote Dr. P. B. Ballard in *The Changing School*, as 'the amount of transfer from one mental function to another is usually proportional to the similarity of the material dealt with and of the mode of dealing with it.'

While it is impossible to summarise briefly all the results of investigations into 'transfer,' we may say that there seems to be general agreement along these lines:

(*a*) Knowledge of facts, when their relevance to the new situation is consciously noted, may transfer. It should be mentioned, however, that while there may be, and most probably is, unconscious transfer, it is the pupil who notes or fails to note that certain facts are relevant. Consequently, we read an increasing number of criticisms of such simple claims as that a first class in the Oxford 'Greats' (the name for the honours degree in philosophy) automatically enables its possessor, for the rest of his life, to handle successfully administrative problems of all kinds. His philosophical training may have shown him how to formulate and analyse them; to seek out and to recognise their resemblances and differences, and to attack them with the aid of his special knowledge of history, yet today many of these 'teasers' demand for their solution

expert special knowledge and appreciation of new facts, e.g. in the physical sciences, economics, or social anthropology, and of the ways in which the minds of others, especially of his subordinates, work.

(*b*) Knowledge of methods and techniques, applicable to the 'new' situation, may transfer. Yet when these are inapplicable this transfer may be 'negative.' An historian, asked publicly about the probable effect upon international relations of the Hiroshima bomb only a few weeks after it fell, began, perhaps automatically, with 'History teaches us. . . .'

(*c*) Within a limited range, habits may transfer, if by habits be meant specific adjustments to specific situations. What are called 'generalised habits' are better termed attitudes or sentiments. Their transfer may lead to virtues or vices, e.g. 'living by the clock' is a virtue in a radio-producer, but a vice in a worker who ought to complete his task before he plays. There is much evidence of negative transfer of habits; e.g. in athletics (excellence on one type of ball-game occasionally obstructs proficiency in another); and in musical skill. Yet a person who has become a 'creature of habit' may as a result develop a character which is strong, dependable, wilful, stubborn, obstinate—the choice of adjective depending upon the chooser; and such a person may be regarded by others as moral or immoral. A point often overlooked is that moral character and ethical standards are to a large degree related to social structure, and behaviour considered admirable at one level is sometimes considered reprehensible at another (52).

(*d*) Training or education may result in a transfer not only of knowledge of subject-matter, but also of attitudes, sentiments, and ideals. In this way much of the transfer asserted to occur by the supporters of general education, and denied by extremists who believe that only specific training is possible, may in fact exercise great influence. A long experience of theoretical and practical economics, combined with great love for the drama, resulted in the unusual instance of a university don, the late Lord Keynes, being able to run a theatre at a profit. The late

Sir Stafford Cripps, for long Chancellor of the Exchequer, did not follow the usual educational path of an English politician from Winchester to New College, Oxford, but went to University College, London, where he studied natural science. Who can measure the result of this upon our nation's present and future? (cf. 194a).

At this point, claims for character-training in schools may find their most secure foundation, for a boarding school in particular inevitably inculcates certain attitudes and sentiments, not only towards work and play in term-time, but to life in general, and by the time some pupils leave the school their characters may have been permanently altered.

'Transfer' and the Concept of 'Transference' in Psycho-analytic Theory

It is interesting that the concepts of 'transfer' in education and of 'transference' in psycho-analysis grew up side by side, but so far as the present writer knows, there has been little cross fertilisation between them, though a suggestion in this direction was made by T. H. Pear, J. N. Langdon, and Edna M. Yates in the *New Era* (177).

The liking of a pupil for a particular school subject is often closely bound up with a trustful affection for its teacher. The converse, that he may dislike and distrust the teacher of another subject, seems possible. Perhaps, therefore, in some instances of transfer, the chief factor is the transference of the learner's affection from his parents, nurse, or early teacher, to the teacher of a new subject. In the great public schools, the number of pupils to each master is usually much smaller than in other schools, the masters have been hand-picked for personality, character, and intellect, and the pupils for long periods are separated from home influence. Consequently both 'transfer' and 'transference' may happen, and their mechanisms interlock.

Now, whatever the terms in which they are expressed, many opinions in prize-day orations, in some sermons, and in speeches praising or blaming the results both of public school and of military training, imply that transfer of attitudes and sentiments occurs. Yet such transfer need not always be socially desirable.

Army discipline, which toughens a boy, may also teach him skills and techniques which are now being used by deserters and others in burglaries and attacks upon civilians. The sentiment of loyalty to his immediately present group may cause an ex-Service man to assume that the Army, now he is out of it, is fair game for anyone who supplies him with an undeservedly laudatory testimonial. One often sees examples of devotion to duty, loyalty, good humour in civilian life attributed to army life, yet scrounging, 'passing the buck,' time-wasting, evasion of responsibility are also learnt in the Forces and transferred outside them. Such problems are easier to comprehend if we can distinguish between transfer of skills, techniques, isolated items of knowledge, and of attitudes and sentiments.

Alleged Defects of the 'Public School Character'

In these democratic times, criticisms are made of arguments advanced with much confidence fifty years ago. Objections now range from a denial of some important assertions underlying them to variations upon the reasonable theme that the social frameworks of 1900 and 1954 are very different. There will be no attempt here to present extreme objections, but only those which to the present writer appear moderate.

The first complains of the explicit acceptance and assumption of England's social stratification when parents, more especially those who have not themselves attended such a school, send their boy to the public school 'to give him a better start in the world,' or because 'he will mix with a better type of boy.' These phrases will be ambiguous to the sceptic, but not to the parents, who may be making great financial sacrifices for the children. To them, therefore, it will seem obvious justice that their boy should have the best that money can buy. But acceptance of this attitude would make social 'pull' a commodity, and today, to a certain extent, it is. Some would object that in both the above assertions 'better' begs the question, and ask 'Better for what?' To answer, we must inquire whether, assuming that the public schools once met the need for leaders, they are doing so at this day. Has the type of demand changed, and have the schools changed to meet it? Now that our foreign policy is more

important than our domestic policy*—a matter so delicate that it was hardly mentioned by either side in the General Election of February 1950—some critics urge that for the Foreign and Diplomatic Service the orthodox public school training, with the attitude that it engenders towards 'foreigners,' especially if they are small-business men, needs much modification. 'Mixing with a better type,' even if the postulate be granted, may make it difficult to mix with types deemed to be less good. When middle-class—especially 'lower-middle'—parents send their boy to a school far distant, both geographically and socially, from themselves, they ensure that in the holidays he will have few acquaintances of the social class he knows at school—these, too, he may not be able to entertain at his home—and may now find it hard to mix with the boys in his own street. Consequently at an early age he may come to regard the experience of 'not-mixing' or semi-isolation as normal. The experiences of the 'scholarship boy' at a school where most parents pay full fees is not as unpleasant as it was fifty years ago, though the facts are not fully documented. A recent radio play and film, *The Guinea-Pig* (the name applied to a poor boy, who was sent to this type of school, as the subject of an experiment in implementing the Fleming report), may have been written to please both stalls and gallery, and obviously does not take all the possible factors into account. Yet a scholarship boy from this type of home must often experience divided loyalties, especially if he knows that he has been sent to this school because of its reputation as a first-class employment agency. And mention of this function may infuriate not only egalitarians, but the many thousands of pupils from excellent schools not recognised as 'public' by the Head Masters' Conference.

Again, it is often asserted that public schools encourage intellectual immaturity, and—this is put more politely at some times than at others—after years of residence in such schools, some masters, when among mature 'outsiders,' feel ill at ease, and this embarrassment may cause a strengthening of existing tendencies to put first in their lives loyalty to the school, especially to its games and routine.

* This sentence was written in August, 1950.

Related to this is the charge that the public schools narrow their pupils' outlook. Old boys might reply defiantly that it is necessary to produce men who are loyal to their country and the Empire. In this respect schools will differ considerably, yet before 1930, some discouraged the formation of branches of the League of Nations Union and were, to put it mildly, lukewarm towards the Scout Movement, while making membership of the Officers' Training Corps practically compulsory. Among legislators who find it hard to grasp the idea that unlimited national sovereignty cannot exist if hydrogen bombs and bacteria are ever to be used as weapons, are many products of this type of training, by no means confined to the public schools or to England.

Attitudes toward Parents

To *The Character of England*, edited by Sir Ernest Barker, Lady Violet Bonham-Carter contributes a delightful chapter (28) on the 'Nanny'—the devoted nurse of young children in English upper-class households, more especially before 1940. Anyone acquainted with psychology and social anthropology may regard it as significant that in this family framework, for some years after the first month of life, the boy is physiologically and psychologically disciplined, especially in feeding and toilet-training, by a woman not his mother. His own mother may see and play with him at certain times of the day, usually in circumstances pleasant for them both. Consequently, many 'do's' and 'don'ts,' 'of courses' and taboos, are implanted by a mother-substitute, who later may fade out of the child's picture, though sometimes she lives with the family for many years. But if at the age of eight the boy goes to a 'prep' (boarding) school to prepare him for his public school, he may become part-sharer in a second foster-mother—often very likeable and efficient. It therefore seems possible, in the light of what is known about the laming effect of serious mother-complexes, that this regime may be beneficial for a boy destined in early manhood to make difficult decisions in distant countries—for at least he may be free from any haunting doubt whether his mother would approve his action, and by that time he will probably regard 'Nanny' as

incapable of judging the rightness of his conduct, even if she knew or could understand the issues involved, which he would consider unlikely. The day, therefore, on which such a little boy leaves home for the 'prep' school may not be as painful as to a boy who has grown up with one mother only. At the 'prep' school, he may find a second mother-substitute, and a father-substitute (Cf. (13)). Many boys are very happy at their 'prep' school, but may a note of criticism creep in? If the school is in or near a small town, the headmaster may impose rigorous isolation from local residents; the boys may walk two by two to reserved pews in the local church, or to the beach, where they swim as a supervised group. If they or their parents happen to have friends in the town, occasional visits may be allowed, though not encouraged because of the possible 'unsettling' effect. Yet home-sickness is feared less than the making of local acquaintances.

We are here concerned not with judging, but with pointing out, the special social pattern into which the child is fitted. Some critics, however, would add that occasionally the 'prep' school is permeated by a public school atmosphere of thirty or more years ago, as this is remembered by the headmaster, so that the boys' mode of life may be dominated by some conventions already out of date by public school standards. This class-segregated, sex-segregated regime produces in some boys a tendency to regard women as falling into two classes, those who resemble his mother and sisters, and the others. In some social patterns, particularly in the outposts of Empire, such an attitude may have tended to efficiency, even if a ruthless kind. Under its influence, home-sickness will be less; rituals like that of dressing in special ways at special times, speaking either with authority or with conscious equality, easy, habitual, never quite unconscious alteration of manners towards people of different social classes, may seem more natural to the 'prep' and public school pupil than to the day school boy. Yet from the products of such training there have come criticisms. Geoffrey Gorer, for example, describes in detail the 'shyness' produced in this type of Englishman, and asserts that it was an important factor in 'losing' India (83a).

Let us return to the operative definitions of personality and character on pages 190 to 192. These may shade into each other, more or less; less in a theatrical impersonator, more in a country-town bank manager. It is obvious that some visible and audible signs of the public school boy's personality have been cultivated, especially if he has been to a 'prep' school, at some of which, even in the severest rationing period, parents were commanded to give up their personal coupons to provide school uniform and distinctive games-clothing.

Since judgments of personality and of character may reflect peculiarities of the judge as well as of the person judged, I will note some of my own, as neutrally as possible, while the reader decides to agree or disagree. Consider first, personality. The public school boy is taller and heavier than the average boy in this country. The question whether he is also 'better-looking' can be avoided by most scientists, as involving subjective standards, but a social psychologist must face it. Judged by English standards, the public school boy is definitely better-looking. This is often because his parents' financial advantages, their ability to travel, both physically and mentally, their wider range of acquaintances, their greater freedom from money-worries, have allowed them to mate for reasons of physical and mental attractiveness, and this kind of sexual selection may have continued for several generations. Such boys, to use the drill-instructor's expression, 'strip better.' Add to this, modifications made by barber, dentist, and tailor. Many of these are desirable for everyone—e.g. healthy, straight teeth, clothes cut to fulfil their proper functions in work and in play; made of good material, resisting rain and wind. Other modifications are 'class' symbols. Some styles of hair-dressing mark off the 'prep' and public school boy, who perpetuates them for several years when he leaves school. Not only do 'quiffs' and special kinds of moustache designate certain social classes, but upper- and lower-class haircuts are associated with some barbers who, if allowed, could show more versatility.

There is even a type of upper-class facial expression; relatively unchanging, called strong, firm, equine, or wooden according to taste. It may be 'loosened' to people in the wearer's

class, or in one obviously several grades below his, but not when giving orders.

Such conscious restriction of overt signs of friendliness is sometimes defended on several grounds—the firmest one, perhaps, being that if a social hierarchy is assured and respected, as in a battleship, necessary duties get done without demur or argument. Compare, defenders may say, the demeanour of a taxi-driver on a station rank who, seeing only one passenger, gets on with the job cheerfully, with that of the same man in war-time, when he could 'oblige' three persons besides the original hirer, taking, often incivilly, four fares for one journey. The weakness of this argument lies in the fact that acceptance of military rank-differences implies reciprocal obligation. The officer has to return a soldier's salute, and has definite duties towards 'his' men. Class-differentiated obligations are non-reciprocal. When most public school boys joined an Officers' Training Corps, awareness of this distinction was instilled early.

The above passages refer chiefly to signs of personality—i.e. to the ways in which a person appears, sounds (etc.) to others. Such behaviour-signs are different if directed towards people recognised as of his own class (even renegades or rebels) or towards other classes. Against such deliberate discrimination the ex-public school boy occasionally revolts, though, as Victor Gollancz points out in his introduction to the late George Orwell's *The Road to Wigan Pier* (171), the manner of the protest is apt to be conditioned by public school etiquette.

The extent to which, in any individual, personality and character are independent or integrated may offer important problems to the psychologist and psychiatrist, for a highly integrated character may co-exist with several different, integrated personalities—in a man who has many friends and acquaintances and adjusts himself to them. His average personality may be attractive to some people, neutral or repellent to others, and his integrated primary character may develop a secondary character-structure more or less closely bound up with it.

Maturity of Character

Much work remains to be done by psychologists before the different meanings which can legitimately be given to the term 'maturity' are distinguished. It seems certain that the 'permanent adolescence' to which some critics of the public schools object is a type of emotional immaturity. But it is frequently claimed as a virtue in the public school system that it develops a special kind of maturity of character, at an earlier age than any other system in our own culture-pattern does, at least nowadays.

To this important question, 'What is Mental Maturity?' comparatively little attention seems to have been given, at least if educational and psychological publications are to be regarded as a criterion (cf. 173, 180, 187). Dr. Overstreet's recent book is a striking exception, and it would be interesting to examine it in detail to determine how far the English public school character, as usually portrayed, measures up to his American demands. In the book and the Rylands lecture cited above, the present author has compared and considered the views of Professors Gordon W. Allport, D. W. Brogan, Sir Cyril Burt, Edward L. Thorndike, Doctors Charlotte Bühler, E. Glover, Marie Jahoda, Alan Maberly, Margaret Mead, May Smith, F. H. Spencer, and Mr. Cyril Connolly. As a result of such comparison one may well inquire 'Mature for what?'

Let us sort out the more reasonable criticisms of 'the public school character,' though this is a question-begging term. One alleged defect, which some urge is a virtue, is that it nurtures in small groups of boys the assumption that they are 'natural' leaders, and that there will always be a large pool of naturally leadable persons. This is often disputed. The Battle of Britain was not won on the playing-fields of Eton, but, as J. B. Priestley remarks in *Out of the People*, by secondary school boys. The heroism of the Merchant Navy, usually unsung, is shown by men very few of whom learned leadership in public schools, and the famous Dartmouth system produces leaders for the Navy by strictly vocational training. In India, the ex-public school boy type of leadership needed, and often did not obtain, considerable supplementation. It worked better half a century ago when the whole world was simpler.

A more impressive claim is, not that in World War II public school boys as a whole, when given responsibility, succeeded, but that, 'as to the manner born,' they were specially apt to look for and to assume responsibility. This is easy to believe, since they often had respected parental and grandparental examples, a sense of family prestige, an assumption, understood even in nursery days, that giving orders to certain people was natural. Moreover, at school they were used to the prefect system. A natural result would be an attitude (not a 'complex') of superiority. Yet as the Officer Cadet Training Units found, the inter-war diminution in size of classes in many non-public schools and their imitation of the 'house' and prefect system had increased the numbers of boys who 'naturally' looked for responsible jobs. Moreover, in World War II, though the basic officer-like qualities required in any fighting force might be similar, different intellectual and other demands were made upon, say, fighting air-pilots and cavalry officers, and the techniques of jungle and commando fighting, 'intelligence' and 'resistance' must often have developed ethical values which no school chapel is likely to have instilled. And, as the Services' vote in the 1945 General Election showed, many combatants, both men and women, distinguished sharply between the kind of leadership they desired in war and peace respectively.

Whether and to what extent the public-school-trained leader will be useful will depend largely upon the type and degree of social stratification in the society which employs him, as a glance at the system in the U.S.S.R. would show. At the time of writing, our own Prime Minister is a public school, but not university product.

Closely connected with ability for leadership in a stratified society is the general advantage of good manners, including suitable ways of speaking. The public schools are expected to inculcate these, and usually do. Many other types of school do likewise, but to possess manners which will seem good to different strata of society generally requires wide social experience. Up to 1939, the public school boy had usually travelled more than the average boy. This state of affairs was then altered,

though the foreign friends of most 'other ranks' were limited in variety.

Inevitably criticism, both positive and negative, turns upon the question of loyalties, especially patriotism. In the public schools a high degree of patriotism is taken for granted, yet did the country as a whole do so badly from 1939 to 1945? At the General Election of February, 1950, it could be inferred from the very few attempts to make foreign affairs an issue, that the two chief political parties correctly assumed the existence of loyalty to this country, even if sectional loyalty was so evenly divided. The public schools, however, have not led the country in trying to foster a supra-national loyalty (70).

A difficult question arises in connection with the degree of obedience which any educational system should foster. It is sometimes claimed that the fagging tradition, which of course does not exist in a number of public schools, inculcates unquestioning obedience of the 'theirs not to reason why' kind. Yet in World War II, in contrast to the Crimean War, many leaders, especially Field-Marshal Montgomery, ensured that, so far as possible, every soldier should know not only what he was going to do, but why. And one method of getting rid of an incompetent minor army leader in peace-time is for his subordinates to obey every order he gives, however fatuous.

An interesting result may arise from disciplining boys to regard their own wishes and reasoning as irrelevant to many situations they are called upon to meet, e.g. when a fag must 'hang about' in case a bigger boy may want him to do something, useful or useless. It has been suggested* that the inculcation of this general attitude of utter self-subordination may explain why the study of elementary Latin and Greek occasionally 'trained the will' of those who knew they were not going to use these subjects afterwards—so far as the study was unpleasant, but compulsory, it might as well have been shoe-cleaning—except that shining shoes may shed their lustre on the cleaner, while irregular verbs do not.

Perhaps the question of the moral value of fagging is not important today, though some would demur. It seems to have

* By Mr. A. B. Royse in a personal communication to the writer.

begun for reasons of utility, and moral justifications followed—a not uncommon sequence. Where, as in day schools such as St. Paul's and Merchant Taylors', servants were unnecessary, fagging was absent (2, 15). In 1830, the *Edinburgh Review* wrote that fagging does not diminish, but authorises and multiplies tyranny, describing it as the only regular institution of slave labour, enforced by brute violence, which now exists in these islands. In 1835 the *Westminster* was of the opinion that fagging makes the boy from a wealthy family 'see life in terms of tyrants and slaves.' Yet the Government Commission in 1864 had nothing but praise for the prefect system.

Dr. Arnold argued that the fag learns 'quickness, handiness, thoughtfulness, and punctuality.' Not surprisingly these alleged 'faculties,' unhesitatingly invoked at that time, have been subjected to later analysis by educationalists and psychologists. Dr. Badger considers this claim tantamount to saying that if we wish to inculcate dexterity of mind and hand in a child, we should make him an errand boy-*cum*-domestic servant, and writes that to hang about idly for orders does not seem the best method of inculcating thoughtfulness and punctuality. He disapproves strongly of this specious form of propaganda on behalf of a system which serves only 3 per cent of the children of this country, a section rendered almost alien to the majority by its curious system of taboos.

It would seem that Dr. Badger does not distinguish sufficiently between the prefect system and the fagging system, but most people will agree that 'Jump to it!' may be an educationally desirable order if given by a trained superior, whether skipper or sergeant-major, captain or teacher, but to be at the mercy of an ignorant big schoolboy is often a very different matter. Bernard Darwin, an old Etonian, strongly favours the prefect system (55). 'It is good for the clever boy to have colleagues who will not let him turn into a prig.' Yet in *Must England Lose India?* (172) Lieut.-Colonel Arthur Osburn condemns the system whereby a prefect, himself only a child and at the most neurotic, irritable, and exotic period of his life, is allowed to 'flog and to discipline children smaller than himself.' These sadistic gentlemen, exclaimed Colonel Osburn, afterwards became our Judges

and Lieutenants, Governors and High Commissioners. Against this, in *Life and the Public Schools*, Dr. David finds that the administrators of the British Empire are the finest fruits of the prefect system: 'their success in ruling men, which is beyond dispute, has some connection with their early practice in the handling of boys.' (55a).

The above excerpts were selected by Dr. Badger, from whose book I am borrowing—Chapter VIII is devoted to *The Public School Training of Character*. Here he summarises many features of the public school system claimed to be good. These are the system of boy-discipline, the consciousness among many public school boys of belonging to privileged families of wealth and influence, setting them apart from the majority of boys in the British community, the *mores* (manners and morals) fostered and acquired, historically conditioned and fashioned by centuries of tradition. The French chivalric code of conduct has had a predominating influence on the public schools ever since Bishop Wykeham: 'The body hardened and strengthened by much exercise in the open air, and by early rising'; 'an early attempt at a "Compliance and suppleness of children's wills" till Awe and Respect be grown familiar . . .' (John Locke). There is training in virtue, which 'alone is true nobility' (Lord Chesterfield). Outward behaviour and appropriate conduct are very important, for 'everyman should perform everything in the most becoming manner' (Addison and Steele). 'The playfellows . . . of a boy of spirit may be the future friends of his head or his interest.' 'In a free intercourse with his equals, the habits of truth, fortitude, and prudence will inevitably be matured' (Edward Gibbon). To Thomas Hughes the main characteristic of Rugby boys was 'their genial and hearty freshness and youthfulness of character.' In the public schools there is 'the educating of the sense of independence, individualism, empiricism and a strong national consciousness' (L. Wiese). 'The public school boy plays fair, and although not positively magnanimous, he tries to be just. He may often be narrow-minded, but he is not mean or petty' (Bernard Darwin). Finally, the public school boy is 'free from any consciousness of social inferiority; his home influence is wider and more knowledgeable; he is more stable

since he has spent a number of years away from his parents among boys,' and he is better 'for a period of absence from unrestricted attention to the crooner, the dance-band, and the popular cinema; he is taught that spiritual values should come first'; and he has a conscious pride in his school, which can be very snobbish but 'at its best is purified by a spirit of *noblesse oblige*, a sense of responsibility for those who are in some way or other inferior or less fortunate' (203).

It may puzzle some readers that this chapter deals only with the claim that English public schools train character. Little appears to have been written concerning the efforts made in non-public schools. The assumption perhaps is that in them character is trained indirectly. We should, however, refuse to face facts if we were to assume that the claims made for the public schools are not claims of superiority in this respect. A corresponding analysis therefore of the character-training in our secondary and elementary schools needs to be written.

CHAPTER TEN

Social Differences in English Education

Psychological discussions of this subject are rare. The writer's sources of information. Prestige; functional, 'glamour,' and 'snob.' Class privileges and manners. Social differences between and within universities, colleges and schools. Oxbridge and Redbrick manners and customs. Debates and realistic discussions. A discussion of recent researches.

SOCIAL differences in English education are frequently mentioned; perhaps oftener in writing than orally. The sentences are apt to have a political tinge, usually of distaste. This does not prove the presence of almost universal discontent with the *status quo*, for people who like the English social set-up feel no overpowering desire to write about it. This fact has not escaped the notice of friendly foreigners. Of our social stratification Clifton Fadiman observed in the *New Yorker*, 'the folks on top probably like it better than those on the bottom.' And a Norwegian psychologist, musing upon the observation that a hen who has pecked her way to the top of her hierarchy remains (while she stays in that company) gracious and poised, added 'like an aristocratic English lady.'

Social differences in English education have interested modern historians (*32*, *216*, *235a*) and economists (*49*, *50*, *233*). A really psychological approach to the subject is rare. Psychologists, however, are blameless for the innocence of psychology displayed by the framers of the Norwood Report (*54*), and of the White Paper, *Educational Reconstruction* 1943 (Cmd. 6458 H.M. Stationery Office). 'From the rash and impetuous American viewpoint' (Mr. Fadiman again), 'the English educational system, to our innocent eyes, has always seemed caste-ridden and money-dominated.' Yet until recently there has been a taboo upon considering psychologically these aspects of the system.

To break taboos may cause a blend of delight and fear, and this may account for the diverting style of some books by destructive critics of English education. Yet few writers

have attempted even to state the relevant problems as they appear to social psychologists. Anyone who does this has no easy task; for example, he must be prepared to discover, record and, if necessary, discount his own social prejudices, especially those concerning the nature of morale (154a) and leadership (19, 106); subjects discussed in Chapter 9.

Making no claim to a mentally aseptic attitude towards this subject, I will describe my sources of information. First, and to anyone but a behaviourist, foremost; the personal, subjective sources. I cannot divest myself entirely of my own frame of reference; temporal, spatial, social, economic, aesthetic, nor is there any implicit assumption that in writing this chapter I am completely or continually aware of this frame.

Here is a rough sketch. I was born, brought up in and have often revisited the country of Norfolk, some parts of which, e.g. between King's Lynn and Holkham, are highly stratified socially, while others, e.g. the Fens, have few layers. I lived in London, studying at King's and University Colleges, for four years. After this, I studied six months at the University of Würzburg, then went to Manchester University for six months and to Giessen University for four. Since then, with interludes, and short visits to the U.S.A., Canada and the Continent of Europe, I lived in Manchester. For three sessions I was attached to the staff of Liverpool University. During the whole of my adult life I have made many visits to London, and am now living there. For twenty-five years I have taken a special interest in the psychology of speaking, and especially in those problems of social psychology which centre around Standard English and the objections sometimes raised by other English-speaking nations to a few of our 'accents.' The social stratification of clothing has not escaped my notice, since it is important in the psychology of advertising and public relations. I claim no special powers of observation in these spheres, and in this book am likely to show blind spots which many readers will notice.

It might be mentioned that few professional psychologists have come from Charterhouse, Eton, Harrow, Marlborough, Rugby, Westminster or Winchester. Perhaps this may have a

simple psychological explanation. Anyhow, we lack an account of the social psychology of their masters and pupils, written by someone who not only sympathises with but 'empathises' their special culture-pattern. We lack, too, a corresponding description of his way of living by a proletarian psychologist.

I have observed social behaviour for several years in many circumstances. Though I have not 'functionally penetrated' many social strata to any depth or for any long time, my duties have continually brought me into relationship with people of very different classes, for Manchester contains more social strata than might appear to a casual visitor. I was a tutor of the Workers' Educational Association for twenty-six years. Though it is an old jibe that W.E.A. students are atypical because they are W.E.A. students, from them I learnt a great deal when their attitudes differed from my own.

It has long been a delight to read books by non-English people about England (including the most brilliant, that of Professor D. W. Brogan) (32). I have encouraged friends from the U.S.A., Canada, Australia and New Zealand to speak and write to me about aspects of English society strikingly different from their own and freely to distribute praise or blame. I have also collected the views of fervent English egalitarians and inegalitarians, the latter just as sincere if less articulate.

In this chapter there is no attempt to be immediately useful. Assuming pure science to be a reality, the present approach is 'pure.' There will be no judicial summing up. My own belief is not alarmingly original: that it might be wise to study certain manifestations of behaviour by the leisured classes, in case some traits underlying them prove to be worth preserving. Their ways of expression might then be spread more widely so that others could share them; as a result, following the general principle of increased production, the attainment of these virtues may become much cheaper and available to anyone possessing the necessary intelligence.

Further problems arise because opinions about the relative advantages of different systems of education (they may provisionally be distinguished as expensive and inexpensive) have not been examined to filter off from them, some workable

psychological concepts. Note, for example, the Norwood Report's assumption that 'tradition' (unspecified) is desirable and should be maintained, that Society must 'correct the bias' (how?) against schools which train for the 'design and craftsmanship side of industry,' that the grammar school has a 'prestige' (yet, curiously enough, when this refulgence becomes really dazzling, the word 'grammar' is often dropped by the ambitious Head Master and Governors.) Consider too, the assertion that the job of the public schools will still be to 'produce leaders' (quality again unspecified, though the English know that 'Führer' is the German equivalent). And throughout such discussions there is apt to be confusion between outward and visible signs and inward and spiritual grace, i.e., between what I should term Personality and Character, though the fifty other meanings of Personality, to say nothing of those borne by *Charakter*, make this missionary effort difficult.

In this connection, it would be profitable to consider the psychological nature of traits, and the bio-social aspect of personality; e.g., along the lines of Gordon W. Allport (*5*) and Henry A. Murray (*163a*). For example, what one English observer calls admiringly 'independence,' another may term 'truculence.' Again, apparently unfriendly manners shown by some members of a certain social class may be defended by them on the ground that the other class does not really 'understand' this speech and behaviour. Some members of the other class may agree; others may think it does, only too well (*26*, 171). In England many types of churlishness are forgiven by the English if the 'offender' is alleged to be 'shy' (*127*). All these are preliminary problems to any observer of English social classes.

It is important that characteristics of the upper and upper-middle classes shall be described as seen by members of the middle and lower-middle, as well as by the poorest classes. A wide difference of social stratum, or sub-culture-pattern between observer and observed makes it much harder to perceive intelligently, or even to be aware of important subtleties of behaviour (*126*). A social psychologist writes to me about his ignorance, when beginning his job, of the table-manners of poorer people

with whom he lived, and of appropriate phrases to be used by them, e.g. when drinking a person's health. This caused solecisms which he later outgrew.

It will be useful to employ in this chapter the following classification of social strata, slightly modified from that used by 'Mass-Observation' (151).

A—Upper Class
B—Middle class—1
Middle class—2
C—Artisans and skilled workers.
D—Unskilled, and the least economically favoured or educationally trained third of our people.

What are the chief signs or characteristics of social stratum? First, let us consider those appealing to the 'senses'. Here the A class has distinct advantages. To say this implies in no way that the D class as a whole is not good-looking, for beauty may exist in the eye of the beholder, yet few members of the D class would object to greater height and weight in their children, and many would be delighted if they could only afford to make themselves better-looking along the lines laid down so sternly in the advertising columns of our magazines. The rich and the poor are often easily distinguishable, for example, by the state of their hair and teeth. And to achieve such excellence costs money paid to milkmen, dentists, hairdressers.

It may be asked 'Is not this a muddled view? What has appearance to do with education?' In theory, little; in practice, much. Many schools, for example, insist upon their pupils wearing certain types of clothes, and this inspires letters to the Press from approving or disapproving writers. 'Finishing' schools may compensate for personal limitations imposed upon 'Mädchen in Uniform.' Moreover, when a commission is being applied for, especially perhaps in the women's services, 'looks' are an advantage.

In England, members of different social classes emit distinctive spoken sounds. There may be physiological causes of some kinds of C- and D-class voices, e.g. 'thick' speech may

result from catarrh, tonsils, adenoids. The vague phrase 'upper class accent' blankets many distinguishable facts. In English speech, the marks of class are vowels, speech-melody and characteristic words and phrases: phatic, emollient, endearing or antagonistic. I noticed the features of upper-class speech most easily on returning to England from Würzburg, where I had noticed geographical, but not the subtler class differences in German. When after this absence I suddenly heard characteristically A-class English speech I found it novel, interesting, thought-provoking. Whether such 'accents' are called beautiful, 'cissy' or affected, whether admired or hated, they characterise many A-class people at the summit of English society.

'Voice,' however, is usually accompanied by gestures (as anyone who has been disappointed by hearing a friend's voice on the radio will agree), posture and facial expression. Deliberately omitting gesture is an important 'negative gesture.' In what ways can these be socially useful? For some kinds of social mixing, certain facial expressions, gestures and postures are very desirable; some have a long, interesting history.

The particular patterns of total speech-behaviour which I have in mind make it possible, almost or entirely unconsciously, to show friendliness towards very different types of stranger. Like the semi-professional bonhomie of members of royal families, it was learned as a technique, but after some years it becomes functionally autonomous. In broaching or discussing matters likely to arouse strong emotion such 'manners' can be especially useful. Their absence is frequently noticeable in municipal councils, the members of which may have had no practice in exercising them.

In our society, such speech-behaviour is often useful in giving direction or commands. We may notice the assurance of many ex-public school boys who, after a time in the business world, now hold in middle age, positions of authority under the Government. Their 'manner' is often useful in carrying out the Chairman's function at meetings, as it seems suited to all parties. This is not surprising as it follows old traditions. It

can, however, be used as a velvet-coated bludgeon against opponents who lack a repertory of politely-offensive phrases.

How far today are these observations true of any country other than England? Would reading these remarks amuse or irritate an Australian or an American? If so, would this fact seem more serious to the English now than it did in 1939? Answers to such questions are probably desirable; one recalls the assertion that the way in which the English case was put in America in 1939 was hardly successful, one reason being the 'cissy' accents of some speakers. In the anti-democratic countries, Mussolini and Hitler encouraged a special kind of egalitarianism for their own purposes. William Shirer's account in *Berlin Diary* (201a) describes the fraternisation of Nazi officers with privates when off duty in Paris. American soldiers have expounded what seemed to me a complicated stylised fraternisation between officers and men in certain defined circumstances.

Certain emollient phrases, stereotyped as some of them must inevitably become, are useful in many social situations where difference of opinion is likely to be marked by warmth.

Signals of social stratification may affect the other senses less, yet among the rich and the very poor, olfactory stimuli are effective. Expensive, distinctive scents are widely bought and their alleged psychological effects discussed or suggested in some magazines. Perhaps the deliberate taboo upon scent by certain 'intellectual' (or at least scholastic) women is a class-sign cutting obliquely across other social strata. A preference for heavy scents perhaps marks off different nations rather than different classes. But dirtiness—in peace-time a class mark—may produce smells offensive even to egalitarians. Tactual signals of class need merely be mentioned; everyone knows the time and money spent in achieving and keeping softness of hands.

It is useful to recall Mrs. Barbara Wootton's division of prestige into three classes (233): (1) functional prestige—disappearing when the particular function is not being exercised (cf., a policeman on and off point-duty); (2) glamour prestige existing beyond the function in which the person is eminent (cf., popular interest in the views of a film-star upon the

physiological effects of a particular brand of cigarettes, of a famous athlete upon the conditions of world peace; (3) snob prestige, resulting merely from relationship (especially blood relationship) to a famous person.

Varieties (1) and (2) can exist without many of the outward and visible signs already mentioned; (3) I believe, cannot, except perhaps in the matter of clothes. Can a lord wear brown shoes with a blue suit? One used to, but he had functional prestige, widely accepted, gained by administrative success in public office.

We pass now to some class privileges. First, cultural. For a century to the rich, extensive travel has been possible and, in consequence, a wide range of enjoyment of music, art and literature. The B.B.C., Arts Council and similar institutions are now spreading this knowledge to others, and education in the Forces has developed better taste in these directions. Yet, until forty years ago, few of these cultural joys were possible outside the A and B classes.

About social privileges, volumes could be written, but I will select a few which seem of special psychological interest. One is the advantage of feeling unembarrassed in certain difficult situations. This is not necessarily synonymous with 'feeling at home.' An experienced private soldier when working with a superior officer, ought to feel unembarrassed since he knows the rules, but might not feel 'at home' with him when off duty, for many reasons, simple and complicated. I happened to travel on a cross-country journey in a train full of members of the Eighth Army going home on leave after returning from the North African campaign. By chance, the first stage was made in a compartment full of high-spirited 'other ranks.' At a junction, we all had to pile into the guard's van, which already contained several young officers. For many miles scarcely any soldier spoke at all and when the two groups separated the relief could be felt. I sometimes found myself in a railway compartment containing American 'other ranks' and one or two officers. The officers appeared embarrassed. It seems, therefore, that inferiority complexes are not the only kind aroused in such situations.

We pass now to the social stratification of English manners. Little seems to have been written about them, or indeed about manners in general from a purely psychological standpoint, except by R. H. Thouless (212). There are plenty of descriptions of our manners—and lack of them—by non-English observers, yet most of them confine their remarks to the members of some one, usually the richer, class; because it costs money to stay in England merely to write a book about its inhabitants. We badly need an account of the English working classes and perhaps more, of the poorer white-collared class* by an unprejudiced outside observer, psychologically trained.

In considering any codes of manners, especially English, it is important to distinguish between reciprocal and non-reciprocal obligations. Neglect of this often leads discussions wide of the mark. When the fighting services are cited as examples where stratification is necessary and accepted in order to get the job done, it is sometimes forgotten that the layers have reciprocal obligations, e.g. the private's salute must be 'returned' by a general, however inconvenient this may be. In civilian society, however, many obligations are non-reciprocal. The London waitress impresses foreigners by saying 'Kew!' for bringing food to the guest, who often enough does not express any thanks to her.

Different kinds of 'manners' are distinguishable. The first are those in which the 'good' or 'bad' 'behaver' is clearly aware of the salient details in his conduct, consciously directing it towards someone whose relations to him are clearly recognised, e.g. a private speaking to a captain†, an official greeting another ceremonially, a practised host entertaining a stranger from another country, a receptionist in an hotel or office. Here the movements may be as stylised as in a dance‡; Then there are habitual, semi-automatic manners (raising the hat, saluting, opening the door, saying 'please' and 'thank

* Dr. Margaret Mead suggested this to me.

† In the popular B.B.C. programme 'Much-Binding-in-the-Marsh,' the performers by speech alone, punctiliously preserve their former hierarchical relations in the R.A.F. Real appreciation of the humour often depends upon the listeners' grasp of this fact.

‡ Though friendly souls add personal touches.

you'). These are often rigidly selective, directed only towards the person who expects such attention. To the A and B classes the C and D classes do not seem to possess, or at any rate to use, many of these techniques. The question whether a majority desires them seems disputed. They involve the ability to discriminate and recognise the 'proper' situation and to set in action appropriate muscular patterns including, especially, speech.

Lastly, there is a category of manners arising from partly conscious, partly unconscious sources. The following are typical:

Showing special sympathy towards an ill, unfortunate, neurotic, shy or taciturn person, or one with consciously or unconsciously noted resemblance to a prototype to whom, in early life, the behaver felt affectionate, protective or dependent.

Showing antipathy; envy, jealousy of rank, wealth, clothes, beauty, youth or social technique, e.g. a woman who gets on well with her own sex may dislike or disapprove of one who is popular with men.

Exhibiting behaviour suggestive of inferiority-complexes. I know of no book in which Alfred Adler's theory is linked up with that of culture-patterns (cf. 24, 182, 186), though there is a hint of this in Dr. J. C. Flügel's *A Hundred Years of Psychology* (71; p. 295).

Exhibiting behaviour suggesting other complexes, more difficult to label; e.g. those inspiring 'untidy,' unpredictable conduct towards members of certain professions, such as the clergy, teachers, 'theatricals,' 'egg-heads,' 'high-brows,' 'low-brows' (the choice of name may suggest a complex in the user), Conservatives, Communists, etc. The effect of such a complex is that the sufferer cannot be naturally but only artificially polite and, therefore, may be unintentionally rude to people of a particular class. Ambivalence is one cause. This is true of some people's embarrassment towards Anglican, but not towards Nonconformist clergy. It is significant that in England Anglican, not Roman Catholic or dissenting, clergy are 'guyed' on the music halls; to a lesser degree now than a generation ago. The distinctive manners of the Society of Friends deserve a special study.

Let us examine the alleged advantages of some manners of the A and B-plus class. They are said to possess a wider repertoire of suitable phrases; to display correct discrimination of the situation in which these are useful, and greater graduation of the response. Some consider this as open to criticism. They hold that if such different manners are assumed only when the other person has been 'sized up,' it symbolises an undemocratic state of affairs which ought to be abolished. This is, of course, not a strictly psychological view. Other critics might hold that anyone who knew one of the other classes well could observe similar behaviour inside it.

So far, little comparison seems to have been made between the 'average' or 'typical' (these descriptions are not synonymous) manners of members of different English universities up to 1939. There may be special reasons for reluctance to describe and especially to compare them. Those who have spent time, money and energy in acquiring any special types of manner may not wish to mention them, still less to have them described or dissected. But people blessed with perfect teeth or first-class dentists may deprecate popular discussion of these subjects.

There are few published accounts of the social stratification inside the University of Oxbridge; even inside some of its colleges. Social stratification also exists among public schools and inside some of them. It is often claimed that a public school education produces a specially desirable blend of qualities which may be possessed singly or, in other blends, by boys from non-public schools.

I am prepared to take seriously the more restricted assertion that public schools produce in many boys a recognisable blend of characteristics. But difficulties arise: can we equate Eton with Rugby? Mr. Donald Hughes's *The Case for the Public Schools* describes the Leys, but is it typical? Some would smile at the phrase 'girls' public schools' but Dr. F. H. Spencer warns us that it is meant seriously. A candidate for a commission in the women's services before 1940 would probably have mentioned if she had been at Wycombe or Roedean, and anyhow her speech would obligingly have betrayed her. There appear to be few

articulate public-school women rebels to set alongside Cyril Connolly, George Orwell, Geoffrey Gorer or one half of Tom Harrisson.

The social stratification of the English university system—if it is a system—is well illustrated on school prize days. The Headmaster's speech, after the usual thanks for the pupils' freedom from contagious diseases, often mentions scholarships won to Oxbridge. Even if the local Redbrick University is a stone's throw away, its turn comes later. Almost invariably the principal is an Oxbridge graduate, a fact often blazoned in gold outside the school, and if not from Oxbridge, probably from Scotland; a good wine which needs, or at any rate gets no bush. It is usual for the head of a school in a Redbrick town to exert considerable pressure on a bright scholar to proceed to Oxbridge with state and municipal scholarships, and to importune authorities for extra grants for this purpose. The head of a Redbrick department may thus discover that for years he has been paying both taxes and rates to deflect, to an increasing degree, brilliant scholars from thirty miles around away from the local university.

Probably the headmaster or headmistress would assert that the amenities, the beauty and the wider ranks of society from which the Oxbridge students are drawn justify this. Both sides in this conversation would tactfully and tacitly agree not to compare the teaching; indeed, this would vary with the subject, and there is always a certain amount of to-ing and fro-ing of staff between Oxbridge and Redbrick. But do the students always find Oxbridge's undoubted cultural advantages available? Let me quote a letter from a university professor, distinguished as teacher and writer:

I went up to Oxbridge in 1925, to a small college chosen because it had the reputation of providing a university education as cheaply as possible. Fees were small and inclusive; there were not supposed to be many extras. On the economical side the college certainly lived up to its reputation. Undergraduates were well fed (breakfast, lunch and dinner in Hall), and reasonably though not luxuriously housed. But on the side of social and cultural life X was disappointing. The college stood some distance away from most of the others, and there was a general feeling of being rather out of the main stream of uni-

versity life. One was less likely to make as many interesting contacts as at some of the wealthier colleges. Of course, within the college there was a fair sprinkling of the more well-to-do, mainly from the lesser public schools, and I think these, together with the more outstanding athletes from secondary schools, dominated most of the college societies. They certainly mixed more easily with men from other colleges, largely through the athletic clubs, etc. In my time X was doing particularly well on the river, and the rowing men not only enjoyed a particular prestige within the college but tended to have easier access to university life outside X.

But at X there was probably a larger proportion of poorer men than at other colleges, men who had come to work and get a decent degree with the minimum of expense, and I think they all shared a feeling of not quite 'belonging' within the university as a whole. I was certainly in this group, from which all my friends were drawn. I think most of us felt a bit envious of the wider social life (or so it seemed) of members of other colleges and the more well-to-do men at X. We kept too much to ourselves. And I think we all missed the opportunity of mixing with members of the women's colleges. We couldn't afford expeditions on the river or social functions that demanded a dinner jacket. My first dinner jacket was one of the extravagances I was able to allow myself as a result of winning a handsome scholarship at the end of my second year. Incidentally, it was as a result of this windfall that I was able to join the Union. 'Union activities' are, of course, of little value in themselves (even then I could see that the debating society was an anachronistic joke, a hangover from the nineteenth century); but the Union has a good library and a good reading-room where I first acquired the habit of looking at the more expensive periodicals and the learned journals. None of my friends at X was a member of the Union.

Intellectually, X was a backwater. We were coached well enough for the practical purpose of making a decent class in the final examination and, of course, we attended university lectures. But within the college there was no 'current of fresh ideas,' and one was only rather dimly aware of what was going on in the larger world—in modern literature, for example, or even in politics and international relations. X, it is true, had an Intellectual Society, composed of dons and undergraduates, where papers were read and discussed; but it was largely dominated by the boat club, and to my chagrin, I was never invited to become a member, though men who a year or two later were to come to me for coaching got elected easily enough. And intellectually

stimulating contacts outside the college were rare. In my third year a supervisor at another college invited those of us who were his pupils to his literary 'evenings,' and we were glad to go; but on the whole one never seemed to come across the more interesting members, senior or junior, of other colleges. (It should be remembered that since most of us came from small secondary schools which only sent one or two boys to the university each year, we hadn't the ramifications of 'connexions' that boys from 'better' schools had). My impression is that very few men at X belonged to any of the intellectual societies within the university—though a large number belonged to the Student Christian Movement or to one of the other religious societies (I remember at least one stimulating meeting of the Industrial Christian Fellowship) and a smaller number belonged to the political clubs. (I think that at X the Conservative Club had the most members.) I should have liked to join the A's—a highbrow university society which did get interesting outside speakers and discuss interesting topics; but first of all, lack of money and then the fact that I didn't know anyone who belonged prevented me from joining.

The result of all this was that those of us with latent intellectual interests tended to form a little band that was much more limited, undeveloped and so to speak 'provincial' than it would have been with just a little more stimulus or a little more cross-fertilisation. Looking back, I can see that some of the obstacles to a fuller university life were by no means insuperable. It is true that when you have to debate anxiously before buying a book not strictly necessary for 'work', even a five shilling subscription to a society looks like a luxury. But I think the obstacles were not so much economic as moral. We tacitly accepted the assumption that the college was of inferior status, and since we plainly weren't of the boating or athletic aristocracy within the college, there was nothing for it but to keep our noses down to the grindstone. And no contrary suggestion—no suggestion that we should raise our heads, look around and sniff a fresher air—was forthcoming within the college either from the dons or from any undergraduate tradition. We did get some education, and we educated each other a bit, but because of the cramped intellectual quarters in which we lived, we certainly didn't benefit from our undergraduate years as we might have done.

Bruce Truscott's *Redbrick University* (216a) and its sequels, have, not surprisingly, caused useful discussion which may have noticeable results upon the minds of members of post-war

committees concerned with university education. Before these books appeared, however, I was fortunate enough to have entrusted to me, for publication in any way I thought desirable, an article comparing the 'culture-patterns' of Oxbridge and Redbrick by a woman who had recently studied at both types of institution. She will here be called Miss Bodley (the choice of this name gives no clue). By the omission of distinctive detail—though this weakens the presentation—I have disguised the actual old and new university in each case. Nothing has been added. The writer was up at Oxbridge from 1939–1942, at Redbrick 1942–43; all war years, it should be noted. The observation is by one person as, incidentally, most social descriptions have been until lately. (Miss Bodley's paper extends from here to the middle of page 233, and is followed by comments by a woman graduate who was up at Cambridge in 1949).

Three fundamental factors largely determine the culture-pattern of Oxbridge University and thereby differentiate it from that of Redbrick; they are tradition, the residential nature of the university and the environment. These factors do not exert independent influences, but at all times co-operate with and reinforce each other, forming a pattern of such complex ramifications that it is often impossible to trace back any one feature directly to its origin.

In any study of the university life at Oxbridge, a tradition of some eight hundred years cannot be lightly ignored. It predetermines many of the students' attitudes and customs through having endowed the university with a national and international prestige; it accounts for much of the academic routine and obligations, and embodied in the historical buildings and age-old associations, it is permanently with the student.

Established, endowed and honoured by royalty, the university, up to the middle of the nineteenth century, served the aristocracy. They responded with a high respect for its learning and regarded it both as the centre for higher education and as a social finishing school for recruits for political and diplomatic circles.

Since then, the middle classes, rising on the tide of industrial pros-

perity, have tended to make wealth the condition for entrance. This, combined with the residential nature of the university, has established a tradition of high fees and expenses. This again necessarily limits the chances of entrance to students from the upper and middle classes. It has also given the title of B.A. Oxon or Cantab. a caste value out of all proportion to its significance as the achievement of a certain minimum standard of knowledge. But it would be quite unjustified to conclude from this traditional privilege granted to the possessors of wealth that the intellectual standards of the university have suffered. In a society based on a capitalistic economic system, like that as existing in England today, wealth and intellectual ability must to a great extent exist together. The one is often the precondition to the other.

Tradition, environment and its residential nature all combine to foster an intense group consciousness, the outstanding feature in the cultural-pattern of Oxbridge. The civic buildings are completely overshadowed by the world-famous colleges, chapels and libraries.

Redbrick University, on the other hand, has not this national position. It is essentially a local institution with a provincial status. It was established and financed not by members of the royal family but by wealthy and influential citizens for the purpose of providing higher education for the youth of the locality.

One of the largest cities in the country, one of the leading trading centres in the world, Redbrick can only allow its university a position equal to those enjoyed by other civic associations. Tradition and historical associations are influences to be found in the economic and social life of the city, not centred in the university. The connections between city and university are intimate and numerous, since, being non-residential, university life, city life and the home life of the students constantly intermingle and are largely inter-dependent. The absence of any traditional high level of fees has opened its educational opportunities to most classes of men and women, and although the university cannot secure as firm a group consciousness as exists in Oxbridge, it does in the long run serve to build up the group consciousness and civic pride of the locality.

A *residential* university such as Oxbridge entails from the

student an almost complete severance with home and family life and their parochial associations. Each college is a unit of residence as well as a unit of education, and even if the student lives in lodgings, the presence of a hereditary landlady-class carries the college and university environment within the urban area.

Group consciousness, therefore, is not limited within strictly educational boundaries but extends over all the activities enjoyed throughout the day and night. Given a certain amount of observance of college and university rules, the authorities allow the student the maximum independence. He is not allowed to do no work at all, but beyond this his time is at his own disposal.

The *non-residential* nature of Redbrick University tends to give an entirely different form of student life. Most of its students are accustomed to the routine of day-school life, and the pattern of their university follows closely along these lines. The standards of the home and of the city life tend to have more influence on the student than that of his university, since many of the students will spend the rest of their lives in the district, and so home and city associations will be accepted as permanent.

Because of this, there is no clearly definable group consciousness attached to the members of the university, which maintains a somewhat precarious balance between the conflicting attitudes and values arising from family and urban life and the obligations due to these. Environment exerts a constant pressure on the students' life. The bustle and stir of everyday urban life eddies round the student all day; he comes to his daily lectures by tram, bus or train and returns by them in the evening. Once at home, the student may find his time pre-occupied with family duties and obligations and he may have few facilities for continuing his studies peacefully. University life stops about six o'clock at night, and there are no college libraries open at night as at Oxbridge. At week-ends there is an almost complete cessation of university life.

Group consciousness at Oxbridge is reinforced by such external bonds as the wearing of academic dress by all students and senior members of the university. The cap and gown is a symbol of membership of the group and this is strengthened by the colourful and dignified academic ceremonies and traditional customs. The presentation of degrees, the procession of the Vice-Chancellor in his robes of office to the university sermon, the nightly progress of the proctors and

'bulldogs' round the town—all these may have little utilitarian value but they inspire a communal sense and stress the unity of the group. The possession by each student of a room of his own with the time honoured privileges of 'sporting his oak' ensures a high degree of peace and privacy, and the absence of daily contact with adult values and standards, coupled with the independence he is granted means that the student has the time, place and encouragement to assimilate and appreciate the meaning and purpose of the university.

A group consisting of young people, given the favourable circumstances which exist at Oxbridge, tends to possess certain characteristics which play vital parts in shaping the culture pattern. Among such a group, students will be more ready to adjust their values, habits and attitudes which they have acquired at home or school to those prevailing within the group. There is a strong desire to identify oneself with the group.

This can be seen most clearly in the behaviour of the new student who is possessed by a fear of being isolated by the common attitude of scorn and criticism towards a 'mere fresher.' So great is this fear that, despite his self-conscious pride in his new gown hanging in stiff folds, he is driven to rubbing it in the dust under his bed, or using it to draw his fire up or tie his books in, until it has achieved the desired appearance of honourable age and neglect. The characteristics of the public school are largely maintained and further developed in the culture pattern of Oxbridge. Like the schoolboy, the undergraduate enjoys defying authority, and every student is acquainted with the secret after-midnight exits and entrances to his college and with the skilled technique necessary for manœuvring revolving spikes and eight-foot drops. Night Climbers' Clubs are illustrations of the undergraduate's desire to dignify what are originally only schoolboy escapades.

In the same way, the habits and clichés of the school playing field and debating society find their fullest expression in the athletic and political circles of the university. Many of the features of the culture-pattern are derived from the public school, owing to the arrested development of the adolescent which is the heritage of English youth. This characteristic of retarded adolescence is greatly encouraged by the students' sheltered existence and by the wide tolerance with which they are treated by the authorities. For three years the student can pursue all his whims and fancies; he can get drunk, and next day's hangover is considered to be sufficient punish-

ment; he can read for Honours or a pass degree; he can run through every affectation known even to X College; he can be sober and serious, or flippant, but if he persists in defying authority he will be sent down, or if he persists in defying public opinion he will be 'debagged' or thrown in the river.

These childish and naïve characteristics are created fundamentally both from the sheer delight in the unusual freedom of life and from ignorance of its true meaning. This is a side to university life which hardly exists at Redbrick. There is, of course, not the same amount of independence. Sheer high spirits and zest for life are hampered from finding or creating any pattern of expression by the restraining influence of the presence of adult values.

The conversation of Redbrick students is on the whole very much more practical, simple and honest than that of Oxbridge undergraduates, but the lack of a coherent and permanent group life does not allow for any opportunity for studying 'the art of conversation.' This has been over-ridiculed in connection with both Oxford and Cambridge undergraduates, but it must not be overlooked, because it does exist and it is an important feature.

The nature of the university is such that it encourages and fosters the mutual exchange of ideas and thoughts. Young people find more stimulus and enjoyment in discussing various problems and subjects with their own contemporaries than with those of an older generation; and when they share a communal life and have the facilities for entertaining friends in their own rooms, it is not surprising that the nights are spent in putting the world right. Oxbridge students, therefore, have few inhibitions in conversing, and generally possess after their three years a fairly extensive if not very profound intimacy with all subjects. But there is also the tendency to pursue the art of conversation for its own sake, and to use phrases and terms for the sake of their air of elegance only. A great deal of futile conversation goes on which gives an impression of hypocrisy and superficiality.

Among Redbrick students, conversation is generally limited to academic 'shop' and university matters. Political and religious arguments are pursued with great intensity but their value is seriously diminished by the lack of any place in which a quiet discussion can be conducted. There are no coffee shops or tea shops close enough

to the university to justify their monopolisation by the students, whereas in Oxbridge coffee at eleven is part of the daily routine. The general environment also is responsible for these differences in conversational technique and equally for certain differences in the political and social attitudes of the students. The peace and beauty of a moonlight night on the Cher or the Cam inevitably call forth the desire to ponder over the problems of philosophy or art. City slums at night stimulate only the fiercest socialistic, if not anarchistic, beliefs. Oxbridge undergraduates, therefore, will tend to be conservative in their attitudes towards society, though only a minority crystallise this tendency into political form.

Politically minded students of Redbrick will tend towards the Left rather than to the Right. Wealth, unfortunately perhaps, does play an important part in forming the average Oxbridge student's habits and behaviour.

He has no standard by which to value money, for unless he is up on a scholarship, the money he spends has not been earned by him, and there is no daily reminder of the implications of this fact by his parents. Money, therefore, slips rapidly through the student's fingers, because for the first time he is surrounded with every facility for indulging in all his whims and desires. There are shops catering specifically for the student, wherein tradition is more punctiliously worshipped than anywhere else in the university. Here the student is reminded that he is a 'gentleman,' and as such is entitled to the privilege of running up accounts.

The college servants all help in impressing on him the relation between wealth and social prestige by means of their traditional end-of-term tips—one 'scout-gyp' even referring to the students on his staircase as 'five bobbers,' 'ten-bobbers,' or 'quidders.' He proportioned the amount and quality of his services accordingly.

The student can spend his money easily and often unwisely by being attracted by the daring extravagance of the wealthier minority. He follows the fashions they set in dress; scorns the blue suit for gaily coloured corduroys and learns that bowler hats are never worn, trilbies very rarely and that tweed caps are reserved for hunting and racing men. Public opinion favours individuality in dress, especially a studied shabbiness and carelessness, but the extremes of sober respectability and exaggerated foppishness only arouse amusement.

The attitude towards drink is also largely the effect of tradition based on wealth. The college cellars have been famous for generations for their unique collections of wines and special ales, since the authorities, apart from consideration for their own pleasure, regard a knowledge of wines as part of a gentleman's education. The dons at High Table, therefore, set the standard, and it is encouraged by the balls, suppers and college dinners. At the college buttery a student may purchase his drink, and only when his bill assumes alarming proportions is the buttery door closed to him. Even then, some public houses will still serve him.

Persistent drunkenness, however, is not tolerated either by the authorities or by student public opinion. It is an unwritten law that anyone may get drunk on certain 'agreed' nights, celebrating boat races, the end of examinations, and passing (or failing) finals. At all other times he is expected to exercise discretion. Drinking is very much more common at Oxbridge than at Redbrick, probably because the entertainment of one's friends is a more constant social obligation in a residential university. There is also greater variety in the types of drinking, ranging from beer at a riverside inn after punting, to elegant sherry or punch parties.

Membership of many of the clubs in Oxbridge also entails a fairly high financial outlay, but the most expensive ones are deliberately so in order to preserve their class exclusiveness and, therefore, appeal only to the wealthy minority. Nevertheless, the cheapest dramatic society in Oxbridge demands a guinea a year and five shillings entrance fee from its members as compared with the half-crown subscription at Redbrick.

The day to day expenses of a Redbrick student receive no encouragement to amount to any large sum. There is no very strong competitive incentive to spend money exclusively on clothes or on entertaining. The fact that few students possess a room of their own, with complete freedom to bring friends in at any time, explains much of the limited social life of the university. The social life of the Oxbridge student depends greatly on the spirit of competition in setting new standards in sherry parties, 'bottle parties' and river picnics—so much so that one popular student confessed to his tutor that he would have to fail his exams rather than lose his reputation as a good host.

Although today students from public schools have conceded the position of majority to those from secondary schools, the 'pattern'

still owes many of its features to the public school, and so to upper-class influence. It will be a long time before they are eliminated. It is an upper-class characteristic which is revealed in the presence in Oxbridge of juvenile reproductions of certain West End Clubs in London. The fact that cricket is the pre-eminent university sport has a similar origin. At Redbrick there appears to be an annual difficulty in raising a good cricket team, but their rugger teams have a high consistent standard. Cricket has very strong aristocratic associations. Although it is called the national sport it has been largely preserved by the upper classes and by those rural areas in which upper class tradition is embedded (Cf. 32). Rugger on the other hand has earned the popularity of the middle and lower classes; it is a sport more in tune with urban life, which finds cricket too slow and subtle.

Voice and accent among the students suggest other illustrations of class influences. The Oxbridge accents have degenerated into a music-hall joke—but, as with many other traditions, they are still alive today.

It is true that you can find some of the same accents in any public school—it is a distinct characteristic of the upper class. It is a form of intonation created for the expression of those thoughts, attitudes and sentiments attributed to the upper class. It has exaggerated vowel sounds and a bored lazy intonation because of the tendency of the average upper class person to inhibit his emotions, understate his thoughts and preserve immobile features.

At Redbrick there exists a preponderance of Northern accents which in style are appropriate to the pragmatic, less self-conscious and less subtle character of the lower middle class. The Oxbridge undergraduate is not demonstrative, therefore when conversing he may give an impression of studied effect—any gesture he uses will be schooled into an apparent ease. The Redbrick student thinks only of what he is saying, not of how he is saying it. Because of his secluded and free life the Oxbridge student has the opportunity of standing apart and seeing himself as a being. This is of tremendous educational value when it is achieved or used with a purpose, but for many students it entails a preliminary period of sheer self-consciousness. This is evident even in their conversation; all the 'hot air' which undergraduates pour out is an indication of this awareness of their own personalities. This is not in such great evidence at Redbrick. There

the student is never given such unconditional personal and mental freedom as exists at Oxbridge—it is no platitude to say that 'he has no time to stand and stare.' Thus his conversation is more limited, more realistic, more aggressive and less pleasing to the ear. He does not listen to himself as he speaks, does not see himself.

At Redbrick the women students are on an equal footing with the men and there is no incentive towards forming a purely feminine group. Possibly this explains the differences in the male undergraduate's attitude towards the women in the two universities. These class differences which have been observed at Oxbridge in the pattern created by the men students are not so marked in the case of the women. But, in comparison with Redbrick, there does exist an upper class minority among the women.

Although the condition for entrance at Oxbridge is intellectual ability rather than wealth, yet the fact that the women's colleges are residential implies that only those of the upper and middle classes can afford to compete. At Redbrick, however, cheaper fees and the non-residential nature of the university allows women of nearly all classes to compete for entrance.

At Oxbridge the residential life allows for a greater degree of co-operation between the men and women over a wider range of interests than at Redbrick. There are time and place for achieving mutual friendships of an enduring quality. At Redbrick time and place are divided between home and university life. Friendship between the two sexes is largely regulated by the standards and values of the home, and in determining the pattern of their children's university, parents play a very much more intimate part than they are probably aware. Friendship between the men and women at Redbrick tends to be based upon common interests in work or upon purely social grounds. Conversation between the two sexes is nearly always limited to discussions on work, university gossip or politics. Here again, this is partly the result of having nowhere to talk and the general influence of the environment. The beautiful surroundings of Oxbridge inevitably encourage romantic and sentimental attitudes, and a tendency towards forming platonic friendships, which would not survive for long in the severe realism of the environment at Redbrick. Also at Redbrick there is no strong majority of upper-class students whose class-culture tends to foster æsthetic and philo-

sophic sentiments. The Redbrick students often prefer to choose women friends from outside the university, and it is noticeable that at dances their partners are not women students, but the more smartly dressed and attractive girls from among home acquaintances.

At Oxbridge, however, there is a sharp cleavage between town and university, and it is not considered 'correct' to bring 'town' girls to a university dance—daughters of dons or of important local residents, of course, excepted.

It is possible, therefore, to see the reason for the attitude of familiarity breeding contempt at Redbrick. When the men and women do meet on friendly terms it is usually at lunch time or tea time in a room which is crowded and noisy, and when time is limited either by lectures or the necessity to catch a bus or train. It is an enforced familiarity, and not a spontaneous friendship.

Upper class standards and customs tend to determine the general behaviour between men and women students at Oxbridge and their attitudes towards each other. The man is expected to be polite and courteous to the woman and 'social graces' are considered to be part and parcel of their general education. Social etiquette of this kind is not nearly as prevalent among the Redbrick students. Their rough and tumble daily routine partly explains this, also the absence of any dominating upper class standards. The communal social life almost entirely consists of faculty dances or 'hops', and the general behaviour between the sexes is less mature than is the tendency at Oxbridge. The use of the word 'girl-friend' or 'boy-friend' is very common in the conversation of Redbrick students. The woman students refer to their opposites as 'the boys' and are in turn called 'those girls'. An Oxbridge woman student is much more likely to refer to 'the men' she knows, and the words 'boy' or 'girl' are usually used in a derogatory sense. This difference in behaviour and attitude between the two sexes is the result of many factors; wealth, home life, environment, group consciousness. It may also be due to the fact that at Redbrick there are no adult standards and opinions strong enough to compete with those of the students' parents.

There is very little opportunity at Redbrick for the student to mix with the senior members of the university. His tutor is often to him merely another type of schoolmaster to whom work must be submitted and whose lectures have to be attended.

Compulsory lectures are too akin to school lessons to mean much

more to the average student. He tends to regard them as an evil necessity and behaves during them rather as he did at school. Compulsory lectures, by the way, in many faculties are the only academic reasons why students should appear at the university at all. If lectures were not compulsory, many students would work at home and appear once a week to change their books at the university library.

Contact between dons and students at Oxbridge is necessarily facilitated by the residential nature of the university, and the tutor's advice can be sought on non-academic matters. Undergraduates tend to go to lectures in order not to take down a list of facts but to hear a certain lecturer's point of view. Very often students of one faculty will go to hear lectures in another faculty simply because the lecturer is well-known and his lecture will be stimulating. Note-taking during lectures, especially among art students, is rather regarded as a habit peculiar only to women students and 'freshers'—both by the students and by the lecturers. Undergraduates at Oxbridge tend to have an attitude of respect towards the senior members—the result of tradition which has endowed the older universities with a hereditary line of professors of international standing. The research work of each professor, his or her thesis or latest publication, is always of personal, as well as of group, interest to the student. The coffee parties, sherry parties and informal discussion groups held by the dons in their rooms for students are a marked feature in the undergraduates' life.

On the other hand, the average Redbrick student who does not live in either the men's or women's hostels tends to form his opinion of his professor entirely from his contact with him in lectures or tutorials.

To these accounts there is perhaps little to add, except to mention the effect of social differences, not only between colleges in Oxbridge but sometimes in the same college; and not unnaturally, the Oxbridge *esprit de corps*, extending to material as well as spiritual matters. When an important post is to be filled in some Redbrick universities, there may occur an unconcealed and unashamed coagulation of an 'Oxford (or Cambridge) Group' already on the Redbrick staff. This habit, less strong now than twenty-five years ago, has weakened but not died away. Whether it is desirable will not be discussed here.

Connected with this by superficial and deeper links, is the fact

that sometimes a code of manners, developed in adjustment to the special residential life of an Oxbridge college, is not only brought to Redbrick unchanged, but is applied to social contacts, even outside universities, for the rest of the graduate's life. This stylisation—not confined to men—does not always make for general popularity. Examples are avoidance of spoken greetings, often of visible signs of recognition when meeting or passing a colleague, closure of conversation by the sudden unheralded departure of the interlocutor, or by his taking up a book or paper, as soon as he has obtained the information he desired, or ceased to be interested in the answer. This causes the person's tempo, seen from the standpoint of others, to appear rather jerky. Occasionally, too, there seems to be a tendency, when asked a question, not to answer except in disagreement. Perhaps on the whole Cambridge graduates prefer to discuss facts; Oxonians, views and opinions. This was asserted by one of England's most famous anthropologists about 1917, and I have seldom seen reason to disbelieve it since then. The increasing importance of the sciences at Oxford will probably blur this difference.

A circumstance favourable to observations of this kind is that Redbrick staffs usually contain a high percentage of Oxbridge and Scottish graduates. Interesting and occasionally unpredictable cultural changes can often be observed in a Scottish student who has been subsequently worked upon by Oxbridge.

As Miss Bodley notes, Redbrick students often lack satisfactory relationships with the teaching staff. The reasons given by her are cogent, and in certain Redbrick universities, there may be a specially powerful one, the local tradition of not appearing to ingratiate oneself with the authorities. This is carried to the university from the schools. It arises, not necessarily out of antagonism, but because any personal approach to a member of the staff may be regarded by other students as toadying. My impression is that the attitude grew much more marked between the wars.

It may be maintained that the Redbrick universities described by writers are apt to be Northern, and the characteristics assigned to them are really Northern peculiarities, but since

there are three in the South, a different picture might be drawn of these. This possibility is freely conceded.

The chief defect of Redbrick students seems to be the absence of a virtue which Miss Bodley attributes to many Oxbridge undergraduates. Except in certain individuals at Redbrick there is a regrettable lack of ability for urbane, polite discussion, of the kind which not only does not antagonise the *vis-à-vis*, but increases friendliness between the conversers. Among students, there is plenty of discussion, but its technique seems suited only to the students themselves.

Debates are shunned by the best-informed students, especially by experts upon the particular subject debated. In the students' magazines of some Redbrick universities the debates are reported with sarcasm, cynical gloom and quinine-like bitterness; this scarcely encourages any but pachydermatous extraverts to take part in them. Even at Oxbridge, however, the average student does not speak in or even attend debates. The influence of the Oxford Union is certainly double-edged, and it leans heavily for support upon the London press and the B.B.C.

I now add comments upon Miss Bodley's description, kindly furnished by a woman graduate who was at Cambridge in 1949. These were sent in note form and have been extended by me into sentences, without alteration in sense. (It should be remembered that Miss Bodley wrote of 'Oxbridge'.)

(1) (Aristocracy, up to the middle of the 19th century, regarded Cambridge as the centre for higher education, and a social finishing school for recruits for political and diplomatic circles.) 'There has always been a large proportion of poor, often under-privileged, often local East Anglian students, especially before the 19th century and the rise of the modern public school.'

(2) (A residential university such as Oxbridge entails the student's almost complete severance with home family life and their parochial associations—even if he lives in lodgings, the presence of a hereditary landlady-class carries the college

and university environment within the urban area.) 'What about married undergraduates?'

(3) (The possession by each student of a room of his own with the time-honoured privileges of 'sporting his oak' ensures a high degree of privacy.) 'Sharing rooms because of over-crowded conditions?'

(4) (Joy in defying authority, after-midnight exits and entrances to colleges, night-climbers' clubs, etc.) 'Influence of older and ex-service men leaves such exploits to a small minority.'

(5) (Cricket the pre-eminent university sport.) 'Rowing and rugger are probably equals of cricket.'

(6) (Oxbridge residential life allows for greater co-operation between men and women over a wider range of interests than at Redbrick.) 'But the unbalanced ratio of women to men undergraduates means that only a small proportion of men know any women students well.'

(7) (In comparison with Redbrick, there exists an upper class minority among the women.) 'Probably there is a higher proportion of wealthy upper-class undergraduates in women's colleges, than in the university as a whole.'

(8) (At Redbrick the general behaviour between the sexes is less mature than at Oxbridge.) 'At Cambridge there is plenty of very adolescent discussion of sex, etc.'

(9) (Note-taking during lectures, especially among arts students, is regarded as a habit peculiar only to women student and freshers—both by the students and by the lecturers.) 'Methodical note-taking is now a general habit.'

(10) (Oxbridge undergraduates tend to have an attitude of respect towards the senior members—the research work of each professor, his or her latest publication, is always of personal interest to the student. The coffee parties, sherry parties and informal discussion groups held by the dons in their rooms for

students are a marked feature in the undergraduate's life.) 'Most Cambridge undergraduates feel strongly that they do not have enough contact with dons. 'X' College, where dons and undergraduates really mix, is exceptional. In other colleges, the increased numbers of students and the pressure on the dons make the attitude to senior members more like that in Redbrick.'

(11) (On the present writer's remark: 'at Oxbridge, the average student does not speak in or even attend debates,') the Cambridge graduate comments: 'The Cambridge Union depends for debates on a small group in political clubs, regarded as cliques by many members of the Union, who never speak, rarely attend debates, but use the club facilities. The majority of undergraduates never even belong to the Union, which does not play any central part in university life.'

In connexion with the difference between debates and realistic discussion, perhaps I may be allowed to quote from a letter of mine published in the *Manchester Guardian* on September 1st, 1943:

The authors of the Norwood Report, 'Curriculum and Examination in Secondary Schools,' emphasise that the expression of thought in speech is socially important:

> It happens too often that little stress is laid upon oral expression as a means of developing ease in social relationship . . . such practice and facility in expressing thoughts aloud in the presence of others as will lead to some degree of confidence and at least the appearance of ease of manner (page 94).
>
> It is not clear why only pupils in grammar schools should enjoy such benefits as can be conferred by training in speech . . . it seems incontrovertible that the primary schools cannot divest themselves of responsibility (page 96).

These words are timely. Members of the staffs in some secondary schools, too, may wish that more of their pupils, if spared a little time from the excessive concentration upon writing essays which have 'created in the minds of many pupils an unnatural habit of thought and expression,' could develop, through group conversation, greater ease and effectiveness in

social relationships. To make the machinery of a democratic community more efficient—and this means increasing government by committees—we must offer direct training in the techniques of discussion. These are quite unlike the pyrotechnic skills used in debating 'both sides' of a question, previously mangled flat by its framers. Social problems are usually polyhedral. To solve them requires the amicable exchange and re-exchange of views guided by constructive aims.

'Expressing thoughts aloud in the presence of others' ought to be influenced by the awareness that the hearers may hold different views; to be expressed and respected later. The light frolics or heavy sparring of the debating society, though they may occasionally alleviate the term's seriousness, involve methods of another kind. As many successful debaters honestly acknowledge, the game is too easy, and success goes to the head. Have not Ministers been reproved for attempts to make mere debating points on serious issues in Parliament? Too frequent debates inculcate habits and attitudes which often are not shaken off till middle age, if then. The clever speaker for his side, when his school "challenges" another to a debate (note the implications), may become the ligneous type of M.P. who pains even his own party. He is not always a Blimp, or lovable.

The plea is often made that debates are fun, they stir up interest in a dull subject, allow the play of English humour, and encourage speakers who otherwise might blush unseen. One may reply (in no debating mood) that this kind of fun is often double-edged, "funny" subjects being occasionally tragic to the minority, that the very wording of a question for debate can be used to ridicule the subject publicly, that group discussion also encourages interest and humour, often of a higher grade, and that shy speakers enter more readily into honest discussion. Experts can rarely be persuaded to debate their subject in public with those who know little of it, and, for obvious reasons, a subject which seems dull to one class may interest another.

The signatories of the report are to be thanked for hauling down to earth the unattached adjective "English," which has been dragging its cables too long. English speech is a form of social

behaviour. To acknowledge this officially by changing examination requirements would offer the schools new opportunities for making responsible citizens.'

When the greater part of this chapter was written, there were few, if any, published reports of inquiries into the influence of social stratification on English education, and the far-reaching results of the 1944 Education Act are still too complex to be envisaged as a whole, but recently several sociologists have cast light on this subject. In a paper presented to the 1953 Liége Congress of the International Sociological Association Mrs. Jean E. Floud, Dr. F. M. Martin and Mr. A. H. Halsey reported an investigation of 'Equality of Educational Opportunity and Social Status in Britain' (66). (A fuller account will appear in a book by them: *Educational and Social Mobility—Social Factors at the Secondary Stage*, to be published soon.)

This investigation forms part of a wider programme of research into social stratification. It is reported in *Social Mobility in Britain*, edited by Professor D. V. Glass (81). As the *Year-Book of Education* for 1950 and 1953 is entirely devoted to the sociology of education, the reader may be referred to these volumes for further information relevant to the present chapter.

Floud, Martin and Halsey conclude that during the half century that has elapsed since the passing of the 1922 Education Act, considerable advance has been made towards the achievement of equality of opportunity at the secondary stage of English education. Their inquiry clearly illustrated the national trend. They chose for their field of research the Educational Division of S.W. Hertfordshire in 1952.

At the turn of the century, 11 per cent of the pupils at the Watford Boys' Grammar School in that area were the sons of manual workers; fifty years later, the corresponding proportion was 43 per cent. The most marked increase in the representation of working-class children has taken place since 1945.

Investigations carried out not less than twenty years ago revealed a very substantial volume of unused ability in English primary schools. 'Today, if we were to employ—as did the earlier investigators—the intelligence test as our criterion, we

might confidently assert that at any rate in S.W. Hertfordshire all children capable of profiting from a Grammar School education in fact receive such education. If Grammar School places were awarded on the basis of measured intelligence only, there would be no increase in the representation of working-class children.'

However, it might be misleading to assume that the estimate of educable capacity which the intelligence test provides is itself entirely free from social bias. . . . It seems highly probable that both the capacity to handle verbal material, and the neglected but important factor of motivation in the test situation are alike influenced by the child's social and cultural background.

The area studied has been particularly susceptible to measures of educational reform. Regional variations, however, are considerable, and elsewhere—particularly in the industrial North—there are still, no doubt, fairly gross obstacles hindering the attainment of equality of opportunity. . . . But it would be naïve to expect that any way of by-passing the individual's life history is likely to be discovered . . . perhaps just because (such ways) draw to some extent upon the individual's past experience, and give a very efficient prediction of success in the Grammar School. From the point of view of social mobility it may be more germane to inquire whether the present structure of secondary education provides the best possible means of fostering all grades and types of ability at all social levels.

To assert that 'home environment' has considerable influence on a child's educational progress seems to state the obvious, yet in such general terms the sentence may mean little. As W. J. Campbell shows (*36a*), the evidence presented by previous research is far from conclusive. Many workers have reported negative results. But few investigators have attempted to make objective assessments: most attention has been concentrated on the socio-economic status of the home, and other aspects have been largely neglected. As Sir Cyril Burt writes (*34*). 'Social surveys in this country have hitherto been limited chiefly to economic conditions and the material standards of life. The social attitudes, ideals and behaviour of different groups

are barely touched upon.' He suggests that investigators ought to consider not only the influence of an unfavourable, but of a good environment. When one studies the failures among those who were selected for grammar schools and the oversights among those who were not selected, not a few mistakes, it is seen, might have been avoided had the child's social environment been taken into account.

Campbell investigated four groups of twenty-five children from the London County Council area; (failures and oversights in the sense of the above paragraph) and two groups of correctly placed children. Data were obtained from three sources: (1) an informal interview with each child; (2) a number of short tests; (3) a visit to each of the homes. The investigator was interested in (a) the social activities in the home (b) the 'cultural objects' noticed there (c) the parents' own cultural values and attitudes. Of 100 parents written to, all but one invited him to visit the home and to discuss with them the system of education in the child's school. The data obtained strongly confirm the suggestion that home environment affects secondary school achievement. He concludes that the most satisfactory course of (short-range) action is to create closer co-operation between schools and parents.

The relation between education and social mobility has been studied by A. H. Halsey and L. Gardner (93). They state that the very high incidence of early leaving in some Grammar Schools has been shown, in the main, to be a problem of social class. Closely related to social class are the chances of allocation to a Grammar School at the borderline range of intelligence. It is not difficult to believe that at any rate with the social strata related as they are at present, middle class pupils are rated higher than working-class pupils on popularity, good behaviour and manners and, despite the 1944 Education Act, a boy has a greater chance of entering a Grammar School if he comes from a middle class rather than a working class home. The working-class boys confess less interest in extra-curricular activities organised by the school. The length of school life preferred by the boy and (according to him) by his parents is shorter, the lower his social level and the larger his family.

The evidence suggests that the middle-class rather than the working class boy, and the boy from the small family rather than the large is better equipped in his attitudes and family background to take full advantage of education in a Grammar School and thus to set out on a career leading to an occupation of high social prestige.

I end by expressing full agreement with Professor Brogan's opinion (32):

'Politically England is a democracy, perhaps the most mature democracy in the world. But democracy is not merely a matter of government—it is an attitude to life. And England will not be a full, or anything like a full, democracy as long as one of the kindliest and most united peoples in the world is internally divided in a fashion that impoverishes the national life.'

CHAPTER ELEVEN

*Social Differences in Leisure Pursuits**

Definitions of 'sport' and 'sporting.' Social psychologists' lack of interest in the study of sport here and in America. The part played in English life by sports and games. Attention given to them by Press, cinema and radio. The place of the professional, and of the spectators. The cost of different sports and games: recent changes. Sports of the upper and upper middle classes, and of schools and universities. Racing: the place of the horse in society. Hunting; stags and foxes. Shooting and fishing. Ball games. Cricket, football, association and Rugby (Union and League). The 'partial eclipse of soccer.' Tennis, hockey, golf. Athletics, motor cycling, boxing, wrestling, winter sports, water sports. The social significance of leisure pursuits today.

AN English dictionary provides several different definitions of sport; some of those are 'class-implicated.' 'Unsporting' may be applied to a person who does not play certain games, but especially to one who breaks or ignores the code of a particular group, stratum, class, or even nation. Though, when used today, the phrase 'It's not cricket' is generally meant to be facetious, at times it is still intended seriously. Significantly, the working classes do not use the phrase ironically if at all: they are interested in cricket much less than football. The middle and upper-middle classes include many people who take cricket seriously, and when playing scrupulously observe its code, but if they have read D. B. Wyndham-Lewis, Hubert Phillips, Timothy Shy and Dogberry of the *News Chronicle* and A. G. Macdonnell on this theme would laugh at any assumption that it is often transferred to other social situations; e.g. in modern warfare.

A 'sportsman' may be 'a person fond of hunting, shooting and fishing' (the dictionary-makers of 1926 may never have foreseen that all these words would some day be spoken in amused 'quotes,' even by those who were once described as 'indulging' in these pastimes.)

* Amplified from a paper read to the British Psychological Society on 21 October, 1953. I gratefully acknowledge help from Mrs. Pamela Holland-Gems, who contributed many sections, and to several issues of *Contact*.

'A good sport' usually refers to someone who resembles the speaker or exemplifies his ideals. Yet even in cricket and 'rugger'—two of the most sporting of games—serious differences of opinion can arise about sporting behaviour, the 'body-line bowling' controversy being an example, though there have been recent ones in both games.

The concept of 'sportsmanship' gave rise to Stephen Potter's playfully satirical broadcasts and writings on 'Gamesmanship.' They were usually enjoyed most by gamesmen of the upper and middle classes.

In recent writings on social psychology, in England and America, games and their functions in the life of the ordinary person are seldom mentioned. This fact is psychologically interesting for two reasons. The first is that until recently psychologists have eschewed everyday themes (185). It would be interesting to know how many English social psychologists were distinguished in outdoor games, at school or university, and how many played them with average or less than average success. A tendency towards introversion and introspection seems necessary for early interest in psychology (as distinct from behaviourism, a form of physiology) and most distinguished athletes are extraverts.

Another possible reason for this avoidance of psychological interest in sport is that to enjoy playing a game, one must experience it as being real and earnest. There is the old story of the man who, asked why he played games, replied, 'To keep fit.' Asked what he kept fit for, he answered 'To play games.' Some psychologists, when they write about sports, assume an attitude not of ironical amusement but of objective detachment. This destroys the empathy necessary to appreciate an athlete's enthusiasm.

Here is a problem which often confronts social anthropologists —whether to restrain oneself from developing complete sympathy and empathy with one's subject-matter, achieving, it is hoped, scientific neutrality, or unreservedly to experience the joys and sorrows of the activity studied, at the risk of 'going native.' Such a dilemma often crops up when one studies the social stratification of amusements. Anyone who has fully

participated in and enjoyed the activities of the Royal Enclosure at Ascot is unlikely to be so catholic in his tastes as to share with the same enthusiasm the excitements of understanding the 'points' of racing greyhounds. The mutual attitudes of rugger and soccer players are often antagonistic, and few if any observers can have felt them with equal intensity in rapid alternation. The belated discovery by a Third Programme commentator that first class professional soccer is a form of ballet was psychologically interesting. To discuss this is to defy a taboo. A more serious breach of etiquette would be to assert that, in a socially stratified community, some people may play a game or pursue a sport for reasons other than pure love. Few psychologists, for instance, would think it necessary, merely because of social advantages, to continue to play a game for which their enthusiasm has disappeared; yet some lawyers, business men, even doctors find it wise to play golf.

Before discussing social differences in leisure pursuits, let us consider the part played by sport in English life. Bernard Hollowood (102) studied the daily and weekly newspapers of May 5th, 1948. The space devoted to sport in eleven main papers was shown as a block graph. To various sports, the *Daily Mail* allotted 180 column-inches, *The Times* 130, the *Daily Telegraph* 110, the *Daily Mirror* 100. Most of this space was distributed fairly evenly between reports on cricket, golf and horse-racing.

During the winter, such Sunday papers as the *News of the World*, the *Sunday Express*, the *Sunday Dispatch*, *The People*, and *Reynolds* devote one sixth of their total space to football alone.

Interest in various sports is unequally spread amongst different classes. Compare, for example, interest in Rugby and Association football respectively. Rugby Union matches are reported by daily and Sunday papers circulating among the upper and upper-middle classes. The illustrated weeklies, *The Tatler* and *The Sketch* frequently publish photographs of 'Rugger Balls' at expensive places such as Grosvenor House. *The People*, *Reynolds* and the *Daily Dispatch* give only perfunctory accounts of Rugby matches. While the *Daily Express*

published two front-page photographs of the Woodcock Heavyweight Championship fight (1949) with a leading article and a back-page 'round-by-round' report, the *Daily Telegraph* gave it six inches.

Equally interesting results would reward examination of the B.B.C.'s treatment of sports. A classification of the listening public's approval or disapproval of the 'air-time' given to each might throw light upon our social stratification, as inside the B.B.C. the tendency to give the public what it wants, or is believed to want, is not always curbed. A single example may suffice: the last few bars of a great symphony, played by one of the world's finest orchestras were faded out because a prize-fight was to begin at that moment. There were, of course, protests; not unsuccessful, as it happened.

Newspapers and radio assume a universal attachment of English people to sport, though this belief is now questioned; there are many grumbles about the 'emptiness' of Saturday afternoon radio-programmes for those who do not listen to sport-broadcasts. Participant observation would show class-differences of tastes in sport; observers, for example, might profitably compare lunch-time conversation in a Bethnal Green public bar and in the Berkeley.

In women's attitude to sport, the class influence is obvious. A woman who knits herself a white sweater decorated with a Wembley lion to watch ice hockey is unlikely to don tweeds, to crouch in a damp spot waiting for grouse to flush. It is interesting to note the low percentage of women at a soccer match or a boxing bout with the high percentage at race-meetings and some yacht regattas. Picture papers represent women archers as elegantly dressed and poised; a lavishly illustrated article on women in a bowling match portrayed, perhaps deliberately, plainer costumes and less elegant postures.

Our widely-discussed 'national attitude' towards sport (compare too, Chapter 12) is by no means simple in nature. An example was our reaction to defeat by the Americans at the Wembley Olympic Games in 1948. Though nothing short of a Mass-Observation survey and public opinion poll could provide

a sound basis for estimating any national attitude, a common opinion was that the Americans' grim training made their prowess incomparable with that of real amateurs, and that entire dedication of a life to sport was not admirable. In contrast, there was considerable admiration for Maureen Gardner, an English typist, who broke the world record for the 80 metres women's race and nearly won the hurdles. It was recognised that sport was reserved for her leisure time. I think this attitude was unchanged in the 1952 Olympiad at Helsinki. It is not new. After World War I, an Oxbridge college which trained its 'eight' so rigidly that they did not take a reasonable part in university life, was criticised as exposing the University to the suspicion of encouraging 'shamateurs.'

The problem of the professional's place in sport complicates any study of social stratification in this country. Indeed, the social status of professional vocations outside sport deserves and receives examination (129). Nowadays there are few famous amateur executants in music or painting, while in the universities amateur physical scientists of the Cavendish type are rare.

Dr. C. E. M. Joad (111) emphasised that players bound by Rugby Union rules must not, while Rugby League players may, be paid. Some outstanding professional sportsmen are accepted in social circles 'higher' than their own, on the basis of their functional prestige, yet when this wanes, they are likely to slip into oblivion.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when sports familiar today reached a recognisable form, the social distinction between professional and amateur was definite. Only during the last thirty years, in these times of economic change, has the sport-professional attained social standing. Even so, those who succeed are in the minority, as anyone who knows the complex relationships between instructor and pupil in certain fashionable games and sports will recognise.

A social psychologist ought to discover more about those thousands of people whose contribution to sport is financial. Little is known about why they watch, how, while so doing, they speak, eat and drink, the money they spend, the satisfactions they seek and obtain. Spectator-clothing is a matter of

interest. In the hot days of 1952, the dress of the spectators at Wimbledon as well as that of the competitors was freely commented upon in the Press, with a fear, real or assumed, that standards of decorum were being seriously lowered. Though at great football matches, it shows consideration for other spectators if a man wears a cap, not a hat, a social difference can be perceived between caps worn in the crowds at rugger and soccer matches. There is something about the amount of peak. . . . Community-singing, led by a professional conductor who advertises a national newspaper before ordering the crowd to sing 'Abide with Me,' has not yet been considered necessary at Twickenham. At certain grey-hound racing tracks, one may, if wealthy, eat costly foods in a glass-fronted warmed restaurant and, aided by intermediaries, transact all betting from the meal-table. This is a long way from the coursing meeting of the old style country farmer and his friends, so, too, is the clientèle.

It might be interesting to arrange sports in certain hierarchial orders. Would a scale of their costs correlate highly with the economic stratification of their devotees? It has been asserted that sport does not bridge, but underlines, the division between rich and poor. This is true of some sports, preserves of the rich and privileged; e.g. fox-hunting (to answer the usual objection, it may be said that farmers who hunt are seldom or never really poor), 'real' tennis, polo, squash, fives, Rugby Union football and, with reservations, cricket. Other sports belong to the poor; speed-racing, greyhound-racing, pigeon-racing and darts, and, as a rule, Association football. A few public schools have an unbroken tradition of 'soccer,' but for the last 50 years, there has been a tendency to consider 'rugger' as a higher-class game. Many schools during this period dropped soccer for rugger (one headmaster frankly told inquiring press reporters that the change was made because his teams would meet 'better types'). Recently, with the rise of such amateur teams as Pegasus, there have been hints in upper-class papers that first-class amateur 'soccer' games ought to be encouraged by more spectators and, it is said, some upper-class schools are once again taking up soccer.

Yet participation in some 'lower-class' sports is not cheap. Before a potential speedway rider is tried on the third-division track, he must possess an adapted motor-bicycle which costs, secondhand, about £150, and a set of boots and leathers at about £60 (these prices were quoted some years ago). A visit to the first-division track at Belle Vue, Manchester, on a Saturday evening will convince an observer that this is a working man's sport.

Forty to fifty years ago in England, indoor ice-skating, which then consisted of 'school figures,' the solemn 'English' style of combined skating, and a little dancing, was an upper-class amusement. There were very few rinks, and some, like Prince's in London, expensive. Ice-skating, if taken seriously, is still not cheap, as any aspiring medallist will find. To attain championship proficiency, training usually begins in childhood, with expensive skates, dresses, for practice and for shows, travelling and hotel or lodging expenses, and fees for rinks and instructors. A few amateur world-championship skaters have been children of skating-instructors, and obtained their tuition free, but this is rare.

When, after World War I, the few indoor rinks reopened, none was available in conquered Europe: as a result, famous Continental instructors attached themselves to the Manchester, Edinburgh and Paris rinks—London had none. This novelty and rarity-value naturally attracted leisured people, and economic stratification was immediately observable; 'sessions' costing 1/– to 10/6d, while private and semi-private clubs reserved the ice at certain times. Even then, some people took lessons in figure-skating only when foot-and-mouth disease rendered hunting impossible. Normally, they postponed tuition until arrival in Switzerland, and even then often did not regard any kind of skating seriously if ski-ing was possible. One heard petulant voices 'Not enough snow; we'll just *have* to skate!' Writers and artists at that time, e.g. Joyce Dennis and Alan D'Egville, represented winter-sporters as rich, though not observably upper-class. Winter-sport clothing, like battle-dress and the 'dinner jacket' can be a great social leveller. A comparison between types of visitor to the Swiss resorts would

have repaid any observer interested in the difference, at that time, between social class and economic stratum.

Today in many English public ice-rinks—the Park Lane and Westminster Ice Clubs, originally private, have long ago vanished—most visitors, who do not take this pleasure sadly, have hired their skates on the premises. Seldom is there a live orchestra; hardly ever one specially trained to play for ice-dancing. 'Canned' music, often with little relation to the special pace or rhythms of skating, and sometimes from worn records, is usually provided. The economic stratum which, with its non-skating guests, habitually lunched or dined in the expensive restaurant is now less important; patches of ice for individual figure-skating are difficult to retain during a public session.

The ice is cleared for dancing, but competition in ice-dancing and figure-skating, which today has reached a much higher level of quality, is often intensely local, and any Englishwoman who has learnt to skate only at winter-sports would seldom be good enough to enter for a competition if, when in England, she has other amusements.

As a sport, ice-skating probably became socially more divided by multiplication of the indoor rinks to which most English skating is confined. The upper-class young woman will be delighted if (in mid-week) the local pond is frozen, though it offers only bumpy ice, dangerously freckled with stones, yet she may ignore the ever-open rink with its 'nursed' surface in a nearby town. Ice-skating carries no exclusive prestige, since it is available at a reasonable cost, without the necessity of buying skates or wearing a special costume. In *Girls Growing Up* (108), Pearl Jephcott gives figures showing the proportion of some working-girls' weekly wage spent at the ice-rink.

Even the claim of modern ice-skating to be a sport has been disputed, since nowadays, with its increased visual attractions, pretty dresses, heavy stage make-up and spot-lighting, it has become an exhibitionistic art, comparable with ballet. After seeing the ice-show at, say, the Brighton rink; if one watches skating by the general public, the thought arises that if thirty years ago an observer had written about the social aspects of

skating, he might be surprised to see how his article has been out-dated.

The less fluid 'English' style of figure-skating developed at St. Moritz and in clubs in England is subtly exhibitionistic too. 'Making difficult things look easy' is its motto: a typically 'modest' English remark, especially when uttered with the twinkling suggestion that the 'Continental' (which in fact is the International) style 'makes easy things look difficult.'

The money scale imperfectly measures social stratification in sport. Often it reliably indicates exclusiveness—lack of money may be one reason why a ticket-collector at Baker Street does not hunt—but not of inclusiveness; he may be just as keen to see Australia at Lord's as the lord who passes through his barrier.

A great factor in stratifying sport was the Industrial Revolution. The resultant prosperity made possible the Empire-building middle-class. Its members geared themselves into the rapidly developing public-school system, determining the suitable games to be played by the upper and upper-middle classes. Note, for instance, the chasm between Rugby Union and Rugby League football; symbolised any Saturday afternoon by the different accents of B.B.C. commentators. During the War, an embarrassing situation was accidentally brought about by an English officer who, challenged by a Scottish team, chose his 'fifteen' from any men who claimed to play 'rugger.' The Scots were defeated in a clean game, but the victorious team contained Rugby League players. Whether the losers even got so far as to say in public that they had been unfairly beaten is a question which may never be asked, for the game was 'rugger.'

Open disputes about the eligibility of Soccer players are not unknown.

It has been asserted that Rugby is not a poor man's game, except in South Wales, and League Rugby has been termed a special brand introduced for poor people. This statement is not quite correct, for 'poor man's rugby' also exists in the North of England, and in the North-East, it is played by miners—hardly poor men nowadays—who provide the much-

needed weight and toughness. Yet the spectators from the North who can be seen in London's Oxford Street on the morning of an important Rugby League match are easily distinguishable from a Twickenham or Blackheath crowd.

In one social stratum there is often ignorance, not only of the codes of games popular in another, but even of their nature. Popular in public schools are 'squash' and badminton. Asked about these, most members of a Manchester Girls' club could not define either. At a Southern Grammar School, seven out of ten boys know nothing about fives, and of the three who knew something, only one, son of a medical specialist, could give a correct description.

The public schools, however, represent only one influential section of society, and these criteria may exercise little influence upon the games played by its ex-pupils. At some public schools, the élite are drawn from those who play cricket and 'rugger,' but once he is at Oxbridge, the social value of rowing may seem to the undergraduate greater than that of any other sport; especially perhaps if he wishes to enter the Church or to become a master at certain schools. On 'going down,' he may find golf and lawn-tennis socially more useful, even necessary, if he plans to earn his living out of England.

We now turn to outdoor sports; first, those involving animals, to be killed, with or without the aid of other animals, or to be raced.

Horse-racing takes social precedence over dog-racing; if only of account of its antiquity. Comparing the two sports would produce a wealth of psychological information; on one side, the storied dazzling traditions of Ascot, Newmarket, Epsom; on the other, little but the arc-lights of the local White City. The contrast has attracted writers, e.g. Hugh Massingham (152) in an article on bookmaking. At 'the dogs'

> There is sometimes a rather pompous attempt to capture the older traditions of horse-racing; the dogs are trailed round the course accompanied by men in white coats and wearing incongruous black bowlers. At the tail of this dispirited procession mourns a lone man carrying a dustpan and brush to sweep up anything which may defile the white straw covering the track. A starter manfully tries to pre-

tend that he is connected with the turf. He decks himself up in a fancy dress of riding breeches, gaiters and boots, deceiving no one; the crowd is without tradition.

This *de haut en bas* view ought to be supplemented by a horizontal one, but it is hard to find except in novels.

Dog-racing does not seem to have been patronised by Royalty, and probably no member of the House of Lords breeds greyhounds for racing. In contrast, not long ago a young viscount is said to have sold his town house rather than let his stables go, and social stratification exists among training stables themselves.

The functional importance of the horse in English society has been a theme for many authors, serious and ribald (235). During World War I, when the Australian soldiers came to England, despite their fine horsemanship and mounts, certain members of the cavalry demanded, successfully, that the immigrants should be termed 'mounted infantry.' And in World War II, the complaints of some cavalry officers when presented with tanks and told to get on with, or into them, had several foundations; one, naturally, connected with social prestige. Claims to ride in horse-drawn vehicles in the Coronation procession worried the Earl-Marshal's office, and the wearing of spurs by un-horse-minded officers in certain units of the Services gave rise to problems, and jokes.

An interesting illustration of the horse's social significance is that breeding horses and dogs, both of which have been and are closely associated with English sport, is on a social level much higher than the breeding of rabbits, pigeons, canaries or even pedigree cats.

Oddly, perhaps, horse-jumping and *dressage* are the cults of leisured people and not of professional jockeys; a list of Olympic competitors will include many cavalry officers. The names of Colonel Llewellyn and Miss Pat Smythe are household words. In the upper strata, riding *per se* is a universally recognised necessity, even if the rider does not hunt or jump. Distinction is made between stables and riding schools. 'Stables' are on the decline; the war dealt them a death-blow by dispersing their

clientele. Their places are being taken by the schools. At a riding school, opened several years ago, 80 per cent of the pupils were female; successful career women, unmarried women in their thirties and forties. Their marked similarity in their social awareness and the rigid correctness of their dress and bearing, indicated the importance they attached to riding as a symbol of social superiority.

Today in upper-class circles it is necessary to own a horse; to ride as the guest of a friend-owner, or, fashionably, to admit that you can no longer afford to ride. Many riding schools, catering for new demands, relax their strictness and allow pupils to ride American fashion. To the élite this is sacrilege, but to film-goers it may appear quite natural. Its technique has been explained on the radio; television may follow suit.

A Fellow of All Soul's, Oxford, noticed a low gate on the landing of his staircase. Speculating that it might be a nursery fixture, he was told that it was to keep the hounds out. Such traditions are now almost lost in oldish people's memories, yet stratification among hunts still exists, and amongst types of hunting. Feeling about this is intense and perhaps difficult to analyse. Now that the old estates are being broken up, stag-hunting in England is comparatively rare and the sport is confined to relatively few enthusiasts. Otter-hunting continues, e.g. in Devon, with farmers and villagers to the fore, under the direction of local landowners or gentry. Fox-hunting in the Lake District, for obvious reasons undertaken on foot, is business-like and cheerfully democratic.

To return to fox-hunting on horseback, the loss of much of its 'county' value is attributable to death-duties, penalising landowners, and to land-taxes, particularly the clauses of the new Property Betterment Act. Nowadays the nucleus of many a hunt is formed by farmers and local members of the professional classes. Of one hunt a number of young women primary school teachers are members. Yet some older hunts still attempt to restrict their participants to the upper classes. This is true of the Pytchley, Quorn, Belvoir and Cottesmore, although even in them economic necessity causes 'screening' to be less rigid. It is hardly necessary to say that the American,

wider use of the word 'hunting' is not acceptable to the English. Shooting retains much of its social exclusiveness, since in order to shoot, it is necessary to own or hire the shooting rights of a preserve. Most of the best shooting is in Scotland, and to a lesser degree on the Yorkshire moors. Because of its exclusiveness, it is regarded as socially very desirable, and the dream of many 'climbers' is to be invited to someone's shoot. This is often a mark of great favour from a host, who naturally wishes to restrict his house-party to people of his own sort, who, he feels, will understand, appreciate and enjoy the sport and with whom he can relax. To be well equipped is a necessity for any guest: it would be a serious error to use the host's cartridges, though they are always provided.

Punt-gunning, popular in the Wash and Carlisle areas, is socially simpler. As a sport it can be almost free from the atmosphere of the '19th hole,' though in the Wash area at least, there may be a pleasant 'pub,' sometimes famous, not far away. Nevertheless, the sport is confined almost entirely to the upper and upper-middle strata, with a few independent men who have the leisure necessary to wait upon the birds' vagaries, for few active farmers are interested in this sport primarily as a means of keeping down 'vermin.'

Though this book is not about America; in that country too, punt-gunning is a sport in which much time and money are expended for a small material return. Ogden Nash writes (164)

> The hunter crouches in his blind
> 'Neath camouflage of every kind
> And conjures up a quacking noise
> To lend allure to his decoys.
> This grown-up man, with pluck and luck
> Is hoping to outwit a duck.

To anyone acquainted with English idiom, hunting and shooting suggest fishing, and nowadays young people who engage in these sports probably pronounce the words like any one else, though some of their grandparents might omit the final 'g.' The reasons given for fishing have enriched our

literature, and it was a man who wrote 'It is an escape from wife, family and business worries, a male need characteristic of all classes.' Virginia Graham's *Say Please!* (85) contains hints on behaviour expected of any women who accompany hunting, fishing and shooting males.

A few clubs charging high fees for the privilege of fishing a well-stocked preserve, tend to become exclusive. A coveted fishing spot is the upper reaches of the mill stream at Christchurch, Hampshire; these were reconstructed by Cistercian monks for their own trout-fishing 700 years ago. Some older estates still stock their own fish, making an artificial lake if no river or stream comes within their boundary.

In England, sea-fishing is primarily a means of earning a living, with no social *cachet*. The fishermen may allow privileged visitors, particularly yachtsmen, to take part in a day or night's fishing, but a rowing boat at the harbour-edge is usually hired by the local aspirant for the season's challenge cup. Most cruising or sailing vessels carry fishing gear, mainly spinners which can be thrown out under way. Amongst sailing people, fishing is usually regarded as the prerogative of the longshore fisherman, respected for his experience and dexterity, but deferred to for his knowledge of wind and tide rather than for his skill in fishing.

Sports involving animals comprise a wide scatter of social strata, with a preponderance of the upper layers.

In trying to assess the social status of horse-racing, it is necessary to keep in mind the sport's pageantry and picturesque background. They make it a perfect setting for the products of the great fashion-houses of that vague collection of tailors in Savile Row (52a) which, like Boston, Mass. is 'not so much a place as a state of mind.' Even the ordinary racing at Kempton, Epsom and Aintree shows an almost feudal distribution, from the owner and trainer to the jockey, the lads and the outsiders; bookmakers and tipsters. A man who regularly bets half-a-crown each way on the advice of a 'tip' may rarely, if ever see a race.

Restriction to upper classes characterises some forms of shooting. The social structure of an expensive 'shoot' depends

upon the exclusiveness of those who actually fire, served by their beaters and loaders. Fishing is common among all strata, but more popular among the upper levels. From mere observation of behaviour, it is difficult to discover any particular pattern in the codes or apparently capricious rulings peculiar to each sport. Some people might hold that to shoot a sitting bird is more humane because more accurate, and the age-old controversy about the cruelty or 'unsportingness' of fox-hunting is not confined to special stratum-levels.

We turn to games dearly loved by the English which entail catching, throwing, kicking, striking or heading a ball. Association football attracts the greatest crowds, and in spite of conventional denials, it is England's national sport. Its tremendous popularity has several reasons, one being implied in 'Mass-Observation's' report that 'coupon (pool) talk' was recorded all the way from Shepherd's Bush to Shepherd Market, but interest in actual football was much less. Gambling on 'the pools' is a pastime which has infiltrated upwards, a rare event; perhaps surprising since Association football has now little popularity in higher-class 'prep' schools, most public schools and upper classes generally. The commercial taint on 'Soccer' (its sincerest defender could not completely explain this away, with its tendency to buy and sell players at high prices) has deprived it of much esteem as a sport amongst the upper classes.

Some would assert that regarded purely as a game, 'Rugger' offers nothing better than 'Soccer.' Others, including some soccer players, admit that dirty play is less common in rugger. In 1953–4 however, there was newspaper correspondence about the 'unnecessarily enthusiastic' behaviour of University rugger teams.

I am indebted to Dr. R. W. Pickford, Lecturer in Psychology in the University of Glasgow, for interesting data culled from material collected to throw light upon university students' attitude towards 'rugger' and 'soccer' respectively. The social *cachet* of the games was only one subject of his investigation, but forms the theme in the following extracts from records of students' actual conversations:

Only snobs play Rugby.
Rugger appeals to women more than Soccer.
It helps one's career to be known as a Rugger player.
I like the social atmosphere of a Rugby club.
Rugby is a game for the upper classes.
When I went in front of my Commissioning Board, they looked shocked when I said I didn't play Rugger.
My C.O. insisted that all his subalterns should play Rugby.
I usually tell people that I play Rugger and Squash; I wouldn't dream of doing either, really. (This may be the occasional 'leg-pull' almost inevitable in such a collection of remarks by students.)
No working man would be at home in a Rugger club.
You need more skilled referees in Rugger than in Soccer.
When I left school I deserted Rugger for Soccer.
Soccer is far too commercialised now.
Soccer has replaced religion as the opium of the people.
Rugger is a more mature game than Soccer.
Rugger teaches one to control one's temper.

A long personal communication; 'Why I dislike Rugby,' from a medical student, aged 23, gives as one reason that his political views are Leftish. He feels that in Scotland all Rugby players and supporters are drawn from the Right.

A short communication from a Social Science Student, aged 22: 'Everybody knows how to play soccer, but only relatively few people who are better educated play rugger, so I prefer rugger. Besides, the girls who are most attractive watch rugger, while there are very few in a football crowd. If you play rugger in the district in which I play, your name appears in the paper, but soccer teams don't.'

From a long account by an international Rugby player:

'As to why this difference in atmosphere (between rugger and soccer) should exist, I will venture to make some explanation. Rugby requires . . . a grass pitch and proper goal posts . . . it is not easy for the young boy of eight or nine to pick up the rudiments for himself, accordingly . . . it is taught to boys . . . usually by a schoolmaster or an older boy, who invariably acts as referee. Indeed, Rugby without a referee would be almost impossible. Moreover, it . . . involves a good deal of soiling of clothes. Small boys do not

play it in ordinary clothes in the first field that may be vacant, nor can they play it in streets or school playgrounds. There is always someone in authority present, and there is no need for the boys to quarrel among themselves over rules or their application. One becomes so accustomed to accepting decisions that the thought of questioning them never arises. Thus the unwritten law about silence on the playing field becomes readily explicable.'

There follow temperately expressed reasons why, except in the case of the boy at a school providing playgrounds, goal-posts and referees, soccer is often learnt in unfavourable conditions. 'When there is no referee, all decisions which are not patently obvious (and many which are) are argued out on the field of play. This disputatious atmosphere may be carried over into the adult regions of the sport . . . and even into the organisation of the amateur game, with its protests to the relevant League committee about such subjects as the alleged incompetence of referees or the charge that the other team had played an unregistered man.'

At present, increased interest in amateur soccer is growing; an article in *Punch*, by Alan Ross (195) discusses this expertly.

In 1953 the 'university' soccer match (to non-English readers it may be explained that Universities is the tacitly accepted description of contests between Oxford and Cambridge) was held, as an experiment, at Wembley, but 'the 5,000 spectators looked strangely lonely in the great grey stone amphitheatre that holds 100,000' and 'the funeral emptiness of the stadium contributed to the anaesthetic gloom.' Yet amateur soccer is greatly on the mend, 'after a period when soccer, once the preserve of the Beau Brummels of Sport, sank into total social disrepute.' The Amateur Cup Final has also suddenly caught the public imagination, and Pegasus, a team composed of Oxford and Cambridge players, is much admired.

Mr. Ross discusses some of the reasons for this half-century's partial eclipse of soccer, 'The amateur cricketer, Rugby player, squash player, tennis player, rider, can hold his own with anyone. . . . Yet Oxford and Cambridge soccer players are

pygmies compared with the general run of 1st, 2nd or 3rd division professionals . . . as stumbling chorus-girls to ballerinas.' This is because today the professional soccer player must be a dedicated, special sort of man . . . football has become an industry, and so, early in the century, the great amateurs, who had helped the Wanderers, Oxford University and Old Etonians, among others, to win the F.A. cup, dropped out of the game.' He ends by recommending anyone interested in comparative anthropology or aesthetics to visit Wembley for the amateur and professional soccer Cup Finals, and Twickenham, to see England play Scotland. 'They will, even without looking at the field of play, find much to speculate about.'

Lawn tennis—the English lawns on which it is played are sadly disappearing—is enjoyed by several social classes. On park-courts, the standard would seem surprisingly low if one did not remember that professional coaches are rarely seen there. To play lawn tennis reasonably well is a social asset, but by the upper classes it is regarded as a necessary and expected accomplishment rather than a sport to be seriously practised. Amongst, them, tennis clubs, those strongholds of the bourgeois, are rare. 'Real' tennis, the ancient historic game which requires expensive covered courts constructed in a complicated way so unfamiliar to the average Englishman that *Punch* recently published a serious description of them and their ancillary apparatus, cannot be played by poor men (it seems uncertain if women are ever invited to take part) and receives little attention nowadays. There are so few courts that it is perhaps unprofitable to consider whether membership of a 'real' tennis-club is a highly prized social asset.

One reads the complaint that boys who are unable to afford cricket coaching can never hope to achieve a county standard of play. This limitation of possible talent has been cited as a cause of our defeats in Test matches. For a long time an annual feature of Manchester newspapers has been a photograph of public-schoolboys, home for the Easter holidays, being coached at Old Trafford. It is only a partial answer that boys of outstanding promise can receive coaching if they take jobs on a club ground-

staff, e.g. nineteen-year-old Malcolm Hilton, who bowled Bradman twice in 1948. Of some county cricket, it would appear that determined attempts are made to restrict it to the upper middle and upper classes, despite the inevitable narrowing of selection.

The spectators at cricket are fewer than those at football matches. Only at 'Test' cricket does the figure rise to 50,000 or thereabouts; at a county match, 4,000 to 5,000 is a good 'gate.' County cricket does not try to cater for the masses; games are played during the week, from Monday to Friday.

Hockey, for males, seems almost confined to members of the public schools and Universities, playing as pupils, undergraduates and old boys. The game is popular in girls' schools. In the school-life of the English female, the divisions between primary, secondary, and 'public' schools are delimited nearly as sharply by their games; netball, hockey and lacrosse respectively.

Golf, as reported in the Press, received (about 1947) the third greatest slice of 'writing-up,' measured in inches, though it would be interesting to know how many readers ever look at this part of their paper. In England, golf is socially stratified. Today it cannot be a poor man's game: to achieve a reasonable handicap requires a fair amount of leisure, and more than a fair amount of money. According to Sir Guy Campbell (36), early in this century, when a full set of clubs numbered ten, the cost of a selected craftsman-made split-hickory-shafted club averaged 6/–. In 1929, steel-shafted clubs arrived. Nowadays a club of any value costs 50/– upwards, and a complete set of fourteen modern clubs, at least £35. Add such accessories as a bag, rainproof coat and trousers and a pair of golfing shoes, and the player will receive a bill for £50 before he sets foot on a links.

Balls, which before the War cost 2/6d. are now 3/9d. Clearly, the writer adds, such charges are not only uneconomic but prohibitive. Yet, as the above article points out, from the beginning of the 17th century golf was Scotland's national game, practised by the King and commoners.

After 1900, it became expensive, and private clubs dis-

couraged the unattached player. The introduction of the rubber ball necessitated longer links and more costly clubs.

True lovers of golf may wish to see the game democratised. To many people, however, golf is *the* game of social importance. The club-house figures more prominently than in any other sport, and '19th hole' expenditure can be serious. Since golf, because it needs less intense physical exertion than many sports, is possible for many middle-aged persons, its players nowadays tend to be drawn from a stabilised section of society with leisure and means, not only to pay for equipment and dues, but for the not inconsiderable entertainment inseparable from the game. Since it is naïve to pretend that for some young men, or their employers, social advancement is unconnected with prowess at golf, this entertainment is often an expected source of expense.

In many circles, a woman's ability to play golf well carries social distinction. Sometimes this is a mark of leisure, prized among women today, when domestic staff is difficult to obtain and expensive to keep. On wet days, bridge in the club-house may replace golf.

Mechanical sports show, for simple reasons, a closer correlation between economic and social stratification. Nowadays for private owners motor racing is extremely expensive, and in modern racing most competitors represent commercial firms. Fifteen years ago, these men might have been considered 'outsiders.'

A parallel exists in flying. The days of Amelia Earhart and Lindbergh are over. Just as scientists now work in teams, highly paid and requiring extremely expensive apparatus, aviation has become so complex that, slipping into the hands of the 'professional,' it is gradually losing its short-lived prestige as a sport.

Motor cycling retains an 'upper-lower' cachet, since the cost of a motor cycle is midway between that of a car and a bicycle. In the main, bicycle races are confined to the lower classes, though in the '30s, cycling and 'hiking' (perhaps the use of the name in this country has class-significance) became popular 'lower-middle' leisure pursuits. Hiking and camping offered

cheap holidays, but a rival suddenly, rather noisily, appeared; the Holiday Camp. As yet no objective sociological study of this is available, though one reads amusing, cynical or 'realistic' accounts by the intelligentsia; a film, 'Holiday Camp,' capable of interpretation at different psychological levels, was successful, and the subject lends itself to the novelist. There is some reason to believe that these camps have by now separated out into different strata, and perhaps, classes.

It is difficult to mark off social strata in athletics, partly because so much depends upon individual prowess and not upon team-spirit. A track-star too, may be narcissistic and less sensitive than other stars to public adulation—or criticism. Here again are economic causes of stratification, e.g. primary schoolboys can seldom get first-class coaching. At the top of the social scale are such outstanding figures as Lord Burghley, ex-Olympic hurdler and chairman of the 1948 Olympic Games.

One reason why stratification is less obvious in this sphere is that the athlete is not paid to be a spectacle. Another is connected with narcissism: his degree of excellence is often obvious to everyone, including himself, while he is still at school. Moreover, he will know that his skill, unlike intelligence or educational attainment, is not estimated, only in relation to his present, junior and local competitors, since he knows the height or breadth of his jump in inches, his time for the 'hundred' in tenths of a second, and how these compare wtih university or world records. The athlete successful at school may therefore retain and increase his keenness after leaving, whereas, were he the school 'soccer' star, he might find later that, judged absolutely, he had not been very good, or that his special ability had little social prestige.

Another sport involving individual prowess is boxing, which, in spite of occasional distinguished patronage, is a poor man's sport. In the public schools, boys box, but this, like some other skills already mentioned, is regarded as socially desirable; excellence in it is accidental. It is hard to imagine that a fashionable doctor or lawyer's social prestige would be increased by reports of his frequent appearances in the boxing ring. Boxing flourishes in industrial areas like Glasgow,

Liverpool, Birmingham, London, Manchester and Newcastle. As Lyall Wilkes writes (226),

'At one time unemployment and hardship were the greatest recruiting-sergeants for the ring, just as they were for the Army. With the mines ejecting unwanted thousands to rot in idleness, and the shipyards silent, the prize ring was a possible—and often the only possible—way out of poverty and slumdom. How many professional boxers during the last fifty years have come from homes which did not know hardship and pinching?'

The boxer can find himself suddenly on top of the world, and as quickly in the gutter. If successful and a local 'draw,' he may become declassed, leave his old home and haunts, buy a new house, acquire a sports-car. In London he may mix with film-stars and colourful folk, until, going 'soft,' he finds himself where he started, and tries to begin again, sometimes to discover that speed and youth have vanished.

Modern crowds have little discriminative appreciation of boxing. In boxing stadiums today, much of the sportsmanship and chivalry is shown inside the ring by the boxers. The skill and craft in a good boxing match are too often lost upon spectators in search only of excitement.

Wrestling is lower in the social scale than boxing, and attracts chiefly sensation-mongers. Fifty per cent of its audiences are made up of women, susceptible to the attraction of a man whose bulk gives him supremacy in the ring. As a profession, wrestling has degenerated into a mimed show, providing coarse thrills and an atmosphere of low-level excitement. Amateur wrestling is regarded differently; it is not exhibitionistic, it is popular at Youth clubs, and a necessary part of Army training.

The exciting phrase 'Winter sports' suggests to many stay-at-homes the glamorous thrills of the idle rich. Though to enjoy a fortnight's winter-sports before 1939, one need not have been rich or idle, some Swiss resorts contained many people who could have been fairly described by these adjectives, for few busy people can take a holiday around New Year as well as in the summer. Currency restrictions have reduced the seasonal exodus to Switzerland, and there has been a levelling-down of both first-class and second-class travellers to Con-

tinental winter sports. Before 1939, there was a social differentiation of resorts, particularly in the Swiss Alps, but economic and social stratification were not always parallel. The ambiguous saying 'The Engadine looks down on the Oberland, which looks down on the Jura' was understood by many; the display of wealth at St. Moritz repelled people who could well afford to go there, and members of universities and public schools had a soft spot for parts of the Bernese Oberland.

'Probably few who 'winter-sport' in Switzerland nowadays feel that their social rating is thereby raised, though one has heard of attempts to re-impose exclusiveness upon ski-ing (the way of pronouncing its name could once be used as a shibboleth). Some years ago, a young millionaire attempted to popularise Morocco amongst his friends with its excellent ski-ing, amid surroundings uncontaminated by tourists, but in 1953, an upper-class English newspaper published an article on reducing expenses on winter-sports by going to Austrian hotels without bathrooms!

Last comes aquatic sport. There seems little to say about the social class of swimming; professional swimming is not widespread in England, and amateur competitive swimming is most popular during school years. Water-polo, a robust and noisy business, enormously enjoyed by the players (with the possible exception of the goal-keepers) would not seem to a spectator, or auditor, to rank high socially. While England's crack figure-skaters and ice hockey players come from the big towns, since they require a constant fresh supply of 'nursed' ice, for the last three generations the country-bred child who wishes to learn swimming has been at a disadvantage compared with one who lives near cheap public baths. Consequently many English top-rank swimmers are city-dwellers, who learned at primary schools.

Rowing has a hallowed place in the traditions of Oxford and Cambridge, where rowing 'Blues' are prized above all others. Public schools encourage the sport, and the tradition has spread to some older and larger business organisations; the five great Banks each have rowing clubs.

Then comes a gap. Among those whose livelihood depends

upon the sea, rowing clubs have grown out of a functional necessity. But they are not common and, on the whole, in these quarters, little importance is attached to rowing as a sport. Where ferrymen are concerned this is not surprising; only a very keen house-painter would paint houses as a hobby. To the non-fisher folk of all classes, rowing has its place as a pleasant way of entertaining a female companion on a holiday. Any competent yachtsman can bend an oar—if an old hand he will scull more often than row, as the fishermen do. Yet there is a subtle distinction between sculling and rowing in a standing position facing forward, a common longshoreman habit The adept yachtsman will casually scull himself across the harbour, but if he rows, will row in a conventional fashion. To row standing seems to be tabooed socially, despite its technical difficulty.

Where sailing is concerned, customs and unwritten laws are legion and at first overwhelming. The sources of many of these—social dictation or technical necessity?—are difficult to discover and to distinguish. The different uses of the terms 'sailing' and 'yachting' serve as example. The owner of a Dragon-class racing yacht might say he intended to spend the holiday sailing his boat. If a member of the upper classes he would probably belong to a yacht club and not to a sailing club.

There are clubs accepted socially, designated 'Sailing Clubs,' e.g. the Royal Navy's club is 'The Royal Naval Sailing Association.' In the main, however, 'sailing' denotes a dinghy club, usually middle class, drawn from the local population.

Stratification is rigid on the South coast, particularly in the Solent area—the world's most distinguished and famous yachting centre. Lymington has both a yachting and a sailing club. Cowes is the home of the Royal Yacht Squadron, its club-rooms housed in the famous castle at the harbour entrance. It also boasts the Island Yacht club, which, though not vying with the Squadron maintains considerable social dignity, and the Medina Sailing Club, for enthusiasts, carrying and probably desiring no social distinction, but recognised at regattas in virtue of its locality on 'The Island.'

As with other sports of high social rank, locality is all-

important. The Solent, because of its many beautiful and safe harbours, and its double tide, deserves its supremacy. The whole of the South coast is frequented by large and small craft. Cornwall is cut off by the Lizard; the region eastwards, towards Dover, is less popular because of the terrific race up the Channel and the Goodwins, with treacherous quicksands piled up at the bottle-neck.

The East Coast is the second yachting centre, with yachts berthing at the famous London clubs; the Royal Thames, the Little Ship, and the renowned Corinthian, to name the most outstanding in the lower reaches of the Thames. Further North are the Broads, which within the last thirty years have become more commercialised and at times noisy, so that apart from some serious dinghy-sailing, they are not considered suitable by yachtsmen, except as nursery waters for beginners. Yet stratification still exists, e.g. the Seagull-class sailing club is exclusive. This tendency to stratify among clubs of one class can be seen in the Bembridge, Isle of Wight, Redwing Club, the membership of which is very restricted.

The 'screening' of members in all famous clubs, most particularly those prefixed by 'Royal,' is thorough. Here yachting differs, perhaps, from other sports in that its rigid exclusiveness is explicitly worded. A member of the Royal Yacht Squadron must have been proposed and seconded by members of the peerage, and pay 100 guineas per year. In the days of Lipton, Sopwith and other kings of yachting, when the 'Shamrocks' and 'Endeavours' attempted to wrest the highest sailing honours from America, the Royal Yacht Squadron attained its social peak; and although the hulks of these leviathans now lie rotting in the brokers' yards at Portsmouth and Southampton, and today's cost of living prohibits the building of boats on such a gigantic scale, the name of the Royal Yacht Squadron retains its international prestige.

To attain membership of any of the more famous yacht clubs is difficult, and entails a high standard of seamanship, a correlation not always found in other socially restricted sports. Younger members are often called to heel for misdemeanors, and rulings sometimes seem unnecessarily detailed. Not all of

these spring from social snobbery: often attention to detail may mean the difference between life and death in serious sailing.

On the whole, racing is confined to the upper and upper middle classes, with the exception, perhaps, of dinghy-size classes. It is in racing rather than in cruising that social fetishes most often appear. Obvious examples occur in Cowes Week. During the season, a true yachtsman is recognisable by his shapeless footwear, indescribable trousers, voluminous sweater and decrepit, tar-stained duffle coat. His hair is unkempt; his fingernails broken and hardly clean. His cabins are a morass of tinned soup, margarine papers, charts and lashings; on deck, the sail is lashed loosely to the boom, denoting that it has been up recently, but everything else is in smooth running order, the blocks varnished and the stays greased. The more signs of recent wear and tear on owner and boat, the more proudly she sits on her moorings, and the more casual-looking her owner.

During Cowes Week, however, even if the owner has come from Norway or further afield, and encountered gales all the way, this must make no difference either to his personal appearance or to that of his boat. Ashore his attire must consist, ideally, of navy blazer and yachting flannels, with a correct yachting cap and unobtrusively nautical shoes. In the larger boats the helmsman may be faultlessly dressed, particularly if he is of the old school. In lighter racing, informal clothing is necessary. (There were, however, reports that dress standards in 1952 had slackened in Cowes Week.)

It is hoped that this chapter's intention will not be misunderstood. It attempts to record superficial, overt signs of social stratification in English sports today. To a reader living in another country, some of these observations may seem fantastic, even incredible; yet if he lives in the Dominions or Colonies they may merely underline resemblances and differences between the Old Country and his own.

In this account are many bare patches. Inevitably some social patterns, as described here, will have been distorted. For obvious reasons, there are available more printed accounts of the older sports, favoured by the richer or more highly educated classes. It is hoped that perception of errors or

omissions in this account may stimulate some readers to supplement and correct it.

Whether such marked social stratification in our leisure pastimes is desirable will not be discussed, yet the ways in which a community spends its leisure are surely important, especially in the days of the Welfare State. What does it mean if a man would rather risk losing his job than miss watching (not playing in) a football match? Are the accent on sport and the adulation of sporting heroes comparable to the signs of degenerative periods in olden times? Is sport replacing religion, as some assert? (238) Do arguments—often phrased in question-begging terms—in favour of horse-racing stand up to serious criticism? Are the time and energy spent on football pools thrown away, half-consciously, for lack of incentives to a better use?

Interesting investigations might ascertain, for example, how often a financial criterion alone determines which sport a man chooses; the strength and direction of the influence of the public-school tradition; the extent to which its prestige or early associations in his mind draw a man towards a sport. How does a man's ambition for prowess in sport compare with his desire for promotion at work? Is he ambitious for his son to shine in upper-class sport; if so, is this in part a compensation for his own felt privations or lack of success?

CHAPTER TWELVE

Social Stratification and the English Character

The English as they see themselves and as others see them. Popular concepts of their 'character': some imply knowledge of social stratification; others are based on stereotypes of the upper and wealthier classes. The views of Lady Violet Bonham-Carter, James Bridie, D. W. Brogan, M. Ginsberg, Emily Hahn, Margaret Halsey, James Laver, Salvador da Madaraiga, Pierre Maillaud, Moray Maclaren, Aubrey Menen, George Orwell, I. J. Pitman, S. K. Radcliffe, G. J. Renier, Karl Silex, Kurt von Stutterheim, Rebecca West.

The English sense of humour: its representation by writers and artists. To what extent does it imply appreciation and acceptance of social differences?

WRITERS who assert that one cannot indict a whole nation, often appear to attempt this feat. To a particular nation, named but seldom defined, they apply adjectives; to the delight of readers who share their religious or party-political views, the anger of those who do not, and the despair of students of semantics. Yet in writings about the English character, by admirers and by destructive critics, one seldom finds real appreciation, as distinct from casual mention, of this country's important social strata, or any inclination to study them in detail. As almost every month authors from other countries offer some new 'appreciation' of the English character, we may be forgiven for asking 'Which "English" are being described?'

Let us consider 'the' English, as they see themselves and as others see them. At once we encounter a difficulty; since the social structure is changing before our eyes, haste in writing may be pardonable. Prophesies, optimistic or pessimistic, that World War II would almost abolish classes, have been false, to the surprise of no social psychologist, yet relatively few writers have noticed the great importance today of strata and status.

It may be permissible to comment, from a psychological standpoint, upon popular concepts of National Character. The important volume *The Character of England*, edited by Sir Ernest Barker (18) was followed by a 'review' (10) which

took the form of an anonymous essay, 'The English,' in which praise was infrequent and faint. This produced a spirited defence by Mr. St. John Ervine (63), an Ulsterman, and a counter-attack (10a) by the unknown writer, claimed for their nation by two Scots (31). This excitement among foreigners demonstrated a deep-rooted belief that at least the English have a character. Yet another Scot, Hamilton Fyfe, had already published an uncompromising book *The Illusion of National Character* (75): the title speaks for itself. Sir Ernest Barker's compilation of excellent essays presents interesting declarations of faith, if little more.

Since concepts of the character of a single person and of a nation are obviously psychological, it is interesting that few psychologists have written about National Character. Professor Morris Ginsberg's article on 'National Character' (80), Professor C. A. Mace's on 'National Stereotypes, their Nature and Function' (139) and Professor Julian M. Blackburn's chapter, 'National Differences,' in *The Framework of Human Behaviour'* (25) have helped to clarify our thinking.* From these it is clear that many writers confuse national character with national reputation or national stereotype. Yet they are complexly related; cf. the common saying 'I like individual Americans (Frenchmen, etc.), but I don't like the American (French, etc.) Nation' (cf. 5a).

Let us try to see ourselves as others see us, choosing writers who specifically mention English social stratification. In Karl Abshagen's *Kings, Lords and Gentlemen* (1), the title is self-explanatory. The date of writing was shortly before the Munich agreement; the writer was attempting to persuade his English readers that a cementing of friendship between his country and, at least, the upper classes in ours was urgently necessary. Karl Silex's *John Bull at Home* (202) chiefly concerns the wealthy inhabitants of London. It is significant that he describes the English female 'gold-digger,' whose existence is not mentioned in our leading humorous weekly (in contrast with America's: England has no Peter Arno) K. von Stutterheim

* Cf., too., W. J. H. Sprott (206) and H. J. Eysenck, *Uses and Abuses of Psychology*, London, 1954, Penguin Series.

in *Those English* (208) describes 'the English sense of humour,' but chiefly as displayed in political and diplomatic circles, and he specially praises the character of our Empire-makers' wives.

Pierre Maillaud seems to be one of the rare foreign writers who has ventured into industrial England. He contrasts it with London's West End, with insight, in *The English Way* (142). André Maurois writes about our upper classes; so does Paul Morand (162). In *The English, are they Human?* (193) Professor G. J. Renier, a Dutchman, does not concern himself much with the working classes.

In *With Malice Towards Some* (94), Margaret Halsey described behaviour, as seen by a New Yorker, of English porters, customs officials, ecclesiastical dignitaries, retired army officers, professors, publishers, country ladies and their maids, with abundant references to class. Edmund Wilson, Dibelius, Paul Cohen-Portheim (48a), Agnes Duer Miller, Cornelia Otis Skinner, Emily Hahn (89a)—the list of those non-English appreciators is long.

How do we English see ourselves? Some writers on this topic have already been quoted e.g. Margery Allingham, J. B. Priestley, H. J. Laski. Mass-Observation has made frequent contributions to this subject. Alan Bott in *Our Fathers* (29) and with Irene Clephane in *Our Mothers* (30) gives us pictures as well as remarks. Pont's *Punch* drawings illustrating the English character are well-known. But perhaps the fullest and most interesting collection of opinions is in *The Character of England.*

No contemporary observer would deny that English social stratification is easily visible and audible. In the *Observer* of 5th June 1949 an article on the 'Fourth' at Eton described with affectionate humour the dresses, cars and luncheon arrangements, lamenting the absence of glories of past days, but recording the high levels maintained by effort. Three years later, in the *New Yorker*, Emily Hahn commented on the same ceremonies from an American standpoint. Awareness of social stratification, however, may affect the behaviour of anyone who notices its salient points; if he moves in only a few parallel, inter-related strata, he may overlook the others; if he takes his own stratum for granted, assuming that it requires little or no

justification to any reasonable person, he may describe any other stratum with condescension, envy or jealousy; seldom with insight into the behaviour, attitudes and sentiments of its members. The following citations might be interpreted with such a consideration in mind.

Many English writers describe vividly and accurately the strata which they know, or used to know, assuming that the reader will sympathise or understand. An example is Lady Violet Bonham-Carter, daughter of a famous Prime Minister, Mr. Herbert H. Asquith. Of her, the writer of the pamphlet 'The English' writes '. . . she is not only an author; she is the very thing of which she writes; she is no less than the English Character itself.' In her chapter in *The Character of England* (18) 'Childhood and Education' she describes the Golden Age of nursery life in England between 1870 and 1914. The nursery floor or wing of the house was a self-regulated kingdom for children dominated by the inimitable Nannie, who took charge of the child a month after his birth, and made all important executive decisions concerning him. Sir Osbert Sitwell's *Left Hand, Right Hand* is quoted. He describes how the servants acted as a shock screen between parents and children. This screen has now fallen with a crash, parents of all income groups have been obliged to 'bring up' their own children, who now range at large throughout the whole of every household during the whole of every day.

I have already speculated concerning the effect upon the Nannie-cultured Englishman, of two mothers, one of whom satisfies his baby-craving for bodily attention, warmth and security, and directs all his early conduct. Reflecting that she is not his real mother, we are reminded of culture-patterns in which the real father delegates to his wife's brother the (to us) 'usual' paternal privileges and duties. Perhaps an analogy with this complex relationship, which however may seem simple to those who have experienced it, is that of the negro 'mammy' to the white sons of planters in the Southern States of America. The ambivalence which this early situation can condition is well known.

To discuss whether this two-mother dominance is reflected in folk-ways of the English aristocracy would take us far afield.

But if a boy has been brought up in what are really two adjacent homes, seeing his mother only at hours and in places convenient to her, his basic training carried out by his Nanny, may not a dual sentiment make his banishment to 'prep-school' easier to bear? While young, he may not have regarded his mother's quarters as his own, but rather 'the day-nursery with its rocking-horse, dolls-house and Noah's Ark, its high fire-guard on which hot flannel aired eternally, its scrap-book screen with stray fragments of our dream of human life' (Lady Bonham-Carter). And since at the earliest age Nanny disciplined him in the routine ceremonials connected with eating, drinking and elimination, which play an important part in forming character-structure, there will be fewer opportunities for him to develop, towards his mother, sentiments which may confuse him later when he finds it necessary to disagree with her. If indeed his mother is beautiful and charming, his sentiment towards her may be unmatched in any community usually studied by anthropologists, or Continentally-educated psychologists. Yet at times he may feel unwanted, if she is obviously enjoying herself in sports, often abroad, while he is at boarding school. Has not an Irish critic, George Bernard Shaw, described our boarding-schools as cloakrooms in which the English upper classes deposit children, so that grown-up pleasures may not be disturbed?

This problem is merely sketched here, and only as it affects the reciprocal attitudes of mother and son. The daughter-mother relationship may be as complex. Lady Bonham Carter expresses her views on the results of attempts to bring more closely together the children of Disraeli's Two Nations by compulsory education, which not only has kept children out of the factories, but has brought with it, after long and bitter struggles, school meals, for even the State cannot compel a hungry child to learn. We have seen first, kindergartens, then nursery schools and play centres, fresh air and country holiday funds, clubs and holiday camps, so that the little prisoners of the pavement may enjoy happy play in grassy places. Then there are children's courts and family allowances.

The 'spirit of complacent pessimism' which, Mr. J. L. Hammond

tells us, did more than any other to create the two nations in this country, is banished from our midst for ever.

But those who feel tempted by a spirit of complacent optimism should not yield to it until they have read *Branch Street* by Marie Paneth, and *Our Towns—A Close Up.*

In *Branch Street,* we read of outcast children living in a London slum 'who have no store of happy memories. First and foremost, they expect evil to happen': in *Our Towns,* how 'the flashes of the blitz opened our eyes to . . . the forgotten child of great cities.' This book describes the child who has never slept in a bed but only under one, who runs late and breakfastless to school, who suffers from lice, impetigo and scabies, who lies and pilfers. The report of the Curtis Committee (1944) will diminish any complacent optimism which may be left. Writers to the newspapers are now asking whether the recent alarming increase in violent crime by young people may not in great part be the harvest of the blitz-years.

In Mr. James Laver's chapter in *The Character of England* (18) we note with interest the way in which he correlates social with architectural stratification. Describing the Victorian London houses which can still be seen in and around Westbourne Terrace, Paddington, he remarks:

> The rooms were arranged on top of one another. This was the vital fact. Great as had been the social divisions in the typical eighteen-century country house, masters and servants were, at least in the physical sense, on the same level. Now that society was confronted with a perpetual symbol of its hierarchical structure, the servants became quite literally the 'lower classes.'

He describes, with characteristic comments, the accommodation 'below stairs': the kitchens, pantries, larders, sitting-room (if any) for the servants. 'On the ground floor . . . the domain of gentility commenced.' The front room was the dining-room, the back room the study. The first floor was given over entirely to one fine apartment; the drawing room, the sacred shrine of the Lady of the House, the gilded cage of her daughters. Above the drawing room was the 'front bedroom,' occupied by the master and mistress, and another bedroom. The one or

two floors above were shared by servants and children. In the history of architecture there never was a more class-conscious house than this astounding product of Victorian democracy. . . . One of the main problems of modern London is how to live in a persistently hierarchical house in a decreasingly hierarchical world.'

In the same book, Rebecca West describes how the richer classes helped to de-intellectualize the social life in which they played.

People went through foreign countries as blindly as the Romantics, but for a different reason. Shelley and Byron saw little of the life around them because they were doing so much with their minds. These men and women were preoccupied because they did so much with their bodies. They swam at Cannes, they golfed at Le Touquet, they motor-raced in Savoy, they ski-ed and skated above any snow-line they could find. In these winter sports there was a powerful indication of the de-intellectualization of life which was in progress.

Mountaineering, she remarks, had been especially the sport of Victorian scientists and philosophers, who by going up to the peaks hoped to show how men without faith could still bear pain and know exalted emotion. Perhaps Miss West avoided the temptation to discuss in this connection the social history of Mürren.

In Mr. I. J. Pitman's chapter, he writes:

All the sports in which animals are the protagonists, either as racers or as hunters of other animals, are based on the Englishman's love of his domestic animals and of his pride in their prowess. The man who has bred and owns a fine racing pigeon, the man who has brought up a whippet from a puppy, even the man who has brushed out the stable for a horse, are all one at heart with Charles II on Newmarket Heath.

The class divisions are economic, not intrinsic. Polo, ski-ing, deer-stalking are not as widely accessible as pigeon-racing, darts and ferreting, and it is not lack of common interest but only of opportunity which makes for segregation of classes. If further confirmation were needed, those who rear pheasants will assert that geographical propinquity alone is all the accessibility that a poacher requires, and that every Englishman is at heart a poacher, with the exception only of the man who has paid for rearing those particular pheasants!

In *The English People* (32) Professor Denis W. Brogan points out the talented misrepresentation of England's essential character by the films, novels, plays which present an England that is no more representative of the real England than the rural and sporting life of Warrenton (Virginia) is of the realities of the Alabama iron mines or the Mississippi cotton fields. Modern fiction fails to give anything like a reasonably proportioned picture of English life, for most people in England live in large industrial towns. Arnold Bennett told us about these, and J. B. Priestley has done much to restore the balance.

Professor Brogan puts his finger on a widespread English characteristic; the middle and upper class habit of avoiding any mention of specific details about the ways in which the speaker earns his living; the focused conversation known as 'shop':

> Most people are more interesting when they talk shop than when they talk non-shop, since they have something to say which is their own, however silly, when they discuss how they make or do not make a living. . . . Nor should the verbal frivolity of English speech be taken too seriously. It is a bad habit, and one common in all ranks of society. This convention means that only the thickest-skinned and thickest-headed Englishman can talk easily on serious subjects with comparative strangers. . . .

Professor Brogan notes that, in England, to ask for specific information or a definite judgment is bad manners. He makes an interesting comparison between this convention and the American direct approach, with candid willingness to talk. Yet when at a dinner-party in the Eastern States I was asked for specific information about the procedure of criminal trials in England, and for a definite judgment, comparing it with the American procedure (a notorious example of delay had been discussed in the world's press only a few weeks before this) my replies transformed a light-hearted social group into a debating society, when antagonistic views were honestly and freely aired with what seemed to an Englishman unusual party manners.

Many middle and upper class English would not demur to Professor Brogan's view that their habit of under-statement,

combined with inflexible maintenance of their original point of view, is not only an irritating mannerism but a cause of serious misunderstanding. Used by them, 'rather' and 'not quite' may be superlatives: 'Of course, this isn't my line of country, but . . .' may preface an attack upon a whole profession or even a nation, and the non-Englishman who bites his lip to hold back a stinging answer may realise that 'an expensive education has made the speaker incapable of conveying his thoughts except to a small group who know them already.'

We turn to another British observer, Mr. S. K. Ratcliffe, with many years of experience in explaining us to the Americans, and vice versa. He indicated many important differences between the English nation in 1900 and in 1948 when he wrote (191a):

In the nineteenth century foreign critics looked upon England as an aristocratic system.

They noted the riches, power and prestige of the governing classes, the general acceptance of their dominance, the popular reverence for titles. They confessed wonder and envy of the upper-middles, the prosperous business and professional classes, steadily becoming dominant. These, with a high level of ability, possessed wealth and influence going far beyond that of the bourgeoisie in any continental country. They were completely assured as to the strength of their positions. The success of England, it was believed, was a result of the union of aristocracy and commerce, and our privileged classes were said to combine strong individuality with formalism in social life. Europeans from Voltaire onwards were agreed as to England's good fortune in having the largest measure of social freedom.

Foreign observers, again, were agreed as to the industry and steadiness of our working people, while they had shocked comments on the mass poverty of the cities, the drunkenness and rowdyism of the slums. It may be doubted whether any European critics could equal in harshness the judgment of Carlyle and Ruskin, or be as effective as Matthew Arnold in his jibes against the narrowness of our religious philistines—'drugged with business', 'blunted for any stimulus other than religious' 'and in their evenings, for a great treat, a lecture on teetotalism or nunneries.'

All that Victorian England has disappeared in two generations of social change. Everyone who is able to look back over fifty or sixty

years is aware of positive changes for the better, especially in social and public behaviour. A marked growth in civility and a higher level of manners make us a more agreeable nation than we used to be. The removal of barriers, the inter-mingling of classes, goes on without pause. Present day England is a land of opportunity, making a startling contrast to the country of six classes which once seemed to be unchanging.

Since many foreign observers of the English refer to their characteristic sense of humour, it is relevant to consider whether, as many believe, a special, or specially prevalent, sense of humour exists in the English. (In this discussion there must be no confusion between 'English' and 'British'). Related to this are two questions: to what extent does the English sense of humour today imply awareness of social class or stratification, and how far does an attribution of this awareness to the English, colour foreigners' jokes about them?

One approach to these questions might be to consider examples of alleged English humour which do not amuse friendly Americans, because the humour assures that English social differences will be understood. Two obstacles must not be by-passed here. The first is that during both World Wars some English class-differences were temporarily lessened and some not restored when hostilities ceased. In the Wars, other differences reappeared in changed forms, e.g. the master-man relationships were replaced by those of officers and 'other ranks.' This suspension led to much humour of a sort: many Home Guard jokes turned upon the novel contrast between civilian status and Home Guard rank, and in 1919 at least the restoration of civil hierarchies led to more humour—e.g. when a smiling barmaid transmitted a telephone message from a new bank manager to a dilatory clerk; 'Will you kindly tell Major A. that Lance-Corporal B. wants him at once?'

Any easy assumption that the English and the American senses of humour are respectively represented by *Punch* and the *New Yorker* would be fatuous, especially as the policy of *Punch* has changed during the last ten years and is still changing. Yet probably these journals symbolise certain aspects of national humour. The *New Yorker* seldom publishes a humorous effort

depending upon the postulate that A's social class is superior to that of B, who accepts the distinction. The very rich person is often laughed at, the complicated social patterns of Harvard, Yale and Princeton are commented upon obliquely; Philip Hamburger writes a *New Yorker* profile 'J. P. Marquand, Esquire' which might have been by Marquand himself. Mary Petty depicts maidservants in incredible quasi-Victorian houses, but her pictures are not interpreted by words, and there are no jokes assuming that the maids speak differently from their employers. Emily Kimbrough and the late Helen Hokinson cause readers to smile at those who confuse the possession of riches with intellectual distinction, and Cleveland Amory deals with *The Proper Bostonians* (6). Humour and jokes about social classes certainly do not go down well in the U.S.A., and the same trend is now observable here, though less marked. The P. G. Wodehouse brand of humour is nearly extinct; the flavour of Angela Thirkell's tends to become vinegary, and Nancy Mitford's is possibly meant to be caviare to the general.

It is significant, and not merely to an economist, that though in 1919 'lower class' people who had amassed money during the War were called profiteers, and their alleged tendency to fall off horses made the readers of upper-class papers merry, 1946 produced few jokes of this kind, and it was almost blasphemous then to express the belief that as a result of World War II some Englishmen were richer, in spite of taxes.

Returning to English class, whether considered humorous or not, let us consider accounts by non-English writers who disapprove our social differences. Margaret Halsey's *With Malice Towards Some* dates slightly, but the type of social stratification which she observed in an English cathedral city has not vanished.

As Professor Morris Ginsberg has pointed out, in describing England, the foreign writer is inclined to regard London's West End or Suburbia as representing the whole of the country. So, until recently, did *Punch*. In 1949 (27) Richard Blyth described *Punch* as a magazine of suburban humour.

It defers to Hayes, to Beckenham, to Croydon and Gerrard's Cross,

and deferring, it must respect the gods of those lands. Picture to yourself, American, if you can, a magazine of humour, a magazine of nation-wide popularity withal, devoted almost entirely to the sense of humour, interests and habits of the commuter from Staten Island. That would be your American *Punch*.

Today, the policy of *Punch* is harder to predict.

Professor Ginsberg emphasises that foreigners who try to picture England, to themselves, their compatriots and to us, devote much space to manners, taste, tact, humour, conventions, fashions and the doings of 'Society'. Of such writers Kurt von Stutterheim was an example. In *Those English* he really describes England's ruling classes of 1936, and considers the most important aspects of the British Character to be courage, joy in danger and (our italics) *the most cold-blooded bargaining*.

Pierre Maillaud, who (says Raymond Mortimer) under the *nom de guerre* of Pierre Bourdan, lifted up the hearts of the millions of Frenchmen who dared to listen, from the fall of France through the liberation of Paris, to the nightly broadcast from London of *Les Français Parlent aux Français*, described our social system in *The English Way*.

Mortimer contrasts Maillaud with one or two other Frenchmen who, before 1939, professed to explain us to their compatriots. Maillaud 'knew not only Westminster, Mayfair and Fleet Street, but our London suburbs, the provincial cities and countryside.' The most obvious drawbacks of English society, he thinks, are social prejudice and social consciousness which, *independent of class feeling* (the distinctions are interesting) are alive everywhere, save perhaps among the nobility whose very status keeps them immune from it.

From the very superficial classification made immediately according to accent (and from which there was no appeal) to subtle distinctions amid which the uninitiated lose the scent, there were almost as many social degrees in pre-war England as in the hierarchy of an Indian state, except that the English order was preserved by human respect and discretion.

In England, it requires (or required) Napoleonic attention to details, such as the tone of the voice, the practice of cordial detach-

ment, the suitable dose of affability, and perhaps the proper variations of address to animals, from hunter to Pekinese.

He continues:

In the years 1935, 1936 and 1937, class feeling certainly played a part, if not in the national life of the country, at least in its international conduct.

The first great occasion on which England truly and broadly reacted ideologically to a foreign issue and on which class sentiment played a decisive part was the Italian menace and subsequent aggression against Abyssinia in 1935.

The cumulative effect of the Abyssinian affair and of the Spanish civil war was not only to render the English public aware of class problems but to transform its attitude to the issue of war and peace. Abyssinia destroyed the remnants of pacifism and substituted for them in the English Left a strong urge to intervene abroad. Spain kept that tendency alive and broadened the class cleavage between Right and Left by rendering the Right class-conscious also.

An interesting example of appreciation of English character was *A Small Stir* (31) by James Bridie and Moray McLaren.

The late Osburn Henry Mavor (James Bridie) was based geographically and spiritually, on Glasgow, but was a member of the Athenaeum, Garrick and Savage Clubs in London. Moray McLaren went to a Scottish public school, Merchiston, proceeding to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, was a B.B.C. programme director and assistant editor of the *London Mercury* and the *Listener*, has spent much of his life in England, among the English, and his London club is the Savile.

Such details, which might seem out of place here, illustrate an important fact: the 'England' about which these writers exchange penetrating and well-founded impressions, seems to be London between Ludgate Hill and Hyde Park Corner. To judge by this book, while there, they were seldom in the open air. They discuss chiefly clubs, pubs, eating-houses; journalists, publishers, editors and play-producers. They freely mention the *Spectator*, *New Statesman and Nation*, *Time and Tide*, the *Manchester Guardian* and the *Daily Express*, but not the *Daily Telegraph*, *News Chronicle* and *Daily Herald*.

They make few references to the lower middle or working class, though the Euston porters are compared favourably with their opposite numbers at Edinburgh and Paris. Mr. McLaren has occasionally visited Manchester, of which he has gloomy recollections, yet of these the only example he gives is of a 'pub' which must have stank to high heaven—as they often do in London and Edinburgh. 'In the North of England' he writes, not mentioning county or social stratum, 'amiability exists alongside not only insensitivity and tactlessness but downright crass rudeness' (described elsewhere as 'honest-to-God, unaffected'). Manchester's 'hoarse catarrhal voices are louder and more hideous than anything you will hear in the Gorbals or Caithness.' However, in order to emphasise English ruthlessness in war he employs (in writing) North-Country dialect. Yet, one might ask, in World War II, among those members of the British higher command who decided upon ruthless methods, how many had marked Northern English accents?

This provocative book which tells us, and fairly, about a few English social strata may be cited as more evidence that today concepts of stratum and élite can be more useful than that of class. Perhaps the authors felt this too, e.g. Bridie (p. 64) writes 'Are you not confusing the Englishman with his rulers? . . . You know quite well how English Governments are chosen. . . .'

We have already mentioned the essay-review purporting to deal with *The Character of England* in the *Times Literary Supplement* for 7th August 1948. Reprinted as a pamphlet, it sold well. Bridie considered it the best essay on the English he had ever read, adding that it has been credited to André Maurois, Cyril Connolly and Bernard Shaw. McLaren replies that it is by 'the anonymous but perfectly well-known mystery Scot' who threw the English literate world into a state of chattering, half-shocked delight, and provoked St. John Ervine into a sentimental defence of his view of the English. To this naturally, the mystery man replied vigorously.

This essay confidently attributes certain characteristics to 'The English,' and, bearing in mind our social stratification, we may comment on them. They are self-admiration, of which

hypocrisy is the most distinguished product, ruthlessness, which the English ignore completely, a habit of buccaneering—simple, bluff, hearty plundering—a propensity for endless aggressive war combined with a tendency to pose as a sheep; an attitude which also deceives the poseur. The English are passionately artistic, enormously addicted to the cult of 'pattern,' especially in their games and sports, they have a faculty beyond all other people of ignoring their neighbours, their surroundings, or, in the last resort, themselves, and a belief that the story is meant to end happily, i.e. with an English victory, moral or material.

Possibly some readers of the *Times Literary Supplement* were pleased to imagine themselves to be the English thus described above; others may doubt if it is fair to praise or blame them for possessing all those picturesque qualities. They might smile at the Mystery Man's *riposte* to Mr. St. John Ervine's generous defence of us. 'The English . . . with that disdain for personally justifying themselves before outside opinion which is one of their most lasting characteristics, invited an Irishman to take up the cudgels.' ('The English' —a comprehensive term—were presumably the B.B.C. Talks Department.)

The Mystery Man is aware of strata other than the 'ruling class' and the professional literary people. He points out that in *The Character of England*, the 'newest England, the England of the streets' gets two pages only, out of 575, and declares that no country is so urbanised as England:

> In spite of the fact that a grocer's calendar will carry the picture of a cottage in the snow, or that the frontispiece of the *Listener* may show a village spire, England, modern England, is a series of city streets. Nine out of every ten Englishmen anywhere are born in the towns and bred in the streets. Yet out of these streets came the men who could outlast the Arabs in the desert, who could fight the Japanese in the forests, who flew above the birds and dived below the whales. . . . The chapter of English city life . . . ought in logic to have been written by someone who could and would write, sing, whistle, dance and watch for his or her own personal pleasure The Lambeth Walk.

And like the unanonymous, indubitably Scottish Professor Brogan, he reminds the English that nowadays their national game is not cricket but 'Soccer.'

An estimation of the English character by his grandmother, a strong-minded Hindu lady belonging to the caste called Nayars of Malabar, is reported by Aubrey Menen in the *New Yorker* (157). His father was a Hindu doctor trained in England, where he married an Irishwoman and settled down. The grandmother had never met the English; but she knew all about them. They were tall, fair, given to strong drink, had conquered her native country and were incurably dirty in their personal habits, for decent people took a minimum of two baths a day. She abominated their manners, especially their habit of watching each other thrust food into their mouths, masticate and swallow it. Yet, had she met some of the English, she would have found that they had much in common with her; e.g. racial pride. Moreover the Nayars, traditionally, had two obligations to society; they were warriors when there was fighting to do, and when there was not, they carried, on certain holy days, flowers to the temple. But observes Mr. Menen, this caste exists in England, all over the countryside: the men are called Army and the women take not only flowers but fruit to the temple on the occasion of the Harvest Festival. The combination of these two activities, whether in the shires or in the coconut groves of Malabar, produces the most ferocious snobs.

The Nayars keep their dignity when dealing with priests (Brahmans). These are expected to mind their own business, which is to perform weekly ceremonies and to direct their preaching at the lower orders, particularly to the Servants. . . . The grandson was exhorted to remember himself when moving among the English, who would look up to him as a Nayar, to set an example. And, wishing him goodbye, his English headmaster said 'Let them see by your example that you have been trained in an *English* school. Wherever you go, it is for you to set the tone.'

Whether or not anything so definite as a character can be predicated of the English today, the average Englishman is not only aware of our social stratification but is inclined to

accept, or at least not to criticise, a considerable amount of it. Though as yet there have been few studies of the lower-middle and working classes one reason may be suggested: that over the the last three decades there was a definite transmission downwards of culture-values, once regarded, rightly or not, as a prerogative of the upper classes. This suggestion however may cover reluctance to undertake a complicated task. The clash of 'upper' and 'lower' class values inside a family, which could result when a member who had served in the war and been promoted to commissioned rank, returned to live at home, has been treated by novelists, and now that university education is available to more children, similar problems have been increased, though there are several ways of solving them, or preventing them from becoming acute.

It is hoped that evidence has now been given that foreign observers who have written about the English, often take our social hierarchies for granted and describe only the upper and wealthier classes. Since the estimate, in other countries, of our 'national character' (13a) is still important, the relevance of this chapter to the general theme of the present book seems indubitable.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Summary and Conclusions. Personal Prejudices

IT has been thought advisable to offer the reader a summary of this book, and its author is well aware of many omissions.

While in England social differences matter less today than they did fifty years ago, they are still important, obvious; accepted, with pleasure or resignation, or resented. The concept of class is insufficient to subsume the chief facts. Those of stratum, status and élite are useful for different purposes.

To some observers the subjective aspects of class seem more important than the objective. Class consciousness is distinguishable from class feeling, especially of the kind which leads to conflict within or between persons.

Speech and occupation are important signs of class, but occupation often implies status, which can be more important. Professional activities are still sharply distinguished from those of commerce, trade and manual work. There is perhaps a tendency to begrudge or even to deny the title of 'profession' to new pretenders, and to overlook the changing status of some established professions.

The prestige assigned to occupations varies with the experience of the person who estimates it. Possibly, adolescents (lower middle and working class) value class and status less than most social investigators, themselves predominantly middle aged and middle class, have hitherto imagined.

The concept of élites has been used less often in England than on the Continent of Europe, but powerful overt and covert élites exist here too. A study of Her Majesty's Judges, an outstanding numerically limited élite, is described.

Social stratification in England and in the U.S.A. are compared. In England the relations between social and economic

status are still so complex that the usefulness of the concept 'socio-economic status' is limited. Signs of social strata, visual, auditory, tactual, olfactory, have changed rapidly in this century. The importance of owning land and property is still considerable.

Concepts of the aristocrat and the gentleman are examined. Some writers assert that though there are many aristocrats, the aristocratic system has vanished. 'Opportunity class' is compared with social class. The effects of evacuation during World War II are discussed.

Manners are important in emphasising or blurring class distinctions. Etiquette prescribes manners expected from certain people in predictable situations; consequently it may be at variance with good manners, which can change, especially in war time. Etiquette is still important in the professions. It may or may not increase actual goodwill.

Ways of speaking are linked complexly with manners; their relationships vary with class and locality. Outstanding local and class differences in speech are described. Twenty-five years of radio have established stereotypes and prototypes of speech: these are copied, and this fact decreases social differentiation.

Ways of speaking may be socially inclusive or exclusive: A social 'sound-barrier' still exists. Problems concerning dialects, standard English and 'received pronunciation' are outlined.

Different meanings of 'culture,' and the relation of cultural to social differences are discussed, with reference to the views of anthropologists and others.

The changing uses of the word 'snob' are mentioned, and intellectual and inverted snobbery described. Evidence has been offered that snobbishness amongst the Women's Voluntary Services is decreasing: 'particular groups are no longer regarded as inherently capable of fulfilling particular functions.'

On the assumption that the nation can still be divided into three classes; upper, middle and working, different accounts of them are discussed, especially those by Cole, Lewis and Maude, and Zweig. Arguments in support of upper class ideals and conventions are examined. The relation of children to parents

in different classes and in different economic strata are discussed. Doubt is cast upon the existence of *a* middle class.

Since few investigations of class differences in clothing, eating and drinking have been made, the writer draws upon the evidence of some experts and his own observations. The fact that for certain purposes one can now buy, or hire, 'good taste,' and the popularisation of fashions by press, film and television blur the old distinction between good clothes as exclusive signs of the upper classes and as signs of wealth. Some types of clothes may proclaim that their wearer has leisure.

The increase in hotel and restaurant charges, and in the number of people who eat and entertain in them 'on expenses sheets' makes it difficult to observe class differences in public eating and drinking, yet the questions 'what, when and how' repay investigation.

It is claimed on behalf of some public schools that they train character rather than, or together with, intellect. The two concepts are seldom defined by apologists, but studies of 'character structure' are relevant, as well as investigations into the relations between general and specific training, the transfer of training, and 'transference.' The alleged virtues and defects of the 'public school character,' as popularly conceived, are outlined, with particular reference to the achievement of mental maturity.

In English education, social differences are important, and some systems emphasise and preserve distinctions. It is hard to discuss this subject without exhibiting personal or political prejudice. Examining the prestige of educational institutions offers objective and subjective difficulties. Social differences are noticeable, not only between but within universities, colleges and schools. Accounts of 'Oxbridge' and 'Redbrick' during the last thirty years support the view that important social changes are occurring in both types of university. Recent researches into social consciousness in modern schools have given illuminating results.

A balanced conspectus of English leisure pursuits is probably beyond any one person's reach, but an attempt is made here, with the help of students of games and sports, to examine some

marked differences in the social valuation of leisure pursuits, especially cricket, football (in its two forms) tennis, golf, hockey, athletics, motor cycling, boxing, wrestling, shooting, fishing and sports which necessitate the use of animals.

The book concludes with a collection of impressions of the English as they see themselves and as others see them. Foreigners' concepts of the English are often based upon stereotypes of the upper and wealthy classes. Perhaps, at least before 1914, there were more resemblances between the 'characters' of the corresponding classes in neighbouring countries than between the 'characters' of the different classes in our own.

Few writers who have discussed English social differences have stated explicitly their likes, dislikes, prejudices and reasoned opinions concerning their subject-matter. These may seem to appear more or less clearly to the reader, whose judgment however may depend upon his own bias or tendency to find party-political implications in neutral statements. Since, though trying to be impartial, I have often failed, there now follows a record of personal prejudices, in case anyone feels that to know them may help him better to understand this book.

I regard the objective and subjective importance of class as diminishing, though the rate of its decrease varies in different parts of England, in towns and the countryside; class consciousness and class feeling (in the sense of antagonism) do not necessarily go together. The real test of class-quality is the convivial one: who, if you could afford it, would you naturally entertain in your home, being unsurprised if the invitation were returned, and introduce with pleasure to your friends?

In many schools, class matters less every year, but the authorities of certain schools are deliberate and conscious curators of class symbols. In our universities, both ancient and modern, the proportion of students depending upon scholarships increases, but the college's cultural standards and mores which they accept, even expect, are usually derived from the upper or upper-middle classes.

Today's redistribution of incomes, reducing extremes of wealth and poverty, will increase the usefulness of the concept of strata, especially economic, relative to that of classes. Other

strata, e.g. educational and cultural, are open to aspirants with the requisite intelligence and financial resources, yet some strata are 'class-implicated' to a considerable degree; the fact may not be well known to outsiders.

Within some strata, new élites have grown up, as powerful as the military and ecclesiastical élites of last century. It is difficult to gauge the social influence of scientists today, but it is very considerable. The presence of an overt élite may be approved or disapproved by the majority, but the growing power of covert élites, e.g. great industrial combines employing many scientists on secret or semi-secret work, is profoundly disturbing.

The increasing importance of status is undeniable. When the elevation of a person's status is due mainly to his own efforts, if they are not socially undesirable, I regard it without mistrust, for unlike rank, status can often be lost as soon and as easily as it is gained. Having always assumed that rank is part of the English social structure, and writing with fresh memories of Coronation year, I think of ranks as making England interesting and picturesque.

All my life I have been friendly with people from the professions, commerce, trade, and manual work. Until I became interested in psychology, probably I regarded their social gradation as natural. Were I to earn my living again, I would like to do it once more in a profession, and I sympathise with writers who extol the character qualities expected and usually found in professional people, but admit that I could have done more to experience the joys and sorrows of manual work. I doubt, however, if this would have altered my political views.

Most of the religious people whom I have known were members of the Church of England, neither 'high' nor 'low.' At an early age, I had noticed social differences between 'Church' and 'Chapel,' and I feel sure, identified them with distinctions between professions and trade, Conservativism and Liberalism. The term 'Radical,' which was heard only occasionally, I took to mean extreme Liberal. I remember the surprise with which, when Mr. W. E. Gladstone died, I read that he was a Churchman.

On going to live in Manchester at the age of 23, I discovered with interest that my new friends were almost all nonconformists or agnostic, and if religiously inclined, were seldom members of the Church of England. Most of them would probably have been amused, perhaps with a touch of ambivalence, at a suggestion that they were the social inferiors of Churchmen. I felt, too, that my Scottish friends liked one to know the sect to which they belonged. The beautiful ancient buildings (in East Anglia) the music and the liturgy of the Church of England were deeply appreciated: I thought of nonconformist services sometimes as attractively hearty, sometimes as intellectual but lacking the bonhomie of the university lecture room. I have known few Anglo-Catholics or Roman Catholics, and many Jews, orthodox and unorthodox. Since, until 18, I knew no members of these sects, I was immediately interested in the ways in which their social behaviour differed from mine, though I should have regarded personal questions about these differences as impertinent intrusions upon their privacy.

I am well aware of the poverty of many professional people, but am impressed by their different views concerning 'necessaries.' They expend, out of comparable incomes, very different amounts upon education, clothes, medical attendance, food and drink, tobacco, books, entertainment, clubs and societies, theatres, holidays and travel*. For this reason, any concept of English 'socio-economic status' seems to me quite unworkable for understanding this section of society; the one I know best.

Never having understood why one should apologise for using the word 'culture,' and preferring, in general, the company of the more cultured to that of the less cultured, in the popular sense of that word, I cannot accept the view that in these days of books, theatres, concert-halls, radio and film, culture ought to be, or even can be, restricted to a minority, however distinguished or deserving, and mistrust the suggestion that to disseminate culture is necessarily to spread it more thinly.

*Cf. the pamphlet 'The Middle Class Way of Life :' correspondence reprinted from the *Manchester Guardian*, March 1954.

The large audiences at the Royal Festival Hall for 'difficult' music, and the success of the da Vinci Exhibition in London are evidence to the contrary. Increasing separation of culture from class is inevitable.

So far as I can, by personal experience, by conversation and reading, sympathise and empathise with 'sportsmen' and 'sportswomen' of very different kinds, I find it easy to understand the social stratification of our leisure pursuits. The fact that 'rugger' players are tempted, rightly or wrongly, to give themselves airs in relation to 'soccer' players during the last fifty years is not puzzling to anyone who knows the history of the games, and the traditions of chivalry account in part for the cult of the horse which journalists and artists record so affectionately and in such very different ways. It is easy to understand why the popularity of all-in wrestling and speedway racing has not spread 'upwards,' while that of pool-betting has.

It is hard to state briefly but fairly my attitude, or attitudes, towards the public schools; the difficulty is not decreased by increasing knowledge of their pupils. Our public schools number over a hundred, each with a different history. Some, famous or obscure, are ancient, others almost brand new, and the character of any school, if indeed it can even be summed up with an adjective or two, may be drastically altered by a strong-willed headmaster. The school to which an old boy sends his son may in twenty years have become markedly 'better' or 'worse,' though often he is unlikely to know this. With the country's financial prosperity or decline, the relative numbers of different types of parent may change. In any one school, intellectual development may be regarded as more or less important than character. A school may be known to prepare a relatively large number of boys for the Church, the Civil Service or the Forces: it may be a Quaker or a Roman Catholic foundation.

One might therefore be tempted to take the easy way and to deny that any generalisation about English public schools is possible, but this is unjustified, for a 'public school type,' even types from particular schools, can often be recognised after a brief acquaintance. Having met numerous ex-public schoolboys informally and formally, I am convinced that in many of them

there has been inculcated a readiness not only to accept responsibility but to seek it, and an assumption that theirs is the class destined to play this part in society. Many have been toughened in ways which most elementary schoolboys experience only in National Service. A boy's tendency to look to his mother for emotional support—perhaps too for moral guidance—may have been discouraged at a public school (Cf. 219a). Whether such education is described as practical 'muscular Christianity' or a Spartan training depends upon the school—and the describer (Cf. 17a). Unless the boy has sisters, and spends a fair amount of the holidays with them and their friends, he is often puzzled, on leaving school, by the unpredictable ways (to him) of the other sex.

Whether he mixes well or badly with people outside the class he considers to be his own will depend upon himself, his family and his school. His manners are likely to be good, though they may not be extended widely.

The answer often given to such a statement 'But at summer camps such boys mix easily with the poorest London lads' is too simple. Do they mix easily with adults as well as boys from the lower middle class in ordinary life and not in camps?

I know many public schoolboys popular because they are friendly, courteous, thoughtful and sensitive to others' feelings. But a number of their fathers and mothers, and many boys with these outstanding qualities, have not been to public schools. To end these platitudes—but platitudes may be important and true—public schools differ in the extent to which they attempt to compensate for the boy's monastic life by bringing in representatives of the world outside.

If it be true that two types of psychology can be distinguished: 'understanding' (*verstehende*) and 'scientific' (*wissenschaftliche*) this book is offered as a modest contribution to the former. I have tried not to take sides; the reader may judge the degree of my success.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1 ABSHAGEN, K. *Kings, Lords and Gentlemen*, London, Heinemann.

2 ADAMSON, J. W. *An Outline of English Education*, 1925, London.

3 ALLINGHAM, MARGERY. *The Oaken Heart*, 1941, London, Michael Joseph.

4 ALLISTER, RAY. *Manners for Moderns*, 1950, London, Convoy Press.

5 ALLPORT, G. W. *Personality*, 1938, London, Constable.

5a ALLPORT, G. W. *The Nature of Prejudice*, 1954, Cambridge, Mass., Addison Wesley Co.

6 AMORY, C. *The Proper Bostonians*, New York, E. P. Dutton; and *Harpers*, Sept. and Oct. 1947.

7 ANON. 'High Fashion, Low Price,' *Contact No.* 1. London, Contact Press.

8 ANON. *Contact No.* 10.

9 ANON. 'The Future of the Upper Class,' *Contact No.* 1.

10 ANON. *Times Literary Supplement*, 7th August, 1948.

10a ANON. *Listener*, 16th Dec. 1948.

10b ANON. 'Can Hunting Survive?' *News Review*, 12th Jan., 1950.

11 ANSON, H. *Looking Forward*, 1938, London, Heinemann.

11a ARLOTT, J. *Concerning Soccer*, 1952, London, Longmans Green.

11b ARLOTT, J. *Cricket*, 1953, London, Burke.

12 ARON, R. 'Social Structure and the Ruling Class.' *Brit. Jour. of Sociol.* 1, 1950, pp. 1–17.

13 ASHLEY-MONTAGU, M. F. *On Being Human*, 1950, New York, Henry Schuman.

13a *As Others See Us*, 1954, International Press Institute, Zürich.

14 AUDEN, W. H. *New Yorker*, 23rd April, 1949, pp. 85–86.

15 BADGER, A. B. *The Public Schools and the Nation*, 1940, London.

16 BAKER, P. J. N. *The Private Manufacture of Armaments*, 1937, London.

17 BAKKE, E. W. *The Unemployed Man*, 1933, London, Nisbet.

17a BALSTON, T. *Dr. Balston at Eton*, 1952, London, Macmillan.

17b BARON, S. and MULLAHY, F. 'Butlin Between Seasons,' *Contact No. 3.*

18 BARKER, E. (ed.) *The Character of England*, 1947, Oxford University Press.

19 BARTLETT, F. C. 'The Social Psychology of Leadership,' *Jour. Nat. Inst. of Ind. Psychol.* 1926, 3, 188–193.

20 BEAGLEHOLE, E. *Property*, London, Kegan Paul.

21 BEAGLEHOLE, E. 'Character Structure,' *Psychiatry*, 1944, 7.

21a BEALES, H. L. and LAMBERT, R. S. *Memoirs of the Unemployed*, 1934, London, Gollancz.

22 *Bedside Guardian*, 1952, London, Collins.

23 BEHRMAN, S. N. *Lord Duveen*, London.

24 BENEDICT, RUTH. *Patterns of Culture*, 1934, London, Methuen.

24a BENNEY, M. and GEISS, PHYLLIS. 'Social Class and Politics in Greenwich,' *Brit. Jour. of Sociol.* 1950, pp. 310f.

25 BLACKBURN, J. M. *The Framework of Human Behaviour*, 1947, London, Kegan Paul.

25a BLANCH, LESLEY. 'The English in the Kitchen,' 1949, *Contact No. 15.*

26 BLOOMFIELD, P. *B.B.C.*, 1941, London, Eyre and Spottiswoode.

27 BLYTH, R. *The English-Speaking World*, 1949, London, English-Speaking Union.

28 BONHAM-CARTER, VIOLET, in *The Character of England* (cf. Barker, E.)

29 BOTT, A. *Our Fathers*, 1931, London, Heinemann.

30 BOTT, A., and CLEPHANE, IRÈNE, *Our Mothers*, 1932, London, Gollancz.

31 BRIDIE, J. and MCLAREN, MORAY. *A Small Stir*: *Letters on the English*, 1948, London, Hollis and Carter.

32 BROGAN, D. W. *The English People*, London, Hamish Hamilton, p. 123–124.

33 BROGAN, D. W. *U.S.A.: An Outline of the Country, Its People and Institutions*, 1941, Oxford University Press, pp. 116–123.

34 BURT, C. 'The Education of the Young Adolescent,' *Brit. J. of Educ. Psychol.* 1943, 13, pp. 125–140.

34a BURT, C. 'The Selection of Pupils for Different Types of Secondary Schools,' *Brit. J. of Educ. Psychol.* 20, 1950, pp. 1–10.

35 BURT, C. *Contributions of Psychology to Social Problems*, 1953, Oxford University Press.

36 CAMPBELL, G. 'Golf Faces a Crisis,' *Contact No.* 11.

36a CAMPBELL, W. J. 'The Influence of Home Environment on the Educational Progress of Selective Secondary School-children,' *Brit. Jour. of Educ. Psych.* 22, 1952, pp. 89–100.

37 CANTRIL, H. 'Identification with Social and Economic Class,' *J. of Abn. & Soc. Psychol.*, 38, 1943, pp. 74–80.

38 CANTRIL, H. and SHERIF, M. *The Psychology of Ego-Involvement*, 1947, London, Chapman & Hall.

39 CARDUS, N. *Autobiography*, London, Collins.

40 CARR-SAUNDERS, A. M. and WILSON, P. A. *The Professions*, 1933, Oxford University Press.

40a CATTELL, R. B. 'The Concept of Social Status,' *Jour. of Soc. Psychol.* 15, 1942, pp. 293–308.

40b CATTELL, R. B. 'The Cultural Functions of Social Stratification,' *Jour. of Soc. Psychol.* 21, 1945, pp. 3–23 and 25–55.

41 CAUDWELL, C. *Studies in a Dying Culture*, 1938, London, John Lane.

42 CENTERS, R. *The Psychology of Social Classes*, 1949, Princeton University Press.

43 CHAMBERS, ROSALIND C. Chapter on Women's Voluntary Organisations (see Glass, D. G.).

44 CHAPMAN, D. *The Family, The Home and Social Status*, 1954. London, Kegan Paul.

45 CHASE, MARY ELLEN. *In England Now.*

46 CHASE, S. *The Proper Study of Mankind*, 1950, London, Phoenix House.

47 CHORLEY, KATHERINE. *Manchester Made Them*, 1950, London, Methuen.

48 COHEN, J. 'Can We Have a Science of Society?' *The Listener*, 1948, 40, pp. 485–488, and Chapter in G. M. Heddle (ed.) 1950, *The Times We Live In*, London, Longmans Green.

48a COHEN-PORTHEIM, P. *England the Unknown Isle* and *The Spirit of London*, London, Batsford.

49 COLE, G. D. H. and POSTGATE, R. *The Common People:* 1746–1938, 1938, London, Methuen.

50 COLE, G. D. H. 'The Social Structure of England; Part I, the working classes; part II; the middle classes.' *History Today*, 1, Feb., March, 1951, pp. 57–68, 46–58.

50a COLE, G. D. H. 'The Conception of the Middle Classes,' *Brit. J. of Sociol.* 1, 1950, pp. 275–290.

51 COLE, MARGARET. 'How Democratic is Britain?', *Harpers*, July, 1948, pp. 98–106.

52 COMFORT, A. *Authority and Delinquency in the Modern State*, 1950, London, Routledge.

52a 'Craftsman Tailor, The,' *Future*, 3, 1, 1950.

53 CUMMINGS, A. J. (see 153).

54 *Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools*, 1943, London, H.M.S.O.

54a DARLINGTON, C. D. *The Conflict of Science and Society*, 1948, London, Watts.

55 DARWIN, B. *The English Public School*, 1929, London.

55a DAVID, A. A. *Life and The Public Schools.*

56 DAVIES, A. F. 'The Prestige of Occupations,' *Brit. J. of Sociol.* 1952, 3, pp. 134–147.

56a DAVIS, A. *Deep South*, 1941, Chicago, University Press.

57 DAVIS, A. *Social Class Influences Upon Learning*, 1948, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

58 DELANE, MARY. 'Fashion is World-Wide,' *Contact No.* 17, Dec. 1949.

59 DICKENS, MONICA. *One Pair of Hands* and *One Pair of Feet*, London.

60 DICKS, H. V. Chapter IX in *Psychological Factors of Peace and War* (ed. T. H. PEAR), 1950, London, Hutchinson.

60a DOLLARD, J. *Caste and Class in a Southern Town*, 1937, New Haven, Yale University Press.

61 DREVER, J. 'Academic Freedom in British Universities,' *Jour. of Social Issues*, 9, 3, pp. 17–24.

61a ELIAS, N. 'Studies in the Genesis of the Naval Profession,' *Brit. J. of Sociol.* 1, 1950, pp. 291–310.

61b ELIOT, T. S. *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*, 1948, London, Faber and Faber.

62 ENSOR, R. C. K. *Courts and Judges*, 1933, Oxford University Press, p. 84.

63 ERVINE, St. John, *The Listener*, 14th Oct. 1948.

64 EYSENCK, H. J. 'Social Attitudes and Social Class,' *Brit. J. of Sociol.* 1, 1950, pp. 56–66.

64a EYSENCK, H. J. 'Primary Social Attitudes as Related to Social Class and Political Party,' *Brit. J. of Sociol.* 2, 1951, pp. 198–209.

65 FLEET, S. 'The Edwardian Influence in Savile Row,' *Contact I-IV*, Dec. 1950

65a FLOUD, JEAN. Review of Lewis and Maude, 'The English Middle Classes,' *Brit. J. of Sociol.* 1, 1950, pp. 87–89.

66 FLOUD, JEAN, MARTIN, F. M. and HALSEY, A. H. 'Equality of Educational Opportunity and Social Studies in Britain,' 1953, *Congress of International Sociological Association*, Liêge.

67 FLOUD, JEAN. *Educational Opportunity and Social Mobility*,' 1950, *Year Book of Education*, London, Evans Bros. pp. 117–136.

68 FLOUD, JEAN. 'Social Stratification in Denmark.' (Review Article of GEIGER, T. *Soziale Umschichtungen in einer Danischer Mittelstadt*, 1951, Acta Jutlandica, Copenhagen), *Brit. Jour. of Sociol.* 3, 1952–4, 173–178.

69 FLÜGEL, J. C. *The Psychology of Clothes*, 1930, London, Hogarth Press.

70 FLÜGEL, J. C. Chapter VI in *Psychological Factors of Peace and War* (ed. T. H. PEAR), 1950, London, Hutchinsons.

71 FLÜGEL, J. C. *A Hundred Years of Psychology*, London, Duckworth. 1933

72 FOX, T. F. *The Lancet*, 1951, ii, pp. 115f, 171f.

73 FROMM, E. *The Fear of Freedom*, London, Kegan Paul.

75 FYFE, HAMILTON. *The Illusion of National Character*, London.

76 GALTON, F. *Hereditary Genius*, 1869, London, Macmillan.

77 GATES, E. C. and PEAR, T. H. 'An Inquiry into Juvenile Delinquency,' *Social Welfare*, July 1941, pp. 190–209.

78 GINSBERG, M. 'Class Consciousness,' *Ency. Soc. Sciences*, 1930, New York, Macmillan.

79 GINSBERG, M. Chapter IX of *Studies in Sociology*, 1932, London, Methuen.

80 GINSBERG, M. 'National Character,' *Brit. J. of Psychol.* 1942, 32, pp. 183–205.

81 GLASS, D. G. (ed.) *et al. Social Mobility in Britain*, 1954, London, Kegan Paul.

82 GOFFMAN, E. 'Symbols of Class Status,' *Brit. J. of Sociol.* 1951, 2, pp. 294–305.

83 GORER, G. *The Americans*, 1948, London, Cresset Press.

83a GORER, G. 'Some Notes on the British Character,' *Horizon*, 20, 1949, 120–211, pp. 369–379.

84 GORHAM, M. A. C. *The Local* and *Back to the Local.*

84a GORHAM, M. A. C. 'Lets Have Good New Pubs!', *Leader*, Nov. 19, 1949.

84b GRAHAM, M. *Human Needs*, Cresset Press, 1951, London.

85 GRAHAM, VIRGINIA. *Say Please!* 1949, London, Harvill Press.

86 GRAVES, R. *Lars Porsena*, London, Kegan Paul.

87 GRETTON, R. H. *The English Middle Class*, 1917, London, Bell.

88 GUTTSMAN, W. L. 'The Changing Social Structure of the British Political Elite,' *Brit. J. of Sociol.* 2, 1951, pp. 122–135.

89 GUTTSMAN, W. L. 'Aristocracy and the Middle Class in the British Political Elite,' 1886–1916. *Brit. J. of Sociol.* 5, 1954, pp. 12–32.

89a HAHN, Emily. *England To Me.*

90 HALL, J. and JONES, D. C. 'Social Grading of Occupations,' *Brit. J. of Sociol.* 1, 1950, pp. 31–55 (cf. Hall and Moser.)

92 HALL, J. and MOSER, C. 'The Social Grading of Occupations,' Chapter in *Social Mobility in Britain* (ed. D. V. GLASS), (81).

93 HALSEY, A. H. and GARDNER, L. 'Selection for Secondary Education and Achievement in Four Grammar Schools,' *Brit. J. of Sociol.* 4, 1943, pp. 60–75.

94 HALSEY, M. *With Malice Towards Some*, New York, Simon and Schuster.

95 HARDING, D. W. *Social Psychology and Individual Values*, 1953, London, Hutchinson.

95a HARTLEY-GRATTAN, C. 'The Middle Class, Alas!' *Harpers*, 202, No. 1209, Feb. 1951.

96 HARRIS, K. *Travelling Tongues*, 1949, London, John Murray, p. 150.

97 HARRISON, T. 'Notes on Class Consciousness and Class Unconsciousness.' *Sociol Rev.*, 34, 1942, pp. 147–164.

98 HAWTON, H. *Monthly Record* of Conway Hall, 58, 5, 1953.

98a HILTON, J. *Rich Man, Poor Man*, London, Allen and Unwin.

99 HIMMELWEIT, H. T., HALSEY, A. H. and OPPENHEIM, A. N. 'The Views of Adolescents on Some Aspects of the Social Class Structure,' *Brit. J. of Sociol.*, 1952, 3, pp. 148–152.

100 HOGBEN, L. *Dangerous Thoughts*, London, Allen and Unwin.

101 HOLLINGSHEAD, A. B. *Elmtown's Youth*, 1949, New York, Wiley.

102 HOLLOWOOD, B. *Contact No.* 11.

103 HUGHES, D. *A Defence of the Public Schools.*

103a HYMAN, H. 'The Psychology of Status,' *Arch. of Psychol.*, 1942.

104 ISAACS, SUSAN S. (ed.) *The Cambridge Evacuation Survey*, 1941, London, Methuen.

105 JAHODA, Marie. 'Some Socio-psychological Problems of Factory Life,' *Brit. J. of Psych.* 31, 1940, pp. 191–200.

106 JAMES, E. J. F. *Education and Leadership.*

107 JENKINS, HESTER and JONES, D. 'Social Class of Cambridge University Alumni of the 18th and 19th Centuries.' *Brit. J. of Sociol.* 2, 1951, pp. 122–135.

108 JEPHCOTT, PEARL. *Girls Growing Up*, London.

109 JEPHCOTT, PEARL. *Rising Twenty*, 1948, London, Faber and Faber.

110 JESPERSEN, O. *Mankind, Nation and Individual from a Linguistic Point of View*, 1946, London.

111 JOAD, C. E. M. 'The Englishman and Sport,' *Contact No.* 11.

112 KEETON, G. W. *Monthly Record* of South Place Ethical Society, 1949, 54.

113 KINSEY, A. C. *et al. Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male*, 1948, Philadelphia, Saunders.

114 KLUCKHOHN, C. and KELLY, W. H. 'The Concept of Culture,' in *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, ed. R. Linton, 1944, New York, Columbia University Press.

115 KRAKAUER, S. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1949, XIII, p. 53–72.

116 LASKI, H. J. *Report of the Committee on Ministers' Powers* (1932), Cmd. 4060, London, H.M. Stationery Office.

117 LASKI, H. J. *The Dangers of Being a Gentleman*, London, Allen and Unwin.

118 LASKI, MARGHANITA. *The Village.*

119 LAVER, J. *Clothes*, 1953, London, Burke.

120 LAVER, J. *Westminster Bank Review*, 1951, Festival of Britain Supplement.

121 LAVER, J. Chapter in *The Character of England* (see Barker, E.) 1941, Oxford University Press.

121a LAVERS, G. R. and ROWNTREE, B. S. (see 196).

122 LAWRENCE, EVELYN M. 'An Investigation into the Relations Between Intelligence and Inheritance.' *Brit. J. of Psychol.* Mon. Supp. XVI, 1931.

123 LAWS, F. (ed.) *Made for Millions*, 1947, London, Contact Press.

124 LAZARSFELD–JAHODA, M. and ZEISL, H. *Die Arbeitslosen von Marienthal*, 1933. Leipzig, Hinzel.

125 *Leader*, The.

126 LEAVIS, Q. D. 'Lady Novelists and the Lower Orders,' *Scrutiny*, 1934, 4, pp. 112–132.

127 LEWINSKY, HILDE. 'The Nature of Shyness,' *Brit. Jour. Jour. of Psychol.* 32, 1941, pp. 105–113.

128 LEWIS, R. and MAUDE, A. *The English Middle Classes*, 1949, London, Phoenix House, and Penguin Books, 1953.

129 LEWIS, R. and MAUDE, A. *Professional People*, 1952, London, Phoenix House.

130 LINTON, R. Chapter II in *The Cultural Background of Personality*, 1947, London, Kegan Paul.

132 LIPSET, S. M., and BENDIX, R. 'Social Status and Social Structure,' *Brit. J. of Sociol.* 1951, 2, 150–168, 243.

133 *Listener*, The. Nos. 509–514, 1938.

134 LLOYD JAMES, A. *The Broadcast Word*, London, Allen and Unwin.

135 LLOYD JAMES, A. *Our Spoken Language*, London, Methuen.

136 LOGAN, R. F. L. and GOLDBERG, E. M. 'Rising Eighteen in a London Suburb,' *Brit. Jour. of Sociol.*, 4, 1953, pp. 323–345.

137 LYND, R. S. and H. M. *Middletown*, 1929, London, Constable, also *Middletown Revisited.*

137a LYNES, R. 'High Brow, Low Brow, Middle Brow,' *Harpers' Magazine*, Feb. 1949.

138 MACE, C. A. Chapter in *Class Conflict and Social Stratification*, (Ed. T. H. Marshall), London, LePlay House Press.

139 MACE, C. A. 'National Stereotypes, their Nature and Function,' *Sociological Review*, 1948, 35, pp. 29–36.

140 MACRAE, D. G. 'Social Stratification,' *Current Sociology*, 2, 1, 1953–1954, UNESCO publication.

141 MADGE, C. and HARRISSON, T. *Britain by Mass-Observation*, 1939, London, Penguin Books.

142 MAILLAUD, P. *The English Way*, 1945, London.

142a MALLALIEU, J. P. W. 'Mud and Money,' *Contact No.* 11.

143 *Manchester Guardian*, 'More Indifference than Dirt,' Feb. 2nd, 1953.

143a *Manchester Guardian*, 'The Middle Class Way of Life' (pamphlet, March, 1954.)

144 MANNHEIM, K. 'Some Reflections on Crime in War-Time,' *Fortnightly Review*, January, 1942.

145 MARSHALL, A. *The Future of the Working Class*, Lecture; 1873, London.

146 MARSHALL, T. H. 'Social Class—A Preliminary Analysis,' *Sociological Review*, 1934, 26, pp. 55–76.

147 MARSHALL, T. H. (ed). *Class Conflict and Social Stratification*, 1938, London, LePlay House Press.

148 MARSHALL, T. H. *Citizenship and Social Class*, 1950, Cambridge Univ. Press.

149 MARSHALL, T. H. 'The Nature and Determinants of Social Status,' *Year Book of Education*, 1953, London, Evans Bros.

149a MARTIN, F. M. 'Some Subjective Aspects of Social Stratification' (see 81).

149b MARTIN, K. *The Magic of Monarchy*, 1937, London, Nelson.

150 Mass-Observation, *The Pub and the Public*, London, Gollancz.

151 Mass-Observation, *War Factory*, London, Gollancz.

152 MASSINGHAM, HUGH. 'The Bookmaker and the Punter,' *Contact No.* 11.

153 MAUDE, A. *Political Quarterly*, April, 1953. (Review by Cummings, A. J. *News Chronicle*, 21st April, 1953.)

154 MCCALLUM, R. B. 'The Labour Party and the Middle Classes,' *The Listener*, March, 1948.

154a MACCURDY, J. T. *The Structure of Morale*, Cambridge University Press.

155 MEAD, MARGARET. *The American Character*, 1944, London, Penguin Books.

156 MEIER, R. L. 'Research as a Social Process,' *Brit. J. of Sociol.* 1951, II, 91–104.

157 MENEN, AUBREY. *Dead Man in the Silver Market*, 1954, Chatto and Windus.

158 MESS, H. A. *Social Groups in Modern England*, 1940, London, Nelson.

159 MILLER, ALICE DUERR. *The White Cliffs*, 1941, London, Methuen.

160 MILLS, C. W. *White Collar*, 1951, Oxford University Press.

161 MONEY, R. R. 'Mr. A,' *Blackwood's*, 1953, Oct.

162 MORAND, P. *A Frenchman's London*, 1934, London, Cassell.

162a MOSER, C. A. and HALL, J. 'The Social Grading of Occupations,' (see 81).

163 MUELLER, J. H. 'Methods of Measurement of Aesthetic Folkways,' *Amer. J. of Sociol.* 51, pp. 276–282.

163a MURRAY, H. A. (*et. al.*) *Explorations in Personality*, London, Cumberlege.

164 NASH, OGDEN. *Versus*, 1949, Boston; Little, Brown.

165 *New Statesman and Nation*, The

166 NICOLSON, H. Article on 'Snobbishness,' *Spectator*, 20th Jan., 1950.

167 NICOLSON, N. 'What should "A" Do?', *Contact No.* 15.

168 OAKESHOTT, W. F. (*et. al.*) *Men Without Work*. 1938, Cambridge University Press.

169 *Observer, The*, 'British Class Distinctions,' 27th December, 1953.

170 ORWELL, G. *The English People*, 1947, London, Collins. (review by G. W. Stonier, *The Observer*, 3rd August, 1947.)

171 ORWELL, G. *The Road to Wigan Pier*, London, Gollancz.

172 OSBURN, A. *Must England Lose India?*, 1930, London.

173 OVERSTREET, H. A. *The Mature Mind*, 1950, London, Gollancz.

174 PARSONS, T. 'An Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification,' *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 45, pp. 841–862.

175 PARSONS, T. 'The Theory of Social Stratification,' *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 1945, 40, pp. 841–862.

177 PEAR, T. H., LANGDON, J. N. and YATES, EDNA M. 'Transfer of Training and Transference,' *New Era*, 1928.

178 PEAR, T. H. *The Psychology of Conversation*, 1939, London, Nelson.

179 PEAR, T. H. 'Psychologists and Culture,' *Manchester University Press*, and *Bulletin of John Rylands Library*; 1939, Vol. 23.

180 PEAR, T. H. *The Maturing Mind*, 1939, London, Nelson.

181 PEAR, T. H. 'The Social Status of the Psychologist and its Effect Upon his Work,' *Sociol. Rev.*, 34, 1942, pp. 68–81.

182 PEAR, T. H. (ed.) *Psychological Factors of Peace and War*, 1950, London, Hutchinson, pp. 24–25.

183 PEAR, T. H. *Voice and Personality*, 1931, London, Chapman and Hall.

184 PEAR, T. H. *The Psychology of Effective Speaking*, 1933, London, Kegan Paul.

185 PEAR, T. H. Chapter X of Mace, C. A. and Vernon, P. E. (ed.) *Current Trends in British Psychology*, 1953, London, Methuen.

186 PEAR, T. H. 'Personality in its Cultural Context,' Manchester University Press and *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 30, 1942.

187 PEAR, T. H. 'The Concept of Mental Maturity,' 1944, Manchester University Press and *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 28.

188 PEKIN, L. B. *The Public Schools*, 1922, London.

189 PRIESTLEY, J. B. *Out of the People*, 1941, London, Heinemann, and *English Journey*.

190 *Punch.*

191 RATCLIFFE, S. K. 'The English Middle Classes,' *Monthly Record* of Conway Hall, Vol. 54, Oct. 1949.

191a RATCLIFFE, S. K. 'The Changing English Character,' *Monthly Record* of Conway Hall.

192 RAVERAT, GWEN. *Period Piece*, 1952, London, Faber and Faber.

193 RENIER, G. J. *The English, Are They Human?* 1947, London.

194 RIESMAN, D. (*et. al.*) *The Lonely Crowd*, 1952, London, Geoffrey Cumberlege, and *Faces in the Crowd.*

194a ROBERTSON, NANCY E. and WAITES, J. A. 'The Present House of Commons: its Educational and Social Background,' *Brit. J. of Psychol.* 37, 1946, pp. 96-108.

195 ROSS, ALAN, *Punch*, 1953.

195a ROSS, ALAN, 'Fading Heroes,' *Contact No.* 11.

196 ROWNTREE, B. S. and LAVERS, G. R. *English Life and Leisure*, 1951, London, Longmans Green.

196a RUDDOCK, R. 'Middle-Class Wives,' *Manchester Guardian*, 17 Jan., 1953.

197 SACKVILLE-WEST, VICTORIA. *English Country Houses*, 1941, London, Collins.

198 SANSOM, C. *Speech in our Time*, London, Hinrichsen.

198a SCOTT, W. H. *Industrial Leadership and Joint Consultation*, 1952, Liverpool University Press.

199 SHAW, G. B. *Pygmalion*, London, Constable, and Penguin Books.

200 SHERADSKI, RUTH. 'Clothes and Class,' *Contact No.* 10, p. 49.

201 SHILS, E. 'The Present Situation in American Sociology,' 1947, London *Pilot Papers*, 1948 and Glencoe Free Press.

201a SHIRER, W. L. *Berlin Diary*, 1941, New York, Knopf.

201b SHRAPNEL, N. 'The Innocent Following of Speed,' *Manchester Guardian*, 19th April, 1954.

202 SILEX, K. *John Bull at Home*, London.

203 SIMPSON, J. H. *The Future of the Public Schools*, Rugby, George Over.

204 SOROKIN, P. A. *Society, Culture and Personality*, 1947, New York, Harpers.

205 SOROKIN, P. A. *Social Mobility*, 1937, New York, Harpers.

205a SPENDER, S. on 'Snobbery,' *World Review*, March 1950.

206 SPROTT, W. J. H. *Social Psychology*, 1952, London, Methuen.

207 STIEBEL, V. 'London versus Paris versus New York,' *The Leader*, May, 1949.

208 STUTTERHEIM, K. von. *Those English*, London.

209 SWIFT, W. 'Quality Street,' *Contact*, May 1949.

210 TAWNEY, R. H. 'The Rise of the Gentry,' *Econ. Hist. R.* 11. 1941, pp. 1–39.

211 TAWNEY, R. H. *Equality*, 1952, London, Allen and Unwin.

212 THOULESS, R. G. *General and Social Psychology*, 1932, London, University Tutorial Press, pp. 333–345.

213 THOULESS, R. H. *Straight and Crooked Thinking*, 1930, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1953, Pan Books.

213a *Titles and Modes of Address*, London, A. & C. Black.

214 TITMUSS, R. M, *Poverty and Population*, London.

215 TITMUSS, R. M. *Birth, Poverty and Wealth*, 1943, London, H. Hamilton.

216 TREVELYAN, G. M. *English Social History*, 1942, London, Longmans Green.

216a TRUSCOTT, B. *Redbrick University*, Faber and Faber.

217 TUKE, A. W. on 'The Middle Classes,' *News Chronicle*, Feb. 18, 1954.

218 VEBLEN, T. *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, 1926, London, Allen and Unwin.

219 WAGNER, GERTUD. *Our Wartime Guests*, Liverpool, University Press, London, Hodder and Stoughton.

219a WALKER, K. 'The British Mother', *Picture Post*, 62, 6 Feb., 1954, pp. 20–21.

220 WARNER, W. L. and LUNT, T. S. *The Social Life of a Modern Community*, 1941, New Haven, Yale University Press.

221 WARNER, W. L. *Structure of American Life*, 1952, Edinburgh, Univ. Press.

222 WARNER, W. L. and LUNT, P. S. *The Status System of a Modern Community*, 1942, New Haven, Yale University Press.

223 WELLS, H. G. *Kipps*, London.

224 WEST, REBECCA. Chapter in *The Character of England* (see Barker, E.)

225 WEST, REBECCA. *The Meaning of Treason*, 1952, London, Macmillan.

226 WILKES, L. 'The Boxer Asks No Pity,' *Contact No.* 11.

226a WILKINS, L. T. 'Estimating the Social Class of Towns,' 1952, *Applied Statistics*, 1, pp. 27–33.

227 WILLIAMS, F. *News Chronicle.*

228 WILSON, E. *The Wound and the Bow*, 1942, London, Secker and Warburg.

229 WILSON, E. *Europe Without Baedeker*, London, Secker and Warburg.

229a WILSON, E. 'Notes on the British,' *New Yorker*, Oct. 6, 1945.

230 WILSON, R. A. *The Miraculous Birth of Language*, 1941, London, Dent.

231 WINGFIELD-STRATFORD, E. *The Making of a Gentleman*, 1938, London.

231a WOOLF, VIRGINIA. *A Room of One's Own.*

232 WOOTTON, BARBARA. 'Some Aspects of the Social Structure of England and Wales,' *Adult Education*, 1940, 13, pp. 97–116.

233 WOOTTON, BARBARA. *End Social Inequality*, 1941, London, Kegan Paul.

234 WORSLEY, T. C. *Barbarians and Philistines*, 1940, London, Robert Hale.

234a *Year Book of Education*, 1951, London, Evans Bros.

235 YEATMAN, R. J. and SELLAR, W. C. *Horse Nonsense*, 1933, London, Methuen.

235a YOUNG, G. M. *Early Victorian England*, London.

236 ZWEIG, F. *Work, Wealth and Poverty*, Gollancz.

237 ZWEIG, F. *Men in the Pits*, London, Gollancz.

238 ZWEIG, F. *The British Worker*, London, Pelican Books.

239 ZWEIG, F. *Women's Work and Wages*, London, Gollancz.

240 ANDERSON, C. A. and SCHNAPER, M. *School and Society in England; the Social Backgrounds of Oxford and Cambridge Students*, 1952, Washington, Public Affairs Press.

241 ANON. "The Keele Experiment," *Planning*, 20, No. 372, 18 October, 1954.

242 ANON. "Background of the University Student," *Planning*, 20, No. 373, 8 November, 1954.

AUTHOR INDEX

ABSHAGEN, K., 271
Adler, A., 131
Allingham, Margery, 66
Allister, R., 109, 116
Allport, G. W., 203, 212
Amory, C., 280
Anson, H., 100
Arnold, T., 206
Auden, W. H. 125, 126

BAKKE, E. W., 60
Badger, 206, 207
Ballard, P. B., 194
Barker, E., 199, 271
Beaglehole, E., 192
Behrman, S. N., 13, 14
Bendix, R., 27, 151
Benedict, Ruth, 122
Blackburn, J. M., 58, 60, 271
Bloomfield, P., 134
Blyth, R., 280
Bonham-Carter, Violet, 199, 270, 274
Bridie, J., 270, 282, 283
Brogan, D. W., 58, 203, 211, 242, 270, 277, 285
Bühler, Charlotte, 203
Burt, C. L., 42, 43, 44, 45, 91, 203, 240

CAMPBELL, W. J., 240–1
Centers, R., 10–1, 16–7
Chambers, Rosalind C., 135/6
Chapman, D., 44
Chase, Mary Ellen, 149
Chase, S., 121
Cohen, J., 21
Cohen-Portheim, P., 272
Cole, G. D. H., 58, 139, 140, 144
Cole, Margaret, 20, 58, 170, 288
Connolly, C., 203, 220, 283
Cooke, A., 17
Coward, N., 138
Croce, B., 131
Croome, Honor, 146
Cummings, A. J., 16

DARLINGTON, C. D., 21
Darwin, B., 206
David, A., 207
Davies, A. F., 31
Delane, Mary, 171
Dibelius, 272
Dickens, Monica, 135, 138
Dicks, H. V., 192
'Dogberry', 243

ELIOT, T. S., 13, 16, 124, 125–6–7–8, 148, 167
Ervine, St. J., 271, 284
Eysenck, H. J., 17

FADIMAN, C., 209
Floud, Jean, 17, 239
Flugel, J. C., 72, 99, 171, 172, 218
Fowler, F. G., 146
Fowler, H. W., 146
Fox, T. F., 37–9
Freud, S., 131
Fyfe, H., 271

GOLLANCZ, V., 202
Galsworthy, J., 73, 138
Galton, F., 47–8
Gardner, L., 241
Gems, Pamela H., 243
Ginsberg, M., 58, 270–1, 280–1
Glass, D., 69, 135, 239
Glover, E., 203
Goffman, E., 33
Gorer, G., 122, 200, 220
Graham, Virginia, 89, 132, 138, 256
Graves, R., 90

HACHETTE, 146
Hahn, Emily, 270, 272
Hall, J., 31
Halsey, A. H., 28, 239, 241
Halsey, Margaret, 270, 272, 280
Hamburger, P., 280
Harris, K., 105
Harrisson, T., 220
Heard, G., 40
Himmelweit, Hilde, 28
Hogben, L., 21, 76
Hollowood, B., 245
Hokinson, Helen, 280
Hughes, D., 219
Hyman, H. H., 25–6

JAHODA, MARIE, 60, 203
James, A. Lloyd, 70
Jephcott, Pearl, 116, 157, 162, 250
Joad, C. E. M., 247

Jones, D. C., 31
Jones, D., 95
Jones, T., 81, 82
Joyce, William, 51, 131
Jung, C. G., 131

KAFKA, 131
Keeton, G. W., 53
Kelly, W.H., 122
Kierkegaard, S., 131
Kimbrough, Emily, 280
Kluckhohn, C., 122
Koestler, A , 131
Krakauer, S., 133, 134

LANGDON, J. N., 196
Laski, H. J., 52, 53, 75, 81, 82
Laski, Marghanita, 135
Laver, J., 168, 172, 174, 178, 179, 270, 275
Lavers, G. R., 157
Lewis, R., 16, 17, 39, 40, 58, 123, 146, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 288
Lingard, Nancy E., 49
Linton, R., 121
Lipset, S. M., 27, 151
Lynes, R., 132

MABERLEY, A., 203
Macdonell, A. G., 243
Mace, C. A., 271
MacRae, D. G., 45, 46, 47
Madaraiga, S. da, 270
Maillaud, Pierre, 270, 271, 281
Marshall, A., 26
Marshall, T. H., 26, 37, 58
Martin, F. M., 239
Massingham, H., 252
Maude, A., 16, 17, 39, 40, 58, 123, 146, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 288
Maurois, A., 283
McCallum, R. B., 145
McDougall, W., 43, 191
MacLaren, M., 270, 282, 283
Mead, Margaret, 166, 122, 203
Meier, R. L., 32
Menen, A., 270, 285
Mess, H. A., 58
Miller, Alice D., 63, 272
Mills, C. W., 47
Mitford, Nancy, 138, 280
Morand, P., 272
Mortimer, R., 281
Mueller, J. H., 36
Murray, H. A., 212
Myers, C. S., 43

Nicolson, H., 105
Nicolson, N., 91, 107

OPPENHEIM, A. N., 28
Orwell, G., 102, 103, 202, 220, 270
Osburn, A., 206
Overstreet, H. A., 203

PEAR, T. H., 49, 196
Petty, Mary, 280
Phillips, H., 243
Pickford, R. W., 257
Pirandello, L., 131
Pitman, I. J., 270, 276
Potter, S., 244
Priestley, J. B., 63, 64, 65, 66, 203

RATCLIFFE, S. K., 153, 154, 270, 278
Raverat, Gwen, 144
Renier, G. J., 270, 272
Richardson, Dorothy M., 71
Riesman, D., 47
Robertson, A., 16
Ross, A., 259

SANSOM, C., 102, 103
Sarte, J. P., 131
Shaw, G. B., 70, 71, 92, 93, 138, 283
Sherriff, R. C., 122
Sheradski, Ruth, 170
Shirer, W., 215
'Shy, T.', 243
Silex, K., 270, 271
Sitwell, O., 138
Skinner, C. O., 272
Smith, Adam, 38
Smith, May, 203
Sorokin, P., 10, 11
Spectator, The, 17
Spencer, F. H., 203, 219
Sprott, W. J. H., 58
Stiebel, V., 170
'Struther, Jan', 138
Stutterheim, Kurt v., 270, 271, 281

TAWNEY, R. H., 58
Thirkell, Angela, 138, 280
Thompson, L., 113
Thomson, G. H., 191
Thorndike, E. L., 203
Thouless, R. H., 58, 60, 61, 125, 217
Titmuss, R., 68
Trevelyan, G. M., 139
'Truscott, B.', 222
Tuke, A. W., 166

VEBLEN, T., 46

WAITES, J. A., 49
Warner, W. L., 31
Wells, H. G., 135, 138
West, Rebecca, 270, 276
Wilkes, L., 264
Williams, F., 57
Wilson, E., 108, 124, 272
Wilson, R. A., 71
Wodehouse, P. G., 280
Woolf, Virginia, 131
Wootton, Barbara, 17, 24, 58, 67, 76, 215
Wyndham-Lewis D. B., 243

YATES, E. M., 196

ZAHAROFF, B., 23
Zweig, F., 21, 60, 157, 159, 160, 161, 162, 288

SUBJECT INDEX

'Accent', 96, 113f, 157, 214, 230
Adolescence, 28, 102, 116, 226
Age, 98
Aggressiveness, 84
Amateur, 247–8, 259
Ambivalence, 88, 96, 218
Americans, 12, 42, 45, 48, 59, 62, 71, 86, 93, 96, 105, 108, 182, 243, 247, 272, 277
Analysis, social, 15
Anthropologists, 14, 15, 43, 106, 109, 116, 180, 185, 234
Architecture, 275
Aristocrats, 37, 41, 44, 59, 66, 74, 142, 153, 235, 273, 278
Art, 14
Arts Council, 216
Ascot, 12
Athletics, 263
Attitudes, 16, 26

Bankers, 176–7, 178
Battledress, 168
B.B.C., 24, 60, 71, 76, 129, 130, 131, 167, 181, 216, 217, 235, 243, 245–6, 284
Beauty, 46, 74, 96
Book Clubs, 131
Bourgeoisie, 132, 153, 155, 278
Bowls, 246
Boxing, 21, 68, 246, 263f
Brahmans, 285

Cambridge, 129, 144, 227, 233, 236, 259, 265
Character, individual, 41, 75, 111, 115, 189, 190, 201
Character, national, 48, 199f, 270f
Character structure, 192
Charm, 46
Churches, 17, 41, 126
Cinema, 43, 89, 106, 243
Civil Services, 81–2
Civilisation, 119
Class, 10, 16–17, 29, 34, 43, 47, 123, 125, 138f, 163f, 180f, 213, 281
Clichés, 91
Climbing, 276
Clothes, 30, 45, 60, 99, 149, 169f, 213, 228, 248, 268
Clubs, 78, 229, 236
Cockney speech, 71, 90, 93, 103
Colleges, 209, 220f
Communists, 142, 218, 57
Concepts, 9
Conservatives, 104, 153, 155, 218, 221
Conversation, 81, 227, 230, 277f
Convivial relations, 43, 77, 108
Coronation, 9, 45, 156, 169
Cricket, 230, 236, 243, 244–5, 248, 251, 260
Criticism, 14
Culture, 13, 26, 72, 109, 119f, 216, 231, 292
Culture-pattern, 53, 122, 212, 218, 223, 273
Curator groups, 36, 91

Dances, 232
Dartmouth 41, 111f
Debates, 209, 226, 235–6
Delinquency, 56, 73
Democracy, 46, 242, 262
Dialect, 80, 87f, 92, 105
Diplomatic Services, 81
Discussions, 19, 209, 235–8
Dogs, 253
Dons, 236f
Dress (see Clothes)
Drinking, 23, 41, 43, 72, 81, 180, 229

Eating, 43, 180, 248, 72, 117
Economic factors, 13, 21, 43, 59, 63, 77, 147, 156, 240, 243, 249, 262
Education, 209f, 239, 273
Egalitarianism, 215
Ego-involvement, 15
Élites, 14, 19, 24f, 41, 47f, 123, 252
Emollient phrases, 101
Empathy, 244
Etiquette, 81, 85f, 106, 232, 235
Euphemisms, 60, 69, 89
Evacuation, 79, 160
Exclusiveness, 35, 59, 91, 99f, 107–8

Facial expression, 85, 94, 201, 214, 230
Fagging, 205
Family, 68, 78, 111, 148, 154, 160
Fashions, 15, 90, 98f, 168f, 228
Fathers, 160
Fighting Services, 18, 22, 33, 72, 81, 81, 94, 101, 102, 112, 152, 155, 160, 173, 197, 216–7, 219, 286
Fishing, 243, 255f

Fives, 248
Football, Association, 243, 245, 250, 257f, 285
Football, Rugby, 230, 236, 243, 244, 248, 247, 287f
Foreign and Diplomatic Service, 198
Foreigners, 157, 217, 278
Foremen, 158

Gentlemen, 26, 34, 66, 149–150, 153, 165, 176, 228
Gesture, 85
Girls, 157, 162
Golf, 78, 245, 251, 261f
Goodwill, 85f, 109f
Greyhound racing, 248
'Guinea-Pig, The,' 198

HEAD MASTER'S CONFERENCE, 198
HEREDITY, 48, 51, 54, 74, 149
Hierarchy, 168–9, 209
Highbrows, 132, 218
Historical background, 47, 139
Hockey, 246, 261
Humour, 46, 84, 88, 109, 238, 271, 278
Honorary Degrees, 22, 23
Horses, 13, 253
House of Commons, 182
Hunting, 12, 101, 172, 243, 248, 254f

IMPERSONATIONS, 89
Inclusiveness, 35, 99, 109
Income, 44
Individual differences, 31
Inferiority-complex, 15, 67, 88, 186, 218
Intellect, 14, 26, 151, 193, 218, 221, 276
Intelligence, 28, 94, 132, 231, 239
Intelligentsia, 141
Introversion, 244

JUDGES, 24, 47, 123

LABOURERS, 158
Labour Party, 41, 155
Lawn Tennis, 168
Lawyers, 19, 22
Leadership, 74, 210
Lectures, 232
Leisure, 37, 74, 157, 211, 269
Lords, 20, 54, 104, 150
Lowbrows, 132, 218
Loyalty, 199, 205

MANNERS, 14, 30, 46, 49, 61, 72, 79, 81, 82f, 84, 85f, 106, 109–10, 115, 124, 143, 205, 212, 214, 217–9, 234, 277
Manual work, 22, 40, 69
Marxism, 31, 46
Masses, 65
Mass Observation, 157, 213, 246
Maturity, 189, 198, 203f, 226
Medical profession, 20, 24, 152–3, 164
Men, 231
Mental Health, 23
Members of Parliament, 113, 123, 152, 49f
Merchant Navy, 203
'Middlebrows', 133
Middle Classes, 16, 27, 60, 87, 100, 128, 139, 146f, 166f, 230, 243, 278
Milk Bars, 183f, 187
Mobility, Social, 21, 29f, 69, 239, 241
Morale, 210
'Much Binding', 94, 217
Motor Racing, 262
Music, 13, 36, 127, 246, 250

National Health Service, 20, 41, 153
'Natural history' of society, 9
Narcissism, 263
Nayars, 285
Nazism, 47
'New Look', 170
'New Poor', 147-8
'New Rich', 153
New Yorker, 279
North (of England), 47, 63, 70, 86, 100, 103, 159, 163, 230, 234, 240
Norwood Report, 209, 212, 237
Novelists, 71, 72
Nurseries, 79

Observer, The, 163f
Occupation, 11, 18, 31, 57, 77, 115f, 287
O.C.T.U., 204
Olympic Games, 246–7, 253
'Oxbridge', 209, 219f
Oxford, 227, 233, 259, 265

PARENTS, 199, 231, 241, 273f
Patriotism, 205
Personality, 31, 52, 90, 111, 121, 189, 201–2, 212
Phenomena, 10
Phoneticians, 83, 86, 91
Poverty, 17, 68, 79, 157
Prefect system, 206
Prejudices, 287f

Preparatory Schools, 173, 189, 199
Press, The, 22f, 25, 111, 243, 245–6, 282
Prestige, 31, 68. 77, 209, 215f
Prime Minister, 204
Privilege, 57, 67, 76, 84, 216
Prize-days, 220
'Professionals', 19, 21–2, 37f, 40f, 62, 243, 247
Professions, 152, 166, 278
'Profiteers', 280
Proletariat, 66
Property, 68, 73, 155, 44
Psychiatrists, 202
Psychoanalysts, 18, 102, 189, 196
Psychologists, 210
Public-houses, 76, 160–2, 183
Public Schools, 161, 165, 173, 189f, 293 (*see also* Schools)
Punch, 279f
'Pygmalion' 72, 88, 92, 100

RACING, 245, 252
Radicals, 58
Radio, 9, 14, 19, 44, 73, 87, 97, 104, 106
Railway trains, 12
Rank, 18, 20, 25, 33, 57, 202
Rationing, 169
'Redbrick', 209, 222
Religion, 74, 126, 181, 278, 291
Residence, in Universities, 224f, 235
Responsibility, 204
Restaurants, 181, 183
Restrictions, 34f
Rowing, 222, 236, 268f
Royal Society, 14, 24
Ruling Class, 76f

SAILING, 266f
'Savile Row', 256
Scents, 215
Scholarships, 228
Schools, 13, 15, 28f, 32, 36, 50f, 70, 73, 82, 101, 104, 114, 205f, 229f, 239, 290
Scientists, 32, 38, 123
Scotsmen, 113, 234
Segregation, 200
Sentiments, 83, 189, 191, 196, 232
Servants, 174
Sex-attractiveness, 36, 174, 177
Shooting, 78, 243, 256
Shyness, 127
Skating, 249
Ski-ing, 249, 265
Skill, 41, 158f
Snack Bars, 183
Snobs, 67–8, 129f, 165, 209, 216
Socialism, 10, 41
Social ladder, 157
Social Psychology, 21, 40, 42, 58, 106, 180, 211, 244
Sociologists, 21, 41, 45, 87, 239
'Sound-barrier', 113, 164
South (of England), 47, 63, 70, 100, 159
Speaking, 14, 18, 27, 30, 60, 69f, 85f, 105f, 204, 213f, 287
Speech-Melody, 71, 82, 85, 93, 102
Speedway racing, 249
Spectators, 248, 261
Spelling, 86
'Spivs', 178
Sport, 18, 75, 243f
Standard English, 92, 104, 134
Standardisation, 171
State, 37, 39, 41
Status, 21, 25, 26, 37f, 57, 59f
Stereotypes, 97
Stratum, 10, 18, 45, 58f, 119, 144, 150–1, 169, 182, 212–3, 239, 269
Style, 201, 217, 234
Swimming, 265
Symbols, 33, 59
Syndicalism, 31

TABLENAPKINS, 185
Taboos, 89, 90, 91, 180, 209
Taste, 35–6
Teachers, 22, 25, 32, 39, 102, 152
Technicians, 39
Television, 9, 45, 73, 128, 164
Tennis, 251, 261
Third Programme, 60–1
Times of eating, 184
Tipping, 182, 184, 228
Titles, 25
Tolerance, 75, 84
Trade, 13, 21–2, 24, 62, 78, 153, 176, 228
Tradition, 223, 228
Training, 38f, 43, 189f
Transferance, 196
Transfer of thinking, 56, 189, 193f
Treason, 51f
Tutors, 232

UNEMPLOYMENT, 264
Under-statement, 277–8
Unions (University), 221, 235–6
Universities, 14, 22, 50f, 105, 108, 209f, 290

Upper Classes, 17, 19, 27, 41, 44, 46, 75, 85f, 96, 100, 106, 138–9–40, 142, 231, 243, 254
U.S.S.R., 204
Utility, 168–9, 170, 177

Validity of judgment, 95f
Vocabulary, 102
Voice, 96, 213, 230, 281

War, 10, 42, 83
Wealth, 59, 66, 77, 228, 229, 231, 236, 265
Welfare State, 92, 167, 269
'White-collared' class, 217
Winchester, 166
Winter Sports, 264f
Women, 135, 231
Working Classes, 17, 29, 76f, 79, 96, 103, 138, 156f, 230, 272, 277, 280, 283, 286
Wrestling, 264

'Yankee City', 27



GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD
London: 40 Museum Street, W.C.1

Auckland: Haddon Hall, City Road
Sydney, N.S.W.: Bradbury House, 55 York Street
Cape Town: 58–60 Long Street
Bombay: 15 Graham Road, Ballard Estate, Bombay 1
Calcutta: 17 Chittaranjan Avenue, Calcutta 13
New Delhi: 13–14 Ajmere Gate Extension, New Delhi 1
Karachi: Haroon Chambers, South Napier Road, Karachi 2
Toronto: 91 Wellington Street West
Sao Paulo: Avenida 9 de Julho 1138–Ap. 51

The Social Foundations of Wage Policy

BARBARA WOOTTON

Demy 8vo About 15s. net

Barbara Wootton seeks to uncover some of the social influences which affect the determination of wage and salary rates. The pay of every worker—miner, doctor, shipwright or archbishop—is found to be not only the result of a bargain in economic terms, but also an expression of the social attitudes on the part of the community. Moreover, the growth during the present century both of collective bargaining and of the practice of submitting wage claims to arbitration has greatly encouraged the discussion of wage and salary questions on a social and ethical, rather than a purely economic, plane. These developments are illustrated by a review of some of the features of the wage and salary structure of post-war Britain.

History of the Homeland

HENRY HAMILTON

Demy 8vo 18s. net

"It is an inspiring as well as a highly instructive study, popular in form while scholarly in substance. *Very Rev. Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury*

Education and the Social Order

BERTRAND RUSSELL

4th Impression Crown 8vo 9s. 6d. net

"Most stimulating . . . every chapter of it will repay careful study." *Scotsman*

"It is consolingly practical . . . inspiritingly original." *Time and Tide*

"All through the book there runs a note of conviction, and of a respect for intellectual sincerity which almost amounts to reverence." *Journal of Education*

"Immensely sane and stimulating." *Daily Herald*

"Brilliant and provocative. . . . A contribution to the theory and practice of education which even his opponents ignore at their peril." *Nature*

GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN LTD